

What about These Children?
Assessing Poverty Among the 'Hidden Population' of
Multiracial Children in Single-Mother Families

Jenifer Bratter & Sarah Damaske

Rice University

Paper proposal for the 2011 Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America. The first author would like to acknowledge the Kentucky Poverty Center Young Investigator's award and the Woodrow Wilson Fellowship Foundation that provided support for this project.

What about These Children? Assessing Poverty Among the ‘Hidden Population’ of Multiracial Children in Single-Mother Families

Capturing the conditions of children of color living in single-parent families has become more complex due to the growing presence of interracial families. This analysis assesses the size and poverty status of single-female headed families housing multiracial children. Using data from the 2000 Census, we find nine percent of female headed families house either children who are classified with more than one race or are classified as a single race different than their mothers. Logistic regression analyses assessing the odds of poverty finds that multiracial families, like most families of color, are more likely to experience poverty than white monoracial families. The one exception is Asian multiracial families who have similar poverty rates as white monoracial families.

Word count: 116

At the beginning of the twenty-first century, over 12 million American children lived in poverty (U.S. Census Bureau 2004). These children were disproportionately from minority and immigrant families and from single-parent households (Van Hook, Brown and Kwenda 2004; U.S. Census Bureau 2004). Over the past forty years, the number of children living in non-marital circumstances has risen dramatically. While only six percent of children in the United States lived with a single parent in 1960, today just over half of all children will live in a single-parent household for a portion of their childhood (McLanahan & Percheski 2008). Conditions facing non-marital families headed by women have received growing attention as they are far more likely to live below the poverty line than any other family type (Edin & Kefalas 2005; Hays 2003; McLanahan 2004). Births in single-parent households have increased most rapidly among women with low socio-economic status (Ellwood & Jencks 2002). Moreover, the likelihood that female-headed families will exit poverty has declined (Stevens 1994).

Just as dramatic as this rise, is the degree to which non-marital births are differentiated by race. Declining marriage rates and higher rates of non-marital childbearing have been a feature of African American family patterns since the 1960s (Franklin 1997; Tucker & Mitchell-Kernan 1995) and these trends remain a core of the debate whether single-parenthood either a “cause or consequence” of poverty (Lichter, Qian & Crowley 2005). As of 2004, 49 percent of the 11.3 million of Black (non-Hispanic) children live only with their biological mother, compared to 25 percent of Hispanic children and less than 20 percent of white children (Kreider 2007). An even greater percentage of Black children, over 65 percent, are born to an unmarried mother, compared to 40 to 50 percent of Hispanic children and less than 25 percent of white

children (Ventura & Bachrach 2000; Kennedy & Bumpass 2007). Moreover, Black children may face higher economic costs of being raised in a single-parent household than do their white peers, particularly when they have less educated mothers (Cooper et al. 2007; Page & Stevens 2005).¹ The implication is clear—children of color are more likely to live in single-parent households and, therefore, face the associated degree of economic vulnerability.

Capturing the conditions of children of color has recently become more complex in light of growing presence of interracial families and racially mixed children. According to the Pew Center, a little more than 3 percent of all marriages crossed racial lines in 1980 and this figure has increased to 8 percent as of 2008 (Passell, Wang, and Taylor 2010) and, according to 2000 Census data, the number of children reared in interracial circumstances have risen to more than six percent (Lee & Edmonston 2005). Reflective of this change has been the shift in the ways race is measured in federal forms and many social surveys. Revisions of the federal standards in racial and ethnic classification that allows respondents to report one or more races, provides new opportunities for tracking the racially mixed population (OMB 1997). As of Census 2000, the number of individuals selecting one or more races stands at 6.7 million (Farley 2002; Jones & Smith 2001; Tafoya, Johnson & Hill 2004). Recent population projections predict this group will grow to 34.4 million by 2020 (Edmonston, Lee & Passel 2002).

In light of the increase in the number of interracial families, scholars have begun to focus on the implications of multiracial lives (Cheung and Powell 2005; Bratter and Heard 2009), yet, to our knowledge, none have focused explicitly on the multiracial population within the single-parent household, provided comparisons to similar

monoracial populations, nor have there been attempts to examine the degree of economic vulnerability experienced by multiracial children. The absence of answers represent a considerable shortcoming as interracial families are particularly vulnerable to divorce and more likely than their same-race counterparts to cohabit (Van Hook, Bratter and King 2008; Blackwell and Lichter 2000). These patterns point to a possibly high concentration of non-marital childbearing and childrearing for interracial families and by extension a substantial presence of children possibly exposed to impoverished conditions. This paper seeks to fill this gap by providing an in-depth assessment of the single-parent multiracial family. First, we estimate the size and geographic scope of the multiracial population living within female headed families. Second, we estimate the extent of the economic vulnerability in these families relative to other families, and third using multivariate statistical techniques, identify the factors that may explain the differentials between multiracial and monoracial groups.

SINGLE-PARENT HOUSEHOLDS, POVERTY AND RACE

Children in Single-Parent Households

Children living in single-parent families experience higher rates of poverty than do children living in other family structures (Lichter and Crowley 2004; McLanahan 2004). The increased presence of female-headed households during the 1980s and to a lesser degree in the 1990s is linked to growing presence of children in poverty (Lichter et al. 2005). While there is a fierce debate about whether poverty is a cause or consequence of family structure, it is clear that lower wages and lower employment rates have driven down marital rates and increased the presence of single-parent households (McLanahan

& Percheski 2008). Stagnating male wages are correlated with declining marriage rates (Gould & Paserman 2003; Loughran 2002), as unmet cultural expectations that men will earn a breadwinning wage lead women to reconsider marriage as a viable option (Edin & Kefalas 2005; Gibson-Davis et al. 2005). Declining marriage rates have not coincided, however, with similar declines in childbearing rates among disadvantaged women (Edin and Kefalas 2005), leading to higher rates of single-parenthood among the poor (McLanahan & Percheski 2008). Although maternal employment can reduce poverty rates (Lichter and Crowley 2004), employment opportunities are often scarce for poorly educated single-mothers (Danzinger et al 2000; Edin and Lein 1997). Single-parent births are highly correlated with low education levels and a lack of work experience among women (Corcoran et al 2000; Musick 2002). Because of the established relationships between teenage pregnancies, single-parenthood, and workforce participation, researchers have also considered the effects of age at first birth, finding that a teenage birth reduces educational attainment and that women's cumulative earnings are increased by even short delays of entrance into motherhood (Hoffman 2008; Miller 2006). In turn, low education levels and a lack of work experience are associated with unstable employment and poverty (Corcoran et al 2000; Hays 2003).

There are significant racial differences in the instances of single-parent households. Black children are much more likely to be born to a single-parent than either White or Hispanic children (Bianchi 1990). There also has been an increasing connection between race and poverty over the last forty years, as well as between gender, race and poverty (Eggebeen & Lichter 1991; Elmelech & Lu 2004). Employment rates for single-mothers are also tied to race. While married Blacks have higher employment rates than

their married white and Hispanic contemporaries, unmarried Blacks have lower employment rates than their unmarried white and Hispanic contemporaries (Ciabattari 2007; Marks & Leslie 2000; Neal 2002).

Given seemingly overwhelming obstacles to employment and persistent poverty, how do families headed by single mothers get by? Single-mother headed families, particularly African-American families, rely heavily on their social networks, receiving monetary and in-kind support from extended family and community members (Stack 1974; Edin & Lein 1997). Additionally, Census data measures single-mother families to include both unmarried/unpartnered mothers and co-habiting mothers. Attempts to measure the extent of cohabitation suggest that cohabitating mothers have almost 50 percent of all nonmarital births (McLanahan et al. 2001; Kennedy & Bumpass 2007). Moreover, parental cohabitation occurs during 25 percent to 40 percent of all childhoods (Hueveline & Timberlake 2004; Kennedy & Bumpass 2007). Boyfriends and non-resident fathers are also a source of cash contributions for poor mothers (Edin & Lein 1997). But these cash contributions are often unreliable and diminish as time passes (Edin & Lein 1997), and cohabiting parent families break up at much higher rates than married parent families (Kennedy & Bumpass 2007; Osborne & McLanahan 2007). Taken together, social networks are crucial means of support for female headed families.

Recent evidence suggests that the tie between race, family structure, and poverty may be more complex than broader trends suggest. Families housing multiracial children are a “hidden population,” as there is little available data about the race of a child’s parents, or about the racial identity (single race vs. multiracial) of the child, or about the relationship between a child’s racial identity and their household conditions. Because

interracial children's racial identity is often unknown, there has been an assumption that children born to single-mothers are predominately monoracial. However, this assumption is likely flawed for several reasons. First, despite the focus on interracial marriages, interracial coupling quite often occurs either outside of marriage. Data from both 1990 and 2000 Censuses show that interracial partnerships are more likely among cohabiters than among married couples (Qian and Lichter 2007; Blackwell and Lichter 2000). In addition, couples that do marry across racial lines may have children that are more likely to live within divorced households, as interracial married couples are more likely to divorce across many racial combinations regardless of whether or not they have children, at least relative to monoracial white couples (Bratter and King 2008).

While the connection between race, single-parenthood, and poverty continues to drive research and policy, families that cross racial lines are nearly absent from this discourse. Families that house racially mixed children are rarely counted among anything other than two-parent families, nor are they regularly identified in research on single-parent families. The following section explores the implications of this omission given what is known about multiracial families for broader research on female headed households and their economic vulnerability. In addition, we propose several explanations for how single-parent multiracial families may stand out from their racially similar counter-parts.

MULTIRACIAL SINGLE PARENT FAMILIES: A NEEDED ADDITION

Enumerating Multiracial Families

While the literature on multiracial families focuses most often on the dynamics of the married (e.g., Cheung and Powell 2005), a growing number of studies have

documented even greater partnership among interracial couples are who are unmarried. For example, Qian and Lichter (2007) show that the level of interracial partnership among the cohabiters is greater than among the married (see also Blackwell and Lichter 2000; Harris and Ono 2000). Not only are interracial couples more likely to cohabit, they are also more likely to disrupt, regardless of whether they have children (Bratter and King 2008; Zhang and Van Hook 2009; Bramlett and Mosher 2004). Moreover, there is some evidence there may be higher rates of interracial births among single-parent households, as unmarried white women are “much more likely to have a child with a non-white male than white married women” (Garfinkel, Gleib, McLanahan 2002: 417). Alternatively, using the Add Health Data, Harris (2002) similar finds that the percentage of self-identified multiracial respondents is actually higher among single-parent families. Despite these trends, discussions of single parent families rarely incorporate a focus on those that cross racial lines, and single-parent families remain a relatively unexplored site of multiracial experiences.

The relative absence of interracial single-parent families from a discussion of single parent families arises largely because these families are difficult to identify in national representative data sources. Identifying multiracial families generally hinges on locating multiracial children, whose presence is either generally inferred by parental racial background (i.e. families where mother’s race and father’s race do not match) or attained directly from child’s stated racial background (Campbell and Eggerling-Boeck 2006; Harris 2002). In the first, parental race can allow for locating mixed-race children on the basis of origin, irrespective of self-identification. However, unless race data on the non-resident parent is available, only households where both parents are present can be used

to identify all such children. While the second potentially allows for an inclusion of all multiracial children, regardless of family structure, self-identification provides an incomplete and in many ways biased picture of the multiracial population (Campbell and Egerling-Bock 2006). Repeatedly scholars have shown tremendous nonrandom variation in the use of racial labels, depending upon, among other issues, their racial make-up, class background, parental gender, and racial composition of community (Qian 2004; Roth 2005; Brunisma 2006; Xie and Goyette 1997)ⁱⁱ. Thus, the first goal of this research is to document, to the extent possible, the number of multiracial children among female headed families relative to two parent families using a simple algorithm which combines both sets of criteria.

Poverty, Female-Headship, and Mixed-Race Families

While enumerating single-parent families housing multiracial children is a formidable task, it begs the question, how many multiracial female-headed families are enumerated among the poor? To answer this question, we examine the likelihood that female-headed family live in poverty, given the race of the mother, and identify how/if this likelihood changes once we account for whether that family is multiracial. Relative to White single-mothers, mothers from all other race/ethnic groups are more likely to live in impoverished circumstances (Lichter et al. 2005). However, does this pattern extend to when white mothers are raising children of color? Further, how do rates of poverty differ when Black or Hispanic mothers, who tend to have some of the highest rates of poverty (Lichter et al 2005), have children of different racial groups? This analysis will show whether well-established patterns of poverty, by race of mother, change once

multiracial status is taken into account. Answering this question will help find the proper “place” for multiracial families in a discourse on family structure and poverty.

We present three hypotheses for the propensity of multiracial families to live in poverty across race relative to similar race counter-parts. We begin with the base-line expectation that housing multiracial children has no real impact on the likelihood that White, Black, Asian or Hispanic mothers live at or below the poverty line. This explanation, which we refer to as “monoracial effects in multiracial lives,” places interracial families (and multiracial individuals) within the context of component racial groups by surmising that the same forces operate in the lives of women regardless of whether their children are the result of a multiracial relationship. This expectation asserts that the resources that keep women out of poverty discussed above are equally available or out of reach regardless of whether they have multiracial children.

Prior research on interracial families, most of whom are non-poor, has found mixed results for notion that interracial families simply iterate towards the most or least advantaged of the two racial groups. On one hand, rates of divorce among interracial families have been repeatedly documented as being higher than same-race couples (Bratter and King 2008; Bramlett and Mosher 2004), however, when contrasted relative to their single-race counterparts, interracial couples divorce as frequently as the most divorce prone group (Zhang and Van Hook 2009). Other work on multiracial adolescents find that they do fare either better or worse than their component racial groups (Campbell and Eggerling-Boeck 2006; Cheng and Lively 2010; Udry et al 2003) suggesting that multiracial lives do stand out significantly from their monoracial counterparts. These

patterns point to a complex array of forces that permeate the lives of those crossing racial barriers that may affect whether or not women with multiracial children live in poverty.

Hypothesis 1: The likelihood of being in poverty for families with multiracial children will essentially mirror that of the mother's race/ethnic group.

Alternatively, racial differences in the likelihood of living in poverty may be more extreme for families housing multiracial children. It may be that female-headed families with multiracial children live “racially segregated lives” where they are disproportionately disconnected from crucial sources of support that aid many single-parent families leading to live in poverty. The presence of a multiracial child indirectly indicates a previous interracial partnership and conditions surrounding that union may result in a greater likelihood of living in poverty than is experienced by similar race/ethnic mothers who did not cross racial lines. The rise of interracial unions (and same-sex unions) has been linked to an “age of independence,” where interracial families are both less impinged by their extended family members and more likely to form relationships outside of their home communities (Rosenfeld and Kim 2005). While this shift in mate selection points to an improvement of race relationships through allowing greater freedom to individuals to enact their own desires without the imposition of third parties (Kalmijn 1998), the well-being of interracial families yields a less optimistic picture. Classic assessments cast this group as facing unique challenges linked to social marginalization due to unconventional behavior (i.e. crossing racial lines in romantic relationships) or living an unconventional identities (i.e. being a multiracial person) (Park 1931; Gibbs 1988). While this perspective has been heavily critiqued (Root 1998), studies of multiracial adolescents and interracial couples continue to draw on its insights

(e.g. Campbell and Eggerling Boeck 2006; Chen and Lively 2010; Bratter and Eschabch 2006), finding that a marginal existence does not characterize all or even the majority of multiracial individuals or persons in bicultural interactions.

While some race-specific pairs of interracial couples do report poorer outcomes on a range of measures, it is notable that many of these problems plague white females most consistently. For example, relative to whites with white partners, white females report heightened levels of psychological distress and higher rates of divorce (Bratter and Eschbach 2006; Bratter and King 2008). While the source of these differences are not known, other work on experiences of Black/White couples does find that they encounter substantial hostility from both racial communities (Childs 2005). While couples of various backgrounds report challenges, the experiences of white females tends to draw upon both long-standing taboos against white females partnering and bearing children outside of their race, as well as conventions of racial labeling that would classify the offspring as non-white and thus provide definitive “evidence” of a interracial sexual encounter (Root 2001). Arguably, to whatever degree that rearing multiracial children coincides with social marginalization and a greater likelihood of living in poverty, this may be most evident in the lives of white females.

Hypothesis 2: The likelihood of being in poverty for families with multiracial children will be greater than monoracial families headed by the mother’s race/ethnic group.

However, there are reasons to believe that the gap in poverty between whites and other groups is actually less extreme for those in multiracial families, particularly those headed by women of color. First, prior research has shown that, relative to racial minorities, these families tend to fare better by several standards. Relative to minority

counterparts, those who partner interracially tend to be better educated (Gullickson 2005; Qian and Lichter 2007). In addition, many multiracial families devote more material resources to their children (Cheng and Powell 2005), live in higher quality and more integrated neighborhoods (Sassler and White 2000; Wright and Holloway 2007). Even among low-income families, the rigors of family formation and particularly separation of partners following the birth of a child appears less common for Black and Hispanic women partnering with White men relative to those partnering with Black men (Goldstein and Harknett 2006). Further, these authors find no evidence of a uniform “interracial” effect on union status because the level of relationship commitment following a birth is strongly associated with the race of the father, regardless of race of the mother. These patterns suggest that even if couples disrupt or never married at all, women heading families with children may be able to tap social networks that improve their chances of staying out of poverty more so than racially similar women.

Hypothesis 3: The likelihood of being in poverty for families with multiracial children will be lower than that of the mother’s race/ethnic group.

DATA AND SAMPLE

The data for this project comes from the Census 2000 Integrated Public Use Microdata Samples 5 Percent Public Use file (Ruggles et al 2006). The analytical sample is restricted to primary families (not sub-families) designated as “female-headed with no husband present” with minor children present (age < 18). This individual-level data was organized into a family-level file where each record includes information on the householder (the mother), each child, a co-resident partner, and other relatives living in the same household. In order to match biologically related children with their mothers,

only children who are designated as “natural born” as opposed to step or adopted are included. The analysis is based on 368,302 families.

METHODS AND MEASUREMENT

The analyses focuses on the likelihood that female headed families (with no husband present) earn incomes that are at or are below the poverty line. This is assessed through using the “Poverty Status in 1999” measure of the U.S. Census for the householders in female headed households. This information is derived from income data for all members of the family. The poverty status measure is a continuous measure indicating the percent of the families’ income is of the poverty line (ranging from 0 to 500 percent or more). We define poverty if the poverty status is between 0 and 100 percent, indicating that the family is either at (100%) or below the poverty line. Poverty status is currently determined using information from the number of persons in one’s family and the presence and number of persons under age 18. For more information on how the specific line is determined please see the technical documentation of the Public Use Microdata Sample file (Census 2000, p. B-35).

Race/Ethnicity. We first measure racial/ethnic background employing standard Census administrative categories set forth by the Office of Management and Budget [OMB]. These use a combination of the data on the questions on Race and Hispanic Ethnicity to create the following categories which we apply to all persons in these data: White (Non-Hispanic), Black/African American (Non-Hispanic), American Indian / Alaskan Native (Non-Hispanic), Asian (Non-Hispanic), Native Hawaiian (Non-Hispanic), Some Other Race (Non-Hispanic) and Hispanic. As respondents may now choose a combination of these categories, which commonly signifies a multiracial

ancestry, we also include a separate category of respondents (non-Hispanic) who select more than one race. Those selecting two or more races are also referred to here as multiracial.

Identifying Multiracial Children in Single Mother Families. To identify families as multiracial (i.e. those housing multiracial minor children) we draw on information on individual's racial classification and comparisons between children's race and mother's race. Families that include either multiracial mothers or multiracial children are considered multiracial in this analysis. Given the tremendous slippage between statements of personal identity as multiracial and actual multiracial heritage, we also include those we may infer are multiracial by comparing mother's race to that of their "natural born" children. If a householder (all of whom in this sample are mothers) has a child who is defined as a different race than she, that child is defined as multiracial. For example, white (non-Hispanic) women with children classified as anything by white are considered multiracial families as these children's race likely reflects that of the non-resident father. Clearly, we underestimate the extent of multiracial families with this definition since households with multiracial children who have been identified in single-race terms that match their mothers will be defined as monoracial (i.e. children who have a white father and a black mother, but are identified as black on the Census will be counted as monoracial here).

Prior analyses done among interracial married families indicate that this definition will undoubtedly create some bias but we argue that this does not constitute a "fatal flaw." Across possible parental racial combinations, a sizable portion employ the designation of two or more races (Roth 2005), with the highest propensity among native

Hawaiians and American Indians and the lowest among those with partial African American/Black ancestry. In addition, across all racial groups, children are more likely to match their father's race (Qian 2004), at least suggesting that if this propensity continues among households where fathers are likely not present, multiracial children will at least be identifiable by having a race different from their mother's.

A number of factors related to poverty status are likely important to mediating, and perhaps moderating, the variation in poverty status between monoracial and multiracial families. We adjust for demographic characteristics, acculturation, family composition, socioeconomic status, geographic mobility, and characteristics of the current place, described below.

Demographic Characteristics. We introduce a continuous measure for mother's age, mother's age at the birth of her eldest child, and a dichotomous variable indicating whether the mother is never married (1=previous married, 0=otherwise). Previously married individuals include those who are either married with spouse absent, widowed, separated, and divorced.

Acculturation. The analysis also adjusts for nativity and English proficiency. We introduce a dichotomous measure for those born outside of the U.S. and U.S. territories (1=foreign born, 0 = otherwise). We also adjust for English proficiency using those who speak only English as the reference, and allowing for categories of those who indicate that they speak English or speak it well, those who do not speak English well, and those who speak no English at all.

Family Composition. We also assess the composition of the family to capture the presence of readily accessible social networks and resources, as well as drains on

resources if householders are charged with supporting additional co-resident members. We include covariates for presence of at least one grandparent (1=present, 0=otherwise), separate covariates for male and female partners, and a continuous measure of the total number of persons in the family.

Socioeconomic Status. We also adjust for the influence of socioeconomic resources on poverty. We includes a categorical measure of mother's education, with those with a less than high school education declared as the reference, and categories signifying education at the high school level or beyond (i.e., high school graduate / GED, some college experience with no degree or an associate's degree, and those with a college degree or more. In addition, we adjust for the strong linkage between poverty status and employment with a categorical measure where the mothers may be working full time (i.e. works 35 hours or more), part time (between 1 and 34 hours a week of work), unemployed but in the labor force, and not in the labor force. Full time work is the reference category. Determining hours worked was done using a combination of the weeks worked last year (1999) and the "usual hours worked" variable. Several respondents (n=7,900) were classified as "at work" though had worked no weeks in the previous year. These respondents were coded to unemployed.

Residential Stability. We argue that frequent movers will have less access to networks that provide resources that keep many women heading households out of poverty. To tap this influence, we adjust for level of migration in the past five years. Our measures distinguish between those who have lived in the same house since five years earlier (reference categories), those who have changed households but moved within state, those who have moved across stated, and those who have moved from abroad.

Geographic location. Poverty status is also strongly shaped by geography. We adjust for two facets of geography: regional location and metropolitan area status. Using the standard U.S. Census regions, we include categories signifying whether respondents live in the Northeast, Midwest, or the Western United States, relative to the South, whose rates of poverty are the highest in the country. We also include a covariate in all models for whether respondents live in a non-metropolitan area, to identify those experiencing poverty in rural areas.

ANALYTICAL PLAN

We begin with frequencies and percentages to assess the extent of multiracial families under different specifications, showing how our definition compares. We then compare the distributions of key variables between multiracial families and all families. We then focus on the rate of poverty across families by race and multiracial status and identify significant differences using chi square tests of independence. To predict the likelihood of living in poverty, we employ logistic regression analyses to predict a dichotomous outcome of presence in or out of poverty. We begin with a base-line model with only controls for mother's age, race, whether the family lives in a metropolitan area, and a covariate indicating if they are a multiracial family. We then disaggregate racial effects by employing a series of categories signifying mono- and multi-racial combinations of mothers and children. We then attempt to explain the differences between monoracial white families and all others with several categories of predictors (demographic, family composition, socioeconomic status, and geographic influences). All analyses are conducted in SAS version 9.2 (SAS Institute 2001).

RESULTS

Estimates of Multiracial Families by Different Criteria of Racial Mixture

We begin with Table 1, which displays the percentage and number of multiracial families for married couples and unmarried female-headed households by different definitions of multiracial: those employing parent's race, those using child's race, and those including a combination of the two. These percentages show that while identifying children within married couple households may be more precise because they use information on both parents, applying these same criteria to female headed households renders a either a comparable or higher percentage of multiracial families. By the criteria of parents' races, we find that 7.9 percent of the married couple families can be defined as multiracial, as these families are headed by an interracial couple. Using modified version of this criteria within female headed households, we find that 7.47 percent of the families can be defined as multiracial. This estimate refers to families where the mother's race and the child's race do not match. Finally, we may simply define households as multiracial if one or both parents are defined as multiracial. This yields an estimate of 2.14 percent of married couple households and 1.87 percent of female headed households.

We may also apply children's racial identification as the standard to determine households as multiracial. The 2000 Census is repeatedly cited for its use of the innovating "mark one or more" race question as it lends, for the first time population based estimates of multiracial population since the Census employed self-reported race (Perlmann and Waters 2002; Farley 2004). Using this definition we find a higher percent of children defined with two or more races among female headed households than among dual-headed households. A little more than four percent of female headed families house

children that meet this definition, compared to only 2.72 percent among married couple families.

The best estimate will combine both information on parent's races and child's race. Again, using this criteria, we find a higher proportion of multiracial families among those headed by women with no husband present than among married couples. This includes families where the child's race does not match the mothers, where children are listed as two or more races, and where at least one parent is identified with two or more races. Using these criteria, we find that 9.34 percent of female headed families can be defined as multiracial compared to 8.88 percent of married couple families.

Descriptive Statistics

Next, we explore the circumstances and unique vulnerabilities of female headed households. As we have discussed earlier, female headed households are far more likely than any other to live at or below the poverty line. To what degree does this reality extend to multiracial families? Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics of the sample of female headed households (under the heading of "All Families") and then distributions among those designated as multiracial (under heading "Multiracial Families"). We find the roughly a third of the families in this sample are at or below the poverty line (34.5 %), meanwhile slightly more families are in poverty among multiracial families (37.4 %). Overall we find few clear differences between the entire sample and the multiracial sub-sample that would indicate these families are clearly more or less vulnerable.

There is noted racial variation in multiracial single-mother families. Among all families, a little more than half of these mothers are white, nearly 30 percent are Black, and 14 percent are Hispanic. Among multiracial families, however, we find a greater

representation of white mothers (54.1% vs. 52.2), far fewer Blacks (28.2% vs. 8.1%), Hispanics (14.3 % vs. 9.7%), and a greater representation of smaller groups who tend to intermarry often, such as Asians (3.9 % vs. 1.7%), American Indians (3.4 % vs. 1.5 %) and Native Hawaiians (0.5% vs. 0.1%). These differences likely reflect both the racial differences in interracial coupling as well as the conventions of labeling in multiracial families. While Blacks, and particularly Black women, have persistently intermarried at lower rates than other non-white populations, when they do intermarry they are the most likely to label their mixed-race offspring children as “Black,” a practice that would render them invisible as multiracial families if the non-Black parent were absent. While Hispanics intermarry at far higher rates, they are also fairly likely to label their mixed-race children as Hispanic (Qian 2004; Brunsma 2005).

The remaining distributions indicate few ways multiracial families clearly stand out. As with female-headed households in general, mothers heading multiracial families tend to be in their mid thirties and were in their mid twenties when giving birth to their first child (inferred from the age at birth of their eldest child in the household). Mothers in multiracial families are slightly more likely to have never been married, (39.2 % vs. 33.8 percent), more likely to be foreign born (13.4 % vs. 11.2%), and are more likely to be proficient English Speakers, among those who are bilingual (16% vs. 13%). Multiracial families are more likely, than the sample as a whole, to have a co-resident male unmarried partner (17.0 % vs. 13.6 %) and female partners (3.9 % vs. 2.9 %) but are equally likely to have a grandparent present in the household (3.9 % vs. 4.0 %). Socioeconomically, multiracial families have comparable levels of employment. More than half of the entire sample and the multiracial sub-sample include full time employed

mothers, but single mothers heading multiracial households are slightly more educated (14.8 % college degree or more vs. 13.6 % in entire sample). Multiracial families are more mobile, with a higher percentage moving between states in the past five years (13.1% vs. 8.1%). Geographically, they are situated in ways very similar to interracial married couples as they are more likely to live outside of the Southern part of the country, with a high prevalence in the West (32.6 % vs. 21.0%), and less likely to live outside of metropolitan areas (22.2 % vs. 26.7 %).

Rates of Poverty for Monoracial and Multiracial Families

Table 3 shows rates of poverty by race of mother and by whether the family houses monoracial or multiracial children. We also include the results of chi-square tests of significance showing whether poverty is more or less likely, statistically speaking, depending on whether the family is multiracial or monoracial. Rates of poverty are lowest among families headed by white women (27 %) and highest among families headed by Black, American Indian, and Hispanic women (44.8%, 48.1%, and 47.5 % respectively). The remaining sub-groups hover between these two extremes, with Asians at the lower end (30.5% in poverty) and Native Hawaiians and Some Other Race at the high end, with the percent in poverty close to 40 percent.

When compared to respective mono-racial families, we find some evidence for our second hypothesis for multiracial families headed by white women. Rates of poverty are only higher among multiracial families headed by white women, compared to white-female headed families housing white children (27.48% vs. 35.9%). Among families headed by non-white women, rates of poverty are either confirm the first hypothesis (i.e. are not significantly different between monoracial and multiracial families), as is the case

of families headed by Black, Native Hawaiian, and Some Other Race women, or confirm the third hypothesis (i.e. have lower percentage in poverty), as is the case where mothers are American Indian, Asian, and Hispanic women. This presents a diverse picture and suggests that a variety of circumstances that may be masked had the presence of multiracial children been ignored.

Table 4 shows the results of logistic regression models predicting whether families are living at or below the poverty line on race/ethnic composition of families headed by unmarried women. We begin with a base-line model that estimates the odds of living in poverty by the race of mother (non-Hispanic White as the reference) and whether or not the family is defined as multiracial. This model also includes controls for mother's age and residence in a non-metropolitan area. All families headed by non-white women, are statistically more likely than those headed by white women to live in poverty. Independent of race, however, those housing multiracial children are 1.23 times more likely than those headed by white mothers to be in poverty.

Although this indicates that as a group multiracial children are more prone to face impoverished circumstances than their racially homogenous counter-parts, we still do not know how or if this varies by specific racial background. In Models II through VI, we apply separate covariates for family racial composition. Those at the top of the table (e.g. Black, American Indian, Asian, etc) signify families where mother's race matches the child's race, that is they refer to families with Black mothers and Black children, American Indian mothers and American Indian children, and Asian mothers and Asian children, and so forth. The remaining covariates represent families where children's single or multiple racial classification does not match their mother's race (e.g. White

mother / non-White children; Black mother / non-Black children). The reference category is white female headed families with white children. After observing the initial differences in likelihood of living in poverty, we attempt to explain these differences by adjusting for demographic characteristics (Model III), family/household composition (Model IV), socioeconomic characteristics (Model V), and region of residence and migration (Model VI). We first turn to the differences between White mother – white children families and other non-white monoracial families.

Mono-racial differences. We begin with a discussion of the race/ethnic differences in likelihood of living in poverty between families of similarly classified mothers and children, termed here on as monoracial families. Families housing single-race Black, Hispanic, and Native American children with similarly classified mothers are at least twice as likely as families with white children and white mothers to be in poverty. The odds ratios of the remaining households of similarly classified children and mothers (i.e. Asians, Native Hawaiians, and Some Other Race) of living in poverty relative to white-white families all exceed 50 percent.

What explains these differences? The remaining models adjust for variation in poverty status due to mother's demographic background, composition of persons in the household, socioeconomic status, and geographic location. In Model III, which adjusts for demographic characteristics, shows that female headed families are more likely in poverty when mothers are younger when their first child is born, when they have never been married, when they are U.S born, or when they are not proficient in English. Adjusting for these influences reduces the racial disparity in likelihood of living in poverty most drastically for Asians and Hispanic families, relative to whites. Model IV

shows that family composition influences also explain a sizable portion of the White/non-white differential in poverty. Co-residing with a grandparent for female headed families virtually guarantees that a female headed family is not living at or below the poverty line (OR=0.235), meanwhile having a male partner (but not female partner) increases the likelihood of living in poverty (OR=1.614) as does an increasing number of persons in the family (OR=1.279). Adjusting for these differences substantially lowers the odds ratio of poverty for mono-racial families headed by Black, American Indian, Hispanic, and Native Hawaiian women relative to the odds for White women. In Model V, we introduce socioeconomic characteristics. Not surprisingly, those with an education beyond high school and those who are employed full time or part time have far lower odds of living in poverty than their respective racial groups. Accounting for socioeconomic differences, such as educational attainment and employment, also substantially narrows the racial disparity in poverty.

The final model introduces two sets of geographic variables-- migration in the past five years and region of residence. We find that movement across state lines or movement from abroad in the past 5 years is associated to living in poverty, relative to not moving. Those moving within their state of residence experience virtually no slight increase in the odds of poverty (OR=1.078). Independent of these and other controls, however, racial differences in poverty persist for most groups. All non-white monoracial families continue to be more likely than whites to live in poverty, with the exception of Native Hawaiians. Blacks, American Indian, and Some other Race families are more than 40 percent more likely than White families to live in poverty independent of covariates.

Meanwhile, the odds ratios for monoracial families headed by Hispanic and Asian women indicate they are 30 percent more likely.

Multiracial Families. We turn now to the covariates for multiracial families. Two questions drive the interpretation of these effects. First, are *all* multiracial female headed families more likely than the reference group (monoracial White female headed families) to be in poverty as is the case with all non-white monoracial families? And second, how much do these families differ from their monoracial counterparts? To answer the second question, we re-estimate the odds of the outcome with the homogenous corresponding group as the reference. For example, we place Black mothers with Black children as the reference category and assess the significance of their presence in poverty relative to families with Black mothers and non-Black children. We conduct similar comparisons with all other racial categories of female headed family. Significant differences are noted with superscripts.

Are multiracial families more likely to be in poverty than the reference? Looking across models, the answer appears to be yes, for most categories of families. According to Model II, multiracial children with white single mothers are 37 percent more likely to be in poverty than their white monoracial counterparts. For the remaining families, with the exception of those headed by Asian women, the likelihood of being in poverty is even greater. Multiracial families headed by Black or Some other race (SOR) women are more than twice as likely to be in poverty compared to the reference. Meanwhile, those headed by American Indian, Native Hawaiians, Multiracial, or Hispanic women are more than 75 percent as likely as monoracial families headed by White women to live at the poverty line. The major exception to this pattern are Asian multiracial families, whose odds ratio

of living in poverty is close to 1.00 and non-significant (OR = 1.068), even as Asian monoracial female-headed families are *more* likely than whites to live in poverty than Whites.

How well do controls explain these differences between the reference group and multiracial families? While adjusting for controls attenuates the racial difference in poverty for multiracial families, none of these controls explains the increased likelihood of poverty completely for most groups. In the fully adjusted model (Model VI), we observe significant odds ratios for multiracial families headed by Black, American Indian, Hispanic, SOR, and Multiracial single women. Multiracial families headed by Black, American Indian, Hispanic and multiracial women are more than 30 percent more likely than white monoracial families to be in poverty independent of controls. Multiracial families headed by SOR women are 67 percent more likely to be in poverty than the reference. The one exception are those multiracial families headed by Native Hawaiian women. Adjusting for socioeconomic characteristics, as well as family composition and demographic characteristics, narrows the differential in the odds of living in poverty to non-significance (OR=1.275)

But how much do these patterns mirror the disparities observed for monoracial groups? We assess this by re-estimating the models with each monoracial family group as the reference and reporting significant differences for the respective multiracial family contrast using superscript ^a. In only one case, Asians, multiracial families fare better, or are less likely to experience poverty, than the monoracial counterparts. As was stated above, these families virtually experience the same likelihood of poverty as the reference category, White families with white children, and this translates into a being significantly

less likely than their monoracial Asian counterparts, to be in poverty, regardless of controls. Meanwhile, white families with multiracial children represent the only case where multiracial children are more likely to live in poverty than their monoracial counterparts. The fully adjusted model indicates that white women with multiracial children are 24 percent more likely than white women with white children to be in poverty, independent of controls.

Most multiracial families, however, show little difference in potential for being in poverty compared to their monoracial counterparts. According to Model IV, Black female headed families with multiracial children are slightly less likely to be in poverty relative to their monoracial counterparts. However, the difference is slight (OR=1.633 vs. OR=1.61) and it disappears in the next model. The likelihood that children are living in poverty when families are headed by single Hispanics, American Indians, and SOR women does not vary by the racial background of the child. When the monoracial families are the reference category, the odds ratio for the corresponding multiracial family is not significantly different.

In summary, regardless of the racial composition of the mother and children in female headed families, those headed by non-white women are, with the exception of those headed by Asian women with multiracial children, are more likely than white monoracial families to be in poverty. We find some confirmation for our first hypothesis, as most are as likely as their respective monoracial counterparts to be in poverty. The exceptions are those families headed by Asian and white women as Asian multiracial families fare better than their monoracial counterparts meanwhile those headed by white women do worse. While families headed by Black women are somewhat less likely to be

in poverty than monoracial Black women, this slight difference disappears once employment and education were controlled.

Discussion and Proposed Analyses

Multiracial children living in single parent households are mostly absent from the research on either single-parents or multiracial families. This work aims to fill this gap by documenting the patterns available in Census data. Further, we explore the relative well-being of these families by assessing the variation in poverty, a condition particularly common among this family structure (McLanahan and Percheski 2008). Our specification of multiracial families examines those where either the child is listed as multiple races or the child is listed as a single race that is not the race of the mother. Both are conventional ways to identify mixed-race children (Harris 2002; Qian 2004), however we are not able to identify children who are listed as the same race parent but are in fact multiracial. While we are aware that this offers an incomplete picture of single-female headed multiracial families, the inability to identify the “full” multiracial population is common among research focusing on multiracial individuals (Harris 2002) and that what we have shown thus far has the potential to inform a discussion on the varied ways poverty is racialized. Overall, we find that many mixed race children of unmarried women are similarly likely to face poverty as their monoracial counterparts.

Our proposed analysis will incorporate two new facets. First, we will attempt to assess how much these patterns have changed over time by employing American Community Survey data (Three year estimates) to examine the prevalence of these types of families in a more recent time point. While interracial marriage has increased over time (Pew Center 2010), it is not clear if the same can be said of non-marital interracial

coupling. Second, we will further attempt to disentangle the differences between monoracial and multiracial families by including contextual information on the metropolitan area level. Do these families live in segregated areas with limited marriage markets, as their monoracial counterparts do, or do they live in areas with relatively more diversity?

Selected References

- Bianchi, Suzanne M. 1990. "America's Children: Mixed Prospects." *Population Bulletin* 45:1-42.
- Childs, Erica Chito. *Navigating Interracial Borders: Black-White Couples and Their Social Worlds*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Ciabattari, Teresa. 2007. "Single Mothers, Social Capital, and Work-Family Conflict." *Journal of Family Issues* 28:34-60.
- Cooper, Carey E, Sara S McLanahan, Sarah O Meadows, and Jeanne Brooks. 2009. "Family Structure Transitions and Maternal Parenting Stress." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 71:558-574.
- Corcoran, Mary, Sandra K. Danziger, Ariel Kalil, and Kristin S. Seefeldt. 2000. "How Welfare Reform is Affecting Women's Work." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26:241-269.
- Danziger, Sandra et al. 2000. "Barriers to the Employment of Welfare Recipients." Pp. 245-278 in *Prosperity for All?: The Economic Boom and African Americans*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Edin, Kathryn, and Maria Kefalas. 2005. *Promises I Can Keep: Why Poor Women Put Motherhood before Marriage*. Berkeley: University of California Press

- Edin, Kathryn, and Laura Lein. 1997. *Making Ends Meet: How Single Mothers Survive Welfare and Low-Wage Work*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Edmonston, B., S. M Lee, and J. S Passel. 2002. "Recent Trends in Intermarriage and Immigration and their Effects on the Future Racial Composition of the US Population." *The New Race question: How the Census Counts Multiracial Individuals* 227–55.
- Eggebeen, David J, and Daniel T Lichter. 1991. "Race, Family Structure, and Changing Poverty among American Children." *American Sociological Review* 56:801-817.
- Ellwood, David T., and Christopher Jencks. 2002. "The Uneven Spread of Single-Parent Families: What Do We Know? Where Do We Look for Answers?." Pp. 3-77 in *Social Inequality*.
- Elmelech, Yuval, and Hsien-Hen Lu. 2004. "Race, Ethnicity, and the Gender Poverty Gap." *Social Science Research* 33:158-182.
- Farley, R. 2002. "Racial Identities in 2000." Pp. 33-61 in *The New Race Question: How the Census Counts Multiracial Individuals*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Franklin, Donna L. 1997. *Ensuring Inequality: The Structural Transformation of the African-American Family*. Oxford University Press US.
- Garfinkel, Irwin, Dana Gleib, and Sara S. McLanahan. 2002. "Assortative Mating among Unmarried Parents: Implications for Ability to Pay Child Support." *Journal of Population Economics* 15:417-432.
- Gibson-Davis, Christina M., Kathryn Edin, and Sara McLanahan. 2005. "High Hopes but Even Higher Expectations: The Retreat From Marriage Among Low-Income Couples." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 67:1301-1312.

- Gould, Eric D., and M. Daniele Paserman. 2003. "Waiting for Mr. Right: Rising Inequality and Declining Marriage Rates." *Journal of Urban Economics* 53:257-281.
- Hays, Sharon. 2003. *Flat Broke with Children: Women in the Age of Welfare Reform*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Heuveline, Patrick. 2004. "The Role of Cohabitation in Family Formation: The United States in Comparative Perspective." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 66:1214-1230.
- Hoffman, Saul D., and Rebecca A Maynard. 2008. *The Consequences of Teenage Childbearing on the Mother and Their Spouse*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.
- Jones, N., and A.S. Smith. n.d. *Two or More Races Population: 2000*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Census Bureau.
- Kennedy, Sheela, and Larry Bumpass. 2008. "Cohabitation and Children's Living Arrangements: New Estimates from the United States." *Demographic Research* 19:1663-1692.
- Kreider, R.M. 2007. *Living Arrangements of Children: 2004*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Census Bureau.
- Lee, S. M, and B. Edmonston. 2005. "New Marriages, New Families: US Racial and Hispanic Inter-marriage." *Population Bulletin* 60.
- Lichter, Daniel T, and Martha L Crowley. 2004. "Welfare Reform and Child Poverty: Effects of Maternal Employment, Marriage, and Cohabitation." *Social Science Research* 33:385-408.

- Lichter, Daniel T, Zhenchao Qian, and Martha L Crowley. 2005. "Child Poverty among Racial Minorities and Immigrants: Explaining Trends and Differentials." *Social Science Quarterly* 86:1037-1059.
- Loughran, David S. 2002. "The Effect of Male Wage Inequality on Female Age at First Marriage." *Review of Economics and Statistics* 84:237-250.
- Marks, S.R., and L.A. Leslie. 2000. "Family Diversity and Intersecting Categories: Toward a Richer Approach to Multiple Roles." Pp. 402-423 in *Handbook of Family Diversity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- McLanahan, Sara. 2004. "Diverging Destinies: How Children Are Faring under the Second Demographic Transition." *Demography* 41:607-627.
- McLanahan, Sara, Irwin Garfinkel, Nancy E. Reichman, and Teitler. 2001. "Unwed Parents or Fragile Families? Implications for Welfare and Child Support Policy." in *Out of Wedlock: Causes and Consequences of Nonmarital Fertility*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- McLanahan, Sara, and Christine Percheski. 2008. "Family Structure and the Reproduction of Inequalities." *Annual Review of Sociology* 34:257-276.
- Miller, Amalia. 2009. "The Effects of Motherhood Timing on Career Path." *Journal of Population Economics*.
- Musick, Kelly. 2002. "Planned and Unplanned Childbearing Among Unmarried Women." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 64:915-929.
- Office of Management and Budget. 1997. *Revisions to the Standards of the Classification of Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity*.

- Osborne, Cynthia, and Sara McLanahan. 2007. "Partnership Instability and Child Well-Being." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 69:1065-1083.
- Page, Marianne E., and Ann Huff Stevens. 2005. "Understanding Racial Differences in the Economic Costs of Growing up in a Single-Parent Family." *Demography* 42:75-90.
- Passell, Jeffrey, Wendy Wang and Paul Taylor. 2010. "Marrying Out : One-in-Seven New U.S. Marriages is Interracial or Interethnic" Pew Center Research
- Stack, Carol B. 1974. *All Our Kin: Strategies for Survival in a Black Community*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Stevens, Ann Huff. 1994. "The Dynamics of Poverty Spells: Updating Bane and Ellwood." *The American Economic Review* 84:34-37.
- Tafoya, S.M, H. Johnson, and L.E. Hill. n.d. *Who Chooses to Choose Two?* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Census Bureau.
- Tucker, M. Belinda, and Claudia Mitchell-Kernan. 1995. *The Decline in Marriage among African Americans: Causes, Consequences, and Policy Implications*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- U. S. Census Bureau. 2010. *Children Below Poverty Level by Race and Hispanic Origin*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Census Bureau
http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/cats/income_expenditures_poverty_wealth.html
(Accessed June 24, 2010).
- Van Hook, Jennifer, Susan L Brown, and Maxwell Ndigume Kwenda. 2004. "A Decomposition of Trends in Poverty among Children of Immigrants." *Demography* 41:649-670.

Ventura, Stephanie J, and Christine A Bachrach. 2000. "Nonmarital Childbearing in the United States, 1940-99." *National Vital Statistics Reports* 48:46.

Table 1. Percentages (and Estimates) of families (w/ co-resident minor children) by ways of identifying Multiracial for Married-Couple and Female Headed Households, 2000.

| Rule for Identifying Multiracial Households | 2000 Census (PUMS) | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|------|----------------------|------|---|
| | Married-Couple | | Female Headed | | |
| | <i>Parent's Race</i> | N | % | N | % |
| Interracial Couple w/ children | 101,293 | 7.94 | ----- | | |
| Parent(s) classified w/ Multiple Races (MR) | 27,317 | 2.14 | 6,664 | 1.87 | |
| <i>Child's Race</i> | | | | | |
| Mother's Race different from Child's Single Race | ----- | | 29,631 | 7.47 | |
| MR Child | 34,303 | 2.72 | 14,501 | 4.05 | |
| <i>Combination of Parent's and Child's Race</i> | | | | | |
| Interracial Couple w/ children , MR Parent(s), MR Child | 113,198 | 8.88 | ----- | | |
| Mother's Race and Child's Single Race no not Match, MR Mother, MR Child | ----- | | 33,710 | 9.34 | |

Note: Percentages are weighted, N's are unweighted
MR = Multiple Race

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics on Independent Variables for All Families and Among Multiracial Families

| | All Families (n=368,302) | Multiracial Families (n = 33,614) |
|---|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Poverty Status | | |
| In Poverty (Between 0 and 100% of Poverty Line) | 34.5 | 37.4 |
| Not in Poverty (101-199% of Poverty Line) | 65.5 | 62.6 |
| Demographic Characteristics | | |
| <i>Mother's Race</i> | | |
| White (%) | 52.2 | 54.1 |
| Black | 28.2 | 8.1 |
| Amer. Indian | 1.5 | 3.4 |
| Asian | 1.7 | 3.9 |
| Native Hawaiian | 0.1 | 0.5 |
| Some Other Race (SOR) | 0.2 | 0.62 |
| Multiracial | 1.8 | 19.8 |
| Hispanic | 14.3 | 9.7 |
| <i>Age of Mother</i> | | |
| Mother's Average Age (M) | 35.9 (8.6) | 34.7 (8.9) |
| Age at Birth of Eldest Child (M) | 25.5 (6.4) | 25.2 (6.7) |
| <i>Mother's Marital Status</i> | | |
| Never Married (%) | 33.8 | 39.2 |
| Widowed / Divorced / Spouse Absent | 66.2 | 60.8 |
| <i>Nativity</i> | | |
| Foreign Born (%) | 11.2 | 13.4 |
| <i>English Proficiency</i> | | |
| Speaks Only English | 82.6 | 80.8 |
| Speaks English / Well | 13.1 | 16.6 |
| Does Not Speak English / Not well | 4.2 | 2.7 |
| Family / Household Composition | | |
| Family Size | 2.8 (1.4) | |
| Unmarried Partner (Male) Present | 13.6 | 17.03 |
| Unmarried Partner (Female) Present | 2.9 | 3.91 |
| Grandparent Present | 3.9 | 4.0 |

Note: N's are un-weighted, Statistics are un-weighted
Source: 2000 5 Percent Public Use Micro-data Samples

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics on Independent Variables for All Families and Among Multiracial Families, 2000 (Continued)

| | All Families (n=368,302) | Multiracial Families (n = 33,614) |
|---|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Socioeconomic Characteristics | | |
| <i>Mother's Employment</i> | | |
| Full time | 57.1 | 56.3 |
| Part time | 11.7 | 12.7 |
| Unemployed | 8.8 | 9.2 |
| Not in Labor Force | 22.4 | 21.9 |
| <i>Mother's Education</i> | | |
| < H.S. | 20.5 | 18.3 |
| High School / GED | 31.0 | 28.7 |
| Some College / Assoc. Degree | 34.9 | 38.3 |
| Bachelor's Degree or More | 13.6 | 14.8 |
| Geographic Characteristics | | |
| <i>Residential Stability</i> | | |
| Lives in Same House | 38.1 | 31.3 |
| Lives in Different House same State | 52.2 | 53.7 |
| Lives in Different House Different State | 8.1 | 13.1 |
| Moved from Abroad | 1.7 | 1.8 |
| <i>Region</i> | | |
| Northeast | 18.6 | 17.7 |
| Midwest | 21.2 | 19.9 |
| South | 39.2 | 29.7 |
| West | 21 | 32.6 |
| <i>Metropolitan Area Status</i> | | |
| Lives in non-Metropolitan Area / Not Identifiable | 26.7 | 22.2 |

Note: N's are un-weighted, Statistics are un-weighted

Source: 2000 5 Percent Public Use Micro-data Samples

Table 3. Percentage in Poverty by Race of Mother for Same Race and Multiracial Households

| | With Same Race Children | With Multiracial Children |
|-------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| White | 27.48 | 35.9*** |
| Black | 44.8 | 43.9 |
| Amer. Ind | 48.1 | 43.2** |
| Asian | 30.5 | 24.4*** |
| Nat. Haw. | 38.6 | 39.8 |
| SOR | 39 | 43.8 |
| Multiracial | N/A | 39.49 |
| Hispanic | 47.5 | 38.9*** |
| Sample Size | 334,688 | 33,614 |

Un-weighted Percentages. Significance according to a Chi-Square Test

***p<.001; **p<.01, *p<.05

N/A -Not applicable because all households headed by multiracial mothers are, by definition, multiracial households

Table 4. Odds Ratios of Presence in Poverty for Unmarried Female Headed Families on Race of Mother and Presence of Racially Different/Multiracial Children, 2000.

| | Base-Line | Adjusting for Racial Composition of Mothers and Children ¹ | | | | |
|--|-----------|---|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| | | Model II | Model III | Model IV | Model V | Model VII |
| Mother's Age | 0.945 | 0.946 | 0.963 | 0.947 | 0.951 | 0.953 |
| <u>Racial Composition of Family</u> | | | | | | |
| <i>Race of Mother (ref = White)</i> | | | | | | |
| Black | 2.096*** | 2.168*** | 1.946*** | 1.766*** | 1.52*** | 1.446*** |
| American Indian | 1.888*** | 2.063*** | 1.849*** | 1.633*** | 1.379*** | 1.419*** |
| Asian | 1.414*** | 1.658*** | 1.286*** | 1.299*** | 1.281*** | 1.274*** |
| Native Hawaiiin | 1.609*** | 1.787*** | 1.605*** | 1.325* | 1.229 | 1.254 |
| Some Other Race | 1.77*** | 1.882*** | 1.662*** | 1.627*** | 1.463** | 1.451*** |
| Hispanic | 2.480*** | 2.638*** | 1.926*** | 1.761*** | 1.246*** | 1.251*** |
| Multiracial Family | 1.231*** | | | | | |
| <i>Multiracial Family Categories</i> | | | | | | |
| White Mothers / Multi. Children | | 1.370*** | 1.302*** | 1.234*** | 1.249*** | 1.243*** |
| Black Mothers / Multi. Children | | 2.006***+ | 1.814***+ | 1.61***a | 1.44*** | 1.391*** |
| Amer. Ind. Mothers/ Multi. Children | | 1.849*** | 1.716*** | 1.604*** | 1.352*** | 1.335*** |
| Asian Mothers / Multi. Children | | 1.068c | 1.044c | 1.051c | 1.036c | 1.025c |
| Native Hawaiiin Mother / Multi. Children | | 1.782*** | 1.614** | 1.558** | 1.275 | 1.244 |
| SOR Mothers / Multi. Children | | 2.106*** | 1.917*** | 1.738*** | 1.675** | 1.679*** |
| Hispanic Mothers / Multi. Children | | 1.843*** | 1.578*** | 1.515*** | 1.221*** | 1.209*** |
| Multiracial Mothers | | 1.753*** | 1.628*** | 1.555*** | 1.384*** | 1.357*** |
| <i>Demographic Characteristics</i> | | | | | | |
| Age at Birth of Eldest Child | | | 0.979*** | 1.001 | 0.998 | 0.997* |
| Mother Never Married (ref=Previous Married) | | | 1.361*** | 1.404*** | 1.196*** | 1.225*** |
| Foreign born (1=yes, 0=no) | | | 0.938*** | 0.935*** | 0.897*** | 0.889*** |
| Speaks English/ Well (ref=Speaks only English) | | | 1.107*** | 1.112*** | 1.124*** | 1.109*** |
| Speaks English/ Not Well | | | 2.450*** | 2.272*** | 1.507*** | 1.459*** |
| Does not Speak English | | | 3.452*** | 2.956*** | 1.506*** | 1.419*** |
| Pseudo R squared | 0.070 | 0.071 | 0.079 | 0.096 | 0.277 | 0.278 |

1. Note: In Models II through VII, the covariates for race of mother in the following categories: Black, American Indian, Native Hawaiiin, Asian, SOR, and Hispanic refer to monoracial households inclusive of single race Mothers and similarly classified single race children. For example, "Black" refers to "Black with Black Children".

Table 4. Odds Ratios of Presence in Poverty for Unmarried Female Headed Families on Race of Mother and Presence of Racially Different/Multiracial Children, 2000.

| | Base-Line | Adjusting for Racial Composition of Mothers and Children ¹ | | | | |
|---|-----------|---|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| | | Model II | Model III | Model IV | Model V | Model VII |
| <u>Family Composition</u> | | | | | | |
| Presence of Grandparent | | | | 0.235*** | 0.221*** | 0.220*** |
| Male Unmarried Partner (ref=No Partner Present) | | | | 1.614*** | 1.389*** | 1.405*** |
| Female Unmarried Partner | | | | 0.952* | 0.987 | 0.984 |
| Number of Persons in Family | | | | 1.279*** | 1.185*** | 1.189*** |
| <u>Socioeconomic Status of Mother</u> | | | | | | |
| High School Educated (ref = Less than H.S) | | | | | 0.570*** | 0.573*** |
| Some College | | | | | 0.363*** | 0.365*** |
| College Degree or More | | | | | 0.186*** | 0.185*** |
| Part Time Employed (ref = Full Time Employed) | | | | | 5.648*** | 5.75*** |
| Unemployed | | | | | 8.876*** | 8.927*** |
| Not In Labor Force | | | | | 8.106*** | 8.162*** |
| <u>Migration in past five years (ref = Not Moved)</u> | | | | | | |
| Moved within Same state | | | | | | 1.078*** |
| Moved across state | | | | | | 1.235*** |
| Moved from abroad | | | | | | 1.593*** |
| <u>Regional Location (ref=South)</u> | | | | | | |
| Northeast | | | | | | 0.856*** |
| Midwest | | | | | | 0.831*** |
| West | | | | | | 0.851*** |
| Lives in Non-Metropolitan Area | 1.697*** | 1.712*** | 1.738*** | 1.731*** | 1.662*** | 1.624*** |
| Pseudo R squared | 0.070 | 0.071 | 0.079 | 0.096 | 0.277 | 0.278 |

1. Note: In Models II through VII, the covariates for race of mother in the following categories: Black, American Indian, Native Hawaiian, Asian, SOR, and Hispanic refer to monoracial households. Therefore, "Black" refers to "Black with Black Children", Native American refers to "Native American with Native American Children" and so on.

ⁱ Although the evidence remains somewhat inconclusive, as other studies suggest that family structure might have weaker effects for Black children (Fomby & Cherlin 2007).

ⁱⁱ Further, declarations of race vary within individuals depending on the context within which their race is asked (Harris and Simm 2002) and can vary over time (Doyle and Kao 2007; Hitlin, Brown, and Elder 2006).