

Welfare Reform and Neighborhoods: Race and Civic Participation

By JAMES JENNINGS

ABSTRACT: Welfare reform is weakening the social and institutional fabric of neighborhoods with relatively high levels of poverty and is, therefore, antiurban and antineighborhood policy. This article is based on an in-depth study of three Massachusetts communities that finds that welfare reform is increasing regulatory and service demand pressures in inner-city neighborhoods, thereby altering the mission, organizational capacities, and planning activities of community-based organizations. These findings support recent research that examines the problematic connections between welfare reform and race, neighborhood development, and civic participation. The emerging lesson is that the building of civic consciousness and the strengthening of institutional capacities to pursue community and economic development are ignored in the push of welfare reforms to change individual behavior. Neighborhood revitalization initiatives, as well as the call for increasing citizen participation and self-help strategies, are similarly being weakened or ignored.

James Jennings is professor of urban and environmental policy and planning at Tufts University. He has written and lectured extensively on urban politics and community development. His books include Understanding the Nature of Poverty and Race, Politics, and Economic Development: Community Perspectives.

THE latest stage of welfare reform is a major impediment both to building social capital and to encouraging civic participation in black and Latino urban neighborhoods with relatively high proportions of families on public assistance. At its heart, the current policy is a top-down reform driven by faulty, but historically rooted, presumptions about the behavior of poor people and fueled by a political rhetoric reflecting misinformation about the nature and causes of persistent poverty in the United States. In fact, welfare reform has little to do with attempts to alleviate urban poverty but instead seeks to control the economic mobility and behavior of poor people and families.

An examination of how the institutional fabric and social and economic capital of poor neighborhoods are affected by welfare reform shows that this policy can be characterized as antineighborhood or antiurban public policy. It is producing negative effects on neighborhood organizations, and it forces community-based agencies to chase low-paying jobs for their clients rather than strengthening the economic infrastructure of the area as a way of producing jobs or preparing and educating people for higher-wage employment. Welfare reform also undermines the development of economic capital in inner cities and generally ignores important lessons about neighborhood revitalization that have emerged over many years of local victories and examples of improving living conditions (Richman, Chaskin, and Ogle-tree 1992).

This article is based on a forthcoming study assessing the institutional impact of welfare reform in three poor and working-class neighborhoods in Massachusetts.¹ For the most part, as I will explain below, we found that welfare reform is increasing regulatory and service demand pressures in inner-city neighborhoods and thereby altering the mission, organizational capacities, and planning activities of community-based organizations. The major conclusion of the study is that welfare reform, as embodied in Massachusetts Temporary Aid to Needy Families (TANF) policy (specifically, time limits to benefits, regulations forcing individuals to find any available job, regulations against schooling as a way to earn benefits, and work-first rules), coupled with erroneous misperceptions and civic biases against our poorer black and Latino neighborhoods, is weakening the social and institutional fabric of neighborhoods with relatively high levels of poverty.

WELFARE REFORM AND RACE

The legislative and policy debates preceding welfare reforms at federal and state levels indicate that the target issue was reducing the use of public assistance, not resolving structural causes of poverty. The underlying rationale of this law is that by combating dependency the problem of persistent poverty associated with families and children will be alleviated because indigent people will be forced into employment and poor

single mothers will be forced to marry and/or be employed (*Personal Responsibility and Work Reconciliation Act of 1996*).

According to the goals of welfare reform, dependency and lack of a work ethic represent key factors explaining persistent poverty, and therefore public policy should be aimed at combating such dependency through work-first initiatives. This assertion is challenged by the fact that the composition of the poverty population in this country includes many demographic groups, including children and the elderly, working and nonworking people, single and married-couple families, and people with disabilities. Millions of people who do work full- and part-time are still poor (Jennings 1994). Further, the history of antipoverty efforts shows that this welfare reform does not represent new thinking about the causes or responses to widespread poverty in our society (Brown 1999; Hamilton and Hamilton 1997).

Civic and political discourse surrounding the adoption of welfare reform reflected two implicit messages about poor people. First, poor people were viewed as being impoverished due to their own dependency on government dole, but the second message is that the undeserving poor are mostly black and Latino people. Poverty was thereby racialized in a way that facilitated the adoption and support of welfare reform. This racialization was conducted in several ways, beginning with polemical works by both liberal and conservative scholars and writers who created a genre of literature proposing that

poverty is not only a social and cultural aberration but primarily ensconced in the urban culture and even native intelligence of black people (Banfield 1973; Auletta 1983; Herrnstein and Murray 1994).

Our study and others find that welfare reform has differential racial and ethnic impact in those predominantly black and Latino neighborhoods with high numbers of recipients compared to other neighborhoods. Since many neighborhoods reflect high levels of residential segregation and even hypersegregation, even neutral or universal public policies can carry racial and ethnic implications in terms of their impact on neighborhood services or resources (Massey and Denton 1993). In Massachusetts, the concentration of poor people and families on public assistance that are affected by the institutional effects of welfare reform occurs precisely in the same places where we find the highest number and concentration of black, Latino, and Asian residents. For example, our study found that the zip codes with at least 400 or more families on public assistance in 1999 were the same zip codes with the highest concentration of blacks, Latinos, and Asian-descent people across the whole state.²

Building social capital and increasing citizen participation as a tool for improving the quality of public policy and responding to local economic problems is an utmost concern of poorer communities. Growing demands exist for improving living conditions and enhancing opportunities for residents of low-income communities by the building of social capital through strengthening and

tapping neighborhood resources. Yet the federal context of devolution and welfare reform means fewer resources for urban programs and provides a significant obstacle to interorganizational cooperation and collaboration between neighborhood organizations.

Increasing evidence, including our study, points to racial and ethnic differences in how welfare reform is being implemented at the local level. In some places, for example, black and Latino recipients of public assistance may not be receiving the same kinds of benefits that are doled out to white recipients. In a study of clients in Illinois who were denied benefits due to sanctions, for instance, it was reported, "Latinos were more likely to experience case closings due to non-compliance than non-Latinos. Fifteen percent of Latinos reported such a closing compared to 8 percent of non-Latinos. Communication problems may have contributed to Latinos with low English proficiency either missing meetings, or failing to comply with regulations" (Chicago Urban League 2000, 35). This study concluded that the likelihood was greater for white recipients than black or Latino recipients to be referred to education programs before being required to accept a job (64).

Another study compared the employment experiences of black and white welfare recipients and concluded that "among black and white welfare recipients with similar barriers to employment, blacks have more negative employment outcomes than whites. In general, blacks

earn less than whites, are less likely to be employed full-time and are over-represented in lower paying occupations" (Gooden 1998, 24). Gooden shows that these racial differences are due to discrimination and a workforce that is culturally unbalanced, as well as the role that caseworkers perform in the implementation of welfare reform. Caseworkers have wide discretion in assisting welfare recipients at various levels of interaction and activity, including the point of assessing needs and setting goals, adopting actions for meeting these goals, referring clients to services, and monitoring the behavior of clients.

Our study, among a few others on the topic, suggests that welfare reform is adversely influencing the mission, work, and capacity of community-based organizations in black and Latino neighborhoods to meet the social and economic needs of residents. Community-based organizations are involved in activities that seek to provide resources to individuals, families, and neighborhood organizations in the areas of human services, education, youth activities, health, public safety, housing, and economic development. Ironically, it is these kinds of community organizations that could help poor people and families to acquire the resources and necessary services for social and economic mobility. If these kinds of institutions are bypassed, then it tends to weaken efforts to enhance the social mobility of poor people and families or to improve living conditions in some places.

WELFARE REFORM
AND NEIGHBORHOOD
REVITALIZATION

Overall neighborhood characteristics, including the state of community-based organizations, can play a major role in ensuring the success of welfare reform in terms of moving people into meaningful employment. Economist John Fitzgerald (1995) notes, for example, "A weakness in previous studies is that they do not adequately account for local labor market conditions or other local area effects. This omission may bias the estimated effects of policy and labor market variables" (43). He adds that

neighborhood can have other effects as well. Information about jobs may be lacking in poor areas. The degree of stigma associated with welfare will influence choices and reflects neighborhood (peer) tastes, as well as state welfare policy and personal tastes. Neighborhood may affect human capital, and hence the values of job options, directly through school quality and indirectly through peer pressure to continue education. (45)

A serious oversight in welfare reform is inattention to the role of community organizations in those neighborhoods most affected by the changes. Coulton (1996), for example, highlights the role of neighborhood institutions and local processes for understanding how the social and economic mobility of individuals can be enhanced: "To respond to the challenges of the new era . . . more intricate knowledge of the workings of low-income communities and low-skill labor markets is required, particularly knowledge about how these factors support or undermine indi-

viduals' chances of finding a job that provides a living wage" (510). She argues that "understanding what needs to be done to create and support opportunity within communities, however, requires a focused and multidisciplinary program of community research. To date little of the research on welfare dynamics and welfare-to-work programs has been embedded in a social context" (511). Another urbanist reiterates this observation:

The ability for a welfare recipient to move from welfare to work depends to some extent on the quality and competence of the set of local institutions that are in place to serve and assist her—in particular, local welfare, employment and training and other labor market intermediary institutions (e.g. employment agencies, vocational schools, community colleges, local economic development agencies). We can assume that the quality of these institutions varies across areas as does the degree to which this set of institutions perform in a cooperative, integrated, and coordinative manner. Where local welfare and employment and training agencies co-operate closely, and where these, in turn, are well-integrated with other community institutions, welfare recipients should, *ceteris paribus*, have an easier path moving from welfare to work. (Wolman 1996, 6)

Professors Avery M. Guest and Susan K. Wierzbicki (1999) add, "The degree of social interaction among neighbors is a key indicator of the strength of localized communities in urban society" (92). And in a study about factors that explain the state of children's social and health conditions, Jason M. Fields and Kristin E. Smith (1998) report that certain

kinds of neighborhood characteristics are associated positively with the well-being of children. Such arguments imply that the chances of poor people, including individuals on public assistance, to become self-sufficient is related to the capacity of community-based organizations to work effectively in certain kinds of neighborhoods. As a matter of fact, one researcher discovered that the quality of life in a neighborhood, including its institutional richness and support networks, was a major factor in explaining the likelihood of recipients of the previous public assistance program, Aid to Families with Dependent Children, to leave its rolls (Vartanian 1997; see also Bratt and Keyes 1997; Schwartz and Vidal 1999).

Many representatives of community organizations in our study reported that they had to change the direction and activities aimed at neighborhood improvements as a result of welfare reform. These organizations had to shift from community and economic development planning and related activities and instead respond to public assistance recipients seeking information about the availability of services needed to comply with new welfare regulations. Areas such as employment and training, community development, and planning for economic development strategies had to take a secondary role in those organizations that were assisting TANF recipients. Staffing could not be devoted to creative or strategic planning either because resources were not available or because TANF recipients generated added fiscal and personnel

pressures. The origins of such pressures are the regulations and procedures that agencies had to follow, accompanied by new needs forced upon TANF recipients seeking referrals for child care, housing, and transportation assistance.

Under welfare reform it is difficult for community organizations in these neighborhoods to plan strategies and activities aimed at growth since there is little information about the impact of time limits or how new welfare regulations might affect their own operations. Interviewees noted that the new welfare reform regulations functioned in a way that inhibited or discouraged collaborative planning and networking between their organizations. This development is problematic in that welfare reform is causing a shift in the mission and capacities of community-based organizations at a point when the call and need for cooperation has started to emerge as necessary for the survival of some of these organizations (Keyes 1990).

Competition between agencies for showing that clients are successful within a work-first strategy weakens the call for organizational collaboration. As lamented by one interviewee in our study,

Before, many of us used to get together once in a while to talk about problems we were all having in helping the Latino community. Now . . . they see everyone as competition. . . . Now, everyone is doing outreach trying to get the welfare clients from the agencies your friends work for, and they are doing the same to you.

Competition is also encouraged because there is a need to count suc-

cessful clients regardless of whether people are being really helped or not. Another interviewee, for example, stated that

some people around here are taking our clients who are still on welfare to give them other services that they don't really need. . . . Some clients have complained about this. They come to me to help them find an apartment, and the next thing I know someone from one of our job training programs is trying to push them into their program.

This kind of environment is not conducive to community revitalization strategies where organizations have to plan and implement activities collaboratively for the benefit of people and the neighborhood.

Welfare reform further weakens neighborhood institutions because it is implemented within a specter of big government and a highly regulatory bureaucracy used for monitoring poor people. President Ronald Reagan helped to trigger the devolution revolution by calling for "getting government of our backs" in his 1980 inaugural speech. Today's welfare reform shows that this was not meant for poor people or their neighborhoods. The presence of state government and centralization mandated by welfare reform in inner-city communities is enormous.

An example of this problem is the requirement that all welfare recipients have to report to newly created employment and training centers for assessment. They can no longer first approach a local community agency for employment assistance. Welfare

recipients must now be processed by a central bureaucracy that emphasizes a quick stamp of "job readiness" in order to comply with policies and regulations pushed by state agencies administering welfare reform. Only clients with the most extreme debilitating conditions tend to be referred to training programs, which, in turn, are mostly short term and aimed at entry-level employment. Some job-ready clients are referred to community-based organizations that are forced to accept contracts seeking any job placements rather than providing supportive services and skills training to the clients.

The punitive monitoring of poor people on public assistance mandated by welfare reform in states like Massachusetts adds burdens and pressures to community-based organizations because highly centralized procedures dictated by the state must be followed in order to assist people. This new red tape requires management information and personnel systems that smaller neighborhood organizations may not be able to afford, and thus they become less competitive with larger agencies that may be disconnected socially from the community. Community-based organizations in black and Latino neighborhoods tend to rely to a greater extent on public funds since they serve a poorer clientele. Private sector initiatives and larger service agencies can compete better for reduced funding than can neighborhood-based organizations due to the possibility of operating economies of scale.

In many places, welfare recipients are treated as pariahs who are not to be trusted and must be forced to the first available jobs. Indirectly, this contributes to social divisions in poor neighborhoods. It encourages divisive blame-the-victim attitudes on the part of citizens living in the same neighborhood rather than building networks of citizens who could be working together on behalf of their neighborhood interests. Racial and ethnic divisions were identified as a potential problem created by the implementation of welfare reform in Massachusetts in a study conducted by the Radcliffe Institute for Public Policy in 1998 (Dodson, Joshi, and McDonald 1998).

As resources for local programs are reduced either directly through lesser budgetary allocations or as a result of increased demands for assistance, competition between community-based organizations for scarce public funding is exacerbated, as suggested by Bailey and Koney (1996): "With the focus on expanding state control of welfare and reducing social spending, competition for finite resources is increasing as well. Community-based organizations are particularly vulnerable to these changes" (604).

Another study similarly documented greater competitive pressures for community-based agencies as a consequence of welfare reform in many urban neighborhoods across the nation (Withorn and Jons 1999). It was reported that welfare reform generated new internal and external tensions for many neighborhood

agencies surveyed during 1998. They also noted that agencies serving immigrants believed that they have become more politically vulnerable in neighborhoods where other agencies are serving nonimmigrant but impoverished sectors.

Similar observations were echoed in our interviews and meetings with many representatives of community-based service agencies in the three neighborhoods. In the predominantly Latino neighborhood of Lawrence, the director of a community-based organization noted that "not only is the agency competing for welfare clients with other agencies, but programs within the agency are fighting one another for eligible people." This kind of competition produces an informal practice that one observer describes as "churning," which occurs when

CBO [community-based organization] consumers of one program are directed to other agency programs, not because they need the services but because they are eligible in social characteristics, for the agency to bill or justify their existence to another funding source. . . . We see this with Medicaid where a welfare client comes into the CBO for housing, but because they have Medicaid are forced to get a mental health assessment just for the agency to bill Medicaid.

Thus, rather than government partnering with successful and effective community-based organizations, welfare reform encourages yet greater institutional efficiencies and waste rather than productive collaboration.

WELFARE REFORM AND CIVIC PARTICIPATION

There is also a disconnection between major themes in the literature on civic participation in local places and welfare reform in black and Latino urban neighborhoods.

The foundation sector in this nation has taken the lead in identifying civic consciousness and the building of social fabric and social capital as fundamental elements for comprehensive urban revitalization. The role of neighborhood organizations involved in community and economic development has been highlighted in numerous reports and national discussions. But while praising the work and role of community-based organizations in places with relatively high poverty, the foundation sector has been passive and reactive to the adoption and operationalization of welfare reform. This is occurring at the very time that welfare reforms across many states discourage civic participation in poor communities and at the same time that it seeks to fight dependency.

The contradictions and inconsistencies between the rhetorical call for self-sufficiency and reduction in dependency and the effects of welfare reform are evident in the findings of a recent online seminar sponsored by Handsnet (Gross 2000). The online proceedings state that "if self-sufficiency for poor families is the goal of welfare reform, welfare clients must be perceived in more than just economic terms; their social and political roles as parents, family members, and community members cannot be ignored." The proceedings included several ways in which current wel-

fare reform inhibits the development of self-sufficiency that parallel the concerns of community representatives in the three neighborhood areas we studied: "Self-sufficiency may demand long-term supports not provided by TANF. Indeed, TANF time limits can short-circuit welfare clients' attempts to achieve self-sufficiency." Further, "Human service providers need additional tools and resources to help their clients overcome major barriers to self-sufficiency including lack of adequate education, job training, health care, housing, transportation and child-care."

This online report indicated that welfare reform is undermining the development of the self-sufficiency of clients and their families. Through the testimony of a wide range of people, including representatives of agencies providing direct services to clients, it suggests that self-sufficiency requires comprehensive approaches and tools optimally within a framework of developing and supporting stronger communities.

The inconsistency between "ending welfare as we know it" through current welfare reform and building self-sufficiency is suggested by other observers. Delgado (1999) writes that self-sufficiency involves much more than the values or actions of individuals (see also Bratt and Keyes 1997). Community-based support systems also have to be intact and effective in order to encourage and sustain self-sufficiency in low-income urban neighborhoods. Delgado's review of the history of self-help movements in this country

indicates that these supporting factors include building a sense of community on the part of institutions; the geographical and psychological accessibility of institutions; institutional practices that accentuate affirmation rather than stigmatization on the part of clients; support and respect for cultural heritages; encouraging the development of community leadership; and building trust between clients, citizens, and institutions.

The staff members of one organization we interviewed, however, expressed concern that their work in encouraging entrepreneurship and self-help is being undermined by welfare reform: "Dollars to be earned by welfare clients are not sufficient for entrepreneurship. Day care and other life issues make it difficult for welfare recipients to advance beyond low-level paying jobs." Welfare reform is not aimed at satisfying this kind of criteria for building or maintaining effective local self-help strategies and programs.

CONCLUSION

While the language of welfare reform is directed at changing presumed antiwork individual behavior, the fact that some urban locations have relatively large and concentrated numbers of families receiving public assistance raises questions about the effect of this policy on these places in terms of institutional, social, and economic effects. Welfare reform policy avoids the issues of the quality of life in neighborhoods, investment in the economic development of these places, and the invest-

ment of resources necessary for strengthening community-based organizations and for revitalization strategies. It focuses not on strengthening neighborhood institutions but rather on eliciting a prescribed social behavior of individuals and families that presumably, in turn, leads to their own economic mobility. But the negative consequences of welfare reform on neighborhood organizations involved with enhancing or maintaining the social and economic health of predominantly black and Latino neighborhoods cannot be ignored.

Although generally not treated as such, welfare reform is manifestly a community development and urban policy matter. It must be considered within the ongoing debates about effective policy and institutional strategies for improving living conditions in inner cities—where both the processes and effects of welfare reform bolster the views of scholars and observers who believe that social and economic investments in black and Latino neighborhoods should be discouraged because they will be ineffective or wasteful.

Some scholars have advocated place-based strategies as a way to revitalize inner cities, while other scholars would use opportunities for residents to move to other neighborhoods. Commentators such as Robert Halpern argue that investment of time and money in urban neighborhoods is not a panacea to systemic problems: "The idea that poor neighborhoods contain the resources and capacities for their own regeneration can be, and often has been, used to promote self-help without the req-

uisite external supports and linkages" (Halpern 1995, 222). Halpern adds, "Creating local governance bodies and mechanisms can seem somewhat empty when the local community has few public resources of its own to govern" (223).

However, this often valid criticism does not, *a priori*, invalidate the call for neighborhood empowerment but perhaps forces us, along with urban scholar Clarence N. Stone, to see it as a "mixed picture." Stone (1999) argues against,

Dismissing bottom-up efforts to strengthen civic capacity in poorer neighborhoods, paying little attention to the engagement of lower socioeconomic status citizens in developing an agenda of their fashioning, and writing off activities that might enhance their skills in pursuing that agenda relegate economically marginal people to the nonpolitical condition of forever being acted upon without a prospect of being able to have a voice in their own fates. (854)

Welfare reform, by discouraging the social and economic revitalization of poor neighborhoods and by ignoring the role that neighborhood organizations can play in improving living conditions, can be seen as serving this dismissal. We found that welfare reform is not only hurting families and children but also the neighborhoods in which relatively high numbers and proportions of poor people live and work and where many residents are actively striving for change. It is, therefore, an antineighborhood public policy because the building of civic consciousness and the strengthening institutional capacities to pursue com-

munity and economic development are ignored. Neighborhood revitalization initiatives, as well as the call for increasing citizen participation and self-help strategies, are similarly being weakened or ignored.

Community-based organizations and a healthy institutional infrastructure are key pieces for urban revitalization strategies. Strong neighborhoods allow citizens from different backgrounds and with different racial and ethnic characteristics to work together on common problems facing their cities. Today, welfare reform is undermining the building of this kind of foundation. Unfortunately for poor people and, ultimately, others in the neighborhood as well, "ending welfare as we know it" has little to do with the lessons learned over the years about revitalizing poor and working-class neighborhoods and thereby equipping the citizenry to come and work together across racial and ethnic boundaries.

Notes

1. The study includes interviews conducted between 1997 and 2000 with many community representatives working in three neighborhood areas in the cities of Boston, Lawrence, and Brockton. These places have relatively high number of families on TANF and predominantly black and Latino populations with a high rate of poverty and near-poverty status. The following individuals assisted in this research project with interviewing and related tasks: Dr. Jorge Santiago, Maria Estella Carrion, Barbara Gomes Beach, and Danielle Wilson.

The questions posed to civic and neighborhood representatives were aimed at highlighting changes or new pressures that community-based organizations have experienced as a result of welfare reform, both in terms of level

and kinds of services in demand and the resources available for meeting new demands or regulations. The three neighborhood areas were studied in terms of how institutions involved with community and economic development revitalization strategies are influenced by welfare reform.

2. From monthly reports provided by the Massachusetts Department of Transitional Assistance; population projections and estimates provided by Applied Graphics Solution (for 1999).

References

- Auletta, Ken. 1983. *The Underclass*. New York: Random House.
- Bailey, Darlyne and Kelly McNally Koney. 1996. Inter-organizational Community-Based Collaboratives: A Strategic Response to Shape the Social Work Agenda. *Social Work* 41(6): 602-11.
- Banfield, Edward C. 1973. *The Unheavenly City Revisited*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Brown, Michael K. 1999. *Race, Money, and the American Welfare State*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Bratt, Rachel G. and Langley C. Keyes, with Rhae Parkese, Kim Phinney, and Diana Markel. 1997. *New Perspectives on Self-Sufficiency: Strategies for Non-profit Housing Organizations*. Medford, MA: Tufts University and the Department of Urban and Environmental Policy.
- Chicago Urban League and the Center for Urban Economic Development. 2000. *Living with Welfare Reform: A Survey of Low Income Families in Illinois*. Chicago: Chicago Urban League and the Center for Urban Economic Development.
- Coulton, Claudia J. 1996. Poverty, Work, and Community: A Research Agenda for an Era of Diminishing Federal Responsibility. *Social Work* 41(5):509-19.
- Delgado, Melvin. 1999. *Social Work Practice in Nontraditional Urban Settings*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dodson, Lisa, Pamela Joshi, and Davida McDonald. 1998. *Welfare in Transition: Consequences for Women, Families, and Communities*. Cambridge, MA: Radcliffe Public Policy Institute.
- Fields, Jason M. and Kristin E. Smith. 1998. *Poverty and Family Structure, and Child Well-Being: Indicators from the SIPP*. Population Division Working Paper, no. 23, Apr. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Population Division.
- Fitzgerald, John M. 1995. Local Labor Markets and Local Area Effects on Welfare Duration. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 14(1):43-67.
- Gooden, Susan. 1998. All Things Not Being Equal: Differences in Caseworker Support Toward Black and White Clients. *Harvard Journal of African American Public Policy* 4.
- Gross, June. 2000. *Pressure from All Sides: Living Through the Conflicting Realities of Poverty*. Working Families Online Roundtable (30 Mar. 2000). Available at www.igc.org/handsnet/whitepaper2.html.
- Guest, Avery M. and Susan K. Wierzbicki. 1999. Social Ties at the Neighborhood Level: Two Decades of GSS Evidence. *Urban Affairs Review* 35(1):92-111.
- Halpern, Robert. 1995. *Rebuilding the Inner City: A History of Neighborhood Initiatives to Address Poverty in the United States*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hamilton, Charles V. and Dona C. Hamilton. 1997. *The Dual Agenda: Race and Social Welfare Policies of Civil Rights Organizations*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Herrnstein, Richard J. and Charles Murray. 1994. *The Bell Curve: Intelli-*

- gence and Class Structure in American Life*. New York: Free Press.
- Jennings, James. 1994. *Understanding the Nature of Poverty in Urban America*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Keyes, Langley C. 1990. The Shifting Focus of Neighborhood Groups: The Massachusetts Experience. In *The Future of National Urban Policy*, ed. Marshall Kaplan and Franklin James. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Massey, Douglas S. and Nancy A. Denton. 1993. *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Personal Responsibility and Work Reconciliation Act of 1996*. U.S. Public Law 104-193. 104th Cong., 22 Aug. 1996.
- Richman, Harold A., Robert J. Chaskin, and Renae Ogletree. 1992. *The Ford Foundation's Neighborhood and Family Initiative: Toward a Model of Comprehensive Neighborhood-Based Development*. Chicago: University of Chicago, Chapin Hall Center for Children.
- Schwartz, Alex F. and Avis C. Vidal. 1999. *Between a Rock and a Hard Place: The Impact of Federal and State Policy Changes in Housing in New York City*. In *Housing and Community Development in New York City*, ed. Michael H. Schill. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Stone, Clarence N. 1999. Poverty and the Continuing Campaign for Urban Social Reform. *Urban Affairs Review* 34(6):843-56.
- Vartanian, Thomas P. 1997. Neighborhood Effects on AFDC Exits: Examining Social Isolation, Relative Deprivation, and Epidemic Theories. *Social Science Review* 71(4):548-74.
- Withorn, Ann and Pamela Jons. 1999. *Worrying About Welfare Reform: Community-Based Agencies Respond*. Unpublished paper, Academic Working Group on Poverty, University of Massachusetts Boston.
- Wolman, Hal. 1996. *Welfare to Work: The Need to Take Place Differences into Account*. Technical Analysis Paper, no. 45. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation.