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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Janice Smith lives in an urban area with her two small children, one four and one seven years old. They survive on a living standard below the federal poverty level through a combination of AFDC (Aid to Families with Dependent Children) payments, food stamps and Medicaid. Bob Smith left her and their children shortly after the younger one was born. Initially he made sporadic payments but has not been heard from for the last year or so. Mrs. Smith has looked for work but without a high school diploma and with almost no job experience, she is poor competition for jobs with training and advancement potential. The minimum wage jobs open to her pay about $80 a week (with payroll, but no income tax deductions). After meeting weekly child care costs of $50 and bus fare is not enough to cover the rent, let alone other basic needs, and the increased cost of food and transportation that she would incur working full time. She also realizes that a full time job would severely cut into her time with the children. She works over sixty hours a week now feeding and caring for them, and maintaining their small apartment. Most of her time goes into making the greatest possible use of the few goods that they can buy. Although this existence is a far cry from the way that Mrs. Smith would like her children to grow up, at least the AFDC payments are regular, they are getting by. Yet, the outlook for the future is grim. Mrs. Smith will probably always feel a day late and a dollar short, for she has learned that the amount of time and money required to raise children is greater than she and most other mothers can find.

This excerpt is from an article by Clair Vickery, entitled "Economics and the Single Mother Family". Although Mrs. Smith is fictitious, she represents the economic plight confronting a large proportion of the current 7.5 million female headed American families. Mrs. Smith's problem is not
an uncommon one.

The number of persons below the official poverty line in the United States has increased dramatically since 1980, rising from 30 to 34 million, or 15% of the population. Women and children have entered the ranks of the poor at a rate that greatly exceeds that observed for men or the aged. This trend has been accelerated by the recent decrease in the public aid programs aimed at poor women and children (Zinn and Sarri, 1985).

Poverty among children in the United States has become more acute, more visible, and more widespread as women's economic responsibility for themselves and their children has increased. This impoverishment is associated with the dramatic rise of single-parent female-headed households. While the rate of poverty among families headed by white males decreased by 51% between 1960 and 1981, the number of persons in poor female-headed families increased 54%. Among female-headed families with children under 18, 68% of the Black family members were poor, 67% of the Hispanics and 43% of white (Feldberg, 1985).

In the first half of the twentieth century the most frequent cause for the loss of the male parent was death, but in the second half of the century, the sharp increase in the number of female-headed families has primarily been the result of divorce, separation or desertion. When the family is thus broken, the pattern is
for the children to remain with the mother. Less than one half of one percent of all one-parent households with children are headed by a male parent (Dinnerman, 1977).

Not only are women and their dependent children the single largest group, they are also the major welfare recipient. Female family heads and their dependent children constitute over 80% of all AFDC (Aid to Families with Dependent Children) recipients, over half of all Food Stamp households, almost half of all recipients of free or reduced-priced school meals, 55% of the household receiving Medicaid, and over half of the nonaged residents of public housing (Rodgers, 1987).

Concern for the increase in the numbers of families on welfare rolls, and more importantly, the increase in costs and government spending, has given rise to welfare reform by the Reagan administration. Legislators and the general public call for reforming the program, so as to decrease federal spending and to decrease the number of families receiving public assistance.

One of the major issues in the continuing debate over welfare reform involves the relationship between the receipt of welfare benefits and employment (Chrissinger, 1980). Ever since the development of the Elizabethan Poor Laws, public policy has struggled to separate the able-bodied poor who should help themselves from those who are incapable of self-support, and who deserve public aid. In
this tradition, the Social Security Act defined three categories of people as eligible for public aid because of their inability to work: the old, the blind, and children deprived of the support of a parent (Dinnerman, 1977).

Later amendments to the act aided the caretaker parent as well, a further judgment not only that children could not and should not be self-supporting, but also that caring for them was a desirable occupation, precluding economic self-support by the caretaker. However, in 1971 President Nixon proposed Workfare, a program that formalized a turnabout in policy by requiring caretaker adults to be working or training for work in order to be eligible for Aid to Families with Dependent Children (Dinnerman, 1977).

This change in policy and the concern for the increasing welfare rolls from 1960 to 1972 have given rise to an increase in alternatives to welfare. Until recently, public assistance was seen as an income maintenance means of last resort, a necessity to be drawn upon when all other alternatives had failed. A contending and more current view asserts that there is an element of choice in the use of welfare. This concept is based on the notion that there are competing ways for low-income families to manage their maintenance function; welfare is only one of these ways, and work is another (Rein, 1982).

While income maintenance strategies have addressed problems of poverty and income inequality, they have not
considered the capability of the disadvantaged to achieve economic independence. Barriers to employability of welfare and low-income persons have not been adequately assessed or remedied. Many of the persons, facing the dilemma of making the choice between welfare or work, are single female head of households, with little prior work experience, job skills, or labor market familiarity. Real barriers to employability exist for these women, some of which can be corrected via a regimen of training and improvement of existing skills, and others which are more difficult to ascertain and correct. These barriers must be overcome before individuals can be expected to benefit from any program designed to reduce their dependence on welfare (Wilson, Steinberg and Kulik, 1980).

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Within the last few years the employment of AFDC mothers has become an issue. When the AFDC program started in 1935, most recipients were children of widows, and like its predecessor, Mother's Pensions, the program had the explicit function of keeping the mother out of the labor force and in the home to better raise her fatherless children. Early studies of AFDC children indicated that the primary interest was the welfare or progress of AFDC children, who together with their widowed mothers clearly comprised a segment of the deserving poor. In fact, the
progress made by the children in the recipient homes was attributed to the beneficial effects of stable income from AFDC, and continuous periods of assistance were considered desirable for their welfare (Rein, 1972).

Over the years, however, in the population at large, it has become more and more acceptable for women, including mothers to work outside the home. In 1970, 43 percent of all U.S. women were in the labor force, as contrasted with only 38 percent in 1960 (Rein, 1972). American women for many years have sustained high rates of participation in the labor market, even those with small children at home. The rates for non-white women have been and are particularly high. In 1967, for instance, of all women in the population from 18 to 64 years old, almost half (47.6%) were either working or looking for work. Among non-white women 56.2 percent between 18 and 64 were in the labor force (U.S. Dept. of Labor, 1972).

The 27 million women 14 years of age and over, who were working in March 1966, included 10 million mothers with children under 18 years of age. Among them, 3.8 million had children under six and 2.1 million had children under three years of age. Furthermore, 34.3 percent of the white and 47.7 percent of the non-white mothers were in the labor force. In March 1967, 42 percent of non-white and 25 percent of the white mothers with children under six years of age were working or seeking work (U.S. Dept. of Labor, 1972).
Studies of labor supply or the amount of time an individual spends in market work, generally focus on males or married women. However, several demographic changes in the 1970s call this focus into question. The proportion of all families headed by women rose from 12 to 15 percent in the last decade, with 41 percent of Black families now headed by women (Coverman and Kemp, 1987). A high proportion of both adults and children in female-headed households, relative to those in all households, live in poverty; there is a 35.6 percent poverty rate for persons in female-headed households as compared to a 10 percent poverty rate for persons in all families. Further, 50.6 percent of children in female-headed households live in poverty, compared to 15.7 percent in all families (Coverman and Kemp, 1987).

The poverty that characterizes families headed by women had been attributed, at least in part, to the limited work hours of these women (Coverman and Kemp, 1987). Given female family heads' family and economic situation, their labor force experience should be distinct from those of both men and married women.

The working mother who heads a family carries a heavier burden than the mother who is only a secondary wage earner in the family. Furthermore, having a job, even a regular one, is no guarantee to the woman who heads a family that she can earn enough to support herself and her dependents at a minimally adequate level (Carter, 1968).
Whether family income is sufficient to provide for
even a minimum adequate level of living depends on the level
and regularity of that income and the number of family
members, both children and adults, who must be provided for
out of it. However, if the sole burden of earning income for
the family falls on the marginally skilled woman, her hope
for reaching a satisfactory level of living is dim until her
income is considerably increased by work training or the
income she earns is supplemented with public
assistance (Carter, 1968).

The family's income may be inadequate not only
because of the kind of job the mother holds but also because
she must meet work related expenses from her earnings. The
major expense is probably the cost of child care. Other
expenses may include the cost of transportation and work
clothes. In fact, a working mother may pay from one-fourth
to one-half of her gross wages to make it possible to go to
work (U.S. Dept. of Labor, 1967). The time the mother who does
not work can give to careful household management in
shopping, meal preparation and the care of clothing
represents possible savings for the family and another
economic gain over the working mother who heads a
family (Carter, 1968).

Breakdown in provisions for child care or the
health of the mother seem to be the major reason why single
mothers drop out of job training as well as employment.
Continuity in the availability of the job and in personal and family conditions are equally essential to avoid the pattern of intermittent employment. When continuity is assured on the job and in the home situation, the opportunity for upward mobility and job progression through training are additional incentives for the single working mother (Carter, 1968).

However, one must question what it means to be gainfully employed for the single female head of household. What considerations must the female head of household take into account when making the decision to enter the labor market, and more importantly, what barriers or obstacles must she overcome, in order to provide for all of the basic necessities and expenses she must face as an employed single parent?

A number of recent studies have examined the apparent influence of earning potential, family income and the presence of pre-school age children on how much time women spend in the labor force. Despite these efforts, however, we remain painfully ignorant of the saliency of different barriers to the labor force participation of women, especially poor women, who remain outside the labor force. Therefore, this study will examine selected barriers to the employment of single female head of households.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY
The purpose of this study is to determine the relationship of four factors or variables to the employment activity of single female head of households. These variables are as follows: educational level, cost and availability of child care, health of family members and welfare dependence among family members. The following terms utilized in this study have been operationalized as indicated below:

**Employment Activity:** The number of jobs held since the birth of the first child.

**Educational Level:** The highest grade completed.

**Day Care:** The cost and availability of services provided by a day care center or friends/relatives for the care of children while the mother is working.

**Health of Family Members:** Illness or disability of the mother or family members that prevent labor market participation.

**Welfare Dependence Among Family Members:** Receipt of welfare benefits by the parents or the siblings of the single female head of household in the past or at the present time.

**STATEMENT OF HYPOTHESES**

There is no significant relationship between educational level and the employment activity of single female head of households.

There is no significant relationship between cost and availability of child care and the employment activity of single female head of households.

There is no significant relationship between health of family members and the employment activity of single female head of households.

There is no significant relationship between welfare dependence among family members and the employment activity of single female head of households.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Literature available on studies investigating the employment barriers which impact single female head of households is somewhat limited. There appears to be a dearth of literature regarding single female family heads. Although researchers and social scientists have studied the growing numbers of this group, little attention has been given to the problems facing single women with families. Literature examining the problems is virtually non-existent, as most studies have been limited to men and married women.

Recently much attention has been given to issues, such as comparable worth, welfare reform and the feminization of poverty. However, little emphasis has been placed on evaluating the impact of those forces (such as adequate and affordable day care, transportation costs) that impact single mothers as they face decisions about seeking employment.

Barriers to the employment of single female family heads have not been studied collectively or otherwise, therefore each of the variables selected for this study will be examined individually. For the purpose of logical presentation, the review of the literature has been divided
into four subheadings: (1) educational level and the employment activity of single female head of households, (2) child care and the employment activity of single female head of households, (3) health of family members and the employment activity of single female head of households, and (4) welfare dependency among family members and the employment activity of single female head of households.

**Educational Level**

It has been noted that formal education, translated into job skills that are further represented in occupational level is a factor that influences labor force attachment. The extent to which this is true among single female head of households and how it is expressed will be examined and further clarified by this study.

The level of education, for instance unquestionably, is a barrier for many single mothers. A study on the employment activity of AFDC recipients in Michigan indicated that seven out of ten AFDC mothers had less than a high school education. It also pointed out that a significant number read and write at the grade school level or both. For some, the time for remedial action may be long past and others may have decided on their own that the expected pay-off of additional schooling does not merit the personal effort involved. However, for a substantial number, particularly those who are younger and with fewer children,
completion of additional schooling may be the single most important factor, in increasing labor force participation (Goodwin, 1969).

Smith and Ulusan (1982), stated that most often basic education and high school equivalency courses are available to single female head of households, in their communities, at no or very low cost, with adequate space and are offered during the daytime hours. While this would seem to ensure maximum use, it does not. They contend that part of the reason may simply be a lack of emphasis or information on the part of casework staff, or single female head of households may not have the time, motivation or means for transportation.

According to Levitan, Rein and Marvick (1972), the median educational attainment of single female head of households increased between 1961 and 1971 from less than nine years to more than ten years. However, they still trailed by two years of other adult females. Furthermore, the proportion who had completed eight or fewer years of schooling declined from 56 percent to 31 percent. While education is viewed by economist as an investment in human capitol, that is suppose to lead to improvement in earnings ability, the added educational attainment of single female head of households does not necessarily result in rising returns. Moreover, they contend that Blacks benefit substantially less than whites from education and that in
urban ghettos the returns to nonwhites are extremely small, neither increasing nor decreasing unemployment.

For example, Levitan, Rein and Marvick (1972) pointed out that white female family heads experienced less unemployment, worked in better paying occupations and accordingly, were less likely to be in poverty if they were in the work force. In March 1970, almost twice as many Black female family heads with minor children were unemployed, as among whites. The average weekly earnings of sixteen to forty-four year old female family heads were nearly one-fifteen better for whites than for nonwhites, this differential held true for all educational levels. Not only were nonwhite female family heads more likely to work in lower paying occupations, but within every occupation they were more likely to be poor.

Faced with more and lengthier periods of unemployment, fewer Black female family heads worked full time, but more worked full time for at least half of the year or part time year round. Similarly, among female family heads, nonwhites were about 50 percent more likely to work than whites. For each level of labor force effort, Blacks were far more likely to be in poverty. Thus, because of more unemployment and lower earnings for each occupation and educational level, nonwhite female family heads are about twice as likely to be poor. They are also about twice as likely to receive AFDC as whites (Levitan, Rein and
According to a study conducted in 1967, AFDC mothers were somewhat better educated than nonworking mothers, in that slightly fewer had less than 12 years of education and slightly more were high-school graduates (U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, 1970). Similarly, Goodman (1972) found that women on AFDC are more likely to work and are more likely to work if they have had more education. His study concluded that the proportion of women who did not work during the 37-month period studied went down as educational achievement went up. However, an exception to this relationship was seen in those women who worked during the entire 37-month period. That the latter proportion did not vary with education gives further evidence of the persistence of labor force attachment.

Although more-educated women are more likely to work more and more likely to work full time, higher education does not necessarily determine the occupational bracket. As a group, working mothers had more education than AFDC mothers as a whole, but, nevertheless, they were more likely to consider themselves domestic workers. Simultaneously, the data from a 1967 characteristics survey showed that fairly well-educated women (high school graduates and above) did a substantial amount of domestic work and that being in domestic work was just as probable as being at the professional level (U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and
Welfare, 1970). Also the Camden study supported this finding. Among those respondents, there was no correlation between education and earnings. The study concluded that education influenced the decision to enter the working world but either does not encourage them (mothers) to work more regularly or does not provide access to higher paying jobs (Klausner, 1972).

Obviously, a group of female family heads who encounter such pervasive unfavorable conditions will be less able to earn enough to avoid welfare dependency. Consequently, as the proportion of nonwhites increases, the earning potential and capacity for self-support declines among female family heads.

**Child Care**

One of the most critical needs of parents who want or need to be employed or to enter educational or job training programs is adequate and affordable child care. The demand for child care continues to be very high and can be expected to increase in the future. The population of children under six is expected to grow from 19.6 million in 1980 to 22.9 million in 1990. The number of children under ten in single-parent households was also expected to increase from six to nine million during this period and of course, women both married and unmarried were increasing their participation in the work force. Over half of all
single mothers were employed and by the early 1990s over half of all married mothers with young children are expected to be employed (Rodgers, 1987).

A study conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau, revealed that many mothers reported that they would enter the job market if child care were available. This included 26 percent of all mothers not in the job market. This figure increased to 36 percent of all women in a household with an annual income below $15,000, and 45 percent of single mothers. Additionally, 21 percent of all mothers working part time said they would increase their work hours if they could obtain child care (Rodgers, 1987).

The presence of young children was the most obvious barrier to the employment for all mothers and certainly no less a problem for single female head of households. According to Levitan, Rein and Marvick (1972), of all married women, husband present, with children under three, 27 percent were in the labor force. Furthermore, of single female head of households with children under three, some 14 percent were in training or at work; when the unemployed were included, the participation rate approached 18 percent. They also pointed out that it has become increasing acceptable for mothers to leave their children in another's care while they work. For some mothers, however, the limited supply of day care facilities was a severe constraint on their ability to work outside the home.
Levitan, Rein, and Marvick (1972) further point out that of every eight AFDC mothers in 1971, about five had a child under six, another two had no child under six but one under thirteen, the balance had only children over thirteen. They contend that more than 60 percent of the mothers might need full time, year-round day care if they were to work; and another quarter might need day care in the afternoon during the school year and all day during the summer.

However, according to Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) estimates, the total capacity of licensed day care centers and family day care homes in 1971 was only 750,000. In the same year, there were 23 million AFDC children under six, who presumably would need full time care and another 2.8 million between six and twelve requiring part time care, if their mothers were not available to care for them. Additionally, licensed facilities fall far short of being able to accommodate the children of single female head of households, and of course, another thirteen million working mothers might be competing for such facilities.

Nevertheless, the mothers of nearly 26 million minor children, including six million under six years of age were working in March 1970. Rein (1982), stated that these working mothers have accommodated themselves in a variety of ways to the paucity and cost of licensed facilities. She stated that the amount and type of child care arrangements used depended primarily on the number and age of the
children, and on the availability of relatives to provide inexpensive services. She pointed out further that of all employed mothers, ages 30 to 44, with minor children, who participated in a national survey, only two in five reported the need to make regular child care arrangements. However, of the single mothers with children under six, the proportion rose to seven in ten. Few of the mothers surveyed used facilities that were licensed. Only one single mother in eleven used a child care center. The others used equally, relatives and non relatives, in either the child's or the caretaker's home. This informal arrangement, which was not subject to licensing, constituted the bulk of child care.

However, because preschool children must be supervised for a larger part of the day and also more carefully, daily cost rise substantially when a child under six is present. Costs of child care also depend more heavily on the availability of relatives and others who can provide free services than on the type of services. Rein(1982) observed that for those who paid child care in 1977, daily cost ranged from $2.50 to $3.50 for care by a relative, from $3.00 to more than $4.00 for care provided by a non-relative, and to about $2.75 for school or group care center.

Furthermore, expenditures for child care also rise with earnings. Not only can parents with higher incomes
afford to spend more money, but better paying jobs may require more reliable, more consistent and longer care. Black mothers spend significantly less on child care than do white mothers. Not only are their incomes lower but they are also more likely to have access to relatives who will provide services without charge. Furthermore, reflecting their lower earnings, Black mothers are forced to choose less expensive forms of care and have lower costs for each type of child care arrangements (Levitan, Rein and Marvick, 1972).

Largely, because the potential demand is so much greater than the available supply, child care has been and continues to be the panacea for the employment problems of single female head of households. Emphasizing the scarcity of child care facilities, however, may divert attention from the ability of these mothers to locate services on their own. A single mother's willingness to bear the cost of leaving her children depend largely on the expected benefits of doing so, especially on the potential earnings.

Health

Health problems can be an important impediment to employment, which may or may not be correctable in the short run. All public assistance groups are provided the range of services offered through Medicaid, but does not include routine, preventative types of care. AFDC recipients are
also eligible for free physical examinations in connection with assessment of employability which may lead to early detection of major health problems. However, many single female family heads have had difficulty finding a physician who will accept them as patients, given past experience with the Medicaid system (Smith and Ulusan, 1980).

Poor health is another handicap to employment for single female head of households who are poor. The health problems of poor people, reinforced by inadequate diet, poor housing and deficient medical care, are well documented. A nutrition study conducted by HEW in ten states found that persons below the poverty line were twice as likely to be low or deficient in several important nutrition criteria, including hemoglobin, that may lead to anemia (Smith and Ulusan, 1982). Similarly, a study of labor force participation in New York City poverty areas found that the incidence of disability or ill health was substantially higher than nationally of the population twenty-five and older, 10 percent of all men and 15 percent of all women in the poverty areas were not participating in the labor force because of health problems, as compared with four percent of the men and nine percent of the women for the rest of the population (Levitan, Rein and Marvick, 1972).

However, the impact of ill health on labor force participation by single female head of households is difficult to assess. According to Rein (1982), in response to
a HEW survey, about one in every nine mothers cited physical or mental incapacity as the primary reason for not being in the labor force. A study conducted by Social and Rehabilitation Service also found that about two mothers in five answered yes to the question, are there some kinds of jobs you cannot get because of your health, and yes to the question, does your health keep you from working altogether (Levitan, Rein and Marvick, 1977).

Most studies that assess the employability of single female heads of households have considered the presence and degree of physical limitations as a factor related to an individual's probability of seeking and obtaining employment. What has been most disturbing about the research has been its failure to sort out the relative significance of ill health as a causal factor in poverty. Clearly, inability to sustain adequate employment because of health limitations has a good deal to do with welfare dependency and poverty. Nevertheless, there is considerable support for the opposite argument that the correlates of poverty themselves provide a causal line to illness (Sanger, 1982).

Much of the data on the incidence of health conditions that limit employment among single mothers on welfare came from surveys made of welfare recipients. In fact, knowledge about the seriousness of health problems among the welfare poor is generally dependent upon their
self-assessments. There has been considerable skepticism about the accuracy of these data because there is reason to believe that recipients may see illness as a justification or rationalization of their unemployed status, rather than as the objective cause. Some researchers have argued that there may be a considerable unconscious need among welfare recipients to define their unemployment as health determined because society views illness and disability more sympathetically and sees it more legitimate than failure to work (Sanger, 1982).

Sources of knowledge and appropriate techniques on objective health indicators are still very limited. Nevertheless, the issues related to the health status of the welfare poor appear to be so important in understanding their dependency that review and analysis of the best indicators and explanations are necessary. Whether ill health is a cause of continued and persistent dependency or its results, its incidence has a great deal to do with the work and welfare patterns of the population at risk. The provision and use of health care services will in part indicate the present and future employment patterns of AFDC families. To be sure, the use of such services has considerable impact on the future health status of the heads of recipients families and more importantly, of their children. Medical problems are very frequently cited as the reason for the opening of welfare cases. Also, recent
research has identified convincing links between health and achievement in school. Clearly, educational success has important implications for the employment status and later levels of economic well-being of families. Health may best be seen as one critical intervening variable of the many that relate to work and welfare (Sanger, 1982).

Welfare Dependence

Some people argue that being on welfare leads to a change in attitudes and values, such as loss of motivation to achieve and loss of sense of control over one's life, which feeds back into a cycle of dependence. Others argue that such attitudes are passed on from one generation to the next, which leads to dependence among the offspring of welfare recipients.

The latter argument is quite similar to the culture of poverty thesis outlined by Lewis in his classic case study of poor Puerto Rico families living in the slums. Lewis noted that once poverty comes into existence, it tends to perpetuate itself from generation to generation because of its effects on children. By the time slum children are age six or seven, they have usually absorbed the basic values and attitudes of their subculture and are not psychologically geared to take full advantage of changing conditions or increased opportunities which may occur in their lifetimes (Lewis, 1966).
What was originally given as an explanation for the persistence of poverty is now given as an explanation for the persistence of dependency. In a recent study of participants in a Supported Work Program, Auletta (1982), described what he called the behavioral deficiencies of the underclass in America. He concluded that the underclass, which is made up of street criminals, hustlers, welfare dependent mothers and the chronically ill, operates outside the mainstream of commonly accepted values and is responsible for a disproportionate amount of the crime, the welfare costs, the unemployment and the hostility that beset many Americans.

He further stated that to support the culture of dependence argument, at least two sets of relations must be demonstrated. First, it must be shown that a particular set of attitudes reduces economic mobility in adults or offspring and second it must be shown that being on welfare produces such attitudes. With regard to the former, several researchers have demonstrated that future mobility is related to feelings of efficacy, that is a sense of control over one's life. Andrisani (1968) for example, reported that higher efficacy led to economic progress in both young and middle-aged adults. Similarly, Hill and her colleagues (1983) showed that both efficacy and motivation to achieve are related to certain kinds of mobility. Although Hill and her colleagues concluded that overall attitudes had only a small
effect on future achievement, compared with the effect of achievement on attitudes, their results indicated that efficacy in particular is related to a number of critical outcomes. For example, they showed that Black women with high efficacy are about 20 percent more likely to work their way out of welfare than those with low efficacy, and that white and Black daughters of parents with high efficacy are about 50 percent less likely to go on welfare than daughters of parents with low efficacy.

Evidence for the belief that being on welfare leads to decline in efficacy is much weaker. Although numerous studies have shown that welfare recipients have lower self-esteem and lower efficacy than non-recipients, the studies have not proved that welfare caused such attitudes. People who go on welfare could have been worse off to begin with. Researchers need to examine changes in self esteem and efficacy subsequent to a person's going on welfare. Until recently, very little has been done in this area; moreover, the studies that have been done reported conflicting results. O'Niell and her colleagues (1984), observed that there is nothing to indicate that experience with AFDC causes significant changes in personal efficacy. In contrast, Nicholas-Casebolt (1985), found that going on welfare was associated with declines in efficacy among Black women but not among white women. Somewhat surprisingly, he also found that going on welfare increased self-esteem,
which is counter to what theories of stigma would have predicted.

Researchers have also examined the concept of welfare dependence from a cultural or subcultural perspective. Many observers of lower-class life have noted the intensity of interaction in a lower class neighborhood. Kronick (1963) found this high degree of social intercourse in two-thirds of her sample. She stated that troubles are shared, help is given and knowledge is transmitted. Knowledge about welfare permeates this kind of community. She goes on to say that information regarding welfare assistance is so pervasive in this population that a single referral service cannot be isolated. The availability of AFDC as a resource is known, not only because of high interaction and communication, but also because of high use. In describing a ghetto community, Valentine (1968) also shared a similar view. He stated that every welfare check day truly galvanizes Blackston first with expectation, then with delayed commercial and credit transactions, and finally with celebration. He furthered stated that if those who benefit indirectly are included, there can be little doubt that a majority of our African-American population and perhaps of the whole community, gain some portion of their livelihood from the welfare system. Welfare is not only known and used but also accepted.

In addition to the culture around which harbors a
great deal of knowledge and use of welfare, also there is
the culture above, which is expressed in the concept of
intergenerational dependency on welfare. Both the horizontal
and the vertical elements of culture are pertinent to the
transmission of a welfare culture. In this respect,
Hannerz(1969), paraphrasing Oscar Lewis, stated that slum
children soon absorb the values and attitudes of their
subculture so that they may not be able later to take
advantage of increased opportunities and that once the
culture of poverty comes into existence, it tends to
perpetuate itself in new generations.

Indeed, to the extent that people currently on
welfare have parents who have been on welfare, this
proposition can be documented. Rein(1972), in a Greenleigh
study conducted in 1964 concluded that over 43 percent of
the families then on AFDC had parents who were dependent at
some time. Similarly Podell(1967) concluded in his study of
AFDC recipients in New York City, that 15 percent of the
mothers on welfare reported that their parents had been
assisted at some time. His study also found that about one-
fourth of the mothers on welfare had at least one sibling on
welfare at the time of the study. Burgess and Price(1963)
also concluded from a national study that 40 percent of the
adults in their AFDC sample had been reared in homes in
which some form of public assistance was received at some
time.
From these accounts, it seems welfare is both familiar and acceptable in many lower-class communities. The alleged stigma that supposedly acts as a deterrent to the use of welfare in some types of areas may not be a pertinent factor here. There is a difference between stigma from the overall community and stigma from one's own community, particularly if it is a ghetto community. Although stigma may flow from the outside community to the welfare recipient, the effect may be nullified by the lack of stigma in the immediate environment (Rein, 1972).

The extent to which work for women is a community norm in the same way that welfare appears to be in ghetto areas, is not clear. Goodman (1972), attempted to correlate welfare stigma with employment on the basis of the notion that AFDC recipients may not work because welfare is an acceptable alternative (not stigmatizing) or that they do work because welfare is stigmatizing. He concluded that the amount of employment was not positively correlated with the feeling that receiving welfare is socially stigmatizing.

Furthermore, Rein (1972) states that although the work effort among AFDC and potential AFDC recipients appears not to be affected by the acceptability of welfare, such acceptability should have a significant impact on the use of welfare.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In the review of the literature, it is apparent
that there are several theories that comprise the conceptual framework of this study. Although many theories have been developed to explain causes of poverty, welfare dependency and unemployment, this researcher is of the opinion that the most appropriate theories to help explain variation in the dependent variable are: Dual Labor Market Theory, Psychological Theory of Control and the Cultural Theory of Poverty.

**Dual Labor Market Theory**

Dual labor market theorists have specifically addressed the phenomena of poverty and unemployment and underemployment, and maintain that a dual or split market best accounts for these social phenomena. According to the Dual Labor Market Theory, the market consists of a primary and secondary market, that are both distinguished by job and individual type characteristics. The primary sector contains the privileged positions in the labor force and is governed by good working conditions, high pay, job security and mobility. Conducive personality traits for the primary sector include a high degree of work discipline and reliability. Jobs in the secondary sector do not require much skill, training and credential specifications. In addition, there is little chance for high pay, upward mobility, and job security in this sector (Thomas and Scott, 1979).
Watchel, Betsy (1975) and other dual labor market theorists have noted that youth, racial minorities and females are disproportionately represented in the secondary labor market, largely as a result of employers' biases and labor market discrimination. These theorists have hypothesized that (1) individuals channeled into the secondary market develop and display over time, traits and behavior commensurate with secondary job characteristics; (2) certain workers who do qualify for primary market jobs lack access to these jobs because employers view the ascriptive characteristics of these workers as better suited for secondary jobs; and (3) that racial minorities, females and the urban poor in general have not obtained gainful employment and earnings commensurate with their acquired stock of human capital.

Dual labor market theorists also argue that structural elements of inequality influence the positioning of groups in the social structure. Therefore, in explaining the disadvantageous position of single female family heads in the labor market, these theorists argue that being Black, being female and being of low socioeconomic status are liabilities which employers often use as mechanisms for limiting the employment opportunities of this group and controlling the labor markets (Thomas and Scott, 1979).

Furthermore, dual labor market theorists argue that the division, created by the primary and secondary
sectors in the labor market, forces people to circulate between employment and unemployment within either the primary or secondary sectors, but not between sectors, thus making permanent the inequality of opportunity and achievement between the two worlds (Thomas and Scott, 1979).

The disparity, they argue, in the treatment between the primary and secondary sectors, is more than a matter of remuneration or eligibility. It derives from fundamentally different conceptions of men workers and women workers. Men who are disadvantaged by factors such as imports and recessions should be compensated in a way that will facilitate their readjustment, via training, relocation and further education. That is, they have a right to the opportunity of good self-supporting jobs. In contrast, women who are disadvantaged because of divorce, poor vocational training or preparation or low education, should be helped or forced to take any job and any child day-care, as quickly as possible, even if the job does not provide them with sufficient income to support themselves and their children (Watchel, 1974).

Psychological Theory of Control

The psychological theory of control predicts two phases of response: the first phase would be reactance and the second, if loss of control persists, learned helplessness. According to reactance theory, developed by
Brehm in the mid-1960s, individuals react to loss of control by vigorously attempting to regain it. An individual becomes aggressive in trying to regain a sense of mastery over the environment. The degree of reactance a person exhibits depends on the individual's prior expectation of control. The more a person expects to have the freedom of choosing his or her own destiny, the more strongly he or she will react to regain control (Brehm, 1981).

According to this theory two parameters appear to be important: first, one's prior expectation of control and second, the duration of the experience of loss of control. People should respond with reactance only when they have expectations of control. As time passes, if more information becomes available that confirms the fact that outcome is uncontrollable, helplessness would eventually develop (Brehm, 1981).

Seligman and others, in developing the learned helplessness model, hypothesized that repeated experience with uncontrollable outcomes interferes with people's ability to seek out and recognize opportunities for exercising control. Learned helplessness implies a motivational deficit (people come to believe action is futile), cognitive interference (people will have difficulty learning that action can produce favorable results in new situations), and an affective reaction (depression or resignation). Further, Langer has shown that the perception
of helplessness can be inferred from the environment without
direct experience of failure. Aware of being labeled
helpless, inferior or incompetent, people may assume
helpless behavior even without first experiencing
failure (Jahoda, 1982).

Furthermore, the theorists contend that repeated experience with the lack of control or being labeled as incompetent makes it less likely that people will recognize potentially effective actions later. Perceived helplessness in one situation may generate to other spheres of action. The woman who is repeatedly turned down in seeking a job is often less likely to look for jobs in the future because she lacks a sense of efficacy or control.

People's attributions of causality for lack of control, whether it be to internal deficits, such as, skill or ability or to external forces, such as, luck, will have implications for generalizability and persistence. If the internal factor one blames is something permanent, such as intelligence, the learned helplessness would be more general and persistent. On the other hand, if the reason for failure is perceived to be external and specific to a particular situation, such as, the bias of a specific personnel manager, then the degree of generalization and persistence would be minimal. In Goodban's study of teenage mothers on welfare, those who blamed themselves for their loss of control were more likely to exhibit the learned
helplessness response, never disagreeing with their caseworkers and being unwilling to join a welfare rights group to press other demands (Jahoda, 1982).

Culture of Poverty Theory

The culture of poverty theorists refer to the lives of the poor, or at least many of the urban poor, in the United States, who are seen as being different from the non-poor, not only economically, but in many other respects as well. Their being different or deviant, with respect to a whole set of patterns of behaviors, sets them apart basically from the rest of the society. According to the cultural perspective on poverty, the lower class is seen as manifesting patterns of behavior and values which are characteristically different from those of the dominant society and culture. Moreover, these unique patterns of behavior and values are transmitted intergenerationally through socialization and have become the subcultural determinants of the lower socioeconomic status of the poor (Waxman, 1986).

These theories viewed in conjunction with one another will help researchers better understand the variation among single female head of households and the employment barriers they face in terms of education, child care, family health and family welfare dependence.
LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

1. The study was limited to eligible participants in Project Self-Sufficiency.

2. The study was limited too single female head of households that resided in the city of Atlanta.
CHAPTER III

Methodology

Research and Design

The research design employed was a correlational design. Correlational studies include all those research projects in which an attempt is made to discover or clarify relationships through the use of correlational coefficients (which express in mathematical terms the degree of relationship between two variables. The design reveals the extent to which the dependent variable is affected by the independent variable.

Sampling

The sample in this study is comprised of 30 single female heads of household that participated in Project Self-Sufficiency during Fiscal Year 1988. Project Self-Sufficiency was a community-based multipurpose, educational and counseling program, designed to serve single female heads of household, who were eligible for Section (8) housing. The Project was located in Atlanta, Georgia, which is a large metropolitan city.

The subject pool consisted of all single female heads
of household that were eligible for participation in Project Self-Sufficiency. The participants were selected by using convenience sampling. This involves taking whatever elements are readily available to the researcher. The researcher acknowledges the possible limitations of generalizability, for it tends to reduce the utility of the findings based on availability samples. However, this sampling style proved to be the most economical.

The data was collected between June 1, 1988 and June 30, 1988 and the following procedures were used in carrying out this research project:

A. The researcher and the subjects entered into a verbal agreement to carry out the research project.

B. All subjects were informed that the research project would begin on June 1, 1988.

C. Questionnaires were mailed with a stamped self-addressed envelope to each subject in the research project on June 1, 1988.

D. All questionnaires were returned by June 30, 1988.

E. All questionnaires were examined by the researcher to determine that all items were complete and correct.

F. The research period was then terminated.

Instrumentation

The instrument used to collect the data for this research project was a questionnaire designed by the researcher. The questionnaire was pilot-tested, for validity and reliability, by the researcher, through the assistance of 10 graduate students in the Atlanta School of
Social Work. The questionnaire was then mailed to the 30 single female heads of households participating in the research study. The instrument consisted of thirty-nine items pertaining to educational level, cost and availability of child care, health of family members and welfare dependency among family members.

**Statistical Analysis**

For the purpose of this study, Frequency Analysis, Measures of Central Tendency and Measures of Variability were used in the analysis of the data. Specifically, Chi Square ($x^2$) and Cramer's V (V) were used to test the significance for the differences between the dependent and independent variables. Chi Square is a nonparametric test of significance for differences between two or more samples, whereby expected frequencies are compared against obtained frequencies. The values range from .05 to .01 level of confidence. Cramer's V is an alternative to the contingency coefficient which measures the degree of association for nominal data.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This Chapter is organized in five sections. Section A provides the results on Demographic Information, Section B provides results on Employment History, Section C provides results on Day Care, Section D provides results on Family Health and Section E provides results on Family Welfare Dependency.

The nonparametric statistics used were Chi Square and Cramer's V, in examining the significance between the dependent variable, employment activity and the independent variables, educational level, availability and cost of child care, health of family members and welfare dependence among family members.

Frequency analysis and percentages were also used in Tables 3.0 through 3.27 showing the results of the data collected. Crosstabulations were utilized as indicated in Tables 3.28 through 3.35 to show the significance of the relationships between the dependent and independent variables. These results are included in each of the five sections mentioned above.

Section A

Single Female Head of Households Demographic Characteristics
Age

As shown in Table 3.0, of 30 single female head of households, eight (or 26.7%) reported that they were 20-21, 10 (or 33.3%) reported that they were 22-23, 10 (or 33.3%) reported that they were 24-25, one (or 3.3%) reported that they were 26-27, and one (or 3.3%) reported that they were 30-31. Therefore, the average single female head of household reported that they were between 20-23 years of age.

Marital Status

As shown in Table 3.1, of 30 single female head of households, 25 (or 83.3%) reported that they were single and never married, two (or 6.7%) reported that they were separated, and two (or 6.7%) reported that they were divorced. Meanwhile, one (or 3.3%) did not respond to this question. Therefore the average single female head of household reported that they were single and never married.

Number of Children

As shown in Table 3.2, of 30 single female head of households, one (or 3.3%) reported that they were expecting their first child, 25 (or 83.3%) reported having 1-2 children, three (or 10%) reported having 3-4 children and one (or 3.3%) reported having 5-6 children. Therefore, the average single female head of household reported having 1-2 children.
### Table 3.0
Percent Distribution of Female Head of Household by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE LABEL</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N=30</td>
<td>99.9 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percent does not equal 100 due to rounding.

### Table 3.1
Percent Distribution of Female Head of Household by Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE LABEL</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N=30</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.2
Percent Distribution of Female Head of Household by Number of Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE LABEL</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st pregnancy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N=30</td>
<td>99.9 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percent does not equal 100 due to rounding.
Age of Youngest Child

As shown in Table 3.3, of 30 single female head of households, four (or 13.3%) reported that their youngest child was less than 12 months old, nine (or 30%) reported that their youngest child was age 1-2, 12 (or 40%) reported that their youngest child was age 3-4, three (or 10%) reported that their youngest child was age 5-6, and two (or 6.7%) reported that their youngest child was age 7-8. Therefore, the average single female head of household reported that their youngest child was between 3 and 4 years of age.

Educational Level

As shown in Table 3.4, of 30 single female head of households, 10 (or 33.3%) reported having less than a high school education, 15 (or 50%) reported having earned a high school diploma and four (or 13.3%) reported that they had some college. Meanwhile, one (or 3.3%) did not respond to this question. Therefore, the average single female head of household reported having a high school diploma.

Source of Income

Of the 30 single female head of households, 26 (or 86.7%) reported receiving their monthly income from AFDC, and four (13.3%) reported receiving their monthly income from earnings. Therefore, the average single female head of household reported receiving their monthly income from AFDC.
Table 3.3
Percent Distribution of Female Head of Household by Age of Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE LABEL</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age of Youngest</td>
<td>Less than 12 mnths.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N=30</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4
Percent Distribution of Female Head of Household by Educational Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE LABEL</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate/junior college</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N=30</td>
<td>99.9 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percent does not equal 100 due to rounding.

Table 3.5
Percent Distribution of Female Head of Household by Job Training Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE LABEL</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Training</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N=30</td>
<td>99.9 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percent does not equal 100 due to rounding.
Family Structure

The 30 single female heads of household who participated in this study reported that neither parents nor other relatives lived with them.

Job Training Participation

As shown in Table 3.5, of 30 single female head of households, 10 (or 33.3%) reported that they were participating in a job training program and 19 (or 63.3%) reported that they were not participating in a job training program. Meanwhile, one (or 3.3%) did not respond to this question. Therefore, the average single female head of household reported that they were not participating in a job training program.

Hypothesis 1. There is no significant relationship between the employment activity of single female head of households and educational level.

To test this hypothesis, a crosstabulation was performed using the SPSSX batch system, to determine the relationship between the employment activity of single female head of households and educational level. The results of the statistical analysis, as indicated in Table 3.28, showed chi square, $x^2 = 5.43$; degrees of freedom, df = 8; and the level of significance, $p < 0.05$. Thus, we would accept the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between the employment activity of single female head of households and educational level. Therefore, there appears to be no relationship between employment activity of single
Table 3.28
Crosstabulation Showing Day Care Availability and Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational level</th>
<th>Zero</th>
<th>One</th>
<th>Two</th>
<th>Three</th>
<th>Four</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate/junior college</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 5.44,\; \text{df} = 8,\; p < 0.05,\; \text{Cramer's V} =$
female head of households and educational level.

Summary - Section A

In summary, the average single female head of household reported that they were 20-23 years of age, single, never married, had 1-2 children with the youngest aged 3-4 and had earned a high school diploma. In addition, the average single female head of household received AFDC as their monthly income, was not living with their parents or other relatives and was not participating in job training.

Section B

Employment History

As shown in Table 3.6, of 30 single female head of households, 27(or 90%) reported that they had been employed in the past and three(or 10%) reported that they had not been employed in the past. Therefore, the average single female head of household reported that they had been employed in the past.

Type of Previous Employment

As shown in Table 3.7, of 30 single female head of households, six(or 20%) reported that they had been employed as clerical workers, two(or 6.7%) reported that they had been employed as data processors, six(or 20%) reported that they had been employed as sales clerk/cashiers, two(or 6.7%) reported that they had been employed as housekeepers in hotels, four(or 13.3%) reported
Table 3.6

Percent Distribution of Female Head of Household by Employment History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE LABEL</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment History Yes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>90 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N=30</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.7

Percent Distribution of Female Head of Household by Type of Previous Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE LABEL</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Previous Employment Clerical</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Process</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales/Cashier</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Housekeep</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fastfood</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse Aid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N=30</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.8

Percent Distribution of Female Head of Household by Rate of Pay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE LABEL</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Pay $3.25-4.25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4.26-5.25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5.26-6.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6.26-7.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8.26-9.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N=30</td>
<td>99.9 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percent does not equal 100 due to rounding.
Table 3.9
Percent Distribution of Female Head Household by Employment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE LABEL</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N=30</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.10
Percent Distribution of Female Head of Household by Hours Worked

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE LABEL</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hours Worked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8am-5pm</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pm-11pm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11pm-7am</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N=30</td>
<td>99.9 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percent does not equal 100 due to rounding.

Table 3.11
Percent Distribution of Female Head of Household by Weekend Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE LABEL</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekend Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N=30</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.12

Percent Distribution of Female Head of Household by Job Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE LABEL</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Benefits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Insur.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>N=30</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.13

Percent Distribution of Female Head of Household by Reason for Leaving Job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE LABEL</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reason for Leaving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of hours</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of pay</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ill health</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company closed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No advancement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>N=30</td>
<td>99.9 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percent does not equal 100 due to rounding.

Table 3.14

Percent Distribution of Female Head of Household by Present Unemployment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE LABEL</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reason for Present Unemployment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child too Young</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot afford day care</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In need of training</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>N=25</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Distribution of Female Head of Household by Hourly Pay at Steady Job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE LABEL</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hourly Pay at Steady Job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5.00 an hour</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6.00 an hour</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7.00 an hour</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total N=30 99.9 %

Note: Percent does not equal 100 due to rounding.

| Table 3.16 |
| Percent Distribution of Female Head of Household by Length of Employment in Last Five Years |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE LABEL</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of Employ in Last 5 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3 mos.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 months</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8 months</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11 months</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year or more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total N=30 100 %

| Table 3.17 |
| Percent Distribution of Female Head of Household by Number of Jobs Since Birth of First Child |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE LABEL</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Jobs Since Birth of 1st Child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total N=30 99.9 %

Note: Percent does not equal 100 due to rounding.
Table 3.18
Percent Distribution of Female Head of Household by Disposition of Last Job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disposition of Last Job</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quit</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laid off</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fired</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still Employ.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total                     | N=30      | 100 %       |
that they had been employed as fast food/counter workers, two (or 6.7%) reported that they had been employed as nurse's aides and five (or 16.7%) reported that they had been employed in other types of jobs. Meanwhile, three (or 10%) did not respond to this question. Therefore, the average single female head of household reported that they had been employed as clerical workers or sales clerk/cashiers.

Rate of Pay

As shown in Table 3.8, of 30 single female head of households, 14 (or 46.7%) reported that they had earned a rate of pay of $3.26–4.25 per hour, nine (or 30%) reported that they had earned a rate of pay of $4.26–5.25 per hour, one (or 3.3%) reported that they had earned a rate of pay of $5.26–6.25 per hour, one (or 3.3%) reported that they had earned a rate of pay of $6.26–7.25 per hour and one (or 3.3%) reported that they had earned $8.26–9.25 per hour. Meanwhile, three (or 10%) did not respond to this question. Therefore, the average single female head of household reported that they earned a rate of pay of $3.26–4.25.

Employment Status

As shown in Table 3.9, of 30 single female head of households, 13 (or 43.3%) reported that they had worked full-time and 14 (or 46.7%) reported that they had worked part-time. Meanwhile, 3 (10%) did not respond to this question. Therefore, the average single female head of
Household reported that they had worked part-time.

**Hours Worked**

As shown in Table 3.10, of 30 single female head of households, 16 (or 53.3%) reported that their working hours had been from 8:00 am - 5:00 pm, one (or 3.3%) reported that their working hours had been from 3:00 pm - 11:00 pm, and one (or 3.3%) reported that their working hours had been from 11:00 pm - 7:00 am. Meanwhile, nine (30%) reported that they had worked various untraditional hours and three (or 10%) did not respond to this question. Therefore the average single female head of household reported that their working hours had been from 8:00 am - 5:00 pm.

**Weekend Work**

As shown in table 3.11, of 30 single female head of households, 19 (or 63.3%) reported that they had to work on weekends and eight (or 26.7%) reported that they did not have to work on weekends. Meanwhile, three (or 10%) did not respond to this question. Therefore, the average single female head of household reported that they had to work on the weekends.

**Job Benefits**

As shown in Table 3.12, of 30 single female head of households, 12 (or 40%) reported that they had received hospitalization benefits from their jobs, two (or 6.7%) reported that they had received life insurance coverage from
their jobs and 12 (or 40%) reported that they had received other kinds of benefits from their jobs. Meanwhile, four (or 13.3%) did not respond to this question. Therefore, the average single female head of household reported that they had received hospitalization or other types of benefits from their jobs.

**Reasons for Leaving Jobs**

As shown in Table 3.13, of 30 single female head of households, four (or 13.3%) reported that their reason for leaving a job was due to pregnancy, four (or 13.3%) reported that the reason for leaving the job was due to not being able to work enough hours, four (or 13.3%) reported that their reason for leaving the job was due to not being able to earn enough money, two (or 6.7%) reported that they lacked adequate day care arrangements, one (or 3.3%) reported that their health or the health of a family member prevented them from continuing to work, one (or 3.3%) reported that the company closed or relocated and one (or 3.3%) reported that she left the job because there was no opportunity for advancement. Meanwhile, nine (or 30%) did not respond to this question. Therefore, the average single female head of household reported that they left the job because of pregnancy, not enough hours of work available, or not enough pay.

**Present Employment**

Of the 30 single female heads of household who
participated in this study, five (or 16.7%) reported that they were presently employed and 25 (or 83.3%) reported that they were presently unemployed. Therefore, the average single female head of household reported that they were presently unemployed.

**Work Status**

Of the five single female heads of household who participated in this study who are presently employed, two (or 40%) reported that they were employed full-time and three (or 60%) reported that they were working part-time. Therefore, the average single female head of household who was presently employed, reported that they were employed part-time.

**Present Unemployment**

As shown in table 3.14, of the 25 single female head of households that reported that they were presently unemployed, five (or 20%) reported that they were unemployed because their children were too young, three (or 12%) reported that they were unemployed because they could not afford the cost of child care, nine (or 36%) reported that they were unemployed because they were in need of training or a high school diploma and eight (or 32%) reported that they were unemployed because of other reasons. Therefore, the average single female head of household who was presently unemployed, reported that they were unemployed because they were in need of training or a high school
diploma.

**Job Training Adequacy**

Of the 30 single female heads of household who participated in this study, eight (or 26.7%) reported that they felt that they had enough training and education needed to obtain a job with adequate pay and 22 (73.3%) reported that they had not had enough training and education needed to obtain a job with adequate pay. Therefore, the average single female head of household reported that they felt that they had not had enough training or education to obtain a job with adequate pay.

**Work at a Steady Job**

All of the single female heads of household who participated in this study reported that they would work if they could find a steady job.

**Hourly Pay at Steady Job**

As shown in table 3.15, of 30 single female head of households, seven (or 23.3%) reported that they thought they should be paid $5 an hour if they found a steady job, 10 (or 33.3%) reported that they should be paid $6 an hour if they found a steady job, 10 (or 33.3%) reported that they should be paid $7 an hour if they found a steady job and three (or 10%) reported that they should be paid higher. Therefore, the average single female head of household reported that they should be paid $6 or $7 an hour if they could find a steady jobs.
Length of Employment in the Last Five Years

As shown in Table 3.16, of 30 single female head of households, seven (23.3%) reported that the longest length of time that they had worked in the last five years was less than three months, four (or 13.3%) reported that the longest length of time that they had worked in the last five years was three-five months, five (or 16.7%) reported that they longest length of time that they had worked in the last five years was six-eight months, 12 (or 40%) reported that the longest length of time that they had worked in the last five years was nine-eleven months and two (or 6.7%) reported that the longest length of time that they had worked in the last five years was one year or more. Therefore, the average single female head of household reported that the longest length of time that they have worked in the last five years was nine-eleven months.

Number of Jobs Since the Birth of First Child

As shown in Table 3.17, of 30 single female head of households, one (or 3.3%) reported that they had never worked since the birth of their first child, three (or 10%) reported that they had one job since the birth of their first child, seven (or 23.3%) reported that they had two jobs since the birth of their first child, five (or 16.7%) reported that they had three jobs since the birth of their first child, and 13 (or 43.3%) reported that they had four jobs since the birth of their first child. Meanwhile,
one (or 3.3%) did not respond to this question. Therefore, the average single female head of household reported that they had four jobs since the birth of their last first child.

Disposition of Last Job

As shown in table 3.18, of the single female head of households, 14 (or 46.7%) reported that they quit their last jobs, six (or 20%) reported that they were laid off, four (or 13.3%) reported that they were fired and five (or 16.7%) reported that they were still employed. Meanwhile, one (3.3%) did not respond to this question. Therefore, the average single female head of household reported that they has quit their last jobs.

Summary - Section B

In summary, the average single female head of household reported that they had been employed in the past, had worked as clerical workers or sales clerks/cashiers, had earned $3.26 - 4.25 per hour and had been hired most often on a part-time basis. In addition, they reported that they had worked most often from 8:00 am - 5:00 pm, most often worked weekends, received hospitalization as a benefit from their jobs and most often left employment because of pregnancy or inadequate work hours or pay. Moreover, the average single female head of household reported that they were presently unemployed and reported that their reason for being unemployed was because they did not have enough training or
education. However, for those who were employed, the average single female head of household worked part-time. Furthermore, the average single female head of household reported that they would work if they could obtain a steady job with adequate pay and that pay should be $6 or $7 an hour. Finally, the average single female head of household reported that the longest length of time they had been employed since the birth of their first child was nine-eleven months and that they had quit the last jobs held.

Section C
Day Care

Availability of Day Care Services During Hours Worked

As shown in table 3.19, of 30 single female head of households, 17 (or 56.7%) reported that day care services were available during the hours that they worked and nine (or 30%) reported that day care services were not available during the hours that they worked. Meanwhile, four (or 13.3%) did not respond to this question. Therefore, the average single female head of household reported that day care services were available during the hours that they worked.

Day Care Arrangements

As shown in Table 3.20, of 30 single female head of households, nine (or 30%) reported that they used a day care center for the care of their children while they were
Table 3.19
Percent Distribution of Female Head of Household by Availability of Day Care Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE LABEL</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Day Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>56.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N=30</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.20
Percent Distribution of Female Head of Household by Day care Arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE LABEL</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day Care Arrangements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day care center</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives/friends</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N=30</td>
<td>99.9 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percent does not equal 100 due to rounding.

Table 3.21
Percent Distribution of Female Head of Household by Cost of Day Care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE LABEL</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Day Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $25 wkly</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$26.00-30.00 wkly</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$31.00-35.00 wkly</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$36.00-40.00 wkly</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$46.00-50.00 wkly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not need day care</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N=30</td>
<td>99.9 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percent does not equal 100 due to rounding.
Table 3.22
Percent Distribution of Female Head of Household by Day Care Assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE LABEL</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day Care Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>66.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn't Know</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N=30</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.23
Percent Distribution of Female Head of Household by Care of Children if Steady Job Obtained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE LABEL</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Care of Children if Steady Job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day care center</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends/relatives</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one available</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N=30</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
working, 16 (or 53.3%) reported that they used friends or relatives for the care of their children when they were working and one (or 3.3%) reported that they made other arrangements for the care of their children when they were working. Meanwhile, four (or 13.3%) did not respond to this question. Therefore the average single female head of household reported that they used friends or relatives for the care of their children when they were working.

Cost of Day Care

As shown in Table 3.21, of 30 single female head of households, six (or 20%) reported that their day care costs were less than $25 a week, six (or 20%) reported that their day care costs was $26-30 a week, six (or 20%) reported that their day care costs was $31-35 a week, four (or 13.3%) reported that their day care costs was $36-40 a week, one (or 3.3%) reported that their day care costs was $46-50 a week and three (or 10%) reported that they did not need day care services when they last worked. Meanwhile, four (or 13.3%) did not respond to this question. Therefore, the average single female head of household reported that their day care costs was less than $35 a week.

Day Care Assistance

As shown in Table 3.22, of 30 single female head of households, 20 (or 66.7%) reported that they did not receive day care assistance through the welfare department when they were working and six (or 20%) reported that they
did not know about day care assistance through the welfare department. Meanwhile, four (or 13.3%) did not respond to this question. Therefore, the average single female head of household reported that they did not receive day care assistance through the welfare department when they were working.

**Care of Children if Steady Job Obtained**

As shown in Table 3.23, of 30 single female head of households, 21 (or 70%) reported that they would use a day care center for the care of their children if a steady job was obtained, six (or 20%) reported that they would use a relative or friend for the care of their children if a steady job was obtained and two (or 6.7%) reported that they would have no one available for their children's care if a steady job was available. Meanwhile, one (or 3.3%) did not respond to this question. Therefore, the average single female head of household reported that they would use a day care center for the care of their children if a steady job was obtained.

**Hypothesis 2.** There is no significant relationship between the employment activity of single female head of households and the cost and availability of child care.

To test this hypothesis, two crosstabulations were performed using the SPSSX batch system to determine the relationship between the employment activity of single female head of households and the cost and availability of child care. The
Table 3.29

Crosstabulation Showing Day Care Availability and Employment Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY CARE AVAILABILITY</th>
<th>NUMBER OF JOBS HELD SINCE THE BIRTH OF FIRST CHILD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 7.13, \text{ df } = 3, \text{ p } < 0.05, \text{ Cramer's } V = 0.5 \]

Table 3.30

Crosstabulation Showing Day Care Costs and Employment Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY CARE COST</th>
<th>NUMBER OF JOBS HELD SINCE THE BIRTH OF FIRST CHILD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $25.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$26.00-30.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$31.00-35.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$36.00-40.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$46.00-50.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not need</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 19.46, \text{ df } = 9, \text{ p } < 0.05, \text{ Cramer's } V = 0.4 \]
results of the first statistical analysis, as indicated in Table 3.29, showed that Chi Square, $x^2 = 7.13$; degrees of freedom, $df = 3$, and level of significance, $p < 0.05$. Thus, we reject the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between the employment activity of single female head of households and the availability of child care. However, from the results of Cramer's $V (v = 0.5)$, we can conclude that this relationship is not that strong.

The results of the second statistical analysis, as indicated in Table 3.30, showed that Chi Square, $x^2 = 19.46$, degrees of freedom, $df = 9$, level of significance, $p < 0.05$. Thus we reject the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between the employment activity of the single female head of households and the cost of child care. However, from the results of Cramer's $V (v = 0.4)$, we conclude that this relationship is not that strong.

Summary - Section C

In summary, the average single female head of household reported that day care services were available during the hours that they worked, day care arrangements were made through the use of a relative or friend and the average costs of day care was less than $35 a week. In addition, the average single female head of household did not receive day care assistance through the welfare department and that if a steady job was obtained, the average single female head of household would use a day care center for the care of their
children.

Section D
Family Health

Health of the Mother

As shown in Table 3.24, of 30 single female heads of household, six (or 20%) reported that their health prevented them from obtaining some kinds of jobs and 23 (or 76.7%) reported that their health did not prevent them from obtaining some kinds of jobs. Meanwhile, one (or 3.3%) did not respond to this question. Therefore, the average single female head of household reported that their health did not prevent them from obtaining some kinds of jobs.

Health of Family members

Of the 30 single female heads of household who participated in this study, two (or 6.7%) reported that the health of a family member prevented them from obtaining some kinds of jobs and 28 (or 93.3%) reported that the health of a family member did not prevent them from obtaining some kinds of jobs. Therefore, the average single female head of household reported that the health of a family member did not prevent them from obtaining some kinds of jobs.

Disability of the Mother

The 30 single female heads of household who participated in this study reported that their health did not prevent them from working altogether. Therefore, the
### TABLE 3.24

Percent Distribution of Female Head of Household by Health of the Mother

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE LABEL</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health of Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>76.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>N=30</strong></td>
<td><strong>100 %</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.25

Percent Distribution of Female Head of Household by Disability of a Family Member

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE LABEL</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disability of Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>93.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>N=30</strong></td>
<td><strong>99.9 %</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percent does not equal 100 due to rounding.

### Table 3.26

Percent Distribution of Female Head of Household by Medical Assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE LABEL</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>N=30</strong></td>
<td><strong>100 %</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
average single female head of household reported that their health did not keep them from working altogether.

Disability of a Family Member

As shown in Table 3.25, of 30 single female head of households, one (or 3.3%) reported that the health of a family member prevented them from working altogether and 28 (or 93.3%) reported that the health of a family member did not prevent them from working altogether. Meanwhile, one (or 3.3%) did not respond to this question. Therefore, the average single female head of household reported that the health of a family member did not prevent them from working altogether.

Medical Assistance

As shown in Table 3.26, of 30 single female head of households, 14 (or 46.7%) reported that they remained eligible for medical assistance while they were working and 13 (or 43.3%) reported that they did not remain eligible for medical assistance while they were working. Meanwhile, three (or 10%) did not respond to this question. Therefore, the average single female head of household reported that they did remain eligible for medical assistance while they were working.

Hypothesis 3. There is no significant relationship between the employment activity of single female head of households and the health of family members.

To test this hypothesis, three crosstabulations were
performed using the SPSSX batch system to determine the relationship between the employment activity of single female head of households and the health of family members. The results of the first statistical analysis, as indicated in Table 3.31, showed that Chi Square, \( x^2 = 1.74 \), degrees of freedom, \( df = 4 \), level of significance, \( p < 0.05 \). Thus we accept the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between the employment activity of single female head of households and the health of the mother that prevents her from working some kinds of jobs.

The results of the second statistical analysis, as indicated in Table 3.32, showed that Chi Square, \( x^2 = 2.64 \), degrees of freedom, \( df = 4 \), level of significance, \( p < 0.05 \). Thus we accept the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between the employment activity of single female head of households and the health of family members that prevent her from obtaining some kinds of jobs.

The results of the third statistical analysis, as indicated in Table 3.33, showed that Chi Square, \( x^2 = 8.64 \); degrees of freedom, \( df = 4 \); level of significance, \( p < 0.05 \). Thus, we reject the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between the employment activity of single female head of households and the health of the family members. However, from the results of Cramer's V (\( V = 0.5 \)), we can conclude that the relationship is not that strong.
Table 3.31
Crosstabulation Showing the Health of the Mother that Prevents her from Working Some Kinds of Jobs and Employment Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTHER'S HEALTH</th>
<th>NUMBER OF JOBS HELD SINCE THE BIRTH OF FIRST CHILD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 1.74, \; df = 4, \; p < 0.05, \; \text{Cramer's V} = 0.3 \]

Table 3.32
Crosstabulation Showing the Health of a Family Member that Prevents her from Obtaining Some Kinds of Jobs and Employment Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTHER'S HEALTH</th>
<th>NUMBER OF JOBS HELD SINCE THE BIRTH OF FIRST CHILD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 2.64, \; df = 4, \; p < 0.05, \; \text{Cramer's V} = 0.3 \]

Table 3.33
Crosstabulation Showing the Health of a Family Members that Prevents the Mother from Working Altogether and Employment Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAMILY HEALTH</th>
<th>NUMBER OF JOBS HELD SINCE THE BIRTH OF FIRST CHILD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 8.64, \; df = 4, \; p < 0.05, \; \text{Cramer's V} = .5 \]
Summary – Section D

In summary, the average single female head of household reported that her health and the health of family members did not keep her from obtaining some kinds of jobs. In addition, the average single female head of household reported that her health and the health of family members did not keep her from working altogether. Furthermore, the average single female head of household reported that she did remain eligible for medical assistance while she was working.

Section E
Family Welfare Dependence
Family Composition

As shown in table 3.27, of 30 single female head of households, 12 (or 40%) reported that they were reared in the home with both parents present, 16 (or 53.3%) reported that they were reared in the home with their mothers only present, and two (or 6.7%) reported that they were reared in the home by other family members. Therefore, the average single female head of household reported that they were reared in the home with their mothers only present.

Mother's Employment

Of the 30 single female heads of household who participated in this study, 23 (or 76.7%) reported that their mothers worked outside of the home and seven (or 23.3%) reported that their mothers did not work outside of the
home. Therefore, the average single female head of household reported that their mothers worked outside of the home.

Dependence of the Mother

Of the 30 single female heads of household who participated in this study, 12 (or 40%) reported that their mothers received AFDC assistance and 18 (or 60%) reported that their mothers did not receive AFDC assistance. Therefore, the average single female head of household reported that their mother did not receive AFDC assistance.

Dependence of Siblings

Of the 30 single female heads of household who participated in this study, 14 (or 46.7%) reported that they had a sibling who received AFDC assistance and 16 (or 53.3%) reported that they did not have a sibling who received AFDC assistance. Therefore, the average single female head of household did not have a sibling who received AFDC assistance.

Hypothesis 4. There is no significant relationship between the employment activity of single female head of households and welfare dependence among family members.

To test this hypothesis, two crosstabulations were performed using the SPSSX batch system to determine the relationship between the employment activity of single female head of households and welfare dependence among family members. The results from the first statistical analysis, as indicated in
TABLE 3.27

Percent Distribution of Female Head of Household by Family Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE LABEL</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both parents</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother only</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other family member</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>N=30</strong></td>
<td><strong>100 %</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.34, showed that Chi Square, \( x^2 = 2.57 \); degrees of freedom, \( df = 4 \); level of significance, \( p < 0.05 \). Thus, we accept the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between single female head of households and the welfare dependence of their mothers. The results from the second statistical analysis, as indicated in Table 3.35, showed Chi Square, \( x^2 = 1.72 \); degrees of freedom, \( df = 4 \); level of significance, \( p < 0.05 \). Therefore, we accept the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between the employment activity of single female head of households and welfare dependence among their siblings. Therefore, we can conclude that there appears to be no significant relationship between the employment activity of single female head of households and the welfare dependence among family members.

Summary - Section E

In summary, the average single female head of household reported that they were reared in a single parent(mother) home, that their mothers worked outside of the home and that their mothers and siblings did not receive AFDC assistance.
Table 3.34
Crosstabulation Showing Welfare Dependency of the Mother and Employment Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTHER'S DEPENDENCY</th>
<th>NUMBER OF JOBS HELD SINCE THE BIRTH OF FIRST CHILD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1 4 1 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 2.57, \text{ df } = 4, \text{ p } < 0.05, \text{ Cramer's V } = 0.30 \]

Table 3.35
Crosstabulation Showing Welfare Dependency of Siblings and Employment Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIBLING'S DEPENDENCY</th>
<th>NUMBER OF JOBS HELD SINCE THE BIRTH OF FIRST CHILD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2 3 3 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1 1 4 2 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 1.72, \text{ df } = 4, \text{ p } < 0.05, \text{ Cramer's V } = 0.24 \]
Chapter V

Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship of four variables to the employment activity of single female head of households. These variables were educational level, cost and availability of child care, health of family members and welfare dependence among family members.

Educational Issues

In this study it was hypothesized that there was no significant relationship between the employment activity of single female head of households and educational level. This hypothesis was accepted based on the crosstabulation as shown in Table 3.28. The literature also appears to support these findings.

Levitan, Rein and Marvick (1972), stated that the educational attainment of single female head of households does not necessarily result in rising returns. In addition, they stated that Blacks benefit substantially less than whites from education and that in urban ghettos, the returns to nonwhites are extremely small, neither increasing nor decreasing unemployment. Furthermore, the results of the
Camden study indicated that education influenced the decision to enter the working world but either didn't encourage them (mothers) to work more regularly or didn't provide access to higher paying jobs.

The results of this study indicated that more than half of the single female head of households had earned a high school diploma but a large majority of the single females were presently unemployed despite educational achievement. However, the large majority of single female head of households had been employed in the past, indicating that some labor force attachment existed among this group. But, as indicated in Table 3.7, the majority of the single females were employed in the secondary labor market, limited to low wage paying jobs, earning less than $4.50 an hour.

The literature attempts to point out that perhaps there is more of a relationship between earnings potential and educational level. Although, this study deals with the issue of earnings, it is somewhat limited and therefore beyond the scope of this study to determine if this relationship is true. Certainly, this is an area for future research, particularly in relation to single female head of households and their relationship to the labor market.

Day Care Issues

In this study it was hypothesized that there was no significant relationship between the employment activity of single female head of households and the
availability and cost of child care. This hypothesis was rejected based on the crosstabulations as shown in Tables 3.29 and 3.30. The literature also appears to support these findings.

Levitan, Rein and Marvick (1972), stated that of every eight single female head of household in 1971, about five had a child under six, another two had no child under six but one under thirteen, the balance had only children under thirteen. The results of this study indicates that this pattern continues to hold true, as more than four-fifths of the single female head of households used in this study had children under the age of six, indicating a need for child care if employed.

Secondly, Rein (1982) found in his study that only one single mother in eleven used a child care center, while all others equally used relatives and non relatives in the child or the caretakers home, while working. The results of this study certainly support this, as more than half of the single female head of households used in this study used relatives or friends for child care arrangements when employed. Furthermore, the literature appears to suggest that the use of relatives and friends for child care, by single female head of households, is related to a scarcity of licensed facilities and access to family members who will provide the services free of charge. Whether the former is true or exists is beyond the scope of this study, however,
the results of this study show the opposite to be true when children are being cared for by relatives.

The results of this study indicate that although friends and relatives were utilized for child care services, none were provided free of charge. All of the single female head of households indicated that they were charged for day care services regardless of who provided those services. In fact the use of a relative may not be the most cost effective means for child care in regards to the single female head of household.

For instance, Rein (1982) found in his study that for those who paid child care in 1977, daily costs ranged from $2.50 to $3.50 for care by a relative, from $3.00 to more than $4.00 for care by a non-relative and to about $2.75 for school or group care center. If this is true, than the costs of child care in a relative or friend's home was greater than the cost of a child or group care center. Although, this study does not compare daily cost and types of care, the results indicate that daily cost ranged from $5.00 to $7.00. Furthermore, more than four-fifths of the sample indicated that they did not receive or did not know about child care assistance through the welfare departments, indicating that the majority bore the cost of child care from their meager earnings. Moreover, as indicated by the results of this study, when earnings are compared to the cost of child care, regardless of the type used, the daily
costs of child care exceeds the hourly rate of pay earned by these mother. Certainly child care cost, as well as availability, becomes a critical factor in influencing the decision of the mother to enter the labor market.

Health Issues

In this study it was hypothesized that there was no significant relationship between the health of family members and the employment activity of single female head of households. This hypothesis was accepted based on the crosstabulations as shown in Tables 3.31 and 3.32, but rejected based on the crosstabulation as shown in Table 3.33. However the literature does not seem to support these findings.

Levitan, Rein and Marvick (1977) found in their study that about two mothers in five indicated ill health prevented them from obtaining some kinds of jobs or prevented them from working altogether. Rein (1982) also found in his study that one in every nine mothers cited physical or mental incapacity as the primary reasons for not being in the labor force. However, the results of this study indicates that the ill health of the mother and the ill health of family members would not prevent the single mothers used in this study from obtaining some kinds of jobs nor would the health of the mother prevent them from working altogether.

Surprisingly though, the results did indicate that
the health of a family member would prevent some of the mothers from working altogether. However, there is very little literature available to support or refute these findings. Moreover, the literature appeared to indicate that there has been a considerable unconscious need among single mothers who rely on welfare to define their unemployment as health determined because society viewed illness and disability more sympathetically and sees it as more legitimate than failure to work. However, the results of this study, while limited, clearly indicates that the opposite is true, as more than three-fifths of the single female head of households used in this study did not cite ill health as a reason for their present unemployment. Moreover, previous research in this area has received criticism in relation to ill health and self assessment, which limits generalizability.

Welfare Dependence Issues

In this study it was hypothesized that there was no significant relationship between the employment activity of the single female head of household and welfare dependence among family members. This hypothesis was accepted based on the crosstabulations as shown in Tables 3.12 and 3.13. The literature does not appear to support these findings.

Rein (1982) concluded in his study that over two-fifths of the families then on AFDC had parents who had been
dependent at some time. Podell also concluded in his study of AFDC recipients in NYC, that more than half of the mothers on welfare reported that their parents had been assisted at some time. He also found that approximately one-fourth of the mothers on welfare had at least one sibling on welfare at the time of the study. Further, Burgess and Price (1960) also found that two-fifths of the adults in their AFDC sample had been reared in homes in which some form of assistance had been received at some time.

However, the results of this study indicated that three-fifths of the single female head of households did not have a mother who had received welfare and more than half did not have siblings who had ever received welfare. Furthermore, more than three fourths of the sample had a mother that worked outside of the home. As indicated earlier, the overwhelming majority of the single female head of households appeared to have some labor force attachment. All of them had worked in the past and indicated that they would work now if a steady job with adequate income were available. Perhaps, as Hill and her colleagues concluded, higher efficacy or a sense of control over one's life is more of an indicator of one's labor force attachment, rather than the belief that a parent or sibling's receipt of welfare benefits reduces one's economic mobility and increases one's dependency.

Although this study is somewhat limited, given the
small sample size, making it very difficult to make any startling revelations, some conclusions can be made based on the results of this study.

The findings of this study lead to the conclusions that the most significant barrier to the employment activity of single female heads of household is the cost and availability of child care services. The care of children, and more importantly, the cost of child care while the mother works, continues to be the most crucial factor involved in the decision to enter the labor market. Although the literature suggested that some single mothers, particularly Black mothers, have access to free day care through relatives and friends, this study findings draw some different conclusions. While the majority of the mothers used relatives and/or friends for child care, none of them reported that those services were provided free of charge. Furthermore, as more and more women make the decision to enter or return to the labor market, relatives and/or friends may no longer be available as a viable resource for these women.

Moreover, the study found no evidence to support the idea that the educational level attained by the single female head of household was related to her employment activity. The overwhelming majority of the single female heads of household had worked at some time regardless of her educational level. In fact, as a group the single female
heads of household shared a positive attitude toward the work ethic, as shown by their answers to the questions about work, regardless of educational level. However, the study also concludes that the overwhelming majority of the single mother were concentrated in the secondary labor, earning low wages and having little job security or benefits, regardless of educational level.

Furthermore, the study concludes that there was little evidence to support the idea that ill health was perceived as a viable excuse by single female head of households, in relation to their employment activity. The overwhelming majority of the single female of heads of household did not cite ill health as the major reason for being unattached to the labor market at this time and reported that their health at this time would not keep them from working some kinds of jobs or from working altogether.

Finally, the study found no evidence to support the idea that intergenerational or cultural factors influenced the employment activity of single female head of households. There was no significant relationship between the employment activity of single female head of households and relatives receipt of welfare or patterns of serial monogamy. In fact, most of the single female heads of household were reared in homes where the mother was employed.

In summary, the single female head of household's
employment activity appears to be determined by economics, particularly in relation to child care. The decision to work appears to be based on what is most cost effective, in relation to the amount of money earned and the cost and availability of child care. Thus, the single female head of household makes the decision to work based on her assessment of her potential earnings tempered by the work related expenses she will incur and meet from her meager earnings.
CHAPTER VI

Implications

Several implications from this study should be taken into account in considering policies in relation to the employment activity of single female head of households. The study points to the failure of social institutions in preparing the single female head of household for participation in the labor market and in providing employment yielding enough income to enable the female family head to become self-sufficient. Possession of a high school diploma does not seem to aid the single female head of household in gaining steady employment, nor does it provide her with access to jobs in the primary labor market, that would provide adequate income and some job security. Furthermore, this study's findings contradict some of the myths and beliefs, perpetrated upon single female head of households, for as a group, patterns of work did exist and some form of labor force attachment was present.

Furthermore, job training programs must begin to address the issues surrounding the types of training offered and the types of jobs that training will yield. Providing training that will only result in low wage jobs, embedded in the secondary labor market, is often not cost effective in
relation to the work related expenses the female family head will incur if employed. Training should be structured in such a way as to provide access to the primary labor market in traditional as well as non-traditional employment for women.

Secondly, the issues surrounding the cost and availability of adequate and affordable child care services for single female head of household are not being addressed and have come under the cuts of our former administration. Although the Reagan Administration called for the end of welfare rolls, they failed to provide assistance in the area that creates the biggest barrier for single mothers to enter the labor force. The irony involved in this is that although some private sector employers are responding to this need, by providing child care on the job, many of single female head of households do not have access to those jobs.

Policy makers must begin to recognize that single female family heads are the sole child caretaker. The problems of obtaining adequate and affordable child care may force many single mothers to obtain jobs because of convenience rather than opportunity factors. The problems faced by these mothers underscores the necessity of greater child care assistance and facilities, in order to improve the economic outcomes of female heads, a need that policy makers should take into account.
In developing policy changes or options relating to some of the implications of this study, social workers need to begin to lobby for better work and training opportunities for the single female head of household. One appropriate strategy would be to focus on assisted job searches, job training and placement efforts in obtaining primary sector employment for the single female head of household. Such a strategy could be pursued by encouraging public and private primary sector employers to consider either full-time or permanent part-time employment within this sector. Because the focus is on the primary sector of the labor market, a number of benefits could be realized by the single female head of household. Earnings, for example, would be increased without necessarily having to increase the number of hours worked, since wage rates will be higher in this sector; flexibility in childcare arrangements is facilitated by part-time work, and the opportunity of obtaining work-related, transferable skills will be obtained.

Policy makers must begin to recognize that they have failed in their efforts to find employment solutions to the problems faced by female family heads. They must recognize that the training offered to these single mothers and the present structure and organization of the labor market continues to confine the majority of the single female head of households in the secondary, low-wage sector.
of the labor market. Policy makers and social workers could also begin to move in the direction of studying low-income and low-benefit jobs and how to upgrade them, in order that those employed in this sector, at least have the opportunity to be self-sufficient.

Future Research

Certainly, this study doesn't address all of the concerns related to the employment activity of the single female head of household. Future researchers should begin to examine or look at what opportunities exist in the non-female dominated and non-traditional occupations and core industries, where opportunities for more advantaged higher status jobs and industries could begin to enhance the female family heads' economic prospects.

Although many opportunities have opened in this area for women today, it has been fully explored as a viable alternative for job training opportunities. Perhaps, an analysis of how many unions in the United States not only admit women, but how they deal with providing jobs for women, could be a good place to begin to look at this issue. Another of the areas of concern for future researchers, however, should be the economic instability of single Black males and how this relates to the impoverish condition of the female head of household. High rates of joblessness among Black men have left many Black single mothers as the sole support of their families or dependent on poverty level
Social workers need to begin to address such issues, as the lack of jobs in the central cities where many poor Black families reside and the institutional racism that relegates Blacks to a limited number of occupations and jobs within occupations. Finally, in relation to the employment activity of single female head of households, researchers should begin to explore the attitudes of private sector employers in relation to hiring and training single female head of households for part-time or full-time employment in the primary sector, particularly in large urban areas in the United States. Clearly the issue for single mothers is not the willingness to work, but the ability to earn enough income to become self-sufficient, if given first the opportunity to do so.
APPENDIX

Questionnaire

Hello, my name is Jenice Scott Wiltz and I am a graduate student at Atlanta University School of Social Work. I am doing a research project on the barriers to the employment activity of single female heads of household. I would like for you to complete the questionnaire and return it to me in the stamped self-addressed envelope that has been provided. Your cooperation in filling out this questionnaire and participating in this research project is appreciated. Of course your answers are anonymous and confidential. Please do not put your name on the questionnaire. Thank you.

SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Please place a check or an (X) by your answer.

1. What is your age?
   □ 1. 20-21
   □ 2. 22-23
   □ 3. 24-25
   □ 4. 26-27
   □ 5. 28-29
   □ 6. 30-31

2. What is your marital status?
   □ 1. Single, never married
   □ 2. Separated
   □ 3. Divorced
   □ 4. Widowed

3. How many children do you have?
   □ 1. Expecting my first child
   □ 2. 1-2
   □ 3. 3-4
   □ 4. 5-6
   □ 5. 7-8

4. What is the age of your youngest child?
   □ 1. Less than 12 months old
   □ 2. 1-2
   □ 3. 3-4
   □ 4. 5-6
   □ 5. 7-8
   □ 6. 9-10

5. What is the highest grade/school you have completed?
   □ 1. Less than high school
   □ 2. High school graduate
   □ 3. Associate/junior college
   □ 4. College graduate
6. Please indicate the source of your income.
   ___ 1. AFDC
   ___ 2. Social Security
   ___ 3. Child Support
   ___ 4. Earnings from Work
   ___ 5. Other, please indicate ______________________

7. Do you live with your parents or other relatives?
   ___ 1. Yes
   ___ 2. No

8. Are you presently participating in a job training program?
   ___ 1. Yes
   ___ 2. No

SECTION B: EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

1. Have you ever been employed?
   ___ 1. Yes, please go to Question 2
   ___ 2. No, please go to Question 11

2. What type of job did you work in?
   ___ 1. Clerical
   ___ 2. Data processing
   ___ 3. Sales clerk/cashier
   ___ 4. Housekeeping/hotel
   ___ 5. Fast food/counter work
   ___ 6. PBX switchboard
   ___ 7. Structural assembly
   ___ 8. Nurse's aide/hospital attendant
   ___ 9. Other, please indicate ______________________

3. What was your rate of pay?
   ___ 1. Per hour ______
   ___ 2. Per week ______
   ___ 3. Per month ______

4. Did you work full or part time?
   ___ 1. Full time
   ___ 2. Part time

5. What were your working hours?
   ___ 1. 8:00 am - 5:00 pm
   ___ 2. 3:00 pm - 11:00 pm
   ___ 3. 11:00 pm - 7:00 am
   ___ 4. Other, please indicate ________________

6. Did you have to work on weekends?
   ___ 1. Yes
   ___ 2. No
7. What kind of benefits were offered by your job?
   ___ 1. Hospitalization
   ___ 2. Clothing allowance
   ___ 3. Transportation allowance
   ___ 4. Day care on the job
   ___ 5. Life insurance
   ___ 6. Other, please indicate____________________

8. Why did you leave your last job?
   ___ 1. Pregnancy
   ___ 2. Not enough hours
   ___ 3. Not enough pay
   ___ 4. Lack of adequate day care
   ___ 5. Ill health of self or children
   ___ 6. Company closed business/relocated
   ___ 7. No opportunity for advancement
   ___ 8. Other, please indicate____________________

9. Are you presently employed?
   ___ 1. Yes
   ___ 2. No

10. Are you working full or part time?
    ___ 1. Full time
    ___ 2. Part time

11. Please indicate the reason that you are not employed or participating in a job training program.
    ___ 1. Children are too young
    ___ 2. Cannot afford the cost of child care
    ___ 3. In need of training or high school diploma
    ___ 4. Ill health of self or children
    ___ 5. Pregnancy
    ___ 6. Other, please indicate____________________

12. Do you feel that you have enough training or education needed to obtain a job that provides an adequate income?
    ___ 1. Yes
    ___ 2. No

13. Would you want to work if you could find a steady job?
    ___ 1. Yes
    ___ 2. No

14. How much do you think you should be paid per hour if you could find a steady job?
    ___ 1. $4.00
    ___ 2. $5.00
    ___ 3. $6.00
    ___ 4. $7.00
    ___ 5. Other, please indicate____________________
15. What is the longest length of time you have been employed in the last five years?
   ____ 1. Less than three months
   ____ 2. Three to five months
   ____ 3. Six to eight months
   ____ 4. Nine to eleven months
   ____ 5. One year or more

16. How many jobs have you held since the birth of your first child?
   ____ 1. Zero
   ____ 2. One
   ____ 3. Two
   ____ 4. Three
   ____ 5. Four
   ____ 6. Other, please indicate ______________________

17. What was the disposition of last job that you held?
   ____ 1. Quit
   ____ 2. Laid off
   ____ 3. Fired
   ____ 4. Still employed

SECTION C: DAY CARE

1. Were day care services available during the hours that you had to work?
   ____ 1. Yes
   ____ 2. No

2. What kind of child care arrangements did you have?
   ____ 1. Day care center
   ____ 2. Friends/relatives
   ____ 3. Other, please indicate ______________________

3. What was the cost of day care per week?
   ____ 1. Free day care provided
   ____ 2. $1.00 - 25.00
   ____ 3. $26.00 - 30.00
   ____ 4. $31.00 - 35.00
   ____ 5. $36.00 - 40.00
   ____ 6. $41.00 - 45.00
   ____ 7. $46.00 - 50.00
   ____ 8. Did not need day care when I last worked

4. Did you receive day care assistance through the welfare department?
   ____ 1. Yes
   ____ 2. No
   ____ 3. Did not know they provided assistance
5. If you were to go to work who would take care of your children?
   ___ 1. Day care center
   ___ 2. Relatives/friends
   ___ 3. Older child in the home
   ___ 4. No one available
   ___ 5. Other, please indicate ____________________

SECTION D: FAMILY HEALTH

1. Are there some kinds of jobs you can't get because of your health?
   ___ 1. Yes
   ___ 2. No

2. Are there some kinds of jobs you can't get because of the health of other family members?
   ___ 1. Yes
   ___ 2. No

3. Does your health keep you from working altogether?
   ___ 1. Yes
   ___ 2. No

4. Does the health of a family member keep you from working altogether?
   ___ 1. Yes
   ___ 2. No

5. Did you remain eligible for medical assistance while you were working?
   ___ 1. Yes
   ___ 2. No

SECTION E: FAMILY WELFARE DEPENDENCY

1. Please indicate the type of family in which you were reared before moving on your own.
   ___ 1. Both parents in the home.
   ___ 2. Mother only
   ___ 3. Father only
   ___ 4. Parents deceased, reared by other family members
   ___ 5. Other, please indicate ______________________

2. Did your mother work outside the home?
   ___ 1. Yes
   ___ 2. No

3. Did your mother ever receive public assistance(AFDC)?
   ___ 1. Yes
   ___ 2. No
4. Do or have any of your siblings (sisters, brothers) receive public assistance (AFDC)?
   _____ 1. Yes
   _____ 2. No
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