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Using the first and second waves of the National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH), I examine the culpability of parenting practices and economic resources, respectively, for the status attainment of children of single mother households. Contrary to charges that single parents are “pathological” in their attitudes and parental values, my research finds that, although parenting practices explain significant variation in years of education completed, they do not differ by marital status. Instead, the results indicate the importance of testing the possible mediating relationship of economic resources and of educational experiences (at the classroom level) between single motherhood and offspring’s educational attainment. Further, the manifestation of several latent variables suggests that further research use LISREL structural equations modeling to test a revised model of the status attainment (including enrollment in a four-year college or university) of children of single mothers.
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In excess of half of the children born in the last decade are expected to spend time in a single mother family (Bumpass and McLanahan 1988). Given that these families are often living below the poverty line (Bianchi 1995; McLanahan, Astone, and Marks 1991; Garfinkel and McLanahan 1986), the reproduction of economic disadvantage has become especially salient. Arguments of economic deprivation and “pathological” parental socialization (McLanahan 1989; McLanahan and Sandefur 1994) are the most prominent explanations evoked to account for the lower status attainment (for both educational and socioeconomic measures) of children of single mother families (Hong and Wojekowitz 1992; Mueller and Cooper 1986). The implications of the socialization argument being that single mothers, themselves, are unable to respond to the demands of work, finances, and parenting and that, as a result, their insufficient parenting is to blame for the failure of their children. More structural in its orientation, the economic deprivation hypothesis cites the negative effect of low parental education, income, and socioeconomic status on child’s attainment (McLanahan 1989). My research is intended to design a causal model that accurately depicts the
relationship between parenting and economics on offspring's achievement in single mother families. Understanding the dynamics and pressures of female-headed households is of particular importance for creating social policy to improve the situation of these women and their children. As such, the findings of this research can be used to suggest the direction, be it "attitudinal" (i.e., the laziness or poor parenting) or institutional (through improved access to education and job training), of changes in welfare reform and legislation.

**Conceptualization of single motherhood**

Rather than examining the relative explanatory power of socioeconomic status or parenting behavior on child's attainment in single mother families (both African American and White), early research tended to cite a "cultural pathology" in the African American community as responsible for the lower status attainment of single mother offspring (Collins 1990, McLanahan 1985). Cultural deprivation models deemed that single mothers, in response to the pressures of poverty and racism, developed pathological parenting values that were responsible for both their "welfare dependency" and the hypothesized deviant socialization of their children into an "underclass, culture of poverty" (Auletta 1982; Moynihan 1967). Encouraged by this literature, the stereotype of the Black matriarch depicted emotionally absent and controlling mothers as responsible for the failure of Black youth; from the view of White society, African American children of single mothers "lack the attention and care allegedly lavished on middle class white children and so retards their achievement" (Collins 1990, p.74). Further, the racist image of the Black welfare mother or "welfare queen" holds mothers culpable for the transmission of disdain for marriage and welfare dependency to their children who will, themselves, reproduce the single family form and live in poverty (Collins 1990; Coontz 1992). Cumulatively, the images of
single mothers as lazy, unmotivated, and unable to properly socialize their children have motivated contemporary welfare reform to correct the "attitude" of those in poverty using punitive measures (such as contractual agreements and terms limits for receiving benefits) that do not take into account insufficient resources for educational or occupational training or the shortage of job placements that might ameliorate their poverty (Whitman 1996).

Theoretically, it has also been argued that single mothers (of all races and ethnicities) are stigmatized because of the threat female-headed families pose to the core of the gendered and patriarchal nuclear family in the United States (Abramowitz 1988). As Abramowitz (1988) describes it, the "family ethic" dictates that women stay in the home while their husbands earn money for the family. Punishment for violation of the ethic, even when out of economic insecurity or financial necessity, is forfeiture of the rights of womanhood and domesticity and relegation to an inferior place in the work force. Single mothers who defy the institutionalized "family ethic" of marrying and raising children are, Abramowitz (1988) argues, societal "rejects" undeserving of public assistance and unrecognized for their efforts at home or in the workplace (Donati 1995). Ultimately, the growth in single mother families (along with the feminization of the labor force, decreasing marriage opportunities, and the no-fault divorce) challenges the core of the family ethic and the archetype of the male-headed household (Abramowitz 1988).

Indeed, the Moynihan Report (1967) conjectured that the solution to the crime, delinquency, high drop-out rates, poverty, and unemployment associated with single mother families was not income subsidies or job training, but the need for more two-parent, male-headed households. Black, female-headed households, according to Moynihan, lack the economic strength and access to the "pattern of men working" present in White families such that "Negro children without fathers founder and fail"
leading to an overall reduction in educational attainment (Moynihan 1967, p.81). In this “tangle of pathology” whereby African American women are better educated and have higher prestige white collar jobs than their male counterparts, it is difficult for African Americans to “escape from the cultural influences” of single motherhood to embrace the ideal of a Black, middle class family (Moynihan 1967, p.75). Although Moynihan acknowledges that the conditions of economic deprivation in single mother families are due more to social inequality than to the inherent inferiority of this family form, his solution is not to change the dynamics of society but to increase male family leadership in the hope of stopping the expansion of the welfare rolls which, in his opinion, “can be taken as a measure of the steady disintegration of the Negro family structure” (Moynihan 1967, p.60). Interestingly, recent studies have found that the sex of the single parent is less salient to offspring attainment when compared to the impact of family resources (time and money) (McLanahan and Bumpass 1988); as such, although my analysis deals with the more frequently occurring incidence of single motherhood, the suggestion is that it is not single mothers, but the economic disadvantages associated with single parenthood that are deleterious to their youth.

Relatedly, Wilson (1978) argues that the impoverishment of many African American families is related to the structural shift from an industrial to a low-paying service sector economy causing high male unemployment and the increasing poverty of Black single mothers.

As the number of children in impoverished single mother families grows, the intergenerational implications for offspring’s achievement have become increasingly important. In the 1960’s, Moynihan (1967) reported that African American women were twice as likely as White women to head a family. Although African Americans continue to be more likely (since 1970, the number of single mother families has increased by 75% to encompass 60% of all families) to be single mothers, the number
of White women in this situation has increased two-fold since the 1970’s to include 20% of all families (Kamerman and Kahn 1988). This translates to a 280% increase in the number of White women heading families over the last four decades1 (Bianchi 1995); a statistic that, when coupled with the fact that the National Institute of Health and Human Development estimates that, of the children born after 1980, 70% of White and 94% of African Americans will spend some time in a single parent home, emphasizes the importance of considering the situation of single mothers of all races and ethnicities (Mulroy 1988). That said, different factors may contribute to the incidence of single motherhood for White and African American women. Foremost, the increase in White single motherhood is largely attributable to increasing divorce rates while African American women have experienced the largest growth in single motherhood among those who do not marry (Garfinkel and McLanahan 1986). Further, Black mothers are more likely not to remarry (following a divorce) than White women and, hence, single motherhood is a more temporary phenomena for White women (Garfinkel and McLanahan 1986). Overall, as of 1991, 60% of single mother families were the result of divorce, 34% of never marrying, and 6% are families of widowers (Lino 1995; Heatherington, Camara, and Featherman 1983).

Although the 1980’s were the decade witness to the smallest growth in the percentage of single mother households (26% increase) since the 1940’s, we are currently trying to evaluate the decreased status attainment of the children of these families (Bianchi 1995). Thus, in the debate over the social reproduction of poverty we must consider whether the problems of children of single mothers are more a result of the presumed “moral decay and deviant parenting” of such families or the consequence for those caught (without sufficient day care, maternity leave, or income)

---

1 In addition, single motherhood has increased among Native Americans and moderately for Hispanic and Puerto Rican peoples (Bianchi 1995).
in the double bind of managing work and family (Abramowitz 1988, p.8). Indeed, the concern over the intergenerational transmission of disadvantages and poverty in single mother families includes findings that children, particularly following a divorce, often manifest fearfulness, inhibition, and neediness in the midst of the stress of housing arrangements, child care, a mother returning to work, and a decline in economic status (Heatherington, Camara, and Featherman 1983; Garfinkel and McLanahan 1986). In addition, younger children may blame themselves for the marital dissolution and have difficulties coping with their own aggression (Heatherington, Camara, and Featherman 1983).

In terms of my interest in the deleterious effects on measures of educational status attainment for these offspring, Bianchi (1995) reports that 16-20% of single mother children (compared to only 12% of those in two parent families) had to repeat a grade and children from single mother homes were also more likely to be suspended or expelled, called in for conferences with their teachers, have poor work habits and attendance records, or be cited for behavioral problems. The result of student-teacher conflict is lowered teacher expectations (both in behavior and academics) and lower grades (and overall grade point averages) for children of single mother families (Heatherington, Camara, and Featherman 1983; Garfinkel and McLanahan 1986; Mulkey, Crain, and Harrington 1992). Consequently, children from single parent homes are also found to complete fewer years of education than those from intact families (Heatherington, Camara, and Featherman 1983; Krein and Beller 1988). With decreased educational attainment and a greater likelihood to engage in early family formation, premarital birth, and divorce (Garfinkel and McLanahan 1986; Hogan and Kitagawa 1985), children of female-headed households also have lower occupational status and, as a result, are more likely to have lower incomes than their counterparts from two-parent homes (Garfinkel and McLanahan 1986; Mueller and Cooper 1986).
Indeed, single mothers, themselves, are coping with insufficient educational and occupational resources. Young single mothers are only half as likely as single fathers and one-third as likely as women from two-parent families to have a college degree (Bianchi 1995). Lacking the education and job skills and training, these women are funneled into low paying, service sector jobs (Schein 1995). Thus, the work force maintains occupational segregation and discrimination towards women (e.g., entering traditionally "male" jobs in construction or maintenance could earn them a livable wage of up to $30,000 a year (Schein 1995)) predicated, in part, on the fact that women (according to the "family ethic") are also expected to do unpaid work in the home that might interfere with their job responsibilities (Goldberg and Kremen 1990; Abramowitz 1988). This rationale for a gendered division of labor also justifies the persistent wage gap between men and women which, coupled with the structural changes of a service economy and international competition among businesses, equates to a decline in real wages (Bowen, Desminone, McKay 1995). Not only has the minimum wage (what many single mothers would be earning) declined by 30% relative to inflation, but only 30% of those in the health care industry, for instance, (a sector where low paying jobs for women are rapidly expanding) are afforded comprehensive health care as opposed to 80% of those employed (predominantly men) by manufacturing companies (Amott 1988). However, for the 52% of single mothers who are employed, earning too much may endanger the AFDC benefits which supplement their incomes and guarantee medical insurance for their children (Polakow 1993).

In these situations, money and the income inequalities of single mother homes become crucial deficits; although 20% of all children live in poverty, 47% of those living in single parent homes (with mothers younger than 25) are chronically poor (as of 1991) (Polakow 1993; Lino 1995). Mother-only families remain the most
impoverished and the income gap is only growing (Garfinkel and McLanahan 1986). As of 1991, single mothers had a median family income only 31% that of two-parent families and median assets of $3,000 compared to $11,000 in intact families (Lino 1995; Bianchi 1995). Indeed, following a divorce, mother's household earnings can be depleted to half of the pre-divorce earnings and the income loss exacerbated by the difficulty in enforcing child support payments (for which half of the female-headed households qualify under the Family Support Act of 1988) from the absent father (Lino 1995; Teachman 1992).

Arguably, the welfare system is not equipped to meet the needs of female-headed households that are the majority (three-fifths) of all poor families with children (half of which are receiving welfare) and characterize the new feminization and infantilization of poverty (Goldberg and Kremen 1990). With the benefits available to single mothers through Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) significantly less than those given to widows via Survivor's Insurance and unadjusted for inflation (Polakow 1993; Garfinkel and McLanahan 1986)², the expectation in the welfare system is that single mothers will work their way out of poverty with AFDC as a supplement to their income. Given that the system revokes food stamps, medical assistance, and cash benefits (almost dollar for dollar) with additional earnings, single mothers face the dilemma of whether it is better to work (often sacrificing time with your children) or to remain on AFDC (risking the label of “welfare dependent”) (Schein 1995; Kamerman and Kahn 1988).

Indeed, the new welfare bill is designed to hasten the “welfare to work” process by providing additional funding for job training and education for single mothers. Also in the bill are term limits for receipt of benefits (not to exceed five years) which are

---

² Evidence, according to Abramowitz (1988) and Lino (1995), that the “family ethic” and the welfare system reward those who followed the rules of marriage (widows) with the right to be “stay at home” mothers while deviant single parents are sent back to work.
included to motivate welfare mothers to comply with their “contract” toward progressing off of welfare. As such, government policy is directed at eradicating the welfare mentality of “irresponsibility (Whitman 1996, p.32),” helplessness, and low-self-esteem that purportedly afflicts the 68.6% of single mothers receiving welfare (80% on AFDC and 55% getting Medicaid insurance) leaving them unmotivated and dependent on welfare (Bowen, Desimone, and McKay 1995). Indeed, researchers have found that feeling “out of control” among those living in poverty is associated with lowered motivation; but, importantly, have not found this feeling to be causally related to receiving welfare (Garfinkel and McLanahan 1986, p.41).

Although the new welfare provides for day care for families with young children, subsidized day care is often inaccessible and encumbered by wait lists during which time single mothers working outside the home must meet their day care needs independently (Schein 1995). In contrast to the United States where day care costs can consume 45-78% of the wages of single mothers, countries with subsidized day care have child centers closely situated to the mother’s employment and mandatory child benefits (Polakow 1993). To balance the demands of work and child care, single mothers are innovating their families by organizing with other single mothers and forming community day care to allow women to have flexible work schedules and a safe place for their children (Omolade 1986). Donati (1995) cites these cooperative efforts as the “family of the future” to help single mothers with everything from raising their children to unemployment support and job training (p.32). Thus, for those without family support (nuclear, extended, or kin groups) (Collins 1990; Coontz 1992), working outside established welfare institutions with a “wider family” of a boss, the church, a child’s teacher, or workers at a training or abuse shelter can provide support for single mothers (Schein 1995, p.92).

The lives of single mothers highlight the delicate balance of time and resources
needed to meet both parenting and economic needs (Polakow 1993). The ethnographic literature reflects single mothers trying to be "all" of the family; seeing themselves first as mothers and then as providers and often deferring their own educational and occupational aspirations to attend to the needs and well-being of their children. Self-reported difficulties include having a hard time finding quality employment with flexible hours, feeling degraded and stigmatized by using food stamps, and feeling the need to do more parenting in order to make up for the absence of a father (Schein 1995). Caught in the double bind of work and welfare, Joey, herself from a single mother home, has her mother and sister to help with day care needs but now earns too much to qualify for welfare (Polakow 1993). Situational factors also complicate the lives of these women: in poorer neighborhoods and public housing projects, mothers worry for the safety of their children from the drugs on the street while they battle against homelessness (waiting for up to 18 years to receive better housing) (Polakow 1993).

Despite their own unfulfilled educational and occupational aspirations, many single mothers report that caring for their children is the first priority (Schein 1995). One woman chooses to accept medical aid and food stamps (she does not earn enough as a part-time waitress) rather than working longer hours because she wants to focus on parenting and wants her daughter to feel she is "there and dependable" (Schein 1995, p.45). Lacking the money for appropriate day care for her emotionally disturbed son, Marilyn spends all the time that he's not in school involved in activities with her son. In her attempt to keep activities with her children varied and stimulating, Julie takes them to free reading programs, makes trips to the library, and invents fun indoor picnics to prevent winter boredom (Schein 1995).

The situation of young single mothers also includes women who are not emotionally equipped to handle parenting as in the case of Sara whose psychologist
says “never learned how to love, [and] needs to stay at home with her child” (a 3 year old son diagnosed with Attention Deficit Disorder) (Polakow 1993, p.72). Indeed, some children of single mothers report feelings of abandonment when work or schooling (i.e., pursuing a GED, associates, or bachelor's degree) takes away time from parent-child interactions; in the case of the 22 year old nurses aid, Susan, who works full-time, the only opportunity she has to be with her son is in the morning before he goes to school (Schein 1995). Although single mothers may chose not to work in favor of being “stay at home mothers” or to help a child with behavioral and psychological disorders, the stigma of being a welfare mother motivates many women to assume the role as provider (Polakow 1993; Abramowitz 1988). It is this struggle over finances and the time and resources to parent, presumably heightened in single mother families, that motivates my research into the implications of female-headed households.

Ultimately, this analysis is crucial because of the need to address the intergenerational effects of growing up in a single mother family. Although “culture of poverty” models recognize the strains of economic and racial inequality, they also posit that a “pathological” culture emerges from these conditions (characterized by “bad,” negligent, and deficient parenting) which is responsible for the improper socialization of children and their educational and occupational failure. Further, the accusations against single mothers as reproducing a new generation of the “underclass” have contemporary implications for welfare reform (as seen in the authorization of term limits for benefits) (Super, Parrot, and Mann 1996). The question that remains is whether the emphasis should be placed on changing the structural and economic dynamics affecting single mother families (which may also contribute to reduced time and resources for parenting) or on compensating for the possible “deviant” parenting style of single mothers in order to increase attainment among
children of these families.

My analysis adds to the literature on single motherhood by trying to refine a structural equations model to use to examine the causal importance and relationships between economics and parenting in single mother families and the effect on intergenerational attainment. This work also utilizes the relatively new longitudinal data from the second wave of the National Survey of Families and Households which includes more comprehensive (measuring participation in school activities and adding indexes to previously single indicator concepts) measures of parenting practices (Thomson, Hanson, and McLanahan 1994; Astone and McLanahan 1991). Further, the role of these and economic factors are considered on years of education completed and, as discussed subsequently, on whether or not adult offspring have ever enrolled in a four-year college or university to illuminate the effect of educational attainment on eventual socioeconomic status (occupational prestige and earnings). As suggested by Astone and McLanahan (1991), it is hoped that these measures of educational attainment will capture the intergenerational effects of growing up in a female-headed family.

Literature Review

Theories on disadvantage and single motherhood

Testimony of single mothers illuminates the difficulties of managing work, parenting, and finances and has given rise to a number of theories relating to the intergenerational transmission of single family formation and economic disadvantage. Theoretical paradigms have included the “no effects,” “father absence,” “family stress,” “neighborhood effects,” and, preeminently, the “socialization” and “economic deprivation” hypotheses. Among the earlier ideas of intergenerational transmission of
disadvantage, the "no effects" approach assumed that there were not attainment
differentials unique to single parenthood, but that differences in achievement were the
result of background factors included in status attainment models such as race and
parental education and occupation (McLanahan 1985, 1989). However, with the
relationship between female-headed families and attainment differences affirmed
when controlling for background variables (McLanahan 1989; McLanahan and
Sandefur 1994), recently researchers have focused on other explanations such as the
"economic deprivation" explanation positing that the negative implications on
attainment of living in a single mother family are the result of the mother having less
time and money (relative to intact families with money allowing for greater coping
ability) to invest in her children and fewer finances available to send the children to
quality schools or pay for after school lessons and extracurricular activities. In
addition, this approach notes the early maturation of children in female-headed
families; in particular, that they may be expected to put aside their own academic
achievement (leading to higher high school drop-out rates and poor school
performance) and take a job in order to help support the family (McLanahan and
Sandefur 1994; McLanahan 1989; McLanahan and Bumpass 1988; McLanahan
1985; Garfinkel and McLanahan 1986; Clark 1983). Relatedly, the "neighborhood
argument" states that mother only families are more likely to live in low income,
isolated neighborhoods (or to move there following the loss of income concomitant
with a divorce (Heatherington, Camara, and Featherman 1983)) that limit the
opportunities for social and economic advancement and increase the temptations of
deviant behavior (McLanahan 1989; Hogan and Kitagawa 1985). Like Wilson's
(1978) structural treatment of life in the ghetto, the neighborhood hypothesis focuses
on how "social structure constrains family behavior" but loses generalizability due to
the low numbers of single mothers (only 1% of Whites and less than half of the African
American women) living in such neighborhoods (McLanahan 1989, p.590).

Equally prominent is the parental socialization argument emphasizing the negative parental values and childrearing practices (resulting from emotional turmoil or time constraints) in single mother families with respect to parental attachment, involvement, supervision (at home and at school), control, and authority (McLanahan 1989; McLanahan and Sandefur 1994; Dornbusch and Carlsmitthe, et. al. 1985).

Socialization can also include the “father absence” hypothesis which cites the lack of a male role model for personality development and sex role formation; the longer the absence, the worse are the predicted effects for men in single mother families (McLanahan and Bumpass 1988; McLanahan 1985; Garfinkel and McLanahan 1986; Teachman 1992; Furstenberg and Harris 1992; Furstenberg and Nord 1985).

Concomitantly, daughters of single mothers may, with their mother as a role model, legitimize the role of being a single parent and engage in early family formation by having children out of wedlock or divorcing young (McLanahan and Bumpass 1988; Matsueda and Heimer 1987). With competing predictions, the “family stress” theories would argue that the negative effects diminish over time with those from never married families experiencing the least effects and those from separated families the most (i.e., no upheaval versus long-term disruption) (McLanahan 1989, McLanahan and Bumpass 1988, McLanahan 1985). From the family stress perspective, distraught mothers, following marital dissolution, may create family disequilibrium whereby the depression, rejection, helplessness, and anger felt by the adult can undermine the critical social bond between parent and child (creating behavioral and school performance problems) which is presumably most important during adolescence and shortly after the divorce or separation (Heatherington, Camara, and Featherman 1983).

My work focuses on, in particular, the relative explanatory power of the socialization
and economic deprivation hypotheses for differences in the status attainment of the offspring of these families. As such, it is important to analyze differences in economic resources by marital status and, concomitantly, the effect on offspring attainment. Further, I seek to identify direct and mediating effects as well as the interrelatedness of parenting practices, economic indicators, and single motherhood (Thomson, Hanson, and McLanahan 1994; Astone and McLanahan 1991).

**Status attainment and single motherhood**

The status attainment model provides a template for understanding any intergenerational effects on educational attainment, occupational prestige, and income of offspring from single mother families. The earliest findings of Blau and Duncan (1967) that living in a single mother household has negative effects on the educational achievement of the offspring have been confirmed in recent studies (Kamo, et. al. 1991; Hong and Wojekowitz 1992; Mueller and Cooper 1986; Amato and Keith 1991; Mulkey, Crain, and Harrington 1992; McLanahan 1985; Krein and Beller 1988; Sandefur and McLanahan 1994). When controlling for model variables of occupational prestige, total household income, and mother's employment status, those from single mother families completed fewer years of schooling relative to those from intact families (Kamo, et. al. 1991; Hong and Wojtkiewicz 1991; Krein and Beller 1988). Given that much of the racist criticism of single mothers has been biased against the African American community (Collins 1990), it is interesting to note that Krein and Beller (1988) did not find significant differences in the attainment of White and African American children of single mothers. With the increasing prevalence of single mother families of all races in poverty (Bianchi 1995), the issue is no longer strictly one of race and individual pathology among minority males from matriarchal families (Moynihan 1967; Collins 1990). Examining the differences in education
among African American, White, and Hispanic adult men and women from female headed families, Amato and Keith (1991) actually found less impact on the educational success of minority males from single parent families than any other group. Investigating if long-term economic inequality is due more to family structure or disparities in social class, McLanahan (1985) found that the probability of being in high school at age 17 for children of single mothers was decreased by 5% for Whites and 13% for Blacks and also significantly related to a reduced likelihood of graduation from high school (an event that is proven to correlate with future poverty, welfare attrition, and persistent unemployment) (Krein and Beller 1988; McLanahan 1985; Astone and McLanahan 1991). Likewise, Sandefur and McLanahan (1994) find significant differences in high school graduation (single mother offspring being twice as likely not to graduate), college enrollment, and college graduation in favor of those from two-parent families.

Lowered educational attainment for children of single mothers (especially the half below the poverty line) negatively impacts their future occupational and income security (Krein and Beller 1988; Sewell and Hauser 1976, Blau and Duncan 1967, Sandefur and McLanahan 1994; Kamo, et. al. 1991; Amato and Keith 1991; Mueller and Cooper 1986). Comparatively few studies exist examining, solely, the impact of educational disadvantages on occupational status and income for single parent offspring; likely due to the aforementioned ability of education to mediate between marital status and occupational prestige and income. Amato and Keith (1991) do report that White, Black, and Hispanic women as well as White males all experienced lower occupational status and asset accumulation than those from two-parent families. In studies of the status attainment model taking into account changes in marital status, there was evidence that, in disturbed marital status families (single or step-parent), reduced educational attainment does deleteriously mediate occupational status and
earnings (Hong and Wojkewitz 1992; Mueller and Cooper 1986). By including the full complement of attainment (occupational prestige and income) as well as the additional indicator of enrollment in a college or university (discussed subsequently), this analysis expands on the status attainment model for offspring of single mothers.

**Economic deprivation**

In an attempt to understand this decreased attainment, the economic deprivation argument, by including both time and money constraints on the ability of the single mother to cope and provide for her family, evaluates the role of poverty in disadvantaged neighborhoods, the extra strain placed on the resources of the family by additional siblings, and the difficulty of work force participation in addition to poverty and income inequality (McLanahan 1985, 1989; McLanahan, Astone, and Marks 1991; McLanahan and Bumpass 1988; McLanahan and Sandefur 1994; Krein and Beller 1988; Thomson, Hanson, McLanahan 1994). Theoretically, the question being asked is whether the intergenerational transmission of inequality is a result of single motherhood, reduced earnings and poverty status (noting that educational attainment is related to time and money inputs), or to both whereby income mediates the effect of marital status on achievement.

Anomalous to the rest of the findings discussed and dubious because of the inability to directly control for household income, McLanahan and Bumpass (1988) found that “the majority of intergenerational consequences [in single mother families] are not attributable to differences in family socioeconomic status” (p.147). However, when indicators of socioeconomic status in the form of earned income are available, they account for much of the differences in educational attainment and early family formation between Whites, African Americans, and Hispanics from single mother and two-parent homes (McLanahan, Astone, and Marks 1991). Indeed, income accounts
for about 40% of the disadvantage in the school grades and behavior of children of
female-headed versus intact families and about 20% of the differences found between
step-father and original families (Thomson, Hanson, and McLanahan 1994). Adding
the effects of family income for White and African American children from disturbed
family arrangements, the probability of being in high school at age 17 is altered by
17% for Whites and 13% for African Americans with each $10,000 change in income
(overall, economic factors in this model have less explanatory power for African
Americans) (McLanahan 1985). Further, household income accounts for 40% of the
increased likelihood that children from single mothers, as opposed to intact families
(this relationship does not extend to differences between two parent and step-father
families), will drop out of high school, have lower grade point averages, or become
teenage parents (McLanahan and Sandefur 1994).

Importantly, pre-divorce income is not the exogenous source of lowered attainment.
Rather, higher rates of dropping out of high school for children of single mothers are
the result of the loss in economic resources concomitant with marital dissolution
(McLanahan and Sandefur 1994; Astone and McLanahan 1991). Income is also able
to explain up to half of the differences in attainment for single mother offspring with
respect to standardized test scores and college enrollment and graduation indicating
that access to financial resources and socioeconomic status may play an even larger
role in effecting educational outcomes in higher education than in high school
(McLanahan and Sandefur 1994). Finally, although being on welfare does not
significantly explain differences in attainment for African American youth, receiving
welfare for Whites is related to a 36% decrease in the likelihood of being in school at
age 17 (McLanahan 1985). Thus, the literature supports the expectation of differences
in economic resources by family structure and the ability of these differences in income
to explain the disadvantages in attainment among children of single mothers.
Affiliated with the economic deprivation argument, the neighborhood hypothesis predicts that those in single mother families are more likely to reside in areas with fewer quality job opportunities ultimately depressing offspring motivation to pursue an education. When looking at the effect of neighborhood on such educational outcomes as dropping out of school and having problems in school, McLanahan, Astone, and Marks (1991) found that neighborhood quality is not a powerful mediator of marital status for either step or single mother families but did find a significant negative effect of neighborhood residence for African Americans and Hispanics in female-headed families on the likelihood of dropping out of school. As an extension of both economic and socialization arguments, neighborhood quality has also been examined to determine any mediating effects between single mothers and their ability to supervise and control their children (McLanahan, Astone, and Marks 1991; Matsueda and Heimer 1987; Hogan and Kitagawa 1985). Indeed, living in low socioeconomic status neighborhoods with crime impedes parental supervision for both Whites and Blacks (also negatively influenced by contact with delinquent peers) and this reduced parental attachment is indirectly related (through identifying with delinquent influences) to increased levels of deviance among children of single mothers (Matsueda and Heimer 1987). Further, living in an economically challenged neighborhood, along with less parental supervision, more siblings, and lower social class, is related to higher levels of teen fertility among offspring from female-headed families (Hogan and Kitagawa 1985).

Based on the assumption that having more children in the household further compromises the single mother's ability to provide both financially and emotionally for her offspring, studies have confirmed that having more siblings impacts the mother-child attachment, early family formation, and educational outcomes (Coleman 1988; Hogan and Kitagawa 1985; Kamo, et. al. 1991; Astone and McLanahan 1991; Clark
Additional sibling are associated with weakened social bonds between mother and child leading to lowered IQ scores, higher high school drop-out rates (Coleman 1988), and fewer years of educational attainment (Kamo, et. al. 1991; Krein and Beller 1988) in single mother families. Cumulatively, I would expect additional siblings in a female-headed family to place strain on both the economic and emotive ties important for the achievement of the offspring.

Evident from the accounts of single mothers, working outside the home is also, despite it's monetary benefits (Garfinkel and McLanahan 1986), a prime example of the strain between financial need and time available to invest in parenting (Kamerman and Kahn 1988; Simons, Johnson, and Lorenz 1989*; Steinburg 1986; Milne, Myers, et. al. 1986; Krein and Beller 1988; Astone and McLanahan 1991; Kamo, et. al. 1991). The more time a single mother spends working outside the home, the less quality time she is likely to have to spend with her family. Thus, in addition to living in poverty, single mothers often suffer from “time poverty” in that there is not enough time to handle child care tasks, shopping, cooking, and household chores (Coleman 1988; Simons, Johnson, and Lorenz 1989; Kamerman and Kahn 1988, p.187; Garfinkel and McLahanan 1986). Simons, Johnson, and Lorenz (1989) also found that divorced mothers, in order to make up for the loss of income following marital dissolution, are liable to work more than one job and to work longer hours. With time and energy constraints hypothesized to impact the female head’s ability to supervise the children (Astone and McLanahan 1991), Steinberg (1986) found support that single mothers who were employed full-time provided less supervision leading to higher susceptibility to deviant peer influences. There are also deleterious effects for offspring’s reading and math achievement scores in both White and Black (although less for African Americans perhaps because of the ability of increased income to offset the effects
(Garfinkel and McLanahan 1986)) single mother families in direct relation to the number of hours the mother works (Milne and Myers, et. al., 1986). Further, pertaining to educational attainment, White male offspring of single mothers complete fewer years of schooling in contrast to White women hypothesized to benefit from having their working mother as a role model (Krein and Beller 1988). Cumulatively, I would predict that more work hours completed for single mothers may have a positive effect on achievement as mediated by earned income (Garfinkel and McLanahan 1986) but a subsequently negative influence on status attainment indicators through reduced time spent in parenting.

**Does economic deprivation mediate parental socialization?**

The relationship alluded to in the discussion of neighborhood quality, number of siblings, and mother's work status is the possible mediating effect of economic factors on socialization indicators. Although there is evidence that income acts to intervene the effect of the family form on school achievement scores (Milne and Myers, et. al. 1986), studies tend not to support the hypothesis that income mediates parenting practices and their effect on offspring from female-headed families (Astone and McLanahan 1991; Thomson, Hanson, McLanahan 1994). Out of the parenting indicators (including supervision and control), income affected only mother's likelihood of leaving children unsupervised. However, mother's employment status does explain the majority of this relationship given that earning more money means spending more time away from the home (Milne and Myers, et. al. 1986; Thomson, Hanson, and McLanahan 1994; Astone and McLanahan 1991). Lacking a larger body of research, additional research as to the interrelationship of economic (with income, siblings, and work hours) and socialization factors is recommended and will be explored in the model (Astone and McLanahan 1991; Thomson, Hanson, and McLahanan 1994;
Parenting practices and socialization

Socialization arguments posit that single mothers, either as a result of insufficient time or parenting skills, are less equipped to meet the needs of their children for authoritative parenting, school monitoring, supervision, and emotional support which, individually, are all related to achievement (McLanahan 1989; McLanahan and Bumpass 1988). Lacking role models and supervision, children are more susceptible to delinquent peer influences and less prepared for enrollment in educational institutions. In the case of marital disruption, socialization extends to apply, not only to the loss of the father's income, but to the impact on the daily care giving and supervision by the child's mother (Amato and Keith 1991).

Cumulatively, mild to moderate support has been found for the ability of parental socialization to mediate the effect of family status on child well-being and attainment (McLanahan, Astone, and Marks 1991; McLanahan and Bumpass 1988; Astone and McLanahan 1991; Sandefur and McLanahan 1994; and Thomson, Hanson, and McLanahan 1994). Socialization is a mediator for up to 50% of the increased likelihood of early family formation (McLanahan and Bumpass 1988; McLanahan and Sandefur 1994) and high school completion (McLanahan, Astone, and Marks 1991) for children of single mother families. Parental practices are weakly, but consistently, related to reduced attainment for offspring of single mother families; accounting for little of the effect on school behavior, performance, and psychological well-being in single mother families but 13-35% of those in disrupted step or mother-partner families (Thomson, Hanson, and McLanahan 1994). Perhaps because of non-inclusive parental indicators, parental practices account for as little as 15% (Astone and McLanahan 1991) but up to 50% of the decreased likelihood of high school
graduation for children of single mothers as well as almost all of the effect of "idleness" (operationalized as not having a job or being in school) of adult offspring from female-headed families (Sandefur and McLanahan 1994). To confirm that differences in parenting practices in single mother families are not exogenous to marital disruption (as presumed if marital conflict were to deteriorate parental attention prior to divorce or separation (Heatherington, Camara, and Featherman 1983)), Sandefur and McLanahan (1994) found that parental involvement and supervision decline for children whose parents have recently separated relative to those that remain intact (as compared to pre-divorce levels).

Socialization and family stress theories compete in their predictions concerning the effects of age at and duration of family disruption; for socialization, it is the increased exposure to poor parenting that is to blame rather than, as implicated in family stress, the act of disturbing family roles and relations (McLanahan and Bumpass 1988; McLanahan, Astone, and Marks 1991; McLanahan 1989; McLanahan and Sandefur 1994). Family stress posits that the time immediately after family separation is the worst (those in never married families, spared the tumult of separation, have the least effect) while socialization theory cites early childhood as the worst time to dissolve a family largely because the longer the absence of the father, the more time for a child to be exposed to inferior parenting practices (McLanahan and Bumpass 1988). Indeed, time spent with the absent father in the daily tasks of supervision, sharing mealtimes, school supervision, and help with homework decreases exponentially over time (with only 10% keeping close contact with their biological father) (Furstenberg and Nord 1985; Teachman 1992; Furstenberg and Harris 1992; Heatherington, Camara, and Featherman 1983). Mixed findings were reported by McLanahan and Bumpass (1988) as both early (ages 0-4) and adolescent (ages 10+) marital disruptions increased the likelihood of early family formation. However, the family stress
conjecture that the effects of marital disruption are only temporary is weakened by findings that differences in the likelihood of being in school at age 17 and of eventual high school graduation do not decrease over time for offspring from female-headed families (McLanahan, Astone, and Marks 1991). In support of socialization theory predicting a negative impact on those exposed to longer duration parental time deficits or those starting at the preschool age (when there aren’t yet teachers and peers to assist in socialization), the more years spent in a single parent family as well as marital separation during the preschool years reduces years of education completed (Krein and Beller 1988; Hong and Wojkowitz 1992).

Although moderate correlations exist between many of the parenting indicators in socialization theory such that deficiencies in one category are related to those in others (Patterson and Loeber 1984), distinct categories include parent-child emotional attachment, decision making, supervision, and school monitoring and activities (Thomson, Hanson, and McLanahan 1994). Specifically, socialization theory includes the contended assertion that single mothers spend less quality time building positive emotional bonds necessary for psychological and academic development than mothers from two-parent families (Coleman 1988; Matsueda and Heimer 1987; Thomson, Hanson, McLanahan 1994; Weiss 1979). Coleman (1988) argues that in order for parents to transmit the educational and occupational human capital they possess to their children, they must engage in social capital through high quality and quantity of attention paid to offspring. From this, single mothers with busy work schedules are hypothesized to have less time to spend with their children cultivating intellectual pursuits and, concomitantly, their children are less likely to depend on them emotionally (Weiss 1979) which impedes the transmission of human and cultural capital (as it also would for two-parent families with both parents too busy working outside the home) (Coleman 1988; Astone and McLanahan 1991). However, Clark
(1983) notes that many children who are high achievers had mothers who concertedly discouraged excessive parental contact; they limited warm interactions so that the child would be able to adjust to the demands of the role of the student. Indeed, the argument is also made that offspring become "confidants" of their mothers in female-headed families as supported by findings that these children actually spend more time communicating with their children than mother's in two-parent families (which is positively related to school attitude and grade point average) (Astone and McLanahan 1991; McLanahan, Astone, and Marks 1991).

However, McLanahan and Sandefur (1994) report that divorced single mothers do spend less time with their children and share fewer activities and meal times than mothers in intact families. With the divorce may come the desire for more independence from their children leading to less attention, erratic meal and bedtimes, and shorter play or leisure activities in single mother families (Heatherington, Camara, and Featherman 1983). Interestingly, children from intact and never married families had consistently higher maternal support than those from other forms of dissolved and reconstituted families, and the level of parental support (combined with the other parenting indicators) was able to explain 5-20% of the reduced school performance and the poor temperaments of children in step or mother-partner (versus intact) families (Thomson, Hanson, and McLanahan 1994). Matsueda and Heimer (1987) support the link between reduced parental attachment and negative outcomes; for both White and African American children of single mothers, less parental supervision and weaker attachment in the midst of greater peer and neighborhood delinquent definitions leads to a higher incidence of delinquent behavior. The quality, not just the quantity of mother-child interactions is also at issue (McLanahan, Astone, and Marks

---

3 Remarried or mother-partner families report the least amount of involvement in shared meals, reading and activities with their children (McLanahan and Sandefur 1994).
In this regard, we find only that never married mothers were more pessimistic and less likely to hug or praise their children (McLanahan and Sandefur 1994). If it is found that single mothers have a weaker emotional bond to their children (using measures of both quality and frequency of time spent together), I would expect this to have a significant negative impact on offsprings’ educational attainment.

Further, socialization encompasses discussion that single mother families are more permissive in their decision making styles and that this difference is related to decreased attainment for their offspring (Nock 1988; Steinberg 1986,1987; Dornbusch and Carlsmith, et. al. 1985; Hogan and Kitagawa 1985; Clark 1983). In regimented and hierarchical educational and occupational institutions, students and employees must understand their place within the authority structure and be competent subordinates (Nock 1988). Nock (1988) argues that children from single mother families experience less educational success because they enjoy a “parent into peer” relationship with their mothers such that sharing problems, responsibilities, and decision making erodes both generational gaps and family hierarchy. Rather than complying in deferential relationships, children who were allowed to make their own rules or who were consulted as equals by their mothers and thereby comfortable with adult-child egalitarian relationships are less likely to do as well or complete as many years of education as children from intact families accustomed to “traditional” family rank in age, gender, and income (Nock 1988). Although Weiss (1979) also cites that children of single mothers are more likely to participate equally in household decisions from food to house buying, he views the assumption of additional responsibilities as a positive thing for these children.

Using measures of permissive to authoritative decision making measuring, on a continuum, whether parents allow behavior or rules to be determined by the child, to have some input from the child, or to be set by parents, the experimental assumption is
that permissive parenting leads to reduced parental control which increases early family formation and poor behavior at home and in school (and less success in this hierarchical system) (Hogan and Kitagawa 1985; Steinberg 1986, 1987; Nock 1988; Dombusch and Carlsmith, et. al. 1985; Sandefur and McLanahan 1994). Single mothers are less willing to make decisions (in the absence of a partner or husband) without consulting their child(ren) which is a tendency, where permissiveness was associated with susceptibility to peer pressure and delinquent influences (Steinberg 1986, 1987), significantly related to increased deviant tendencies for males from female-headed families (Dombusch and Carlsmith, et. al. 1985; Clark 1983). Indeed, in a study of Black “ghetto” neighborhoods, those in single mother families who were high achievers were at the bottom of the family hierarchy and given firm discipline at home (Clark 1983) to remind, in the words of one single mother, that the child is “not an adult and not to be treated as such” (Garfinkel and McLanahan 1986). Thus, permissive parenting is presumed to be more characteristic of single mother families and, by undermining parental control and lowering teacher evaluations (grades), to be negatively related to educational attainment.

Steinberg (1986) suggests that authoritative parenting can counteract the negative effect of child deviance and offset possible disadvantages from insufficient parental supervision. Indeed, parental supervision (i.e., one’s willingness to leave a child without supervision after school, at home, or at a friend’s house) is weaker in single parent than intact families and this distal adult presence is related to increased deviant peer pressure (Steinberg 1986; Matsueda and Heimer 1985; Patterson and Loeber 1984). The importance of parental supervision is also reflected in the finding that the chance of early pregnancy is reduced by 64% with adequate parental supervision (Hogan and Kitagawa 1985). With single mothers having less time and availability to monitor the dating habits of their children (and themselves acting as a
role model for single parenthood), differences in parental supervision by family structure help explain intergenerational consequences in terms of early family formation (McLanahan and Bumpass 1988).

Parental control concerning child’s whereabouts, curfew, unsupervised periods, and completion of household chores is also decreased in disrupted families (McLanahan and Sandefur 1994; McLanahan, Astone, and Marks 1991; Astone and McLanahan 1991) and explains a moderate amount of the poor school behavior and temperament of these students (Thomson, Hanson, McLanahan 1994). Importantly, single mother families with less supervision have offspring with, via negative teacher evaluations, decreased grade point averages (Mulkey, Crain, and Harrington 1992). Clark (1983) finds that high achieving African American, inner-city children, in contrast to those from low achieving homes, have strict limits on the type of activities they are allowed to engage in and are diligently supervised. Finally, the lowered supervision reported in single mother families by Astone and McLanahan (1991) is negatively associated with educational outcomes including dedication to school, grades, college aspirations, school attendance, and remaining in high school or obtaining a GRE.

More specifically, parent’s participation in supervision and monitoring of school work is important in directly affecting both classroom behavior and educational attainment (Elder and Russell 1996; Milne and Myers, et. al. 1986; McLanahan, Astone, and Marks 1991; Astone and McLanahan 1991; Baker and Stevenson 1986; Heatherington, Camara, and Featherman 1983; Mulkey, Crain, and Harrington 1992). Especially in the case of “time poor” working single mothers (Garfinkel and McLanahan 1986), studies have found that children of mothers who are involved in their schooling and encourage them to complete homework prove greater mastery of material and engage in fewer deviant activities (Milne and Myers, et. al. 1986; Elder and Russell 1996; Clark 1983). Given that mother’s input on school projects (except in
the instance of young children where parents may do too much of the work for them (Milne and Myers, et. al. 1986) is positively related to maintaining grades (Baker and Stevenson 1986), school attendance, and receiving a high school diploma without dropping out (Astone and McLanahan 1991), the fact that children in single mother families, on average, receive less help with daily homework and school projects (McLanahan, Astone, and Marks 1991; Astone and McLanahan 1991) indicates the ability of this parenting practice to attenuate the effects of marital status on attainment. Indeed, Clark (1983) reports that high achieving children of single mothers have the help of their parent with school work on a regular basis and guidance toward teacher help for chronic problems. From the literature, I would expect female-headed families to provide less supervision and control of both child's whereabouts and of school work such that, through poor grades (and lowered parental aspirations), single mother offspring will complete fewer years of schooling and be less likely to enroll in a four-year college.

It has also been hypothesized, although likely correlated with monitoring school work, that parental involvement in school or community activities improves both the mother-child bond and offspring's educational achievement and commitment to school (Coleman 1988; Baker and Stevenson 1986; Elder and Russell 1996*; Lareau 1987). Coleman posits that mother's involvement in such school organizations as the PTA or others that increase mother-child contact facilitate the transmission of social capital needed in order to accrue educational and cultural capital. In one study, poorer single mothers viewed education as the responsibility of the school while those from wealthier families tended to become involved in school activities and gained teacher support and approval for their child (Lareau 1987). Indeed, Elder and Russell (1996) implicate reduced parental involvement in school activities for divorced mothers as
simultaneously opening the window for deviant attachments and closing options for
the parent to act as an advocate in teacher-child conflicts. In the belief that
participation in school activities may be compromised in busy single mother homes
and that, consequently, this may reduce offspring performance and behavior in the
classroom leading to lowered grade point averages and college aspirations, this
analysis will include the largely untested factor of parent participation in school related
activities as part of the parenting practices examined (Elder and Russell 1996; Mulkey,
Crain, and Harrington 1992; Heatherington, Camara, and Featherman 1983; Clark
1983).

*Institutional inequality*

Indeed, it is this kind of “educational advocacy” by parents who assist with
homework or engage in extracurricular school activities that may endow the children of
wealthier, more educated parents with the skills, knowledge, and cultural capital
needed to succeed in the classroom (Elder and Russell 1996; Baker and Stevenson
1986; DiMaggio 1982; Lareau 1987; Mulkey, Crain, and Harrington 1992; Polakow
1993). Educated mothers from two-parent, financially secure homes are more likely to
have time to spend with a child’s teacher, examine a child’s report card, help a child
with academic problems, and encourage a child to take college preparatory classes;
all with the goal of maximizing attainment (Baker and Stevenson 1986). In contrast,
single parent White and African American mothers of low achieving students living in
poverty report feeling “helpless” about their child’s schooling, blame their child for
educational failures (thus, depressing their self-esteem and aspirations), and do not
see how they can intervene to help (Clark 1983). Further, in terms of status attainment,
mother’s education has been shown to be the strongest indicator of increased
likelihood of dropping out of high school (McLanahan and Sandefur 1994). School
success requires parents to manifest interest in their child's schooling (rather than placing the burden on the institution itself) without which teachers may stigmatize the students as lacking in the cultural or linguistic skills necessary to succeed and, hence, facilitate social reproduction by tracking or categorizing their potential for mobility (Lareau 1987; DiMaggio 1982; Polakow 1993). From the evidence presented thus far, single mothers are less likely to possess the educational and occupational prestige, higher income, and greater time and resources that, consistent with status attainment literature, imbue students with the cultural capital to elevate them above the "culture of poverty" (DiMaggio 1982; Lareau 1987).

The point of this interlude being that the role of the school in social reproduction must not be forgotten. Possessing the right cultural traits (gleaned from the financial and human capital of their parents) and linguistic patterns mediates one's family background and school outcomes such that teachers reward those who are from the cultural elite by, on the basis of interactional patterns, imbuing them with higher status (DiMaggio 1982). As such, one could conjecture that classrooms are segregated along race, class, gender, and marital status such that teachers may condemn these students quickly for transgressions (e.g., being less well versed or poorly skilled at hierarchical interpersonal relationships) to lower educational tracks which negatively affect their standardized test scores and grades (Polakow 1993; Mulkey, Crain, and Harrington 1992). Thus, in this model student's grades are being considered as a product of parenting practices but keeping in mind how the classroom and the biases of teachers toward those rich in cultural capital may affect this relationship.

Poor classroom behavior is implicated in significantly lower teacher-evaluated grades indicating a less successful adaptation to the conformity, obedience, and desire for academic mastery requisite for success in the school as an institutionalized setting for children of single mothers (Garfinkel and McLanahan 1986; Mulkey, Crain,
and Harrington 1992). As a result, even when controlling for the effects of family income, children from single parent homes have lower grade point averages which are, themselves, strong predictors of success in college (Heatherington, Camara, and Featherman 1983). Indeed, in single mother families, depressed grade point averages and standardized test scores and poor school behavior (Mulkey, Crain, and Harrington 1992; Dornbusch and Carlsmith, et. al. 1985) can lead to reduced educational aspirations (Elder and Russell 1996; McLanahan and Sandefur 1994; Sewell, Hauser, and Alwin 1976). Further, evidence exists that student performance in school, as measured by grade point average, is a better predictor of college aspirations than parental expectations (themselves influenced by grades (Sewell, Hales, and Portes 1969; Elder and Russell 1996)). This analysis assumes grades to vary as a function of both parenting and economic factors and to affect educational achievement indirectly via parental academic expectations.

Trying to assess any differences in parental aspirations, as a result of economic background and independent of the influence of students' grades, is inconclusive. The literature reflects that high educational aspirations of parents translate to high aspirations among their children (McLanahan and Sandefur 1994; Clark 1983). Ethnographic reports reflect high hopes of single mothers for their children; one mother stated that her returning to school was a good incentive for her children to do well and tangible evidence that education provides the desired material rewards (Schein 1995). Another single mother acknowledged the importance of higher education for her child saying, "I want her to have an education. High school is nothing these days" (Schein 1995, p.60). Importantly, in his study of inner city, poor Black families, Clark (1983) found that, among both single and two-parent families, the highest achievers received both encouragement and praise for their abilities. Along with the evidence of high aspirations, it has been found that mothers in non-intact
families have higher hopes for their children's college matriculation than those in two-parent homes (McLanahan, Astone, and Marks 1991) lending support to the idea that economically self-sufficient mothers may transcend gender roles and advocate greater child attainment and independence for both their sons and daughters (McLanahan 1989). Contradictory hypotheses also exist conjecturing that, given their financial insecurities, single mothers are less hopeful for their children's futures (McLanahan, Astone, and Marks 1991; McLanahan 1989). Indeed, one finding reports that single mothers are less likely to report parental disappointment if their children do not attend college than two parent or mother/step-father families (McLanahan and Sandefur 1994). However, to date, studies have not shown that single mothers transmit lower aspirations to their children (McLanahan 1989). As such, to try to add to the findings, the question posed is whether any differences exist in the academic aspirations of single mothers (in reaction to their economic situation) for their children and if these differences have a concomitant effect on educational attainment.

Ultimately, although high school completion may be related to future economic disadvantage to a greater degree than college enrollment, participation in higher education for children of single mothers represents overcoming major institutional barriers of resources, access, and opportunity (Krein and Beller 1988; Amaury and Horvath 1989; Rendon and Mathews 1989). Further, college enrollment indirectly represents social reproduction in education operating through cultural capital, falsely egalitarian and meritocratic ideology, and financial inequality (Karabel and Brint 1989; Monk-Turner 1994; Karabel 1972; Karabel and Astin 1975; Lee and Frank 1990; Amaury and Horvath 1989; Rendon and Mathews 1989; and McLanahan and Sandefur 1994). Dual hypotheses exist concerning marital status and higher education: in one respect, higher education could be less pertinent to children of single mothers because those with the least amount of motivation and talent would
already have exited the system before high school graduation. However, one could also assume that college enrollment represents a greater achievement for single mother offspring (than those from two-parent families) able to gain the educational and financial resources required for participation in higher education (McLanahan and Sandefur 1994).

Indeed, enrollment in a four-year college or university, as opposed to a two-year community college, is an important outcome to assess because of the limited social mobility of community college graduates (Rendon and Mathews 1989; Karabel and Brint 1989). The meritocratic tenet of the community college was to open up access to higher education for those academically and financially unprepared to enter a four-year college (Karabel 1972; Karabel and Brint 1989). However, the implications for social reproduction are manifest when one considers that minority and poor students, disproportionally likely to enter community colleges, are also 5-25% less likely to transfer to a four-year university than higher class students who were already financially equipped to enter a four-year school (Rendon and Mathews 1989; Lee and Frank 1990). As such, the image of the community college as ameliorating educational stratification and allowing opportunities for the disadvantaged is an illusion and only perpetuates inequality as:

"it is only those who could attend four-year colleges in the first place- by virtue of higher family income and better academic preparation and motivation- who appear to be taking advantage of this inexpensive alternative. Just offering the opportunity, without an institutional press in that direction, does not seem adequate if the claim that community colleges provide a second academic chance to higher education to socially and academically disadvantaged students is to be realized" (Lee and Frank 1990, p. 191).

In theory, as more people enter colleges, the stratification mechanism operates to
create a hierarchy whereby elite four-year colleges monopolize economic opportunity and privilege while community colleges entertain those from the bottom of the socioeconomic ladder (Karabel 1975, 1977). Further, the aspirations of those in community colleges are “cooled out” via the myth of meritocracy; predicated on the falsehood that these students have been given every opportunity to succeed but have failed to transfer to a four-year university, students consider themselves worthless rather than finding fault with a system of unequal educational rewards and distribution (Karabel 1972; Karabel and Brint 1989). Thus, whether or not children of single mothers enter a four-year college or university (and how this is affected by parenting practices and socioeconomic status) is important because four-year colleges are the arbiters of educational and occupational prestige as well as eventual socioeconomic outcomes (Karabel and Brint 1989; Monk-Turner 1994). Indeed, community and four-year college completion are not homogeneous events; rather, those who were four-year college entrants (controlling for IQ, SES status, and years of education), enjoyed a 6.4% wage increase over those who entered community colleges (Monk-Turner 1994). Each additional year of college education yields a 7.9% increase in wages as compared to only a 5.4% increase for more years of community college. Further, the savings of attending a community college (averaging $1990) are not enough to justify the lost returns in wages of matriculating at a four-year university (in excess of $6856) (Monk-Turner 1994). Ultimately, this model conjectures that offspring from female-headed families are less likely to overcome the institutional barrier of four-year college enrollment and, thus, to be denied educational, occupational, and income prestige; if this relationship exists, the causes of the difference (be they related to economics, socialization, or an unidentified factor) should be explored.

The first portion of the analysis is a comparison of each of the conceptual indicators in the model by marital status; looking to see any significant differences in economic or
parenting factors in single mother families. Additionally, analysis of variance (ANOVA) is used as background statistical analysis to determine the explanatory power of such measures as economics, parenting, and marital status on educational attainment. Further, factor analysis facilitates the tentative assignment of indicators in the path model ideally refined to best illuminate conceptual causality and intervening relationships (Dwyer 1983). Indeed, it is my intent to revise Model 1, as constructed from my hypotheses in the literature review, for testing of the factors involved in the status attainment of single mothers using step regression with latent variables (or LISREL analysis).

Model 1 about here.

**Data and Methods**

Data are from both the first and second waves of the National Survey of Families and Households (completed in 1987 and 1994, respectively). As a nationally representative data set with an over-sampling of single parents, NSFH1 data is from interview and self-administered questionnaires with a primary respondent (Sweet, Bumpass, and Call 1988). The second wave (NSFH2), allowing for longitudinal analysis, includes follow-up interviews with the focal child (randomly selected during the first wave) now ages 18-26. Data on educational attainment, occupation, dating practices, and adult parent/child interactions were collected via NSFH2. For multivariate analysis, 598 possible cases remain (from a total of 1090) once missing data is excluded.

In order to investigate the substantive debate over single motherhood and considering the relative scarcity of single father families (Moynihan 1967; Auletta
1982), only female respondents from NSFH1 are included for analysis. I do not include any information on parenting styles or practices reported by the spouses (either fathers or step-fathers) resident in two-parent homes because the lack of congruity in the spouse and main respondent questionnaires results in missing information. Further, measures of participation (both financial and emotional) of an absent father in the focal child's life in single and two-parent families, where available, are not used given the rapid and continued decline in contact and visitation between children and non-resident fathers. In particular, absent fathers spend little time doing the daily duties of helping with homework, supervising, or eating meals with the child that are emphasized in this model (Teachman 1992; Furstenberg and Harris 1992; Furstenberg and Nord 1985).

Low sample sizes inhibited the degree to which I was able to divide the sample either by type of single or two parent family or by race or ethnicity. Prohibitive small cell counts for whether female-headed families were the result of divorce, separation, never marrying, or widowhood as well as the fact that the great majority (584 out of n=598) of female respondents were the biological parent of the focal child combined to make this analysis a straightforward comparison of single versus two-parent families. Ideally, I would have liked to contribute to the literature comparing the experience of African American and White single mothers. However, cell counts are too small to compare when single mothers are divided into racial categories and existing literature provides some indication that the effects of single motherhood are not significantly different for African American versus White children of single mothers (Krein and Beller 1988; Amato and Keith 1991).

Dependent variables in the analysis include years of education completed, whether or not the adult child has ever enrolled in a four-year college or university, occupational prestige, and offspring's cumulative income. Years of education
completed for the focal child was constructed according to the guidelines for the creation of respondent’s (offspring’s parent) education in the first wave of the NSFH (Sweet, Bumpass, and Call 1988). As such, adult children were coded with the corresponding level of academic completion through grade 12 (representing high school or GED completion). In addition, those who indicated attending a business or secretarial school were given the equivalent of high school completion. Those with some experience in a two or four-year college or university were coded as 13 years, a two-year associates or community college degree was awarded 14 years, and completion of a four-year degree was coded as 16 years. This indicator as well as four-year enrollment are suggested as useful in measuring the nuances of the effects of parenting practices on educational attainment (Astone and McLanahan 1991).

Whether the offspring has ever enrolled in a four-year college or university is a dichotomous variable where 1 indicates enrollment and 0 represents no prior enrollment.

From the literature on status attainment and on the intergenerational transmission of economic disadvantage, educational attainment will impact the offspring’s occupational prestige and, ultimately, their earnings (Mueller and Cooper 1986; Hong and Wojekowitz 1992). Occupational prestige was derived by recoding responses of offspring’s occupational industry, using the Stevens and Cho (1985) index of occupational prestige, to reflect occupational status. Offspring income represents earnings from wages (or salaries), commissions, tips, or self-employment in the last year before taxes or other deductions. For both occupational prestige and income, mean substitution was used for the missing cases after, using a t-test between occupational prestige and dummy variables to represent missing cases (coded 0=valid scores, 1=missing), it was found that the missing cases do not significantly differ from those reported.
Respondent's marital status, from the first wave of the NSFH, designates those who are married (coded=0) as representing two-parent families and those who are separated, divorced, widowed, or never married as single mother households (coded=1). Due to the low numbers of African Americans, race is controlled as a dichotomous variable with 1 representing Whites and 0 for all other races and ethnicities (including African American, Mexican American, and Asian America). Unfortunately, the NSFH is conspicuously missing a measure of the racial or ethnic identification of the focal child; as such, I use the measure of parent's race as indicative of the child's race. Further, in keeping with status attainment models (Blau and Duncan 1967), parent's education is included as a background variable intimately related to both parent's socioeconomic status and child's eventual success. In this case, parent's education is mother's education for female-headed households and, for offspring from two-parent families, the highest number of years of education completed in the family (thus, the mother or father depending on the level of educational attainment). Hopefully, this measure will provide a more accurate view of gender stratification and account for the additional resources provided by high status males in intact families.

In addition, parent's occupational status is constructed such that, in the case of two-parent families, the higher value (of the two parents) is used. Combined with the evidence that mother's occupational status is a more appropriate indicator for single mother families (Kalmijn 1994) than the traditional measure of father's occupational status used by Blau and Duncan (1976) and Sewell and Hauser (1976), mother's occupation is used for single mother families. Parent's socioeconomic prestige, along with income, poverty status, work hours, and number of siblings are all considered relevant variables for the economic deprivation argument. Measures of parental income including wages and assets (with mean substitution whereby the missing
cases are not statistically different) and a dichotomous measure of whether or not the family receives welfare (coded 0=no and 1=yes) are the main indicators of the family's economic solvency (Thomson, Hanson, and McLanahan 1994).

My analysis also includes, as an indirect causal indicator, the number of siblings of each focal child to address the hypothesized negative effect of each additional sibling on financial resources and, ultimately, on educational attainment in single mother families. Mother's average work hours (per week) is included to assess the interrelationship of economics and parenting practices. From the anticipated mediating effect on attainment of economics by marital status, I would predict that the more hours the female respondent works, the better the financial situation for herself and her children. However, the number of hours worked is also related to the hypothesized ability of economic indicators to mediate parenting practices in the model and may negatively affect the parent's ability to monitor, interact, and help the child (Thomson, Hanson, and McLanahan 1994; Astone and McLanahan 1991).

Parenting practices are measured with both single and multiple indicators from the first wave of the NSFH parent interviews concerning the focal child (then ages 12-18). In order to evaluate the theories of permissive parenting in single mother families leading to reduced attainment of children (Nock 1988; Dornbusch and Carlsmith, et. al. 1985; Steinberg 1987), I used whether or not a parent “allows the child to help set rules” as a measure of parental decision making coded on a continuum such that 1= “never” (indicating authoritarian parenting), 2= “seldom,” 3= “sometimes,” and 4= “very often” (indicating permissive parenting). Measures of the strength of the emotive relationship between parent and child, hypothetically damaged in single mother families where the parent is suffering physically and emotionally, are combined in an index. The index is similar to that used previously by Astone and McLanahan (1991) and Thomson, Hanson, and McLanahan (1994) and includes 3 variables: time spent
by the female respondent with the child in leisure activities, working on projects and playing together, and having private talks (all coded: 1=never, 2=once a month, 3=several times a month, 4=once a week, 5=several times a week, and 6=almost everyday). The index of intensity of emotional relationships, ranging from 3 to 18 where 18 represents the most time spent in fun, supportive, time intensive, and bond-forming activities, has an alpha of .7051.

General parental supervision or parental control is also an index similar to that of Thompson, Hanson, and McLanahan (1994). The index includes five measures related to whether or not the parent would allow the child to be home alone: before school, after school, all day, at night, and overnight (all coded 1=yes, 2=sometimes/depends, 3=no) and whether or not the child is required, when away from home, to let her/his parent(s) know her/his whereabouts coded with 1 being "sometimes or hardly ever," 2 as "most of the time," and 3 as "all of the time." Thus, the index is scored from 6-18 where 18 represents the highest amount of parental supervision and has an alpha of .7883. School supervision is also an important variable due to its presumed effect on the grades and educational attainment of the offspring of single mother families and should embody the "day to day, time consuming" work of monitoring school progress (Astone and McLanahan 1991, p.313). Respondent's "time spent helping the child with homework" is measured where 1=never, 2=once a month, 3=several times a month, 4=once a week, 5=several times a week, and 6=almost everyday. My analysis also investigates whether there is a positive effect of increased parental participation in school related activities (hypothesized to be more difficult in resource-poor single mother families) on educational attainment operationalized as the number of hours spent per week in school related activities (with mean substitution where the missing cases are not statistically different from those reported).
Finally, the model incorporates the effect of these parenting practices on the student’s success in the classroom and the effect this has on parental educational aspirations. From the status attainment literature, high school grades are included as directly affecting attainment and are coded as 1=mostly F’s, 2=D’s and F’s, 3=mostly D’s, 4=C’s and D’s, 5=mostly C’s, 6=B’s and C’s, 7=mostly B’s, 8=B’s and A’s, and 9=mostly A’s. Grades are an important measure of the child’s experience of the educational institution as a social setting and reflect the ability of the child, from his or her human and cultural capital, to negotiate the demands of the classroom (DiMaggio 1982). As a result, I would offer that they are equally if not more important than the dubious indicators of intellectual ability utilized in early research (Blau and Duncan 1967; Sewell, Hauser, and Alwin 1976). Indeed, Astone and McLanahan (1991) find that their results are not significantly altered by controlling for measures of ability. Given these factors and the fact that ability quotients are not available in the NSFH, this analysis will not include IQ or comparable measures.

High school grades also have a direct effect on both parent and child’s educational aspirations. This analysis includes parent’s (NSFH1 respondent) educational aspirations for the focal child as measured in years of education the parent hopes their child will complete. Unfortunately, there is not a self-reported measure of the focal child’s educational aspirations at the time of the first or second wave of the NSFH and my analysis is unable to account for this social psychological variable in the status attainment model as suggested by Sewell, Hales, and Portes (1969). Further, focal child’s age (at the time of the NSFH2) and sex (coded as 0=male and 1=female) are included as background controls in the model.

Cumulatively, I want to identify: 1. any differences in parenting practices, economic factors, and educational experiences by marital status, 2. the explanatory power of each of these constructs with respect to educational attainment, and 3. any latent
variables, via factor analysis, that may help to conceptualize economic resources or parenting practices. The research will identify direct effects on attainment as well as suggest mediating relationships between marital status and attainment. My goal is to try to isolate a model that is best suited to testing and explaining deficiencies in the attainment of children from single mother families.

This analysis extends previous research into the intergenerational transmission of resources by, using the new, second wave of the NSFH, further examining the role of socialization theories in explaining reduced educational attainment in single mother families including whether or not the offspring has enrolled in a four-year college or university. Indeed, although highly correlated with future welfare receipt and poverty (Astone and McLanahan 1991; Sandefur and McLanahan 1994), dropping out of high school is not the most common educational outcome and research, as suggested by Astone and McLanahan (1991), needs to consider socialization and socioeconomic status in terms of post-secondary achievements. In addition to years of education completed, I am interested in a model for use in examining the effect of marital status, parenting practices, and family income on likelihood of enrolling in a four-year college or university; with reason to suspect that the lack of resources and prior disadvantage in educational achievement will act to prohibit entry by those from single mother families.

Results

My results refute the assertions that single mothers have pathological parenting practices or that they spend insufficient time with their children (Moynihan 1967; Auletta 1982). Instead, I find that the parenting processes in female-headed families, more often than not, do not significantly differ from those reported by women in two-parent households. Thus, although educational attainment is found to vary according
to parenting practices, these practices are not directly linked to "unhealthy" behaviors of single mothers. Further, the fact that single parents have significantly lower incomes (and are more likely to live in poverty) combined with the variation in educational achievement explained by economic indicators supports the salience of socioeconomic status in models of the attainment of single mother offspring. Finally, parent's educational aspirations and child's grades are significant in understanding offspring attainment and I will offer suggestions as to how to understand the role of the classroom in reproducing disadvantage.

Table 1 displays descriptive statistics for all indicators including the dependent variables of years of education completed (mean of 12.66 years), likelihood of enrolling in a four-year college (average of 45.18% of the focal children), mean offspring earned income ($9014.55), and adult child's occupational prestige (average on Stevens and Cho (1985) scale of 30.87). Further, of these offspring, 22.01% were living in a single mother family at the time of the first wave of the NSFH.

Table 1 about here.

-----------------------------

Significant differences in measures of attainment, socioeconomic status, and parenting practices by marital status (single or two-parent) are assessed using t-tests in Table 2 and with cross tabulations in Table 3. Importantly, at the .001 level of significance, mean years of education completed by adult offspring of single mothers (12.35 years) is less than those from two-parent families (12.75 years). In support of my hypothesis that children from single mother families (for economic and institutional reasons) will encounter more barriers in four-year than two-year or community college enrollment, I find that children of single mother households are significantly less likely (Chi-Square of 6.141 at the .05 level of significance) to enroll in a four year college or
university than those from two-parent families (34.6% compared to 48.0%). However, there is not a significant association between marital status and likelihood of enrolling in a two-year or community college (with 36.5% from two-parent compared to 33% of single parent offspring). Thus, the fact that there is not a significant difference in community college enrollment by marital status indicates that there is access to the bottom level of the hierarchy of higher education, but that four-year colleges and universities operate to limit the institutional opportunities of children of single mothers as seen in the significantly less likely enrollment for single mother offspring in four-year colleges. Cumulatively, the findings support the conclusion that educational attainment is lower in children of single mother families (Sandefur and McLanahan 1994; Hong and Wojkiewicz 1991; Krein and Beller 1988; Kamo, et. al. 1991). There are, also, significant differences in the average occupational prestige of offspring by marital status (29.40 for single and 31.29 for dual parent) at the .01 level indicating that children of single mothers have both lower education and poorer job placement. The counter intuitive differential in adult child's income (average of $9209.00 for single and only $8959.67 for two-parent) is not significant in the population. The lack of difference in child's income (expected given the lower occupational prestige of children of single mothers) may be spurious or could be, though not directly related to marital status, an indirect result as mediated by educational completion and occupational status.

Table 2 and Table 3 about here.

Differences in parenting practices by marital status (as predicted by the socialization hypothesis to be related to poor educational attainment (Astone and McLanahan 1991)) were also measured. The predicted association between marital
status and patterns of decision making is not supported and, counter to the direct effects found by Steinberg (1986, 1987) and Dornbusch and Carlsmith, et. al. (1985), single mothers are not significantly more likely than dual parents to be "permissive" parents. Further, although two-parent families report more average hours spent in school related activities (1.21 hours per week) than single mothers (.97 hours), this difference is not statistically significant as was predicted given the "time poverty" associated with single motherhood (Garfinkel and McLanahan 1986). The negligible difference in the index of time spent in leisure play, joint projects, and long talks between single mothers (11.51) versus two-parents (11.75) is also not significant and refutes the assumption of Coleman and the findings of Matsueda and Heimer (1987) and Sandefur and McLanahan (1994) that single mothers have both lowered quality and quantity of interpersonal relations with their children. Single mothers also score higher on the index of general supervision over child's whereabouts and time spent unsupervised (10.80) than women in two-parent households (10.76) and, though the difference is not likely to be observed in the population, it does not support previous studies asserting lower supervision in single parent homes (Steinberg 1986; Matsueda and Heimer 1987; Patterson and Loeber 1984). In addition, there is not a significant difference in the amount of time spent in school supervision and homework activities between single (3.63 days per week) and two-parent mothers (3.79 days) which differs from research that finds less attention to school related endeavors by single mothers (McLanahan, Astone, and Marks 1991; Astone and McLanahan 1991). Cumulatively, the findings do not support direct effects between single motherhood and differences in parenting practices often used against single mothers as evidence of pathological or "bad" parenting (see Model 2 which reflects this revision). Thus, both parenting practices and marital status, independently, have a direct impact on offspring attainment, but the hypothesized indirect or mediating effect of parenting
practices between marital status and attainment is not supported. This indicates that perhaps economic indicators, educational experience, or even some other intangible construct, rather than poor parenting, may be responsible for mediating the effects of marital status.

Model 2, revised, about here.

Indeed, indicators of socioeconomic status are directly related to marital status. As predicted by Thomson, Hanson, and McLanahan (1994) and Sandefur and McLanahan (1994) and significant in my study at the .0001 level, single mothers have lower household incomes, on average ($29,309.50), than women from two-parent households ($57,471.40). As expected, single mothers and their children are also significantly more likely (22.3%) than women in two-parent households (7.5%) to live in poverty. Related to this economic deficit, single mothers were found to have completed fewer years of schooling (average of 12.39 years) and to be employed in less prestigious occupations (mean score of 49.44) when compared to households with another resident parent (13.58 average years of schooling and 72.72 SES score). These findings are indicative of the financial and occupational disadvantage of single mother families compared to two-parent households benefited by gendered occupational segregation and wage inequalities (Kamerman and Kahn 1988; Abramowitz 1988). Further, although single mothers (particularly African American women) have been labeled as “lazy welfare queens” (Collins 1990) unwilling to “work hard” to increase their economic resources, the data reveal that single mothers work significantly more hours per week (32.25) than women in two-parent families (25.29 hours).

In terms of the relationships between classroom interactions, the educational
institution, and single motherhood; at the .10 level of significance, I find both lower grades for children of single mothers (6.38 versus 6.65 for two-parent) and lower parental educational aspirations for the focal child (14.38 years of schooling versus 14.76 years anticipated by two-parent mothers). These findings imply testing the tentative hypothesis that, as a result of their own depressed educational and economic situation, single mothers may have lower aspirations for their children (McLanahan, Astone, and Marks 1991; McLanahan 1989). It also suggests, as status attainment models have reported (Sewell and Hauser 1976; Blau and Duncan 1967), that lower student grades may negatively influence parental aspirations. Demographically, 35.6% of the women of a racial group other than White (including African American, Mexican American) are single mothers (35.6%). Conversely, White women are more likely to reside in a two-parent home (85.2%). Also, single mothers are more likely to have more children (and the focal child to have more siblings) (average of 3.23 children) than women in two-parent families (mean of 2.21 children). Finally, there is no statistically significant difference in the ages of offspring from single (20.77) and two-parent families (20.59 years) with slightly (but not significantly) more women (n=67 or 22.3%) than men (n=64 or 22.0%) from single mother homes.

To address the question of the explanatory power and salience of marital status, parenting practices, economic factors, and educational indicators on status attainment, ANOVA's with MCA were performed using the aforementioned conceptual blocks on the dependent variable of years of education completed.4 Table 4 represents the first ANOVA model including the effects of marital status, decision making, school activities, emotional attachment, help with homework, general supervision, and educational

---

4 This dependent variable was chosen for analysis due to the dichotomous nature (and inappropriate for ANOVA or simple regression) of the indicator of enrollment in a four-year college or university and because the effect of years of education completed is ultimately presumed to mediate offspring earning and occupational prestige (Sewell and Hauser 1976; Blau and Duncan 1967).
aspirations on years of education completed.\(^5\)

Table 4 about here.

Specifically, when controlling for the effects of the other independent variables, mean years of schooling completed by marital status vary in the predicted direction whereby single mother offspring average only 12.41 years as opposed to 12.78 years in two-parent families (significant at the .01 level). Considered autonomously, marital status has a weak, positive effect (eta=.140) on educational attainment that is lessened when controlling for the parenting indicators (beta=.124). Significant at the .05 level (.052), parental styles of decision making has a weak positive association (eta=.167 and beta, controlling for the other independents=.111) on years of education completed. Both when considered bivariately and autonomously when controlling for the effects of the marital status and the parenting indicators, decision making reflects a linear effect on educational completion whereby progressing from authoritative (holding constant other indicators=12.54) to permissive (12.90) parenting reflects an overall increase in the years of education completed. Thus, the results do not vary in the predicted direction (Nock 1988) and may represent the fact that children who are allowed to discipline themselves may also assume more responsibility for their education.

Further, the quantity and quality of emotional interaction between parent and child does have a significant (at the .1 level with actual significance=.055) effect on variation in the years of education completed. Additionally, at the .0001 level, both the amount of parental supervision (knowing whereabouts and monitoring the child) and the parent's educational aspirations do produce a significant effect on years of education completed.

---

\(^5\) The model was also run without the inclusion of marital status. The ANOVA including marital status is presented because the significance levels of the parenting factors do not significantly change and the latter model explains 22.9\% as opposed to 21.4\% of the variance in years of education completed.
completed. Overall, the model, without including economic indicators, is able to explain 22.9% of the variance in years of education completed for offspring and provides substantial justification for testing the effects of both parenting and marital status on attainment; although the two are not directly associated (i.e., it is not the deviant parenting of single mothers), each is responsible for important variations in achievement. In contrast to the other parenting indicators, we find support for the null hypotheses that mean years of education does not vary by hours spent participating in educational activities or by parental help with homework. In this case, it could be that these factors explicitly related to involvement in child's schooling would, in a causal model, have some direct effect on the child's school grades which, in turn, lead to an indirect effect on reduced educational achievement.

Interestingly, the effects of socioeconomic indicators on educational attainment predict only 8% of the variation in education completed (see Table 5). Marital status is not included in this test due to the significant (at the .01 level) correlation with parent's income (Pearson's=-.184). Thus, this analysis of variance determines the effect of living in poverty, parent's socioeconomic status, work hours and earned income on years of education completed.

Table 5 about here.

entered dichotomously, living in poverty, when controlling for the other indicators, is weakly and positively (eta=.141, beta=.112) related to a significantly negative change in years of education completed (12.31 years for those below compared to 12.75 for those above the poverty line). Each of the covariates is also significant and indicate that there is an effect on years of education completed for (holding constant the other independent variables) parent's socioeconomic status, mother's work hours,
household income. Thus, each of the main effects in the model is significant and illustrates the ability of socioeconomic factors to directly, and in the case of poverty status, negatively, impact educational achievement. Combined with the direct relationship between marital status and parent’s socioeconomic status, my findings strongly support the importance of economic indicators to mediate the reduced educational attainment in children of single mother households.

Table 6 about here.

Finally, an ANOVA assessed the effect of marital status, child’s grades in high school, parental education, and educational aspiration on offspring years of education completed (results reported in Table 6). My model hypothesizes a relationship between parenting practices and economic indicators in single parent families (with less money to invest in extracurricular activities and training) on student grades which, in turn, impact educational achievement. Further, from the work of Lareau (1987), we know that, in addition to the role of parental socioeconomic status, parent’s educational achievement plays a part in fostering participation in school activities and student aspirations. Finally, status attainment models emphasize the impact of teacher-evaluated grades on shaping parent’s aspirations for the child’s achievement (Sewell and Hauser 1976).

Probably due to high collinearity with the other measures included, years of education does not significantly vary with marital status in this analysis of variance. The rest of the main effects are significant and provide support, at the .0001 level, that there is variation in years of educational completed by offspring’s high school grades, amount of parental education, and parent’s education aspirations for their children. The fact that, cumulatively, the model explains 23% of the variance in offspring years
of education completed indicates the potential strength of these measures, working to mediate the effects of economic and parenting factors in single mother families, on status attainment. As such, an even more micro-level analysis would pay attention to classroom interactions and the bias and stigma teachers may apply to children of single mothers in the process of social reproduction within institutionalized education (Mulkey, Crain, and Harrington 1992).

Using the ANOVA's as support for the impact of economic deprivation and parental socialization, factor analysis is also employed to identify the operationalized factors that may represent underlying constructs (Dwyer 1983). With unrotated factor analysis and considering loadings of +.50 as constituting factors, (Doss and Gross 1992), measures of mother's parenting practices (including participation in school activities, decision making, child supervision, help with homework, and emotional interaction) yield two factors distinguishable as parental supervision/social control and as parent/child personal involvement as represented in Table 7.

Table 7 about here.

Loading on the first factor are the index of child supervision (-.65) (i.e., knowing whereabouts and providing supervision when not in school) and the indicator of permissive or authoritative parent/child decision making (.77). Given the inverse relationship between decision making and supervision whereby more authoritative parenting (or vice versa) can compensate for a lack of supervision (Steinberg 1986), I think the two may represent a latent indicator of the effect of parental control on educational attainment. The second factor is composed of mother's daily help with homework assignments and an index of the quantity and quality of emotional interactions (including time in leisure activities, working on projects, and having private
talks). I would offer that this factor conceptualizes the degree of personal and emotive connection between mother and child through spending time on projects and homework or through private talks and fun activities. Since the analysis of variance did not support direct variation in years of education completed by parent's time spent helping with homework, this latent variable could be tested for; 1. its direct effect on enrollment in a four-year college or university, 2. any indirect effect on education through a direct effect on the child's grades, or 3. dissolved and entered as the single indicators of parent-child emotional interaction (predicted to influence education) and amount of parental help with homework (predicted to impact high school grades). If considered as multiple latent variables of parenting practices, the first factor is indicative of more instrumental details of parenting and the second of more expressive aspects. Parental participation in school activities does not load strongly on either factor and will be considered autonomously as a parenting indicator under the assumption that its effect on educational attainment is mediated by offspring's grades (Lareau 1987).

The overall theoretical concept of economic deprivation is also divisible, from among poverty status, earned income, mother's work hours, and parental socioeconomic status, into two contributing factors as seen in Table 8. Loading on the first factor and representing tangible income is whether or not the respondent and her family lives in poverty (-.66) and the household income of the respondent (.81) (including wages and assets). The second factor, as a manifestation of occupational dynamics, is directly related to earned income and includes mother's work hours (-.83) and parental occupational prestige (.81). Together, work hours and occupational SES (factor 2) represent the proportionate return in wealth (factor 1) for investment of time as related to the economic deprivation hypothesis.
Together, occupational dynamics and real income are multiple indicator factor constructs of the latent variable of economic resources. The representation of the economic deprivation indicators as a latent variable indicates that LISREL analysis may be best for evaluating both the direct and mediating effects of economic resources on offspring’s educational attainment.

In addition, an experimental factor analysis (shown in Table 9) also included parental marital status, race, and education.

Although my model is most concerned with the effects of marital status on attainment, the observed likelihood that single mothers complete fewer years of schooling has direct implications for their socioeconomic status. Further, mother’s marital status and her years of education completed, combined with the race and ethnicity of the respondent (significantly correlated, at the .01 level, with marital status as Pearson’s=-.217), may represent the building materials for the life chances of the focal child (Mueller and Cooper 1986). Indeed, factor analysis illuminates that marital status (-.60), race and ethnicity (.76), and parental education (.74) load on one factor that, if considered together rather than as independent indicators, might represent offspring’s life chances.

Conclusions and Implications

The results of the factor analysis are significant in that they suggest that the next
logical step in the research would be running the model using a structural equations LISREL path model.\textsuperscript{6} Importantly, my research found underlying, latent constructs of life chances and multiple factors for both economic resources and parenting practices. Although exploratory factor analysis is criticized statistically for employing arbitrary criteria, it is "a useful technique when...identifying clusters of observed variables that are more closely correlated within clusters than between clusters" (Dwyer 1983, p.275). Indeed, I believe that using multiple factors may be a more detailed analysis of the latent variables of parenting (with factors for social control and supervision and for emotive contact) and of economics (with occupational dynamics and real income constructs) and could be accommodated by LISREL.

Further, the implications are to proceed with a structural equations path model in order to investigate the causal and indirect hypotheses in the model. For instance, the exact contributions and placement of child's grades as influenced or influencing parental aspirations and how these variables might mediate marital status, parenting practices, or economic factors and attainment should be explored. Structural equations modeling can also measure causal relationships between multiple dependent variables as are hypothesized to exist between enrollment in a four-year college or university and years of education completed on, first, occupational prestige and, second, offspring's earned income. This tolerance in measuring dependent variables is necessary in order to include the variable of enrollment in a four-year college or university (previously excluded from analysis of variance or simple regression because of its dichotomous nature). In addition, LISREL is appropriate for testing the model because collinearity between indicators and factors is expected rather than problematic (as it is for OLS regression) (Dwyer 1983).

\textsuperscript{6} This step has not been taken and my discussion of the potential and limitations of LISREL has been truncated due to an interruption in my training in this technique.
Ultimately, the causal path, latent variables, and single indicators that compose the model must be tested to find the "best fitting" model for explaining reduced attainment in single mother families. Since factor conceptualization and causal connections remain subject to change depending on the "fit" of the covariance matrix, it may be the case that several models should be hierarchically tested until the lowest Chi-Square is produced (Dwyer 1983). Revisions to the model originally conceived (see Model 1) have already been proposed in Model 2 after differences in the indicators by marital status were evaluated.

Indeed, several notable conclusions were reached through analysis of variance and independent samples t-tests by marital status. Perhaps most important is the ability of marital status and parental practices to explain 22.9% of the variation in years of education completed. The significant main effects for parental supervision, decision making, and emotional attachment indicate the strength of parenting factors hypothesized by parental socialization models on educational achievement. Despite the salience of parenting practices on attainment, none of the indicators of parenting practices were found to vary by marital status. As such, direct relationships remain between both marital status and parenting on educational attainment but parent socialization is not a mediating factor in this relationship. Thus, this research suggests that reduced attainment is not a function of deviant or pathological parenting in single mother families; an explanation popularly evoked (Moynihan 1967) blaming the individual, rather than the system, for a failure to perform. The important implications of this finding being that we turn our attention away from investigations into the moral and behavioral "deficiencies" of single mothers and their children and concentrate on identifying mediating relationships with economic deprivation or, as I will suggest, an examination of classroom dynamics.

Indeed, provided with a more complete data set on this issue or using more
ethnographic data, I would analyze the micro-level factors in the classroom. Children of single mothers (especially African American children) may be stigmatized and tracked by teachers into lower educational programs (Lareau 1987; Polakow 1993; Mulkey, Crain, and Harrington 1992). Mulkey, Crain, and Harrington (1992) suggest and my findings support that children of single mothers have poorer school behavior than children from intact families and that this has a deleterious effect on their teacher evaluated grades and aspirations. The direct effects of marital status on grades combined with the effect of grades on variations in attainment calls for studying such dynamics as student/teacher interactions, pedagogical structures, and tracking mechanisms for children of single mother families (Lareau 1987; Clark 1983).

Additionally, my preliminary analyses support the assertions of the economic deprivation paradigm. Not only are the main effects of the economic indicators all significant in the analysis of variance of years of education completed by the focal child, but these variables alone (without race, marital status, or respondent's education) account for 8% of the variation in this dependent variable. Additionally, there is a direct relationship between marital status and lowered economic resources which encourages the use of a causal, path model to test the mediating power of economic resources between single motherhood and offspring's status attainment.

Policy Implications

Support for the economic deprivation argument implies that the structural dynamics of occupational segregation, wage discrimination, and aid (or lack thereof) in insurance, food, child care, education, and job training that perpetuate social and economic inequality for single mothers need attention. Economic indicators of wealth and poverty status are both directly related to marital status and explain much of the variation in years of education completed. Pending completion of a causal analysis, it
is important to evaluate: 1. the existing policy recommendations from researchers who have found culpability for lowered attainment in economic factors (McLanahan 1985, 1989; McLanahan, Astone, and Marks 1991; McLanahan and Sandefur 1994), 2. the implications of current welfare reform for single mothers given their high likelihood of living in poverty and receiving government benefits, and 3. beneficial programs that are helping single mothers achieve greater social standing and earnings.

Given that financial difficulties are a major contributor to the lower status attainment for children of single mother families (McLanahan 1985; Thomson, Hanson, and McLanahan 1994), increasing mother's earnings, private fund transfers (i.e., child support), and the public transfer of funds (i.e., AFDC) has been suggested (McLanahan 1989; McLanahan, Astone, and Marks 1991). With single mothers earning only 35% of the amount of the major earner (most often the father) in intact families (Garfinkel and McLanahan 1986), we need equity in earning potential (women make 60% as much as men) by increasing the education and job training opportunities of single mothers and by destroying the "glass ceiling" for women in higher status employment (McLanahan, Astone, and Marks 1991). Further, if the implication is for increased work force participation for single mothers to facilitate economic solvency, adjustments must be made in subsidized day care. McLanahan, Astone, and Marks (1991) suggest universal government child care using a sliding fee scale which would provide single mothers with the economic mobility to work outside the home without depleting their incomes on day care costs.

The financial situations of single mother families can also be improved through more stringent enforcement of child support and alimony payments (McLanahan and Sandefur 1994). With the resident mother losing up to half of her income following marital dissolution (Lino 1995; Teachman 1992), the Child Support Assurance System (CSAS) bypasses delinquent fathers and garnishees a percentage of earnings to go
toward the welfare of the child. The program (including a component of public fund transfer as well), if nationally implemented, is estimated to decrease poverty in female-headed families by up to 40% (McLanahan, Astone, and Marks 1991; Garfinkel and McLanahan 1986).

Aid to Families with Dependent Children, as a major source of public monetary transfer to single mothers, has declined 30% in real value since 1970 (as opposed to Survivors Insurance for widows that is protected from inflation as part of Social Security). Welfare, it is charged, encourages dependency on subsidies and discourages the impetus to work as epitomized by the image of the “lazy, welfare queen” (Collins 1990). These stereotypes proliferate, however, without recognition that the nearly dollar-for-dollar reduction in benefits with additional earned income combined with high expenses for independent health insurance and child care make welfare a better alternative, financially and emotionally (as mothers have more time to spend at home with their children), than work force participation (McLanahan, Astone, and Marks 1991). One of the major initiatives surrounding the welfare debate for the last couple of years has been the “welfare to work” campaign. In cases where more money is spent on education, transportation, and job training for the mother in preparation for working outside the home, the infusion of money and skill into single mother families may be a positive effect of work initiatives. On the contrary, if income is merely substituted for welfare benefits, the experience of children in single mother families may decline as there is less time to spend with their mothers (McLanahan, Astone, and Marks 1991).

Indeed, the emphasis in the welfare reform bill signed August 1996 is on moving from welfare to work. Work requirements in the new bill include that the AFDC recipient must work within two years after receiving benefits after which time those without jobs will be placed in state subsidized employment. Further, welfare checks
cannot be received for more than five years although benefits in public housing, food stamps, and Medicaid remain intact (IUGM “Welfare Reform,” 1996). Additional stipulations of the new bill relevant to female-headed families include the elimination of automatic “entitlement” to AFDC, ending cash benefits to unmarried mothers under age 18 (to try to discourage teen pregnancy and keep single mothers in school), and denying increased payments if a mother has more children while receiving welfare. Parts of the approved bill that are less punitive in nature include guarantees to child care for those with children under six years of age who are looking for work and increased funding to the JOBS program which is designed to help single parents receive the education, training, and employment (with subsidized child care and transportation) they need to get off of welfare (IUGM, “Parenting,” 1996).

I would argue that the conditions of the new reform could be especially deleterious to the condition of single mother families because of the insistence on locating the problem in individual factors without consideration of such institutional dynamics as the availability of good jobs or the ineptness of many public services. Single mothers will be required to enter a “compact” with AFDC workers to “develop a personal employability plan, identifying their needs for schooling or technical training, job search, or other preparation related to work opportunities” (Department of Health and Human Services 1994). Yet this compact, designed to move single mothers to work as quickly as possible, deals only with restrictions and requirements on the single mother herself. It does not allow for the fact that, even though the bill subsidizes day care for those under six while their mother works, current conditions for those qualifying for care include a 40,000 child wait list for day care in Texas and a 225,000 child list in California where mothers may wait two years for toddler assistance and a year for infant care (Twentieth Century Fund 1997). With child care necessary to allow the mothers to enter the work force, the government has not successfully offered the
institutional vehicles for single mothers to profitably enter the work force.

Furthermore, the welfare bill, according to one legislator, is intended to evoke an "attitudinal change across the entire country...The idea is to make welfare not a way of life, but simply a short-term bridge over tough time" (IUGM, "Welfare reform," 1996). This approach to welfare, in my opinion, wrongly treats the condition of poverty as one of attitude and morality as opposed to societal inequality. As such, the speaker does not take into account that "moving the homeless and welfare recipients into the work force depends on elements that cannot be legislated" (IUGM, "Welfare Reform," 1996). Indeed, even if job training and education is able to improve the skills of some, the pay received for their entry level positions may not be sufficient to push them above the poverty line. The paucity of good paying, quality benefit positions is hard to negotiate for the most qualified single mothers and even more detrimental for those with only remedial skills (IUGM, "Welfare Reform," 1996). Rhetoric and reality clash where, despite the fact that only 13% of AFDC single mothers received job training, work programs, or education in 1994, Clinton (in the same year) said that his reform had brought "work and responsibility [emphasis added] back to the lives of 75% of the Americans on welfare" (Whitman 1996, p.32).

Reform, it is charged, is also misleading in that the interpretation of shrinking welfare rolls at the state and national level as indicative of successful welfare to work transition does not reflect the housing instability and precarious incomes of the single mothers (now off of welfare) who are working part-time jobs and jostled between low income housing options (Vobejda and Havemann 1997). Quality of life is an issue as the welfare benefits shrink for women and children. Without unconditional "entitlement," many battered women may stay with an abusive yet financially supportive husband rather than risk receiving only meager welfare benefits (less than $400 a month) (Ehrenreich 1995). Basic subsistence is also threatened by legislation
to end food stamps and hot food services for AFDC children. As funding for hot lunch programs is converted into state block grants, states choosing to use the funding on emergency assistance, for instance, would not have sufficient funds remaining to help supplement the diets of young students (Gleick 1995).

Given my findings that the attainment problems of children of single mothers are likely more economic than the product of an individual or parenting pathology, the fact that the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities predicts that the reform and dissolution of AFDC into a block grant (the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF)) is likely to push an additional 1.1 million children and 2.6 adults into poverty is not encouraging for the achievement of children from poor single mother families (Super, Parrott, Steinmetz, and Mann 1996). The news is even worse when one considers that the “poverty gap” (the amount of money to lift all families above the poverty line) will widen with the reform bill to increase the severity of poverty for the already poor by 20% (an increase of 4 billion in the poverty gap). Finally, although the new bill was designed to facilitate more work force participation and greater income, the Center finds that not only will households with an unemployed mother receiving AFDC and food stamps become poorer, but “most of the children who would be pushed below the poverty line live in families with a working parent” (Super, Parrott, Steinmetz, and Mann 1996).

Thus, welfare reform is informed by the myth “that we have a budget deficit solely because we are spending huge amounts of money on the poor (who are assumed to be Black)” (Klein 1996, p.45). In reality, the spending for defense budget, the elderly, and special interest and corporate subsidies, each, exceed the amount spent on

---

7 A report with similar findings was produced by the Department of Heath and Human Services and suppressed by the White House. This and reports produced by other findings such as the Urban Institutes were done independently (and at with the encouragement of Daniel Moynihan) following Presidential requests that the DHHS not analyze the most recent reform bill (Heilemann 1996).
public welfare (Klein 1996). As such, it is criminal to talk principally of the savings to the government when, for instance, the hot lunch program is jeopardized for savings of $6.7 billion dollars in administrative costs (Gleick 1995). The ultimate commentary comes in the objections of Democrat Daniel Moynihan to the reform bill. Although responsible for phrases like the “culture of pathology” applied to African American female-headed families, Moynihan notes that rather than focusing on structural inequality in society and the production of poverty, “the country has come to mistake the symptoms of social breakdown for the causes” (Heilemann 1996, p.24).

In the midst of the pessimism of welfare reform, what can we do in the short term until Congress decides to tackle the sources of poverty rather than reform welfare? A paradigmatic shift advocated by Sherraden (1988) is to focus not on income, but asset transfer. He argues that gross inequalities (the richest 1% own assets equivalent to the bottom 90%) in asset accumulation between the rich and poor are due, in part, to the benefits of possession of cultural capital in the form of understanding the “elaborate structures of information, associations, procedures, and favorable rules” needed to accrue wealth and position (Sherraden 1988, p.38). The proposed attention to asset accumulation is designed to “cushion income shocks,” reduce household transaction costs (e.g., an old car that breaks down needing repair or finding appropriate health care coverage), and to provide motivation to pursue higher education (using an asset fund). Sherraden’s (1988) proposals for implementation of asset transfer include using direct transfer through AFDC for trusts for children, for a house or car down payment, or for a principal or interest payments on private homes. Further, Sherraden (1988) radically proposes the creation of accounts (started at birth) for the higher education of children of families on AFDC whereby savings would come through public and private funds and subsidies. I believe that successful application of this model would include both asset and income transfer where the income subsidies
are also protected by a “child care tax credit or assurance system” that only gradually decreases welfare benefits as earned income increases (McLanahan, Astone, and Marks 1991).

More immediately, in direct response to the nation-wide cuts to AFDC and the welfare system by the welfare reform bill, it is now up to each state to legislate and generate innovative ways to assist low income single mothers. For instance, Illinois has taken advantage of a directive of the Department of Health and Human Services stating that a single mother who has cooperated with AFDC programs, but has not yet found a job, cannot be removed from welfare (despite the two year work initiative and five year cap on cash assistance) (Whitman 1996). Further, as a leader in welfare reform and in consultation with Texas, California, North Carolina, Virginia, and Indiana, the State of Iowa has employed the Family Development and Self-Sufficiency (FaDSS) Council within the Department of Health and Human Services to evaluate programs attending to families at risk of long-term welfare dependency (State of Iowa 1996).

Cognizant of the imperative to help single mothers on aid become self-sufficient quickly given the new federal time limits on welfare receipt, the Iowa program is a comprehensive approach to the need for support services for financially vulnerable female-headed families. The program facilitates the creation of a support system for mothers; one example, as related by a case worker, explains the benefit to a single mother’s coping resources by explaining the cost and lost time of a flat tire before FaDSS as opposed to the same experience while receiving program assistance. While participating in FaDSS, the hypothesized scenario is that the single mother who gets a flat tire on her way to work calls her case worker for a ride (reaching work on time). Her social worker then uses funds for a new tire and asks for the generosity of a mechanic to replace it without loss of income or work time for the mother. It is
assumed by the program that, the next time there's a flat tire, the participant will have friends at work for a ride, have connections with the mechanic who will give her a break on payment, and have enough money saved to pay for the repairs without endangering her subsistence (State of Iowa 1996). The success of the program supports the assertion that cooperative efforts among single mothers and their community are to be the “families of the future” (Donati 1995).

In the experience of a single mother (age 21) of three on FaDSS, the case worker reports that “Sally” is a loving and attentive parent with resourceful budgeting skills. Despite confrontations with her abusive husband (whom she fled in relocating from Arizona to Iowa), Sally was able to find a part-time waitressing job and, through a work contact, to find a house to rent. In addition she worked with both of her children on their schoolwork and decided to pursue group counseling to assist with their behavioral problems. Notably, she was also accepted for advanced education provided by the PROMISE JOBS program. With rent and child care assistance, Sally has maintained car payments and family subsistence. Unfortunately, her income is prohibitively high for certain cash benefits and the limited duration and funding for the FaDSS means she will soon lose eligibility for that program (State of Iowa 1996).

I would argue that “Sally’s” progress is important and needs to be encouraged through continued full AFDC benefits and the FaDSS program until her situation is more stable and she has completed educational programs that will help her earn a livable wage (again, provided quality jobs are available). Ultimately, I advocate not only continued welfare benefits and asset accrual to help address the economic needs of single mothers, but also the improvement of educational resources and the end of the occupational segregation and wage discrimination that impedes the progress of these women and their children. Further, the lowered educational aspirations of single parents for their children indicates that their experiences in schools and jobs have only
discouraged and depressed their perceptions of social mobility. As well, the lower grades of children of these families may represent teacher stigmatization and lowered expectations of “at-risk” students. The combined exclusion of these mothers and their children from the educational institution is a result, not of their own inferiority, but of a discriminatory and unequal system. My results indicate that we, as a society, need to focus less on the pseudo-pathological parenting behaviors and attitudes of dependency of single mothers and more on our own prejudicial attitudes and policies toward women and the poor.
Table 1: Descriptive Statistics- Means and Standard Deviations for Adult Child’s Status Attainment and Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kideduc</td>
<td>12.66</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fouryear</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidses</td>
<td>30.87</td>
<td>11.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childinc</td>
<td>9014.55</td>
<td>9026.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newrace</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision (E1003B)</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childsex</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R’s workhrs</td>
<td>26.84</td>
<td>19.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent ses</td>
<td>67.59</td>
<td>31.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent educ.</td>
<td>13.31</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidage</td>
<td>20.63</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent inc</td>
<td>47661.7</td>
<td>53015.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ asp</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework (E1002D)</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion (Capital)</td>
<td>11.69</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity hours</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Differences Among Means for Single Mother and Two-Parent Families by Adult Child’s Status Attainment and Selected Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Single Mother</th>
<th>Two-Parent</th>
<th>t-Scorea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kideduc</td>
<td>12.35 (1.37)</td>
<td>12.75 (1.17)</td>
<td>3.26****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child SES</td>
<td>29.40 (8.81)</td>
<td>31.29 (12.05)</td>
<td>1.99**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child income</td>
<td>9209.00 (10306.70)</td>
<td>8959.67 (8641.95)</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Hours</td>
<td>.97 (2.83)</td>
<td>1.21 (3.94)</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotive (Capital)</td>
<td>11.51 (3.63)</td>
<td>11.75 (3.33)</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework (E1002D)</td>
<td>3.63 (1.81)</td>
<td>3.79 (1.83)</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ. asp.</td>
<td>14.38 (2.14)</td>
<td>14.76 (2.11)</td>
<td>1.79*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent’s income</td>
<td>29309.5 (25362.16)</td>
<td>52841.5 (57471.40)</td>
<td>6.80****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades</td>
<td>6.38 (1.52)</td>
<td>6.65 (1.50)</td>
<td>1.77*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single Mother</th>
<th>Two-Parent</th>
<th>t-Score&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent's educ.</td>
<td>12.39</td>
<td>13.58</td>
<td>4.88&lt;sup&gt;****&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.37)</td>
<td>(2.70)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=131</td>
<td>n=462</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent's SES</td>
<td>49.44</td>
<td>72.72</td>
<td>7.81&lt;sup&gt;****&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(31.01)</td>
<td>(29.96)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=132</td>
<td>n=466</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R's workhrs</td>
<td>32.25</td>
<td>25.29</td>
<td>3.65&lt;sup&gt;****&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(19.19)</td>
<td>(19.44)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=130</td>
<td>n=453</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>10.76</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.20)</td>
<td>(3.09)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=124</td>
<td>n=445</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>4.09&lt;sup&gt;****&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.66)</td>
<td>(1.83)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=130</td>
<td>n=460</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kid age</td>
<td>20.77</td>
<td>20.59</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.95)</td>
<td>(1.90)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=129</td>
<td>n=459</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<=.10; ** p<=.05; *** p<=.01; **** p<=.001
Note: Standard Deviations in Parentheses
Table 3: Cross tabulation tables for Single Mother versus Two-Parent Households by Enrollment in a Four-Year College and selected Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count Column</th>
<th>Two-Parent</th>
<th>Single Mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearsons' Chi-Square=6.14</td>
<td>Sign.=.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phi=-.108</td>
<td>Sign.=.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearsons' Chi-Square=.455</td>
<td>Sign.=.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phi=.030</td>
<td>Sign.=.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearsons' Chi-Square=18.69</td>
<td>Sign.=.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phi=.196</td>
<td>Sign.=.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lambda=.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3: cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Two-Parent</th>
<th>Single Mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Race**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Column %</th>
<th>Single Mother</th>
<th>Phi</th>
<th>Sign.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Other&quot;</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>-0.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>(\Phi = -0.218)</td>
<td>(\text{Sign.} = .000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**White**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Column %</th>
<th>Single Mother</th>
<th>Phi</th>
<th>Sign.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>(\Phi = 0.000)</td>
<td>(\text{Sign.} = .000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Child Sex**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Sex</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Mother</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Parent</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Marital Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Single Mother</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Mother</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Parent</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count Column %</th>
<th>Two-Parent</th>
<th>Single Mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision (E1003B)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pearsons’ Chi-Square=3.72 Sign.=.292 Lambda=.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Never”</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Seldom”</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Sometimes”</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Very often”</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Simple Factorial ANOVA for the Effects of Parenting Practices on Mean Years of Education Completed

Analysis of Variance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Effects</th>
<th>F-Score</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>10.16</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covariates</th>
<th>F-Score</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity hrs</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotive</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1002D</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>21.02</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ. asp.</td>
<td>83.97</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple Classification Analysis:

Grand Mean for Years of Education Completed: 12.66 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status:</th>
<th>Adjusted for Means (Bivariate)</th>
<th>Adjusted for Independents and Covariates</th>
<th>Eta</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two-Parent (n=415)</td>
<td>12.79</td>
<td>12.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Mother (n=111)</td>
<td>12.37</td>
<td>12.41</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Decision Making:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Making:</th>
<th>Adjusted for Means (Bivariate)</th>
<th>Adjusted for Independents and Covariates</th>
<th>Eta</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never (n=39)</td>
<td>12.34</td>
<td>12.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom (n=75)</td>
<td>12.45</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes (n=272)</td>
<td>12.68</td>
<td>12.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often (n=140)</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple R Square:                             | .229                            |
Note: All means for education completed, in years, are adjusted.

Table 5: Simple Factorial ANOVA for the Effects of Economic Resources on Mean Years of Education Completed

Analysis of Variance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Effects:</th>
<th>F-Score:</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariates:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent’s SES</td>
<td>24.10</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R’s wrkhrs</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent’s inc</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple Classification Analysis:

Grand Mean for Years of Education Completed: 12.66 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty:</th>
<th>Adjusted for Means (Bivariate)</th>
<th>Adjusted for Independents and Covariates</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No (n=425)</td>
<td>12.76</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (n=49)</td>
<td>12.21</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple R Square: .080

Note: All means for education completed, in years, are adjusted.
### Table 6: Simple Factorial ANOVA for the Effects of Educational Factors on Mean Years of Education Completed

#### Analysis of Variance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Effects</th>
<th>F-Score</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Covariates:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covariates</th>
<th>F-Score</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grades</td>
<td>27.24</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent's educ.</td>
<td>15.47</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ. asp.</td>
<td>25.04</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Multiple Classification Analysis:

Grand Mean for Years of Education Completed: 12.66 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Adjusted for Means (Bivariate)</th>
<th>Adjusted for Independents and Covariates</th>
<th>Eta</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two-Parent</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td>12.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=415)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Mother</td>
<td>12.39</td>
<td>12.53</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=111)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple R Square: .230

Note: All means for education completed, in years, are adjusted.
Table 7: Factor Analysis of Parenting Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1: Emotional Involvement</th>
<th>Factor 2: Parental Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making (E1003B)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework Help (E1002D)</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotive (Capital)</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only factor loadings equal to or greater than +.50 are shown. As such, Activity Hours (loading .37 on Factor 1 and -.27 on factor 2) is excluded.

Table 8: Factor Analysis of Economic Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1: Tangible Income</th>
<th>Factor 2: Occupational Dynamics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>-.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent's inc.</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R's wrkhrs</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent's educ.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only factor loadings equal to or greater than +.50 are shown.
Table 9: Factor Analysis of Parenting Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1: Life Chances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>-.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent's Educ.</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only factor loadings equal to or greater than +.50 are shown.
Model 1
Model 2: Revised
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