

# **The Role of Child Support in Texas Welfare Dynamics:**

## **Statistical Supplement for Local Workforce Development Areas**

Deanna T. Schexnayder  
Jerome A. Olson

July 1999

**Center for the Study  
of Human Resources**



---

Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs  
The University of Texas at Austin  
3001 Lake Austin Blvd., Suite 3.200 Austin, TX 78703 (512) 471-7891

This report was prepared with funds provided through an Interagency Agreement from the Texas Workforce Commission to the Center for the Study of Human Resources at The University of Texas at Austin. The views expressed here are those of the authors and do not represent the positions of the funding agency or of The University.

## **Acknowledgments**

We would like to express our appreciation to staff members at the Texas Workforce Commission (TWC) for suggesting that we expand the research sample being used for *The Role of Child Support in Texas Welfare Dynamics* so that statistics could be developed for each of Texas' local workforce development areas. This report was made possible because TWC provided supplemental funding to the statewide project so that we could develop the local statistics. We also would like to thank Lela Dyson and Jeri Goldgar at TWC for serving as project managers for this effort.

Several of our colleagues at the Center for the Study of Human Resources contributed to the completion of this project. Kathy Faliski verified the accuracy of the local statistics and assisted with text editing. Diane Tucker monitored the financial and contractual aspects of this project, and Karen Franke provided her expert assistance in formatting this report into its final form.



## **Executive Summary**

In September 1998, the Center for the Study of Human Resources at the University of Texas at Austin published *The Role of Child Support in Texas Welfare Dynamics*. That four-year study measured the influence that increased child support enforcement strategies had on Texas welfare dynamics in the period following the implementation of the Family Support Act but prior to passage of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, the country's latest round of welfare reform.

This document provides descriptive statistics about Texas' adult welfare recipients and the noncustodial parents of their children for each of Texas' 28 local workforce development areas. It should be used as a companion piece to the statewide publication and provides statistics about both welfare caretakers and noncustodial parents that are often difficult to obtain, especially at the substate level. With the increased emphasis on improving the employability of noncustodial parents in welfare families, these statistics should provide background information to guide local planners in developing appropriate services for this group.



## **Introduction**

The collection of private child support payments, as a means to increasing exits from welfare rolls, has become a popular policy initiative. However, few studies have explored which factors influence the award and collection of child support, or the effects of child support payments on welfare exits and recidivism. The Center for the Study of Human Resources at the University of Texas at Austin (CSHR) recently prepared a report entitled “The Role of Child Support in Texas Welfare Dynamics,”<sup>1</sup> which examines the influence of increased child support enforcement strategies on the AFDC caseloads at the state level. This guidebook serves as a companion piece to that report. Its purpose is to provide statistics for local workforce development areas (LWDAs) that are comparable to those in the state report. It also explains how to interpret the data for each region.

Given the size of Texas, the characteristics of each local area’s welfare caseload often differ from the statewide average. In turn, the strategies employed to increase welfare and poverty exits could differ by area. This guidebook provides descriptive data at the local level for examining the characteristics of the welfare caseloads within Texas’ LWDAs to determine the likely effects of increased child support efforts. For comparison purposes, the guidebook also includes state-level data. Using the local-level data, each local workforce development board (LWDB) can prepare an analysis of its region. As a result, each LWDB can better allocate resources to mechanisms best suited for increasing the likelihood of child support awards and collection, as well as AFDC exits in its region.

## **Interpreting the Data**

The data from this study were derived using two main statistical approaches, descriptive statistics and statistical inference. While the descriptive statistics were calculated at both the state and local level, the statistical inferences were calculated at the state level only. Thus, unlike the state report, local areas should be cautious about making statistical inferences based on the characteristics of that area. To make such statistical inferences, individual regression analyses would need to be conducted for each area. Nevertheless, the descriptive statistics provided in this report offer valuable insight into the population of each LWDA.

<sup>1</sup> Schexnayder, Deanna T. et al. *The Role of Child Support in Texas Welfare Dynamics*. Austin: Center for the Study of Human Resources, The University of Texas at Austin, 1998.

The following table presents a crosswalk between the local area statistics provided in this guidebook and the tables/figures presented in “The Role of Child Support in Texas Welfare Dynamics” report. The tables/figures from that report provide a useful framework for analyzing the data in each area. By preparing similar tools, each local area can gain a better understanding of its AFDC caseload and the likely effects of child support payments on welfare and poverty exits. Local areas should use these crosswalks to help create tables or figures that can be compared to the state-level statistics. In general, local areas can simply copy the relevant numbers directly from the appropriate data tables as referenced below.

### Crosswalk Between Descriptive Statistics and Report Tables

<b>Statewide Report Tables</b>	<b>Variables in Statewide Report Tables</b>	<b>LWDA Table Number(s)</b>	<b>LWDA Table Description</b>
Table 1. Selected Characteristics of AFDC Caretakers (Page 16)	Race/Ethnicity	1, 2	Caseload by Race and Ethnicity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Percent Black</li> <li>• Percent White</li> <li>• Percent Hispanic</li> <li>• Percent Other</li> </ul>
	Educational Attainment	3, 4	Caseload by Educational Attainment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unknown</li> <li>• Grades 0-6</li> <li>• Grades 7-8</li> <li>• Grades 9-11</li> <li>• H.S. or greater</li> </ul>
	Age	5, 6	Caseload by Age <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• &lt;18</li> <li>• 18-24</li> <li>• 25-34</li> <li>• 35-44</li> <li>• 45 or more</li> </ul>
	Total Lifetime Months on AFDC	7, 8	Caseload by Lifetime Months of AFDC Dependence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• &lt;6 months</li> <li>• 7-12 months</li> <li>• 13-24 months</li> <li>• 25-30 months</li> <li>• 31-60 months</li> <li>• More than 60 months</li> </ul>
	Number of Children on AFDC Grant	9, 10	Caseload by Number of Children

<b>Statewide Report Tables</b>	<b>Variables in Statewide Report Tables</b>	<b>LWDA Table Number(s)</b>	<b>LWDA Table Description</b>
Table 2. Child Support Statistics (Page 17)	AFDC Caretakers with OAG Case	11	Percent of AFDC Caretakers with OAG Case
	Number of Opened OAG Cases per Custodial Parent	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total Numbers of AFDC Caretakers with OAG Cases</li> <li>• AG Cases per Custodial Parent</li> </ul>
	Marital Status of AFDC Caretaker at Children's Births	13	<p>Marital Status of AFDC Caretakers at Children's Births</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Percent of Cases with All Children Born While Married</li> <li>• Percent of Cases with Some Children Born Out of Wedlock</li> <li>• Percent of Cases with All Children Born out of Wedlock</li> </ul>
Table 3. Employment and Earnings Statistics (Page 18)	Employment Rates (within Texas) Mean Quarterly Earnings (for persons employed) Median Quarterly Earnings (for persons employed) Earnings as a Share of Poverty (employed custodial parents only)	14 - 16	Employment and Earnings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employment Rates for Custodial Parents</li> <li>• Employment Rates for Non-custodial parents (Includes only cases where NCP is located)</li> <li>• Mean Quarterly Earnings for Custodial Parents</li> <li>• Mean Quarterly Earnings for Non-custodial Parents</li> <li>• Median Quarterly Earnings for Custodial Parents</li> <li>• Mean Quarterly Earnings for Non-custodial Parents</li> <li>• Earnings as a Share of Poverty</li> </ul>
Table 5. OAG Cases by Highest Case Status (Page 20)	OAG Cases by Highest Case Status	17 - 19	OAG Cases by Highest Case Status <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Payments received in full</li> <li>• Partial collection of child support</li> <li>• Wage withholding established</li> <li>• Child support order in force</li> <li>• NCP located</li> <li>• OAG case opened</li> <li>• OAG Case Not Opened</li> </ul>
Table 6. Aggregate Obligations and Collections (Page 22)	Collections Obligations Percent Paid	20	Total and Per Case Collections and Obligations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collections—Total Amount Collected</li> <li>• Obligations—Total Amount Owed</li> <li>• Total Amount Collected as a Percentage of Total Amount Obligated</li> </ul>

<b>Statewide Report Tables</b>	<b>Variables in Statewide Report Tables</b>	<b>LWDA Table Number(s)</b>	<b>LWDA Table Description</b>
Figure 2. Distribution of Child Support Collections (monthly) (Page 30)	Collections  Amount Retained by State  Percent Retained by State	21	Distribution of Child Support Collections (annual) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total Collections</li> <li>• Amount Retained by State</li> <li>• Amount Retained by State as Percent of Total</li> </ul>
Figure 3. Quarterly Probability of Exit from AFDC (Page 31)	Probability of All Exits  Probability of Grant Jeopardy Exits	22	Exits and Grant Jeopardy Exits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total AFDC Caseload</li> <li>• All Exits</li> <li>• Grant Jeopardy Exits</li> <li>• Probability of All Exits</li> <li>• Probability of Grant Jeopardy Exits</li> </ul>
Figure 4. One-Year Recidivism Rate for Exits and Grant Jeopardy Exits	Probability of Recidivism for All Exits  Probability of Recidivism for Grant Jeopardy Exits	23	AFDC Exits and Recidivism <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total AFDC Caseload</li> <li>• All Exits</li> <li>• Probability of Recidivism within One Year</li> </ul>
Figure 5. Exits from Poverty	Exits from AFDC  Families Still in Poverty  Families Not in Poverty	24	Exits from Poverty Due to Child Support Received <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Percent of Families in Poverty After AFDC Exit</li> <li>• Percent of Families Not in Poverty After AFDC Exit</li> </ul>

**LWDA Table 1**  
**Caseload by Race and Ethnicity**  
**Entire Sample Oct-Dec 1992**

LWDA	Area Name	Total Caseload	Percent Black	Percent White	Percent Other	Percent Hispanic
1	Panhandle	3,084	18.6%	46.4%	1.2%	33.8%
2	South Plains	4,308	23.1%	20.3%	0.4%	56.2%
3	North Texas	1,582	26.2%	60.4%	1.2%	12.2%
4	North Central	6,213	27.4%	60.8%	0.6%	11.2%
5	Fort Worth/Tarrant Co.	10,098	47.7%	33.5%	2.8%	16.0%
6	Dallas/Dallas Co.	22,386	63.9%	19.5%	1.8%	14.8%
7	North East Texas	2,606	57.5%	41.0%	0.3%	1.1%
8	East Texas	7,116	49.8%	47.2%	0.4%	2.7%
9	West Central Texas	2,363	16.4%	51.6%	0.3%	31.8%
10	Upper Rio Grande	8,622	3.8%	7.1%	0.3%	88.7%
11	Permian Basin	4,104	16.9%	30.2%	0.1%	52.8%
12	Concho Valley	1,079	9.0%	44.9%	0.6%	45.4%
13	Heart of Texas	3,494	51.3%	32.0%	0.2%	16.4%
14	Austin/Travis Co.	5,411	38.2%	23.6%	0.6%	37.5%
15	Rural Capital	1,879	22.8%	40.7%	0.3%	36.2%
16	Brazos Valley	1,965	62.3%	25.6%	0.2%	11.9%
17	Deep East Texas	3,624	52.9%	44.4%	0.4%	2.4%
18	South East Texas	4,187	63.2%	32.0%	2.8%	1.9%
19	Golden Crescent	1,712	22.1%	22.4%	0.2%	55.4%
20	Alamo Area	20,773	12.9%	14.5%	0.3%	72.4%
21	South Texas	3,132	0.1%	0.6%	0.1%	99.3%
22	Corpus Christi/Rural Coastal Bend	8,478	7.2%	16.0%	0.4%	76.4%
23	Hidalgo/Willacy	7,685	0.2%	2.4%	0.1%	97.3%
24	Cameron Co.	4,534	0.2%	3.4%	0.1%	96.2%
25	Texoma	1,272	23.6%	72.6%	0.9%	2.9%
26	Central Texas	2,795	40.2%	42.2%	1.1%	16.5%
27	Middle Rio Grande	2,361	0.6%	5.9%	1.6%	91.9%
28	Gulf Coast	49,076	54.6%	21.8%	2.2%	21.4%
-	Texas	195,938	36.4%	24.2%	1.2%	38.2%

**LWDA Table 2**  
**Caseload by Race and Ethnicity**  
**Sample on AFDC July-Sept 1996**

LWDA	Area Name	Total Caseload	Percent Black	Percent White	Percent Other	Percent Hispanic
1	Panhandle	948	23.4%	38.7%	1.0%	37.0%
2	South Plains	1,604	24.6%	14.6%	0.3%	60.6%
3	North Texas	444	32.7%	51.4%	0.2%	15.8%
4	North Central	1,794	32.9%	53.9%	0.5%	12.8%
5	Fort Worth/Tarrant Co.	3,473	53.7%	25.5%	2.8%	18.1%
6	Dallas/Dallas Co.	8,140	70.9%	12.7%	1.7%	14.7%
7	North East Texas	773	67.2%	32.6%	0.0%	0.2%
8	East Texas	2,172	54.7%	41.8%	0.1%	3.4%
9	West Central Texas	751	17.5%	47.9%	0.2%	34.4%
10	Upper Rio Grande	3,420	3.6%	5.1%	0.1%	91.2%
11	Permian Basin	1,369	19.7%	23.6%	0.3%	56.4%
12	Concho Valley	323	11.5%	37.2%	0.6%	50.8%
13	Heart of Texas	1,258	57.7%	26.5%	0.0%	15.8%
14	Austin/Travis Co.	1,661	40.1%	16.2%	0.4%	43.3%
15	Rural Capital	571	23.6%	30.0%	0.2%	46.2%
16	Brazos Valley	758	66.7%	20.3%	0.3%	12.7%
17	Deep East Texas	1,230	57.9%	40.0%	0.1%	1.9%
18	South East Texas	1,591	68.3%	26.4%	3.8%	1.5%
19	Golden Crescent	637	23.2%	17.7%	0.2%	58.9%
20	Alamo Area	8,356	13.2%	11.5%	0.3%	75.0%
21	South Texas	1,363	0.1%	0.5%	0.0%	99.4%
22	Corpus Christi/Rural Coastal Bend	3,461	7.5%	11.4%	0.2%	80.9%
23	Hidalgo/Willacy	3,380	0.1%	1.9%	0.2%	97.8%
24	Cameron Co.	1,989	0.0%	2.2%	0.1%	97.7%
25	Texoma	376	31.4%	64.1%	1.1%	3.5%
26	Central Texas	761	41.2%	37.0%	1.1%	20.7%
27	Middle Rio Grande	1,029	0.4%	5.2%	1.9%	92.6%
28	Gulf Coast	16,996	60.4%	18.3%	1.9%	19.4%
-	Texas	70,628	38.6%	18.4%	1.1%	41.9%

**LWDA Table 3**  
**Caseload by Educational Attainment**  
**Entire Sample Oct-Dec 1992**

LWDA	Area Name	Unknown	Grades 0-6	Grades 7-8	Grades 9-11	H.S. graduate or greater
y	Panhandle	3.8%	4.8%	8.9%	34.0%	48.4%
2	South Plains	3.6%	9.3%	12.2%	36.8%	38.0%
3	North Texas	2.5%	3.0%	8.8%	33.8%	51.9%
4	North Central	3.0%	2.1%	10.3%	32.1%	52.5%
5	Fort Worth/Tarrant Co.	3.3%	3.4%	6.8%	32.4%	54.0%
6	Dallas/Dallas Co.	2.5%	3.1%	6.1%	31.7%	56.6%
7	North East Texas	3.9%	1.1%	5.1%	28.1%	61.8%
8	East Texas	3.9%	1.7%	7.0%	29.1%	58.3%
9	West Central Texas	3.4%	4.7%	12.5%	34.7%	44.8%
10	Upper Rio Grande	4.1%	16.9%	10.5%	24.1%	44.4%
11	Permian Basin	3.3%	9.5%	11.2%	36.8%	39.1%
12	Concho Valley	2.4%	5.3%	13.8%	34.3%	44.2%
13	Heart of Texas	5.4%	2.2%	6.5%	34.1%	51.8%
14	Austin/Travis Co.	4.3%	3.8%	9.3%	32.1%	50.5%
15	Rural Capital	2.9%	5.0%	10.3%	32.5%	49.3%
16	Brazos Valley	3.5%	2.4%	9.0%	36.5%	48.5%
17	Deep East Texas	3.2%	1.7%	8.7%	34.9%	51.5%
18	South East Texas	2.7%	2.8%	4.9%	28.1%	61.4%
19	Golden Crescent	3.2%	9.5%	16.9%	32.1%	38.3%
20	Alamo Area	3.6%	8.5%	14.5%	32.7%	40.7%
21	South Texas	2.0%	30.4%	17.0%	24.9%	25.8%
22	Corpus Christi/Rural Coastal Bend	4.3%	9.1%	14.6%	31.7%	40.4%
23	Hidalgo/Willacy	2.4%	36.6%	14.1%	23.1%	23.8%
24	Cameron Co.	3.1%	31.8%	14.4%	25.1%	25.6%
25	Texoma	3.8%	1.6%	7.9%	30.7%	56.1%
26	Central Texas	3.4%	2.6%	8.1%	28.7%	57.1%
27	Middle Rio Grande	2.2%	28.8%	15.0%	23.8%	30.2%
28	Gulf Coast	3.0%	4.3%	7.0%	29.7%	56.0%
-	Texas	3.3%	7.8%	9.5%	30.6%	48.9%

**LWDA Table 4**  
**Caseload by Educational Attainment**  
**Sample on AFDC July-Sept 1996**

<b>LWDA</b>	<b>Area Name</b>	<b>Unknown</b>	<b>Grades 0-6</b>	<b>Grades 7-8</b>	<b>Grades 9-11</b>	<b>H.S. graduate or greater</b>
1	Panhandle	1.3%	6.6%	10.7%	34.2%	47.2%
2	South Plains	1.9%	10.7%	13.8%	34.8%	38.9%
3	North Texas	1.1%	4.1%	9.7%	36.0%	49.1%
4	North Central	1.5%	2.4%	9.9%	36.0%	50.2%
5	Fort Worth/Tarrant Co.	1.2%	3.6%	8.5%	36.4%	50.3%
6	Dallas/Dallas Co.	1.6%	3.8%	8.0%	35.0%	51.7%
7	North East Texas	2.1%	1.8%	9.1%	31.7%	55.3%
8	East Texas	1.2%	1.5%	10.0%	34.7%	52.6%
9	West Central Texas	1.2%	5.7%	17.6%	35.8%	39.7%
10	Upper Rio Grande	1.6%	20.6%	12.3%	24.1%	41.4%
11	Permian Basin	1.7%	10.7%	13.3%	38.6%	35.7%
12	Concho Valley	0.6%	7.7%	18.0%	35.9%	37.8%
13	Heart of Texas	2.2%	2.4%	7.6%	34.5%	53.4%
14	Austin/Travis Co.	3.1%	4.3%	14.2%	32.5%	45.8%
15	Rural Capital	1.5%	8.7%	11.8%	36.9%	41.1%
16	Brazos Valley	2.0%	3.1%	9.9%	42.2%	42.9%
17	Deep East Texas	1.3%	1.3%	10.8%	36.5%	50.1%
18	South East Texas	1.0%	3.6%	4.8%	29.2%	61.4%
19	Golden Crescent	0.9%	11.8%	18.2%	33.1%	35.9%
20	Alamo Area	1.7%	9.2%	17.8%	34.1%	37.1%
21	South Texas	1.3%	26.9%	20.6%	28.2%	23.1%
22	Corpus Christi/Rural Coastal Bend	2.8%	9.6%	17.1%	34.4%	36.1%
23	Hidalgo/Willacy	1.0%	37.6%	15.1%	23.5%	22.8%
24	Cameron Co.	1.9%	32.6%	16.5%	22.5%	26.5%
25	Texoma	1.6%	2.1%	10.6%	34.3%	51.3%
26	Central Texas	1.7%	3.6%	10.2%	34.7%	49.8%
27	Middle Rio Grande	1.1%	29.4%	16.5%	25.0%	28.0%
28	Gulf Coast	1.9%	5.5%	8.1%	34.8%	49.8%
-	Texas	1.7%	9.4%	11.7%	33.1%	44.1%

**LWDA Table 5**  
**Caseload by Age**  
**Entire Sample Oct-Dec 1992**

LWDA	Area Name	<18	18-24	25-34	35-44	45 or older
1	Panhandle	1.6%	33.1%	40.2%	19.6%	5.6%
2	South Plains	1.7%	33.1%	38.4%	19.0%	7.8%
3	North Texas	1.5%	29.8%	43.8%	19.1%	5.8%
4	North Central	1.3%	32.0%	44.0%	18.3%	4.4%
5	Fort Worth/Tarrant Co.	1.4%	35.0%	42.7%	16.6%	4.3%
6	Dallas/Dallas Co.	1.1%	35.0%	43.1%	16.6%	4.3%
7	North East Texas	1.4%	32.5%	42.0%	18.8%	5.2%
8	East Texas	1.0%	30.5%	42.8%	20.1%	5.5%
9	West Central Texas	1.3%	29.5%	42.2%	20.5%	6.5%
10	Upper Rio Grande	0.8%	29.3%	39.2%	22.9%	7.8%
11	Permian Basin	1.6%	30.6%	41.7%	18.4%	7.7%
12	Concho Valley	1.7%	31.0%	40.7%	19.5%	7.1%
13	Heart of Texas	1.8%	34.1%	39.5%	18.6%	5.9%
14	Austin/Travis Co.	1.6%	32.2%	42.9%	18.3%	4.9%
15	Rural Capital	0.9%	29.2%	41.9%	19.9%	8.1%
16	Brazos Valley	1.4%	33.1%	40.6%	19.1%	5.8%
17	Deep East Texas	1.2%	29.3%	41.7%	21.0%	6.9%
18	South East Texas	1.1%	29.6%	43.7%	19.7%	5.9%
19	Golden Crescent	1.4%	28.4%	39.8%	20.8%	9.6%
20	Alamo Area	1.3%	31.0%	40.4%	20.9%	6.5%
21	South Texas	1.3%	24.5%	36.3%	23.0%	14.9%
22	Corpus Christi/Rural Coastal Bend	1.4%	28.3%	39.8%	21.3%	9.2%
23	Hidalgo/Willacy	1.3%	21.2%	33.1%	26.5%	17.8%
24	Cameron Co.	1.1%	24.1%	32.8%	25.5%	16.4%
25	Texoma	1.3%	31.4%	44.6%	18.0%	4.7%
26	Central Texas	1.4%	31.8%	43.2%	18.6%	5.0%
27	Middle Rio Grande	1.4%	22.1%	35.2%	26.6%	14.7%
28	Gulf Coast	1.1%	32.3%	42.1%	18.8%	5.7%
-	Texas	1.2%	31.1%	41.1%	19.7%	6.9%

**LWDA Table 6**  
**Caseload by Age**  
**Sample on AFDC July-Sept 1996**

LWDA	Area Name	<18	18-24	25-34	35-44	45 or older
1	Panhandle	0.0%	14.6%	49.0%	26.0%	10.4%
2	South Plains	0.0%	18.2%	45.2%	25.3%	11.3%
3	North Texas	0.0%	16.2%	48.6%	25.7%	9.5%
4	North Central	0.0%	16.5%	53.2%	24.6%	5.7%
5	Fort Worth/Tarrant Co.	0.0%	18.7%	53.3%	22.6%	5.5%
6	Dallas/Dallas Co.	0.0%	18.2%	52.3%	23.4%	6.0%
7	North East Texas	0.0%	14.8%	51.0%	25.1%	9.1%
8	East Texas	0.0%	15.2%	48.6%	25.6%	10.5%
9	West Central Texas	0.0%	12.3%	50.2%	28.4%	9.1%
10	Upper Rio Grande	0.0%	12.6%	38.8%	34.9%	13.7%
11	Permian Basin	0.0%	14.4%	49.4%	25.4%	10.9%
12	Concho Valley	0.0%	17.6%	45.8%	23.2%	13.3%
13	Heart of Texas	0.0%	19.3%	47.6%	24.2%	8.9%
14	Austin/Travis Co.	0.0%	18.9%	49.4%	23.3%	8.4%
15	Rural Capital	0.0%	12.9%	45.1%	26.8%	15.2%
16	Brazos Valley	0.0%	13.8%	49.8%	27.2%	9.2%
17	Deep East Texas	0.0%	13.7%	45.1%	31.6%	9.6%
18	South East Texas	0.0%	15.4%	48.4%	28.9%	7.4%
19	Golden Crescent	0.0%	13.2%	44.4%	27.3%	15.1%
20	Alamo Area	0.0%	15.2%	48.5%	26.0%	10.3%
21	South Texas	0.0%	10.6%	42.1%	29.3%	18.0%
22	Corpus Christi/Rural Coastal Bend	0.0%	14.3%	46.6%	25.0%	14.1%
23	Hidalgo/Willacy	0.0%	9.9%	37.1%	28.7%	24.3%
24	Cameron Co.	0.0%	12.0%	36.4%	30.5%	21.0%
25	Texoma	0.0%	14.6%	51.3%	28.2%	5.9%
26	Central Texas	0.0%	19.9%	46.4%	26.1%	7.7%
27	Middle Rio Grande	0.0%	9.4%	36.9%	32.5%	21.2%
28	Gulf Coast	0.0%	15.9%	49.4%	26.1%	8.6%
-	Texas	0.0%	15.4%	47.6%	26.4%	3.8%

**LWDA Table 7**  
**Caseload by Lifetime Months of AFDC Dependence**  
**Entire Sample Oct-Dec 1992**

LWDA	Area Name	<6 months	7-12 months	13-24 months	25-30 months	31-60 months	More than 60
1	Panhandle	18.0%	11.9%	18.7%	6.7%	23.6%	21.0%
2	South Plains	12.8%	10.6%	16.2%	6.2%	23.0%	31.2%
3	North Texas	17.1%	13.2%	19.8%	7.0%	22.6%	20.4%
4	North Central	18.4%	14.1%	20.2%	7.0%	21.4%	18.9%
5	Fort Worth/Tarrant Co.	19.0%	12.9%	17.7%	7.3%	21.2%	21.9%
6	Dallas/Dallas Co.	15.3%	11.6%	17.3%	6.9%	20.8%	28.2%
7	North East Texas	14.1%	10.2%	15.7%	5.1%	18.8%	36.2%
8	East Texas	15.8%	10.9%	16.8%	6.3%	20.2%	30.0%
9	West Central Texas	16.3%	11.3%	19.5%	6.6%	23.2%	23.1%
10	Upper Rio Grande	17.2%	10.6%	17.5%	7.3%	20.4%	27.0%
11	Permian Basin	16.7%	11.4%	16.5%	8.2%	24.0%	23.2%
12	Concho Valley	17.3%	12.4%	16.9%	6.1%	24.4%	22.9%
13	Heart of Texas	11.5%	9.3%	14.5%	7.3%	21.8%	35.6%
14	Austin/Travis Co.	12.7%	10.8%	16.1%	6.2%	22.3%	31.8%
15	Rural Capital	15.4%	10.6%	19.1%	6.0%	21.8%	27.1%
16	Brazos Valley	9.6%	8.8%	12.3%	6.1%	22.3%	40.9%
17	Deep East Texas	11.7%	9.6%	14.5%	4.8%	20.9%	38.4%
18	South East Texas	10.8%	8.6%	13.6%	5.3%	22.0%	39.5%
19	Golden Crescent	10.6%	9.7%	13.5%	5.2%	23.3%	37.7%
20	Alamo Area	11.8%	8.8%	14.2%	6.3%	20.9%	38.0%
21	South Texas	11.8%	9.8%	16.0%	6.3%	23.4%	32.7%
22	Corpus Christi/Rural Coastal Bend	11.1%	8.9%	14.4%	4.8%	21.9%	38.9%
23	Hidalgo/Willacy	13.3%	10.1%	15.4%	6.0%	20.4%	34.8%
24	Cameron Co.	12.4%	9.8%	15.0%	5.7%	19.8%	37.3%
25	Texoma	17.1%	12.9%	21.1%	6.3%	22.6%	20.0%
26	Central Texas	17.4%	12.2%	16.7%	5.6%	21.4%	26.7%
27	Middle Rio Grande	11.0%	10.0%	14.8%	6.2%	20.8%	37.2%
28	Gulf Coast	12.8%	10.1%	16.3%	5.8%	21.7%	33.3%
-	Texas	13.9%	10.5%	16.3%	6.3%	21.4%	31.6%

**LWDA Table 8**  
**Caseload by Lifetime Months of AFDC Dependence**  
**Sample Remaining on AFDC July-Sept 1996**

LWDA	Area Name	<6 months	7-12 months	13-24 months	25-30 months	31-60 months	More than 60
1	Panhandle	10.2%	10.2%	14.3%	7.6%	28.6%	29.1%
2	South Plains	7.2%	4.6%	14.8%	5.5%	29.4%	38.5%
3	North Texas	10.6%	11.3%	14.0%	7.2%	27.5%	29.5%
4	North Central	11.0%	8.6%	18.6%	6.6%	28.1%	27.2%
5	Fort Worth/Tarrant Co.	10.2%	9.6%	17.3%	7.9%	25.3%	29.6%
6	Dallas/Dallas Co.	9.0%	8.0%	15.4%	6.5%	23.8%	37.3%
7	North East Texas	5.9%	7.5%	12.8%	4.5%	20.3%	49.0%
8	East Texas	9.0%	7.7%	13.6%	5.1%	23.2%	41.3%
9	West Central Texas	9.1%	8.6%	16.3%	7.2%	25.9%	33.0%
10	Upper Rio Grande	10.7%	8.7%	15.8%	8.0%	21.4%	35.4%
11	Permian Basin	10.9%	10.7%	12.7%	7.2%	27.5%	31.0%
12	Concho Valley	8.4%	9.3%	17.3%	5.9%	23.8%	35.3%
13	Heart of Texas	9.1%	6.9%	13.0%	7.0%	21.8%	42.3%
14	Austin/Travis Co.	7.3%	8.5%	12.2%	5.0%	25.0%	42.0%
15	Rural Capital	8.0%	6.7%	14.4%	5.9%	25.3%	39.7%
16	Brazos Valley	4.2%	6.1%	11.8%	6.3%	22.0%	49.5%
17	Deep East Texas	6.8%	6.1%	14.0%	5.6%	20.4%	47.1%
18	South East Texas	6.4%	6.8%	15.1%	4.3%	23.2%	44.2%
19	Golden Crescent	7.7%	4.9%	11.0%	4.7%	23.9%	47.9%
20	Alamo Area	6.8%	6.3%	10.8%	5.9%	22.4%	47.8%
21	South Texas	7.4%	8.3%	13.7%	6.2%	25.6%	38.9%
22	Corpus Christi/Rural Coastal Bend	5.7%	6.7%	13.5%	4.3%	23.1%	46.6%
23	Hidalgo/Willacy	10.0%	7.1%	14.2%	4.5%	23.0%	41.2%
24	Cameron Co.	7.3%	7.4%	13.1%	6.1%	21.3%	44.8%
25	Texoma	9.3%	6.1%	17.8%	8.2%	27.7%	30.9%
26	Central Texas	11.5%	9.6%	13.8%	4.4%	22.4%	38.3%
27	Middle Rio Grande	6.4%	8.2%	13.4%	6.8%	20.8%	44.4%
28	Gulf Coast	8.1%	7.6%	12.5%	5.7%	22.1%	44.0%
-	Texas	8.3%	7.6%	13.7%	6.0%	23.3%	41.1%

**LWDA Table 9**  
**Caseload by Number of Children**  
**Entire Sample Oct-Dec 1992**

<b>LWDA</b>	<b>Area Name</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4 or more</b>
1	Panhandle	41.8%	30.4%	17.5%	10.4%
2	South Plains	37.0%	30.5%	19.4%	13.1%
3	North Texas	42.6%	33.0%	16.6%	7.8%
4	North Central	42.7%	31.9%	17.1%	8.3%
5	Fort Worth/Tarrant Co.	39.3%	33.5%	17.0%	10.3%
6	Dallas/Dallas Co.	38.2%	34.4%	18.5%	9.0%
7	North East Texas	41.8%	32.8%	16.8%	8.6%
8	East Texas	40.3%	33.0%	17.1%	9.6%
9	West Central Texas	41.8%	30.7%	17.2%	10.2%
10	Upper Rio Grande	42.7%	29.9%	17.3%	10.1%
11	Permian Basin	38.7%	30.8%	18.6%	12.0%
12	Concho Valley	42.0%	32.0%	16.1%	9.9%
13	Heart of Texas	36.7%	31.8%	19.7%	11.8%
14	Austin/Travis Co.	40.6%	30.6%	17.8%	11.0%
15	Rural Capital	40.7%	30.9%	17.9%	10.6%
16	Brazos Valley	36.1%	29.6%	19.4%	15.0%
17	Deep East Texas	40.3%	32.3%	17.2%	10.2%
18	South East Texas	40.5%	30.5%	18.5%	10.4%
19	Golden Crescent	38.0%	31.3%	18.5%	12.2%
20	Alamo Area	37.6%	29.2%	18.9%	14.3%
21	South Texas	37.4%	29.7%	18.6%	14.4%
22	Corpus Christi/Rural Coastal Bend	38.9%	27.9%	20.8%	12.5%
23	Hidalgo/Willacy	38.1%	28.6%	18.4%	14.9%
24	Cameron Co.	38.7%	29.4%	18.1%	13.8%
25	Texoma	45.4%	33.8%	16.0%	4.7%
26	Central Texas	42.2%	30.1%	18.0%	9.7%
27	Middle Rio Grande	39.9%	29.4%	17.0%	13.7%
28	Gulf Coast	38.8%	31.5%	18.1%	11.6%
-	Texas	39.2%	31.2%	18.2%	11.4%

**LWDA Table 10**  
**Caseload by Number of Children**  
**Sample Remaining on AFDC July-Sept 1996**

<b>LWDA</b>	<b>Area Name</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4 or more</b>
1	Panhandle	29.9%	32.6%	22.4%	15.1%
2	South Plains	30.0%	30.9%	23.3%	15.8%
3	North Texas	35.1%	33.1%	20.3%	11.5%
4	North Central	34.4%	34.1%	20.4%	11.1%
5	Fort Worth/Tarrant Co.	28.2%	31.5%	24.5%	15.9%
6	Dallas/Dallas Co.	26.1%	36.8%	24.1%	13.0%
7	North East Texas	34.2%	31.0%	22.1%	12.7%
8	East Texas	34.1%	34.1%	18.8%	13.0%
9	West Central Texas	34.8%	32.2%	20.4%	12.7%
10	Upper Rio Grande	30.0%	35.0%	22.0%	13.0%
11	Permian Basin	32.7%	31.3%	23.1%	12.8%
12	Concho Valley	33.4%	34.7%	20.1%	11.8%
13	Heart of Texas	28.8%	31.9%	22.8%	16.5%
14	Austin/Travis Co.	28.9%	34.2%	20.5%	16.3%
15	Rural Capital	33.8%	30.2%	21.5%	14.4%
16	Brazos Valley	28.3%	32.0%	22.1%	17.5%
17	Deep East Texas	38.7%	31.0%	18.3%	12.0%
18	South East Texas	33.2%	29.7%	22.1%	15.0%
19	Golden Crescent	35.0%	32.2%	19.0%	13.8%
20	Alamo Area	28.9%	29.9%	23.9%	17.3%
21	South Texas	30.4%	30.3%	23.7%	15.7%
22	Corpus Christi/Rural Coastal Bend	33.4%	28.8%	22.1%	15.8%
23	Hidalgo/Willacy	32.1%	28.7%	21.4%	17.8%
24	Cameron Co.	34.8%	31.3%	20.1%	13.8%
25	Texoma	35.1%	39.6%	18.6%	6.6%
26	Central Texas	32.8%	31.8%	23.6%	11.9%
27	Middle Rio Grande	32.6%	32.7%	20.2%	14.5%
28	Gulf Coast	30.1%	31.7%	22.6%	15.6%
-	Texas	30.5%	32.1%	22.4%	14.9%

**LWDA Table 11**  
**Percent of AFDC Caretakers with OAG Case**

LWDA	Area Name	Entire Sample Oct-Dec 1992	Entire Sample July-Sept 1996	Sample Remaining on AFDC July-Sept 1996
1	Panhandle	68.2%	91.3%	91.6%
2	South Plains	66.5%	91.9%	92.6%
3	North Texas	70.9%	92.9%	91.7%
4	North Central	66.5%	90.8%	89.9%
5	Fort Worth/Tarrant Co.	62.2%	89.9%	89.8%
6	Dallas/Dallas Co.	57.8%	90.1%	91.6%
7	North East Texas	71.3%	91.4%	89.8%
8	East Texas	65.5%	88.8%	84.9%
9	West Central Texas	68.4%	90.8%	91.3%
10	Upper Rio Grande	68.6%	89.7%	89.9%
11	Permian Basin	63.2%	90.7%	90.3%
12	Concho Valley	67.6%	90.4%	89.2%
13	Heart of Texas	66.0%	91.8%	89.7%
14	Austin/Travis Co.	60.4%	90.1%	90.4%
15	Rural Capital	65.0%	89.6%	90.9%
16	Brazos Valley	62.2%	92.3%	90.6%
17	Deep East Texas	67.4%	89.3%	89.5%
18	South East Texas	66.8%	91.9%	90.8%
19	Golden Crescent	65.0%	90.4%	89.5%
20	Alamo Area	65.4%	90.2%	90.4%
21	South Texas	64.0%	83.4%	85.0%
22	Corpus Christi/Rural Coastal Bend	67.5%	90.7%	91.3%
23	Hidalgo/Willacy	58.9%	80.5%	82.5%
24	Cameron Co.	63.2%	84.6%	86.0%
25	Texoma	67.3%	91.3%	92.3%
26	Central Texas	67.1%	92.5%	88.9%
27	Middle Rio Grande	63.3%	84.7%	85.3%
28	Gulf Coast	57.8%	90.8%	90.6%
-	Texas	62.5%	89.8%	89.8%

**LWDA Table 12**  
**Number of Opened OAG Cases Per Custodial Parent**

LWDA	Area Name	Entire Sample Oct-Dec 1992			Sample Remaining on AFDC July-Sept 1996		
		Number of AFDC Caretakers	Number of Caretakers with OAG Case	AG cases per Custodial Parent	Number of AFDC Caretakers	Number of Caretakers with OAG Case	AG cases per Custodial Parent
1	Panhandle	3,084	4,045	1.31	948	1,419	1.50
2	South Plains	4,308	6,060	1.41	1,604	2,501	1.56
3	North Texas	1,582	2,083	1.32	444	677	1.52
4	North Central	6,213	7,913	1.27	1,794	2,646	1.47
5	Fort Worth/Tarrant Co.	10,098	13,851	1.37	3,473	5,574	1.60
6	Dallas/Dallas Co.	22,386	30,725	1.37	8,140	13,064	1.60
7	North East Texas	2,606	3,596	1.38	773	1,274	1.65
8	East Texas	7,116	9,411	1.32	2,172	3,376	1.55
9	West Central Texas	2,363	3,369	1.43	751	1,232	1.64
10	Upper Rio Grande	8,622	10,739	1.25	3,420	4,639	1.36
11	Permian Basin	4,104	5,439	1.33	1,369	2,043	1.49
12	Concho Valley	1,079	1,410	1.31	323	497	1.54
13	Heart of Texas	3,494	5,118	1.46	1,258	2,085	1.66
14	Austin/Travis Co.	5,411	7,357	1.36	1,661	2,586	1.56
15	Rural Capital	1,879	2,445	1.30	571	819	1.43
16	Brazos Valley	1,965	2,916	1.48	758	1,296	1.71
17	Deep East Texas	3,624	4,666	1.29	1,230	1,732	1.41
18	South East Texas	4,187	6,012	1.44	1,591	2,609	1.64
19	Golden Crescent	1,712	2,392	1.40	637	1,005	1.58
20	Alamo Area	20,773	28,751	1.38	8,356	12,875	1.54
21	South Texas	3,132	3,720	1.19	1,363	1,745	1.28
22	Corpus Christi/Rural Coastal Bend	8,478	11,949	1.41	3,461	5,351	1.55
23	Hidalgo/Willacy	7,685	9,403	1.22	3,380	4,543	1.34
24	Cameron Co.	4,534	5,490	1.21	1,989	2,533	1.27
25	Texoma	1,272	1,636	1.29	376	543	1.44
26	Central Texas	2,795	3,910	1.40	761	1,295	1.70
27	Middle Rio Grande	2,361	3,139	1.33	1,029	1,453	1.41
28	Gulf Coast	49,076	67,317	1.37	16,996	27,140	1.60
-	Texas	195,938	264,862	1.35	70,628	108,551	1.54

**LWDA Table 13**  
**Marital Status of AFDC Caretakers at Children's Births**

LWDA	Area Name	Entire Sample Oct-Dec 1992				Entire Sample July-Sept 1996				Remaining Sample on AFDC July-Sept 1996			
		Percent of Cases with All Children While Married		Percent of Cases with Some Children Born Out of Wedlock		Percent of Cases with All Children Born		Percent of Cases with Some Children Born Out of Wedlock		Percent of Cases with All Children While Married		Percent of Cases with Some Children Born Out of Wedlock	
		Children Born	Out of Wedlock	Children Born	Out of Wedlock	Children Born	Out of Wedlock	Children Born	Out of Wedlock	Children While Married	Out of Wedlock	Children Born	Out of Wedlock
1	Panhandle	38.7%	30.0%	31.3%	38.4%	35.1%	26.6%	33.2%	40.3%	26.5%	26.5%	29.0%	29.0%
2	South Plains	36.5%	32.4%	31.1%	36.4%	35.4%	28.2%	31.2%	39.8%	29.0%	29.0%	30.8%	30.8%
3	North Texas	42.7%	27.6%	29.7%	43.5%	31.1%	25.4%	35.6%	40.8%	23.6%	23.6%	40.8%	40.8%
4	North Central	41.8%	26.9%	31.3%	41.6%	31.2%	27.1%	32.6%	42.5%	24.9%	24.9%	42.5%	42.5%
5	Fort Worth/Tarrant Co.	31.2%	34.5%	34.3%	31.5%	39.2%	29.3%	24.1%	47.3%	28.6%	28.6%	47.3%	47.3%
6	Dallas/Dallas Co.	24.6%	39.8%	35.5%	24.3%	44.9%	30.9%	18.7%	53.5%	27.8%	27.8%	53.5%	53.5%
7	North East Texas	31.4%	34.8%	33.8%	31.8%	38.3%	29.8%	25.7%	47.4%	26.9%	26.9%	47.4%	47.4%
8	East Texas	38.4%	30.6%	31.0%	38.1%	35.1%	26.8%	28.9%	41.7%	29.4%	29.4%	41.7%	41.7%
9	West Central Texas	41.0%	29.0%	30.0%	41.9%	31.5%	26.6%	35.6%	36.3%	28.1%	28.1%	36.3%	36.3%
10	Upper Rio Grande	41.0%	28.3%	30.7%	41.0%	32.8%	26.2%	35.7%	40.2%	24.1%	24.1%	40.2%	40.2%
11	Permian Basin	40.0%	31.6%	28.4%	39.7%	34.7%	25.6%	31.9%	40.8%	27.4%	27.4%	40.8%	40.8%
12	Concho Valley	41.7%	26.7%	31.6%	41.0%	30.3%	28.7%	34.4%	35.0%	30.7%	30.7%	35.0%	35.0%
13	Heart of Texas	30.6%	38.3%	31.1%	30.7%	41.3%	28.0%	25.5%	49.2%	25.3%	25.3%	49.2%	49.2%
14	Austin/Travis Co.	25.4%	36.1%	38.4%	25.7%	41.0%	33.3%	20.0%	48.6%	31.4%	31.4%	48.6%	48.6%
15	Rural Capital	38.3%	32.0%	29.7%	37.7%	34.4%	27.9%	30.8%	42.0%	27.2%	27.2%	42.0%	42.0%
16	Brazos Valley	28.2%	39.4%	32.4%	29.0%	41.4%	29.7%	22.8%	48.4%	28.8%	28.8%	48.4%	48.4%
17	Deep East Texas	34.9%	35.0%	30.1%	35.1%	37.2%	27.6%	29.1%	40.2%	30.7%	30.7%	40.2%	40.2%
18	South East Texas	30.3%	36.4%	33.4%	30.2%	41.3%	28.4%	23.6%	48.9%	27.5%	27.5%	48.9%	48.9%
19	Golden Crescent	39.0%	31.5%	29.4%	39.5%	33.1%	27.4%	31.2%	38.8%	30.0%	30.0%	38.8%	38.8%
20	Alamo Area	38.5%	32.2%	29.4%	38.1%	36.0%	25.9%	32.3%	43.2%	24.5%	24.5%	43.2%	43.2%
21	South Texas	47.2%	29.1%	23.7%	47.1%	31.1%	21.9%	41.6%	34.6%	23.8%	23.8%	34.6%	34.6%
22	Corpus Christi/Rural Coastal Bend	42.0%	28.9%	29.1%	42.2%	31.6%	26.2%	36.9%	37.7%	25.4%	25.4%	37.7%	37.7%
23	Hidalgo/Willacy	42.1%	32.6%	25.3%	42.2%	34.6%	23.2%	38.7%	38.5%	22.8%	22.8%	38.5%	38.5%
24	Cameron Co.	39.7%	31.4%	28.9%	40.2%	33.7%	26.1%	34.0%	37.8%	28.2%	28.2%	37.8%	37.8%
25	Texoma	42.6%	26.5%	30.9%	43.4%	29.8%	26.7%	33.8%	37.5%	28.7%	28.7%	37.5%	37.5%
26	Central Texas	39.2%	30.4%	30.5%	39.2%	34.0%	26.8%	32.8%	44.4%	22.8%	22.8%	44.4%	44.4%
27	Middle Rio Grande	41.3%	30.7%	28.0%	40.9%	33.4%	25.7%	36.3%	37.9%	25.8%	25.8%	37.9%	37.9%
28	Gulf Coast	26.6%	37.5%	35.9%	26.3%	41.2%	32.5%	19.8%	49.1%	31.1%	31.1%	49.1%	49.1%
-	Texas	33.4%	34.2%	32.4%	33.3%	37.9%	28.8%	27.4%	45.0%	27.6%	27.6%	45.0%	45.0%

**LWDA Table 14**  
**Employment and Earnings**  
**Entire Sample, October to December, 1992**

LWDA	Area Name	Employment Rates†		Mean Quarterly Earnings‡		Median Quarterly Earnings		Earnings as a Share of Poverty for Custodial Parents		
		Custodial Parents	Non-custodial Parents (Includes only cases where ncp is found)	Custodial Parents	Non-custodial Parents	Custodial Parents	Non-custodial Parents	No Earnings	Less than 50% of Poverty	>155% of Poverty
1	Panhandle	28.4%	43.4%	\$1,312	\$2,930	\$970	\$2,610	71.6%	18.0%	9.5%
2	South Plains	26.6%	46.9%	\$1,176	\$2,795	\$864	\$2,432	73.4%	18.0%	0.9%
3	North Texas	26.4%	38.3%	\$1,152	\$2,903	\$850	\$2,454	73.6%	17.4%	0.6%
4	North Central	31.9%	44.7%	\$1,318	\$3,457	\$970	\$2,977	68.1%	19.4%	0.7%
5	Fort Worth/Tarrant Co.	35.5%	45.7%	\$1,375	\$2,965	\$1,112	\$2,596	64.5%	20.8%	1.3%
6	Dallas/Dallas Co.	34.0%	49.1%	\$1,347	\$3,236	\$1,062	\$2,826	66.0%	20.2%	1.1%
7	North East Texas	24.4%	40.3%	\$1,210	\$3,208	\$915	\$2,574	75.6%	15.8%	0.7%
8	East Texas	25.9%	49.5%	\$1,283	\$3,287	\$979	\$2,962	74.1%	16.1%	0.9%
9	West Central Texas	27.2%	39.0%	\$1,102	\$2,860	\$803	\$2,467	72.8%	18.8%	0.3%
10	Upper Rio Grande	18.9%	42.6%	\$1,309	\$3,024	\$1,047	\$2,796	81.1%	11.0%	0.3%
11	Permian Basin	25.6%	47.9%	\$1,185	\$3,363	\$943	\$2,936	74.4%	16.3%	0.4%
12	Concho Valley	27.5%	46.1%	\$1,162	\$3,106	\$950	\$2,746	72.5%	17.3%	0.6%
13	Heart of Texas	33.3%	44.2%	\$1,260	\$2,933	\$949	\$2,551	66.7%	21.7%	0.9%
14	Austin/Travis Co.	36.4%	42.8%	\$1,268	\$3,006	\$906	\$2,579	63.6%	23.1%	1.2%
15	Rural Capital	31.1%	43.2%	\$1,396	\$3,219	\$1,154	\$2,919	68.9%	18.0%	0.9%
16	Brazos Valley	29.0%	50.2%	\$1,104	\$3,146	\$844	\$2,680	71.0%	20.3%	0.3%
17	Deep East Texas	23.4%	45.7%	\$1,230	\$3,497	\$960	\$3,147	76.6%	15.3%	0.5%
18	South East Texas	28.2%	47.0%	\$1,186	\$3,213	\$947	\$2,664	71.8%	19.2%	0.8%
19	Golden Crescent	22.1%	52.5%	\$1,193	\$3,466	\$840	\$3,065	77.9%	14.8%	0.6%
20	Alamo Area	23.0%	46.6%	\$1,218	\$2,897	\$846	\$2,617	77.0%	15.3%	0.7%
21	South Texas	20.3%	38.4%	\$1,347	\$2,935	\$1,044	\$2,600	79.7%	12.7%	0.8%
22	Corpus Christi/Rural Coastal Bend	18.7%	45.5%	\$1,151	\$3,257	\$848	\$2,839	81.3%	12.8%	0.4%
23	Hidalgo/Willacy	16.0%	36.0%	\$1,143	\$2,789	\$825	\$2,547	84.0%	11.1%	0.3%
24	Cameron Co.	18.1%	38.5%	\$1,271	\$3,038	\$1,013	\$2,652	81.9%	11.5%	0.4%
25	Texoma	29.2%	44.3%	\$1,182	\$3,262	\$1,003	\$2,800	70.8%	19.2%	0.6%
26	Central Texas	27.1%	34.5%	\$1,191	\$3,187	\$972	\$2,795	72.9%	17.6%	0.5%
27	Middle Rio Grande	17.1%	40.9%	\$1,028	\$3,046	\$699	\$2,618	82.9%	12.3%	0.3%
28	Gulf Coast	27.3%	45.3%	\$1,394	\$3,598	\$1,043	\$3,156	72.7%	16.7%	1.2%
-	Texas	26.7%	44.9%	\$1,298	\$3,216	\$959	\$2,751	73.3%	16.8%	0.9%

Notes: † Earnings are averaged for employed individuals only.

**LWDA Table 15**  
**Employment and Earnings**  
**Entire Sample, July to September, 1996**

LWDA	Area Name	Employment Rates†		Mean Quarterly Earnings‡		Median Quarterly Earnings		Earnings as a Share of Poverty for Custodial Parents	
		Custodial Parents	Non-custodial Parents (Includes only cases where np is found)	Custodial Parents	Non-custodial Parents	Custodial Parents	No Earnings	Less than 50% of Poverty	>155% of Poverty
1	Panhandle	43.7%	42.1%	\$2,237	\$3,940	\$1,980	\$3,741	56.3%	19.0%
2	South Plains	46.5%	45.7%	\$1,890	\$3,462	\$1,640	\$3,188	53.5%	23.6%
3	North Texas	47.3%	39.0%	\$1,982	\$3,511	\$1,716	\$3,300	52.7%	22.4%
4	North Central	48.4%	46.2%	\$2,331	\$4,295	\$2,105	\$3,945	51.6%	19.1%
5	Fort Worth/Tarrant Co.	51.2%	44.7%	\$2,283	\$3,949	\$2,060	\$3,507	48.8%	22.0%
6	Dallas/Dallas Co.	51.1%	48.1%	\$2,410	\$4,028	\$2,151	\$3,664	48.9%	21.1%
7	North East Texas	47.3%	42.7%	\$1,993	\$3,791	\$1,775	\$3,224	52.7%	22.6%
8	East Texas	48.0%	49.0%	\$2,143	\$4,144	\$1,916	\$3,780	52.0%	21.2%
9	West Central Texas	44.9%	41.2%	\$1,971	\$3,645	\$1,704	\$3,299	55.1%	21.8%
10	Upper Rio Grande	34.4%	41.7%	\$2,177	\$3,757	\$2,005	\$3,381	65.6%	13.6%
11	Permian Basin	40.3%	48.2%	\$2,045	\$4,124	\$1,757	\$3,760	59.7%	19.0%
12	Concho Valley	47.8%	47.0%	\$2,057	\$3,817	\$1,713	\$3,335	52.2%	22.3%
13	Heart of Texas	50.9%	45.3%	\$1,955	\$3,775	\$1,731	\$3,500	49.1%	25.7%
14	Austin/Travis Co.	53.6%	45.1%	\$2,266	\$3,942	\$1,997	\$3,609	46.4%	22.8%
15	Rural Capital	47.9%	44.5%	\$2,374	\$4,012	\$2,219	\$3,721	52.1%	18.3%
16	Brazos Valley	49.3%	48.7%	\$1,998	\$4,090	\$1,766	\$3,634	50.7%	24.2%
17	Deep East Texas	44.3%	46.4%	\$2,095	\$4,216	\$1,817	\$3,841	55.7%	20.8%
18	South East Texas	42.5%	43.7%	\$1,823	\$3,883	\$1,521	\$3,386	57.5%	23.3%
19	Golden Crescent	43.8%	49.3%	\$2,188	\$4,205	\$1,851	\$3,816	56.2%	19.7%
20	Alamo Area	41.4%	47.3%	\$2,067	\$3,533	\$1,906	\$3,279	58.6%	18.9%
21	South Texas	31.8%	38.4%	\$2,114	\$3,702	\$1,732	\$3,250	68.2%	15.8%
22	Corpus Christi/Rural Coastal Bend	38.2%	45.8%	\$1,889	\$3,837	\$1,548	\$3,469	61.8%	20.3%
23	Hidalgo/Willacy Cameron Co.	27.0%	34.2%	\$1,913	\$3,475	\$1,710	\$3,091	73.0%	13.1%
24	Texoma	30.5%	35.7%	\$2,042	\$3,676	\$1,821	\$3,308	69.5%	13.5%
25	Central Texas	49.2%	42.4%	\$2,235	\$4,240	\$2,049	\$3,657	50.8%	18.5%
26	Middle Rio Grande	45.4%	36.3%	\$2,142	\$3,913	\$1,897	\$3,655	54.6%	20.4%
27	Gulf Coast	29.4%	41.3%	\$1,745	\$3,568	\$1,417	\$3,083	70.6%	16.0%
28	- Texas	43.5%	46.5%	\$2,283	\$4,325	\$1,985	\$3,864	56.5%	19.0%
		43.7%	45.2%	\$2,185	\$3,968	\$1,866	\$3,525	56.3%	19.5%

Notes: † Earnings are averaged for employed individuals only.

**LWDA Table 16**  
**Employment and Earnings**  
**Sample Remaining on AFDC, July to September, 1996**

LWDA	Area Name	Employment Rates <sup>†</sup>		Mean Quarterly Earnings <sup>‡</sup>		Median Quarterly Earnings		Earnings as a Share of Poverty for Custodial Parents	
		Custodial Parents	Non-custodial Parents (Includes only cases where npc is found)	Custodial Parents	Non-custodial Parents	Custodial Parents	No Earnings	Less than 50% of Poverty	>155% of Poverty
1	Panhandle	30.3%	36.7%	\$982	\$3,330	\$684	\$3,302	69.7%	25.2%
2	South Plains	36.3%	45.0%	\$1,119	\$3,050	\$825	\$2,784	63.7%	28.0%
3	North Texas	32.9%	36.2%	\$978	\$2,788	\$671	\$2,190	67.1%	26.4%
4	North Central	35.1%	45.5%	\$1,162	\$3,753	\$792	\$3,194	64.9%	25.7%
5	Fort Worth/Tarrant Co.	41.6%	40.3%	\$1,306	\$3,377	\$954	\$3,009	58.4%	28.8%
6	Dallas/Dallas Co.	40.3%	46.0%	\$1,321	\$3,465	\$968	\$3,173	59.7%	27.8%
7	North East Texas	32.4%	39.7%	\$1,017	\$2,992	\$706	\$2,515	67.6%	26.4%
8	East Texas	32.8%	46.4%	\$1,168	\$3,584	\$801	\$3,220	67.2%	24.6%
9	West Central Texas	28.8%	40.0%	\$1,119	\$3,172	\$840	\$2,991	71.2%	21.6%
10	Upper Rio Grande	19.6%	40.7%	\$1,150	\$3,383	\$992	\$2,986	80.4%	14.5%
11	Permian Basin	27.6%	42.0%	\$1,121	\$3,415	\$901	\$3,088	72.4%	20.6%
12	Concho Valley	28.8%	44.1%	\$1,088	\$3,343	\$879	\$2,634	71.2%	20.4%
13	Heart of Texas	36.5%	41.4%	\$1,071	\$3,438	\$854	\$3,007	63.5%	30.3%
14	Austin/Travis Co.	39.4%	42.5%	\$1,117	\$3,342	\$787	\$3,017	60.6%	29.6%
15	Rural Capital	28.5%	43.5%	\$1,324	\$3,238	\$962	\$2,825	71.5%	19.8%
16	Brazos Valley	31.7%	43.9%	\$920	\$3,641	\$543	\$3,207	68.3%	26.4%
17	Deep East Texas	27.5%	46.3%	\$939	\$3,454	\$639	\$3,000	72.5%	22.6%
18	South East Texas	31.6%	43.5%	\$954	\$3,304	\$697	\$2,793	68.4%	26.4%
19	Golden Crescent	23.1%	45.4%	\$1,079	\$3,684	\$892	\$3,355	76.9%	17.7%
20	Alamo Area	25.3%	42.4%	\$1,149	\$3,030	\$827	\$2,804	74.7%	19.1%
21	South Texas	16.1%	34.7%	\$1,067	\$3,207	\$753	\$2,941	83.9%	13.4%
22	Corpus Christi/Rural Coastal Bend	22.0%	44.5%	\$945	\$3,484	\$660	\$3,206	78.0%	18.6%
23	Hidalgo/Willacy	15.3%	32.5%	\$957	\$3,119	\$649	\$2,921	84.7%	12.4%
24	Cameron Co.	15.1%	31.2%	\$1,105	\$3,131	\$868	\$3,018	84.9%	11.5%
25	Texoma	37.5%	44.4%	\$1,325	\$3,844	\$989	\$3,339	62.5%	25.0%
26	Central Texas	34.3%	36.7%	\$1,032	\$3,155	\$740	\$2,844	65.7%	27.2%
27	Middle Rio Grande	17.6%	38.0%	\$922	\$3,075	\$676	\$2,701	82.4%	14.6%
28	Gulf Coast	29.9%	42.8%	\$1,224	\$3,809	\$915	\$3,326	70.1%	21.4%
-	Texas	29.4%	42.2%	\$1,171	\$3,433	\$814	\$3,019	70.6%	21.9%

Notes: <sup>†</sup>Earnings are averaged for employed individuals only

**LWDA Table 17**  
**OAG Cases by Highest Case Status**  
**Entire Sample, October to December, 1992**

LWDA	Area Name	Payments Received in Full	Partial Collection of Child Support	Wage Withholding Established	Child Support Order Established	NCP Located	OAG Case Opened	OAG Case Not Opened
1	Panhandle	3.8%	3.9%	4.8%	10.5%	31.6%	12.0%	33.4%
2	South Plains	3.5%	5.6%	6.1%	7.3%	34.6%	8.4%	34.5%
3	North Texas	3.5%	3.6%	7.2%	8.0%	34.7%	10.8%	32.2%
4	North Central	2.6%	2.7%	3.7%	8.6%	29.8%	17.1%	35.6%
5	Fort Worth/Tarrant Co.	1.9%	2.4%	5.0%	6.5%	30.2%	14.8%	39.3%
6	Dallas/Dallas Co.	1.9%	1.4%	3.0%	5.0%	25.0%	19.6%	44.1%
7	North East Texas	6.0%	5.6%	7.9%	10.8%	30.9%	9.7%	29.1%
8	East Texas	3.7%	4.8%	2.7%	9.4%	29.1%	11.7%	38.6%
9	West Central Texas	3.1%	4.3%	6.5%	10.2%	36.4%	7.0%	32.6%
10	Upper Rio Grande	2.7%	3.2%	5.0%	5.0%	27.8%	23.4%	33.0%
11	Permian Basin	3.3%	4.3%	5.7%	8.5%	27.9%	13.0%	37.3%
12	Concho Valley	4.0%	4.3%	4.8%	8.7%	32.7%	10.4%	35.2%
13	Heart of Texas	5.0%	4.2%	6.5%	12.1%	28.2%	10.5%	33.6%
14	Austin/Travis Co.	3.6%	3.1%	4.1%	7.5%	25.3%	15.2%	41.1%
15	Rural Capital	3.4%	4.9%	3.0%	8.5%	29.6%	13.7%	36.9%
16	Brazos Valley	2.6%	4.6%	3.7%	6.9%	29.4%	13.7%	39.1%
17	Deep East Texas	3.9%	4.9%	3.9%	10.1%	33.9%	10.5%	32.9%
18	South East Texas	4.8%	4.2%	6.2%	10.9%	29.6%	9.9%	34.5%
19	Golden Crescent	4.4%	4.3%	3.1%	10.6%	29.4%	10.7%	37.6%
20	Alamo Area	3.9%	4.1%	4.7%	9.1%	26.5%	16.6%	35.0%
21	South Texas	4.5%	4.4%	4.9%	8.8%	24.3%	16.8%	36.4%
22	Corpus Christi/Rural Coastal Bend	4.8%	4.8%	4.5%	11.3%	28.6%	10.8%	35.2%
23	Hidalgo/Willacy	4.6%	3.2%	4.1%	8.3%	23.5%	15.4%	40.8%
24	Cameron Co.	5.3%	4.4%	4.3%	7.9%	21.2%	18.9%	38.0%
25	Texoma	4.1%	3.3%	3.9%	10.6%	29.2%	14.8%	34.2%
26	Central Texas	3.2%	3.9%	5.1%	9.4%	30.0%	13.8%	34.6%
27	Middle Rio Grande	5.4%	4.0%	5.0%	9.7%	24.6%	14.5%	36.8%
28	Gulf Coast	1.3%	1.4%	2.0%	5.4%	26.4%	20.0%	43.5%
-	Texas	2.9%	3.0%	3.8%	7.5%	27.5%	16.3%	38.9%

**LWDA Table 18**  
**OAG Cases by Highest Case Status**  
**Entire Sample, July to September 1996**

LWDA	Area Name	Payments Received in Full	Partial Collection of Child Support	Wage Withholding Established	Child Support Order Established	NCP Located	OAG Case Opened	OAG Case Not Opened
1	Panhandle	17.5%	4.3%	19.5%	6.7%	24.0%	19.0%	8.9%
2	South Plains	19.4%	5.2%	21.5%	5.1%	24.5%	16.0%	8.3%
3	North Texas	14.9%	4.4%	21.3%	5.8%	27.2%	18.6%	7.8%
4	North Central	9.1%	2.8%	11.3%	6.6%	33.3%	27.7%	9.2%
5	Fort Worth/Tarrant Co.	10.0%	3.3%	14.5%	5.1%	33.4%	24.6%	9.1%
6	Dallas/Dallas Co.	7.7%	2.5%	9.5%	3.3%	31.1%	36.8%	9.1%
7	North East Texas	19.7%	5.3%	22.8%	7.7%	21.8%	14.4%	8.2%
8	East Texas	17.4%	5.1%	14.5%	7.6%	25.9%	17.6%	12.0%
9	West Central Texas	15.1%	5.9%	20.1%	6.7%	30.1%	13.7%	8.5%
10	Upper Rio Grande	11.0%	3.6%	11.7%	3.5%	26.0%	34.1%	10.0%
11	Permian Basin	14.6%	5.7%	18.6%	6.3%	24.8%	21.5%	8.5%
12	Concho Valley	17.7%	6.9%	17.0%	5.6%	28.7%	14.9%	9.2%
13	Heart of Texas	15.4%	4.5%	23.7%	6.5%	23.1%	19.9%	6.9%
14	Austin/Travis Co.	12.6%	3.3%	16.1%	5.1%	26.2%	27.0%	9.6%
15	Rural Capital	17.0%	3.9%	16.5%	5.0%	24.8%	22.4%	10.4%
16	Brazos Valley	14.6%	6.0%	19.9%	3.7%	24.6%	23.9%	7.3%
17	Deep East Texas	19.3%	4.5%	14.9%	7.9%	28.8%	14.6%	10.0%
18	South East Texas	14.1%	4.9%	17.6%	7.5%	30.8%	17.5%	7.7%
19	Golden Crescent	18.4%	5.2%	18.8%	7.1%	23.3%	17.9%	9.4%
20	Alamo Area	15.2%	4.7%	18.0%	5.0%	22.4%	25.9%	8.8%
21	South Texas	13.9%	3.1%	15.0%	5.4%	22.5%	24.8%	15.4%
22	Corpus Christi/Rural Coastal Bend	15.1%	5.0%	17.6%	6.0%	28.6%	19.0%	8.8%
23	Hidalgo/Willacy	13.7%	4.1%	14.2%	4.4%	21.7%	24.0%	17.9%
24	Cameron Co.	15.4%	4.1%	14.6%	4.4%	18.3%	28.1%	15.2%
25	Texoma	10.2%	3.5%	12.9%	8.4%	31.7%	24.5%	8.8%
26	Central Texas	15.3%	4.2%	13.7%	9.3%	27.4%	22.8%	7.3%
27	Middle Rio Grande	17.1%	3.8%	17.5%	5.0%	21.8%	21.0%	13.9%
28	Gulf Coast	8.8%	3.0%	9.5%	3.3%	30.5%	36.5%	8.4%
-	Texas	12.3%	3.8%	13.9%	4.8%	27.7%	28.0%	9.5%

**LWDA Table 19**  
**OAG Cases by Highest Case Status**  
**Sample Remaining on AFDC, July to September, 1996**

LWDA	Area Name	Payments Received in Full	Partial Collection of Child Support	Wage Withholding Established	Child Support Order Established	NCP Located	OAG Case Opened	OAG Case Not Opened
1	Panhandle	11.8%	5.3%	23.1%	8.3%	25.2%	17.5%	8.8%
2	South Plains	15.5%	6.7%	21.6%	5.2%	27.6%	16.4%	7.0%
3	North Texas	9.9%	5.2%	23.7%	4.7%	28.8%	19.6%	8.0%
4	North Central	8.2%	4.0%	11.9%	6.4%	33.6%	26.3%	9.6%
5	Fort Worth/Tarrant Co.	6.3%	4.0%	18.1%	5.2%	36.3%	21.9%	8.2%
6	Dallas/Dallas Co.	4.1%	3.5%	10.4%	2.7%	33.8%	37.6%	7.9%
7	North East Texas	15.4%	7.5%	27.5%	8.0%	21.3%	11.9%	8.4%
8	East Texas	13.6%	6.0%	16.2%	7.3%	26.2%	16.3%	14.5%
9	West Central Texas	10.8%	5.2%	24.1%	7.1%	30.7%	13.9%	8.2%
10	Upper Rio Grande	8.7%	4.9%	11.7%	4.4%	26.4%	34.8%	9.1%
11	Permian Basin	11.4%	6.1%	20.7%	6.4%	27.0%	20.7%	7.7%
12	Concho Valley	11.7%	8.5%	19.9%	7.0%	30.4%	11.9%	10.7%
13	Heart of Texas	11.0%	5.5%	26.0%	7.7%	23.2%	18.8%	7.7%
14	Austin/Travis Co.	8.3%	4.8%	18.4%	5.6%	27.5%	26.7%	8.7%
15	Rural Capital	10.7%	5.3%	19.6%	6.0%	24.1%	25.3%	8.9%
16	Brazos Valley	10.1%	7.3%	22.3%	3.8%	26.9%	22.1%	7.5%
17	Deep East Texas	13.3%	6.6%	16.8%	10.7%	29.3%	13.9%	9.4%
18	South East Texas	8.9%	5.2%	18.4%	7.6%	34.0%	18.0%	7.9%
19	Golden Crescent	13.8%	7.4%	21.0%	7.1%	21.7%	19.7%	9.5%
20	Alamo Area	10.6%	5.9%	19.6%	5.0%	24.1%	27.0%	7.9%
21	South Texas	10.9%	4.2%	17.2%	5.7%	23.3%	25.4%	13.1%
22	Corpus Christi/Rural Coastal Bend	12.7%	6.4%	18.4%	6.3%	29.3%	19.4%	7.4%
23	Hidalgo/Willacy Cameron Co.	12.4%	5.5%	15.4%	4.3%	23.0%	24.2%	15.2%
24	Cameron Co.	13.3%	5.7%	14.8%	4.9%	17.7%	29.9%	13.6%
25	Texoma	10.3%	4.6%	14.6%	7.4%	33.4%	22.5%	7.2%
26	Central Texas	9.9%	5.3%	16.0%	9.1%	30.4%	19.0%	10.2%
27	Middle Rio Grande	14.3%	4.9%	18.9%	4.7%	21.9%	22.7%	12.6%
28	Gulf Coast	5.7%	3.6%	10.1%	3.2%	32.4%	37.1%	8.0%
-	Texas	8.8%	4.8%	15.3%	4.8%	29.1%	28.2%	8.9%

**LWDA Table 20**  
**Total and Per Case Collections and Obligations†**

LWDA	Area Name	Collections				Obligations				Total Amount Collected as a Percent of Total Amount Obligated	
		Total Amount Collected		Average Annual Collections per AFDC Case with Collections‡		Total Amount Owed		Average Annual Obligation per Obligated AFDC Case‡		(FY1993)	(FY1996)
		Year 1 (FY1993)	Year 4 (FY1996)	Year 1 (FY1993)	Year 4 (FY1996)	Year 1 (FY1993)	Year 4 (FY1996)	Year 1 (FY1993)	Year 4 (FY1996)		
1	Panhandle	658,579	1,569,642	214	511	1,631,040	3,136,035	556	1,070	40.4%	50.1%
2	South Plains	1,086,024	2,372,527	253	561	1,849,108	4,034,410	449	995	58.7%	58.8%
3	North Texas	356,777	765,947	224	488	820,846	1,649,436	533	1,089	43.5%	46.4%
4	North Central	824,838	1,740,814	132	271	2,718,818	4,336,432	454	702	30.3%	40.1%
5	Fort Worth/Tarrant Co.	1,307,023	3,082,138	130	302	3,769,172	6,871,155	392	704	34.7%	44.9%
6	Dallas/Dallas Co.	2,230,571	5,494,802	101	243	6,079,741	11,072,264	287	512	36.7%	49.6%
7	North East Texas	673,717	1,291,258	257	493	1,394,807	2,426,305	549	956	48.3%	53.2%
8	East Texas	1,564,053	3,569,586	222	505	3,114,587	6,038,799	459	889	50.2%	59.1%
9	West Central Texas	514,285	1,086,603	215	459	1,232,999	2,043,138	544	910	41.7%	53.2%
10	Upper Rio Grande	1,282,931	2,500,977	150	294	2,506,957	4,291,307	310	535	51.2%	58.3%
11	Permian Basin	867,740	1,704,890	211	416	1,943,367	3,586,489	496	919	44.7%	47.5%
12	Concho Valley	248,094	548,930	228	513	502,203	896,483	483	876	49.4%	61.2%
13	Heart of Texas	889,909	1,516,673	253	433	1,853,470	3,067,320	541	899	48.0%	49.4%
14	Austin/Travis Co.	1,047,282	1,939,231	196	362	2,240,011	4,175,015	434	808	46.8%	46.4%
15	Rural Capital	431,074	940,832	225	495	766,507	1,592,074	422	886	56.2%	59.1%
16	Brazos Valley	379,227	967,357	191	493	715,515	1,480,109	368	771	53.0%	65.4%
17	Deep East Texas	854,980	1,930,847	234	533	1,718,305	3,101,987	500	913	49.8%	62.2%
18	South East Texas	1,022,068	1,802,422	243	435	2,532,734	3,941,383	625	984	40.4%	45.7%
19	Golden Crescent	487,108	1,070,000	281	621	965,664	1,850,476	580	1,119	50.4%	57.8%
20	Alamo Area	4,502,131	9,224,578	219	443	8,925,464	15,875,126	454	798	50.4%	58.1%
21	South Texas	610,806	1,131,408	195	367	1,230,454	2,091,929	442	768	49.6%	54.1%
22	Corpus Christi/Rural Coastal Bend	2,119,945	3,899,311	251	461	4,707,524	7,537,371	588	940	45.0%	51.7%
23	Hidalgo/Willacy	1,437,540	2,802,544	186	366	2,552,745	4,383,589	385	665	56.3%	63.9%
24	Cameron Co.	970,736	1,694,638	213	378	1,846,219	2,928,144	451	726	52.6%	57.9%
25	Texoma	237,732	393,362	185	305	642,285	987,592	523	802	37.0%	39.8%
26	Central Texas	589,931	1,277,402	209	461	1,396,615	2,459,596	509	912	42.2%	51.9%
27	Middle Rio Grande	491,251	1,010,179	207	432	1,011,985	1,665,510	477	799	48.5%	60.7%
28	Gulf Coast	4,349,399	13,545,392	90	274	12,874,874	25,334,105	276	533	33.8%	53.5%
-	Texas	32,035,750	70,874,290	164	361	73,544,077	132,853,580	397	712	43.6%	53.3%

Notes:

†The data in this table is annual rather than quarterly to ameliorate seasonality in IRS Intercept Collections

‡ Collections are averaged only for cases with collections, and obligations are averaged only for obligated cases.

**LWDA Table 21**  
**Distribution of Child Support Collections†**

LWDA	Area Name	Total Collection		Amount Retained by State		Amount Retained by State as a Percent of Total	
		FY1993	FY1996	FY1993	FY1996	FY1993	FY1996
1	Panhandle	658,579	1,569,642	426,525	620,735	39.3%	28.3%
2	South Plains	1,086,024	2,372,527	688,599	1,040,350	38.8%	30.5%
3	North Texas	356,777	765,947	208,719	282,728	36.9%	27.0%
4	North Central	824,838	1,740,814	492,792	643,031	37.4%	27.0%
5	Fort Worth/Tarrant Co.	1,307,023	3,082,138	765,692	1,086,013	36.9%	26.1%
6	Dallas/Dallas Co.	2,230,571	5,494,802	1,272,961	1,930,194	36.3%	26.0%
7	North East Texas	673,717	1,291,258	415,445	497,071	38.1%	27.8%
8	East Texas	1,564,053	3,569,586	942,098	1,309,092	37.6%	26.8%
9	West Central Texas	514,285	1,086,603	298,521	436,252	36.7%	28.6%
10	Upper Rio Grande	1,282,931	2,500,977	801,260	1,100,333	38.4%	30.6%
11	Permian Basin	867,740	1,704,890	548,916	712,952	38.7%	29.5%
12	Concho Valley	248,094	548,930	128,464	196,364	34.1%	26.3%
13	Heart of Texas	889,909	1,516,673	556,330	613,897	38.5%	28.8%
14	Austin/Travis Co.	1,047,282	1,939,231	608,523	662,702	36.8%	25.5%
15	Rural Capital	431,074	940,832	274,448	345,138	38.9%	26.8%
16	Brazos Valley	379,227	967,357	224,880	387,131	37.2%	28.6%
17	Deep East Texas	854,980	1,930,847	511,035	738,660	37.4%	27.7%
18	South East Texas	1,022,068	1,802,422	639,244	719,509	38.5%	28.5%
19	Golden Crescent	487,108	1,070,000	289,077	443,532	37.2%	29.3%
20	Alamo Area	4,502,131	9,224,578	2,903,585	4,093,943	39.2%	30.7%
21	South Texas	610,806	1,131,408	395,303	537,735	39.3%	32.2%
22	Corpus Christi/Rural Coastal Bend	2,119,945	3,899,311	1,318,067	1,675,695	38.3%	30.1%
23	Hidalgo/Willacy	1,437,540	2,802,544	1,021,937	1,507,942	41.6%	35.0%
24	Cameron Co.	970,736	1,694,638	650,084	789,981	40.1%	31.8%
25	Texoma	237,732	393,362	149,036	145,187	38.5%	27.0%
26	Central Texas	589,931	1,277,402	334,597	463,510	36.2%	26.6%
27	Middle Rio Grande	491,251	1,010,179	312,129	535,987	38.9%	34.7%
28	Gulf Coast	4,349,399	13,545,392	2,395,469	4,933,787	35.5%	26.7%
-	Texas	32,035,750	70,874,290	19,573,736	28,449,451	37.9%	28.6%

Notes: †The data in this table is annual rather than quarterly to ameliorate seasonality in IRS Intercept Collections

**LWDA Table 22**  
**Exits and Grant Jeopardy Exits**

LWDA	Area Name	AFDC Caseload			All Exits <sup>†</sup>			Grant Jeopardy Exits <sup>†</sup>			Probability of All Exits			Probability of Jeopardy Exits		
		Oct to Dec 1992	Apr to Jun 1996	Oct to Jun 1992	Oct to Dec 1996	Apr to Jun 1996	Oct to Jun 1992	Oct to Dec 1992	Apr to Jun 1996	Oct to Jun 1992	Oct to Dec 1992	Apr to Jun 1996	Oct to Dec 1992	Apr to Jun 1996	Oct to Dec 1992	Apr to Jun 1996
1	Panhandle	3,084	948	502	207	65	58	16.3%	21.9%	2.1%	6.1%	6.1%	2.3%	4.5%	6.5%	6.5%
2	South Plains	4,308	1,604	654	207	99	72	15.2%	12.9%	2.3%	4.5%	4.5%	2.0%	2.0%	4.4%	4.4%
3	North Texas	1,582	444	268	97	32	29	16.9%	21.8%	2.0%	6.5%	6.5%	2.0%	2.0%	3.9%	3.9%
4	North Central	6,213	1,794	978	401	121	78	15.7%	22.4%	2.0%	4.4%	4.4%	2.0%	2.0%	3.1%	3.1%
5	Fort Worth/Tarrant Co.	10,098	3,473	1,638	699	204	136	16.2%	20.1%	2.0%	3.9%	3.9%	2.0%	2.0%	2.1%	2.1%
6	Dallas/Dallas Co.	22,386	8,140	2,780	1,470	221	249	12.4%	18.1%	1.0%	6.1%	6.1%	2.3%	2.3%	6.1%	6.1%
7	North East Texas	2,606	773	431	163	61	47	16.6%	21.0%	2.1%	5.9%	5.9%	2.1%	2.1%	5.7%	5.7%
8	East Texas	7,116	2,172	1,055	475	147	129	14.8%	21.9%	2.1%	5.7%	5.7%	2.1%	2.1%	2.7%	2.7%
9	West Central Texas	2,363	751	373	129	49	42	15.8%	17.1%	1.4%	4.4%	4.4%	1.4%	1.4%	2.7%	2.7%
10	Upper Rio Grande	8,622	3,420	1,092	446	124	94	12.7%	13.0%	21.6%	21.6%	21.6%	1.9%	1.9%	5.8%	5.8%
11	Permian Basin	4,104	1,369	570	295	79	79	13.9%	21.6%	3.3%	6.5%	6.5%	3.3%	3.3%	6.5%	6.5%
12	Concho Valley	1,079	323	185	61	36	21	17.1%	18.9%	2.1%	4.7%	4.7%	2.5%	2.5%	5.7%	5.7%
13	Heart of Texas	3,494	1,258	447	221	87	60	12.8%	17.6%	2.0%	4.0%	4.0%	1.4%	1.4%	2.7%	2.7%
14	Austin/Travis Co.	5,411	1,661	731	366	109	95	13.5%	22.1%	2.0%	5.7%	5.7%	2.0%	2.0%	5.7%	5.7%
15	Rural Capital	1,879	571	312	96	61	34	16.6%	16.7%	3.2%	5.9%	5.9%	3.2%	3.2%	4.4%	4.4%
16	Brazos Valley	1,965	758	269	107	42	33	13.7%	14.1%	2.1%	4.2%	4.2%	2.1%	2.1%	3.7%	3.7%
17	Deep East Texas	3,624	1,230	516	184	84	45	14.2%	14.9%	2.3%	4.4%	4.4%	2.3%	2.3%	4.4%	4.4%
18	South East Texas	4,187	1,591	577	219	72	70	13.8%	13.8%	1.7%	4.4%	4.4%	1.7%	1.7%	4.4%	4.4%
19	Golden Crescent	1,712	637	232	86	37	27	13.6%	13.5%	2.2%	4.2%	4.2%	1.7%	1.7%	4.5%	4.5%
20	Alamo Area	20,773	8,356	2,283	1,245	357	373	11.0%	14.9%	1.4%	2.6%	2.6%	1.4%	1.4%	2.6%	2.6%
21	South Texas	3,132	1,363	360	147	43	35	11.5%	10.7%	1.4%	2.6%	2.6%	1.4%	1.4%	2.6%	2.6%
22	Corpus Christi/Rural Coastal Bend	8,478	3,461	921	599	156	176	10.9%	17.3%	1.8%	5.1%	5.1%	1.8%	1.8%	5.1%	5.1%
23	Hidalgo/Willacy	7,685	3,380	825	495	82	91	10.7%	14.7%	1.1%	2.7%	2.7%	1.1%	1.1%	2.7%	2.7%
24	Cameron Co.	4,534	1,989	560	223	62	44	12.4%	11.2%	1.4%	2.2%	2.2%	1.4%	1.4%	3.7%	3.7%
25	Texoma	1,272	376	173	67	20	14	13.6%	17.8%	1.6%	3.7%	3.7%	1.6%	1.6%	7.1%	7.1%
26	Central Texas	2,795	761	464	163	67	54	16.6%	21.5%	2.4%	3.6%	3.6%	1.7%	1.7%	3.6%	3.6%
27	Middle Rio Grande	2,361	1,029	219	125	40	37	9.3%	12.1%	1.1%	3.2%	3.2%	1.1%	1.1%	3.2%	3.2%
28	Gulf Coast	49,076	16,996	5,913	3,229	558	51	12.0%	19.0%	1.6%	3.9%	3.9%	1.6%	1.6%	3.9%	3.9%
-	Texas	195,938	70,628	25,327	12,221	3,114	2,773	12.9%	17.3%	1.6%	3.9%	3.9%	1.6%	1.6%	3.9%	3.9%

Notes: <sup>†</sup>The next to the last quarter of the observation period is the last quarter for which an exit can be observed.

**LWDA Table 23**  
**AFDC Exits and Recidivism**

LWDA	Area Name	Total AFDC Caseload		All Exits†		Exits that were Followed by Return within One Year		Probability of Recidivism within One Year	
		Oct to Dec 1992	Jul to Sep 1995	Oct to Dec 1992	Jul to Sep 1995	Oct to Dec 1992	Jul to Sep 1995	Oct to Dec 1992	Jul to Sep 1995
1	Panhandle	3,084	1,219	502	153	171	47	34.2%	30.6%
2	South Plains	4,308	1,911	654	272	219	97	33.5%	35.6%
3	North Texas	1,582	602	268	89	84	34	31.3%	38.2%
4	North Central	6,213	2,479	978	315	299	62	30.6%	19.7%
5	Fort Worth/Tarrant Co.	10,098	4,391	1,638	681	556	215	33.9%	31.6%
6	Dallas/Dallas Co.	22,386	10,632	2,780	1,271	978	343	35.2%	27.0%
7	North East Texas	2,606	1,045	431	141	131	52	30.4%	37.3%
8	East Texas	7,116	2,916	1,055	507	290	185	27.5%	36.4%
9	West Central Texas	2,363	999	373	129	116	35	31.0%	27.0%
10	Upper Rio Grande	8,622	4,190	1,092	425	308	100	28.2%	23.6%
11	Permian Basin	4,104	1,779	570	220	166	70	29.2%	31.6%
12	Concho Valley	1,079	447	185	66	56	19	30.3%	28.8%
13	Heart of Texas	3,494	1,644	447	187	155	51	34.6%	27.3%
14	Austin/Travis Co.	5,411	2,143	731	343	241	125	33.0%	36.5%
15	Rural Capital	1,879	712	312	99	77	31	24.7%	31.9%
16	Brazos Valley	1,965	893	269	92	93	31	34.5%	33.7%
17	Deep East Texas	3,624	1,514	516	165	189	36	36.6%	22.0%
18	South East Texas	4,187	2,064	577	250	197	100	34.2%	39.8%
19	Golden Crescent	1,712	815	232	92	91	29	39.2%	31.5%
20	Alamo Area	20,773	10,411	2,283	1,017	788	277	34.5%	27.2%
21	South Texas	3,132	1,667	360	134	134	25	37.2%	19.0%
22	Corpus Christi/Rural Coastal Bend	8,478	4,470	921	374	306	111	33.2%	29.6%
23	Hidalgo/Willacy	7,685	4,111	825	361	304	85	36.9%	23.5%
24	Cameron Co.	4,534	2,403	560	183	190	33	33.8%	18.2%
25	Texoma	1,272	506	173	74	48	23	27.7%	31.1%
26	Central Texas	2,795	1,002	464	178	117	63	25.2%	35.2%
27	Middle Rio Grande	2,361	1,298	219	136	82	50	37.2%	36.4%
28	Gulf Coast	49,076	23,833	5,913	2,856	1,883	644	31.8%	22.6%
-	Texas	195,938	92,096	25,327	10,810	8,268	2,972	32.6%	27.5%

Notes: †In order to have a one-year period to observe recidivism, exits that take place later than the third quarter of 1995 cannot be analyzed.

**LWDA Table 24**  
**Exits From Poverty Due to Child Support Received**

LWDA	Area Name	Percent of Families In Poverty After AFDC Exits	Percent Not in Poverty After AFDC Exits		
			Total Not in Poverty	Not in Poverty Based on Earnings Alone	Not in Poverty Based on Earnings Plus Child Support
1	Panhandle	82.7%	17.3%	16.0%	1.3%
2	South Plains	84.9%	15.1%	13.7%	1.4%
3	North Texas	84.9%	15.1%	14.1%	1.0%
4	North Central	80.9%	19.1%	18.6%	0.6%
5	Fort Worth/Tarrant Co.	78.5%	21.5%	20.5%	1.0%
6	Dallas/Dallas Co.	76.2%	23.8%	23.1%	0.7%
7	North East Texas	87.3%	12.7%	11.5%	1.3%
8	East Texas	83.8%	16.2%	14.5%	1.7%
9	West Central Texas	86.0%	14.0%	12.9%	1.1%
10	Upper Rio Grande	86.6%	13.4%	12.5%	0.9%
11	Permian Basin	86.3%	13.7%	13.0%	0.6%
12	Concho Valley	86.1%	13.9%	12.8%	1.2%
13	Heart of Texas	83.9%	16.1%	14.6%	1.5%
14	Austin/Travis Co.	76.4%	23.6%	22.1%	1.5%
15	Rural Capital	79.6%	20.4%	18.5%	1.9%
16	Brazos Valley	83.0%	17.0%	15.3%	1.7%
17	Deep East Texas	83.8%	16.2%	15.1%	1.1%
18	South East Texas	87.3%	12.7%	11.5%	1.2%
19	Golden Crescent	83.5%	16.5%	15.0%	1.5%
20	Alamo Area	84.3%	15.7%	14.7%	1.1%
21	South Texas	85.6%	14.4%	13.7%	0.7%
22	Corpus Christi/Rural Coastal Bend	86.9%	13.1%	12.1%	1.1%
23	Hidalgo/Willacy	89.9%	10.1%	9.2%	1.0%
24	Cameron Co.	88.9%	11.1%	10.4%	0.7%
25	Texoma	81.8%	18.2%	17.2%	1.0%
26	Central Texas	85.4%	14.6%	13.8%	0.7%
27	Middle Rio Grande	90.1%	9.9%	9.3%	0.6%
28	Gulf Coast	81.2%	18.8%	17.5%	1.2%
-	Texas	82.5%	17.5%	16.4%	1.1%

Notes: An exit from poverty due to receipt of child support for a caretaker in poverty is defined to have taken place if the caretaker's wages alone are below the poverty level, but the caretaker's wages plus the amount received from child care are above the poverty level.