# Assessing Employment Outcomes from the Survey of Program Dynamics Second Longitudinal File: What type of jobs do welfare leavers get?

John J. Hisnanick and Katherine G. Walker *
U.S. Census Bureau, Longitudinal Income Statistics Branch, Housing and Household Economic Statistics Division, Washington, DC 20233

ABSTRACT:

A primary goal of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA) was reducing welfare dependency through job preparation and employment. Rather than having entitlement benefits, welfare recipients now face time limits and must, along with their caseworker, develop a program that will assist them in preparing for employment and finding a job. Prior work with the Survey of Program Dynamics (SPD) first longitudinal file found that for approximately 1.1 million people who moved from welfare to work between 1993 and 1997, over one-third were employed in low-wage, service sector jobs. Using the SPD second longitudinal file (SLF), supplemented with data for occupational measures from the dictionary of occupational titles (DOT), a better picture emerges on the types of jobs that former welfare recipients get.

**Key Words:** Survey of Program Dynamics (SPD), public assistance, employment outcomes.

## Introduction

Passage of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA) led to a higher percentage of welfare recipients seeking employment than under the 61 year-old Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program. The PRWORA legislation, along with the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families

* This paper reports the results of research and analysis undertaken by the U.S. Census Bureau staff. It has undergone a Census Bureau review more limited in scope than that given to official Census Bureau publications. This paper is released to inform interested parties of ongoing research and to encourage discussion of work in progress. This paper was presented at the 2003 Joint Statistical Meetings, American Statistical Association, San Francisco, CA, August 2-5, 2003.

(TANF) program it created, provides states with the authority to implement and enforce work requirements for welfare recipients, as well as impose a time limit of five years or less on federally funded welfare receipt (Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, 2000). These measures are meant to ensure that a far larger proportion of current and former welfare recipients participate in the paid labor force. However, federal and state governments are not guaranteeing jobs for those newly off the welfare rolls. Even during periods of continued economic growth and prosperity, many former recipients may have difficulty securing jobs that allow them to adequately support themselves and their families.

To better understand which former recipients are at risk of remaining poor, as well as those who are positioned to be successful in the paid labor market, this paper focuses on the employment outcomes and job types of former welfare recipients. The Survey of Program Dynamics (SPD)[1] is used to look at the impact that individual and family characteristics have on employment outcomes that lead to or hinder the financial independence of former welfare recipients under PRWORA guidelines.[2] In addition, the SPD data is supplemented with information on the nature and demands of various occupations leading to further insights on employment outcomes and job types.[3]

[1] For this study, the second longitudinal file was used. This file contains fully edited data covering calendar years 1993-1994 and 1996-1999.
[2] The estimates in this report are based on responses from a sample of the population. As with all surveys, estimates may vary from the actual values because of sampling variation or other factors. All comparisons made in this report have undergone statistical testing and are significant at the 90-percent confidence level unless otherwise noted.
[3] The occupational codes available on the SPD SLF were supplemented with job characteristics available from the Occupational Measures from the Dictionary of Occupational Title for the 1980 Census Detailed Occupations, ICPSR Study No. 8942, Principal investigators, Paula England and Barbara Kilbourne.

**Background on Welfare Reform**

Work requirements under PRWORA were based largely on the idea that women who stayed on welfare for extended periods of time saw poor paid labor market outcomes and became dependent on public assistance (Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, 2000). Through devolution states were given autonomy in defining work, as well as designing and implementing state-level programs (Blank, 2002). The legislation mandates include that by 2002, at least 50 percent of single-parent households and 90 percent of two-parent households were to be working or in work preparation programs. A majority of current and former recipients of welfare, however, do not possess the skills and training necessary to find a job in the paid labor market earning a wage that allows them to gain economic independence (Hisnanick, 2002). When time limits are reached, many former recipients and their families may be forced to live below the meager income levels that they had while receiving welfare (Holzer and Danziger, 1998).

Previous studies found that while approximately 60 percent of former recipients work after welfare, more than 40 percent remained poor five years after they left AFDC (Meyer and Cancian, 1998). This is most evident when reviewing previous studies looking at both wage and recidivism rates for former welfare recipients. These studies found that recipients who left the AFDC rolls were paid, on average, between $5 or $6 per hour (Vartanian and Gleason, 1999). In addition, wage increases were found to be minimal, at best, for those who left welfare. Women who left welfare with some college, on average, experienced a $0.45 increase per year in hourly wages; women who left

welfare with a high school degree, on average, experienced a $0.07 increase per year in hourly wages (Friedlander and Burtless, 1995). Returning to welfare after an initial exit was not uncommon. Ellwood (1988) found that recidivism rates ranged from 34 percent to 40 percent over a 15-year period, and similarly, Harris (1996) found recidivism rates to range from 11 percent for the first six months after leaving welfare to 15 percent after being off welfare for 24 months.

As varying wage and recidivism rates highlight, the economic independence of former welfare recipients rests not only on getting a job, but also finding one that will pay them enough to support themselves and their families. Although research exists on welfare recipients after they leave the rolls, only with the advent of PRWORA has the focus changed to investigating the type of jobs that former recipients take after leaving welfare.

**Background on the Low Wage Labor Market**

In the years immediately following the passage of PRWORA, the U.S. economy grew rapidly and there was a simultaneous increase in the demand for paid labor. Between 1996 and 1999, real gross domestic product jumped 12.5 percent, the unemployment rate declined from 5.6 percent to 4.3 percent, and the labor force expanded by 5.6 million people.[4] Gains in employment were accompanied by an increase in earnings. Weekly earnings among full-time workers rose, on average, from $599 to $665 per week among adult men and from $439 to $494 per week among adult

[4] Council of Economic Advisors (2002). Economic Report of the President.

women, representing a rise of 1.5 percent to 2 percent per year after adjusting for price increases (Lerman and Ratcliffe, 2001).

Former welfare recipients, many of whom have minimal or no employment skills, seek jobs in the secondary, low-wage labor market. Jobs in the secondary labor market are characterized by low mobility, low wages, no benefits, high levels of turnover, unpleasant working conditions, and low prestige (Bernstein and Hartmann, 1999; Doeringer and Piore, 1971). For unskilled, low-wage workers, changing patterns of employment are highly sensitive to the changing demands and growth in the U.S. economy. Periods of lagging growth and recessions significantly impact the economic well-being of these workers. They are the first to be laid-off or dismissed and the last to be called back or rehired. The wage structure and employment patterns for low-wage workers are not only affected by the level of demand for labor, but also the relative demand among all industries, and the relative demand for workers in different skill classes or occupational groups.

The movement from welfare-to-work raises concerns regarding the possibly large influx of low-skilled, single women with children into the job market, which could depress the wages of all low-skilled workers. Between 1995 and 1999, the labor force participation rate of single women with children rose rapidly in several major metropolitan areas. During this time the share of single mothers working or looking for work increased from 67 percent to 79 percent, reflecting more than a quarter-million women. The increased labor force activity extended to less educated , as well as more educated, single women with children. Those with a high school degree or less raised

their rate of labor force participation from 59 percent to 79 percent (Lerman and Ratcliffe, 2001).

The effect of welfare reform on single women with children might be expected to influence the job market for less educated adult workers more dramatically than the job market for all workers. The reason is that single mothers, most likely to enter the labor market because of welfare reform, have lower educational attainment than the average worker (Hisnanick, 2002). Their most plausible adult competitors are women and unmarried men with a high school degree or less. While single women with children made up 13 percent of this less educated segment of the workforce, they accounted for 24 percent of its labor force growth (Lerman and Ratcliffe, 2001).

**Data**

Under PRWORA guidelines, the Census Bureau was directed to conduct the SPD to help researchers evaluate the legislation's effectiveness.[5] Longitudinal data were collected for 7 years on the demographic, social, and economic characteristics of a nationally representative sample of the U.S. population. These data supplemented 3 years of longitudinal data available from the 1992 and 1993 panels of the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP). When all data are released, the SPD will

[5] The specific language of P.L. 104-193 requires and funds a new survey by the Census Bureau, the Survey of Program Dynamics. The legislation directs the Census Bureau to "continue to collect data on the 1992 and 1993 panels of the Survey of Income and Program Participation as necessary to obtain such information as will enable interested people to evaluate the impact on a random national sample of recipients of assistance under state programs funded under this part and other low-income families, and in doing so, shall pay particular attention to the issues of out-of-wedlock birth, welfare dependency, the beginning and end of welfare spells, and the causes of repeat welfare spells, and shall obtain information about the status of children participating in such panels."

provide 10 years of data on program eligibility, access and participation; transfer income and in-kind benefits; employment transitions; income sources and values; and family composition.

The SPD collected data in three phases. First, respondents interviewed in the first and last waves of the 1992 and 1993 SIPP panels were re-contacted and interviewed May through July of 1997. At this time, approximately 35,000 households were asked about their 1996 income and program participation using the 1997 "Bridge" Survey, a slightly modified version of the March 1997 Current Population Survey (CPS) Supplement.

Second, full implementation of a core set of questions on topics such as employment, earnings, income, and program participation during the preceding calendar year took place in 1998. A new computer-assisted questionnaire was administered to household respondents age 15 years old and over in a sample of approximately 19,000 households. Third, starting in 1999 and continuing through 2002, core data as well as data dealing with such topics as child well-being, health care, and child support were collected.

The SPD second longitudinal file (SLF) provides information on more than 29,000 people, and spans 1993-1994 and 1996-1999. There is core data collected on demographic characteristics, labor force activity, income, and program participation from each year. The SPD SLF provides information on program participation, causes of

program participation, and its long-term effects on the well-being of recipients and their households, particularly employment outcomes.[6]

To supplement the SPD SLF, a set of occupational characteristics from the 1980 Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT) were merged with the data for people who had an annual, three-digit occupational code. This additional data was incorporated to control for the skill demands and conditions for occupations. The set of characteristics measure and assess occupational requirements in such areas as strength, reach, physical demand, manual dexterity, intelligence, and eye-hand-foot coordination. The methods employed in constructing these occupational characteristics are extensively documented elsewhere (England and Kilbourne, 1988; England, Farkas, Kilbourne and Dou, 1988; England and Dunn, 1988).

**Findings**

The longitudinal nature of the SDP SLF allows for tracking public assistance participation between 1993 and 1999. In 1993, around 6 million people (age 15+) received public assistance and three-in-four of these people remained on the rolls 1 year later. By 1999, 3 years after the passage of PRWORA, the number of people on the public assistance rolls dropped to 2.5 million people, with two-in-three people having been on the rolls in the prior year. Similarly, looking at 2 year lags in public assistance participation, 4.1 million people were on the rolls in 1998, with 49 percent having

[6] A more complete description of the SPD longitudinal files is available at the SPD website (http://www.bls.census.gov/spd) and the SPD Users Guide, also available on-line.

received public assistance 2 years earlier. And, for the 2.5 million people receiving public assistance in 1999, just over half were receiving it in 1997 (see Table 1).

There are notable differences between the characteristics of those who left the public assistance rolls before (1993-1994) and after (1996-1999) PRWORA (see Tables 2 and 2a). To start with, those receiving public assistance in 1993 and 1997 are statistically equal across the categories of race/ethnicity, marital status, and level of educational attainment, while those who stopped receiving public assistance in the 1994 and 1998 are different. For example, those who moved off the public assistance rolls between 1993 and 1994 were more likely to be married and have a higher level of education compared to those who received public assistance in 1993. By comparison, those who moved off the public assistance rolls between 1997 and 1998 were comparable to those who received public assistance in 1997. Those who moved off the rolls between 1993 and 1994 are notably different from those individuals who moved off the rolls between 1997 and 1998. Specifically, those who left the rolls between 1997 and 1998 were less likely to be married, and less likely to be a high school graduate.

Around 1.2 million people who received public assistance in 1994 had left the rolls by 1996. Of this group, eight-in-ten remained off the rolls from 1996 to 1999, with another 13.1 percent moving on-and-off the public assistance rolls. It should not be surprising that those who initially moved off the rolls in 1996 are comparable to those who moved off and stay off the rolls from 1996 to 1999. Those who returned at least once to the rolls between 1996 and 1999 are different from those who moved off and stayed off the rolls. Those who returned to the public assistance rolls, if employed in

1999, were employed in either sales or service occupations and never married, but have comparable levels of education and race/ethnicity composition to those who move off and stayed off the public assistance rolls (see Table 3).

The movement from welfare-to-work could lead to a large influx of people into the low-wage job market (Lerman and Ratcliffe, 2001). In order to investigate this outcome, the SPD SLF was used to compare the characteristics of low-wage workers with people who left the public assistance rolls. For this comparison a conventional definition of a low-wage worker was used -- that is, an employed individual with a family income at 150% or less of poverty. In 1996, there were 17.2 million low-wage employees with a median household income of $14,518. Half of these workers were females, eight-in-ten worked full-time for the full-year, and three-in-four were less than 45 years old. In addition, nearly two-in-five were never married, two-in-three had at most a high school education, and one-in-two were either employed in a sales occupation or a service sector occupation (see Table 4).

One-in-ten of low-wage workers in 1996 were welfare recipients in 1994; over 90 percent were female, 86 percent were working full-time for the full year, and more than half were under 35 years old. Nearly six-in-ten were either never married or divorced and seven-in-ten had at most a high school education. These former public assistance recipients had a median household income that was $3000 less than low-wage workers, in general, and tended to be more concentrated in service occupations (see Table 4).

By 1999, the number of low-wage workers had dropped to 15.1 million people, with just under 8 percent being former public assistance recipients in 1998; over half

were females, and around eight-in-ten were employed full-time for the full-year. A major difference for low-wage workers is that while their median household income declined, they experienced an increased concentration in the sale and service occupations. By comparison, low-wage workers in 1999 who were on the public assistance roles in 1998 tended to be predominantly female, with over half under 35 years old, over half never being married, three-in-four having at most a high school education, and two-in-five working in service sector occupations (see Table 4a).

**DISCUSSION**

Single women with young children are the majority recipients of AFDC/TANF programs. Prior work has shown that former welfare recipient who entered the labor market had a lower level of educational attainment than the average worker and that around one-third of those who found jobs were employed in low-paying service sector occupations (Hisnanick, 2002). Our previous discussion focusing on people who left the public assistance rolls found, irrespective of the amount of time off the rolls, that more than one-in-three were non-workers (see Table 3). In order to further investigate the employment outcomes of former public assistance recipients under PRWORA, outcomes are compared to single women with young children who were never on welfare and are low-wage employees.

In 1994, the median household income of low-wage, working mothers with young children who were not on the public assistance was one-third higher ($18,930 vs. $14,152) than low-wage, working women who were on the public assistance rolls in the prior year. This difference in median household income between the two groups can, in

part, be due to the following differences between the two groups in 1994. Low-wage working mothers who were not on the public assistance rolls were older, had high levels of educational attainment, were more likely to be employed full-time for the full-year, and were less likely to be employed in service occupations than low-wage, working mothers who were formerly on the public assistance rolls (see Table 5 and 6).

In 1996 and 1997, while low-wage working mothers who were not on public assistance still were less likely to be employed in service occupations and their household median income continued to be higher than low-wage working mothers previously on the public assistance rolls. The proportions working full-time, full-year between the two groups was statistically equal. Over time, however, the notable differences between the two groups also become statistically equivalent. In 1998 and 1999, low-wage working mothers who were not on public assistance still had higher levels of educational attainment and were less likely to be employed in service occupations compared to low-wage working mothers who were previously on the public assistance rolls (see Tables 5 and 6). But the median household income and the worker status of the two groups became statistically equivalent.

**Occupational Outcomes of Former Public Assistance Recipients**

The labor market for former public assistance recipients is primarily the low-wage, secondary market. This market is characterized by jobs that lack basic employment amenities and benefits, as well as tend to have unpleasant working conditions, low prestige, and poor or non-existent advancement potential (Bernstein and

Hartmann, 1999; Doeringer and Piore, 1971). Our findings support this notion. Between 1996 and 1999, over 2 million former public assistance recipients were employed in low-wage occupations, with four-in-ten concentrated in service occupations. A closer inspection of the occupations of former public assistance recipients provides insightful, but not necessarily surprising, outcomes (see Table 7).

Between 1996 and 1999, the number of former public assistance recipients who worked in service sector occupations increased from 960,000 to 1.1 million. Several occupational groups experienced notable change during this time period. The proportion employed as private household cleaners and servants increased from 1.9 percent to 6.5 percent and the proportion employed as janitors and cleaners increased from 3.5 percent to 10.4 percent. While the proportion employed as waitresses declined from 16 percent to 4.4 percent, during this time period the proportion employed as cooks increased from 1.2 percent to 14.3 percent. Similarly, while the proportion working as health aides (except nursing) declined from 21 percent to 2 percent, during this time the proportion working as nursing aides, orderlies and attendants increased from 8 percent to 18 percent.[7]

The job demands for the service occupations that former public assistance recipients are employed in are physically demanding, lack general educational development and high levels of education, and the benefits from these jobs are marginal at best (see Table 8). The fact that occupations that experienced the largest proportional changes between 1996 and 1999 in the employment of former public assistance recipients

[7] In comparison, those low-wage, single mothers who were not public assistance recipients and worked in service occupations, none of the proportional changes between 1996 and 1999 for these occupations are statistically significant.

have selected occupational characteristics that should not be surprising. These jobs require moderate amounts of strength, nearly constant reaching, as well as stooping, kneeling, crouching and/or crawling, average to below average aptitude and low to moderate levels of formal and informal training.

If the success of welfare reform is to be measured by the reduction in the numbers that receive cash assistance and become employed, then the above information would suggest a degree of success. The short-term benefits from employment for former welfare recipients, however, may be overshadowed by the long-term consequences associated from the jobs they get. Differences that initially existed between low-wage workers and former welfare recipients became statistically equivalent over time. The movement from welfare-to-work saw the number of public assistance recipients in service sector jobs increase by 15 percent from 1996 to 1999. This change was accompanied by an increase in service sector jobs such as private household cleaners, janitors and cleaners, as well as nursing aides, orderlies and attendants.

REFERENCES:


Bernstein, Jared, and Heidi Hartmann (1999, December). "Defining and Characterizing the Low-Wage Labor Market" in *The Low-Wage Labor Market: Challenges and Opportunities for Economic Self-Sufficiency*. Retrieved from the internet: http://aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/lwlm99/bernhart.htm

Blank, Rebecca M. (2002). "Evaluating Welfare Reform in the United States." *Journal of Economic Literature*, Vol. 60. December, pp. 1005-1166.

Committee on Ways and Means U.S. House of Representatives. (2000). "2000 Green Book." Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Council of Economic Advisors (2002). Economic Report of the President. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Doeringer, P.B and Piore, M.J. (1971). *Internal Labor Markets & Manpower Analysis*, Lexington, MA: DC Heath

Ellwood, David (1988). Poor Support: Poverty and the American Family. New York: Basic Books.

England, Paula, George Farkas, Barbara Stanek Kilbourne and Thomas Dou (1988). "Explaining Occupational Sex Segregation and Wages: Findings From a Model with Fixed Effects," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 58, August, pp. 544-558.

England, Paula and Dana Dunn (1988). "Evaluating Work and Comparable Worth," *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 14, pp. 227-248.

England, Paula and Barbara Kilbourne (1988). Occupational Measures from the Dictionary of Occupational Titles for the 1980 Census Detailed Occupations. ICPSR 8942.

Friedlander, Daniel and Gary Burtless (1995). Five Years After: The Long-Term Effects of Welfare-to-Work Programs. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Harris, Kathleen M. (1996). "Life After Welfare: Women, Work, and Repeat Dependency." *American Sociological Review* 61, pp. 407-426.

Hisnanick, John J. (2002). "An Evaluation of Early Welfare Reform Efforts: A First Look Using the Survey of Program Dynamics." SPD Working Paper, SPD2002-1, U.S. Census Bureau, available at http://www.bls.census.gov/spd/

Holzer, Harry J. and Sheldon Danziger (1998). "Are Jobs Available for Disadvantaged Workers in Urban Areas?" Institute for Research on Poverty: Discussion Paper No. 1157-98. University of Wisconsin, Madision.

Lerman, Robert I. And Caroline Ratcliffe (2001). "Are Single Mothers Finding Jobs without Displacing Other Workers?" *Monthly Labor Review*, July, pp. 3-12.

Meyer, Daniel R. and Maria Cancian. (1998) "Economic Well-Being Following an Exit from Aid to Families With Dependent Children." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 60, pp. 479-492.

Vartanian, Thomas P. and Philip M. Gleason (1999). "Income and Job Market Outcomes After Welfare: 1990-1995." Working Paper, Graduate School of Social Work and Social Research, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, PA.

**Table 1: Receipt of public assistance: 1993 - 1999**

| Year | Received public assistance (thousands) | Received public assistance in 1993 | Received public assistance in 1994 | Received public assistance in 1996 | Received public assistance in 1997 | Received public assistance in 1998 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | |
| 1993 | 5,883.2 | | | | | |
| 1994 | 5,928.7 | 4,618.1 | | | | |
| 1996 | 4,410.0 | 2,401.7 | 2,639.8 | | | |
| 1997 | 4,271.3 | 2,068.0 | 2,258.3 | 2,852.3 | | |
| 1998 | 4,175.9 | 1,792.3 | 1,093.9 | 2,058.1 | 2,547.8 | |
| 1999 | 2,533.6 | 1,164.1 | 1,180.9 | 1,298.8 | 1,361.5 | 1,639.0 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Program Dynamics, Second Longitudinal File

**Table 2: Comparison of characteristics of those who received public assistance to those who stopped receiving it the next year: pre-PRWORA**

| | 1993 | St. Error | 1994 | St. Error |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Received Public Assistance** | | **Did not receive public assistance** | |
| **Total (thousands)** | 5,883.2 | | 1,167.8 | |
| | | | | |
| **Race/Ethnicity** | **Percent** | | **Percent** | |
| White | 60.1 | 2.7 | 74.4 | 5.3 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 41.8 | 2.7 | 60.9 | 6.0 |
| Black | 34.5 | 2.6 | 18.3 | 4.7 |
| American Indian / Alaska Native | 2.5 | 0.9 | 6.5 | 3.0 |
| Asian, Pacific Islander | 3.0 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.2 |
| Hispanic (any race) | 22.7 | 2.3 | 15.9 | 4.5 |
| | | | | |
| **Sex** | | | | |
| Male | 13.8 | 1.9 | 23.0 | 5.2 |
| Female | 86.2 | | 77.0 | |
| | | | | |
| **Age** | | | | |
| Under 25 yrs. | 24.6 | 2.4 | 27.4 | 5.5 |
| 25-34 yrs. | 35.7 | 2.6 | 32.3 | 5.8 |
| 35-44 yrs. | 22.1 | 2.2 | 20.4 | 5.0 |
| 45-54 yrs | 8.6 | 1.5 | 6.6 | 3.0 |
| 55-64 yrs. | 5.4 | 1.2 | 5.5 | 2.8 |
| 65-74 yrs. | 2.1 | 0.8 | 2.0 | 1.7 |
| 75+ yrs. | 1.4 | 0.7 | 5.9 | 2.9 |
| | | | | |
| **Marital Status** | | | | |
| Married, spouse present | 20.7 | 2.2 | 33.7 | 5.8 |
| Married, spouse absent | 2.4 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 1.3 |
| Widowed | 3.3 | 1.0 | 3.2 | 2.2 |
| Divorced | 18.9 | 2.1 | 14.7 | 4.4 |
| Separated | 12.4 | 1.8 | 9.2 | 3.6 |
| Never Married | 42.3 | 2.7 | 38.0 | 6.0 |

**Table 2 -- continued**

| | 1993 | St. Error | 1994 | St. Error |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Received public assistance** | | **Did not receive public assistance** | |
| **Education level** | | | | |
| Did not graduate from high school | 47.6 | 2.7 | 32.7 | 5.8 |
| Only graduated from high school | 33.4 | 2.6 | 42.6 | 6.1 |
| Some college | 16.1 | 2.0 | 18.7 | 4.8 |
| Associate college degree | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. |
| College graduate, or more | 2.9 | 1.0 | 6.0 | 2.9 |

Note: n.a.. – data not available
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Program Dynamics, Second Longitudinal File

**Table 2a: Comparison of characteristics of those who received public assistance to those who stopped receiving it the next year: Post-PRWORA**

| | 1997 | St. Error | 1998 | St. Error |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Received Public Assistance** | | **Did not receive public assistance** | |
| **Total (thousands)** | 4,271.3 | | 1,723.5 | |
| | | | | |
| **Race** | **Percent** | | **Percent** | |
| White | 58.4 | 3.2 | 65.9 | 4.8 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 38.7 | 3.2 | 49.4 | 5.0 |
| Black | 36.4 | 3.1 | 31.0 | 4.7 |
| American Indian / Alaska Native | 1.0 | 0.7 | .5 | 0.7 |
| Asian, Pacific Islander | 4.1 | 1.3 | 2.6 | 1.6 |
| Hispanic (any race) | 24.7 | 2.8 | 20.8 | 4.1 |
| | | | | |
| **Sex** | | | | |
| Male | 17.6 | 2.4 | 24.8 | 4.4 |
| Female | 82.4 | | 75.2 | |
| | | | | |
| **Age** | | | | |
| Under 25 yrs. | 20.6 | 2.6 | 23.6 | 4.3 |
| 25-34 yrs. | 28.0 | 2.9 | 29.0 | 4.6 |
| 35-44 yrs. | 24.1 | 2.7 | 22.2 | 4.2 |
| 45-54 yrs | 14.9 | 2.3 | 13.6 | 3.5 |
| 55-64 yrs. | 5.6 | 1.5 | 5.2 | 2.2 |
| 65-74 yrs. | 3.9 | 1.3 | 2.9 | 1.7 |
| 75+ yrs. | 3.0 | 1.1 | 3.5 | 1.9 |
| | | | | |
| **Marital Status** | | | | |
| Married, spouse present | 18.2 | 2.5 | 21.6 | 4.2 |
| Married, spouse absent | 2.6 | 1.0 | 1.3 | 1.2 |
| Widowed | 5.2 | 1.5 | 6.0 | 2.4 |
| Divorced | 17.7 | 2.4 | 17.1 | 3.8 |
| Separated | 9.1 | 1.8 | 6.3 | 2.5 |
| Never Married | 47.2 | 3.2 | 47.7 | 5.0 |

**Table 2a -- continued**

| | 1997 | St. Error | 1998 | St. Error |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Received public assistance** | | **Did not receive public assistance** | |
| **Education level** | | | | |
| Did not graduate from high school | 47.9 | 3.2 | 42.6 | 5.0 |
| Only graduated from high school | 30.9 | 3.2 | 32.9 | 4.7 |
| Some college | 14.4 | 2.2 | 17.6 | 3.9 |
| Associate college degree | 4.3 | 1.3 | 3.3 | 1.8 |
| College graduate, or more | 2.5 | 1.0 | 3.7 | 1.9 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Program Dynamics, Second Longitudinal File

**Table 3: Comparison of labor force and selected demographic characteristics of those who stopped receiving public assistance**

| | Received public assistance in 1994, but did not in 1996[8] | Std. error | Received public assistance at least one year after leaving in 1996[9] | Std. error | Stayed off public assistance from 1996 - 1999[10] | Std. error |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total (thousands)** | 1,167.8 | | 153.5 | | 1,014.3 | |
| | **Percentage** | | **Percentage** | | **Percentage** | |
| **Type of worker** | | | | | | |
| Full-time, full-year | 51.1 | 4.4 | 39.7 | 12.0 | 50.0 | 4.8 |
| Part-time, full-year | 6.0 | 2.1 | 9.7 | 7.2 | 5.4 | 2.2 |
| Full-time, part-year | 6.5 | 2.2 | 3.4 | 4.4 | 7.0 | 2.4 |
| Non-worker | 36.4 | 4.3 | 28.5 | 11.0 | 37.6 | 4.6 |
| **General Occupation Classes** | | | | | | |
| Non-workers | 36.4 | 4.3 | 28.5 | 11.0 | 37.6 | 4.6 |
| Managerial, Professional | 9.2 | 2.6 | 2.9 | 4.1 | 10.2 | 2.9 |
| Technical/Sales/Admin Support | 21.5 | 3.6 | 30.8 | 11.3 | 20.1 | 3.8 |
| Service Occupations | 18.3 | 3.4 | 30.8 | 11.3 | 16.5 | 3.5 |
| Farming/forestry/fishing | 2.1 | 1.3 | -- | | 2.4 | 1.5 |
| Prec. Prod. /craft/repair | 4.0 | 1.7 | -- | | 4.6 | 2.0 |
| Operators/Fab/laborers | 8.6 | 2.9 | 7.9 | 6.5 | 8.7 | 2.7 |
| **Marital Status** | | | | | | |
| Married, spouse present | 52.9 | 4.4 | 39.7 | 12.0 | 55.0 | 4.7 |
| Married, spouse absent | 2.2 | 1.3 | 5.9 | 5.8 | 1.6 | 1.2 |
| Widowed | 5.4 | 2.0 | 2.6 | 3.9 | 5.9 | 2.2 |
| Divorced | 21.3 | 3.6 | 15.3 | 8.8 | 22.2 | 4.0 |
| Separated | 1.9 | 1.2 | -- | | 2.2 | 1.4 |
| Never Married | 16.2 | 3.3 | 36.6 | 11.8 | 13.2 | 3.2 |

[8] These data are from 1996.
[9] These data are from 1999.
[10] These data are from 1999.

**Table 3 -- continued**

| | Received public assistance in 1994, but did in 1996 | Std. error | Received public assistance at least one year after not receiving it in 1996 | Std. error | Stayed off public assistance from 1995 -99 | Std. error |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Race/Ethnicity** | | | | | | |
| White | 74.4 | 3.9 | 80.6 | 9.7 | 73.5 | 4.2 |
| Non-Hispanic White | 60.9 | 4.3 | 71.5 | 11.0 | 59.3 | 4.7 |
| Black | 18.3 | 3.4 | 19.4 | 9.7 | 18.1 | 3.7 |
| American Indian/Alaska Native | 6.5 | 2.2 | N.A. | | 7.5 | 2.5 |
| Asian, Pacific Islander | 0.8 | 0.8 | n.a. | | 1.0 | 0.9 |
| Hispanic (any race) | 15.9 | 3.2 | 9.1 | 7.0 | 17.0 | 3.6 |
| **Level of Education** | | | | | | |
| Less than a high school graduate | 32.7 | 4.2 | 28.0 | 11.0 | 26.2 | 4.2 |
| High school graduate | 42.6 | 4.4 | 49.2 | 12.2 | 34.6 | 4.5 |
| Some college | 18.7 | 3.5 | 19.0 | 9.6 | 21.8 | 3.9 |
| Associate college degree | n.a. | | n.a. | | 10.8 | 3.0 |
| College graduate, plus | 6.0 | 2.1 | 3.7 | 4.6 | 6.6 | 2.4 |

Note: N.A. - data not available
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Program Dynamics, Second Longitudinal File

.

**Table 4: Comparison of characteristics of low-wage workers in 1996 and those who received public assistance in 1994 but stopped receiving it in 1996**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Low-wage workers 1996** | **St. Error** | **Received public assistance in 1994 and low-wage worker in 1996** | **St. Error** |
| **Total (thousands)** | 17,218.3 | | 1,987.6 | |
| | | | | |
| **Median Household Income** | $14,518 | | $11,260 | |
| **Race** | **Percent** | | **Percent** | |
| White | 75.0 | 1.0 | 61.2 | 3.3 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 57.7 | 1.1 | 41.0 | 3.3 |
| Black | 21.6 | 1.0 | 33.9 | 3.2 |
| American Indian / Alaska Native | 1.4 | 0.3 | 2.5 | 1.1 |
| Asian, Pacific Islander | 2.0 | 0.3 | 2.4 | 1.0 |
| Hispanic (any race) | 20.8 | 0.9 | 24.8 | 2.9 |
| **Sex** | | | | |
| Male | 45.7 | 1.1 | 9.9 | 2.0 |
| Female | 54.3 | | 90.1 | |
| **Type of worker** | | | | |
| Full-time, full-year | 80.3 | 0.9 | 86.0 | 2.3 |
| Part-time, full-year | 10.5 | 0.7 | 9.8 | 2.0 |
| Full-time, part-year | 8.8 | 0.7 | 4.1 | 1.3 |
| Part-time, part-year | 0.3 | 0.1 | n.a. | |
| **General Occupation Classes** | | | | |
| Managerial, Professional | 9.2 | 0.7 | 6.7 | 1.7 |
| Technical/Sales/Admin Support | 26.5 | 1.0 | 30.9 | 3.1 |
| Service Occupations | 27.4 | 1.0 | 38.5 | 3.3 |
| Farming/forestry/fishing | 6.0 | 0.5 | 3.0 | 1.2 |
| Prec. Prod. /craft/repair | 10.2 | 0.7 | 3.0 | 1.2 |
| Operators/Fab/laborers | 20.4 | 0.9 | 17.9 | 2.6 |
| Last job, armed forces | 0.2 | 0.1 | n.a. | |

**Table 4 -- continued**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Low-wage workers 1996** | **St. Error** | **Received public assistance in 1994 and low-wage worker in 1996** | **St. Error** |
| **Total (thousands)** | 17,218.3 | | 1,987.6 | |
| **Age** | | | | |
| Under 25 yrs. | 25.6 | 1.0 | 16.2 | 2.5 |
| 25-34 yrs. | 28.3 | 1.0 | 43.8 | 3.4 |
| 35-44 yrs. | 23.4 | 1.0 | 26.1 | 3.0 |
| 45-54 yrs | 12.8 | 0.8 | 9.8 | 2.0 |
| 55-64 yrs. | 6.8 | 0.6 | 3.8 | 1.3 |
| 65-74 yrs. | 2.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.4 |
| 75+ yrs. | 0.6 | 0.2 | n.a. | |
| **Marital Status** | | | | |
| Married, spouse present | 36.7 | 1.1 | 23.1 | 2.9 |
| Married, spouse absent | 1.2 | 0.3 | 2.3 | 1.0 |
| Widowed | 3.1 | 0.4 | 2.1 | 1.0 |
| Divorced | 15.3 | 0.8 | 23.6 | 2.9 |
| Separated | 5.9 | 0.5 | 8.9 | 1.9 |
| Never Married | 37.7 | 1.1 | 40.0 | 3.3 |
| **Education level** | | | | |
| Did not graduate from high school | 31.9 | 1.1 | 36.1 | 3.3 |
| Only graduated from high school | 35.7 | 1.1 | 36.7 | 3.3 |
| Some college | 20.1 | 0.9 | 18.4 | 2.6 |
| Associate college degree | 4.3 | 0.5 | 5.9 | 1.6 |
| College graduate, or more | 8.0 | 0.6 | 2.9 | 1.1 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Program Dynamics, Second Longitudinal File

**Table 4a: Comparison of characteristics of low-wage workers in 1999 and those who received public assistance in 1998 but stopped receiving it in 1999**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Low-wage workers 1999** | **St. Error** | **Received public assistance in 1998 and low-wage worker in 1999** | **St. Error** |
| **Total (thousands)** | 15,144.6 | | 1,151.3 | |
| | | | | |
| **Median Household Income** | $14,102 | | $13,120 | |
| **Race** | **Percent** | | **Percent** | |
| White | 75.0 | 1.1 | 52.2 | 4.5 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 57.8 | 1.2 | 30.9 | 4.1 |
| Black | 21.3 | 1.0 | 35.3 | 4.2 |
| American Indian / Alaska Native | 1.2 | 0.3 | 4.2 | 1.8 |
| Asian, Pacific Islander | 2.5 | 0.4 | 8.3 | 2.5 |
| Hispanic (any race) | 20.1 | 1.0 | 29.9 | 4.1 |
| **Sex** | | | | |
| Male | 44.0 | 1.2 | 10.1 | 2.7 |
| Female | 56.0 | | 89.9 | 2.7 |
| **Type of worker** | | | | |
| Full-time, full-year | 78.7 | 1.0 | 78.9 | 3.6 |
| Part-time, full-year | 9.4 | 0.7 | 14.3 | 3.1 |
| Full-time, part-year | 11.0 | 0.8 | 6.8 | 2.2 |
| Part-time, part-year | 0.9 | 0.2 | n.a. | |
| **General Occupation Classes** | | | | |
| Managerial, Professional | 9.9 | 0.7 | 6.4 | 2.2 |
| Technical/Sales/Admin Support | 27.5 | 1.1 | 31.6 | 4.2 |
| Service Occupations | 28.1 | 1.1 | 44.1 | 4.4 |
| Farming/forestry/fishing | 6.0 | 0.6 | 1.7 | 1.2 |
| Prec. Prod. /craft/repair | 9.4 | 0.7 | 2.6 | 1.4 |
| Operators/Fab/laborers | 19.1 | 1.0 | 13.6 | 3.1 |

**Table 4a -- continued**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Low-wage workers 1999** | **St. Error** | **Received public assistance in 1998 and low-wage worker in 1999** | **St. Error** |
| **Total (thousands)** | 15,144.6 | | 1,151.3 | |
| **Age** | | | | |
| Under 25 yrs. | 27.7 | 1.1 | 21.2 | 3.7 |
| 25-34 yrs. | 22.8 | 1.0 | 38.8 | 4.4 |
| 35-44 yrs. | 24.9 | 1.1 | 27.8 | 4.0 |
| 45-54 yrs | 13.6 | 0.8 | 10.3 | 2.7 |
| 55-64 yrs. | 6.9 | 0.6 | 1.9 | 1.2 |
| 65-74 yrs. | 3.3 | 0.4 | n.a. | |
| 75+ yrs. | 0.8 | 0.2 | n.a. | |
| **Marital Status** | | | | |
| Married, spouse present | 32.3 | 1.2 | 13.2 | 3.0 |
| Married, spouse absent | 2.5 | 0.4 | 3.3 | 1.6 |
| Widowed | 3.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.6 |
| Divorced | 13.3 | 0.8 | 18.2 | 3.4 |
| Separated | 4.9 | 0.5 | 9.4 | 2.6 |
| Never Married | 43.5 | 1.2 | 55.4 | 4.4 |
| **Education level** | | | | |
| Did not graduate from high school | 30.5 | 1.1 | 32.9 | 4.2 |
| Only graduated from high school | 35.0 | 1.2 | 43.9 | 4.4 |
| Some college | 19.2 | 1.0 | 17.4 | 3.4 |
| Associate college degree | 6.1 | 0.6 | 5.0 | 1.9 |
| College graduate, or more | 9.2 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.8 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Program Dynamics, Second Longitudinal File

**Table 5: Characteristics of low-wage, single women workers with children who were never on public assistance: 1994-1999**

| | 1994 | | 1996 | | 1997 | | 1998 | | 1999 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total (000s)** | 1,475.2 | | 1,572.1 | | 1,496.4 | | 1,427.7 | | 1,210.5 | |
| **Median HH Income*** | $18,930 (($801) | | $16,541 ($699) | | $15,942 ($1286) | | $13,272 ($909) | | $15,000 ($1170) | |
| | **%** | **S.E.** | **%** | **S.E.** | **%** | **S.E.** | **%** | **S.E.** | **%** | **S.E.** |
| **Class of worker** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Full-time, full-year | 84.3 | 2.9 | 86.5 | 2.6 | 79.5 | 3.2 | 81.2 | 3.1 | 80.0 | 3.5 |
| Part-time, full-year | 11.2 | 2.5 | 10.3 | 2.3 | 14.4 | 2.8 | 11.4 | 2.6 | 14.6 | 3.1 |
| Part-time, full-year | 2.8 | 1.3 | 3.2 | 1.3 | 6.1 | 1.9 | 7.4 | 2.1 | 5.0 | 1.9 |
| Part-time, part-year | 1.6 | 1.0 | n.a. | | n.a | | n.a. | | 0.4 | 0.5 |
| **Occupation** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Managerial, professional | 9.0 | 2.4 | 12.8 | 2.6 | 14.4 | 2.8 | 14.0 | 2.8 | 16.5 | 3.2 |
| Technical, sales, admin. Support | 36.0 | 3.8 | 35.2 | 3.7 | 34.0 | 3.7 | 38.3 | 3.9 | 34.0 | 4.1 |
| Service Occupations | 31.8 | 3.7 | 34.4 | 3.6 | 35.1 | 3.7 | 28.8 | 3.6 | 30.5 | 4.0 |
| Farming, forestry, fishing | n.a. | | 1.6 | 1.0 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 3.3 | 1.4 | 2.9 | 1.5 |
| Precision production, craft, repair | 2.3 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 1.8 | 1.0 | 1.9 | 1.1 | 3.3 | 1.6 |
| Operators, fabricators, laborers | 20.8 | 3.2 | 15.4 | 2.8 | 13.0 | 2.6 | 13.7 | 2.8 | 12.8 | 2.9 |

**Table 5 -- continued**

| | 1994 | | 1996 | | 1997 | | 1998 | | 1999 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total (000s)** | 1475.2 | | 1572.1 | | 1496.4 | | 1427.7 | | 1210.5 | |
| | **%** | **S.E.** | **%** | **S.E.** | **%** | **S.E.** | **%** | **S.E.** | **%** | **S.E.** |
| **Race** | | | | | | | | | | |
| White | 59.7 | 3.9 | 65.2 | 3.6 | 65.1 | 3.7 | 62.8 | 3.9 | 67.0 | 4.1 |
| Non-Hispanic White | 39.9 | 3.9 | 50.8 | 3.8 | 50.2 | 3.9 | 44.1 | 4.0 | 49.9 | 4.4 |
| Black | 37.7 | 3.8 | 32.4 | 3.6 | 31.8 | 3.7 | 36.3 | 3.9 | 28.6 | 3.9 |
| American Indian / Alaska Native | 2.2 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 0.9 | 2.0 | 1.1 | n.a. | | 1.5 | 1.1 |
| Asian, Pacific Islander | 0.4 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 1.2 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 2.9 | 1.5 |
| Hispanic (any race) | 23.0 | 3.3 | 19.5 | 3.0 | 19.5 | 3.1 | 25.3 | 3.5 | 20.6 | 3.5 |
| **Age** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Under 25 yrs. | 30.6 | 3.6 | 41.1 | 3.8 | 39.2 | 3.8 | 36.4 | 3.9 | 39.9 | 4.2 |
| 25-34 yrs. | 27.8 | 3.5 | 18.0 | 2.9 | 17.4 | 3.0 | 23.0 | 3.4 | 19.6 | 3.5 |
| 35-44 yrs. | 26.0 | 3.5 | 23.0 | 3.2 | 28.2 | 3.5 | 22.6 | 3.4 | 20.3 | 3.5 |
| 45-54 yrs. | 10.5 | 2.4 | 11.9 | 2.5 | 9.2 | 2.3 | 10.4 | 2.4 | 12.1 | 2.8 |
| 55-64 yrs. | 4.4 | 1.6 | 5.5 | 1.7 | 5.5 | 1.8 | 5.7 | 1.9 | 6.3 | 2.1 |
| 65-74 yrs. | n.a. | | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 1.9 | 1.1 | 1.8 | 1.2 |
| 75+ yrs. | 0.8 | 0.7 | n.a. | | n.a. | | n.a. | | n.a. | |
| **Geographical region** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Northeast | 12.6 | 2.6 | 12.4 | 2.5 | 10.4 | 2.4 | 13.9 | 2.8 | 10.2 | 2.6 |
| South | 15.0 | 2.8 | 24.8 | 3.3 | 20.3 | 3.2 | 16.9 | 3.0 | 17.7 | 3.3 |
| Midwest | 51.7 | 3.9 | 40.9 | 3.8 | 46.7 | 3.9 | 50.1 | 4.0 | 49.6 | 4.4 |
| West | 20.8 | 3.2 | 21.8 | 3.2 | 22.6 | 3.3 | 19.0 | 3.1 | 22.5 | 3.6 |
| **Highest level of education** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Less than high school | 33.6 | 3.7 | 20.1 | 3.1 | 13.1 | 2.6 | 13.7 | 2.8 | 12.9 | 2.9 |
| High school graduate | 40.6 | 3.9 | 35.3 | 3.7 | 38.9 | 3.8 | 33.7 | 3.8 | 34.2 | 4.1 |
| Some college | 23.8 | 3.4 | 29.6 | 3.5 | 32.1 | 3.7 | 33.0 | 3.8 | 28.3 | 3.9 |
| AA degree | n.a. | | 3.2 | 3.6 | 4.4 | 1.6 | 8.2 | 2.2 | 10.9 | 2.7 |
| College graduate, plus | 2.1 | 1.1 | 11.8 | 2.5 | 11.5 | 2.5 | 11.4 | 2.6 | 13.7 | 3.0 |

Notes: n.a. – data not available

* -- Median household income are adjusted up to 1999 dollars using the CPI-U-RS

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Program Dynamics, Second Longitudinal File

**Table 6. Characteristics of low-wage, single women workers who were on public assistance: 1994-1999**

| | 1994 | | 1996 | | 1997 | | 1998 | | 1999 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total (000s)** | 1,618.7 | | 2,159.6 | | 2,564.5 | | 2,674.8 | | 2,657.6 | |
| **Median HH Income*** | $14,152 ($543) | | $12,039 ($584) | | $13,458 ($679) | | $13,353 ($698) | | $14,000 ($627) | |
| | **%** | **S.E.** | **%** | **S.E.** | **%** | **S.E.** | **%** | **S.E.** | **%** | **S.E.** |
| **Class of worker** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Full-time, full-year | 74.3 | 3.3 | 84.0 | 2.4 | 82.7 | 2.3 | 77.6 | 2.4 | 79.4 | 2.4 |
| Part-time, full-year | 21.7 | 3.1 | 12.4 | 2.2 | 12.4 | 2.0 | 16.8 | 2.2 | 14.0 | 2.0 |
| Part-time, full-year | 3.5 | 1.4 | 3.6 | 1.2 | 4.6 | 1.3 | 5.6 | 1.3 | 6.6 | 1.5 |
| Part-time, part-year | 0.5 | 0.5 | n.a. | | 0.2 | 0.3 | n.a. | | n.a. | |
| **Occupation** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Managerial, professional | 2.7 | 1.2 | 7.0 | 1.7 | 5.6 | 1.4 | 6.9 | 1.5 | 10.0 | 1.8 |
| Technical, sales, admin. Support | 31.5 | 3.5 | 29.1 | 3.0 | 35.4 | 2.9 | 36.7 | 2.8 | 30.2 | 2.7 |
| Service Occupations | 50.4 | 3.8 | 44.4 | 3.2 | 42.5 | 3.0 | 37.4 | 2.8 | 41.9 | 2.9 |
| Farming, forestry, fishing | 2.6 | 1.2 | 2.1 | 0.9 | 1.7 | 0.8 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 2.9 | 1.0 |
| Precision production, craft, repair | 1.0 | 0.7 | 1.4 | 0.8 | 2.7 | 1.0 | 3.7 | 1.1 | 2.6 | 0.9 |
| Operators, fabricators, laborers | 11.8 | 2.4 | 16.0 | 2.4 | 12.1 | 2.0 | 14.0 | 2.0 | 12.5 | 1.9 |

**Table 6 -- continued**

| | 1994 | | 1996 | | 1997 | | 1998 | | 1999 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total (000s)** | 1,618.7 | | 2,159.6 | | 2,564.5 | | 2,674.8 | | 2,657.6 | |
| | **%** | **S.E.** | **%** | **S.E.** | **%** | **S.E.** | **%** | **S.E.** | **%** | **S.E.** |
| **Race** | | | | | | | | | | |
| White | 54.0 | 3.8 | 57.7 | 3.2 | 59.8 | 2.9 | 61.7 | 2.8 | 58.4 | 2.9 |
| Non-Hispanic White | 39.4 | 3.7 | 40.5 | 3.2 | 42.2 | 3.0 | 42.8 | 2.9 | 40.0 | 2.9 |
| Black | 37.7 | | 37.7 | 3.2 | 36.2 | | 34.4 | 2.8 | 37.0 | 2.8 |
| American Indian / Alaska Native | 5.4 | 3.7 | 2.4 | 1.0 | 1.6 | 2.9 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 2.0 | 0.8 |
| Asian, Pacific Islander | 2.9 | 1.7 | 2.2 | 1.0 | 2.3 | 0.8 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 2.7 | 1.0 |
| Hispanic (any race) | 21.7 | 1.3 | 22.4 | 2.7 | 23.6 | 0.9 | 24.3 | 2.5 | 24.1 | 2.5 |
| **Age** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Under 25 yrs. | 30.2 | 3.5 | 15.5 | 2.4 | 18.8 | 2.3 | 17.1 | 2.2 | 14.8 | 2.1 |
| 25-34 yrs. | 41.6 | 3.7 | 46.2 | 3.3 | 43.0 | 3.0 | 43.7 | 2.9 | 37.7 | 2.9 |
| 35-44 yrs. | 20.4 | 3.0 | 26.6 | 2.9 | 28.2 | 2.7 | 28.5 | 2.6 | 35.5 | 2.8 |
| 45-54 yrs. | 5.9 | 1.8 | 8.6 | 1.8 | 6.8 | 1.5 | 7.4 | 1.5 | 10.1 | 1.8 |
| 55-64 yrs. | 1.2 | 0.8 | 2.7 | 1.1 | 2.7 | 1.0 | 2.7 | 1.0 | 1.9 | 0.8 |
| 65-74 yrs. | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | n.a. | |
| 75+ yrs. | n.a. | | n.a. | | n.a. | | 0.2 | 0.3 | n.a. | |
| **Geographical region** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Northeast | 18.9 | 2.9 | 19.5 | 2.6 | 19.3 | 2.4 | 22.8 | 2.5 | 23.6 | 2.5 |
| South | 26.3 | 3.3 | 31.9 | 3.0 | 24.3 | 2.6 | 23.3 | 2.5 | 18.8 | 2.3 |
| Midwest | 28.2 | 3.4 | 28.8 | 3.0 | 32.8 | 2.8 | 31.3 | 2.7 | 33.9 | 2.8 |
| West | 26.6 | 3.3 | 19.9 | 2.6 | 23.6 | 2.5 | 22.6 | 2.5 | 23.6 | 2.5 |
| **Highest level of education** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Less than high school | 36.2 | 3.6 | 34.3 | 3.1 | 33.6 | 2.8 | 32.3 | 2.7 | 32.8 | 2.8 |
| High school graduate | 44.2 | 3.7 | 38.6 | 3.2 | 39.9 | 2.9 | 40.4 | 2.9 | 41.8 | 2.9 |
| Some college | 19.2 | 3.0 | 18.6 | 2.5 | 17.4 | 2.3 | 20.2 | 2.4 | 19.3 | 2.3 |
| Associate of Arts degree | -- | | 6.3 | 1.6 | 6.7 | 1.5 | 5.5 | 0.7 | 4.7 | 1.2 |
| College graduate, plus | 0.4 | 0.5 | 2.2 | 1.0 | 2.4 | 0.9 | 1.6 | 0.4 | 1.4 | 0.7 |

Notes:
n.a. – data not available

Median household income are adjusted up to 1999 dollars using the CPI-U-RS
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Program Dynamics, Second Longitudinal File

**Table 7. Distribution of service occupations for low-wage females workers who were on public assistance: 1994-1999**

| | 1994 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total (000s) | 816.3 | 959.5 | 1090.5 | 1001.3 | 1112.6 |
| **Occupation** | % | % | % | % | % |
| Housekeepers and butlers | | 1.6 | 2.5 | | 0.4 |
| Child care worker, private household | 3.9 | 4.4 | 2.8 | 3.3 | 1.6 |
| Private household cleaners and servants | 6.4 | n.a. | 1.9 | 2.9 | 6.5 |
| Correctional institution officers | n.a. | 1.3 | 0.5 | 0.9 | n.a. |
| Crossing guards | 0.7 | 3.5 | 2.4 | 0.6 | 0.5 |
| Guards and police, except public service | 1.4 | 1.0 | 1.5 | 0.8 | 1.7 |
| Protective service occupations | n.a. | 0.6 | 4.6 | 1.0 | 0.9 |
| Supervisors, food preparation & service occupations | n.a. | 2.7 | 2.3 | 1.6 | 0.7 |
| Bartenders | 0.7 | 3.8 | 8.6 | 1.5 | 2.8 |
| Waitresses | 7.1 | 16.4 | 10.2 | 4.1 | 4.4 |
| Cooks | 10.6 | 1.2 | 3.2 | 9.7 | 14.3 |
| Food counter, fountain & related occupations | n.a. | 0.5 | 3.0 | 0.6 | 2.6 |
| Kitchen workers, food preparation | 0.6 | 3.4 | 0.4 | n.a. | 3.6 |
| Waiters' – waitresses' assistants | 4.4 | 2.9 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 1.2 |
| Misc. food preparation occupations | 5.1 | 0.7 | n.a. | 5.7 | 2.7 |
| Dental assistants | n.a. | 0.5 | 3.7 | n.a. | 0.6 |
| Health aids, except nursing | n.a. | 20.8 | 13.9 | 2.5 | 2.0 |
| Nursing aids, orderlies, & attendants | 20.2 | 8.0 | 7.1 | 20.4 | 17.9 |
| Maids | 7.9 | 8.5 | 10.3 | 14.3 | 5.2 |
| Janitors & cleaners | 4.6 | 3.2 | 3.5 | 5.8 | 10.4 |
| Hairdressers & cosmetologist | 5.9 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Public transportation attendants | 1.0 | 1.6 | -- | 0.5 | -- |
| Welfare service aids | 0.7 | 2.3 | 2.2 | -- | -- |
| Family child care providers | 1.0 | 6.3 | 6.8 | 4.5 | 4.1 |
| Early childhood teacher's assistants | 7.9 | 4.1 | -- | 6.1 | 5.2 |
| Child care workers | 8.4 | 0.7 | -- | 5.6 | 5.2 |
| Personal service occupations | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1.7 |

Notes:
n.a. – data not available
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Program Dynamics, Second Longitudinal File

**Table 8. Selected occupation characteristics for low-wage females workers who were on public assistance**

| | Strength | Reach | Physical demand | Intelli-Gence | GED |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Ave. for all occupations in group** | 2.7 | 96.0 | 2.0 | 3.5 | 2.8 |
| **Occupation** | **Ave.** | **Ave.** | **Ave.** | **Ave.** | **Ave.** |
| Housekeepers and butlers | 3.2 | 96.0 | 2.8 | 3.9 | 1.9 |
| Child care worker, private household | 2.6 | 99.6 | 2.0 | 3.9 | 1.9 |
| Private household cleaners and servants | 2.4 | 98.5 | 2.0 | 3.6 | 2.6 |
| Correctional institution officers | | | | | |
| Crossing guards | 2.1 | 93.0 | 1.2 | 3.0 | 2.5 |
| Guards and police, except public service | 2.9 | 96.6 | 1.6 | 3.5 | 2.5 |
| Protective service occupations | 2.7 | 83.3 | 1.8 | 3.7 | 3.0 |
| Supervisors, food preparation & service occupations | 2.8 | 98.4 | 1.2 | 3.8 | 2.3 |
| Bartenders | 2.0 | 98.4 | 1.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Waitresses | 2.6 | 99.1 | 1.5 | 3.5 | 2.8 |
| Cooks | 2.8 | 97.7 | 2.0 | 3.6 | 2.6 |
| Food counter, fountain & related occupations | 2.0 | 99.9 | 1.0 | 3.1 | 2.9 |
| Kitchen workers, food preparation | 2.8 | 98.4 | 1.7 | 3.7 | 2.7 |
| Waiters' – waitresses' assistants | 2.8 | 91.6 | 1.9 | 3.1 | 3.2 |
| Misc. food preparation occupations | 3.2 | 97.9 | 2.2 | 3.6 | 2.4 |
| Dental assistants | 2.0 | 99.8 | 1.0 | 4.1 | 3.9 |
| Health aids, except nursing | 3.1 | 98.9 | 2.7 | 3.5 | 3.3 |
| Nursing aids, orderlies, & attendants | 2.8 | 93.4 | 2.1 | 3.4 | 3.1 |
| Maids | 2.5 | 98.9 | 1.9 | 3.4 | 2.7 |
| Janitors & cleaners | 2.8 | 98.8 | 2.4 | 3.7 | 2.3 |
| Hairdressers & cosmetologist | 2.6 | 99.2 | 1.9 | 3.0 | 3.6 |
| Public transportation attendants | 2.6 | 84.1 | 1.7 | 3.0 | 2.7 |
| Welfare service aids | 2.2 | 98.1 | 2.6 | 3.3 | 2.5 |
| Family child care providers | 2.2 | 63.9 | 1.2 | 2.9 | 3.7 |
| Early childhood teacher's assistants | 3.1 | 97.7 | 2.6 | 3.3 | 2.6 |
| Child care workers | 2.7 | 94.1 | 2.1 | 3.6 | 3.0 |
| Personal service occupations | 2.5 | 99.4 | 3.7 | 3.8 | 3.8 |

Notes:

Strength scale: 1=sedentary 2=light 3=medium 4=heavy 5=very heavy

Reach scale: 0-100%, percent of job that requires physical demands for reaching, handling, fingering, and/or feeling

Physical demands scale: 1=requires climbing and balancing 2=stooping, kneeling, crouching, and/or crawling 3=reaching, handling, fingering and/or feeling 4=seeing

Intelligence scale, 1-4, (measures the aptitude of the aggregate group) 1=occupation requires an extremely high degree of aptitude 2=occupation requires an above average to high degree of aptitude 3=occupation requires a medium degree of aptitude 4=occupation requires an average or below average aptitude 5=occupation requires negligible degree of aptitude

GED, general educational development, scale: 1 (highest) to 6 (lowest), measures what an occupation requires in terms of formal and informal education that contributes to the worker's reasoning development and ability to follow instructions, and the acquisition of knowledge, such as language and mathematical skills.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Program Dynamics, Second Longitudinal File