Research Summaries

Working mothers reach record number in 1984

HOWARD HAYGHE

Working mothers have become a familiar feature of today's economy. A record 19.5 million, or 6 out of 10 with children under 18 years old, were in the labor force in March 1984. In contrast, 14 years earlier, 6 out of 10 stayed at home. Moreover, according to data from the Current Population Survey¹, the majority of employed mothers work full time. (See table 1 on page 32.)

Labor force. Since 1970, the rise in mothers' labor force participation rates has been phenomenal—about 20 percentage points. The increase was about the same for mothers of preschoolers as it was for mothers of school age children. Most of the gain was among married mothers, whose participation rate rose from 40 percent in 1970 to 59 percent in 1984. The rates for other mothers also advanced, but at a much slower pace. Among divorced women, for example, 79 percent of the mothers were working or looking for work in March 1984, compared with 76 percent in 1970.

One important aspect of this increase is the degree to which mothers today do not leave the job market after childbirth. This is clearly demonstrated in the following comparison of married mothers' labor force participation rates:

Age of youngest child	March 1970	March 1984
I year and under	24.0	46.8
2 years	30.5	53.5
3 years	34.5	57.6
4 years	39.4	59.2
5 years	36.9	57.0

Nearly half of the mothers with a child² age 1 or younger were in the labor force in 1984. By the time the youngest is 3 years old, married mothers' participation rates approach 60 percent, and nursery school attendance or day care in some form becomes increasingly necessary.

The relatively high current participation rates of married mothers, especially those with infants, attest, in part, to the turnaround in society's attitudes regarding the employment



of such mothers. The rates also reflect the fact that married women often delay having children until they have established themselves in the labor market.

Most employed mothers—71 percent in March 1984 work full time (35 hours a week or more). Even when the youngest child is under 3, about 65 percent of employed mothers are full-time workers. Divorced mothers are the most likely to work full time, partly because relatively few have preschoolers. Moreover, whether they work full or part time, the majority of working mothers have jobs

Table 2. age, type March 19	Number of children under age 18 in families, by of family, and employment status of parents, 84
(in thousands)	

	Total	ļ	Under			
Characteristic	under	Total Age		Age	age	
	age 18	14 to 17		6 to 13	6	
Total	58,096	38,738	13,610	25,128	19,358	
	32,701	23,361	8,615	14,746	9,340	
	24,169	14,518	4,604	9,914	9,650	
In married-couple families	45,991	30,027	10,304	19,724	15,964	
Mother in labor force	25,786	17.969	6.506	11,463	7,817	
Mother not in labor force	20,205	12,058	3,798	8,260	8,147	
Father in labor force	42.981	27,982	9.457	18.525	14,999	
	24.525	17,053	6.098	10,956	7,471	
	18.456	10,929	3.359	7.569	7.527	
Father employed	40,375	26,429	9.019	17,410	13.946	
Mother in labor force	23.034	16,100	5.830	10,270	6.934	
Mother not in labor force	17.341	10,329	3.189	7,140	7.013	
Father unemployed	2,606	1,553	438	1,115	1.052	
	1,491	953	268	686	538	
	1,115	600	170	430	515	
Father not in labor force	2.062	1,562	747	815	500	
	802	626	336	290	176	
	1.260	936	411	525	324	
Father in Armed Forces	948	484	100	384	465	
Mother in labor force	460	290	73	217	170	
Mother not in labor force	489	194	27	167	295	
In families maintained by women ¹	10.878	7,851	2.915	4,936	3,027	
Mother in labor force	6.914	5,391	2.109	3,282	1,523	
Employed	5.803	4,610	1.866	2.744	1,193	
Unemployed	1.112	781	243	539	330	
Mother not in labor force	3.964	2,460	806	1,654	1,504	
In families maintained by men ¹	1,226	859	391	468	367	
Father in labor force	1,036	741	346	395	295	
Employed	942	694	325	369	248	
Unemployed	94	47	21	26	47	
Father not in labor force	160	103	43	60	57	
Father in Armed Forces	30	14	2	13	15	

¹Includes only families where the householder is a divorced, separated, widowed, or never-married person.

Note: Children are defined as "own" children of the family. Included are nevermarried daughters, sons, stepchildren, and adopted children. Excluded are other related children such as grandchildren, nieces, nephews, and cousins, and unrelated children.

Howard Hayghe is an economist in the Office of Employment and Unemployment Statistics, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Beverly L. Johnson, a social science research analyst in the same office, assisted in the preparation of this report.

throughout most of the year. For instance, 2 of 3 employed married mothers worked 40 weeks or more in 1983, mostly at year-round, full-time jobs.

Children. About 56 percent of the Nation's 58 million children under age 18 had mothers in the labor force in March 1984. In 1970, the proportion was 39 percent. The vast majority of these children were under 14 years—age groups for which all-day care, after-school care, or a combination of both is likely to be needed over the year. (See table 2 on page 31.)

Parents' employment status clearly has a major impact on children's welfare. In 1984, almost half the children in two-parent familes had both an employed father and mother, and nearly all of the remainder were in homes with an employed father. Only about 2.8 million, or 6 percent, were in families where neither parent was employed. As might be expected, children in single-parent families—especially those in families maintained by women—were much less likely to have a working parent in the home. About 2 of 10 children in families maintained by men and nearly 5 of 10 in families maintained by women did not have an employed parent. Overall, approximately 1 child in 7 lived in a home where there was no employed parent, and income was consequently low (a median of \$6,782 in 1983).

Single-parent families. A record 6.2 million families³ with children were maintained by the mother alone (widowed, divorced, separated, or never married), and they accounted for one-fifth of all families with children. In 1970, there were fewer than half as many such families, and they constituted only one-tenth of the families with children.

Families maintained by the mother alone are less likely than two-parent families to contain a wage earner. Largely for this reason, almost half the families maintained by a mother in 1983 had incomes below the official poverty levels⁴ compared with 10 percent of two-parent families.

Whatever the number of children, the proportion of twoparent families with earners substantially exceeded 90 percent, while the ratio for families maintained by women varied from a high of 78 percent where there was only one child to 43 percent where there were four children or more. Childcare responsibilities are undoubtedly a prime reason for the differences in the percent of families maintained by

Characterístic	Civilian noninsti- tutional population	Civilian iabor force	Percent of population		Empl	oyed		Unemployed	
				Number	Percent	Full time ¹	Part time ¹	Number	Percent of labor force
Total	92,485	49,210	53.2	45,414	100.0	72.0	28.0	3,796	7.7
lo children under age 18	60,200	29,666	49.3	27,694	100.0	72.8	27.2	2,022	6.8
Vith children under age 18	32,285	19,544	60.5	17,770	100.0	70.7	29.3	1.774	9.1
Children age 6 to 17, none younger	16,884	11,514	68.2	10,718	100.0	73.0	27.0	795	6.9
Children under age 6.	15,401	8,030	52.1	7,052	100.0	67.2	32.8	979	12.2
Children under age 3	9,248	4,407	47.7	3,843	100.0	65.2	34.8	564	12.8
ever married.	19,820	12,552	63.3	11,187	100.0	66.6	33.4	1,365	10.9
No children under age 18.	17,729	11,489	64.8	10,427	100.0	66.2	33.8	1,062	9.2
With children under age 18	2,091	1,063	50.8	760	100.0	72.8	27.2	303	28.5
Children age 6 to 17, none younger	557	391	70.2	308	100.0	75.3	24.7	83	21.3
Children under age 6.	1,534	672	43.8	452	100.0	70.8	29.2	220	32.7
Children under age 3.	1,018	409	40.1	267	100.0	65.5	34.1	142	34.8
tarried, husband present	50,856	26,861	52.8	25,323	100.0	71.1	28.9	1,537	5.7
No children under age 18	26,159	12,331	47.1	11,762	100.0	75.2	24.7	569	4.6
With children under age 18	24,697	14,530	58.8	13,562	100.0	67.4	32.6	968	6.7
Children age 6 to 17, none younger	12,690	8,304	65.4	7,890	100.0	69.3	30.7	415	5.0
Children under age 6	12,007	6,225	51.8	5,672	100.0	64.7	35.3	553	8.9
Children under age 3	7,425	3,586	48.3	3,250	100.0	63.8	36.2	336	9.4
arried, husband absent.	3,313	2,023	61.1	1,743	100.0	80.7	19.3	280	13.8
No children under age 18	1,551	919	59.3	837	100.0	84.6	15.3	83	9.0
With children under age 18	1,762	1,103	62.6	906	100.0	76.9	23.1	197	17.9
Children age 6 to 17, none younger	933	655	70.2	569	100.0	79.6	20.6	86	13.1
Children under age 6	829	448	54.0	337	100.0	72.7	27.3	111	24.9
Children under age 3	441	214	48.5	158	100.0	73.4	26.6	56	26.3
/idowed	11,079	2,260	20.4	2,120	100.0	66.7	33.3	140	6.2
No children under age 18	10,518	1,929	18.3	1,821	100.0	66.6	33.5	108	5.6
With children under age 18	561	331	59.0	299	100.0	67.2	32.4	32	9.8
Children age 6 to 17, none younger	471	285	60.4	255	100.0	69.8	30.2	30	10.4
Children under age 6	90	46	51.4	44	100.0	(²)	(²)	3	(²)
Children under age 3.	30	12	(²)	11	100.0	(²)	(²)	1	(²)
ivorced No children under age 18 With children under age 18 Children age 6 to 17, none younger Children under age 6 Children under age 3	7,418 4,244 3,174 2,233 941 334	5,514 2,997 2,517 1,878 639 185	74.3 70.6 79.3 84.1 67.9 55.5	5,041 2,797 2,244 1,696 548 157	100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0	87.6 87.7 87.5 87.7 87.0 85.4	12.4 12.3 12.5 12.3 13.0 14.6	473 200 274 182 91 28	8.6 6.7 10.9 9.7 14.3 15.0

Table 3. Number of families by number and relationship of earners in 1983, family type and presence and number of children under age 18, March 1984

[In thousands]

		With no	With children under age 18				
Characteristic	Total	children under age 18	Total	1 child	2 children	3 children	4 or more
Total families . No earners . One earner . Two or more earners .	62,501 9,602 19,448 33,450	31,075 7,191 8,176 15,707	31,426 2,411 11,272 17,743	13,126 885 4,145 7,853	11,860 821 4,357 6,681	4,480 388 1,748 2,344	1,960 317 777 865
Married-couple families. No earners Husband Wife Other family member Two or more earners Husband and wife Husband and other(s) not wife Husband is nonearner	50,143 6,578 13,680 11,094 1,943 643 29,884 26,128 2,982 774	25.785 6.045 6.446 4.434 1.462 550 13.294 11.184 1.554 555	24,358 533 7,234 6,660 481 93 16,590 14,944 1,428 219	9.553 169 2.205 1.961 199 44 7.180 6.334 721 124	9.564 190 3.011 2.815 178 6.362 5.892 410 59	3,680 79 1,369 1,281 75 14 2,232 2,031 182 19	1,561 95 648 603 28 17 817 688 114 16
Families maintained by women ¹ No earners One earner Two or more earners	10,265 2,749 4,788 2,728	4,029 965 1,330 1,734	6,236 1,784 3,458 994	3,033 660 1,809 565	2,073 609 1,186 278	752 300 343 109	377 216 120 42
Families maintained by men ¹ No earners One earner . Two or more earners	2,093 275 980 838	1,261 181 400 679	832 94 580 159	539 56 375 108	224 22 160 41	48 9 36 3	21 6 9 6
$^{-1}\mbox{Includes only families where the householder is a divorced, separated, widowed, or never-married person.}$	Note: daughte such as	Children are rs, sons, stej oranchildren	l e defined as ''o pchildren, and nieces, neph	L own'' children adopted child ews. and cou	l of the family, fren. Excluded sins, and unre	Included are r I are other rel lated children	l never-married lated children

mothers that had an earner. Even in two-parent families, the proportion where the wife was an earner ranged from nearly 70 percent in which there was only one child, to below half where there were four children or more. (See table 3.)

Minorities. A higher percentage of black than white or Hispanic mothers were in the labor force in March 1984. (See table 4.) However, when labor force participation is examined by marital status, a different picture emerges. While black married mothers are much more likely to be in the labor force than their white counterparts, the opposite is true among divorced or separated mothers. Age, education, and the number of children are important factors underlying these differences. On average, black mothers without husbands are younger, have completed fewer years of education, and have more children than their white counterparts and, thus, are likely to have a harder time finding and holding jobs⁵.

The labor force participation rates of Hispanic mothers, regardless of their marital status, are lower than those of white of black women. Part of this difference undoubtedly lies in Hispanics' cultural heritage,⁶ and part may stem from the fact that Hispanics, on average, have completed fewer years of school than whites or blacks.⁷

Black and Hispanic children are more likely than white children to be living in one-parent households and, consequently, are more likely to be living in poverty. More than 60 percent of the black and Hispanic one-parent families had incomes below the poverty threshold, as did 36 percent of similar white families. In contrast, the poverty rate was Table 4. Labor force participation rates of mothers and number of children in families, selected characteristics, by race and Hispanic origin, March 1984

Characteristic	White	Black	Hispanic origin	
Participation rates of mothers				
Total with children under age 18 Age 6 to 17, none younger Under age 6 Under age 3	60.2 67.9 51.3 47.0	63.3 70.3 56.8 52.1	48.7 58.3 41.0 36.0	
Married, spouse present Divorced	57.9 80.5 63.8 59.6 53.5	70.3 75.2 61.3 59.3 49.4	49.1 63.4 42.9 (¹) 35.7	
Children in families (in thousands)				
Total under age 18 Mother in labor force	48.473 27.047 20,463	7.743 4.675 2.840	5,235 2,343 2,802	
In married-couple families	40.641 22.403 18.238	3.775 2.547 1.228	3,934 1,826 2,108	
In families maintained by women ² Mother in labor force Mother not in labor force	6,869 4,644 2,225	3,740 2,127 1,613	1,211 517 694	
In families maintained by men ² Father in labor force ³ Father not in labor force	962 871 91	228 170 58	90 68 22	

'Data not shown where base is less than 75,000

²Families where parent is never-married, widowed, divorced, or separated.
³Includes children living with fathers on or off a military post.

Note: Children are defined as "own" children of the family. Included are nevermarried sons, daughters, stepchildren and adopted children. Excluded are other related children such as grandchildren, nieces, nephews, and cousins, and unrelated children.

20 percent for black and Hispanic two-parent families and 9 percent for whites.

----FOOTNOTES------

¹The Current Population Survey (CPS), conducted for the Bureau of Labor Statistics by the Bureau of the Census, is a monthly sample survey of some 60,000 housholds in the United States. Information obtained from this survey relates to the employment status of persons 16 years and over in the noninstitutional population. In the survey conducted each March, supplemental information is obtained on the earnings, income, and work experience of persons in the prior year. These data, along with information on employment status are tabulated annually in conjunction with information on marital and family status.

Because it is a sample survey, estimates derived from the CPS may differ from the actual counts that could be obtained from a complete census. Therefore, small estimates or small differences between estimates should be interpreted with caution. For a more detailed explanation, see the Explanatory Note in *Families at Work: The Jobs and the Pay*, Bulletin 2209 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1984), pp. 30-34.

²Children are defined as "own" children of the family. Included are never-married daughters, sons, stepchildren, and adopted children. Excluded are other related children such as grandchildren, nieces, nephews, and cousins, and unrelated children.

³A family consists of two persons or more who are related by blood or marriage and living in the same household. Relationship of family members is determined by their relationship to the reference person or householder, that is, the person in whose name the housing unit is owned or rented.

⁴For more information on poverty thresholds for 1983, see *Money Income and Poverty Status of Families and Persons in the United States:* 1983, Series P-60, No. 145 (Bureau of the Census, 1984), p. 31.

⁵See Beverly L. Johnson and Elizabeth Waldman, "Most women who maintain families receive poor labor market returns," *Monthly Labor Review*, December 1983, pp. 30–34.

⁶See Morris J. Newman, "A profile of Hispanics in the U.S. workforce," *Monthly Labor Review*, December 1978, pp. 3 and 5.

⁷See Educational Attainment of Workers, March 1982–83, Bulletin 2191 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1984), pp. 1 and 2.

Unemployment insurance: identifying payment errors

PAUL L. BURGESS, JERRY L. KINGSTON, AND ROBERT D. ST. LOUIS

A system for detecting payment errors in the unemployment insurance program was recently developed by the U.S. Department of Labor. This system has made it possible to identify the level of both fraud and nonfraud overpayments, as well as underpayments, in the program. Prior to the introduction of this detection system, it was not possible to determine the extent and nature of payment errors.

Currently, the detection system—known as the random audit system—is operating in 46 unemployment insurance jurisdictions.¹ The remaining jurisdictions will be included in this program or its successor (the UI quality control program) during fiscal year 1985. At that time, the audit system will provide a basis for: (1) estimating the extent of payment errors in the nationwide unemployment insurance program; (2) indentifying the primary sources of the payment errors; (3) implementing corrective action, where appropriate; and (4) evaluating the effects of such corrective actions (or other programmatic changes) on unemployment insurance payment accuracy. This summary discusses the design and methodology of the random audit system and presents findings from the pilot tests conducted in five States—Illinois, Kansas, Louisiana, New Jersey, and Washington—over a 1-year period ending in March 1982.²

Because of the large volume of weekly payments made in the unemployment insurance system, it would be prohibitively expensive (under current law and policy)³ to verify each claimant's eligibility to receive benefits. Thus, the random audit system relies on a small sample of payments made in each unemployment insurance jurisdiction as the basis for estimating the extent and nature of payment errors. The payments selected for investigation are taken from a specially constructed computer file of weekly statewide unemployment insurance payments in each participating jurisdiction. Each week, a probability sample of cases is selected from the file, and the results of verifying benefit eligibility for those cases are used to estimate statewide payment errors;⁴ quarterly estimates are developed for each unemployment insurance jurisdiction.⁵

After a sample has been selected for review, a detailed and consistent procedure is followed. When cases are selected for investigation, it is assumed that claimants have been properly paid, and this opinion is changed only if documented evidence to the contrary is presented.

Verification of benefit eligibility includes the following procedures:⁶ (1) files related to the case are obtained and reviewed; (2) the base period wages upon which the claimant established his or her claim for benefits are verified (with employers if possible);⁷ (3) a personal interview with the claimant is conducted to verify relevant facts regarding the individual's claim for benefits; (4) the claimant's reasons for separation from previous employers are verified to determine if any disqualifying circumstances were involved; (5) attempts are made to verify if the claimant was able and available for work during the sampled week; (6) if applicable, employers listed by the claimant as work search contacts during the sampled week are contacted for verification as to whether the claimant actually applied for work; (7) as appropriate, attempts are made to determine if the claimant refused any offers of "suitable" work that would disqualify the individual from receiving benefits; (8) attempts are made to determine if the claimant accurately reported any earnings or work performed during the sampled week; and (9) depending on the circumstances of the case, other individuals may be contacted to verify any other determinants that could affect the claimant's eligibility for benefits during the sampled week.

Paul L. Burgess and Jerry L. Kingston are professors of economics, and Robert D. St. Louis is an associate professor of decision and information systems, Arizona State University. This paper summarizes some of the major findings of a study conducted by the authors under a contract with the Unemployment Insurance Service, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily represent the official position or policy of the U.S. Department of Labor.