APPENDIX M. DATA ON NONMARITAL BIRTHS TO ADULTS AND TEENAGERS AND FEDERAL STRATEGIES TO REDUCE NONMARITAL PREGNANCIES

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

In 1965, Daniel Patrick Moynihan, then an Assistant Secretary in the Department of Labor, published a government document arguing that black Americans were being held back economically and socially in large part because their family structure was deteriorating. More specifically, by that time, one-quarter of black children were born outside marriage. The results of these nonmarital births and fatherless childrearing were, according to Moynihan, catastrophic. Although Moynihan's report caused an outpouring of rebuttal and even invective (Rainwater & Yancey, 1967), the decades since the report have revealed with great clarity the perspicacity of Moynihan's vision. Today nearly one-third of all American children are born outside marriage, and the ratio for black children has reached the remarkable level of 70 percent. As the illegitimacy ratio among white children climbed past the ratio that characterized blacks when Moynihan wrote his original report, in 1993 Charles Murray wrote a similar report in the Wall Street Journal about the crisis in nonmarital births among whites. Unlike the 1965 Moynihan report, the Murray report was greeted by widespread acceptance and increased concern that progress against poverty and its accompanying misery could only be achieved if the tide of nonmarital births was halted.

In this appendix, we review the trends in various measures of nonmarital childbearing and discuss the numerous policies, especially those contained in the 1996 welfare reform law (Public Law

104–193), that the Congress has enacted to fight both the frequency of illegitimacy and its effects.

NONMARITAL BIRTHS IN THE UNITED STATES

Data on nonmarital births are usually expressed by three measures: the number of nonmarital births, the ratio of all births that are nonmarital to total births, and the rate of nonmarital births per 1,000 total births. Table M–1 shows all three measures, as well as the birth rate per 1,000 married women aged 15–44, for selected years from 1950 to 1998. These figures show that although the overall birth rate for married women has been declining in recent decades, there has been a very substantial increase in all three measures of illegitimacy.

TABLE M–1.—NUMBER, RATE, AND PERCENT OF BIRTHS TO UNMARRIED WOMEN AND BIRTH RATE FOR MARRIED WOMEN, SELECTED YEARS 1950–98

| Year | Births to unmarried women | | Ratio of nonmarital births to all births | Birth rate for married women (aged 15–44) |
	Number	Rate (per 1,000 unwed women aged 15–44)		
1998	1,292,534	NA	32.8	NA
1997	1,257,444	44.0	32.4	84.3
1996	1,260,306	44.8	32.4	83.7
1995	1,253,976	45.1	32.2	83.7
1994	1,289,592	46.9	32.6	83.8
1993	1,240,172	45.3	31.0	86.8
1992	1,224,876	45.2	30.1	89.0
1991	1,213,769	45.2	29.5	89.9
1990	1,165,384	43.8	28.0	93.2
1989	1,094,169	41.6	27.1	91.9
1988	1,005,299	38.5	25.7	90.8
1987	933,013	36.0	24.5	90.0
1986	878,477	34.2	23.4	90.7
1985	828,174	32.8	22.0	93.3
1980	665,747	29.4	18.4	97.0
1970	398,700	26.4	10.7	121.1
1960	224,300	21.6	5.3	156.6
1950	141,600	14.1	3.9	141.0

NA—Not available.

Source: Ventura et al. (1999); 1950 and 1960 data, various U.S. Census Bureau documents.

ILLEGITIMACY RATIO

The ratio of nonmarital births to all births increased almost every year from 1950 through 1994, but has more or less leveled off since then. In 1950, the percent of births to unmarried women was 3.9; by 1994 it had risen to 32.6. But the ratio changed only slightly in the next 4 years, dropping to 32.2 percent in 1995, rising

to 32.4 percent in 1996, remaining at that level in 1997, and increasing to 32.8 percent in 1998 (table M–1).

During the period 1950–60, the ratio increased 36 percent; from 1960–70, it increased 102 percent; from 1970–80, it increased 72 percent; from 1980–90, it increased 52 percent; and from 1990–98, it increased 17 percent. Thus, the time of greatest increase in the illegitimacy ratio was the period 1960–80; the rate of increase has been declining since roughly 1980. Adolescent pregnancy, declining marriage rates, and more childbearing among unmarried women relative to married women have contributed to the relatively high proportion of children being born to unwed mothers. The illegitimacy ratio has changed little since 1994 even though the rate of births for unmarried women has declined because births to married women have also declined.

The illegitimacy ratio varies considerably by race and ethnicity. In 1997, the ratio was 32.4 percent for unmarried women of all races; 21.5 percent for non-Hispanic white women; 40.9 percent for Hispanic women; and 69.4 percent for non-Hispanic black women (Ventura et al., 1999, p. 45).

Birth Rate for Unmarried Women

The illegitimacy rate is the number of births to unmarried women in a given year per 1,000 unmarried women ages 15–44. The illegitimacy rate has increased substantially since 1970, although like the illegitimacy ratio, it has declined slightly since 1994. Thus, between 1970 and 1994, the rate increased from 26.4 to 46.9 before falling slightly to 44.0 in 1997. Over the entire period 1970–97, the birth rate for unmarried women increased by 67 percent.

Birth rates for unmarried women also vary considerably by race and ethnicity. In 1997, the rates were 44.0 for women of all races; 27 for non-Hispanic white women; 73.4 for non-Hispanic black women; and 91.4 for Hispanic women. Between 1990 and 1997, the birth rate for all unmarried women increased by less than 1 percent, but the rate for unmarried non-Hispanic white women increased nearly 11 percent while the rate for unmarried non-Hispanic black women dropped by 19 percent. The rate for unmarried Hispanic women increased only 2 percent (Ventura et al., 1999, pp. 43–44).

Interstate Variation

According to the National Center for Health Statistics, births to unmarried women increased from 1996 to 1997 in 32 States, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, and decreased in 18 States and the District of Columbia. Similarly, the percent of births to unmarried women also increased in 32 States, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, and decreased in 15 States and the District of Columbia; it remained unchanged in 3 States (Ventura et al., 1999, pp. 8–9).

Marriage and Birth Rate for Married Women

Both the marriage rate and the birth rate for married women generally have been declining since 1970. During the period 1970–

97, the marriage rate per 1,000 population dropped 16 percent, from 10.6 to 8.9 (National Center for Health Statistics, 1995, 1999). Moreover, the median age of women at first marriage has risen by 16 percent to 24.0 in 1990 from 20.6 in 1970. Concurrent with the decrease in marriage and the increase in the birth rate for unmarried women over the 1970–97 period, the birth rate for married women has generally declined. In 1970, there were 121.1 births per 1,000 married women aged 15–44. By 1997, the birth rate for married women had dropped by 30 percent, falling to 84.3 (see table M–1).

Census Bureau data also show a decline in the propensity of women to marry before the birth of a premaritally conceived child (Bachu, 1999). Hence, in the early 1960s, 60 percent of pregnant women married before the birth of their child, thereby avoiding an out-of-wedlock birth. Since that time, the propensity to marry before the baby is born has fallen consistently, reaching 49 percent in the early 1970s, 29 percent in the early 1980s, and just 23 percent in the early 1990s.

BIRTHS TO TEENAGERS

Overview

In 1996, an estimated 905,000 teenagers (married and unmarried) became pregnant; approximately 128,000 had miscarriages, 274,000 had legal abortions, and 503,000 gave birth (Henshaw, 1999). About 494,000 of the 3,950,000 (12.5 percent) U.S. births in 1998 were to teens. Although the number of teenagers who marry has always been low, the proportion dropped from 10 percent in 1970 to less than 5 percent in 1997. Moreover, relatively fewer women in all age groups are married nowadays. Consequently, while most births to teenagers are nonmarital (79 percent in 1998), teenagers do not account for the majority of all births to unmarried women. In 1998, births to teenagers comprised only 30 percent of the nearly 1.3 million births to unmarried females. By contrast, in 1970 they comprised 50 percent of the 398,700 births to unmarried females (table M–2).

It is also noteworthy that the birth patterns of unmarried women indicate that about half of them had their first child as a teenager. Moreover, in 1998 22 percent of teenage births were second or higher-order births (Moore, 1999). These two facts have led some analysts to contend that unless welfare reform or other efforts are successful in modifying the behaviors that result in a relatively high proportion of births to unwed teenagers, associated problems such as delinquency, school failure, and reliance on welfare will persist.

National trends

The number of births to teens declined by: almost 17 percent from 1960 to 1998; 25 percent from 1970 to 1998; 12 percent from 1980 to 1998; and 7 percent from 1990 to 1998. The number of births to teens was 593,746 in 1960 and had dropped to 494,456 by 1998.

TABLE M–2.—BIRTHS TO UNMARRIED WOMEN BY AGE, 1970 AND 1998

Age	1970		1998	
	Nonmarital births	Percent of non-marital births	Nonmarital births	Percent of non-marital births
Under age 15	9,500	2.4	9,152	0.7
Ages 15–19	190,400	47.8	380,569	29.4
Ages 20–24	126,700	31.8	NA	NA
Ages 25–29	40,600	10.2	NA	NA
Ages 30–34	19,100	4.8	NA	NA
Ages 35–39	9,400	2.4	NA	NA
Age 40 and older	3,000	0.8	NA	NA
Total, all ages	398,700	100.0	1,292,534	100.0

NA—Not available.

Note.—The 1998 birth data are disaggregated by age only for births to adolescents. Details may not add to totals due to rounding.

Source: National Center for Health Statistics (1970); Ventura et al. (1999).

In 1970, teens (15–19 years of age) gave birth at the rate of 68.3 per 1,000 teens, whereas in 1998 teens gave birth at a rate of 51.1 per 1,000. After increasing sharply during the late 1980s, birth rates for teenagers declined every year from 1991 to 1998. Although the teen pregnancy rate, birth rate, and abortion rate have all declined since 1991, the U.S. teen birth rate is still far above that of most industrialized countries (Alan Guttmacher, 2000a, 2000b).

During the period 1991–96, the pregnancy rate for teenagers 15–19 dropped from a high of 116.5 per 1,000 teenagers to 98.7. Similarly, the birth rate dropped from 62.1 in 1991 to 54.4 in 1996 and to 51.1 in 1998. Moreover, the abortion rate for teenagers has fallen fairly steadily since the late 1980s. For example, the abortion rate for 15- to 19-year-olds dropped from 37.6 in 1991 to 29.2 in 1996, a drop of over 20 percent. Because the teen pregnancy rate, birth rate, and abortion rate have all declined since 1991, the total decline in the teen birth rate cannot be attributed solely to an increase in abortions by teens. The teen pregnancy rate fell by 15 percent between 1991 and 1996 and the abortion rate by 22 percent. According to the National Center for Health Statistics (1998), the declines in birth and pregnancy rates for teenagers since 1991 reflect a stabilization and reduction in the proportion of teenagers who have ever had sex, a fall in the proportion of teenagers who are sexually active at a given time, and an increase in the likelihood that teenagers use contraceptives (see also Child Trends, undated). Others attribute the declines in teen birth rates in part to teens' adopting a more conservative attitude about engaging in sexual activity before marriage and their fear of contracting AIDS or other sexually transmitted diseases (National Governors', 2000; Alan Guttmacher, 2000a; Child Trends, undated).

Ethnic differences

Since 1991, birth rates have declined for white, black, American Indian, Asian or Pacific Islander, and Hispanic adolescents between the ages of 15 and 19. The greatest decline in teen birth rates occurred among black teens, for whom rates were down 26 percent over the period from 1991 to 1998. Specifically, birth rates for black teenagers declined from 115.5 per 1,000 in 1991 to 85.3 in 1998. For Hispanic teenagers, birth rates declined by 12 percent between 1991 and 1998, from 106.7 to 93.7. However, despite the general decline in teenage birth rates for all races and persons of Hispanic origin, birth rates for black and Hispanic teenagers continue to be substantially higher than for other ethnic groups. As compared with the black and Hispanic rates of 85.3 and 93.7 per 1,000 respectively, non-Hispanic white teens gave birth at a rate of only 35.2 per 1,000 and Asian or Pacific Islanders were lower still at 23.1 per 1,000 (National Center for Health Statistics, 1999).

State trends

Birth rates for teens 15–19 vary considerably from State to State. In 1997, the lowest reported rate by a State was 26.9 per 1,000 in Vermont; the highest was Mississippi at 73.7, although the territories of Guam and Puerto Rico had rates of 106.3 and 77.8 respectively. Despite this variability, between 1991 and 1997, a reduction in the rate of births among teens aged 15–19 was observed in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the Virgin Islands (teen birth rates increased in Guam and Puerto Rico). In 10 States and the District of Columbia, the rate was down by more than 20 percent. Overall, declines ranged from 9 percent in Arkansas, Delaware, and Texas to 32 percent in Alaska (National Center for Health Statistics, 1999).

Financial and social costs of teen births

The Robin Hood Foundation (Maynard, 1996) estimates that adolescent childbearing costs the U.S. taxpayer about $6.9 billion per year; more specifically, welfare and food stamp benefits, $2.2 billion; medical care expenses, $1.5 billion; spending on incarceration (for the teen sons of women who had them as adolescents), $1 billion; foster care placements, $0.9 billion; and lost tax revenue because of work patterns of fathers, $1.3 billion. Research also indicates that teens who give birth are less likely to complete high school and go on to college, thereby reducing their potential for economic self-sufficiency. For the children of teens, research indicates that they are more likely to experience problems in school, are more likely to drop out of high school, and as adults are more likely to repeat the cycle of teenage pregnancy, poverty, and welfare use (U.S. Department, 1995; Maynard, 1996; National Governors', 2000).

FEDERAL STRATEGIES TO REDUCE NONMARITAL PREGNANCIES

OVERVIEW

In recognition of the negative, long-term consequences associated with nonmarital births and the long-term costs to society, the prevention of childbearing outside marriage has been identified by Congress as a major national goal. Although birth rates for teens have dropped in recent years, they remain higher than they were in the mid-80s. Similarly, although the overall illegitimacy ratio has stabilized, it is still at an extraordinarily high level, especially for minorities.

Moreover, U.S. teen birth rates are much higher than the rates of other industrialized nations; they are 2 and 13 times, respectively, those of England and Japan. The diversity in teen birth rates across industrialized countries in 1995 ranged from a low of 4 births per 1,000 teens aged 15–19 in Japan to 56 in Armenia, with the U.S. rate near the top at 54.4 (Alan Guttmacher, 2000a, 2000b).

In an attempt to ameliorate some of the social and financial costs of nonmarital births even before the 1996 welfare reform law, the Federal Government funded a variety of teenage pregnancy prevention programs. These include: family planning, created in 1970 as title X of the Public Health Services Act; the Adolescent Family Life Program, created in 1981 as title XX of the Public Health Services Act; the Maternal and Child Health Services Block Grant, created in 1981 as title V of the Social Security Act; the Medicaid Program, created in 1965 as title XIX of the Social Security Act, and which includes 90 percent Federal matching funds for family planning services (e.g., patient counseling and education concerning pregnancy prevention and reproductive health, including birth control); and the Social Services Block Grant, created in 1981 as title XX of the Social Security Act.

NONMARITAL BIRTH PROVISIONS IN THE 1996 WELFARE REFORM LAW

Despite these programs already in the law, the 1996 welfare reform law (Public Law 104–193), and especially the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Block Grant in title I of the law, included many new provisions designed to reduce nonmarital births. In fact, one of the four goals of the law was the prevention and reduction of out-of-wedlock pregnancies. In addition, the law contained many other provisions aimed at focusing the Nation's attention and State and Federal policy on reducing nonmarital pregnancies.

Findings

The findings section of the 1996 law notes the increase in out-of-wedlock pregnancies and births, asserts that an effective strategy to combat teenage pregnancy must address the issue of male responsibility, and lists some of the negative consequences of out-of-wedlock births on the mother, child, family, and society. This section of the law states that it is the "sense of the Congress" that

prevention of out-of-wedlock pregnancy and reduction in out-of-wedlock births are very important government interests and that the policy contained in the TANF Program and in other provisions of the 1996 law are intended to initiate a national attack on non-marital births.

Purpose

The purpose statement of the 1996 legislation stipulates in part that States should design their TANF Program to prevent and reduce the incidence of out-of-wedlock pregnancies and that States must establish annual numerical goals for preventing and reducing the incidence of such pregnancies.

State plan

The TANF State plan must include an outline of how the State intends to establish goals and take action to prevent and reduce the incidence of out-of-wedlock pregnancies, with special emphasis on teen pregnancies. States must also establish numerical goals for reducing their illegitimacy ratio for calendar years 1996–2005. Finally, the State is required to outline how it intends to conduct a program that provides education and training on the problem of statutory rape so that teenage pregnancy prevention programs may be expanded to include men, especially older males who prey on young women.

Bonus for decline in out-of-wedlock births

For fiscal years 1999–2002, the 1996 law provides that cash bonuses be awarded to five States that have lower out-of-wedlock birth rates than in preceding years and lower abortion rates than in fiscal year 1995. Under the law, the five States with both the greatest decline in out-of-wedlock birth rate and a reduced abortion rate are to receive a bonus of $20 million each. If fewer than five States qualify for the bonus, it is increased to $25 million. If Guam, the Virgin Islands, or American Samoa qualify for the bonus, they would be paid $1.172 million, $889,000, and $250,000, respectively. These payments would not affect the number of other jurisdictions that could receive the bonus, but the $20 or $25 million paid to other qualifying States (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico) would be reduced pro rata. On September 13, 1999, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) awarded $100 million in bonuses to five jurisdictions for achieving the largest percentage reductions in out-of-wedlock birth rates between 1994 and 1997. The winners and their 1996–97 birth rates to unmarried women, followed by the percentage decline from their 1994–95 rates are: California, 30.4 percent, down 5.7 percent; the District of Columbia, 64.9 percent, down 3.7 percent; Michigan, 33.5 percent, down 3.4 percent; Alabama, 33.8 percent, down 2 percent; and Massachusetts, 25.7 percent, down 1.5 percent. For the United States as a whole, the nonmarital birth rate for 1997 was virtually unchanged from 1996 at 32.4 percent. In all, 12 jurisdictions achieved lower nonmarital birth rates in 1996–97 (table M–3). In the 43 remaining jurisdictions, including American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, the rates increased by less than 1 percent in 4 jurisdictions, by between 1 and 4 percent

in 16 jurisdictions, and by more than 4 percent in 23 jurisdictions. The lowest absolute rates in 1996–97 were registered by Utah (16.4 percent) and Idaho (21 percent), but both rates represented increases over the 2-year span. The highest absolute rates in 1996–97 were those of the Virgin Islands (66 percent) and Washington, DC (64.9 percent).

TABLE M–3.—STATES IN WHICH NONMARITAL BIRTH RATES DECLINED FROM 1994–95 TO 1996–97

State	Percent of births to unmarried women, 1994–95	Percent of births to unmarried women, 1996–97	Percentage decline in nonmarital birth rate
California	32.2	30.4	− 5.7
District of Columbia	67.4	64.9	− 3.7
Michigan	34.7	33.5	− 3.4
Alabama	34.5	33.8	− 2.0
Massachusetts	26.1	25.7	− 1.5
Illinois	34.1	33.6	− 1.5
Virginia	29.2	29.1	− 0.6
Mississippi	45.4	45.2	− 0.4
Georgia	35.3	35.2	− 0.3
Pennsylvania	32.6	32.5	− 0.2
Arizona	38.3	38.2	− 0.1
Maryland	33.5	33.5	− 0.1

Source: Table prepared by the Congressional Research Service on the basis of data provided by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Bonus to reward high-performance States

For each year of the 5 years from fiscal year 1999 to fiscal year 2003, the 1996 welfare reform law provides a bonus grant to States that are successful in meeting the goals of the TANF Program. A total of $1 billion is appropriated for these bonuses, which are to average $200 million annually. As mentioned earlier, one of the goals of the TANF Program is to prevent and reduce the incidence of out-of-wedlock pregnancies. However, the DHHS announced that the performance award for fiscal years 1999 and 2000 would be based only on State rankings of job entry and "work force success" measures. On December 4, 1999, DHHS announced the award of the first TANF high-performance bonuses totaling $200 million to 27 States. Also in December 1999, DHHS announced that beginning in 2002 part of the bonus would be awarded to States with the largest increase in the percentage of children living in two-parent families with incomes below 200 percent of the poverty level. Although this measure does not provide a direct gauge of illegitimate births, it is at least an indirect indication of increases in marital births.

Certain minor mothers ineligible for TANF assistance

The 1996 law specifies that a State may not use any part of the Federal TANF grant to provide assistance to unwed mothers under age 18 without a high school diploma or its equivalent unless they attend school or other equivalent educational or training program

once their youngest child is 12 weeks old. The law also specifies that a State may not use any part of the Federal TANF grant to provide assistance to unwed mothers under age 18 or their children unless they live in the home of an adult relative or in another adult-supervised arrangement.

Abstinence education

One of the most important illegitimacy policies adopted in the 1996 legislation was $250 million over 5 years in entitlement money for abstinence education. Sponsors of the provision wanted to be certain that every project funded by the abstinence education program was based on an unambiguous abstinence message. Programs could include information on birth control, but could not advocate its use. Rather, abstinence programs had to be based on several clear messages about abstinence, including: "abstinence from sexual activity outside marriage [is] the expected standard for all school age children"; "abstinence from sexual activity is the only certain way to avoid out-of-wedlock pregnancy, sexually transmitted diseases, and other associated health problems"; and "sexual activity outside the context of marriage is likely to have harmful psychological and physical effects."

The abstinence education money was provided directly to the States. States were then required to devise a procedure for distributing the funds to qualifying projects. In 1998, the first year of the program, every State except California and New Hampshire had accepted the abstinence education funds and had awarded funding to local and statewide projects designed to promote abstinence. By 1999, New Hampshire elected to accept the abstinence education funds. Today, every State except California is sponsoring one or more abstinence education projects, many of which have received additional funding from the State or local level.

In the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, Congress appropriated money for a scientific evaluation of the abstinence education projects. In competitive bidding, the Mathematica research company of Princeton, New Jersey won the contract to conduct the evaluation; Mathematica has now selected the evaluation sites and is expected to begin collecting data in 2000. Given the paucity of scientific information on the impacts of abstinence programs, it can be anticipated that sometime in 2002 or 2003, results from the Mathematica evaluation will provide reliable information on whether abstinence programs have an impact on teens' attitudes toward sex, their sexual behavior, or their nonmarital birth rates.

Other provisions to reduce nonmarital births

Family planning.—States are prohibited from using any part of the Federal TANF grant to provide medical services or abortions, but prepregnancy family planning is allowed as a use of TANF funds.

Family cap.—Although there is no explicit provision in the 1996 law, the block grant nature of the program allows States to deny additional TANF benefits for a new baby in a family already receiving TANF benefits. By 2000, 21 States had adopted some version of this policy, often called the "family cap."

Ranking and review of States regarding out-of-wedlock births.—The Secretary of DHHS is directed to rank States in order of success in reducing the proportion of out-of-wedlock births and review the programs of the five States most recently ranked highest and the five States most recently ranked lowest (see table M–3).

Report on circumstances of certain individuals.—The Secretary must report to four Committees of Congress annually, beginning on August 22, 1999, on specified matters about three groups: children whose families lost TANF eligibility because of a time limit, children born after enactment (i.e., August 22, 1996) to teen parents, and persons who became teen parents after enactment. Among the specified matters is the rate at which the members of each group are born, or have children, out-of-wedlock, and the percentage of teens that are married. The Secretary has not yet issued this report.

National goals to prevent teenage pregnancies.—The Secretary must also establish and implement, no later than January 1, 1997, a strategy for preventing out-of-wedlock teenage pregnancies. In response to this requirement, DHHS announced a teen pregnancy prevention strategy in January 1997 called the "national strategy to prevent out-of-wedlock teen pregnancies." The purpose of the national strategy is to ensure that at least 25 percent of communities in the United States have pregnancy prevention programs in place. DHHS is required by the 1996 law to report to the Congress by June 30 of each year on progress made in implementing the national strategy. Created as a complementary approach to teen pregnancy prevention efforts mandated in the 1996 welfare reform legislation, the national strategy works under two main principles: to strengthen the national response to prevent out-of-wedlock pregnancies by combining existing programs with emerging ones, and to support and encourage abstinence among adolescents (U.S. Department, 1998, 1999).

Research on TANF Programs.—The Secretary is also required to conduct research on the benefits, effects, and costs of operating State TANF Programs. The research is to include the effects and operation of various programs on nonmarital births and teen pregnancy.

Census Bureau report.—The U.S. Census Bureau must expand the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) to obtain data with which to evaluate TANF's impact on a random sample of American families. One of the areas the Census Bureau is directed to include in this study is out-of-wedlock births. The law appropriates $10 million per year for each of fiscal years 1996–2002 to pay for this major study.

NONMARITAL BIRTH PROVISIONS IN THE CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM

The 1996 law also contained the most powerful and far-reaching reforms of the Child Support Enforcement Program ever enacted (see Section 8). Because strict child support enforcement has been shown to have a deterrent effect on nonmarital childbearing (Garfinkel et al., 1999), the child support provisions of the law were seen by Congress as another method of attempting to reduce illegitimacy.

Perhaps the most direct provisions of the 1996 law that were expected to have an impact on nonmarital childbearing were the exceptionally strong paternity establishment requirements. If the State child support agency determines that a TANF recipient is not cooperating with officials in establishing paternity or in establishing, modifying, or enforcing a support order for her child, the State must reduce the family's TANF benefit by at least 25 percent and may remove the family from the program entirely. Moreover, if a State does not enforce penalties requested by the State child support agency against TANF recipients who fail to cooperate, the DHHS Secretary must reduce the state's Federal TANF grant by up to 5 percent and the State must replace these funds with its own money.

The 1996 law also requires States to take several actions to promote paternity establishment. These include creating a simple civil process for voluntary acknowledgment of paternity, maintaining a hospital-based paternity acknowledgment program as well as programs in other State agencies (including the birth record agency), and issuing an affidavit of voluntary paternity acknowledgment based on a form developed by the Secretary. When a child's parents are not married, the father's name must not appear on the birth certificate unless there is an acknowledgment or adjudication of paternity. In addition, signed paternity acknowledgments must be considered a legal finding of paternity unless rescinded within 60 days.

The child support reforms include many other provisions that are expected to increase personal responsibility and promote deterrence. Among these measures are: mandatory employer reporting of information on new hires to promote rapid location of noncustodial parents; uniform interstate child support laws; establishment of a computerized statewide collection and disbursement unit to expedite child support payments to custodial parents; and stringent penalties, such as revocation of drivers' license and other professional and recreational (including sporting) licenses, of parents who owe past-due child support.

REFERENCES

Alan Guttmacher Institute. (2000a, January/February). Adolescent pregnancy and childbearing: Levels and trends in developed countries. *Family Planning Perspectives, 3*(1), 14–23.

Alan Guttmacher Institute. (2000b, February 24). *United States and the Russian Federation lead the developed work in teenage pregnancy rates* (News Release). New York: Author.

Bachu, A. (1999, October). *Trends in Premarital Childbearing: 1930 to 1994* (P23–7). Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.

Child Trends. (Undated). *Trends in sexual activity and contraceptive use among teens* (Research Brief). Washington, DC: Author.

Garfinkel, I., Gaylin, D.S., McLanahan, S.S., & Huang, C.C. (1999). *Will child support enforcement reduce nonmarital childbearing?* Paper presented at the Brookings Institution Roundtable on Children, Washington, DC.

Henshaw, S.K. (1999, June 1). *U.S. teenage pregnancy statistics: With competitive statistics for women aged 20–24*. New York: Alan Guttmacher Institute.

Maynard, R.A. (Ed.). (1996). *Kids having kids: A Robin Hood Foundation special report on the costs of adolescent childbearing*. New York: Robin Hood Foundation.

Moore, K.A. (1999, December). *Facts at a glance*. Washington, DC: Child Trends.

Moynihan, D.P. (1965). *The Negro family: The case for national action*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor.

Murray, C. (1993, October 29). The coming white underclass. *Wall Street Journal*, p. A–14.

National Center for Health Statistics. (1970). *Vital Statistics of the U.S.* (Vol. I: Natality). Hyattsville, MD: Author.

National Center for Health Statistics. (1995, July). *Monthly vital statistics report, 43*(12). Hyattsville, MD: Author.

National Center for Health Statistics. (1998, December 17). *Declines in teenage birth rates, 1991–97: National and State patterns, 47*(12). Hyattsville, MD: Author.

National Center for Health Statistics. (1999, October). *National vital statistics reports, 47*(26). Hyattsville, MD: Author.

National Governors' Association Center for Best Practices. (2000, January 14). *State role in preventing teen pregnancy*. Washington, DC: Author.

Rainwater, L., & Yancey, W.L. (1967). *The Moynihan report and the politics of controversy*. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (1995). *A report to Congress on out-of-wedlock childbearing* (DHHS Pub. No. 95–1257–1). Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (1998, June). *A national strategy to prevent teen pregnancy* (Annual Report, 1997–98). Washington, DC: Author.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (1999). *A national strategy to prevent teen pregnancy* (Annual Report, 1998–99). Washington, DC: Author.

Ventura, S.J., Martin, J.A., Curtin, S.C., & Matthews, T.J. (1999, April). Birth: Final data for 1997. *National vital statistics report, 47*(18). Hyattsville, MD: Author.