

Caught in the middle? Differences in work/family conflicts for “sandwich generation” women living in their own home compared to those who live in their parents’ home.

Renee Ellis, U.S. Census Bureau

Abstract

As the population ages, and marriage and childbearing are delayed, the potential for concurrent caring of parents and children increase. Caring for children and elderly parents may influence parents, particularly women, to stop working or work part-time. Some research finds women with dependent children under eighteen and coresident parents experience work interruptions, unemployment, or reduction in work hours. Other research finds that the availability of parents for housework and/or childcare improves a woman’s ability to work. This study examines how having coresident parents and children impact part-time work or work stoppages due to childcare and/or family obligations. Using the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), this study contributes to the literature by distinguishing between women who live in their own home and those who live in their parents’ home. This distinction helps deepen our understanding of differences between workers who balance care of children and parents from those who utilize parental support.

This paper is released to inform interested parties of ongoing research and to encourage discussion of work in progress. The views expressed on statistical or methodological issues are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the U.S. Census Bureau.

Introduction

The topic of the “sandwich generation” has been popular in the media and research over the last few decades. The term refers to people who provide care for both aging parents and dependent children. As the population ages, characterized by an increase in the percentage of the total population that is in the older ages (65 and over), and marriage and childbearing are delayed, there are increased chances for people to find themselves caring for parents and children at the same time. There are competing ideas as to how raising children and caring for aging parents may influence the lives of women. On one side, these women are depicted as stressed out while trying to juggle the needs of caring for both parents and children, which results in significant work/life conflict, or trouble balancing both work demands and family demands. This conflict may often lead to compromising one or the other. On the other side, women are shown to experience a reduction in stress and work/life conflict by utilizing parental resources such as financial help, housework help, and childcare. Both of these factors may be at play and other characteristics of family structure can improve our understanding of how “sandwich generation” women cope and struggle with work/life conflict.

The purpose of this paper is to examine how household structure influences two particular indicators of work/life conflict: 1) stopping work by ending a job, becoming temporarily unemployed or taking off two or more weeks at a time and 2) moving from full-time work to less than full time for some duration during the reference period. This paper compares working mothers who do not live with their parents to working mothers who either live in their own home with their parents or live in their parents’ home. The purpose of this comparison is to gain a deeper understanding of how differences in these living arrangements influence work stoppages or moving to part-time work and the reasons for the stoppage or part-time schedule.

Background

The “sandwich generation” is generally characterized as suffering from the pressures of job and family conflict as they try to balance care of their children and parents with other responsibilities such as work. Women are more likely to be caring for both children and parents at the same time and spend significantly more time caring compared to men (Spillman and Pezzin 2000; Williams 2004). Some research has found that “sandwich generation” workers often experience increased stress (Chapmen, Ingersoll-Dayton, and Neal 1994; Voydandoff and Donnelly 1999; Williams 2004). Additionally, “sandwich generation” caregivers often have more work absences, reduce work hours, or enter part-time work with less job security in order to cope with family caregiving (Buffardi et. al., 1999; Chapmen, Ingersoll-Dayton, and Neal 1994; Hammer and Neal 2008; Williams 2004).

However, this may not be an entirely accurate depiction of this group. Caregiving may provide emotional benefits to caregivers (Stephens, Franks, and Townsend 1994). Additionally, the older population may have significant time or monetary resources available to help their children and grandchildren. Because of their resources, grandparents may actually be easing pressures of work/family conflicts by contributing childcare, housing or other resources to parents, which allows parents to focus more time on work (Ingersoll-Dayton, Neal, and Hammer, 2001). In fact, about 32 percent of employed mothers use grandparents for childcare (see Table 2 in Laughlin 2013).

One of the challenges of researching “sandwich generation” work/family conflict is disaggregating parents who care for their aging parents from those who are receiving help from their parents. One way of looking at the distinction is to look at family structure, in particular, households where mothers live with both their children and parents. While these women may struggle to balance demands of care for two generations, having both generations under one roof may make things comparatively easier. Utilizing parents for childcare and other help is also not restricted to working mothers who live with their parents. However, we know from

other research that multigenerational households differ in important ways from households without both children and grandparents present. These differences in household structure allow for an exploration of how work/life conflicts vary by household type among “sandwich generation” working mothers.

A recent Census report on grandparents and grandchildren found that grandparents who lived in parent maintained households had poorer health, were more frequently disabled, and less likely to work compared to grandparents who live in their own home with coresident children and grandchildren (Ellis and Simmons 2014). However, grandparents who live in their own home have lower levels of education compared to those who live in their children’s home and their households are also more likely to be in poverty. This suggests that “sandwich generation” women who live in their own home may be more likely to spend time caring for aging parents compared to those who live with their parents, but it also suggests that mothers who live in their parents’ home may have less access to parental resources including time and money. Households where both grandparents and grandchildren are present are also more likely to be in poverty compared to households where children live with just their parents.

The differences in household structure may be masked in previous studies about work/life conflicts. Work stoppages or part-time work may vary between working mothers who do not have their parents present and those who do. There may also be differences between women who live in their parent’s home and those who do not. This study compares women’s work stoppages and changes to part-time work by presence of parents, and by who is the householder, in order to gain a deeper understanding of work conflicts due to caring for parents and children, as well as possible help gained from parents among working mothers.

Data and Methods

This research focuses on the following questions: Do rates of work stoppages or part-time work differ by household structure? Do women cite childcare or family obligations as the reason they stopped working or worked part-time more frequently if they live with a parent? For those who live with a parent, are there

differences in citing family obligations for working part-time or work stoppages between women who live in their own home with coresident parents and children compared to women who live in their parents' home with children?

This research uses Wave 2 of the Survey of Income and Program Participation's (SIPP) 2008 panel to compare work experiences of women by household structure. SIPP is a nationally representative longitudinal survey that includes a variety of economic and workforce information.¹ The Wave 2 topical module contains a matrix of the relationship of each person in the household to every other household resident. This feature of SIPP allows for better identification of the relationships of household members compared to surveys that only contain the relationship to the reference person. By using SIPP, this study is able to identify the presence of parents and separate respondents who live in their own home from respondents who live in their parents' home as a way of, at least in part, disaggregating those who care for their parents from those who mainly receive help from parents. Although one of the benefits of SIPP is that it is a longitudinal survey, this research focuses only on Wave 2, where the relationship matrix is available. Future research might expand upon this work to utilize the longitudinal nature of the survey.

This study analyzes descriptive statistics and logistic regression models for women who are in the workforce (including unemployed) and have at least one child (biological, step, or adoptive) in the household. Note, this excludes women who do not work by choice (i.e., those who are not in the workforce). The independent variable of interest is household structure. Household structure was coded into three groups using the Wave 2 household relationship matrix of relationships among everyone in the household. The three groups are: 1) women who do not live with a parent, 2) women who live with a parent but live in their own home, and 3) women who live with a parent and live in the parent's home. There are two sets of comparisons.

¹ For information on sampling and nonsampling error see <<http://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/programs-surveys/sipp/tech-documentation/source-accuracy-statements/2008/SIPP%202008%20Panel%20Wave%2004%20-%20Core%20Source%20and%20Accuracy%20Statements.pdf>>.

The first set compares women who live in their own home with a parent and women who live in their parents' home to women who do not live with a parent. The second comparison is between women who live with a parent and compares women who live in their own home to those who live with a parent.

The weighted sample included about 28 million working mothers with children (see Table 1).² The majority of mothers (26 million) did not have a parent in the household. Of the 1.9 million who did have a parent in the household, more than 600,000 lived in their own home and 1.3 million lived in their parents' home. Approximately 4.4 million mothers had a work stoppage and 11.5 million worked part time (see Table 1).³ About 4 million of the mothers with a work stoppage had no parent in the household and 11 million mothers with no parent in the households worked part time. Among mothers who lived with a parent, 362,000 stopped working and 789,000 worked part time.

Work stoppages were coded from three separate questions: 1) having no work during the four-month reference period, 2) ending of the job the respondent had in the previous reference period, or 3) taking an unpaid leave of two or more weeks during the reference period. If one of more of these conditions were true, the respondent was coded as having a work stoppage.

A reason for having a work stoppage was coded if a respondent had a work stoppage either from the ending of the job from the previous reference period or from taking leave for two or more weeks during the current 4-month reference period. There was some variation in the options for reasons for stopping. For example, reasons for no longer working at the job from last reference period included being fired or laid off, while reasons for a two-week or more work stoppage included changing jobs or vacation. In all cases,

² Statistics from surveys are subject to sampling and non-sampling error. All comparisons presented in this report have taken sampling error into account and are significant at the 90-percent confidence level unless otherwise noted.

³ These groups are not mutually exclusive; a mother may report both working part-time and having experienced a work stoppage.

explanations of childcare, caring for children, or caring for other relatives were coded as family reasons. All other reasons were coded as non-family reasons.⁴

Part-time work was coded from a question asking if at any time during the reference period the respondent had worked less than 35 hours a week. A response of yes to this question was considered working less than full-time. Reasons for working part-time were coded as family reasons if they were due to childcare or caring for a child or other relative. All other reasons were coded as non-family reasons.⁵

Control variables that may be related to women's work status include age of respondent, race and Hispanic origin, educational attainment, presence of a spouse or cohabiting partner, and the number of children under 18 in the household. In the logistic regressions, age, educational attainment and number of children present are treated as continuous variables. Descriptive data and logistic regressions are weighted to the national level.

The dependent variables in the logistic regression models are work stoppage or part-time work and the family reason, if one was given, for the work stoppage or part-time work. This means that the variables are interpreted as increasing or decreasing a mother's chance of having a work stoppage or part-time work, working part-time, or having a family reason for the work stoppage or working part-time.

Model 1 examines work stoppage. Model 2 is limited only to women who had a work stoppage and compares women who cited family reasons for stopping work to those who did not. Model 3 examines part-time work and Model 4 is limited to women who had part-time work, and looks at family reasons for part-time work.

Each model has two iterations. In the first iteration (A), mothers who do not live with a parent are the reference group. Women who live in their parents' home and women who live in their own home with their

⁴ Non-family reasons for work stoppage include: temporarily unable to work because of an injury, temporarily unable to work because of an illness, unable to find work, going to school, on layoff, fired, employer sold business, quit to take another job, and unsatisfactory work arrangements.

⁵ Non-family reasons for part-time work include inability to find full time job, wanted to work part-time, job sharing arrangement, unable to work full time because of chronic health condition, slack work or material shortage etc.

parents are compared to women who do not live with a parent. In the second iteration (B), the two groups of women who have parents present are compared and women who live in their own home are the reference group.

Results

Of the approximately 28 million working mothers in the sample, 93 percent did not live with a parent (see Table 1). Of the 7 percent who did live with a parent, 33 percent lived in their own home and 67 percent lived in their parents' home (see Table 1). Sixteen percent of all working mothers had a work stoppage during the reference period and 13 percent of those with a work stoppage cited family reasons for the stoppage (see Table 2). A much larger percentage of mothers reported some part-time work during the 4-month reference period (41 percent, see Table 3). Seventeen percent of women who reported part-time work cited family reasons.

There is some variance by household structure. Sixteen percent of working mothers without parents in the household experienced a work stoppage while 21 percent of mothers living in their parents' home did so (see Table 2).⁶ Between 12 (mothers without parents in their home) and 14 (mothers living in their parents' home) percent of women with a work stoppage reported family reasons for the stoppage.⁷ Mothers living in their parents' household reported the highest rates of part-time work (see Table 3). Forty-seven percent reported working less than full time, while 41 percent of mothers without a parent in the household and 33 percent of those who lived in their own home with a parent reported part-time work. Family reasons for part-time work were not significantly different by family structure (see table 3). Working mothers who lived in their parents' home had higher reports of work stoppage and part-time work compared to mothers who lived in

⁶ There is no significant difference in work stoppage between mothers with no parent in the household and mothers living in their own home with a parent.

⁷ There is no significant difference in family reasons for work stoppage between any of these groups.

their own home with parents or mothers who did not live with parents, but the frequency of reporting family reasons was in line with that of mothers in other family structures.

There was some variation in work stoppage and part-time work and the family explanations for these changes by other demographic characteristics. For example, women under 34 had higher reports of work stoppages for family reasons compared to women in older age groups (see Table 2).⁸ Respondents with less than a high school education reported a higher percentage of work stoppages and part-time work compared to other education levels (see Tables 2 and 3).⁹ Women with no spouse or partner in the household reported higher percentages of work stoppages compared to those with a spouse or partner (see Table 2). However, women with a partner in the household were more likely to cite family reasons for work stoppages. Women with a spouse or partner had higher rates of citing family reasons for part-time work compared to women without a spouse or partner (see Table 3).

The results from the descriptive statistics indicate that there are differences by household structure in work/family conflicts as indicated by differences in work stoppage and part-time work. However, the differences in work/family conflict by family structure are also impacted by differences in demographic characteristics. Examination of logistic regressions allow for further understanding of how household structure and demographic characteristics may contribute to differences in work outcomes.

Table 4 shows that, when controlling for demographic characteristics, household structure is not a very good predictor of work stoppage by family structure. This is true when comparing mothers who live with parents to those who do not (Model 1A) and when comparing mothers who live in their parents' home to those who live in their own home with parents (Model 1B). Family structure was not significant in either model. When interaction terms were incorporated in the model (results not shown here), family structure was

⁸ There is no significant difference in family reasons for work stoppages between women 15-24 and women 25-34.

⁹ There is no significant difference in part-time work between women with a high school degree and women with a Bachelor's degree.

significant when interacted with race and Hispanic origin for women living in their parents' home, but only for Hispanics.

Table 5 shows results for women who had a work stoppage and gave a family reason. In Model 2A, family structure is not significant. However, in Model 2B where women living in their parents' home are compared to those who live in their own home with parents present, family structure is significant. Women living with their parents are less likely to have a work stoppage due to family reasons compared to women who live in their own home with parents present. This suggests that women who live in their own home with parents may be more likely to resolve their conflicts by not working for a period of time.

Table 6 provides results for part-time work. Compared to mothers who did not have a parent present, women who live in their own home with parents were less likely to do part-time work during the reference period (Model 3A). Women who live with their parents were more likely to do part-time work compared to women who did not live with their parents. No difference was found when comparing mothers who lived in their own home to those who lived with their parents (Model 3B). In models not shown here, adding interaction effects with any of the other variables produced a significant difference. However, because of the small sample size, I do not present those models. Interaction effect models are likely to be more robust if used to analyze the longitudinal sample.

Family structure did not result in significant differences in whether a family reason was given for part-time work when comparing women with a parent present to those who did not have a parent present (see Model 4A in Table 7). However, women who lived with their parents were more likely to give family reasons for part-time work compared to women who lived in their own home with their parents. Compared to women who lived in their own home with parents, women who lived with their parents may be more likely to resolve work/family conflicts by transitioning to part-time work.

Discussion

This study is a first exploratory attempt at understanding how considering parent coresidence may improve our understanding of work/family conflict and the contradictions in the research between “sandwich generation” mothers being depicted as having to make work compromises because of family conflicts or having parental help to resolve conflicts. There was not clear evidence that work/family conflicts are reduced for working mothers in one household structure over the other. There was some evidence that mothers who live with their parents may be more strained by work/family conflicts compared to women who do not live with parents and therefore reduce their work hours. However, this did not extend to a difference in part-time work usage between women who lived in their parents’ home and women who lived in their own home with a parent.

Perhaps the most interesting finding here is that women who lived with parents deal with work conflicts differently depending upon household structure. Women who lived with their parents were significantly more likely to cite family reasons for moving to part-time work compared to women who lived in their own homes. Women who lived in their own homes with parents were more likely to give family reasons for a work stoppage compared to women who lived in their parents’ home. This difference in coping mechanisms for work/family conflict could be explained by earlier research on grandparent households that found higher rates of poverty in grandparent headed households (Ellis and Simmons 2014). A mother living in her parents’ home may not have the option of not working or leaving a job due to income limitations in the family, and may opt for flexible part-time work instead. This may also be related to higher education levels in households where the working mother is the householder. This may allow for flexibility in type of work that makes it easier to leave a job or work jobs of short duration in order to cope with family needs.

Further research is needed to better understand how family structure differences may influence how a working mother copes with work/family conflict. The most severe limitation of this study was sample size. The

group of working mothers who lived with their parents was only 7 percent of the sample and it was further broken down into two groups. It is likely that part of the lack of significance when comparing to mothers who did not live with parents was the sheer sample size of that group (26 million) compared to the small sizes of the other group (less than 2 million). The limited time span of 4 months was also an issue. Looking at work stoppages or work hour reductions over a longer time would greatly improve our ability to understand conflicts. For that reason, future studies should take advantage of the longitudinal nature of SIPP to look at changes in work over a longer period of time. This would allow us to potentially see more mothers with changes in work schedule in order to increase our understanding of how family structure impacts work/family conflicts.

Works cited

- Buffardi, L.C., Smith, J. L., O'Brien, A. S. and Erdwins, C. J. 1999. The impact of dependent care responsibility and gender on work attitudes. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 4, 356-367.
- Chapman, N., Ingersoll-Dayton, B. and Neal, M. 1994. Balancing the multiple roles of work and caregiving for children, adults, and elders. In: Keita, G. and Hurrell, J. (Eds.) *Job stress in a changing work-force: Investigating gender, diversity and family issues*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, pp. 283-300.
- Ellis, R, and Simmons, T. 2014. Coresident Grandparents and Their Grandchildren: 2012. *Current Population Reports*, P20-576. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.
- Hammer, L., and Neal, M. 2008. Working sandwich generation caregivers: prevalence, characteristics, and outcomes. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*, 11, 93-112.
- Ingersoll-Dayton, B., Neal, M., and Hammer, L. 2001. Aging parents helping adult children: The experience of the sandwiched generation. *Family Relations*, 50, 262-271.
- Laughlin, L. 2013. Who's Minding the Kids? Child Care Arrangements: Spring 2011. *Current Population Reports*, P70-135. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.
- Spillman, B.C., and Pezzin, L.E. 2000. Potential and active family caregivers: changing networks and the 'sandwich generation.' *The Milbank Quarterly*, 78(3), 347-374.
- Stephens, M., Franks, M., and Townsend, A. 1994. Stress and rewards in women's multiple roles: the case of women in the middle. *Psychology & Aging*, 9(1), 45-52.
- Voydanoff, P., and Donnelly, B. 1999. Multiple roles and psychological distress: the intersection of the paid worker, spouse, and parent roles with the role of the adult child. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 61(3), 725-738.
- Williams, C. 2004. The Sandwich Generation. *Perspectives on Labour and Income*. Statistics Canada <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/75-001-x/10904/4168707-eng.htm>.

Table 1. Mothers in the Labor Force with Children Under 18 by Family Structure and Work Status

(Numbers in thousands)

Work Status	All mothers		No parent in the household		Lives with a parent					
					Total		Mother-headed household		Parent-headed household	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	27,752	100	25,878	93.2	1,874	100	621	33.1	1,253	66.9
Stopped working or unemployed	4,410	15.9	4,048	15.6	362	19.3	95	15.3	267	21.3
Worked part time	11,482	41.4	10,692	41.3	789	42.1	204	32.9	585	46.7

Source: Survey of Income and program participation 2008, Wave 2 topical Module.

For information on sampling and nonsampling error see <<http://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/programs-surveys/sipp/tech-documentation/source-accuracy-statements/2008/SIPP%202008%20Panel%20Wave%2004%20-%20Core%20Source%20and%20Accuracy%20Statements.pdf>>

Table 2. Demographic Characteristics of Mothers Who Experienced a Work Stoppage by Family Structure

(Percent of mothers in the labor force)

Demographic Characteristics	All mothers		Mothers with no parent in household		Mothers with parent in their household		Mothers living in parents' household	
	Experienced work stoppage	Gave family reason	Experienced work stoppage	Gave family reason	Experienced work stoppage	Gave family reason	Experienced work stoppage	Gave family reason
All mothers	15.9	12.5	15.6	12.4	15.3	13.0	21.3	14.2
Age								
15-24	27.6	24.8	28.4	23.4	30.0	23.6	24.7	29.9
25-34	17.5	18.8	17.3	19.9	18.8	21.6	20.9	4.8
35-44	14.8	8.4	14.8	8.6	11.0	6.6	19.6	4.4
45-54	12.9	4.1	12.9	4.2	13.9	0.0	5.4	0.0
55 and over	12.3	0.0	12.0	0.0	26.5	0.0	32.0	0.0
Presence of spouse or partner in household								
No spouse or partner present	18.5	9.6	17.7	8.4	17.5	17.1	17.4	13.5
Spouse present	14.9	13.2	14.9	13.0	12.5	9.3	11.5	14.8
Partner present	15.4	21.1	15.4	21.0	31.0	0.0	6.9	100.0
Education								
Less than high school	21.8	14.0	21.3	12.5	34.6	26.0	22.7	25.4
High school	17.6	12.1	17.3	11.1	14.0	15.2	22.6	22.5
Some college or Bachelor's degree	15.6	11.8	15.4	12.2	13.7	7.8	21.0	6.8
Graduate degree	10.0	18.2	10.1	18.5	9.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
Race and Hispanic origin								
Non-Hispanic White	16.0	13.8	15.7	13.3	13.0	25.1	24.2	20.2
Black	15.3	9.9	15.1	10.5	13.9	18.4	18.6	0.0
Other races	15.1	17.8	14.9	17.8	13.9	20.9	21.2	15.4
Hispanic	16.4	8.0	16.2	8.4	19.0	0.0	17.4	8.2
Number of children								
1	14.9	14.2	14.7	14.0	13.0	17.3	18.7	16.8
2-3	15.9	10.9	15.6	10.9	12.8	0.0	23.3	13.1
4 or more	24.2	14.6	23.6	14.0	33.6	27.3	25.9	9.2

Source: Wave 2 Topic Module of the 2008 Survey of Income and Program Participation.

For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see <<http://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/programs-surveys/sipp/tech-documentation/source-accuracy-statements/2008/SIPP%202008%20Panel%20Wave%2004%20-%20Core%20Source%20and%20Accuracy%20Statements.pdf>>

Table 3. Demographic Characteristics of Mothers Who Worked Part Time by Family Structure
(Percent of mothers in the labor force)

Demographic Characteristics	All mothers		Mothers with no parent in household		Mothers with parent in their household		Mothers living in parents' household	
	Worked part time	Gave family reason	Worked part time	Gave family reason	Worked part time	Gave family reason	Worked part time	Gave family reason
All mothers	41.4	17.1	41.3	17.3	32.9	12.7	46.7	15.9
Age								
15-24	53.8	19.1	53.5	15.9	56.7	0.0	54.4	13.6
25-34	41.9	21.4	41.9	21.4	25.7	26.8	47.4	20.0
35-44	39.7	18.4	40.0	18.8	34.1	11.2	36.2	7.2
45-54	40.5	9.9	40.5	9.8	30.3	9.0	36.3	30.7
55 and over	40.4	5.7	40.3	5.4	58.2	0.0	32.0	100.0
Presence of spouse or partner in household								
No spouse or partner present	40.1	10.7	39.1	10.3	34.5	6.6	48.2	13.9
Spouse present	42.0	19.6	42.2	19.5	31.7	19.4	37.1	31.0
Partner present	40.3	18.4	40.3	18.6	26.6	0.0	50.1	17.4
Education								
Less than high school	48.5	13.7	44.0	13.5	35.3	25.2	54.7	12.6
High school	42.1	15.4	41.3	15.8	31.1	8.2	58.2	12.2
Some college or Bachelor's degree	41.1	18.3	41.4	18.3	33.8	14.4	38.7	19.4
Graduate degree	36.2	17.8	36.3	17.9	30.5	0.0	45.0	28.9
Race and Hispanic origin								
Non-Hispanic White	43.9	18.4	43.6	18.7	44.3	6.2	51.1	15.8
Black	35.4	10.2	34.9	9.7	30.2	14.7	45.9	15.3
Other races	36.0	17.4	34.1	16.3	30.3	28.8	25.3	44.7
Hispanic	39.0	17.0	39.6	17.3	23.1	17.6	42.6	13.3
Number of children								
1	38.6	12.8	38.2	12.6	35.2	20.3	46.5	13.2
2-3	43.0	19.9	43.2	20.0	34.3	7.8	44.1	21.1
4 or more	47.8	21.7	48.3	23.4	19.0	0.0	61.9	8.0

Source: Wave 2 Topic Module of the 2008 Survey of Income and Program Participation.

For information on sampling and nonsampling error, see <<http://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/programs-surveys/sipp/tech-documentation/source-accuracy-statements/2008/SIPP%202008%20Panel%20Wave%2004%20-%20Core%20Source%20and%20Accuracy%20Statements.pdf>>

Parameter	Model 1A		Model 1B	
	Estimate	Error	Estimate	Error
Intercept	1.6824 ***	0.2669	1.4983	0.1819
Family structure				
Mother with no parent in household (<i>reference in Model 1A</i>)	-	-	-	-
Mothers with parent in their household (<i>reference in Model 1B</i>)	-0.1031	0.1143	-	-
Mothers living in parents' household	-0.0087	0.0769	0.0264	0.1524
Control variables				
Age	-0.0249 ***	0.0019	-0.0131	0.0783
Education	-0.0573 ***	0.0063	-0.0635	0.0269
Non-Hispanic White (ref)	-	-	-	-
Non-Hispanic Black	-0.223 ***	0.0519	-0.3801	0.1673
Non-Hispanic other races	-0.0622	0.069	-0.0824	0.2566
Hispanic (any race)	-0.2243 ***	0.0491	-0.3921 *	0.1537
Number of children	0.0928 ***	0.0166	0.1881 **	0.1649
Spouse or partner present	-0.2265 ***	0.0394	-0.6658 ***	0.1649
Significance level: * .01 ** .001 *** <.001				
Source: Survey of Income and Program Participation 2008, Wave 2 topical Module. For information on sampling and nonsampling error see < http://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/programs-surveys/sipp/tech-documentation/source-accuracy-statements/2008/SIPP%202008%20Panel%20Wave%2004%20-%20Core%20Source%20and%20Accuracy%20Statements.pdf >				

Parameter	Model 2A		Model 2B	
	Estimate	Error	Estimate	Error
Intercept	-1.0226	0.1935	19.3784 ***	4.571
Family structure				
Mother with no parent in household (<i>reference in Model 2A</i>)	-	-	-	-
Mothers with parent in their household (<i>reference in Model 2B</i>)	0.3551	0.3208	-	-
Mothers living in parents' household	-0.0123	0.2067	-1.9243 *	0.6361
Control variables				
Age	-0.0972 ***	0.0065	-0.1761 ***	0.0354
Education	0.0482 *	0.0195	-0.3632 **	0.1095
Non-Hispanic White (ref)	-	-	-	-
Non-Hispanic Black	-0.3126	0.1613	-2.4584	1.0549
Non-Hispanic other races	0.4444	0.1754	0.7108	0.6773
Hispanic (any race)	-0.7005 ***	0.1585	-3.4027 ***	0.1854
Number of children	0.018	0.0469	0.1168	0.1854
Spouse or partner present	0.6506 ***	0.1275	-0.1424	0.641
Significance level: * .01 ** .001 *** <.001				
Source: Survey of Income and Program Participation 2008, Wave 2 topical Module. For information on sampling and nonsampling error see < http://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/programs-surveys/sipp/tech-documentation/source-accuracy-statements/2008/SIPP%202008%20Panel%20Wave%2004%20-%20Core%20Source%20and%20Accuracy%20Statements.pdf >				

Table 6. Logistic Regression Results of Working Part Time During the Reference Period

Parameter	Model 3A		Model 3B	
	Estimate	Error	Estimate	Error
Intercept	1.6384 ***	0.2003	4.3538 ***	0.9068
<i>Family structure</i>				
Mother with no parent in household (reference in Model 3A)	-	-	-	-
Mothers with parent in their household (reference in Model 3B)	-0.3066 **	0.0874	-	-
Mothers living in parents' household	0.1763 *	0.0014	0.2017	0.1197
<i>Control variables</i>				
Age	-0.0083 ***	0.0014	-0.0244 ***	0.0062
Education	-0.0435 ***	0.0046	-0.0927 ***	0.0216
Non-Hispanic White (ref)	-	-	-	-
Non-Hispanic Black	-0.3959 ***	0.0387	-0.3467 *	0.1315
Non-Hispanic other races	-0.3269 ***	0.0513	-0.7424 **	0.2149
Hispanic (any race)	-0.3621 ***	0.0368	-0.7549 ***	0.1245
Number of children	0.1206 ***	0.013	0.037	0.047
Spouse or partner present	0.0432	0.0302	-0.1449	0.1236

Significance level: * .01 ** .001 *** <.001

Source: Survey of Income and Program Participation 2008, Wave 2 topical Module.

For information on sampling and nonsampling error see <<http://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/programs-surveys/sipp/tech-documentation/source-accuracy-statements/2008/SIPP%202008%20Panel%20Wave%2004%20-%20Core%20Source%20and%20Accuracy%20Statements.pdf>>

Table 7. Logistic Regression Results of Having a Family Reason for Working Part Time During the Reference Period

Parameter	Model 4A		Model 4B	
	Estimate	Error	Estimate	Error
Intercept	-4.2599 ***	0.4168	-5.6545 *	1.9804
<i>Family structure</i>				
Mother with no parent in household (reference in Model 4A)	-	-	-	-
Mothers with parent in their household (reference in Model 4B)	-0.2003	0.2165	-	-
Mothers living in parents' household	0.0361	0.1292	0.88 *	0.0307
<i>Control variables</i>				
Age	-0.0435 ***	0.00317	-0.0119	0.0144
Education	0.0831 ***	0.0099	0.0862	0.0465
Non-Hispanic White (ref)	-	-	-	-
Non-Hispanic Black	-0.5315 ***	0.0993	0.3701	0.2816
Non-Hispanic other races	-0.0288	0.1091	1.0462 *	0.4028
Hispanic (any race)	0.0359	0.0764	0.336	0.273
Number of children	0.2253 ***	0.0238	-0.2114	0.108
Spouse or partner present	0.6662 ***	0.0733	1.1404 ***	0.2723

Significance level: * .01 ** .001 *** <.001

Source: Survey of Income and Program Participation 2008, Wave 2 topical Module.

For information on sampling and nonsampling error see <<http://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/programs-surveys/sipp/tech-documentation/source-accuracy-statements/2008/SIPP%202008%20Panel%20Wave%2004%20-%20Core%20Source%20and%20Accuracy%20Statements.pdf>>