

**THE SURVEY OF INCOME AND  
PROGRAM PARTICIPATION**

**TANF Participation and Employment  
in SIPP (2004-2007)**

No. 248

Shelley Irving  
U.S. Census Bureau

August 2010

U.S. Department of Commerce U.S. CENSUS BUREAU

**TANF PARTICIPATION AND EMPLOYMENT IN SIPP (2004-2007)**

**SEHSD Working Paper #2010-09**

**Shelley Irving\***  
**U.S. Census Bureau**  
**SEHSD**

For presentation at the 2010 Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association,  
August 14-17, 2010, Atlanta, Georgia.

\*This paper is released to inform interested parties of research and to encourage discussion. The views expressed or technical issues are those of the author and not necessarily those of the U.S. Census Bureau.

## **TANF PARTICIPATION AND EMPLOYMENT IN SIPP (2004-2007)**

### **Abstract**

This paper examines trends in TANF receipt and employment among women ages 18 to 64 annually from 2004 to 2007 using the 2004 Panel of the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP). Results from this paper show that there was no significant change in the number of recipient women ages 18 to 64, the TANF participation rate for this group, or the characteristics of TANF-recipient women between 2004 and 2007. TANF women were less likely to work full-time and more likely to be unemployed or not in the labor force than non-TANF women and never married, non-TANF women, and their reasons for not working differ from those of non-recipient women. Employed TANF-recipient women are similar to their counterparts with no labor force attachment, except in terms of income to poverty ratios. Finally, former recipients are more likely to be employed and less likely to be in poverty than current recipients.

## **TANF PARTICIPATION AND EMPLOYMENT IN SIPP (2004-2007)**

The federal Welfare Reform Act of 1996 (the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation ACT, or PRWORA) replaced Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) with Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF). The new program abolished the entitlement status of welfare, imposed stronger work-related requirements, introduced lifetime limits on welfare receipt, and tied federal funding levels to states' success in moving welfare recipients to work. This dramatic overhaul of the welfare system in 1996 was followed by unprecedented caseload declines and increased work participation among TANF recipients.<sup>1</sup>

When PRWORA was passed, there were fears that the most disadvantaged welfare recipients would remain on TANF – as the least disadvantaged left welfare for work – making it more difficult for states to transition their remaining welfare recipients into the labor force and meet federally mandated work participation rates. While there is little evidence to suggest that the remaining welfare recipients were any more disadvantaged than in years past, the rate of caseload decline slowed and work participation rates among TANF recipients fell post-2000.<sup>2</sup> Despite these trends, Congress passed the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (DRA, or more commonly referred to as TANF Reauthorization), which requires states to place even greater numbers of TANF recipients in the labor force – largely through changes in the structure of federal TANF work requirements. Under the 1996 law, states were required to have a certain percentage of families engaged in work activities (as defined by federal rules) or face financial

---

<sup>1</sup> See U.S. Department of Health and Human Service, (2009), *Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Program (TANF), Eighth Annual Report to Congress*. Washington, DC.

<sup>2</sup> See Acs, Gregory and Pamela Loprest, (2007), *TANF Caseload Composition and Leavers Synthesis Report*, The Urban Institute: Washington, DC. Also, see The Urban Institute, (2006), *A Decade of Welfare Reform: Facts and Figures*, Assessing the New Federalism, Washington, DC.

penalties. However, for each one percentage point decline in the state's caseload since 1995, states were granted a one percentage point credit toward their work participation requirement.<sup>3</sup> For example, in 2002, the work participation rate standard before the application of the caseload reduction credit was 50 percent for all families and 90 percent for two-parent families. This means that if a state saw no declines to its caseload, it would have to have 50 percent of all families and 90 percent of two-parent families participating in work activities. Yet, the adjusted standard for all families across the 50 states and the District of Columbia averaged just 6.2 percent because of caseload declines in every state.<sup>4</sup> However, TANF Reauthorization altered the caseload reduction credit by basing adjustments to the work participation requirements on caseload declines since 2005. Accordingly, most states would be required to have a higher proportion of recipient families engaged in the labor market because of slowed caseload declines since 2005.

Using data from the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) 2004 panel – a household survey representative of the civilian noninstitutionalized population living in the United States, which followed the same individuals over a period of 48 months from October 2003 to December 2007<sup>5</sup> – this paper describes select demographic and well-being characteristics of TANF-recipient women ages 18 to 64 during the 2004 to 2007 period. In some places, TANF-recipient women ages 18 to 64 are compared to all non-recipient women and never married, non-recipient women ages 18 to 64 who are in families with children. The period under investigation includes the years leading up to and following the 2005 TANF

---

<sup>3</sup> See Zedlewski, Sheila, (2002), *40 Hour Work Rule: Implications for Families and Children*, The Urban Institute: Washington, DC.

<sup>4</sup> See <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ofa/particip/2002/table01a.htm>.

<sup>5</sup> This is the reference period in calendar months covered by SIPP 2004 panel. For more details on the interview procedures, interview waves, and rotation groups, see the *SIPP User's Guide* at [www.sipp.census.gov/sipp/usrguide/sipp2004.pdf](http://www.sipp.census.gov/sipp/usrguide/sipp2004.pdf).

Reauthorization legislation, which could have had an impact on the TANF population in several ways, such as fewer people on TANF, a more disadvantaged TANF population, or higher rates of employment among TANF-recipient adults.

The current paper has six major sections preceded by a brief overview of the TANF data in the SIPP 2004 panel. The first section presents TANF participation rates for women ages 18 to 64 over the survey period (2004 to 2007). The second section describes select socioeconomic characteristics (e.g., educational attainment, poverty status, and marital status) of TANF-recipient women during each calendar year of the survey period. The third section compares the rates of employment and non-employment of TANF-recipient, non-TANF recipient, and never married, non-TANF recipient women ages 18 to 64 from 2004 to 2007. The fourth section examines the reasons for not working and for working only part-time for TANF, non-TANF, and never married, non-TANF recipient women between 2004 and 2007. The fifth section compares the characteristics of TANF-recipient women ages 18 to 64 who were working to those who were not working between 2004 and 2007. The final section compares current and former TANF-recipient women ages 18 to 64 across selected demographic and socioeconomic characteristics.

## **DATA ON WELFARE PARTICIPATION**

Along with the detailed information on respondents' demographic (e.g., sex, race, ethnicity, age, and educational attainment), work (e.g., employment status, income, and disability status), and family (e.g., marital status) characteristics, SIPP also collects data on respondents' participation in government transfer programs in its core questionnaire. Data collected from TANF recipients and their families included their monthly program coverage, benefit amount,

program transitions, and welfare reciprocity history during the 2004-2007 time period.<sup>6</sup> In this analysis, respondents are identified as TANF recipients by reporting that they are covered under cash assistance welfare payments, and does not include, for example, the receipt of childcare subsidies, child support, or the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC).

Unless otherwise specified, analyses in this paper are presented by calendar year (2004 to 2007), and results for each calendar year are based on the full sample of respondents for whom data are obtained (either reported or imputed) for every month of the calendar year. Since TANF receipt status is reported monthly, respondents may be considered TANF recipients in some months of a year but not others. Calendar year estimates are produced by averaging results across all months in the year.

Due to budget cuts, the sample size was cut by one-half after wave 7. While the sample remains nationally representative (when the proper weights are applied) after this drop in sample size, the calculation of standard errors is impacted. Standard errors are considerably larger in calendar years 2006 and 2007 compared to earlier years. Accordingly, it is more difficult to ascertain statistically significant differences between the estimates for two or more groups in 2006 and 2007.

The sample is weighted to produce national and state-level estimates.<sup>7</sup> The estimates in this report (which may be shown in text and tables) are based on responses from a sample of the population and may differ from the actual values because of sampling variability or other factors. As a result, apparent differences between the estimates for two or more groups may not be statistically significant. All comparative statements have undergone statistical testing and are

---

<sup>6</sup> Also visit <http://www.sipp.census.gov/sipp/dews.html> for updates on Census' recent reengineering efforts on SIPP.

<sup>7</sup> See "Using Sampling Weights on SIPP Files" in *SIPP Users' Guide: 2004*, 8-1.

significant at the 90-percent confidence level unless otherwise noted. Standard errors are corrected to account for SIPP's complex sampling design.

## **TANF PARTICIPATION BETWEEN 2004 AND 2007**

There were well-documented, unprecedented declines in TANF caseloads just prior to and immediately following the Welfare Reform Act of 1996. After 2000, caseloads continued to fall, but the rate of decline was considerably slowed.<sup>8</sup> Table 1 shows the number of female TANF recipients ages 18 to 64 as a percentage of all women ages 18 to 64. Between 2004 and 2007, an average of 760,000 women ages 18 to 64 received TANF, or approximately 0.8 percent of all women in that age range. There was no significant change in the number of female TANF recipients ages 18 to 64 or the program participation rate for this group between 2004 and 2007.

## **CHARACTERISTICS OF TANF RECIPIENTS**

This section discusses several dimensions of female welfare recipients' demographic and well-being characteristics for each year between 2004 and 2007 to examine the composition of TANF women and determine whether any changes occurred during this time. Table 1 shows that the racial composition of TANF women remained similar between 2004 and 2007.<sup>9</sup> An average of 55 percent of TANF women ages 18 to 64 were white (35 percent were non-Hispanic white), 35 percent were black, 3 percent were Asian, 7 percent were some other race, and 24 percent of recipients reported being Hispanic.

[Table 1 about here]

---

<sup>8</sup> See U.S. Department of Health and Human Service, (2009), *Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Program (TANF), Eighth Annual Report to Congress*. Washington, DC.

<sup>9</sup> There was a significant decline in the estimates for percent white between 2004 and 2005.



Approximately two-thirds of TANF-recipient women were in poverty – measured as a ratio of family income over the poverty threshold – each year between 2004 and 2007; yet, there was considerable variation in income to poverty ratios.<sup>10</sup> On average across the 2004 to 2007 time span, Table 1 shows that about 25 percent of TANF women had family income to poverty ratios between 0.50 and 0.99, about 28 percent had ratios between 0.25 and 0.49, and about 14 percent had ratios below 0.25.<sup>11</sup> Table 1 also shows that TANF was not the only source of assistance for many recipients. When TANF replaced AFDC, it also ended the automatic Medicaid coverage provided to families via cash welfare rolls.<sup>12</sup> Nonetheless, an average of 96 percent of TANF women continued to be covered by Medicaid between 2004 and 2007. However, the percent of TANF women receiving Medicaid fell from 98.5 percent in 2005 to 93.1 percent in 2007. A majority of TANF-recipient women also received Food Stamps (an average of 90 percent between 2004 and 2007).<sup>13</sup> Far fewer TANF women (about 11 percent) received WIC during this time, which is expected given the limitations on WIC receipt.<sup>14</sup>

Table 1 shows that most TANF-recipient women ages 18 to 64 were never married (about 51 percent) between 2004 and 2007, while about 21 percent were married and about 28 percent were widowed, divorced, or separated. There was no significant change in the marital status of adult TANF recipients across this time period. There were also no dramatic change in the

---

<sup>10</sup> For details of poverty definition and thresholds, visit U.S. Census Website at [www.census.gov/hhes/poverty/threshld.html](http://www.census.gov/hhes/poverty/threshld.html).

<sup>11</sup> The estimates for income to poverty ratios of 0.50 to 0.99 and ratios of 0.25 to 0.49 were not statistically different in any year. The estimates for income to poverty ratios of 0.50 to 0.99 and ratios below 0.25 were not statistically different in 2006.

<sup>12</sup> See Committee on Ways and Means. (2004). Green Book, Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office: 7-11.

<sup>13</sup> On October 1, 2008, the federal Food Stamp Program was renamed the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP).

<sup>14</sup> Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) provides supplemental foods, health care referrals, and nutrition education to low-income pregnant women and to infants and children up to age 5. For more information on this program, visit the Food and Nutrition Service website at [www.fsn.usda.gov/wic](http://www.fsn.usda.gov/wic).

educational attainment of TANF recipients, ages 18 and older, from 2004 to 2007. About 27 percent of adult TANF recipients lacked a high school degree, while about 41 percent had a high school diploma, or equivalent, and about 32 percent had at least some college.

## **EMPLOYMENT AMONG TANF PARTICIPANT ADULTS**

Table 2 examines the employment status of TANF-recipient women ages 18 to 64 and compares them to (1) non-recipient women and (2) never married, non-recipient women ages 18 to 64 who were in families with children. Respondents who reported working at least 35 hours in each week of the month are considered to be working full-time, while those who reported working less than 35 hours one or more weeks of the month are considered working part-time. All respondent who were not employed during the month are placed into one of two categories: unemployed or not in labor force. Unemployment refers to those who are on layoff from a job or are currently looking for work. Non-employed respondents who are neither laid-off from a job nor looking for work are considered not in the labor force.

TANF recipient women ages 18 to 64 were less likely to be employed (about 23 percent) than women not receiving TANF benefits (about 68 percent) and never married, non-recipient women (about 64 percent) each year between 2004 and 2007.<sup>15</sup> These differences in employment were most pronounced for full-time employment, with an average of 6 percent of TANF recipients working full-time between 2004 and 2007, compared to an average of 46 percent of non-recipient women and an average of 37 percent of never married, non-recipient women.<sup>16</sup> Conversely, TANF-recipient women were more likely than non-TANF women and

---

<sup>15</sup> In 2007, the employment rate of non-TANF women was significantly higher than the rate for never married, non-recipient women. In all other years, the differences were not statistically significant.

<sup>16</sup> Non-TANF women had significantly higher rates of full-time employment compared to never married, non-recipient women each year between 2004 and 2007.

never married, non-TANF women to be unemployed (an average of 12 percent, 3 percent, and 5 percent, respectively) and not in the labor force (an average of 65 percent, 28 percent, and 31 percent, respectively) between 2004 and 2007.<sup>17</sup>

[Table 2 about here]

## **REASONS FOR NOT WORKING AND FOR WORKING PART-TIME**

Given the differences in employment status between TANF, non-TANF, and never married, non-TANF women, it is worth exploring whether there are differences in their reasons for not working and for working part-time. Table 3 shows the reported reasons for not working for TANF-recipient women, non-recipient women, and never married, non-recipient women who were not employed between 2004 and 2007. During this time, TANF recipient women were less likely than non-TANF women to say they were not working because they were pregnant or caring for a child (an average of 36 percent compared to 62 percent, respectively), but more likely to report this as a reason for non-work than never married, non-TANF women (an average of 24 percent).<sup>18</sup> About one-third of TANF recipients not in the labor force reported not working because of health-related reasons, which was significantly higher than the rate of all non-TANF women (an average of 12 percent) and never married, non-TANF women (an average of 14

---

<sup>17</sup> Between 2004 and 2006, the unemployment rate of never married, non-TANF women was higher than that for non-TANF women. This difference was not statistically significant in 2007. In 2007, never married, non-TANF women were significantly more likely to report being not in the labor force than non-TANF women as a whole. The differences were not statistically significant in the other years.

<sup>18</sup> In 2006, the difference between TANF women and never married, non-TANF women was not statistically significant. In all years, a significantly higher proportion of non-TANF women compared to never married, non-TANF women reported not working because they were pregnant or caring for a child.

percent).<sup>19</sup> TANF-recipient women were less likely than never married, non-TANF women to report not working because of school attendance (an average of 19 percent compared to 48 percent, respectively).<sup>20</sup> Finally, between 2004 and 2007, TANF-recipient women were significantly less likely than non-TANF women to report not working because they had no interest in working (an average of 1 percent compared to 3 percent, respectively).

[Table 3 about here]

Table 4 shows the reported reasons for working part-time for those TANF, non-TANF, and never married, non-TANF women who were employed part-time between 2004 and 2007. TANF women were less likely than non-recipient women to report working only part-time because they wanted to work part-time in 2004 and 2005 (an average of 15 percent compared to 31 percent, respectively). However, in 2004 and 2005, about 19 percent of recipient women worked part-time because they could not find full-time employment, compared to about 6.5 percent of all non-recipient women. Finally, TANF women were less likely than never married, non-TANF women to report school attendance as a reason for working part-time between 2004 and 2007 (an average of 14 percent compared to 37 percent, respectively).<sup>21</sup>

[Table 4 about here]

---

<sup>19</sup> The difference between non-TANF women and never married, non-TANF women was statistically significant in 2005. In all other years, the differences were not statistically significant.

<sup>20</sup> In 2007, TANF women were significantly more likely than non-TANF women to report not working because of school attendance. The differences were not significant in any other year. In all years, never married, non-TANF women were more likely than non-TANF women to report not working because of school attendance.

<sup>21</sup> The difference between TANF women and never married, non-TANF women was not statistically significant in 2006.

## **WORKING TANF RECIPIENTS VERSUS NON-WORKING TANF RECIPIENTS**

Among TANF-recipient women, it is likely that those who work are different in some ways from those who do not work. For example, those who are working may have higher educational attainment and lower poverty rates than those who are not working. Table 5 shows selected characteristics of TANF women ages 18 to 64 for 2004 through 2007 by employment status. Employed TANF recipients (part-time and full-time) are compared to recipients with no attachment to the labor force (unemployed and not in the labor force). Of those in the labor force, an average 28 percent were working full-time and 73 percent were working part-time, and of those not in the labor force, an average of 16 percent were unemployed 84 percent were not working, not looking for work, not laid-off between 2004 and 2007.<sup>22</sup>

[Table 5 about here]

The characteristics of employed adult TANF recipients are not significantly different from those of non-employed recipients in terms of race and Hispanic origin, other public assistance receipt, and marital status. These two groups of TANF recipients do differ, however, in terms of poverty status and educational attainment levels. Employed TANF recipients were less likely to be in poverty than TANF recipients with no attachment to the labor force. On average, between 2004 and 2007, 49 percent of employed TANF women had family income to poverty ratios below 1.00 compared to 71 percent of TANF women who were not employed.<sup>23</sup> Furthermore, an average of 4 percent of employed TANF women had income to poverty ratios

---

<sup>22</sup> In each year, employed TANF recipients were significantly more likely to be working part-time than full-time, and non-employed TANF recipients were significantly more likely to be not in the labor force than unemployed.

<sup>23</sup> The difference was not statistically significant in 2006.

below 0.25, compared to an average of 17 percent of those who were not employed during this time period. Finally, in 2004 and 2007, TANF women who were not employed were significantly more likely to lack a high school degree than their employed counterparts (about 29 percent and 11 percent, respectively).<sup>24</sup>

## **FORMER AND CURRENT TANF RECIPIENTS**

The Wave 1 topical module in the 2004 SIPP asked respondents whether they had ever been authorized to receive AFDC or TANF. Respondents not receiving TANF at the time of the interview who reported that had previous authorization to receive welfare are considered former recipients for this analysis. Those receiving TANF at the time of the January 2004 interview are considered current recipients, regardless of any previous welfare receipt. The characteristics of all current TANF recipient women ages 18 to 64 are compared to those of former recipient women ages 18 to 64 in Table 6. Current recipients look considerably different than former recipients in many regards. Compared to former TANF recipients, current recipients were more likely to be black, Asian, Hispanic, in poverty (at all levels), never married, unemployed, and not in the labor force and to have less than a high school degree. In contrast, former TANF recipients were more likely than current recipients to be white, non-Hispanic white, married, widowed, divorced, or separated, and employed full-time and to have some college experience. Finally, Table 6 shows that most former recipients have been on TANF one time before (86.4 percent), while 7.7 percent have received it twice, and 5.9 percent three or more times.

[Table 6 about here]

---

<sup>24</sup> The estimates were not significantly different in 2005 and 2006.

## DISCUSSION

The TANF Reauthorization legislation of 2005 placed added pressures on states to move TANF participants either off the program or into employment. Yet, this study finds that there was no significant change in TANF participation or in the employment status of TANF recipient women ages 18 to 64 between 2004 and 2007. It should be noted, however, that results in this study are at the national-level and do not examine state-specific trends. Some states may have had more success than others in moving TANF recipients off the program or into employment during this time period. In general, though, many states may face difficulty meeting federally-mandated work participation requirements.

As expected, employment levels among TANF women were far below those of non-TANF women and never married, non-TANF women, and unemployment and disengagement from the labor force exceeded that of non-recipient women and never married, non-recipient women. TANF recipients often face barriers to employment, which include physical and mental health problems, domestic violence, low educational attainment, few job skills, inadequate access to transportation, and perceived workplace discrimination. In fact, it is not unusual for recipients to experience multiple barriers to employment, and the more barriers a woman faces, the less likely she is to enter the labor force.<sup>25</sup> Accordingly, a multifaceted approach is needed to improve the labor force outcomes of TANF recipients.

There was no significant change in poverty rates among TANF-recipient women between 2004 and 2007, with about two-thirds falling below 100 percent of the income to poverty ratio.

---

<sup>25</sup> See Danziger, Sandra et al., (2000), "Barriers to the Employment of Welfare Recipients" pps. 245-276 in *Prosperity for All?: The Economic Boom and African Americans*, edited by Robert Cherry and William M. Rodgers III, Russell Sage Foundation, New York.

About 40 percent of TANF women had income to poverty ratios below 0.50 and about 14 percent had ratios under 0.25. Despite the low total family income among TANF-recipient women, it does appear that many received additional support from other public assistance programs – namely Medicaid and Food Stamps – which does not affect poverty status. Future research using SIPP’s welfare reform topical module data will determine the extent to which TANF recipient families receive other types of support (e.g., clothing assistance, energy assistance, and food assistance) that could further increase socioeconomic well-being among low-income families.

TANF women were much less likely to work than non-recipient women and never married, non-recipient women, and their reasons for not working differ from these other groups of women. Results from this analysis show that TANF-recipient women are much more likely to report not working because of health-related reasons than non-TANF women and never married, non-TANF women. TANF recipients do have higher rates of personal health problems, which is often a major obstacle to employment.<sup>26</sup> While many TANF women report not working because they are pregnant or caring for a child, they are less likely to do so than non-TANF women. This group, however, is less likely than never married, non-TANF women to report school attendance as a reason for not working. Finally, contrary to popular opinion, only a very small proportion of TANF recipients report not working because they had no interest in working, which was significantly lower than the proportion of all non-TANF women.

Unlike non-recipient women, TANF women are more likely to be working part-time than full-time. One important reason for doing so is the inability to find full-time work, which brings up the issue of barriers to employment. Nonetheless, similar numbers of TANF recipients report

---

<sup>26</sup> See Danziger, Sandra et al., (2000), “Barriers to the Employment of Welfare Recipients” pps. 245-276 in *Prosperity for All?: The Economic Boom and African Americans*, edited by Robert Cherry and William M. Rodgers III, Russell Sage Foundation, New York.



that they work only part-time because they wanted to. While this response could be attributed to an unwillingness to work, it may indicate that part-time work helps recipients strike a balance between earning income and caring for their children.

A comparison of TANF women who work to those who do not work shows few differences between the two groups, except in terms of income to poverty ratios. When a TANF-recipient woman is employed, her family is much less likely to be in poverty than if she were not employed. Furthermore, TANF women who work are much less likely to have family income to poverty ratios below 0.25 compared to TANF women who do not work. Yet, employment is no guarantee that a family will rise out of poverty, as about one-half of employed TANF women have income levels below the poverty threshold.

Finally, this analysis shows the difference between current and former TANF recipients. While this analysis is unable to determine the reasons that current recipients differ from former recipients, there is some room for speculation. One possibility is that the more advantaged TANF recipients are the ones more likely to exit TANF, while the most disadvantaged remain on the program. The differences in educational attainment may point to this explanation, as former recipients are more likely to have some college experience and less likely to lack a high school diploma than current recipients. Alternatively, leaving TANF for employment may facilitate upward mobility. The higher employment rates among former recipients may suggest that this group left welfare for work, which in turn led to higher family income and lower poverty rates compared to those remaining on TANF.

**Table 1. Selected Characteristics of TANF-Recipient Women Ages 18 to 64, 2004 to 2007**

(Numbers in thousands)

	2004 Average		2005 Average		2006 Average		2007 Average	
	TOTAL	90-Percent C.I. (+/-)	TOTAL	90-Percent C.I. (+/-)	TOTAL	90-Percent C.I. (+/-)	TOTAL	90-Percent C.I. (+/-)
<b><u>TANF-recipient women (18-64)</u></b>	<b>756</b>	97	<b>740</b>	104	<b>731</b>	150	<b>812</b>	162
As percent of total U.S. population	0.8	0.1	0.8	0.1	0.8	0.2	0.9	0.2
<b>Race and Hispanic Origin</b>								
White	50.5	6.4	60.1	6.9	54.3	10.3	55.9	9.9
White, non-Hispanic	35.2	6.1	37.4	6.8	33.2	9.7	32.5	9.4
Black	40.3	6.3	31.8	6.5	34.2	9.8	34.9	9.5
Asian	3.4	2.3	2.6	2.3	3.2	3.6	2.0	2.8
Other race	5.8	3.0	5.4	3.2	8.3	5.7	7.1	5.1
Hispanic, of any race	20.2	5.2	26.6	6.2	23.8	8.8	25.3	8.7
<b>Income to Poverty Ratio</b>								
Below Poverty Line	67.8	6.0	65.5	6.7	65.9	9.8	65.6	9.5
Between .50 and .99	23.5	5.4	27.1	6.2	24.4	8.8	23.6	8.5
Between .25 and .49	28.1	5.8	24.3	6.0	27.6	9.2	31.1	9.3
Below .25	16.2	4.7	14.2	4.9	13.9	7.1	10.9	6.2
<b>Other Public Assistance</b>								
Medicaid	96.6	2.3	98.5	1.7	96.3	3.9	93.1	5.1
Food Stamps	90.2	3.8	90.1	4.2	92.6	5.4	87.2	6.7
WIC	12.6	4.3	11.0	4.4	9.0	5.9	10.9	6.2
<b>Marital Status</b>								
Married	23.1	5.4	19.4	5.6	18.8	8.1	20.8	8.1
Widowed/divorced/separated	27.0	5.7	29.0	6.4	32.8	9.7	25.1	8.7
Never married	49.9	6.4	51.6	7.0	48.4	10.3	54.1	10.0
<b>Educational Attainment</b>								
Less than high school diploma	28.5	5.8	25.5	6.1	24.9	8.9	22.1	8.3
High school diploma/equivalent	34.5	6.1	43.2	7.0	44.1	10.2	44.0	9.9
Some college or above	37.1	6.2	31.3	6.5	31.0	9.5	33.9	9.5

\* Details may not add to total due to rounding.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation, 2004 Panel.

For information on confidentiality protection, sampling and nonsampling error see <http://www.census.gov/sipp/source.html>.

**Table 2. Employment Status of Women Ages 18 to 64 by TANF Status and Marital Status, 2004 to 2007**

(Numbers in thousands)

	TANF women	90-Percent C.I. (+/-)	Non-TANF women <sup>1</sup>	90-Percent C.I. (+/-)	Never married, non-TANF women <sup>1</sup>	90-Percent C.I. (+/-)
<b>2004</b>	<b>756</b>		<b>43,059</b>		<b>8,401</b>	
Employed	25.0	5.6	69.0	0.8	67.1	1.8
Full-time	8.4	3.6	46.4	0.8	39.2	1.9
Part-time	16.6	4.8	22.5	0.7	27.9	1.7
Unemployed	12.0	4.2	4.0	0.3	5.7	0.9
Not in Labor Force	63.0	6.2	27.0	0.8	27.2	1.7
<b>2005</b>	<b>740</b>		<b>43,740</b>		<b>9,064</b>	
Employed	24.1	6.0	69.1	0.8	67.2	1.9
Full-time	8.2	3.9	46.8	0.9	39.6	2.0
Part-time	15.9	5.1	22.3	0.8	27.6	1.8
Unemployed	12.0	4.6	3.1	0.3	5.7	0.9
Not in Labor Force	63.9	6.8	27.8	0.8	27.1	1.8
<b>2006</b>	<b>731</b>		<b>44,069</b>		<b>9,419</b>	
Employed	20.3	8.3	69.8	1.2	67.9	2.7
Full-time	3.2	3.6	46.7	1.3	40.6	2.8
Part-time	17.2	7.8	23.1	1.1	27.3	2.6
Unemployed	11.6	6.6	2.3	0.4	4.7	1.2
Not in Labor Force	68.1	9.6	27.8	1.2	27.4	2.6
<b>2007</b>	<b>812</b>		<b>39,762</b>		<b>8,392</b>	
Employed	20.6	8.1	65.7	1.4	51.9	3.1
Full-time	5.6	4.6	44.0	1.4	29.5	2.8
Part-time	15.1	7.2	21.7	1.2	22.4	2.6
Unemployed	13.8	6.9	4.0	0.6	5.3	1.4
Not in Labor Force	65.6	9.5	30.3	1.3	42.8	3.1

\* Details may not add to total due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup>Unrelated individuals and women who do not belong to families with children are not included in this table.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation, 2004 Panel.

For information on confidentiality protection, sampling and nonsampling error see <http://www.census.gov/sipp/source.html>.

**Table 3. Reasons for Not Working of Women Ages 18 to 64 by TANF Status and Marital Status, 2004 to 2007**

(Numbers in thousands)

	TANF women		Non-TANF women <sup>1</sup>		Never married, non-TANF women <sup>1</sup>	
	TOTAL	90-Percent C.I. (+/-)	TOTAL	90-Percent C.I. (+/-)	TOTAL	90-Percent C.I. (+/-)
<b>2004</b>	<b>512</b>		<b>12,097</b>		<b>2,345</b>	
Pregnancy/childrearing	36.7	7.5	64.1	1.5	27.5	3.3
Health-related	34.9	7.4	12.9	1.1	14.6	2.6
School	15.8	5.7	10.5	1.0	40.0	3.6
Unable to find work/layoff	8.9	4.4	4.9	0.7	11.2	2.3
No interest in working	1.0	1.5	3.1	0.6	2.7	1.2
Retired	0.8	1.4	2.4	0.5	0.7	0.6
Other	1.9	2.1	2.1	0.5	3.4	1.3
<b>2005</b>	<b>524</b>		<b>12,169</b>		<b>2,508</b>	
Pregnancy/childrearing	41.9	8.2	63.6	1.7	26.2	3.4
Health-related	37.7	8.1	13.7	1.2	17.0	2.9
School	11.8	5.4	11.3	1.1	40.9	3.8
Unable to find work/layoff	5.8	3.9	4.4	0.7	10.9	2.4
No interest in working	1.1	1.8	3.2	0.6	2.6	1.2
Retired	0.5	1.2	2.3	0.5	0.3	0.4
Other	1.1	1.7	1.4	0.4	2.0	1.1
<b>2006</b>	<b>545</b>		<b>12,037</b>		<b>2,576</b>	
Pregnancy/childrearing	36.7	11.5	63.5	2.4	26.8	4.9
Health-related	40.9	11.7	14.2	1.8	17.6	4.2
School	11.5	7.6	11.8	1.6	42.6	5.4
Unable to find work/layoff	6.4	5.8	3.8	1.0	8.0	3.0
No interest in working	0.8	2.2	3.4	0.9	1.8	1.5
Retired	1.0	2.4	1.7	0.7	0.6	0.9
Other	2.6	3.8	1.7	0.7	2.5	1.7
<b>2007</b>	<b>597</b>		<b>12,448</b>		<b>3,652</b>	
Pregnancy/childrearing	30.4	10.7	58.4	2.5	14.8	3.3
Health-related	22.8	9.8	8.8	1.4	7.8	2.5
School	36.0	11.2	23.4	2.2	68.3	4.4
Unable to find work/layoff	7.4	6.1	4.2	1.0	6.0	2.2
No interest in working	0.4	1.4	2.5	0.8	1.7	1.2
Retired	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.4	0.0	0.0
Other	3.0	4.0	2.0	0.7	1.5	1.1

\* Details may not add to total due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup>Unrelated individuals and women who do not belong to families with children are not included in this table.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation, 2004 Panel. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling and nonsampling error see <http://www.census.gov/sipp/source.html>.

**Table 4. Reasons for Working Part-time of Women Ages 18 to 64 by TANF Status and Marital Status, 2004 to 2007**

(Numbers in thousands)

	TANF women		Non-TANF women <sup>1</sup>		Never married, non-TANF women <sup>1</sup>	
	TOTAL	90-Percent C.I. (+/-)	TOTAL	90-Percent C.I. (+/-)	TOTAL	90-Percent C.I. (+/-)
<b>2004</b>	<b>165</b>		<b>12,943</b>		<b>2,972</b>	
Wanted to work part-time	18.1	10.6	29.3	1.4	16.8	2.4
Could not find full-time job	16.8	10.3	6.5	0.8	11.7	2.1
Health-related	8.1	7.5	4.6	0.6	3.7	1.2
School	11.8	8.8	9.9	0.9	34.5	3.1
Taking care of a child	10.0	8.3	15.9	1.1	7.0	1.7
Slack work/material shortage	13.3	9.3	8.5	0.9	9.0	1.8
Full-time workweek is less than 35 hours	13.5	9.4	9.1	0.9	8.0	1.8
Other	8.4	7.6	16.3	1.1	9.3	1.9
<b>2005</b>	<b>145</b>		<b>12,805</b>		<b>3,125</b>	
Wanted to work part-time	11.4	10.1	32.0	1.6	19.0	2.7
Could not find full-time job	20.5	12.8	6.5	0.8	10.9	2.1
Health-related	11.9	10.3	4.5	0.7	3.7	1.3
School	12.0	10.3	10.5	1.0	36.4	3.3
Taking care of a child	22.3	13.2	15.4	1.2	5.9	1.6
Slack work/material shortage	7.3	8.3	7.7	0.9	8.6	1.9
Full-time workweek is less than 35 hours	5.0	6.9	7.9	0.9	6.8	1.7
Other	9.6	9.3	15.5	1.2	8.8	1.9
<b>2006</b>	<b>151</b>		<b>13,298</b>		<b>3,268</b>	
Wanted to work part-time	17.0	17.0	33.5	2.3	20.1	3.9
Could not find full-time job	11.1	14.2	6.7	1.2	10.4	3.0
Health-related	19.0	17.7	4.2	1.0	2.6	1.5
School	18.9	17.7	10.5	1.5	35.4	4.7
Taking care of a child	8.5	12.6	14.9	1.7	6.3	2.4
Slack work/material shortage	7.4	11.9	7.6	1.3	9.1	2.8
Full-time workweek is less than 35 hours	10.3	13.7	7.9	1.3	7.4	2.6
Other	7.9	12.2	14.7	1.7	8.7	2.7
<b>2007</b>	<b>165</b>		<b>11,473</b>		<b>2,393</b>	
Wanted to work part-time	15.6	16.1	28.9	2.4	18.2	4.5
Could not find full-time job	13.1	15.0	6.4	1.3	9.6	3.4
Health-related	16.8	16.6	4.0	1.0	2.3	1.8
School	11.6	14.2	10.6	1.6	40.3	5.7
Taking care of a child	7.8	11.9	16.9	2.0	7.3	3.0
Slack work/material shortage	18.0	17.0	7.6	1.4	6.6	2.9
Full-time workweek is less than 35 hours	8.5	12.4	8.5	1.5	6.9	3.0
Other	8.6	12.5	17.1	2.0	8.7	3.3

\* Details may not add to total due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup>Unrelated individuals and women who do not belong to families with children are not included in this table.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation, 2004 Panel.

For information on confidentiality protection, sampling and nonsampling error see <http://www.census.gov/sipp/source.html>.

**Table 5. Selected Characteristics of Working-age Female TANF Recipients in 2004 and 2007, by Employment Status** (Numbers in thousands)

	2004				2005				2006				2007			
	Employed		Not employed		Employed		Not employed		Employed		Not employed		Employed		Not employed	
	TOTAL	90- Percent C.I. (+/-)	TOTAL	90- Percent C.I. (+/-)	TOTAL	90- Percent C.I. (+/-)	TOTAL	90- Percent C.I. (+/-)	TOTAL	90- Percent C.I. (+/-)	TOTAL	90- Percent C.I. (+/-)	TOTAL	90- Percent C.I. (+/-)	TOTAL	90- Percent C.I. (+/-)
<b>Female TANF recipients (18-64)</b>	<b>189</b>		<b>567</b>		<b>179</b>		<b>561</b>		<b>149</b>		<b>583</b>		<b>168</b>		<b>645</b>	
<b>Employment status</b>																
Employed full-time	33.5	12.1			34.1	13.6			15.5	16.6			26.9	19.526		
Employed part-time	66.5	12.1			65.9	13.6			84.5	16.6			73.1	19.526		
Unemployed			16.0	5.4			15.8	5.9			14.5	8.1			17.3	8.5
Not in labor force			84.0	5.4			84.2	5.9			85.5	8.1			82.7	8.5
<b>Race and Hispanic Origin</b>																
White	41.9	12.7	53.4	7.4	55.0	14.2	61.7	7.8	31.4	21.2	60.1	11.3	47.7	22.0	58.1	11.1
Non-Hispanic White	30.3	11.8	36.8	7.1	39.9	14.0	36.6	7.8	29.9	20.9	34.1	10.9	32.1	20.5	32.6	10.5
Black	47.2	12.8	38.0	7.2	32.6	13.4	31.6	7.5	49.6	22.9	30.3	10.6	37.4	21.3	34.3	10.7
Asian	2.4	3.9	3.7	2.8	3.8	5.5	2.3	2.4	8.6	12.8	1.8	3.1	0.6	3.3	2.4	3.4
Other race	8.5	7.2	4.9	3.2	8.6	8.0	4.4	3.3	10.4	13.9	7.8	6.2	14.3	15.4	5.2	5.0
Hispanic (of any race)	17.4	9.7	21.2	6.1	20.1	11.5	28.7	7.3	4.7	9.7	28.6	10.4	19.1	17.3	26.9	10.0
<b>Income to Poverty Ratio</b>																
Below poverty line	50.5	12.8	73.5	6.5	49.3	14.3	70.7	7.3	52.1	22.8	69.4	10.6	42.2	21.7	71.7	10.1
Between .50 and .99	28.9	11.6	21.7	6.1	29.2	13.0	26.4	7.1	28.2	20.6	23.4	9.8	26.7	19.5	22.8	9.4
Between .25 and .49	15.4	9.3	32.3	6.9	17.0	10.7	26.6	7.1	20.2	18.3	29.6	10.5	14.4	15.5	35.5	10.7
Below .25	6.3	6.2	19.5	5.9	3.2	5.0	17.7	6.2	3.7	8.6	16.4	8.6	1.1	4.6	13.5	7.7
<b>Other Public Assistance</b>																
Food Stamps	87.2	8.6	91.2	4.2	86.7	9.7	91.2	4.6	89.7	13.9	93.3	5.8	86.0	15.3	87.5	7.4
WIC	16.9	9.6	11.2	4.7	11.4	9.1	10.9	5.0	13.4	15.6	7.9	6.2	12.0	14.3	10.7	6.9
Medicaid	95.2	5.5	97.0	2.5	96.2	5.5	99.3	1.4	94.3	10.6	96.9	4.0	94.0	10.4	92.9	5.8
<b>Marital Status</b>																
Married	20.8	10.4	23.9	6.3	24.3	12.3	17.8	6.2	20.0	18.3	18.5	9.0	20.6	17.8	20.8	9.1
Widowed/divorced/separated	26.5	11.3	27.1	6.6	28.7	12.9	29.0	7.3	31.1	21.2	33.3	10.9	40.9	21.6	21.0	9.1
Never married	52.7	12.8	49.0	7.4	46.9	14.3	53.1	8.1	49.0	22.9	48.2	11.5	38.5	10.9	58.2	11.1
<b>Educational Attainment</b>																
Less than high school diploma	16.5	9.5	32.5	6.9	20.8	11.6	27.0	7.2	19.6	18.1	26.2	10.2	5.8	10.3	26.4	9.9
High school diploma/equivalent	36.9	12.4	33.6	7.0	40.5	14.0	44.1	8.0	33.7	21.6	46.8	11.5	45.6	21.9	43.5	11.1
Some college or above	46.5	12.8	33.9	7.0	38.7	13.9	28.9	7.3	46.8	22.8	27.0	10.3	48.6	22.0	30.1	10.3

\* Details may not add to total due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup>Unrelated individuals and women who do not belong to families with children are not included in this table.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation, 2004 Panel.

For information on confidentiality protection, sampling and nonsampling error see <http://www.census.gov/sipp/source.html>.

**Table 6. Selected Characteristics of Former and Current TANF Recipients: January 2004**

(Numbers in thousands)

	January 2004			
	Current TANF recipients		Former TANF recipients	
	TOTAL	90-Percent C.I. (+/-)	TOTAL	90-Percent C.I. (+/-)
<b>Recipients 18 and over</b>	<b>730</b>		<b>6,502</b>	
<b>Race and Hispanic Origin</b>				
White	51.8	6.5	65.1	2.1
Non-Hispanic White	33.9	6.2	53.5	2.2
Black	40.1	6.4	28.8	2.0
Asian	2.6	2.1	0.4	0.3
Other race	5.5	3.0	5.8	1.0
Hispanic (of any race)	22.4	5.4	13.3	1.5
<b>Income to Poverty Ratio</b>				
<b>Below Poverty Line</b>	74.8	5.5	27.7	2.0
Between .50 and .99	23.6	5.4	15.9	1.6
Between .25 and .49	32.9	5.9	4.7	0.9
Below .25	18.3	4.9	7.0	1.1
<b>Marital Status</b>				
Married	26.0	5.5	38.8	2.1
Widowed/divorced/separated	26.5	5.6	37.4	2.1
Never married	47.5	6.3	23.8	1.9
<b>Educational Attainment</b>				
Less than high school diploma	37.0	6.1	16.7	1.6
High school diploma/equivalent	29.9	5.8	25.7	1.9
Some college or above	33.2	5.9	57.6	2.2
<b>Employment status</b>				
Full-time employment	7.0	3.2	47.6	2.2
Part-time employment	18.4	4.9	20.0	1.7
Unemployed	12.4	4.2	4.6	0.9
Not in labor force	62.3	6.1	27.8	2.0
<b>Times on TANF</b>				
Once			86.4	1.5
Twice			7.7	1.2
Three or more times			5.9	1.0

\* Details may not add to total due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup> All TANF recipients ages 18 to 64 and former TANF recipients ages 18 to 64 are included in this table.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation, 2004 Panel.

For information on confidentiality protection, sampling and nonsampling error see

<http://www.census.gov/sipp/source.html>.