

Exploring the Impact of Gender on the Economic Well-Being of Single Parents

Rose Reed-Maxfield
SOC 387: Research Methods and Data Analysis
Cornell College, Class of 2015
February 5th, 2014

Erin Davis
600 First Street SW
Mount Vernon, IA 52314
319-895-4296

Submitting for the Manford Kuhn award.

Abstract: Previous research has shown that single mothers are among the most economically disadvantaged groups in society, but much less information is known regarding the economic situations of single fathers. Using data from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study, this paper compares the economic situations of single mothers and single fathers, looking specifically at annual income, experiences within the workplace, relationships with public support services, and the extent to which single parents rely on financial help from friends or extended kin networks. Race and educational background are used as control variables. While findings are inconclusive, results suggest that single mothers tend to be worse off economically than single fathers in all of the areas examined, and present opportunities for further research.

Single parenthood has been a popular topic of sociological research and discussion for the last several decades. However, while the term “single parenthood” is used frequently when discussing different forms of family structures, more often than not, people are in fact speaking only of single mothers, and much less attention has been paid to single fathers. The fact that single mothers are much more likely than married or cohabiting couples with children to live in poverty and face other forms of socioeconomic difficulty is by no means new information, (Kalil and Ryan, 2010) but the extent to which these economic hardships stem from gender-specific inequalities that disadvantage women, and to what extent they are a byproduct of single parenthood in general is one question that remains unclear.

By comparing the socioeconomic situations of single mothers with those of single fathers, this study will explore the impact that gender has on one’s experiences with single parenthood, with the goal of examining the extent to which single mothers are disadvantaged by their statuses as women, and the extent to which they are disadvantaged by their statuses as single parents.

Theoretical Framework: The Feminization of Poverty and Human Capital Theory

The concept of the “feminization of poverty” has been a popular topic of discussion in the sociological community ever since the term was coined in the 1970s. The term describes a global phenomenon in which women compose the majority of the world’s poorest and most economically disadvantaged population, due to a web of gender inequalities both on an individual and an institutional level (Pearce, 1978. Fukuda-Parr, 1999). Among the key contributors to this phenomenon is the fact that the majority of single parent households are headed by women. According to the 2011 U.S. Census Bureau, 85% of single parents in the U.S. were women, compared to 15% men.

Min Zhan and Shanta Pandey use the Human Capital Theory to explain the lower socioeconomic status of single parents, especially single mothers (Zhan and Pandey, 2004). The Human Capital Theory argues that investments in human resources enhance one’s future earning capacity in the labor market. “Human resources” in this case refers to education, work experience, and on-the-job training (Becker,

1993. Zhan and Pandey, 2004). From the perspective of the Human Capital Theory, the socioeconomic struggles of single parents (especially single mothers) can be seen primarily as a result of lower educational status and work training (Zhan and Pandey, 2004).

Connecting the Human Capital theory to the feminization of poverty, previous studies have found that gender discrimination within the workplace exists on three main levels: hiring, wage remuneration, and training and promotion. Women are less likely to be hired for higher-level occupations, even when equally qualified or having higher levels of educational attainment than male competition. Even when they have the same jobs, women's wages tend to lag behind men's, and women are less likely to receive employer-aided job training (Glick et al. 1988). Zhan and Pandey use these three different levels of gender discrimination within the workplace to argue that overall, employers tend to be reluctant to invest in human capital development of women employees, further contributing to the phenomenon of the feminization of poverty. (Zhan and Pandey, 2004.)

Previous Research: Single Mothers

In a 2010 study using data collected for the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing survey, Ariel Kalil and Rebecca M. Ryan found that 53% of single mothers in the sample were classified as "poor" (living below the federal poverty line), compared to only 14% of married mothers. (Kalil and Ryan, 2010). For the most part, the financial difficulties of the women in the study were not seen as a result of lack of employment, as 80% of the mothers in the study reported having worked in the last year, over half of the unwed mothers in the study reported having worked full time, and 64% were employed at least part time at the time of a follow-up study three years after the child's birth. While the mothers in the study tended to work extensive hours, they still suffered economically, largely because of the low wages and unreliability of the jobs they were working (Kalil and Ryan, 2010). Kalil and Ryan also point out that single mothers are less likely to have savings or credit, and therefore are much more likely to depend solely on their own incomes, which leads to increased vulnerability and dependency on the current

economy. If the economy dips, work hours drop, jobs are lost, and financial situations are further worsened.

Providing further support to Zhan and Pandey's argument that human capital is directly related to single mothers' socioeconomic situation, Kalil and Ryan argue that the primary obstacle between many unwed mothers and higher paying, more dependable jobs is their lack of education and job qualification. Of all of the single mothers in the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing survey, 49% did not have a high school diploma, (compared with only 18% of married mothers) and only 2.4% of unwed and single mothers had a college degree (compared to 36% of the married mothers).

Zhan and Pandey point to further structural factors contributing to the high rates of poverty among single mothers, including shortages of job opportunities in economically difficult areas where many struggling single mothers find themselves living, poorly enforced child support, and lacking public benefits. Women of all races are over-represented in lower-status, lower-paying jobs, which provide fewer benefits and opportunities for career advancement (Zhan and Pandey, 2004).

Another significant aspect of the economic situation of single motherhood is the reliance on public programs such as welfare, food stamps, and public housing to help make ends meet. Past research shows that most single mothers do not survive on income from formal paid work alone, but rather depend on "complex income packages" made up of cash and other types of benefits from public programs and private help from family members, romantic partners, or close friends. (Zhan and Pandey, 2004). From the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing study, nearly one third of unwed mothers received TANF benefits (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families), during the first year following their child's birth, almost one half received food stamps, and over one fourth were receiving some type of housing assistance (Kalil and Ryan, 2013).

A final element of the economic situation of single mothers that is worth drawing attention to is the importance of "private safety nets." Teitler and colleagues found that 96% of unwed mothers

received support in some form from private sources, with 86% reporting receiving help from the child's father, and 64% saying they received help from family or friends (2004). In this case, "private support" could refer to cash or other material items such as food or diapers, or help in immaterial forms, such as assistance with childcare or transportation to or from work or school.

Previous Research: Comparing Single Mothers With Single Fathers

While there is a lot of existing research about single mothers, much less attention has been paid to single fathers. The research that does exist tends to focus more on the conditions leading up to a man becoming a single father and different social perceptions and attitudes toward single fatherhood, and less on the socioeconomic status of single fathers.

While still making up a very small percentage of all single parent families, single father families have become much more common in recent years, and are now growing at a faster rate than single mother families (Goldsheider and Kaufman, 2006). With this recent increase in single father families, there is an emerging opportunity for new areas to be researched, which could provide further insight into the effects that gender has on the socioeconomic struggles linked to single parenting.

In their 2004 study, Zhan and Pandey examined the role of post-secondary education on the economic well-being of single mothers and single fathers, trying to determine whether or not post-secondary education had the same effects on the economic status of single mothers as single fathers. They took into account the differences and similarities in demographic, social and economic characteristics of single-mother families and single-father families and questioned whether or not the same factors that explained the economic well being of single mothers were as useful in explaining the economic well being of single fathers.

They found that single mothers and single fathers tended to struggle with similar economic difficulties, but single mothers were found to be consistently worse-off than single fathers. Only 13% of single fathers in Zhan and Pandey's study lived below the poverty line, compared to 41% of single

mothers. While both single fathers and single mothers with a college education were more likely to live above the poverty line than those without a college education, single mothers with a 4-year college degree were less likely to live above the poverty line than single fathers with the same level of education, and single fathers were more likely than single mothers to receive higher levels of education in the first place. As one of few existing comparative studies of single mothers and single fathers, Zhan and Pandey's work is important for assessing and understanding the differences in the economic well-beings of single mothers and single fathers; however, the limited focus of the study (which looks at education exclusively as a contributing factor to the economic situations of single parents) highlights the need for further research in this area.

Bearing in mind previous research findings, my study will explore in further depth the differences in the socioeconomic situations of single mothers and single fathers. In order to explore different aspects of economic difficulty, I will examine household incomes, difficulties within the workplace, and the use of both public and private safety nets, comparing the experiences of single mothers in all of these fields with those of single fathers. My hypothesis is that, consistent with Zhan and Pandey's findings, single mothers will tend to be in worse off economic situations than single fathers as a result of continuous gender inequalities, while race and educational background will have strong effects on the relationship between gender and the socioeconomic standing of single parents.

Methods

Sample

This study was conducted using secondary data from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study, a multi-wave survey study of new parents and their children from the years 1997-2003. The study used a stratified random sample of all United States cities with 200,000 or more residents. The total sample size was 4,700 families, out of which there were 3,600 sets of unmarried parents and 1,100 married parents. The data is representative of non-marital births in United States cities with populations

over 200,000.

The mothers and fathers in this study were interviewed separately and were asked questions regarding a wide range of topics, including, but not limited to, education, employment, income, mother-father relationships, social support and extended kin, knowledge about local policies and community resources, and experiences with local welfare and child support agencies. The data analyzed for this study comes from the fifth wave of the study, which was collected in a follow-up survey five years after the participants gave birth.

Measures

For this study, I defined “single parent” as any parent who was no longer living with the child’s other parent, not living or cohabiting with a new romantic partner, and who had the child living with them more often than the other parent. In analyzing data, I created a filter to show only the responses of respondents who met these criteria. After filtering out all parents from the original sample who did not fit this definition of “single parent,” my sample became considerably smaller, with only 354 single mothers and 27 single fathers. Out of this final sample, 82.6% of single mothers were non-white and 17.4% were white, 72% of single fathers were nonwhite and 28% were white. 70.3 % of single mothers and 74.1% of single fathers had a high school diploma or less, and 29.7% of single mothers and 25.9% single fathers had at least some college education.

To measure different aspects of economic well-being of single parents, I looked at whether the respondent’s annual household income was above or below the federal poverty line¹, three different variables related to relationships with public support services (whether or not they received help from welfare, food stamp programs, or lived in public housing projects); two variables related to the concept of “private safety nets” (whether or not they reported having borrowed money from friends or family in the last year to help pay bills and whether they relied on relatives or non-relatives for primary sources of

¹ Based off of HHS poverty guidelines for a two-person household in 2002, the year that the data for the fifth wave of the survey was collected.

childcare); and four different variables related to balancing family life with formal jobs (whether or not they'd worked more than one regular job in the last year, if they often felt as if their work schedules caused extra stress for the family, if they felt that their work schedules allowed them flexibility to handle family needs, and whether or not they found it difficult to deal with childcare related problems during work). I used race (recoded into "white" and "nonwhite") and educational background (recoded to separate those who had a high school diploma or less from those who had at least some college) as control variables.

Limitations

The biggest limitation in my methodology is the small sample sizes, particularly in single fathers, which limits the generalizability of my findings. Even when results appear to be statistically significant, it is impossible to make any claims about a larger population using data from a sample of only 27 people.

Because of this small sample size, I was only able to use dichotomous variables in my analysis, as any questions with more than two possible answers would have subset the sample into groups that were too small to analyze. The need to code all variables to be dichotomous limited my ability to examine many of these variables in as much depth as I would have liked to. Ideally, I would have liked to look at a more diverse range of variances in annual household income, rather than simply above or below the federal poverty line, and for my control variables, I would have liked to consider specific racial categories (White, Black, Asian, American Indian etc. rather than only "white and "nonwhite") and a larger variety of options for educational background rather than simply "high school diploma or less" and "at least some college", but the limited sample size made this impossible. Even with the dichotomous coding, I was unable to analyse some of the original variables I wanted to look at because the number of respondents were too small.

Results

Bivariate Analyses

The bivariate crosstab between gender and poverty shows a strong, statistically significant relationship ($\gamma = -.8$, $p = .011$). From this data, we see that the percentage of single mothers with yearly incomes below the poverty line is noticeably larger than that of single fathers (33.3% compared to 5.3%). (See Table 1).

The bivariate crosstab analysis between food stamps and gender shows that there is a fairly strong, statistically significant relationship ($\gamma = -.639$, $p = .001$). Over half (56.5%) of the single mothers in the study reported having received help from food stamps in the last year, compared to 22.2% of single fathers. (See Table 3). We see another noticeable and statistically significant difference in receiving welfare ($\gamma = -1$, $p = .002$), where 27.7% of the single mothers in the study reported having received income from Welfare or TANF in the last year, compared to none of the single fathers (See Table 4). The count of single fathers who responded to the question regarding public housing was too small to produce any sort of comprehensible results.

For the private safety net variables, 37.6% of single mothers reported having borrowed money from friends or family members in the last year to help pay bills, compared to 5.6% of single fathers. This relationship was strong and statistically significant ($\gamma = -.822$, $p = .006$). Like the response rate for public housing, the father count for the question regarding primary child care providers was too low to analyze, therefore neither of these variables will be discussed in multivariate.

For working more than one job, experiencing family stress due to work schedules, and having flexibility within work schedules to handle family needs, there is little difference within these samples between percentages of single mothers and single fathers; the results are not statistically significant, and the cell counts were too low to run a meaningful multivariate analysis, so these variables will not be examined in multivariate. However, the percentage of single fathers who answered that it was either always or often difficult to deal with childcare problems during work was moderately strong ($\gamma = .399$), and notably higher than that of single mothers who gave the same answer (20% of single fathers compared to 9.7% of single mothers). (See Table

2)

Multivariate analyses

When controlling for race, the relationship between gender of single parent and poverty is not statistically significant. However, it is possible that this is due to the limited sample size of single fathers. The strong gamma values (-.696 for nonwhite and -1 for white) indicate that there is a strong association for both racial categories within the sample (See Table 6).

When using educational background as a control variable, there is a strong, statistically significant relationship between gender and poverty for parents who have a high school education or less ($\gamma = -.796$, $p = .014$). Within this group, 40.4% of single mothers with high school education or less had annual incomes below the poverty line, compared to 7.1% of single fathers (see Table 5). While there was a strong relationship ($\gamma = -1$) between gender of single parent and poverty for single parents who had at least some college education, these results were not statistically significant.

Turning to the public and private safety net variables, controlling for race, the multivariate crosstab analysis between gender of parent and help from food stamps shows that among both nonwhite and white respondents, single mothers are much more likely to be on food stamps than single fathers (see Table 10). Among nonwhite respondents, 60% of single mothers had received income from food stamps in the past year, compared to 33.3% of single fathers. Among white respondents, 41% of single mothers had received income from food stamps, compared to none of the white single fathers. The results for both of these groups were statistically significant ($p = .026$ for nonwhite and $.033$ for white), and both had strong gamma values (-.5 for nonwhite and -1 for white). When controlling for education, we see that regardless of educational background, there are higher percentages of single mothers than single fathers on food stamps, (see Table 11) though only the results of respondents with a high school diploma or less were statistically significant ($p = .001$, $\gamma = -.687$)

Controlling for race and looking at the relationship between gender and income received from welfare, we see that for both nonwhite and white single parents, single mothers are much more likely to be on welfare than single fathers. (See Table 12). 29.3% of nonwhite single mothers and 21.3% of white single mothers had received income from welfare in the last 12 months, while no single fathers in this study received income from welfare in the last 12 months. Both non-white and white have a gamma value of -1, and while only the results of the non-white participants are statistically significant ($p=.007$), the nonsignificance of the white participants could once again be a result of insufficient sample size in single fathers (only 7 white single fathers answered the question).

Controlling for education, the results are only statistically significant for single parents with a high school education or less ($p=.004$). However, the strong gamma values ($\gamma=-1$ for both high school or less and some college education) suggest that regardless of educational background, single mothers are more likely to receive welfare benefits than single fathers. 30.5% of single mothers with high school or less and 21% of single mothers with at least some college education, compared to no single fathers in the sample. (See Table 13).

Controlling for race, we see that there is a strong, statistically significant relationship ($\gamma=-1$, $p=.004$) between gender and reliance on private safety nets for nonwhite respondents, suggesting that non-white single mothers are more likely to borrow money from friends or family than non-white single fathers. Among white single parents, there is not a big difference between single mothers and single fathers, and the results are nonsignificant. (See Table 7).

Controlling for education, once again the results are only significant for respondents

with a high school diploma or less ($p=.030$, $\gamma=-.753$), showing that among single parents with less than a high school education, single mothers are more likely to rely on private safety nets than single fathers (35.3% of single mothers had borrowed money from family or friends within the last year, compared to 7.1% of single fathers). (See Table 8). However, this is another case where the nonsignificance in results of single parents with at least some college education could be due to the limited sample size (only 4 single fathers with at least some college education answered the question).

For both white and nonwhite respondents, there were a higher percentages of single fathers than single mothers who answered that it was often difficult to deal with childcare problems during work ($\gamma=.498$ for nonwhite respondents and $.277$ for white respondents. See Table 14). When controlling for education, we see that among parents a high school education or less, there is a strong, statistically significant ($p=.018$, $\gamma=.565$) relationship between gender of parent and difficulty dealing with child care problems during work, showing that a higher percentage of single fathers (27.8%) than single mothers (9.6%) often experience difficulty dealing with child care problems while at work. Among parents with at least some college education, this percentage was higher for single mothers (9.6%) than single fathers (0%), however, the results for parents with at least some college education were not statistically significant. (See Table 9)

Discussion

The goal of this study was to examine the effect that gender has on economic struggles associated with single parenthood by comparing different aspects of the socioeconomic status of single mothers to single fathers. Overall, my hypothesis, that single mothers would tend to be economically worse off than single fathers, was supported by the

findings presented in the previous section. The relationships that were statistically significant for either the bivariate or multivariate analysis were poverty, food stamps, welfare, and borrowing money from family or friends. For all of these variables, the general trend is that single mothers tend to be in worse off economic situations than single fathers.

The bivariate analysis of gender and poverty shows that single mothers are much more likely to live below the poverty line than single fathers. While nonsignificant, the multivariate analysis between poverty, race, and gender suggests that among both whites and nonwhites, single mothers are more likely to live below the poverty line than single fathers. The same trends were found in the multivariate analyses between welfare, food stamps, race and gender. For both whites and nonwhites, single mothers were consistently economically worse off than single fathers.

The multivariate analysis of education, poverty, and gender shows that single mothers with only a high school education or less are more likely to live in poverty than single fathers with the same level of education. Similar patterns are found in the findings for the multivariate analyses of help received from food stamps and welfare. For all three of these variables, the results are statistically significant for respondents who had a high school education or less and show that out of single parents with only high school education or less, single mothers are more likely to live in poverty, more likely to receive help from food stamps, and more likely to rely on income from welfare than single fathers.

These findings are consistent with the findings of Zhan and Pandey's study, and suggest that there may be more factors contributing to single mothers disproportionate likelihood of living in poverty than inequalities in educational opportunities alone. If lack of higher education were the main contributing factor, then one would expect to see less

difference in poverty rates among single mothers and single fathers with the same level of education.

Another possible interpretation is the possibility that even when having similar levels of formal education, men are still presented with other opportunities to develop human capital (for example, through job training and built up work experience), that women are not as likely to be presented with, leaving them economically better off than women with the same level of formal education. Finally, as Zhan and Pandey point out, women are consistently over-represented in the lowest paying jobs with the least benefits, and the types of entry-level jobs that men with little education tend to go into still tend to be more highly paid than jobs that women with lower levels of education tend to go into (Zhan and Pandey, 2004).

Turning to the concept of private safety nets, the multivariate analyses showed that among non-white single parents and single parents with high school education or less, single mothers were more likely to borrow money from family or friends to help pay bills than single fathers. Because of the limited sample, it is hard to know whether the lack of statistical significance among white respondents and respondents with at least some college education is because the counts of single fathers are too low to be generalizable, or because there is no difference between these variables for these groups. This would be an area for future research to examine in more detail.

As far as interpretations of why this trend exists, it could be that there are more single mothers than single fathers, and single mothers are more likely to be in difficult economic situations that would create the need for help from private safety nets, as previous research as well as the results of this study have illustrated. However, it is also

possible that differences in social perceptions of what constitutes appropriate behavior for men versus women prevent single fathers from reaching out to private safety nets for help, even when they are in need, or that men tend to have less strong ties to family or friends, and therefore do not have the same sorts of support systems to rely on that women have. With the limited data and sample size of this survey, there is not enough information to test any of these theories, but this trend presents need for future research.

The results for both the bivariate and multivariate analyses of the variables relating to balancing work with family life are inconclusive, and due to the limitations of the small sample size, no statements can be made regarding these analyses, except that the variances that arise controlling for race and educational background suggest that these variables may be interesting to study with a larger sample. It is particularly interesting to note the trend that single fathers were more likely to say it was difficult to handle child care problems during work than single mothers. One possible interpretation of this trend is that single fathers may tend to work in male-dominated environments, where it is less expected that employees will have to deal with child care problems and therefore harder to deal with child care problems while at work.

Suggestions for Further Research

This study does not present concrete conclusions regarding the differences in the socioeconomic statuses of single mothers and single fathers, but expands on previous research in this area and present new possible trends in need of further study. My primary suggestion for future researchers is to look at these same variables I have examined in this study, and to over-sample single fathers so as to acquire a large enough sample for generalizable findings. This study sheds light on some possible areas in which the

experiences of single mothers may be different from that of single fathers, but more research needs to be done with a more adequate sample size before we can come to any concrete conclusions.

Appendix

Table 1

Poverty vs. Gender Bivariate			
		single mother	single father
Above poverty line	Count	174	18
	Expected Count	179.0	13.0
	Percent	66.7%	94.7%
Below poverty line	Count	87	1
	Expected Count	82.0	6.0
	Percent	33.3%	5.3%

P-value= .011, γ : -.8

Table 2

How often true: Where I work, it is hard to deal with childcare problems during work			
		single mother	single father
Rarely or never	Count	298	20
	Expected Count	295.6	22.4
	Percent	90.3%	80.0%
Often or always	Count	32	5
	Expected Count	34.4	2.6
	Percent	9.7%	20.0%

P-value=.104, γ =.399

Table 3

In the past 12 months, have you received help from food stamps?				
		SINGLEPRT4		
		single mother	single father	
No	Count	154	21	
	Expected Count	162.6	12.4	
	Percent	43.5%	77.8%	
yes	Count	200	6	
	Expected Count	191.4	14.6	
	Percent	56.5%	22.2%	

P-value=.001, γ =-.639

Table 4

In the past 12 months, have you received income from Welfare or TANF?				
		single mother	single father	
No	Count	256	27	
	Expected Count	262.9	20.1	
	Percent	72.3%	100.0%	
Yes	Count	98	0	
	Expected Count	91.1	6.9	
	Percent	27.7%	0.0%	

P-value=.002, γ =-1

Table 5

Poverty, Education, and Gender Multivariate					
EDUPRT			single mother	single father	
At least some college	Above poverty line	Count	72	5	
		Expected Count	72.9	4.1	
		Percent	80.0%	100.0%	
	Below poverty line	Count	18	0	
		Expected Count	17.1	.9	
		Percent	20.0%	0.0%	
	Total	Count	90	5	
		Expected Count	90.0	5.0	
		Percent	100.0%	100.0%	
Highschool diploma or less	Above poverty line	Count	102	13	
		Expected Count	106.3	8.7	
		Percent	59.6%	92.9%	
	Below poverty line	Count	69	1	
		Expected Count	64.7	5.3	
		Percent	40.4%	7.1%	
	Total	Count	171	14	
		Expected Count	171.0	14.0	
		Percent	100.0%	100.0%	

At least some college: p-value=.267, $\gamma=-1$
 High School or Less: p-value =.014, $\gamma=-.796$

Table 6

Race, Gender and Poverty Multivariate				
RACEPRT			single mother	single father
Non-White	Above poverty line	Count	136	10
		Expected Count	138.8	7.2
		Percent	64.2%	90.9%
	Below poverty line	Count	76	1
		Expected Count	73.2	3.8
		Percent	35.8%	9.1%
	Total	Count	212	11
		Expected Count	212.0	11.0
		Percent	100.0%	100.0%
White	Above poverty line	Count	37	6
		Expected Count	38.2	4.8
		Percent	77.1%	100.0%
	Below poverty line	Count	11	0
		Expected Count	9.8	1.2
		Percent	22.9%	0.0%
	Total	Count	48	6
		Expected Count	48.0	6.0
		Percent	100.0%	100.0%

Non-White: p-value=.069, $\gamma=-.696$

White: p-value=.186, $\gamma=-1$

Table 7

Race, Gender, and Private Safety Net Multivariate				
RACEPRT			single mother	single father
Non-White	No	Count	179	14
		Expected Count	184.1	8.9
			61.7%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	111	0
		Expected Count	105.9	5.1
			38.3%	0.0%
	Total	Count	290	14
		Expected Count	290.0	14.0
			100.0%	100.0%
White	No	Count	40	2
		Expected Count	40.0	2.0
			65.6%	66.7%
	Yes	Count	21	1
		Expected Count	21.0	1.0
			34.4%	33.3%
	Total	Count	61	3
		Expected Count	61.0	3.0
			100.0%	100.0%

Non-white: p-value=.004, $\gamma=-1$ White: p-value=.969, $\gamma=-.024$

Table 8

Education, Gender, and Private Safety Net Multivariate				
EDUPRT			single mother	single father
At least some college	No	Count	60	4
		Expected Count	61.7	2.3
		% within SINGLEPRT4	57.1%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	45	0
		Expected Count	43.3	1.7
		% within SINGLEPRT4	42.9%	0.0%
	Total	Count	105	4
		Expected Count	105.0	4.0
		% within SINGLEPRT4	100.0%	100.0%
Highschool diploma or less	No	Count	161	13
		Expected Count	164.7	9.3
		% within SINGLEPRT4	64.7%	92.9%
	Yes	Count	88	1
		Expected Count	84.3	4.7
		% within SINGLEPRT4	35.3%	7.1%
	Total	Count	249	14
		Expected Count	249.0	14.0
		% within SINGLEPRT4	100.0%	100.0%

At least some college: p-value=.088, $\gamma=-1$
 High School Diploma or Less: p-value: .03, $\gamma=-.753$

Table 9

Childcare problems, education, and gender multivariate				
EDUPRT			single mother	single father
At least some college	Rarely or never	Count	92	7
		Expected Count	92.6	6.4
		Percent	90.2%	100.0%
	Often or always	Count	10	0
		Expected Count	9.4	.6
		Percent	9.8%	0.0%
	Total	Count	102	7
		Expected Count	102.0	7.0
		Percent	100.0%	100.0%
Highschool diploma or less	Rarely or never	Count	206	13
		Expected Count	203.0	16.0
		Percent	90.4%	72.2%
	Often or always	Count	22	5
		Expected Count	25.0	2.0
		Percent	9.6%	27.8%
	Total	Count	228	18
		Expected Count	228.0	18.0
		Percent	100.0%	100.0%

At least some college: $p=.385$, $\gamma=-1$
 High school or less: $p=.018$, $\gamma=.565$

Table 10

Food Stamp, Gender, and Race Crosstab				
RACEPRT			single mother	single father
Non-White	No	Count	116	12
		Expected Count	120.5	7.5
		Percent	40.0%	66.7%
	yes	Count	174	6
		Expected Count	169.5	10.5
		Percent	60.0%	33.3%
	Total	Count	290	18
		Expected Count	290.0	18.0
		Percent	100.0%	100.0%
White	No	Count	36	7
		Expected Count	38.6	4.4
		Percent	59.0%	100.0%
	yes	Count	25	0
		Expected Count	22.4	2.6
		Percent	41.0%	0.0%
	Total	Count	61	7
		Expected Count	61.0	7.0
		Percent	100.0%	100.0%

Non-white: p-value=.026, $\gamma=-.5$ White: p-value: .033, $\gamma=-1$

Table 11

Foodstamp, education, and gender multivariate				
EDUPRT			single mother	single father
At least some college	No	Count	65	6
		Expected Count	66.6	4.4
		Percent	61.9%	85.7%
	yes	Count	40	1
		Expected Count	38.4	2.6
		Percent	38.1%	14.3%
	Total	Count	105	7
		Expected Count	105.0	7.0
		Percent	100.0%	100.0%
Highschool diploma or less	No	Count	89	15
		Expected Count	96.3	7.7
		Percent	35.7%	75.0%
	yes	Count	160	5
		Expected Count	152.7	12.3
		Percent	64.3%	25.0%
	Total	Count	249	20
		Expected Count	249.0	20.0
		Percent	100.0%	100.0%

At least some college: p-value=.205, γ =-.574

High school or less: p-value=.001, γ =-.687

Table 12

In the past 12 months, have you recieved income from welfare or TANF? Control variable-Race				
RACEPRT			single mother	single father
Non-White	No	Count	205	18
		Expected Count	210.0	13.0
		% within SINGLEPRT4	70.7%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	85	0
		Expected Count	80.0	5.0
		% within SINGLEPRT4	29.3%	0.0%
	Total	Count	290	18
		Expected Count	290.0	18.0
		% within SINGLEPRT4	100.0%	100.0%
White	No	Count	48	7
		Expected Count	49.3	5.7
		% within SINGLEPRT4	78.7%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	13	0
		Expected Count	11.7	1.3
		% within SINGLEPRT4	21.3%	0.0%
	Total	Count	61	7
		Expected Count	61.0	7.0
		% within SINGLEPRT4	100.0%	100.0%

Non-white: p-value=.007, $\gamma=-1$ White: p-value=.174, $\gamma=-1$

Table 13

In the past 12 months, have you received income from Welfare or TANF? Control variable: Education				
EDUPRT			single mother	single father
At least some college	No	Count	83	7
		Expected Count	84.4	5.6
		Percent	79.0%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	22	0
		Expected Count	20.6	1.4
		Percent	21.0%	0.0%
	Total	Count	105	7
		Expected Count	105.0	7.0
		Percent	100.0%	100.0%
Highschool diploma or less	No	Count	173	20
		Expected Count	178.7	14.3
		Percent	69.5%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	76	0
		Expected Count	70.3	5.7
		Percent	30.5%	0.0%
	Total	Count	249	20
		Expected Count	249.0	20.0
		Percent	100.0%	100.0%

At least some college: p-value= .177, $\gamma=-1$ High School diploma or less: p-value= .004, $\gamma=-1$

Table 14

How Often True- Where I work, it is difficult to deal with child care problems during work. Control: Race				
RACEPRT			SINGLEPRT4	
			single mother	single father
Non-White	Rarely or never	Count	242	12
		Expected Count	239.7	14.3
		Percent	90.0%	75.0%
	Often or always	Count	27	4
		Expected Count	29.3	1.7
		Percent	10.0%	25.0%
	Total	Count	269	16
		Expected Count	269.0	16.0
		Percent	100.0%	100.0%
White	Rarely or never	Count	53	6
		Expected Count	52.6	6.4
		Percent	91.4%	85.7%
	Often or always	Count	5	1
		Expected Count	5.4	.6
		Percent	8.6%	14.3%
	Total	Count	58	7
		Expected Count	58.0	7.0
		Percent	100.0%	100.0%

Non-White: p-value=.062, γ =.498
 White: p-value=.625, γ =.277

Works Referenced

- Fukuda-Parr, Sakiko. 1999. "What Does Feminization of Poverty Mean? It Isn't Just Lack of Income." *Feminist Economics*. 5(2), 99-103
- Glick, P., Zion, C., & Nelson, C. 1988. "What Mediates Sex Discrimination in Hiring Decisions?" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55, 178-186.
- Goldscheider, Frances., Scott, Mindy E., Iijla, Emily. and Bronte-Tinkew, Jactina. 2013. "Becoming a Single Parent: The Role of Father and Mother Characteristics". *Journal of Family Issues*.
- Kalil, Ariel, and Ryan, Rebecca. 2010. "Mothers Economic Conditions and Sources of Support In Fragile Families". *The Future of Children*. 20(2)39-61.
- Pearce, Diane. 1978. "The Feminization of Poverty: Women, Work and Welfare". *The Urban and Social Change Review* 11(1)28-36.
- Teitler, Julien O., Reichman, Nancy E., and Nepomnyashchy, Lenna. 2004. "Sources of Support, Child Care, and Hardship among Unwed Mothers, 1999-2001," *Social Service Review* 78(1)125-48
- Zhan, Min. and Pandey, Shanta. 2004. "Postsecondary Education and Economic Well-Being of Single Mothers and Single Fathers". *Journal of Marriage and Family* 66 661-673