THE SURVEY OF INCOME AND PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

A STATISTICAL PROFILE OF AT-RISK CHILDREN IN THE UNITED STATES

No. 168

C. Winquist Nord and A. Rhoads
Child Trends, Inc.

U. S. Department of Commerce BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

This paper was supported by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development under Grant NUMBER R01-HD23286 with supplemental funds provided to NICHD through an Interagency Agreement with the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

The Survey of Income and Program Participation
As a Source of Data on Children:
A STATISTICAL PROFILE OF AT-RISK CHILDREN IN THE UNITED STATES

Introduction

The Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) is an ambitious data collection effort that to date has been under-used by researchers. Although there are many reasons why researchers choose not to work with SIPP, one reason often given is that the sample size is too small to make reliable estimates, particularly for selected subgroups of the population. If other data sources, such as the Current Population Survey (CPS), are available that provide similar data, researchers often choose to work with these other data instead.

In an earlier paper, we evaluated SIPP as a source of data on children by comparing estimates derived from SIPP with estimates derived from several other sources including the CPS (See Nord and Rhoads, 1991). In particular, we compared estimates of the percent of related children under 18 in poverty by age and race, the percent of children under 6 who are poor or near poor by selected family and parental characteristics, and the percent of families receiving AFDC derived from the 1986 panel of SIPP with estimates derived from the CPS, the National Integrated Quality Control System, and the 1988 Child Health Supplement to the National Health Interview Survey. With a few exceptions, we found that the estimates derived from SIPP were very close to the estimates derived from the other sources. we noted that as the population became more narrowly defined, the estimates from SIPP did begin to deviate from the other sources. Thus, we speculated that SIPP's smaller sample size relative to the CPS may indeed hinder its usefulness in studying specific groups that occur relatively rarely in the population.

In this paper, we continue to explore whether SIPP provides reasonable estimates of the child population by comparing estimates derived from SIPP with estimates from the Current Population Survey[1]. Specifically, children living in families receiving AFDC, children living in families that are poor, but not receiving AFDC, and children living in near-poor families (those with incomes below 150% of the poverty threshold) are compared with children living in non-poor families and with all children in the United States on some basic demographic variables and by selected characteristics of their parents.

In addition, we create a profile of children in America who are at-risk of adverse outcomes because of living in welfare families, living in or near poverty, or living with a mother who began childbearing as a teenager. For this profile, we describe in more detail the estimates derived from SIPP and present additional data from SIPP that are not available in the March

[1]Data from the March 1988 Current Population Survey were used to make these comparisons. The reference period for that survey is the previous calendar year 1986. Thus the time periods are one year different. This fact should not materially affect the results.

CPS. Thus, selected demographic and parental characteristics of children living in families receiving AFDC, those living in poor families that are not receiving AFDC, and children living in near-poor families are described and contrasted with children who are not poor and with all children in the United States. In addition, children born to women who began childbearing as teenagers are compared to children born to older mothers and to all children in the United States. The March CPS does not contain information on women's ages at first birth, thus it is not possible to use the CPS to examine children born to teenage mothers.

Before making the comparisons between the SIPP and the CPS and developing the profile of at-risk children, the design and objectives of SIPP and of the CPS are briefly described.

The Design and Objectives of SIPP

SIPP is designed to provide more accurate and detailed data on income and program participation of persons, families, and households in the United States and on the determinants of income and program participation than has heretofore been available. Analysis of the data provides a better understanding of the distribution of income, wealth, and poverty in the society and of the effects of federal and state programs on the well-being of families and individuals. It also serves as a tool for managing and evaluating government transfer and service programs. The gathering of more detailed information on earned, unearned, and asset income sources, coupled with the measurement of monthly variations in such contributing factors as household structure, the determinants of program eligibility, and actual participation, assists researchers and policy makers as they grapple with ways to reform welfare, improve entitlement programs, and otherwise monitor and influence the policies and programs designed to help the needy of this country.

The survey design for SIPP is complex, but very flexible. It calls for a new panel of respondents to be initiated every year. The first panel -- the 1984 panel -- was fielded at the end of 1983. Each panel is followed for approximately two-and-one-half years and respondents are interviewed every four months during that time period. Thus each panel is interviewed approximately 8 times or for 8 **waves**. In order to simplify the task of collecting the information, each panel is divided into four **rotation groups**. Data collection for each wave is spread across four months. Each month a different rotation group is interviewed. Respondents are asked to recall a variety of information about the four months preceding the interview. This four-month period is referred to as the **reference period**.

Original plans called for a sample size of approximately 20,000 households. Budgetary constraints, however, forced panels after 1984 to be reduced to approximately 13,000 households per panel. Although the 1990 panel was increased to approximately 21,500 households, the 1991 panel was again reduced in size to approximately 14,000 households.

The first wave consists of a core questionnaire, which gathers information about labor force participation, income, assets, and program participation in the previous four months, as well

as other basic information. The remaining waves include both the core questionnaire and one-or more topical modules that are asked periodically and contain more detailed questions about specific topics such as child support or education and training history.

SIPP's sample universe is the noninstitutionalized, resident population of the United States. Persons ineligible for the survey in addition to the institutionalized are U.S. citizens living aborad, crew members of merchant vessels, and Armed Forces personnel living in military barracks. Persons living in group quarters such as school dormitories or family-type living quarters on military bases, however, are included. Only persons 15 and older are interviewed, although some information is gathered about children under age 15.

Only persons included in the initial (wave 1) sample and persons living in the same household as an original sample person are eligible for interviews in subsequent waves of SIPP. Every effort is made to follow original respondents who move to different locations. Because children under age 15 at the first interview and those born during the course of the interview are not respondents, they are not followed if they leave the household of an-original respondent. Thus each month persons can enter or leave the SIPP population because of birth, death, entering or leaving the household of an original sample person, moving to military barracks or institutions, moving without leaving a forwarding address, or moving to a remote area with no telephone number.

The complexity of the design of SIPP and its sample size have deterred many researchers from attempting to use the data, even though its use could potentially provide a better understanding of short-term spell's of poverty, transfer income receipt, and other relatively volatile events in people's lives.

The Design and Objectives of the March Income and Demographic Supplement to the Current Population Survey

The March Income and Demographic Supplement to the CPS collects data on employment and income for the previous calendar year. The reference period differs from the monthly core survey, which collects data on unemployment, employment, and labor force characteristics pertaining to the preceding week. Thus, the income supplement provides additional data to study the work experience of the population in a given year (including job changes, lay-offs, And part-year employment), data which cannot be obtained from the monthly core survey.

In addition to earnings and work experience data, the Income and Demographic Supplement collects more detailed income data, including sources of income and receipt of child support, alimony, and AFDC payments. The March Supplement also provides extensive detail on marital status, family and household composition, and living arrangements.

The CPS is designed to be representative of the civilian, noninstitutional population of the

United States, including Armed Forces personnel living off base or on base with their families. Approximately 57,000 households are interviewed in the monthly survey. Thus, the CPS is approximately four times the size of the SIPP. The household respondent must be a knowledgeable household member 15 years old or older; the respondent provides information for each household member.

Each month's sample is divided into eight approximately equal **rotation groups**. A rotation group is interviewed for four consecutive months, then temporarily leaves the sample for eight months, and returns for four more consecutive months before retiring permanently from the CPS (a total of eight interviews). Only 25% of the households differ between consecutive months.

Comparison of Results from the SIPP and the CPS

In this section, estimates derived from SIPP are compared with estimates derived from the March 1988 supplement to the CPS. The focus is on the similarities and differences between the SIPP and CPS estimates. The substantive discussion of the SIPP estimates themselves is contained in the next section.

Tables 1 and 2 present demographic characteristics of children living in AFDC families, in poor non-AFDC families, in near-poor families, and in non-poor families, and for all children under 18. Estimates in Table 1 are derived from the SIPP and those in Table 2 are derived from the CPS. A comparison of the last column in both tables, labeled 'All Children', shows a remarkable similarity in estimates derived from the SIPP and the CPS. The distribution of children by race and ethnicity, the presence of parents in the household (with the exception of children living in father only families), the education of the most educated parent, the age of the youngest child, the age of the focus child, the number of children, and the age distribution of children in the household are virtually the same in both surveys.

SIPP and the CPS deviate somewhat for 'All Children' on family income, housing tenure, and receipt of Food Stamps. SIPP provides a slightly higher estimate than the CPS on Food Stamp receipt (18.7% of all children under 18 compared with 15.2%), and a slightly lower estimate of children living in public housing (4.7% compared with 5.9% in the CPS). SIPP also provides a lower estimate of children living in families earning less than $5,000 (5.4% compared with 7.6%) and of children in families earning $50,000 or more (14.4% versus 20.0%) and a higher estimate of children living in families earning $15,000 to $34,999 (42.2% versus 34.0%) compared to the CPS.

The SIPP variable on housing tenure was based on an item in the Wave 2 Topical Module on recipiency history. The income and Food Stamp variables were created using the quarterly responses on income and Food Stamp receipt in the four months prior to each interview. To create these two variables, respondents, rotation groups were examined in order to obtain actual 1986 data from January through December. For persons missing four or fewer

months of data out of the 12-month period, the average income for all months of valid data was assigned for the income variable for the missing months. This adjustment was made for 3% of the cases. The Food Stamp recipiency was only concerned with the dichotomy of receiving Food Stamps at least once during the 12 month period and never receiving Food Stamps. If a respondent with four or fewer months of missing data did not receive Food Stamps during any of the months for which data were available, s/he was assumed not have received Food Stamps during the missing months. The CPS variables, of course, are based on recall of the experience for the entire previous year. Given the shorter recall period for income and Food Stamp receipt in the SIPP, SIPP is expected to capture more spells of Food Stamp receipt and more income than the CPS. However, it is not clear why SIPP should provide a lower estimate than the CPS of children living in high income families -- that is, families earning $50,000 or more.

Tables 3 and 4 show the distribution of children by the characteristics of their mothers for the SIPP and the CPS, respectively. Tables 5 and 6 show the distribution of children by the characteristics of their fathers for the SIPP and the CPS, respectively. Again the estimates are, for the most part, remarkably similar. Many of the differences that are present are readily explainable. For example, as noted earlier, mother's age at first birth is explicitly asked in the SIPP, however, it could only be approximated with the March CPS by subtracting the age of the oldest child in the household from the mother's current age.

Because some of the older children of teenage mothers will have already left the household, the CPS approximation underestimates the number of women who began childbearing as teenagers. The SIPP estimates, not surprisingly, are consistently larger at the younger ages and smaller at the older ages at first birth. The distribution of children by mother's current age, her education level, and her marital status are also quite similar in the two surveys. SIPP shows more children living with mothers who are 55 and older and slightly more children living with mothers who have less than a high school education than does the CPS. However, the CPS estimates excluded mother-figures who were 65 or older from the tabulation. Thus, these differences are probably not reflections of real differences between the SIPP and the CPS.

With regard to the mother's employment status in the last year, SIPP shows more children living with unemployed mothers and fewer with mothers who are not in the labor force compared to the CPS. SIPP also shows more children living with disabled mothers than does the CPS (4.6% of all children compared with 1.3% in the CPS). The shorter recall period for SIPP respondents may be capturing more efforts to find jobs and more periods when illness interfered with work -- efforts and events that are forgotten when the recall period is a year as it is in the CPS.

As with the distribution of children by the characteristics of their mothers, the distribution of children by the characteristics of their fathers are quite similar with only a few differences apparent. SIPP shows slightly more children living with fathers who are 55 or older and with fathers who have less than a high school education than the CPS. As with the mothers, however, father-figures who were 65 or older were excluded from the CPS tabulations.

Clearly, SIPP estimates for all children are generally comparable to estimates derived from the CPS, even though the SIPP sample size is only one-quarter the size of the CPS. In addition, comparison of the estimates in the first four columns of Tables 1, 3, and 5 with the first four columns in Tables 2, 4, and 6. suggest that SIPP estimates remain similar to those from the CPS even for subgroups of the child population. The pattern of similarities and differences noted for all children is, for the most part, repeated within these subgroups.

The most marked difference between the SIPP and the CPS is in the distribution of children by their mothers, employment in the last year (see Tables 3 and 4). The SIPP data for children living in AFDC families show a much higher proportion of children living with mothers who were either employed in the previous year or looking for work compared to estimates derived from the CPS. According to data from SIPP, only 32.9% of children in AFDC families lived with mothers who were not in the labor force at all during the year. The CPS estimates that 60% of children in AFDC families had mothers who were not in the labor force at all in the previous year. SIPP also shows a smaller proportion of children in poor and near-poor families who were living only with their fathers or with neither parent and more children in these families living with both parents than does the CPS (see Tables 1 and 2). In addition, SIPP shows a higher proportion of children in AFDC families who have no siblings in their household than does the CPS (24.9% compared to 16.7%). Overall, however, the estimates from the two surveys are very close.

In the remainder of the paper, a statistical profile of children at risk of poor outcomes because of AFDC receipt, living in or near poverty, or being born to a woman who began childbearing as a teenager is described based on data from SIPP.

Children At-Risk

Children are commanding more and more attention among policy makers and researchers (Huston, 1991; National Commission on Children, 1991; Fuchs and Reklis, 1991; Bianchi, 1990; Zill and Rogers, 1988). Many fear that the next generation will be ill-equipped and ill-prepared to assume the responsibilities that will fall to them. The growing concentration of poverty among America's children is another major cause for concern. Nearly one child in every nine in the United States is in a family that receives AFDC. As of 1989, more than 7 million children under the age of 18 were receiving AFDC at any given time and the number has continued to grow.

Children in AFDC Families and in Poor, Non-AFDC Families

Children living in AFDC families are disproportionately African American or Hispanic (see Table 1). Whereas approximately one of every seven children in the U.S. is African American and one out of every ten is Hispanic, more than one of every three children living in families receiving AFDC is African American and one of every five is Hispanic. These children are also overrepresented in poor, non-AFDC families and underrepresented in non-poor families. While nearly 80% of all white children live in non-poor families, only 38% of African American

children and 41% of Hispanic children are so fortunate (data not shown in tables).

As is well-known, children living in AFDC families are much less likely than other children to live with both parents and are much more likely to live with only their mother. More than three out of four children living in AFDC families. and one out of three children in poor, non-AFDC families live with only their mother compared to only one out of ten children in non-poor families.

Children in AFDC families and in poor, non-AFDC families are also much more likely to live with a parent who has less than a high school education. The most educated parent in the household of nearly one out of two children in AFDC families and two out of five children in poor, non-AFDC families has less than a high school education. Only about one out of sixteen children in non-poor families live in families in which the most educated parent has less than a high school education. Without a good education, steady work is difficult to find. Only 6.8% of children in AFDC families had mothers who worked full-year compared with 14% of children in poor, non-AFDC families, 32% of children in near-poor families, and nearly 53% of children in non-poor families. Aside from their generally lower educations, AFDC mothers are also more likely to be unable to work because of illness or disability. Approximately 15.5% of children living in AFDC families had a mother who said she did not work because of illness or disability compared with 7.9% of children in poor, non-AFDC families, 4.7% in near-poor families, and 2.3% in non-poor families.

Children in AFDC families and in poor and near-poor families are also more likely to have several siblings. Nearly half of the children in AFDC families and more than half of the children in poor, non-AFDC families and in near-poor families have two or more siblings compared to less than one-third of children in non-poor families.

Coming from a single parent family,.having poorly educated parents, and having a large number of siblings are all associated with poorer outcomes for children (McLanahan, Astone, and Marks, 1991; Zill et al., 1991). Children in such families are more likely to have poorer health, to exhibit learning and behavior problems, and to fail in school. In part, the poorer outcomes are due to the home environments that the children's parents provide (Zill et al., 1991; Menaghan and Parcel, 1991). Single parents, particularly those with a low education, often do not have the resources, either monetary or psychological, to provide stimulating environments for their children. The presence of several children only adds to the difficulty.

Children in AFDC families are also particularly likely to be living with a mother who has never married (see Table 3). Approximately 38% of children in AFDC families live with a never married mother compared to not quite 12% in poor, non-AFDC families, 6% in near-poor families and 1% in non-poor families. When children do not live with their fathers, there is a tendency for the absent father to disappear from the children's lives (Furstenberg et al., 1983). Even when absent fathers maintain regular contact, truly cooperative parenting is rare. Moreover, a large proportion of absent fathers either do not provide any child support for their children or provide it only irregularly (Peterson and Nord, 1990). Fathers who have never married their children's

mothers are particularly likely to lose contact and not to pay child support (Furstenberg et al., 1983; Peterson and Nord, 1990).

Children in AFDC families and children in poor and near-poor families are also much more likely to have a mother who began childbearing as a teenager than are children in non-poor families: 58% of children in AFDC families, 46% of children in poor, non-AFDC families, and 45% of children in near-poor families have mothers who began childbearing as teenagers compared to 23% of children in non-poor families.

Children of Teenage Mothers

A number of studies have shown that children of teenage mothers are at-risk of a number of problems including low birthweight, school failure, and behavior problems when they, .themselves, become teenagers. Factors such as low maternal education, single parent families, poverty, welfare receipt, and family size all contribute to the association between early childbearing and the negative outcomes for the children of teenage mothers.

Most children whose mothers began childbearing as teenagers are white, although African American and Hispanic children are more likely than white children to have a mother who began childbearing as a teenager. Approximately 61% of children born to women who began childbearing as teenagers are white, 22% are African American, and 14% are Hispanic (see Table 7). However, Only 27% of white children have a mother who began childbearing as a teenager compared to 54% of African American children and 42% of Hispanic children (data not shown in tables).

Children born to teenage childbearers are more likely to live with only their mother than are children born to older childbearers (33% compared to 17.8%) and they are more than twice as likely to be living in poverty (32% compared to 14%). However, over half of the children born to women who began childbearing as teenagers are living in families that earn more than 150% of the poverty threshold.

More than one out of four children born to a teenage mother live in a household in which the most educated parent has less than a high school education compared with fewer than one out of ten children born to women who began childbearing at older ages. Children born to teenage childbearers are also more likely to live in public housing or in rented living quarters than are children born to older childbearers (52.9% compared with 31.6%) and they are more likely to receive Food Stamps (31.1% compared with 13.3%). In addition, they are more likely to have three or more siblings (21.3% compared with 14.3%).

The characteristics of the mothers is also quite different for children born to teenage childbearers compared to children born to older mothers (see Table 8). Children born to women who began childbearing as teenagers have younger mothers than children born to older childbearers. Whereas 53.7% of children born to older childbearers are living with a mother who

is 35 or older, only 27.5% of children born to women who began childbearing as teenagers have mothers who are 35 or older. Children born to teenage childbearers are also much less likely to have a mother who has completed college. Only 1.9% of children born to women who began childbearing as teenagers live with a mother who is a college graduate compared to 20.5% of children living with mothers who began childbearing at older ages. They are also less likely to live with a mother who is currently married than are children born to older mothers (66.5% compared with 82.2%) and are more likely to be living with a never married mother, (13.4% compared with 4.2%). Recall, however, that it is children living in AFDC families who are most likely to be living with a never married mother -- 38.1% of such children lived with a never married mother.

Children born to women who began childbearing as teenagers are no more likely, however, than children born to older mothers to have a mother-who is not in the labor force -- 22.1% of children are living with a mother who is not in the labor force, regardless of the age at which she began childbearing. However, children born to a teenage childbearer are less likely to have a mother who worked the entire year than are children born to older mothers (35.3% compared with 45.3%). They are also somewhat more likely to live with a mother who reports being unable to work because of illness or disability (4.9% compared with 3.5%).

Although children born to women who began childbearing as teenagers are clearly less well off in a variety of respects than children born to older mothers, many of them fare better than children who are living in AFDC families or in poor, non-AFDC families (compare Tables 1 and 7 and Tables 3 and 8). They are more likely to live in a home that is owned than are children in AFDC families or than children in poor, non-AFDC families and they are less likely to receive Food Stamps. As noted earlier, over half of them live in families that earn more than 150% of the poverty threshold. Nearly one-quarter of them live in families in which the most educated parent has at least some college education. Moreover, their mothers are more likely to be married than are children in AFDC families or even than children living in poor, non-AFDC families.

Summary and Conclusion

The first part of this paper compared estimates derived from SIPP with estimates derived from the CPS. With only a few exceptions, the estimates from SIPP were remarkably similar to those from the CPS in spite of the fact that the SIPP sample size is only about one-quarter that of the CPS. These results should help to allay the fears of those who believe that the smaller sample size of SIPP might yield untrustworthy estimates.

For some types of questions -- specifically those related to employment, income, and Food Stamp receipt, data from SIPP may be better than what is available in the CPS because of the shorter recall period within SIPP for these questions.

The second half of this paper developed a profile of children who are at risk of poor outcomes because of living in AFDC families, living in or near poverty, or being born to a woman who began childbearing as a teenager. Many differences were noted among the children living in these different circumstances compared to children who were not living in poverty or who had

been born to older mothers. It is children who are living in AFDC families and who are in poverty who are most likely to live in circumstances that do not bode well for their future.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Children Living in AFDC Families, Poor Non-AFDC Families, Near-Poor Families, and Non-Poor Families, Children Under 18, United States, 1986. SIPP Weighted Data.

Children in:

	AFDC Families	Poor Non-AFDC Families	Near-Poor[1] Families	Non-Poor Children	All Children
Race/Ethnicity					
White (non-Hispanic)	39.5%	46.5%	64.3%	82.8%	72.2%
Black (non-Hispanic)	38.2%	30.8%	11.9%	8.l%	14.2%
Hispanic	19.2%	16.9%	21.5%	6.3%	10.4%
Other	3.2%	5.8%	2.2%	2.8%	3.l%
Presence of parents in household[2]					
Both	15.0%	57.6%.	75.3%	85.3%	73.7%
Mother only	76.7%	34.l%	21.2%	10.0%	20.9%
Father only	2.2%	1.6%	1.0%	2.l%	2.0%
Neither	6.0%	6.6%	2.5%	2.5%	3.4%
Education of More Educated Parent					
Less than high school	13.2%	14.0%	9.9%	1.9%	5.3%
Some high school	33.0%	25.1%	16.7%	4.2%	10.9%
High school graduate	40.4%	43.6%	47.3%	34.7%	37.6%
Some college	11.6%	13.8%	16.9%	26.5%	22.5%
College graduate	1.6%	3.4%	9.2%	32.7%	23.7%
Family Income[3]					
<$ 5,000	28.8%	20.7%	.0%	.0%	5.4%
$ 5,000 - 9,999	41.7%	46.6%	8.6%	.0%	10.6%
$10,000 - 14,999	10.3%	24.3%	36.6%	2.2%	9.0%
$15,000 - 24,999	10.6%	8.3%	49.2%	21.2%	21.4%
$25,000 - 34,999	4.1%	.0%	5.7%	29.2%	20.8%
$35,000 - 49,999	3.1%	.0%	.0%	26.5%	18.3%
$50,000+	1.3%	.0%	.0%	20.9%	14.4%
Housing Tenure					
Owned	19.4%	37.3%	47.2%	74.8%	61.8%
Rented	58.8%	53.5%	48.4%	24.0%	33.5%
Public Housing	21.9%	9.2%	4.4%	1.3%	4.7%
Receipt of Food Stamps	90.0%	54.9%	18.0%	1.5%	18.7%

(continued)

1. "Near-Poor" is defined as from 100% to 150% of the poverty level.

2. Presence of parents was determined as of Wave 2, month 4. Month 4 of Wave 2 corresponds to May, June, July, or August of 1986, depending on the rotation group.

3. AFDC status is based upon receipt at any time during the year. Some families' economic situations may change dramatically during the year because of marriage, employment, or other reasons.

Children in:

AFDC Families	Poor Non-AFDC Families	Near-Poor[1] Families	Non-Poor Children	All Children

Age of youngest child					
Under 1	17.4%	14.0%	15.5%	9.8%	11.7%
1-2	22.2%	22.3%	22.0%	17.3%	18.8%
3-5	27.2%	23.5%	21.0%	19.2%	21.3%
6+	33.2%	40.2%	41.6%	53.7%	48.7%
Age of focus child					
2 or younger	23.2%	17.3%	18.3%	16.6%	17.6%
3-5	19.6%	20.l%	20.2%	15.7%	17.l%
6-8	20.2%	17.9%	18.7%	15.l%	16.4%
9-11	14.9%	18.2%	14.3%	15.8%	15.9%
12-14	11.1%	15.0%	16.0%	16.6%	15.8%
15-17	10.9%	11.41	12.41	20.2%	17.4%
Number of siblings					
None	24.9%	22.7%	17.7%	27.l%	25.4%
1	26.5%	26.5%	30.5%	41.2%	36.9%
2	25.5%	23.8%	29.5%	20.4%	22.3%
3	13.8%	13.7%	15.2%	7.9%	9.9%
4 or more	9.3%	13.3%	711%	3.4%	5.5%
Ages of children[4]					
All under 5	21.3%	13.4%	16.3%	17.0%	17.0%
Under 5, 5-11	25.6%	25.l%	25.2%	16.4%	19.2%
Under 5, 12-17	10.6%	13.0%	8.9%	5.4%	7.2%
All 5-11	14.8%	16.7%	14.6%	16.9%	16.4%
5-11, 12-17	18.9%	19.3%	21.2%	20.2%	20.l%
All 12-17	8.7%	12.4%	13.9%	24.11	20.l%

4. To match the CPS tabulation in which the combination of ages <5 and 12-17 was inadvertently assigned to missing, (see table 2), this combination of ages has been assigned to missing in this table as well. Approximately 2.3% of children live in families in which some children are under 5 and some are 12-17.

Source: Child Trends, Inc., analysis of data from the 1986 Panel of the Survey of Income and Program Participation, U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Table 2. Demographic Characteristics of Children Living in AFDC Families, Poor Non-AFDC Families, Near-Poor Families, and Non-Poor Families, Children Under 18, United States, March 1988. CPS Weighted Data.

Children in:

Poor

	AFDC Families	Non-AFDC Families	Near-Poor[1] Families	Non-Poor Families	All Children
Race/Ethnicity					
White (non-Hispanic)	35.3%	47.5%	62.9%	80.9%	70.3%
Black (non-Hispanic)	41.3%	25.9%	17.3%	8.8%	15.%
Hispanic	18.3%	22.3%	16.6%	16.8%	10.8%
Other	5.0%	4.3%	3.3%	3.6%	3.8%
Presence of parents in household at time of survey[2]					
Both	20.5%	49.l%	70.l%	85.3%	72.4%
Mother only	72.5%	36.0%	23.4%	10.0%	21.3%
Father only	1.9%	3.7%	2.9%	2.9%	2.9%
Neither	5.l%	1.11%	3.6%	1.9%	3.5%
Education of More Educated Parent					
Less than high school	17.8%	16.0%	8.7%	1.7%	5.7%
Some high school	31.6%	21.7%	14.l%	4.0%	9.9%
High school graduate	38.8%	40.7%	49.5%	35.2%	37.5%
Some college	10.1%	14.8%	18.2%	24.6%	21.3%
College graduate	1.7%	6.9%	9.6%	34.6%	25.7%
Family Income[3]					
<$ 5,000	32.6%	34.0%	.0%	.0%	7.6%
$ 5,000 - 9,999	40.4%	37.0%	5..0%	.0%	9.3%
$10,000 - 14,999	12.2%	25.5%	37.7%	1.4%	8.7%
$15,000 - 24,999	8.9%	3.5%	51.8%	15.9%	17.0%
$25,000 - 34,999	2.8%	.0%	5.5%	23.8%	17.0%
$35,000 - 49,999	2.0%	.0%	.0%	29.6%	20.4%
$50,000+	1.1%	.0%	.0%	29.3%	20.0%
Housing Tenure					
Owned	19.2%	38.l%	47.3%	77.4%	63.5%
Rented	52.l%	50.0%	46.9%	21.5%	30.6%
Public Housing	28.7%	11.9%	5.8%	1.l%	5.9%
Receipt of Food Stamps	86.l%	33.5%	10.8%	0.9%	15.2%

(continued)

1. "Near poor" is defined as from 100% to 150% of the poverty level.

2. Excludes head (or wife) if under 18.

3. AFDC status is based upon receipt at any point in the last year. Some families' economic situations may change dramatically during the year because of marriage, employment, or other reasons.

			Children in:		
	AFDC Families	Poor Non-AFDC Families	Near-Poor[1] Families	Non-Poor Families	All Children
Age of youngest child					
Under 1	17.4%	14.7%	13.4%	10.0%	11.7%

1-2	23.2%	18.7%	21.3%	17.6%	18.7%
3-5	24.3%	22.8%	%l.6%	20.5%	21.3%
6+	35.2%	43.9%	43.8%	51.9%	48.3%
Age of focus child					
2 or younger	20.7%	18.4%	18.0%	16.6%	17.4%
3-5	20.6%	17.0%	17.6%	16.6%	17.2%
6-8	19.4%	17.3%	17.6%	16.4%	17.0%
9-11	14.6%	15.6%	16.8%	16.3%	16.1%
12-14	13.0%	16.4%	15.1%	15.6%	15.4%
15-17	11.7%	15.2%	15.0%	18.4%	17.0%
Number of siblings					
None	16.7%	21.7%	17.7%	27.0%	24.3%
1	29.0%	28.7%	34.6%	43.6%	39.4%
2	28.0%	23.4%	26.4%	20.8%	22.4%
3	14.1%	15.2%	12.2%	6.2%	8.7%
4 or more	12.3%	11.1%	9.1%	2.5%	5.2%
Ages of children[4]					
All under 5	17.6%	17.1%	15.6%	16.9%	16.9%
Under 5, 5-11	27.8%	20.5%	23.0%	18.7%	20.3%
Under 5, 5-11, 12-17	10.7%	10.8%	10.7%	4.6%	6.6%
All 5-11	14.5%	13.1%	14.0%	18.1%	16.8%
5-11, 12-17	18.9%	22.6%	22.4%	19.5%	20.0%
All 12-17	10.6%	16.0%	14.4%	22.2%	19.4%

4. Inadvertently, the combination under 5, 12-17 was omitted from the tabulation

Source: Child Trends, Inc., analysis of data from the 1986 Panel of the Survey of Income and Program Participation, U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Table 3. Distribution of Children by Characteristics of Their Mothers, Children Living in AFDC Families, Poor Non-AFDC Families, Near-Poor Families, and Non-Poor Families, Children Under 18, United States, 1986, SIPP Weighted Data[1]

	Children in:			
AFDC	Poor Non-AFDC	Near-Poor[2]	Non-Poor	All

	Families	Families	Families	Families	Children
Mother's Age at First Birth					
Under 15	9.l%	5.6%	2.9%	1.5%	2.9%
16-17	23.0%	15.4%	14.2%	6.9%	10.3%
18-19	26.2%	25.4%	28.3%	14.9%	18.7%
20-24	33.7%	43.6%	38.8%	45.9%	43.6%
25-29	6.7%	7.5%	12.5%	24.5%	19.6%
30+	1.3%	2.4%	3.2%	6.2%	5.0%
Mother's Current Age					
Under 20	3.4%	1.5%	1.7%	.5%	1.0%
20-24	19.2%	10.4%	10.5%	5.1%	7.8%
25-34	48.7%	49.6%	50.l%	41.5%	44.l%
35-44	21.8%	26.8%	29.3%	42.8%	.37.4%
45-54	3.9%	8.0%	7.2%	8.7%	8.0%
55+	3.0%	3.6%	1.2%	1.3%	1.7%
Mother's Education Level					
Eighth grade or less	14.3%	18.4%	13.8%	3.3%	7.3%
Some high school	39.1%	29.9%	22.2%	8.4%	15.6%
High school graduate	36.4%	40.5%	47.4%	45.4%	44.1%
Some college	9.0%	8.6%	12.0%	22.8%	18.6%
Four or more yrs college	1.2%	2.5%	4.6%	20.0%	14.5%
Mother's Marital Status					
Married	16.3%	61.3%	78.4%	89.1%	77.0%
Separated	20.5%	12.3%	2.2%	2.3%	5.4%
Divorced	23.4%	11..8%	10.7%	6.4%	9.3%
Widowed	1.7%	3.1%	2.6%	.9%	1.4%
Never Married	38.1%	11..5%	6.1%	1.4%	7.0%
Mother's Current Employment Status					
Employed	21.3%	34.2%	50.2	67.9%	57.3%
Unemployed	14.6%	11.1%	6.6%	2.1%	4.9%
Not in labor force	64.1%	54.7%	43.1%	29.8%	37.7%
Mother's Employment Last Year					
Full year	6.8%	14.2%	32.2%	52.9%	41.9%
Part year	36.7%	37.8%	33.9%	26.2%	29.3%
No work, looked for work	23.7%	12.3%	7.0%	2.3%	6.l%
Not in labor force	32.9%	35.6%	26.9%	18.5%	22.7%
Mother Disabled[4]	15.5%	7.9%	4.7%	2.3%	4.6%

1. Children with no mother in the household are excluded from this table. These children constitute 8.2% of AFDC children and 5.4% of all children under 18.

2 "Near-Poor" is defined as from 100% to 150% of the poverty level.

3. Disability is determined by the respondent saying that the main reason she did not work was because she was ill or disabled.

Source: Child Trends, Inc., analysis of data from the 1986 Panel of the Survey of Income and Program Participation.

Table 4. Distribution of Children by Characteristics of Their Mothers, Children Living in AFDC Families, Poor Non-AFDC Families, Near-Poor Families, and Non-Poor Families, Children Under 18, United States, March 1988. CPS Weighted Data.[1]

	Children in:				
	AFDC Families	Poor Non-AFDC Families	Near-Poor[2] Families	Non-Poor Families	All Children

Mother's Age at First Birth (Approximated)[3]					
Under 15	6.6%	4.2%	2.4%	1.4%	2.4%
16-17	17.8%	12.3%	8.9%	3.5%	6.5%
18-19	23.4%	18.1%	16.8%	9.2%	12.4%
20-24	34.1%	37.7%	43.9%	38.3%	38.3%
25-29	10.9%	18.9%	18.5%	31.4%	26.6%
30+	7.1%	8.8%	9.6%	16.3%	13.9%
Mother's Current Age[4]					
Under 20	3.7%	2.6%	1.6%	.5%	1.2%
20-24	17.1%	12.7%	9.3%	4.8%	7.4%
25-34	51.7%	46.0%	49.9%	42.9%	44.9%
35-44	22.9%	31.5%	32.3%	43.2%	38.7%
45-54	4.1%	6.5%	5.9%	8.0%	7.2%
55+	.6%	.8%	1.2%	.6%	.7%
Mother's Education Level					
Eighth grade or less	19.7%	19.9%	12.0%	2.9%	7.4%
Some high school	32.4%	23.9%	20.0%	6.6%	12.6%
High school graduate	38.2%	39.8%	48.5%	46.2%	44.9%
Some college	8.3%	12.5%	14.3%	22.9%	19.4%
Four or more yrs college	1.5%	3.9%	5.2%	21.3%	15.8%
Mother's Marital Status					
Married	22.1%	57.7%	74.9%	89.5%	77.3%
Separated	19.1%	15.2%	5.5%	2.1%	5.7%
Divorced	18.9%	12.4%	12.0%	5.6%	8.4%
Widowed	1.5%	3.6%	2.8%	.9%	1.4%
Never Married	38.5%	11.1%	4.8%	1.9%	7.2%
Mother's Current Employment Status					
Employed	18.2%	38.7%	50.7%	67.1%	57.1%
Unemployed	11.4%	8.3%	4.0%	2.4%	4.1%
Not in labor force	70.6%	53.0%	45.3%	30.6%	38.7%
Mother's Employment Last Year					
Full year	5.3%	19.3%	31.5%	49.5%	39.8%
Part year	25.7%	28.7%	31.2%	26.4%	27.0%
No work looked for work	9.0%	4.3%	1.5%	.8%	2.1%
Not in labor force	60.0%	47.8%	36.0%	23.4%	31.2%
Mother Disabled[5]	4.9%	2.7%	1.6%	.4%	1.3%

1. Children with no mother in the household are excluded from this table. These children constitute 7% of AFDC children and 6.3% of all children under 18.
2. "Near-Poor" is defined as from 100% to 150% of the poverty level.
3. Mother's age at first birth was estimated by subtracting the age of her oldest child in the household from her age.
4. Persons 65 and older were excluded.
5. Disability is not determined by, the respondent saying that the main reason she did-not work in the last year was because she was ill or disabled.

Source: Child Trends, Inc., analysis of data from the March 1988 Supplement to the Current Population Survey, U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Table 5. Distribution of Children by Characteristics of Their Fathers, Children Living AFDC Families, Poor Non-AFDC Families, Near-Poor Families, Non-Poor Families, Children Under 18, United States, 1986 SIPP Weighted Data.

	Children in:			
AFDC Families	Poor Non-AFDC Families	Near-Poor[2] Families	Non-Poor Families	All Children

Father's Age					
Under 20	.l%	.0%	.4%	.l%	.l%
20-24	2.5%	3.2%	4.8%	2.4%	2.7%
25-34	5.0%	25.l%	33.3%	28.8%	26.3%
35-44	7.9%	21.4%	418.l%	42.0%	34.6%
45-54	1.4%	6.9%	8.6%	12.3%	10.2%
55+	1.4%	4.8%	2.8%	3.l%	3.l%
No father in household	81.7%	38.7%	22.0%	11.2%	23.0%
Father's Education Level					
Eighth grade or less	3.4%	16.0%	12.3%	3.8%	6.0%
Some High School	4.3%	15.3%	18.5%	7.4%	9.1%
High School Graduate 6.4%	20.4%	29.4%	31.5%	27.3%	
Some College	3.7%	7.7%	11.0%	20.6%	16.3%
Four or more yrs college	.4%	1.6%	6.7%	25.5%	18.2%
No father in household	81.7%	38.7%	22.0%	11.2%	23.0%
Father's Current Employment Status					
Employed	8.8%	40.2%	63.4%	85.0%	69.6%
Unemployed	3.2%	10.0%	7.4%	1.4%	3.2%
Not in labor force	6.2%	11.0%	7.2%	2.5%	4.3%
No father in household, or father under 15	81.7%	38.7%	22.0%	11.2%	23.0%
Father's Employment Last Year					
Full year	4.0%	22.8%	44.1%	77.2%	60.0%
Part year	7.4%	26.7%	28.7%	10.0%	13.4%
No work, looked for work	2.2%	5.1%	2.1%	.3%	1.2%
Not in labor force	3.5%	4.6%	2.5%	1.1%	1.9%
No father in household	82.9%	40.9%	22.6%	11.4%	23.5%

Source: Child Trends, Inc., analysis of data from the Panel of the Survey of Income and Program Participation.

Table 6. Distribution of Children by Characteristics of Their Fathers, Children Living in AFDC Families, Poor Non-AFDC Families, Near-Poor Families, and Non-Poor Families, Children Under 18, United States. March 1988. CPS Weighted Data.

	Children in:				
	AFDC Families	Poor Non-AFDC Families	Near-Poor Families	Non-Poor Families	All Children
Father's Age					
Under 20	.3%	.4%	.2%	1%	.2%

20-24	1.7%	3.4%	5.2%	1.8%	2.3%
25-34	.9.9%	21.4%	30.1%	29.9%	26.7%
35-44	7.3%	18.4%	27.0%	41.6%	33.7%
45-54	2.6%	5.9%	7.7%	12.6%	10.3%
55+	.7%	3.1%	2.5%	2.0%	2.0%
No father in household	77.6%	47.4%	27.4%	12.0%	24.9%
Father's Education Level[1]					
Eighth grade or less	7.2%	14.0%	11.4%	3.4%	5.8%
Some High School	5.1%	11.7%	11.7%	6.3%	7.3%
High School Graduate 7.2%	17.4%	32.3%	32.8%	28.1%	
Some College	2.6%	5.5%	11.3%	18.4%	14.5%
Four or more yrs college	.3%	4.2%	6.2%	27.2%	19.6%
No father in household	77.6%	47.1%	27.0%	11.9%	24.8%
Father's Current Employment Status					
Employed	8.9%	36.6%	59.0%	82.3%	66.6%
Unemployed	4.6%	6.5%	4.6%	2.1%	3.2%
Not in labor force	8.7%	8.2%	4.8%	1.9%	3.8%
No father in household, or father under 15	77.8%	48.8%	31.7%	13.6%	26.6%
Father's Employment Last Year					
Full year	5.1%	23.7%	46.4%	75.7%	59.0%
Part year	6.8%	19.7%	17.8%	9.4%	11.0%
No work, looked for work	2.4%	.9%	.4%	.1%	.5%
Not in labor force	7.9%	6.8%	4.1%	3:.3%	2.9%
No father in household	77.8%	48.8%	31.7%	13.6%	26.6%

1. Persons 65 and older are excluded.

Source: Child Trends, Inc., analysis of data from the March 1988 Supplement to the Current Population Survey, U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Tables 7. Demographic characteristics of children living with mothers who began childbearing as teenagers, children with mothers who began childbearing age 20 or older, and all children under age 18 ; United States 1986. SIPP Weighted Data.

	Children, living with mothers who began childbearing as teenagers	Children living with mothers who were 20 or older at first birth	All Children
Race/Ethnicity			
White (non-Hispanic)	61.0%	78.5%	72.2%
Black (non-Hispanic)	22.3%	9.1%	14.2%

Hispanic	14.0%	9.0%	10.4%
Other	2.7%	3.4%	.1%
Presence of Parents in Household			
2 Bio/adoptive	56.5%	77.0%	65.2%
Mother-Stepfather	10.3%	5.4%	6.4%
Father-Stepmother	.0%	.0%	2.1%
Mother only	33.1%	17.8%	20.9%
Father Only	.0%	.0%	2.0%
Neither	.0%	.0%	3.4%
Education of Most Educated Parent			
Less than high school	6.8%	3.8%	5.3%
Some high school	21.5%	5.3%	10.9%
High school graduate	47.8%	33.0%	37.6%
Some College	18.0%	25.1%	22.5%
College graduate	5.9%	32.8%	23.7%
Family Income			
< $5,000	9.4%	3.5%	5.4%
$5,000-9,999	17.5%	6.9%	10.6%
$10,000-14,999	12.1%	7.6%	9.0%
$15,000-24,999	24.9%	20.2%	21.4%
$25,000-34,999	18.8%	22.2%	20.8%
$35,000-49,999	10.9%	21.4%	18.3%
$50,000 +	6.4%	18.3%	14.4%
Poverty Status			
Below Poverty Level	32.0%	13.6%	19.8%
100-149% of Poverty Level	16.9%	9.0%	11.1%
Above 150% of Poverty	51.0%	77.4%	69.1%

(continued)

	Children, living with mothers who began childbearing as teenagers	Children living with mothers who were 20 or older at first birth	All Children
Housing Tenure			
Owned	47.1%	68.4%	61.8%
Rented	44.0%	28.8%	33.5%
Public Housing	8.9%	2.8%	4.7%
Receipt of Food Stamps	31.1%	13.3%	18.7%

Age of Youngest Child			
< 1 year	12.2%	12.5%	11.7%
1-2	18.8%	19.8%	18.8%
3-5	23.0%	20.1%	20.7%
6-11	28.2%	29.5%	29.1%
12-14	11.6%	10.6%	11.5%
15-17	6.1%	7.5%	8.1%
Age of Child			
2 or younger	15.6%	19.6%	17.6%
3-5	18.3%	17.4%	17.1%
6-8	16.3%	16.5%	16.4%
9-11	16.4%	15.7%	15.9%
12-14	17.5%	14.6%	15.8%
15-17	16.0%	16.1%	17.4%
Number of Siblings			
None	18.8%	21.5%	25.4%
1	32.3%	41.9%	36.9%
2	27.6%	22.2%	22.3%
3	13.9%	8.9%	9.9%
4 or more	7.4%	5.4%	5.5%
Ages of Children			
all under 5	13.1%	19.1%	16.6%
under 5, 5-11	21.1%	19.4%	18.8%
under 5, 12-17	4.5%	1.3%	2.3%
under 5, 5-11, 12-17	9.0%	6..2%	7.1%
all 5-11	13.5%	16.5%	16.0%
5-11, 12-17	21.0%	19.4%	19.6%
all 12-17	17.8%	18.1%	19.6%

Source: Child Trends, Inc., analysis of data from the 1986 Panel of the Survey of Income and Program Participation, U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Table 8. Distribution of children by characteristics of their mothers, children[1] with mothers who began childbearing as teenagers, children living with mothers who began childbearing at age 20 or older, and all children under 18, United States, 1986. SIPP Weighted Data.

	Children living with mothers who began childbearing as teenagers	Children living with mothers who were 20 or old at first birth	All Children
Mothers age at first birth			
15 or younger	9.1%	.0%	2.9%
16-17	32.3%	.0%	10.3%

18-19	58.6%	.0%	18.7%
20-24	.0%	64.0%	43.6%
25-29	.0%	28.7%	19.6%
30+	.0%	7.3%	5.0%
Mother's Current Age			
under 20	3.2%	.0%	1.0%
20-24	15.8%	4.4%	7.8%
25-34	53.6%	41.8%	44.1%
35-44	23.1%	44.4%	37.4%
45-54	4.2%	8.7%	8.0%
55+	.2%	.6%	1.7%
Mother's Education			
Less than high school	10.1%	5.0%	7.3%
Some high school	29.7%	8.6%	15.6%
High school graduate	47.7%	43.2%	44.1%
Some College	10.6%	22.7%	18.6%
College graduate	1.9%	20.5%	14.5%
Mother's Marital Status			
Married	66.5%	82.2%	77.0%
Separated	7.2%	4.7%	5.4%
Divorced	11.6%	8.0%	9.3%
Widowed	1.3%	.9%	1.4%
Never Married	13.4%	4.2%	7.0%
Mother's Current Employment Status			
Employed	52.1%	60.3%	57.3%
Unemployed	7.7%	3.9%	4.9%
Not in labor force	40.1%	35.8 %	37.7%
Not in Labor Force Because Unable to Work	4.9%	3.5%	4.6%
Mother's Employment Status in Last Year			
worked all last year	35.3%	45.3%	41.9%
worked part of year	33.0%	28.0%	29.3%
unemployed	9.6%	4.5%	6.1%
not in labor force	22.1%	22.1%	22.1%

Source: Child Trends, Inc., analysis of data from the 1986 Panel of the Survey of Income and Program Participation, U.S. Bureau of the Census.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bianchi, Suzanne M. 1990. "America's Children: Mixed Prospects" Population Bulletin 45(l): June. Washington, D.C.: Population Reference Bureau.

Fuchs, Victor R. and Diane Reklis. 1991. "America's Children: Economic Perspectives and Policy Options." Paper prepared for Science.

Furstenberg, Frank F., Christine Winquist Nord, James L. Peterson, and Nicholas Zill. 1983. "The Life Course of Children of Divorce: Marital Disruption and Parental Contact." American Sociological Review 48(5): 656-668.

Huston, Aletha C., Editor. 1991. Children in Poverty: Child Development and Public Policy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McLanahan, Sara S., Nan Marie Astone, and Nadine F. Marks. 1991. "The Role of Mother-Only Families in Reproducing Poverty." In Huston, Aletha C., Editor. 1991. Children in Poverty: Child Development-and Public Policy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 51-78.

Menaghan, Elizabeth G. and Toby L. Parcel. 1991. "Determining Children's Home Environments: The Impact of Maternal Characteristics and Current Occupational and Family Conditions." Journal of Marriage and the Family 53(2): 417-431.

National Commission on Children. 1991. Beyond Rhetoric: A New American Agenda for Children and Families. Final report of the National Commission on Children. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Nord, Christine Winquist and Amy Rhoads. 1991. "The Survey of Income and Program Participation as a Source of Data on Children and Families: A Comparison of Estimates Derived from SIPP with Estimates from Other Sources." Unpublished manuscript prepared for the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Peterson, James L. and Christine Winquist Nord. 1990. "The Regular Receipt of Child Support: A Multistep Process." Journal of Marriage and the Family 52(2): 539-551.

Zill, Nicholas, Kristin A. Moore, Ellen Wolpow Smith, Thomas Stief, and Mary Jo Coiro. 1991 "The Life Circumstances and Development of Children in Welfare Families: A Profile Based on National Data." Washington, D.C.: Child Trends, Inc.

Zill, Nicholas and Carolyn C. Rogers. 1988. "Recent Trends in the Well-Being of Children in the United States and Their Implications for Public Policy." in Andrew J. Cherlin, Editor. The Changing American Family and Public Policy. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press.