THE SURVEY OF INCOME AND PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

# FOLLOWING CHILDREN IN THE SURVEY OF INCOME AND PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

No. 20

E. K. McArthur and K. S. Short
Bureau of the Census

U. S. Department of Commerce BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This paper was prepared for presentation at the Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America, San Francisco, April 3-5, 1986. The authors wish to acknowledge the significant programming assistance of Marie Pees, Bob McArthur and Emmett Spiers. Each of the authors contributed equally to this work.

# PREFACE

The SIPP is designed to measure changes in the economic status of individuals, families, and households over time. Unique to the SIPP is the frequency of data collection; every four months information is gathered for each sample household and each person in the sample. This frequency of data collection enables the tracking of changes over short periods of time. The survey concentrates on persons 15 years old and over for each of whom a detailed questionnaire is filled. This paper describes the procedure and results from an effort to examine the status of children using the SIPP data set. This requires the linking of information from other person's records to the child's record. We look at the child's status at the start of the survey and monitor changes in status recorded in each succeeding interview. The file to be used for this work consists of children's (and adults') records containing information collected from five waves of interviewing, covering over one and one-half years. Thus, the interrelationships among changes in residential characteristics, changes in household income, changes in family and household size and structure due to divorce, etc., may be examined on a longitudinal basis.

Household living arrangements have undergone tremendous change during the past two decades. A significant aspect of that change has been the increase in the proportion of children who spend at least part of childhood living with only one parent, usually the mother. The divorce rate soared during the 1970s, increasing the percentage of children who experienced a parental marital disruption. And, as fertility within marriage declines and births to unmarried women increase, a growing proportion of children begin life in a single-parent family rather than in the more traditional two-parent family.

A child's psychological and economic well-being is tied to his or her family living arrangements. Many view recent trends in family structure as particularly foreboding for the future health and well-being of children. One of the best documented consequences of single parent living for children is the increased probability that such children will reside in poverty.

Analysis of repeated cross-sectional data, such as that collected in the March Income Supplement to the Current Population Survey (CPS), shows that income in families maintained by a woman has declined relative to income in two-parent families. An increasing share of the poverty population is accounted for by single mothers and their children. These trends are apparent among all racial groups but have been particularly accentuated among blacks. Currently,

half of all black children are born out-of-wedlock (National Center for Health Statistics, 1984), more black children live with a mother only than in a two-parent family (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1985a), and members of these female maintained families make up 68 percent of the black poverty population (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1985b).

Both CPS marital history data and the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID) data have been used to move beyond descriptions of children's current living arrangements and estimate the likelihood that children will experience marital disruption (see Bumpass, 1984, 1985; Hofferth, 1985; Norton and Glick, 1986). Additionally, the longitudinal nature of the PSID allows for the analysis of the longer term economic consequences for children who experience a change in family living arrangements. However, much more research is needed on the interrelationship of changes in family structure and economic well-being of children.

In 1983, the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) joined the CPS and the PSID as another major ongoing household survey. The advantage SIPP offers over other surveys in studying the lives of children is that it is a longitudinal survey which collects detailed information at short intervals (Nelson, et al, 1985; U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1986). SIPP data complement cross-sectional data collected in the CPS and the relatively long-term longitudinal information available in the PSID (Bane and Welsh, 1985). The longitudinal aspect of SIPP makes it possible to study the short-term impact on children of a change in family living arrangements such as that

caused by a parental divorce or separation (McMillen and Herriot, 1985; Koo, 1985). Thus it is possible to measure changes in income and labor force behavior of parents that occur just prior to and after a marital split, out-of-wedlock birth, etc.

Hence, our goal in embarking on a study of children using SIPP data is to be able to answer questions such as: What proportion of children experience a parental marital separation over the course of the panel? Given a separation, what happens to the income of the child's family? For those children who remain with their mother, how many experience not only a parental break-up but a change in the mother's labor force participation? How often is separation followed by a move onto the welfare rolls? Can we begin to model the hazards of a change in income/economic well-being conditional on specific changes in family structure? Can we begin to get a more dynamic picture of both household structure and household income from the point of view of children?

In this paper we describe our effort to use SIPP to measure the living conditions of children over a 20-month period and describe the creation of a special children's file. The file is used to assess household compositional and income change for children in the survey. Children with complete information for the 20-month period are compared with children in households with missing interviews. The paper also discusses how sample attrition may bias the measurement of characteristics and changes in those characteristics over time.

## SIPP DATA AND STUDY DESIGN

Most major surveys, such as the CPS, PSID, and SIPP, are not designed specifically for the purpose of studying children although some limited information on children is obtained. In the case of SIPP the information on the child's record includes household and family characteristics as well as some characteristics of the child. As with the CPS, in the core portion of the SIPP the child's relationship is tied to the household reference person. If the child's parent(s) is in the household but is someone other than the householder or spouse of the householder, it can be complicated to determine other relationships within the household. Fortunately, on the record of each person in SIPP (and since 1982 in CPS also) the person number of a parent, if present in the household, is recorded. If both parents are household members the mother's person number is recorded; if only the father is present, it is the father's; if neither is a household member, this item is not filled. Additionally, on each adult's record, the person number of a spouse is recorded, if present in the household.

In this study, we used the 1984 SIPP panel of abc = 20,000 households initially interviewed between October 1983 d January 1984. Persons whose usual residence was at one th originally selected addresses have been followed and inte vie d subsequently at four month intervals. During the summer of 1986, the 1984 panel was interviewed a final time for a total of 8 or 9 interviews.

For the analysis that follows, we make use of a file in which data from the first five interviews have been merged. Five interviews provide monthly data for 20 months because interviews are scheduled four months apart and each interview covers a reference period of the four previous months. The sample is divided into four groups, called rotation groups, each of which is interviewed in turn during a designated month. So, for example, for the rotation group which was interviewed initially in October 1983, they had their wave 2 interview in February 1984, wave 3 in June 1984, wave 4 in October 1984, and wave 5 in February 1985. In these 5 interview waves, respondents reported income and program participation information for the period from June 1983 through January 1985. The second rotation group, originally interviewed in November 1983, has information covering the 20-month period from July 1983 through February 1985; the third group, originally interviewed in December 1983, has information covering the period from August 1983 through March 1985. Members of the fourth group, who were originally interviewed in January 1984, were interviewed a second time in May 1985 but, because of a quirk in the survey design, instead of receiving the wave 2 interview they received a wave 3 interview as their second interview. Hence, for this group we have only 4 interviews covering 16 consecutive months of information (covering September 1983 through December 1984). To summarize, we have a sample of persons tracked over, in most cases, a 20-month period. The actual 20 months that constitute the reference

period varies depending upon the month in which the household was initially interviewed.

We restricted our analysis to persons under 15 years of age as of the first interview, who were in interviewed households at that time. (That is, about 1549 children who were born into a sample household or who join a sample household during the course of the panel were excluded.) Persons under 15 present special problems because SIPP is designed as a study of persons 15 years and over. However, as long as a person under 15 continues to live with an adult sample member, he or she is maintained in sample. Especially for younger children, this no doubt means that most are followed and that attrition of children almost always occurs because the sample adult to whom a child is attached, usually the parent, is also lost to the study.

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE LINKED FILE

The basic internal SIPP files are produced containing information collected during one interview and they are "relational," that is, they contain eight types of records: the sample unit, household, family, person, wage and salary self-employment, asset income, and other income sources. Each of these records contains pointers which link that record to others for that person in that sample unit.

For our work, first an extract file was created which contained only a small proportion of the data that are available

from each SIPP interview. Information on the internal file was rectangularized, or "flattened," to the person level and data from five interview files were merged together. One record was created for each person in the survey and that record contained some information about that person's household and family as well as selected socioeconomic characteristics of the person during each month of the reference period. This file was not edited longitudinally so some of the changes measured may be due to errors. 1/

In order to look at the data on the SIPP records from the perspective of children, we then wrote a FORTRAN program that stored members of each household in an array, counted the number of children, and stored the person number of the parent that was on each child's record. Then it searched for the parent's record within the household array. The program did not assume that each child in a household would have the same identified "parent." Rather, it went through this process for each child in the household. When the parent was found, the person number of spouse (located on the parent's record) was stored. Then the record of the spouse of the parent was located. Finally, for each child in the household, an expanded child's record was written containing household information, the child's information, the record of the reference person (that is, a

1/ A rectangular file containing linked information for three interviews for the complete sample is under development. The demographic information on this file will be longitudinally edited.

person in whose name the housing unit is either owned or rented), the parent's record, and the record for the spouse. n every case the expanded record contained information for the child and the reference person. For over 98 percent of the children on the file, a successful parent-child link was accomplished: that is, a parent number was coded on the child's record and that parent record was found. The parent and the spouse records were padded with zeros if no parent or spouse was in the household.

In creating the linked file and working with the data, many assumptions were made. One basic set of assumptions was about the quality of the data. We assumed that sex and race, for example, were correctly recorded during the initial interview. (However, we are aware that, in a small proportion of the cases in which the original information was found to be in error, corrections have been made during later interviews, see Kalton, et al, 1986). We assumed that changes in income would primarily surface between interviews rather than within the months covered during one interview (even though in the real world they are as likely to occur between one pair of months as between any other)(Burkhead and Coder, 1985). Therefore we use the income reported in the fourth reference month of each interview wave and ignored, for the time being, month-to-month chang within the waves. In addition we made the assumption that the person originally identified on the child's record as the parent was correctly identified.

Perhaps the most questionable assumption concerns data not included in this file. In creating the linked file, we selected the parent identifier from the first interview and then merged that person's record with the child's in each of the successive waves. If the person number of the parent changed in one of the successive waves, we know from the child's record that it changed but we did not pick up information on the "replacement" parent. This was done primarily for reasons of economy -- our record containing information for four individuals within a household (child, parent, spouse, reference person) and five interview waves exceeded 750 variables and required more than one SPSS file to perform statistical analysis. In over 97 percent of the cases, the parent number on the child's record is the same throughout all interview waves. The remaining 3 percent of the children for whom the recorded parent changed are of great interest and in the future the file may be reconstructed to pick up the record of "new" parents assigned to a child after the first interview.

## SAMPLE ATTRITION OF PERSONS UNDER 15

Analyses of change in longitudinal surveys are complicated by the existence of a variety of kinds of nonsampling error, in particular nonsampling error due to nonresponse. To escape these complexities, analyses are often restricted to sample persons for whom an interview was obtained during each visit. However, we began with a look at person nonresponse patterns in

order to answer the question: Does restricting analysis to children for whom 5 complete waves of data were obtained affect our results? The data shown and our consequent conclusions are preliminary.

Tables 1 and 2 present some demographic and economic characteristics of children who were present throughout the 5 waves of interviewing compared with those who were missing one or more waves of data. We began with 10,048 children (i.e., persons under age 15) in wave 1. Of those, 2,556 were in rotation group 4 and, thus, because of the sample design lack a wave 2 interview. By design this group was randomly selected and the characteristics of this group, shown in column 4 of the tables, closely approximate those of the total sample. For this initial look at children we deleted these cases from further consideration because they have 4 not 5 interviews in our data set.

Of more significance are the 2nd and 3rd columns in tables 1 and 2. Of the 7,492 children who were in households eligible for all five interviews, 6,214, or about 83 percent, were retained throughout all five waves of interviewing. Tables 1 and 2 help to illustrate whether biases are introduced if we restrict analysis to children for whom we have complete information for the 20-month period.

Children with missing information are less likely to be the child of the household reference person than are children who are retained in sample throughout the 20-month period. The

distributions by race and Hispanic ethnicity of children who are missing one or more interviews appear to be different from those for children with complete information -- minority children appear to be more likely to have missing information. 2/ Children with missing information appear more likely to be in two- or three-person households than those with complete information. The difference in the distribution by age and sex of those children with missing interviews compared with those with 5 interviews is not significant.

Turning to economic characteristics, children of lower income households (less than $1,000 income per month), children in housing units which are not owned, and children in households which received cash or non-cash benefits are much more likely to be missing one or more interviews than are children in higher income households or children who live in owner-occupied units.

We hypothesized that the changes we are interested in -- changes in household structure and income -- could be related to the probability of missing interviews. We therefore looked at the proportion of children whose household size changed from one wave to the next. Additionally, we calculated the percentage of children who were in households which experienced a change in average monthly income -- either up or down -- of more than $500 between one interview wave and the next. It should be noted that item nonresponse and imputations for individual interviews

---

2/ Unless otherwise specified, differences described in this paper are significant at the 95 percent level. Hispanic ethnicity was significant at the 90 percent level.

may contribute changes that are not real. On the other hand measured changes may underestimate total changes for childre with missing interviews because changes may occur concurrent with leaving the sample and we have no way of assessing thc e changes.

Table 3 reports these wave-to-wave household size and income changes for the 6,214 children with five complete interview waves. This table indicates that about 5 percent of children live in households that increase in size from one interview to the next, and another 4 to 6 percent are in households that decrease in size. This estimate is fairly constant from wave to wave, i.e., changes between interviews 1 and 2 are similar to changes between interviews 2 and 3, 3 and 4, and 4 and 5.

Interview-to-interview changes in household income are much greater than changes in the number of persons in the household. Around 40 percent of children are in households in which monthly income for the wave remains within plus or minus $500 from one wave to the next. Between 27 and 29 percent experience an increase in income of more than $500 between any two waves, and around one-third experience a drop of more than $500.

These results indicate the amount of change in hou hold size and income if estimates are based only on those ch dren retained in sample for five successive waves. What are e changes for children with other wave response patterns a could our estimate of change in household size or income be bi ed in some systematic way by eliminating those with missing waves of data?

Table 4 contrasts changes for children with all 5 interview waves with those for children who have only the first and second interviews, those with the first three but missing the fourth and fifth interviews, and those who were retained through the first four waves of interviewing but were not in households successfully interviewed a fifth time.

The estimate of the percentage of children whose households undergo a change in size from one wave to the next appears to be smaller for those who have five complete waves of data than for those who are lost to interview before the fifth wave. Table 4 indicates that 9 to 11 percent of children with five complete interviews experience a change in household size between two waves -- either a loss or an addition of one or more persons. Among children missing one to three waves of data, 10 to 20 percent are estimated to experience a change in household size between two successive waves. Perhaps not surprisingly, these data suggest that when household size changes, the probability of subsequently losing a child from interview also increases. Also, in the interview wave preceeding the child's household dropping out of the survey there is clearly more change occurring in household size compared to the children whose households remained in sample all 5 waves.

The relationship of income change to attrition is less clear. Table 4 shows the percentage of children who experience a change in household income of at least $500 between waves. Although it appears that, as with household size change, there is a tendency for greater change in income amounts received just

prior to dropping out of the survey, these differences were not significant. Thus changes in income received by a household do not appear to be related to the probability of the child's household dropping out of sample.

To summarize, our preliminary look at sample attrition does suggest that estimates of household compositional change may be biased downward when we restrict analysis to children who are retained in sample throughout the first five waves of interviewing. Changes in household income, on the other hand, do not appear to be related to subsequent sample attrition.

## STUDYING FAMILY COMPOSITION CHANGE FOR CHILDREN

With the creation of the expanded child's record we now have what we believe is a uniquely rich data set for studying children. On the child's record we have parent's age, race, sex, and, as of each interview, marital status, employment, earnings, recipiency status, and total household income. We have this information for the identified spouse and for the reference person as well. Data shown in this analysis are in terms of the children. Therefore data for a particular "parent" may be counted more than once if more than one child identified that person as "parent."

By looking at the relationship codes on the child, parent, and spouse records -- all of which are keyed to the reference person, not to each other -- we can begin to estimate the proportion of the sample for which we do actually have a good

picture of family relationships within the household. We also can begin to examine how family structure changes -- for example, does the parent change marital status? -- over the course of the 20 months for which we have data.

Table 5 provides a perspective on household composition. This table is for children and shows the child's and the child's parent's relationship to the reference person. The columns show all the possible relationship categories for the child; the rows show the possible relationship categories for the parent. In those cases in which the child is identified as a "child of reference person" and the parent is either the "reference person" or "spouse" -- that is, in 92.7 percent of the cases -- we are dealing with a situation in which determining the "connectedness" of the child to other household members is fairly straightforward. Because all household members are keyed relationally to the reference person and the reference person is the child's parent, it will usually be possible to determine relationships to the child. For example, someone identified as a brother of the reference person will be an uncle to the child.

Determining family composition for the other 7.3 percent of the children in the survey is less easy. For the 3.5 percent of children who are "other relatives" of the reference person with a parent who is a "child" of the reference person, we can do a reasonably accurate job of depicting family relationships because the child is probably a grandchild of the reference person. For the remaining 3.8 percent of children, we have only limited information. For about half, we know who their parent

is and whether they are related or not related to the person who maintains the household. For the other half, we know only whether they are related to the reference person. That is, we do not have a parent-child link. 3/

As can be seen from table 5, in the case of black children, the child's relationship to other household members is more often unclear. Also, we are less likely to have a parent-child link for these children than for white children. That is, more often for black than for white children either no parent is identified or the person record of the parent was not found.

One of our primary purposes in constructing the linked parent-child file was to begin to assess family compositional change. Table 6 provides a preliminary look at characteristics of children's parents by whether or not the children were in households which had five completed interviews. The table shows the marital status distribution of the children's parents at the time of the first interview. As can be seen parents of children in five interview households are much more likely than the other parents to have been married and living with a spouse at the time of the first interview. However no significant differences appeared in the proportions whose parent experienced a marital status change during the 20-month period. For those children missing one or more interview waves, a marital status change was

---

3/ To aid in establishing within household relationships, detailed relationship of each household member to all other household members is obtained in a special topical module which was included in the eighth interview wave of the 1984 Panel. Data collected at that time are not yet available. This module is being repeated in future panels.

counted only when there was a completed interview for that wave. 4/

Tables 7 and 8 contain data for children who were in households interviewed during all 5 waves. Both tables focus on the marital status and marital status change of the child's parent. Column 1 of Table 7 contains distributions of first interview characteristics for children whose parent was identified as "married, spouse present" in the first interview (4,806 children). The second column contains distributions of characteristics for children whose parent was identified as "married, spouse present" in the first interview and who subsequently experienced no marital status change (4,560 children). The third column presents distributions for children whose parent was "married, spouse present" in Wave 1 but who experienced a marital status change at some time during the second through fifth interviews (246 children). The third column of data is of principal interest here. Compared to children whose parent remains married, spouse present, children who experience a parental marital change -- separation, divorce,

---

4/ For example, for a parent who was in the survey in waves 1 and 2, not interviewed in wave 3, but successfully interviewed in waves 4 and 5, we ascertained whether there was a change in marital status between waves 1 and 2, and 1 and 4, and 1 and 5, but did not make any assumptions of change occurring in wave 3. A much more frequent situation is one in which we have a parent record for the first 2 or 3 waves and then that person is lost to the sample (see Appendix table A-1). At the time the person disappears from the household, the person could have experienced a change in marital status but we would not count any such changes. Hence, we probably underestimate the proportion who actually experience a parental marital status change over the 20-month period.

death -- are more often from lower income households (monthly income less than $1,000), are more likely to live in rental units rather than in owner-occupied households, and are more likely to be in households which received cash or noncash benefits.

Table 8 shows the reported fifth wave parental marital status for children whose parents were married, spouse present at the time of the first interview. The table is restricted to children whose parent reported a marital status change during one of the later interviews. About 13 percent were reported to be married, spouse present, again -- these parents may have been only temporarily separated, they may have remarried, or there may be error in the marital status classification at one of the points in time. About 49 percent of these children had a parent reported to be separated at the fifth interview and 21 percent had a parent who was divorced by the time of the 5th interview. At least 2 percent of the change -- into "never married" -- would appear to be due solely to error (coding, response, keying, or interviewer). Currently longitudinal edits are being developed for the SIPP which should eliminate this type of problem (Kalton, et al, 1986).

## CONCLUSIONS AND DIRECTION OF FUTURE WORK

The study described in this paper involved linking information on persons interviewed in the SIPP, a survey which

focuses on persons 15 years old and over, such that the economic status and social condition of children in households could be studied over a period of 20 months. We encountered both conceptual and data quality difficulties typical of longitudinal survey data. Of particular concern to us was determining when a child ceased to be in an interviewed household, i.e. when attrition occurred.

It appears that approximately 17 percent of the children who were members of sample households at the initial interview were not followed for all five interviews. At this time, we are still not completely confident of our ability to determine the true interviewing status of a small group of these children. As a child is not personally interviewed in SIPP, the only determination about whether a child remains in a sample household is made when the interviewer reviews the household roster with the household respondent. Also, unlike the adult records, in compiling the data for this study, there is no specific code on a child's record which can be used to determine whether a child was in an interviewed household during an interview wave or not.

Table A-1 shows the interview patterns for all children in households eligible for five interviews. This table shows that between each interviewing wave about 3 to 4 percent of the sample children are lost to the survey. Very few children were in households which missed one or more interviews and then returned to the sample. Table A-2 shows reasons for noninterview recorded for children with one or more interviews

missing. As can be seen, a household refusal is the most frequently recorded reason for missing interviews.

In this preliminary work we have focussed primarily on describing the characteristics and living conditions of children who were members of sample households. We were concerned that nonresponse could significantly bias the sample over time. Therefore we compared the characteristics of children who left the sample with those of children who remained in the sample. We found that the children most likely to cease to participate in the survey were from lower income households at the time of the initial interview and were more likely to experience household size change just prior to leaving the survey. However, there did not appear to be any relationship between parental marital status change or income change and attrition from the survey.

Much of the usefulness of SIPP for the study of children is the ability to monitor changes in the economic well-being of children. We are encouraged that our preliminary work suggests that changes in parental marital status and household income are not related to sample attrition. We will, of course, continue to assess the relationship between the occurrence of "events" in children's lives and attrition as we move on to examine the interrelationship among income change, family compositional change, and migration. But our conclusion, based on findings to date, is that limiting analysis to those children who are in interviewed households throughout the five waves is an acceptable analytic strategy and probably does not seriously

bias the study of the changing well-being of children. When files with longitudinal weighting become available, analysts will be able to compensate for selection biases introduced by the apparently greater attrition of minority and lower income children.

## REFERENCES


Bane, Mary Jo and James Welsh
1985 "Potential Contributions to Policy Research on Children." JOURNAL OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL MEASUREMENT 13:273-279.

Bumpass, Larry L.
1984 "Children and Marital Disruption: A Replication and Update." DEMOGRAPHY 21:71-82.
1985 "Bigger Isn't Necessarily Better." JOURNAL OF MARRIAGE AND THE FAMILY 47:797-798.

Burkhead, Daniel and John Coder.
1985 "Gross Changes in Income Recipiency from the Survey of Income and Program Participation." PROCEEDINGS OF THE AMERICAN STATISTICAL ASSOCIATION, SOCIAL STATISTICS SECTION.

Hofferth, Sandra L.
1985 "Updating Children's Life Course." JOURNAL OF MARRIAGE AND THE FAMILY 47:93-115.

Kalton, Graham, David McMillen and Daniel Kasprzyk.
1986 "Nonsampling Error Issues in the Survey of Income and Program Participation." SIPP WORKING PAPER SERIES, No. 8602. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Koo, Helen.
1985 "Short Term Changes in Household and Family Structure." PROCEEDINGS OF THE AMERICAN STATISTICAL ASSOCIATION, SOCIAL STATISTICS SECTION.

McMillen, David and Roger Herriot.
1985 "Toward a Longitudinal Definition of Households." JOURNAL OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL MEASUREMENT, 13:349-360.

National Center for Health Statistics
1984 "Advance Report of Final Natality Statistics, 1982." MONTHLY VITAL STATISTICS REPORT. Vol 33, No. 6, Supplement. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Nelson, Dawn, David McMillen and Daniel Kasprzyk.
1985 "An Overview of the Survey of Income and Program Participation: Update 1." SIPP WORKING PAPER SERIES, No. 8401, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Norton, Arthur J. and Paul C. Glick.
1986 "One Parent Families: A Social and Economic Profile." FAMILY RELATIONS, 35, pp. 9-17.

U.S. Bureau of the Census
1985a "Marital Status and Living Arrangements: March 198 ' CURRENT POPULATION REPORTS, Series P-20, No. 399. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
1985b "Money Income and Poverty Status of Families and Persons in the United States: 1984." CURRENT POPULATION REPORTS, Series P-60, No. 149. Washinç n, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
1986 "Economic Characteristics of Households in the Uni:ed States: Fourth Quarter 1984." CURRENT POPULATION REPORTS, Series P-70, No. 6. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Table 1: First-Wave Demographic Characteristics of Children Present in the First Five Interview Waves of the 1984 SIPP Panel and of Children Missing One or More Interview Waves (Unweighted data)

| Characteristic | Total | Present in all 5 waves | Missing 1 or more waves | Rotation 4 (No Wave 2) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AGE | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 0-2 | 19.7 | 19.4 | 19.9 | 20.3 |
| 3-5 | 20.1 | 19.7 | 20.5 | 20.8 |
| 6-8 | 19.7 | 20.1 | 19.7 | 18.6 |
| 9-11 | 19.1 | 19.6 | 18.9 | 17.8 |
| 12-14 | 21.5 | 21.2 | 21.0 | 22.5 |
| SEX | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Male | 50.3 | 51.0 | 52.1 | 47.8 |
| Female | 49.7 | 49.0 | 47.9 | 52.2 |
| RACE | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| White | 81.6 | 82.8 | 77.9 | 80.6 |
| Black | 15.1 | 13.9 | 18.5 | 16.8 |
| Other | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.6 | 3.2 |
| HISPANIC ETHNICITY | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Hispanic | 8.4 | 8.3 | 10.7 | 7.7 |
| Non-Hispanic | 91.6 | 91.7 | 89.3 | 92.3 |
| RELATIONSHIP TO REFERENCE PERSON | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Child | 92.2 | 93.5 | 88.8 | 91.0 |
| Other Relative | 6.3 | 5.5 | 7.6 | 7.3 |
| Nonrelative in Family | 1.2 | 0.7 | 3.1 | 1.3 |
| Nonrelative No Family | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.4 |
| HOUSEHOLD SIZE | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Two persons | 2.9 | 2.7 | 4.7 | 2.6 |
| Three persons | 17.5 | 16.7 | 19.4 | 18.5 |
| Four persons | 36.4 | 37.6 | 32.2 | 35.6 |
| Five persons | 23.3 | 23.4 | 21.9 | 23.7 |
| Six persons | 10.2 | 9.5 | 12.5 | 10.8 |
| Seven persons | 4.4 | 4.3 | 4.1 | 4.7 |
| Eight or more | 5.2 | 5.6 | 5.1 | 4.1 |
| Sample size | 10,048 | 6,214 | 1,278 | 2,556 |

NOTE: Rotation group 4 did not receive a wave 2 interview.

Table 2: First-Wave Economic Characteristics of Children Present i .ne First Five Interview Waves of the 1984 SIPP Panel and of ldr Missing One or More Interview Waves (Unweighted data)

| Characteristic | Total | Present in all 5 waves | Missing 1 or more waves | Ro (Nc | ic v |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TENURE | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 10 | |
| In Owned Unit | 63.2 | 65.2 | 50.8 | 64.4 | |
| Other | 36.8 | 34.8 | 49.2 | 35.6 | |
| HOUSEHOLD INCOME IN 4TH REFERENCE MONTH | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Income Loss/None | 1.1 | 0.9 | 2.2 | 1.0 | |
| $1-499 | 10.0 | 9.3 | 14.4 | 9.6 | |
| $500-999 | 13.0 | 13.0 | 13.8 | 12.8 | |
| $1,000-1,499 | 14.0 | 13.7 | 15.9 | 13.9 | |
| $1,500-1,999 | 14.2 | 14.6 | 14.3 | 12.9 | |
| $2,000-2,499 | 13.1 | 13.3 | 12.5 | 12.8 | |
| $2,500-2,999 | 10.1 | 9.6 | 7.7 | 12.4 | |
| $3,000-3,499 | 7.7 | 8.7 | 4.1 | 7.0 | |
| $3,500-3,999 | 5.2 | 5.6 | 3.4 | 5.1 | |
| $4,000-4,999 | 5.2 | 5.1 | 5.6 | 5.2 | |
| $5,000 and Over | 6.4 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 7.2 | |
| % Who Received Cash Benefits | 13.1 | 12.5 | 16.1 | 13.2 | |
| % Who Received Noncash Benefits | | | | | |
| Food Stamps | 16.1 | 15.7 | 17.8 | 16.4 | |
| Other Benefits | 16.8 | 16.5 | 20.3 | 15.9 | |
| Sample size | 10,048 | 6,214 | 1,278 | 2,556 | |

NOTE: Rotation group 4 did not receive a wave 2 interview.

Table 3: Percentage Experiencing a Change in Household Size and Household Income Between Interviews (Persons with 5 Interview Waves)(Unweighted data, N = 6,214)

| | Wave 1 to 2 | Wave 2 to 3 | Wave 3 to 4 | Wave 4 to |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| HOUSEHOLD SIZE | | | | |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| More Persons | 4.7 | 5.1 | 5.1 | 5.1 |
| Same | 91.3 | 90.5 | 89.1 | 90.7 |
| Fewer Persons | 4.0 | 4.4 | 5.8 | 4.2 |
| HOUSEHOLD INCOME | | | | |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| More Income (+$500) | 27.0 | 27.3 | 29.4 | 27.7 |
| Same | 40.9 | 39.1 | 38.3 | 41.5 |
| Less Income (-$500) | 32.1 | 33.6 | 32.3 | 30.8 |

Table 4: Percentage of Children with Changes in Number of Persons in Household or in Total Household Income Between Interview Waves (Unweighted data)

| Interview Pattern | Total | Change Between Waves 1 and 2 | 2 and 3 | 3 and 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| HOUSEHOLD SIZE | | | | |
| All Waves | 6,214 | 8.7 | 9.5 | 10.9 |
| Waves 1,2,3,4 | 240 | 14.6 | 9.6 | 19.6 |
| Waves 1,2,3 | 220 | 10.9 | 16.8 | |
| Waves 1,2 | 268 | 16.0 | | |
| HOUSEHOLD INCOME (+ or - $500) | | | | |
| All Waves | 6,214 | 59.1 | 60.9 | 61.7 |
| Waves 1,2,3,4 | 240 | 59.2 | 61.7 | 63.3 |
| Waves 1,2,3 | 220 | 58.2 | 65.0 | |
| Waves 1,2 | 268 | 65.7 | | |

Table 5: Relationship to Reference Person(RRP5) of Child and Parent by Race: Wave 1 (Unweighted data)

| | CHILD | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Child | Other Relative | Non-relative w/ Family | Non-relative w/o Family |
| **PARENT** | | | | |
| **Total (N=7492)** | | | | |
| Reference Person | 24.8 | | | |
| Spouse | 67.9 | | | |
| Child | | 3.5 | | |
| Other Relative | | 0.9 | | |
| Nonrelative w/ Family | | | 1.1 | |
| Nonrelative w/o Family | | | | |
| Not in Household | | 1.5 | | 0.3 |
| **White (N=6141)** | | | | |
| Reference Person | 21.0 | | | |
| Spouse | 73.8 | | | |
| Child | | 2.4 | | |
| Other Relative | | 0.6 | | |
| Nonrelative w/ Family | | | 1.0 | |
| Nonrelative w/o Family | | | | |
| Not in Household | | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
| **Black (N=1102)** | | | | |
| Reference Person | 46.2 | | | |
| Spouse | 34.6 | | | |
| Child | | 9.3 | | |
| Other Relative | | 2.8 | | |
| Nonrelative w/ Family | | | 1.5 | |
| Nonrelative w/o Family | | | | |
| Not in Household | | 5.3 | | 0.4 |
| **Other (N=249)** | | | | |
| Reference Person | 24.1 | | | |
| Spouse | 69.1 | | | |
| Child | | 2.0 | | |
| Other Relative | | 1.2 | | |
| Nonrelative w/ Family | | | 1.2 | |
| Nonrelative w/o Family | | | | |
| Not in Household | | 2.0 | | 0.4 |

Table 6: Characteristics of Children's Parents for Children Present in Five Interview Waves and of Children Missing One or More Interview Waves (Unweighted data)

| Characteristic | Total | Present in all 5 waves | Missing 1 or more waves | Rotation 4 (No Wave 2) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| PARENT'S WAVE 1 MARITAL STATUS | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Married, Sp. Pres. | 75.3 | 77.3 | 67.4 | 74.1 |
| Married, Sp. Absent | 0.8 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 0.9 |
| Widowed | 1.6 | 1.5 | 1.3 | 1.9 |
| Divorced | 9.2 | 8.8 | 10.6 | 9.4 |
| Separated | 5.3 | 4.5 | 10.4 | 4.9 |
| Not married | 5.9 | 5.4 | 6.3 | 7.0 |
| No parent in household | 1.9 | 1.7 | 2.8 | 1.8 |
| % WITH MARITAL STATUS CHANGE | | | | |
| Total | ** | 7.4 | 7.1 | ** |
| Married, Sp. Pres in Wave 1 | ** | 5.1 | 5.1 | ** |
| Sample size | 10,048 | 6,214 | 1,278 | 2,556 |

NOTE: Rotation group 4 did not receive a wave 2 interview.

** Not applicable

Table 7: First-Wave Demographic Characteristics of Children Present in Five Interview Waves of the 1984 SIPP Panel whose Parent was Married Spouse Present in Wave 1 by whether a Marital Status Change Occurred in a Later Wave (Unweighted data)

| Characteristics | Parent Married, Spouse Present | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | Without Change | With Change |
| AGE | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Less than 6 | 40.2 | 40.2 | 40.2 |
| 6 to 11 | 39.4 | 39.5 | 36.6 |
| 12 to 14 | 20.3 | 20.2 | 23.2 |
| RACE | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| White | 89.2 | 89.2 | 89.0 |
| Black | 7.3 | 7.3 | 9.3 |
| Other | 3.5 | 3.5 | 1.6 |
| HISPANIC ETHNICITY | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Hispanic | 7.8 | 7.7 | 8.9 |
| Non-Hispanic | 92.2 | 92.3 | 91.1 |
| HOUSEHOLD INCOME IN 4TH REFERENCE MONTH | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Less than $1,000 | 14.3 | 13.8 | 22.7 |
| $1,000-1,999 | 28.9 | 28.8 | 32.5 |
| $2,000-2,999 | 26.4 | 26.4 | 27.2 |
| $3,000-3,999 | 16.7 | 17.1 | 9.4 |
| $4,000 or more | 13.6 | 14.0 | 8.1 |
| % WITH $500+ INCOME CHANGE | 82.8 | 82.6 | 87.4 |
| % WHO RECEIVED CASH BENEFITS | 4.0 | 3.8 | 7.7 |
| % WHO RECEIVED NONCASH BENEFITS | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Food Stamps | 7.2 | 6.9 | 3.0 |
| Other Benefits | 14.0 | 13.6 | 0.3 |
| No Benefits | 78.8 | 79.5 | [illegible].7 |
| TENURE | 100.0 | 100.0 | 10[illegible].0 |
| In Owned Unit | 72.7 | 74.0 | 48 |
| Other | 27.3 | 26.0 | 51 |
| Sample Size | 4,806 | 4,560 | 24[illegible] |

Table 8: Parents Married Spouse Present at First Interview with Marital Status Change by Fifth Wave Marital Status (Unweighted Data)

| Fifth wave Marital Status | N=246 Percent |
|---|---|
| TOTAL | 100.0 |
| Married, Sp. Present | 13.4 |
| Married, Sp. Absent | 7.3 |
| Widowed | 2.4 |
| Divorced | 21.1 |
| Separated | 49.2 |
| Never Married | 2.4 |
| No Parent in Household | 4.1 |

Table A-1: Children's Interviewing Patterns (Includes only Children in Households Eligible for Five Interviews) (Unweighted data)

| Interview Pattern Waves 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Response every interview | | | | | | |
| X | X | X | X | X | 6,214 | 82.9 |
| 2. Apparent attrition | | | | | | |
| X | X | X | X | O | 240 | 3.2 |
| X | X | X | O | O | 220 | 2.9 |
| X | X | O | O | O | 268 | 3.6 |
| X | O | O | O | O | 221 | 3.0 |
| 3. First and Fifth Interview, one intervening missing | | | | | | |
| X | X | X | O | X | 128 | 1.7 |
| X | X | O | X | X | 104 | 1.4 |
| X | O | X | X | X | 40 | 0.5 |
| 4. First and Fifth Interview, two or more intervening missing | | | | | | |
| X | X | O | O | X | 3 | -- |
| X | O | X | O | X | 2 | -- |
| X | O | O | X | X | 4 | -- |
| X | O | O | O | X | 3 | -- |
| 5. Fifth Interview Missing, and one or more intervening | | | | | | |
| X | O | X | X | O | 3 | -- |
| X | X | O | X | O | 19 | 0.3 |
| X | O | O | X | O | 1 | -- |
| X | O | X | O | O | 13 | 0.2 |
| | | | | | 7,493 | 100 0 |

NOTE: X represents a successful interview in child's household, O used when child was not in an interviewed household.

Table A-2: Children Missing One or More Interview Waves by Reasons Recorded for Noninterview--Included only Children in Households Eligible for Five Interviews (Unweighted data)

| Reason | Total | | Missing at least 5th Interview | | With 5th Interview but Missing 1 or more Other | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Household refused | 639 | 50.0 | 538 | 54.1 | 101 | 35.4 |
| No one home | 125 | 9.8 | 50 | 5.0 | 75 | 26.3 |
| Household moved, address unknown | 229 | 17.9 | 199 | 20.0 | 30 | 10.5 |
| Household moved within U.S., beyond survey limits | 22 | 1.7 | 22 | 2.2 | 0 | -- |
| Child died, institutionalized moved out of country | 49 | 3.8 | 48 | 4.8 | 1 | 0.4 |
| Other reasons* | 214 | 16.8 | 136 | 13.8 | 78 | 27.4 |

*Includes a small number of children whose interviewing status is currently unclear.