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Work and Poverty Research

• A large amount conducted on these central outcomes
• Much was on the pre-1996 Waivers but is relevant to the 1996 Law
• Some was conducted in the 1990s on randomized trials of features related to those in the 1996 law but not exactly the same
• Almost no true evaluation research conducted on the 2005 Deficit Reduction Act (DRA)
• Most of the research was conducted in the late 1990s and early 2000s; not a great deal of formal evaluation research conducted since then, although trends in work and poverty have been tracked
Evaluation Challenges

It proved to be a very challenging reform to evaluate for a number of reasons (Moffitt and Ver Ploeg, 2001)

• All states adopted the basic reforms; no variation
• Pre-1996 Waivers differed from those in the 1996 Law
• Economy was doing well, hard to separate from effects of reform
• EITC had been liberalized shortly before, effects were still being felt
• Data deficiencies (survey, administrative) became rapidly apparent
• Hard to obtain information on exactly what states were doing
• But it was clear that the details of state programs were very complex

These challenges mean that the evidence does not always speak clearly
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Summary of Findings: Caseloads

• Start with a familiar graph
Trends in Total and Child-Only AFDC/TANF Recipients, 1960-2013

- Total Recipients
- Child-Only Recipients as Fraction of Total
Unemployment Rate
Research Findings on Caseloads

- Wide range of estimates allocating how much of decline due to economy vs policy, many methodological debates
- Use different unemployment rates in different states
- Effects for waiver period smaller than those for TANF period
- Range due to policy in the TANF period: 18% to 35% caseload reduction due to the reform
- But today, many think the percent is higher because caseloads have not risen in either the mild 2000-2001 recession or the Great Recession; the reform (broadly speaking) is the likely cause
Summary of Findings: Employment

- Again, start with an illustrative graph
Never-Married Mothers’ Work Rates Jumped in 1990s but Have Fallen Since

Percent of women between the ages of 20 and 49 with a high school education or less with any work during the year

Research Findings: Employment

- There was a major growth of employment of less educated single mothers after welfare reform relative to others
- Leaver studies: 60%-70% employed in first few quarters
- How much due to policy and how much due to economy?
- Rough range: 2 to 4 percentage points increase due to policy, which is about half
- Some studies have shown that EITC was responsible for much more and recent estimates have, indeed, shown EITC effects greater than welfare reform estimates
- Some studies: employment effects have faded out
Summary of Findings: Poverty

- Look again at the time series pattern first
Historical SPM Poverty and Deep Poverty Rates, Single Mothers, 1968-2013

Source: C. Wimer
Research Findings: Poverty

- If employment increased, earnings must have risen; but welfare benefits fell; which one dominated?
- Poverty rates fell a bit after 1996: but due to the economy, the EITC, or welfare reform?
- Research is, as usual, mixed; but many results show that reform reduced poverty rates overall, at least in the first few years after reform.

- But other studies suggest the effects have fallen over time and possible increases in the rates of deep poverty have been caused by the reform.
- Consistent with the latter: Increase in families with no earnings and no welfare; increase in “floundering families”; Deep Poverty (Income > 50% of pov line) is increasing as a percent of poor.
Summary of Findings: Components

• Are all these effects a result of work requirements? Time Limits? Work requirements? Sanctions? Fixed block grant funds? Other components?
• Unfortunately, the research has not been successful in disentangling the relative contributions of each of these to the overall outcomes just described; hard to separate
• Components are too complex in detail, are correlated with each other within states, and we cannot measure them well; and data barriers (sample sizes, lack of administrative data) have been faced.
• Put differently: cannot say with confidence what would open if changed work requirements, time limits, or block grants, holding the other two fixed
Summary

- **My reading of the research evidence:**
  - Reform lowered caseloads, and magnitude of the reduction has increased over time
  - Reform raised average employment among single mothers, even if some have not been able to find work
  - Reform did not have major positive effects on average income, but probably lowered overall poverty rates to some extent but also may have increased deep poverty rates