

**State of Welfare Families on Reservations: Progress, Setbacks, and Issues for
Reauthorization
(Working Paper 3)**

Shanta Pandey, Ph.D.
Eddie F. Brown, D.S.W.
Min Zhan, Ph.D.
Sarah Hicks, Doctoral Student
Patricia Welch, Doctoral Student

**Kathryn M. Buder Center for American Indian Studies
George Warren Brown School of Social Work
Washington University
One Brookings Drive
St. Louis, MO 63130**

September 12, 2001

This research is supported by a grant from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Washington, D.C. The opinions expressed are solely those of the authors.

Acknowledgements

We wish to thank a number of individuals who helped make this report possible. We are grateful to the 350 respondents who agreed to participate in this study. Without their support, this report would not have been possible. We want to thank the tribal consultants who conducted the interviews. Many tribal representatives of the three reservations (Navajo, Salt River and San Carlos) and the staff from the Inter Tribal Council of Arizona (ITCA), Bureau of Indian Affairs (Phoenix), and the Arizona Department of Social Security (DES) worked closely with us in making this study possible. They provided thoughtful comments to this report. To maintain confidentiality we will not mention their names. Debbie Geddes, our project secretary, coordinated the needs of the interviewers. Many students from the George Warren Brown School of Social Work helped in data entry. We want to particularly recognize the efforts of Man-fai Wu, Gyanesh Lama, Seow Ling Ong, Aya Kawasaki, and Sarah G. Comstock, who participated in data entry.

**State of Welfare Families on Reservations: Progress, Setbacks, and Issues for
Reauthorization
(Working Paper 3)**

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Introduction 1

Chapter 1: Are the Lives of Welfare Families on Reservations Improving?..... 4

Chapter 2: Issues for Welfare Reform Reauthorization in Indian Country..... 28

References 36

Appendix I..... 39

Executive Summary

1. Longitudinal data indicate that marginally higher proportions of welfare recipients on reservations are engaged in education, training, and employment compared to last year.

2. Welfare recipients on reservations continue to have lower levels of education than the general welfare population in the nation. They are not equipped to exit welfare without additional job preparation. Policies should be developed to support human capital development on reservations. For example, TANF work requirements should be waived and the benefit should be provided in full for women who are participating in education.
3. Despite a record low unemployment rate at the national level, the unemployment rate remains high among working age populations on many Indian reservations. The 1995, 1997, and 1999 Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) reports indicated that on many reservations 50 percent of the working age population were not participating in the labor force. A shortage of employment opportunities on reservations is reflected in the sample. Of the total sample, only a small percentage (15%) of the respondents have found employment compared to their counterparts in the nation. Therefore, job opportunities must be created on reservations before we can expect welfare families to exit welfare. This will require increasing tribes' access to funds for economic development. For example, funding streams for economic development could be made available to tribes that do not have Community Development Corporations. Another approach might be to create an Indian program that supports and promotes job creation for the welfare population.
4. Most of the employed respondents are not escaping poverty. With an average hourly wage of \$6.8 and monthly wage of \$591, they continue to live below the poverty line and to report material hardship, such as food, fuel, and clothing insufficiency. Many of these households continue to rely on public assistance. Jobs must pay a living wage so that those who are working full time are able to exit welfare.
5. Support services (transportation and childcare) are severely inadequate on reservations. Demand for transportation and childcare has increased. Only 25 percent of the respondents owned an automobile, many of which were not reliable. Due to lack of transportation, many women had difficulty getting basic tasks done (e.g., going to the grocery store, doctor, or work). Eighty-six percent of the sample had children under the age of 13, with an average of 2.5 children under age 13 per respondent. Only a few respondents received help to defray the costs of childcare. At the same time, support from families and friends are declining. Therefore, to help families exit welfare, more funds for support services must be made available.
6. Since PRWORA was enacted, the TANF rolls have declined on some reservations. A large portion of the remaining caseload is composed of families with one or more adults unable to work and to successfully enter and remain in the workforce. Welfare recipients who comply with all program requirements should not be arbitrarily dropped from assistance because of the lack of available jobs in their communities. An expansion of the hardship exemption is a way to deal with this issue. Another option would be to "stop the clock" (or discount months on assistance) for recipients that are meeting all the program requirements but still receiving some subsidy/assistance or simply cannot find employment.

7. American Indian adults residing on reservations with a 50 percent or higher rate of joblessness are exempted from the five-year benefit limitation but required to comply with all other program requirements. The 50 percent threshold is not based on any empirical evidence. Options for dealing with the 50 percent rate should be sought.
8. Majority of tribal communities are still served by state TANF programs. States should consult with tribes in the development of their state TANF program and ensure that tribal members who are not served by tribal TANF programs truly have “equitable access” to state services.
9. The number of tribal TANF grantees is increasing every year. To date, 34 tribal plans have been approved. Some tribes have devoted a significant portion of their tribal resources toward welfare reform requirements. Innovative ways to administer TANF are also being developed on reservations. Tribes that are administering TANF do not have the same opportunity as states to design, modernize, and customize programs and services. Tribal efforts should be encouraged by escalating current funding, increasing program flexibilities, improving cooperation between tribes and states, and by adopting poverty reduction as a goal of welfare reform.
10. The five-year life time limit policy is difficult to justify for most welfare recipients on reservations. Childcare slots and public transportation facilities are severely inadequate. Educational level is very low. The five-year life time limit clock should stop for recipients attending or waiting to attend the educational and training programs. Similarly, the clock should stop for the recipients who are waiting to enroll their children in childcare and if they reside in areas where public transportation is severely inadequate.

Introduction

The passage of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) of 1996 (Public Law 104-193) was a turning point in our nation’s approach to public assistance for poor families with children. The legislation brought an end to the 60-year-old Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program as an entitlement to individuals. The 1996 federal welfare legislation replaced AFDC, emergency assistance and the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) programs¹ with the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant. According to this law, adults can receive cash assistance for a maximum of five² cumulative years in their lifetime³ (or less at state option) and must start working within two years of receiving assistance. The law requires that states put 50 percent of single parents receiving cash assistance in work programs for at least 30 hours per week⁴ by FY 2002 (U.S. Congress, 1996).

All states were required to begin - implementation of the new law by July 1, 1997. The state of Arizona received a waiver from the federal government and began implementing its version of welfare reform, the *EMPOWER* (Employing and Moving People Off Welfare

and Encouraging Responsibility) program, as part of its TANF block grant on November 1, 1995. Arizona has opted to provide benefits to adults for a maximum of 24 months within the first 60 months and to waive the 24-month time limit for adults residing on reservations with a 50 percent or higher rate of joblessness.⁵ While Arizona continues to use the required 60-month lifetime limit, an adult recipient has to collect these benefits over a period of at least 11 years (a maximum of 24 months of benefit within the first five years, 24 months of benefits in the following five years and 12 months of benefits in the 11th or last year) (Pandey, Zhan, Collier-Tenison, & Hui, 2000a).

Another dimension of the PRWORA of 1996 is that Section 412 of this legislation has bestowed power upon tribal governments that wish to administer their own public assistance programs (U.S. Congress, 1996). The legislation authorizes the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) to provide direct funding to tribes intending to design and implement their own TANF services. Under the 1996 legislation, tribes can negotiate directly with the Secretary of the DHHS in order to design and implement TANF services to fit their own unique conditions.

¹ However, JOBS funding will continue (under the Native Employment Works JOBS program) on American Indian reservations where JOBS programs have previously been administered.

² The PRWORA of 1996 has exempted adults residing on reservations with populations of at least 1,000 and jobless rates of at least 50 percent from the five-year life time limit. The federal Balanced Budget Act, passed on August 5, 1997, has modified the PRWORA of 1996 by removing the requirement of “population of at least 1,000” and has exempted adults residing on reservations of any size with 50 percent or higher jobless rates from the five-year life time limit (The U.S. Congress, 1997).

³ States may exempt up to 20% of their caseloads from the five-year lifetime benefit limitation in addition to the five-year benefit limitation exemption of American Indians residing on reservations with a 50 percent or higher rate of joblessness.

⁴ Twenty hours per week for single parents with a child under age six.

⁵ Arizona used the Bureau of Indian Affairs’ 1995 Labor Statistics to determine the jobless rate by looking at the percentage of persons not employed in the potential labor force on reservations and has exempted from the two-year time limits all adults residing on Navajo, White Mountain, Hopi, Tohono O’Odham, San Carlos, San Juan Paiute, Camp Verde and Havasupai reservations.

Many tribes see this as an opportunity to protect tribal families with children by shifting the focus of social services from temporary and rehabilitative to long-term and development-oriented (Pandey, Brown, Scheuler-Whitaker, Gundersen, Eyrich, & Villarreal, 1999a; Pandey, Brown, Scheuler-Whitaker, Gundersen, & Eyrich, 1999b). As a result, there is a growing interest among tribes to administer TANF services on their own instead of allowing states to administer the services on reservations (Pandey, et al. 1999b). Thus far, the DHHS has approved 34 tribal plans serving 170 tribes in the nation. These tribes are administering their TANF services. Of the three Arizona reservations (Salt River, Navajo and San Carlos) from which the data are collected for this study, Salt River began implementing TANF on June 1, 1999, Navajo Nation on October 1, 2000, and the state of Arizona continues to administer TANF on the San Carlos reservation. The impact of the 1996 welfare

legislation on families with children may vary depending upon who administers the services—the state or the tribe. The data analyzed in this report was collected while the state administered TANF on two (San Carlos & Navajo) of the three reservations and the tribe (Salt River) administered TANF programs on the third reservation.

The state of Arizona used the 1995 and 1997 Bureau of Indian Affairs' (BIA) Labor Statistics to determine the jobless rate by looking at the percentage of persons not employed in the potential labor force on reservations. Consequently, adults residing on two of the three reservations (Navajo and San Carlos) have been exempted from the two-year time limits. Salt River reservation is close to Phoenix and has less than 50 percent unemployment of the working age population (BIA, 1995, 1997). San Carlos and Navajo are geographically isolated and have over 50 percent of their working age population not in the labor force (BIA, 1995, 1997).

The aim of this study is to monitor the impact of the 1996 federal welfare reform legislation over a period of five years (September 1997-August 2002) on families with children, as well as on the delivery of social services on reservations in the State of Arizona. Our study examines the effects of the 1996 federal welfare legislation and informs the public policy debate on improving economic opportunities for reservations' families with children. We have generated a series of reports and academic articles to provide ongoing feedback to federal, state and local policy makers, social service providers, advocates and tribal members about how families are faring on reservations with the implementation of welfare reform.

In 1999, we produced a comprehensive report based on the data collected between 1997 and 1998 (Pandey, et al. 1999a), which focused on aspects of reform implementation and outcomes. In the same year, we published an article that examines early experiences of tribes in their attempt to administer TANF programs and services (Pandey, et al. 1999b).

In 2000, we produced another report (Working Paper 2) based on our first wave of data collected in 1998-1999, which included 445 respondents from three reservations (Salt River, Navajo and San Carlos) (Pandey et al. 2000a). This report documented how families were faring under welfare reform on reservations. Several manuscripts under review for journal publication document issues related to welfare experiences of service providers and recipients on reservations (Pandey, Brown, Scheuler-Whitaker, & Collier-Tenison, forthcoming; Pandey & Collier-Tenison, under review; Pandey & Zhan, under review).

This report (Working Paper 3) has two chapters. The first chapter is based on our second wave of interviews with 350 either former or current welfare families with children conducted between September 1999 and August 2000. The first wave of interviews was conducted with the same respondents between September 1998 and 1999. The respondents were from three Indian reservations (Navajo, San Carlos and Salt River) within Arizona. This information was substantiated by several focus group interviews with welfare recipients and tribal social service providers. The results provide useful insights into understanding the characteristics of welfare recipients on reservations across time. As documented in our report from wave 1 data (Working Paper 2), a substantial proportion of respondents from these reservations continue to report a serious shortage of job opportunities and support services. Welfare recipients on reservations continue to have lower levels of education than the general welfare population in the nation. Compared to wave 1, the percentage of respondents receiving welfare benefits declined and their employment rate increased marginally in wave 2. However, even with this increase in employment rate, employment rate of welfare recipients on reservations remains extremely low compared to their counterparts in the

nation. Moreover, even the few who are employed continue to earn incomes below poverty level. These respondents continue to report material hardship, such as food, fuel, and clothing insufficiency. Compared to last year (wave 1), a higher percentage of respondents in wave 2 held negative opinions towards welfare changes, as they encountered numerous obstacles in their attempt to exit welfare. We further underscore the role of federal, state, and tribal governments in addressing multiple problems that families on reservations encounter as they strive to exit welfare.

The second chapter of this report not only relies on evidence presented in the first chapter but also on the information we collected at numerous tribal meetings, seminars and workshops that were held across the country in the past three years. List of meetings, seminar and workshops attended are presented in Appendix I. This chapter identifies issues for congressional reauthorization in 2002.

Chapter 1: Are the Lives of Welfare Families on Reservations Improving?

In this chapter we analyze the second wave of survey data obtained from face to face interviews with 350 current or former welfare recipients (out of 445 respondents from wave 1) from three reservations--Navajo, San Carlos and Salt River. The interviews were conducted in 1999-2000. Specially trained tribal members were responsible for conducting these interviews. They were able to locate and interview 79 percent (n=350) out of 445 respondents interviewed in the previous year. The follow up interview rates were high on two smaller reservations--Salt River (89%) and San Carlos (91%) compared to Navajo (66%). Geographic isolation, remote residence and greater mobility of poor families on reservations have made follow up interviews more challenging and difficult, particularly on Navajo. The sampling method was non-probability convenience. In addition, we visited the three reservations several times between January 1997 and April 2001 and conducted group interviews with tribal and state service providers as well as welfare recipients on these reservations. Survey data is substantiated using the qualitative information from these focus group interviews. Specifically, this chapter of the report addresses the following questions:

1. What are the demographic, social, and economic characteristics of American Indian families with children who are either current or former welfare recipients?
2. To what extent are current or former welfare recipients receiving public assistance in childcare, health care and transportation, and how does this assistance affect parents' participation in work activities or in education and training programs?
3. What is the range of basic and job-related skills of American Indian parents who are current or former welfare recipients? What are the characteristics of recipients who find work?
4. What are the reservation-based or individual level barriers to raising the skills and employment potential of American Indian parents who are current or former welfare recipients?

5. What strategies are parents, particularly those who are sanctioned or impacted by time limits and work requirements, using to attain economic independence?
6. What are the similarities and differences among the three reservations?
7. What are the similarities and differences between data from wave 1 and wave 2?

To address these questions, simple descriptive statistical analysis was utilized. The findings are presented.

Findings

In this study, a total of 350 welfare recipients were interviewed from three tribal communities: Salt River (n=64), San Carlos (n=149), and Navajo (n=137).

Gender

Gender breakdown of the sample was 95.4 percent women and 4.6 percent men.

Race

Out of 341 respondents who answered this question, 340 (99.7%) were American Indians or Native Alaskans, with one (0.3%) Hispanic.

Age

The mean age was 37.8 years, ranging from 19.6 years old to 68.4 years old. Nearly 90 percent (n=311) of respondents were between 20 to 50 years old.

Household size

The mean household size was 5.6. The average number of household members who moved out and moved in since last year was .22 and .79, respectively.

Marital status

Among 343 respondents, forty-one percent (n=142) of the respondents were never married, another 41 percent (n=141) were separated, divorced or widowed and only 17.5 percent (n=60) were married and living with their husband. Among the 90 (29%) respondents who were currently living with their boyfriend or partner, 56 percent were never married, 36 percent were separated, divorced or widowed and 8 percent were married.

Welfare status of families when growing up

Nearly half of the 300 participants (46.7%, n=140) reported that their families received welfare when they were growing up. The remaining 160 (53.3%) respondents indicated that their families did not receive welfare. Among the 93 participants whose families received welfare, 53.8 percent (n=50) received welfare throughout their childhood, 30.1 percent (n=28) received welfare for two or more years and 16.1 percent (n=15) received welfare for two years or less.

Education of respondents' mothers

A total of 315 recipients reported on the educational attainment of their mothers. The results were as follows: Almost one-fifth (19%, n=60) of the mothers lacked any formal schooling, 42.9 percent (n=135) did not complete high school, 29.5 percent (n=93) completed the 12th grade or attained their GED, 7.9 percent (n=25) attended some college and only 0.6 percent (n=2) earned Bachelors or higher degrees.

Sources of earned and unearned income

Sources of income reported are for the month previous to the interview. Every effort was made to report the income of respondents. Some categories of income, however, are reported at the household level because respondents were unable to distinguish between individual and household benefits.

Only a small fraction of respondents were employed. Employed respondents earned an average of \$590.7 per month, which puts them well below the poverty line. Thus, most households (88%) in our sample received public assistance. Households on average received \$668.9 per month in public assistance (including TANF, Food Stamps, SSI, or Tribal General Assistance). We show the different sources of income in the following.

- a. Employment income: 26.6 percent (n=93) of the total respondents had employment income (reported for the previous month of interview), which includes income from regular employment and self-employment. The mean monthly employment income for these 93 respondents was \$590.7 (median: \$570), ranging from \$8 to \$2,200.
- b. Other earned income: 4.9 percent (n=17) of total respondents had income from seasonal and irregular work. The mean monthly other earned income for these 17 respondents was \$1,227.5 (median: \$50), ranging from \$5 to \$8,000.
- c. TANF: 70.6 percent (n=247) of households received TANF. The mean TANF cash assistance for these 247 households was \$350.3 (median: \$347), ranging from \$33 to \$825. Not all respondents in these households received TANF--66.9 percent (n=234) out of the total respondents received TANF.
- d. Food Stamps: 78 percent (n=273) of households received food stamps. The mean value of food stamps for these 273 households was \$324.6 (median: \$308) ranging from \$40 to \$990.
- e. SSI: 16 percent (n=56) of households received SSI. The mean benefit received by these 56 households was \$433.7 (median: \$500), ranging from \$37 to \$1,000.
- f. Tribal General Assistance: 7.4 percent (n=26) of households received tribal general assistance. The mean amount of tribal general assistance received by these 26 households was \$278.8 (median: \$252.5), ranging from \$1 to \$987.5
- g. Child Support and Alimony: 1.7 percent (n=6) of households had income from child support or alimony. The mean amount of child support or alimony received by these six households was \$216.7 (median: \$200), ranging from \$100 to \$400.
- h. Gifts: Gifts include petty cash received from friends or relatives including husband, wife, ex-spouse, partner, children's father or mother. About nine percent (n=30) of households received monetary gift. The mean value of gifts received by these 30 households was \$573.5 (median: \$303.5), ranging from \$5 to \$4,000.
- i. Retirement income: Retirement income includes Social Security and pensions or other retirement income. Almost nine percent (8.9%, n=31) of households had retirement income. The mean value of retirement income received by these 31

households was \$425.8 (median: \$423), ranging from \$32 to \$1,100.

j. Unemployment benefits: 1 household received unemployment benefits of \$304.8.

With regard to assets, twenty-six percent (n=89) of 344 respondents had savings or checking accounts. The mean amount in their accounts was \$148.1, ranging from \$.23 to \$3,400. Twenty-five percent (n=88) of 347 respondents owned a car or other motor vehicle with a self-estimated average selling value of \$2,976.5, ranging from \$5 to \$15,000. Only three had bonds, stocks, Certificates of Deposits (CDs) or money market accounts.

Fertility and child bearing

About six percent (n=19) of 341 women were pregnant at the time of the interview; and 10 percent (n=33) of 333 women had been pregnant since the previous interview.

Children under the age of 13 and childcare

Of 337 respondents, a large portion (86.4%, n=291) had children under the age of 13, ranging from 1 to 14 with an average of 2.5 children. Most of them (83%, n=242) had three or fewer children. Eighty-nine percent (n=260) of them relied on themselves for childcare. When they were unavailable, they relied on grandparents, husbands, children's fathers, older siblings, and neighbors for childcare. A small number of respondents (n=23) sent their children to formal programs such as preschool, childcare centers, Head Start and youth programs. Forty-four percent (n=70) of those who had children under 13 and worked or participated in training programs (n=160) relied on their older children (siblings) for childcare. Forty-six percent (n=133) of the total respondents with young children (n=291), however, allowed their children to take care of themselves when it was difficult to make childcare arrangements.

Among the 263 respondents who had young children, only 5.7 percent (n=15) got help paying for childcare costs. The state government, tribal agencies, employers or other sources, usually provided assistance. Twenty-two percent (n=70) of the respondents who had young children under 13 reported they were not able to take a job or start a school/training program due to the difficulty of finding childcare. Of respondents who had young children and either worked or were attending school/training programs, 22.5 percent (n=38) had to quit a job, school or training program due to lack of childcare.

Education and training

The majority of 336 respondents had less than a high school degree (70%, n=235) and 22.9 percent (n=77) graduated from high school or attained their GED. Six percent (n=20) attended college and 1.2 percent (n=4) graduated from college or completed graduate school.

Regarding education and training participation in the past 12 months (see Table 1), less than 25 percent of respondents participated in each type of class or on-the-job training activity. Fifteen percent (n=48) of 322 respondents had a trade license or training certificate.

Table 1. Participation in educational activities in the past 12 months

	% Participated
--	----------------

Those who had not completed high school or GED only	
Adult basic education classes (N=210)	18
GED classes (N=212)	23
Other classes preparing for high school (N=212)	8
ESL classes (N=207)	3
All respondents	
Short classes on preparing resumes and job applications (N=346)	21
Volunteers for at least one month (N=345)	24
On the job training positions such as JTPA or NEW JOBS ^a (N=345)	17
Vocational training classes (N=344)	11
Other educational or training activities for at least one month (N=342)	8
Any other educational or training related services since Nov. 95 (N=312)	11

^a NEW JOBS stands for Native Employment Works Job Opportunity and Basic Skills.

Welfare experiences

At the time of the interview, 66.9 percent of 350 respondents (n=234) were receiving TANF and 33.1 percent (n=116) were not. Among the 224 respondents who were receiving TANF, 71 percent (n=159) had less than a high school degree, 21.9 percent (n=49) graduated from high school or earned a GED and 7.1 percent (n=16) attended education beyond high school. Of the 112 respondents who were not receiving welfare, 68 percent (n=76) had less than a high school degree, 25 percent (n=28) graduated from high school or a GED program and 7.1 percent (n=8) attended education beyond high school. Those who were receiving TANF were slightly older (average age=38.2) than those who were not (average age=36.9).

Reasons for welfare exits and support services after leaving welfare

At the time of the interview, 101 respondents who were not receiving welfare provided several reasons for not receiving TANF. Others may not have answered this question, as they were unaware of the circumstances involved in the termination of their assistance. The most common reason why the respondents stopped receiving TANF was that they (58.4%, n=59) were economically well off because they got a job, a raise or had more assets. The next important reason is welfare department cut them off (22.8%, n=23). The remaining 19 respondents (18.8%) provided various reasons including moving in with a partner or family, getting married, moving to another reservation, wanting to avoid the work requirement, or “could not stand the hassles” and thus dropped out of the system.

Table 2 compares the characteristics of the above three groups. Those who left welfare “due to other reasons” were less likely to be single mothers and had larger household size compared to the other two groups. This is because this group also includes respondents who left welfare either because they got married or moved in with family or partner. Those who got a job were more likely to have a high school degree, automobile ownership and higher employment income compared to the other two groups. This group received less in Food Stamps compared to other two groups.

Table 2. Characteristics of respondents who left welfare due to different reasons

Demographics/ income/ assets	Got a job or raise (N=59)	Cut off from welfare (N=23)	Left welfare due to other reasons (N=19)
Average age	36	35	35
Mean household size	5.8	4.5	6.7
Mean number of children under 13	2.6	2.3	2.9
Marital status			
% Married	14	13	37
% Separated, divorced, or widowed	48	30	16
% Never married	38	57	47
Educational status			
% Less than high school	61	73	72
% High school diploma, GED, or above	39	27	29
Own an automobile			
% Yes	47	9	16
% No	53	91	84
Mean monthly income/benefits (\$)			
Employment income (Respondent)	602	21	161
Food stamps (household)	132	209	242

Note: Number of valid responses varies for each question. Percentages do not reflect the total N.

Of the respondents who were cut off from TANF (n=23), only 12 respondents were aware of why they were fully sanctioned. Of these five indicated that they were sanctioned because they failed to follow the program rules and another five reached their 24-month time limit. The remaining two respondents lost benefits because their children turned 18.

After leaving welfare, most of the respondents did not receive assistance by a governmental program for childcare, transportation or job location. Among 116 respondents who had left TANF at the time of the interview, only 10 respondents received help in finding childcare, 10 respondents received assistance paying for childcare, 20 received help on health insurance, 18 received support to find a job, and 11 got aid with transportation.

Survival strategies of respondents who were sanctioned from TANF

As indicated above, 23 respondents were fully sanctioned. In addition, 22 respondents were partially sanctioned. Their benefits had been reduced between 25 to 75 percent. Among the respondents who were partially or fully sanctioned (n=45), many of them cut extra (n=40) or necessary (n=38) expenses, or borrowed money from friends/family (n=36) when benefits were cut. Other survival strategies of these respondents included getting a job (n=26), stopping paying bills (n=25), applying for benefits in other programs (n=18), and moving in with others (n=17). A small portion of respondents also moved to cheaper housing (n=6), got

child support from their children's fathers (n=5), placed children in someone else's care (n=4), or got married (n=4).

TANF requirements

Of those respondents who were receiving TANF assistance at the time of the interview (n=234), 56 percent (n=121) were not required to do anything to receive TANF, and the remaining 44 percent (n=95) were required to work, attend school or participate in other activities to receive benefits. Respondents who are required to work (n=95) are expected to choose at least one of the following activities:

- a. Seventy-four percent (n=74) indicated that they were required to look for jobs;
- b. Fifty-one percent (n=46) were required to work in paid jobs;
- c. Sixty-six percent (n=61) were required to work in unpaid jobs (e.g., be volunteers, or participate in JTPA); and
- d. Seventy-five percent (n=70) were required to attend school or training activities.

In addition, participants were required to follow the program rules (e.g., cooperate with child support, keep children's immunization records up to date, and ensure school attendance of their children).

Availability of support services for job preparation

Many respondents indicated that they received support services for job preparation and job retention as follows:

- a. About half of 140 respondents (51.4%, n=72) indicated that their case manager took time to help;
- b. More than half of 139 respondents (56.1%, n=78) received help from their case managers in finding and maintaining a job;
- c. Sixty percent of 143 respondents (n=85) thought their case manager urged them to get education or job training;
- d. About 38 percent of 136 respondents (n=52) felt pressure from their case manager to get a job; and
- e. Twenty-six percent of 126 (n=33) quit school or training programs to find a job.

Employment

Of the total 350 respondents, 42.3 percent (n=148) never worked at a regular job for pay, 39.4 percent (n=138) worked in the past but were not working at the time of the interview and only 15 percent (n=53) were currently employed at the time of the interview. Of the 50 respondents who were employed at the time of the interview, 88 percent (n=44) were working for employers only, two percent (n=1) were self-employed only, and five (10%) respondents indicated they were both working for employers and self-employed. Forty-one of these 50 respondents indicated that they had one job at the time of the interview and the remaining nine respondents had two jobs. Table 3 shows how these three groups differ in terms of their demographics, educational status, health status, ownership of cars,

income and number of times they moved in the last year. Of the three groups, a higher proportion of those who worked had completed high school than those who never worked. Respondents who were employed at the time of the interview were more likely to own an automobile than the other two groups. As expected, households with respondents who were working at the time of interview received less TANF and Food Stamp assistance as compared to the other two groups.

Table 3. Characteristics of respondents by labor force participation

Characteristics	Never employed (N=148)	Employed in the past but not at the time of interview (N=138)	Employed at the time of interview (N=53)
Mean age	38	37	37
Mean number of children under 13	2.5	2.5	2.5
Mean number of times moved last year	.79	1.4	1
Marital status			
%Married	21	16	12
%Separated, divorced, or widowed	34	45	47
%Never married	45	39	41
Educational status			
%Less than high school	82	58	66
%High school diploma or GED	13	31	30
%Attended college	5	9	2
%College graduates or higher	0	2	2
Physical health status			
%Excellent or very good	43	40	45
%Somewhat healthy	36	37	38
%Somewhat unhealthy	14	14	9
%Poor or very poor	7	9	8
Mental Health status			
%Excellent or very good	47	51	63
%Average	45	47	31
%Poor or very poor	8	2	6
Own an automobile			
%Yes	19	23	53
%No	81	77	47
Average Income /benefits per month (\$)			
Mean Employment income (Respondent)	0	79	690
Mean TANF (Household)	282	272	71
	266	278	136

Mean Food Stamps (Household)			
---------------------------------	--	--	--

Note: Number of valid responses varies for each question. Percentages do not reflect the total N.

Salary and benefits

We examined the salary and benefits of those respondents who were working at the time of the interview (n=53). Table 4 provides job-related information on these respondents. These respondents worked an average of 35 hours per week with an average hourly wage of \$6.8. Most of them did not receive any additional benefits. In terms of primary ways of transportation to work, driving their own vehicle to work (n=29) and hitchhiking (n=24) are two major ways. Walking (n=14) and public transportation (n=5) are two other transportation means to work. On average respondents spent \$30 per week on transportation to their jobs. The average time they spent to get to their jobs was 25 minutes. Since tribal members are eligible for tribal health care coverage, respondents were not able to separate out the employer provided health benefits from tribal health care programs.

Table 4. Job related information for those participating in labor force

Labor force participation	Employed at the time of interview (N=53)
Work hours and salary	
Mean weekly work hours	35
Mean hourly wage (\$)	6.8
Work benefits available	
% Sick or personal days with pay (n=34)	30
% Paid vacation (n=34)	27
% Health insurance for respondents (n=36)	31
% Health insurance for children (n=34)	27
% Dental benefits for respondents (n=35)	23
% Dental benefits for children (n=33)	18
% Training class or tuition reimbursement (n=33)	18
Transportation	
% Drive own vehicle	55
% Walk	26
% Get a ride with someone	45
% Public transportation	9
Mean transportation expenditure /week (\$)	30
Mean minutes from home to work	25

Note: Number of valid responses varies for each question. Percentages do not reflect the total N.

Housing

On average, respondents had 4.1 rooms in their homes. They also spent an average of

\$83 per month for housing, but the average expense for utilities was \$117 per month. This is likely because many of these families qualify for low-income housing subsidies, which cover rent rather than utilities. Housing arrangements of the 350 respondents are as follows:

- a. Over fifty percent lived in a rented home or apartment (50.9%, n=178);
- b. Nearly a quarter of these respondents owned their homes (24%, n=84);
- c. Twenty-three percent (n=80) lived with family or friends, with some not paying rent (12.6%) or contributing only part of the rent (10.3%);
- d. One respondent lived in a group shelter; and
- e. Seven respondents (2%) had other housing arrangements.

Quality of housing occupied by these respondents was poor and lacked many basic necessities. At the time of our second interview in 1999-2000, the quality of housing that respondents occupied is summarized as follows:

- a. Twenty-four percent (n=82) of 336 respondents had a leaky roof or ceiling;
- b. Twenty-two percent (n=72) of 326 respondents had a toilet, hot water or other plumbing that did not work;
- c. Thirty-seven percent (n=123) of 337 respondents had broken windows;
- d. Eighteen percent (n=59) of 326 respondents had exposed electrical wires;
- e. Thirty-four percent (n=115) of 331 respondents had problems with rats, mice, roaches or other insects in their housing units;
- f. Nineteen percent (n=60) of 320 respondents had non-dependable heating systems;
- g. Fifteen percent (n=48) of 327 respondents had a stove or refrigerator that did not work properly;
- h. Eleven percent (n=36) of 334 respondents had large holes in the floor; and
- i. Thirty-five percent (n=117) of 336 respondents had open cracks or holes in the walls or ceiling.

Material hardship

To assess material hardship of poor families on reservations we asked our respondents to describe their hardships in the last three months. Their responses are summarized as follows:

- a. Forty-five percent (n=154) of 346 respondents indicated that they needed food but could not afford to buy any.
- b. Twenty-five percent (n=57) of 224 respondents said their child(ren) had gone to bed or school hungry because they had no money to buy food.
- c. Seventeen percent (n=60) of 350 respondents indicated that in the past three months there was sometimes not enough food to eat, and three percent (n=11) indicated that in the past three months there was often not enough food to eat.
- d. Forty-five percent (n=158) of 350 respondents said that in the past three months there was enough food but not always the kinds of food they wanted to eat.
- e. Twenty-eight percent (n=98) of 347 respondents needed to see a doctor in the past three months but could not see a doctor. The primary reason given was a lack

of transportation (n=80), and a lack of money to pay the doctor (n=17).

f. Twenty-one percent (n=69) of 335 respondents had their gas or electricity turned off as they could not afford to pay the bill.

Transportation

Lack of transportation is a major problem on reservations. Out of 347 respondents, 25 percent (n=88) owned an automobile. However, due to the need for repair, 6.9 percent (n=12) were always unable to use it, and 77 percent (n=96) could not use it sometimes, ranging from every week to once a year. Only 24.6 percent (n=86) of respondents drove their own cars, 11.7 percent (n=41) depended on public transportation, and 1.4% (n=5) used a bicycle. Since only a small percentage of families owned reliable automobile and public transportation on reservations is severely inadequate, nearly everyone shared a ride with someone else or walked. Our sample indicates that due to the lack of transportation a large proportion of respondents on reservations had difficulty getting basic tasks done. The exact proportion of respondents who faced difficulty getting certain tasks done is listed below.

- a. Forty percent (n=75) of 189 respondents had difficulty getting to work;
- b. Fifty-one percent (n=166) of 323 respondents had difficulty seeing a doctor;
- c. Twenty-six percent (n=55) of 210 respondents had difficulty going to their childcare provider;
- d. Forty-eight percent (n=153) of 320 respondents had difficulty going to the welfare office or making appointments;
- e. Fifty-seven percent (n=187) of 326 respondents had difficulty going to the grocery store; and
- f. Thirty-five percent (n=18) of 52 respondents had difficulty going to other places.

Health and health care

In describing the physical health status of 345 respondents, 41.8 percent (n=144) indicated that they were in excellent health, 36.5 percent (n=126) were somewhat healthy, 13.6 percent (n=47) were somewhat unhealthy and 8.2 percent (n=28) were in poor or very poor health. In terms of the mental health status of 346 recipients, 50.9 percent (n=176) described having excellent or very good mental health, 43.6 percent (n=151) said average and 5.5 percent (n=19) had poor or very poor mental health. But 56 percent (n=190) of 340 respondents had felt depressed, "down" or "unhappy" for at least 2 weeks in the past three months.

Eighteen percent (n=62) of all respondents had someone in their household who had an illness or disability that demanded much attention, making it hard for them to go to work or school. Access to healthcare did not appear to be a major problem on any of the three reservations as most respondents had access to Indian Health Services. When health problems occurred, a majority (93.4%, n=327) of respondents and their family members went to the Indian Health Services (IHS). Others went to a doctor's office, a hospital outpatient clinic, a hospital emergency room, a health maintenance organization, or other clinic or health center. More than half (63.5%, n=219) of 345 respondents described the health services available to them as somewhat adequate, while 10.2 percent (n=35) described these

services as not adequate or severely inadequate. Only 26.4 percent (n=91) described the health services available to them as very adequate.

Neighborhood characteristics

When respondents were asked about their living preferences, about three quarters of 292 respondents (75.3%, n=220) would prefer to live on their reservation, 20.9 percent (n=61) would prefer to live somewhere else and only 3.8 percent (n=11) would prefer to live on another reservation in Arizona. When rating their reservation as a place to live, nearly half of the 327 respondents (45%, n=147) described it as very good or good. Another 40.7 percent (n=133) rated their reservation as fair, and the remaining 14.4 percent (n=47) thought their reservation was bad or very bad. When asked how their reservation changed within the last year, 39.4 percent (n=129) of 327 respondents said it has stayed the same, 36.1 percent (n=118) thought it was worse or a lot worse and 24.5 percent (n=80) thought it was better or a lot better. With regard to the future of their reservation, 42.9 percent (n=126) of 294 respondents expected it would be the same, 29.3 percent (n=86) expected it would be better or a lot better and the other 27.8 percent (n=82) thought it would be worse or a lot worse.

Forty-one percent of 218 respondents (n=90) thought the number of women on their reservation receiving welfare had increased as compared to the previous year, 38 percent (n=83) thought it stayed the same, and 20.6 percent (n=45) thought the number decreased. Also, most of the 284 respondents (65.5%, n=186) thought that only a few women on welfare found jobs last year, 28.9 percent (n=82) thought some women on welfare found jobs, and only 5.6 percent (n=16) thought most women on welfare found jobs. When asked about how many women they knew that left the reservation in search of jobs, 67.2 percent (n=168) of 250 answered they knew only a few women, while 26.8 percent (n=67) answered they knew some. The remaining six percent (n=15) thought a lot of women they knew left in the last year for jobs elsewhere.

About the number of men who worked steadily over the past year, more than half of 176 respondents (55.1%, n=97) felt the number stayed the same, 27.8 percent (n=49) thought the number decreased and only 17 percent (n=30) thought it increased. Additionally, a majority of the 312 respondents (81.4%, n=254) described gangs on their reservation as a big problem, while 17.9 percent (n=56) thought it was a small problem and 0.6 percent (n=2) did not think it was a problem.

Table 5 lists participants' attitudes toward safety problems on their reservations. Most respondents thought that these problems had increased or stayed the same.

Table 5. Respondents' attitudes toward their concerns about their reservations

Reported problem	% felt problem increased	% felt problem decreased	% felt problem stayed the same
Vandalism (N=346)	65	10	25
Crime (N=346)	63	12	25
Trash, litter or garbage (N=346)	61	10	29
Rundown, abandoned houses or buildings (N=346)	39	20	41
Odors, smoke or gas fumes (N=338)	21	20	59

Referring to the safety concerns on their reservations, more than half of 346 respondents (51%, n=175) reported staying home in the previous month rather than going somewhere, as they feared for their safety. In general, 59.4 percent (n=203) of 342 respondents rated their community as very safe or fairly safe, and the other 40.6 percent (n=139) thought it was very unsafe or fairly unsafe. Also, 70.3 percent (n=242) of 344 respondents thought their home was very safe or fairly safe, with the remaining 29.7 percent (n=102) feeling it was very unsafe or fairly unsafe.

Opinions regarding welfare changes

When respondents were asked their opinions in regard to welfare reform changes, many of them indicated that the changes are negative (see Table 6) regarding changes of

- a. five-year life time limit on welfare (61%);
- b. not increasing welfare benefits to those who have additional children while on welfare (68%); and
- c. requiring teen mothers to live with adults to receive benefits (41%).

Additionally, 60 percent of the respondents preferred that the state, rather than their tribes, continue to implement TANF. However, recipients from one of the three tribes (Salt River) are supportive (76%) of tribal takeover of TANF (see Table 7).

Table 6. Respondents’ attitudes towards changes made to the welfare rules

Changes made to welfare rules	% felt change is positive	% felt change is negative	% felt change is neither positive nor negative
An adult can receive benefits for maximum 5 years (N=343)	23	61	16
Additional children born while on welfare will not increase welfare benefit (N=341)	17	68	15
Teenage mothers are required to reside with an adult to receive benefits (N=342)	43	41	16
Tribes may administer the welfare programs (N=343)	22	60	19

Similarities and differences among the three reservations

We report some of the findings by reservations (see Table 7) to compare the characteristics of respondents across the three reservations--Salt River (n=64), San Carlos (n=149) and Navajo (n=137). The three reservations share similarities in demographics, lack of job opportunities, barriers to employment, material hardship, and availability of support services.

With regard to demographics, the majority of the welfare recipients on each reservation are single mothers of a similar age group (30s). Only a small fraction of respondents from each reservation is married. Most respondents had an average of a little over two children under the age of 13.

There is a shortage of employment opportunities on all three reservations. Only a small fraction of the sample is employed on each reservation. Across reservations, employed women are making similar incomes below the poverty line. Even if the jobs were available, the respondents would need additional education and training to exit welfare.

When asked, many families on each reservation report struggling to obtain basic necessities (e.g., food and clothing). For instance, over one-third of the respondents from Salt River and Navajo and almost two-thirds from San Carlos reported at least one time of not being able to afford food within the past three months.

Support services (transportation and childcare) are severely inadequate on all three reservations. Furthermore, only a small fraction of respondents on all three reservations received funds to help defray the cost of childcare (9% on Navajo; 5.3% on Salt River and 2.8% on San Carlos). Only 23 respondents out of those who had children under 13 years of age (n=291) used formal childcare facilities including pre-school, nursery school, childcare center, Head Start and youth programs. The majority (n=19) of these 23 respondents were from Navajo Nation probably because slightly higher proportion of the respondents on this reservation received financial support for childcare. The remaining four respondents were from Salt River reservation. With regards to transportation, on all three reservations many respondents do not own an automobile. Of those who own a vehicle, many report that their vehicles are not reliable.

Even though the three tribes share many similarities there are some differences. Mostly, differences are seen when comparing employment and welfare experiences, income and assets, attitudes toward tribal takeover of TANF, and their opinions about the future of their reservations.

With regard to employment experience, Salt River differs from the other two tribes. This can be attributed to Salt River's geographic proximity to Phoenix. A higher percentage of respondents from Salt River have previous employment experience (66% compared to 36% of San Carlos and 31% of Navajo). Likewise, on Salt River, the percentage of those who have never worked is the lowest among the three tribes (9% compared to 55% on San Carlos and 44% on Navajo). Salt River has a 25 percent employment rate among respondents compared to six percent for San Carlos and 20 percent for Navajo.

Other differences between these three tribes are seen in the percentages of participants receiving welfare, those that have been sanctioned, recipients that are required to work a regular job that pays, and a change in attitudes toward the TANF time limit. San Carlos has the highest percentage (79%) of recipients (out of those interviewed on this reservation) currently receiving welfare compared to Salt River (48%) and Navajo (62%). At the same time, San Carlos has the lowest percentage of recipients sanctioned while on welfare with only nine percent (out of those interviewed on this reservation) as compared to Salt River with 25 percent and Navajo with 15 percent. The Navajo Nation and Salt River, on the other hand, have much higher percentages of people who are required to work at a regular job that pays than does the San Carlos tribe. Thirty-two percent (out of those who were required to work to receive welfare benefits) of the San Carlos tribe is required to attain regular paid employment compared to 79 percent of Navajo and 52 percent of Salt River. This may also play a part in the attitudes of respondents from San Carlos towards education/training because they had time to pursue education/training. Due to the federal time limit, 86 percent of recipients from San Carlos feel that they need to acquire education and training compared to only 58 percent of respondents from Salt River and 53 percent from

Navajo. Seventy-three percent of Navajo participants decided not to have another child due to the time limit. This is higher than the 51 percent of San Carlos and 50 percent of Salt River respondents.

As for tribe's income and assets, there are also some differences seen among the three tribes. Even though respondents from all three reservations are paid similar amounts per hour of work, respondents from the Navajo Nation tend to earn more money from employment per month (\$683) compared to San Carlos (\$481) and Salt River (\$526). More participants from the Navajo Nation have a checking/saving account (45%). In San Carlos, only seven percent of participants have a checking/saving account in comparison to 29 percent of recipients in the Salt River. The Navajo Nation has more automobile ownership in relation to the other two tribes with 33 percent of its participants owning an automobile (only 16% of Salt River and 22% of San Carlos individuals own a vehicle).

In terms of welfare benefits, welfare recipients from Salt River received the lowest average monthly amount of SSI (\$237) compared to those from San Carlos (\$471) and the Navajo Nation (\$456). But respondents from Salt River received much higher average monthly tribal general assistance (\$618) compared to \$204 in San Carlos and \$254 in Navajo.

In regard to respondents' opinions, only those from Salt River hold a positive view of their tribal administration of welfare programs. This difference must be underscored. The respondents from Salt River favor tribal administration of TANF by 76 percent as compared to 5 percent of San Carlos and 15 percent of Navajo. Three factors may have contributed to this difference. First, the Salt River tribe must follow the 24-month time limit because of its less than 50 percent jobless rate among working age populations. Second, members of this tribe were concerned that the state might subcontract to a private organization to implement TANF on this reservation. Lastly, Salt River is the only one of these three tribes that has been administering its TANF programs since June 1, 1999. In addition, this tribe started a dialogue to self-administer TANF on this reservation as early as 1997. It appears that TANF recipients on this reservation were kept abreast of the advantages of tribal takeover of TANF and thus were comfortable with the idea. While Navajo has also begun implementing the TANF services since October 1, 2000, the data for this report was collected before this date.

As for attitudes about their tribe, more respondents (60%) from Salt River are hopeful that their reservation will improve in the future. Only 21 percent of San Carlos and 23 percent of Navajo participants believe their reservation will get better. There may be some correlation to the prevalence of crime on reservations and their belief about the future of their reservations. A higher proportion of respondents from San Carlos were afraid to leave their homes due to crime. A similar percentage of respondents from Navajo (42%) and Salt River (39%) stayed home out of fear for their safety as compared to 63 percent of participants from San Carlos.

Table 7. Tribal Comparison: Salt River, San Carlos, and Navajo

VARIABLES	Salt River (N=64)	San Carlos (N=149)	Navajo (N=137)	Total (N=350)
Race				
% American Indian/Native Alaskans	98	100	100	100

Age				
Mean age	36	37	39	38
% between 20 and 50 years old	94	93	85	90
Education				
% participant's mothers without GED, high school	51	69	59	62
% participant's mothers with GED or high school	36	24	33	30
% participant's mothers beyond high school	13	7	9	8
% participants without GED, high school	73	67	72	70
% participants with GED or high school	18	29	19	23
% participants beyond high school	10	4	9	7
Fertility and Childbearing				
% pregnant since previous interview	10	11	9	10
Marital Status				
% married	15	17	19	18
% never married	43	49	33	42
% separated, divorced, and widowed	42	34	48	40
% living with boyfriend or partner	22	35	25	29
Childcare				
% with children under 13	89	87	85	86
Mean number of children under 13 per respondent	2.4	2.4	2.6	2.5
% receiving assistance paying childcare	5.3	2.8	9	5.7
% having difficulties starting a job, school, or training due to problems w/childcare	33	13	26	22
Health and Mental health				
% with excellent or very good health	27	49	41	42
% with poor or very poor health	10	6	10	8
% with excellent or very good mental health	52	58	43	51
% with poor or very poor mental health	3	1	11	6
Welfare Experiences				
% remember receiving welfare while growing up	47	37	57	47
% receiving TANF at time of interview	48	79	62	67
% sanctioned (fully or partially) while on welfare	25	9	15	13
% required to work at a regular job that pays	52	32	79	51
% find tribe administering welfare as positive	76	5	15	22
% decided not to have another child due to time limit	50	51	73	62
% decided to start education/training due to time limit	58	86	53	67
Employment				
% have worked at a regular job that pays	66	36	31	39
% currently working a regular job that pays	25	6	20	15
% never worked a regular job that pays	9	55	44	42

Note: Number of valid responses varies for each question. Percentages do not reflect the total N.

Table 7. Continued

VARIABLES	Salt River (N=64)	San Carlos (N=149)	Navajo (N=137)	Total (N=350)
Assets/income/benefits				
% with savings or checking account	29	7	45	26
% with own automobile	16	22	33	25
% own home	31	20	26	24
\$ Mean Employment income	526	481	683	591
\$ Mean hourly wage	7.8	6.4	6.4	6.8
\$ Mean TANF (household)	377	324	373	350
\$ Mean Food Stamps (household)	344	330	312	325
\$ Mean SSI (household)	237	471	456	434
\$ Mean Tribal General Assistance (household)	618 448	204 365	254 627	279 574
Material Hardship				
% could not afford food in past three months	37	58	34	45
% elec/gas turned off due to inability to pay	8	20	27	21
Neighborhood				
% feel reservation will get better	60	21	23	29
% have stayed at home because it was unsafe	39	63	42	51

Note: Number of valid responses varies for each question. Percentages do not reflect the total N.

Similarities and Differences between Wave 1 and Wave 2

We followed 350 respondents out of our sample of wave 1 (n=445) (Pandey et al. 2000a), and interviewed them in wave 2. Most of the respondents we could not follow (n=95) were from Navajo (n=72). We present some of the salient characteristics of respondents from wave 1 and wave 2 in Table 8. A comparison of data from wave 1 and wave 2 indicates that welfare recipients on reservations resemble each other in their demographic and economic characteristics. They encounter similar barriers to employment. Reservations continue to lack employment opportunities and support services (childcare and transportation). Families continue to suffer from material hardship.

However, a close comparison of data between wave 1 and wave 2 indicates a marginal improvement in employment and hardship related statistics. For example, the employment rate of respondents improved marginally (15% in wave 2 compared with 11% in wave 1). Similarly, 42 percent of respondents from wave 2 lacked any job experience compared to 46 percent in wave 1. A much lower percentage of welfare recipients was required to work at a regular job that pays in wave 2 (51%) compared to wave 1 (81%) possibly because many of them were already engaged in education/training programs. A higher proportion of respondents in wave 2 (67%) were participating in education or job training compared to wave 1 (57%).

The percentage of respondents who could not afford to buy food (in the past three months) dropped by 4 percent in wave 2 (45% compared with 49% in wave 1). Also, those whose electricity/gas had been turned off due to inability to pay dropped by one percent in

wave 2 (21% compared to 22% in wave 1).

At the same time, family and friends support is dwindling over time. Nine percent of respondents in wave 2 received financial support from families and friends in comparison to 14 percent in wave 1.

With regards to support services (childcare and transportation), financial support from governments for childcare increased marginally over time. About four percent of respondents received funding for childcare in wave 1 whereas six percent of them received in wave 2. Also, number of families using formal childcare facility increased from two families in wave 1 to 23 families in wave 2. Yet, many respondents with small children continue to rely on themselves or friends and families for childcare.

Transportation facility, on the other hand, has not improved since last year. Indeed, automobile ownership declined over time. Fewer respondents in wave 2 owned an automobile (24%) compared to wave 1 (29%).

In addition to these marginal differences, we want to underscore several important differences. These differences are seen when comparing income sources and amount, respondents' opinions towards welfare changes, savings /checking account ownership, TANF requirements, and their concerns about problems and safety on their reservations. One of the reasons for these changes may be due to the drop in sample size between wave 1 and wave 2.

Fewer percentages of respondents received welfare benefits (including TANF, Food Stamps, SSI, and Tribal General Assistance) in wave 2 (88%) compared to wave 1 (93%). Also, the percentage of those who are fully or partially sanctioned increased by one percent in wave 2 (13 percent compared to 12 percent in wave 1). The proportion of households who received TANF, Food Stamps, SSI, and Tribal General Assistance all dropped in wave 2. For example, 85 percent of households and 77 percent of respondents received TANF in wave 1. In wave 2, only 71 percent of households and 67 percent of respondents received TANF. The work requirement under current welfare reform may contribute a factor to the drop. Similarly, the percentage of households receiving Food Stamps dropped from 86 percent to 78 percent, Tribal General Assistance recipients dropped from 12 percent to 7 percent. However, a higher proportion of respondents reported employment income in wave 2 (27%) in comparison to wave 1 (12%). The average employment income increased in wave 2 (\$591 compared to \$482 in wave 1). The mean hourly wage, however, stayed almost the same (\$6.8 in wave 2 and \$6.7 in wave 1) over time. A higher percentage of respondents in wave 2 had savings and/or checking accounts (26%) compared to wave 1 (17%), a reflection of an increase in the employment rate.

Another important difference between wave 1 and wave 2 is respondents' opinions regarding welfare changes. In wave 1, many respondents were supportive of changes brought about by welfare reform except for tribal takeover of TANF programs. One year later, data from wave 2 indicate that their attitude toward welfare changes had reversed. More respondents in wave 2 held negative opinions toward these changes as they encountered multiple stumbling blocks on their way to exit welfare.

- a. Five year life time limit on welfare: 46 percent saw this requirement as a positive change in wave 1 as opposed to only 23 percent in wave 2.
- b. Not increasing welfare benefit to those who have additional children while on welfare: 43 percent in wave 1 saw this requirement as a positive change as opposed to only 17 percent in wave 2.
- c. Requiring teen mothers to live with adults to receive benefits: 49 percent in

wave 1 saw this requirement as a positive change as opposed to 43 percent in wave 2.

d. Tribal takeover of TANF programs: 32 percent in wave 1 saw this flexibility as a positive change compared to only 22 percent in wave 2.

With regard to their opinion about their reservations, a higher percentage of respondents felt positive about their reservation this year compared to last year. For example, a higher proportion of respondents (75%) preferred to live on their own reservation compared to last year (66%). Also, compared to last year, a lower percentage of respondents stayed at home due to safety concerns (51% in wave 2 compared to 61% in wave 1). Overall, respondents' attitude toward their community has improved since the implementation of welfare reform.

Table 8. Comparison of wave 1 and wave 2

VARIABLES	Wave 1 (N=445)	Wave 2 (N=350)
Race		
% American Indian/Native Alaskans	100	100
Age		
Mean age	37	38
% between 20 and 50 years old	90	90
Education		
% participant's mothers without GED, high school	64	62
% participant's mothers with GED or high school	29	30
% participant's mothers beyond high school	8	8
% participants without GED, high school	68	70
% participants with GED or high school	25	23
% participants beyond high school	7	7
Fertility and Childbearing		
% pregnant since 1995 / previous interview	37	10
Marital Status		
% married	19	18
% never married	44	42
% separated, divorced, and widowed	36	40
% living with boyfriend or partner	29	29
Childcare		
% with children under 13	86	86
Mean number of children under 13 per respondent	2.4	2.5
% receiving assistance paying childcare	3.9	5.7
% having difficulties starting a job, school, or training due to problems w/childcare	26	22
Health and Mental health		
% with excellent or very good health	41	42
% with poor or very poor health	9	8
% with excellent or very good mental health	51	51
% with poor or very poor mental health	5	6

Welfare Experiences		
% remember receiving welfare while growing up	45	47
% receiving TANF at time of interview	77	67
% sanctioned (fully or partially) while on welfare	12	13
% required to work at a regular job that pays	81	51
% find tribe administering welfare as positive	32	22
% decided not to have another child due to time limit	52	62
% decided to start education/training due to time limit	57	67

Note: Number of valid responses varies for each question. Percentages do not reflect the total N.

Table 8. Continued

VARIABLES	Wave 1 (N=445)	Wave 2 (N=350)
Employment		
% have worked at a regular job that pays	39	39
% currently working a regular job that pays	11	15
% never worked a regular job that pays	46	42
Assets/income/benefits		
% with savings or checking account	17	26
% with own automobile	29	25
% own home	24	24
\$ Mean Employment income	482	591
\$ Mean hourly wage	6.7	6.8
\$ Mean TANF (household)	318	350
\$ Mean Food Stamps (household)	327	325
\$ Mean SSI (household)	455	434
\$ Mean Tribal General Assistance (household)	195	279
\$ Mean Gifts (household)	306	574
Material Hardship		
% could not afford food in past three months	49	45
% elec/gas turned off due to inability to pay	22	21
Neighborhood		
% feel reservation will get better	31	29
% have stayed at home because it was unsafe	61	51

Note: Number of valid responses varies for each question. Percentages do not reflect the total N.

A comparison of responses across three reservations also documents change in some variables since the previous year. Changes occurred in the following variables: childcare support, difficulties to start job/training due to childcare problems, welfare experiences, and the respondents' opinion about the future of their reservations.

Overall, financial support for childcare for welfare recipients on reservations continues to remain inadequate both in wave 1 and wave 2. Yet, compared to wave 1, the

percentage of respondents who received financial support for childcare increased marginally on both Navajo (4.8% in wave 1 to 9% in wave 2) and San Carlos (1.6% in wave 1 to 2.8% in wave 2) reservations. Respondents on the Salt River reservation, on the other hand, saw a slight decline in financial support for childcare from 6.5 percent to 5.3 percent over time.

On the San Carlos reservation, the proportion of respondents who had difficulty starting education or job training due to lack of childcare facilities increased by 10 percent (from 3% in wave 1 to 13% in wave 2). The proportion of those who had difficulty starting education/training due to lack of childcare facilities on Salt River and Navajo, on the other hand, declined by 18 percent and eight percent, respectively. These changes may be related to a big jump in the number of respondents on San Carlos reservation that had started education/training in wave 2 (49 percent up from 37 percent in wave 1 to 86 percent in wave 2). On the other hand, a much higher percentage of respondents from Salt River (55%) and Navajo (68%) were already participating in education/job training in Wave 1.

Over time the percentage of respondents required to participate in paid work also changed across the three reservations. On the Salt River reservation, a higher percentage of welfare recipients (5% increase from 52% in wave 1 to 57% in wave 2) was required to participate in paid work. At the same time, a lower percentage of respondents was required to participate in paid work both on Navajo Nation (6% drop from 85% in wave 1 to 79% in wave 2) and on San Carlos (56% drop from 88% in wave 1 to 32% in wave 2).

The opinions of respondents with regard to the tribal takeover of welfare programs also changed over time. Compared to data from wave 1, a higher percentage of respondents in wave 2 (76% in wave 2 and 71% in wave 1) from Salt River favored tribal takeover of TANF. Respondents on San Carlos and Navajo reservations, however, have yet to be convinced that tribal takeover of TANF will benefit them. It is important to note that at the time the data were collected for this section, only Salt River was administering its own TANF programs.

Analysis

Welfare families on American Indian reservations are among the most economically vulnerable groups in the country (Pandey et al. 2000a). Their vulnerability is a product of geographic isolation, lack of job opportunities, and low levels of human capital in the form of health, mental health, education and work experience (Pandey et al. 2000a). Through focus groups and structured interviews, we explored the barriers and hardships that families on reservations encounter in their attempt to move from welfare to work. The sample for this report was not randomly selected. Nevertheless, the sample does give a sense of how families on reservations are faring under the 1996 federal welfare legislation as compared to the general welfare population.

Demography

A similar percentage of welfare recipients on reservations are single mothers as compared to national data. Eighty-two percent of the respondents in our sample from the three reservations (Navajo, San Carlos and Salt River) are single mothers without a spouse. Nationally, about 80 percent of adult recipients are single mothers (DHHS, 2000a).

Barriers to employment

Because of the post-industrial nature of the U.S. economy, rural women with children on reservations experience similar barriers when trying to move from welfare to work, as do

their urban and suburban counterparts across the country (Pandey et al. 2000a). These barriers include shortage of employment opportunities on reservations; poor job preparation; lack of support services; and other family and personal constraints. Evidence from our data from wave 2 (and from wave 1) suggests that these barriers are far more pronounced on reservations than elsewhere in the nation.

Job opportunities. Economic and labor market conditions vary dramatically across reservations (Pandey et al. 1999b). Despite a record low unemployment rate and continued growth in the national economy, the unemployment rates remain high among working age populations on many American Indian reservations (Pandey et al. 2000a). The BIA's 1997 report indicated that two of the three reservations under study, Navajo Nation and San Carlos, had over 50 percent of the working age population not participating in the labor force. The third reservation, Salt River, had 32 percent of its working age population not employed. Reservations have more severe economic problems than urban areas, due in part to the limited number of jobs on or near reservations (Pandey et al. 2000a). A focus group participant who has been unsuccessful in job searching said, "There are not a lot of vacancies. [I am] hoping for the best. Life isn't easy. It takes a lot of confidence and encouragement. [I am] taking one day at a time." When asked to identify one area that they would like federal, state, or tribal governments to address, a focus group participant said he hoped they could "create more jobs." Many focus group participants on all three reservations shared this sentiment.

Nationally, 23 percent of TANF recipients are employed and 39 percent of recipients in Arizona are employed (DHHS, 1999). In the current sample, however, only a small fraction (15%) of the respondents is employed; of these respondents, most are making far below the poverty line with an average hourly wage of \$6.8. Nationally, about a quarter of the welfare recipients lack work experience (Spalter-Roth, Burr, Hartmann, & Shaw, 1995), whereas 42 percent of the sample in wave 2 lacks labor market experience.

Because of the scarcity of job opportunities on reservations, current strategies for moving welfare families to work will not be sufficient on many of these reservations. The support programs (short-term job training and support services) at the state and national level that are designed to help recipients exit welfare are based on the premise that jobs are available. On reservations, jobs are limited. Simply focusing on support programs will not reduce welfare caseloads on reservations (Pandey et al. 2000a). Tribes will have to introduce economic development activities and create jobs before they can expect welfare mothers to find employment.

Job preparation. Respondents on reservations are not equipped to move from welfare to work without additional job preparation (Pandey et al. 2000a). Many respondents (42%) have never worked at a regular job for pay. Nationally, about 50 percent of welfare recipients have a high school diploma or a GED compared to only 23 percent in our sample. In our study, 70 percent of participants have not completed high school as compared to only 30.3 percent of all rural women in the U.S. (with less than a high school education) who were receiving AFDC in 1995 (Porterfield & McBride, 1997). Only 23 percent of our sample had completed a high school degree as compared to 42.3 percent of rural women receiving AFDC in 1995 (Porterfield & McBride, 1997). About 7 percent of our sample had received education beyond high school. Yet the relationship between education and employment was

quite clear in our sample. A higher proportion of those with at least a high school education were employed both in wave 1 and wave 2.

Additional studies underscore the importance of education on women's employment status, wages and benefits (Gittell & Moore, 1989; Gittell, Gross, & Holdaway, 1993; Pavetti, 1997a; 1997b; Pandey, Zhan, Neely-Barnes, & Menon, 2000b; Spalter-Roth & Hartman, 1991). Welfare recipients are aware of the importance of education. A respondent who has no car and lives about an hour away from the closest GED center and is eager to get her GED says, "I went up as far as 11th grade. That year in my senior year, my father died. I had no motivation. I think many of the welfare recipients are high school dropouts. When I spoke with a couple of them they don't have GED but want to get their GED. They live in remote areas but there's lack of transportation. The closest [GED center] is out west about 45-50 miles (1 hour) in Gallop. Majority of them don't have transportation. Planning to [get a GED] like I said but don't have transportation. I want to. Have temporary construction job. Can go if after 5. I work between 7 a.m. and 5 p.m. I was on cash assistance and food stamps about a month ago. Now, no. I make \$8/hour and no benefits. I want to buy my own benefits. I catch a ride everyday to work. My sister has her own car. She lives near me so convenient for me. But you know when you catch a ride, I pay for gasoline. I live with my mom. She's also old. She's eighty. She watches my daughter after school. She's got a cane and relies on that cane. I can't live anywhere (else) because I have to chop wood for her, take care of her, etc. Another reason why I can't get my GED." Another participant said, "[My goal is to] get my GED, go to school, earn BA in political science. My sister is 55 and she is working on her Ph.D. The most important thing to do right now [for me] is to get my GED. How am I going to get there? I have a child to think about. One day I walk, I might get hit, kidnapped." Many respondents live in remote areas.

When asked about their opinions with regard to the five-year life time limit, a respondent said, "Some of us never finished school. Welfare office tells me to go look for a job and I tell them that I never finished school. How can I get a job? They tell us that we should go get a job. How can a person get a job if they haven't finished their education? [It is] hard since [we have] no transportation. Hard to turn to someone [for help], difficult. Have to keep things very confidential to ourselves. Some of us people should be on income longer. Well, I couldn't really say how long." Many respondents across reservations indicated that the time limit should be extended to those who are attending school or training programs.

Welfare reform has increased participation of welfare populations in education and job training programs. Yet, short-term training programs that are currently available are not likely to prepare welfare recipients on reservations for jobs that pay a living wage. Policies should be in place to encourage women who wish to continue their education beyond high school.

Support services. Support services (childcare and transportation) are severely inadequate on reservations. Eighty-six percent of sample in wave 2 had children under the age of 13, indicating the importance of childcare as a support service for transitioning from welfare to work. On average there were 2.5 children under 13 per respondent. The supply of childcare slots for children of various ages is severely inadequate in rural areas of the US, especially on reservations (Pandey et al. 1999a; 2000a). In wave 2, only 23 families (only 2 families in wave 1) out of a total of 291 families who had children under the age of 13 utilized a formal childcare program such as pre-school, nursery school, childcare center,

Head Start program, and youth program. Others either took care of their children themselves or relied on informal sources of childcare such as friends and relatives. The shortage of childcare slots is a problem on all three of the reservations in which interviews were conducted. Childcare workers from all of these reservations reported that the number of children on the waiting list has increased dramatically since the passage of PRWORA.

Transportation is the most limiting factor barring women on reservations from moving from welfare to work (Pandey et al. 1999a; Porterfield, Pandey, & Gunderson, 1999). According to the U.S. Department of Transportation (1994), ninety-one percent of the rural households in the U.S. have an automobile. Thirty-eight percent of rural residents live in areas without any public transit and another 28 percent live in areas where public transit is negligible. A study of welfare recipients in rural Missouri found that 33 percent of welfare recipients interviewed owned a car (Porterfield, Pandey & Gunderson, 1999) whereas only 25 percent of the households we interviewed on the three reservations owned an automobile. Those who did own a vehicle spoke about the unreliability of their vehicle. Referring to inadequate transportation, one TANF recipient who lives on a reservation said, “How are you supposed to get your child to childcare when you don’t have transportation? You have to keep appointment [with case worker] to keep your benefits. If you don’t, you get cut. And you have no way to get there anyway.” Another respondent said, “There should be help especially people that have been on [welfare] for a lifetime. Willing to help you to go to school and help you financially. And offer transportation since it is one of the biggest issues. Especially for us since we cannot afford a car.”

The lack of automobile ownership and reliable public transportation forces women to walk or rely on family or friends for a ride (Pandey et al. 1999a; 2000a; Porterfield, Pandey & Gunderson, 1999). A respondent said, “I never had a car, don’t know how to drive. My neighbors take here and there and I give them gas money for taking me.” Many women who needed to go to the doctor in the last three months did not go because they did not have transportation. Having an automobile is correlated with work status. Respondents who owned an automobile were more likely to be employed as compared to those without automobiles. Only 19 percent of those who never worked had an automobile, whereas 53 percent of those who were working had access to an automobile.

Lack of a telephone is another barrier. One respondent said, “Lots of jobs required a telephone. It’s pretty hard to get a telephone. Cost quite a bit to run a line out to my place. Like two miles to nearest line. Have to pay myself.”

Other constraints. Within reservations, personal or family histories of poor physical and mental health and substance abuse were reported to be barriers to employment. Nine percent (n=33) of the total respondents indicated poor or very poor health (physical or mental) status. This figure is smaller than the national figures. Studies at the national level estimate that about 20 percent of the welfare caseload is suffering from serious physical or mental health problems that limits them from seeking employment (Acs & Loprest, 1999). An analysis of the 1997 National Survey of America’s Families (NSAF) also confirms that about 20 percent of non-elderly, low-income (i.e., below 200% of Federal Poverty Level) American Indian families have fair or poor health status (Staveteig & Wigton, 2000).

About 16 percent of households in sample in wave 2 received SSI. And about 18 percent of the respondents had someone in the house with a serious disability. The difference between these two numbers may be due to the under report of SSI income by some

households. This figure is smaller than the national figures (Acs & Loprest, 1999).

Substance abuse is also a problem on reservations. Referring to substance abuse on reservations, a respondent said it is a “big problem [on reservation]. It’s out of control on this reservation. All these young people giving their life away for something so worthless.” Generally, women with substance abuse history have a difficult time finding jobs (Pandey et al. 1999a; 2000a). Support programs for women with substance abuse problems are not adequate. These programs must be made available.

Income, benefits and sanctions

About a quarter (26.6%) of respondents in wave 2 had employment income (mean income = \$591 per month), which included income from both formal and informal jobs. Indeed, at the time of the interview only 15% of the sample were employed. Those who had left TANF and were employed were receiving Food Stamps--an indication that their income was low enough to qualify for Food Stamps. For the many poor families on reservations, public assistance is the main source of income. In our sample, 88 percent (n=309) of the households received public assistance. Average monthly public assistance (including TANF, Food Stamps, SSI and Tribal General Assistance) was \$668.9. Several focus group participants said that the benefits were too low. As one woman said, “We need more money. Although I’m not saying what we get doesn’t help.” Many of the women agreed that they only made it “month to month” and had difficulty paying their bills.

About 13 percent of either current or former welfare recipients from the three reservations were partially or fully sanctioned in wave 2. Sanction implies that these respondents lost 25 percent to 100 percent of their cash benefit for failure to comply with program requirements. This figure is twice the national average. Welfare data from 49 states indicate that in 1998 about 5 percent of the total caseload received partial or full sanctions during any given month (U.S. GAO, March 2000). One focus group participant was already receiving benefits when her youngest child was born. She was told that she “can’t receive anything for that child until the year 2000. So now I have to take the money from the other kids to pay for the baby’s Pampers.”

Material hardship

Despite a rapid decline in welfare caseloads, hunger and hardship among low-income families has remained high across the nation (ECONorthwest, 1998; Hunger on the rise, 1998; Moore & Selkove, 1999; Revkin, 1999a; 1999b). On reservations, there is evidence that families are living under extreme financial hardship, lacking the ability to purchase basic household supplies including food, fuel and clothing. Women, particularly those who have been sanctioned, are cutting back on other expenses, letting bills go unpaid and increasing their reliance on relatives and friends simply to provide for necessities, especially for their children. One focus group recipient who lost her TANF benefits when her three month subsidized position ended was making ends meet by selling clothes and toys that her daughter had outgrown. This recipient left the reservation for “a while” to search for work in Phoenix. However, without a phone or transportation, she decided to return to the reservation where her family could provide some support. Forty-five percent of the respondents are not able to buy food they need and a quarter of respondents indicated that their children go to bed or school hungry due to a lack of food. Twenty-one percent of women interviewed said that their gas or electricity had been cut off in the last three months

because they were not able to pay the bill in time. These findings are consistent with other research examining economic hardship among American Indian families. Staveteig and Wigton (2000) in their analysis of 1997 NSAF data found that fifty-nine percent of non-elderly low-income American Indian families (i.e., below 200% of Federal Poverty Level) in the nation are experiencing food hardship; and 41 percent of these families are experiencing difficulty paying rent, mortgage or utility bills.

Living conditions are very poor for low-income families on reservations. The quality of housing occupied by these families is inadequate and lacks basic necessities. Women reported problems such as a leaky roof or ceiling, plumbing problems, broken windows and pest infestations. A focus group participant also mentioned that rent “goes sky-high when you do get a minimum wage job.” This defeats the purpose of helping participants find a job, as they do not have time to get on their feet before the rent increases. Yet, two thirds of the respondents would prefer to live on their reservations rather than somewhere else.

Our focus group interviews also validated extreme material hardship and lack of basic necessities among poor families on reservations. Most focus group participants reported never buying anything for themselves, only for their children. One woman said, “I haven’t bought clothes for myself in three or four years.” Another woman said her parents still bought her clothes. Many reported that their children wear “hand-me-downs.” One woman reported, “The money I get from welfare is not enough to cover rent and butane. My fuel runs out and we have to sit in the house with blankets over us.”

The hardship that this respondent describes is not atypical among families residing on reservations. Many of these children and families are living in extreme material hardship amidst national prosperity. In order to exit welfare, families on reservations need long-term education, support services, and job opportunities that pay a living wage.

Conclusion

What do we know about the state of welfare families on reservations? Longitudinal data indicate that higher proportions of welfare recipients on reservations are engaged in education, training, and employment compared to last year. However, the increase is marginal. Welfare recipients on reservations continue to have lower levels of education than the general welfare population in the nation. They are not equipped to exit welfare without additional job preparation. Seventy percent of welfare recipients on these reservations do not have a high school degree. Only 23 percent of welfare recipients have a high school degree and only 7 percent have gone beyond high school. Since education is related to employment, policies should be developed to support human capital development on reservations. For example, the current five-year life time limit policy should be revisited. In particular, the clock should stop for women who are waiting to participate or participating in education and training and the benefit should be provided in full while they are attending education and training.

Despite a record low unemployment rate at the national level, the unemployment rate remains high among working age populations on many Indian reservations. The 1995 and 1997 Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) reports indicated that on two of the three reservations studied, over 50 percent of the working age population were not participating in the labor force. On the third reservation, less than 50 percent of the working age population was not employed. A shortage of employment opportunities on reservations is reflected in the sample.

Of the total sample, only a small percentage (15%) of the respondents has found employment and exited TANF. This employment rate among welfare recipients on reservations is extremely low compared to their counterparts in the nation. Therefore, job opportunities must be created on reservations before we can expect welfare families to exit welfare.

As the five-year life time limit is running out, welfare families are getting more nervous about their future. Of the employed respondents, most are making far below the poverty line with an average hourly wage of \$6.8 and monthly wage of \$591; this does not lift them above the poverty line. Even the employed respondents continue to report material hardship, such as food, fuel, and clothing insufficiency. Many households continue to rely on public assistance. Jobs must pay a living wage so that those who are working full time are able to exit welfare.

Support services (transportation and childcare) are severely inadequate on reservations. Only 25 percent of the respondents owned an automobile, many of which were not reliable. Due to lack of transportation, many women had difficulty getting basic tasks done (e.g., going to the grocery store, doctor, or work). Eighty-six percent of the sample had children under the age of 13, with an average of 2.5 children under age 13 per respondent. Very small percentage of families in the whole sample used a formal childcare facility. Others either took care of their children themselves or relied on friends and relatives for childcare. Only a few respondents received help to defray the costs of childcare. Due to a lack of childcare, some respondents had to quit their jobs or training programs. At the same time, support from families and friends are declining. Therefore, to help families exit welfare, more funds for support services must be made available. Also, the five-year life time limit clock should stop for recipients who are waiting in line to enroll their children in childcare centers and for those who live in areas where public transportation is severely inadequate.

Chapter 2: Issues for Welfare Reform Reauthorization in Indian Country

Due for reauthorization in the 107th Congress, the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) of 1996 (Pub. L. 104-193), better known as welfare reform, represented a major change in federal policy concerning cash assistance to poor families and children. The PRWORA focused on moving people from welfare to work and altered the provision of services to poor families and children. Additionally, PRWORA offered tribal governments an option to administer TANF and some related support programs for the first time (U.S. Congress, 1996). As a result, tribal communities have been uniquely affected by welfare reform.

For decades, poverty has persisted in many Indian communities. Specifically, many tribal communities suffer from disproportionate poverty rates (Deloria & Lytle, 1994); remote, rural geography; inaccessibility of services and high cost of service delivery; lack of economic base; inadequate training, job opportunities, and support services; and lack of facilities and infrastructure (Pandey, et al. 1999a; Pandey, et al. 1999b; Pandey, et al. 2000a). Tribes face challenges in coordinating tribally provided and state-provided services, as there are still various related programs that tribes do not have the authority to administer directly. Beyond an attempt to provide a safety net for all low-income families, the United States government has made commitments to Indian tribes in treaties and laws (i.e. the Synder Act of 1920). In exchange for lands, the United States government has an obligation to provide for the health, safety and welfare of tribal communities beyond the implementation of

welfare reform (DHHS, 1996).

Since Welfare Reform was enacted, every tribe has dealt with the many challenges that PRWORA presents to tribal children, families and communities. Tribes commonly provide childcare, employment, training, education and a variety of social services to needy Indian people within their service areas. Many of these services are funded through Indian programs authorized under PRWORA. In addition, tribes devote a significant amount of tribal resources to dealing with welfare reform requirements. For example, the Navajo Nation appropriated approximately \$1.5 million from tribal revenues to provide start up costs for TANF administrative planning and the development of a tribal management information system. Some tribes, including many in Washington and Wisconsin, even provide services to their people on public assistance through grants and contracts from state government agencies.

Many tribes have adopted new and innovative approaches to restructuring and integrating their services, in part using the opportunities under Public Law 102-477, to better serve their needy families. The Public Law 102-477, the Indian Employment, Training and Related Services Act of 1992 allows tribes to integrate the employment, training and related services in order to improve effectiveness of services, reduce joblessness and serve tribally-determined goals. In effect, tribes can use the Public Law 102-477 to co-locate services and streamline eligibility processes, providing recipients with one-stop shopping. Tribes, such as the Three Affiliated Tribes of North Dakota and the Central Council of Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska, have been successful in streamlining the eligibility process by creating a single point of entry. Additionally, the Sisseton Wahpeton Tribe of South Dakota has integrated 13 employment/training and related programs, funded by three different federal agencies, and has allowed tribal members to access all of these programs in one office.

To date, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services has approved thirty-four Tribal TANF “plans” (in effect, applications), serving 170 tribes across the nation. In FY 2001, two hundred and fifty-seven Tribal Childcare grantees, serving over 500 tribes, received \$90 million, approximately two percent of the federal Child Care Development Fund. Seventy-nine tribal grantees administer the Native Employment Works (NEW) program, and 86 tribes administered \$15 million in Welfare-to-Work (WtW) grants. Of the 15 tribes that received demonstration grants to explore and plan for tribal Child Support Enforcement programs, five tribes have received direct funding to operate these complex programs.

American Indian and Alaska Native tribal governments have shown great enthusiasm for operating new programs and for re-designing service delivery systems. They are committed to strengthening tribal families, protecting the interests of tribal children, promoting family self-sufficiency, reducing dependence on public assistance, and developing economically prosperous and culturally thriving tribal communities. While struggling with limited resources and the lack of employment opportunities on reservations, tribes have made great strides in offering coordinated and holistic support services to their tribal members. Tribal governments have made assistance programs and support services far more accessible to their communities than ever before. For example, the Tanana Chiefs Conference (TCC), a non-profit corporation serving tribes in interior Alaska, has used the Tribal TANF program to create 38 part time jobs, a single point-of-contact in each of the 38 isolated villages, to assist recipients in accessing the benefits for which they are eligible. In addition, TCC created 13

full-time jobs in their main office in Fairbanks, and 75 percent of all the jobs created have employed former welfare recipients. Tribes have also begun to take advantage of the opportunity to become directly involved in the administration of child support enforcement programs

Of the programs that are expiring in 2002, we examined four program categories that authorize funding directly to tribes: TANF, Employment and Training programs (Native Employment Works and Welfare-to-Work), and the Child Care Development Fund, and the Child Support Enforcement program. We propose some specific changes in these programs. In addition, we discuss opportunities for job creation and raise some issues related to state administration of TANF programs on reservations.

Tribal TANF program

Section 412, Title I of PRWORA authorizes the direct funding of TANF to federally-recognized American Indian tribes, 12 regional non-profit corporations, and Metlakatla in Alaska. As of June 2001, 34 Tribal TANF plans, serving 170 tribes in 15 states have been approved by the DHHS. Over \$86 million in Tribal TANF grants will be awarded in FY 2001. Because tribes can apply to administer TANF at any point in time, the number of tribal grantees is increasing every year, despite the limited resources that tribes receive. Nonetheless, many tribes are unable to administer a Tribal TANF program because of the lack of sufficient funding. Many of the South Dakota tribes would like to take over TANF, but are unable to because the state has decided not to provide any TANF matching funds to Tribal TANF programs. A number of important PRWORA amendments that can assist in facilitating success of Tribal TANF programs.

First, the Tribal TANF funding formula should provide resources no less than former resource levels under state AFDC programs. The Tribal TANF funding formula should offer tribal grantees options (similar to states options) that will allow them to select a funding formula that benefits their individual program. Tribes should have access to funding levels, incentive bonuses and contingency funds as states do. Adequate planning, start-up, administrative and support service funding are equally important (Pandey, et al. 1999b).

Second, consistent with the discretion that states have in establishing their eligibility criteria, Tribal TANF grantees should continue to have the flexibility to distinctly define their service area and service population.

Third, in the interest of integrated, consumer-oriented service delivery, tribal governments administering TANF should have the option of making eligibility determinations for other related support programs, including Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP). Tribes should be eligible for direct funding under the Title XX Social Services block grant program, Food Stamps and Title IV-E foster care assistance. Moreover, in order to enable tribal governments to administer these programs (and others such as the Access to Jobs and Reverse Commute programs), matching fund requirements should be waived. For example, the Southern California Tribal Chairman's Association Tribal TANF program, serving a consortium of 18 tribes in southern California, has been unable to access the transportation programs because they cannot meet the matching fund requirements. Gaining access to funds available for support services, such as transportation, mental health, substance abuse, and domestic violence services is critical so that tribes can help welfare participants move from welfare to work.

Fourth, the Secretary of HHS should be given the discretion to develop, in

consultation with tribes, reporting requirements appropriate to tribal circumstances. The TANF reporting requirements in Section 411 were written for states, not tribes. Consequently, the reporting elements do not capture the uniqueness of Tribal TANF programs and do not allow for reporting of various unique activities in which tribal members are working. For example, data systems do not provide codes for elements that could reflect participation in the Navajo TANF silver smith apprenticeship, or work activities such as sheep herding, weaving, or ceremonial activities. Furthermore, reporting requirements are unnecessarily burdensome to tribes wishing to assume the responsibility for administering the TANF program. Tribes should be assisted in acquiring management information system (MIS) technology to track services to their recipients, as states were for a number of years. Ultimately, with adequate financial support, tribally driven program evaluation and policy research will yield the development of appropriate reporting systems and requirements.

Fifth, Alaska-specific provisions should be removed in the reauthorization process, allowing Alaskan tribes to be treated as tribes in other states. There are two sections of PRWORA that treat Alaska Native tribes differently than the tribes in other states. The first is Section 419(4)(b), which provides a special definition of “Indian tribe” for Alaska to include only the 12 regional non-profit corporations, with no reference to the federally-recognized tribes in Alaska. The second is Section 412(h), which requires that Tribal TANF programs in Alaska to be “comparable” to the state-operated TANF program. Tribal implementation of TANF in Alaska has shown that neither provision is needed and unduly restricts tribal programming. Moreover, these provisions hinder self-determination and the ability of tribes in Alaska to make tribal-specific program decisions.

Employment and training programs

Employment and training programs play a critical role in moving families toward self-sufficiency. The two primary tribal employment and training programs authorized in PRWORA are the NEW program and the tribal component of the WtW program. Nationally, 98 tribes, Alaska Native organizations and inter-tribal consortia receive direct federal funding under either the tribal component of the WtW program, the NEW program or both. About a quarter of these tribes currently operate their own Tribal TANF programs.

Many tribes have already exhausted their WtW funds, a total of \$15 million a year, provided in FY 1998 and FY 1999. These tribes have had to substantially reduce the employment and training support they have been providing to tribal families on TANF. Funding for the NEW program, only \$7.6 million a year, expires with the end of PRWORA at the end of FY 2002. Only 79 tribes, intertribal consortia, and Alaska organizations that had formerly administered the JOBS program are eligible for NEW program funding. In effect, this prohibits 483 tribes from receiving NEW program funding. This limitation on which tribes can receive NEW funds constrains the ability of many tribes who have taken over TANF, as well as tribes who would like to assume TANF, to meet the employment and training needs of their families. WtW eligible Indian communities are those American Indian tribes, intertribal consortia, or Alaska Native regional nonprofit corporations that are operating their own TANF or NEW programs or are operating employment programs funded through other sources under which “substantial services”⁶ are provided to welfare recipients (Department of Labor, 1998). Using these regulations, a total of 93 tribes, intertribal consortia, and Alaska Native groups across the United States are eligible to apply to the Department of Labor (DOL) for tribal WtW funds. Through the Indian and Native

American Employment Training Coalition, tribal employment and training grantees have outlined five major goals for reauthorization.

First, an employment and training program strengthening existing government-to-government funding relationships is an essential component for self-sufficiency. Acting with very limited resources, tribes have made a major effort to assist their families in meeting the work and other requirements of welfare reform. Tribes have done this even when the state remains responsible for TANF and other welfare services.

Second, tribal employment and training services should be adequately funded. One way to begin addressing the inadequacy of employment and training resources, is to combine the funding already available in the NEW program and tribal WtW program. In addition, funding should be increased to allow the 464 tribes that have not been able to enter either program. Additional resources should be provided for special needs, like capacity building, listed below.

Third, tribal employment and training services should have the flexibility to address the needs of a wide variety of people on welfare, transitioning off welfare or at risk of becoming dependent on cash assistance. Tribes have also tried to develop special services for youth, including teen parents, and for non-custodial parents. Future tribal employment and training services for welfare recipients should encourage tribes to choose to target these kinds of clients.

Fourth, the program should authorize tribes to provide whatever types of services and activities that they consider effective in furthering self-sufficiency. One of the most significant characteristics of tribal programs is their focus on each individual participant and addressing that participant's barriers to employment. Federal funding should allow tribes to provide a range of activities to meet the participant's needs in a culturally relevant, family-focused, holistic way based on individual tribal customs and practices. Many tribes have found that the ability to integrate their welfare reform-related services with other services through the Pub. L. 102-477 initiative has been the key to more and better services for welfare recipients.

⁶“Substantial services” means that a tribe has served at least 50 welfare recipients in its employment and training programs over the last two years and at least 20% of the participants in those programs during the most recent program or fiscal year are welfare recipients. The same test is used to determine whether tribes that do not operate TANF or NEW JOBS programs were eligible to receive WtW funds.

Fifth, in addition to the money for basic client services, there should be additional funding available for a number of program support functions, such as capacity building, management information systems development, research and evaluation.

A program consistent with these principles would provide a single funding stream, combining and expanding the resource levels which have been available in the NEW and WtW programs, along with support for tribes that have not been able to access those resources under current law. The combined program would have the flexibility described above and include the relevant program support functions. Administration through the Indian office in the Labor Department would enable a closer integration of this proposed program with related tribal workforce development efforts funded through other statutes.

Child Care Development Fund

In FY 2001, 257 tribal Child Care Development Fund (CCDF) grantees (representing

some 500 tribes) have received \$90 million combined in mandatory and discretionary funds, approximately two percent of the CCDF. Since August 1997, tribes used over \$24 million of CCDF funds for the construction and renovation of 70 childcare facilities. Tribal childcare programs also provide employment and training for childcare providers, monitor health and safety standards, and provide a modest source of economic opportunities on reservations.

In looking toward PRWORA reauthorization, tribal childcare grantees, as represented by the National Indian Child Care Association (NICCA), have set forth six primary suggestions for the reauthorization of CCDF.

First, consistent with the government-to-government relationship, tribes should continue to receive funding directly from the federal government to provide childcare services. Because of limited tribal resources and the high percentage of tribal families residing in urban areas, tribal children should continue to be dually eligible for childcare services from both state and tribal CCDF programs.

Second, greater demands for childcare are being placed on tribal childcare programs as a result of increasing population, increasing job search, employment and education opportunities, and TANF time limits. The PRWORA gives states the option of using federal TANF dollars and unlimited amounts of state TANF matching dollars for their state CCDF program. In contrast, majority of tribal CCDF grantees do not administer TANF and do not have other resources to supplement their childcare programs. Even the tribes that administer TANF do not have the financial ability to use TANF funding for childcare, because of other demands on TANF dollars, including providing cash assistance and addressing administrative start-up costs. The one to two percent (based on DHHS Secretarial discretion) tribal CCDF set-aside has remained the same over the past four years, with the Secretary of HHS consistently allocating two percent. During this time, demand for services rendered by Tribal CCDF programs has increased. An overall increase in the CCDF allocation and five percent set aside of the total CCDF appropriation for tribal grantees is necessary to help tribes meet increased childcare needs.

Third, each state enjoys flexibility in developing childcare programs and policies that best suit the needs of children and parents within that state. As a result, health and safety standards vary across 50 states. Like states, tribal entities should have the final authority to develop health and safety standards and licensing requirements. The American Indian/Alaska Native Tribal CCDF grantees should be allowed to develop their own minimum health and safety standards rather than being forced to adopt federal standards.

Fourth, the implementation of any new, yet-to-be-finalized federal health and safety standards will place a new burden on tribal programs and families that utilize tribal childcare services. Additional funding, beyond the 2-5 percent tribal CCDF set aside should be appropriated to ensure that the level of services does not decrease with the implementation, monitoring and enforcement of the standards.

Fifth, tribal programs currently have the option of allocating a portion of their CCDF funding for the construction or renovation of childcare facilities if such an allocation does not reduce the level of current services offered by the tribe. Such an option for construction should continue and exceptions to the criteria (so long as such an allocation does not reduce the level of services) should be made if the level of funding from the government decreases or justification of long-term goals is approved by the DHHS. Construction can be key to meeting the health and safety standards; the cumbersome construction application process

should also be simplified.

Finally, PRWORA currently states that childcare centers must have at least 25 percent of the enrolled children or 25 percent of the licensing capacity receiving Title XX assistance before the center is eligible for the Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP). Tribal grantees do not receive Title XX funds. Therefore, tribal children do not count towards the eligibility determination for participation in the food program. Tribal children in private childcare centers that are receiving tribal subsidies should have access to the CACFP. The law should be amended to read, ... “a private organization can participate in the food program if at least 25 percent of the enrolled children meet income eligibility guidelines established by the Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP).”

Child support enforcement program

PRWORA allowed tribes to directly receive Title IV-D Child Support Enforcement grants for the first time. In FY 1997, DHHS made an administrative decision to fund only 15 tribes to receive Child Support Enforcement (CSE) grants on a demonstration project basis while they promulgated regulations to govern the tribal CSE program. On December 19, 2000, the comment period on the proposed tribal CSE regulation ended. Currently, five tribes are funded under the interim rule. The Sisseton Wahpeton Sioux Tribe, Navajo Nation, and Lac du Flambeau Tribe, are three CSE grantees that also run Tribal TANF programs. The other two grantees are the Pullayup and Chickasaw tribes. Because few tribes actually operate CSE programs now, it is difficult to propose comprehensive amendments (or even identify all the pertinent tribal issues) for CSE reauthorization.

The general recommendations are primarily in response to the DHHS proposed regulation. Because PRWORA did not address tribal CSE programs at any length, but rather simply authorized tribes to receive direct funding, many of the problems that tribes will have with CSE implementation are due to regulatory and administrative guidelines and not PRWORA itself. To make the Congressional intent clear, tribes have requested a number of provisions that will clarify issues that the DHHS is attempting to regulate.

First, Section 455(f) of Title III of PRWORA includes a list of five core eligibility criteria for direct federal CSE funding. The DHHS has, however, gone beyond these five criteria and has required the 14 criteria set out in 45 CFR § 309.65. The new requirements added by the DHHS are overly burdensome to tribal governments and impinge on tribal self-determination. Rather than providing the documentation proposed to demonstrate a tribal capacity to establish paternity; establish, modify and enforce support orders; and locate absent parents, the PRWORA requires only that tribes assert that they have such capacity. The DHHS should not have to “approve” all tribal procedures to assess tribes’ capability to operate a Tribal CSE program

Second, contrary to PRWORA, the regulation also limits the direct funding of Tribal CSE programs to Indian tribes that have a minimum of 100 children under the age of majority, as defined by tribal law or code and within their jurisdiction. The DHHS’ concern with the cost of establishing CSE infrastructure is clear, however, this restriction hinders tribal self-determination and is unnecessary. Tribes consistently make fiscal decisions that serve to benefit them, and often form consortia when they see fit. Currently, many of the TANF tribes in Southern California are served through consortia that the tribes formed of their own volition. Requirement of minimum population, however, discriminates against small tribes and denies some tribes that administer Tribal TANF programs the opportunity to

administer CSE programs. The federal government should not require tribes with fewer than 100 children in their jurisdiction to form consortia in order to administer a Tribal CSE program. The DHHS imposition of such a requirement is not consistent with statute and section 455(f).

Finally, the proposed funding formula should be altered. This formula should not include a matching requirement, as even the proposed 10 or 20 percent non-federal matching requirement would prevent many tribes from administering a CSE program. Tribes support the DHHS recognition that the proposed funding formula should be reconsidered if it “imposes hardship and is disruptive to tribes.” The funding for necessary start-up costs and flexibility for tribes to contract for various CSE services with whomever they choose- other tribes, states, or private organizations- should also be maintained.

Job Creation

In addition to the currently authorized PRWORA programs, there is a major unmet need in Indian Country for an economic development initiative which would serve to create permanent, unsubsidized employment opportunities into which welfare recipients could move as they transition off assistance and to prevent welfare receipt in the first place. With this in mind, tribes have proposed strengthening two additional programs.

Job opportunities are lacking on many Indian reservations. Indian families should not be expected to move e from welfare to work if work is not available. Reservation based economic development programs are necessary for welfare reform to succeed. In reauthorizing the programs under PRWORA, the Congress should provide tribes with resources to help create long term and unsubsidized jobs that will benefit public assistance recipients. In addition, tribes assisting families in moving from welfare to work (whether or not they administer a tribal TANF program) should have increased access to funds for economic development. Many funding streams for economic development (such as DHHS’ Job Opportunities for Low-Income Individuals- JOLI) are not currently available to tribes who do not have Community Development Corporations; various statutes authorizing these programs could be amended to increase tribes’ access to funds for economic development. A separate Indian program that supports and promotes job creation for the welfare population should be developed.

Indian Recipients under State TANF Programs

As state TANF programs still serve majority of tribal communities, tribes have an interest in provisions relating to state TANF programs. First, states should consult with tribes in the development of their state TANF program. “Consultation” should be defined in the statute and performance measures should be identified. Second, the term “equitable access” should be defined and made enforceable in current provisions in section 402 of Title I of PRWORA that mandate tribal members not served by a tribal TANF program have “equitable access” to state TANF programs and services. —

Third, tribes, like states, have an interest in changes to the definition of “work activities.” States should have some discretion in the definition of “work.” They should have the flexibility to include educational and some cultural activities as “work” for the purpose of meeting work requirements. There should be an increased focus on education, as many studies have shown that education, in combination with work experience, is likely to yield more welfare leavers who are able to secure higher-paying jobs and are more successful

in keeping those jobs (Pandey, et al. 2000b).

Fourth, since PRWORA was enacted, the TANF rolls have declined on some reservations. A large portion of the remaining caseload is composed of families with one or more adults unable to work and to successfully enter and remain in the workforce. The reauthorization of PRWORA must enable states and tribes to continue essential cash assistance without arbitrary limits on the duration of assistance or inappropriate work requirements for this population. An expansion of the hardship exemption is one way to deal with this issue.

Finally, under Section 408 of PRWORA's Title I (as amended), any month in which a TANF recipient lives in Indian Country or an Alaskan Native Village where 50 percent or more of all adults are not employed does not count toward the applicable time limit on TANF assistance but continues to require TANF recipients to comply with all other program requirements. The 50 percent threshold rate was arbitrarily selected. There is no significant difference in the quality of life for Indian families who live on reservations with a 38 percent or 45 percent joblessness rate, instead of a 50 percent joblessness rate. Regardless of the joblessness rate for a particular area, welfare recipients who comply with all program requirements should not be dropped from assistance because of the lack of jobs in their communities.

Conclusion

Indian tribes and Native families have an important stake in several provisions of PRWORA which address TANF and other services. Indian tribal governments and families are committed to the principle of self-sufficiency at both the community and the family levels. To reduce poverty and develop economically viable tribal communities, an investment in both Indian families and tribal communities is necessary. The federal and state governments should make investments to empower tribal governments to build the economic and social infrastructure to move tribal families to self-sufficiency in the short-term, and to make reservations thriving economic communities in the long-term. We propose that any changes in the reauthorization should strengthen existing government-to-government funding relationships and cooperation among federal, state and tribal governments. The programs should be adequately funded to meet tribal needs, including funding for capacity building and special needs. The programs should have the flexibility to serve the needs of a wide variety of persons on welfare, transitioning off welfare or at risk of becoming dependent on cash assistance. Policies should authorize tribes to provide any types of services and activities that they consider effective in furthering self-sufficiency. In particular, education, job creation, and economic development components should be included and the goal of welfare reform should be expanded to address poverty reduction.

References

Acs, G., & Loprest, P. (1999). The effects of disabilities on exits from AFDC. *Policy Analysis and Management*, 18 (1), 28-49.

Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) (1995). *Indian Service Population and Labor Force Estimates*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) (1997). *Indian Service Population and Labor Force Estimates*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) (1999). *Indian Service Population and Labor Force Estimates*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Deloria, V., & Lytle, C.M. (1994). *American Indians in Historical perspective*. American Indians, American Justice, University of Texas Press, pp. 1-24.

Department of Labor (1998). *Indian and Native American Welfare-to-Work Grants Program: Interim Final Rule*, Employment and Training Administration, 20 CFR Part 646, Department of Labor. [On-line]. Available: <http://www.wdsc.org/dinap/dinapw2w/resources/reg-finl.html>.

Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) (2000a). *Change in TANF caseloads (1993-December 1999)*. Available [On-line]:

<http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/news/stats/caseload.htm> and
<http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/news/stats/case-fam.htm>

Department of Health and Human Services (1996). Comprehensive Health Care Program for American Indians and Alaska Natives. Washington D.C.: U.S.

ECONorthwest (1998). Comparing recent declines in Oregon's cash assistance caseload with trends in the poverty population. Silverton, Oregon: The Oregon Center for Public Policy. Available [On-line]: <http://www.ocpp.org/1998/rpt9808caseloadpov.pdf/>

Gittell, M., Gross, J. & Holdaway, J. (1993). Building human capital: The impact of postsecondary education on AFDC recipients in five states. New York: Howard Samuels State Management and Policy Center.

Gittell, M., & Moore, J. (1989). Denying independence: Barriers to the education of women on AFDC. In S. L. Harlan, and R.J. Steinberg (Eds.), Job training for women: The promise and limits of public policies. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Hunger on the rise. (1998, January 31). America Press Inc., v178 n3 p3(1).

Moore, T. S., & Selkove, V. (1999). The growing crisis among Wisconsin's poorest families: A comparison of welfare caseload declines and trends in the state's poverty population--1986-1997. A report by The Institute for Wisconsin's Future, Wisconsin. [On-line] Available: <http://www.execpc.com/~iwf/reports/FoodStampRep.pdf/>

Pandey, S., Zhan, M., Collier-Tenison, S., & Hui, K. (2000a). How are families on reservations faring under welfare reform? Published report, St. Louis, MO: Kathryn M. Buder Center for American Indian Studies, George Warren Brown School of Social Work, Washington University.

Pandey, S., Zhan, M., Neely-Barnes, S., & Menon, N.(2000b). The higher education option for poor women with children. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, XXVII (4), 109-170.

Pandey, S., Brown, E.F., Scheuler-Whitaker, L., Gundersen, B., Eyrich, K., & Villarreal, L. (1999a). Implementation of the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) on American Indian Reservations: Early Evidence from Arizona. Working Paper, St. Louis, MO: Kathryn M. Buder Center for American Indian Studies, George Warren Brown School of Social Work, Washington University.

Pandey, S., Brown, E.F., Scheuler-Whitaker, L., Gundersen, B., & Eyrich, K. (1999b) Promise of welfare reform: Development through devolution on Indian reservations. *Journal of Poverty*, 3(4), 37-61.

Pandey, S., Brown, E. F., Scheuler-Whitaker, L., & Collier-Tenison, S. (Forthcoming, 2002). Welfare reform on American Indian reservations: Initial experience of service providers and recipients on reservations in Arizona. *Journal of Social Policy*.

Pandey, S., & Collier-Tenison, S. (under review). Welfare reform: An exploration of devolution.

Pandey, S., & Zhan, M. (under review). Families' experience with welfare reform on reservations in Arizona

Pavetti, L. (1997a). Moving up, moving out or going nowhere? A study of the employment patterns of young women. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute. [Online] Available: <http://www.urban.org/welfare/jobtr.htm>

Pavetti, L. (1997b). How much more can they work? Setting realistic expectations for welfare mothers. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute. [Online] Available: <http://www.urban.org/welfare/howmuch.htm>

Porterfield, S.L., & McBride, T. D. (1997). Welfare to work: Factors Influencing Work and Welfare Transitions in Female-Headed Families. Paper presented at the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management, annual research conference, Washington, DC, November.

Porterfield, S., Pandey, S., & Gunderson, B. (1999). Assessing the barriers: Welfare to work among rural, female-headed households. Presented at the annual research meeting of the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management, Washington, DC, November.

Revkin, A. (1999a, February 26). Welfare policies altering face of lines at charities offering food. The New York Times. Available [On-line]: <http://www.nytimes.com/library/national/regional/022699food.html/>

Revkin, A. (1999b, February 27). As demand for food donations grows, supplies steadily dwindle. The New York Times. Available [On-line]: <http://www.nytimes.com/library/national/regional/022799food.html/>

Spalter-Roth, R.M., & Hartman, H. I. (1991). Increasing working mothers' earnings: Executive summary. Washington, DC: Institute for Women's Policy Research.

Spalter-Roth, R. M., Burr, B., Hartmann, H., & Shaw, L. (1995). Welfare that works: The working lives of AFDC recipients. Washington, DC: Institute for Women's Policy Research.

Staveteig, S., & Wigton, A. (2000). Racial and ethnic disparities: Key findings from the national survey of America's families. New Federalism: National Survey of America's Families. Series B, No. B-5. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

U.S. Congress (1996). The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193.

U.S. Congress (1997). Balanced Budget Act of 1997, P. L. 105-33. [On-line]
Available: <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/z?c105:H.R.2015.ENR>:

U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) (March, 2000). Welfare reform: State sanction policies and number of families affected. Washington, D.C.: U.S. GAO, GAO/HEHS-00-44

Appendix I

List of Tribal PRWORA Reauthorization meetings, seminars and workshops attended

List of meetings

NCAI Welfare Reform Task Force, meeting in Washington, DC, on 2/23/00.

DHHS ACF Region VIII conference Denver, CO, on 3/14-16/00

DHHS ACF “Empowering Tribal Families in the New Millenium” conference
Albuquerque, NM, on 4/25-27/00.

DHHS ACF Tribal Child Care conference, Portland, OR, on 5/2-4/00.

Tribal TANF Administrators’ meeting, St. Louis, MO, on 5/4/00.

Washington University “Empowering American Indian Families: New Perspectives
on Welfare Reform” symposium, St. Louis, MO, on 5/5-6/00.

Tribal TANF Administrators’ meeting Salt River Indian Community, AZ, on
7/6-7/00.

Tribal TANF Administrators’ meeting, Washington, DC, on 10/30/00.

NCAI/Indian and Native American Employment and Training Coalition conference,
Washington, DC, on 10/31-11/2/00.

NCAI Welfare Reform Task Force, Minneapolis, MN, on 11/12/00.

NCAI Welfare Reform Task Force, Washington, DC, on 2/20/00.

Tribal TANF Administrators’ meeting, Washington, DC, on 4/20/01.

List of conferences and workshops

Brown, E. F. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children
and Families, Region X, Conference “Taking Stock – Living with the Realities of Welfare
Reform”. Keynote Speaker, “Realities of Welfare Reform,” February 1-2, 1998, Sea Tac, WA.

Brown, E.F. National Congress on American Indians (NCAI), Welfare Reform Implementation in Indian Country: A National Forum. Moderator, February 28, 1998, Washington, D.C.

Brown, E.F. Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) Conference. Presenter, American Indian Faculty Forum, "Monitoring the Impact of Welfare Reform on American Indian Families with Children", March 3 - 7, 1998, Orlando, FL.

Brown, E.F. National Congress on American Indians, Welfare Reform Impacts on Tribal Social Services: A National Forum, Moderator, Thursday, April 23, 1998, Portland, OR

Brown, E. F. Navajo Area Health Advisory Board Annual Conference, Presenter, "Impact of Welfare Reform in Health Care Services", June 29 – July 1, 1998. Albuquerque, NM

Brown, E.F. Administration of Children, Youth and Families, Presenter, "Welfare Reform and its Effects on the American Indian Family, July 8-10, 1998, Washington, DC

Brown, E. F. The Second Northwest Tribal Welfare Information Project Conference, Keynote Speaker, "Impact of Welfare Reform on Indian Country: Early Lessons", August 25-26, 1998, Clackamas, OR

Brown, E. F. National Congress of American Indians (NCAI), Fourth National Welfare Reform Forum, "Organizational Reports on Welfare Reform in Indian Country: A National Forum". Presenter. October 18, 1998, Myrtle Beach, SC.

Brown, E. F. Kaiser Family Foundation, Udall Center for Studies in Public Policy and The University of Arizona, Native American Health and Welfare Policy Conference. Guest Speaker, "Is Welfare Reform Working for Native American Communities?", October 22-24, 1998, Tucson, AZ.

Brown, E. F. US Department of Health and Human Services, "Welfare Reform: Promising Practices National Conferences", Workshop Presenter, "Tribal Administration of TANF: Lessons Learned", February 2-4, 1999, San Diego, CA.

Brown, E. F. United States Senate Congressional Briefing, Welfare Reform in Indian Country, March 15, 1999, Washington, DC.

Brown, E. F. San Carlos Tribal Council Workshop on TANF Administration, Presenter, March 16-18, 1999, San Carlos, AZ.

Brown, E. F. United States Senate, Committee on Indian Affairs, testimony "Welfare to Work: Monitoring the Impact of Welfare Reform on American Indian Families with Children: Early Findings", April 14, 1999, Washington, DC.

Brown, E.F. Indian Child Welfare Association (ICWA) “ICWA: 20 Years of Weaving Indian Families Back Together,” Keynote Speaker, June 2, 1999, San Diego, CA

Brown, E.F. National Indian Child Welfare Association, The Navajo Nation and the New Mexico Indian Child Welfare Association, “Gaining Equal Access: Making IV-E Work for Our People,” Guest Speaker, June 16, 1999, Albuquerque, NM

Brown, E.F. W.K. Kellogg Foundation and University of Maryland, Scholar-Practitioner Program of the Devolution Initiative, Advisory Committee Meeting, June 22-23 and October 6-7, 1999, Washington, DC

Brown, E.F. U.S. Department of Labor, Division of Indian and Native American Programs, “Strengthening the Next Generation by Preserving Self-Sufficiency and Ending Welfare Dependency,” Workshop Presenter –“Impact of Welfare Reform in Indian Country,” July 25-27, 1999, San Diego, CA

Brown, E.F. 2nd Annual Western States Tribal Welfare Reform Conference, “Past, Present, and Future: Returning to Traditional Family Strengths,” Keynote Address - “Concepts and Principles for Social Work Practice in the 21st Century, Empowering American Indian Families,” September 29, 1999, Glacier Park, MT

Brown, E.F. W.K. Kellogg Foundation and University of Maryland, Devolution Network Meeting, Workshop Consultant, October 6-7, 1999, Albany, NY

Brown, E.F. Idaho Indian Child Welfare Conference, Keynote Address, “Tribal-State Partnerships: From Cowboys and Indians to a Shared Vision of the Future”, October 26-27, Boise, ID

Brown, E.F. Morris K. Udall Foundation, Center for Studies in Public Policy, University of Arizona, Panel Presenter, “Building American Indian Nations for the 21st Century”, November 11-13, 1999, Tucson, AZ.

Brown, E.F. Indian Health Service and the Center for Native American Health at the University of Arizona, “Crafting the Future of American Indian and Alaska Native Health into the Next Millennium”, Welcome Address, “Empowering Tribal Governments, Institutions and Communities through Collaborative Partnerships”, December 9-11, 1999, San Diego, CA

Brown, E.F. British Columbia First Nations Employment Society, “Making Welfare Work Conference”, Keynote Speaker, “Making Welfare Work: A New Path for Empowering First Nations’ Families”, January 17-20, 2000, Vancouver, BC

Brown, E.F. Society for Social Work and Research (SSWR) 4th Annual Conference, Symposium Presenter, “A Framework for the Development of Research Projects with Tribal Communities”, January 29-30, 2000, Charleston, SC

Brown, E.F. National Congress of American Indians (NCAI), Welfare Reform Task Force Meeting, Group Facilitator, February 22-24, 2000, Washington, DC

Brown, E.F. United States Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, Testimony on the President's budget request for Fiscal Year 2001, February 23, 2000, Washington, DC

Brown, E.F. Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), 46th Annual Program Meeting, Panel Presenter, "Impact of TANF on American Indian Reservations: Early Evidence", February 26-29, 2000, New York, NY

Brown, E.F. Georgetown University/The Catawba Indian Nation, The Tribal Executive Management Program, Workshop Presenter, "The Development of Sustainable Tribal Communities," March 7, 2000, Washington, DC

Brown, E.F. Inter Tribal Council of Arizona, Panel Presenter and Group Facilitator, "Working with Tribal Human Service Providers for the Development of Coordinated, Community-based Family Centered Services", April 25-27, 2000, Phoenix, AZ.

Brown, E.F. George Warren Brown School of Social Work/Kathryn M. Buder Center for American Indian Studies, "Empowering American Indian Families: New Perspectives on Welfare Reform" Symposium, May 5-6, 2000, St. Louis, MO

Brown, E.F. Washington University Elliot Society, Keynote Speaker, "The Kathryn M. Buder Center for American Indian Studies: Educating American Indian Students and Impacting the National Policy Debate Towards the Development of Sustainable Tribal Communities," May 8, 2000, Phoenix, AZ

Brown, E.F. National Association of Social Workers, Michigan Chapter, 24th Annual Conference, Keynote Speaker, "Making Welfare Work – A Rejuvenation of the Spirit," May 8-19, 2000, Mt. Pleasant, MI

Brown, E.F. W.K. Kellogg Foundation/University of Maryland Devolution Initiative Meeting, "Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Welfare Reform," July 14-16, 2000, Washington, DC

Brown, E.F. National Association for Welfare Research and Statistics 40th Annual Workshop, Guest speaker, "A Path Toward Developing Solutions that Utilize the Strengths of American Indian Families and Communities," July 31, 2000, Phoenix, AZ

Brown, E.F. W.K. Kellogg Foundation/University of Maryland Devolution Networking Meeting, "Equitable Access: Is Devolution Leaving Some Communities Behind?" September 25-28, 2000, Seattle, WA

Brown, E.F. National Congress of American Indians (NCAI), Group Facilitator, Welfare Reform Reauthorization Work Group, November 11, 2000, St. Paul, MN

Brown, E.F. Region Ten Tenth Annual Tribal Grantee Conference, Panel

Presentation, “Devolution – How Far Have We Come in the Past 10 Years?” December 5-7, 2000, Seattle, WA

Brown, E.F. Inter Tribal Council of Arizona, Inc. 16th Annual Indian Child & Family Conference. Keynote Speaker, “Strengthening Tribal Systems: Building a Web of Support for Indian Families”, December 13, 2000, Phoenix, AZ

Brown, E.F. Indian Child Welfare Association Work Group meeting, February 2, 2001, Phoenix, AZ

Brown, E.F. National Congress of American Indians (NCAI), Group Facilitator, Welfare Reform Reauthorization Work Group, February 19-22, 2001, Washington, DC