

**Comments to the**  
**U.S. Department of Health and Human Services**  
**Regarding Teen Pregnancy Prevention and**  
**Teens Parents Provisions**  
**in the**  
**Temporary Assistance for Needy Families**  
**(TANF) Block Grant**

by Jodie Levin-Epstein, Christine Grisham,  
and Myra Batchelder  
on Behalf of  
the Center for Law and Social Policy

November 30, 2001

Center for Law and Social Policy  
**CLASP**

**Comments to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services  
Regarding Teen Pregnancy Prevention and Teen Parents Provisions  
in the Reauthorization of the  
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Block Grant<sup>1</sup>**

**Submitted November 30, 2001**

**by Jodie Levin-Epstein Christine Grisham, and Myra Batchelder  
on Behalf of  
the Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP)**

Thank you for seeking comments concerning reauthorization of the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) Block Grant and related programs. In this letter, we expand upon the overall comments offered by the Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP) by focusing on some initial ideas for provisions related to teen parents, reducing out-of-wedlock births, and teen pregnancy prevention. We believe that reauthorization presents an opportunity to recognize that teen pregnancy prevention is a vital strategy in addressing non-marital births. It is a “doable” strategy since recent research points to effective program interventions. Reauthorization also permits us to redirect our approach to needy teen parents, which too often has pushed them away; instead, such teens should be engaged in TANF rules and services. Broadly:

**It is appropriate for TANF to focus on teen pregnancy prevention and on teen parents.** In the TANF program, only about 5% of recipients are identified as teen mothers (108,000 individuals),<sup>2</sup> yet historically about 40-50% of older mothers who receive welfare started parenting as teenagers.<sup>3</sup> In addition, such mothers tend to have longer stays on welfare. For these reasons it is appropriate that TANF seek to address teen pregnancy prevention and to support teen mothers.

**Prevention of teen pregnancy is vital in any national effort to decrease non-marital births.** Nearly 500,000 teen births occurred in 2000.<sup>4</sup> About 80% of these teen births are non-marital;<sup>5</sup> thus, about 400,000<sup>6</sup> non-marital births are to teens. Researchers have recently noted that increases in non-marital first births “is what drives” the increase in non-marital fertility over the last 25 years;<sup>7</sup> 50% of all first non-marital births are to teens.<sup>8</sup>

**Prevention of subsequent pregnancies by teen parents is often overlooked but would also decrease non-marital births and improve well-being.** About 20% of the roughly 500,000 teen births are not the first child to a teen mother; about 100,000 teenagers gave birth to a second or higher order child in 2000.<sup>9</sup>

In these comments, we describe a set of issues. Each is followed by recommendations as listed below:

- ❑ Replicate and adapt proven teenage pregnancy prevention programs
- ❑ Revisit the restrictive approach to abstinence education

- ❑ Implement a “Transitional Eligibility” period for teen parents
- ❑ Increase funding for “second chance” homes
- ❑ Improve current sanction policies
- ❑ Start the time clock for teen parents beginning at age 20
- ❑ Improve data collection of teen parent data, including more specific state plan requirements

**Issue: About one-third of all births are non-marital.** During the 1990s the birth rate for unmarried women declined slightly, and the share of births to unmarried women appears to have flattened. At the peak year, 1994, the birth rate for unmarried women aged 15-44 was 46.9 per 1,000; preliminary data indicate that the rate declined to 45.2 in 2000.<sup>10</sup> After many years of growth, the percentage of births to unmarried women has hovered around 32-33% since 1994. The change was evident before enactment of the 1996 law. (The National Center for Health Statistics reports that because of underreporting in some states, the actual peak would have been in the early 1990s, rather than 1994, had numbers been fully reported.<sup>11</sup>)

Between 1991 and 2000, the nation’s teen birth rate dropped 22%.<sup>12</sup> The teen birth rate in 2000 was 48.7 births per 1,000 women aged 15-19, a record low for the nation, though still high in comparison to many other countries, and still involving nearly 500,000 births to teenagers. The decline in the rate of teen births is significant, both because of concerns about outcomes for children born to teenagers and because nearly 80% of teen births are out-of-wedlock births.<sup>13</sup> At the same time, the teen birth rate, while at a record low in 2000, is significantly higher than most other developed countries (e.g., England, Canada, Australia, Germany, France, Spain, Italy).<sup>14</sup>

While most non-marital births are to older women, many of these women started as teenage mothers. Of all non-marital births, more than half (57%) were teen births or births by older women who first were teen mothers (1992-95 average).<sup>15</sup> Thus, a focus on teens in efforts to address non-marital births makes particular sense.

One way to avert non-marital births is for couples to be married. The other way to reduce such births is for unmarried couples to avoid pregnancy. A strategy that focuses on avoiding teen pregnancy is compelling for several reasons. First, teen births are a substantial part of the overall picture of non-marital births. Second, we know of programs that have been proven to help reduce pregnancy and sexual risk-taking.<sup>16</sup> Finally, encouraging marriage by teenagers might result in a “premature” marriage; the earlier the marriage, the more unstable and likely to dissolve.<sup>17</sup>

Strong evaluation evidence is now available that provides examples of successful teen pregnancy prevention programs. In his meta-analysis of teen pregnancy prevention program evaluations, Douglas Kirby provides specific examples of programs that have been proven successful, allowing for replication of programs that get results.<sup>18</sup> These proven programs span a wide spectrum of ideology, allowing for communities to choose curricula and activities that meet their own needs and norms. Programs such as community service (the TOP program); a comprehensive after-school program (the

Carrera model); and a home visitation program have all demonstrated their ability to reduce sexual risk-taking. These and other proven programs provide an array of choices for communities that wish to replicate strategies known to work.

**Recommendation: Replicate and adapt proven teenage pregnancy prevention programs; continue evaluating new innovations.** CLASP believes that the \$100 million awarded annually in “illegitimacy” bonuses should be redirected into a Family Formation Fund and that the monies should, in part, be tapped for replication and adaptation of proven best practices related to teen pregnancy prevention (first and subsequent births). For the first time, research points to specific programs that have been able to accomplish this goal,<sup>19</sup> and the funds should be available to help states and localities implement these proven programs. Those funds should also be available to test new teen pregnancy prevention initiatives. It makes sense to redirect the “illegitimacy” bonus funds for this purpose because it appears the bonus rewards states for statistical changes rather than, as intended, the performance of programs.<sup>20</sup>

**Issue: Since 1996, at least \$533 million in federal and state matching funds have been earmarked on abstinence-unless-married programs,<sup>21</sup> and it is not known whether these programs work at increasing abstinence, avoiding pregnancy, and averting sexually transmitted diseases.** Through an expansion of the Maternal and Child Health (MCH) block grant enacted as part of welfare reform, \$50 million in federal funds are made available each year to support abstinence programs that preclude education about contraception (Title V). A state match of \$3 for every \$4 federal dollars is required, and all but one of the states have accepted the federal funds. In addition, millions more in abstinence-unless-married education funding has been made available through two other federal funding sources since the passage of TANF.<sup>22</sup> All three of these funding sources are subject to the eight-point definition laid out in the welfare law, which includes provisions that require any abstinence-unless-married program have as its “exclusive purpose, teaching the social, psychological and health gains to be realized by abstaining from sexual activity” and that the program teach that “sexual activity outside of the context of marriage is likely to have harmful psychological and physical effects.”

Proponents of increased funding argue that funding “parity” is needed<sup>23</sup> between abstinence-unless-married education and family planning available to teens. This comparison, however, contrasts expenditures for education against costs for medical services. Thus, this is a comparison of “apples” and “oranges” and creates even greater misunderstanding in the public debate.

A recent review of “abstinence-only” evaluations found that “there do not currently exist any abstinence-only programs with reasonably strong evidence that they actually delay the initiation of sex or reduce its frequency.”<sup>24</sup> However, other research does suggest that particular abstinence strategies appear to delay the onset of sexual activity; however, this good news is tempered by findings of negative health consequences for some youth. For example, a “virginity” pledge — to abstain from sex until marriage — delayed intercourse on average by nearly 18 months, but pledging had no effect among older teens (18 and older). Further, pledgers were less likely than a comparison group to use

contraceptives once they had intercourse, and thereby were at greater risk for sexually transmitted infections and pregnancy.<sup>25</sup> In contrast, evaluations of programs that combine abstinence education with contraceptive information find that they can help delay the onset of intercourse without a concomitant concern regarding health risk.<sup>26</sup>

Unfortunately, the federally funded evaluation of abstinence-unless-married programs funded through the 1996 law will not be finalized until 2003; thus, the 2002 reauthorization process will not be able to benefit from any insights offered by the evaluation. While the evaluation should help us learn more about some of the impacts of the programs, it will, nevertheless, not answer the question that needs to be asked. That central question is “How does a program of abstinence-unless-married education compare to an abstinence program that also provides contraceptive education?”

U.S. Surgeon General David Satcher, in his report, *Call to Action to Promote Sexual Health and Responsible Sexual Behavior*, states that informing adolescents about contraception “does not increase adolescent sexual activity, either by hastening the onset of sexual intercourse, increasing the frequency of sexual intercourse, or increasing the numbers of sexual partners.”<sup>27</sup> A significant number of professional medical organizations also support sexual education that goes beyond the abstinence-unless-married message, including the National Institutes of Health, the Institute of Medicine, the White House Office on National AIDS Policy, and the American Medical Association.<sup>28</sup>

Parents also want abstinence education along with contraceptive information. Nearly 100% of parents of 7th-12th graders want their children’s sexuality education program to cover abstinence, according to a national study in 2000 by the Kaiser Family Foundation.<sup>29</sup> Notably, these parents *also* want lessons on how to use condoms (85%) and on general birth control topics (90%).<sup>30</sup> State and local surveys also have found strong support for information about both abstinence and birth control.<sup>31</sup>

***Recommendation: Revisit the restrictive approach to abstinence education.***

Currently, there is no rigorous research evidence that indicates that abstinence-unless-married programs help prevent pregnancy, yet there is new evidence this approach puts some individuals more at risk of unintended pregnancy and/or sexually transmitted illnesses. In the face of possible health harm to some individuals, continued funding for the prescriptive abstinence-unless-married education approach should be highly scrutinized. To the extent funds are made available, they should be allowed to be spent more flexibly as states shape their abstinence education and pregnancy prevention programs.<sup>32</sup>

***Issue: Teen parents, even when they are eligible for and in need of TANF, may too often be denied access to the TANF program.*** Emerging research, from a study in Los Angeles county and preliminary findings in Chicago, indicates that some teen mothers are wrongly being denied TANF, particularly due to caseworker misunderstandings about the TANF teen parent rules. This local “turning away at the door” appears to be out of sync with state policy, which allows for caseworker flexibility to have such teens receive

TANF. In addition, some minor mothers may not seek applications because they believe that unless they “live at home” they are ineligible.<sup>33</sup>

Participation in TANF requires teen parents to meet two important eligibility criteria that reflect goals specific to teens — participation in school and living in an approved setting (teen parents are also subject to other eligibility rules that are not limited to teens such as child support cooperation). Once teen parents participate in TANF, these goals remain central to effective implementation. Thus, if implemented well, the TANF requirements should help teens “stay on track” towards economic self-sufficiency and this includes avoiding a rapid subsequent birth. However, instead of reaching out to eligible teen parents to get them onto the social services radar screen, this emerging research suggests the message may be “stay away.”

For teen parents to “stay on track” more readily, help may be needed to avoid a rapid repeat birth. About 20% of the roughly 500,000 teen births each year are not the first child to a teen mother; about 100,000 teenagers gave birth to a second or higher order child in 2000.<sup>34</sup> While it is not evident how much of a contribution, if any, the specific TANF teen parent requirements make to the goal of reducing subsequent births, in an effective program a case manager working with an at-risk teen mother might engage this mother in a set of activities that could ameliorate this problem.

When teen mothers have more than one child, problems compound for both the mother and child. Teen mothers who have more than one child are less likely to complete high school or to get a GED; babies born to a teen who already has one child are more likely to be born premature or at low-weight.<sup>35</sup>

Teen mothers seeking TANF sometimes do not meet the teen parent eligibility requirements at time of application. Most state policies allow caseworkers the flexibility to work with such teens, yet the emerging research suggests that in some local offices this flexibility is not being used to get needy teen parents into TANF. Part of the reason a teen parent applicant may not be meeting these requirements and needs “flexible” assistance is that she is not aware of appropriate placements that would meet the requirements. For example, she may have dropped out of high school, but she does not know about alternatives. Further, there may be limited alternative placements in her community. In a CLASP survey of state administrators, nearly all of the 33 respondents identified at least one service need of teen parents who are mandated to meet the school and living requirements, with 16 states identifying more than one service need. Alternative placements for teen parents, for both education and appropriate living arrangements, as well as better or more case management, substance abuse treatment, mental health services, child care services, and in particular learning disability services, were cited.<sup>36</sup>

***Recommendation: Implement a “Transitional Eligibility” period for teen parents.*** TANF reauthorization could encourage states to reach out to needy teen parents through a “transitional eligibility” provision, a period of three months (with state discretion to extend) for teen parents who at application do not meet program requirements. This

allows the state to provide customized case management to help the teen come into eligibility compliance. The purpose of the transitional eligibility period would be to “signal” to states that time is available to provide supports and services for teen parents, enabling teen parents to come into compliance with federal requirements.

**Issue: TANF requires that minor teen parents live in an approved living situation, but no funding is provided for alternative living arrangements.** The law requires that a minor, custodial teen mother live with her own parent, legal guardian, or other relative, subject to some exceptions.<sup>37</sup> Older teen mothers also sometimes face difficulties in finding appropriate living arrangements.

The goal of teen parents residing with parents and relatives may make sense for many teen parents but for others it is problematic. Exempting some teen parents from the living arrangement requirement is necessary due to family violence.<sup>38</sup> While the need for alternative arrangements is most evident with respect to violence, it is less understood with regard to more subtle relationship issues. For example, residing with grandmothers may also have a negative effect on the children of some young mothers (not just minor parents) with low levels of depression; specifically, it is hypothesized that such young mothers who participated in the New Chance program evaluation<sup>39</sup> may have modeled higher levels of competence for their children, which was undercut by grandmother involvement.<sup>40</sup> And, under some circumstances, co-residence of a teen mother and her mother is associated with emotional distress. Specifically, teen mother depression and thus her progress in school, her ability to be a good mother, and the development of her child could be affected by the teen mother-grandmother relationship, according to research that examined the decision-making process in multi-generational homes in a Midwest county.<sup>41</sup> Finally, an increase in non-marital childbearing has been attributed to minor parent living arrangement and school requirements; specifically, non-marital childbearing increased nearly 12 percentage points for black teens and almost 17 percentage points for white teens according to a statistical analysis of pre-TANF welfare waivers similar to the TANF requirements.<sup>42</sup>

The need for alternative housing for teen parents is increasingly being recognized. Second chance homes provide teen mothers a stable and safe place to live while also providing intense support services. A CLASP survey found, among 20 state administrators that addressed the question of implementing the living arrangement rule, at least 13 had specific concerns about a lack of alternative housing options for teen parents or difficulties in assessing the safety of teen parents’ current living arrangement.<sup>43</sup> This underscores concerns about the need for alternative living arrangements (few states have established networks of second chance homes<sup>44</sup>), as well as a need for improved assessment of living arrangements experienced by teen parents.<sup>45</sup>

**Recommendation: Increase funding for “second chance” homes.** To assist teen parents who do not have an appropriate living arrangement, funds beyond the TANF block grant amounts should be made for “second chance” homes. CLASP supports the Bush Administration’s budget proposal to increase funding for second chance homes by

\$33 million; legislation currently under consideration would provide funding. Such increased funding is a step in the right direction.

**Issue: Teen parents appear to be disproportionately sanctioned under TANF, according to a “rough” data analysis.** A 2000 CLASP survey found that nearly 2,500 teen parents in five responding states were sanctioned in just *one month* for failure to comply with the school/training requirement.<sup>46</sup> The sanction rate for teen parents in these five states ranged from 6% to 23%, and all five of the states imposed a higher sanction rate for teen parents in comparison to the sanction rate for families overall as assessed in a separate GAO study.<sup>47</sup> For example, in California, 5.6 % of teen parents were sanctioned versus 0.9% of the overall caseload. Similarly in Illinois, 10.5% of teen parents were sanctioned versus 5.3% of the overall caseload. While these five states cannot depict a national trend, the possibility of such differences should raise a flag that moves us toward a deeper understanding of this issue.

For all families, sanctions are important not only because of the loss of immediate income but also because instability is likely to result. Very young families may be particularly vulnerable to the ill effects of instability. Evidence of poor outcomes for children in welfare families resulting from family turbulence has been found.<sup>48</sup>

Research indicates that it is often vulnerable families who are sanctioned. For example, a South Carolina study found that among all families leaving TANF, those with the lowest education levels were the mostly likely to be sanctioned; a Utah study concluded that 72% of families sanctioned had three or more barriers to employment.<sup>49</sup> With respect to teens, an analysis of AFDC teens sanctioned in Milwaukee due to Wisconsin’s education requirement found that many were known to the child welfare or juvenile justice system. Of the teens sanctioned in Milwaukee, 20% were in families identified as having problems with abuse or neglect; 21% of all teens sanctioned had been in the Children’s Court system.<sup>50</sup>

In Tennessee, a “customer review” process was established because of a concern that sanctions were inappropriately imposed on some families, that there was a need to develop strategies to get at the barriers that created the sanction, and that there was a need to better inform recipients of program rules. As a result of the review process, approximately one-third of the cases that were scheduled for closure at the time of the assessment program’s implementation were not closed, and a review by the University of Memphis found that 34% of those sanctioned for not signing their personal responsibility plan did not understand that they were required to comply with the plan.<sup>51</sup>

**Recommendation: Improve current sanction policies.** Improvements to existing TANF sanction policies should benefit TANF parents of all ages. CLASP recommends that sanction policies be changed to better address such issues as the sanction notice process — in advance of the sanction and subsequent to imposition of the sanction — and how sanctions are resolved (see CLASP’s overall comments on TANF reauthorization).

Given the CLASP finding that teen parents may be disproportionately affected by sanctions, reauthorization should be viewed as an opportunity to foster provisions that would further our understanding about the extent of this problem, why it is happening, and its impact. The following identifies some initial ideas; additional ones may emerge in the coming months as we learn more:

- ❖ **Undertake a DHHS Study.** An in-depth examination in a handful of states is needed regarding sanctions imposed on teen parents to fully understand the nature, extent, and impact of these sanctions. A study would explore questions such as: What rules are generating the most sanctions? Are teens sanctioned at rates higher than families headed by adults? Are sanction policies understood by teen parents in advance of sanction? Are notice procedures and mechanisms for cure understood by teen parents? By local welfare staff?
- ❖ **In-State Reports on Teen Parent Sanctions.** State collected data, reported by county (or other appropriate jurisdiction) and distributed in-state, should help state and local administrators self-assess operations related to sanctions. Federal data reporting already requires states to report to the federal government if the reason for a teen parent sanction is due to a failure to attend school or a failure to comply with an individual responsibility plan (with respect to the living arrangement rule, the federal requirement is that cases closed for this reason are to be reported). Keeping this data disaggregated could help as a management tool by identifying areas where improvements might be made. Such a state report could also include a comparison with sanction levels of older families. To be most useful, the in-state report should collect the processes local jurisdictions use to help avert inappropriate sanctions through such steps as face-to-face meetings with the teen parent, procedures that identify barriers that led to the sanction, etc. The in-state report could be required as part of the TANF state plan, recommended by DHHS as a “best practice,” or be part of some other mechanism.

**Issue: Life-time limits on TANF receipt affect all participating families but may pose particular implications for teen parents and their children.** Teen parents are subject to a “ticking” time clock if they are considered “adults.” This is defined as all 19-year-olds and those teen parents who are 18-years-old and are not participating as full-time students in a secondary school or equivalent training program. In addition, time clocks tick for minor parents who are heads-of-household or those who are married to heads-of-household.<sup>52</sup>

Time-limited assistance and the “work first” approach of TANF are intended incentives for parents to find employment. While minor teen parents are generally directed towards education under TANF, older teen parents may not be. New research of longer-term employment indicates that education may be particularly important if teen mothers are to achieve economic self-sufficiency. By their late 20s, women who ever received welfare and have not completed high school, have given birth as a teen, or had three or more children are unlikely to find a “good” job,<sup>53</sup> relative to other recipients without such characteristics. Further, fewer than one in five of women who give birth to their first

child before turning age 18 are predicted to work primarily in a “good” job, even though more than half will be working steadily by their late 20s.<sup>54</sup> Such outcomes suggest that time limits may force more disadvantaged TANF recipients, such as teen mothers and those without high school, into the workforce before they are ready. Those who are teen mothers *and* have no high school are particularly challenged in securing employment with livable wages.

**Recommendation: Start the time clock for teen parents beginning at age 20.**

For those TANF teen parents who are complying with education and training, the time-limit clock should not start.

**Issue: Available data on teen parent participation in TANF is inadequate.** CLASP survey analysis regarding teen parent participation in TANF found that the number of young parents is likely undercounted, and the status of such parents is often unknown. For instance, among the 10 states able to report to CLASP the number of teen parents participating in their TANF programs, half reported a count higher than that reported by the federal government. States also were often unable to report how many teens were subject to the states’ school/training requirements, or where teen parents were living.<sup>55</sup>

While federal reporting may improve some of the limited information available about teen parents in TANF, additional data is needed to get an accurate picture of the treatment of teen parents.

**Recommendation: Improve collection of teen parent data, including more specific state plan requirements.** In addition to continued improvements in DHHS data collection and reporting, TANF state plans should require some basic information on teen parents, such as the estimated number of TANF-eligible teen parents in the state, assessment procedures, and interagency coordination.

## Endnotes

---

<sup>1</sup> See “Reauthorization Issues: Teens/Reproductive Health,” <http://www.clasp.org/readingroom.htm>

<sup>2</sup> Department of Health and Human Services, *Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program: Third Annual Report to Congress*, August 2000.

<sup>3</sup> *AFDC Women Who Gave Birth as Teenagers*. GAO/HEHS 94-115; May 31, 1994

<sup>4</sup> 479,067. *Facts At A Glance*, Child Trends, August 2001.

<sup>5</sup> 79% in 1999. Child Trends, 2001.

<sup>6</sup> 378,585 in 2000. Joyce A. Martin, M.P.H., Brady E. Hamilton, Ph.D., and Stephanie J. Ventura, M.A., “Births: Preliminary Data for 2000.” *National Vital Statistics Report*, Vol. 49, No. 5, Division of Vital Statistics: July 24, 2001.

<sup>7</sup> Lawrence L. Wu, Larry L. Bumpers, and Kelly Musick, “Historical and Life Course Trajectories of Non-Marital Childbearing”, *IRP Abstract Report # 829*.

<sup>8</sup> 49%. Stephanie Ventura, National Center for Health Statistics, unpublished data, (2001) as cited in Elisabeth Terry-Humen, Jennifer Manlove, and Kristin Moore “Births Outside of Marriage: Perceptions vs. Reality”, *Child Trends Research Brief*, April 2001.

<sup>9</sup> “...After falling 22 percent between 1991 and 1996, the second birth rate for teenagers who had already had one child stabilized. In 1991 the rate was 220.9 second births per 1000 women aged 15-19 years with one child, and dropped to 173.5 in 1996; the rate has changed little since (174.1 in 1999). To put it another

---

way, 17 percent of teenagers who already had one child gave birth to a second child each year, 1996-1999, compared with 22 percent in 1991. Despite the decline over the decade in repeat childbearing, about 100,000 teenagers gave birth to a second or higher order child in 2000.” Stephanie J. Ventura, M.A., T.J. Matthews, M.S., and Brady E. Hamilton, Ph. D., “Births to Teenagers in the United States, 1940-2000”, *National Vital Statistics Reports*, Vol. 49, No. 10, Division of Vital Statistics: September 25, 2001.

<sup>10</sup> Martin et al., 2001.

<sup>11</sup> Stephanie J. Ventura, M.A. and Christine Bachrach, Ph.D., “Nonmarital Childbearing in the United States, 1940-99.” *National Vital Statistics Reports*, Vol. 48, No. 16 (revised), Division of Vital Statistics: October 18, 2000.

<sup>12</sup> Martin et al., 2001.

<sup>13</sup> Ventura et al., 2001.

<sup>14</sup> Child Trends, 2001.

<sup>15</sup> Unpublished calculations (1992-95) from the National Survey of Family Growth; the prior teen birth of an older woman may or may not have been non-marital. Child Trends, April 2001.

<sup>16</sup> Douglas Kirby, *Emerging Answers: Research Findings on Programs to Reduce Teen Pregnancy*. National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy, May 2001.

<sup>17</sup> While divorce and separation rates are high in the U.S. overall, rates are particularly high for teen marriages, ranging from 56-68%. Based on data from CDC, Vital and Health Statistics, “Fertility, Family Planning, and Women’s Health,” *New Data from the 1995 National Survey of Family Growth*, Series 23, No. 19, May 1997.

<sup>18</sup> Kirby, 2001.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid.

<sup>20</sup> Ron Haskins, the former staff director of the House Ways and Means Subcommittee on Human Resources during the 1996 reforms, says that “There is good reason to doubt that the bonus enacted in 1996 for states that reduce their illegitimacy and abortion rates are operating effectively. In fact, there is no discernable reason why some states win the bonus and other don’t; states that win do not seem to have operated special programs of any type.” See *CLASP Update* October, 2001, for his comments.

<sup>21</sup> About \$483 million will have been spent since one state, California, opted out of the 1996 federal program. The expenditure total includes about \$388 million in federal and state funding due to the 1996 law (excluding California), \$50 million in SPRANS community grants, and \$45 million in AFLA abstinence education.

<sup>22</sup> Two additional federal abstinence-unless-married funding sources, the Adolescent Family Life Act (AFLA) and Special Projects of Regional and National Significance-Community-Based Abstinence Education (SPRANS-CBAE) program, have made more money available. Under SPRANS grants, MCH can bypass states and award grants directly to local projects; grantees, however, may not provide contraceptive education, even with separate funds. Proponents of increased funding for SPRANS-CBAE argue that funding “parity” is needed between abstinence-unless-married education and family planning. This comparison, however, contrasts expenditures for education against costs for medical services.

<sup>23</sup> Department of Health and Human Services, “Statement by Tommy G. Thompson Secretary of Health and Human Services Regarding CDC’s Trends in Pregnancy Rates Report”, Tuesday, June 12, 2001.

Available online at: <http://www.hhs.gov/news/press/2001pres/20010612.html>

<sup>24</sup> Kirby, 2001.

<sup>25</sup> Peter Bearman and Hannah Brückner, “Virginity Pledges as They Affect the Transition to First Intercourse,” *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 106, No 4, 2001. John B. Jemmott III, Loretta Sweet Jemmott, and Geoffrey T. Fong, “Abstinence and Safer Sex HIV Risk-Reduction Interventions for African-American Adolescents, A Randomized Control Trial,” *Journal of the American Medical Association*, Vol. 279, May 20, 1998.

<sup>26</sup> Kirby, 2001.

<sup>27</sup> Dr. David Satcher, *The Call to Action to Promote Sexual Health and Responsible Sexual Behavior*. Office of the U.S. Surgeon General: June 2001.

<sup>28</sup> Marcela Howell and Ammie N. Feijoo, “Science or Politics? George W. Bush and the Future of Sexuality Education in the United States,” *Advocates for Youth Issue Brief*, January 2001.

- 
- <sup>29</sup> 97% of parents. “Sex Education in America: A View from Inside the Nation’s Classrooms,” *A Series of National Surveys of Students, Parents, Teachers, and Principals*, Kaiser Family Foundation Website, September 26, 2000. Available online at: <http://www.kff.org/content/2000/3048/Chartpack.pdf>
- <sup>30</sup> Kaiser Family Foundation, 2000.
- <sup>31</sup> Jodie Levin-Epstein, “Abstinence-Unless-Married Education,” CLASP: March 1999.
- <sup>32</sup> The abstinence program is not a part of TANF but was enacted at the same time as part of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act.
- <sup>33</sup> Martha Mathews and Shannon Shelley, “Turned Away, Misinformed, Denied — Teen Parents’ Experiences in Welfare Offices,” *Youth Law News*, July-August 1999. Also see “Accessing TANF Benefits: A Survey of Low-Income Teen Mothers in Chicago,” Center for Impact Research, Chicago, Illinois (forthcoming).
- <sup>34</sup> “...After falling 22 percent between 1991 and 1996, the second birth rate for teenagers who had already had one child stabilized. In 1991, the rate was 220.9 second births per 1000 women aged 15-19 years with one child, and dropped to 173.5 in 1996; the rate has changed little since (174.1 in 1999). To put it another way, 17 percent of teenagers who already had one child gave birth to a second child each year, 1996-1999, compared with 22 percent in 1991. Despite the decline over the decade in repeat childbearing, about 100,000 teenagers gave birth to a second or higher order child in 2000.” Ventura, 2001.
- <sup>35</sup> J. Manlove, C. Mariner, and A. Roman, “Positive Outcomes Among School-Age Mothers: Factors Associated with Postponing a Second Teenage Birth,” *Child Trends*, November 1997, Table 4 and page 14; *CDF Reports*, Children’s Defense Fund, 18:11, October 1997, p. 16.
- <sup>36</sup> See Janellen Duffy, “Add It Up: Teen Parents and TANF — Undercounted and Underserved”, CLASP (forthcoming).
- <sup>37</sup> P.L. 104-193 Title I, Section 408(a)(5)(A).
- <sup>38</sup> Few studies have examined the relationship with teen parents and abuse by intimate family members. One study of 535 young mothers in Washington state found that two-thirds of those who became pregnant as adolescents had been sexually abused. Of those, 55% had been molested, 42% had been victims of attempted rape, and 44% had been raped. See D. Boyer and D. Fine, “Sexual Abuse as Factor in Adolescent Pregnancy and Child Maltreatment,” *Family Planning Perspectives*, Vol. 24, 1992.
- <sup>39</sup> New Chance was a demonstration project, beginning the late 1980s and conducted in 16 sites around the country. The voluntary program provided comprehensive services including education, training, family planning, and child care.
- <sup>40</sup> Elisa A. Rosman and Hirokazu Yoshikawa, “Effects of Welfare Reform on Children of Adolescent Mothers: Moderation by Maternal Depression, Father Involvement, and Grandmother Involvement,” *Women & Health*, Vol. 32, No. 3.
- <sup>41</sup> Heidi Schweingruber, and Ariel Kalil, “Decision-making and Depressive Symptoms in Multigenerational Teen Parent Families,” *Journal of Family Psychology*, December 2000, Vol. 14, No. 4.
- <sup>42</sup> Ann Horvath-Rose and H. Elizabeth Peters, “Welfare Waivers and Non-marital Childbearing,” *JCPR Policy Briefs*, Vol. 2, No. 7, September 1999.
- <sup>43</sup> Duffy, forthcoming.
- <sup>44</sup> For more information on Second Chance programs, see Kathleen Sylvester, “Seeking Supervision: Second Chance Homes and the TANF Minor Teen Parent Living Arrangement Rule,” Social Policy Action Network: March 1999; “Second Chance Homes Fact Sheet,” U.S. Department of Health and Human Services: October 2000. Available online at: <http://aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/2ndchancehomes00/index.htm>
- <sup>45</sup> Jodie Levin-Epstein, *Seeking Supervision: State Policy Choices in TANF Minor Parent Living Arrangement Rule*. CLASP: March 1999. Available online at: [http://www.clasp.org/pubs/teens/Seeking\\_Supervision.htm#toptop](http://www.clasp.org/pubs/teens/Seeking_Supervision.htm#toptop)
- <sup>46</sup> Similarly, an earlier study by Mathematica on teen parents and TANF examined *annual* sanction rates and found rates ranging from 11% of teen parents in Virginia statewide to 48% in the two study counties in California. See Robert G. Wood and John Burghardt, *Implementing Welfare Reform Requirements for Teenage Parents: Lessons from Experience in Four States*, Vol. 1 and 2, October 1997.
- <sup>47</sup> The March 1999 survey data on teen parents are compared to state data on partial sanctions for families in an average month in 1998 as reported by the GAO in *Welfare Reform: State Sanction Policies and Number of Families Affected*, March 2000. (The GAO data were the only available comparison data).

---

<sup>48</sup> Research by Child Trends, Inc., found that instability, or turbulence, in childhood (which included events like changing schools and changes in a family member's employment or health) is associated with increased emotional and behavioral problems for children. Among the children in families receiving AFDC in 1996, 14% had experienced turbulence at some point in their lives, versus just 6% of children in families that did not receive AFDC. Kristin Anderson Moore et al. "Turbulence and Child Well-Being," Created for the New Federalism project. Series B, No. B-16, June 2000.

<sup>49</sup> Heidi Goldberg, "A Compliance Oriented Approach to Sanctions in State and County TANF Programs." Center on Budget and Policy Priorities: March 2001.

<sup>50</sup> "Family Matters," *CLASP Update*. Center for Law and Social Policy, Winter 1994.

<sup>51</sup> Russ Overby, "Customer Service Review: Tennessee's Review Process Before Welfare Reform Cases Are Closed." *Welfare News*. Tennessee Justice Center: 1998.

<sup>52</sup> See Jodie Levin-Epstein, *The 1996 Teen Parent Provisions*. CLASP: October 1996.

<sup>53</sup> Defined as a job that pays at least \$8.00 an hour in 1993 Consumer Price Index dollars, and for at least 35 hours a week

<sup>54</sup> LaDonna Pavetti and Gregory Acs, "Moving Up, Moving Out, or Going Nowhere? A Study of the Employment Patterns of Young Women," The Urban Institute: July 1997.

<sup>55</sup> Duffy, forthcoming.