

Donald Arwood module

SOC 362—POPULATION PROBLEMS WEB-CHIP EXERCISES

INTRODUCTION

When I was growing up in Watertown, South Dakota in the 1960s, I lived in a neighborhood filled with *Father Knows Best* and *Leave It to Beaver* families. There was a father, mother, and at least one child in nearly every house up and down the block. Of course there were a few exceptions; the son of the middle-aged couple who lived across the alley moved off to California making his parents empty-nesters; two nice middle-aged ladies lived next door; and, my siblings and I lived in a female-headed household.

You most likely learned in your Introduction to Sociology, Social Problems, and Family classes that traditional mom-pop-children households in the United States are not as dominant as they once were. You may also have learned that the change was due in part to the increasing status of women and changes in customs and laws that made divorce less troublesome to obtain. And we all have known for quite some time that children in female-headed households have a much greater chance of living in poverty.

While you do the exercises in this lesson, you will find data that look at some of these claims. In the next lesson, we will explore some of the demographic “causes” of the increase in the status of women—declines in both mortality and fertility and an increase in urbanization.

The first exercise The second exercise uses the **centrend/fpov7090.dat** WebCHIP file to do a number of things: (1) demonstrate that the trend in family types is actually occurring; (2) find out if there is a relationship between family type and poverty; and (3) see if that relationship held over time. The third exercise will use the **custom/family9.dat** file to look at the relationship between the number of children present in the family and percent living in poverty for different kinds of families. The fourth exercise allows you to develop and test hypotheses of your own.

<http://www.abs.sdstate.edu:81/sociology/soc362/xrs-chip.pdf>

EXERCISE #1

Using the Dataset Query Engine (<http://ssdan2.psc.isr.umich.edu/query.html>), explore the various datasets by selecting a subject, geography, and data source.

EXERCISE #2—PART 1

Using the file **fpov7090.dat** in WebCHIP, identify the percent of female-headed, male-headed, and married couple families for 1970, 1980, and 1990. Report your data in the table 1.

- Load the webCHIP launcher by typing <http://ssdan2.psc.isr.umich.edu/webchip.html>
- Type: datasets/pc/centrend/fpov7090.dat and click “Submit query” tab
- Click “Marginals” tab to get frequency distributions of each variable in the file
- Select %Down
- Bring up “Famtype” in the row variable box and “Year” in the column variable box, and click the Crosstabs tab.

Table 1. Family Type by Year

FAMILY TYPE	YEAR			All
	1970	1980	1990	
MrrdCpl				
MaleFam				
FemlFam				
ALL				

What changes have occurred?

EXERCISE #2—PART 2

Using WebCHIP, identify the percent of each type of family that fall in each of the following poverty categories: poverty, near poverty, and other.

Absolute hypothesis to be tested: Female-headed households (no spouse present) are more likely to live in poverty than male-headed (no spouse present) and married couple households.

What pattern exists?

Table 2. Poverty Classification by Family Type

POVERTY CLASSIFICATION	FAMILY TYPE			All
	MrrdCpl	MaleFam	FemlFam	
Poverty				
Near Poor				
Other				
ALL				

EXERCISE #2—PART 3

Using WebCHIP, determine if poverty levels vary by family type for the 1970, 1980, and 1990 census years.

Conditional hypothesis to be tested: Female-headed households (no spouse present) are more likely to live in poverty than male-headed (no spouse present) and married couple households, even over time.

To produce contingency tables: (1) select your independent, dependent, and control variables; (2) click “Control by” tab; and (3) click “Crosstabs” tab.

Table 3. Poverty Classification by Family Type—1970

POVERTY CLASSIFICATION	FAMILY TYPE			All
	MrrdCpl	MaleFam	FemlFam	
Poverty				
Near Poor				
Other				
ALL				

Table 4. Poverty Classification by Family Type—1980

POVERTY CLASSIFICATION	FAMILY TYPE			
	MrrdCpl	MaleFam	FemlFam	All
Poverty				
Near Poor				
Other				
ALL				

Table 5. Poverty Classification by Family Type—1990

POVERTY CLASSIFICATION	FAMILY TYPE			
	MrrdCpl	MaleFam	FemlFam	All
Poverty				
Near Poor				
Other				
ALL				

What did you find?

EXERCISE #3

Using WebCHIP, focus on the relationship between number of children in the family and family income (custom/family9.dat). Complete the table once you have found your data. What pattern exists?

Table 6. Poverty Classification by Presence of Children

POVERTY CLASSIFICATION	PRESENCE OF CHILDREN			
	None	Kids<6	KidsOtr	All
Poverty				
Near Poor				
Middle				
Comfortable				
ALL				

Now focus on the relationship between number of children in the family and family income controlling for family type. Does family type make a difference? Which household type has the highest percentage in poverty and near poverty? Which has the lowest? Why?

Table 7. Poverty Classification by Presence of Children—Married Couple Households

POVERTY CLASSIFICATION	PRESENCE OF CHILDREN			
	None	Kids<6	KidsOtr	All
Poverty				
Near Poor				
Middle				
Comfortable				
ALL				

Table 8. Poverty Classification by Presence of Children—Male-Headed (no wife present) Households

POVERTY CLASSIFICATION	PRESENCE OF CHILDREN			
	None	Kids<6	KidsOtr	All
Poverty				
Near Poor				
Middle				
Comfortable				
ALL				

Table 9. Poverty Classification by Presence of Children—Female-Headed (no husband present) Households

POVERTY CLASSIFICATION	PRESENCE OF CHILDREN			
	None	Kids<6	KidsOtr	All
Poverty				
Near Poor				
Middle				
Comfortable				
ALL				

EXERCISE #4

Using WebCHIP develop and test absolute and conditional hypotheses of your own. Did you find support for your hypotheses? Why or why not?