

**IMPLEMENTATION OF THE TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY
FAMILIES (TANF) ON AMERICAN INDIAN RESERVATIONS:
EARLY EVIDENCE FROM ARIZONA**

Shanta Pandey, Ph.D.

Associate Professor and Associate Director of the Center for
Social Development

Eddie F. Brown, D.S.W.

Associate Dean and the Director of the Kathryn M. Buder Center for
American Indian Studies

Leslie Scheuler-Whitaker, Ph.D. Student and Research Associate

Bethney Gundersen, Ph.D. Student and Research Associate

Karin Eyrich, Ph.D. Student and Research Associate

Lisa Villarreal, M.S.W. Student and Research Associate

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

October 26, 1999

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.

**IMPLEMENTATION OF THE TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY
FAMILIES (TANF) ON AMERICAN INDIAN RESERVATIONS:
EARLY EVIDENCE FROM ARIZONA**

Table of Contents

OVERVIEW

| | |
|---|----|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY..... | i |
| I. INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| II. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS OF AMERICAN INDIAN COMMUNITIES..... | 6 |
| III. A HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF SOCIAL SERVICES TO AMERICAN INDIANS..... | 9 |
| IV. DATA SOURCES..... | 15 |
| V. FINDINGS..... | 17 |
| VI. ANALYSIS | 41 |
| VII. CONCLUSION | 46 |
| REFERENCES | 48 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1. Total AFDC/TANF families and recipients in the United States, 1993-1998.... | 55 |
| Table 2. Total AFDC/TANF recipients by state, 1993-1998 | 56 |
| Table 3. Total AFDC/TANF families by state, 1993-1998 | 58 |
| Table 4. Demographics and educational attainment by reservations in Arizona, 1990.. | 60 |
| Table 5. Poverty Statistics by reservations in Arizona, 1990 | 61 |
| Table 6. Income by reservations in Arizona, 1990 | 62 |
| Table 7. Labor force statistics by reservations in Arizona, 1990 | 63 |
| Table 8. Status of Tribal TANF Plans | 64 |
| Table 9. Characteristics of Tribal TANF Plans | 65 |
| Table 10. TANF cases and recipients on reservations in Arizona, January 1995-January 1998 | 69 |
| Table 11. Total cases sanctioned by reservations in Arizona, 1998-1999 | 70 |

OVERVIEW

This study is aimed at monitoring the impact of the 1996 federal welfare legislation on American Indian families with children on reservations within the state of Arizona over five years (1997-2002). Our goal is to inform the public policy debate on how to improve the social and economic opportunities for low-income families with children on reservations. This report is based on our first year (October 1, 1997-September 30,1998) of work, which focused on aspects of reform implementation and short-term and potential long-term outcomes. We analyzed secondary data from administrative sources relevant to the implementation of welfare legislation in Indian communities. In addition, we collected and analyzed primary (qualitative) data regarding welfare reform options implemented on reservations and their potential impacts. Primary data were collected from in-depth telephone interviews with service providers of 15 of the 21 reservations in Arizona. This information was substantiated by two site visits to three reservations where we conducted focus groups with current and former welfare recipients and state and tribal social service providers.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Early feedback on the effects of the 1996 federal welfare legislation supports the following conclusions:

- 1. Increased Legislation Granting Tribes Authority to Self-Administer Welfare Policies and Services:** Recent federal legislation (including the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, P.L. 104-193) has granted more independence and flexibility to tribes to design and implement their own social service programs on reservations. There is much interest among tribes in Arizona, as well as in tribes in other states, to utilize this new option and exercise authority over the administration of TANF. Nationally, as of January 1999, 22 Indian Tribal Organizations had submitted their own tribal TANF administration plans to the DHHS. So far, the DHHS has approved the plans of 19 Indian Tribal Organizations. In comparison with other Indian communities, the Indian communities with approved plans are generally smaller and have lower levels of unemployment. Three of the 19 Indian Tribal Organizations with approved Plans are in Arizona. Several other Arizona tribes expect to have a self-administration plan developed within the next few years. Tribes that have elected to stay with the state-administered TANF program are either gathering information so they may position themselves to self-administer TANF, or are disinterested as they are nearly “welfare independent” and have very few TANF households. These tribes have either employment opportunities (due to economic development opportunities within or near reservations) or tribal per capita payments, which disqualify families for receipt of other welfare assistance (e.g., TANF, Tribal General Assistance).
- 2. Limitations of the 1996 Federal Welfare Legislation on Tribal Administration of TANF:** The option for tribes to administer their own TANF programs has been praised as an example of the “government-to-government” relationship between tribes and the federal government. However, as tribes begin to develop plans for self-administration of TANF programs, they are also noticing the legislation’s limitations. For instance, the 1996 federal welfare legislation fails to treat them on par with the states. This is especially evident in three areas: unexpended TANF funds, funds to evaluate their performance, and federal rewards for “successful” work. In the first area, unexpended TANF funds, states are allowed to keep these funds for future (unlimited time) use, but tribes must return any unexpended federal funds to the federal government within two years. In regards to the second area, performance evaluation funds, a limited amount of funding was set aside to evaluate PRWORA performance. As a result, not all states received federal dollars for evaluating their performance. At the tribal level, the federal funding for performance evaluation is even scarcer. For example, tribes that are implementing their own TANF services do not receive any federal money to evaluate their performance even when the states within which they are located receive federal money to evaluate their performance. Finally, with respect to the third area, federal rewards for "successful" work, states receive bonuses for reducing caseloads, unwed births and teen pregnancies, whereas tribes do not receive any of these bonuses, even when they are able to make reductions in the same areas. Also noteworthy is that tribes administering their own TANF programs may not receive state matching funds, support costs and start-up money. As such, tribal leaders and service providers are concerned that devolution of responsibility for TANF administration without commensurate allocation of financial resources to the tribes may render the policy ineffective. Currently, we are aware of

only nine states in the nation that have agreed to provide state matching funds to tribes that administer their own TANF services. It is important to note that, 13 of the 19 Indian communities that are currently self-administering TANF come from these nine states that provide matching funds. This evidence underscores the importance of providing matching funds to expedite tribal takeover of TANF programs.

- 3. The 1996 Federal Welfare Legislation's Impact on Enhancing Organizational Coordination, Communication and Collaboration:** According to state and tribal social service administrators, under the 1996 welfare legislation, both states and tribes find it advantageous to enter into intergovernmental agreements to ensure the coordination and provision of TANF and related services. The legislation has strengthened coordination, communication and collaboration at all levels--among tribal social service providers, between tribes, tribes and states, and tribes and the federal government--that are interested in examining issues around TANF implementation on reservations. At the tribal level, for instance, coordination, collaboration, and communication have increased between staff of social services, employment training, childcare, education and other departments. An increase in coordination, communication, and collaboration is a positive early effect of TANF legislation and may improve the tribe's efforts to serve families with children in need in the future.
- 4. Changes at the Community Level Under the 1996 Federal Welfare Legislation:** Like states, reservations also experienced a decline in the number of households and individuals (13 percent change) receiving TANF from January 1995 to January 1998, but for reservations the rate of decline was less rapid. During the same period, households and individuals among non-reservation TANF recipients within Arizona declined by 44 percent while the state of Arizona, which includes reservation and non-reservation TANF recipients, experienced a decline of 41 percent. With regards to sanctions, some families on reservations in Arizona have experienced sanctions, losing 25 percent to 100 percent of their cash benefit. With regards to time limit, a very small proportion of the TANF recipients from reservations has been removed from the TANF program due to a two-year EMPOWER time limit between January of 1998 and January of 1999.
- 5. Barriers to Employment:** American Indian families with children on reservations experience similar barriers when trying to move from welfare to work as do their counterparts across the country. These are: a shortage of employment opportunities at the lower rungs of the economic ladder, a lack of transportation and childcare facilities, and low levels of education and job experience. These barriers are magnified on reservations. In addition, many families on reservations lack basic necessities (like telephones).
- 6. Survival Strategies of Families:** Since Arizona began implementing its version of welfare reform in 1995, there has been evidence of increased efforts to participate in work and training activities by former and current welfare recipients. Waiting lists for job training and childcare programs have increased over the last two years. There is also evidence that families are living under extreme financial hardship--lacking the ability to purchase basic household supplies including food, fuel and clothing.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES (TANF) ON AMERICAN INDIAN RESERVATIONS: EARLY EVIDENCE FROM ARIZONA

I. INTRODUCTION

The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) of 1996 (Public Law 104-193) brought an end to Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) as an entitlement to individuals. The PRWORA reflects the public sentiment that the able-bodied poor who are of working age should change their reproductive and parenting behavior in order to engage in productive employment. 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 lifetimes³ (or less at state option) and must start working⁴ after two years of receiving assistance. States may require participants to begin community service as early as after two months on public assistance. The law also requires that states put 40 percent (50 percent by FY 2002) of single parents receiving cash assistance in work programs for at least 30 hours per week⁵ by FY 2000.

States can opt for a shorter lifetime limit and demand more stringent work requirements, but they must not be less stringent than the federal requirements. All states were required to begin the 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. Also, 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 50 percent or higher unemployment rates.⁶ While Arizona continues to use the required 60-month lifetime limit, an

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 unemployment 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 unemployment 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 life time benefit limitation in addition to the five-year benefit limitation exemption of American Indians residing on reservations with 50 percent or higher unemployment rates.

⁴ Work activities recognized under the legislation include subsidized and unsubsidized employment, community service, job search and job readiness program participation, jobs skills training, on-the-job training, secondary school education, and vocational education for up to 12 months.

⁵ Twenty hours per week for single parents with a child under age six.

⁶ Arizona used the Bureau of Indian Affairs’s 1995 Labor Statistics to determine the unemployment 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

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).

According to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (1998) welfare caseloads have dropped dramatically both nationally and at the state level (see Tables 1-3). Under the 1996 federal welfare legislation, states can sanction adults who do not comply with TANF requirements and drop them off the welfare rolls at any time. Across the U.S., TANF caseloads have been dropping not solely as a result of people finding work, but also due to noncompliance with welfare requirements. The Washington Post reports that “in some states, sanctions have become a significant part of declining caseloads. More than half of the 14,248 cases closed in Indiana in a three-month period last year, for example, were a result not of people finding work but of sanctions” (Vobejda & Havemann, March 23, 1998, p. A01). The same Washington Post article reports that of the 148,000 Florida cases closed in the second half of 1997, 27 percent were closed due to sanctions (Vobejda & Havemann, March 23, 1998, p. A01). In Arizona, sanctions may be imposed for TANF recipients who fail to comply with certain program requirements, which for adults who receive assistance, include the following: active pursuance of employment (e.g. sending out at least three job applications per month and obtaining at least three signatures from the potential employers contacted through the applications; enrollment of children in school; and up-to-date immunizations of children. TANF recipients must also be cooperative in the process of establishing paternity for their children. In addition, an adult TANF recipient must show up for appointments with his/her Department of Economic Security caseworker. Failure to comply with any of these requirements may result in sanctions.

Aside from the issue of sanctions, diminishing welfare caseloads in Arizona are attributable to ineligibility. For instance, a teenage mother living without an adult family member in the house, children born while the mother is on welfare, and individuals with criminal records (those convicted after 1985, drug abusers and those fleeing prosecution) are ineligible for TANF. In essence, the 1996 federal welfare legislation, and its implementation in the state of Arizona, emphasizes changes in personal and work behavior, parenting behavior, and the reproductive behavior of adult recipients.

Another dimension of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (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. 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. 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. Still, the impact of the 1996 welfare legislation on families with children is likely to vary depending upon who administers the services—the state or the tribe.

Navajo, White Mountain, Hopi, Tohona O’ Odham, San Carlos, San Juan Paiute, Camp Verde and Havasupai reservations. The list of tribes eligible for 24-months time limit exemptions may change when BIA releases its new unemployment statistics.

Arizona is home to 21 reservations⁷ of which, according to the 1990 census, one reservation (Quechan Tribe) owns land in Arizona but no Native Americans reside in Arizona portion of the reservation. In Arizona, as in other states, American Indian communities vary tremendously in terms of size, extent of geographic isolation, availability of economic opportunities, levels of welfare dependency, and structure of available social services. For instance, some reservations have better employment opportunities on or near their reservations (with few residents receiving welfare), whereas others are not only geographically isolated, but also economically depressed (i.e. very high poverty rates). Due to these differences, the impact of the 1996 welfare legislation on families with children will vary significantly by reservation and must be tracked over an extended period of time. Also, because the 1996 federal welfare legislation is aimed at changing behavior and attitudes of people, only a longitudinal study can document whether or not the law will meet this goal. As such, the aim of this study is to monitor the impacts of welfare reform on both families with children and the delivery of social services on reservations in the state of Arizona, over a period of five years (September 1997-August, 2002). In the end, our study seeks to estimate the downstream effects of the 1996 federal welfare legislation and inform the public policy debate on how to improve social and economic opportunities for low-income families with children on reservations.

Our study focuses on the following research questions:

1. What are the demographic, social, and economic characteristics of American Indian families with children who are current or former welfare recipients? How are noncompliers (sanctioned parents) different or similar to former or current welfare recipients?
2. To what extent are current or former welfare recipients receiving public assistance in areas like child care, health care, and transportation, and how does this assistance affect parents' participation in work activities or in education and training programs?
3. What are the characteristics of recipients who find work, and what is the nature of that work?
4. What is the range of basic and job-related skills of American Indian parents who are current or former welfare recipients? What type of employment and training related programs are currently available to them (e.g., Native Employment Works JOBS programs)? How relevant are these training programs to providing the skills required in job markets on or near reservations?

⁷The 21 reservations are as follows: Ak-Chin Indian Community, Maricopa; Cocopah Tribe, Somerton; Colorado River Tribe, Parker; Fort McDowell Indian Community, Fountain Hills; Fort Mojave Tribe, Needles, CA; Gila River Indian Community, Sacaton; Havasupai Tribe, Supai; Hopi Tribe, Kykotsmovi, Second Mesa; Hualapai Tribe, Peach Springs; Kaibab-Paiute Tribe, Fredonia; Navajo Nation, Window Rock; Pascua Yaqui Tribe, Tucson; Quechan Tribe, Yuma; Salt River Puma Maricopa Indian Community, Scottsdale; San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos; San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe, Tuba City; Tonto Apache Tribe of Payson; Tohono O' Odham, Nation Sells; White Mountain Apache Tribe, White River; Yavapai Apache Tribe, Camp Verde; and Yavapi-Prescott Indian Community, Prescott.

5. 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?
6. How have Tribal Councils prepared themselves to face the consequences of welfare reform? As for those tribes who plan to administer TANF independently, how have they positioned themselves to undertake a task of this magnitude? What sort of administrative and evaluative infrastructures do they have in place? How will they coordinate with the state and other service providers in determining Medicaid and Food Stamp eligibility, and in ensuring child support enforcement, job creation, and job development?
7. Will the benefits and outcomes for families vary significantly depending upon whether a tribe participates in a state program or administers its own plan? What measures will the state of Arizona undertake to ensure equitable access of eligible tribal residents to services under the state's TANF block grant?
8. What strategies are parents, whom are sanctioned or impacted by time limits and work requirements, using to attain economic independence? Do they change their strategies over time?
9. How will other tribal support programs be affected by TANF? What proportion of the population losing TANF eligibility will shift to tribal General Assistance programs? How will changes in Medicaid eligibility affect service provision by the Indian Health Service? What other changes will occur in the next five years in the provision of social services at the tribal level?
10. How will the social and economic conditions on reservations change as welfare reform progresses? Will rates of social problems like poverty, malnutrition, crime, child abuse and neglect, addictions, and teen pregnancy go up in the next five years, and if so, by how much?

Because reservations are often geographically isolated (Sandefur & Scott, 1983) and economic opportunities on reservations are limited (Vinje, 1996), the impact of the new welfare policy on families with children living on reservations requires close monitoring. Through a series of academic reports and articles over a period of five years, we expect to document the unique impacts of the 1996 welfare legislation on reservations. This report is the result of our first year of study (October 1, 1997-September 30, 1998) in which we performed the following:

1. Reviewed the social and economic conditions of reservation-based American Indian communities.
2. Reviewed the history of welfare policies in American Indian communities.
3. Presented qualitative data from interviews with service providers and current or former welfare recipients regarding the impacts of welfare reform. This data addresses the following questions:

- a. What is the response of tribes to the devolution of authority to administer TANF services from federal and state governments to Tribal Governments?
- b. How have Tribal Councils prepared themselves to face the consequences of the 1996 federal welfare legislation?
- c. How have tribes who plan to administer TANF services positioned themselves to undertake a task of this magnitude?
- d. What are the barriers to tribal administration of TANF services? How can these barriers be reduced?
- e. How are tribal women with children preparing themselves to face the consequences of welfare reform?
- f. What are short-term and potential long-term outcomes of reform implementation on families with children on reservations?
- g. What are the reservation-based or individual-level barriers to increasing the skills and employment potential of American Indian parents who are current or former welfare recipients?

II. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS OF AMERICAN INDIAN COMMUNITIES

Most reservation-based families with children are economically vulnerable. While unemployment rates have fallen to their lowest levels across the country, poverty and unemployment rates in many Indian communities in Arizona remain high. This suggests that residents of reservations are untouched or isolated from national and regional economic upturns.

The vulnerability of American Indians is a product of several factors: geographic isolation of reservations (Sandefur & Scott, 1983), limited economic opportunities on reservations (Vinje, 1996), low levels of human capital (in the form of health, mental health, education and work experience), growth in the number of single parent (female-headed) families, lack of adequate support programs, and reductions in public assistance. Nationally, 41 percent of the poor are children under the age of 18 (Blank, 1997). On reservations this figure is higher, due in part to higher fertility rates on reservations (Hodgkinson, 1990) and higher levels of overall poverty (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1993). In 1990, 55 percent of the children living on reservations lived below the poverty level (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990). Compared to a national birthrate of 15.6 per 1,000 population in 1986, American Indians had a birthrate of 27.5 per 1,000 population, with fertility rates reaching their highest levels on reservations (Hodgkinson, 1990). In terms of poverty, both the 1980 and 1990 Censuses indicate that the poverty rate for American Indians is considerably higher than that of the total population. For example, in 1989, 31 percent of American Indians both on and off reservations lived below the poverty level, compared to 13 percent of the total U.S. population (Paisano, 1990). On reservations, poverty is even more prevalent. In 1990, 51 percent of reservation residents lived below the poverty level (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990).

Higher rates of poverty are especially evident for female-headed families, and these families are more prevalent among American Indians than among the U.S. population overall. For example, in 1990, 27 percent of American Indian families both on and off reservations were headed by a female householder compared to a national figure of 17 percent (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1993; U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990). Single-parent families are more likely to be poor; this is especially true for American Indian families. In 1989, 50 percent of American Indian families maintained by females with no husband present lived in poverty, compared to 31 percent of all families maintained by women without husbands in the U.S. (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1993). The median income in 1990 for American Indian families headed by women was only \$10,742, or 62 percent of the median income (\$17,414) for all families headed by women without husbands in the U.S. (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1993). On reservations, the 1989 median income for year-round, full-time female workers was \$14,800, but the median income for all females with any income (ages 15 and over) was only \$5,308 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990). Of 30,953 female-headed households on American Indian reservations, 55 percent have an income of less than \$10,000.

In general, most families on public assistance have low levels of human capital and experience other personal and family problems, such as substance abuse, or having children with chronic medical conditions or serious disabilities (Olson & Pavetti, 1996). These barriers to employment also apply to American Indian families with children on reservations. In terms of human capital, the educational attainment levels of American Indians lag far behind those of the overall population. In 1990, 66 percent of American Indians 25 years old and over were high school graduates (but on reservations this number was reduced to 53.8 percent), compared to 75

percent of the total population. American Indians were also less likely than the entire U.S. population to complete a bachelor's degree or higher, with nine percent of American Indians earning four-year degrees (but on reservations this number was reduced to 3.9 percent) compared to 20 percent of the total population (Paisano, 1990). Census data indicate that 46 percent of females (aged 25 and over) residing on reservations in 1990 had less than a high school diploma (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990). Moreover, many who live on reservations are often less prepared for the labor force because they lack job-related skills and training. Other barriers to their economic success are a lack of adequate technology and support programs (such as telephones, child care, health care, and transportation), which is due, in part, to the geographic isolation of reservations and other tribal lands (Sandefur & Scott, 1983). According to the 1990 Census, 34 percent of households on reservations lacked telephones, while 17 percent lacked access to a working vehicle (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990). Lack of vehicles and phones increases the difficulty of finding work because on the one hand, a lack of communication and transportation hinders job-searching efforts by potential employees, and on the other hand, employers are reluctant to hire individuals without these basic amenities. Although economic opportunities are more favorable in urban areas, moving to these areas may mean the loss of cultural identification and social support, as well as the loss of services available on reservations (Shumway & Jackson, 1995). If American Indians then, cannot gain employment due to a lack of resources (phone or vehicle), or because of fear of the loss of cultural support and identification, their choices are limited to available jobs on tribal land, which vary by number and type from reservation to reservation. Most employment opportunities available on reservations are created within Tribal Governments, the service sector and retail. A few tribes have development activities (gaming and recreational activities such as holiday resorts). Even on reservations with employment opportunities though, the available work is generally not substantial enough to employ an entire tribe. Thus, if American Indians cannot gain employment on or off reservations, fulfilling TANF work requirements is impossible and sanctions are inevitable.

Most of the public assistance recipients who are directly impacted by TANF (required to enter the labor force) are women. For example, of the 6,664 TANF recipients in the state of Arizona who were slated to be impacted by time limits⁸, 98 percent were women (Arizona Department of Economic Security, 1997). In terms of work force participation, American Indian women have a slightly lower labor force participation rate (55 percent) than the general population of American women (57 percent) (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1993). Employment rates overall, in tandem with employment opportunities, vary by reservation. For example, on reservations in the state of Arizona in 1990, unemployment rates ranged from 35 percent at the White Mountain Apache reservation to 10 percent at the Yavapai-Prescott reservation (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990). Nationally, the unemployment rates on reservations averaged 26 percent (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990).

Because of high unemployment on many Indian reservations, public assistance may be a more dependable source of income for residents than employment (Cebula & Belton, 1994). Cebula and Belton (1994) found that Native Americans' migration decisions are influenced by geographic public assistance differentials (Cebula & Belton, 1994). Considering the impacts of high unemployment, higher fertility rates, and the younger median age of the American Indian population on reservations (which is 22 years, compared to the median age of 33 for the total U.S. population) (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1993), it is reasonable to expect that a higher

⁸ On November 1, 1997.

proportion of single parent (mostly female-headed) families with children on reservations rely on public assistance. On Arizona reservations alone, 43,406 individuals,⁹ the majority of which are children, received AFDC benefits, and 62,292 individuals received Food Stamps in 1994 (Inter Tribal Council of Arizona, 1997). Nationally, approximately 23 percent of households on reservations receive some form of public assistance (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990). Therefore, since single parent families, the majority of which are female-headed, are already subjected to higher rates of poverty, it is reasonable to expect that American Indian women with children who live on reservations will be more severely impacted by the 1996 welfare reform legislation than any other racial or ethnic group in the U.S.

⁹ Of which 12,874 were adults and 30,640 were children.

III. A HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF SOCIAL SERVICES TO AMERICAN INDIANS

A discussion on the current administration of social services for American Indians requires an understanding of the historical relationship between the Indian Nations and the U.S. government. American Indians are different from other U.S. citizens in that they have citizenship status with the federal and state governments, yet as tribal members they also have a unique federal-Indian relationship (“federal trust responsibility”) based upon treaties, acts of Congress, and presidential directives, which recognize tribes as sovereign entities. This dual relationship complicates policy making for American Indian social services .

Prior to the 1920s, social services for American Indians were based solely on their trust relationship with the federal government. In 1924, American Indians were granted U.S. citizenship, and as they became citizens of the states in which they resided, they became entitled to general services provided for other citizens of the state. However, since the U.S. Constitution explicitly granted authority for the responsibility of the American Indians to the federal government, states did not view Indians as their responsibility and historically have often denied them rights to state-administered services. Due, then, to this unsteady and highly complex relationship between the federal government, the states and the Indian Nations, an historical perspective is important. Through an historical perspective, one can appreciate the current situation American Indians and tribal governments face regarding the administration and delivery of public assistance and social services.

A. Destruction of Tribal Social Service Systems

Early relations between the United States government and the American Indian Nations were based on treaties that recognized and respected tribes as sovereign nations. Federal assistance consisted of goods and services offered in exchange for land and friendship. These goods and services included clothing, farming equipment, technology and educational services. This early relationship between sovereign nations and the United States government came to an end as the American Army was strengthened and the colonialists’ need for allies and friendship was thereby reduced. The end of the treaty period resulted in a change in perspective towards American Indians and in a simultaneous effort to assimilate them into the dominant Western culture. In 1832, Chief Justice John Marshall declared American Indian tribes as sovereign nations who were nonetheless under the “superior power from the federal government” (Deloria and Lytle, 1983 p. 4).

Fear of losing of land and culture led the Indian Nations to cede large tracts of land formerly occupied by them in return for land specifically reserved for them (reservations). Indians agreed to occupy reservations in an effort to isolate themselves from the encroaching Western culture. Essentially, they ceded land in exchange for a promise of protection of their new land, as well as to preserve the remains of a tribal existence that depended, in part, on that land.

Although American Indians had bargained for their own legally recognized land, reservation life was, in fact, traumatic for Indian culture. The traditional survival strategies of American Indians were ill suited for the lands on which the U.S. government placed American Indians. For example, the Shawnee Tribe was placed on the arid plains of Kansas even though they were forest dwellers; the Cherokees, traditionally from the Smokey Mountains, were placed in Oklahoma (O’Brien, 1989). The disruption of survival techniques that followed from the

displacement of tribes devastated the traditional social networks of American Indians. Tribal members traditionally relied on other members, as well as on family, in times of need. The reservation setting changed this dynamic, forcing tribal members to rely on outside forces for help. Because reservations did not provide adequate resources for self-sufficiency, tribes became dependent on the federal government for food, education, clothing, shelter, health care, and other services. This period in Indian history marked the beginning of food rations, surplus food supplies from army forts, provided by the U.S. government. During this same period, the federal government expanded the number of off-reservation boarding schools, removing American Indian children from their families. Thus, education, through off-reservation boarding schools, became a major initiative of the federal government. The objective of the U.S. was to control and assimilate Indians. The assimilation of Indians was facilitated by transferring responsibility for the provision of social services (i.e., food, clothing and shelter) from the tribes to the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA).

In 1887, the U.S. government, in another attempt to assimilate American Indians into the dominant culture, began a land allotment program, offering land to individual American Indian families. This program resulted in a reduction of American Indian owned land, as well as in a continuing pattern of weakening Tribal Governments. Once situated on land acquired through the land allotment program, Indian families were not provided with the technology required to farm. Not only was the lack of technology a problem for Indian families, but they were also unaccustomed to the notion of private property. Since owning and farming land were unfamiliar to American Indians, many of the families eventually sold the land allotted to them. As a result of the land allotment program, American Indians lost two thirds of their 150 million acres of land (Tyler, 1973). With the loss of land and disruption of tribal life, the dwindling authority of Tribal Governments was inevitable. The structure of the program was such that the BIA provided goods and services directly to individual Indian families, ignoring existing tribal governmental structures. This period was extremely destructive to the American Indian way of life, creating a landless group of poor Indians, and increasing American Indians' dependency on the federal government for goods and services.

The plight of the American Indians led Congress to call for assistance in the form of emergency food and shelter. Through the early 1900's, the services of the BIA were expanded. Due to this dependency of tribes on the federal government, during this period, American Indians were not viewed as citizens but "wards" of the federal government.

B. Federal Reconciliation and the Development of New Social Service Programs

The increased provision of federal social services for American Indians was not explicitly explained in U.S. law. The role of the BIA in the provision of social services was determined under a variety of treaties and acts, and each reservation had different sources of funds. The lack of a uniform policy for American Indian social services created confusion about the role of the BIA. This ambiguity changed in 1921 with the Snyder Act, which placed all federal Indian services under the BIA. This act "institutionalized" social services for American Indians and became the basis for the provision of all social, health, and educational services for the Indian Nations.

Even with the provision of increased services though, American Indians were not granted even the basic right of citizenship. Instead, the right to citizenship was not acquired until after American Indians voluntarily participated in World War I. Rewarding the American Indians for their participation, in 1924 the U.S. government granted them citizenship (Tyler, 1973; O'Brien, 1989). Gaining citizenship placed American Indians under the rights of the 14th Amendment.

They were considered citizens of the state in which they resided; and thus, they were allowed the right to the same social services as other state citizens. Historically, states have been reluctant to recognize that American Indians, as state citizens, have rights to certain benefits. This reluctance was due to the traditional federal responsibility for dealing with the Indians, the location of many governmental functions at the state level, and the constantly changing policies regarding the individual status of American Indians (Deloria and Lytle, 1983). However, the granting of citizenship did not necessarily improve conditions for American Indians. That is, though American Indian were legally considered citizens of the states in which they resided, states did not readily acknowledge this right and continued to view them as outcasts.

It was not until 1954 that the courts finally enforced tribal member rights as “equal to those enjoyed by all other citizens and residents of the state” (Deloria and Lytle, 1983, p. 245). Today, American Indians residing on or off reservations are as eligible as other state residents to receive state social services, as long as they meet the eligibility requirements. Even still, the relationship between the Tribal Governments, their members and their respective states, is not perfect; many Tribal Governments and their members continue to meet with political resistance from states.

Structural reform of federal funding as a result of the Snyder Act of 1921 and the granting of citizenship did not radically improve the situation of American Indians. Out of concern for the American Indian situation, the Meriam Commission of 1928 reported on the deplorable social conditions of American Indians and the inadequacy of government programs to address their conditions. Specifically, the Meriam Report admitted the failure of the land allotment program and reported that the BIA control on reservations prevented Indians from attaining self-sufficiency (Deloria and Lytle, 1983). This report led to the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, which reestablished the rights of American Indians to their own governments. This act formally ended the allotment program, prevented the transfer of land to anyone but the tribe itself, allowed Tribal Councils to negotiate directly with the federal, state and local governments, and reduced the power of the BIA. The act also enabled the development of Tribal Governments by providing official tribal recognition, increasing services and funding, and creating an economic development program specifically for tribes. From this point forward, Tribal Governments began developing public work programs in health, education and welfare.

With the onset of World War II, American Indians, once again, were willing to protect America. In contrast to the honor and respect received after their contributions to World War I however, American Indians returned home to dilapidated reservations after WWII. There were no jobs, no financial assistance, and few educational services available to them. The federal government decided to deal with Indians as they did with poor rural residents: they relocated them to urban areas to find employment. Through this Indian Relocation Program, Indians who wished to seek employment opportunities away from the reservation were assisted with financial support and job placement services. The federal government wanted to cut back on special social service programs for American Indians and to incorporate them into the social programs for other citizens. As part of this initiative, the federal government passed legislation in 1953 both to terminate the federal trust responsibility for those tribes qualified to manage their own affairs and to facilitate the transition of full jurisdiction over tribes to the states (Tyler, 1973). American Indians did not tolerate this solution, however, and, eventually, through a strongly organized coalition of Tribal Governments, were able to successfully work for the repeal of this legislation. In essence, it was decided that the federal government had a responsibility to reservations and

could not, as a policy solution, relocate American Indians to urban areas or abolish the social programs created specifically for them.

C. Impact of Indian Self-Determination on Tribal Social Services

The Civil Rights movement of the 1960s paved the way for the introduction of self-determination as a major goal of Indian policy and increased federal funding for tribal social services. With this renewed recognition of Indian reservations as governmental entities, tribes became eligible for a variety of programs, not as beneficiaries of the federal government's trust responsibility, but as political units with the same eligibility for funding as state and local governments. As such, Indian Nations began receiving direct funding from a variety of government agencies. The Department of Health and Human Services was responsible for health care; the Department of Commerce was responsible for economic development; the Department of Housing and Urban Development provided housing grants, and the Department of Labor provided job-training grants (O'Brien, 1989). At the same time, American Indians, as U.S. citizens, were eligible for services from other social welfare programs, including Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Food Stamps, and Medicaid. Thus, the role of the BIA changed from sole provider of social services to "provider of last resort," assisting only those American Indians not eligible for aid from the state or local government (Taylor, 1984).

The "Great Society" programs, such as Food Stamps and Medicaid (mentioned above), had the purpose of strengthening the reservations economically, governmentally, and socially. Additional legislation created to this end included the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Vocation Education Act, the Higher Education Act, and the Economic Opportunity Act (Taylor, 1984). During the 1970s, the number of federal programs and funds directed to Tribal Governments dramatically increased. A review of a 1991 report by the Congressional Research Service revealed that eleven federal departments funded approximately 198 different programs and services for which American Indian governments could apply.

Another way to study shifts in federal programs and funds directed towards Tribal Governments, is to focus on presidential administrations. For example, the Johnson and Nixon administrations both supported policy initiatives which aimed to improve the quality of reservation life without diminishing the powers of tribal governments. As part of these initiatives, Congress passed the Indian Self-Determination Act in 1975. This act confirmed the federal government's commitment to transferring administrative control of services to Indian Nations through the contracting of BIA-administered services to the tribes. The act also supported tribal autonomy by allowing tribes to tailor their social service programs to the unique needs and special circumstances of their communities (Walke, 1991). Also during this period, the Indian Child Welfare Act and the Health Care Improvement Act were passed. Like the policy initiatives and other acts mentioned, these acts were enacted with the intention of improving reservation life while recognizing tribal autonomy (O'Brien, 1989).

Like the Johnson and Nixon administrations, the Reagan administration encouraged tribal autonomy. To do so, the Reagan administration supported federally administered block grants. However, the results of the block grants were contradictory. That is, while block grants gave tribal and state governments more autonomy, they also led to decreased funding for social and economic programs. In examining federal expenditures in terms of constant dollars, from 1981 to 1988, Stuart (1990) found a negative 34 percent change in Indian Education grants and a 28 percent decline in job training expenditures. Undoubtedly, these reductions in spending have impacted American Indian parents of young children (as well as the overall population) living on Indian reservations. This decline in federal program monies correlates with the rate of labor

force participation on reservations, which declined from 67 percent of the working age population in 1980 to 53 percent in 1990 (Vinje, 1996).

In more recent years, the Bush and Clinton administrations have also impacted American Indian life. Following the Reagan administration, the Bush administration strengthened policies which fostered Indian self-governance through the development of a self-governance compact, which allowed for block grants of existing BIA and Indian Health Services funds to tribal governments. The Clinton administration has further strengthened the “government to government” relationship with tribes by maintaining support for the development of self-governance compacts. In general, the self-governance compacts have allowed tribes greater flexibility in designing programs to meet the needs of tribal members.

D. Current Tribal Administration of Social Services

Currently, tribal governments administer a variety of social service programs through various funding structures. Federal funding for these programs is channeled to tribal governments through two basic conduits : 1) direct federal funding to tribes, which includes self-determination contracts (e.g. General Assistance), block grants (e.g. Child Care Development), and special initiative grants (e.g. Domestic Violence); and 2) federal funds channeled to the state and “passed through” to tribal governments via state/tribal agreements (e.g. Title IV-E Foster Care).

As tribal governments have labored to accommodate these various funding structures, the common approach has been to view the different funding streams as individual “program” funds and to develop independent administrative structures for each funding source. The individualization of funds has resulted in the creation of a complex web of bureaucratic regulations and reporting requirements at the tribal level. The complexity of the current system is underscored by the sheer number of funding sources for different programs. For instance, funding for employment and training programs comes from a variety of departments: the Job Training Partnership Act and Welfare to Work services funded by the Department of Labor; the Native Employment Works Job Opportunity and Basic Skill (NEW JOBS) initiative funded by the Department of Health and Human Services; and the Tribal Work Experience and Employment Assistance Program funded by the Department of Interior. Funding sources for assistance to families and children include the Department of Interior (which funds General Assistance), the Department of Agriculture (which administers Commodity Food Distribution), and the Department of Health and Human Services (which funds childcare services). All of the above funding sources dictate different service regulations and reporting requirements.

E. Legislation Granting Tribal Independence and Strengthening State-Tribal Relationships

Critics of Tribal Governments have stated that, as presently funded and organized, tribal programs are not structured to provide responsive and efficient services capable of meeting the social and economic needs of their communities (O’Brien, 1989). Tribal Governments, as well as their state counterparts, will face a major challenge in adapting their programs and funding patterns to accommodate the recent welfare reform legislation. Although state governments have historically tried to exert control over tribal communities and have resisted providing social services to tribal members, several pieces of federal legislation, in addition to Section 412 of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (P.L. 104-193), have granted more independence to tribes to design and implement social service programs on reservations. Under these laws, both states and tribes may find it advantageous to enter into

intergovernmental agreements to ensure the coordination and provision of TANF and related services. These laws are briefly discussed below.

1. The 1992 Indian Employment, Training, and Related Services Demonstration Act (P.L. 102-477) was intended to reduce paperwork and other administrative burdens placed upon Tribal Governments. Under this legislation, Tribal Governments may develop one plan to obtain funds from multiple federal agencies for the provision of a range of employment and job training services. Simply put, they may combine the grants they receive into one funding stream. Also, under P.L. 102-477, tribes may write one financial report reflecting the entire budget and are only required to report to a single federal agency, the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). Then, under this legislation, responsibility for the disbursement of reports falls to the BIA, which shares the reports with other federal agencies. Programs that can be combined under P.L. 102-477 are JTPA-IV-A, Summer Youth Program-II-B and Welfare to Work from the Department of Labor; NEW JOBS, the Child Care Development Fund and TANF from the Department of Health and Human Services; and Tribal Work Experience, AVT, Direct Employment, Adult Education and Higher Education from the BIA.

2. The Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (P.L. 93-638) and C.F.R. Part 900, as amended by P.L. 103-413, P.L. 103-435, and P.L. 103-437 on October 1994 and November 2, 1994, assures “maximum Indian participation in the direction of educational as well as other federal services to Indian communities so as to render such services more responsive to the needs and desires of those communities” (P.L. 93-638). This amendment gives freedom to American Indians on reservations to develop and implement their own educational and social programs. Some tribes have taken advantage of this amendment and have designed and implemented a wide variety of programs. The federal government covers support costs (which include start-up costs, pre-award costs and technical and administrative costs), as well as the costs of the programs that are contracted under P.L. 93-638. With this regulation, the tribes are familiar with tribal takeover of financing and administration. Tribes such as Navajo Nation originally proposed to administer TANF under P.L. 93-638 because under this law the federal government provides support costs of program administration. On the other hand, the 1996 federal welfare legislation does not require the federal government to cover the support costs of implementing TANF by tribes. Once the tribes secure funding (program costs plus support costs) from different federal agencies under the P.L., 93-638, they may combine these funds under P.L. 102-477 and report to a single agency.

IV. DATA SOURCES

The state of Arizona has been implementing the EMPOWER program as a part of its TANF block grant since November 1, 1995. In order to gain early feedback on the impact of the 1996 federal welfare legislation, we collected data from six main sources: 1) The Department of Health and Human Services web sites; 2) The U.S. Bureau of the Census and other national data sources; 3) Administrative data on welfare recipients by reservations from the state of Arizona, beginning in January 1995; 4) The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) and Tribal Social Services (aggregate data); 5) Tribes and the Inter-Tribal Council of Arizona (ITCA), with supplementary information gathered through site visits and service provider interviews (documentation regarding information on TANF options and implementation); and 6) Focus group interviews with welfare recipients and former recipients on the three reservations selected as focus sites. The data sources, with a description of data provided by each source, are outlined below:

- 1) **The Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS).** We obtained the status of welfare caseloads by state electronically from the web sites of the DHHS (see tables 1-3). In addition, we obtained the status of all Tribal TANF Plans and their characteristics from this source (see Tables 8-9).
- 2) **U.S. Bureau of the Census and other national level data.** The U.S. Bureau of the Census provided us with data specific to each reservation for the year of 1990.¹⁰ We entered this data for all reservations in Arizona. This data has allowed us to compare and contrast Indian communities within Arizona. We will also compare how aggregate information on reservations changes between 1990 and the year 2000. We report several important social and economic indicators for these communities (using the 1990 census) in Tables 4-7.
- 3) **The Department of Economic Security (DES), Phoenix, Arizona.** The DES provided us with administrative data on welfare recipients by reservations beginning January 1995 (see Tables 10-11).
- 4) **The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), Phoenix, and Tribal Social Services.** The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) provided us with aggregate data, including annual data on crime, child abuse and neglect, as well as Tribal General Assistance (GA) caseloads and expenditures by reservation.¹¹
- 5) **Tribes and the Inter Tribal Council of Arizona (ITCA).** Tribes and the ITCA provided us with two types of information. First, many tribes provided us with statistical reports of services and assistance in their communities in aggregate format, which we have used to gain a clearer picture of their particular situations. Second, tribes and the ITCA provided us with documentation regarding information on TANF

¹⁰ We hope to receive 1999 Census data by reservation electronically so we can compare change over the decade.

¹¹ This data is incomplete in that we are still updating our database with information from several tribes within Arizona. This report, therefore, does not include analysis of these data.

options and implementation. In regards to the latter, we have received some documentation from tribes and the ITCA about the developmental process of administration of TANF programs (three tribes). However, most of our information in this area has been gathered through interviews (phone or on-site) with tribal service providers and state Department of Economic Security (DES) administrators responsible for the coordination of services on or near reservation communities. These telephone interviews were conducted between October and December of 1997.

- 6) **Focus group interviews.** Perhaps some of the best sources of information allowing us to form an accurate picture of the early impacts of welfare reform on American Indian families with children have been the focus group interviews with TANF recipients and other former welfare recipients. Demographic profiles of these recipients are documented in the endnote¹.

We had originally requested ITCA staff in Arizona to help us contact all the tribes in Arizona and explore their interest in participating in this study. Of all the tribes in Arizona, three tribes (Salt River, San Carlos and Navajo Nation) demonstrated a particular interest in being part of this study. As a result, we chose these three tribes as our focus tribes for this study. In addition, two tribes (Hopi and White Mountain) invited us to visit their reservations. As planned, we visited these five reservations (Salt River, San Carlos, Hopi, Navajo Nation and White Mountain) for two weeks in January of 1998 and group interviewed tribal and state service providers on four reservations (Salt River, San Carlos, Hopi, and Navajo Nation). During that same visit we conducted focus group interviews with current and former welfare recipients residing on three focus reservations (Salt River, San Carlos and Navajo Nation). For one week in May 1998, then, we made a follow-up visit to each of the three focus reservations. During these visits, we group interviewed with the same group of tribal service providers and conducted follow-up focus group interviews with welfare recipients.

The in-depth group interviews we completed with tribal service providers and welfare recipients have been a valuable source of information about the early impacts of welfare reform. We reviewed and analyzed information collected from multiple sources using a qualitative, story format. To maintain confidentiality, we do not identify individuals, offices they are associated with or the tribal names in any of the findings of this study. Tribal names are mentioned only if the information is public, derived mainly from secondary data, and is exemplary in nature.¹² Findings of this study are presented below.

¹² Comments of tribal members and employees of ITCA, BIA and the Arizona Department of Economic Security were incorporated before making this report public.

V. FINDINGS

A. Tribal administration of TANF

Though the 1996 welfare law brought an end to entitlements for families with children, it has bestowed power upon tribal governments wishing to administer their own programs. Until now, states have been the principal administrators of AFDC programs, including the administration of AFDC benefits to American Indian families on reservations. Of the 500 tribes and 310 reservations recorded in the country by the 1990 Census (Shumway & Jackson, 1995), only five tribes in Wisconsin¹³ subcontracted with the state to provide AFDC and to determine eligibility requirements for Food Stamp and Medicaid on their reservations. In contrast, the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 provides each tribe with two options. Tribes may either participate in their respective state programs or submit their own TANF Plans to the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). The latter choice will allow tribes to receive funding in the form of a block grant.¹⁴ However, states will continue to determine Medicaid and Food Stamp eligibility on reservations and will also continue to administer these programs.¹⁵

Tribal Plans can be different from the federal mandate in that the law allows tribes the flexibility to determine: (a) their own service populations (e.g., whether to cover all registered members or only those members residing on reservations.), (b) their definitions of “family” (e.g., how to define “Indian” and “Non-Indian” families), (c) the scope of assistance (e.g., whether to include childcare or not), (d) job participation rates, and (e) variations in time limitations.

Nationally, as of April 1999, 22 Indian Tribal Organizations had submitted their own formal plans¹⁶ for tribal TANF programs (see Tables 8 & 9), of which the DHHS had approved 19 plans (DHHS, 1998). As shown in Table 8, these 19 TANF plans are located in the following states: four in Wisconsin, three in Arizona (Pascua Yaqui, Salt River and White Mountain), two each in Oregon and Washington, and one each in Oklahoma, South Dakota, Wyoming, California, Idaho, Minnesota, Montana and Alaska. These 19 Indian Tribal Organizations with approved plans are generally smaller (see Table 9) and have lower levels of unemployment compared to other tribes. Many of them have modeled their tribal TANF administration plans after their state plans, making only slight modifications in terms of time limits and work requirements (see Table 9). In general, state plans tend to be more stringent than federal requirements, whereas the tribal plans tend to be more generous than state requirements. For instance, Arizona’s Department of Economic Security (DES) has instituted a two-year time limit¹⁷ on benefit receipt within the first five years of receiving benefit, whereas the Pascua

¹³ Red Cliff, the Bad River Indian Band of Lake Superior, Lac du Flambeau, Oneida and Stockbridge Munsee.

¹⁴ Tribes may lose their portions of state matches if this option is chosen, however, Arizona has passed legislation that will allow tribes to retain state matching funds.

¹⁵ However, the Arizona state legislature has recently authorized the state DFS to request a federal waiver from the DHHS that permits those tribal governments that perform eligibility determinations for TANF to also perform the Medicaid and Food Stamp eligibility determinations. The state of Arizona will provide state matching monies for the administrative costs associated with the Medicaid and Food Stamp eligibility based on federal guidelines.

¹⁶ Known as Tribal Family Assistance Grant applications.

¹⁷ In Arizona, the adult portion of the benefit is eliminated after a family reaches the two-year time limit within the first five years, but cash assistance for the children in the

Yaqui tribe (in Arizona) will waive the two-year time limit for adult recipients who are meeting the work activity requirement.

Based on recommendations made by Indian leaders at the National Tribal Leaders Conference on Welfare Reform,¹⁸ the Inter-Tribal Council of Arizona (ITCA) outlined five different options a tribe may consider in implementing welfare reform. These options include: (1) leaving TANF program administration completely to the state, (2) subcontracting to provide a state-administered TANF program, (3) completely administering TANF at the tribal level, (4) allowing the state to subcontract in providing a tribal-administered TANF program, and (5) subcontracting with a private organization for the provision of a tribal-administered TANF program. In other words, the options the tribes select may vary. For example, of the five options, the Arizona tribes with approved tribal plans have selected two different plans: Salt River has chosen option three whereas the other two tribes, Pasqua Yaqui and White Mountain, have chosen the fourth option.

For those tribes selecting option four, there is even more variance. This variance is a result of the impossibility of predicting the exact nature of the subcontract agreement between tribes and the state. For instance, the Pasqua Yaqui tribe has subcontracted with the state to determine TANF eligibility, issue payments and generate monthly reports, while White Mountain is relying on the state to determine TANF eligibility, implement job placement activities and generate monthly reports.

In addition to the three tribes with approved tribal TANF Plans (Pasqua Yaqui, Salt River and White Mountain), several other tribes in Arizona are also making efforts to develop their own TANF programs. For example, the Navajo Nation plan is being reviewed by the District court; and two additional tribes expect to develop plans at some point in the future. The remaining 14 Arizona tribes have elected to stay with the state-administered TANF program, either through a deliberate decision-making process, or through “default”— by not formally considering the option at this time. Several of these tribes deliberately chose not formally consider implementing tribal TANF because they are small communities comprised of few TANF-receiving-residents. Thus, these tribes feel that administering their own program would not be worthwhile. For example, seven of these 14 tribes (Ak-Chin, Cocopah, Fort McDowell, Fort Mojave, Havasupai, Kaibab Paiute and Yavapai Apache) have less than seven households receiving TANF (see Table 10). Five tribes (Ak-Chin, Cocopah, Fort McDowell, Fort Mojave and Yavapai Prescott) have either employment opportunities (due to economic development opportunities within or near reservations) or tribal per capita payments, which disqualify families for receipt of other welfare assistance (e.g., TANF, Tribal General Assistance).

Two smaller tribes, in order to compensate for tribal size, are considering the option of collaboration with other tribes to develop and implement joint TANF programs – one tribe is considering working with a number of other small tribes, and the other tribe is considering working with a large tribe that has already submitted a TANF proposal. Lastly, five larger tribes have adopted a “wait and see” approach before developing their own TANF program. They are hoping to learn from the experiences of those tribes which are in the process of implementing tribal TANF and want to make sure that they have “all the facts regarding their options.” These tribes, electing to remain with the state TANF program, felt that they lacked the infrastructure necessary for the administration of a public assistance program, such as facilities for service

family is continued for the five years. The two-year time limit began on November 1, 1995 and the 60-month lifetime limit began on October 1, 1996.

¹⁸ Held in Seattle, Washington, from October 29 through October 31, 1996.

delivery, and computer hardware and software for information management systems. For these more hesitant tribes, lack of staff and staff training were also perceived as potential setbacks for the implementation of a TANF program.

In making future decisions about TANF, many tribes are networking with one another (either on their own initiative or through the ITCA) to continue their decision-making and plan development process.¹⁹ By May of 1998 four tribes had formed task forces to perform in-depth studies on issues of welfare reform. Most of these task forces included social service administrators, as well as other service providers and frontline staff. One task force included the local DES staff. Some task forces included subcommittees in areas such as economic development, child support and education. In one community, the Tribal Vice Chair initiated a review of the TANF legislation and engaged social service staff in forecasting the impact of welfare reform on tribal members. In general, formal decisions were made after task forces or social service staff made their recommendations to the Tribal Chair, the Tribal Council, or a committee of the Tribal Council. Final decisions were then voted upon and made by Tribal Councils.

These task forces have been instrumental in expediting TANF implementation decisions on reservations. For instance, between our last meeting in January and our follow up visit in May 1998, the Salt River tribe had created a task force that met every other week for three months. As a result of these task-force-meetings, this tribe arrived at the decision to implement its own TANF program. The task force decided it would like to have a proposal ready so that it could begin a tribal TANF program by July. In order to arrive at the July deadline, the task force began meeting in February to prepare a proposal for the Tribal Council. Two months later the Tribal Council received and approved the proposal, which was then sent to the federal government for approval.

In general, tribes had similar motives for administering their own tribal TANF programs. For the tribes which have either submitted TANF plans or plan to do so in the near future, the main reasons service providers asserted for wanting to implement tribal TANF programs are:

1) To give their community members greater flexibility in regards to the enforcement of work requirements and time limits. The need for flexibility in the enforcement of work requirements and time limits is underscored by the concerns of many social service providers who fear that the lack of employment opportunities on or near reservations will make it impossible for some recipients to meet all the deadlines under the state plan. Local DES staff are aware of these factors in the decision-making process. One DES staff member said, "The major reason they decided to do tribal TANF was to help the people who would have been sanctioned."

Flexibility was also a motive for another tribe which decided to develop its own plan. This tribe was interested in formulating its own plan because doing so allowed for mobility in the selection of program requirements, while still enabling the tribe to use the state as its service provider. As the Tribal Social Services Director said, "The state made it simple to do TANF on our own. They offered the state matching funds and agreed to subcontract to provide the

¹⁹ Some efforts at developing TANF strategies have "slacked off" or slowed down due to the impact of waivers for reservations with unemployment rates over 50 percent. As one social services manager said, "The waiver has taken the gun away from our temples. We will be allowed to move at a slower pace."

services. We felt it would benefit community members because we would have flexibility and be able to protect recipients from time limits.”

As expected, greater flexibility has permitted tribes to develop a variety of distinct TANF plans, differing both from the federal mandate and from one another. For instance, the Navajo Nation has proposed to require only five percent of adult participants (ages 18 to 60) to comply with work requirements in the first two years, with a minimum of 10 hours per week for the first and second years.²⁰

2) To maintain minimum benefit payments to families with children. The DES in Arizona recently agreed to endow private companies with the right to administer TANF on reservations. This concession has presented tribal members with a new concern. That is, tribes fear that private companies may make compliance with welfare requirements and living conditions under welfare even more difficult than they were under state supervision. For example, private companies may lower benefits to families, as well as advocate for even stricter time limits and work requirements. Substantiating the validity of this concern, service providers of a tribal community in which TANF services may be privatized in the future indicated that the proposed plan under privatization is not only more stringent in its suggested time limits and work requirements than is the state plan, but also that the privatized plan would cap benefit levels for families, regardless of family size.

3) To develop programs that are culturally appropriate. In general, tribes are concerned about maintaining culturally appropriate programs. Privatization is one area in which the fear of the potential loss of culturally appropriate programs is manifested. Tribes are concerned that the private companies may lack cultural sensitivity to Indian communities. As one social service provider stated, “The private companies may not be sensitive to cultural aspects of our Indian Community.” One tribal TANF coordinator said, “We have a lot of confidence in our tribal capabilities. Tribes have struggled under bureaucracies before. We don’t want to work like that with the state. We want a government-to-government agreement.” He also stressed that this was the opportunity to design something that “truly reflected” their cultural values and traditions: “Ideas about welfare reform apply mostly to urban areas. Our community is unique. We have a unique lifestyle, and our plan is designed to fit our unique needs.”

Similar desires to protect tribal sovereignty and culture were articulated by other tribes intending to develop their own TANF plans in the future. A service provider for one of these tribes stated:

“We have a support system that is centuries old. Traditionally, the kinship and clan systems have provided assistance for their members. If we do our own program, we have to structure TANF to build on what’s already there. We have to protect the tribal system of people helping each other. We need to ‘massage’ government regulations so they fit what is here. We have a totally different philosophy from other tribes, and we don’t want to undermine our culture.”

Tribes are concerned that private companies may not appreciate the cultural differences in Indian community. This concern is reflected in the comment of a Tribal Social Service

²⁰ Ten percent of all families on the third year and thereafter.

Provider who said, “They do not appreciate our past and our history.” The social service provider’s concern is corroborated by evidence showing that American Indians experience discrimination in employment agencies, a circumstance which may be better addressed by a tribe than a private company. As such, most service providers indicated that as privatization proceeds, tribes will have additional impetus for administering their own plan.

4) To use TANF programming as an opportunity to restructure and coordinate tribal welfare systems. Tribes that are considering the possibility of implementing their own TANF program have concluded that they are better positioned to develop services that are flexible, generous and culturally appropriate. An additional incentive for tribal TANF programming, specific to Arizona, is the agreement of the state of Arizona to provide state matching funds²¹ to the tribes. Yet, tribal members are aware that even with state matching funds, if they administer their own TANF program, they will have fewer funds than if they continue with the state program. Also, they recognize that the monies provided by the state for social services is inadequate. Still, tribes think they will be able to assist more families with fewer funds than the state or a private company could because, as stated by a Tribal Social Service Provider, tribes generally feel that “as a community, we know our own people better.”

To adjust to the new changes, especially to save costs, tribes are consolidating their programs and services. For instance, a Tribal Social Service Provider from the Salt River tribe indicated that his tribe is consolidating different programs to “create a new Division of Family Assistance where we will merge together GA (Tribal General Assistance), JTPA (Job Training and Partnership Act), TANF, NEW JOBS (Native Employment Works and Job Opportunity and Basic Skills) and Welfare-to-Work.” Additionally, this tribe has discussed the possibility of coordinating support systems such as childcare and transportation. To facilitate some of these changes, this tribe created a Coordinating Committee so that, according to a Tribal Social Service Provider, when “an individual comes in who needs mental health services, transportation and childcare, the tribal Coordinating Committee can decide how all the programs in the community will assist the individual. This is a better system than simply referring individuals to different departments.” The tribe is concerned, however, about consolidating departments under Public Law 477. Concern about PL-477 arises primarily from the threat of budget cuts once funds are pooled into one source.

As tribes implement their own TANF services some Tribal Governments may put additional dollars into these services if they see the connection between welfare reform implementation and tribal social and economic development. A tribal member hoped “that the tribal government will be involved in this initiative to implement a tribal welfare system.” For the Salt River tribe, for example, interest and participation from Tribal Governments has increased as a result of the creation of a tribal administration system. Tribal service providers indicated that the tribe will submit a request to their Tribal Council to assist in funding the tribally administered welfare program. The service providers on this reservation estimate that they will need over one million dollars for the program, with over half of the money allocated to start-up costs, which will provide for the purchase of buildings, furniture and computers.

²¹ Nine states--Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Minnesota, Montana, Oregon, Washington and Wyoming-- have agreed to provide state matching funds. Arizona will provide 80% of the state money that it spent on AFDC recipients on reservations in 1994.

B. Cooperation, collaboration, and communication

Coordination, communication and collaboration regarding the implementation of social programs and services have increased since the passage of the PRWORA in the following ways: 1) tribes are communicating directly with the federal government; 2) tribes are coordinating with state social service administrators; and 3) collaboration and communication is occurring on a regular basis between tribes, as well as among service providers and administrators within each tribe.

Under the PRWORA, both states and tribes find it advantageous to ensure the coordination and provision of TANF and related services. On this topic, one Tribal Social Service Director stated, "This is an exciting time. We are coming to the table to talk with state workers. We are tapping resources not previously available and working to 'know the other side.'" Also to this end, another Tribal Social Service Director said, "The Vice Chair was interested in tribal TANF all along, and the state made it simple to do our own. They offered the state match and agreed to subcontract to provide the services."

Overall, state DES staff have cooperated with tribes and assisted them in making decisions regarding TANF. In addition, many DES staff are supportive of tribal efforts to administer their own plans. A DES administrator, commenting on a tribe considering tribal administration of TANF in the future, had this to say on the subject:

"I think the tribe(s) will eventually move forward with their own TANF plans. That's the way to go. The tribe(s) will have more flexibility, and the family cap is waived. Plus they do not have a huge caseload. They could also contract back with DES."

During the TANF decision-making process, state DES staff (including staff from the Intergovernmental Relations office) met with tribal staff to provide information and resource materials, especially to those tribal staff members interested in developing their own TANF plans. In addition, local DES staff also provided assistance to five tribes while they were making their TANF decisions. A DES District Program Manager commented that one of the tribes electing to utilize their own plan "looked at all the options carefully and did a thorough job gathering information." She added that this same tribe has a "strong social services department."

Even with so much support however, most tribes lack the technical skills and the infrastructures required to administer TANF services. As a result, even the two tribes in Arizona that have received approval from DHHS to run their own TANF programs have subcontracted with the state to implement different components of TANF. In other words, TANF money will flow from the federal government to the tribe, and then to the state. As such, tribes will enjoy the freedom to design culturally sensitive programs while the state will provide the technical skills needed to implement the program. For the first time, Tribal Governments and service providers are negotiating with the state in the bargaining process. So far, the relationship between the tribes and the state appears to be a productive one. Thus, it is possible that welfare recipients will truly benefit from such state-tribal relationships.

At the tribal level, the 1996 welfare legislation has also led to increased communication, collaboration and coordination. Among Tribal Social Service Providers, the legislation has afforded them an opportunity to convene for the assessment of the services and needs of their respective communities. Improvements in this area were noticeable even between our January and May visits to reservations in 1998. A Tribal Social Service Provider indicated that the idea of integration and consolidation of existing programs is "embedded in peoples' [Tribal Social

Service Providers] minds and has become a must and a necessity.” Another Tribal Social Service Provider, alluding to the idea that welfare reform is not only focused on social services and social welfare, but also on departments of employment, childcare, transportation, education and training, stated: “we're getting to the point where we have the key programs, components and collaboration between departments to make TANF work.”

As a result of increased communication among Tribal Social Service Providers, several tribes have recognized the need to restructure already existing services. By doing so, tribes feel they will be better equipped to meet the needs of their communities. For example, in order to improve coordination, one community combined its health and social service departments into one administrative entity. Also seeking to facilitate greater coordination and communication, other communities have initiated long-range planning processes to integrate economic development, job training and educational staff.

Despite these efforts to increase cooperation, collaboration and communication, refinements continue to be necessary. One area in need of improvement stems from the necessity of guidance in tribal attempts to implement the TANF program. One Tribal Social Service Provider noted, "There are no rules or guidelines in place to direct us on how to develop our own program. We have to interpret the law as we see fit, so we are drawing from other program guidelines and public laws [such as 412, 477 and 638]." So far, the federal government has not contributed to tribal efforts to integrate existing programs. The state, on the other hand, has provided useful technical assistance by meeting with tribes and creating “transition teams,” i.e. teams representing both state and Tribal Social Service Providers which examine ways that tribes can take over responsibility for TANF implementation. Additionally, the Tribal Task Forces, composed of experts from different departments, have been crucial in developing TANF programs. Still, expressing a common sentiment among tribes, one Tribal Social Service Provider stated, tribes feel that they "need greater understanding about the need for resources at the congressional level - this is a long term commitment from the Federal government."

Implicit in the efforts to improve cooperation, collaboration and communication between tribes, is the notion that such progress, will simplify the administration of tribal TANF. For example, a tribal member stated:

“If a recipient moves off the reservation to find employment in a nearby city, she still participates in tribal programs to meet her work requirements, but the state is not aware of it. Therefore, the state notifies the recipient that she must participate in the state JOBS program. The recipient then has to contact the tribe, who has to straighten it out with the state.”

C. Tribal challenges to self-administer TANF

There are challenges associated with tribal attempts to self-administer TANF that need to be met. Some of these challenges are listed below:

1. State match

Under the 1996 federal welfare legislation tribes will receive varying levels of support for TANF administration from their respective states. This discrepancy may affect a tribe’s ability to administer TANF. The 1996 federal welfare legislation does not require states to support tribes that wish to implement TANF independently. In other words, tribes are only entitled to federal dollars, not state dollars. Thus far, we are aware of only nine states in the nation (see Tables 8

and 9) that have agreed to provide state matching funds (DHHS, 1998), all of which may or may not provide the state match at the 1994 expenditure level. That is, states that are matching tribal expenditures may choose to give tribes varying percentages of the 1994 state match (e.g. some states may provide 80% while others will choose to provide higher or lower percentages). In order to compensate for this loss, tribes must make up the remaining percentages either through caseload reductions or cut in program expenditures. Both the 1994 expenditure level, as well as the option to provide varying percentages of the state match, apply even if the number of welfare recipients in a given tribe rose after 1994.²²

2. Support costs

As indicated earlier, tribes are encouraged to develop TANF administration plans under P.L. 102-477, the law which allows them to combine funds from different sources into one funding stream. Of the 19 Indian communities with approved TANF plans, two communities have structured their plans to meet the requirements of P.L. 102-477.²³ However, it appears that tribes may not be able to use P.L. 93-638, the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975, to administer TANF services. As stated earlier, P.L. 93-638 allows tribes the freedom to develop and implement their own social programs and facilitates this process through the provision of start-up costs. If this law is not applicable to TANF implementation, tribes opting to administer their own TANF programs must secure their own start-up costs. Included in these costs is money to strengthen infrastructure, as well as money to hire and train additional caseworkers. This is a concern for all the tribes we interviewed. In Arizona, Navajo Nation, attempting to secure support costs, originally applied to DHHS to administer TANF under the (P.L. 93-638). The Secretary of the DHHS has rejected the Navajo Nation proposal to administer TANF under P.L., 93-638, but recently the Navajo Nation has appealed that decision in the Federal District Court in Phoenix. Other tribes are waiting to hear how the Navajo Nation's application will be decided so they can prepare their TANF administration application using either P.L. 93-638 or P.L. 102-477.

Also, the Navajo Nation has experience with the administration of several programs (e.g., GA, NEW JOBS, JTPA, Welfare-to-Work, childcare, transportation, Women Infant and Children (WIC) program and food stamp distribution) and hopes to create an employment-oriented TANF program. However, the tribe needs additional funds to integrate these programs. So far, the tribe has received general funds (supplemental dollars) from the Tribal Council in the amount of \$1.4 million for (TANF) start-up costs. According to a Tribal Social Service Provider, "This is only a drop in the bucket, but it is something that we, as a nation, have understood that we would have to provide some seed money to get a program such as this [TANF] off the ground." Additional funds are needed from the federal government and the state to replenish funds the tribe has spent on TANF.

3. State and tribal governments are not treated equally

The 1996 federal legislation has strengthened the "government-to-government" relationship between the federal government and tribes by allowing tribes greater

²² According to the Department of Economic Security of Arizona four tribes have experienced an increase in the number of households receiving TANF (Colorado River, Hualapai, Pasqua Yaqui and San Carlos) between January 1995 and January 1998.

²³ They are Confederated tribes of Siletz Indians, Oregon and Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux tribe, South Dakota.

flexibility in the design and administration of welfare programs on reservations. However, tribes are not treated on par with states in at least three areas. First, states are allowed to keep unexpended TANF funds for future (unlimited time) use, but tribes must return any unexpended federal funds to the federal government within two years. In regards to the second area, performance evaluation funds, a limited amount of funding was set aside to evaluate PRWORA performance. As a result, not all states received federal dollars for evaluating their performance. At the tribal level, the federal funding for performance evaluation is even scarcer. For example, tribes that are implementing their own TANF services do not receive any federal money to evaluate their performance even when the states within which they are located receive federal money to evaluate their performance. Finally, with respect to the third area, federal rewards for "successful" work, states receive bonuses for reducing caseloads, unwed births and teen pregnancies, whereas tribes do not receive any of these bonuses, even when they are able to make reductions in the same areas.

4. Discrepancy in federal and state fiscal years

Federal and state awards may follow separate fiscal years. For example, in Arizona, a tribe that takes over the responsibility of implementing TANF will receive both federal and state funds, but federal and state awards follow separate fiscal years (the state fiscal year runs from July to June, but the federal fiscal year runs from October to September). Tribal Administrators did not mention this as a major problem, but it does make administrative tasks more complex.

5. Technical expertise

As indicated earlier, most tribes lack the technical skills and the infrastructures required to administer TANF programs. This is a big concern for tribes that wish to self-administer TANF. Lack of technical expertise means that tribes will have to either subcontract with the state or a private organization. By doing so, tribes lose employment opportunities on reservations. Currently, tribes within Arizona seem to prefer to subcontract with the state rather than with a private organization. Two of the three tribes in Arizona that have received approval from DHHS to run their own TANF programs have subcontracted with the state to implement different aspects of TANF.

D. Tribal response to assist TANF recipients

Tribes are aware that it is a challenge to employ poor women on public assistance, simply because many reservations are geographically isolated, have high unemployment rates, and have welfare populations that lack child care, transportation, education and employment skills. Tribal members are concerned about their ability to move these families from welfare to work with a shrunken budget.

Tribes generally feel that TANF must be an investment from the federal government, i.e. it is not tribes' responsibility to commit their funds directly for TANF. They think that the federal government must provide funds to tribes because of their historic trust responsibility to tribes. A Tribal Social Service Provider indicated that every time a budget related to TANF services is proposed, "the tribal leadership reminds us of the trust responsibility and that this is what solidifies the government to government relationship."

Indirectly, however, Tribal Governments have committed funds through programs already in existence at the tribal level, which will contribute to TANF services. The tribes

consider these indirect funds as “third party, in-kind contributions” for the development of TANF services. On one reservation, Tribal Social Service Providers indicated that their economic development department had started introducing some employment initiatives “to focus on those coming off the welfare roles.” Recognizing the low employment skills of many welfare recipients, the department began developing low-skill jobs. In addition, some chapters on this reservation have begun their own initiatives to encourage economic development targeted to increase the employment of welfare recipients.

Tribal members of another reservation noted that it is harder to find employment for welfare recipients than it is to motivate them to look for work. They indicated that many welfare recipients struggled with finding long-term employment. Through the Job Training and Partnership Act (JTPA) program, recipients are placed in a job for 1,000 hours (which amounts to about six months of work) in order to receive work experience. One recipient worked in a data entry job while another cooked for a senior citizens home in her community. Both recipients worked 40 hours per week, earned the minimum wage or slightly above, and enjoyed their jobs. Although most employers seek employees with work experience, several focus group participants indicated that JTPA did not provide the experience that they needed to find long-term employment. One of the recipients had finished her 1,000 hours during our May 1998 focus group interview. She did not find a long-term job after her JTPA training, even though she sent out 15 applications: "Right now I am looking for volunteer work at my previous work experience job." The other JTPA participant had not finished her 1,000 hours, but nonetheless was aware that her employer would not hire her, and therefore was seeking employment to begin after her job training ended. She sent out four applications, but had "not heard news from them." During our May visit, we spoke with a focus group participant who had recently reapplied for welfare after her JTPA training ended because she was not able to find employment. She had not received a welfare check yet. She was distressed about receiving TANF: "TANF is too much for me. It costs a lot of money to get the paper work together and to drive to the office." To be eligible for TANF, she must provide proof that she is seeking employment. This requirement is especially difficult because she lives 55 miles away (one way) from the nearest welfare office.

Most employers are reluctant to hire welfare recipients after the 1,000 hours have been exhausted. As a result, recipients are trapped in a “vicious six-month cycle of work experience and TANF participation.” This issue of employers wishing to employ individuals for the 1,000 hours job training period, but not after this period ends, is a problem on reservations. To end this cycle, one of the tribes recognizes the importance of encouraging both private and tribal employers to view welfare recipients as long-term investments and to provide them with training and experience that they are looking for in an employee. On this particular reservation, there is a movement to develop "an agreement with personnel departments that once a position becomes available, the employer will give the welfare recipient a shot at the job.”

E. Changes in Attitudes and Behavior

According to Tribal Social Service Providers and DES staff, there is evidence of parents’ increased work activity (consisting of forms signed by local employers), changes in attitudes toward welfare and greater interest in education and training. To this end, the Director of JTPA for one tribe said:

“A lot of our TANF recipients are looking for employment and participating in job search activities. Clients are coming in more. Many have found employment, for example, in

entry-level jobs in retail, although some of it is seasonal. Also, the state JOBS office steers many of them toward jobs.”

In addition, one state JTPA Coordinator said, “A lot of tribal members are going to work. They see that [the federal government] is serious about work. Most welfare recipients are complying. This is a positive impact.”

Overall, one tribe has noticed more compliance among welfare recipients to participate in job search activities. The quota for reducing the welfare roles has not been achieved, but, according to at least one Tribal Social Service Provider, a change in culture and attitudes towards welfare has occurred: “Everyone is wondering what is going to happen.” However, adjustments are still needed in order to support former recipients once they find employment. For example, according to another Tribal Social Service Provider, “If a recipient finds a job at the minimum wage she is dropped from childcare support. A more effective program would provide assistance for at least a year while the recipient is getting on her feet. We need to develop a transitional section in our plan.”

Focus group members attested to the increase in work activities by describing their own efforts to meet TANF requirements. Five focus group members living in a community located near an urban center felt that changes in welfare were positive. They noted behavioral changes in others as well, as is indicated by one focus group member’s comment: “Since welfare reform began, younger people are coming out now. More people are riding the [commuter] van in the morning. There are more people working.” However, these perceptions were not necessarily shared by focus group participants living on more isolated, rural reservations.

The number of referrals to education and job training programs has increased, which, according to Tribal Social Service Providers, is “very important.” A local DES staff member, who is also a member of the tribe she serves, commented that “TANF is opening people’s eyes. It’s going to change the way we think as Indian people.” According to her, recipients are “reading and asking questions about what is going to happen and what is happening.” One DES staff person said that welfare reform “woke up a lot of people. Many recipients went into GED programs. Welfare reform has had a significant psychological impact.” He also commented that the impact would be negative if people return to complacency because of the work requirement/time limit waiver granted to tribes with an unemployment rate of 50 percent or higher.

The Director of Social Services for one tribe stated, “Welfare reform has made women realize they need to do something. Many were scared they would get cut off when they received the general letter from the state informing them of changes. They came in to the tribal offices and were told they wouldn’t be cut off [because the tribe is implementing its own program].” Another Tribal Social Service Provider said, “People realize they need to be trained for work, but the jobs may not be there. Welfare reform has created psychological stress. It will require a different lifestyle for people who receive assistance.” One Director of JTPA for a tribe noted that while more TANF recipients were requesting services, many recipients were still “afraid of change.” Also to this end, a Tribal Social Service Provider said recipients were “afraid of getting cut off.” This anxiety about new TANF requirements can lead to other adverse effects. Substantiating this claim, one DES worker noted that “A lot of people get depressed. They want to drink [alcohol] if they lose their welfare or lose their job.” In addition, a focus group participant expressed anxiety about TANF when she said, “The money goes too fast. People

don't live like we do [in remote areas]. They don't understand what I'm going through. . . The world's going to change. Soon there won't be any assistance."

In addition to welfare recipients, Tribal Social Service Providers are also reexamining their roles as a result of the 1996 federal welfare legislation. One Tribal Social Service Provider stated, "It is the expectation of people that the tribe has got to do something, especially the people who have assumed the dependency role. They expect the Tribal Government to help them. Reality hasn't registered that public assistance is no longer an entitlement." Another Tribal Social Service Provider stated, "We have to change people's habits. People haven't seen the necessity of getting out of the rut. Minimum wage pays less than public assistance [when food stamps and Medicaid are included], but getting jobs will help other problems." Also on this subject, a Tribal Social Service Manager stated, "We have to redefine what employment is. Our people think of work as ranching, farming, crafts, and building homes. It is not full-time, but people work [sporadically] as work is available."

F. Sanctions, Relocations and Opting Out of the System

As indicated earlier, 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 50 percent or higher unemployment rates. Many of the immediate impacts of the 1996 welfare legislation, in regards to terminations or sanctions, have been delayed for reservations with waivers. In general, waivers have stifled some of the initial urgency tribes felt while developing and implementing their TANF plans. Tribal Social Service Providers and DES staff were aware of only a few terminations or sanctions in the various communities. Due to the granting of waivers in many reservations with high unemployment,²⁴ sanctions that have been given are the result of recipients not complying with the job readiness training, immunization, school enrollment or child support requirements. Such sanctions have motivated recipients to actively prepare for and seek employment. Sanctions increase incrementally, beginning at 25 percent of benefits, then rising to 50 percent and 100 percent, if noncompliance with program requirements continues.

Speaking about one reservation which did not receive a waiver, a DES Office Manager reported that due to noncompliance with child support and work requirements, approximately 40 people had been sanctioned in the past six months. On another reservation, of the 27 parents that have had their TANF checks held due to noncompliance with the employment program attendance policy, only seven of these parents returned to the employment program. The tribe has not followed the remaining 20 parents to determine what strategies they are employing to survive. One question that needs to be asked is: Have they found employment or have they moved in with relatives who receive other public assistance such as GA (Tribal General Assistance) or SSI (Supplemental Security Income)? The tribe is certain, however, that the parents are not receiving GA instead of TANF because persons who leave TANF voluntarily are not eligible for GA.

Tribal Social Service Providers on two reservations, speculating on how parents are surviving without TANF or employment, thought that women might be relocating to more urban areas in order to find work. Some of these women are leaving their children with relatives on the reservation. One focus group member who was encountering difficulty with meeting work activity requirements, as well as with finding adequate childcare and a stable place to live,

²⁴ The state does not remove recipients who have exhausted the 24-month time limit from TANF grant if they reside on reservations with 50 percent or higher unemployment rate.

reported placing her younger daughter in a boarding school. Other Tribal Social Service Providers felt that women who have been sanctioned might be moving back in with relatives.

Also, reports from current and former welfare recipients and Tribal Social Service Providers suggest that many women have simply been opting out of the system since welfare reform began. Tribal Social Service Providers believe that recipients opt out of the system because there are too many requirements to receive TANF (in terms of paper work) and the welfare offices are too far away for recipients in isolated communities.

One focus group participant said she got off welfare because “it was more of a hindrance than a help. I couldn’t meet the appointment and got cut off. I didn’t reapply because it was too much of a hassle.” Another woman was on welfare but hasn’t reapplied because she was “embarrassed to be on aid.” She missed an appointment due to school, and she said DES staff were “rude” to her. She stated, “They gave me a hard time because I live with my mom. They asked about my mom’s income and said that she should be the one taking care of me.”

A manager for a tribal department of employment and training said that his office had sent letters to 150 TANF recipients to inform them of an informational session on JTPA, as well as other options available for meeting work requirements. Only 47 of the 150 showed up. Many of the welfare recipients he works with have asked to see the law for themselves. He reports that many women agree with the comment made by one woman who said: “It looks like a lot of requirements. We don’t want to reveal all that information.” In addition, he commented that other women agree with the words of a tribal member who said, “Go ahead and sanction me.”

G. Employment Opportunities

One of the greatest barriers faced by American Indian communities in implementing welfare to work is the shortage of employment opportunities on or near reservations. Such shortages were mentioned by Tribal Social Service Providers and DES staff alike during both of our visits in January and May of 1998. One Tribal Social Service Provider said, “Even if we trained everyone we wanted, we don’t have enough jobs.” Another Tribal Social Service Provider echoed this thought:

“The big concern is that we can train people until we turn blue, but if we don’t have the jobs, where will we put these people once they’re trained? There is no way we can employ another 6,000 people. It doesn’t just take Tribal Government to create jobs, but also churches, employers, and all members of society.”

Job opportunities are limited because reservations are isolated from towns and urban areas. As one Tribal Planner commented, “We have no access to the urban employment market” due to transportation difficulties [a topic which will be discussed in a later section] and other barriers.”

A few tribes that are not geographically isolated have a lower unemployment rate and their emphasis under welfare reform may be different from those tribes that are isolated. For instance, the Salt River tribe, located in the outskirts of Phoenix, has attracted private business investors. In addition, this tribe opened a casino in May of 1998. In the next five years, this tribe expects to have even more development on the reservation. A private company is developing a resort hotel, a golf course, a casino and a restaurant. Tribal Social Service Providers project that the casino itself will provide as many as 400 jobs for skilled and experienced employees. This tribe, however, is concerned about the mismatch between the skills

employers desire and the skills that potential tribal employees actually possess. In order to overcome this barrier, the tribe wishes to emphasize the Indian Preference Act²⁵ to encourage employers to hire American Indians. Additionally, the tribe would like to encourage employers to, in the words of a Tribal Social Service Provider, “rewrite their job descriptions and hire individuals who may not have the skills or education needed but require them to obtain the skills or education within a specified period.” Along with the efforts to change employer behavior, the tribe is concentrating on ensuring that every welfare recipient has at least a GED.

One of the predicted impacts of welfare reform is that it will, as one Tribal Planner suggested, “force the tribes to quit being lackadaisical about economic development.” Another Tribal Planner stated, “Welfare reform will not work in rural areas without the economic development piece. However, we may be faced with taking capital from other (tribal) economic development efforts if we have to ‘make work’ for TANF recipients.” A staff member for the economic development department of another tribe reported that the reservation community needed large employers, because “without big companies and operations that pay, it doesn’t do any good to have small businesses – they wouldn’t survive.” Ideas for economic development that tribes are currently exploring are tourism, environmental restoration, arts and crafts, and in-home businesses. In one community, they are renovating an old plant to become a cabinet-making facility. The project will create jobs, providing potential employees with opportunities to make cabinets for homes built by the Tribal Housing Authority. At least one tribe is beginning to explore the idea of tax breaks for employers who hire reservation members.

Other tribes have mixed feelings about private development by outsiders in their communities. Some feel this development is necessary and will provide employment to tribal members, while others do not agree. According to one Tribal Social Service Provider:

“The tribe has a natural resources based economy. We are not willing to open up our reservation to development by outsiders. Some of our most successful projects have been environmental restoration programs. These programs have captured the ideas of our youth. These projects fit in with the culture and environment of our people. They reconnect our youth to the land.”

This Tribal Social Service Provider envisions creating a community service corps (using a WPA-like model) to provide work for TANF recipients and believes that the federal government should provide incentives for tribes to put their resources into work development.

Tribal Social Service Providers in three communities said a growing number of construction jobs were being made available, including jobs for women. Respondents from several reservations also mentioned that more community members were turning to entrepreneurial activities to make money, including selling baked goods and lunches. Two Tribal Social Service Providers noted that, while towns near their reservations had a variety of tourist and service industry (fast food) jobs available, these jobs were low-paying and far away (due to lack of transportation). For at least four tribes, the tribe itself was the largest employer. To meet

²⁵ The policy of giving American Indians preference for employment in the BIA and HIS is based upon Section 12 of the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 which was further expanded in 1972 based upon Commissioner Louis Bruce’s recommendation. The new policy states that a qualified Indian candidate will be given preference for initial employment in newly created positions, to fill a vacancy, for reinstatement, for training opportunities in preparation for advancement, and for promotions (Lyman, 1973).

the work requirements in communities where jobs are scarce, recipients are performing job search activities, which involve little more than going to three local employers every month and obtaining forms signed by potential employers stating that there are no jobs available.

H. Support Services

Transportation. Lack of support services, such as for transportation and childcare, is a barrier to employment and training on reservations. On virtually every reservation where a representative was interviewed, transportation was mentioned as one of the main barriers in employing TANF recipients. One Tribal Social Service Provider's statement spoke for everyone when he said that transportation "was and will be one of the main barriers" reservations face in employing their participants. This is especially true for reservations in remote rural areas. As one DES office manager reported:

"The biggest problem is that people tend to live far out from the nearest town. There is no public transportation. People in remote areas are very isolated. If they need assistance to get to the DES office, the tribe owns a bus, but there's nothing to help people get to jobs. Their available transportation is not adequate for maintaining employment."

A TANF recipient on another reservation said:

"My transportation is definitely not adequate. My truck is always broken down. The further I go with my education and training, the harder it is. I'm not close enough to town and not close enough to stores. My aunt has to take me shopping. I have to go 30 miles for gas."

A Tribal Social Service Provider stated, "Our transportation problems are shocking. We're close to the city yet we are still isolated. It's like there is a big wall around the community."

One participant was making payments on a vehicle which she considered reliable, but car payments of \$700 per month were an economic burden for her family: "It takes a large chunk out of what I get from the state." Another participant owns an unreliable vehicle. Yet another participant had to hitchhike to and from her workplace three days per week. On the other two days, her sister drove her to work. She hopes to buy her own vehicle as soon as she can afford it.

Most of the communities do not receive state assistance to provide transportation for people on a daily basis. One tribe has a transit system, but it operates on a limited route, making stops at few stations. Another tribe provides a van service, but faces similar limitations. Though the vans operate weekdays between 5 a.m. and 5 p.m., they do not have designated stops but instead pick riders up at their homes. In order to utilize this service, a rider must schedule a time. In addition, people in need of the service for transportation to and from their employment sites, benefit only after transportation is afforded to, for example, those in need of medical help, who receive first priority. Though medical emergencies are an understandable priority, jobs may be jeopardized because of the lack of transportation during these situations. Also, the van system is "overburdened" and limited in how far it can travel. On two reservations, people reported that road conditions were another serious barrier. Because roads may be unpaved, even tribes with access to some form of transportation may be disadvantaged due to rain and snow, which make driving on these roads impossible.

Without public transportation, or ownership of their own vehicles, Tribal Social Service Providers and focus group members reported that most people walk (in the few places where this is possible), borrow cars from friends and family or get rides from them, or hitchhike in order to arrive at appointments, training or jobs. In one community, a TANF recipient reported hitchhiking eight miles to a GED class every day. Fortunately, a classmate gives her a ride home. Another recipient reported that she hitchhikes 50 miles to her GED class three times a week.

One reservation provides transportation for “adult GED students to education programs.” This tribe is also considering a wheels-to-work program, similar to the plan that the state of Arizona has established. Through this tribe’s program, welfare recipients will be able to lease a car from a used car company for \$20 a month. Once the recipient finds employment, she will have the option to keep the car, which the company will be able to use as a tax write-off.

Childcare. Both service providers and focus group participants agreed that it would be difficult to move families from welfare to work because support services are not adequate enough to encourage employment. Childcare, in particular, is a problem on all reservations we visited. A focus group participant said: “People can’t find childcare for their children while they’re at work or training. Now the agencies have a long waiting list.” Still, all but the smallest tribes had access to some form of childcare, whether the state, a county or the tribe provided the services itself. While three communities had childcare facilities on site, by far the preferred type of care was in-home care, otherwise known as family care. Family members, including grandparents, and in-home caregivers are eligible for state reimbursement for providing care if their homes are certified for childcare. Several focus group respondents indicated that their relatives were not refunded for childcare services because these participants did not apply for childcare reimbursement, nor were the homes of these relatives certified for childcare.

There is also a lack of trust toward child care providers. Many focus group participants indicated that they preferred family care because they knew their children would be well cared for; they didn’t trust daycare facilities and “didn’t want strangers taking care of their children.” Many of them relied on relatives (grandparents, sisters, aunts, etc.). At least one focus group participant relied on an older sibling to take care of a younger sibling. One respondent has a chronically ill child who needs in-home care. Currently she relies on her unemployed sons to watch this child “and make sure he takes his medication.” But she cannot always depend on them. She stated, “I never had a problem with childcare before because I was always there.”

Most communities reported increasing demands for childcare in the last several years. Demand for childcare had increased even between our January and May visits in 1998. In one community, the Childcare Director reported the demand had doubled in the last two years. Several tribes maintain long waiting lists for services. For example, in January 1998 in one community, there were 60 children on the waiting list, with only 80 total childcare slots in existence. By May the wait list had grown “substantially” on this reservation. In another community, there were over 100 children on a waiting list for 100 already-filled slots in agencies on the reservation. In at least one community, the waiting list was prioritized, with low-income parents who are working, going to school, or participating in job training receiving first priority. The available services were limited in a number of ways. For example, most providers only care for children from 7 a.m. to 5 or 6 p.m., weekdays only. While a few casinos provide childcare services to employees, even these services were only available during the daytime (although casinos are open 24 hours). Some programs place restrictions on the children they will care for.

For example, one facility did not accept children under the age of five. All the service providers who were asked stated that childcare services were not adequate in meeting the needs of their communities. They attribute the shortage of services to the shortage of funding.

I. Education and Job Experience

Other significant barriers to employment include low levels of education and a lack of job experience. In one tribal program, 50 percent of the participants had an eighth grade education or less; some participants had only a third grade education. Some JTPA programs require applicants to have GEDs before they can even participate in the program; other JTPA programs offer GED classes. One problem however, noted by several Tribal Social Service Providers is that communities do not have enough GED slots to meet the need. An employment training coordinator said that most TANF recipients who apply for his programs need extensive assistance with reading, writing and basic math. Only two of the educational and vocational training staff persons that we interviewed indicated that the educational services available to tribal members were “adequate.” All of the other staff persons described their available educational services as “inadequate.” They said that they are having a difficult time meeting the increased demands for services, because “a lot of the individuals referred to us are hard to serve. They need the most basic skills.”

Regarding job experience, several focus group members had never held paid positions outside of Job Corps or similar programs. Focus group members were also aware of the importance of experience: “The employers I see each month [to sign her work activity form] tell me the same thing: You need a GED and you need job experience. Although I would have to apply for their jobs if there are openings, I know they won’t pick me because I don’t have experience.”

To address the lack of job experience and training, the Inter Tribal Council of Arizona (ITCA) and six tribes²⁶ (of which we visited three) in Arizona have received Welfare-to-Work (WtW) funding.²⁷ This funding is made available to boost unsubsidized employment of hard-to-employ²⁸ welfare recipients. This money is available to tribes to provide the transitional employment-related assistance (e.g., transportation, childcare, skill development and creation of job opportunities) needed to move hard-to-employ welfare recipients from welfare to unsubsidized work. Unlike states, Indian communities are not required to come up with matching funds in order to receive WtW grants. In addition to TANF and WtW funds, tribes are eligible for funding the Native Employment Works (NEW) JOBS program, the Child Care and Development Fund, Child Support Enforcement, Tribal Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), and the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) Adult and Vocational Training Programs.

²⁶ The six Arizona tribes that received WtW funding are: Cocopah, Gila River, Hualapai tribe, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, The Navajo Nation, and White Mountain Apache Tribe.

²⁷ Only those Indian communities that are operating their own TANF or NEW JOBS programs or are operating employment programs funded through other sources under which “substantial services” are provided to welfare recipients are eligible for WtW grants (Department of Labor, 1998).

²⁸ Individuals who have been on TANF or AFDC for at least 30 months, lack access to childcare and transportation, those who require substance abuse treatment for employment, and those who have a low human capital (in the form of health, mental health, education and employment experience).

Four of the tribes we visited indicated they had NEW (Native Employment Works) JOBS programs. Of these tribes, three received WtW grants. However, the majority of tribes in Arizona did not have NEW JOBS programs and did not receive WtW funding. Some communities have access to state and local employment assistance programs. The majority of communities also had access to JTPA programs, which were either operated by the state or by the tribe. However, one Tribal Social Service Provider said the JTPA program on his reservation was “not receptive to TANF recipients.” In another community, a DES administrator reported that “participating in JTPA is the preferred way of meeting the work requirements.” Other communities reported a high demand for JTPA services. As one JTPA Director said, “We have very limited funding. We are trying to meet increased demand with the same level of funding.” He reported they have more than 30 individuals on their waiting list each quarter.

In general, American Indians on reservations have traditionally “been resistant to education because they have not seen educated Indians receive benefits from their efforts.” The attitude of welfare recipients toward education seems to have changed since the passage of the 1996 welfare legislation. Enrollment in tribal schools and colleges has increased. According to reports from residents and Tribal Social Service Providers, TANF recipients are anxiously looking to enroll in education and training programs. All focus group participants indicated that they wanted or needed more education and training. On all reservations we visited, there were waiting lists of women wanting to get into GED programs and/or JTPA training programs (which include training in basic skills, GED preparation, a six-month work experience, referrals to vocational training and other education). Once they are enrolled in these programs, a big problem is solved for TANF recipients, at least for the next six months. Those who have completed training or are on waiting lists for training must document that they are actively looking for employment by collecting signatures from local employers.

Of those participants who had completed the training, two felt that the training they received from JTPA was not enough. In fact, one respondent indicated that she basically taught herself skills: “They didn’t train me the way they should.” Two respondents were actively planning strategies to gain more training either through night school (so that they can work and attend school concurrently) or through applying for scholarships from the tribe. One participant was taking classes at a four-year college off the reservation to earn credits toward her Associates degree in pre-professional education. She has completed 60 credits toward her degree and hopes to teach computer science.

To further assist welfare recipients, one reservation (Salt River) is emphasizing innovative educational and fund raising strategies. This tribe has a strong vocational training program (e.g., training persons in different trades, such as carpentry, construction and electrical trades) which, according to one Tribal Social Service Provider, “has been successful in placing trainees in jobs.” Also according to this same Provider, “Some trainees earn an annual salary of \$40,000. There is such great interest in the trade program that there is a need for more instructors, more facilities for training, and more tools and equipment.” The education department on this reservation provides services for infants to adults, with a special focus on educating individuals for employment. According to a Tribal Social Service Provider, “We have been gearing up for welfare-to-work for a few years now by developing a school-to-work program.” Their “school-to-work” program focuses on education and is accompanied by additional on-the-job training and mentoring. Education services on the reservation are “low cost, relying on resources within the community.” To strengthen their educational services, they are seeking funding from other sources. For example, the tribe’s education department is

currently applying for a grant to begin a program called Even Start, which is a five-year program to provide adult education to low-income families. The program will provide training in parenting skills and childcare. Also, the department has assigned staff to locate Request for Proposals (RFPs) on the Internet and to submit proposals for funding. This tribe also recognizes that partnerships with outside funding sources are crucial: “Partnerships between departments is key for education grants and this is happening in the tribe, which will help us get the grants we need.”

On this same reservation, Salt River tribe, JTPA programs focus on preparing individuals for specific job openings in the community. JTPA is closely involved with different employers across the reservation to target permanent jobs for welfare recipients. For instance, since enrollment in the tribal schools has increased, the education department is seeking teacher assistants and support staff for all educational levels, i.e. staff for the high school level, the child care level and the Head Start level. JTPA will begin working with the education department to target recent JTPA graduates for such positions. JTPA is also working with the transportation department to hire bus drivers. The programs have been successful in placing graduates in employment. According to one Tribal Social Service Provider, “They are finding jobs right away. The problem is that we need to make supportive services available such as childcare, transportation and providing work clothing, so that they can maintain their employment.” JTPA hopes that working with the Coordinating Committee will help make support services accessible for new workers. One example of greater accessibility is that departments will be more aware of which services each department provides. Tribal Social Service Providers also want to ensure that recipients find employment that will lift them out of poverty: “The last thing we want is to place clients in minimum wage jobs where they have no place to go beyond that.”

One of the focus group participants was working at a tribal childcare agency on one of the reservations. She worked 40 hours per week at a wage of seven dollars per hour, with the exception of limited overtime for which she received time and a half. She had been working at the childcare agency for a month, but the position was temporary. A permanent position has opened up though, and she is applying for that position. As to this opportunity, the focus group participant stated, “I have a good shot at this position because I am already there.” Once she becomes a permanent employee she is eligible for employee benefits. She received her current job while training through JTPA to be a travel agent. She is pleased to currently work with children, however she may look into a job as a travel agent in the future.

Another participant faced significant barriers to finding work experience. She has health problems that made employers wary about hiring her. According to this participant, due to a variety of health problems, “a lot of which were stress-related,” there was a “gap between her training and work experience.” She also stated that her original work experience placement employer “got scared or something. They didn’t want to continue my contract.” However, she recently received placement through JTPA at the Health and Human Services office on her reservation. She will receive seven dollars per hour, which is paid by JTPA. According to her, she “enjoys working in the health field and has a lot of experience”, and is pleased with her placement. Her job requires her to drive so she is currently reapplying for her driver’s license. The JTPA service provider noted that “this position will open for a permanent position as well. We always ask if a permanent position will open for the client.”

One of the participants was trying to enhance her basic skills so she can eventually go to school at a community college. She is attending Basic English and math modules. Her employer encourages her education by allowing four hours of paid leave, once she is a permanent

employee, to attend her modules. The training center and her workplace are a few minutes away from each other by bus, which further encourages her education. The education department pays her \$50 for each module she completes, which is yet another incentive. This participant hopes to eventually receive an Associates degree in child development.

Another participant was currently attending JTPA for training. She once attended college to receive a Law degree, but her education was disrupted by family problems. She is interested in Law because she would like to work with the Indian Community to counteract injustice towards Indians.

J. Basic necessities

Another barrier to work faced by reservation residents is the lack of basic necessities (e.g., telephones, food, fuel and clothing). Of all the focus group participants interviewed, only a few had telephones. Participants expressed the dilemma this posed when potential employers asked them to provide, not only their own phone numbers, but also the phone numbers of references on job applications. Potential employers request three reference letters or three names of people with telephones whom they can contact for references. They also ask for the telephone number of the applicant. Employers are reluctant to hire people they cannot reach by phone.

Although data on income was not collected, focus group participants provided anecdotal information regarding the economic hardships they experienced. Most of them reported lacking basic household supplies at the end of each month, including food, fuel and clothing. Most 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." In some communities, residents still rely on wood-fuel for heating their homes. 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." Lack of basic necessities makes it incredibly difficult for recipients to care for their families and effectively pursue employment at the same time.

K. Individual and family problems

Some focus group members reported having children with health and behavioral problems, hardships which make it difficult to work and find childcare. Two focus group participants were grandmothers caring for their daughters' children because their daughters were no longer living in the home. In addition, according to both Tribal Social Service Providers and focus group participants, alcoholism is a problem in many of the communities. As one Tribal Social Service Provider said, "Alcohol abuse is a big problem here. It impacts employment, parenting, violence, suicides, crime, and other things." One focus group participant expressed her problems with alcohol and employment: "For 12 years I was employed by this tribe. I had everything. But alcoholism took its toll and landed me on my knees. I lost my house, I lost my car, and I almost lost my children due to neglect." She later received treatment through the tribe's behavioral health service program and reports that she is now in her third year of sobriety. Problems reported by focus groups provide a glimpse of the nature of problems poor families with children face on reservations.

L. Stereotypes and discrimination

In some communities, Tribal Social Service Providers and focus group participants were aware that due to gender issues, ethnicity, or personal and family histories, TANF recipients were often discriminated against by employers. Many focus group participants felt that employers discriminate against women, especially single mothers. One respondent said, "Women have the right to work – single women and mothers included." Another respondent said that employers think "women are too much trouble." Many respondents perceived these attitudes in employers on and off reservations. In towns and cities outside the reservations, Tribal Social Service Providers and focus group participants perceived that American Indians were stereotyped and discriminated against by some employers. One Tribal Social Service Provider said that in the nearest town many fast food managers did not want to hire American Indians. According to this Provider, "They think we don't know responsibility, commitment, or the work ethic. They think we always have emergencies that take us away from work." A Tribal Social Service provider in another community said, "It's like we have a wall around us. Do TANF recipients have their best chance to find jobs within the Indian community? Perhaps that would be the ideal. It would be less stressful than working outside in the dominant society."

Within communities, personal or family histories of alcoholism were also reported to be barriers to employment. A Tribal Social Service Director said, "Discrimination is a problem here. Once you're labeled as an alcoholic, you have a stigma for life. People who know the background of individuals won't hire them. That's the weakness of trying to work within the community." In one of the focus groups, a participant indicated that she was having great difficulties finding a job: "It's because of my background is why they're rejecting me. Because of my name. People think all my family are alcoholics. My father died of alcoholism." Another woman had a similar story: "I've been sober for three years, but no one will hire me because I used to be an alcoholic. I'm trying to get back with the rest of the world, but I have been labeled as an alcoholic." She experienced discrimination while seeking employment both on and off the reservation. Off the reservation, employers did not believe her transportation was reliable enough because she lived 70 miles away (she had her own vehicle, however, which she felt was reliable). On the reservation, her past experience with substance abuse made many employers refuse to hire her: "It is really hard to climb out of this hole."

M. Survival strategies and success stories

Welfare recipients indicated that many employers are prejudiced against women on welfare due to their minimal education and job experience, lack of telephones, transportation and reliable childcare, and individual or family histories of substance abuse. However, anecdotal evidence suggests that employers who have hired welfare recipients generally have positive experiences working with them. In one community, Tribal Social Service Providers reported success with hiring a welfare recipient for a position in a tribal childcare program. Other Tribal Social Service Providers had hired approximately six TANF recipients. The childcare director in this community hired four TANF recipients as contract workers, but then gave them permanent positions because they performed so well on the job. Two of these former welfare recipients have been working for her for approximately one year. The other two have been working for approximately seven to eight months. For all four of these individuals, these positions were their first jobs ever. One of these women had been on public assistance for more than 13 years.

Focus group participants also had success stories to share. For example, in one group, four of the five women were no longer receiving welfare. One woman said she had been on

welfare “for a long time” and decided to go off about two months ago due to the changes in TANF requirements. Another woman was on AFDC/TANF, but she was cut off last year after not renewing her application. She reports that she was too busy with school and work to reapply. She reported earning more money at work than she got with welfare. To this end, this woman stated, “I want to give my kids someone to look up to. People should work if they can. I was embarrassed being on welfare. People think you’re lazy. I wanted to better my future. I’m looking forward to the day I start working. I don’t depend on my family. I’m an independent woman.” At the time of this statement, she had graduated from a JTPA program and was a finalist for a facilities maintenance job that paid well over minimum wage.

One respondent feels she has “bettered” herself since she found a job. With encouragement from a family member, she has been able to save money. She opened a savings and checking account and began to cut back on unnecessary expenses. According to her, “I am saving a little bit at a time.” She feels that her ability to save money would have happened whether or not welfare reform occurred. With the money she has saved, she would like to eventually buy a trailer home.

Another participant who had recently found a job considered herself “more responsible and independent” than when she was on welfare. She was recently separated from her husband and she was struggling as a single parent: “I have been trying to adjust to this for quite some time. It is especially hard with my kids as a single parent.” She felt independent, however, by ending a destructive relationship. She earns more than when she was on welfare: “On welfare I got \$440 a month, now I get close to \$900 a month.” This has allowed her to change her spending patterns so that she can better provide for her family. In particular, she noted that she is currently able to buy food and shoes, as well as pay other household bills with less worry than before. Her long-term goals are either to earn a degree in vocational training or move to a nearby city that has greater employment opportunities. Her children perceive her positively since she has been earning her own income through work experience. They also perceive themselves more positively. According to her, “I can see a lot more self-esteem in them.” She is preparing her older child for work by enrolling him in a summer youth program.

Another participant has been “just living from month to month.” Because the TANF assistance she receives is not adequate, she sacrifices her own well-being so that her children “won’t look poor.” For example, she saved for some dental work she needed but then her children wanted to attend an end-of-the-year field trip: “It took a long time to save that money. I was sad at first when I gave it to them for the trip, but then when they came home and I saw their happy faces, I knew I did the right thing.” Purchasing shoes for her children is a struggle as well. One of her children had holes in the bottom of his shoes. At the time she could not afford new shoes for him. Eventually, she found a pair of shoes for six (\$6) dollars. She fears most that her struggles impact her children negatively. She would like to move out of her community because “access is hard and gas is expensive.” To change her current situation, she feels she needs “a good job. I don’t want to be on welfare but it is hard to get off because your rent will rise and everything else will cost more.” Overall, she is happier today because she is sober (recovering from alcohol abuse), but she is financially worse off because TANF does not provide as much as it did before. Her greatest achievement was to receive a tuition scholarship from a four-year college: “That was really a plus.”

A participant is experiencing difficulties in convincing her husband that he, as well as she, must actively seek employment or participation in education and training in order to maintain their benefits. “My husband won’t take part in what I want him to do. I want him to

work. Instead I'm the one that's doing it." This misunderstanding has led to many arguments between her and her husband. He refuses to seek work or attend training. The State will sanction her benefits by 25 percent (and 50, 75 and 100 percent as times goes on) if he does not comply with the welfare regulations. This is not an isolated occurrence. Service providers have noticed that "many American Indian women receiving AFDC-UP are more aggressive than their husbands in adhering to the work requirements because they worry about their children. This may result in separating a family." This participant is hoping to move to a nearby city for the summer to find employment. She plans to take her children with her.

The other respondent had to put school on hold in order to be with her grandchildren while their parents were going through a divorce. "I am just now getting back on my feet, but the kids demand more from me now that I am at home." She was studying to become a lawyer, yet has since entered the health field. She misses school a lot: "I was really happy in school. It was a fun time. I'd like to go back." Currently, she is having a hard time making ends meet: "I was doing fine before. I was paying my own bills and everything. Once I took over my home [returned home to take care of my grandchildren] and got only \$173 a month, I haven't been able to make it. I need one of my sons to get a job and help me out."

N. Change in Community Social Conditions

To understand change in community social conditions under welfare reform we relied on the individual perceptions and comments of focus group participants, as well as on aggregate data. Focus group participants indicated that they noticed an increase in the numbers of persons seeking employment on the reservation, but not necessarily the number of persons finding employment: "There is a lack of jobs." According to a focus group participant, drinking and drug abuse have been on the rise among welfare recipients, youth and elderly. There has also been an increase in the presence of drugs at local schools. All in all, participants felt that welfare reform will only exacerbate these conditions on reservations. One participant noted that, in the long run, it is necessary to have support services that compliment welfare reform, otherwise it will not succeed: "If you have people who are willing and able to help, then things will get better, and this is the responsibility of the government. We need government support because they are the ones making the changes."

Focus group participants have noticed various problems in their communities which need to be addressed. One such area is police protection for vandalism and other crimes, such as spray paint, broken windows, fires, and stolen cars. There is frustration with the slow response by the police to such incidences. Drug and alcohol abuse are problems as well. Sniffing paint and other drug use has become especially popular among younger children. At least one focus group participant noted that "it's really bad."

We also retrieved and analyzed social and economic data at the community level within Arizona using the census 1990 (see Tables 4-7) and the aggregate data on TANF enrollment obtained from the DES (see Tables 10-11). Even though nearly a decade old, the census data provide an overview of the social and economic conditions of these tribes. The TANF enrollment data, on the other hand, are more recent and document the welfare trends on reservations.

Trends in TANF enrollment by reservations

In order to monitor trends in TANF program use by reservation, we analyzed data obtained from the state Department of Economic Security, Phoenix for 17 reservations. For

these reservations we obtained the following data: number of households and number of individuals receiving TANF between January 1995 and January 1998 (see Table 10).

We looked at the percentage changes between the number of households and individuals receiving TANF in January of 1995 and in January of 1998. Like the states, reservations within Arizona also experienced a decline in the number of households and individuals (13 percent change) receiving TANF from January 1995 to January 1998 (see table 10), but for reservations the rate of decline was less rapid. During the same period, households and individuals among non-reservation TANF recipients within Arizona declined by 44 percent while the state of Arizona, which includes reservation and non-reservation TANF recipients, experienced a decline of 41 percent.

This data shows that seven tribes are nearly welfare independent. The TANF households of these seven tribes range from zero to six (Ak-Chin, Cocopah, Fort McDowell, Fort Mojave, Havasupai, Kaibab Paiute, and Yavapai Apache). It is important to note that for tribes with smaller numbers of households and individuals receiving TANF, percentage changes are not an informative measure.

Four tribes had an increase in the number of households receiving TANF: Colorado River (235 percent), Hualapai (127 percent), Pasqua Yaqui (74 percent) and San Carlos (9 percent) between January 1995 and January 1998. Colorado River had a substantial increase (235 percent)—from 23 households in January of 1995 to 77 households in January of 1998.

The remaining six tribes had decreases in both the number of households and number of individuals receiving TANF: Gila River, Hopi, Navajo Nation, Tohono O’odham and White Mountain Apache. Substantial decreases were experienced by two tribes: Gila River (from 631 households and 1,916 individuals in January 1995 to 343 households and 1,099 individuals in January 1998) and Tohono O’odham (from 612 households and 1,693 individuals in January 1995 to 474 households and 1,402 individuals January 1998).

With regards to sanctions, some families on reservations in Arizona have experienced sanctions (see table 11). Between January of 1998 and January of 1999, 623 cases or 9.03 percent of Arizona's total reservation based TANF cases (as of January 1998) were sanctioned 25 percent, indicating that these cases lost 25 percent of their cash assistance. During the same time, a total of 517 cases (7.50 percent) were sanctioned 50 percent, losing 50 percent of their cash benefit while 382 cases (5.54 percent) were closed due to sanctions resulting in a 100 percent loss of the cash benefit.

With regards to time limit, the state of Arizona waived the two-year EMPOWER time limit for all reservations with 50 percent or higher proportion of adults not employed.²⁹ As a result, a very small proportion of the TANF recipients (193 adult recipients) from reservations has been removed from the TANF program due to a two-year EMPOWER time limit between January of 1998 and January of 1999 (see table 11). These recipients (193 adult recipients) make up less than one percent of the total TANF recipients on reservations as of January 1998. Ninety percent of these recipients were from reservations that were ineligible for a two-year EMPOWER time limit waiver (i.e., these reservations had at least 50 percent adults employed). The remaining 10 percent of recipients were from reservations that were eligible for a waiver (i.e., these reservations had less than 50 percent adults employed).

²⁹ The state of Arizona used the Bureau of Indian Affairs' 1995 estimate of the percentage of adult American Indians on reservations that are not employed to waive two-year EMPOWER time limit.

ANALYSIS

Throughout the 1990s, devolution--or entrusting local levels of government to reflect their own attitudes, imagination and insight in the design and administration of social welfare services--has gained increasing attention. In 1996 the 104th Congress devolved TANF programmatic authority from the federal government to the states. Supporters of devolution argue that governmental units that are closer to the people (whether state or local) are more knowledgeable about the tribes. As a result, these governmental units are positioned to respond to people's needs and challenges with greater imagination and insight (Borut, 1996; Buckley, 1996; Kingsley, 1996). The federal government is perceived as bureaucratic, inefficient and distant in terms of providing the welfare needs of people. Those who oppose devolution contend that block granting of welfare programs to states is based on inaccurate premises and will hurt the poor and the nation at large (Caraley, 1996; 1998; Donahue, 1997; Goldberg, 1996; Kuttner, 1995; Steuerle & Mermin, 1997; Weaver, 1996). Still others have mixed views regarding the merits of devolution of welfare programs to the states (Gold, 1996; Nathan, 1997; The Economist, January 3, 1998).

In this report, however, we take the stand that devolution of power from federal and state to tribal governments is advantageous—not because we concur with the arguments used by supporters of devolution, but because it is in line with tribal self-rule (see also Pandey et al., in press). Historically, tribes have consistently sought to gain tribal sovereignty in the administration of social services. Also, in the current political climate, the federal government is unlikely to reverse the block grant approach or enlarge poverty alleviation programs at the federal level in the near future. In other words, devolution of administrative authority from federal government to states and tribal governments is here to stay for the time being. The tribes, witnessing devolution at the tribal level, are taking it seriously. Navajo Nation, for example, recently passed the Local Governance Act of 1998, which gives tribal chapters the authority to take action within their chapters to make welfare reform work. With this act, chapters may focus on economic development within their own community.

Incremental changes that will cure some of the deficiencies in the existing policies are likely to occur. Within this context we highlight some of the weaknesses of the current legislation and suggest remedies within the current policy framework. We conclude this section indicating that the 1996 welfare legislation has indeed increased communication, cooperation, and collaboration within tribes, among tribes, between tribes and states and between tribes and the federal government.

Challenges to Development through Devolution

The 1996 welfare reform legislation was based on the assumption that states are better positioned than the federal government to understand local conditions and to respond to local needs with innovative strategies, greater imagination and insight (Corbett, 1997). If devolution of power from the federal to the state level is a more effective means of delivering public assistance, then it is only logical to think that tribal governments situated closer to the problems are better positioned to understand and respond to tribal challenges. Tribal governments are, thus, better positioned to design suitable programs for their needy populations than the state. To this effect, tribes have begun examining issues that they need to address under welfare reform. Priorities may vary from one reservation to the next. For instance, a critical issue for tribal members of the San Carlos reservation, which has a high unemployment rate, was job

development, whereas at Salt River (located in the outskirts of Phoenix) issues of job placement and retention were more important.

Welfare reform has given Tribal Social Service Providers new opportunities to examine federal and state policy. This opportunity allows them to make their own decisions about what is best for their communities. The federal government has also given flexibility to tribes so that each tribe can determine its own service populations, definitions of family, types of assistance, job participation rates and time limitations. Developing TANF services that are sensitive to the cultural values and practices of their tribes has been a top priority for Tribal Social Service Providers. Because welfare reform gives tribes the option to run their own programs for the first time, it represents a fresh opportunity to design culturally appropriate welfare-to-work programs. Also, under PRWORA tribes are shifting their attention from rehabilitation to long-term development.

Tribes may design innovative poverty alleviation programs and respond to local challenges with greater imagination and insight. Some programs may even become models for other tribes in the nation. It is in the interest of the state and the federal government to remove tribal constraints against self-governance. The states and the federal government can promote tribal self-governance by easing some of their constraints as follows:

Federal support

Tribes are aware that flexibility to design and administer a tribal TANF program involves the responsibility to alleviate poverty and change behavior of current or former welfare recipients. Not all tribes within Arizona are positioned to undertake a task of this magnitude. Most Tribal Governments lack technical expertise and financial resources. Devolution, in the true sense of the word, does not necessarily mean that lower-level governments should do more work with less money. However, this is how the block granting of welfare services is currently set up. Providing financial and technical resources to those tribes with plans to self-administer TANF will not only reduce tribes' constraints to administer TANF, but it may also enhance job opportunities and skills among tribal members. Otherwise, "flexibility without resources may not be flexibility at all" (Corbett, 1997, p. 5).

If the intent is to help tribes become self-reliant, then perhaps funds should be made available to encourage their self-reliance not only at the individual level, but also at the institutional level. One way to build tribal institutional structures is to provide support costs so that tribes can gain experience in service implementation. Navajo Nation's TANF administration proposal creatively requests support costs to administer TANF within the framework of existing federal law (U.S. Congress, 1975, P.L. 93-638).

State-match

Providing state matching funds to tribes with TANF plans that are approved by DHHS is a step in the right direction. State matching funds promote the devolution of power from states to tribes. Yet, as noted earlier, only nine states in the nation have agreed to do so (see Tables 8 & 9). It is important to note that, 13 of the 19 Indian communities that are currently self-administering TANF come from these nine states that provide matching funds. This evidence underscores the importance of providing matching funds to expedite tribal takeover of TANF programs. Further, as noted elsewhere (Pandey et al., 1998), tribal welfare recipients face barriers to employment that are difficult to remove. States should reward tribes that are willing to undertake a task of such enormity with generous matching funds.

Incentives for “positive” outcomes

If it is good policy to encourage states to reduce welfare caseloads, unwed births and teen pregnancies, perhaps the same logic should be applied to tribes who administer their own TANF programs. In other words, tribes should also be rewarded for “good” outcomes, just like the states.

Coordination, collaboration, and communication

Under the 1996 federal welfare legislation, both states and tribes find it advantageous to enter into intergovernmental agreements to ensure the coordination and provision of TANF and related services. The legislation has strengthened coordination, communication and collaboration at all levels—among Tribal Social Service Providers, among tribes, between tribes and states, and between tribes and the federal government. At the tribal level, for instance, coordination, collaboration, and communication have increased between staff of social services, employment training, childcare, education and other departments. An increase in coordination, communication, and collaboration is a positive early effect of TANF legislation and may, in the future, improve tribes’ efforts to serve families with children.

Decline in Welfare Caseloads

Nationwide, welfare caseloads have been declining rapidly. The rate of caseload decline on reservations in Arizona is slower than the national rate. A decline in the number of families on welfare may result in a budget surplus at the state or tribal level. At the same time, poverty and hardship at the individual or family level may be rising (Dodson, Joshi, McDonald, 1998; Sherman, Amey, Duffield, Ebb, Weinstein, 1998; Stromwall, Brzuzy, Sharp, Andersen, 1998). A longitudinal study is needed to understand the survival strategies of low-income women with children on reservations.

Barriers to employment and training

Many women residing on Arizona’s reservations and receiving public assistance have been waived, for the time being, from some of the requirements of the TANF block grant. Waivers have been granted due to high unemployment rates. Still, there is evidence that the new federal welfare policy has motivated many women on reservations to quit the welfare program, or to find training and employment that they hope will lead to better economic security for their families in the future. Demand for educational and training services has increased since Arizona began implementing the EMPOWER program as a part of its TANF block grant in 1995. Demand for support services (e.g., childcare and transportation) has also increased. Welfare reform may give some women the opportunity to increase their human capital, but it will only do so if childcare and educational/training programs are adequate. Barriers to employment on reservations are similar to the barriers to employment nationally. However, these barriers are magnified on reservations.

Support services

Transportation is a major problem in rural America, especially on reservations. Most women we interviewed did not own a car. Those who owned vehicles did not own reliable vehicles. One woman who owns a car said that it “just went out, for the fourth time.” Most participants reported borrowing their relatives’ or friends’ vehicles and paying for gas. While some tribes have community transportation systems, due to restricted routes and distant

destinations, these systems do not appear to be adequate for regular employment. In addition, except for emergency medical purposes, oftentimes these transportation systems run at certain times and not at others.

Childcare services are severely inadequate and under-funded in meeting the needs of welfare recipients on most reservations within the state of Arizona. This finding is consistent with the findings of interviews with welfare recipients and low-wage workers not living on reservations (Edin & Lein, 1997). An inadequate supply of childcare slots for children of different age groups is compounded by the nonstandard work schedules of mothers on welfare (Porterfield & McBride, 1997; Presser & Cox, 1997; Smith, 1995). The General Accounting Office (GAO) reports that in sites they studied, only 12 to 35 percent of childcare providers offered services during nonstandard hours (U.S. GAO, 1997: 15).

Under the 1996 federal welfare legislation, tribes may receive up to two percent of the Child Care Development Fund at the discretion of the secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). Even though two percent of the total fund may sound like a substantial amount of money for the nation's reservation population of .32 percent (total reservation population according to 1990 Census = 808,163), when one considers the magnitude of the problem, it is not. At the tribal level, the lack of childcare is a major problem. One community has 80 childcare slots and 60 on the waiting list. All focus group participants relied on family, friends and neighbors for childcare support. Such network support is likely to be more effective if the need is intermittent. However, this support is likely to subside under the new welfare reform, since these women must have access to regular childcare service in order to participate in employment.

Basic necessities

Basic necessities such as access to communication networks (e.g., telephone and fax), as well as the possession of decent clothing, are necessary to find and retain a job. Most welfare mothers on reservations did not have access to a telephone or a fax machine. This problem is not likely to be solved immediately. Most tribes do not have the resources and infrastructure to provide these services to all families on reservations. Something will have to be done to resolve this deficiency. One option might be to provide resources to tribes to install and maintain community telecommunication systems, i.e. shared telephones and fax machines for a community of 10 households. Lack of food, fuel and clothing is probably an easier problem to resolve, and may be resolved once the adult member of a family is employed.

Education and job experience

Low levels of education and a lack of work experience are barriers to employment on reservations. These barriers are consistent with those experienced by many welfare mothers nationally (Pavetti, 1997; Pavetti & Acs, 1997; Sandefur & Cook, 1997). Compared to urban areas, rural areas in general will have more difficulty implementing welfare-to-work programs. (Goetz & Freshwater, 1997). In addition, reservations have an even bigger challenge due to high poverty rates and severe shortages of employment opportunities at the lower rungs of the economic order. Even though Tribal Social Service Providers have noted an increase in the demand for education and vocational training programs, especially from individuals that have very limited job related skills, they are not hopeful that these women will find jobs on reservations. Also, funding is inadequate for the introduction of economic development programs and for training and job preparation (e.g., GED preparation).

Employment opportunities

It is important to note that the economic conditions of Indian communities across the nation vary greatly. Within Arizona alone, several tribes are essentially welfare independent. These tribes have economic opportunities (e.g., casinos, resorts or other developments) within or near the reservations. In contrast, there are other tribes with extremely high unemployment rates, with very few job possibilities and few support services. The shortage of employment opportunities is the biggest problem on reservations. Reducing dependency on public assistance by promoting training and employment will be a difficult task in communities without strong economic development components and support systems (for childcare and transportation).

To increase employment opportunities on reservations, tribal members will have to attract not only federal and state monies, but private monies as well. Even though tribes have mixed feelings about private development in their communities, this is an area worth investigating, especially at a time when federal responsibility for local development is dwindling.

Individual and family problems

Nationally, recent studies of welfare-to-work programs have indicated that a significant proportion of recipients experience individual and family problems (e.g., mental health problems, substance abuse, domestic violence, poor child health, child behavior problems and legal problems) (DeParle, 1997; Holcomb, Pavetti, Ratchiffe, and Riedinger, 1998; Pavetti, 1997; Pavetti & Acs, 1997). These problems can interfere with their ability to find or retain jobs or participate in training activities. Many poor families on reservations share the same challenges (e.g., alcohol and substance abuse, mental illness). These families need programs that address these challenges. Funding is inadequate for not only training and job preparation, but also for substance abuse treatment programs.

VII. CONCLUSION

The 1996 federal welfare legislation is designed to reduce welfare dependency and poverty simultaneously by emphasizing the devolution of welfare implementation from federal to local governmental units, and by emphasizing changes in the behavior and attitudes of poor families with children. This report provides some initial evidence of the impact of the 1996 welfare law on reservations. It also reveals how American Indian families are surviving. We document some of the initial accomplishments of the 1996 federal welfare legislation.

A historical review of social welfare policies and services to American Indians indicate that American Indians are different from other U.S. citizens in that they have citizenship status with the federal and state governments, yet as tribal members, they also share in a unique federal-Indian relationship. The federal-Indian relationship is based upon treaties, acts of Congress, and presidential directives, which recognize tribes as sovereign entities. This dual relationship complicates policy making for American Indian social services because American Indians have rights based both on their citizenship and the special “federal trust responsibility.” Although state governments have historically tried to exert control over tribal communities, recent federal legislation, including the PRWORA, have granted more independence and flexibility. With this new freedom, tribes can design and implement their own social service programs on reservations. The option for tribes to administer their own TANF programs has been praised as an example of the “government-to-government” relationship between tribes and the federal government.

There is a lot of interest among tribes in Arizona as well as in tribes in other states to self-administer TANF. Thus far, the DHHS has approved the Plans of 19 Indian Tribal Organizations. Three of these 19 Tribal Organizations are in Arizona. Several other Arizona tribes expect to have a plan developed within the next few years. Tribes that have elected to stay with the state-administered TANF program are either gathering information relevant to positioning themselves to self-administer TANF, or are disinterested because they are nearly “welfare independent,” i.e. that have very few welfare recipients. Also, as a result of this legislation, communication, collaboration and cooperation among different units, i.e. within tribes, between tribes, between tribes and states and between tribes and the federal government, have increased.

However, as tribes begin to develop plans for self-administration of TANF programs, they are noticing the legislation’s limitations. In particular, they are noticing the lack of state matching funds, support costs, start-up money and federal rewards for “successful” work. Tribal leaders and Social Service Providers are concerned that the devolution of responsibility for TANF administration without commensurate allocation of financial resources to the tribes may render the policy ineffective. Above all, this concern has slowed tribal takeover of TANF programs.

Like states, reservations in Arizona have experienced a decline in the welfare caseload, but at a slower rate. Generally, all of the women and Tribal Social Service Providers whom we interviewed agreed that women on welfare prefer to work. A few reservations within Arizona are nearly welfare independent. For these reservations, independence is due to economic opportunities on or near reservations. It is important to note that the economic success of families depends greatly on the geographic location of the reservation, the condition of its roadways and the employment opportunities that residents can access. In remote areas, the lack of jobs, paved roads, transportation and communication make it impossible for many residents to

get to work. This creates a great amount of stress and anguish for many women who want to provide a decent way of life for their children. On some reservations we may begin to notice a greater level of disruption of these families' lives, primarily because lack of transportation and communication will force many people to leave the tribal land to be closer to urban areas with jobs.

We anticipate that the impact of the 1996 federal welfare legislation on families with children will vary depending upon a wide variety of individual, family and structural factors. Families' survival strategies will also vary over time and must be studied to understand the occurrence of any tangential conditions such as malnutrition and other health hazards among women and children. Finally, it is important to understand the extent to which policies, such as the 1996 welfare legislation, designed to emphasize work, and changes in reproductive and parenting behavior, will help families attain these goals on reservations.

REFERENCES

Arizona Department of Economic Security (1996). EMPOWER redesign: Changing the culture of public assistance in Arizona. Phoenix, AZ: Author.

Arizona Department of Economic Security (1997). Two-year EMPOWER time limit data. (Available from the Arizona Department of Economic Security, 1717 West Jefferson, Phoenix, AZ 85007).

Bane, M. J., & Ellwood, D. T. (1983). The dynamics of dependence: The routes to self-sufficiency. Cambridge, MA: Urban Systems Research and Engineering, Inc.

Blank, R. (1997). It takes a nation: A new agenda for fighting poverty. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Brown, C. J. (1940). Public relief, 1929-1939. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
Caraley, D. (1998). Separating fiction from reality: A case against dismantling the federal safety net. [On-line] Available: <http://www.epn.org/sage/rscarale.html>

Cebula, R. J., & Belton, W. (1994). Voting with one's feet: An empirical analysis of public welfare and migration of the American Indian, 1985-1990. American Journal of Economics and Sociology, 53 (3), 273-280.

Charnow, J. (1943). Work relief experience in the United States. Washington, DC: Committee on Social Security, Social Science Research Council.

Cooper, M. H. (1996). The Congressional Quarterly Researcher. Congressional Quarterly, 6, 601-624.

Corbett, T. (1997). Informing the welfare debate: Introduction and overview (pp. 1-24). Inorning the Welfare Debate: Perspectives on the Transformation of Social Policy, Institute for Research on Poverty, Special Report no. 70. <http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/irp/>

Deloria, V. Jr. and Lytle, C. M. (1983). American Indians, American Justice. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.

DeParle, J. (1997, Nov. 20). Newest challenge for welfare: Helping the hard-core jobless. The New York Times. [On-line] Available: <http://search.nytimes.com/>

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>.

Dodson, L., Joshi, P., & McDonald, D. (1998). Welfare in transition: Consequences for women, families, and communities. [On-line]. Available: <http://www.radcliffe.edu/pubpol/contents.html>.

- Donahue, J. (1997). The devil in devolution. *The American Prospect*, (May-June), 42-47.
- Edin, K., & Lein, K. (1997). *Making the ends meet: How single mothers survive welfare and low-wage work*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Gilder, G. (1981). Wealth and Poverty. New York: Basic Books.
- Gold, S. D. (1996). The potential impacts of devolution on state government programs and finances. [On-line] Available: <http://www.urban.org/TESTIMON/GOLDTEST.HTM>
- Goldberg, L. (1996). Come the devolution. *The American Prospect*, 24, 66-71.
- Green Book (1996). Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Hagen, J. L. (1995). JOBS program. Encyclopedia of social work (19th edition, pp. 1546-1552). Washington, DC: NASW Press.
- Hobbs, Straus, Dean & Walker (October 16, 1996). General Memorandum 96-147: Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, P. L, 104-193. Washington, DC: Authors.
- Hodgkinson, H. L. (1990). The demographics of American Indians: One percent of the people, fifty percent of the diversity. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership.
- Horwitz, T. 1997. "Poor prospects: Paring welfare rolls proves a huge grind for everyone involved." Wall Street Journal, Tuesday, November 7, p. A1, A10.
- Inter-Tribal Council of Arizona, Inc. (1997, January). Welfare reform in Indian country: Fact sheet. Phoenix, AZ: Author.
- Kaus, M. (1992). The end of equality. New York: Basic Books
- Krueger, A. (1993). How computers have changed the wage structure: Evidence from microdata, 1984-1989. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 108 (1), 33-60.
- Ku, L., & Coughlin, T. A. (1997). How the new welfare reform law affects Medicaid. In New Federalism: Issues and options for states, Series A, No. A-5. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Kuttner, R. (1998). You say you want a devolution? [On-line] Available: <http://epn.org/kuttner/bk950924.html>
- Lyman, T. S. (1973). A History of Indian Policy. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs
- Mead, L. M. (1986). Beyond entitlement: The social obligations of citizenship. New York: Free Press.

Mead, L. M. (1992). The new politics of poverty: The nonworking poor of America. New York: Basic Books

Murray, C. (1984). Losing ground: American social policy, 1950-1980. New York: Basic Books.

Nightingale, D. M. (1997). Work-related resources and services: Implications for TANF. In New Federalism: Issues and options for states, Series A, No. A-7. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

O'Brien, S. (1989). American Indian Tribal Governments. Norman and London: University of Oklahoma Press.

Olson, K. & Pavetti, L. (1996). Personal and family challenges to the successful transition from welfare to work. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute [On-line] Available: <http://www.urban.org/welfare/report1.htm>.

Orthner, D. K., & Kirk, R. S. (1995). Welfare employment programs: Evaluation. Encyclopedia of social work (19th edition, pp. 2499-2507). Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Paisano, E. L. (1990). The American Indian, Eskimo, and Aleut population. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Pandey, S., Brown, E.F., Scheuler-Whitaker, L., Gundersen, B., & Eyrych, K. (in press). Promise of welfare reform: Development through devolution on Indian reservations. Journal of Poverty: Innovations on social, political & economic inequalities.

Pavetti, L. (1997). Against the odds: Steady employment among low-skilled women. [On-line] Available: <http://www.urban.org/welfare/odds.htm>

Pavetti, L. & Acs, G. (1997). Moving up, moving out or going nowhere? A study of the employment patterns of young women. [On-line] Available: <http://www.urban.org/welfare/jobtr.htm>

Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, P.L. 104-193 (1997, June). [On-line] Available: <ftp://ftp.loc.gov/pub/thomas/c104/h3734.enr.txt>.

Porterfield, S.L., and T.D. McBride. 1997b. "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.

Presser, H.B. and A.G. Cox. 1997. "The work schedules of low-educated American women and welfare reform." Monthly Labor Review 120(4): 25-34.

Reischauer, R. D. (1989). The welfare reform legislation: Directions for the future. In P. H. Cottingham & D. T. Ellwood (Eds.), Welfare policy for the 1990s (pp. 10-40). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rowen, H. (1995). The budget: Fact and fiction. The Washington Post National Weekly Edition, (January 16-22), p. 5.

Sandefur, G. D., & Cook, S. T. (1997). Duration of public assistance receipt: Is welfare a trap? Institute for Research on Poverty, Discussion paper no. 1129-97: [On-line] <http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/irp/>

Sandefur, G. & Scott, W. (1983). Minority group status and the wages of Indian and Black males. Social Science Research, 12 (March), 44-68.

Sanders, D. (1987). Cultural conflicts: An important factor in the academic failures of American Indian students. Journal of multicultural counseling and development, 51, 81-90.

Scott, W. J. (1986). Attachment to Indian culture and the “difficult situation:” A study of American Indian college students. Youth and Society, 17(4), 381-395.

Shanley, J. (1997). Welfare reform and the tribal colleges: Who’s left holding the bag? Tribal College Journal, Spring, 1997, 27-28, 46.

Sherman, A., Amey, C., Duffield, B., Ebb, N., & Weinstein, D. (1998). Welfare to what: Early findings on family hardship and well-being. Children's Defense Fund, National Coalition for the Homeless.

Shumway, J. M., & Jackson, R. H. (1995). Native American population patterns. The Geographical Review, 85, 185-201.

Slack, P. (1990). The English Poor Law, 1531-1782. London: Macmillan Education Ltd.

Smith, E.C. 1995. Moving from welfare to work: A snapshot survey of Illinois families. Child Welfare 74(6), 1091-1106.

Steuerle, C.E. & Mermin, G. (1997). Devolution as seen from the budget. New Federalism: Issues and Options for States, Series A, No. A-2, 1-5. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.

Stromwall, L.K., Brzuzy, S., Sharp, P., & Andersen, C. (1998). The implications of “welfare reform” for American Indian families and communities.” Journal of Poverty, 2(4)1-15.

Stuart, P. H. (1990). Financing self-determination: Federal Indian expenditures, 1975-1988. American Indian Culture and Research Journal, 14(2), 1-18.

Szanton, P. L. (1991). The remarkable “Quango”: Knowledge, politics and welfare reform. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 10(4), 590-602.

Taylor, T. W. (1984). The Bureau of Indian Affairs. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

The Economist (1998, January 3). More neighbourly government. (devolution of political power in the United States. The Economist, 345(8049), p. 25(2). Philadelphia: The Economist

Newspaper Ltd. [On-line]

Available:http://web3.searchbank.com/infotra...on/616/475/20128305w3/13!xm_2&bk

The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193.

Tyler, S. L. (1973). A History of Indian Policy. U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Uccello, C. E., & Gallagher, L. J. (1997). General Assistance programs: The state-based part of the safety net. In New Federalism: Issues and options for states, Series A, No. A-4. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

U.S. Bureau of the Census (1997). The official statistics: Overview of the SIPP [On-line] Available: <http://www.census.gov/pub/hhes/www/wippdesc.html>.

U.S. Department of Commerce (1993, September). We, the first Americans. Washington, DC: Economics and Statistics Administration, U.S. Bureau of the Census.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, Bureau of the Census. (1993a). 1990 Census of Housing Detailed Housing Characteristics: American Indian and Alaska Native Areas. (Publication No. 1990 CH-2-1A). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, Bureau of the Census. (1993b). 1990 Census of Population Social and Economic Characteristics: American Indian and Alaska Native Areas. (Publication No. 1990 CP-2-1A). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (1998). Tribal TANF: Update on review/approval of plans. (Available from the Division of Tribal Services - OCS/ACF/DHHS, 370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW, Washington, DC 20447). [On-Line] Available: <http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/dts/track.htm>

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Indian Health Service. Comprehensive Health Care Program For American Indians and Alaska Natives. Washington D.C.

U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO). (May 1994a). Families on welfare: Sharp rise in never-married women reflects societal trend. (GAO Publication No. HEHS-94-92). Washington, D.C: U.S. Government Printing Office.

----- (May 1994b). Families on welfare: Teenage mothers least likely to become self-sufficient. (GAO Publication No. HEHS-94-115). Washington, D.C: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. General Accounting Office. 1997. Welfare reform: Implications of increased work participation for child care.” GAO Publication No. HEHS-97-75. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Vinje, D. L. (1996). Native American economic development on selected reservations: A comparative analysis. The American Journal of Economics and Sociology, 55, 427-442.

Vobejda, B., & Havemann, J. (1998, March 23). Sanctions: A force behind falling welfare rolls. States are cutting off tens of thousands who won't seek work or follow rules. Washington Post, p. A01.

Walke, R. (1991). Federal program of assistance to Native Americans: A report submitted to the United States Senate. Congressional Research Services. Washington D.C.: U.S. Printing Office.

Weaver, R. K. (1996). Deficits and devolution in the 104th Congress. Publius: the Journal of Federalism, 26, 45-85.

Wood, P. B., & Clay, W. C. (1996). Perceived structural barriers and academic performance among American Indian high school students. Youth & Society, 28, 40-61.

Zedlewski, S., & Giannarelli, L. (1997). Diversity among state welfare programs: Implications for reform. In New Federalism: Issues and options for states, Series A, No. A-1. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Zedlewski, S., & Clark, S., & Watson, K. (1996). Potential effects of congressional welfare reform legislation on family incomes. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute [On-line] Available: <http://www.urban.org/welfare/PEC72696.htm>.

ⁱ We conducted focus group interviews with residents of three Indian communities (Navajo, Salt River and San Carlos Apache) who were current or former TANF recipients. There were 19 respondents altogether: nine (47 percent) from the Navajo tribe, six (32 percent) from the Salt River tribe, and four (21 percent) from the San Carlos Apache tribe. The average age of the respondents was 32. The lowest age reported was 20, and the highest was 45. Two respondents were divorced (11 percent), two were living with a partner (11 percent), four were married (22 percent), four were separated (22 percent), and six were single (33 percent). One respondent did not provide her marital status. The average number of years completed in school was 11. The highest number of years completed in school was 16; this respondent had completed a college degree. Two respondents had only completed eight years of schooling (the lowest number of grades completed). Respondents reported an average of four children. Many respondents had one child only. One respondent had 14 children, the highest number reported. The reported ages of the women's children ranged from one to 20, with an average age of nine. Respondents reported an average of five people living in their households. The average number of persons over 18 years of age was two per household. The average length of time reportedly spent on welfare was five years. Two respondents reported spending one year on welfare (the

shortest time period reported). One respondent reported spending 18 years on welfare. Two respondents did not provide this information. In summary, these women tended to have low levels of education and young children at home. There was a lot of variability in the number of years they had received public assistance.

At our second visit (May,1998) four (out of nine) recipients who participated in the January focus group were unable to participate in the May focus group. One recipient graduated from the Arizona Institute of Business and Technology with an Associates degree and was working for the Division of Youth and Community Services. Her job was temporary, but she received a salary of 20,000 dollars. Another, who had one been a long term TANF recipient, had finished her basic education classes and had found employment at a restaurant working 40 hours per week at minimum wage. Although she has a GED, she would like more training. She currently lives with relatives because she cannot find stable housing. Another recipient missed her ride to the training center where the focus group was held. "She lives in a remote area where transportation is a barrier." Usually she hitchhikes to get to her basic education class. She is currently unemployed. Finally, one recipient had a conflicting schedule that prohibited her from attending the focus group. This recipient attends GED classes, to which her parents drive her.

Table 1. Total AFDC/TANF families and recipients in the United States, 1993-1998

| | Jan.93 | Jan.94 | Jan.95 | Jan.96 | Jan.97 | Jun.98 | Percent (93-98) |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-----------------|
| | <i>(thousands)</i> | | | | | | |
| Families | 4.963 | 5.053 | 4.963 | 4.628 | 4.114 | 3.031 | -39% |
| | 1,932,000 fewer families | | | | | | |
| Recipients | 14.115 | 14.276 | 13.931 | 12.877 | 11.423 | 8.380 | -41% |
| | 5,735,000 fewer recipients | | | | | | |

Source:

Change in Welfare Caseloads as of June 1998

U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services

Administration for Children and Families

August 1998

Available <http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/news/caseload.htm>

Contact: [ACF Office of Public Affairs](#)

Phone: 202-401-9215

Table 2. Total AFDC/TANF recipients by State, 1993-1998

| STATE | Jan 93 | Jan 94 | Jan 95 | Jan 96 | Jan 97 | Jun 98 | Percent (93-98) |
|----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|
| Alabama | 141,746 | 135,096 | 121,837 | 108,269 | 91,723 | 54,751 | -61% |
| Alaska | 34,951 | 37,505 | 37,264 | 35,432 | 36,189 | 30,660 | -12% |
| Arizona | 194,119 | 202,350 | 195,082 | 171,617 | 151,526 | 100,425 | -48% |
| Arkansas | 73,982 | 70,563 | 65,325 | 59,223 | 54,879 | 32,073 | -57% |
| California | 2,415,121 | 2,621,383 | 2,692,202 | 2,648,772 | 2,476,564 | 2,019,702 | -16% |
| Colorado | 123,308 | 118,081 | 110,742 | 99,739 | 87,434 | 54,605 | -56% |
| Connecticut | 160,102 | 164,265 | 170,719 | 161,736 | 155,701 | 108,377 | -32% |
| Delaware | 27,652 | 29,286 | 26,314 | 23,153 | 23,141 | 17,191 | -38% |
| Dist. of Col. | 65,860 | 72,330 | 72,330 | 70,082 | 67,871 | 55,722 | -15% |
| Florida | 701,842 | 689,135 | 657,313 | 575,553 | 478,329 | 254,042 | -64% |
| Georgia | 402,228 | 396,736 | 388,913 | 367,656 | 306,625 | 180,195 | -54% |
| Guam | 5,087 | 6,651 | 7,630 | 7,634 | 7,370 | 6,582 | 29% |
| Hawaii | 54,511 | 60,975 | 65,207 | 66,690 | 65,312 | 75,889 | 39% |
| Idaho | 21,116 | 23,342 | 24,050 | 23,547 | 19,812 | 4,101 | -81% |
| Illinois | 685,508 | 709,969 | 710,032 | 663,212 | 601,854 | 482,650 | -30% |
| Indiana | 209,882 | 218,061 | 197,225 | 147,083 | 121,974 | 117,237 | -44% |
| Iowa | 100,943 | 110,639 | 103,108 | 91,727 | 78,275 | 65,809 | -31% |
| Kansas | 87,525 | 87,433 | 81,504 | 70,758 | 57,528 | 33,321 | -62% |
| Kentucky | 227,879 | 208,710 | 193,722 | 176,601 | 162,730 | 119,199 | -48% |
| Louisiana | 263,338 | 252,860 | 258,180 | 239,247 | 206,582 | 125,805 | -52.9% |
| Maine | 67,836 | 65,006 | 60,973 | 56,319 | 51,178 | 40,055 | -41% |
| Maryland | 221,338 | 219,863 | 227,887 | 207,800 | 169,723 | 120,806 | -45% |
| Massachusetts | 332,044 | 311,732 | 286,175 | 242,572 | 214,014 | 165,062 | -50% |
| Michigan | 686,356 | 672,760 | 612,224 | 535,704 | 462,291 | 334,844 | -51% |
| Minnesota | 191,526 | 189,615 | 180,490 | 171,916 | 160,167 | 146,529 | -23% |
| Mississippi | 174,093 | 161,724 | 146,319 | 133,029 | 109,097 | 51,261 | -71% |
| Missouri | 259,039 | 262,073 | 259,595 | 238,052 | 208,132 | 144,675 | -44% |
| Montana | 34,848 | 35,415 | 34,313 | 32,557 | 28,138 | 21,550 | -38% |
| Nebraska | 48,055 | 46,034 | 42,038 | 38,653 | 36,535 | 36,645 | -24% |
| Nevada | 34,943 | 37,908 | 41,846 | 40,491 | 28,973 | 25,515 | -27% |
| New Hampshire | 28,972 | 30,386 | 28,671 | 24,519 | 20,627 | 14,880 | -49% |
| New Jersey | 349,902 | 334,780 | 321,151 | 293,833 | 256,064 | 202,691 | -42% |
| New Mexico | 94,836 | 101,676 | 105,114 | 102,648 | 89,814 | 72,695 | -23% |
| New York | 1,179,522 | 1,241,639 | 1,266,350 | 1,200,847 | 1,074,189 | 888,725 | -25% |
| North Carolina | 331,633 | 334,451 | 317,836 | 282,086 | 253,286 | 162,149 | -51% |
| North Dakota | 18,774 | 16,785 | 14,920 | 13,652 | 11,964 | 8,486 | -55% |
| Ohio | 720,476 | 691,099 | 629,719 | 552,304 | 518,595 | 341,839 | -53% |
| Oklahoma | 146,454 | 133,152 | 127,336 | 110,498 | 87,312 | 59,744 | -59% |
| Oregon | 117,656 | 116,390 | 107,610 | 92,182 | 66,919 | 45,898 | -61% |
| Pennsylvania | 604,701 | 615,581 | 611,215 | 553,148 | 484,321 | 360,667 | -40% |
| Puerto Rico | 191,261 | 184,626 | 171,932 | 156,805 | 145,749 | 122,310 | -36% |
| Rhode Island | 61,116 | 62,737 | 62,407 | 60,654 | 54,809 | 53,712 | -12% |
| South Carolina | 151,026 | 143,883 | 133,567 | 121,703 | 98,077 | 59,995 | -60% |
| South Dakota | 20,254 | 19,413 | 17,652 | 16,821 | 14,091 | 9,791 | -52% |
| Tennessee | 320,709 | 302,608 | 281,982 | 265,320 | 195,891 | 147,171 | -54% |
| Texas | 785,271 | 796,348 | 765,460 | 714,523 | 626,617 | 363,809 | -54% |
| Utah | 53,172 | 50,657 | 47,472 | 41,145 | 35,493 | 28,320 | -47% |
| Vermont | 28,961 | 28,095 | 27,716 | 25,865 | 23,570 | 19,620 | -32% |
| Virgin Islands | 3,763 | 3,767 | 4,345 | 5,075 | 4,712 | 4,078 | 8% |
| Virginia | 194,212 | 194,959 | 189,493 | 166,012 | 136,053 | 98,409 | -49% |
| Washington | 286,258 | 292,608 | 290,940 | 276,018 | 263,792 | 207,647 | -27% |
| West Virginia | 119,916 | 115,376 | 107,668 | 98,439 | 98,690 | 36,958 | -69% |
| Wisconsin | 241,098 | 230,621 | 214,404 | 184,209 | 132,383 | 42,671 | -82% |
| Wyoming | 18,271 | 16,740 | 15,434 | 13,531 | 10,322 | 2,946 | -84% |

| | | | | | | | |
|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------|
| U.S. TOTAL | 14,114,992 | 14,275,877 | 13,930,953 | 12,876,661 | 11,423,007 | 8,380,449 | -41% |
|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------|

Note: as of July 1, 1997, all states changed their reporting system from AFDC to TANF

Source:

Change in Welfare Caseloads as of June 1998
U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services
Administration for Children and Families
August 1998

Available <http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/news/caseload.htm>

Contact: [ACF Office of Public Affairs](#)

Phone: 202-401-9215

Table 3. Total AFDC/TANF families by State, 1993-1998

| States | Jan 93 | Jan 94 | Jan 95 | Jan 96 | Jan 97 | Jun 98 | Percent (93-98) |
|----------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------------|
| Alabama | 51,910 | 51,181 | 47,376 | 43,396 | 37,972 | 22,662 | -56% |
| Alaska | 11,626 | 12,578 | 12,518 | 11,979 | 12,224 | 10,089 | -13% |
| Arizona | 68,982 | 72,160 | 71,110 | 64,442 | 56,250 | 37,008 | -46% |
| Arkansas | 26,897 | 26,398 | 24,930 | 23,140 | 21,549 | 12,905 | -52% |
| California | 844,494 | 902,900 | 925,585 | 904,940 | 839,860 | 689,440 | -18% |
| Colorado | 42,445 | 41,616 | 39,115 | 35,661 | 31,288 | 19,824 | -53% |
| Connecticut | 56,759 | 58,453 | 60,927 | 58,124 | 56,095 | 40,990 | -28% |
| Delaware | 11,315 | 11,739 | 11,306 | 10,266 | 10,104 | 6,747 | -40% |
| Dist. of Col. | 24,628 | 26,624 | 26,624 | 25,717 | 24,752 | 20,454 | -17% |
| Florida | 256,145 | 254,032 | 241,193 | 215,512 | 182,075 | 98,671 | -61% |
| Georgia | 142,040 | 142,459 | 141,284 | 135,274 | 115,490 | 69,777 | -51% |
| Guam | 1,406 | 1,840 | 2,124 | 2,097 | 2,349 | 1,947 | 38% |
| Hawaii | 17,869 | 20,104 | 21,523 | 22,075 | 21,469 | 23,570 | 32% |
| Idaho | 7,838 | 8,677 | 9,097 | 9,211 | 7,922 | 1,832 | -77% |
| Illinois | 229,308 | 238,967 | 240,013 | 225,796 | 206,316 | 164,177 | -28% |
| Indiana | 73,115 | 74,169 | 68,195 | 52,254 | 46,215 | 38,540 | -47% |
| Iowa | 36,515 | 39,623 | 37,298 | 33,559 | 28,931 | 24,219 | -34% |
| Kansas | 29,818 | 30,247 | 28,770 | 25,811 | 21,732 | 12,942 | -56% |
| Kentucky | 83,320 | 79,437 | 76,471 | 72,131 | 67,679 | 49,630 | -40% |
| Louisiana | 89,931 | 88,168 | 81,587 | 72,104 | 60,226 | 48,441 | -46% |
| Maine | 23,903 | 23,074 | 22,010 | 20,472 | 19,037 | 15,226 | -36% |
| Maryland | 80,256 | 79,772 | 81,115 | 75,573 | 61,730 | 45,985 | -43% |
| Massachusetts | 113,571 | 112,955 | 104,956 | 90,107 | 80,675 | 63,501 | -44% |
| Michigan | 228,377 | 225,671 | 207,089 | 180,790 | 156,077 | 115,410 | -49% |
| Minnesota | 63,995 | 63,552 | 61,373 | 58,510 | 54,608 | 48,684 | -24% |
| Mississippi | 60,520 | 57,689 | 53,104 | 49,185 | 40,919 | 20,778 | -66% |
| Missouri | 88,744 | 91,598 | 91,378 | 84,534 | 75,459 | 57,028 | -36% |
| Montana | 11,793 | 12,080 | 11,732 | 11,276 | 9,644 | 7,369 | -38% |
| Nebraska | 16,637 | 16,145 | 14,968 | 14,136 | 13,492 | 13,266 | -20% |
| Nevada | 12,892 | 14,077 | 16,039 | 15,824 | 11,742 | 9,862 | -24% |
| New Hampshire | 10,805 | 11,427 | 11,018 | 9,648 | 8,293 | 6,123 | -43% |
| New Jersey | 126,179 | 121,361 | 120,099 | 113,399 | 102,378 | 76,789 | -39% |
| New Mexico | 31,103 | 33,376 | 34,789 | 34,368 | 29,984 | 22,709 | -27% |
| New York | 428,191 | 449,978 | 461,006 | 437,694 | 393,424 | 324,828 | -24% |
| North Carolina | 128,946 | 131,288 | 127,069 | 114,449 | 103,300 | 68,020 | -47% |
| North Dakota | 6,577 | 6,002 | 5,374 | 4,976 | 4,416 | 3,191 | -51% |
| Ohio | 257,665 | 251,037 | 232,574 | 209,830 | 192,747 | 131,350 | -49% |
| Oklahoma | 50,955 | 47,475 | 45,936 | 40,692 | 32,942 | 22,269 | -56% |
| Oregon | 42,409 | 42,695 | 40,323 | 35,421 | 25,874 | 18,382 | -57% |
| Pennsylvania | 204,216 | 208,260 | 208,899 | 192,952 | 170,831 | 129,383 | -37% |
| Puerto Rico | 60,950 | 59,425 | 55,902 | 51,370 | 48,359 | 40,883 | -33% |
| Rhode Island | 21,900 | 22,592 | 22,559 | 21,775 | 20,112 | 18,992 | -13% |
| South Carolina | 54,599 | 53,178 | 50,389 | 46,772 | 37,342 | 23,253 | -57% |
| South Dakota | 7,262 | 7,027 | 6,482 | 6,189 | 5,324 | 3,734 | -49% |
| Tennessee | 112,159 | 111,946 | 105,948 | 100,884 | 74,820 | 57,059 | -49% |
| Texas | 279,002 | 285,680 | 279,911 | 265,233 | 228,882 | 132,549 | -52% |
| Utah | 18,606 | 18,063 | 17,195 | 15,072 | 12,864 | 10,488 | -44% |
| Vermont | 10,081 | 9,917 | 9,789 | 9,210 | 8,451 | 7,155 | -29% |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------|
| Virgin Islands | 1,073 | 1,090 | 1,264 | 1,437 | 1,335 | 1,174 | 9% |
| Virginia | 73,446 | 74,717 | 73,920 | 66,244 | 56,018 | 40,791 | -44% |
| Washington | 100,568 | 103,068 | 103,179 | 99,395 | 95,982 | 74,969 | -25% |
| West Virginia | 41,525 | 40,869 | 39,231 | 36,674 | 36,805 | 13,374 | -68% |
| Wisconsin | 81,291 | 78,507 | 73,962 | 65,386 | 45,586 | 11,276 | -86% |
| Wyoming | 6,493 | 5,891 | 5,443 | 4,975 | 3,825 | 1,282 | -80% |
| | | | | | | | |
| U.S. TOTAL | 4,963,050 | 5,052,854 | 4,963,071 | 4,627,941 | 4,113,775 | 3,031,039 | -39% |

Source: Change in Welfare Caseloads as of June 1998

U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services,
Administration for Children and Families, August 1998

Available <http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/news/caseload.htm>

Contact: [ACF Office of Public Affairs](#)

Phone: 202-401-9215

Table 4. Demographics and educational attainment by reservations in Arizona, 1990

| Tribe | Population (1990 census) ¹ | number Native American (% Native American) | % persons under 18 with two parents | # single, female householder - children under 18 | # single, female householder - children under 6 | of persons 25 & over, % high school grad or higher | of persons 25 & over, % bachelor's degree or higher |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| All areas ² | 808,070 | 437,771 (54.2) | 49.7 | 61,033 | 32,140 | 53.8 | 3.9 |
| Ak-Chin ³ | 450 | 411 (91.3) | 63.1 | 2 | 2 | 33.3 | 3.2 |
| Cocopah Tribe | 584 | 549 (94) | 20.9 | 25 | 15 | 31.1 | N/A ⁴ |
| Colorado River Tribe | 6846 | 2362(34.5) | 48.4 | 106 | 42 | 61.6 | 4.3 |
| Fort McDowell Indian Com | 628 | 568 (90.4) | 34.8 | 31 | 17 | 62.4 | 3.1 |
| Fort Mojave Tribe | 432 | 333 (77.1) | 35.8 | 22 | 19 | 57.4 | 0.8 |
| Gila River Indian Comm. | 9578 | 9101 (95) | 39.9 | 454 | 304 | 37.3 | 1.3 |
| Havasupai Tribe | 433 | 416 (96.1) | 76.1 | 10 | 2 | 38.1 | N/A |
| Hopi Tribe | 7215 | 7002 (97) | 47.8 | 273 | 130 | 62.6 | 3.3 |
| Hualapai Tribe | 833 | 812 (97.5) | 55.8 | 39 | 27 | 53.9 | 1.3 |
| Kaibab-Paiute Tribe | 120 | 65 (54.2) | 76 | N/A | N/A | 56.3 | N/A |
| Navajo Nation | 90,763 | 87,502 (96.4) | 59 | 2949 | 1468 | 41.5 | 3.2 |
| Pascua Yaqui Tribe | 2406 | 2270 (94.3) | 43 | 146 | 66 | 28.5 | 2.3 |
| Salt River Pima Maricopa | 4856 | 3547 (73) | 41.8 | 162 | 77 | 52.9 | 1.4 |
| San Carlos Apache Tribe | 7239 | 7060 (97.5) | 58.9 | 261 | 155 | 49.4 | 2 |
| San Juan So. Paiute ⁵ | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Tohono O'odham ⁶ | | | | | | | |
| Papago | 8587 | 8490 (98.9) | 27.5 | 511 | 211 | 47.3 | 0.4 |
| San Xavier | 1129 | 1087 (96.3) | 27.2 | 65 | 10 | 42.1 | |
| Tonto Apache ⁷ | 103 | 103 (100) | 100 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| White Mountain Apache ⁸ | 10,506 | 9902 (94.3) | 64.1 | 277 | 132 | 48.3 | 1.3 |
| Yavapai Apache Tribe ⁹ | 624 | 574 (92) | 48.2 | 37 | 11 | 51.4 | 3.7 |
| Yavapai-Prescott Indian | 193 | 151 (78.2) | 58.3 | 15 | 6 | 71.2 | 15.2 |
| United States | 248,709,873 | 2,015,143 | | | | | |

Source: U.S. Bureau of Census (1990). Social and Economic Characteristics: American Indian and Alaskan Native Areas. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of the Census

¹ First two columns include all persons on the reservation; rest of table includes Native American population only.

² All areas includes all tribal areas in the United States.

³ The Ak-Chin Community is listed as Maricopa in the 1990 U.S. Census.

⁴ N/A means that the 1990 U.S. census did not have data on these columns.

⁵ Data on the San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe is included in data on the Navajo Nation in the 1990 U.S. Census.

⁶ The Tohono O'odham Nation is listed in the 1990 U.S. Census as two separate tribes: Papago and San Xavier.

⁷ The Tonto Apache Tribe is listed in the 1990 U.S. Census as Payson.

⁸ The White Mountain Apache Tribe is listed in the 1990 U.S. Census as Fort Apache.

⁹ The Yavapai Apache Tribe is listed in the 1990 U.S. Census as Camp Verde.

Table 5. Poverty statistics by reservations in Arizona, 1990

| Tribe | % in poverty all ages | % in poverty under 18 | % of Families Below Poverty Level | # Female Householders w/ No Husband Present Below Poverty Level | # Families Below Poverty Level w/ Public Assistance Income | # Female Householders w/ No Husband Present w/ Public Assistance Income |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|---|
| All areas ¹ | 50.7 | 55.3 | 47.3 | 18,920 | 21,422 | 11,329 |
| Ak-Chin ² | 46.4 | 54.3 | 39.3 | 9 | 2 | 2 |
| Cocopah Tribe | 56.7 | 65.1 | 50.4 | 24 | 27 | 9 |
| Colorado River | 37.5 | 40.5 | 39.3 | 130 | 67 | 54 |
| Fort McDowell | 30.8 | 33.1 | 23.7 | 23 | 5 | 5 |
| Fort Mojave Tribe | 52.3 | 56.8 | 48.4 | 18 | 10 | 11 |
| Gila River | 64.4 | 71.3 | 62.8 | 590 | 470 | 256 |
| Havasupai Tribe | 31.3 | 35.8 | 27.9 | 5 | 10 | 1 |
| Hopi Tribe | 49.4 | 53.8 | 47.7 | 280 | 215 | 98 |
| Hualapai Tribe | 56.1 | 59.9 | 53.1 | 46 | 43 | 25 |
| Kaibab-Paiute | 41.5 | 44 | 42.9 | N/A ³ | 4 | N/A |
| Navajo Nation | 56.1 | 57.7 | 53.7 | 3092 | 4737 | 1855 |
| Pascua Yaqui | 62.6 | 68.4 | 64.2 | 131 | 185 | 98 |
| Salt River | 52.7 | 58.6 | 50.5 | 227 | 181 | 128 |
| San Carlos Apache | 62.5 | 63.2 | 59.8 | 320 | 392 | 207 |
| San Juan Southern paiute ⁴ | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Tohono O'odham ⁵ | | | | | | |
| Papago | 65.7 | 66.4 | 62.8 | 530 | 653 | 350 |
| San Xavier | 64.4 | 67.4 | 59.4 | 53 | 29 | 14 |
| Tonto Apache ⁶ | 12.6 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| White Mountain Apache ⁷ | 52.7 | 55.7 | 49.9 | 405 | 449 | 284 |
| Yavapai Apache ⁸ | 61.9 | 67.7 | 56.9 | 41 | 19 | 15 |
| Yavapai-Prescott | 20.5 | 23.3 | 17.3 | 5 | N/A | N/A |

Source: U.S. Bureau of Census (1990). Social and Economic Characteristics: American Indian and Alaskan Native Areas. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of the Census.

¹ All areas include all tribal areas in the United States.

² The Ak-Chin Indian Community is listed as Maricopa in the 1990 U.S. Census

³ N/A means that the 1990 U.S. Census did not have data on these columns.

⁴ Data on the San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe is included in data on the Navajo Nation in the 1990 U.S. Census.

⁵ The Tohono O'odham Nation is listed in the 1990 U.S. Census as two separate tribes: Papago and San Xavier.

⁶ The Tonto Apache Tribe is listed in the 1990 U.S. Census as Payson.

⁷ The White Mountain Apache Tribe is listed in the 1990 U.S. Census as Fort Apache.

⁸ The Yavapai Apache Tribe is listed in the 1990 U.S. Census as Camp Verde.

Table 6 – Income by reservations in Arizona, 1990

| Tribe | median household income | Median family income | Median Income of Families w/ Own Children Under 18 yrs | Median Income of Families w/ Own Children Under 6 yrs | per capita income | median income of males who work full-time | median income of females who work full-time | Median Female Income for 15+ yrs old w/ income | Median Income of Female Householder w/ No Husband Present | Median Income of Female Householder No Husband Present Under 18 yrs | Median Income of Female Householder No Husband Present Under 6 yrs |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|--|---|-------------------|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| All areas ¹ | 12,459 | 13,489 | 13,352 | 11,387 | 4478 | 17,832 | 14,800 | 5308 | 8585 | 7504 | 5708 |
| Ak-Chin Indian Com. ² | 14,886 | 16,023 | 15,781 | 13,281 | 3991 | 11,204 | 11,705 | 5658 | 15,833 | 13,750 | N/A ³ |
| Cocopah Tribe | 12,279 | 11,979 | 17,813 | 7788 | 4641 | 20,938 | 20,625 | 6667 | 15,536 | 8447 | N/A |
| Colorado River Tribe | 16,573 | 18,125 | 16,500 | 13,393 | 5959 | 20,781 | 14,734 | 9975 | 7109 | 5000 | 5000 |
| Fort McDowell Indian Com | 15,982 | 17,083 | 16,750 | 17,045 | 5610 | 16,250 | 15,000 | 9318 | 11,071 | 10,250 | 12,188 |
| Fort Mojave Tribe | 14,167 | 11,250 | 10,625 | 9407 | 3942 | 17,500 | 12,500 | 5268 | 5714 | 5714 | 11,250 |
| Gila River Indian Com. | 9379 | 9516 | 9711 | 7189 | 3176 | 13,371 | 12,793 | 4176 | 5508 | 5000 | 5000 |
| Havasupai Tribe | 15,938 | 20,179 | 15,000 | 18,750 | 4112 | 7321 | 16,250 | 5625 | 13,750 | 11,250 | 5360 |
| Hopi Tribe | 13,418 | 13,917 | 12,902 | 9771 | 4566 | 16,818 | 13,851 | 4952 | 11,411 | 6254 | 15,515 |
| Hualapai Tribe | 10,956 | 11,731 | 11,964 | 10,500 | 3630 | 13,438 | 16,641 | 4187 | 5000 | 5000 | 5000 |
| Kaibab-Paiute Tribe | 21,250 | 21,250 | 17,500 | 11,250 | 5245 | 18,750 | 8750 | 4375 | 21,250 | N/A | N/A |
| Navajo Nation | 9769 | 11,524 | 13,015 | 10,981 | 3802 | 19,993 | 14,855 | 4326 | 7167 | 7118 | 6029 |
| Pascua Yaqui Tribe | 10,907 | 10,066 | 8780 | 8347 | 3135 | 19,844 | 15,521 | 4460 | 5300 | 5000 | 5000 |
| Salt River Pima Maricopa | 12,396 | 13,068 | 14,297 | 12,393 | 4215 | 15,517 | 14,399 | 4517 | 5836 | 5000 | 5000 |
| San Carlos Apache Tribe | 8360 | 9457 | 9929 | 7599 | 3173 | 14,806 | 14,120 | 4758 | 6143 | 5333 | 5000 |
| San Juan So. Paiute ⁴ | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Tohono O'odham ⁵ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Papago | 8552 | 7688 | 9645 | 7856 | 3113 | 14,688 | 15,575 | 4339 | 6830 | 7876 | 11,648 |
| San Xavier | 6066 | 6227 | 5000 | 5317 | 2735 | 11,989 | 12,000 | 4098 | 7452 | 5000 | N/A |
| Tonto Apache Tribe ⁶ | 28,750 | 55,030 | 28,750 | N/A | 10,724 | 20,096 | 11,250 | 6250 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| White Mountain Apache ⁷ | 12,403 | 13,169 | 13,737 | 13,681 | 3805 | 15,253 | 11,839 | 4647 | 7080 | 5000 | 5000 |
| Yavapai Apache Tribe ⁸ | 12,426 | 11,776 | 10,167 | 7827 | 3270 | 15,729 | 11,389 | 6538 | 9556 | 9542 | 5000 |
| Yavapai-Prescott | 25,000 | 25,556 | 27,143 | 31,563 | 6499 | 18,750 | 18,750 | 8750 | 26,458 | 26,563 | 21,250 |

U.S. Bureau of Census (1990). Social and Economic Characteristics: American Indian and Alaskan Native Areas. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of the Census.

¹ All areas includes all tribal areas in the United States.

² The Ak-Chin Indian Community is listed as Maricopa in the 1990 U.S. Census

³ N/A means the 1990 U.S. census did not have data on these columns.

⁴ Data on the San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe is included in data on the Navajo Nation in the 1990 U.S. Census.

⁵ The Tohono O'odham Nation is listed in the 1990 U.S. Census as two separate tribes: Papago and San Xavier.

⁶ The Tonto Apache Tribe is listed in the 1990 U.S. Census as Payson.

⁷ The White Mountain Apache Tribe is listed in the 1990 U.S. Census as Fort Apache.

⁸ The Yavapai Apache Tribe is listed in the 1990 U.S. Census as Camp Verde.

Table 7 – Labor force statistics by reservations in Arizona, 1990

| Tribe | % persons 16 and over in labor force | % male 16 and over in labor force | % female 16 and over in labor force | % female in labor force with own children under 6 | % of persons worked 35 hours or more in refer. week | % females worked 35 hours or more in ref. week | % Unemployed U.S. census (% not employed BIA) | # Persons 16 & over, Not in Labor Force | # Families w/ No Workers | # Female Householder w/ No Husband and No Worker | mean travel time to work (minutes) |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|--|---|---|--------------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| All areas ¹ | 51.1 | 57.7 | 45.1 | 50.1 | 76.7 | 73.9 | 25.6 | 130,427 | 20,674 | 10,043 | 20.1 |
| Ak-Chin Indian Com. ² | 52.2 | 67.6 | 40.3 | 35 | 86.3 | 76.8 | 12 (6) | 122 | 2 | 2 | 12.6 |
| Cocopah Tribe | 55.5 | 61.1 | 50 | 100 | 78.3 | 78.9 | 23.1 (45) | 149 | 16 | N/A ³ | 16.3 |
| Colorado River Tribe | 54.5 | 59.1 | 51.1 | 56.7 | 78.5 | 78.1 | 12.4 (25) | 660 | 99 | 46 | 12.5 |
| Fort McDowell Indian Com | 52 | 52.4 | 51.6 | 50 | 75.7 | 70.1 | 14 (8) | 159 | 5 | 5 | 19.9 |
| Fort Mojave Tribe | 60 | 68.9 | 55 | 63.2 | 74.4 | 62.7 | 15.7 (72) | 68 | 13 | 11 | 15.1 |
| Gila River Indian Com. | 44.7 | 55.3 | 35.5 | 37.9 | 77.1 | 75.9 | 30.6 (27) | 3154 | 605 | 402 | 21.4 |
| Havasupai Tribe | 59.9 | 57.5 | 62.7 | 78.6 | 81.6 | 73 | 17.2 (75) | 101 | 11 | 2 | 19.5 |
| Hopi Tribe | 48 | 51.3 | 44.8 | 62.1 | 79.9 | 78.3 | 26.8 (55) | 2352 | 265 | 114 | 18 |
| Hualapai Tribe | 58.6 | 61.6 | 55.7 | 75.9 | 79.2 | 79.6 | 32.4 (37) | 201 | 33 | 19 | 12.6 |
| Kaibab-Paiute Tribe | 59.1 | 61.5 | 55.6 | 75 | 44.4 | 25 | 30.8 (N/A) | 18 | N/A | N/A | 11.3 |
| Navajo Nation | 43 | 48.6 | 37.8 | 47.8 | 82.3 | 80.5 | 30.4 (52) | 29,855 | 5156 | 1891 | 23.1 |
| Pascua Yaqui Tribe | 50.4 | 67.2 | 37.1 | 22.6 | 67.6 | 58.8 | 33.2 (N/A) | 595 | 171 | 95 | 22.8 |
| Salt River Pima Maricopa | 58.4 | 65.3 | 52.4 | 61.2 | 74.3 | 73 | 17.3 (28) | 886 | 128 | 95 | 17.4 |
| San Carlos Apache Tribe | 43 | 58.1 | 29.4 | 32 | 83.5 | 81.3 | 31 (58) | 2409 | 358 | 204 | 17.9 |
| San Juan So. Paiute ⁴ | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A (91) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Tohono O'odham ⁵ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Papago | 36.1 | 40.1 | 32.7 | 35.2 | 70.3 | 75 | 23.4 (79) | 3425 | 656 | 322 | 20.4 |
| San Xavier | 49.6 | 59.1 | 41.6 | 61.3 | 64.5 | 53.6 | 18.6 | 350 | 63 | 33 | 23.8 |
| Tonto Apache Tribe ⁶ | 100 | 100 | 100 | N/A | 83.1 | 50 | N/A (24) | N/A | N/A | N/A | 2.8 |
| White Mountain Apache ⁷ | 54.9 | 64.6 | 45.7 | 48 | 78 | 80.5 | 35.3 (58) | 2583 | 333 | 190 | 19 |
| Yavapai Apache Tribe ⁸ | 50.9 | 62.3 | 42.3 | 48.1 | 75.4 | 73.1 | 14.3 (56) | 157 | 22 | 15 | 20.8 |
| Yavapai-Prescott | 71.9 | 63.8 | 79.6 | 75 | 82.3 | 75 | 10.1 (33) | 27 | 4 | N/A | 8.5 |

U.S. Bureau of Census (1990). Social and Economic Characteristics: American Indian and Alaskan Native Areas. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of the Census.

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

¹ All areas include all tribal areas in the United States.

² The Ak-Chin Indian Community is listed as Maricopa in the 1990 U.S. Census

³ N/A means that the 1990 U.S. Census or the 1995 Bureau of Indian Affairs report did not have data on these columns.

⁴ Data on the San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe is included in data on the Navajo Nation in the 1990 U.S. Census.

⁵ The Tohono O'Odham Nation is listed in the 1990 U.S. Census as two separate tribes: Papago and San Xavier.

⁶ The Tonto Apache Tribe is listed in the 1990 U.S. Census as Payson.

⁷ The White Mountain Apache Tribe is listed in the 1990 U.S. Census as Fort Apache.

⁸ The Yavapai Apache Tribe is listed in the 1990 U.S. Census as Camp Verde.

Table 8. Status of Tribal TANF Plans

| State | Tribe | State Match | Approval date | Implementation date |
|-----------------------|--|--|---------------|---------------------|
| Approved Plans | | | | |
| Alaska | Tanana Chiefs Conference | Yes | 9/17/98 | 10/1/98 |
| Arizona | Salt River Pima - Maricopa Indian Community | \$355,170 | 12/14/98 | 4/1/99 |
| Arizona | White Mountain Apache | Yes | 10/24/97 | 11/1/97 |
| Arizona | Pascua Yaqui Tribe | Yes | 10/21/97 | 11/1/97 |
| California | Southern California Tribal Chairman Association ¹ | Yes | 2/24/98 | 3/1/98 |
| Idaho | Nez Perce Tribe | \$215,000 | 12/14/98 | 1/1/99 |
| Minnesota | Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwa Indians | Expected 40% match of Federal grant | 12/14/98 | 1/1/99 |
| Montana | Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes | Minimum of \$40,000 during the state fiscal year 1999 contingent on compliance with the requirements | 12/14/98 | 1/1/99 |
| Oregon | Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians | Yes | 9/29/97 | 10/1/97 |
| Oregon | Klamath Tribes | Yes | 5/15/97 | 7/1/97 |
| Oklahoma | Osage Tribe | No | 4/3/98 | 5/4/98 |
| South Dakota | Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux Tribe ² | No, but the state is providing transition funds and training to Tribal staff and may provide access to the state's electronic system | 9/29/97 | 10/1/97 |
| Washington | Lower Elwah Klallam | Yes | 9/17/98 | 10/1/98 |
| Washington | Port Gamble S'Klallam | Yes | 9/17/98 | 10/1/98 |
| Wisconsin | Forest County Potawatomi Community | No, but the tribe will provide 100% in matching funds. | 6/30/97 | 7/1/97 |
| Wisconsin | Sokaogon Chippewa Community | No | 9/29/97 | 10/1/97 |
| Wisconsin | Stockbridge-Munsee Band of Mohican Indians | No | 9/29/97 | 10/1/97 |
| Wisconsin | Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians | No, but the tribe will absorb some admin. Program cost | 9/29/97 | 10/1/97 |
| Wyoming | Northern Arapaho Tribe | Yes | 6/3/98 | 7/1/98 |
| Pending Plans | | | | |
| Alaska | Association of Village Council Presidents | | | |
| Alaska | Central Council Tlingit and Haida Indian Tribe | | | |
| Alaska | Cook Inlet | | | |

⁽¹⁾ Consortium of eight Tribes in San Diego County and one Tribe in Santa Barbara County.

⁽²⁾ This Tribe will consolidate its Tribal TANF program into a Public Law 102-477 plan.

Source: Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Internet source: <http://www.dhhs.gov/programs/dts/track.htm>

Table 9: Characteristics of Tribal TANF Plans

| STATE | TRIBE | PROJECTE D # OF FAMILIES | SERVICE AREA | SERVICE POPULATION | TIME LIMIT | WORK ACTIVITIES | WORK PART. RATES | WORK PART. HRS/WEEK |
|-------|---|--------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|---|
| AK | Tanana Chiefs Conference ¹ (37 Village Consortium) | 450-500 | Tanana Chiefs Conference, Inc. Region, as established in ANCSA | Families in which the head of the assistance unit is an enrolled member of, or eligible for membership in, a federally-recognized tribe | 60 months | Basic Education; Job search, Assessment; Job readiness, OJT; Vocational education training (36 months max); Job sampling, work experience; Approved subsistence hunting, fishing, gathering; Approved community work service; Job skills development; Sheltered/supported work; Subsidized and unsubsidized employment; Providing childcare for ASAP clients | All families: FY 99: 25% FY 2000: 30% FY 2001: 35% | All families: FY 99: 20 FY 2000: 25 FY 2001: 30 |
| AZ | Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona ¹ | 250 | Maricopa and Pima Counties | Indian families on the reservation & Tribal member families in Maricopa and Pima Counties | 60 months | Same as section 407(d) | One-parent: FY 98&99: 15% FY 2000 & 2001: 30% Two-parent: FY 98: 30% FY 99: 45% FY 2000 & 2001: 60% | One-parent: FY 98 & 99: 20 FY 2000 & 2001: 25 Two-parent: FY 98: 30 hour. FY 99, 2000, & 2001: 35 hour> |
| AZ | Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community | 277 | Only within the boundaries of the Reservation. | Only needy, eligible, and enrolled Community member families. | 60 months within the adult life-time of a client | Unsubsidized employment, subsidized private sector employment, subsidized public sector employment, work experience, on-the-job readiness assistance, community service programs, vocation education training, job skills training directly related to employment, education directly related to employment, satisfactory attendance at secondary school, the provision of child care services | Single Parent Families: First Year - 15% Second Year - 20% Third Year - 25% Two Parent Families: First Year - 15% Second Year - 20% Third Year - 25% | Single Parent Families: 20 Hours Two Parent Families: 40 Hours |
| AZ | White | 630 | Reservation | All families (Indian and | 60 months | Same as section 407(d) | All families: | All families: |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|---------|---|--|-----------|---|---|--|
| | Mountain Apache Tribe | | | Non-Indian) | | | FY 98: 15% FY 99: 20% FY 2000 & 2001: 25% | FY 98 - 2001: 16% |
| CA | Southern ² California Tribal Chairman's Association ¹ | 160 | Reservations of member Tribes | Indian families | 60 months | Same as section 407(d), with the addition of participation in a NEW program activity | One-parent: FY 98: 25% FY 99: 30% FY 2000 & 2001: 50% Two-parent: FY 98: 35% FY 99, 2000, & 2001: 50% | One-parent: FY 98: 16 FY 99: 24 FY 2000 & 2001: 30 Two-parent: FY 98: 24 FY 99: 32 FY 2000 & 2001: 35 |
| ID | Nez Perce | 133 | On or near Nez Perce Reservation. Near includes Lewiston, Kendrick, Grangeville and Cottonwood. | Enrolled members of the Nez Perce Tribe. | 60 months | Barrier removal, subsidized and unsubsidized employment, work experience, OJT, job search, job readiness, self employment, subsistence gathering, job skills, employment related education, GED, child care, teaching cultural activities, internships, reasonable transportation | All Families: 1999 = 15% to 2001 = 35%: | 20 hours per week |
| MN | Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwa Indians | 130 | Reservation and Six Minnesota Counties near Reservation | Families with at least one adult that is an enrolled member; a descendant of enrolled member; or recognized in the community as a member as determined by the Band | 60 months | Subsidized & unsubsidized employment, work experience, OJT, job search, pre-employment activities; job skills training, self-employment, community service, vocational education, high school completion activities. | All families: 1999: 25% 2000: 30% 2001: 35% Two-parent: 1999: 40% 2000: 45% 2001: 50% | All families: 25 hour/week; Two-Parent families 30 hours/week for one parent, combined 50 hours/week for both parents |
| MT | Confederated Salish and Kootenai (CSKT) | 185-195 | Exterior Boundaries of the Flathead Reservation | All enrolled CSKT members residing or intending to reside, all is currently defined by the State of Montana, on the Flathead Reservation. | 60 months | Basic Education; Job search; Limited parenting and family strengthening activities; Job skills training; On the job training; Sheltered/supported work; Unpaid work experience; Paid work experience; Vocational education; Post secondary education; Approved community service or cultural activities; Other activities that lead to family self sufficiency; | 1999: 15% 2000: 15% 2001: 20% | 1999: 20 per week 2000: 20 hours per week 2001: 30 hours per week for all families |
| OK | Osage Tribe | 60-75 | Osage County | Indian families | 60 months | Unsubsidized employment; Subsidized employment; Work experience; OJT; Job | All families: FY 98: 15% | All families: FY 98-2002: |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|---------------------------------------|---------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | search/job readiness; Job skills training; Vocational education (12 month limit); Community service; | FY 99: 20% FY 2000-2001: 30% Two-parent: FY 98: 30% FY 99: 45% FY 2000 & 2001: 60% | 20 hours Two-parent: FY 98-2002: 35 hours |
| OR | Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians | 70 - 90 | Counties of Benton, Clackamas, Lane, Lincoln, Linn, Marion, Multnomah, Polk, Tillamook, Washington and Yamhill | Tribal member families | 24 months within an 84 month period (similar to Oregon's time limit) | Job search/Job readiness; Job skills training; OJT; Sheltered/supported work; Work experience; Subsidized public/private employment; | All families: FY 98: 15% FY 99: 20% FY 2000: 25% Two-parent: FY 98: 30% FY 99: 35% FY 2000: 40% | All families: 20 hours |
| OR | Klamath Tribes | 70 - 90 | Klamath County | Indian families | 24 months within an 84 month period (similar to Oregon's time limit) | Basic education; Job search/job readiness; Job skills training; OJT; Sheltered/supported work; Work experience; | All families: FY 97: 15% FY 98: 20% FY 99: 25% FY 2000: 30% Two-parent: FY 97: 35% FY 98: 40% FY 99: 45% FY 2000: 50% | All families: FY 97-2002: 20 hours Two parent: FY 97-2002: 25 hours |
| SD | Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux Tribe | 150 | Day, Marshall and Roberts County | Tribal members families - one-parent families only. Two parent families (avg. of 1/year) served by BIA GA. | 60 months | Unsubsidized employment; Work experience; Subsidized private sector employment; Teen parents in school; Child care providers for TANF recipients | One-parent: FY 98: 15% FY 99: 20% FY 2000: 25% | One-parent: FY 98 & 99: 20 FY 2000: 25 |
| WA | Lower Elwha Klallam Tribe | 120 | BIA Service Area: From the Hoko River on the west to Morse Creek on the east and from Strait of Juan de Fuca to the northern | All eligible American Indians and Alaska Natives residing in the designated service area | 60 months | Subsidized and unsubsidized employment; Work experience; OJT; Job search; Job readiness; Self employment; Traditional subsistence activities; Vocational training; Job skills training; Employment related education; GED/High school; Child care for TANF; Teaching cultural activities; Internships; Barrier removal including counseling; Chemical dependency treatment | All families: FY 99: 15% FY 2000: 20% FY 2001: 25% | 20 hr. per week |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|--|--------|--|---|--|--|--|-----------------------------|
| | | | boundary of the Olympic NP. | | | | | |
| WA | Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe | 125 | Kitsap County (within which lies the Port Gamble Reservation | All American Indians living on the Port Gamble Reservation and Port Gamble enrolled members living off reservation in Kitsap County | Up to 24 consecutive months within a 60 months life time limit | Subsidized and unsubsidized employment; Work experience; OJT; Job search; Job readiness; Self employment; Traditional subsistence activities; Vocational training; Job skills training; Employment related education; GED/high school; Child care for TANF; Teaching cultural activities; Internships; Barrier removal including counseling; Chemical dependency treatment | All families: FY 99: 15% FY 2000: 20% FY 2001: 25% | All Adults: 20 hr. per week |
| WI | Forest County Potawatomi Community ³ | 20 | Forest County | Tribal member families | 60 months | Basic education; Job search/job readiness; Job skills training; Vocational education (12 month limit); Community service | Same as section 407(a) ³ | Same as section 407(c) |
| WI | Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians | 50 | Bayfield County | All families (Indian and non-Indian) on the reservation & Tribal member families in Bayfield County | 60 months | OJT; Job search/job readiness; Vocational training (12 month limit); Subsidized/unsubsidized employment; Work experience; Community service employment; Job skills training related to employment; Education related to employment; | Same as section 407(a) | Same as section 407(c) |
| WI | Sokaogon Chippewa Community, Mole Lake Band | 10-Aug | Reservation | Tribal member families | 60 months | Same as section 407(d) | Same as section 407(a) | Same as section 407(c) |
| WI | Stockbridge-Munsee Band of Mohican Indians | 25 | Reservation | Tribal member families | 60 months | Same as section 407(d) | Same as section 407(a) | Same as section 407(c) |
| WY | Northern Arapaho Business Council ¹ | 250 | Reservation/(Fremont and Hot Springs Counties) | Enrolled Northern Arapaho families | 60 months | Unsubsidized employment; Work experience; Subsidized private sector employment; Satisfactory attendance in secondary school or GED program; Child care for participants | | |

¹All statutory references are to the Social Security Act, as amended by the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act.

²Consortium of 8 Tribes in San Diego County and 1 Tribe in Santa Barbara County.

³Indicates Tribe having a Native Employment Works (NEW) program, the work activities program authorized by section 412(a)(2) of the Act. In the case of Southern California Tribal Chairman's Association, some of the member Tribes are participants in the NEW program administered through the California Indian Manpower Consortium.
Division of Tribal Services, 370 L'Enfant Promenade, Washington, DC 20447 (202) 401-9214

Table 10. TANF cases and recipients on reservations in Arizona, January 1995 – January 1998

| Tribe | Jan 95 cases | Jan 96 cases | Jan 97 cases | Jan 98 cases | % change 95-98 | Jan 95 recipients | Jan 96 recipients | Jan 97 recipients | Jan 98 recipients | % change 95-98 |
|----------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Ak-Chin | 11 | 8 | 5 | 1 | -91% | 46 | 28 | 17 | 3 | -93% |
| Cocopah | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0% | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -25% |
| Colorado River | 23 | 20 | 18 | 77 | 235% | 86 | 69 | 70 | 218 | 153% |
| Ft McDowell | 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 | -80% | 11 | 7 | 2 | 2 | -82% |
| Fort Mojave | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0% | 4 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 0% |
| Gila River | 631 | 456 | 451 | 343 | -46% | 1,916 | 1,361 | 1,406 | 1,099 | -43% |
| Havasupai | 3 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 100% | 8 | 0 | 13 | 12 | 50% |
| Hopi | 230 | 190 | 187 | 164 | -29% | 660 | 553 | 541 | 487 | -26% |
| Hualapai | 26 | 22 | 61 | 59 | 127% | 80 | 68 | 171 | 163 | 104% |
| Kaibab Paiute | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | |
| Navajo Nation ^a | 4,583 | 4,454 | 4,282 | 3,920 | -14% | 14,225 | 14,034 | 13,407 | 12,620 | -11% |
| Pasqua Yaqui | 220 | 186 | 150 | 382 | 74% | 740 | 603 | 500 | 684 | -7% |
| Salt River | 234 | 216 | 181 | 170 | -27% | 736 | 692 | 556 | 543 | -26% |
| San Carlos | 571 | 653 | 635 | 621 | 9% | 1,551 | 1,935 | 1,883 | 1,723 | 11% |
| Tohono O'odham | 612 | 593 | 590 | 474 | -23% | 1,693 | 1,625 | 1,600 | 1,402 | -17% |
| White Mountain | 760 | 785 | 745 | 675 | -11% | 2,052 | 2,132 | 1,968 | 1,802 | -12% |
| Yavapai Apache | 9 | 8 | 7 | 2 | -78% | 26 | 16 | 15 | 6 | -77% |
| Reservation total, AZ | 7,920 | 7,596 | 7,320 | 6,898 | -13% | 23,838 | 23,129 | 22,154 | 20,776 | -13% |
| Total non-reservation, AZ | 65,702 | 58,147 | 51,558 | 36,851 | -44% | 178,043 | 155,202 | 136,532 | 99,027 | -44% |
| State total | 73,622 | 65,743 | 58,878 | 43,749 | -41% | 201,881 | 178,331 | 158,686 | 119,803 | -41% |
| U.S. total | 4,963,071 | 4,627,941 | 4,113,775 | 3,031,039 ^b | -39% | 13,930,953 | 12,876,661 | 11,423,007 | 8,380,449 | -41% ^b |

Note: Data for San Juan Southern Paiute is included in Navajo Nation data. Tonto Apache and Yavapai-Scott Tribes either do not have TANF cases or are included in Arizona data. TANF data for three tribes: Colorado River, Kaibab, and Yavapai Prescott may be under reported and may be included under non-reservation state data.

^aData includes only the Arizona portion of Navajo Nation.

^b U.S. totals are for June 1998.

Source: Arizona Department of Economic Security, Phoenix; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Table 11. Total cases sanctioned by tribes in Arizona, 1998-1999.

| Tribe | Total cases sanctioned 25% between January 1998 and January 1999 | Total cases sanctioned 50% between January 1998 and January 1999 | Total cases closed due to sanctions between January 1998 and January 1999 | Total recipients removed from the grant due to two-year EMPOWER time limit between January 1998 and January 1999 |
|------------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| Ak Chin | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cocopah | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Colorado River | 21 | 25 | 29 | 13 |
| Fort McDowell | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Fort Mojave | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Gila River | 51 | 33 | 39 | 83 |
| Havasupai | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Hopi | 11 | 8 | 3 | 1 |
| Hualapai | 1 | 1 | 0 | 19 |
| Kaibab | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Navajo Nation ^a | 284 | 167 | 115 | 9 |
| Pascua Yaqui | 30 | 22 | 6 | 14 |
| Salt River | 22 | 18 | 12 | 44 |
| San Carlos | 52 | 42 | 39 | 2 |
| Tohono O'odham | 115 | 94 | 88 | 5 |
| White Mountain | 35 | 107 | 51 | 0 |
| Yavapai-Apache | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total on reservations ^b | 623 (9.03%) ^b | 517 (7.50%) ^b | 382 (5.54%) ^b | 193 |
| Total on non-reservations | 10,659 | 8,115 | 7,551 | 5,325 |
| Total in Arizona | 11,282 | 8,632 | 7,933 | 5,518 |

^aData includes only the Arizona portion of Navajo Nation.

^bThe denominator used to calculate the percentage of those who have been sanctioned is the total reservation based TANF cases in January 1998 within Arizona.

Note: Data for San Juan Southern Paiute, Tonto Apache and Yavapai-Prescott Tribes were not available.

Source: Arizona Department of Economic Security, Phoenix.