# Appendices

These Appendices are provided for additional transparency, providing detail for which there is not space in the paper itself. It is not proposed that these tables and figures are included in the printed journal; instead these will be made available on the author and/or publisher’s website (if they so choose).

Figure A. Areas of Welfare-to-Work programmes covered by financial data. Source: Federal TANF and State MOE Financial Data, Office of Family Assistance.

***Subsidized Employment*:** payments to employers or third parties to help cover the costs of employee wages, benefits, supervision, or training; costs for subsidizing a portion of the participant’s wage to compensate an employer for training costs; and expenditures for subsidized employment targeted for youth. Does *not* include expenditures related to payments to or on behalf of participants in community service and work experience activities that are within the definition of assistance.

***Education and Training*:** education and training activities, including secondary education (including alternative programs); adult education, high school diploma-equivalent (such as GED) and ESL classes; education directly related to employment; job skills training; education provided as vocational educational training or career and technical education; and post-secondary education. Does *not* include costs of early care and education or after-school or summer enrichment programs for children and youth in elementary, middle school, or high school.

***Additional Work Activities*:** work activities that have not been reported in employment subsidies or education and training. Includes costs related to providing work experience and community service activities, job search assistance and job readiness, related services (such as employment counseling, coaching, job development, information and referral, and outreach to business and non-profit community groups).

Table A. Summary Statistics for TANF Variables 2000-2015, Welfare Rules Database, TANF Financial Data.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Statistic** |
|  |  |
| **Sanction** |  |
|  *N (Non-Missing)* | 196 |
|  *Very Lenient (N)*  | 301 |
|  *Lenient (N)* | 71 |
|  *Severe (N)* | 18 |
|  *Very Severe (N)* | 77 |
|  |  |
| **Job Search** |  |
|  *N (Non-Missing)* | 196 |
|  *No (%)* | 65.5 |
|  *Yes (%)* | 34.5 |
|  |  |
| **Welfare-to-Work** |  |
|  *N (Non-Missing)* | 196 |
|  *Mean ($)* | 697.4 |
|  *Standard Deviation ($)* | 766.2 |
|  |  |

*Notes: 1N refers to the number of states which had a sanction within this category at some point in 2000, 2005, 2010 or 2015.*

Figure A2: Bivariate Relationship between TANF Job Search and Welfare-to-Work Spending
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Figure A3: Bivariate Relationship between TANF Sanctions and Welfare-to Work Spending

0

200

400

600

800

Welfare-to-Work Spend

Lenient

Stringent

Sanction

Figure A4: Bivariate Relationship between TANF Sanctions and Job Search.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Job Search** | **Sanction** |
|  | Lenient | Stringent |
| None (N) | 18 | 48 |
|  *Percent* | *60.0* | *61.5* |
|  |  |  |
| Required (N) | 12 | 30 |
|  *Percent* | *40.0* | *38.5* |

Table A. Type of Change in TANF Policies 2000-2015, Welfare Rules Database & TANF Financial Data, Percentages.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TANF Variable** | **No Change** | **More Severe or Stringent** | **More Lenient or Generous** | **Fluctuated** |
| *Sanction Severity* | 65 | 29[[1]](#endnote-1) | 0 | 6 |
| *Requires Job Search* | 61 | 16 | 14 | 10 |
| *Welfare-to-work*  | 0 | 0 | 33 | 67 |

Table A3. Random effects model for impact of TANF conditionality policies on Mental Health of Low Educated Single Mothers, Coefficients

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variables** | **M1** | **M2** | **M3** | **M4** |
|  | $$β$$ | 95% CI | $$β$$ | 95% CI | $$β$$ | 95% CI | $$β$$ | 95% CI |
| **Individual** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Age | **0.12** | **(0.08 0.16)** | **0.12** | **(0.08 0.16)** | **0.12** | **(0.08 0.16)** | **0.12** | **(0.08 0.16)** |
|  Married | **-2.60** | **(-2.67 -2.52)** | **-2.60** | **(-2.67 -2.52)** | **-2.60** | **(-2.67 -2.52)** | **-2.60** | **(-2.67 -2.52)** |
|  Non-White | **-0.73** | **(-0.81 -0.65)** | **-0.73** | **(-0.82 -0.65)** | **-0.73** | **(-0.81 -0.65)** | **-0.74** | **(-0.82 -0.65)** |
|  Single Low Ed. Mother  | **0.83** | **(0.42 1.24)** | **1.37** | **(1.16 1.58)** | **1.51** | **(1.34 1.69)** | **0.63** | **(0.17 1.08)** |
|  Unemployed | **0.98** | **(0.94 1.02)** | **0.98** | **(0.94 1.02)** | **0.98** | **(0.94 1.02)** | **0.98** | **(0.94 1.02)** |
| **Contextual** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  GDP per capita | **-0.15** | **(-0.22 -0.08)** | 0.00 | (0.00 0.00) | 0.00 | (0.00 0.00) | **-0.12** | **(-0.20 -0.05)** |
|  G’ment Ideology | 0.02 | (-0.06 0.10) | 0.04 | (-0.05 0.12) | 0.03 | (-0.05 0.12) | 0.02 | (-0.06 0.10) |
|  Citizen Ideology | -0.09 | (-0.17 0.00) | -0.08 | (-0.17 0.00) | -0.08 | (-0.17 0.00) | -0.07 | (-0.16 0.02) |
|  Unemployment Rate | **0.22** | **(0.10 0.34)** | **0.24** | **(0.13 0.36)** | **0.24** | **(0.12 0.36)** | **0.19** | **(0.06 0.31)** |
| **TANF\*Single Low Ed Mother** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Sanction (ref: V Lenient) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  *V. Stringent* | **0.86** | **(0.37 1.35)** |  |  |  |  | **0.97** | **(0.42 1.53)** |
|  Job Search (ref: none |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  *Required* |  |  | **0.43** | **(0.06 0.79)** |  |  | **0.44** | **(0.07 0.82)** |
|  Welfare-to-work |  |  |  |  | 0.10 | (-0.10 0.30) | -0.01 | (-0.21 0.20) |
|  Monthly Benefit |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.14 | (-0.07 0.36) |
|  n | 233716 | 233716 | 233716 | 233716 |
|  N | 195 | 195 | 195 | 195 |
| State\*Wave Variance | 0.372 | 0.379 | 0.378 | 0.364 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

*Notes: All models control for the mean effect of TANF policies, the Survey Wave, and for an interaction between GDP\*Low Educated Single mother. All coefficients in bold have confidence intervals that differ significantly from zero.*

Table A4. Impact of TANF Conditionality Policies on Days of Poor Mental Health for single unemployed mothers, Coefficients.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variables** | **M1** | **M2** | **M3** | **M4** |
|  | $$β$$ | 95% CI | $$β$$ | 95% CI | $$β$$ | 95% CI | $$β$$ | 95% CI |
| **Individual** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Age | **-0.17** | **(-2.79 -0.06)** | **-0.17** | **(-2.79 -0.06)** | **-0.17** | **(-2.79 -0.06)** | **-0.17** | **(-2.79 -0.06)** |
|  Married | **-1.23** | **(-1.40 -1.07)** | **-1.23** | **(-1.40 -1.07)** | **-1.23** | **(-1.40 -1.07)** | **-1.23** | **(-1.40 -1.07)** |
|  Non-White | **-0.86** | **(-1.06 -0.66)** | **-0.86** | **(-1.06 -0.66)** | **-0.86** | **(-1.06 -0.66)** | **-0.86** | **(-1.06 -0.66)** |
|  Single Unemployed Mother  | **1.97**  | **(0.75 3.17)** | **1.97**  | **(0.75 3.17)** | **1.97**  | **(0.75 3.17)** | **1.24**  | **(0.73 2.40)** |
|  Education (ref: did not graduate high school) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Graduated from college | **-2.07**  | **(-2.49 -1.64)** | **-2.07**  | **(-2.49 -1.64)** | **-2.07**  | **(-2.49 -1.64)** | **-2.12**  | **(-2.53 -1.69)** |
| **Contextual** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  GDP per capita | **-0.11** | **(-0.22 0.00)** | -0.09 | (-0.20 -0.02) | -0.09 | (-0.20 -0.02) | 0.23 | (-0.09 0.54) |
|  G’ment Ideology | -0.01 | (-0.11 0.09)  | 0.00 | (-0.09 0.10) | 0.00 | (-0.09 0.10) | -0.03 | (-0.14 0.08) |
|  Citizen Ideology | -0.05 | (-0.17 0.08) | -0.03 | (-0.16 0.10) | -0.03 | (-0.16 0.10) | -0.09 | (-0.35 0.16) |
|  Unemployment Rate | 0.08 | (-0.12 0.28) | 0.08 | (-0.12 0.28) | 0.08 | (-0.12 0.28) | -0.00 | (-0.22 0.22) |
| **TANF\*Single Unemployed Mother** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Sanction (ref: V Lenient) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  *V. Stringent* | 0.26 | (-1.58 2.09) |  |  |  |  | 0.96  | (-0.39 2.31) |
|  Job Search (ref: none) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  *Required* |  |  | **1.25** | **(0.28 2.23)** |  |  | 1.23 | (0.27 2.19) |
|  Welfare-to-work |  |  |  |  | -0.20 | (-0.60 0.20) | -0.23 | (-0.59 0.12) |
|  Monthly Benefit |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.64 | (-0.00 1.27) |
|  n | 151420 | 151420 | 151420 | 151420 |
|  N | 195 | 195 | 195 | 195 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

*Notes: All models control for the mean effect of TANF policies, the Survey Wave, and for an interaction between GDP\*Unemployed Single mother. Model 4 controls for N-1 state dummy variables. All coefficients in bold have confidence intervals that differ significantly from zero.*

1. # Notes

 While 29% of all states became more severe in their sanctioning practices (according to the 1-4 scale), 6% of states became dramatically more stringent, increasing from 1 to 4 in severity. These three states were Arkansas, Indiana and Texas. [↑](#endnote-ref-1)