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Overview

- Government programs are often associated with numerous administrative burdens
- Automation of welfare administration is usually considered an improvement over face-to-face administration, but it can lead to even more burdens when imperfectly administered
- **This Project:** Studies an effort by Indiana to automate its welfare services (covering SNAP, TANF, and Medicaid) by outsourcing their management to the IBM Corporation
- IBM used online and phone platforms to replace face-to-face interactions with local caseworkers; burdens included zero-tolerance policy for errors, resubmission of all eligibility documents, and long wait times at call centers
- Automated system was rolled out to 2/3 of Indiana’s counties in staggered fashion before it was permanently halted
- **Research Questions:** What are the effects of the administrative burdens on welfare take-up and targeting? What are the impacts on incomes and well-being?

Rollout of IBM’s Automated System

Data Sources

- SNAP, TANF, & Medicaid enrollment by county/month
- American Community Survey (ACS) microdata
- In ongoing work: linked survey and administrative microdata covering administrative welfare records, IRS tax records, Numident, Decennial Census, and ACS

Methods

- Estimate following difference-in-differences specification:
  \[
  \log(y_{ct}) = \mu + \lambda_t + \sum_k \gamma_k D_{ct}^k + \beta X_{ct} + \epsilon_{ct}
  \]
  where \(y_{ct}\) is an outcome (e.g., number of SNAP cases) for county \(c\) and year-month \(t\)
  - \(D_{ct}^k\) is a dummy variable equaling 1 if county \(c\) receives treatment and month \(t\) is \(k\) periods after treatment
  - \(X_{ct}\) is a vector of county- and time-varying covariates (e.g., population, demographic cuts, etc.)
  - Robustness checks comparing treated/untreated counties:
    - Parallel trends in pre-treatment period
    - Similar trends in economic conditions before/after treatment and during prior recessions
    - Similar patterns in receipt of other programs (Social Security, SSI, Medicare, FARM) not automated by IBM
    - No differences in trends for eligible households

Effects on SNAP Receipt

- Larger declines in small-pop. and high-poverty counties
- Households screened out more likely to have children, non-relatives, physical/mental disabilities, lower education
- Next steps: parse out effects on enrollment and retention, further unpack factors behind enrollment changes, and analyze effects of welfare cuts on incomes (e.g., earnings, other programs) and well-being (e.g., health, financial solvency, migration, homelessness, and child incomes in adulthood)
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