

#92-08a

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

Christine Winqvist Nord and Amy Rhoads  
Child Trends, Inc.  
Washington, D.C.

November 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**

Introduction

The well-being of children is a topic of increasing concern to Americans (Eggebeen and Lichter, forthcoming; National Commission on Children, 1991; Danziger and Stern, 1990; Palmer et al., 1988). One reason for the burgeoning interest is the growing concentration of poverty among children. The Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), although it does not interview children, is potentially a very useful source of information about children's economic well-being and about their families. Yet, only a few analysts have used SIPP to study children (e.g., McArthur et al., 1986; Watts, 1987; Bianchi and McArthur, 1991). Moreover, although the quality of poverty estimates derived from SIPP has been examined (Williams, 1987), an evaluation of child- and family-based estimates has not yet been performed.

This report presents 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 the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP). These estimates are compared with

estimates derived from the March 1987 Current Population Survey (CPS), the 1986 National Integrated Quality Control System (QCS), and the 1988 Child Health Supplement of the National Health Interview Survey (CHS88). Possible explanations for observed differences in the estimates are discussed. A related paper presents a statistical profile of children in or near poverty and of children born to teenage mothers.

Prior to describing the results of the comparisons, however, a brief overview of the objectives of SIPP and its design are given along with a summary of earlier efforts to evaluate the quality of poverty and transfer benefit information from SIPP.

#### Survey Objectives and Design

SIPP is an ambitious survey that, as its name implies, was designed to provide more accurate and detailed data on income and program participation of both persons and households in the United States and on the determinants of income and program participation. The data are collected to assist policymakers 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 out 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. Only persons 15 and older are interviewed, although some information is gathered about children under age 15. Persons ineligible for the survey in addition to the institutionalized are U.S. citizens living abroad, 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 included in the original (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 reduced 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 spells of poverty, transfer income receipt, and other relatively volatile events in people's lives.

#### Earlier Evaluation Efforts

Several reports have been written that evaluate the quality of estimates derived from SIPP. Most of these have relied on the 1984 or 1985 panels. As a result of these studies and other

evaluation efforts of SIPP conducted by the Census Bureau, questionnaire design and processing procedures have been modified for subsequent panels in an effort to improve the quality of SIPP data. Thus the results of these earlier evaluation efforts may not be descriptive of the quality of more recent panels.

John Coder and his colleagues performed an extensive review of the first longitudinal file constructed by the Bureau of the Census based on the first four waves of the 1984 panel (Coder et al, 1987: Working Paper #8702). The longitudinal file contained information for a period of 12 months for each sample person. The time frame covered by this longitudinal file included months in 1983 and 1984. With regard to poverty, SIPP underestimated poverty among both blacks and whites compared with estimates from the CPS. Robertson Williams, using waves 2 through 5 of the 1984 SIPP panel to make estimates of poverty in the 1984 calendar year, also found that SIPP tended to underestimate poverty compared with the CPS (Williams, 1987, Working Paper #8723).

Both Coder and Williams restricted their analysis files to persons with full-year information. Preliminary work by Williams indicates that persons with missing information in some months have higher than average monthly poverty rates. Thus their exclusion could account, in part, for the lower poverty estimates of SIPP compared with CPS.

#### Construction of Data Files and Variables Used in this Report

The 1986 panel of SIPP was used to construct data files containing information for the calendar year 1986. Thus, only

data from the first four waves of the 1986 panel were used. Table 1 depicts for each wave and rotation group the actual calendar months of interview and corresponding reference period.

As described earlier, people can move in and out of the sample being surveyed in any particular month. Thus the population surveyed from wave to wave changes. In order to include as stable a population as possible under these circumstances and to minimize the amount of missing data particularly from questions asked only in Wave 2 in the detailed personal history module, for these analyses the sample was limited to persons who were survey participants during Wave 2, month 4 of the reference period<sup>1</sup>. Persons were selected for the sample used in this study if they met one of the following criteria at Wave 2, month 4:

- |        |  |
|--------|--|
| CHILD  | under the age of 18 and living in a household with a parent or guardian                            |
| PARENT | the "designated parent or guardian" of children under the age of 18 residing in the same household |
| SPOUSE | the spouse of a person meeting the parent or guardian criterion.                                   |

Two types of data files were constructed for these analyses. The first was child-based: one case per child with selected information from the parent and, if applicable, the spouse attached to the child's record. The second file was family-based: one case per parent (and spouse) with information on all relevant children attached. Even if a child turned 18 before the

---

<sup>1</sup>Month 4 corresponds to May, June, July, or August of 1986, depending on the rotation group. See Figure —

end of 1986, s/he was still included in the child file. Similarly, children born after month 4 of Wave 2 were not included in the child file even though they were in the household during the 1986 calendar year. Because interviewing for month 4 of Wave 2 took place between May and August of 1986, we have defined the child population as of approximately the mid-point of the calendar year. Even though the child population was restricted in this manner, we did use the month-to-month family structure and income variables on the file to determine poverty as we describe below.

Several variables for annual figures were created out of data collected on a monthly basis. These include poverty, reciprocity of AFDC or food stamps, annual income, and full-year (as opposed to current) employment status. In creating all of these variables, respondents' rotation groups were examined in order to obtain actual 1986 data from January through December. For poverty, reciprocity, and income, annual variables were created for respondents missing four or fewer months of data out of the 12-month period. This resulted in a mere 0.2% missing data rate using either families or children as the analysis group. For poverty and income, persons missing four or fewer months of data were assigned the average of the amounts for all the months of valid data. This type of adjustment was made to 3% of the families and 3% of children in the sample. Reciprocity variables were concerned only with the dichotomy of receiving the aid at least once during the 12-month period and never receiving



the aid. Thus no adjustment was attempted; if a respondent did not receive the aid during any of the months for which data were available, s/he was assigned the non-recipient value for the variable.

Employment status across 1986 was treated differently. In determining part-year versus full-year employment, the weeks worked were summed for each month of valid data. If the total was greater than 0 but less than 50, the respondent was considered part-year. This procedure slightly overrepresented part-year employed and never employed people among cases with missing data. The CPS definition of full-time versus part-time workers is having worked full-time during a majority of the weeks worked during the year. To match that definition, the number of weeks worked full-time was compared to the total number of weeks worked in all months of available data, ignoring missing months. This decision should not have biased the results in any particular way.

## Results

### All Children Under 18

Poverty: Although previous evaluation efforts had led us to expect that the SIPP estimates of related children under 18 in poverty would be lower than those of the CPS, we obtained an identical estimate -- 19.8% of related children under 18 in poverty (see Table 2). It is likely that our inclusion of persons with up to 4 months of missing income information accounts for the higher estimate of poverty using SIPP compared

to earlier researchers. If we are correct, it highlights the inappropriateness of working with files that contain information only on persons interviewed throughout the year or, even worse, throughout the life of the panel.

Although our overall estimate of children in poverty is comparable with that derived from the CPS, a comparison of childhood poverty estimates by children's ages and race reveals some differences. Compared to the CPS, SIPP yields a slightly lower estimate of childhood poverty among white children, but a higher estimate of poverty among black children. The column labelled "SIPP/CPS" shows the extent to which the two surveys differ in their estimates. A 1.00 indicates that the two estimates are identical. A number less than one indicates that SIPP produces a lower estimate than the CPS. Conversely, a number greater than one indicates that SIPP produces a higher estimate than the CPS. Examining these ratios, it is readily apparent that among white children 14 to 17, the SIPP estimate of the proportion in poverty is substantially lower than the CPS estimate. Among black children aged 3 to 13, on the other hand, the SIPP estimate of the proportion in poverty is much higher than the CPS estimate.

The differences in the poverty estimates by race could occur either because of inaccurate estimates of the numerator or of the denominator. The population estimates derived from SIPP of the number of children under 18 for the total child population as well as by race are quite similar to those derived from the CPS.

In keeping with the SIPP-CPS differences noted above, however, the estimates of the number of children in poverty differ by race with the SIPP estimate being lower compared to the CPS for whites and higher for blacks.

Table 3 notes potential sources of differences between the estimates derived from SIPP and those derived from the CPS. Because SIPP gathers income and family structure information every four months, the quality of the data should be better than data collected at a single point in time with a longer recall period as in the CPS. Moreover, our estimates of poverty based on SIPP use children's ages as of approximately mid-year 1986 and allow the composition of their families to change on a month-to-month basis. As indicated in Table 3, CPS estimates use children's ages and family structure as of March of the following year, 1987 in this case. To the extent that more income is recalled and reported, poverty estimates would be expected to be lower in the SIPP compared to the CPS. However, if family income fluctuates a lot on a month-to-month basis, the SIPP may identify more short-term spells of poverty than the CPS. Similarly, if family structure is volatile -- that is, if it changes often over relatively short periods, then the SIPP may identify more spells of poverty than the CPS that only uses family structure at a point in time. Robertson Williams (1987), using the 1984 SIPP panel, found that annual poverty rates were lower when family composition was allowed to vary compared to when family composition was fixed at a point in time. However, he was not

looking at race/ethnic differences in poverty rates and, as noted above, he was only using information on people who were in the sample for the entire year. It may be that at least part of the apparent overestimate of poverty among black children is actually not an overestimate at all, but rather is capturing true spells of poverty missed by the CPS. Because of budgetary constraints, we were not able to explore this possibility further within this project.

#### Children Under 6

The well-being of very young children is of particular interest to many policy analysts. The fact that poverty rates among children under 6 are higher than poverty rates among older children is of great concern to many (National Center for Children in Poverty, 1990). Table 4 compares CPS and SIPP estimates of family structure, maternal education, maternal age at first birth, and AFDC receipt among all children under age 6, among poor children under age 6, and among near-poor children under 6, defined as children within 150% of the poverty line, but who are not poor.

The CPS and SIPP produce quite similar estimates with respect to family structure, with some exceptions. For all children under 6, SIPP and CPS produce identical estimates of the proportion who are living with two parents -- 76%. SIPP, however, produces slightly lower estimates of young children living with single fathers, but higher estimates of young

children living with single, never-married mothers and of children living with other relatives.

The SIPP family structure estimates continue, for the most part, to be quite similar to those in the CPS even when examining only poor children and near poor children. Again, however, SIPP yields lower estimates of such children living with single fathers and higher estimates of such children living with single, never-married mothers than does the CPS. The estimates for near poor children under 6 who are living with single fathers or with other relatives, however, appear suspiciously low compared to the CPS. It may be that the smaller sample size of the SIPP in comparison with the CPS limits the extent to which specific subpopulations can be examined in detail.

SIPP yields higher estimates than the CPS of the proportion of children under 6 whose mothers began childbearing as teenagers. The CPS estimate for mother's age at first birth, however, is not based on the June Fertility supplement, but is calculated by subtracting the age of the mother's oldest child in the household from her current age. Thus, the CPS estimate understates the proportion of teenage childbearers to the extent that oldest children are no longer in the household.

In general, however, the estimates derived from SIPP are quite similar to those derived from the CPS, regardless of whether one examines the figures for all children under 6 or for the poor or near poor children. When there are discrepancies in the estimates, no clear pattern that might help to explain the

differences is apparent. The smaller sample size of SIPP appears to make the estimates for rarer populations (e.g., near poor children under six living with single fathers) less reliable than those from the CPS.

#### Families Receiving AFDC

Another population of interest to policymakers is the welfare population. The original intent of Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) was to help widows remain home to raise their children. However, since the program was initiated in 1935, the population receiving AFDC has changed dramatically. Widows represent only a small fraction of those who receive AFDC. Moreover, as more mothers have entered the labor force, the idea that taxpayers should pay for some mothers to stay home, while other mothers must juggle family and work responsibilities has been called into question. In 1988, Congress passed the Family Support Act which is intended to help welfare recipients become self-sufficient rather than receive aid over a long period of time. Researchers are very interested in the effects of the new Family Support Act on the AFDC population. SIPP could be very useful for such research. To assess the usefulness of SIPP for such analyses, in Table 5 we compare estimates derived from SIPP with estimates derived from the National Integrated Quality Control System (NIQCS).

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, in conjunction with the states, maintains the NIQCS to help states identify errors in the determination of AFDC eligibility and

amount of payment. The NIQCS consists of a sample of cases selected for review during the Federal fiscal year. The cases are representative of cases receiving AFDC, food stamps, or medicaid during the period. Although the NIQCS is limited in the amount and types of information that is collected, it does contain a random sample of approximately 67,000 recipient households and thus does provide reliable estimates of AFDC recipients and their basic demographic characteristics.

Although the time period covered is slightly different for the two data sets (October 1985 through September 1986 for the NIQCS compared with the calendar year 1986 for SIPP), this fact should not influence their estimates in any particular manner. In general, the SIPP estimates are quite comparable to those from the NIQCS. The one area that is clearly dissimilar is the shelter arrangement of AFDC families. The explanation for these differences is most likely due to differences in the way that the types of shelter arrangements were defined. For example, to estimate whether the house was owned or being bought in SIPP, the responses by all persons in the household were examined and if one person responded affirmatively, the family was said to own or to be purchasing the house. Although the NIQCS reports families that own or are purchasing their homes, its estimate appears quite low. By combining the estimates for owns/buying and private (no subsidy), the overall estimate of private, unsubsidized housing is nearly equivalent with the SIPP and the NIQCS, 69.3% and 68.7%, respectively.

Although the NIQCS provides basic information about AFDC recipients, it does have important gaps. For example, information on parent educational attainment is virtually useless because of extensive missing data. For this reason, we also made comparisons between SIPP estimates of AFDC families and estimates derived from the 1988 Child Health Supplement (CHS88) to the National Health Interview Survey (see Table 6). Again the time frame is different for the two surveys. The CHS88 data was collected in 1988, but the reference period for income and employment was the previous year. As noted above, the SIPP estimates reported in this paper refer to the calendar year 1986. Even with the slightly different time frames, SIPP and CHS88 provide very similar estimates of the education level of the most educated parent. SIPP has more AFDC families with the most educated parent having some high school and fewer families with college or graduate education compared to the CHS88.

Estimates of the labor force status of the parents in AFDC families provided by the SIPP and by the CHS88, however, differ substantially. Although the figures still differ when one examines the estimates for all families, the disparity is not nearly so large. It appears as if SIPP identifies more families as single parent families compared to the CHS88, particularly AFDC families. Some weak support for this statement is gained by examining Table 7 which compares the family living arrangements of children as estimated using SIPP, the CPS, and the CHS88. Both SIPP and the CPS indicate that slightly over 23% of all



children lived in single parent families. The CHS88, on the other hand, estimates that slightly less than 22% of all children lived in such a family.

With regards to the labor force status estimates, it is not clear which of the two surveys provides the more reliable data. SIPP was explicitly designed to collect program and participation data and so might be expected to obtain better estimates of the AFDC population. Moreover, since the respondents are interviewed every four months, their recollection of employment and income should also be better compared to the CHS88 where information is collected at one point in time. A comparison of the income estimates from the two surveys, however, are much more comparable than the employment information (see Table 6).

Limitation in Major Activity: Although SIPP is designed to obtain information about income and program participation, it also contains questions about disabilities. In particular, parents are asked whether any of their children living with them have a long lasting physical condition that limits their ability to walk, run, or play. The parents are also asked about long lasting mental or emotional problems that limit any of their children's ability to learn or to do regular schoolwork. Table contrasts estimates derived from SIPP with those derived from the 1988 Child Health Supplement of the National Health Interview Survey (CHS88). The CHS88 was explicitly designed to obtain detailed health information about the nation's children. Not surprisingly, SIPP consistently underestimates the proportion of

children under 18 who are limited in a major activity compared to the CHS88. The reports in SIPP appear to increase as family income increases, but regardless continue to underestimate limitations compared to the CHS88.

The large differences in the estimates derived from SIPP and the estimates derived from the CHS88 can be attributed primarily to the way in which the questions are asked in the two surveys. The CHS88 asks the respondents about a series of conditions that their child might have had. Thus parents are asked about repeated tonsillitis, frequent ear infections, diabetes asthma, pneumonia, deafness, and frequent or severe ear infections. About 30 conditions are specifically named and the respondent is asked to recall if there are any others. After going through this list, the respondent has to say for each condition mentioned whether during the previous 12 months the condition limited or prevented the subject child from doing usual childhood activities, such as playing with other children or participating in games or sports. The mention of explicit conditions probably serves to stimulate the respondent's memory. Moreover, a chronic condition, such as repeated ear infections, that kept the child in bed or at home for a few days every few months would most likely receive a positive response on the limitation section of the question. In other words, the CHS88 questions probably result in the inclusion of both relatively minor, as well as more serious chronic limitations, whereas the SIPP items explicitly

ask for long-term limitations that probably elicit only more serious health conditions from the respondents.

### Conclusion

Although earlier evaluations of SIPP estimates had found that SIPP underestimates poverty compared to the CPS, we did not find that to be the case. We, however, included persons with up to four months of missing information in our analyses, whereas earlier efforts had only included cases with complete information for the period being examined. Overall, the estimates of childhood poverty derived from SIPP appear excellent, although we did note some differences in estimates by race. SIPP identifies more black children and fewer white children in poverty than does the CPS.

Several specific subpopulations of children and families were examined, including poor children under 6, near poor children under 6, and families receiving AFDC. Even within these smaller populations, estimates derived from SIPP were in a majority of instances comparable to estimates derived from the CPS and other sources. As the population became more narrowly defined, however, the estimates from SIPP did begin to deviate from the other sources. SIPP's smaller sample size relative to the CPS may hinder its usefulness in studying specific groups that occur relatively rarely in the population.

Table 1: Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), 1986 Panel

Wave	Rotation Group	1986 Calendar Year											
		J a n	F e b	M a r	A p r	M a y	J u n	J u l	A u g	S e p	O c t	N o v	D e c
1	2	R4	I										
	3	R3	R4	I									
	4	R2	R3	R4	I								
	1	R1	R2	R3	R4	I							
2	2		R1	R2	R3	R4	I						
	3			R1	R2	R3	R4	I					
	4				R1	R2	R3	R4	I				
	1					R1	R2	R3	R4	I			
3	2						R1	R2	R3	R4	I		
	3							R1	R2	R3	R4	I	
	4								R1	R2	R3	R4	I
4	1								R1	R2	R3	R4	

Legend: R# - Reference Month 1, 2, 3, or 4  
 I - Interview Month

Table 2: Related Children Under 18: A Comparison of Poverty Estimates Devised from the 1986 Panel of the Survey of Income and Program Participation and the March 1987 Current Population Survey.

RELATED CHILDREN UNDER 18	SIPP	CPS	SIPP/CPS
Under 150% of Poverty Level	30.9%	30.4%	1.02
In Poverty -- All Children	19.8%	19.8%	1.00
Under 3 years	22.3%	21.1%	1.06
3 to 5 years	23.6%	22.0%	1.07
6 to 13 years	21.1%	20.5%	1.03
14 to 17 years	12.8%	15.7%	0.82
In Poverty -- White Children	13.8%	15.3%	0.90
Under 3 years	16.7%	16.8%	0.99
3 to 5 years	17.7%	17.6%	1.01
6 to 13 years	14.4%	15.9%	0.91
14 to 17 years	7.8%	11.4%	0.68
In Poverty -- Black Children	49.6%	42.7%	1.16
Under 3 years	48.5%	45.6%	1.06
3 to 5 years	53.7%	44.6%	1.20
6 to 13 years	54.1%	43.1%	1.26
14 to 17 years	39.2%	38.1%	1.03
<b>POPULATION ESTIMATES ('000s)</b>			
Total in Poverty	12,449	12,257	1.02
Whites	7,065	7,714	0.92
Blacks	4,831	4,039	1.20
Total Under 18	62,871	62,009	1.01
Whites	51,044	50,356	1.01
Blacks	9,736	9,467	1.03
<b>FAMILIES WITH RELATED CHILDREN UNDER 18</b>			
In Poverty	16.8%	16.3%	1.03

Source: March 1987 CPS data as reported in U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1988, "Poverty in the United States: 1986." Current Population Reports, P-60, No. 160, Tables 7 and 14. Washington, DC: GPO.

Table 3: Potential Sources of Differences Between Estimates Derived from SIPP and CPS.

SIPP	CPS
Poverty estimates based on income, age, and family structure at each month of the calendar year.	Poverty estimates based on income in prior calendar year, but age and family structure are measured at the time of the March survey of the following year. For example, 1986 poverty estimates for children under 18 are based on income for 1986, but family structure and age in March of 1987.
Income is measured as money income before taxes. It includes lump-sum payments or one-time payments, but excludes educational assistance. Value of non-cash benefits such as employer provided health insurance, food stamps, and Medicaid are excluded.	Income is measured as money income before taxes. However, lump-sum payments are excluded, but educational assistance is included. Value of non-cash benefits is excluded.
Four-month recall period on income and receipt of transfer benefits.	One year recall period on income and receipt of transfer benefits.
Not possible to have negative amounts for self-employment income.	Possible to have negative amounts for self-employment income.
We allowed up to 4 reference months to be missing when we calculated income and poverty. For persons with up to four months missing, we used the average of the information on income and poverty from all other available months to estimate the information for the missing months. About 3% of children and 3% of families were missing up to 4 months of information.	Not a longitudinal survey, therefore issues of attrition do not arise.
We included foster children (approximately 3% of children were foster children).	Foster children are excluded from published tabulations on related children.
We included in the child population persons under 18 who were parents <u>if</u> they lived with their parents.	Excludes from child population persons under 18 with own children.
For child file, included only cases with a designated parent or guardian. For family file, person had to be a designated parent or guardian or the spouse of a designated parent or guardian to be included in the file.	Used published data on related children under 18 or families with related children under 18.
Age was measured as of Wave 2, month four (that is, the month prior to the Wave 2 interview). Thus age was measured between May and August, depending on the rotation group.	Age measured as of March 1987.

Table 4: Familial Characteristics of Related Children Under 6: A Comparison of Estimates Derived from the 1986 Panel of the Survey of Income and Program Participation with Estimates Derived from the March 1987 Current Population Survey.

Related Children Under Age 6	All Children Under 6			Poor Children Under 6			Near Poor Children < 6		
	SIPP	CPS	SIPP/CPS	SIPP	CPS	SIPP/CPS	SIPP	CPS	SIPP/CPS
<b>Family Structure</b>									
Two Parents	76.0%	76%	1.00	38.6%	42%	.92	79.6%	76%	1.05
Single Mother	20.9%	20%	1.05	58.1%	53%	1.10	19.4%	19%	1.02
-Divorced	4.4	5	.88	10.6	10	1.06	4.1	5	.82
-Never Married	10.6	9	1.18	31.2	27	1.16	10.3	8	1.29
-Separated	5.0	5	1.00	14.3	13	1.10	2.7	4	.68
-Widowed	0.1	1	.10	0.0	1	--	0.7	1	.70
Single Father	1.4%	2%	.70	1.8%	3%	.60	0.2%	2%	.10
Other Relatives	1.4%	1%	1.40	2.1%	2%	1.05	0.3%	2%	.15
Non-Relatives	0.8%	<1%	.80	0.4%	1%	.40	1.3%	1%	1.30
<b>Mother's Education</b>									
No High School	5.0%	6%	.83	10.9%	17%	.64	9.4%	9%	1.04
Some High School	14.3%	14%	1.02	35.3%	30%	1.18	18.7%	19%	.98
High School Grad.	46.7%	45%	1.04	45.0%	41%	1.10	52.7%	50%	1.05
Some College	18.2%	18%	1.01	7.2%	10%	.72	15.0%	16%	.94
College Graduate	15.8%	17%	.93	1.6%	2%	.80	4.2%	6%	.70
<b>Mother's Age at First Birth</b>									
Under Age 20	29.9%	24%	1.25	56.7%	47%	1.21	42.3%	36%	1.18
20 or Older	70.1%	77%	.91	43.3%	54%	.80	57.7%	64%	.90
<b>AFDC Receipt</b>									
Yes	13.9%	14%	.99	48.5%	52%	.93	8.5%	13%	.65

**Note:** CPS numbers are rounded so that differences in estimates are only approximate.

**Source:** Unpublished tabulations prepared by Child Trends, Inc., using the March 1987 Current Population Survey and the 1986 Panel of the Survey of Income and Program Participation.



Table 5: Characteristics of Families Receiving AFDC: A Comparison of Estimates Derived from the 1986 Panel of the Survey of Income and Program Participation and the National Integrated Quality Control System's Data for Fiscal Year 1986.

	SIPP	QCS	SIPP/QCS
AFDC Families Receiving Food Stamps	88.3%	80.7	1.09
AFDC Families by Persons in Household			
One	0.0%	0.6%	.0
Two	16.9	22.9	.74
Three	25.7	27.8	.92
Four	21.9	21.6	1.01
Five	14.8	12.8	1.16
Six	7.9	6.9	1.14
Seven or More	12.8	7.4	1.73
AFDC Families by Shelter Arrangement			
Owns/buying	21.4%	4.9%	4.37
Private (no subsidy)	47.9	63.8	.75
Public Housing	16.5	9.6	1.72
Rents (free)	5.0	5.3	.94
Rents (subsidy)	9.2	10.7	.86
Shares group quarters	-	1.9	-
Unknown	-	3.9	-
AFDC Family by Race/Ethnicity of Natural/Adoptive Parent			
White	46.1%	39.7	1.16
Black	35.1	40.7	.86
Hispanic	15.8	14.4	1.10
Other	3.1	5.0	.62
Age Distribution of Children Receiving AFDC			
Total Number	6,770,297	7,162,036	.95
Average Age	7.5 yrs	7.9 yrs	.95
Under 3	19.9%	21.9%	.91
3-5	19.8	21.1	.94
6-8	20.8	17.8	1.17
9-11	15.8	14.6	1.08
12-14	11.2	13.0	.86
15-17	11.9	10.5	1.13
18	0.6	0.8	.75
AFDC Families by Age of Youngest Child			
0-2	38.6%	38.1%	1.01
3-5	22.8	22.5	1.01
6-11	25.6	24.1	1.06
12-15	9.2	10.6	.87
16-18	3.7	3.8	.97
unknown	-	.8	-

Source: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Family Support Administration, undated. "Characteristics and Financial Circumstances of AFDC Recipients, 1986."

Table 6: Selected Characteristics of All Families and AFDC Families: A Comparison of estimates Derived from the 1986 Panel of the Survey of Income and Program Participation and the 1988 Child Health Supplement to the National Health Interview Survey.

	All Families			AFDC Families		
	SIPP	CHS88	SIPP/ CHS	SIPP	CHS	SIPP/ CHS
<b>Education of Most Educated Parent</b>						
Grade school only	4.4%	4.4%	1.00	11.1%	11.9%	.93
Some high school	10.7%	9.2%	1.16	33.4%	28.8%	1.16
High school graduate	38.9%	37.6%	1.03	41.0%	43.4%	.94
Some college	22.3%	23.3%	.96	12.5%	13.6%	.92
College graduate	10.5%	13.3%	.79	1.5%	1.7%	.88
Graduate school	13.2%	12.2%	1.08	0.5%	0.7%	.71
<b>Parent Labor Force Status</b>						
<b>Two-parent Family</b>						
Father employed, mother not in labor force	22.8%	25.8%	.88	2.8%	12.4%	.23
Father unemployed, mother not in labor force	0.9%	0.9%	1.00	1.2%	2.8%	.43
Both currently employed	40.0%	45.1%	.89	2.6%	8.4%	.31
Both in labor force, one or both unemployed	3.9%	4.0%	.98	2.9%	3.7%	.78
Mother in labor force, father not in labor force	2.0%	2.3%	.87	0.8%	3.2%	.25
Neither in labor force	2.0%	2.6%	.77	2.6%	10.8%	.24
<b>Single-parent family</b>						
Not in labor force	9.3%	6.9%	1.35	55.7%	40.5%	1.38
Currently employed	16.8%	11.1%	1.51	18.0%	11.4%	1.58
Currently unemployed	2.3%	1.3%	1.77	13.3%	6.8%	1.96

Family Income						
Less than \$5,000	5.5%	5.5%	1.00	31.4%	30.1%	1.04
\$5,000-\$9,999	9.9%	8.5%	1.16	39.8%	37.7%	1.06
\$10,000-\$14,999	8.9%	8.4%	1.06	9.8%	14.9%	.66
\$15,000-\$19,999	10.5%	10.9%	.96	5.1%	7.7%	.66
\$20,000-\$34,999	31.7%	30.2%	1.05	10.1%	6.6%	1.53
\$35,000 and over	33.4%	36.5%	.92	3.8%	3.1%	1.23

Source: Unpublished tabulations produced at Child Trends, Inc.

Table 7: Family Living Arrangements of Children Under 18: A Comparison of Estimates from the 1986 Panel of the Survey of Income and Program Participation, the March 1987 Current Population Surveys, and the 1988 Child Health Supplement to the National Health Interview.

FAMILY TYPE	SIPP	3/87 CPS*	CHS88**
Two Parents	73.6%	74.2%	73.1%
Single Parent	23.2%	23.6%	21.9%
Mother	21.2%	21.1%	20.4%
Father	2.0%	2.5%	1.5%
Other Arrangement	3.4%	2.2%	5.0%

\* U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1987. "Marital Status and Living Arrangements: March 1986." Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 418, Table E. (Note that children living with non-relatives only were excluded.)

\*\* Dawson, Deborah A. 1991. "Family Structure and Children's Health and Well-Being: Data from the 1988 National Health Interview Survey on Child Health." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 53(3), 573-584, Table 1.

Table 8: Children Under 18 Who Are Limited in a Major Activity: A Comparison of Estimates from the 1986 Panel of the Survey of Income and Program Participation with Estimates from the 1988 Child Health Supplement to the National Health Interview Survey.

Percent of children under 18 limited in school, work, or play because of a chronic condition.			
	SIPP	CHS88*	SIPP/CHS88
Total	2.1%	3.9%	.54
Males	2.5%	4.6%	.54
Females	1.7%	3.2%	.53
Whites	2.0%	4.0%	.50
Blacks	3.1%	4.2%	.74
Family income:			
under \$10,000	2.8%	6.9%	.41
\$10,000-\$19,999	2.1%	4.9%	.43
\$20,000-\$34,999	2.1%	3.6%	.58
\$35,000 and over	1.7%	2.7%	.63

\*Source: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. 1989. "Current Estimates from the National Health Interview Survey, 1988." Vital and Health Statistics, Series 10, No. 173, Table 67.

#92-086

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

Christine Winquist Nord and Amy Rhoads  
Child Trends, Inc.  
Washington, D.C.

August 1992

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<sup>1</sup>. 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

---

<sup>1</sup>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. The SIPP data that are used refer to calendar year 1986. Thus the time periods are one-year different. This fact should not materially affect the results.



additional data from SIPP that are not available in the March 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 abroad, 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 spells 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, labelled '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 reciprocity 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 reciprocity 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.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bianchi, Suzanne M. 1990. "America's Children: Mixed Prospects" Population Bulletin 45(1): 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.

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.

	<u>Children in:</u>				
	<u>AFDC Families</u>	<u>Poor Non-AFDC Families</u>	<u>Near-Poor<sup>1</sup> Families</u>	<u>Non-Poor Families</u>	<u>All Children</u>
<u>Race/Ethnicity</u>					
White (non-Hispanic)	39.5Z	46.5Z	64.3Z	82.8Z	72.2Z
Black (non-Hispanic)	38.2Z	30.8Z	11.9Z	8.1Z	14.2Z
Hispanic	19.2Z	16.9Z	21.5Z	6.3Z	10.4Z
Other	3.2Z	5.8Z	2.2Z	2.8Z	3.1Z
<u>Presence of parents in household<sup>2</sup></u>					
Both	15.0Z	57.6Z	75.3Z	85.3Z	73.7Z
Mother only	76.7Z	34.1Z	21.2Z	10.0Z	20.9Z
Father only	2.2Z	1.6Z	1.0Z	2.1Z	2.0Z
Neither	6.0Z	6.6Z	2.5Z	2.5Z	3.4Z
<u>Education of More Educated Parent</u>					
Less than high school	13.2Z	14.0Z	9.9Z	1.9Z	5.3Z
Some high school	33.0Z	25.1Z	16.7Z	4.2Z	10.9Z
High school graduate	40.4Z	43.6Z	47.3Z	34.7Z	37.6Z
Some college	11.6Z	13.8Z	16.9Z	26.5Z	22.5Z
College graduate	1.6Z	3.4Z	9.2Z	32.7Z	23.7Z
<u>Family Income<sup>3</sup></u>					
<\$ 5,000	28.8Z	20.7Z	.0Z	.0Z	5.4Z
\$ 5,000 - 9,999	41.7Z	46.6Z	8.6Z	.0Z	10.6Z
\$10,000 - 14,999	10.3Z	24.3Z	36.6Z	2.2Z	9.0Z
\$15,000 - 24,999	10.6Z	8.3Z	49.2Z	21.2Z	21.4Z
\$25,000 - 34,999	4.1Z	.0Z	5.7Z	29.2Z	20.8Z
\$35,000 - 49,999	3.1Z	.0Z	.0Z	26.5Z	18.3Z
\$50,000+	1.3Z	.0Z	.0Z	20.9Z	14.4Z
<u>Housing Tenure</u>					
Owned	19.4Z	37.3Z	47.2Z	74.8Z	61.8Z
Rented	58.8Z	53.5Z	48.4Z	24.0Z	33.5Z
Public housing	21.9Z	9.2Z	4.4Z	1.3Z	4.7Z
<u>Receipt of Food Stamps</u>					
	90.0Z	54.9Z	18.0Z	1.5Z	18.7Z

(continued)

1. "Near-Poor" is defined as from 100Z to 150Z 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.

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 (continued).

	<u>Children in:</u>				
	<u>AFDC Families</u>	<u>Poor Non-AFDC Families</u>	<u>Near-Poor<sup>1</sup> Families</u>	<u>Non-Poor Families</u>	<u>All Children</u>
<u>Age of youngest child</u>					
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%
<u>Age of focus child</u>					
2 or younger	23.2%	17.3%	18.3%	16.6%	17.6%
3-5	19.6%	20.1%	20.2%	15.7%	17.1%
6-8	20.2%	17.9%	18.7%	15.1%	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%	11.4%	12.4%	20.2%	17.4%
<u>Number of siblings</u>					
None	24.9%	22.7%	17.7%	27.1%	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%	7.1%	3.4%	5.5%
<u>Ages of children<sup>4</sup></u>					
All under 5	21.3%	13.4%	16.3%	17.0%	17.0%
Under 5, 5-11	25.6%	25.1%	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%	20.1%
All 12-17	8.7%	12.4%	13.9%	24.1%	20.1%

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.

	<u>Children in:</u>				
	<u>AFDC Families</u>	<u>Poor Non-AFDC Families</u>	<u>Near-Poor Families</u>	<u>Non-Poor Families</u>	<u>All Children</u>
<u>Race/Ethnicity</u>					
White (non-Hispanic)	35.3Z	47.5Z	62.9Z	80.9Z	70.3Z
Black (non-Hispanic)	41.3Z	25.9Z	17.3Z	8.8Z	15.2Z
Hispanic	18.3Z	22.3Z	16.6Z	6.8Z	10.8Z
Other	5.0Z	4.3Z	3.3Z	3.6Z	3.8Z
<u>Presence of parents in household at time of survey</u>					
Both	20.5Z	49.1Z	70.1Z	85.3Z	72.4Z
Mother only	72.5Z	36.0Z	23.4Z	10.0Z	21.3Z
Father only	1.9Z	3.7Z	2.9Z	2.9Z	2.9Z
Neither	5.1Z	11.1Z	3.6Z	1.9Z	3.5Z
<u>Education of More Educated Parent</u>					
Less than high school	17.8Z	16.0Z	8.7Z	1.7Z	5.7Z
Some high school	31.6Z	21.7Z	14.1Z	4.0Z	9.9Z
High school graduate	38.8Z	40.7Z	49.5Z	35.2Z	37.5Z
Some college	10.1Z	14.8Z	18.2Z	24.6Z	21.3Z
College graduate	1.7Z	6.9Z	9.6Z	34.6Z	25.7Z
<u>Family Income<sup>3</sup></u>					
<\$ 5,000	32.6Z	34.0Z	.0Z	.0Z	7.6Z
\$ 5,000 - 9,999	40.4Z	37.0Z	5.0Z	.0Z	9.3Z
\$10,000 - 14,999	12.2Z	25.5Z	37.7Z	1.4Z	8.7Z
\$15,000 - 24,999	8.9Z	3.5Z	51.8Z	15.9Z	17.0Z
\$25,000 - 34,999	2.8Z	.0Z	5.5Z	23.8Z	17.0Z
\$35,000 - 49,999	2.0Z	.0Z	.0Z	29.6Z	20.4Z
\$50,000+	1.1Z	.0Z	.0Z	29.3Z	20.0Z
<u>Housing Tenure</u>					
Owned	19.2Z	38.1Z	47.3Z	77.4Z	63.5Z
Rented	52.1Z	50.0Z	46.9Z	21.5Z	30.6Z
Public Housing	28.7Z	11.9Z	5.8Z	1.1Z	5.9Z
<u>Receipt of Food Stamps</u>	86.1Z	33.5Z	10.8Z	0.9Z	15.2Z

(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.

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 (continued).

	<u>Children in:</u>				
	<u>AFDC Families</u>	<u>Poor Non-AFDC Families</u>	<u>Near-Poor Families</u>	<u>Non-Poor Families</u>	<u>All Children</u>
<u>Age of youngest child</u>					
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%	21.6%	20.5%	21.3%
6+	35.2%	43.9%	43.8%	51.9%	48.3%
<u>Age of focus child</u>					
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%
<u>Number of siblings</u>					
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%
<u>Ages of children<sup>4</sup></u>					
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 March 1988 Supplement to the Current Population Survey, 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<sup>1</sup> SIPP Weighted Data<sup>1</sup>

	<u>Children in:</u>				
	<u>AFDC Families</u>	<u>Poor Non-AFDC Families</u>	<u>Near-Poor<sup>2</sup> Families</u>	<u>Non-Poor Families</u>	<u>All Children</u>
<u>Mother's Age at First Birth</u>					
Under 15	9.1%	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%
<u>Mother's Current Age</u>					
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%	50.1%	41.5%	44.1%
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%
<u>Mother's Education Level</u>					
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%
<u>Mother's Marital Status</u>					
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%
<u>Mother's Current Employment Status</u>					
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%
<u>Mother's Employment Last Year</u>					
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%	6.1%
Not in labor force	32.9%	35.6%	26.9%	18.5%	22.7%
<u>Mother Disabled<sup>4</sup></u>	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.<sup>1</sup>

	<u>Children in:</u>				
	<u>AFDC Families</u>	<u>Poor Non-AFDC Families</u>	<u>Near-Poor<sup>2</sup> Families</u>	<u>Non-Poor Families</u>	<u>All Children</u>
<u>Mother's Age at First Birth (Approximated)<sup>3</sup></u>					
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%
<u>Mother's Current Age<sup>4</sup></u>					
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%
<u>Mother's Education Level</u>					
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%
<u>Mother's Marital Status</u>					
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%
<u>Mother's Current Employment Status</u>					
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%
<u>Mother's Employment Last Year</u>					
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%
<u>Mother Disabled<sup>5</sup></u>					
	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 in AFDC Families, Poor Non-AFDC Families, Near-Poor Families, and Non-Poor Families, Children Under 18, United States, 1986  
SIPP Weighted Data.

	<u>Children in:</u>				
	<u>AFDC Families</u>	<u>Poor Non-AFDC Families</u>	<u>Near-Poor Families</u>	<u>Non-Poor Families</u>	<u>All Children</u>
<u>Father's Age</u>					
Under 20	.1%	.0%	.4%	.1%	.1%
20-24	2.5%	3.2%	4.8%	2.4%	2.7%
25-34	5.0%	25.1%	33.3%	28.8%	26.3%
35-44	7.9%	21.4%	28.1%	42.0%	34.6%
45-54	1.4%	6.9%	8.6%	12.3%	10.2%
55+	1.4%	4.8%	2.8%	3.1%	3.1%
No father in household	81.7%	38.7%	22.0%	11.2%	23.0%
<u>Father's Education Level</u>					
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%
<u>Father's Current Employment Status</u>					
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%
<u>Father's Employment Last Year</u>					
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.

	<u>Children in:</u>				
	<u>AFDC Families</u>	<u>Poor Non-AFDC Families</u>	<u>Near-Poor Families</u>	<u>Non-Poor Families</u>	<u>All Children</u>
<u>Father's Age</u>					
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%
<u>Father's Education Level<sup>1</sup></u>					
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%
<u>Father's Current Employment Status</u>					
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%
<u>Father's Employment Last Year</u>					
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%	1.3%	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.

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

	Children ,living with mothers who began childbearing as <u>teenagers</u>	Children living with mothers who were 20 or older <u>at first birth</u>	All <u>Children</u>
<u>Race/Ethnicity</u>			
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%	3.1%
<u>Presence of Parents in Household</u>			
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%
<u>Education of Most Educated Parent</u>			
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%
<u>Family Income</u>			
< \$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%
<u>Poverty Status</u>			
Below Poverty Level	32.0%	13.6%	19.8%
100-149% of Poverty Le	16.9%	9.0%	11.1%
Above 150% of Poverty	51.0%	77.4%	69.1%

(continued)

Table 7. Demographic characteristics of children living with mothers who began childbearing as teenagers, with mothers who began childbearing at age 20 or older, and all children under 18 ; United States 1986 (continued).

	Children ,living with mothers who began childbearing as <u>teenagers</u>	Children living with mothers who were 20 or older <u>at first birth</u>	<u>All Children</u>
<u>Housing Tenure</u>			
Owned	47.1%	68.4%	61.8%
Rented	44.0%	28.8%	33.5%
Public Housing	8.9%	2.8%	4.7%
<u>Receipt of Food Stamps</u>	31.1%	13.3%	18.7%
<u>Age of Youngest Child</u>			
< 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%
<u>Age of Child</u>			
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%
<u>Number of Siblings</u>			
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%
<u>Ages of Children</u>			
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 living 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 <u>teenagers</u>	Children living with mothers who were 20 or older <u>at first birth</u>	All <u>Children</u>
<u>Mothers age at first birth</u>			
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%
<u>Mother's Current Age</u>			
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%
<u>Mother's Education</u>			
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%
<u>Mother's Marital Status</u>			
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%
<u>Mother's Current Employment Status</u>			
Employed	52.1%	60.3%	57.3%
Unemployed	7.7%	3.9%	4.9%
Not in labor force	40.1%	35.8%	37.7%
<u>Not in Labor Force Because Unable to Work</u>			
	4.9%	3.5%	4.6%
<u>Mother's Employment Status in Last Year</u>			
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.