



Health Care  
Cost Trends



Diversity,  
Equity  
and Inclusion

# Using Social Determinants to Identify Profiles of U.S. Children with Low Dental Expenditures and High Medical Expenditures with Clusters: Supplemental Appendices





# Using Social Determinants to Identify Profiles of U.S. Children with Low Dental Expenditures and High Medical Expenditures with Clusters

## Supplemental Appendices

**Author** Margie Rosenberg, PhD, FSA  
Assurant Health Professor of Actuarial Science,  
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Seulkee Yun  
University of Wisconsin-Madison

**Sponsor** Health Care Cost Trends Strategic  
Research Program



**Give us your feedback!**

Take a short survey on this report.

[Click Here](#)



### **Caveat and Disclaimer**

The opinions expressed and conclusions reached by the authors are their own and do not represent any official position or opinion of the Society of Actuaries Research Institute, Society of Actuaries, or its members. The Society of Actuaries Research Institute makes no representation or warranty to the accuracy of the information.

Copyright © 2021 by the Society of Actuaries Research Institute. All rights reserved.

## CONTENTS

<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Appendix A: Summary of Cluster Evaluation Methods .....</b>	<b>5</b>
A.1 Indexes Based on Compactness .....	5
A.1.1 Elbow Plot.....	5
A.1.2 Pseudo F index based on the mutability (PSFM).....	5
A.1.3 Pseudo F index based on the entropy (PSFE).....	5
A.1.4 Best K (BK) Index .....	5
A.2 Indexes Based on Compactness and Separation .....	6
A.2.1 Silhouette index .....	6
A.2.2 Dunn Index .....	6
A.2.3 McClain-Rao index .....	6
A.2.4 Calinski-Harabasz index .....	6
A.2.5 Category utility index.....	6
A.2.6 cluster cardinality index (CCI).....	6
<b>Appendix B: Detailed Summary of Cluster Profiles for Input Variables .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Appendix C: Detailed Summary of Cluster Profiles for Outcomes .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>References.....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>About The Society of Actuaries .....</b>	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>

# Using Social Determinants to Identify Profiles of U.S. Children with Low Dental Expenditures and High Medical Expenditures with Clusters

## Supplemental Appendices

### Executive Summary

This is a group of three supplemental appendices that accompany the main report titled: “Using Social Determinants to Identify Profiles of U.S. Children with Low Dental Expenditures and High Medical Expenditures with Clusters.” These appendices are intended for readers that are interested in exploring Cluster Methodologies, Input Variables and Outcomes.



**Give us your feedback!**

Take a short survey on this report.

[Click Here](#)

**SOA**  
**Research**  
INSTITUTE

## Appendix A: Summary of Cluster Evaluation Methods

Fundamental to the calculation of these indexes is the definition of distance, sometimes referred to as dissimilarity. Distance within a cluster could be measured by the maximum distance between two points, the average of the distances between two points across the cluster, or the distance to a cluster center. Parallel formulations can be calculated for distances between clusters.

Compactness is measured by some distance measure for objects within a cluster, while separation is measured by some distance measure between clusters. One could think of compactness from the standpoint of distance of an object to a cluster center, as for partitioning methods, while separation could involve choosing the linkage method for use between clusters, as for hierarchical clustering. In the summary below, we cover several indexes. A sample of the indexes that are used are shown below. See <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/clusterCrit/vignettes/clusterCrit.pdf> or (Milligan and Cooper 1985) for documentation of these and other indexes that could be utilized.

### A.1 INDEXES BASED ON COMPACTNESS

#### A.1.1 ELBOW PLOT

The elbow plot is the most common approach to choose the number of clusters (Thorndike 1953), by plotting the average dissimilarity within clusters for the number of clusters chosen, where dissimilarity is determined based on the distance measure used for clustering. The average dissimilarity within the clusters decreases as the number of clusters increase, but the rate of decrease slows as the number of clusters are increased. The choice of the cluster is made at the inflection point of the graph, known as the elbow. Thus, the elbow plot only considers compactness. If an obvious elbow does not exist in the plot, it is difficult to determine the optimal number of clusters.

#### A.1.2 PSEUDO F INDEX BASED ON THE MUTABILITY (PSFM)

The PSFM express within cluster variability by using a concept called mutability (Gini 1912; Rezankova, Tomas and Husek 2011) and is designed for categorical variables. Mutability can be interpreted as how often observations differ from one another, as it represents the proportion of possible comparisons (pairings) that are not the same. If a value of one category is dominant, then its mutability is close to 0. If multiple categorical values are distributed uniformly, the mutability is high (Kader and Perry 2007). The highest value is best for this index for the choice of the number of clusters.

#### A.1.3 PSEUDO F INDEX BASED ON THE ENTROPY (PSFE)

A variation of the PSFM is the PSFE (Rezankova, Tomas and Husek 2011) that is based on the concept of entropy (Shannon 1948), rather than mutability. Entropy considers the value of information. A high probability event has low information. The more variability in a particular variable, the higher is the entropy. The highest value is best for this index for the choice of the number of clusters.

#### A.1.4 BEST K (BK) INDEX

The BK index measure compactness as expressed by within cluster variability, where variability is defined by entropy (Chen and Liu 2009). This index calculates the second-order differences of the entropy with k clusters. The highest value of the index, with subsequent small values of the index, indicate that the number of cluster with the highest value is the optimal number of clusters.

## A.2 INDEXES BASED ON COMPACTNESS AND SEPARATION

These indexes examine a ratio of the within and between cluster distances. In some the within distance is in the numerator, in others, the between distance is in the numerator.

### A.2.1 SILHOUETTE INDEX

The silhouette index (Rousseeuw 1987) is a measure as to how similar an object is to other objects in the same cluster, as well as how different the object is to objects in other clusters. The silhouette index ranges from -1 to 1, where higher values indicate well-separated clusters. Those close to minus one suggests poorly separated clusters, and values close to zero indicate that objects in the dataset may be located on the border of two clusters. The silhouette index plot is the average of the silhouette indexes for different number of clusters.

### A.2.2 DUNN INDEX

Similar to the silhouette index, the Dunn index compares the inter-cluster distance and intra-cluster distance (Dunn 1974). For this index, the minimum inter-cluster distance is divided by the maximal within cluster distance. The highest values indicate better decisions for clusters.

### A.2.3 MCCLAIN-RAO INDEX

The McClain-Rao index is also a ratio of the within cluster and the between-cluster distances (McClain and Rao 1975), but also adds measures for the number of pairs of objects in the same cluster and the number of pairs of objects not belonging to the same cluster. Here the denominator for the within sum of distances and between sum of distances to obtain an average distance is based on the number of pairs of objects rather than the number of objects in a cluster. For this index, the lowest value indicates the best choice of the number of clusters.

### A.2.4 CALINSKI-HARABASZ INDEX

The Calinski-Harabasz index (Calinski and Harabasz 1974) is similar to the McClain-Rao index that calculates a ratio of the between sum of squares divided by the within sum of squares. However, in this index, the sums are divided by functions of the number of clusters and the number of objects in total. For this index, the highest value indicates the best choice of the number of clusters.

### A.2.5 CATEGORY UTILITY INDEX

The category utility (CU) function introduced by Gluck (Gluck and Corter 1985) has been applied in COBWEB (Fisher 1987), as a way to conduct hierarchical clustering. Category utility is a tradeoff between compactness and separation. Intra-class similarity, a measure for compactness, is larger, if the proportion of objects in the cluster share common features. Inter-class dissimilarity, a measure of separation, is larger, if fewer objects in the cluster share a value in another cluster. Larger values of CU indicate a better clustering number. If the value of CU is close to zero, then the clustering number is not a good choice.

### A.2.6 CLUSTER CARDINALITY INDEX (CCI)

The CCI evaluates the performance of clustering that are helpful to use with categorical data having unordered attribute values (Gao, Witold and Miao 2013). When a particular cluster is compact, and the objects are similar each other, then the resulting CCI is small. When two clusters are well-separated, then the CCI is small.


The indexes are calculated based on existing R packages but modified to reflect the sampling weights of our data. The PSFM, PSFE and BK indexes are based on the nomclust package, the code for Dunn and McClain-Rao indexes are based on the NbClust package and the code of CU index came from the coolcat package.

The Silhouette, Calinski-Harabasz, CCI and the average dissimilarity within clusters for elbow plot are user-designed.

In the graphs illustrating the results of each of the methods described above, we show the index values for cluster choices of 1 to 50.


**Figure A1**

**APPROACHES TO DETERMINE THE NUMBER OF CLUSTERS: ELBOW PLOT (CHOICE MADE AT INFLECTION POINT)**




**Figure A2**


**PSEUDO F INDEX BASED ON THE MUTABILITY (PSFM) AND THE ENTROPY (PSFE) (HIGHER VALUES ARE PREFERRED)**



**Figure A3**  
**BEST K (BK) INDEX (HIGHER VALUES ARE PREFERRED)**




**Figure A4**  
**SILHOUETTE INDEX (HIGHER VALUES ARE PREFERRED)**







**Figure A5**  
**DUNN INDEX (HIGHER VALUES ARE PREFERRED)**




**Figure A6**  
**MCCLAIN-RAO INDEX (LOWER VALUES ARE PREFERRED)**




**Figure A7**  
**CALINSKI-HARABASZ INDEX (HIGHE VALUES ARE PREFERRED)**



**Figure A8**  
**CATEGORY UTILITY (CU) INDEX (HIGHER VALUES ARE PREFERRED)**



**Figure A9**  
**CLUSTER CARDINALITY INDEX (CCI) (SMALLER VALUES ARE PREFERRED)**



## Appendix B: Detailed Summary of Cluster Profiles for Input Variables

**Table B1**  
CHILD CLUSTER PROFILE INPUT VARIABLES FROM 3 AND 11 CLUSTERS

			From 3 Clusters			From 11 Clusters		
Variables	Attributes	Overall	1	2	3	1	9	11
Rank of Child Net Total Expenditure			1	2	3	2	1	10
Cluster Percentages		100%	55.0%	22.6%	22.4%	18.5%	13.6%	5.6%
Age (Child)	5–6	14.6%	14.5%	13.6%	15.9%	8.6%	15.2%	20.8%
Age (Child)	7–12	45.3%	40.6%	44.9%	<b>57.1%</b>	30.0%	37.2%	<b>60.8%</b>
Age (Child)	13–17	40.2%	<b>44.9%</b>	<b>41.5%</b>	27.0%	<b>61.5%</b>	<b>47.6%</b>	18.4%
Sex (Child)	Male	51.0%	45.5%	<b>56.4%</b>	<b>58.8%</b>	<b>62.3%</b>	<b>56.0%</b>	<b>64.2%</b>
Sex (Child)	Female	49.1%	<b>54.5%</b>	43.6%	41.2%	37.7%	44.0%	35.9%
Race (Child)	White	49.9%	<b>70.7%</b>	29.2%	19.6%	<b>81.3%</b>	<b>70.8%</b>	19.6%
Race (Child) <sup>1</sup>	Hispanic/Latino	24.8%	12.4%	17.8%	<b>62.1%</b>	5.3%	9.5%	17.1%
Race (Child)	Black/African American	14.0%	5.4%	<b>42.7%</b>	5.9%	4.6%	8.8%	<b>55.6%</b>
Race (Child)	Asian American	4.9%	5.7%	0.9%	7.2%	3.8%	3.1%	0.4%
Race (Child)	Other	6.5%	5.8%	9.4%	5.2%	5.0%	7.8%	7.4%
Born in U.S. (Child)	Yes	95.8%	<b>96.5%</b>	<b>97.6%</b>	<b>92.0%</b>	<b>97.3%</b>	<b>96.7%</b>	<b>96.7%</b>
Born in U.S. (Child)	No	4.2%	3.4%	2.4%	7.9%	2.6%	3.3%	3.2%
Born in U.S. (Child)	Missing	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%
Dental Visit (Child)	Yes	58.2%	<b>75.8%</b>	39.2%	33.9%	<b>84.2%</b>	27.0%	18.9%
Dental Visit (Child)	No	41.9%	24.2%	<b>60.8%</b>	<b>66.1%</b>	15.8%	<b>73.0%</b>	<b>81.1%</b>
Dental Care—Preventive (Child)	Yes	53.8%	<b>70.5%</b>	35.7%	31.0%	<b>80.2%</b>	22.0%	17.1%
Dental Care—Preventive (Child)	No	46.2%	29.5%	<b>64.3%</b>	<b>69.0%</b>	19.8%	<b>78.0%</b>	<b>82.9%</b>
Dental Care—Filling (Child)	Yes	8.9%	10.6%	7.5%	6.2%	12.7%	3.8%	3.7%
Dental Care—Filling (Child)	No	91.1%	<b>89.4%</b>	<b>92.5%</b>	<b>93.8%</b>	<b>87.4%</b>	<b>96.3%</b>	<b>96.3%</b>
Dental Care—Severe Condition (Child)	Yes	5.1%	6.0%	5.0%	3.2%	6.6%	2.8%	2.5%
Dental Care—Severe Condition (Child)	No	94.9%	<b>94.0%</b>	<b>95.0%</b>	<b>96.8%</b>	<b>93.4%</b>	<b>97.2%</b>	<b>97.5%</b>

<sup>1</sup> The Society of Actuaries prefers different terminology for races and ethnicities than MEPS used. We report using the SOA’s preferred terms.

SOA Preferred Term	MEPS Term
Race/ethnicity	Race
Asian American	Asian
Black/African American	Black
Hispanic/Latino	Hispanic

**Table B1 (Continued)**  
**CHILD CLUSTER PROFILE INPUT VARIABLES FROM 3 AND 11 CLUSTERS**

Variables	Attributes	Overall	From 3 Clusters			From 11 Clusters		
			1	2	3	1	9	11
Rank of Child Net Total Expenditure			1	2	3	2	1	10
Cluster Percentages		100%	55.0%	22.6%	22.4%	18.5%	13.6%	5.6%
Preventive Care Activities (Child)	0–2	9.8%	8.5%	11.8%	10.9%	7.1%	8.4%	19.6%
Preventive Care Activities (Child)	3–7	69.1%	<b>70.7%</b>	<b>69.8%</b>	<b>64.3%</b>	<b>74.4%</b>	<b>69.9%</b>	<b>69.4%</b>
Preventive Care Activities (Child)	8+	21.0%	20.7%	18.1%	24.7%	18.5%	21.5%	10.6%
Preventive Care Activities (Child)	Missing	0.1%	0.0%	0.3%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.4%
Diagnosed Specific Medical Conditions (Child)	Yes	19.1%	18.0%	23.7%	17.1%	18.3%	31.9%	18.2%
Diagnosed Specific Medical Conditions (Child)	No conditions	51.7%	<b>59.6%</b>	34.8%	<b>49.3%</b>	<b>60.7%</b>	<b>54.9%</b>	30.1%
Diagnosed Specific Medical Conditions (Child)	No medical visit	29.2%	22.4%	<b>41.5%</b>	33.6%	21.0%	13.2%	<b>51.7%</b>
Special Needs (Child)	Need	28.6%	29.0%	30.2%	25.7%	29.5%	<b>57.3%</b>	24.4%
Special Needs (Child)	No need	71.4%	<b>71.0%</b>	<b>69.5%</b>	<b>74.1%</b>	<b>70.5%</b>	42.5%	<b>75.2%</b>
Special Needs (Child)	Missing	0.1%	0.0%	0.3%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.4%

**Table B2**  
**RESPONDENT CLUSTER PROFILE INPUT VARIABLES FROM 3 AND 11 CLUSTERS**

Variables	Attributes	Overall	From 3 Clusters			From 11 Clusters		
			1	2	3	1	9	11
Rank of Child Net Total Expenditure			1	2	3	2	1	10
Cluster Percentages		100%	55.0%	22.6%	22.4%	18.5%	13.6%	5.6%
Respondent & Reference Person (Respondent)	Both—mother	52.8%	<b>47.0%</b>	<b>69.6%</b>	<b>50.3%</b>	<b>45.4%</b>	<b>53.4%</b>	<b>68.0%</b>
Respondent & Reference Person (Respondent)	Both—father	16.8%	22.1%	4.5%	16.5%	21.0%	15.6%	3.3%
Respondent & Reference Person (Respondent)	Respondent—mother & Reference—father	16.1%	20.8%	2.9%	17.9%	24.1%	16.0%	0.8%
Respondent & Reference Person (Respondent)	Both—not parent	6.2%	3.5%	13.6%	5.4%	2.8%	6.1%	18.8%
Respondent & Reference Person (Respondent)	Others	8.0%	6.7%	9.5%	9.9%	6.8%	8.9%	9.1%
Age (Respondent)	13–17	0.2%	0.1%	0.4%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%
Age (Respondent)	18–30	9.6%	5.7%	16.4%	12.2%	2.1%	7.5%	<b>42.9%</b>
Age (Respondent)	31–40	40.9%	33.6%	<b>43.7%</b>	<b>56.0%</b>	16.1%	<b>47.0%</b>	24.2%
Age (Respondent)	41–50	35.8%	<b>46.6%</b>	23.0%	22.1%	<b>65.1%</b>	29.7%	19.0%
Age (Respondent)	51–60	9.7%	10.8%	10.2%	6.3%	13.9%	11.1%	8.5%
Age (Respondent)	61–70	2.7%	2.2%	4.2%	2.3%	2.4%	3.9%	3.3%
Age (Respondent)	71–90	0.5%	0.5%	0.9%	0.2%	0.5%	0.9%	1.1%
Age (Respondent)	Missing	0.8%	0.6%	1.4%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sex (Respondent)	Male	21.4%	26.1%	10.4%	20.8%	26.4%	20.2%	11.8%
Sex (Respondent)	Female	77.9%	<b>73.4%</b>	<b>88.1%</b>	<b>78.7%</b>	<b>73.6%</b>	<b>79.9%</b>	<b>88.2%</b>
Sex (Respondent)	Missing	0.8%	0.6%	1.4%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

**Table B2 (Continued)**  
**RESPONDENT CLUSTER PROFILE INPUT VARIABLES FROM 3 AND 11 CLUSTERS**

Variables	Attributes	Overall	From 3 Clusters			From 11 Clusters		
			1	2	3	1	9	11
Rank of Child Net Total Expenditure			1	2	3	2	1	10
Cluster Percentages		100%	55.0%	22.6%	22.4%	18.5%	13.6%	5.6%
Race (Respondent)	White	54.7%	<b>75.8%</b>	35.7%	22.0%	<b>85.0%</b>	<b>76.2%</b>	24.5%
Race (Respondent)	Hispanic/Latino	21.9%	9.7%	13.9%	<b>60.0%</b>	5.5%	7.9%	13.7%
Race (Respondent)	Black/African American	13.9%	5.2%	<b>42.7%</b>	6.1%	4.0%	8.8%	<b>57.3%</b>
Race (Respondent)	Asian American	5.4%	6.4%	1.0%	7.6%	4.3%	3.2%	0.8%
Race (Respondent)	Others	3.4%	2.4%	5.3%	3.9%	1.4%	3.9%	3.7%
Race (Respondent)	Missing	0.8%	0.6%	1.4%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Born in U.S. (Respondent)	Yes	75.9%	<b>85.1%</b>	<b>86.3%</b>	<b>43.0%</b>	<b>90.5%</b>	<b>91.9%</b>	<b>86.8%</b>
Born in U.S. (Respondent)	No	23.2%	14.3%	12.2%	56.4%	9.5%	8.1%	13.2%
Born in U.S. (Respondent)	Missing	0.8%	0.7%	1.5%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%
Number of Dental Check-Ups (Respondent)	Never	12.1%	6.5%	17.1%	20.9%	3.9%	16.9%	18.4%
Number of Dental Check-Ups (Respondent)	Less than 1	18.1%	14.8%	21.6%	22.8%	11.3%	28.1%	<b>36.5%</b>
Number of Dental Check-Ups (Respondent)	1 per year	26.2%	18.5%	<b>34.4%</b>	<b>36.9%</b>	16.1%	19.4%	23.1%
Number of Dental Check-Ups (Respondent)	2+ per year	42.5%	<b>59.6%</b>	24.9%	18.3%	<b>68.7%</b>	<b>35.4%</b>	21.5%
Number of Dental Check-Ups (Respondent)	Missing	1.1%	0.7%	2.1%	1.1%	0.0%	0.2%	0.5%
Any Delayed Dental Care (Respondent)	Yes	2.8%	2.2%	3.6%	3.2%	2.3%	6.2%	3.7%
Any Delayed Dental Care (Respondent)	No	95.9%	<b>96.7%</b>	<b>94.3%</b>	<b>95.8%</b>	<b>97.1%</b>	<b>93.3%</b>	<b>95.8%</b>
Any Delayed Dental Care (Respondent)	Missing	1.3%	1.1%	2.1%	1.0%	0.7%	0.5%	0.5%
Unable to Get Dental Care (Respondent)	Yes	2.9%	1.9%	4.6%	3.8%	1.2%	6.2%	4.5%
Unable to Get Dental Care (Respondent)	No	95.8%	<b>97.0%</b>	<b>93.3%</b>	<b>95.2%</b>	<b>98.2%</b>	<b>93.3%</b>	<b>95.0%</b>
Unable to Get Dental Care (Respondent)	Missing	1.3%	1.1%	2.1%	1.0%	0.7%	0.5%	0.5%
Overall Health Status (Respondent)	Poor	4.5%	2.9%	7.2%	5.8%	2.5%	8.8%	6.6%
Overall Health Status (Respondent)	Fair	14.9%	10.6%	21.4%	19.1%	7.5%	30.7%	21.6%
Overall Health Status (Respondent)	Good	37.4%	27.8%	<b>46.6%</b>	<b>51.7%</b>	25.8%	<b>38.4%</b>	<b>50.1%</b>
Overall Health Status (Respondent)	Very Good	32.0%	<b>45.8%</b>	15.6%	14.6%	<b>55.8%</b>	16.4%	13.2%
Overall Health Status (Respondent)	Excellent	10.5%	12.4%	7.8%	8.4%	8.5%	5.8%	8.5%

Overall Health Status (Respondent)	Missing	0.8%	0.6%	1.4%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Mental Health Status (Respondent)	Poor	2.3%	1.3%	5.2%	2.0%	0.8%	4.4%	4.8%
Mental Health Status (Respondent)	Fair	9.1%	6.3%	14.9%	10.1%	4.5%	12.7%	14.8%
Mental Health Status (Respondent)	Good	37.0%	27.3%	<b>44.6%</b>	<b>53.2%</b>	21.6%	<b>55.9%</b>	<b>48.1%</b>
Mental Health Status (Respondent)	Very Good	31.1%	<b>42.3%</b>	17.8%	16.8%	<b>57.2%</b>	16.7%	17.1%
Mental Health Status (Respondent)	Excellent	19.8%	22.2%	16.1%	17.4%	15.8%	10.2%	15.2%
Mental Health Status (Respondent)	Missing	0.8%	0.6%	1.4%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

**Table B2 (Continued)**
**RESPONDENT CLUSTER PROFILE INPUT VARIABLES FROM 3 AND 11 CLUSTERS**

Variables	Attributes	Overall	From 3 Clusters			From 11 Clusters		
			1	2	3	1	9	11
Rank of Child Net Total Expenditure			1	2	3	2	1	10
Cluster Percentages		100%	55.0%	22.6%	22.4%	18.5%	13.6%	5.6%
ADL or IADL Limitations (Respondent)	Yes	14.8%	11.8%	23.0%	13.6%	11.4%	27.1%	19.0%
ADL or IADL Limitations (Respondent)	No	83.3%	<b>86.8%</b>	<b>74.4%</b>	<b>83.7%</b>	<b>88.3%</b>	<b>71.6%</b>	<b>80.5%</b>
ADL or IADL Limitations (Respondent)	Missing	2.0%	1.4%	2.6%	2.7%	0.3%	1.2%	0.5%
BMI (Respondent)	Missing	2.7%	2.2%	3.1%	3.6%	1.9%	1.9%	3.0%
BMI (Respondent)	Obese	35.9%	27.5%	<b>47.8%</b>	<b>44.7%</b>	<b>43.4%</b>	<b>53.7%</b>	<b>43.8%</b>
BMI (Respondent)	Overweight	30.3%	30.2%	28.3%	32.9%	26.1%	21.9%	30.0%
BMI (Respondent)	Normal	30.0%	<b>39.2%</b>	19.3%	18.3%	28.5%	21.9%	22.1%
BMI (Respondent)	Underweight	1.0%	1.0%	1.6%	0.6%	0.2%	0.7%	1.0%
Diagnosed Specific Medical Conditions (Respondent)	6+	2.6%	2.0%	4.0%	2.6%	2.2%	7.3%	3.0%
Diagnosed Specific Medical Conditions (Respondent)	3–5	16.1%	15.0%	20.9%	13.9%	15.2%	26.4%	17.4%
Diagnosed Specific Medical Conditions (Respondent)	1–2	44.1%	<b>49.1%</b>	<b>44.1%</b>	31.7%	<b>60.4%</b>	<b>52.6%</b>	30.0%
Diagnosed Specific Medical Conditions (Respondent)	0	36.2%	33.1%	29.2%	<b>50.9%</b>	22.1%	13.7%	<b>48.7%</b>
Diagnosed Specific Medical Conditions (Respondent)	Missing	1.0%	0.7%	1.8%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%

**Table B3**  
**HOUSEHOLD CLUSTER PROFILE INPUT VARIABLES FROM 3 AND 11 CLUSTERS**

Variables	Attributes	Overall	From 3 Clusters			From 11 Clusters		
			1	2	3	1	9	11
Rank of Child Net Total Expenditure			1	2	3	2	1	10
Cluster Percentages		100%	55.0%	22.6%	22.4%	18.5%	13.6%	5.6%
Geographic Region	Northeast	15.8%	17.8%	14.0%	12.6%	21.6%	13.3%	14.3%
Geographic Region	Midwest	21.4%	24.2%	21.5%	14.2%	<b>40.3%</b>	20.9%	24.2%
Geographic Region	South	39.2%	34.2%	<b>51.8%</b>	38.7%	23.2%	<b>53.8%</b>	<b>50.0%</b>
Geographic Region	West	23.7%	<b>23.7%</b>	12.8%	<b>34.6%</b>	15.0%	12.0%	11.5%
Highest Level of Education Among Family Members	No Degree	9.1%	2.5%	12.5%	21.6%	1.0%	5.3%	17.1%
Highest Level of Education Among Family Members	High School	24.2%	<b>17.3%</b>	32.3%	<b>32.9%</b>	10.1%	<b>38.7%</b>	<b>59.0%</b>
Highest Level of Education Among Family Members	College	25.3%	21.5%	<b>36.4%</b>	23.5%	16.0%	26.4%	15.1%
Highest Level of Education Among Family Members	BA-level	22.5%	30.6%	11.1%	13.9%	34.8%	22.0%	6.2%
Highest Level of Education Among Family Members	Graduate-level	18.1%	27.4%	6.2%	7.5%	<b>38.2%</b>	7.6%	2.5%
Highest Level of Education Among Family Members	Missing	0.8%	0.6%	1.5%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%



**Table B3 (Continued)**  
**HOUSEHOLD CLUSTER PROFILE INPUT VARIABLES FROM 3 AND 11 CLUSTERS**

Variables	Attributes	Overall	From 3 Clusters			From 11 Clusters		
			1	2	3	1	9	11
Rank of Child Net Total Expenditure			1	2	3	2	1	10
Cluster Percentages		100%	55.0%	22.6%	22.4%	18.5%	13.6%	5.6%
Employment Status of Mother	Missing	8.0%	7.2%	11.9%	6.0%	5.4%	6.8%	11.2%
Employment Status of Mother	Unemployed	19.4%	12.3%	16.2%	<b>40.1%</b>	10.4%	19.2%	21.7%
Employment Status of Mother	Partially Employed	12.0%	9.6%	15.8%	14.3%	6.6%	13.3%	23.2%
Employment Status of Mother	Full Employed	60.6%	<b>70.9%</b>	<b>56.2%</b>	39.6%	<b>77.6%</b>	<b>60.7%</b>	<b>43.9%</b>
Employment Status of Father	Missing	28.2%	11.0%	<b>85.2%</b>	12.8%	6.6%	8.3%	<b>90.6%</b>
Employment Status of Father	Unemployed	4.0%	4.3%	2.0%	5.3%	3.6%	6.5%	1.9%
Employment Status of Father	Partially Employed	5.1%	5.2%	2.5%	7.3%	4.8%	8.1%	2.7%
Employment Status of Father	Full Employed	62.8%	<b>79.5%</b>	10.3%	<b>74.6%</b>	<b>85.1%</b>	<b>77.1%</b>	4.8%
Household Income	Poor	17.6%	6.1%	32.2%	<b>31.4%</b>	3.5%	9.7%	<b>59.7%</b>
Household Income	Near Poor	5.0%	2.3%	8.6%	7.8%	1.1%	3.5%	8.6%
Household Income	Low Income	16.2%	10.1%	27.5%	19.7%	7.0%	14.7%	16.2%
Household Income	Medium Income	30.8%	33.9%	25.1%	28.8%	24.7%	<b>48.7%</b>	12.9%
Household Income	High Income	30.4%	<b>47.6%</b>	6.6%	12.4%	<b>63.8%</b>	23.3%	2.6%
Food Insecurity of Household	Insecure	21.1%	9.3%	<b>36.0%</b>	<b>35.1%</b>	7.4%	26.0%	23.9%
Food Insecurity of Household	Secure	75.9%	<b>88.3%</b>	59.2%	62.3%	<b>90.9%</b>	<b>72.9%</b>	<b>70.5%</b>
Food Insecurity of Household	Missing	3.0%	2.4%	4.8%	2.7%	1.8%	1.1%	5.5%
Number of Adults in Family (> 17 in age)	0	1.0%	0.6%	1.9%	0.9%	0.0%	0.3%	1.6%
Number of Adults in Family (> 17 in age)	1	18.9%	9.0%	<b>54.0%</b>	7.9%	4.0%	4.6%	<b>56.6%</b>
Number of Adults in Family (> 17 in age)	2	61.4%	<b>72.4%</b>	29.8%	<b>66.3%</b>	<b>76.4%</b>	<b>72.6%</b>	26.6%
Number of Adults in Family (> 17 in age)	3	14.0%	14.1%	10.5%	17.4%	15.6%	16.9%	11.1%
Number of Adults in Family (> 17 in age)	4+	4.7%	3.8%	3.9%	7.5%	4.1%	5.8%	4.1%
Number of Children in Family (≤ 17 in age)	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Number of Children in Family (≤ 17 in age)	1	24.4%	24.6%	31.1%	16.9%	26.3%	21.2%	25.0%
Number of Children in Family (≤ 17 in age)	2	39.9%	<b>46.3%</b>	<b>37.8%</b>	26.1%	<b>52.6%</b>	<b>54.8%</b>	<b>36.8%</b>
Number of Children in Family (≤ 17 in age)	3	23.2%	19.1%	18.1%	<b>38.4%</b>	12.9%	15.7%	20.1%
Number of Children in Family (≤ 17 in age)	4+	12.6%	10.0%	13.0%	18.7%	8.2%	8.4%	18.2%

**Table B3 (Continued)**  
**HOUSEHOLD CLUSTER PROFILE INPUT VARIABLES FROM 3 AND 11 CLUSTERS**

Variables	Attributes	Overall	From 3 Clusters			From 11 Clusters		
			1	2	3	1	9	11
Rank of Child Net Total Expenditure			1	2	3	2	1	10
Cluster Percentages		100%	55.0%	22.6%	22.4%	18.5%	13.6%	5.6%
Parent Status	Live with other family member	3.2%	2.1%	7.4%	1.7%	1.4%	1.1%	7.0%
Parent Status	Live with mother or father (part of year)	2.8%	2.5%	3.4%	3.2%	1.4%	3.5%	3.6%
Parent Status	Live with father	4.6%	4.9%	4.2%	4.2%	3.9%	5.8%	3.1%
Parent Status	Live with mother	24.4%	8.8%	<b>76.5%</b>	10.3%	5.2%	6.6%	<b>82.1%</b>
Parent Status	Live with both	64.9%	<b>81.7%</b>	8.5%	<b>80.6%</b>	<b>88.2%</b>	<b>83.1%</b>	4.2%
Marital Status of Mother	Missing	8.0%	7.2%	11.9%	6.0%	5.4%	6.8%	11.2%
Marital Status of Mother	Never Married	14.6%	3.7%	<b>43.4%</b>	12.1%	1.3%	3.2%	<b>61.0%</b>
Marital Status of Mother	Widowed, Divorced, Separated (This Year)	4.6%	3.1%	10.4%	2.6%	2.1%	2.7%	6.8%
Marital Status of Mother	Widowed, Divorced, Separated	9.5%	5.2%	24.6%	4.6%	3.5%	5.5%	17.4%
Marital Status of Mother	Married	63.4%	<b>80.8%</b>	9.8%	<b>74.8%</b>	<b>87.8%</b>	<b>81.8%</b>	3.7%
Marital Status of Father	Missing	28.1%	11.0%	<b>85.0%</b>	12.4%	6.6%	8.0%	<b>90.6%</b>
Marital Status of Father	Never Married	4.7%	3.2%	4.2%	8.8%	1.3%	3.0%	6.5%
Marital Status of Father	Widowed, Divorced, Separated (This Year)	2.4%	2.2%	2.4%	3.2%	2.1%	4.4%	1.0%
Marital Status of Father	Widowed, Divorced, Separated	2.5%	3.2%	1.1%	2.1%	2.1%	2.7%	0.6%
Marital Status of Father	Married	62.4%	<b>80.4%</b>	7.3%	<b>73.5%</b>	<b>88.0%</b>	<b>81.9%</b>	1.3%
Family Change	Change	2.2%	1.7%	3.8%	2.0%	1.4%	3.0%	4.6%
Family Change	No change	<b>97.8%</b>	<b>98.3%</b>	<b>96.2%</b>	<b>98.1%</b>	<b>98.6%</b>	<b>97.0%</b>	<b>95.4%</b>

**Table B4**  
**CHILD CLUSTER PROFILE INPUT VARIABLES FROM 24 CLUSTERS**

Variables	Attributes	Overall	From 24 Clusters					
			1	12	17	19	21	24
Rank of Child Net Total Expenditure			4	1	8	2	5	24
Cluster Percentages		100%	8.6%	2.4%	6.8%	7.7%	2.5%	3.5%
Dental Care—Orthodontic (Child)	Yes	11.6%	20.7%	10.4%	4.8%	5.3%	3.9%	1.2%
Dental Care—Orthodontic (Child)	No	88.4%	<b>79.3%</b>	<b>89.6%</b>	<b>95.2%</b>	<b>94.7%</b>	<b>96.1%</b>	<b>98.8%</b>
Doctor Advise Regular Dental Visit (Child)	Yes	61.3%	40.9%	<b>58.8%</b>	<b>67.8%</b>	<b>68.2%</b>	45.6%	35.4%
Doctor Advise Regular Dental Visit (Child)	No	36.7%	<b>56.3%</b>	36.2%	29.6%	29.5%	<b>49.0%</b>	<b>61.1%</b>
Doctor Advise Regular Dental Visit (Child)	Missing	2.1%	2.9%	5.1%	2.6%	2.3%	5.4%	3.5%
BMI (Child)	Missing	25.2%	13.4%	25.8%	27.8%	18.9%	<b>29.4%</b>	<b>44.1%</b>
BMI (Child)	Obese	13.2%	7.1%	<b>25.8%</b>	8.9%	18.4%	23.6%	20.1%
BMI (Child)	Overweight	10.9%	13.6%	15.4%	11.6%	13.5%	11.6%	10.4%
BMI (Child)	Normal	44.3%	<b>60.3%</b>	28.7%	<b>46.8%</b>	<b>41.8%</b>	29.5%	14.7%
BMI (Child)	Underweight	6.5%	5.5%	4.2%	4.9%	7.4%	5.9%	10.8%

**Table B4 (Continued)**  
**CHILD CLUSTER PROFILE INPUT VARIABLES FROM 24 CLUSTERS**

Variables	Attributes	Overall	From 24 Clusters					
			1	12	17	19	21	24
Rank of Child Net Total Expenditure			4	1	8	2	5	24
Cluster Percentages		100%	8.6%	2.4%	6.8%	7.7%	2.5%	3.5%
Preventive Care Activities (Child)	0–2	9.8%	6.3%	15.7%	10.3%	8.9%	8.9%	18.8%
Preventive Care Activities (Child)	3–7	69.1%	<b>83.0%</b>	<b>70.1%</b>	<b>73.0%</b>	<b>72.4%</b>	<b>76.6%</b>	<b>72.6%</b>
Preventive Care Activities (Child)	8+	21.0%	10.8%	14.3%	16.7%	18.8%	12.8%	8.6%
Preventive Care Activities (Child)	Missing	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%
Diagnosed Specific Medical Conditions (Child)	Yes	19.1%	18.0%	36.8%	12.2%	35.2%	<b>58.7%</b>	10.6%
Diagnosed Specific Medical Conditions (Child)	No conditions	51.7%	<b>62.8%</b>	<b>54.3%</b>	<b>66.6%</b>	<b>50.8%</b>	30.9%	26.9%
Diagnosed Specific Medical Conditions (Child)	No medical visit	29.2%	19.2%	8.9%	21.2%	13.9%	10.5%	<b>62.5%</b>
Special Needs (Child)	Need	28.6%	31.7%	<b>57.8%</b>	25.7%	<b>60.7%</b>	<b>68.3%</b>	16.7%
Special Needs (Child)	No Need	71.4%	<b>68.3%</b>	42.2%	<b>74.3%</b>	39.4%	30.0%	<b>83.3%</b>
Special Needs (Child)	Missing	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%

**Table B5**  
RESPONDENT CLUSTER PROFILE INPUT VARIABLES FROM 24 CLUSTERS

Variables	Attributes	Overall	From 24 Clusters					
			1	12	17	19	21	24
Rank of Child Net Total Expenditure			4	1	8	2	5	24
Cluster Percentages		100%	8.6%	2.4%	6.8%	7.7%	2.5%	3.5%
Respondent & Reference Person (Respondent)	Both—mother	52.8%	<b>62.3%</b>	4.8%	33.3%	<b>60.6%</b>	<b>72.6%</b>	<b>72.3%</b>
Respondent & Reference Person (Respondent)	Both—father	16.8%	6.7%	8.1%	10.0%	12.2%	4.3%	0.6%
Respondent & Reference Person (Respondent)	Respondent—mother & Reference— father	16.1%	23.8%	0.7%	<b>43.4%</b>	12.2%	0.5%	1.3%
Respondent & Reference Person (Respondent)	Both—not parent	6.2%	2.0%	<b>73.2%</b>	2.8%	5.4%	14.4%	17.9%
Respondent & Reference Person (Respondent)	Others	8.0%	5.3%	13.1%	10.5%	9.6%	8.2%	8.0%
Age (Respondent)	13–17	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	1.2%
Age (Respondent)	18–30	9.6%	2.1%	2.1%	10.9%	6.7%	13.1%	<b>51.1%</b>
Age (Respondent)	31–40	40.9%	8.8%	5.6%	<b>63.0%</b>	<b>46.8%</b>	<b>51.0%</b>	22.7%
Age (Respondent)	41–50	35.8%	<b>73.1%</b>	20.8%	19.5%	33.0%	19.5%	15.3%
Age (Respondent)	51–60	9.7%	14.0%	<b>38.9%</b>	5.9%	9.4%	9.8%	6.7%
Age (Respondent)	61–70	2.7%	1.5%	28.6%	0.6%	3.3%	4.1%	2.7%
Age (Respondent)	71–90	0.5%	0.6%	4.2%	0.2%	0.8%	2.1%	0.3%
Age (Respondent)	Missing	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

**Table B5 (Continued)**  
RESPONDENT CLUSTER PROFILE INPUT VARIABLES FROM 24 CLUSTERS

Variables	Attributes	Overall	From 24 Clusters					
			1	12	17	19	21	24
Rank of Child Net Total Expenditure			4	1	8	2	5	24
Cluster Percentages		100%	8.6%	2.4%	6.8%	7.7%	2.5%	3.5%
Sex (Respondent)	Male	21.4%	10.2%	21.8%	16.4%	18.9%	8.5%	11.8%
Sex (Respondent)	Female	<b>77.9%</b>	<b>89.8%</b>	<b>78.2%</b>	<b>83.6%</b>	<b>81.1%</b>	<b>91.5%</b>	<b>88.2%</b>
Sex (Respondent)	Missing	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Race (Respondent)	White	54.7%	<b>85.2%</b>	<b>78.1%</b>	<b>75.1%</b>	<b>80.6%</b>	29.0%	22.1%
Race (Respondent)	Hispanic/Latino	21.9%	6.2%	4.2%	9.2%	4.1%	9.8%	5.9%
Race (Respondent)	Black/African American	13.9%	3.6%	11.5%	9.1%	9.9%	<b>53.1%</b>	<b>68.0%</b>
Race (Respondent)	Asian American	5.4%	3.6%	0.7%	3.9%	0.7%	0.4%	0.0%
Race (Respondent)	Others	3.4%	1.4%	5.5%	2.7%	4.8%	7.8%	4.0%
Race (Respondent)	Missing	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Born in U.S. (Respondent)	Yes	75.9%	<b>91.6%</b>	<b>97.2%</b>	<b>87.9%</b>	<b>96.5%</b>	<b>97.1%</b>	<b>91.3%</b>
Born in U.S. (Respondent)	No	23.2%	8.4%	2.9%	11.7%	3.5%	2.9%	8.6%
Born in U.S. (Respondent)	Missing	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
Number of Dental Check-Ups (Respondent)	Never	12.1%	2.7%	<b>36.0%</b>	13.6%	15.6%	24.3%	14.6%

Number of Dental Check-Ups (Respondent)	Less than 1	18.1%	12.5%	25.3%	20.0%	28.7%	20.6%	<b>41.4%</b>
Number of Dental Check-Ups (Respondent)	1 per year	26.2%	13.7%	16.2%	25.5%	23.4%	<b>43.2%</b>	21.3%
Number of Dental Check-Ups (Respondent)	2+ per year	42.5%	<b>71.1%</b>	22.5%	<b>40.1%</b>	<b>32.3%</b>	10.6%	22.8%
Number of Dental Check-Ups (Respondent)	Missing	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%
Any Delayed Dental Care (Respondent)	Yes	2.8%	2.2%	8.6%	1.6%	4.9%	5.7%	2.7%
Any Delayed Dental Care (Respondent)	No	95.9%	<b>96.5%</b>	<b>90.7%</b>	<b>96.5%</b>	<b>95.1%</b>	<b>92.4%</b>	<b>96.5%</b>
Any Delayed Dental Care (Respondent)	Missing	1.3%	1.3%	0.8%	1.8%	0.0%	1.8%	0.8%
Unable to get Dental Care (Respondent)	Yes	2.9%	1.5%	15.1%	3.7%	4.1%	9.0%	2.7%
Unable to get Dental Care (Respondent)	No	95.8%	<b>97.2%</b>	<b>84.2%</b>	<b>94.4%</b>	<b>95.9%</b>	<b>89.2%</b>	<b>96.5%</b>
Unable to get Dental Care (Respondent)	Missing	1.3%	1.3%	0.8%	1.8%	0.0%	1.8%	0.8%
Overall Health Status (Respondent)	Poor	4.5%	1.6%	19.4%	0.7%	11.0%	18.2%	5.4%
Overall Health Status (Respondent)	Fair	14.9%	7.9%	17.7%	3.1%	<b>39.4%</b>	<b>60.4%</b>	10.7%
Overall Health Status (Respondent)	Good	37.4%	28.2%	<b>55.8%</b>	24.3%	38.4%	11.3%	<b>57.9%</b>
Overall Health Status (Respondent)	Very Good	32.0%	<b>51.5%</b>	3.7%	<b>64.4%</b>	7.0%	6.0%	16.6%
Overall Health Status (Respondent)	Excellent	10.5%	10.9%	3.3%	7.6%	4.3%	4.1%	9.4%
Overall Health Status (Respondent)	Missing	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Mental Health Status (Respondent)	Poor	2.3%	0.6%	6.1%	0.0%	4.9%	14.1%	3.5%
Mental Health Status (Respondent)	Fair	9.1%	5.0%	24.7%	5.1%	12.8%	32.2%	13.0%
Mental Health Status (Respondent)	Good	37.0%	22.6%	<b>52.2%</b>	19.1%	<b>66.2%</b>	<b>33.2%</b>	<b>47.6%</b>
Mental Health Status (Respondent)	Very Good	31.1%	<b>52.2%</b>	13.5%	<b>59.4%</b>	8.6%	10.3%	20.2%
Mental Health Status (Respondent)	Excellent	19.8%	19.6%	3.5%	16.4%	7.4%	10.2%	15.8%
Mental Health Status (Respondent)	Missing	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

**Table B5 (Continued)**  
**RESPONDENT CLUSTER PROFILE INPUT VARIABLES FROM 24 CLUSTERS**

Variables	Attributes	Overall	From 24 Clusters					
			1	12	17	19	21	24
Rank of Child Net Total Expenditure			4	1	8	2	5	24
Cluster Percentages		100%	8.6%	2.4%	6.8%	7.7%	2.5%	3.5%
ADL or IADL Limitations (Respondent)	Yes	14.8%	13.6%	<b>52.9%</b>	10.2%	29.4%	<b>66.0%</b>	9.1%
ADL or IADL Limitations (Respondent)	No	83.3%	<b>85.8%</b>	<b>45.5%</b>	<b>87.8%</b>	<b>69.2%</b>	34.0%	<b>90.2%</b>
ADL or IADL Limitations (Respondent)	Missing	2.0%	0.6%	1.6%	2.1%	1.3%	0.0%	0.7%
BMI (Respondent)	Missing	2.7%	2.6%	2.2%	1.9%	2.0%	1.7%	3.3%
BMI (Respondent)	Obese	35.9%	<b>47.6%</b>	<b>52.1%</b>	14.4%	<b>56.4%</b>	<b>58.1%</b>	<b>42.8%</b>
BMI (Respondent)	Overweight	30.3%	26.6%	24.4%	<b>53.4%</b>	21.0%	25.7%	33.3%
BMI (Respondent)	Normal	30.0%	22.8%	18.1%	29.5%	18.7%	11.1%	19.8%
BMI (Respondent)	Underweight	1.0%	0.5%	3.2%	0.9%	1.9%	3.4%	0.9%
Diagnosed Specific Medical Conditions (Respondent)	6+	2.6%	1.8%	15.7%	2.8%	7.3%	8.4%	1.2%
Diagnosed Specific Medical Conditions (Respondent)	3–5	16.1%	13.3%	<b>58.2%</b>	13.6%	31.0%	<b>52.5%</b>	7.5%
Diagnosed Specific Medical Conditions (Respondent)	1–2	44.1%	<b>64.8%</b>	20.2%	23.6%	<b>49.1%</b>	29.8%	32.4%
Diagnosed Specific Medical Conditions (Respondent)	0	36.2%	20.1%	5.9%	<b>60.1%</b>	12.6%	8.9%	<b>57.7%</b>
Diagnosed Specific Medical Conditions (Respondent)	Missing	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	1.2%

**Table B6**  
**HOUSEHOLD CLUSTER PROFILE INPUT VARIABLES FROM 24 CLUSTERS**

Variables	Attributes	Overall	From 24 Clusters					
			1	12	17	19	21	24
Rank of Child Net Total Expenditure			4	1	8	2	5	24
Cluster Percentages		100%	8.6%	2.4%	6.8%	7.7%	2.5%	3.5%
Geographic region	Northeast	15.8%	20.6%	15.8%	16.9%	8.4%	9.4%	13.2%
Geographic region	Midwest	21.4%	<b>44.9%</b>	34.3%	24.8%	22.0%	25.8%	24.7%
Geographic region	South	39.2%	18.6%	<b>40.1%</b>	<b>43.6%</b>	<b>57.5%</b>	<b>49.4%</b>	<b>52.7%</b>
Geographic region	West	23.7%	16.0%	9.7%	14.7%	12.1%	15.4%	9.5%
Highest Level of Education Among Family Members	No Degree	9.1%	0.3%	9.9%	0.5%	4.7%	20.4%	12.9%
Highest Level of Education Among Family Members	High School	24.2%	12.6%	27.3%	8.3%	<b>44.5%</b>	<b>51.5%</b>	<b>60.6%</b>
Highest Level of Education Among Family Members	College	25.3%	18.6%	<b>48.8%</b>	<b>51.0%</b>	24.7%	17.8%	16.8%
Highest Level of Education Among Family Members	BA-level	22.5%	14.8%	12.1%	27.4%	19.1%	7.6%	6.8%
Highest Level of Education Among Family Members	Graduate-level	18.1%	<b>53.6%</b>	1.9%	12.8%	7.1%	2.8%	3.0%
Highest Level of Education Among Family Members	Missing	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

**Table B6 (Continued)**  
**HOUSEHOLD CLUSTER PROFILE INPUT VARIABLES FROM 24 CLUSTERS**

Variables	Attributes	Overall	From 24 Clusters					
			1	12	17	19	21	24
Rank of Child Net Total Expenditure			4	1	8	2	5	24
Cluster Percentages		100%	8.6%	2.4%	6.8%	7.7%	2.5%	3.5%
Employment Status of Mother	Missing	8.0%	3.0%	<b>82.5%</b>	2.4%	2.5%	6.1%	7.3%
Employment Status of Mother	Unemployed	19.4%	9.6%	5.1%	14.9%	17.8%	<b>50.7%</b>	16.2%
Employment Status of Mother	Partially employed	12.0%	5.8%	6.3%	17.3%	13.1%	23.9%	25.5%
Employment Status of Mother	Full employed	60.6%	<b>81.6%</b>	6.1%	<b>65.5%</b>	<b>66.6%</b>	19.4%	<b>51.0%</b>
Employment Status of Father	Missing	28.2%	9.6%	<b>64.1%</b>	4.2%	8.1%	<b>89.7%</b>	<b>91.7%</b>
Employment Status of Father	Unemployed	4.0%	2.5%	12.4%	3.1%	5.2%	3.9%	1.7%
Employment Status of Father	Partially employed	5.1%	4.3%	3.7%	8.6%	6.4%	5.3%	3.4%
Employment Status of Father	Full employed	62.8%	<b>83.7%</b>	19.8%	<b>84.1%</b>	<b>80.3%</b>	1.1%	3.2%
Household Income	Poor	17.6%	3.1%	26.5%	9.1%	8.9%	<b>71.7%</b>	<b>54.7%</b>
Household Income	Near Poor	5.0%	1.5%	6.2%	2.4%	2.6%	10.2%	8.5%
Household Income	Low Income	16.2%	6.9%	<b>30.5%</b>	13.8%	10.4%	9.3%	21.5%
Household Income	Medium Income	30.8%	23.9%	22.8%	<b>57.2%</b>	<b>61.7%</b>	8.5%	12.2%
Household Income	High Income	30.4%	<b>64.6%</b>	14.1%	17.5%	16.5%	0.3%	3.1%
Food Insecurity of Household	Insecure	21.1%	8.7%	<b>57.6%</b>	13.3%	30.4%	45.5%	24.1%
Food Insecurity of Household	Secure	75.9%	<b>89.5%</b>	39.8%	<b>86.7%</b>	<b>68.8%</b>	<b>48.1%</b>	<b>71.9%</b>
Food Insecurity of Household	Missing	3.0%	1.8%	2.7%	0.0%	0.8%	6.5%	4.0%
Number of Adults in Family (> 17 in age)	0	1.0%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	0.2%	1.4%	1.8%
Number of Adults in Family (> 17 in age)	1	18.9%	4.9%	23.2%	0.0%	1.4%	<b>60.0%</b>	<b>55.0%</b>
Number of Adults in Family (> 17 in age)	2	61.4%	<b>77.2%</b>	<b>50.1%</b>	<b>86.9%</b>	<b>75.1%</b>	25.9%	27.0%
Number of Adults in Family (> 17 in age)	3	14.0%	13.8%	19.8%	9.0%	18.5%	7.5%	11.1%
Number of Adults in Family (> 17 in age)	4+	4.7%	4.1%	5.0%	4.2%	4.7%	5.3%	5.2%
Number of Children in Family (≤ 17 in age)	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Number of Children in Family (≤ 17 in age)	1	24.4%	29.6%	<b>46.1%</b>	14.7%	19.2%	23.6%	22.0%
Number of Children in Family (≤ 17 in age)	2	39.9%	<b>48.9%</b>	23.9%	28.4%	<b>62.6%</b>	<b>40.3%</b>	<b>38.5%</b>
Number of Children in Family (≤ 17 in age)	3	23.2%	13.4%	17.5%	<b>44.3%</b>	10.9%	20.5%	20.6%
Number of Children in Family (≤ 17 in age)	4+	12.6%	8.0%	12.6%	12.6%	7.3%	15.6%	19.0%

**Table B6 (Continued)**  
**HOUSEHOLD CLUSTER PROFILE INPUT VARIABLES FROM 24 CLUSTERS**

Variables	Attributes	Overall	From 24 Clusters					
			1	12	17	19	21	24
Rank of Child Net Total Expenditure			4	1	8	2	5	24
Cluster Percentages		100%	8.6%	2.4%	6.8%	7.7%	2.5%	3.5%
Parent Status	Live with other family member	3.2%	1.2%	<b>52.1%</b>	1.2%	1.5%	2.8%	5.6%
Parent Status	Live with mother or father (part of year)	2.8%	1.2%	7.0%	1.3%	2.6%	7.5%	5.0%
Parent Status	Live with father	4.6%	1.8%	26.4%	1.1%	1.0%	2.8%	0.6%
Parent Status	Live with mother	24.4%	8.3%	9.6%	1.0%	6.6%	<b>83.6%</b>	<b>83.6%</b>
Parent Status	Live with both	64.9%	<b>87.5%</b>	4.9%	<b>95.5%</b>	<b>88.4%</b>	3.3%	5.2%
Marital Status of Mother	Missing	8.0%	3.0%	<b>82.5%</b>	2.3%	2.5%	6.1%	7.3%
Marital Status of Mother	Never Married	14.6%	1.8%	5.7%	7.0%	3.1%	<b>57.2%</b>	<b>70.2%</b>
Marital Status of Mother	Widowed, Divorced, Separated (This Year)	4.6%	3.3%	4.3%	1.2%	2.7%	11.6%	4.1%
Marital Status of Mother	Widowed, Divorced, Separated	9.5%	6.2%	3.7%	0.5%	5.1%	18.9%	15.7%
Marital Status of Mother	Married	63.4%	<b>85.7%</b>	3.9%	<b>89.1%</b>	<b>86.6%</b>	6.2%	2.7%
Marital Status of Father	Missing	28.1%	9.6%	<b>64.1%</b>	2.9%	8.1%	<b>89.7%</b>	<b>90.2%</b>
Marital Status of Father	Never Married	4.7%	0.8%	9.1%	7.4%	1.7%	3.8%	8.2%
Marital Status of Father	Widowed, Divorced, Separated (This Year)	2.4%	3.2%	10.3%	0.6%	2.5%	4.4%	0.5%
Marital Status of Father	Widowed, Divorced, Separated	2.5%	0.2%	12.7%	0.0%	0.5%	1.0%	0.2%
Marital Status of Father	Married	62.4%	<b>86.2%</b>	3.9%	<b>89.1%</b>	<b>87.3%</b>	1.1%	0.9%
Family Change	Change	2.2%	1.6%	3.8%	0.3%	2.4%	6.5%	4.5%
Family Change	No change	97.8%	<b>98.4%</b>	<b>96.2%</b>	<b>99.7%</b>	<b>97.6%</b>	<b>93.5%</b>	<b>95.6%</b>



**Table B7**  
**CHILD CLUSTER PROFILE INPUT VARIABLES FROM 38 CLUSTERS**

Variables	Attributes	Overall	From 38 Clusters							
			1	6	18	24	27	31	34	38
Rank of Child Net Total Expenditure			5	6	3	14	2	8	1	37
Cluster Percentages		100%	4.2%	5.4%	2.1%	4.4%	5.0%	1.9%	3.4%	1.2%
Age (Child)	5–6	14.6%	5.8%	3.6%	10.1%	17.4%	10.8%	7.3%	9.0%	10.2%
Age (Child)	7–12	45.3%	25.1%	25.3%	<b>57.3%</b>	<b>57.1%</b>	32.7%	<b>60.7%</b>	<b>62.2%</b>	<b>71.1%</b>
Age (Child)	13–17	40.2%	<b>69.2%</b>	<b>71.2%</b>	32.7%	25.5%	<b>56.5%</b>	32.1%	28.8%	18.8%
Sex (Child)	Male	51.0%	<b>64.9%</b>	<b>70.3%</b>	38.0%	34.4%	<b>57.4%</b>	47.6%	<b>80.8%</b>	39.0%
Sex (Child)	Female	49.1%	35.1%	29.8%	<b>62.0%</b>	<b>65.6%</b>	42.6%	<b>52.4%</b>	19.2%	<b>61.0%</b>
Race (Child)	White	49.9%	<b>80.9%</b>	<b>83.5%</b>	<b>68.6%</b>	<b>72.9%</b>	<b>71.6%</b>	29.1%	<b>76.8%</b>	6.4%
Race (Child)	Hispanic/Latino	24.8%	4.2%	5.6%	12.1%	9.2%	7.5%	7.7%	8.9%	<b>76.6%</b>
Race (Child)	Black/African American	14.0%	4.6%	5.0%	13.4%	8.5%	11.3%	<b>53.6%</b>	7.7%	1.8%
Race (Child)	Asian American	4.9%	4.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%
Race (Child)	Others	6.5%	5.6%	5.9%	5.9%	9.1%	9.6%	9.5%	6.6%	14.2%
Born in U.S. (Child)	Yes	95.8%	<b>94.8%</b>	<b>97.1%</b>	<b>99.0%</b>	<b>98.5%</b>	<b>99.4%</b>	<b>99.8%</b>	<b>98.9%</b>	<b>90.6%</b>
Born in U.S. (Child)	No	4.2%	5.2%	2.9%	1.0%	1.5%	0.6%	0.2%	1.1%	9.0%
Born in U.S. (Child)	Missing	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
Dental Visit (Child)	Yes	58.2%	<b>92.5%</b>	<b>86.2%</b>	<b>68.1%</b>	20.7%	22.8%	20.7%	21.1%	20.8%
Dental Visit (Child)	No	41.9%	7.5%	13.8%	31.9%	<b>79.3%</b>	<b>77.2%</b>	<b>79.3%</b>	<b>78.9%</b>	<b>79.2%</b>
Dental Care—Preventive (Child)	Yes	53.8%	<b>78.1%</b>	<b>85.2%</b>	<b>60.9%</b>	15.7%	15.9%	17.6%	18.5%	18.7%
Dental Care—Preventive (Child)	No	46.2%	21.9%	14.8%	39.1%	<b>84.3%</b>	<b>84.1%</b>	<b>82.4%</b>	<b>81.5%</b>	<b>81.4%</b>
Dental Care—Filling (Child)	Yes	8.9%	12.0%	10.4%	8.5%	1.2%	2.7%	4.5%	5.7%	3.1%
Dental Care—Filling (Child)	No	91.1%	<b>88.0%</b>	<b>89.6%</b>	<b>91.5%</b>	<b>98.8%</b>	<b>97.3%</b>	<b>95.5%</b>	<b>94.3%</b>	<b>96.9%</b>
Dental Care—Severe Condition (Child)	Yes	5.1%	3.0%	8.7%	7.1%	0.7%	1.8%	5.3%	0.5%	0.8%
Dental Care—Severe Condition (Child)	No	94.9%	<b>97.0%</b>	<b>91.3%</b>	<b>92.9%</b>	<b>99.3%</b>	<b>98.3%</b>	<b>94.7%</b>	<b>99.5%</b>	<b>99.2%</b>
Dental Care—Orthodontic (Child)	Yes	11.6%	<b>49.0%</b>	15.4%	14.7%	4.7%	7.2%	2.3%	2.3%	0.0%
Dental Care—Orthodontic (Child)	No	88.4%	51.0%	<b>84.6%</b>	<b>85.3%</b>	<b>95.3%</b>	<b>92.8%</b>	<b>97.7%</b>	<b>97.7%</b>	<b>100%</b>
Doctor Advise Regular Dental Visit (Child)	Yes	61.3%	<b>77.0%</b>	32.8%	<b>62.4%</b>	<b>67.4%</b>	<b>66.2%</b>	50.1%	<b>60.3%</b>	34.9%
Doctor Advise Regular Dental Visit (Child)	No	36.7%	19.8%	<b>64.6%</b>	33.6%	30.8%	31.7%	<b>49.0%</b>	35.6%	<b>61.0%</b>
Doctor Advise Regular Dental Visit (Child)	Missing	2.1%	3.2%	2.6%	4.0%	1.8%	2.1%	0.9%	4.2%	4.1%
BMI (Child)	Missing	25.2%	7.3%	8.5%	23.3%	19.4%	13.7%	<b>28.3%</b>	16.9%	<b>64.5%</b>
BMI (Child)	Obese	13.2%	8.2%	6.4%	<b>26.1%</b>	10.8%	19.6%	24.4%	20.1%	7.9%
BMI (Child)	Overweight	10.9%	8.9%	15.2%	17.4%	12.0%	17.1%	11.8%	13.5%	9.4%
BMI (Child)	Normal	44.3%	<b>69.1%</b>	<b>64.7%</b>	28.9%	<b>52.2%</b>	<b>40.2%</b>	29.5%	<b>44.2%</b>	12.0%
BMI (Child)	Underweight	6.5%	6.6%	5.3%	4.4%	5.6%	9.4%	6.0%	5.4%	6.2%

**Table B7 (Continued)**  
**CHILD CLUSTER PROFILE INPUT VARIABLES FROM 38 CLUSTERS**

Variables	Attributes	Overall	From 38 Clusters							
			1	6	18	24	27	31	34	38
Rank of Child Net Total Expenditure			5	6	3	14	2	8	1	37
Cluster Percentages		100%	4.2%	5.4%	2.1%	4.4%	5.0%	1.9%	3.4%	1.2%
Preventive Care Activities (Child)	0–2	9.8%	4.0%	7.5%	15.4%	9.5%	8.1%	6.3%	10.8%	<b>58.5%</b>
Preventive Care Activities (Child)	3–7	69.1%	<b>74.2%</b>	<b>80.7%</b>	<b>69.8%</b>	<b>75.4%</b>	<b>72.1%</b>	<b>82.8%</b>	<b>70.8%</b>	30.3%
Preventive Care Activities (Child)	8+	21.0%	21.8%	11.8%	14.8%	15.1%	19.8%	10.9%	18.5%	11.2%
Preventive Care Activities (Child)	Missing	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Diagnosed Specific Medical Conditions (Child)	Yes	19.1%	27.5%	16.8%	32.0%	16.3%	29.2%	<b>55.9%</b>	<b>58.1%</b>	9.8%
Diagnosed Specific Medical Conditions (Child)	No conditions	51.7%	<b>51.7%</b>	<b>62.0%</b>	<b>58.5%</b>	<b>66.8%</b>	<b>54.6%</b>	31.6%	25.3%	22.8%
Diagnosed Specific Medical Conditions (Child)	No medical visit	29.2%	20.9%	21.2%	9.6%	16.9%	16.2%	12.5%	16.6%	<b>67.4%</b>
Special Needs (Child)	Need	28.6%	32.9%	30.3%	<b>53.9%</b>	28.3%	<b>62.2%</b>	<b>75.0%</b>	<b>61.3%</b>	9.5%
Special Needs (Child)	No Need	71.4%	<b>67.1%</b>	<b>69.7%</b>	46.1%	<b>71.7%</b>	37.9%	25.1%	38.7%	<b>90.6%</b>
Special Needs (Child)	Missing	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

**Table B8**  
**RESPONDENT CLUSTER PROFILE INPUT VARIABLES FROM 38 CLUSTERS**

Variables	Attributes	Overall	From 38 Clusters							
			1	6	18	24	27	31	34	38
Rank of Child Net Total Expenditure			5	6	3	14	2	8	1	37
Cluster Percentages		100%	4.2%	5.4%	2.1%	4.4%	5.0%	1.9%	3.4%	1.2%
Respondent & Reference Person (Respondent)	Both—mother	52.8%	<b>49.2%</b>	<b>62.9%</b>	2.3%	30.2%	<b>62.7%</b>	<b>73.8%</b>	16.0%	33.0%
Respondent & Reference Person (Respondent)	Both—father	16.8%	19.5%	5.3%	9.4%	9.1%	6.9%	5.9%	<b>57.7%</b>	11.6%
Respondent & Reference Person (Respondent)	Respondent—mother & Reference—father	16.1%	27.6%	24.3%	0.0%	<b>49.6%</b>	17.9%	0.7%	6.3%	<b>44.8%</b>
Respondent & Reference Person (Respondent)	Both—not parent	6.2%	2.3%	0.7%	<b>73.7%</b>	2.9%	6.0%	10.3%	7.5%	6.9%
Respondent & Reference Person (Respondent)	Others	8.0%	1.4%	6.8%	14.7%	8.2%	6.5%	9.4%	12.6%	3.7%
Age (Respondent)	13–17	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.2%
Age (Respondent)	18–30	9.6%	0.0%	0.8%	1.1%	10.2%	3.5%	12.8%	6.6%	22.1%
Age (Respondent)	31–40	40.9%	17.7%	10.2%	6.1%	<b>69.6%</b>	<b>53.5%</b>	<b>48.1%</b>	23.2%	<b>63.2%</b>
Age (Respondent)	41–50	35.8%	<b>65.2%</b>	<b>73.3%</b>	18.3%	15.0%	31.0%	23.6%	<b>54.8%</b>	7.5%
Age (Respondent)	51–60	9.7%	15.3%	13.0%	<b>38.4%</b>	4.6%	9.4%	10.6%	11.0%	4.2%
Age (Respondent)	61–70	2.7%	1.8%	2.3%	31.7%	0.6%	2.5%	3.9%	3.6%	2.9%
Age (Respondent)	71–90	0.5%	0.0%	0.4%	4.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.9%	0.0%
Age (Respondent)	Missing	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sex (Respondent)	Male	21.4%	20.4%	8.3%	26.2%	12.9%	10.6%	8.8%	<b>71.4%</b>	13.5%
Sex (Respondent)	Female	77.9%	<b>79.7%</b>	<b>91.8%</b>	<b>73.8%</b>	<b>87.1%</b>	<b>89.4%</b>	<b>91.2%</b>	28.6%	<b>86.5%</b>
Sex (Respondent)	Missing	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

**Table B8 (Continued)**  
**RESPONDENT CLUSTER PROFILE INPUT VARIABLES FROM 38 CLUSTERS**

Variables	Attributes	Overall	From 38 Clusters							
			1	6	18	24	27	31	34	38
Rank of Child Net Total Expenditure			5	6	3	14	2	8	1	37
Cluster Percentages		100%	4.2%	5.4%	2.1%	4.4%	5.0%	1.9%	3.4%	1.2%
Race (Respondent)	White	54.7%	<b>85.7%</b>	<b>89.4%</b>	<b>75.5%</b>	<b>77.4%</b>	<b>73.5%</b>	30.8%	<b>83.9%</b>	13.4%
Race (Respondent)	Hispanic/Latino	21.9%	3.6%	4.7%	4.5%	9.7%	6.4%	6.3%	3.4%	<b>75.5%</b>
Race (Respondent)	Black/African American	13.9%	5.0%	3.4%	13.0%	8.8%	12.0%	<b>54.4%</b>	6.6%	0.8%
Race (Respondent)	Asian American	5.4%	3.7%	0.8%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.5%	2.1%	3.6%
Race (Respondent)	Others	3.4%	2.0%	1.7%	7.0%	3.3%	8.2%	8.0%	4.0%	6.8%
Race (Respondent)	Missing	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Born in U.S. (Respondent)	Yes	75.9%	<b>89.7%</b>	<b>94.3%</b>	<b>97.9%</b>	<b>93.4%</b>	<b>97.1%</b>	<b>96.4%</b>	<b>97.6%</b>	25.5%
Born in U.S. (Respondent)	No	23.2%	10.3%	5.8%	2.1%	6.6%	2.9%	3.6%	2.5%	<b>74.1%</b>
Born in U.S. (Respondent)	Missing	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
Number of Dental Check-Ups (Respondent)	Never	12.1%	0.9%	4.1%	<b>35.9%</b>	13.3%	13.5%	25.2%	15.2%	17.1%
Number of Dental Check-Ups (Respondent)	Less than 1	18.1%	13.4%	11.6%	24.6%	20.3%	31.8%	26.2%	20.7%	<b>53.3%</b>
Number of Dental Check-Ups (Respondent)	1 per year	26.2%	13.7%	15.6%	17.3%	25.9%	17.6%	<b>35.5%</b>	<b>43.2%</b>	19.0%
Number of Dental Check-Ups (Respondent)	2+ per year	42.5%	<b>71.9%</b>	<b>68.7%</b>	22.2%	<b>40.6%</b>	<b>37.2%</b>	11.4%	21.0%	10.5%
Number of Dental Check-Ups (Respondent)	Missing	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%
Any Delayed Dental Care (Respondent)	Yes	2.8%	1.5%	1.9%	9.1%	1.6%	3.8%	5.3%	3.8%	1.5%
Any Delayed Dental Care (Respondent)	No	95.9%	<b>98.5%</b>	<b>96.0%</b>	<b>90.4%</b>	<b>95.6%</b>	<b>96.2%</b>	<b>92.7%</b>	<b>96.2%</b>	<b>98.5%</b>
Any Delayed Dental Care (Respondent)	Missing	1.3%	0.0%	2.1%	0.5%	2.8%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Unable to get Dental Care (Respondent)	Yes	2.9%	0.3%	1.6%	16.0%	4.5%	5.4%	8.4%	0.0%	1.5%
Unable to get Dental Care (Respondent)	No	95.8%	<b>99.8%</b>	<b>96.3%</b>	<b>83.5%</b>	<b>92.7%</b>	<b>94.6%</b>	<b>89.6%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>98.5%</b>
Unable to get Dental Care (Respondent)	Missing	1.3%	0.0%	2.1%	0.5%	2.8%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Overall Health Status (Respondent)	Poor	4.5%	0.0%	2.4%	20.8%	0.9%	11.3%	18.4%	4.6%	4.0%
Overall Health Status (Respondent)	Fair	14.9%	2.4%	6.4%	17.9%	2.2%	<b>43.4%</b>	<b>64.1%</b>	13.6%	10.4%
Overall Health Status (Respondent)	Good	37.4%	14.0%	27.9%	<b>50.6%</b>	17.8%	31.5%	8.5%	<b>70.4%</b>	<b>68.8%</b>
Overall Health Status (Respondent)	Very Good	32.0%	23.8%	<b>59.3%</b>	6.8%	<b>72.1%</b>	9.8%	4.2%	8.1%	9.9%
Overall Health Status (Respondent)	Excellent	10.5%	<b>59.8%</b>	4.0%	3.9%	7.1%	4.1%	4.8%	3.4%	6.9%
Overall Health Status (Respondent)	Missing	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Mental Health Status (Respondent)	Poor	2.3%	0.0%	0.3%	7.0%	0.0%	5.3%	15.1%	1.9%	0.0%
Mental Health Status (Respondent)	Fair	9.1%	0.7%	5.8%	24.9%	5.8%	15.7%	29.7%	6.3%	5.8%
Mental Health Status (Respondent)	Good	37.0%	18.5%	17.1%	<b>48.7%</b>	15.2%	<b>60.5%</b>	<b>34.1%</b>	<b>61.6%</b>	<b>69.5%</b>
Mental Health Status (Respondent)	Very Good	31.1%	8.0%	<b>67.7%</b>	15.4%	<b>61.6%</b>	10.8%	11.7%	14.3%	8.0%

Mental Health Status (Respondent)	Excellent	19.8%	<b>72.9%</b>	9.1%	4.0%	17.4%	7.8%	9.5%	15.9%	16.8%
Mental Health Status (Respondent)	Missing	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ADL or IADL Limitations (Respondent)	Yes	14.8%	4.6%	11.0%	<b>56.3%</b>	10.0%	32.5%	<b>70.0%</b>	20.4%	8.4%
ADL or IADL Limitations (Respondent)	No	83.3%	<b>95.4%</b>	<b>88.2%</b>	42.2%	<b>88.0%</b>	<b>65.6%</b>	30.0%	<b>79.1%</b>	<b>91.6%</b>
ADL or IADL Limitations (Respondent)	Missing	2.0%	0.0%	0.7%	1.5%	2.1%	1.9%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%

Table B8 (Continued)

RESPONDENT CLUSTER PROFILE INPUT VARIABLES FROM 38 CLUSTERS

Variables	Attributes	Overall	From 38 Clusters							
			1	6	18	24	27	31	34	38
Rank of Child Net Total Expenditure			5	6	3	14	2	8	1	37
Cluster Percentages		100%	4.2%	5.4%	2.1%	4.4%	5.0%	1.9%	3.4%	1.2%
BMI (Respondent)	Missing	2.7%	3.4%	2.6%	2.7%	2.1%	1.9%	2.4%	1.1%	5.6%
BMI (Respondent)	Obese	35.9%	9.2%	<b>53.5%</b>	<b>55.2%</b>	14.2%	<b>56.9%</b>	<b>64.1%</b>	<b>64.2%</b>	19.2%
BMI (Respondent)	Overweight	30.3%	23.2%	21.5%	21.6%	<b>51.5%</b>	19.1%	24.4%	24.7%	<b>50.6%</b>
BMI (Respondent)	Normal	30.0%	<b>64.2%</b>	21.6%	16.8%	31.4%	20.7%	5.5%	9.7%	24.6%
BMI (Respondent)	Underweight	1.0%	0.0%	0.8%	3.7%	0.9%	1.5%	3.7%	0.3%	0.0%
Diagnosed Specific Medical Conditions (Respondent)	6+	2.6%	0.5%	1.2%	15.2%	3.8%	9.5%	8.0%	5.3%	0.0%
Diagnosed Specific Medical Conditions (Respondent)	3–5	16.1%	6.2%	14.9%	<b>63.2%</b>	12.8%	33.7%	<b>59.0%</b>	29.3%	14.7%
Diagnosed Specific Medical Conditions (Respondent)	1–2	44.1%	<b>52.5%</b>	<b>63.9%</b>	15.2%	23.4%	<b>45.8%</b>	24.4%	<b>51.5%</b>	16.4%
Diagnosed Specific Medical Conditions (Respondent)	0	36.2%	40.8%	20.1%	6.3%	<b>60.1%</b>	11.0%	7.9%	13.9%	<b>68.7%</b>
Diagnosed Specific Medical Conditions (Respondent)	Missing	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.2%

**Table B9**  
**HOUSEHOLD CLUSTER PROFILE INPUT VARIABLES FROM 38 CLUSTERS**

Variables	Attributes	Overall	From 38 Clusters							
			1	6	18	24	27	31	34	38
Rank of Child Net Total Expenditure			5	6	3	14	2	8	1	37
Cluster Percentages		100%	4.2%	5.4%	2.1%	4.4%	5.0%	1.9%	3.4%	1.2%
Geographic Region	Northeast	15.8%	<b>55.2%</b>	11.1%	16.6%	12.5%	8.6%	8.3%	17.0%	8.0%
Geographic Region	Midwest	21.4%	7.9%	<b>54.1%</b>	28.3%	20.1%	18.3%	22.2%	<b>47.9%</b>	6.1%
Geographic Region	South	39.2%	23.0%	17.4%	<b>48.1%</b>	<b>49.0%</b>	<b>59.3%</b>	<b>55.1%</b>	23.2%	<b>56.7%</b>
Geographic Region	West	23.7%	13.9%	17.5%	7.1%	18.5%	13.8%	14.4%	11.9%	29.2%
Highest Level of Education Among Family Members	No Degree	9.1%	0.0%	0.1%	8.4%	0.4%	5.3%	20.0%	0.1%	<b>50.3%</b>
Highest Level of Education Among Family Members	High School	24.2%	2.0%	15.4%	32.0%	9.0%	<b>58.2%</b>	<b>52.8%</b>	23.8%	23.9%
Highest Level of Education Among Family Members	College	25.3%	18.1%	16.9%	<b>45.3%</b>	<b>56.9%</b>	15.0%	16.3%	<b>46.2%</b>	15.0%
Highest Level of Education Among Family Members	BA-level	22.5%	17.8%	15.1%	12.4%	20.1%	15.6%	8.0%	15.1%	6.2%
Highest Level of Education Among Family Members	Graduate-level	18.1%	<b>62.1%</b>	<b>52.5%</b>	1.9%	13.6%	6.0%	2.9%	14.7%	4.5%
Highest Level of Education Among Family Members	Missing	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Employment Status of Mother	Missing	8.0%	1.7%	2.9%	<b>86.4%</b>	3.0%	3.6%	7.0%	8.8%	1.8%
Employment Status of Mother	Unemployed	19.4%	13.2%	7.1%	4.8%	16.3%	23.3%	<b>54.6%</b>	13.5%	<b>76.4%</b>
Employment Status of Mother	Partially employed	12.0%	7.0%	6.3%	5.2%	18.3%	9.7%	22.0%	13.7%	6.1%
Employment Status of Mother	Full employed	60.6%	<b>78.1%</b>	<b>83.7%</b>	3.5%	<b>62.4%</b>	<b>63.4%</b>	16.4%	<b>64.0%</b>	15.8%

**Table B9 (Continued)**  
**HOUSEHOLD CLUSTER PROFILE INPUT VARIABLES FROM 38 CLUSTERS**

Variables	Attributes	Overall	From 38 Clusters							
			1	6	18	24	27	31	34	38
Rank of Child Net Total Expenditure			5	6	3	14	2	8	1	37
Cluster Percentages		100%	4.2%	5.4%	2.1%	4.4%	5.0%	1.9%	3.4%	1.2%
Employment Status of Father	Missing	28.2%	0.5%	2.8%	<b>69.6%</b>	4.9%	6.9%	<b>87.4%</b>	5.3%	6.1%
Employment Status of Father	Unemployed	4.0%	3.3%	3.7%	6.8%	3.4%	4.9%	3.9%	10.3%	3.8%
Employment Status of Father	Partially employed	5.1%	2.6%	5.4%	3.0%	9.0%	5.6%	7.3%	7.1%	15.8%
Employment Status of Father	Full employed	62.8%	<b>93.5%</b>	<b>88.1%</b>	20.6%	<b>82.7%</b>	<b>82.5%</b>	1.5%	<b>77.3%</b>	<b>74.3%</b>
Household Income	Poor	17.6%	3.4%	2.4%	26.0%	9.8%	8.7%	<b>74.8%</b>	8.5%	<b>46.2%</b>
Household Income	Near Poor	5.0%	0.0%	0.8%	2.2%	3.4%	1.2%	10.4%	6.0%	9.3%
Household Income	Low Income	16.2%	4.0%	5.4%	<b>33.0%</b>	13.7%	11.4%	6.6%	8.2%	21.3%
Household Income	Medium Income	30.8%	19.5%	25.5%	27.6%	<b>55.9%</b>	<b>66.8%</b>	8.3%	27.1%	18.9%
Household Income	High Income	30.4%	<b>73.1%</b>	<b>65.8%</b>	11.2%	17.2%	11.9%	0.0%	<b>50.2%</b>	4.3%
Food Insecurity of Household	Insecure	21.1%	4.9%	6.7%	<b>52.7%</b>	14.3%	33.2%	<b>48.5%</b>	16.5%	17.0%
Food Insecurity of Household	Secure	75.9%	<b>94.4%</b>	<b>91.5%</b>	44.5%	<b>85.7%</b>	<b>65.7%</b>	44.2%	<b>81.7%</b>	<b>79.4%</b>
Food Insecurity of Household	Missing	3.0%	0.7%	1.9%	2.8%	0.0%	1.1%	7.4%	1.8%	3.6%
Number of Adults in Family (> 17 in age)	0	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%	0.0%	0.3%	0.9%	0.0%	0.2%
Number of Adults in Family (> 17 in age)	1	18.9%	0.0%	1.3%	24.2%	0.2%	1.3%	<b>67.9%</b>	3.0%	4.5%
Number of Adults in Family (> 17 in age)	2	61.4%	<b>73.5%</b>	<b>80.9%</b>	<b>53.8%</b>	<b>88.4%</b>	<b>74.1%</b>	20.4%	<b>73.9%</b>	<b>72.2%</b>
Number of Adults in Family (> 17 in age)	3	14.0%	21.1%	14.8%	15.5%	7.1%	20.9%	6.0%	18.5%	9.8%
Number of Adults in Family (> 17 in age)	4+	4.7%	5.4%	2.9%	4.4%	4.2%	3.5%	4.8%	4.7%	13.3%
Number of Children in Family (≤ 17 in age)	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Number of Children in Family (≤ 17 in age)	1	24.4%	23.7%	29.8%	<b>50.3%</b>	14.8%	19.5%	26.9%	24.8%	5.9%
Number of Children in Family (≤ 17 in age)	2	39.9%	<b>51.7%</b>	<b>44.3%</b>	22.7%	23.9%	<b>61.2%</b>	<b>41.7%</b>	<b>54.5%</b>	29.7%
Number of Children in Family (≤ 17 in age)	3	23.2%	12.4%	17.9%	16.5%	<b>45.4%</b>	11.8%	20.5%	15.4%	12.0%
Number of Children in Family (≤ 17 in age)	4+	12.6%	12.2%	8.0%	10.6%	15.9%	7.5%	10.9%	5.3%	<b>52.4%</b>
Parent Status	Live with other family member	3.2%	0.0%	0.0%	<b>60.6%</b>	1.1%	1.7%	2.5%	2.4%	1.4%
Parent Status	Live with mother or father (part of year)	2.8%	0.5%	0.5%	4.0%	1.6%	2.5%	6.7%	3.2%	1.4%
Parent Status	Live with father	4.6%	1.7%	2.9%	25.4%	2.0%	2.0%	3.9%	5.4%	0.4%
Parent Status	Live with mother	24.4%	0.5%	2.8%	6.4%	0.6%	5.3%	<b>84.0%</b>	2.9%	4.7%
Parent Status	Live with both	64.9%	<b>97.2%</b>	<b>93.8%</b>	3.7%	<b>94.8%</b>	<b>88.6%</b>	3.0%	<b>86.1%</b>	<b>92.2%</b>

**Table B9 (Continued)**  
**HOUSEHOLD CLUSTER PROFILE INPUT VARIABLES FROM 38 CLUSTERS**

Variables	Attributes	Overall	From 38 Clusters							
			1	6	18	24	27	31	34	38
Rank of Child Net Total Expenditure			5	6	3	14	2	8	1	37
Cluster Percentages		100%	4.2%	5.4%	2.1%	4.4%	5.0%	1.9%	3.4%	1.2%
Marital Status of Mother	Missing	8.0%	1.7%	2.9%	<b>86.4%</b>	3.0%	3.6%	7.0%	8.8%	1.8%
Marital Status of Mother	Never Married	14.6%	3.3%	0.6%	4.6%	6.2%	2.0%	<b>54.0%</b>	3.5%	12.0%
Marital Status of Mother	Widowed, Divorced, Separated (This Year)	4.6%	0.0%	2.8%	3.9%	0.0%	5.1%	11.6%	1.5%	0.2%
Marital Status of Mother	Widowed, Divorced, Separated	9.5%	0.0%	0.5%	2.5%	0.3%	3.0%	18.6%	0.2%	0.2%
Marital Status of Mother	Married	63.4%	<b>95.0%</b>	<b>93.2%</b>	2.6%	<b>90.4%</b>	<b>86.3%</b>	8.9%	<b>86.0%</b>	<b>85.9%</b>
Marital Status of Father	Missing	28.1%	0.5%	2.8%	<b>69.6%</b>	2.9%	6.9%	<b>87.4%</b>	5.3%	6.1%
Marital Status of Father	Never Married	4.7%	1.1%	0.4%	8.1%	6.4%	2.2%	4.4%	2.4%	9.4%
Marital Status of Father	Widowed, Divorced, Separated (This Year)	2.4%	3.4%	2.7%	11.9%	0.2%	3.0%	5.3%	5.0%	0.5%
Marital Status of Father	Widowed, Divorced, Separated	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	7.9%	0.0%	0.8%	1.4%	2.9%	1.3%
Marital Status of Father	Married	62.4%	<b>95.0%</b>	<b>94.1%</b>	2.6%	<b>90.4%</b>	<b>87.1%</b>	1.5%	<b>84.5%</b>	<b>82.8%</b>
Family Change	Change	2.2%	0.0%	1.3%	4.0%	0.0%	3.3%	8.0%	1.8%	1.0%
Family Change	No change	97.8%	<b>100%</b>	<b>98.7%</b>	<b>96.0%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>96.7%</b>	<b>92.0%</b>	<b>98.2%</b>	<b>99.0%</b>

## Appendix C: Detailed Summary of Cluster Profiles for Outcomes

**Table C1**

### CLUSTER PROFILE OUTCOMES FROM 3 AND 11 CLUSTERS

Variables	Attributes	Overall	From 3 Clusters			From 11 Clusters		
			1	2	3	1	9	11
Rank of Child Net Total Expenditure			1	2	3	2	1	10
Cluster Percentages		100%	55.0%	22.6%	22.4%	18.5%	13.6%	5.6%
Health Insurance (Respondent)	Uninsured	10.7%	4.5%	10.0%	26.7%	4.3%	9.1%	12.2%
Health Insurance (Respondent)	Public	20.0%	8.1%	42.6%	26.5%	3.9%	17.4%	56.7%
Health Insurance (Respondent)	Private	68.6%	86.9%	46.0%	46.3%	91.8%	73.5%	31.1%
Health Insurance (Respondent)	Missing	0.8%	0.6%	1.4%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dental Insurance (Respondent)	No	50.0%	34.6%	67.1%	70.7%	31.3%	47.5%	80.4%
Dental Insurance (Respondent)	Yes	49.2%	64.9%	31.4%	28.6%	68.7%	52.5%	19.6%
Dental Insurance (Respondent)	Missing	0.8%	0.6%	1.4%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Health Insurance (Child)	Uninsured	4.0%	2.6%	3.2%	8.1%	3.6%	5.2%	4.4%
Health Insurance (Child)	Public	37.6%	18.9%	64.4%	56.4%	11.8%	32.1%	72.8%
Health Insurance (Child)	Private	58.5%	78.5%	32.4%	35.5%	84.7%	62.8%	22.9%
Dental Insurance (Child)	No	56.1%	39.1%	78.0%	75.7%	35.0%	51.4%	84.0%
Dental Insurance (Child)	Yes	43.9%	60.9%	22.0%	24.3%	65.0%	48.7%	16.0%
Overall Health Status (Child)	Poor	0.5%	0.3%	0.9%	0.7%	0.3%	0.5%	0.9%
Overall Health Status (Child)	Fair	3.7%	2.0%	6.1%	5.7%	1.0%	6.1%	7.4%
Overall Health Status (Child)	Good	25.9%	19.1%	31.5%	36.9%	17.9%	33.7%	36.3%
Overall Health Status (Child)	Very Good	35.7%	39.3%	32.2%	30.5%	45.5%	35.6%	25.9%
Overall Health Status (Child)	Excellent	34.2%	39.4%	29.4%	26.3%	35.3%	24.2%	29.5%
Mental Health Status (Child)	Poor	1.3%	0.8%	2.6%	1.1%	1.1%	1.9%	2.3%
Mental Health Status (Child)	Fair	4.7%	4.0%	6.2%	5.0%	3.0%	9.3%	6.5%
Mental Health Status (Child)	Good	26.5%	19.0%	34.8%	36.7%	18.3%	34.8%	40.0%
Mental Health Status (Child)	Very Good	30.2%	33.6%	25.6%	26.4%	39.4%	25.3%	22.2%
Mental Health Status (Child)	Excellent	37.3%	42.6%	30.9%	30.8%	38.2%	28.7%	29.1%
Limitations in Attending School (Child)	Yes	1.1%	1.2%	1.0%	1.1%	1.7%	1.7%	0.5%
Limitations in Attending School (Child)	No	0.4%	0.2%	0.7%	0.4%	0.1%	0.4%	0.5%
Limitations in Attending School (Child)	Missing	98.5%	98.6%	98.3%	98.5%	98.2%	97.9%	99.0%
Number of School Days Missed (Child)	Missing	4.2%	3.4%	6.0%	4.5%	2.4%	3.8%	9.4%
Number of School Days Missed (Child)	8+	8.4%	8.5%	9.9%	6.6%	10.5%	12.4%	9.0%
Number of School Days Missed (Child)	3–7	23.3%	24.3%	22.3%	22.0%	26.4%	29.9%	16.1%
Number of School Days Missed (Child)	1–2	27.0%	29.6%	22.2%	25.4%	27.4%	26.4%	20.2%
Number of School Days Missed (Child)	0	37.1%	34.2%	39.7%	41.5%	33.3%	27.6%	45.4%
Behavioral Problems: At Home with Family Members (Child)	Yes	50.3%	52.0%	52.9%	43.4%	57.0%	60.0%	46.8%
Behavioral Problems: At Home with Family Members (Child)	No	47.1%	45.4%	43.7%	54.5%	41.2%	38.2%	47.4%
Behavioral Problems: At Home with Family Members (Child)	Missing	2.7%	2.6%	3.5%	2.1%	1.8%	1.8%	5.9%



**Table C1 (Continued)**  
**CLUSTER PROFILE OUTCOMES FROM 3 AND 11 CLUSTERS**

Variables	Attributes	Overall	From 3 Clusters			From 11 Clusters		
			1	2	3	1	9	11
Rank of Child Net Total Expenditure			1	2	3	2	1	10
Cluster Percentages		100%	55.0%	22.6%	22.4%	18.5%	13.6%	5.6%
Behavioral Problems: At School or with Schoolwork Completion (Child)	Yes	27.5%	26.5%	33.8%	23.7%	28.3%	39.0%	29.7%
Behavioral Problems: At School or with Schoolwork Completion (Child)	No	69.8%	71.0%	62.7%	74.2%	70.0%	59.2%	64.4%
Behavioral Problems: At School or with Schoolwork Completion (Child)	Missing	2.7%	2.6%	3.5%	2.1%	1.8%	1.8%	5.9%
Behavioral Problems: In General, in Having Fun, Being Happy, or Feeling Nervous or Afraid (Child)	Yes	43.7%	46.2%	45.3%	35.9%	47.2%	54.8%	38.6%
Behavioral Problems: In General, in Having Fun, Being Happy, or Feeling Nervous or Afraid (Child)	No	53.6%	51.2%	51.3%	62.0%	51.1%	43.4%	55.5%
Behavioral Problems: In General, in Having Fun, Being Happy, or Feeling Nervous or Afraid (Child)	Missing	2.7%	2.6%	3.5%	2.1%	1.8%	1.8%	5.9%

**Table C2**  
**CLUSTER PROFILE OUTCOMES FROM 24 CLUSTERS**

Variables	Attributes	Overall	From 24 Clusters					
			1	12	17	19	21	24
Rank of Child Net Total Expenditure			4	1	8	2	5	24
Cluster Percentages		100%	8.6%	2.4%	6.8%	7.7%	2.5%	3.5%
Health Insurance (Respondent)	Uninsured	5.1%	3.2%	6.2%	8.0%	8.7%	13.1%	0.0%
Health Insurance (Respondent)	Public	2.9%	41.5%	11.6%	20.2%	73.9%	52.5%	0.0%
Health Insurance (Respondent)	Private	92.0%	55.3%	82.2%	71.9%	17.4%	34.5%	0.0%
Health Insurance (Respondent)	Missing	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dental Insurance (Respondent)	No	32.3%	68.9%	36.3%	48.5%	93.0%	77.7%	0.0%
Dental Insurance (Respondent)	Yes	67.7%	31.1%	63.7%	51.5%	7.0%	22.3%	0.0%
Dental Insurance (Respondent)	Missing	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Health Insurance (Child)	Uninsured	5.3%	1.6%	3.9%	7.1%	1.6%	3.5%	0.0%
Health Insurance (Child)	Public	11.0%	71.0%	24.2%	32.9%	85.4%	74.1%	0.0%
Health Insurance (Child)	Private	83.7%	27.4%	71.9%	60.0%	13.0%	22.4%	0.0%
Dental Insurance (Child)	No	38.3%	80.9%	42.5%	52.6%	92.0%	83.8%	0.0%
Dental Insurance (Child)	Yes	61.8%	19.2%	57.5%	47.4%	8.0%	16.2%	0.0%
Overall Health Status (Child)	Poor	0.6%	1.2%	0.0%	0.4%	4.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Overall Health Status (Child)	Fair	0.8%	7.5%	0.9%	5.8%	21.0%	3.2%	0.0%
Overall Health Status (Child)	Good	17.5%	38.1%	17.4%	42.8%	35.9%	37.2%	0.0%
Overall Health Status (Child)	Very Good	43.7%	37.2%	46.3%	28.8%	23.5%	27.3%	0.0%
Overall Health Status (Child)	Excellent	37.4%	16.0%	35.4%	22.2%	15.0%	32.3%	0.0%

**Table C2 (Continued)**  
**CLUSTER PROFILE OUTCOMES FROM 24 CLUSTERS**


Variables	Attributes	Overall	From 24 Clusters					
			1	12	17	19	21	24
Rank of child net total expenditure			4	1	8	2	5	24
Cluster Percentages		100%	8.6%	2.4%	6.8%	7.7%	2.5%	3.5%
Mental health status (Child)	Poor	1.5%	4.2%	0.0%	2.3%	8.4%	1.1%	0.0%
Mental health status (Child)	Fair	3.5%	8.4%	4.9%	9.6%	19.0%	3.6%	0.0%
Mental health status (Child)	Good	19.9%	37.7%	15.1%	42.2%	36.4%	39.8%	0.0%
Mental health status (Child)	Very Good	38.2%	29.2%	41.9%	21.2%	20.4%	23.6%	0.0%
Mental health status (Child)	Excellent	36.9%	20.6%	38.1%	24.7%	15.8%	31.8%	0.0%
Limitations in attending school (Child)	Yes	1.5%	3.5%	1.1%	1.6%	4.0%	0.1%	0.0%
Limitations in attending school (Child)	No	0.0%	0.5%	0.4%	0.1%	2.6%	0.4%	0.0%
Limitations in attending school (Child)	Missing	98.5%	96.1%	98.5%	98.3%	93.4%	99.6%	0.0%
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Number of school days missed (Child)	Missing	2.6%	5.6%	9.2%	3.3%	6.4%	9.1%	0.0%
Number of school days missed (Child)	8+	11.2%	22.4%	6.5%	13.4%	16.6%	4.8%	0.0%
Number of school days missed (Child)	3-7	23.8%	18.9%	18.8%	32.5%	26.6%	14.2%	0.0%
Number of school days missed (Child)	1-2	28.5%	28.5%	30.0%	26.5%	20.9%	20.7%	0.0%
Number of school days missed (Child)	0	34.0%	24.6%	35.5%	24.4%	29.6%	51.3%	0.0%
Behavioral problems: At home with family members (Child)	Yes	63.2%	77.5%	49.1%	59.7%	64.5%	45.0%	0.0%
Behavioral problems: At home with family members (Child)	No	35.2%	20.1%	47.9%	38.9%	31.4%	49.5%	0.0%
Behavioral problems: At home with family members (Child)	Missing	1.6%	2.4%	3.0%	1.4%	4.1%	5.5%	0.0%
Behavioral Problems: At School or with Schoolwork Completion (Child)	Yes	33.4%	49.3%	27.8%	40.6%	46.9%	29.7%	0.0%
Behavioral Problems: At School or with Schoolwork Completion (Child)	No	65.0%	48.3%	69.2%	58.0%	49.0%	64.8%	0.0%
Behavioral Problems: At School or with Schoolwork Completion (Child)	Missing	1.6%	2.4%	3.0%	1.4%	4.1%	5.5%	0.0%
Behavioral Problems: In General, in Having Fun, Being Happy, or Feeling Nervous or Afraid (Child)	Yes	47.4%	59.0%	48.5%	54.0%	56.6%	36.5%	0.0%
Behavioral Problems: In General, in Having Fun, Being Happy, or Feeling Nervous or Afraid (Child)	No	51.0%	38.6%	48.5%	44.6%	39.3%	58.0%	0.0%
Behavioral Problems: In General, in Having Fun, Being Happy, or Feeling Nervous or Afraid (Child)	Missing	1.6%	2.4%	3.0%	1.4%	4.1%	5.5%	0.0%

**Table C3**  
**CLUSTER PROFILE OUTCOMES FROM 38 CLUSTERS**

Variables	Attributes	Overall	From 38 Clusters							
			1	6	18	24	27	31	34	38
Rank of Child Net Total Expenditure			5	6	3	14	2	8	1	37
Cluster Percentages		100%	4.2%	5.4%	2.1%	4.4%	5.0%	1.9%	3.4%	1.2%
Health Insurance (Respondent)	Uninsured	10.7%	0.6%	8.1%	3.4%	5.6%	9.9%	7.4%	5.2%	37.5%
Health Insurance (Respondent)	Public	20.0%	1.8%	1.8%	35.7%	12.5%	21.9%	74.1%	11.5%	29.2%
Health Insurance (Respondent)	Private	68.6%	97.6%	90.1%	60.9%	82.0%	68.2%	18.5%	83.3%	33.3%
Health Insurance (Respondent)	Missing	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dental Insurance (Respondent)	No	50.0%	27.3%	34.8%	64.5%	33.6%	53.6%	93.0%	40.7%	74.2%
Dental Insurance (Respondent)	Yes	49.2%	72.7%	65.2%	35.5%	66.4%	46.4%	7.0%	59.4%	25.8%
Dental Insurance (Respondent)	Missing	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Health Insurance (Child)	Uninsured	4.0%	2.5%	5.9%	2.3%	3.7%	8.4%	0.7%	0.6%	11.2%
Health Insurance (Child)	Public	37.6%	6.8%	8.1%	72.0%	24.3%	33.1%	85.2%	28.3%	61.5%
Health Insurance (Child)	Private	58.5%	90.7%	86.0%	25.7%	72.0%	58.5%	14.1%	71.1%	27.3%
Dental Insurance (Child)	No	56.1%	30.5%	37.0%	80.1%	43.7%	56.5%	91.9%	41.0%	74.7%
Dental Insurance (Child)	Yes	43.9%	69.6%	63.0%	19.9%	56.3%	43.5%	8.1%	59.0%	25.3%
Overall Health Status (Child)	Poor	0.5%	0.0%	0.8%	1.1%	0.0%	0.5%	3.5%	0.4%	0.0%
Overall Health Status (Child)	Fair	3.7%	0.8%	1.1%	9.0%	0.7%	5.0%	22.5%	2.2%	4.9%
Overall Health Status (Child)	Good	25.9%	9.0%	16.7%	41.0%	15.6%	41.0%	36.6%	33.3%	41.1%
Overall Health Status (Child)	Very Good	35.7%	23.3%	45.9%	33.4%	45.2%	29.7%	20.3%	36.0%	25.8%
Overall Health Status (Child)	Excellent	34.2%	66.9%	35.5%	15.4%	38.6%	23.8%	17.1%	28.1%	28.2%
Mental Health Status (Child)	Poor	1.3%	0.0%	2.4%	4.9%	0.0%	2.6%	9.9%	0.6%	0.0%
Mental Health Status (Child)	Fair	4.7%	2.7%	4.0%	8.3%	4.4%	10.1%	20.2%	9.2%	3.8%
Mental Health Status (Child)	Good	26.5%	13.7%	20.4%	41.8%	14.9%	40.5%	33.9%	28.9%	39.2%
Mental Health Status (Child)	Very Good	30.2%	17.0%	41.6%	25.9%	41.7%	19.8%	21.9%	29.8%	24.0%
Mental Health Status (Child)	Excellent	37.3%	66.7%	31.7%	19.2%	39.1%	27.0%	14.1%	31.6%	33.1%
Limitations in Attending School (Child)	Yes	1.1%	1.3%	1.2%	4.0%	1.7%	2.4%	4.0%	2.2%	0.4%
Limitations in Attending School (Child)	No	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.2%	0.5%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Limitations in Attending School (Child)	Missing	98.5%	98.7%	98.9%	95.4%	98.1%	97.1%	93.4%	97.9%	99.6%
Number of School Days Missed (Child)	Missing	4.2%	0.7%	2.7%	5.8%	8.0%	2.9%	5.5%	2.9%	8.9%
Number of School Days Missed (Child)	8+	8.4%	7.0%	9.8%	23.1%	7.4%	14.2%	16.4%	13.2%	1.5%
Number of School Days Missed (Child)	3–7	23.3%	11.5%	27.4%	20.0%	19.9%	30.7%	24.6%	35.7%	8.4%
Number of School Days Missed (Child)	1–2	27.0%	35.4%	29.5%	30.0%	32.9%	22.6%	23.3%	25.5%	22.0%
Number of School Days Missed (Child)	0	37.1%	45.4%	30.6%	21.0%	31.8%	29.7%	30.2%	22.7%	59.3%
Behavioral Problems: At Home with Family Members (Child)	Yes	50.3%	51.8%	64.8%	71.7%	51.3%	61.1%	69.7%	66.8%	26.5%
Behavioral Problems: At Home with Family Members (Child)	No	47.1%	48.2%	35.0%	25.3%	46.6%	38.5%	27.7%	33.2%	70.8%
Behavioral Problems: At Home with Family Members (Child)	Missing	2.7%	0.0%	0.3%	3.0%	2.0%	0.5%	2.7%	0.0%	2.7%


**Table C3 (Continued)**  
**CLUSTER PROFILE OUTCOMES FROM 38 CLUSTERS**

Variables	Attributes	Overall	From 38 Clusters							
			1	6	18	24	27	31	34	38
Rank of Child Net Total Expenditure			5	6	3	14	2	8	1	37
Cluster Percentages		100%	4.2%	5.4%	2.1%	4.4%	5.0%	1.9%	3.4%	1.2%
Behavioral Problems: At School or with Schoolwork Completion (Child)	Yes	27.5%	23.0%	32.6%	46.7%	28.9%	44.0%	50.7%	41.3%	13.2%
Behavioral Problems: At School or with Schoolwork Completion (Child)	No	69.8%	77.0%	67.1%	50.3%	69.1%	55.6%	46.6%	58.7%	84.1%
Behavioral Problems: At School or with Schoolwork Completion (Child)	Missing	2.7%	0.0%	0.3%	3.0%	2.0%	0.5%	2.7%	0.0%	2.7%
Behavioral Problems: In General, in Having Fun, Being Happy, or Feeling Nervous or Afraid (Child)	Yes	43.7%	45.4%	47.2%	58.2%	45.7%	55.5%	62.5%	51.8%	19.2%
Behavioral Problems: In General, in Having Fun, Being Happy, or Feeling Nervous or Afraid (Child)	No	53.6%	54.6%	52.5%	38.8%	52.3%	44.0%	34.9%	48.2%	78.1%
Behavioral Problems: In General, in Having Fun, Being Happy, or Feeling Nervous or Afraid (Child)	Missing	2.7%	0.0%	0.3%	3.0%	2.0%	0.5%	2.7%	0.0%	2.7%



**Give us your feedback!**  
 Take a short survey on this report.

[Click Here](#)



## References

- Milligan, Glenn W., and Martha C. Cooper. 1985. An Examination of Procedures for Determining the Number of Clusters in a Data Set. *Psychometrika* 50, no. 2:159–179.
- Thorndike, Robert L. 1953. Who Belongs in the Family? *Psychometrika* 18, no. 4:267–276.
- Gini, C. 1912. Variabilità e mutabilità. Reprinted in *Memorie di metodologica statistica* (Ed. Pizetti E, Salvemini, T). Rome: Libreria Eredi Virgilio Veschi, 1955.
- Rezankova, Hana, Tomas Loster, and Dusan Husek. 2011. Evaluation of Categorical Data Clustering. In *Advances in Intelligent Web Mastering – 3. Advances in Intelligent and Soft Computing, vol 86*, edited by Elena Mugellini, Piotr S. Szczepaniak, Maria Chiara Pettenati, Maria Sokhn, 173–82. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer.
- Kader, Gary D. and Mike Perry. Variability for Categorical Variables. 2007. *Journal of Statistics Education* 15, no. 2.
- Shannon, C. E. A Mathematical Theory of Communication. 1948. *Bell System Technical Journal* 27, no. 3:379–423.
- Chen, Keke and Ling Liu. 2009. “Best K”: Critical Clustering Structures in Categorical Datasets. *Knowledge and Information Systems* 20, no. 1:1–33.
- Rousseeuw, Peter J. 1987. Silhouettes: A Graphical Aid to the Interpretation and Validation of Cluster Analysis. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics* 20:53–65.
- Dunn, J. C. 1974. Well-Separated Clusters and Optimal Fuzzy Partitions. *Journal of Cybernetics* 4, no. 1:95–104.
- McClain, John O. and Vithala R. Rao. 1975. Clustisz: A Program to Test for the Quality of Clustering of a Set of Objects. *Journal of Marketing Research* 12, no. 4:456–460.
- Caliński, T. and J. Harabasz. 1974. A Dendrite Method for Cluster Analysis. *Communications in Statistics* 3, no. 1:1–27.
- Gluck, M. A. and Corter, J. E. Information Uncertainty and the Utility of Categories. Paper presented at the meeting of the Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Conference of Cognitive Science Society, 1985.
- Fisher, Douglas H. 1987. Knowledge Acquisition via Incremental Conceptual Clustering. *Machine Learning* 2: 139–172.
- Gao, Can, Witold Pedrycz, and Duoqian Miao. 2013. Rough Subspace-based Clustering Ensemble for 50 Categorical Data. *Soft Computing* 17, no. 9:1643–1658.

## About The Society of Actuaries Research Institute

Serving as the research arm of the Society of Actuaries (SOA), the SOA Research Institute provides objective, data-driven research bringing together tried and true practices and future-focused approaches to address societal challenges and your business needs. The Institute provides trusted knowledge, extensive experience and new technologies to help effectively identify, predict and manage risks.

Representing the thousands of actuaries who help conduct critical research, the SOA Research Institute provides clarity and solutions on risks and societal challenges. The Institute connects actuaries, academics, employers, the insurance industry, regulators, research partners, foundations and research institutions, sponsors and non-governmental organizations, building an effective network which provides support, knowledge and expertise regarding the management of risk to benefit the industry and the public.

Managed by experienced actuaries and research experts from a broad range of industries, the SOA Research Institute creates, funds, develops and distributes research to elevate actuaries as leaders in measuring and managing risk. These efforts include studies, essay collections, webcasts, research papers, survey reports, and original research on topics impacting society.

Harnessing its peer-reviewed research, leading-edge technologies, new data tools and innovative practices, the Institute seeks to understand the underlying causes of risk and the possible outcomes. The Institute develops objective research spanning a variety of topics with its [strategic research programs](#): aging and retirement; actuarial innovation and technology; mortality and longevity; diversity, equity and inclusion; health care cost trends; and catastrophe and climate risk. The Institute has a large volume of [topical research available](#), including an expanding collection of international and market-specific research, experience studies, models and timely research.

Society of Actuaries Research Institute  
475 N. Martingale Road, Suite 600  
Schaumburg, Illinois 60173  
[www.SOA.org](http://www.SOA.org)