

Factors that Facilitated and Inhibited Job-holding Among Female AFDC/TANF Recipients in 1996

Prepared by Denton R. Vaughan
under Contract Order No. YA 323-040SE-0497
Household Economics Statistics Division
Bureau of the Census
August 9, 2007

The views expressed are the author's and do not necessarily represent the position of the Census Bureau or any other Bureau staff. The study has undergone a more limited review than official publications and is released to inform interested parties of the research and to encourage discussion.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background of the Study.....	1
1.2. Data and Time Period.....	3
1.3. Rationale of the Study	4
2. FACTORS THAT AFFECT JOB-HOLDING	6
2.1. Introduction of Factors	6
2.2. Definition of Factors.....	8
2.2.1 Disability and Health-Related Factors	8
2.2.2. Nonhealth-Related Factors.....	11
2.3. Summary of Factors	19
2.4. Effects of Combined Factors	22
2.5 Interaction of Facilitating and Impeding Factors	24
3. SUMMARY AND PLANS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH.....	23
4. REFERENCES.....	26
5. GLOSSARY.....	29
6. APPENDIX: Definition of the Study Sample and Description of the Reweighting Procedure.....	31
6.1. Introduction (defining the analysis universe).....	31
6.2. Characteristics of Units Lost Due to Attrition or Other Restrictions.....	31
6.3. Reweighting the Analytic Sample Research	32
6.4. Results of the Reweighting	33

TABLE OF TABLES

Table No.	Table Title	Page
Table 1	Percent of female AFDC/TANF recipients with paid employment in 1996, by disability status of the primary recipient.....	34
Table 2	Percent of female AFDC/TANF recipients with paid employment in 1996, by disability status of unit members.....	35
Table 3	Employment rate for the severely disabled in the general populations, by perceived health status of unit members	36
Table 4	Percent of female AFDC/TANF recipients with paid employment in 1996, by perceived health status.....	37
Table 5	Percent of female AFDC/TANF recipients with paid employment in 1996, by household vehicle ownership.....	38
Table 6	Percent of female AFDC/TANF recipients with paid employment in 1996, by age of covered children.....	39
Table 7	Percent of female AFDC/TANF recipients with paid employment in 1996, by number of covered children.....	40
Table 8	Percent of female AFDC/TANF recipients with paid employment in 1996, by primary recipient's age.....	41
Table 9	Percent of female AFDC/TANF recipients with paid employment in 1996, by educational attainment.....	42
Table 10	Percent of female AFDC/TANF recipients with paid employment in 1996, by work history prior to the survey.....	43
Table 11	Summary of operational definitions of factors that are observed to impede and facilitate work in health and nonhealth domains among female AFDC/TANF recipients in 1996 ..	44
Table 12	Percent of female AFDC/TANF recipients with paid employment in 1996, by number of factors impeding and facilitating work.....	45
Table 13	Percent of female AFDC/TANF recipients with paid employment in 1996: Number of health and nonhealth factors impeding work, by number of health and nonhealth factors facilitating work.....	45
Appendix tables		
Table A-1	Derivation of study universe.....	47
Table A-2	Comparison of original analytic sample to final analytic sample after attrition due to imposition of study criteria.....	48
Table A-3.1	Unit counts for analytic sample after reduction due to study restrictions.....	50
Table A-3.2	Weighting Adjustment Factors for Weighting Cells for the Female AFDC/TANF Final Analytic Universe	51
Table A-4.1	Characteristics of selected components of the analysis universe and components lost due to attrition based on public use file weights and as reweighted for this study.....	52
Table A-4.2	Unweighted sample counts corresponding to the cells in table A-4.1.....	55

Symbols Used in the Tables

S.E.	}	- Standard error.
s.e		
(N)		- Base of percentage in thousands.
n.a.		- Not applicable.
-		- No observations.
...		- Population base insufficient to yield meaningful estimate.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To John Coder for creating the data set and reweighting the analysis sample, to Katherine Walker for her computer programming to reproduce Jack McNeil's definition of disability from the 5th wave topical module. Michael Leonesio also made a number of suggestions, not all taken. Rob Gesumaria provided helpful programming assistance, to Katalin Zentai for considerable editorial effort, and to Thomas Palumbo, John Hisnanick, Kathy Short, Bruce Klein, and especially Leroy Bailey, who provided a careful reading and useful suggestions. To all I extend my heartfelt appreciation. Funding by the Department of Health and Human Services and the Bureau of the Census supported the work.

ABSTRACT

This study employs the Survey of Income and Participation (SIPP) to assess the extent to which AFDC/TANF recipients worked in 1996, the first year of the 1996 panel of the survey. A set of rather common place attributes such as disability and health, transportation, number and age of children, educational attainment and work experience were subjected to bivariate statistical tests to assess their impact on jobholding of primary recipients. This simple descriptive approach shows that those who experienced one or more impediments accounted for more than four-fifths the national case load. Of nearly one-half of recipients who were affected by two or more impediments, only somewhat less than one-third held a job in 1996. On the other hand, two-fifths of AFDC/TANF recipients seemed well placed to take advantage of the labor market. These individuals possessed three or more factors that facilitated work. Fully 68 percent of this group worked during the year covered by the study. Even greater differentials in job-holding were experienced by the nearly 20 percent of recipients affected by the most impeding and facilitating factors. The recipients favored by five or more positive attributes were seven times more likely to hold a job in 1996 than those with four or more impediments. Thus the population of AFDC/TANF recipients in 1996 was very differentiated in terms of capacity to take advantage of the new emphasis that welfare reform put on the world of paid employment as the road to financial self-sufficiency.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

The Nation's income support program for dependent children was established in the depression year of 1935 with the enactment of Title IV of the Social Security Act. A "dependent child" was defined as a child under age 15 deprived of parental support or care by reasons of death, continued absence from the home, or physical or mental incapacity of a parent, and living with a close relative (SSB 1990: 80). Originally, the program mainly provided assistance to children deprived of support of one parent because of death of the family wage earner. As the social security system matured and social conditions changed with the increase in divorce and the growing population of never married mothers, the program came to serve mostly children of divorced, separated or never married mothers (Myers 1993:807).

Over time, the program, commonly known as AFDC (Aid to Families with Dependent Children), came to encompass three main goals. The original purpose, to provide support for needy children in their homes, was augmented in 1956 by two additional ones - strengthening family life and promoting family self-support. The large shift in female labor force participation that occurred in the post-war period, especially in the period after 1970 (Ferber 1993), established the legitimacy of women working while caring for children and led to increasing importance of the third purpose, self-support. Partially in response to these developments, various program provisions were introduced or modified to accommodate and foster work on the part of caretaker recipients. As early as 1962, Federal matching support was introduced for community work and training programs at the option of the States. The Work Incentive (WIN) program was introduced in 1968. Congress gave the authority to experiment with their own "welfare to work" programs in 1981. In 1988, the Family Support Act (FSA) replaced the WIN program with the Job Opportunities and Basic Skill (JOBS) Training program which was designed to substantially expand "welfare to work" programs (USHR/CWM,1998:404). In addition, the FSA created a new child care entitlement for current and former welfare recipients. Congressional legislation in 1990 created two additional child care programs, so by the beginning of the decade the Federal involvement in

child care was well established (Adams and Rohacek 2002, pp. 121-124).

Concomitantly, various income disregards were introduced to partially shelter earnings of recipients to account for work expenses and provide incentives for work. Work supports in the form of childcare, as mentioned, and transportation expenses also became features of the program in recognition of the need to foster work among those receiving assistance. Such measures were seen to be especially important for a population likely to face difficulties in the job market, and as single parents, would have a certain need for childcare. As the country entered the nineties, the political and social climate combined to increase pressure for further reforms that would emphasize work as the axis of payment for those able to work.

The Clinton Administration entered office with a pledge to “end welfare as we know it”. Appointees within the Department of Health and Human Services developed reform plans that combined time limited benefits with a strong program of work supports. Meanwhile, the Republican Congress developed plans of its own that focused more on temporary assistance combined with time limits and more robust work requirements. The President and Congress finally came together on a compromise proposal that was passed as The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA). It established the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program as a replacement for the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Emergency Assistance (EA) and JOBS programs. In addition to the original purpose of the AFDC program of providing assistance to allow needy families to care for children in their homes, the second and third purposes took on more pointed form. The second was restated and made explicit the goal “to end dependence of needy parents upon government benefits by promoting job preparation, work, and marriage”, and the third, “strengthening family life”, was changed to “encourage formation and maintenance of two-parent families.” A fourth goal was added to “prevent and reduce out-of-wedlock pregnancies and establish goals for preventing and reducing their incidence.” Most importantly, PRWORA ended the Federal –

entitlement to assistance.¹ Under the program, recipients must work as soon as they were *job ready*² or no later than 2 years after coming on assistance. After a four year phase-in period, by 2002, States had to have 50 percent of their caseload in specified work activities.³ The new legislation shifted emphasis from providing support to care for children in the home to an emphasis on self-support from work, with temporary assistance to hold things together while finding employment. Thus these changes posed a central question: *Was the client population able to work and was it well-positioned to become self-supporting through work with only temporary assistance while adjusting to the new regime of assistance or were they affected by more deep-seated problems that would make combining work and child-rearing problematic?* This study will attempt to shed some light on this central question, first by looking at a set of characteristics of the AFDC/TANF⁴ population in the transition year of 1996 and assessing the extent to which they inhibited or promoted work. Later stages of the project will deal with the returns to work in terms of both the level and continuity of earnings of those who had participated in the program in 1996.

1.2. Data and Time Period

The study-period pertains to the initial 12 months covered by 1996 panel of the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP). Interviews were conducted in April 1996 through March of 1997. The cases selected for inclusion in the study were: 1) participants of the original sample who received AFDC/TANF benefits in any of the first 12 months of the survey; 2) had non-imputed receipt status for AFDC/TANF benefits in the last month of receipt; 3) were female; and 4) were interviewed in each of the first five waves of the survey. Most other point-in-time characteristics, such as age, race,

¹ Simultaneously, the Child Care Development Fund (CCDF) was established. It combined the four programs operating since the early 1990's. State discretion was increased and funding augmented through transferring up to 30 percent of their TANF block grant or using TANF funds directly for child care (op. cit., 124).

² A legislative term meaning ready to work in the sense that applied in the TANF program.

³ Under the JOBS program, work requirements did not apply in certain cases to parents with a child under 3 years of age. This was modified under TANF to exempt, at State option, parents with children under one year of age. However, States could not penalize single parents with children under age 6 for failing to meet work requirements because they were not able to obtain needed child care. States were also able to exempt up to 20 percent of their caseload for certain categories of people at the State's discretion (USHRICWM 1998: 399, 496-497).

⁴ Given that both programs were in force during the study period, recipients of either or both programs are referred to as AFDC/TANF recipients.

marital status, and educational attainment were measured as of the last month of the first interview.⁵ Detailed characteristics on disability and health were collected in the fifth interview, conducted in August through November, 1997. In addition to health and disability status, work history prior to the survey, and vehicle ownership were obtained from the first and third topical modules, respectively; they were conducted in April through July, 1996 and December, 1996 through March, 1997. However, as indicated, the reference period for determining participation in the AFDC/TANF program, labor force activity and other facts pertaining to the kinds and amount of income and poverty status is based on the first three interviews and so falls principally in the calendar year of 1996.⁶ By restricting the sample to persons interviewed in the first interview and all subsequent interviews through the fifth, we can study the joint characteristics not only of the core information on income and labor force from the initial 12 months of the survey, but also the information collected in the first five topical modules that deal with topics such as work and reciprocity history, disability history, medical utilization, assets and liabilities, and detailed disability status among others.

Application of the study criteria resulted in loss of approximately 37 percent of the sample due to the effects of attrition and the requirement that AFDC/TANF recipient not be imputed as of the last month of observation. The cases that met the criteria for the study were then reweighted to closely reproduce the population of recipients as of the end of the first wave of the survey. (Details of the derivation of the study sample and the reweighting procedure are given in the Appendix.)⁷

1.3 Rationale of the Study

Characteristics of the population that can be expected to present obstacles to work have been discussed frequently (Adler 1993,1998; Jayakody, Danziger, and Pollack, 2000; Loprest and Acs 1995;

⁵One exception was the number of covered persons in the AFDC/TANF unit which was obtained for the last month.

⁶The SIPP sample is divided into four equal parts (rotations), each with a four-month reference period and rotation starting in successive months. As a result, approximately 92 percent of the reference period pertains to months of calendar year 1996. Of the remaining 8 percent, about 1/3 pertain to 1995 and about 2/3 pertain to 1997. Nineteen ninety-six is used as the short-hand way to refer to the study period throughout the text.

⁷After reweighting, the sample of AFDF/ TANF recipients was further restricted to those recipients age 18-64.

Olson and Pavetti 1996; Needles-Fletcher, Garasky and Jensen 2002; Seefeldt 2004; Zedlewski 1999. Zedlewski and Loprest, 2001). But this population has characteristics that should make finding and holding a job more likely, that have received less attention. Generally the same characteristics that can be used to catalogue the impediments that impinge on AFCD/TANF recipients ability to find and hold a paying job, can be used to characterize factors that facilitate job-holding, so it was decided to use the SIPP to characterize the population of recipients in terms of their strengths, as well as their weaknesses, and to see how these strengths and weaknesses working in isolation, and in combination, would affect job-holding, and to determine the extent to which their juxtaposition could act to offset one another. Implicit in this approach is the presumption that the study population is not homogeneous and will react in a differentiated fashion to the new incentives offered by changes in the program. A further reason for utilizing the SIPP is that it is a nationally representative survey while most of the other studies cited are based on special samples for a single state or group of states.

The emphasis is placed on personal characteristics as the source of the explanatory factors for work behavior in this study. This approach may in-large, be characterized as looking at the store of human capital that the individual commands for the explanation of labor market outcomes. Institutional and contextual factors are likely to be equally important but are not considered. Local labor market conditions, including the kinds of employers in terms of skills required and the kinds of workers sought, the willingness to invest in employees, the overall demand for workers in the local area, and the kinds of accommodations that employers would be willing to make for persons with disabilities are just some of the contextual factors that impinge on the recipient's likelihood of obtaining and retaining employment. In addition, financial incentives that the program, itself, offers for work vary considerably among the States, and plausibly effect jobholding. Indeed, a plethora of institutional factors are present in the low-wage labor market that condition welfare recipients' labor market behavior that might well be considered. However, we have chosen to concentrate on

personal characteristics, because they are readily available, not because we offer them as representing the full set of forces affecting the job-holding tendencies of the recipients. This represents a serious limitation of the study.^{8, 9, 10}

2. FACTORS THAT AFFECT JOB-HOLDING

2.1. Introduction of Factors

In general, positive (facilitating) factors and negative (impeding) factors were defined using characteristics conceived being bivalent. Instead of just focusing on the characteristic as potentially reducing the propensity to hold a job, emphasis was placed on defining the characteristic as a factor that could be seen as fostering the probability of job-holding as well. Each characteristic was used to construct two factors; one conceived as impeding and the other as facilitating work (health status, disability status, automobile ownership, educational attainment, age, number and age of children, and work history prior to the survey). These characteristics can, in general, be seen as representing a continuum that extends from positive to negative, as far as they might affect job-holding, for example, educational attainment may range from high (college degree) to low (less than eight years). An individual with a college degree might be considered to possess a positive or facilitating trait that affects her probability of holding and retaining a job while an individual with low educational attainment (less than eight completed years of schooling) would be counted as having an attribute that could be expected to inhibit work. Some experimentation was used to arrive at the categorizations which produced the largest differential in terms of job-holding during the period under review.

⁸See O'Conner (2001, pp. 141-143 and throughout) for an interesting treatment of the limits of the "new economics" with its emphasis on individual characteristics as explanations for behavior. This approach made its appearance with the War on Poverty in the 1960s and came to be the dominant framework of poverty research from the 1970's to the present

⁹See Ziliak (2004) for an analysis of the effects of contextual factors defined in terms of the changing incentives presented single mothers by the labor market, national disability programs, and AFDC that conditioned their choice among these domains during the period 1979-2000.

¹⁰Despite this emphasis on personal characteristics we experimented with two contextual variables that we thought likely to affect job-holding, one is related to the labor market in the recipient's state of residence (the state's annual unemployment rate) and the second to the character of the AFDC/TANF program, namely the financial incentives for moving from no work to a full-time minimum wage job. The state unemployment rate showed some promise but did not perform as hoped when combined with other variables. The financial payoff that the State program offered for work also failed to perform as expected, perhaps because it was only defined for 12 States covered by the National Survey of American Families (Coe, et al., 1998)

Originally, the intention was to develop a three-fold categorization of each variable based on the simple bivariate relationship to job-holding in the initial 12 months of the survey. In most cases it was relatively easy to define the impeding and facilitating factors in this way. However, there was often a trade-off between the number of individuals affected and the probability of job-holding. Defining a middle group that was statistically distinct from the groups classified as affected by an impediment or facilitator proved difficult and was abandoned. Eventually, we settled for provisionally defining groups that had a low job-holding rate and a high job-holding rate that were nominally quite different. If the difference was sustained by standard statistical tests, these attributes were taken to represent impediments to (or facilitators of) work¹¹. Not infrequently, the middle category could not be said to be statistically distinct from either the category defining the work impediment, the factor facilitating work or both. Consequently, there is clearly a degree of arbitrariness in the procedure used to categorize the factors designating work impediments and work facilitators.

The other studies that have dealt explicitly with barriers to work that affect the AFDC/TANF population generally have considered measures of health and disability, the nature of prior work experience, educational attainment, transportation, and age of children. Zedlewski's (1999, 2001) studies have added English language capability, and receipt of Supplemental Security Income by a child. Jayakody et al. (2000) also consider child care, domestic violence, limited job skills, knowledge of work norms, perceived discrimination, literacy, conviction of a crime and several major mental health conditions. Danziger (2001) reviews Zedlewski and Loprest's findings (2001) based on a Michigan study that identified 19 barriers and argues that failure to consider the wider list of problems facing the AFDC/TANF population seriously understates the obstacles that recipients face when attempting to work. This study, concentrating on a less comprehensive set of potential barriers facing recipients, similar to Zedlewski's, is likely subject to same criticism.

¹¹ Ninety percent confidence intervals were used to distinguish between nominal differences that may or may not be statistically significant and differences that are considered statistically significant. The results of all statistical tests are given in last three columns of each table. The groups compared in the test of the null hypothesis as described in the fifth column; t-values of at least 1.65 are considered to yield a statistically significant difference in employment rates between the two groups being tested. While these tests are sufficient for a descriptive study they are not sufficient to establish the independent effect of a given factor, rather than the factor is associated with a lesser or greater probability of job-holding. Certainly a finding of statistical significance is in no way to be taken as evidence of causality.

A brief discussion of the formulation of each of the inhibiting and facilitating factors to be employed in this study follows.

2.2. Definition of Factors

2.2.1 Disability and Health-Related Factors

Disability.— The domain of disability is defined using data from the fifth wave topical module and closely follows the approach taken by McNeil (2001) to distinguish severe and nonsevere disabilities (see the detailed definition provided in the Glossary on page 29).^{12,13} His approach is extended to other family members of the unit after Adler (1988,1993,1994). Emphasis is placed on those individuals classified as severely disabled by McNeil. As shown in *Table 1*, while recipients with a disability are less likely to have held a job in the study period than those who are not disabled, the lower job-holding rate of those with a disability is due to those with a severe disability. Those who have a nonsevere disability, not only have a higher employment rate than the those with a severe disability, which is not surprising, but their job-holding rate is actually nominally higher and statistically indistinguishable from those who do not have a disability.

Incidentally, this is the same bivariate pattern that McNeil (2000, *Table 4*) found for both

¹²Several specific conditions and/or symptoms that others have used as separate barriers to employment in other studies are subsumed under the definition of severe disability such as the presence of learning disability, an alcohol or drug problem that causes an activity limitation, or symptoms such as frequent depression, anxiety, trouble concentrating, trouble getting along with others and coping with day-to-day stress that are serious enough to interfere with every day activities.

¹³There is a long-standing controversy about the validity of self-reported disability measures. Specifically there is concern that non-workers may tend to over-report disabilities. There is a good deal of empirical research on both sides of the issue. Recently, Kreider and Pepper (2003) assert non-workers, in the SIPP specifically, over-report self reported work disability but provide no point estimates of the degree of resulting bias. For a contrary view, see Rupp and Davies (2004) who find that self-reported measures, especially the presence of function limitations and base-line self assessments of health status, were predictive of both entry into SSA's disability programs and mortality over a 14-year period. Dwyer, et al. (2003) and Hu, et al. (2001) also found that self-reports of functional limitations, and limitations in activities of daily living (ADLs) and instrumental activities of daily living (IADLs), as well as health status, were useful in predicting eligibility for SSA's disability programs. This paper utilizes a definition of disability (see the Glossary for details of our definition) which is not solely reliant on self-reported work limitation/prevention measure, but includes functional limitations as well as ADLs and IADLs To the extent that Kreider and Pepper's findings apply to disability as defined by work-limitation/work-prevented measures, it is not entirely relevant to the measures employed here. In any case, it was decided to accept the reports of disability by recipients at face value, while recognizing that this decision will not meet with universal acceptance.

married and nonmarried mothers. Severely disabled mothers have a much lower employment rate than either those with a nonsevere disability or those who are not disabled.¹⁴ On the other hand, those with a nonsevere disability have an employment rate that is statistically indistinguishable from those who are not disabled.

In addition to the physical and mental impairments that may make work difficult or impossible for the individual recipient, the focus of this study was expanded to include other family members with severe disabilities in order to capture the possible effect of extra care taking responsibilities that arguably would likely fall to the primary recipient, and thereby further interfere with job-holding.

Using McNeil's definitions, 26 percent of primary recipients have a severe disability. Of these primary recipients, approximately half have a severely disabled child or other adult living with them. An additional 18 percent of primary recipients, who do not report a severe disability, have another family member (either a child or other adult) who are reported to be severely disabled. Altogether in 44 percent of units, either the primary recipient, a child, or other adult was affected by a severe disability.

What impact on employment of the primary recipients did their own severe disabilities and the severe disabilities of other family members have? The pattern of nominal differences shown in *Table 2* suggests that the employment rate is highest, not surprisingly, when no member of the unit is severely disabled (57 percent), then decreases slightly with the presence of severe disability among unit members other than the primary recipient (52 percent), and then drops considerably when the primary recipient herself is severely disabled (to 29 percent), and declines further when the primary recipient and other unit members are severely disabled (24 percent). This pattern is consistent with an increasing impact of severe disability on the primary recipient's ability to work from a small impact, when just other family members report a severe disability and the primary recipient conceivably has to cope with the increased care-taking demands of impaired family members, to the effects on her own ability to work when she herself has a severe disability, to the lowest employment rate when she and other members have a severe

¹⁴This pattern holds even if differences in the distributions by marital status between AFDC/TANF mothers and all mothers are taken into account (calculations by author, data not shown).

disability and she likely has to deal not only with her own situation but is required to meet the care needs of other severely disabled unit members as well.

However, statistical tests do not consistently confirm these nominal differences, and so it was decided to define two groups to represent the presence of disability as a factor facilitating or inhibiting work. (1) *The units containing no members with a severe disability, are classified as a being affected by a factor that facilitates work.* The primary recipients in these units have an employment rate of 57 percent and account for 56 percent of the units in the study. (2) *Those units having a primary recipient only and/or a primary recipient and other unit members with a severe disability are classified as having a work impediment.* These units account for 26 percent of primary recipients covered by the study. In such units, primary recipients had a 29 percent employment rate in 1996. (3) *Those in the residual group, units that have one or more members, other than the primary recipient with a severe disability, are treated as an intermediate category in which severe disability neither greatly impedes nor facilitates work.* They constitute 18 percent of units, and the employment rate of the associated primary recipients was 52 percent. Statistical tests confirm that the first two groups have rates of job-holding that are clearly statistically different, while the third group's rate is higher than the group denoted as having a work impediment, but is not different from the group denoted as being affected by a factor that facilitates work.

Perceived health status.—The perceived health status of all adults was measured in the fifth wave interview using a fairly standard five-point scale ranging from positive (excellent) to negative (poor)¹⁵. Zedlewski (1999, p.10) in her study found that 48 percent of adults receiving benefits reported poor general or mental health and counted such individuals as having a potential obstacle to work. McNeil's (2000) study, based on data from the 1996 panel of the SIPP, and suggests that health status and disability may measure phenomena that are at least partially distinct, shows that individuals in the general population classified as severely disabled were significantly less likely to be employed if they rated their health status as fair or poor (22 percent employed) compared to those whose health was reported as excellent (53 percent employed) as shown in *Table 3*.¹⁶

¹⁵ The of categories, from positive to negative are: *excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor.*

¹⁶ Incidentally, only 23 percent of severely disabled AFDC/TANF recipients who were reported being in fair or poor health worked in 1996. They accounted for 16 percent of participants in the program.

Consequently, the effect of health status on the employment of recipients was explored, and it was found that for those reporting fair or poor health, 33 percent held a job during the first 12 months of the survey, while those reported to be in excellent health had much higher employment rate, 60 percent (see *Table 4*). The balance of the primary recipients, those reported to be in very good or good health, were considered to possess neither a positive nor a negative factor that affected job-holding. Their job-holding rate was 52 percent. *Therefore those reporting poor or fair health (representing 23 percent of the study population) were considered as having an impediment to work, while those reporting excellent health (representing 18 percent of the study population) were taken to possess a factor that facilitated work. The remainder of primary recipients, those in very good or good health (59 percent) with an employment rate of 52 percent, were classified as being neither favored nor disfavored by their health status with respect to employment.* The differences between the job-holding rates of the three groups are highly significant statistically (also shown in *Table 4*).

2.2.2. Non Health-Related Factors

Automobile ownership.—Transportation is a necessary part of the work package and can also be indispensable in dealing with other important obligations, such as getting to medical appointments, accessing child care, and so forth. As we have just seen, units are especially impacted by medical needs (recall that in 44 percent of AFDC/TANF units, either the primary recipient, a child or other adult is severely disabled, and 23 percent of primary recipients report fair or poor health). Transportation requirements can be met in various ways: public transportation where available, taxi cabs, or private vehicle, either owned by the individual worker or someone else, such as another household member, a friend or acquaintance willing to lend the vehicle or provide rides to and from the workplace, child care providers, or medical appointments. Furthermore, these transportation modes can be combined in various ways to meet transportation needs.

Vehicle ownership was used as a convenient indicator of the ease with which this need may be met by the AFDC/TANF recipient. Few would question that to own an automobile will make commuting easier and

that not owning one would make getting to work more of a burden. How is this common sense notion reflected in the data?

Information on vehicle ownership was taken from the asset module of the third wave of the SIPP and looked at its simple bivariate relationship to employment in the first 12 months of the survey (*Table 5*).

The variable constructed to represent the effect of automobile ownership has three categories reflecting the manner in which vehicle ownership was obtained in the SIPP. Vehicle owners account for 35 percent of primary recipients and 61 percent of them worked in the first 12 months of the survey. Twenty-three percent of primary recipients live in households in which a vehicle is owned by someone other than the primary recipient (with a primary recipient employment rate of 46 percent), and 42 percent of recipients live in households in which no vehicle is owned by a household member (with a primary recipient employment rate of 40 percent). Consequently, according to our criteria, it is fairly clear that *vehicle ownership by recipients should be classified as a factor that facilitates work, and that absence of vehicle ownership by the recipient or a household member be classified as a factor that impedes work. The third category, other adult household member owns a vehicle, becomes the neutral category, deemed to neither inhibit nor facilitate job-holding.* Tests of statistical significance sustain the notion of a difference between the first two categories, and between the first and the third, but not the second and third. Thus it cannot be said that the intermediate category is clearly distinct from the group that is treated as impeded by lack of vehicle ownership on a statistical basis. The category *vehicle owned by other adult in household* could be combined with the third category *no vehicle owned by a household member*. The larger group would constitute 65 percent of primary recipients and would have experienced an employment rate of only 42 percent during the first 12 months of the survey, but this would violate our rule of thumb of having a three-fold categorization of each dimension we consider.

Age of children.—The age of children covered by the unit is expected to have an important bearing on the employment of primary recipients. Program provisions allow single mothers with children under age of one to be exempted from work requirements at the State's option, and single mothers with children under the age of 6 cannot be penalized for failing to meet work requirements if they cannot

obtain child care (USHR/CWM 1998:498). Also, other research has established that the presence of young children represents a barrier to work for single mothers and/or recipients. Zedlewski (1999) reported that presence of a child under age one significantly depressed work activity among recipients and Lee et al. (2003, p. 20) report that for both single and married mothers having pre-school (age 0-5) or younger school age children (age 6-14) has a significant negative effect on work.¹⁷ These findings are expected based on the literature on the impact of children on mother's labor supply (Ferber, 1993), while having older children (age 15-17) appears to facilitate mothers work, again for both married and single mothers.

In any case, the empirical results are largely contrary to what was expected. The bivariate relationship between the presence of children of various ages (any children under 1 year of age, under 3, 3-5, 6-14, 15-18) and job-holding was examined. Although nominally the presence of children in each of these age groups had the expected negative effect on job-holding, the effects were modest at best and none reached statistical significance. Further restrictions limiting the presence of children to those solely in the indicated age groups, *eg.*, children only under age 1 present, only under age 3, only ages 6-14 and so forth, were tested to see if an effect on employment could be uncovered. The results of these experiments are provided in *Table 6*.

The experiments revealed that the presence of children solely between the ages of 6 and 14 tended to enhance rather than inhibit the probability of work. Fifty-four percent of single parents with only children between ages 6 and 14 in the unit held a job in the first 12 months of the survey. Such units accounted for 24 percent of units in the study. This finding may be motivated by the fact that children at these ages would all be of school age. Childcare during school hours could be available through the school, and the balance of childcare needs might be met from after school programs associated with the school, so we may be observing the effect of the availability of child care which is coincidental with the

¹⁷Both these studies employed multivariate techniques and so perhaps the simple bivariate relationship explored here hides the relationships between age of children and job-holding. Also, employing a logit model, Bavier (2002, table A-1) finds that the presence of children under age 3 is positively associated with welfare receipt but negatively associated with earnings for family heads with children.

presence of children in this age group.¹⁸ However, this finding is not consistent with other research just cited. Also mothers whose only children were between ages 15-18 were nominally less likely to hold a job (39 percent), but the difference from the rest of units with children of all other ages (49 percent) was not statistically significant. The presence of older children (age 15-18) together with younger children (age 14 and under) was tested for to see if it might facilitate work on the supposition that the older children could provide care for the younger ones. The opposite situation was also tested, that is the when younger children were present without the simultaneous presence of older children to provide the opportunity for childcare. Neither of these situations proved to be significant in the bivariate case.

Finally, since mothers with only older children (age 15-18) seemed to be somewhat less likely to work (as we have seen only 39 percent held a job in the reference period), we tested their probability of job-holding against the probability of mothers with children only age 6-14 (as noted above they have 54 percent probability of work), and found that the 15 percent difference between the two groups was statistically significant. Consequently, *we consider mothers caring for only children age 6-14 as being affected by a positive factor that facilitates work and mothers caring for only children age 15-18, as affected by a factor that tends to inhibit work.*¹⁹ They make up 24 and 5 percent, respectively, of the units in the study. *The omitted group, recipients with no children age 6-18 present, constitutes 71 percent of the recipients and has an employment rate of 48 percent.* Statistical tests do not confirm that their employment rate differs from either those designated as affected by an impediment to or a facilitator of work. Again, this residual group is defined not on the basis of statistical criteria but on the basis of need for a third category to characterize the factor.

Number of dependent children in the assistance unit.— The effect that the number of children in the assistance unit had on work (see *Table 7*) was also examined. One would expect at some point an increasing number of dependent children would inhibit work, while a small number of children would facilitate holding a job. Between the extremes the effect of the number of children in the assistance unit

¹⁸ Although speaking about parents who left welfare Besharov with Smari also (2001, p. 466) call attention to the existence of the defacto child care offered to mothers with children during school hours and the structured activities available through after-school programs.

¹⁹ Perhaps it is worth noting that welfare reform has consistently been found to have a range of negative effects on the school performance of adolescents (USDHHS 2004). In Florida, for example, the suspension rate of adolescents increased from 33 to 41 percent. Speculatively, this could act to depress employment rates of recipients with adolescent children.

an employment rate of 43, percent while those with only one child in the unit were more likely to hold a job (53 percent). Recipients with 2-3 children had an intermediate job-holding rate (47 percent) and accounted for 47 percent of recipient units. Statistical tests confirmed those with only one child were more likely to work than those with 2-3 children and four or more children. However, those with four or more children, while nominally less likely to work than those with 2-3 children, the difference in job-holding rates between the groups fell short of statistical significance, so the intermediate category was not truly intermediate, e.g. statistically distinct from both extremes. However, units *with four or more dependent children were classified as experiencing an impediment to work and those with one child as affected by facilitating factor. The residual, intermediate category, 2-3 children was considered neither advantaged nor disadvantaged in regard to job-holding,*

Primary recipient's age.—The bi-variate relationship between paid employment and age is a somewhat complicated one. Restricting ourselves to just nominal relationships (see *Table 8*), the highest employment rate is experienced by the youngest age group (53 percent for 18-24 year olds) and then declines slightly for each of the two subsequent 10-year age groups (to 50 percent, for 25-34 year olds, and to 49 percent for 35-44 year olds) before experiencing a sharp drop to 38 percent for the oldest age group (45-64 year olds). Given the disproportionate representation low skilled individuals among primary recipients, the finding that those age 45-64 have the lowest employment rate is not surprising. The jobs available to those with low education and little work experience tend to be in physically demanding occupations and increasing age leads to a degrading ability to engage in such occupations. For this reason alone, the low rate of employment experienced by those 45-64 years of age is not unexpected.²⁰ Statistical tests indicate that only the 45-64 age group had a significantly different employment rate from the other age groups. Eighteen-twenty-four year olds have the highest nominal employment rate of any age group (53 percent), and one that exceeds that of 45-64 year olds by a statistically significant margin. However, statistical tests do not sustain the notion that they are distinct from the intermediate age

²⁰ *The Social Security Administration takes this fact into account in determining eligibility for its Disability Insurance Program (see Hu, Lahiri, Vaughan and Wixon 2001, and Dwyer, Hu, Vaughan and Wixon 2003)*

groups, even when they are combined (Table 8). Consequently, while it is clear that the 45-64 age group, the oldest among the primary recipients, should be considered as experiencing an inhibiting factor with regard to employment, the 18-24 year olds will be considered, nonetheless, to possess a positive factor that facilitates employment. While statistical tests do not fully sustain this decision, it does make possible the retention of a three-fold categorization for the age factor.

Educational attainment.—Educational attainment is important since it provides a readily observable marker to the employer for evaluation of the suitability of a prospective employee. Educational attainment signals whether the potential employee has mastered at least basic skills, and is useful along with work experience, in assessing the likely productivity of prospective workers. Table 9 displays the relationship between paid employment and educational attainment in the initial 12 months of the survey for the AFCD/TANF recipients. The relationship is quite strong with the employment rate rising from 25 percent for those with less than nine years of schooling to 66 percent of those with some form of post-secondary diploma, certificate or degree. Research has shown the particular role that post-secondary credentials play in validating pre-college attainment levels and in signaling other worthwhile attributes, such as motivation and perseverance (Arkes, 1999). These two groups constituted approximately the lowest and highest deciles (about 11 percent) of primary recipients in terms of educational attainment. The remaining 78 percent of recipients had an employment rate of 50 percent. *Those with eight years or less of education were considered to have a barrier to employment while those possessing a post secondary diploma, certificate or degree were considered advantaged in terms of employment.* Furthermore, all three groups were distinct according to statistical criteria.²¹

²¹Alternative combinations were considered but rejected. For example, the *some college* could have been combined with those who had a *post secondary diploma, certificate, or degree* to enlarge the group affected by a facilitating factor. But this would have required combining who had *graduated high school* with those "with some high school" to satisfy statistical criteria. Those with a negative factor would still be represented as recipients with eight years or less of education, but the result would be a substantial imbalance between positive and negative factors. Conversely, an increase in those classified as affected by an impediment could have been created by combining those with some high school with those with eight years or less education, but then the middle category would have to subsume those with some college to satisfy statistical criteria. However, the alternative would again have caused a substantial imbalance between positive and negative factors.

Patterns of work history prior to the survey.—Experience with the world of work is clearly important for someone seeking employment. A potential candidate's prior work experience signals such things as a prospective worker's basic ability to accommodate to a work regimen,²² to interact positively with co-workers, and to master tasks required of the specific work environment. The quality of prior work experience (for example, the intensity, recency, and continuity of prior employment) is also useful to the prospective employer in validating the functional significance of such external characteristics as educational attainment, and is indicative of the prospective employee's motivation as well.

The initial notion was simply to construct a continuous variable of the number of years of prior work experience taking the lowest 10 or 20 percent as representing a barrier to employment and the upper 10 or 20 percent as representing a factor that would facilitate job-holding. This tentative line of attack was influenced by the way SIPP asks about work experience. The SIPP approach revolves around identifying whether or not the individual ever worked at a paid job or business, and then if so, whether the individual was ever employed for 6 straight months or longer during a year. This gives rise to a four-fold classification: 1) never worked at job or business, 2) worked a job or business, but never for at least 6 straight months, 3) worked at least one year, but not all years, for 6 straight months since first job, and finally 4) always worked at least 6 straight months or longer since the first year worked. These last two groups can be further differentiated by the number of years of work experience.

Those reported as never having worked at a job or business constituted 18 percent of those on the rolls and at the other extreme those reported as always working at least 6 straight months make up 24 percent of primary recipients and slightly more than 4/5ths held a job in the first 12 months of the survey. Although there are modest nominal differences in the job-holding rate by years of work experience in this group, none of the differences are statistically significant. Additionally, those who had worked at least 6

²² Huynh (2000) treats the signaling aspect of AFDC/TANF recipient's work effort, and suggests that as work becomes a mandatory feature of the program, its value as a signal may become degraded.

straight months for at least one year, but not all years since holding their first job, constituted half of the recipients (50 percent), and that a relatively small group (7 percent) had held a job, but never for at least 6 straight months.

Since it seemed desirable to add the criteria recency of work experience that was employed by Zedlewski (1998, p. 8) in her study of the employment barriers faced by participants, the last three groups of the initial classification were examined for the existence of persons who had last worked more than three years ago. In doing so, it turned out that there were a substantial number of such individuals in the second and third groups (those who never held a job for at least six months and those who had worked at least six months for at least one year, but not all years, since their first job). In fact, 38 percent had last worked more than 3 years ago and they nominally accounted for a slightly larger proportion of primary recipients (22 percent) than those who reported never holding a job at all (18 percent). Their employment rate was also about the same as those who had never held a job (18 vs. 20 percent). When combined, these two groups accounted for 40 percent of all primary recipients and had an employment rate of 19 percent.²³

When the group formed by those who last worked more than three years ago was combined with the groups defined on the basis of the criteria of ever holding a job and the continuity of job-holding of at least 6 straight months to create a single dimension of work history, it turned out, as noted above, that the former group was drawn from groups 2 and 3 and none from the 4th group (those who worked at least 6 straight months or longer in all years since holding their first job). Furthermore, as those who last worked more than three years ago had a very low employment rate, the employment rate of those who had held a job, but never 6 months or more or not continuously at least 6 straight months since their first job, rose considerably with the final definition of the work history factor (from 44 percent to 61 percent). Their relatively high employment rate created a problem with respect to the definition of negative and positive factors for the domain of work history.

In any case the final definition of the work history variable conveniently had three categories that corresponded to low, medium, and high groups. The final groups used to categorize

²³Incidentally, this group accounts for about the same percentage of primary recipients as Zedlewski's category, *last worked more than three years ago* (43 percent) (*Ibid*).

positive and negative factors for the dimension of work experience were: 1) *those who reported never working at paid employment or who last worked three years prior to the survey, constituting 40 percent of primary recipients with an employment rate of 19 percent, were considered to be facing an impediment to employment;* 2) *those who reported working continuously at least 6 straight months since their first job, constituting 24 percent of recipients and having an employment rate of 82 percent, were considered to be affected by a facilitating factor in the search for work.* 3) *Those who reported working at job or business but never for 6 straight months, or working at least one year for 6 straight months or more²⁴ (accounting for 36 percent of primary recipients) were clearly intermediate in terms of their employment rate (61 percent).* Their intermediate status was confirmed by statistical tests, but their employment rate was as high as many with facilitating factors that were identified for the other domains.

2.3. Summary of Factors

A summary of the final impeding and facilitating factors employed in the study is given in *Table 11*. For each factor or attribute, the percentage of beneficiaries affected by the factor together with the percent who worked at some time during 1996 is provided.

The percentage of recipients affected by the eight identified impediments ranges between 5 to 42 with employment rates ranging between 18 and 43 percent. On the other hand, for the eight facilitating factors identified, the percentage of affected recipients ranges between 11 and 56 percent and the annual employment rates range between 53 and 82 percent.

The proportions holding a job in 1996 are fairly well balanced between positive and negative effects in three domains (health, vehicle ownership and educational attainment). For four of the five remaining domains (disability, children's age, and age of primary recipient), the proportion affected by the positive factor ranges between a little less than twice to nearly 5 times the proportion affected by the paired negative factor of the same domain. The remaining positive factor, work history prior to the survey, is unbalanced in the opposite direction.

²⁴ And with one or more years since first job when the individual did not work at least six straight months.

Thus, it can be said that there was a good deal of variation in both the number of recipients affected and the impact of the factors on the employment rates of recipients.

2.4. Effects of Combined Factors

To assess the effect of the occurrence of multiple factors on employment, a series of dummy variables were created to represent each positive and negative factor and then the dummies representing the positive (facilitating) and negative (impeding) factors, respectively, were simply summed. This procedure was done separately for health and non-health factors that were classified as facilitators of, and impediments to, employment. The expectation, obviously, is that the more factors affecting a recipient, the greater the impact will be on the probability of holding a job with the job-holding rate increasing with the larger number of positive factors and decreasing with the larger the number of impeding factors affecting the recipient. This rather straightforward notion is strongly sustained by the results (*Table 12*). For example, the more impeding factors affecting a recipient, the less likely the recipient is to have held a job in 1996. In the domains of health and disability, where only two impediments were identified, the job holding rate declines from 56 percent when no impediments are present to only 23 percent when two impediments are present. Thus the jobholding rate of those with no health or disability impediments is more than twice as high as those with two impediments. Those experiencing only one impediment had a job-holding rate intermediate between the other two groups (45 percent). All these differences are highly significant statistically.

In the domains other than health and disability impediments there were more factors defined and thus the impact of multiple factors is more apparent. With no nonhealth impediments affecting the primary recipient, the job-holding rate was 72 percent,²⁵ but when affected by three or more non-health impediments, the rate of job-holding fell to 15 percent. Furthermore, the relationship is strongly

²⁵ As shall be seen, this high job-holding rate for those with no measured impediments is substantially due to the presence of facilitating factors among those with no impediments.

monotonic, with each category separated from the next by a difference at once practical and highly significant, statistically. Each additional impediment decreases the probability of holding a job in the 12-month study period by an average of approximately 19 percentage points. When combined with health impediments the effect of an increasing number of impediments is somewhat moderated but still clearly evident. The relationship is still monotonic, with the job holding rate falling with the increasing number of impediments, from a high of 76 percent for those affected by no impediments to a low of 14 percent for those having three or more impediments. The job-holding rate of recipients with three or more impediments was only 18 percent of the rate of those facing no impediments, and each additional impediment reduced job-holding by about 16 percentage points on average.²⁶

Turning to the effect of facilitating factors on the employment rate of recipients, again the effect is nominally monotonic. With regard to facilitating health factors, 37 percent of those affected by no facilitating factors are employed compared to 62 percent of those affected by two facilitating factors. While the job-holding rate of 62 percent of those affected by two facilitating factors, is nominally higher than those affected by only one facilitating factor (55 percent) the difference, however, is not statistically significant at the .10 level. The presence of non-health facilitating factors has a similar effect with only 32 percent employed among those affected by no facilitating factors, rising to 88 percent for those favored by four or more facilitating factors.

The effect of facilitating factors appears to be further strengthened by combining the favorable factors for health and non-health. When health and non-health factors are combined employment rates increase from 27 percent for those recipients favored by no attributes facilitating employment to 93 percent for those possessing five or more positive attributes. Each additional facilitating factor is generally associated with a statistically significant increase in the employment rate of the affected recipients and

²⁶ Although the study cited by Danziger (2001, p. 332) measured more than twice the number of barriers to employment, it is, perhaps noteworthy that it yielded smaller differentials in job-holding between those with no reported employment barriers and those reported to have the maximum number of job impediments than found in this study. However different time periods covered by the studies and different definitions of work preclude straight forward comparisons.

results in an average increase in employment of approximately 13 percentage points per factor. This holds for both health and nonhealth factors separately and in combination.

2.5 . Interaction of Facilitating and Impeding Factors

This study began with the assumption that the existence of factors that fostered job-holding would offset negative factors that impeded job-holding and vice versa. Sample size hinders what can be said about the offsetting effects of positive and negative factors. Consequently, after a good deal of experimentation, adjacent categories were combined to facilitate judgments concerning the offsetting effects of positive and negative factors on job-holding. Based on sample size considerations, the factors were summarized into three categories for impediments and four for facilitating factors, namely none or one, two or three, and four or more for impeding factors with slightly more detail given for facilitating factors where it was possible to distinguish between four and five or more factors (*Table 13*).

Several findings are evident. First, focusing on the recipients with none or one factor that facilitates work (column 2, rows 2-4 of the table), it can be seen that the job-holding rate consistently decreases as the number of impediments increase. A similar pattern holds for those affected by none or one impeding factor, except that job-holding generally increases as the number of facilitating factors increase beyond three. The pattern is repeated for those affected by two or three factors positive factors (column 3, rows 2 and 3). The observed differences are generally statistically significant. This is just what would have been expected from the earlier results presented in *Table 12*

Second, recipients affected by a relatively large number of factors that either impede or facilitate work, are unlikely to possess offsetting factors. Seventy-three percent of those with four or more impediments are affected by less than two facilitating factors. Eighty-two percent of recipients having four inhibiting factors have to contend with more than two negative factors and fully ninety-six percent of those possessing five or more positive factors have to deal with more than two factors that have been shown to inhibit job-holding. These two subgroups of recipients also have very divergent job-holding rates. As might be expected those with many impediments and few factors that could be expected to

facilitate job-holding have a very low job-holding rate (13 percent) while those affected by none or just one impediment and five factors that facilitate work have a much higher job-holding rate (92 percent). These rates are not appreciably different than those seen in *table 12* that showed those with four or more impediments had a job-holding rate of 14 percent and those with five or more facilitating factors had a job-holding rate of 93 percent based on a univariate view of the effects impediments to and facilitators of work. The close agreement of employment rates in the univariate and bivariate case is precisely because there are relatively few compensating factors affecting these recipients. The bivariate relationship also indicates that the univariate view is somewhat misleading in portraying the effect of a low number of impeding and facilitating factors. The job-holding rate of individuals affected by no impediments or only one impediment in the univariate instance is 67 percent. When the people in this group are restricted to those with no or only one facilitating factor, their job-holding rate is appreciably lower (58 percent). The opposite is true for those classified as having no or only one facilitating factor based on the univariate approach. The 34 percent job-holding rate of these individuals fails to account for the presence of recipients with multiple impediments in this group. The bivariate relationship clarifies this fact and shows that the true rate of those with no or only one factor facilitating work, unaffected by the presence of multiple factors, is 58 percent.

Basically, the univariate view tends to mask the true the effects the that a low number of negative and the positive factors have on recipients' on job-holding rates. This tendency to understatement tends to diminish as the number of factors increases and very nearly ceases to affect those with the maximum number of impeding and facilitating factors. Furthermore this tendency is nominally more pronounced for facilitating factors than impediments.

Finally the bivariate view of factors serves to underscore the substantial degree of heterogeneity that exists in the AFDC/TANF population and establishes without a doubt that job-holding was affected by a relatively small number of fairly common place impeding and facilitating factors. Those recipients faced by the maximum number of impeding factors but less than two compensating positive factors were

seven times less likely to hold a job than those affected by the maximum number of facilitating factors and less than two inhibiting factors

4. SUMMARY AND PLANS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

In the introduction to this study it was stated that the study would attempt to answer the question: *Was the client population able to work and was it well-positioned to become self-supporting through work with only temporary assistance while adjusting to the new regime of assistance, or were they affected by more deep-seated problems that would make combining work and child-rearing problematic for this population?* It was not possible to answer this question unequivocally. The answer offered is one of contending forces. Nearly half of recipients possessed two or more attributes that impeded work in the period of transition to the new regime where work was the first emphasis of the program. Only 30 percent of these participants held a job in 1996. Even those who had only one impediment were significantly less likely to work than those free of impediments. In many cases the observed effect of impediments was ameliorated by positive factors and the 41 percent of recipients that possessed three or more attributes that facilitated work were much better placed to engage the labor market (68 percent held a job during the first year of the survey compared with their counterparts who experienced three or more impediments, only 21 percent of whom worked in 1996). Nearly one-half of recipients experienced two or more impediments and only 30 percent of them held a job. So we can conclude, as several authors have already, that perhaps one-half of AFDC/TANF recipients in the national case load in the transition year, were not well situated to take advantage of the offerings of the labor market to climb the ladder of self-support through work. This is not an especially novel finding, but clearly indicates the challenges of supposing that work can universally lead to self-sufficiency for this population. One finding of note is that the age of the participants' children did not seem to represent a substantial barrier to work. Since a number of other studies have found otherwise, whether this study's results are due to methodological shortcomings, data problems, or the success of the expanded child care provisions under TANF remains to be resolved.

To the author's knowledge, this is the first time that a descriptive treatment of job-holding among recipients has been characterized in terms of the population's strengths, as well as attributes that might be expected to impede work. The author plans to replicate the study with the quasi control-group of single mothers who were not receiving benefits in 1996 to see to what extent non-recipient mothers' employment rates are similarly affected. One of the goals of this "replication" will be to determine the extent to which the differing mix of factors affecting the two groups of single mothers may be said to account for the difference in observed job-holding rates. Furthermore, since subgroups of recipients defined by the characteristics of this study could reasonably be expected to respond to welfare reform efforts very differently, how these characteristics affect retention on the rolls, as well as the ability to gain self-sufficiency through paid employment, whether on or off the rolls, will be investigated.

Over the longer term, the level of earnings that recipients, differentiated by these factors, eventually attain will be assessed to determine their long-term capacity for self-sufficiency through work by the use of administrative records that provide longitudinal picture of the receipt and level of earnings that extends beyond the reference period of the survey.²⁷ Given that the records in question are longitudinal in nature and available for those who continued through the end of the survey as well as those who attrited, they are particularly well-suited to support an assessment of the degree to which job-holding and level of earnings were affected by attrition (see Scheuren and Vaughan 2001). The use multivariate statistical methods that will yield a more sensitive test for the effect that the age of children had on job-holding as well as to evaluate the relative importance of the other factors in the examined in the current study will also be considered.

²⁷ For example, currently the available records extend through calendar year 2004.

4. REFERENCES

- Adams, Gina and Monica Rohacek (2002).
Child Care and Welfare Reform, in **Welfare Reform: The Next Act**. Alan Weil and Kenneth Finegold, eds., The Urban Institute Press, Washington, D.C., pp.121-142.
- Adler, Michele (1993).
Disability Among Women on AFDC: An Issue Revisited. a paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Statistical Association. San Francisco, CA. August 10,1993, revised 9/15/93.
(1988).
Health and Disability of AFDC Families. American Statistical Association. **1988 Proceedings of the Social Statistics Section**. Washington, D.C
- Arkes, Jeremy (1999).
What do Educational Credentials Signal and Why Do Employers Value Credentials? **Economics of Education Review**. (February) 18:1:139-141.
- Bavier, Richard (2002).
Welfare Reform Impacts in the SIPP. **Monthly Labor Review**. November, pp 23-37.
- Besarov, Douglas J. with Naazanin Samari (2001).
Child Care after Welfare Reform. in Rebecca Blank and Ron Haskins, eds.,**The New World of Welfare**, Brookings Institution Press, Washington D.C., pp. 442-459.
- Danziger, Sandra, *et al.* (2000)
Barriers to the Employment of Welfare Recipients in Prosperity for ALL? The Economic Boom and African Americans, revised version (February), Poverty Research & Training Center, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Danziger, Sheldon (2001).
Comment on Will TANF Work for the Most Disadvantaged Families? by Sheila Zedlewski and Pamela Loprest in Rebecca Blank and Rom Haskins, eds.,**The New World of Welfare**, Brookings Institution Press, Washington D.C., pp. 328-333..
- DeParle, Jason (2004).
American Dream: Three Women, Ten Kids, and a Nation's Drive to End Welfare. Viking, New York.
- Dwyer, Debra, Jianting Hu Denton R Vaughan and Bernard Wixon. (2003).
Counting the disabled: Using Survey Self-Reports to Estimate Medical Eligibility for Social Security's Disability Programs. **Journal of Economic and Social Measurement**. 28: 109-142.
- Ferber, Marianne A. (1993).
Women 's Employment and the Social Security System. **Social Security Bulletin**. (Fall) 56:3:33-55.
- Hu, Jianting, Kajal Lahiri Denton R Vaughan and Bernard Wixon (2001).
A Structural Model of Social Security's Disability Determination Process. **The Review of Economics and Statistics**. (May) 83:2:348-361.

- Huynh, Minh (2000).
Welfare Reform and Labor Supply Patterns of AFDC/TANF Participants in the SIPP 1984-1996. A paper presented at the Annual Research Conference of the Association of Public Policy Analysis and Management. November 2-4.
- Lee, Sunhwa, Gi-Taik Oh, Heidi Hartman, and Barbara Gault (2003).
The Impact of Disabilities on Mothers' Work Participation: Examining Differences Between Single and Married Mothers. Institute for Woman's Policy Research. Washington, D.C. September.
- Loprest, Pamela and Gregory Acs. (1995).
Profile of Disability Among Families on AFDC. Urban Institute Research Paper. Series B, No. B-1, Washington, D.C.
- Jayakody, Rukmalie, Sheldon Danziger, and Harold Pollack. (2000).
Welfare Reform, Substance Use, and Mental Health. **Journal of Health, Politics, Policy and Law**. 25 (4): 623-51.
- Kreider, Brent and John V. Pepper. (2003).
Disability and Employment: Reevaluating the Evidence in Light of Reporting Errors. Joint Center for Poverty Research. Working Paper 325, February.
- McNeil, Jack (2001).
Americans with Disabilities: 1997, U.S. Bureau of the Census. **Current Population Reports Series**. P70-73, Washington, D.C.
- McNeil, John M. (2000).
Employment, Earnings and Disability (1991/92, 1994/95, and 1997 data from the Survey of Income and Program Participation). a paper presented at the 75th Annual Conference of the Western Economic Association International, June 29-July 3, Vancouver, British Columbia.
- _____ (1993).
Americans with Disabilities: 1991-92, U.S. Bureau of the Census. **Current Population Reports**. Series P70-33. U.S. Government Printing Office. Washington, D.C..
- Myers, Robert I. (1993).
Social Security, 4th edition. Pension Research Council. Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania and the University of Pennsylvania Press. Philadelphia.
- Needles-Fletcher, Cynthia, Steven Garasky and Helen H. Jensen (2002).
Transiting from Welfare to Work: No Bus, No Car, No Way. A paper presented at the Hard-to-Employ and Welfare reform Conference. Washington, D.C. February 29 - March 1.
- O'Connor, Alice (2001).
Poverty Knowledge: Social Science Social Policy, And the Poor in Twentieth-Century U.S. History. Princeton, New Jersey. Princeton University Press.
- Olson, Krista K. and LaDonna Pavetti (1996).
Personal and Family Challenges to the Successful Transition from Welfare to Work. Project Report. Urban Institute. Washington, D.C. May 17th.

- Rupp, Kalman and Paul S. Davies (2004).
A Long-term View of Health Status, Disabilities, Mortality and Participation in the DI and SSI Disability Programs. Solomon W. Polachek, ed., **Accounting for Worker WellBeing, Research in Labor Economics.** 23: 119-183.
- Seefeldt, Kristin S., (2004).
After PRWORA: Barriers to Employment, Work, and Well-being Among Current and Former Welfare Recipients. **Poverty Research Insights.** (Fall), pp. 1-7), National Poverty Center. University of Michigan.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services {USDHHS} (2004).
Welfare Reform and Children: A Synthesis of Impacts in Five States: The Project on State-Level Child Outcomes. Washington, D.C., Administration on Children and Families, January.
- U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means [USHR/CWM] (1998).
 1998 Green Book. U.S. Government Printing Office. Washington, D.C.
- Vaughan, Denton R. and Fritz Scheuren (2002),
Longitudinal Attrition in the SIPP and SPD, 2002 Proceedings of the American Statistical Association, Social Statistics Section, Washington, D.C., 2002.
- Zedlewski, Sheila (1999).
Work Activity and Obstacles to Work among TANF Recipients.. New Federalism, Report. No. B-2.: National Survey of America's Families. Urban Institute, Washington, D.C.
- Zedlewski, Sheila and Pamela Loprest (2001).
Will TANF Work for the Most Disadvantaged Families? in Rebecca Blank and Ron Haskins, eds., **The New World of Welfare,** Brookings Institution Press, Washington D.C., pp. 311-334.
- Ziliak, James P. (2004).
Relative Prices and Substitution Across Wage, Welfare and Disability Income. University of Kentucky Center for Poverty Research Discussion Paper Series, No. 2004-03. (<http://www.ukdpr.org/Publications/DP2004-03.pdf>)

5. Glossary

Adult Disability.—The criteria developed by McNeil (2001), and closely followed by this study, are given below. They pertain to individuals age 15 years old and over. Individuals were considered to have a *severe* disability if they met criteria 1, 6, or 9; or had Alzheimer’s disease, or were affected by mental retardation or another developmental disability; or were unable to perform or needed help to perform one or more of the activities in criteria 2,3,4,7, or 8. Individuals were identified as having a disability if they met *any* of the nine criteria.

1. Used a wheelchair, a cane, crutches, or a walker;
2. Had difficulty performing one or more functional activities (seeing, hearing, speaking, lifting/carrying, using stairs, walking, or grasping small objects);
3. Had difficulty performing one or more activities of daily living (ADLs), including getting around inside the home, getting in or out of bed or a chair, bathing, dressing, eating, and toileting;
4. Had difficulty performing one or more instrumental activities of daily living (IADLs), including going outside the home, keeping track of money and bills, preparing meals, doing light housework, taking prescription medicines in the right amount at the right time, and using the telephone;
5. Had one or more specified conditions (a learning disability, mental retardation or another developmental disability, Alzheimer’s disease, or some other type of mental or emotional condition);
6. Had any other mental or emotional condition that seriously interfered with everyday activities (frequently depressed or anxious, trouble getting along with others, trouble concentrating, or trouble coping with day-to-day stress);
7. Had a condition that limited the ability to work around the house;
8. If age 16 to 67, and had a condition that made it difficult to work at a job or business; or
9. Received federal benefits based on an inability to work.

Child under 18 with a severe disability.—Children 16 and 17 years of age were considered to be severely disabled using the criteria given above. Children 6-14 years of age were considered to have a severe disability if they met any of the following criteria: (1) they had mental retardation or some other developmental disability, (2) they had some other developmental condition for which they had received therapy or diagnostic services, (3) they used an ambulatory aid, (4) they had a severe limitation in the ability to see, hear, or speak, or (5) they needed personal assistance for an activity of daily living. For purposes of the present study children age five and under were considered severely disabled if they

were reported to have a developmental delay. McNeil (2001) did not classify children under age five as severely disabled by this criteria.

Employment.—Held a job for (pay) or business or received incidental earnings in 12 months period covered by the study, approximating calendar year 1996 (see footnote 4, page 4, above for the precise definition of the study period). Approximately half of the study population (48.8%) met the criteria of jobholding in the study period. The terms having work, or paid work are used interchangeably with holding a paid job or business.

Primary recipient.—The person who was designated as the “owner” of the benefit and authorized to receive benefits for the persons covered by reciprocity unit. It is possible to have more than one reciprocity unit in a household. In such cases the household will include the same number of primary recipients as there are reciprocity units. In program terms this individual was generally the caretaker/parent of the group of household members who made up the unit and were covered by the benefit payment, including the primary recipient, dependent children and any other dependent adults. The study is restricted to those primary recipients who were female and 18-64 years of age as of the last month of the first interview of the survey. See the Appendix, sections 6.1 and 6.2 for a complete description of the sample derivation and universe covered by the study.

Covered children.—All of the children covered by the AFDC/TANF payment. They are generally the children listed by the interview respondent as belonging to the payment unit. Usually they are the own children of primary recipient but may include other listed children who are household members as well. In a small number of cases where no children were listed in the public use file as belonging to the payment unit an edited list was created from among household members who were identified as children in the household of the primary recipient. Despite this edit, nearly 5 percent of units remained without child recipients.

6. APPENDIX: Definition of the Study Sample and Description of the Reweighting Procedure²⁵

6.1. Introduction (Defining the Analysis Universe)

The initial step in developing the data base for the project involved creating a base file containing “unit” records derived from all 100-series persons designated as the “owner” (primary recipient) of either: 1) an AFCD/TANF unit, 2) a General Assistance unit, or 3) an Other Public Assistance unit at any time (for at least one month) during the first three waves of the 1996 SIPP Panel. This base file contained a total of 2,896 unit records representing the last month that the reciprocity unit was observed for each of these income sources. Persons receiving income from more than one of these income sources during the 12-month reference periods contribute one record to this base file for each type of income received. A total of 439 persons received income from more than one source and 397 persons did not receive AFDC/TANF benefits during the initial three waves of the survey. Elimination of these two groups further reduced the number of sample individuals to 2,060 representing all 100-series individuals who were primary recipients of AFCD/TANF benefits at some time during the first three waves of the survey. Further restriction of the universe to female primary recipients resulted in the *final*²⁶ analytic universe for the study of approximately 4.5 million primary recipients represented by a sample of 1,882 individuals. Operational considerations required the imposition of three further restrictions on the universe sample that resulted in the elimination of an additional 693 sample cases or approximately 37 percent of the sample representing the 4.5 million primary recipients. The final sample consists of 1,189 individuals. *Table A-1* gives the detail of the derivation of the analytic universe and operational sample.

6.2. Characteristics of Units Lost Due to Attrition or Other Restrictions

A total of 693 cases were removed from the base sample universe for the reasons enumerated above. The characteristics of these cases, as expected, differ somewhat from those of the group of cases remaining (referred to as the operational sample) and also from the “weighting base” derived from the wave one, month four interviewed persons. It includes both all persons receiving in month four of wave one and any other persons not receiving in that month but receiving in one or more prior or subsequent months in the twelve-month period covered by the study.

A comparison of the complete universe sample (1,882 female recipients) and those cases lost to attrition and other restrictions is shown in the *Table A-2* Characteristics included are age, race and ethnicity, number of persons covered, household relationship, state of residence, poverty status, disability status, and tenure (characteristics are as of wave one/month four except for number covered which is as of the last observed month of reciprocity).

In general, one can characterize the loss in sample relative to the analytic base as:

- somewhat more likely to be under age 35,

²⁵Reweighting of the sample was carried out by John Coder of Avenir Research, Annapolis MD under Bureau of the Census Contract Number 43- Y A-BC-147069. This appendix has been edited for this report but was originally authored by John Coder.

²⁶The universe was further restricted to individuals age 18-64 after the sample was reweighted.

- ♦ somewhat more likely to be of a minority race or Hispanic,
- ♦ more likely to be never married,
- ♦ significantly less likely to be a householder with relatives,
- ♦ significantly less likely to be poor, and
- ♦ more likely to contain only one covered person (no children reported as covered).

6.3 Reweighting the Analytic Sample

The operational sample which is to be used to represent the analysis universe contains a total of 1,189 sample recipients. The project specifications call for the creation of sample weights controlled to wave one/month four based population controls. The population controls are based on the sum of the final wave one/month four monthly weights for 1) persons receiving in wave one/month four and 2) persons not receiving AFDC/TANF in wave one/month four but received in some other month of waves one-to-three. The grand total of this sum of weights is 4,513,199.6318. Of this total, 3,303,168.1544 (73 percent) were receiving in wave one/month four.

The reweighting process was designed to assure that the sum of the new weights for the operational sample of 1,189 cases summed to the population control shown above. The sum of the wave one/month four weights for the analytic universe was 2,829,644.0019 (that is the operational sample weighted using public use file weights), thus the average weighting adjustment factor required in reweighting the operations sample to recover the analytic universe was 1.5950.

The first step in the reweighting process was to establish the reweighting controls for the population characteristics on which control was desired. Each cell of the matrix defined a weighting cell on which control was to be maintained. Design of the weighting matrix was governed by three main considerations. First, the characteristics chosen for defining the row and column marginals should be based on characteristics of owners/units for which significant differences were noted in comparisons between the analytic sample and the sample lost due to attrition and other restrictions. Second, the number of sample cases in each weighting cell should be “adequate” and third, the weighting adjustment factors coming out of the reweighting process should be “reasonable”.

The weighting matrix selected for the final round is given Table A-3.1. It contains the counts of the number of cases in each cell. This matrix is made up of 30 cells. Note that the matrix contains a total of 120 cells, however, 90 of these cells are not “active”. That is, they are not valid given the intersection of row and column characteristics. This asymmetric matrix was employed in order to maximize the characteristics used to define the matrix and, at the same time, meet the minimum cell size guidelines. Characteristics making up the rows of the matrix are based on age, household relationship, race and Hispanic origin, and presence of AFDC/TANF in the base month, and household poverty status. The columns are defined by work status, age, and household poverty status.

In regards to the second and third considerations for implementing the reweighting of the sample, it should be noted that the size of the weighting matrix (numbers of rows and columns) was severely restricted, given the small size of the final operational sample. Guidelines provided by the Statistical Methods Division (SMD) called for a minimum of 30 sample cases in each weighting cell, a maximum adjustment factor of 2.0, and a minimum adjustment factor of .667. The minimum cell size recommended by the SMD (30) was met for 21 of the 30 control cells. Nine of the 30 control cells fell below the minimum value. Four were in the range of 27-29. The remaining five ranged between 21 and 24 (see again, Table A-3.1). Regarding the third consideration, the reasonableness of the adjustment factors,

Table A-3.2 contains the final factor value for each cell of the weighting matrix. All the factors exceed the minimum guideline value (0.667) suggested by the SMD and all but three were below the maximum value (2.0). The three values that exceeded the SMD recommendation did so by less than 0.1 percent and fell in the range $>2.0 <2.1$.

6.4 Results of the reweighting

The reweighting procedure appears to have done a reasonable job in ameliorating the effects of sample loss for the analytic universe (*Tables A-4.1 and A-4.2*). Most categories of the variables noted as having a differential sample loss display less than 1 percentage point absolute difference between the study analytic universe as defined on the basis of wave one/month four sample cases and public use file weights and the universe based on the reweighted sample reduced by imposition of the study restrictions. The procedure was less successful in reproducing the split between those who received AFDC/TANF benefits in wave one/month four and those who received at other times in the study reference period. There is a noticeable shift in proportional distribution between that produced by the original and reweighted samples towards receipt at the end of the first wave and away from receipt at times other than at the end of the first wave when the reweighted sample is employed (from 73 percent with the sample using public use file weights to 78 percent with the sample as reweighted for those who are represented as receiving at the end of the first wave and from 27 to 24 percent for those represented as receiving at some other time in the study reference period). Still these differences are rather small and unlikely to affect the main conclusions drawn by the study.

Table 1 — Percent of female AFDC/TANF recipients ¹ with paid employment in 1996 ² by disability status of the primary recipient

Disability status of primary recipient	Number of units in 1000's	Percent distribution	Employed ³		Comparison groups	Difference	
			Percent	Standard error		Percent	Standard error
Total.....	4,389	100.0	48.8	1.69	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
With a disability.....	1,481	33.8	36.5	2.80	With a disability vs. Not disabled	3.49	5.36
A severe disability.....	1,126	25.7	29.0	3.03	With a severe disability vs. With a nonsevere disability	6.57	4.69
A nonsevere disability.....	355	8.1	59.9	5.83	With a nonsevere disability vs. Not disabled	6.19	-0.77
Not disabled.....	2,908	66.2	55.1	2.07	Not disabled vs. With a severe disability	3.67	-7.10

¹ Primary recipients, age 18-64.

² The initial 12 months of the survey, approximately 92 percent of the reference period pertain to calendar year 1996.

³ One or more weeks with a job or business during the first 12 months of the survey.

Estimation source: Job 14, **Date:** 12/13/2004 - 14:16:15, **run stream:** work_history.sas, **data file:** afdcfem3.sd7

Data source: 1996 Panel of the Survey of Income and Program Participation, waves 1-5, estimates by author.

C:\Documents and Settings\Denny Vaughan\My Documents\excell\tables afdc\ [table 1.xls]Sheet1
5/9/2005; rev.: 8/8/2007

Table 2—Percent of female AFDC/TANF recipients ¹ with paid employment in 1996, ² by disability status of unit members

Disability status of unit members	Number of units in 1000's	Percent distribution	Employed ³		Comparison Groups	Difference	
			Percent	Standard error		Percent	Standard error
Total	4,389	100.0	48.8	1.69	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Primary recipient not severely disabled	3,263	74.3	55.6	1.95	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
No member severely disabled **.....	2,466	56.2	56.7	2.24	No member severely disabled vs. One or more members other than the primary recipient severely disabled	4.56	0.96
Units with at least one member severely disabled	1,922	43.8	38.7	2.49	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
One or more members other than the primary recipient is severely disabled	796	18.1	52.4	3.97	No member severely disabled vs. Primary recipient severely disabled	3.77	7.34
Other adult only.....	396	9.0	46.5	5.62	Other adult only vs. No member severely disabled	6.05	1.69
Child severely disabled.....	332	7.6	57.2	6.09	Child severely disabled vs. No member severely disabled	6.49	0.07
Child and other adult severely disabled.....	68	1.5	62.8	13.16	Child and other adult severely disabled vs. No member severely disabled	13.35	0.45
Primary recipient severely disabled [*]	1,126	25.7	29.0	3.03	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Solely the primary recipient is severely disabled.....	605	13.8	33.1	4.29	Solely the primary recipient severely disabled vs. Primary recipient & other member(s) severely disabled	6.02	1.45
Primary recipient and other member are severely disabled.....	521	11.9	24.3	4.22	Solely the primary recipient severely disabled vs. Primary recipient & other adult severely disabled	6.97	2.06
Primary recipient & other adult severely disabled.....	254	5.8	18.7	5.50	Solely the primary recipient severely disabled vs. Primary recipient & child severely disabled	9.13	0.43
Primary recipient & child severely disabled.....	181	4.1	37.0	8.06	Solely the primary recipient severely disabled vs. Primary recipient, other adult & child severely disabled	-18.80	-1.98
Primary recipient, other adult & child severely disabled.....	86	2.0	14.3	8.44			

* - Designated as factor that impedes work.

** - Designated as a factor that facilitates work.

¹ Primary recipients, age 18-64.

² The initial 12 months of the survey, approximately 92 percent of the reference period pertain to calendar year 1996.

³ One or more weeks with a job or business during the first 12 months of the survey.

Estimation source: Jobs 21, 23, & 27 **Date:** 12/14/2004;15:36:04 14:15:33 -14:50:44, **run stream:** factors by workstatus.sas, file: afdcfem3.sdt7.

Data source: 1996 Panel of the Survey of Income and Program Participation, waves 1-5, estimates by author.

C:\Documents and Settings\Denny Vaughan\My Documents\excel\tables afdc\unit disability.xls\sheet 10/30/04; rev: 8/8/2007

Table 3—Employment rate for the severely disabled in the general population, by perceived health status

Severely disabled by perceived health status	Number of units in 1000's	Percent distribution	Employed ³		Comparison group	Difference		
			Percent	Standard error		Percent	Standard error	t-ratio
Total.....	17,318	100.0	31.1	0.95	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	
Excellent	843	4.9	53.4	3.85	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	
Good.....	4,629	26.7	41.1	1.62	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	
Very good.....	1,799	10.4	47.7	2.64	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	
Fair or poor.....	10,048	58.0	21.7	0.92	Fair or poor vs. Excellent	31.7	3.96	7.99

Source: McNeil (2000, Table 2, p. 12)

C:\Documents and Settings\Denny Vaughan\My Documents\excell\tables afdc\health status& disability.xls]Sheet1
11/11/2004; rev.:8/8/2007

Table 4—Percent of female AFDC/TANF recipients¹ with paid employment in 1996², by perceived health status

Perceived health status	Number of units in 1000's	Percent distribution	Employed ³		Comparison groups	Difference		
			Percent	Standard error		Percent	Standard error	t-ratio
Total.....	4,389	100.0	48.8	1.69	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Excellent **	792	18.0	59.5	3.91	Excellent vs. Poor	5.62	(7.12)	
Very good or good.....	2,568	58.5	52.1	2.21	Excellent vs. Fair	4.45	(4.95)	
Very good.....	1,252	28.5	51.8	3.17	Excellent vs. Fair or poor	3.83	(7.06)	
Good.....	1,316	30.0	52.4	3.09	Excellent vs. Very good or good	2.97	(2.50)	
Fair or poor *	1,029	23.4	32.5	3.28	Excellent vs. Very good	3.73	(2.07)	
Fair.....	743	16.9	37.5	3.98	Excellent vs. Good	3.67	-1.95	
Poor.....	286	6.5	19.5	5.26	Fair or poor vs. Very good or good	3.60	5.44	
					Fair vs. Poor	4.60	-3.91	
					Fair vs. Very good or good	2.98	4.89	
					Fair vs. Good	3.68	4.05	
					Fair vs. Very good	3.74	3.81	
					Poor vs. Good	3.85	8.54	
					Poor vs. Very Good	3.19	10.22	

* - Designated as a factor impeding work.

** - Designated as a factor facilitating work.

¹ Primary recipients, age 18-64.

² The initial 12 months of the survey, approximately 92 percent of the reference period pertains to calendar year 1996.

³ One or more weeks with a job or business during the first 12 months of the survey.

Estimation source: Job 2, **Date:** 11/4/04, 9:14 **Run stream:** workhistory.sas **Data file:** afdcfem3

Data source: 1996 Panel of the Survey of Income and Program Participation, waves 1-5, estimates by author.

C:\Documents and Settings\Denny Vaughan\My Documents\excell\tables afdc\health_status.xls]Sheet1

5/5/2005;rev.: 8/8/2007

Table 5—Percent of female AFDC/TANF recipients¹ with paid employment in 1996,² by household vehicle ownership

Household vehicle ownership	Number of units in 1000's	Percent distribution	Employed ³		Comparison groups	Difference	
			Percent	Standard error		Percent	Standard error
Total.....	4,389	100.0	48.8	1.69	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Recipient owns vehicle **	1,519	34.6	61.1	2.81	Recipient owns vehicle vs. All other	3.49	-5.36
All other.....	2,870	65.4	42.4	2.07	Recipient owns vehicle vs. No vehicle owned by hh member	3.79	-5.49
Other adult member owns	1,010	23.0	46.2	3.52	Other adult member owns vs. No vehicle owned by hh member	4.35	-1.38
No vehicle owned by hh member *	1,859	42.4	40.2	2.55	Other adult member owns vs. Recipient owns vehicle	4.50	3.29

* - Designated as a factor impeding work.

** - Designated as a factor facilitating work.

¹ Primary recipients, age 18-64.

² The initial 12 months of the survey, approximately 92 percent of the reference period pertain to calendar year 1996.

³ One or more weeks with a job or business during the first 12 months of the survey.

Estimation source: to be cited. **Date:** 7/15/04; **Run stream:** carownershp.sas; **Data file:** afdcfem3

Data source: 1996 Panel of the Survey of Income and Program Participation, waves 1-5, estimates by author.

C:\Documents and Settings\Denny Vaughan\My Documents\excel\tables\afdc\vehicle ownership by employment.xls\Sheet1
12/29/2004; Rev:8/8/2007

Table 6—Percent of female AFDC/TANF recipients¹ with paid employment in 1996², by age of covered children

Age of covered children	Number of units in 1000's	Percent distribution	Employed ³		Comparison groups	Difference	
			Percent	Standard error		Percent	Standard error
Total.....	4,389	100.0	48.8	1.69	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Any children under age one							
Yes.....	435	9.9	44.0	5.34	Any children under age 1 vs. All other	5.63	1.05
All other.....	3,954	90.1	49.4	1.78	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Any children under age three							
Yes.....	1,467	33.4	45.2	2.91	Any children under age 3 vs. All other	3.58	1.51
All other.....	2,922	66.6	50.6	2.07	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Any children age three to 5 years							
Yes.....	1,761	40.1	47.7	2.67	Any children 3 to 5 years vs. All other	3.45	0.53
All other.....	2,628	59.9	49.6	2.19	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Any children under 6 years of age							
Yes.....	2,623	59.8	47.9	2.19	Any children under 6 years vs. All other	3.45	0.64
All other.....	1,766	40.2	50.2	2.67	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Any children age 6 to 14 years							
Yes.....	2,495	56.8	48.1	2.24	Any children age 6 to fourteen years vs. All other	3.42	0.50
All other.....	1,894	43.2	49.8	2.58	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Any children age 15 to 18 years							
Yes.....	666	15.2	45.0	4.33	Any children age 15 to 18 years vs. All other	4.70	1.11
All other.....	3,723	84.8	50.3	1.84	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Only children under age 6							
Yes.....	1,415	32.2	52.0	2.98	Only children under age 6 vs. All other	3.62	-1.29
All other.....	2,974	67.8	47.3	2.05	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Only children aged 6 to 14 **							
Yes.....	1,066	24.3	54.0	3.42	Only children age 6 to 14 vs. All other	3.94	-1.74
All other.....	3,323	75.7	47.2	1.94	Only children age 6 to 14 vs. Only children age 15 to 18 present	8.16	-1.84
Only children age 15 to 18 *							
Yes.....	218	5.0	39.0	7.41	Only children age 15 to 18 vs. All other	7.61	-1.36
All other.....	4,171	95.0	49.3	1.74	Only children age 15 to 18 vs. Only children under age 6	7.98	1.63
Only children age 6 to 18							
Subtotal.....	1,284	29.3	51.5	3.13	Only children age 6 to 14 present vs. No children age 6 to 18 present	3.97	1.59
Only children aged six to fourteen present **	1,066	24.3	54.0	3.42	Children under age 15 vs. No children age 6 to 18 present	7.68	1.13
Only children age 15 to 18 present *	218	5.0	39.0	7.41			
No children age six to 18 present.....	3,105	70.7	47.7	2.01			
Only children under age 15 present							
Yes.....	3,803	86.6	49.7	1.82	Children under age 15 with no children age 15 to 18 present vs. All other	4.93	-1.40
All other.....	586	13.4	42.9	4.58			

* - Designated as a factor impeding work.

** - Designated as a factor facilitating work.

¹ Primary recipients age 18-64.

² One or more weeks with a job or business during the first 12 months of the survey.

³ The initial 12 months of the survey, approximately 92 percent of the reference period pertain to calendar year 1996.

Source: Jobs 10 & 13, Date: 12/24/2004; 15:42:16 & 15:49:42, Run streams: factorsbyworkstatus.sas, File: afdcfein3.sd7 and afdcfein.

Data source: 1996 Panel of the Survey of Income and Program Participation, waves 1-5, estimates by author.

Table 7—Percent of female AFDC/TANF recipients¹ with paid employment in 1996,² by number of covered children

Number of covered children	Number of units in 1000's	Percent distribution	Employed ³		Comparison groups	Difference	
			Percent	Standard error		Percent	Standard error
Total.....	4,389	100.0	48.8	1.69	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Four or more*.....	524	12.0	42.8	4.85	Four or more	5.60	1.82
Two or three.....	2,081	47.4	46.6	2.45	vs. two to three	5.43	0.69
One**.....	1,581	36.0	53.0	2.82	One vs. two to three	3.73	-1.72
None.....	203	4.6	48.1	7.87	Four or more	5.38	0.72
Two to three ⁴	2,283	52.0	46.7	2.34	One vs. two to three ⁴	3.66	1.72

* - Designated as a factor impeding work.

** - Designated as a factor facilitating work.

¹ Primary recipients, age 18-64.

² The initial 12 months of the survey, approximately 92 percent of the reference period pertain to calendar year 1996.

³ One or more weeks with a job or business during the first 12 months of the survey.

⁴ Includes units with no minor children,

Estimation source: Job 6, **Date:** 11/15/04, 15:50:28, **Data file:** afdcfem3.sd7

Data source: 1996 Panel of the Survey of Income and Program Participation, waves 1-5, estimates by author.

C:\Documents and Settings\Denny Vaughan\My Documents\excel\tables\afdc\ [number of kids_SFEs.xls]Sheet1
5/5/2005; 8/7/2007

Table 8—Percent of female AFDC/TANF recipients¹ with paid employment in 1996², by age

Age	Number of units in 1000's	Percent distribution	Employed ³		Comparison groups	Difference		
			Percent	Standard error		Percent	Standard error	t-ratio
Total	4,389	100.0	48.8	1.69	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
18 - 24 **	1,016	23.2	52.8	3.51	18 - 24 years vs. 25 - 44 years	- 3.28	4.10	-0.80
25 - 44	2,833	64.6	49.5	2.11	18 - 24 years vs. 45 - 64 years	- 15.13	5.85	-2.59
25 - 34	1,748	39.8	49.9	2.68	18 - 24 years vs. 25 - 34 years	- 2.86	4.42	-0.65
35 - 44	1,085	24.7	48.9	3.40	18 - 24 years vs. 35 - 44	- 3.95	4.89	-0.81
45-64 *	539	12.3	37.7	4.68	25 - 44 years vs. 45 - 64 years	- 11.86	5.13	-2.31
					25 - 34 years vs. 35 - 44 years	- 1.09	4.33	-0.25
					25 - 34 years vs. 45 - 64 years	- 12.27	5.39	-2.28
					35 - 44 years vs. 45 - 64 years	- 11.19	5.79	-1.93

* - Designated as a factor impeding work.

** - Designated as a factor facilitating work.

¹ Primary recipients, age 18-64.

² The initial 12 months of the survey, approximately 92 percent of the reference period pertain to calendar year 1996.

³ One or more weeks with a job or business during the first 12 months of the survey.

Estimation source: Job 7, **Date:** 11 / 29 / 2004; 17:29:58, **Run stream:** demo_recodes_1.sas; **Data file:** afdcfem3.sd7

Data source: 1996 Panel of the Survey of Income and Program Participation, waves 1-5, estimates by author.

C:\Documents and Settings\Denny Vaughan\My Documents\excel\tables afdc\employment by age.xls|Sheet1
5/9/2005, rev.: 8/7/2007

Table 9.-- Percent of female AFDC/TANF recipients¹ with paid employment in 1996², by educational attainment

Educational attainment	Number of units in 1000's	Percent distribution	Employed ³		Comparison Groups	Difference		
			Percent	Standard error		Percent	Standard error	t-ratio
Total.....	4,389	100.0	48.8	1.69	Post secondary diploma, certificate, or degree vs.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Post secondary diploma, certificate, or degree **.....	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	Some high school to some college	-15.50	5.23	-2.96
	481	11.0	65.5	4.86	Post secondary diploma, certificate, or degree vs.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	High school graduate or some college	-9.94	5.43	-1.83
Post secondary diploma, certificate, or degree or some college.....	1,121	25.5	n.a.	n.a.	Post secondary diploma, certificate, or degree or some college vs.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
High school graduate or some college.....	2,144	48.9	58.5	3.30	High school graduate	-2.01	5.65	-0.36
Some college.....	640	14.6	55.6	2.41	Post secondary diploma, certificate, or degree vs.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
High school graduate.....	1,504	34.3	53.3	4.42	Eight years or less	-40.82	6.51	-6.27
Some high school or less.....	1,684	38.4	56.5	2.87	Some high school vs. High school graduate	16.56	4.29	3.86
Some high school.....	1,184	27.0	40.0	2.61	High school graduate or some college vs. Some high school or less	-20.14	3.55	-5.67
Eight years or less *.....	500	11.4	24.7	3.19	Post secondary diploma, certificate, or degree	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Missing.....	80	1.8	49.6	4.32	vs. Some high school or less	-30.08	5.52	-5.45
Some high school to some college ⁴	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	12.56	Some high school or less vs. High school graduate or some college	20.14	3.55	5.67
	3,408	77.6	50.0	1.92	Eight years or less vs. some high school	15.29	5.46	2.80
					Some college vs. High school graduate	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
					Post secondary diploma, certificate, or degree	25.32	4.73	5.35
					vs. Some college	3.23	5.27	0.61
						-12.20	6.57	-1.86

* - Designated as a factor impeding work.
 ** - Designated as a factor facilitating work.

¹ Primary recipients, age 18-64.
² The initial 12 months of the survey, approximately 92 percent of the reference period pertain to calendar year 1996.
³ One or more weeks with a job or business during the first 12 months of the survey.
⁴ Includes missing educational attainment.

Estimation source: Job 3; **Date:** 11/29/2004; **run stream:** demo_recodes_1.sas; **data file:** afdcfem3.ssd7

Data source: 1996 Panel of the Survey of Income and Program Participation, waves 1-5, estimates by author.
 C:\Documents and Settings\Denny Vaughan\My Documents\excel\tables afdc\educational attainment by jobholding in 2.xls\Sheet1
 2/23/2006; rev.: 8/6/2007

Table 10—Percent of female AFDC/TANF recipients¹ with paid employment in 1996², by work history prior to the survey

	Initial definition			Final definition			Comparison groups based on final definition		Difference	
	Number of units in 1000's	Percent distribution	Percent employed ³	Number of units in 1000's	Percent distribution	Percent employed ³	Standard error	Difference	Standard error	t-ratio
Work history prior to the survey										
Total.....	4,389	100.0	48.8	4,389	100.0	48.8	1.69	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Never worked or last worked more than 3 years ago ⁴	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	1,770	40.3	18.5	2.07	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Last worked more than 3 years ago.....	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	969	22.1	17.5	2.74	42.1	3.46	12.16
Never worked at all.....	801	18.3	19.7	801	18.3	19.7	3.15	2.2	4.18	0.53
Worked at a job or business but never for 6 straight months or worked at least 1, but not all years, at least 6 straight months.....	2,532	57.7	44.1	1,564	35.6	60.6	2.77	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Had worked at a job or business, but never but never for 6 straight months or longer.....	320	7.3	54.1	207	4.7	69.4	7.18	63.8	3.35	19.02
Worked at least 1 year 6 straight months or longer, but not all years, since first job.....	2,212	50.4	42.7	1,356	30.9	59.2	2.99	21.7	3.83	5.67
In years worked, worked at 6 straight months or longer, all years since first worked**.....	1,055	24.0	82.3	1,055	24.0	82.3	2.64	-23.1	3.99	-5.78
Fewer than 10.....	543	12.4	79.9	543	12.4	79.9	3.86	4.8	5.25	0.92
Ten or more years.....	513	11.7	84.8	513	11.7	84.8	3.56	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
At least 15 years.....	380	8.7	86.6	380	8.7	86.6	3.91	6.7	5.49	1.22
At least 20 years.....	228	5.2	86.9	228	5.2	86.9	5.02	0.2	6.36	0.03
								6.9	6.33	1.09

* - Designated as a factor impeding work.

** - Designated as a factor facilitating work.

¹ Primary recipients, age 18-64.

² The initial 12 months of the survey; approximately 92 percent of the reference period pertain to calendar year 1996.

³ One or more weeks with a job or business during the first 12 months of the survey.

Estimation source: Jobs 7 & 9; **Date:** 4/12/06 at 16:51:44 & 16:53:34; **run stream:** workhistory.sas; **file:** afdcitem3.sdt

Data source: 1996 Panel of the Survey of Income and Program Participation, waves 1-5, estimates by author.

C:\Documents and Settings\Denny Vaughan\My Documents\sas_output\workhistorybyjobholding_18-64.xls\Sheet1

5/9/05; rev: 8/6/2007

Table 11—Summary of operational definitions of factors that are observed to impede and facilitate work in health and nonhealth domains among female ¹ AFDC/TANF recipients in 1996 ²

Impeding and facillitating factors by domain	Percent with attribute	Percent empolyed	Identifying variable
Impeding factors			
<i>Disability</i>			
Primary recipient severely disabled.....	25.7	29.0	dis_imped=1
<i>Health</i>			
Primary recipient reported to be in fair or poor health.....	23.4	32.5	hlth_stat_f_p=1
<i>Other domains</i>			
Vehicle ownership			
No vehicle owned by household member.....	42.4	40.2	no_auto_ownD1=1
Children's age			
Only children aged 15-18	5.0	39.9	only_kida15_18D=1
Number of covered children			
Four or more.....	12.0	42.8	N_kid_highD=1
Age of primary recipient			
45-64.....	12.3	37.7	age_impedsD1=1
Education attainment			
Eight year or less of schooling.....	11.4	24.7	low_ed1=1
Work history prior to the survey			
Never worked or last worked more than 3 years ago.....	39.9	18.0	work_imped1D=1
Facilitating factors			
<i>Disability</i>			
No unit member is severely disabled.....	56.2	56.7	dis_facil=1
<i>Health</i>			
Primary recipient reported to be in excellent health.....	18.0	59.5	hlth_stat_e=1
<i>Other domains</i>			
Vehicle ownership			
Primary recipient owns a vehicle.....	34.6	61.1	auto_ownD1=1
Children's age			
Only children age 6-14.....	24.3	54.0	only_kida6_14D=1
Number of covered children			
One.....	36.0	53.0	N_kid_LowD2=1
Age of primary recipient			
18-24.....	23.2	52.8	Age_helpsD3=1
Education attainment			
Post secondary dipolma, certificate or degree.....	11.0	65.5	high_ed1=1
Work history prior to the survey			
Worked at least 6 straight months, in all years since first worked.....	24.0	82.3	allyrswrk_6m=1

¹ Primary recipients, age 18-64.

² The initial 12 months of the survey, approximately 92 percent of the reference period pertains to calendar year 1996.

Estimation source: See Tables 1-11 of this report

Data source: 1996 Panel of the Survey of Income and Program Participation, waves 1-5, estimates by author.

C:\Documents and Settings\Denny Vaughan\My Documents\excell\tables afdc\[summary.xls]Sheet1
12/27/2004, Rev.: 8/6/2007

Table 12—Percent of AFDC/TANF recipients¹ with paid employment² in 1996³, by number of factors impeding and facilitating work

Number and type of factor	Number of units in 1000's	Percent distribution	Employed ³		Comparison groups	Difference		
			Percent	Standard error		Percent	Standard error	t-ratio
Impeding factors								
<i>Health & Disability</i>								
Total	4,388.7	100.0	48.8	1.69	Health & disability impediments	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>
None	2,951.0	67.2	55.9	2.05	None vs. One	-10.50	4.64	-2.26
One	720.0	16.4	45.4	4.16	One vs. Two	-22.00	5.47	-4.02
Two	718.0	16.4	23.4	3.54	None vs. Two	-32.50	4.09	-7.94
<i>Other than health & disability</i>								
Total	4,389.0	100.0	48.8	1.69	Impediments other than health & disability	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>
None	1,300.0	29.6	71.6	2.80	None vs. One	-16.83	4.03	-4.17
One	1,481.0	33.7	54.8	2.90	One vs. Two	-24.73	4.28	-5.77
Two	1,064.0	24.2	30.1	3.15	Two vs. Three or more	-15.34	4.65	-3.30
Three or more	543.0	12.4	14.7	3.41	None vs. Three or more	-56.90	4.42	-12.88
<i>All impeding factors</i>								
Total	4,388.7	100.0	48.8	1.69	All impeding factors	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>
None	993.1	22.6	75.8	3.05	None vs. One	-16.05	4.34	-3.70
One	1,269.6	28.9	59.8	3.09	One vs. Two	-19.17	4.70	-4.08
Two or more	2,126.0	48.4	29.7	2.22	Two vs. Three	-12.67	5.51	-2.30
Two	967.7	22.1	40.6	3.54	None vs. two or more	-46.10	3.77	-12.22
Three	568.3	12.9	27.9	4.22	One vs. two or more	-30.05	5.23	-5.75
Four or more	589.9	13.4	13.6	3.16	Three vs. Four or more	-14.32	5.27	-2.72
					None vs. Four or more	-62.22	4.39	-14.16
Facilitating factors								
<i>Health & Disability</i>								
Total	4,388.7	100.0	48.8	1.69	Health and disability facilitators	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>
None	1,717.0	39.1	37.2	2.62	None vs. One	17.50	3.58	4.89
One	2,084.0	47.5	54.7	2.45	One vs. Two	7.50	5.11	1.47
Two	587.0	13.4	62.2	4.49	None vs. Two	25.00	5.20	4.81
<i>Other than health & disability</i>								
Total	4,388.7	100.0	48.8	1.69	Facilitators other than health & disability	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>
None	948.6	21.6	31.7	3.39	None vs. One	7.45	4.55	1.64
One	1,302.2	29.7	39.1	3.03	One vs. Two	14.40	4.38	3.28
Two	1,249.4	28.5	53.5	3.17	Two vs. Three	16.97	5.07	3.35
Three	666.7	15.2	70.5	3.96	Three vs. Four or more	17.37	6.32	2.75
Four or more	221.9	5.1	87.8	4.92	None vs. Four or more	56.19	5.97	9.41
<i>All facilitating factors</i>								
Total	4,388.7	100.0	48.8	1.69	All Facilitating factors	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>
None	395.4	9.0	27.1	5.02	None vs. One	8.93	6.01	1.49
One to two	2,180.8	49.7	36.8	2.32	None vs. One to Two	9.63	5.53	1.74
One	1,053.7	24.0	36.1	3.32	One vs. Two	1.35	4.63	0.29
Two	1,127.1	25.7	37.4	3.23	One to Two vs. Three	21.73	4.33	5.02
Three or more	1,812.5	41.3	68.1	2.46	Two vs. Three	21.08	4.88	4.32
Three	914.0	20.8	58.5	3.66	Three vs. Four	13.56	5.38	2.52
Four	650.2	14.8	72.1	3.95	Four vs. Five or more	20.58	5.42	3.80
Five or more	248.3	5.7	92.7	3.71	None vs. Five or more	65.51	6.24	10.50
					Three or more vs One	-31.97	4.13	-7.74
					Three or more vs Two	-30.62	4.06	-7.54
					Three or more vs. One to Two	-31.28	3.38	-9.26

¹ Primary recipients, age 18-64.

² One or more weeks with a job or business during the first 12 months of the survey.

³ The initial 12 months of the survey, approximately 92 percent of the reference period pertain to calendar year 1996.

Estimate source: Job 4, 20:17:53 of 12/23/06, p. 2; **run stream:** factors byworkhistory.sas, **data file:** afdcfem314r.sd7

Data source: 1996 Panel of the Survey of Income and Program Participation, waves 1-5, estimates by author.

Table 13—Percent of female AFDC/TANF recipients¹ with paid employment² in 1996³: Number of health and nonhealth factors impeding, by number of health and nonhealth factors facilitating work

Number of impeding factors	Total	Number of facilitating factors				Comparison groups	Difference		
		None or one	Two or three	Four	Five or more		Percent	Standard error	t-ratio
Total.....	48.8 (4,389) 1.69	33.6 (1,449) 2.78	46.9 (2,041) 2.48	72.1 (650) 3.95	92.6 (248) 3.72	Total facilitating factors	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
None or one.....	66.8 (2,263) 2.22	58.4 (323) 6.15	59.2 (1,165) 3.23	76.9 (536) 4.09	92.4 (239) 3.85	None or one vs. Two or three impeding factors	n.a.	3.73	3.55
Two or three.....	35.9 (1,536) 2.75	34.3 (696) 4.04	33.7 (719) 3.95	Two or three vs. Four or impeding factors	13.23	4.66	5.41
Four or more.....	13.6 (590) 3.16	13.1 (430) 3.64	Four vs. Five or more facilitating	25.20	5.03	4.09
						<i>None or one facilitating factor</i>	20.57	n.a.	n.a.
						None or one vs. Two or three impeding factors	n.a.	7.36	-3.28
						Two or three vs. Four or impeding factors	-24.11	5.44	-3.91
						<i>Two or three facilitating factors</i>	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
						None or one vs. Two or three impeding factors	-25.50	5.21	-4.90
						<i>Total impeding factors</i>	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
						None or one vs. Two or three impeding factors	-30.89	4.61	-6.71
						Two or three vs. Four or more impeding factors	-22.31	4.19	-5.33
						<i>None or one impeding factors</i>	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
						None or one vs. Two or three facilitating factors	0.81	6.95	0.12
						Two or three vs. Four facilitating factors	17.62	5.21	3.38
						Four vs. Five or more facilitating factors	15.51	5.62	2.76
						<i>Two or three impeding factors</i>	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
						None or one vs. Two or three facilitating factors	0.59	5.65	0.10
						Two or three vs. Four facilitating factors
						Four vs. Five or more facilitating factors
						<i>Four or more impeding factors</i>	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
						None or one vs. Two or three facilitating factors
						Two or three vs. Four facilitating factors
						Four vs. Five or more facilitating factors
						Combinations of factors	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
						Five or more facilitating & none or one impeding vs.			
						None or one facilitating & four or more impeding	-79.30	5.30	-14.95
						Two or three facilitatings & None or one impeding vs.			
						None or one facilitating & two or three impeding	-24.91	5.17	-4.82

¹ Primary recipients, age 18-64.

² The initial 12 months of the survey, approximately 92 percent of the reference period pertain to calendar year 1996.

³ One or more weeks with a job or business during the first 12 months of the survey.

Estimate source: Jobs 1, 13:21:21 & 3, 13:23:43 of 1/1/07; **run stream:** factors byworkhistory.sas, **data file:** atdfcm314r.sd7

Data source: 1996 Panel of the Survey of Income and Program Participation, waves 1-5, estimates by author.

C:\Documents and Settings\Denny Vaughan\My Documents\excel\tables atdc\cross pos & neg factors by work_12_28_06.xls]Sheet1
4/13/2006; rev.: 8/6/2007

Table A-1—Derivation of study universe

Element	Sample count	Weighted count (in 1000's)
Total number of 1) AFDC/TANF 2) General Assistance or 3) other Public Assistance units that existed during the initial 12 months of the survey whose owners (the primary recipient) were 100-series individuals.....	2,896	(1)
Less: primary recipients with PA from more than one source.....	439	(1)
Equals: Unduplicated number of primary recipients.....	2,457	(1)
Less: Received only General Assistance or other Public Assistance during the initial 12 months of the survey.....	397	(1)
Equals: Primary recipients of AFDC/TANF at some time during the initial 12 months of the survey	2,060	(1)
Less: Male primary recipients	178	(1)
Equals: Total minus male primary recipients (total female primary recipients).....	1,882	4,513
Less: Interviewed less than 12 months.....	346	850
Equals: Interviewed for 12 months (initial 3 waves of survey).....	1,536	3,663
Less: Imputed reciprocity last month of wave 3.....	138	342
Equals: Interviewed for 12 months & unimputed reciprocity last month of wave 3.....	1,398	3,321
Less: Missing topical modules 4 or 5 or both.....	209	491
Equals: Interviewed for 12 months & unimputed reciprocity last month of wave 3 and topical modules 4 and 5 present (with original weights).....	1,189	2,830
Equals: Interviewed for 12 months & unimputed reciprocity last month of wave 3 and topical modules 4 and 5 present (as reweighted).....	1,189	4,513
Less: Primary recipients under age 18 or over age 64.....	32	125
Equals: Final analytical universe.....	1,157	4,389

(¹) - Not tabulated.

Source: Tables A-4.1, and A-4.2, this appendix.

C:\Documents and Settings\Denny Vaughan\My Documents\excel\tables afdc\table a-1.1.xls\Sheet1 5/10/2005; rev.: 4/13/2006

Table A-2—Comparison of original analytic sample to final analytic sample after attrition due to imposition of study criteria



Selected Characteristics	Wave 1, Month 4 Universe, Females Only (weighting base)		Final Analytic sample (Col. 1 minus Col. 5)		Cases lost to attrition ¹	
	Number	Column percent	Number	Column percent	Number	Column percent
	[col. 1]	[col. 2]	[col. 3]	[col. 4]	[col. 5]	[col. 6]
AGE OF OWNER						
Total.....	1,882	100.0	1,189	100.0	693	100.0
Under 20 years.....	142	7.5	76	6.4	66	9.5
20 to 24 years.....	367	19.5	209	17.6	158	22.8
25 to 29 years.....	358	19.0	238	20.0	120	17.3
30 to 34 years.....	328	17.4	203	17.1	125	18.0
35 to 39 years.....	266	14.1	185	15.6	81	11.7
40 to 44 years.....	186	9.9	112	9.4	74	10.7
45 to 49 years.....	91	4.8	61	5.1	30	4.3
50 years and over.....	144	7.7	105	8.8	39	5.6
RACE-ETHNICITY OF OWNER						
Total.....	1,882	100.0	1,189	100.0	693	100.0
White.....	704	37.4	462	38.9	242	34.9
Black.....	735	39.1	459	38.6	276	39.8
Native American.....	36	1.9	18	1.5	18	2.6
Asian.....	53	2.8	31	2.6	22	3.2
Hispanic.....	354	18.8	219	18.4	135	19.5
NUMBER COVERED IN UNIT						
Total.....	1,882	100.0	1,189	100.0	693	100.0
One.....	129	6.9	51	4.3	76	11.0
Two.....	637	33.8	393	33.1	236	34.1
Three.....	513	27.3	354	29.8	160	23.1
Four.....	347	18.4	229	19.3	116	16.7
Five or more.....	256	13.6	162	13.6	105	15.2
RECEIPT OF AFDC/TANF IN WAVE 1, MONTH FOUR						
Total.....	1,882	100.0	1,189	100.0	693	100.0
Received.....	1,390	73.9	928	78.0	462	66.7
Did not receive.....	492	26.1	261	22.0	231	33.3
MARITAL STATUS OF OWNER						
Total.....	1,882	100.0	1,189	100.0	693	100.0
Married, spouse present.....	345	18.3	233	19.6	112	16.2
Married, spouse absent.....	47	2.5	33	2.8	14	2.0
Widowed.....	69	3.7	49	4.1	20	2.9
Divorced.....	318	16.9	206	17.3	112	16.2
Separated.....	246	13.1	158	13.3	88	12.7
Never Married.....	857	45.5	510	42.9	347	50.1
HOUSEHOLD RELATIONSHIP OF OWNER						
Total.....	1,882	100.0	1,189	100.0	693	100.0
Reference person with relatives.....	1,183	62.9	793	66.7	390	56.3
Reference person without relatives.....	37	2.0	19	1.6	18	2.6
Spouse.....	198	10.5	135	11.4	63	9.1
Own Child.....	241	12.8	136	11.4	105	15.2
Grandchild.....	16	0.9	9	0.8	7	1.0
Parent.....	25	1.3	14	1.2	11	1.6
Brother/Sister.....	26	1.4	13	1.1	13	1.9
Other relative.....	36	1.9	17	1.4	19	2.7
Foster child.....	1	0.1	1	0.1	-	-
Unmarried Partner.....	59	3.1	30	2.5	29	4.2

Table A-2—Comparison of original analytic sample to final analytic sample after attrition due to imposition of study criteria, CONT.

Selected Characteristics	Wave 1, Month 4 Universe, Females Only (weighting base)		Final Analytic sample (Col. 1 minus Col. 5)		Cases lost to attrition ¹	
	Number	Column percent	Number	Column percent	Number	Column percent
	[col. 1]	[col. 2]	[col. 3]	[col. 4]	[col. 5]	[col. 6]
Housemate/Roommate.....	31	1.6	12	1.0	19	2.7
Roomer/Boarder.....	11	0.6	2	0.2	9	1.3
Other Nonrelative.....	18	1.0	8	0.7	10	1.4
STATE OF RESIDENCE						
Total.....	1,882	100.0	1,189	100.0	693	100.0
California.....	348	18.5	217	18.3	131	18.9
New York.....	141	7.5	83	7.0	58	8.4
Illinois.....	105	5.6	66	5.6	39	5.6
Pennsylvania.....	71	3.8	48	4.0	23	3.3
Florida.....	77	4.1	36	3.0	41	5.9
Texas.....	114	6.1	73	6.1	41	5.9
North Carolina.....	61	3.2	43	3.6	18	2.6
Michigan.....	102	5.4	67	5.6	35	5.1
Ohio.....	94	5.0	62	5.2	32	4.6
Georgia.....	55	2.9	37	3.1	18	2.6
All other states.....	714	37.9	457	38.4	257	37.1
HOUSEHOLD POVERTY STATUS (based on monthly income)						
Total.....						
Not poor.....	1,882	100.0	1,189	100.0	693	100.0
Poor.....	660	35.1	430	36.2	286	41.3
	1,222	64.9	759	63.8	407	58.7
TENURE						
Total.....	1,882	100.0	1,189	100.0	693	100.0
Owner.....	442	23.5	289	24.3	153	22.1
Renter.....	1,371	72.8	855	71.9	516	74.5
Occupied without payment of rent.....	69	3.7	45	3.8	24	3.5
DISABILITY						
Total.....	1,882	100.0	1,189	100.0	693	100.0
Disabled.....	408	21.7	271	22.8	137	19.8
Not Disabled.....	1,474	78.3	918	77.2	556	80.2

Note: Characteristics are as of wave 1, month 4 except for number in covered unit which is as of last observation.

¹Interviewed for less than 12 months, missing topical modules 4 or 5, or imputed AFDC/TANF receipt in last month of receipt.

Source: Produced by John Coder, Sentir Research, under Census contract number 43-YA-BC-147069 as edited and formatted for this report.

C:\Documents and Settings\Denny Vaughan\My Documents\excell\tables afdc[table_A-]UnweightedCounts 5/9/2005

Table A-3.1—Unit counts for analytic sample after reduction due to study restrictions

Demographic/programmatic category	Nonpoor Nonworkers	Poor Nonworkers	Nonpoor, Workers, Under Age 30	Nonpoor, Workers, Age 30 and Over	Poor, Workers, All Ages
NONPOOF					
[1] No AFDC in Wave 1, month 4, and any Race/Ethnicity	52	0	0	0	0
[2] AFDC in Wave 1, month 4, all races married spouse present	40	0	0	0	0
[3] AFDC in Wave 1, month 4, not married spouse present and White/Asian/Native American-NonHispanic	52	0	0	0	0
[4] AFDC in Wave 1, month 4, not married spouse present, African American or Hispanic	60	0	0	0	0
POOR					
[5] No AFDC in Wave 1, month 4, and married spouse present, and any age	0	27	0	0	0
[6] No AFDC in Wave 1, month 4, and not married spouse present	0	38	0	0	0
<i>Under age 35</i>					
[7] Disabled, and White/Asian/Native American-NonHispanic	0	22	0	0	0
[8] Disabled, and African American or Hispanic	0	29	0	0	0
<i>Age 35 and over</i>					
[9] Disabled, and White/Asian/Native American-NonHispanic	0	45	0	0	0
[10] Disabled, and African American or Hispanic	0	60	0	0	0
<i>Under age 30 and head of household</i>					
[11] Widowed/separated/divorced, and White/Asian/Native American-NonHispanic	0	21	0	0	0
[12] Never married, and White/Asian/Native American-NonHispanic	0	24	0	0	0
[13] African American	0	70	0	0	0
[14] Hispanic	0	30	0	0	0
<i>Age 30 or more and head of household</i>					
[15] Widowed/separated/divorced/never married, and White/Asian/Native American-NonHispanic	0	51	0	0	0
[16] Widowed/separated/divorced, and African American-NonHispanic	0	28	0	0	0
[17] Never married, and African American-NonHispanic	0	38	0	0	0
[18] Not married spouse present and Hispanic	0	42	0	0	0
All ages, head of household or spouse, married spouse present					
[19] White/Asian/Native American-NonHispanic	0	43	0	0	0
[20] African American or Hispanic	0	29	0	0	0
[21] Not head of HH or spouse, and African American	0	28	0	0	0
[22] Not head of HH or spouse, and not African American	0	27	0	0	0
POOR AND NONPOOF					
[23] Head of household, All ages	0	0	40	56	73
[24] Not head of household, All ages	0	0	21	53	90

Check sum for total count in table: 1189

Notes: Cells with value of zero cannot have nonzero value due to design of the weighting matrix.
 Categories in rows 1-6 include both disabled and nondisabled.
 Categories in rows 11 to 22 include only nondisabled.
 Categories in rows 23 and 24 include both disabled and nondisabled.

Source: Produced by John Coder, Sentir Research, under Census contract number 43-YA-BC-147069 as edited and formatted for this report.

Table A-3.2—Weighting Adjustment Factors for Weighting Matrix for Female AFDC (TANF) Final Analytic Universe

Demographic/programmatic category	Nonpoor Nonworkers	Poor Nonworkers	Nonpoor, Workers, Under Age 30	Nonpoor, Workers, Age 30 and Over	Poor, Workers, All Ages
NONPOOR					
[1] No AFDC in Wave1. month 4 and any Race/Ethnicity	2.03670	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000
[2] AFDC in Wave1. month 4, all races married spouse present	1.48715	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000
[3] AFDC in Wave1. month 4, not married spouse present and White/Asian/Native American-NonHispanic	1.62277	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000
[4] AFDC in Wave1. month 4, not married spouse present, African American or Hispanic.....	2.04682	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000
POOR					
[5] No AFDC in Wave1. month 4, and married spouse present, and any age	0.00000	1.99896	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000
[6] No AFDC in Wave1. month 4 and not married spouse present	0.00000	1.64734	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000
Under age 35					
[7] Disabled, and White/Asian/Native American-NonHispanic	0.00000	1.43378	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000
[8] Disabled, and African American or Hispanic	0.00000	1.46473	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000
Age 35 and over					
[9] Disabled, and White/Asian/Native American-NonHispanic	0.00000	1.34969	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000
[10] Disabled, and African American or Hispanic	0.00000	1.45638	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000
Under age 30 and head of household					
[11] Widowed/separated/divorced, and White/Asian/Native American-NonHispanic	0.00000	1.26981	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000
[12] Never married, and White/Asian/Native American-NonHispanic	0.00000	1.48588	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000
[13] African American	0.00000	1.49986	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000
[14] Hispanic	0.00000	1.59467	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000
Age 30 or more and head of household					
[15] Widowed/separated/divorced/never married, and White/Asian/Native American-NonHispanic	0.00000	1.41924	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000
[16] Widowed/separated/divorced, and African American-NonHispanic	0.00000	1.84531	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000
[17] Never married, and African American-NonHispanic	0.00000	1.54878	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000
[18] Not married spouse present and Hispanic	0.00000	1.45685	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000
All ages, head of household or spouse, married spouse present					
[19] White/Asian/Native American-NonHispanic	0.00000	1.26896	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000
[20] African American or Hispanic	0.00000	1.53615	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000
[21] Not head of HH or spouse, and African American	0.00000	1.60003	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000
[22] Not head of HH or spouse, and not African American	0.00000	2.09046	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000
POOR AND NONPOOF					
[23] Head of household, All ages.....	0.00000	0.00000	1.83273	1.52420	1.41844
[24] Not head of household, All ages.....	0.00000	0.00000	1.92748	1.60300	1.49178

Note: Cells with value of zero cannot have nonzero value due to design of the weighting matrix

Source: Produced by John Coder, Sentir Research, under Census contract number 43-YA-BC-147069 as edited and formatted for this repo

Table A-4.1 – Characteristics of selected components of the analysis universe and components lost due to attrition based on public use file weights and as reweighted for this study — Continued

Selected Characteristics	Components of the analysis universe, as originally weighted (public use weights) ¹				Units lost to attrition as a result of imposition of study criteria ¹				Analysis universe after reweighting to compensate for cases lost as a result of imposition of study criteria				Absolute percentage difference (weighting base - reweighted total) (col. 1 minus col. 9)
	Wave 1 Month 4 (Weighting Base)	Received AFDC In Wave 1, Month 4	Non AFDC/TANF Recipients In Wave 1, Month 4 ²	AFDC/TANF Units with 1-11 Months Interviewed	AFDC/TANF Units with Missing Topical Modules 4 or 5 ³	AFDC/TANF Units With Imputed Receipt of AFDC/ TANF ^{3,4}	Total Cases Lost To "Attrition" (sum of cols. 4, 5 & 6)	Final Analysis Universe (col. 1 minus col. 8)	Reweight total	Received AFDC in Wave 1, Month 4 ³ (See col. 2)	Not Receiving In Wave 1 Month 4 ³ Only ^{2,3} (See col. 3)	Received TANF, but not Receiving at end of 12 Months ^{2,3}	
	[col. 1]	[col. 2]	[col. 3]	[col. 4]	[col. 5]	[col. 6]	[col. 7]	[col. 8]	[col. 9]	[col. 10]	[col. 11]	[col. 12]	
Age of owner	4,513,200	3,303,169	1,210,031	850,031	491,065	342,459	1,683,556	2,829,644	4,513,200	3,417,618	1,095,582	1,233,368	0.00
Total number.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	...
Under 20 years.....	7.8	5.0	15.7	9.7	8.9	10.6	9.7	6.8	7.4	4.4	16.8	7.7	0.46
20 to 24 years.....	20.4	19.7	22.5	24.0	25.7	17.1	23.6	18.6	19.5	18.1	23.7	17.5	0.97
25 to 29 years.....	19.7	20.6	17.2	15.3	21.3	21.1	18.0	20.7	21.0	21.7	18.8	20.4	-1.28
30 to 34 years.....	17.3	18.0	15.3	20.6	15.4	13.0	17.7	17.1	16.6	17.8	13.1	19.4	0.65
35 to 39 years.....	13.7	14.6	11.4	11.9	10.4	11.7	11.4	15.1	14.4	15.0	12.4	14.7	-0.68
40 to 44 years.....	9.2	10.0	7.1	10.5	11.1	9.9	10.3	8.6	8.2	9.1	5.3	8.1	1.06
45 to 49 years.....	4.7	5.1	3.6	3.7	2.9	7.1	4.3	5.0	4.7	5.3	2.7	4.4	0.00
50 years and over.....	7.1	7.1	7.1	4.2	4.3	9.5	5.1	8.3	8.3	8.6	7.1	7.8	-1.18
Race-Ethnicity Of Owner	4,513,200	3,303,169	1,210,031	850,031	491,065	342,459	1,683,556	2,829,644	4,513,200	3,417,618	1,095,582	1,233,368	0.00
Total number.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	...
White, nonhispanic.....	39.7	37.4	46.2	35.1	40.0	42.5	37.6	41.0	39.6	37.5	46.4	48.9	0.10
Black, nonhispanic.....	37.4	39.4	32.0	41.1	36.4	35.1	38.6	36.8	37.7	39.2	33.0	33.0	-0.24
Native American.....	1.8	1.4	2.8	2.3	1.6	3.8	2.3	1.4	1.4	1.2	2.0	2.6	0.35
Asian.....	3.1	2.5	4.6	4.1	3.4	1.4	3.5	2.8	2.6	2.5	3.1	1.7	0.47
Hispanic.....	18.0	19.3	14.4	17.4	18.5	17.2	18.0	18.0	18.7	19.7	15.6	15.8	-0.68
Number Covered In Unit	4,513,200	3,303,169	1,210,031	850,031	491,065	342,459	1,683,556	2,829,644	4,513,200	3,417,618	1,095,582	1,233,368	0.00
Total number.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	...
One.....	7.2	5.1	12.8	13.9	5.0	15.3	11.3	4.3	4.5	3.1	8.9	7.6	-2.66
Two.....	34.5	35.1	32.8	35.8	34.6	28.8	35.8	34.3	34.9	35.1	34.0	37.0	-0.39
Three.....	27.0	28.1	23.9	23.8	23.7	21.0	24.3	28.8	28.7	29.1	27.5	26.4	-1.77
Four.....	17.7	18.1	16.6	13.9	18.3	16.7	15.4	18.8	18.4	18.7	17.5	16.7	-0.73
Five or more.....	13.7	13.6	13.8	12.6	18.3	18.1	13.2	13.8	13.5	13.9	12.0	12.2	0.22
Marital Status Of Owner	4,513,200	3,303,169	1,210,031	850,031	491,065	342,459	1,683,556	2,829,644	4,513,200	3,417,618	1,095,582	1,233,368	0.00
Total number.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	...
Married, spouse present.....	19.1	16.0	27.5	16.4	17.6	18.3	17.0	20.4	20.1	16.4	31.4	23.5	-0.95
Married, spouse absent.....	2.4	2.5	2.4	2.9	0.9	0.5	1.9	2.8	2.7	2.3	3.7	2.0	-0.23
Widowed.....	3.2	3.3	2.9	1.9	3.2	4.8	2.7	3.5	3.7	4.1	2.4	2.7	-0.46
Divorced.....	16.7	17.3	14.8	13.7	16.6	21.0	16.2	16.9	16.1	17.0	13.1	20.5	0.59
Separated.....	13.0	13.8	10.6	11.0	15.7	14.3	13.0	12.9	12.8	13.6	10.5	10.4	0.12
Never Married.....	45.6	47.1	41.7	54.1	46.0	41.1	49.2	43.5	44.7	46.5	38.9	41.0	0.93

Table A-4.1 - Characteristics of selected components of the analysis universe and components lost due to attrition based on public use file weights and as reweighted for this study — Continued

Selected Characteristics	Components of the analysis universe, as originally weighted (public use weights) ¹			Units lost to attrition as a result of imposition of criteria ¹					Analysis universe after reweighting to compensate for cases lost as a result of imposition of study criteria				Absolute percentage difference (weighting base - reweighted total) (col. 1 minus col. 9)
	Wave 1 Month 4 Universe (Weighting Base)	Received AFDC in Wave 1, Month 4	Non AFDC/TANF Recipients in Wave 1, Month 4 ²	AFDC/TANF Units with 1-11 Months Interviewed	AFDC/TANF Units Missing Topical Modules 4 or 5 ³	AFDC/TANF Units With Imputed Receipt of AFDC/TANF ^{3,4}	Total Cases Lost To "Attrition" (sum of cols. 4, 5 & 6)	Final Analysis Universe (col. 1 minus col. 8)	Reweighted total	Received AFDC in Wave 1, Month 4 ³ (See col. 2)	Not Receiving In Wave 1 Month 4 Only ^{2,3} (See col. 3)	Received AFDC/TANF, but not Receiving at end of 12 Months ^{2,3}	
	[col. 1]	[col. 2]	[col. 3]	[col. 4]	[col. 5]	[col. 6]	[col. 7]	[col. 8]	[col. 9]	[col. 10]	[col. 11]	[col. 12]	
Household Relationship Of Owner													
Total number.....	4,513,200	3,303,169	1,210,031	850,031	491,065	342,459	1,683,556	2,829,644	4,513,200	3,417,618	1,095,582	1,233,368	0.00
Total percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	...
Reference person with relatives.....	60.5	67.0	42.9	47.2	64.1	56.3	54.1	64.4	62.0	69.4	38.9	58.2	-1.46
Reference person w/o relatives.....	2.0	1.3	3.8	1.7	1.8	6.8	2.6	1.6	1.7	1.0	3.6	1.5	0.32
Spouse.....	11.0	8.2	18.6	9.1	10.6	9.9	9.4	12.0	11.9	8.7	22.1	15.0	-0.89
Own Child.....	14.0	12.2	19.1	20.9	10.7	12.6	16.4	12.6	14.1	11.9	21.0	13.1	-0.05
Grandchild.....	0.9	0.5	1.8	1.2	-	-	0.9	0.9	0.4	0.9	-	0.8	-0.05
Parent.....	1.4	1.6	0.9	2.1	0.8	1.2	1.7	1.3	1.4	1.6	2.5	1.9	0.06
Brother/Sister.....	1.3	0.9	2.5	2.4	1.2	2.1	1.7	1.1	1.1	1.0	0.7	0.9	0.19
Other relative.....	1.9	1.6	2.9	3.0	2.6	0.6	2.9	1.3	1.5	1.1	1.7	2.2	0.45
Foster child.....	0.1	-	0.2	-	-	-	-	0.1	0.1	-	-	-	-0.05
Unmarried Partner.....	3.4	3.1	4.2	3.8	4.2	2.6	4.3	2.8	3.2	2.5	2.6	0.4	0.20
Housemate/Roommate.....	1.8	2.0	1.3	4.2	1.8	5.5	2.9	1.1	1.3	1.7	0.5	4.4	0.50
Roomer/Boarder.....	0.7	0.7	0.6	2.1	1.0	1.8	1.5	0.2	0.2	0.2	5.2	1.1	0.49
Other Nonrelative.....	1.0	0.9	1.1	2.3	1.0	0.6	1.5	0.6	0.7	0.5	1.2	0.5	0.31
State Of Residence													
Total number.....	4,513,200	3,303,169	1,210,031	850,031	491,065	342,459	1,683,556	2,829,644	4,513,200	3,417,618	1,095,582	1,233,368	0.00
Total percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	...
California.....	19.5	21.4	14.3	24.1	20.9	7.3	8.1	19.1	19.3	21.0	13.8	13.7	0.22
New York.....	7.3	6.8	8.6	5.5	6.8	17.4	8.1	6.8	6.8	7.3	5.2	3.7	0.45
Illinois.....	5.4	5.4	5.3	5.3	5.6	5.0	5.3	5.4	5.5	5.4	5.7	5.9	-0.08
Pennsylvania.....	3.5	3.0	4.7	1.3	0.7	11.2	3.2	3.7	3.8	3.9	3.4	4.9	-0.28
Florida.....	4.3	4.5	3.8	6.5	7.5	4.2	6.3	3.1	3.1	3.6	1.6	4.2	1.21
Texas.....	5.8	5.2	7.4	7.2	4.3	3.1	5.5	6.0	6.0	5.1	8.6	6.0	-0.17
North Carolina.....	3.3	3.6	2.5	1.8	2.9	3.4	2.5	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.4	3.6	-0.44
Michigan.....	5.1	5.4	4.5	6.2	3.4	3.6	4.8	5.4	5.3	5.3	5.7	4.6	-0.25
Ohio.....	4.7	4.7	4.6	3.5	5.8	4.6	4.4	4.9	4.7	4.6	4.9	5.3	0.03
Georgia.....	2.9	2.8	3.4	3.4	2.5	1.0	2.5	3.2	3.2	3.1	3.8	2.9	-0.30
All other states.....	38.2	37.2	40.8	35.0	39.7	39.3	37.2	38.8	38.6	36.9	43.9	45.1	-0.40
Household Poverty Status (Based On Monthly Income)													
Total number.....	4,513,200	3,303,169	1,210,031	850,031	491,065	342,459	1,683,556	2,829,644	4,513,200	3,417,618	1,095,582	1,233,368	0.00
Total percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	...
Not poor.....	36.8	32.7	48.0	48.5	31.8	45.1	42.6	33.4	36.8	31.8	52.6	45.5	0.00
Poor.....	63.2	67.3	52.0	51.5	68.2	54.9	57.4	66.6	63.2	68.2	47.4	54.5	0.00
Tenure													
Total number.....	4,513,200	3,303,169	1,210,031	850,031	491,065	342,459	1,683,556	2,829,644	4,513,200	3,417,618	1,095,582	1,233,368	0.00
Total percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	...
Owner.....	24.4	23.0	28.1	26.7	17.7	24.5	23.1	25.1	25.9	24.2	31.2	31.1	-1.55
Renter.....	72.0	73.2	68.7	69.8	79.2	72.4	73.6	71.0	70.4	71.8	66.1	65.1	1.64
Occupied w/o payment of rent.....	3.6	3.7	3.3	3.5	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.8	3.7	4.0	2.8	3.8	-0.08
Disability Status Of Owner													
Total number.....	4,513,200	3,303,169	1,210,031	850,031	491,065	342,459	1,683,556	2,829,644	4,513,200	3,417,618	1,095,582	1,233,368	0.00
Total percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	...

Table A-4.1 – Characteristics of selected components of the analysis universe and components lost due to attrition based on public use file weights and as reweighted for this study — *Continued*

	Components of the analysis universe, as originally weighted (public use weights) ¹				Units lost to attrition as a result of imposition of study criteria ¹				Analysis universe after reweighting to compensate for cases lost as a result of imposition of study criteria				Absolute percentage difference (weighting base - reweighted total) (col. 1 minus col. 9)													
	Wave 1 Month 4 Universe (Weighting Base)	Received AFDC in Wave 1, Month 4	Non AFDC/TANF Recipients in Wave 1, Month 4 ²	AFDC/TANF Units with 1-11 Months Interviewed	AFDC/TANF Units with Missing Topical Modules 4 or 5 ³	AFDC/TANF Units With Imputed Receipt of AFDC/TANF ^{3,4}	Total Cases Lost To "Attrition" (sum of cols. 4, 5 & 6)	Final Analysis Universe (col. 1 minus col. 8)	Reweighted total	Received AFDC in Wave 1, Month 4 ³ (See col. 2)	Not Receiving In Wave 1 Month 4 Only ^{2,3} (See col. 3)	Received AFDC/TANF, but not Receiving at end of 12 Months ^{2,3}														
														[col. 1]	[col. 2]	[col. 3]	[col. 4]	[col. 5]	[col. 6]	[col. 7]	[col. 8]	[col. 9]	[col. 10]	[col. 11]	[col. 12]	[col. 13]
Selected Characteristics																										
Disabled.....	21.2	22.0	19.1	20.7	15.5	20.1	19.0	22.5	21.6	23.0	17.2	20.5	20.5	21.6	23.0	17.2	20.5	20.5	21.6	23.0	17.2	20.5	20.5	-0.37		
Not Disabled.....	78.8	78.0	80.9	79.3	84.5	79.9	81.0	77.5	78.4	77.0	82.8	79.5	79.5	78.4	77.0	82.8	79.5	79.5	78.4	77.0	82.8	79.5	79.5	0.37		
State Groups By Case Load Decline (1994-96)																										
Total number.....	4,513,200	3,303,169	1,210,031	850,031	491,065	342,459	1,683,556	2,829,644	4,513,200	3,417,618	1,095,582	1,233,368	1,233,368	4,513,200	3,417,618	1,095,582	1,233,368	1,233,368	4,513,200	3,417,618	1,095,582	1,233,368	1,233,368	0.00		
Total percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	...	
California.....	19.5	21.4	14.3	24.1	20.9	7.3	20.1	19.1	19.3	21.0	13.8	13.7	13.7	19.3	21.0	13.8	13.7	13.7	19.3	21.0	13.8	13.7	13.7	13.7	0.22	
New York.....	7.3	6.8	8.6	5.5	6.8	17.4	8.1	6.8	6.8	6.8	7.3	5.2	3.7	6.8	7.3	5.2	3.7	3.7	6.8	7.3	5.2	3.7	3.7	3.7	0.45	
Under 5 percent.....	5.3	4.8	6.8	4.6	4.3	7.3	4.9	5.5	5.4	5.4	4.8	7.3	7.5	5.4	4.8	4.8	7.3	7.5	5.4	4.8	4.8	7.3	7.5	7.5	-0.13	
5.00 to 9.99 percent.....	11.3	11.3	11.5	10.2	11.3	8.9	10.0	12.1	12.3	12.3	12.1	12.1	13.1	12.3	12.1	12.6	13.1	13.1	12.3	12.1	12.6	13.1	13.1	-0.92		
10.00 to 14.99.....	25.4	23.9	29.7	26.8	27.3	21.3	26.1	25.0	24.9	24.9	22.8	24.2	24.2	24.9	22.8	31.5	24.2	24.2	24.9	22.8	31.5	24.2	24.2	0.54		
15.00 percent or more.....	31.1	31.9	29.2	28.7	29.4	37.8	30.7	31.4	31.3	31.3	29.5	37.7	37.7	31.3	31.9	29.5	37.7	37.7	31.3	31.9	29.5	37.7	37.7	-0.16		
Work Status in Wave 1, Month 4																										
Total number.....	4,513,200	3,303,169	1,210,031	850,031	491,065	342,459	1,683,556	2,829,644	4,513,200	3,417,618	1,095,582	1,233,368	1,233,368	4,513,200	3,417,618	1,095,582	1,233,368	1,233,368	4,513,200	3,417,618	1,095,582	1,233,368	1,233,368	0.00		
Total percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	...	
Working.....	27.9	22.9	41.6	27.3	23.9	32.1	27.3	28.3	27.9	23.1	42.7	39.5	39.5	27.9	23.1	42.7	39.5	39.5	27.9	23.1	42.7	39.5	39.5	0.00		
Not Working.....	72.1	77.1	58.4	72.7	76.1	67.9	72.7	71.7	72.1	76.9	57.3	60.5	60.5	72.1	76.9	57.3	60.5	60.5	72.1	76.9	57.3	60.5	60.5	0.00		

Note: Numbers have 4 implied decimal places which are not displayed

(...) - Not applicable.

¹ Females in the original survey sample (100-series individuals), received AFDC/TANF during the initial 12 months of the survey.

² But received AFDC/TANF in other months.

³ Interviewed 12 Months.

⁴ In month 12 of the survey.

Source: Produced by John Coder, Sentir Research, under Census contract number 43-YA-BC-147069 as edited and formatted for this report.

Table A-4.2 — Unweighted sample counts corresponding to the cells in table A-4.1

Selected Characteristics	Components of the analysis universe, as originally weighted (public use weights) ¹			Units lost to attrition as a result of imposition of study criteria ¹				Analysis universe after reweighting to compensate for cases lost as a result of imposition of study criteria			
	Wave 1, Month 4 Universe (Weighting Base) ¹	Received AFDC/TANF in Wave 1, Month 4	Did not receive AFDC/TANF in Wave 1, Month 4 ²	AFDC/TANF Units With 1-11 Months Interviewed	AFDC/TANF Units With Missing Topical Modules 4 or 5 ³	AFDC/TANF Units With Imputed Receipt Of AFDC/TANF ^{3,4}	Total Cases Lost To "Attrition" (sum of cols. 4, 5 & 6)	Reweight total (Col. 1 minus Col. 7)	Received AFDC/TANF in Wave 1, Month 4 (see col. 2)	Did not Receive AFDC/TANF in Wave 1, Month 4 ² (See col. 3)	Received AFDC/TANF, but not Receiving at end of 12 Months
	[col. 1]	[col. 2]	[col. 3]	[col. 4]	[col. 5]	[col. 6]	[col. 7]	[col. 8]	[col. 9]	[col. 10]	[col. 11]
Age of owner											
Total number.....	1,882	1,390	492	346	209	138	693	1,189	928	261	319
Under 20 years.....	142	67	75	33	18	15	66	76	39	37	24
20 to 24 years.....	367	263	104	87	51	20	158	209	153	56	51
25 to 29 years.....	358	275	83	50	44	26	120	238	191	47	62
30 to 34 years.....	328	250	78	73	33	19	125	203	165	38	63
35 to 39 years.....	266	209	57	42	22	17	81	185	148	37	49
40 to 44 years.....	186	148	38	34	25	15	74	112	96	16	30
45 to 49 years.....	91	73	18	14	6	10	30	61	52	9	14
50 years and over.....	144	105	39	13	10	16	39	105	84	21	26
Race-Ethnicity Of Owner											
Total number.....	1,882	1,390	492	346	209	138	693	1,189	928	261	319
White.....	704	492	212	110	78	54	242	462	348	114	151
Black.....	735	569	166	147	77	52	276	459	368	91	109
Native American.....	36	20	16	9	4	5	18	18	11	7	8
Asian.....	53	31	22	14	6	2	22	31	22	9	5
Hispanic.....	354	278	76	66	44	25	135	219	179	40	46
Number Covered In Unit											
Total number.....	1,882	1,390	492	346	209	138	693	1,189	928	261	319
One.....	129	70	59	42	12	22	76	51	29	22	23
Two.....	637	481	156	128	72	36	236	393	309	84	115
Three.....	513	392	121	83	48	29	160	354	280	74	84
Four.....	347	262	85	52	39	25	116	229	180	49	58
Five or more.....	256	185	71	41	38	26	105	162	130	32	39
Marital Status Of Owner											
Total number.....	1,882	1,390	492	346	209	138	693	1,189	928	261	319
Married, spouse present.....	345	210	135	50	38	24	112	233	151	82	73
Married, spouse absent.....	47	35	12	7	6	1	14	33	23	10	6
Widowed.....	69	52	17	5	7	8	20	49	41	8	10
Divorced.....	318	244	74	48	36	28	112	206	168	38	73
Separated.....	246	193	53	40	28	20	88	158	129	29	33
Never Married.....	857	656	201	196	94	57	347	510	416	94	124

Table A-4.2 — Unweighted sample counts corresponding to the cells in table A-4.1—Continued

Selected Characteristics	Components of the analysis universe, as originally weighted (public use weights) ¹				Units lost to attrition as a result of imposition of study criteria ¹			Analysis universe after reweighting to compensate for cases lost as a result of imposition of study criteria			
	Wave 1, Month 4 Universe (Weighting Base) ¹	Received AFDC/TANF in Wave 1, Month 4	Did not receive AFDC/TANF in Wave 1, Month 4 ²	AFDC/TANF Units With 1-11 Months Interviewed	AFDC/TANF Units With Missing Topical Modules 4 or 5 ³	AFDC/TANF Units With Imputed Receipt Of AFDC/TANF ^{3,4}	Total Cases Lost To "Attrition" (sum of cols. 4, 5 & 6)	Reweight total (Col. 1 minus Col. 7)	Received AFDC/TANF in Wave 1, Month 4 (see col. 2)	Did not Receive AFDC/TANF in Wave 1, Month 4 ² (See col. 3)	Received AFDC/TANF, but not Receiving at end of 12 Months
	[col. 1]	[col. 2]	[col. 3]	[col. 4]	[col. 5]	[col. 6]	[col. 7]	[col. 8]	[col. 9]	[col. 10]	[col. 11]
Household Relationship Of Owner											
Total number.....	1,882	1,390	492	346	209	138	693	1,189	928	261	319
Reference person with relatives.....	1,183	963	220	173	138	79	390	793	680	113	197
Reference person w/o relatives.....	37	19	4	4	4	4	18	19	10	9	5
Spouse.....	198	108	90	31	19	13	63	135	79	56	46
Own Child.....	241	153	88	68	21	16	105	136	89	47	36
Grandchild.....	16	7	9	7	-	-	7	9	3	6	2
Parent.....	25	21	4	8	1	2	11	14	12	2	6
Brother/Sister.....	26	12	14	7	3	3	13	13	8	5	3
Other relative.....	36	22	14	12	6	1	19	17	11	6	7
Foster child.....	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	18	1	1
Unmarried Partner.....	59	40	19	17	9	3	29	30	12	12	11
Housemate/Roommate.....	31	25	6	7	4	8	19	12	2	4	3
Roomer/Boarder.....	11	8	3	5	2	2	9	2	4	-	2
Other Nonrelative.....	18	12	6	7	2	1	10	8	-	-	-
State Of Residence											
Total number.....	1,882	1,390	492	346	209	138	693	1,189	928	261	319
California.....	348	282	66	81	40	10	131	217	185	32	41
New York.....	141	100	41	19	15	24	58	83	70	13	12
Illinois.....	105	78	27	19	13	7	39	66	51	15	18
Pennsylvania.....	71	45	26	5	2	16	23	48	37	11	17
Florida.....	77	59	18	22	14	5	41	36	31	5	12
Texas.....	114	77	37	25	11	5	41	73	51	22	20
North Carolina.....	61	49	12	6	7	5	18	43	35	8	13
Michigan.....	102	80	22	20	9	6	35	67	53	14	15
Ohio.....	94	71	23	15	11	6	32	62	48	14	20
Georgia.....	55	39	16	13	4	1	18	37	28	9	8
All other states.....	714	510	204	121	83	53	257	457	339	118	143
Household Poverty Status (Based On Monthly Income)											
Total number.....	1,882	1,390	492	346	209	138	693	1,189	928	261	319
Not poor.....	660	430	230	159	65	62	286	374	252	122	128
Poor.....	1,222	960	262	187	144	76	407	815	676	139	191
Tenure											
Total number.....	1,882	1,390	492	346	209	138	693	1,189	928	261	319
Owner.....	442	302	140	82	37	34	153	289	207	82	95
Renter.....	1,371	1,034	337	251	165	100	516	855	682	173	211
Occupied w/o payment of rent.....	69	54	15	13	7	4	24	45	39	6	13

Table A-4.2—Unweighted sample counts corresponding to the cells in table A-4.1-- Continued

Selected Characteristics	Components of the analysis universe, as originally weighted (public use weights) ¹				Units lost to attrition as a result of imposition of study criteria ¹				Analysis universe after reweighting to compensate for cases lost as a result of imposition of study criteria						
	Wave 1, Month 4 Universe (Weighting Base) ¹	Received AFDC/TANF in Wave 1, Month 4	Did not receive AFDC/TANF in Wave 1, Month 4	[col. 1]	AFDC/TANF Units With Missing Topical Modules 4 or 5	AFDC/TANF Units With Imputed Receipt Of AFDC/TANF ^{3,4}	Total Cases Lost To "Attrition" (sum of cols. 4, 5 & 6)	Reweighted total (Col. 1 minus Col. 7)	Received AFDC/TANF in Wave 1, Month 4 (see col. 2)	Did not Receive AFDC/TANF in Wave 1, Month 4 ² (See col. 3)	Received AFDC/TANF, but not Receiving at end of 12 Months	[col. 8]	[col. 9]	[col. 10]	[col. 11]
	[col. 1]	[col. 2]	[col. 3]	[col. 4]	[col. 5]	[col. 6]	[col. 7]	[col. 8]	[col. 9]	[col. 10]	[col. 11]	[col. 8]	[col. 9]	[col. 10]	[col. 11]
Disability Status Of Owner															
Total number.....	1,882	1,390	492	346	209	138	693	1,189	928	261	319	1,189	928	261	319
Disabled.....	408	308	100	74	33	30	137	271	221	50	70	271	221	50	70
Not Disabled.....	1,474	1,082	392	272	176	108	556	918	707	211	249	918	707	211	249
Case Load Decline (1994-96)															
Total number.....	1,882	1,390	492	346	209	138	693	1,189	928	261	319	1,189	928	261	319
California.....	348	282	66	81	40	10	131	217	185	32	41	217	185	32	41
New York.....	141	100	41	19	15	24	58	83	70	13	12	83	70	13	12
Under 5 percent.....	95	62	33	15	10	9	34	61	41	20	22	61	41	20	22
5.00 to 9.99 percent.....	220	162	58	36	25	12	73	147	114	33	43	147	114	33	43
10.00 to 14.99.....	491	345	146	100	58	29	187	304	222	82	79	304	222	82	79
15.00 percent or more.....	587	439	148	95	61	54	210	377	296	81	122	377	296	81	122
Work Status In Wave 1, Month 4															
Total number.....	1,882	1,390	492	346	209	138	693	1,189	928	261	319	1,189	928	261	319
Working.....	516	314	202	94	49	40	183	333	214	119	123	333	214	119	123
Not Working.....	1,366	1,076	290	252	160	98	510	856	714	142	196	856	714	142	196

¹ Females in the original survey sample (100-series individuals), received AFDC/TANF during the initial 12 months of the survey.

² But received AFDC/TANF in other months.

³ Interviewed 12 Months.

⁴ In month 12 of the survey.

Source: Produced by John Coder, Sentir Research, under Census contract number 43-YA-BC-147069 as edited and formatted for this report.

C:\Documents and Settings\Denny Vaughan\My Documents\exceltables\afdc\table_A-4.1&4.2.xls\Unweighted 5/10/2005, rev.: 4/13/2006

Table A-4.2—Unweighted sample counts corresponding to the cells in table A-4.1-- Continued

Selected Characteristics	Components of the analysis universe, as originally weighted (public use weights) ¹				Units lost to attrition as a result of imposition of study criteria ¹				Analysis universe after reweighting to compensate for cases lost as a result of imposition of study criteria						
	Wave 1, Month 4 Universe (Weighting Base) ¹	Received AFDC/TANF in Wave 1, Month 4	Did not receive AFDC/TANF in Wave 1, Month 4	[col. 1]	AFDC/TANF Units With Missing Topical Modules 4 or 5	AFDC/TANF Units With Imputed Receipt Of AFDC/TANF ^{3,4}	Total Cases Lost To "Attrition" (sum of cols. 4, 5 & 6)	Reweighted total (Col. 1 minus Col. 7)	Received AFDC/TANF in Wave 1, Month 4 (see col. 2)	Did not Receive AFDC/TANF in Wave 1, Month 4 ² (See col. 3)	Received AFDC/TANF, but not Receiving at end of 12 Months	[col. 8]	[col. 9]	[col. 10]	[col. 11]
	[col. 1]	[col. 2]	[col. 3]	[col. 4]	[col. 5]	[col. 6]	[col. 7]	[col. 8]	[col. 9]	[col. 10]	[col. 11]	[col. 8]	[col. 9]	[col. 10]	[col. 11]
Disability Status Of Owner															
Total number.....	1,882	1,390	492	346	209	138	693	1,189	928	261	319	1,189	928	261	319
Disabled.....	408	308	100	74	33	30	137	271	221	50	70	271	221	50	70
Not Disabled.....	1,474	1,082	392	272	176	108	556	918	707	211	249	918	707	211	249
Case Load Decline (1994-96)															
Total number.....	1,882	1,390	492	346	209	138	693	1,189	928	261	319	1,189	928	261	319
California.....	348	282	66	81	40	10	131	217	185	32	41	217	185	32	41
New York.....	141	100	41	19	15	24	58	83	70	13	12	83	70	13	12
Under 5 percent.....	95	62	33	15	10	9	34	61	41	20	22	61	41	20	22
5.00 to 9.99 percent.....	220	162	58	36	25	12	73	147	114	33	43	147	114	33	43
10.00 to 14.99.....	491	345	146	100	58	29	187	304	222	82	79	304	222	82	79
15.00 percent or more.....	587	439	148	95	61	54	210	377	296	81	122	377	296	81	122
Work Status In Wave 1, Month 4															
Total number.....	1,882	1,390	492	346	209	138	693	1,189	928	261	319	1,189	928	261	319
Working.....	516	314	202	94	49	40	183	333	214	119	123	333	214	119	123
Not Working.....	1,366	1,076	290	252	160	98	510	856	714	142	196	856	714	142	196

¹ Females in the original survey sample (100-series individuals), received AFDC/TANF during the initial 12 months of the survey.

² But received AFDC/TANF in other months.

³ Interviewed 12 Months.

⁴ In month 12 of the survey.

Source: Produced by John Coder, Sentir Research, under Census contract number 43-YA-BC-147069 as edited and formatted for this report.

C:\Documents and Settings\Denny Vaughan\My Documents\exceltables\afdc\table_A-4.1&4.2.xls\Unweighted 5/10/2005, rev.: 4/13/2006