


CHILDREN IN FINANCIAL HARDSHIP: MARYLAND

The number of children growing up in financial hardship in Maryland has been systematically undercounted. For decades, policymakers and community stakeholders have relied on the outdated Federal Poverty Level (FPL) to understand the extent of financial hardship in their communities. According to the FPL, 12% of children in Maryland (154,319) lived in poverty in 2019. Yet United For ALICE data shows that another 35% (470,688) — nearly three times as many — were also growing up in hardship, in households that earned above the FPL but not enough to afford the basics in the communities where they lived.

The reality is that 625,007 children in Maryland — 47% of all children — lived in a household with income below the [ALICE Threshold of Financial Survival](#) in 2019. These households included families in poverty as well as those who were **ALICE**: Asset Limited, Income Constrained, Employed. ALICE households don't earn enough to afford the essentials of housing, child care, food, transportation, health care, a smartphone plan, and taxes — the basics needed to live and work in the modern economy. There are children below the ALICE Threshold in [communities across the state \(PUMAs\)](#), at rates ranging from 19% in south Montgomery County to 80% in central Prince George County.

Children by Household, Maryland, 2019

Number of Children in Maryland = 1,328,582



Note: This research uses the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Samples (PUMS) and focuses on children, whose ALICE status is determined by their household's income compared to local cost of living. The data does not include children who are unhoused or living in group quarters. In this brief, percentages are rounded to whole numbers for ease of reading, which may result in percentages totaling 99% or 101%. All numbers are presented in the [ALICE Children Data Dashboard](#).

Sources: ALICE Threshold, 2019; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, PUMS, 2019



KEY FINDINGS

- Nearly half (47%) of children in Maryland lived in households experiencing financial hardship in 2019. While 12% were below the FPL, an additional 35% — nearly three times as many — were ALICE.
- While there are children below the ALICE Threshold across all demographic groups, 68% of Hispanic children and 61% of Black children in Maryland lived in households with income below the ALICE Threshold in 2019, compared to 31% of White children.
- Having working parents or guardians does not guarantee financial stability: 23% of Maryland children in households with two adults in the labor force were still below the ALICE Threshold in 2019.
- Children below the ALICE Threshold often lack access to resources ranging from stable housing and public assistance to education and broadband services. Nearly 425,000 children below the ALICE Threshold in Maryland did not participate in SNAP and more than 147,000 had no high-speed internet access at home in 2019.

WHO ARE ALICE CHILDREN?

Children below the ALICE Threshold are those under age 18 living in households with income below the basic cost of living for their communities. In 2019, 17% of children below the ALICE Threshold in Maryland were infants (0–2 years), 12% were preschool-age (3–4 years), and 71% were school-age (5–17 years). Children in Maryland’s struggling households are from all demographic groups; they include children born in the U.S. and abroad, of all abilities and races/ethnicities, living with parents or guardians who are married or single, working or not working. Children in households below the ALICE Threshold live in rural, urban, and suburban areas across the state.

Race/Ethnicity and Nativity

In 2019, the largest number of children below the ALICE Threshold in Maryland were found in the largest racial/ethnic populations: Children below the Threshold were predominantly Black (245,480), White (167,984), and Hispanic (146,845). Black and Hispanic children are disproportionately represented among ALICE children – a result of [persistent discrimination and systemic barriers](#) that limit their families’ access to resources and opportunities for financial stability. In 2019, 68% of Hispanic and 61% of Black children in Maryland lived in households below the ALICE Threshold, compared to 41% of Asian children and 31% of White children.

Nativity and English-speaking ability also have an impact. Of the 62,598 children in Maryland who were born outside the country (5% of children in the state), 70% were below the ALICE Threshold in 2019, compared to 46% for those born in the U.S. Rates were even higher for Maryland children living in a family with limited English-speaking ability, with 86% below the Threshold (compared to 84% nationally).

Disability Status

In 2019, there were over 57,927 children with a disability in Maryland – 4% of all children in the state. However, this is likely a significant underestimate as the number of [children being served under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act](#) in the state is substantially higher. Children with a disability in Maryland were more likely to live in households below the ALICE Threshold (61%) than those without a disability (46%). The most common disability, impacting 44,945 children age 5 and older, was a cognitive difficulty due to a physical, mental, or emotional issue – having trouble remembering, concentrating, or making decisions.

Having a household member with a disability affects everyone in the family. In 2019 there were 243,799 children in Maryland living in a household where someone had a disability, and 61% were below the ALICE Threshold. When a parent or guardian had a disability, children were even more likely to be below the Threshold, at 67%.

Key Terms

- **ALICE: Asset Limited, Income Constrained, Employed** – households that earn above the Federal Poverty Level (FPL) but cannot afford the basic cost of living in their county. While the FPL for a family of four in 2019 was \$25,750, the average bare-minimum cost of living for a family in Maryland according to the ALICE Household Survival Budget was just over \$87,000.
- **ALICE Threshold:** Derived from the Household Survival Budget, the average income that a household needs to afford housing, child care, food, transportation, health care, and a smartphone plan, plus taxes. Calculated for various household types for every U.S. state and county.
- **Below ALICE Threshold:** Includes children in both poverty-level and ALICE households combined.

ALICE Children Data Dashboard

Visit the ALICE Children Data Dashboard, to explore data on children living in hardship by:

- State, regional, and local geographies
- Demographic categories including children’s age, race/ethnicity, disability, and nativity
- Household characteristics like work status and living arrangements
- Children’s access to key resources

Visit UnitedForALICE.org/Focus-Children

Living Arrangements

ALICE children live in all kinds of households – with married or unmarried parents, single parents, grandparents, or guardians. Children are more likely to be below the ALICE Threshold when their families have fewer adults and/or adults with lower earning potential due to systemic [racism](#) and [gender](#) and [age discrimination](#).

Most children in Maryland (95%) lived with at least one of their parents (biological or adoptive) in 2019: 61% lived in a household with both parents and 34% in a household with one parent. The largest number of children below the ALICE Threshold were in married-couple households (300,139), followed by single-female-headed households (244,667). Other arrangements, representing smaller groups, were disproportionately ALICE: 63% of children in single-male-headed households were below the ALICE Threshold, as were 68% of children in unmarried-couple households. There were also differences by [marital status and partnership type](#):

- For different-sex couple households, the share of children below the ALICE Threshold was less for married-couple households than unmarried at 35% and 69%, respectively.
- For same-sex couple households, the share of children below the ALICE Threshold was greater for married-couple households than unmarried at 41% and 17%, respectively.

In 2019, 15% of Maryland’s children (195,067) lived in a home with a grandparent, slightly higher than the national rate of 13%. Children living with grandparents had lower rates of poverty than children in all Maryland households (10% vs. 12%), but were more likely to be ALICE (49% vs. 35%).

In addition, there were 72,465 children in Maryland living in households without their parents in 2019. Four percent of these children in Maryland (2,547) were in [foster care](#) (compared to 7% nationwide). But many more children who lived without their parents were in [arrangements outside of the formal system](#), including households headed by a grandparent or other relatives (48,325), or nonrelatives (21,593). Children living without their parents were more likely to be below the ALICE Threshold (67%), higher than the national rate (62%). The largest number of children below the ALICE Threshold living without their parents were Black. And a higher percentage of Hispanic and Black children living without their parents were below the ALICE Threshold (75% and 70%, respectively) compared to those who were White (61%) or Asian (32%).

Household Work Status

The largest driver of a child’s financial stability is the employment status of household members. In 2019, most children in Maryland lived in a household with at least one worker (95%). But having working parents or guardians does not guarantee financial stability.

Children living with two adults were more likely to be financially stable than children living with a single parent or guardian. Yet even in households with two working adults, 23% of children were below the ALICE Threshold. When only one of two adults worked, the rate increased to 65%. Children living in a household with a single working parent or guardian were even more likely to be below the Threshold (68%).



While parents and guardians work in every industry and sector in Maryland, children below the ALICE Threshold are concentrated in families where adults work in occupations with low median hourly wages. For example, in 2019, 87% of children living with an adult working as a cashier, earning a median wage of \$11.40 per hour, were below the ALICE Threshold. Similarly, 82% of children with adults working as a janitor and building cleaner, (median wage of \$13.07 per hour), were below the ALICE Threshold.

Even children with an adult working in a higher-wage job, such as a Registered Nurse (median wage of \$36.91 per hour), were below the ALICE Threshold (30%), as household expenses vary by household size, composition, and location.

In addition, 21% of 16- and 17-year-olds (30,360) in Maryland were in the labor force in 2019. Of teens living in households with income below the ALICE Threshold, 15% were in the labor force compared to 25% living in households above the Threshold. While at first glance these findings may seem counterintuitive, they are in line with existing [research on teen employment](#) that shows youth in low-income households have fewer opportunities and resources needed to work than teens from higher-income families.

Children by Household Financial Status and Key Demographics, Maryland, 2019

| | TOTAL | BELOW ALICE THRESHOLD | POVERTY | ALICE | ABOVE ALICE THRESHOLD |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|---------|-------|-----------------------|
| ALL CHILDREN | 1,328,582 | 625,007 | 12% | 35% | 53% |
| RACE/ETHNICITY | | | | | |
| White | 546,644 | 167,984 | 6% | 25% | 69% |
| Black | 404,855 | 245,480 | 18% | 43% | 39% |
| Hispanic | 216,844 | 146,845 | 14% | 53% | 32% |
| Two or More Races | 78,528 | 31,654 | 15% | 26% | 60% |
| Asian | 73,287 | 30,312 | 11% | 30% | 59% |
| DISABILITY | | | | | |
| Household Member With Disability | 243,799 | 148,275 | 21% | 40% | 39% |
| Child With Disability | 57,927 | 35,308 | 24% | 37% | 39% |
| LIVING ARRANGEMENTS | | | | | |
| Married, Different-Sex | 853,538 | 297,698 | 6% | 29% | 65% |
| Single-Female-Headed | 342,039 | 244,667 | 24% | 47% | 28% |
| Grandparent Living With Grandchild | 195,067 | 115,166 | 10% | 49% | 41% |
| Single-Male-Headed | 118,449 | 74,958 | 14% | 49% | 37% |
| Unmarried Couple | 113,379 | 77,226 | 23% | 45% | 32% |
| Not Living With Parent or Grandparent | 60,166 | 41,087 | 20% | 48% | 32% |
| Married, Same-Sex | 5,992 | 2,441 | 15% | 26% | 59% |
| WORKERS | | | | | |
| Two Adults, Two Workers | 468,000 | 107,378 | 2% | 21% | 77% |
| Two Adults, One Worker | 266,164 | 171,925 | 18% | 46% | 35% |
| One Adult, One Worker | 157,341 | 106,235 | 18% | 49% | 32% |

Note: Percentages are rounded to whole numbers for ease of reading, which may result in percentages totaling 99% or 101%. The groups shown in this figure overlap across categories (Race/Ethnicity, Disability Status, Living Arrangements, and Workers). All racial categories except Two or More Races are for one race alone. The Hispanic group may include children of any race. "Grandparent Living With Grandchild" includes any arrangement where grandparents live with their grandchild, including where parents or other adults are present. For the Workers category, the number of workers is defined as "workers in the family over the last 12 months" from when the survey was conducted. View more on the [ALICE Children Data Dashboard](#).

Sources: ALICE Threshold, 2019; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, PUMS, 2019

WHAT RESOURCES DO ALICE CHILDREN LACK?

Many ALICE families earn too much to be eligible for public assistance but still struggle to meet basic needs for their children. ALICE households are much more likely to lack stable housing, quality child care/early education, private health insurance, and home internet access, yet they still don't qualify for many public assistance programs. When these necessities are at risk, there are both [short- and long-term consequences](#) for children below the ALICE Threshold.

Stable Housing

Housing instability has a profound impact on a family and child's overall well-being. Children in families without stable housing face greater risks for [poor physical health](#), [increased family stress](#), [social isolation](#), and [lower academic performance](#). Children living in rented housing units and cost burdened households are more likely to go through the stress of moving – and ALICE children and children in poverty are more likely to live in both of these types of housing.

Among children below the ALICE Threshold in Maryland in 2019, 58% were in families who rented and 42% were in families who owned their home (vs. 16% and 84%, respectively, for households above the ALICE Threshold). There were also gaps by race and ethnicity both above and below the ALICE Threshold. Below the Threshold, families of Black children had the lowest homeownership rate (29%), compared to 57% for families of White children. Above the Threshold, the homeownership rate for Black children was higher (72%), but still substantially lower than for families of White children (91%).

57%

of children in renter households below the ALICE Threshold in Maryland were rent burdened

Because housing is one of the most expensive items in the Household Survival Budget, it is not surprising that 57% of children in renter households below the ALICE Threshold in Maryland paid more than 35% of household income on rent (compared to 3% for children above the ALICE Threshold in renter households).

The highest rates of children below the ALICE Threshold living in rent burdened households – above 85% – were in east Prince George County, east central Montgomery County, and west Howard County.

For all children – regardless of whether their family rented or owned – the longer they lived at their place of residence, the more likely they were to have higher income. Both above and below the ALICE Threshold, children in renter households were more likely to have moved in the past year compared to those in owner households (28% vs. 8%).



Education

Quality early-childhood programs have proven to be critical to [healthy child development](#), and to acquiring foundational skills required for a [successful transition to school](#) and [future academic achievement](#). Of all preschool-age children in Maryland, 50% were enrolled in preschool in 2019, on par with the national average (49%). Enrollment rates ranged widely in neighboring West Virginia (32%) to a high of 84% in Washington, D.C., with Virginia and Delaware on par with Maryland at 50% and 54%, respectively. Preschool enrollment rates also differed by household financial status: 43% of preschool-age children below the ALICE Threshold in Maryland were enrolled in preschool in 2019, compared to 57% of their peers above the Threshold. A smaller difference was seen in kindergarten enrollment (92% of kindergarten-age children below the Threshold vs. 93% above).

[Being a high school graduate prepares teens for future academic and career success](#). Yet in 2019, 6,444 Maryland children aged 15–17 were not in school. More than three quarters of these teens lived in households with income below the ALICE Threshold (74%).

Health Insurance

Access to health insurance is critical to both [wellness](#) and [financial stability](#) for families below the ALICE Threshold and [especially children](#). While most children in Maryland had health insurance in 2019 (97%, higher than the national rate of 95%), 4% of children in families with income below the ALICE Threshold did not have coverage (lower than the national rate of 7%). Children in families with income below the Threshold were more likely to have public insurance (59%), while those above the Threshold were more likely to have private insurance (89%).

| Children: Maryland | Below ALICE Threshold | Above ALICE Threshold |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| No Insurance | 4% (25,691) | 2% (14,729) |
| Public Insurance | 59% (366,813) | 9% (64,399) |
| Private Insurance | 37% (232,503) | 89% (624,447) |

Home Internet

The availability of internet access and devices for education has become increasingly essential for young people, yet the [digital divide](#) by income and race/ethnicity persists. In Maryland, 97% of children overall had home internet access in 2019, higher than the national rate (95%). However, children below the ALICE Threshold were somewhat less likely to have home internet access than those above the Threshold (94% vs. 99%) and considerably less likely to have high-speed internet, which is often essential for work and online learning (76% vs. 92%).

More than
147,000

children below the ALICE Threshold in Maryland did not have access to high-speed internet at home

There were also differences in access by race/ethnicity, especially for high-speed internet: 27% and 25%, respectively, of children in Hispanic and Black households below the ALICE Threshold did not have high-speed internet access, compared to 22% of White and 15% of Asian children in households below the ALICE Threshold.

By location, access varied. The percentage of children below the ALICE Threshold without high-speed internet access was highest in the Sandstown-Winchester, Ashburton, and Mount Washington sections of Baltimore City (49%) and Carroll County (48%).

Public Assistance

For a [variety of reasons](#), public assistance does not reach all children in households that are struggling. While most children in poverty are eligible, ALICE children live in households that often earn too much to qualify for assistance. For example, the income eligibility threshold in Maryland for one of the most far-reaching public assistance programs, the [Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program](#) (SNAP, formerly food stamps), is [200%](#) of the FPL. Even though all children in poverty should be covered by SNAP, in Maryland, SNAP was utilized by only 58% of children in poverty (89,032) and a mere 24% of children in ALICE households (111,063) in 2019. This left a gap of 424,912 children whose families were struggling to make ends meet but not participating in SNAP.

Nearly

425,000

children below the ALICE Threshold in Maryland were struggling but did not participate in SNAP

SNAP coverage of children below the ALICE Threshold in Maryland was 32% in 2019. Coverage rates varied greatly among neighboring states, from 29% in Virginia to 53% in West Virginia

Differences by race and ethnicity were also striking. In 2019, 46% of Black children below the ALICE Threshold in Maryland participated in SNAP, compared to 24% of White children and 17% of Hispanic children below the Threshold.

HOW HAVE ALICE CHILDREN FARED DURING THE PANDEMIC?

How a child starts in life impacts their long-term health, wellness, education and career. Family financial stability is one of the strongest [predictors of current and future well-being](#). Financial instability not only contributes to current experiences of [stress, trauma and hardship](#), but it impedes a child's opportunity for [future success](#), including higher education, a higher income, and long-term asset building.

Even before the COVID-19 pandemic, children below the ALICE Threshold experienced the ripple effect of challenges related to their parents' work status, lack of income/savings, and family responsibilities. As shown in our recent report, [The Pandemic Divide](#), households below the Threshold suffered disproportionately during the pandemic, with vulnerabilities caused by longstanding racial inequities ensuring that Black and Hispanic households experienced the greatest hardship.

Expanding on [The Pandemic Divide](#), our analysis of the U.S. Census Bureau's most recent [Household Pulse Surveys](#) (July–October 2021) reveals that **children and households below the ALICE Threshold bear the brunt of the pandemic's physical and emotional toll:**

- **Financial uncertainties:** Because households below the ALICE Threshold with children continue to suffer from loss of employment income and are unable to save, they remain far less confident in their ability to make their next rent or mortgage payment on time. In Maryland, more than one-third (38%) of families below the Threshold with children were slightly confident, not at all confident, or had deferred their housing payment compared to 9% of those above the Threshold.
- **Food insufficiency:** Throughout the pandemic, families below the ALICE Threshold with children consistently struggled to afford food. As recently as the fall of 2021, 44% of Maryland families below the Threshold with children reported that sometimes or often “children were not eating enough because we just couldn't afford enough food.” While this was less common in higher-income households, a substantial 24% of respondents above the Threshold also struggled to afford food for their children. Public assistance filled in only part of the gap. In the fall of 2021, 53% of students below the Threshold picked up or ate a free meal at school, received an EBT card to help buy groceries, or had free meals delivered, which means that nearly half (47%) did not.

- **Interrupted learning:** The pandemic has disrupted student learning for nearly two years, and children in households below the ALICE Threshold have been disproportionately affected. The most immediate way to compensate for disrupted K–12 schooling is to attend summer academic programs. In the summer of 2021, Maryland children below the Threshold were more likely to have attended such programs (23% vs. 18% above the Threshold), reinforcing the research that shows [children from low-income households are more likely to have experienced a loss of learning](#). Higher education was also impacted as many students [changed their plans to attend college](#), and those below the ALICE Threshold were more likely as those above to cancel plans to take classes (15% vs. 11%).
- **Delayed or missed health care:** Children below the ALICE Threshold were less likely to have had preventive health care. In the fall of 2021, 32% of Maryland households below the Threshold with children had to miss, delay, or skip their child's preventive check-up in the last 12 months, compared to 20% of those above the Threshold. Forgoing or postponing care caused some children to go without routine vaccinations, screenings, and ongoing care for chronic health conditions.
- **The Child Tax Credit:** More than one-third (39%) of Maryland households below the ALICE Threshold with children were still not receiving the advance Child Tax Credit in the fall of 2021, [for numerous reasons](#) such as a parent not having filed a recent tax return or a child not having a Social Security number. The immediate need for the additional income is evident from the ways Maryland families who did receive the advance Child Tax Credit used it: Those below the ALICE Threshold were more likely to use it to pay off debt than those above the Threshold (48% vs. 25%), and were less likely to save it (15% vs. 41%).

39%

of Maryland households below the ALICE Threshold with children still had not received the advance Child Tax Credit in the fall of 2021

ALICE IN FOCUS: CHILDREN – KEY INDICATORS BY STATE, 2019

| State | Total | Household Income Status | | | Rent Burden | Preschool | Internet | SNAP |
|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|------------|-------------------------|--|------------------------------------|---|---|
| | Number of Children | % Poverty | % ALICE | % Below ALICE Threshold | % Below ALICE Threshold Paying 35% or More on Rent | % Preschool-Age Enrolled in School | % Below ALICE Threshold with High-Speed Internet Access | % Below ALICE Threshold Participating in SNAP |
| United States | 72,723,350 | 16% | 33% | 49% | 53% | 49% | 69% | 36% |
| Alabama | 1,084,431 | 21% | 32% | 53% | 41% | 45% | 56% | 40% |
| Alaska | 177,930 | 12% | 33% | 45% | 50% | 47% | 59% | 32% |
| Arizona | 1,635,592 | 18% | 33% | 51% | 46% | 42% | 64% | 36% |
| Arkansas | 696,534 | 23% | 32% | 55% | 39% | 48% | 57% | 31% |
| California | 8,857,941 | 15% | 41% | 56% | 59% | 51% | 73% | 29% |
| Colorado | 1,250,988 | 10% | 40% | 50% | 51% | 52% | 78% | 22% |
| Connecticut | 725,789 | 13% | 29% | 42% | 65% | 67% | 77% | 37% |
| Delaware | 203,357 | 15% | 33% | 48% | 56% | 54% | 72% | 34% |
| D.C. | 127,468 | 20% | 34% | 54% | 54% | 84% | 75% | 49% |
| Florida | 4,219,941 | 17% | 39% | 56% | 61% | 53% | 71% | 38% |
| Georgia | 2,498,618 | 19% | 38% | 57% | 50% | 51% | 69% | 35% |
| Hawaii | 299,765 | 12% | 35% | 47% | 64% | 53% | 80% | 32% |
| Idaho | 448,452 | 12% | 33% | 45% | 47% | 33% | 68% | 28% |
| Illinois | 2,809,314 | 15% | 26% | 41% | 56% | 56% | 69% | 42% |
| Indiana | 1,566,776 | 16% | 28% | 44% | 48% | 41% | 63% | 31% |
| Iowa | 719,042 | 14% | 25% | 39% | 45% | 47% | 62% | 39% |
| Kansas | 698,097 | 15% | 30% | 45% | 48% | 50% | 71% | 26% |
| Kentucky | 996,896 | 21% | 28% | 49% | 44% | 36% | 66% | 38% |
| Louisiana | 1,084,053 | 26% | 31% | 57% | 53% | 51% | 60% | 45% |
| Maine | 245,182 | 12% | 36% | 48% | 37% | 51% | 76% | 40% |
| Maryland | 1,328,582 | 12% | 35% | 47% | 57% | 50% | 76% | 32% |
| Massachusetts | 1,345,145 | 11% | 34% | 45% | 55% | 59% | 78% | 35% |
| Michigan | 2,134,523 | 17% | 27% | 44% | 52% | 47% | 68% | 41% |
| Minnesota | 1,299,381 | 10% | 26% | 36% | 52% | 48% | 74% | 29% |
| Mississippi | 696,324 | 27% | 27% | 54% | 45% | 60% | 51% | 42% |
| Missouri | 1,363,714 | 16% | 32% | 48% | 43% | 46% | 64% | 36% |
| Montana | 225,787 | 17% | 27% | 44% | 45% | 38% | 67% | 37% |
| Nebraska | 472,477 | 11% | 29% | 40% | 37% | 47% | 77% | 31% |
| Nevada | 689,628 | 18% | 34% | 52% | 59% | 37% | 72% | 30% |
| New Hampshire | 256,279 | 7% | 32% | 39% | 45% | 58% | 82% | 27% |
| New Jersey | 1,926,659 | 12% | 29% | 41% | 59% | 70% | 75% | 31% |
| New Mexico | 472,259 | 24% | 32% | 56% | 47% | 48% | 56% | 48% |
| New York | 3,995,206 | 17% | 35% | 52% | 58% | 60% | 69% | 36% |
| North Carolina | 2,288,488 | 19% | 32% | 51% | 47% | 46% | 67% | 39% |
| North Dakota | 176,687 | 9% | 24% | 33% | 27% | 32% | 62% | 30% |
| Ohio | 2,566,933 | 18% | 28% | 46% | 46% | 47% | 71% | 42% |
| Oklahoma | 948,484 | 20% | 30% | 50% | 47% | 45% | 57% | 39% |
| Oregon | 859,939 | 13% | 35% | 48% | 49% | 43% | 74% | 38% |
| Pennsylvania | 2,615,510 | 17% | 27% | 44% | 54% | 43% | 73% | 47% |
| Rhode Island | 202,058 | 12% | 31% | 43% | 52% | 49% | 77% | 44% |
| South Carolina | 1,107,123 | 19% | 36% | 55% | 45% | 43% | 62% | 37% |
| South Dakota | 213,617 | 13% | 29% | 42% | 33% | 42% | 74% | 38% |
| Tennessee | 1,507,924 | 20% | 35% | 55% | 46% | 41% | 67% | 36% |
| Texas | 7,380,301 | 19% | 34% | 53% | 52% | 44% | 63% | 37% |
| Utah | 926,458 | 10% | 31% | 41% | 53% | 45% | 76% | 19% |
| Vermont | 112,768 | 9% | 33% | 42% | 45% | 69% | 78% | 39% |
| Virginia | 1,852,456 | 12% | 35% | 47% | 54% | 50% | 72% | 29% |
| Washington | 1,660,090 | 11% | 32% | 43% | 51% | 50% | 78% | 34% |
| West Virginia | 357,343 | 19% | 29% | 48% | 38% | 32% | 71% | 53% |
| Wisconsin | 1,260,851 | 12% | 26% | 38% | 48% | 45% | 72% | 37% |
| Wyoming | 134,190 | 10% | 25% | 35% | 40% | 32% | 68% | 20% |

NEXT STEPS

There is a lot more to be done to change the trajectory for ALICE children. Visit UnitedForALICE.org to learn more, then share this data with stakeholders in your community.

Learn more with:

- The [ALICE Children Data Dashboard](#), to dig deeper into related topics, demographics, and sub-state geographies
- [Resources related to children and financial hardship](#), including the references linked in this Research Brief, as well as additional resources that offer important context and even deeper analysis
- [The Pandemic Divide: An ALICE Analysis of National COVID Surveys](#) (2021) and other resources on the ALICE and COVID-19 webpage, to see the impacts of the pandemic on ALICE
- [On Uneven Ground: ALICE and Financial Hardship in the U.S.](#) (2020), to learn about the trends that contributed to a growing number of ALICE households even before the pandemic
- The [ALICE Wage Tool](#), to explore wage levels by geography and occupation

Connect with stakeholders:

- [Contact your local United Way](#) for support and volunteer opportunities
- [See members of the committees that support this work](#), including the ALICE in Focus National Research Advisory Committee for Children, and the ALICE in Focus National Leadership Committee for Children
- Find your state and federal representatives and see ALICE household data by legislative district with our [ALICE Legislative District Tool](#)
- Advocate for more accurate data collection by the [U.S. Census Bureau](#) for children who have been [historically undercounted](#), including (but not limited to) young children, children of color, children with disabilities, and children in low-income households.

United For ALICE is a driver of innovative research and action around financial hardship. The data and analysis are shared with United Ways, corporations, foundations, government, and nonprofits, to inform policy and promote positive change.

United For ALICE partners with the following United Ways and sponsors to bring the ALICE research to Maryland:

[County United Way](#)

[United Way of Frederick County](#)

[United Way of the National Capital Area](#)

[United Way of Central Maryland](#)

[United Way of Kent County](#)

[United Way of Southern Maryland](#)

[United Way of Cecil County](#)

[United Way of the Lower Eastern Shore](#)

[United Way of Washington County](#)



Leidos Biomedical Research, Inc.

operator of the Frederick National Laboratory for Cancer Research



The **ALICE in Focus Series** utilizes ALICE measures – the Household Survival Budget and the ALICE Threshold – to analyze the U.S. Census Bureau’s American Community Survey (ACS) Public Use Microdata Samples (PUMS). Each “Focus” in the series highlights a different demographic group. For more details about the methodology for the ALICE in Focus Series, go to UnitedForALICE.org/Methodology.