

types of jobs and motivations of persons who work in the regular economy but moonlight in the hidden economy. They state that most of these moonlighters were "concerned primarily with meeting actual or perceived needs."⁸ As to the extent of the hidden economy, estimates have ranged from 10 to 33 percent of the gross national product.⁹

Summary

Among all employed persons, men are far more likely than women to exceed the standard workweek. Women who work extended hours are slightly more likely than men to do so through multiple jobholding than on one job alone. Multiple jobs for women often consist of two part-time jobs, whereas men usually combine a full-time and a part-time job.

The occupational distribution of wage and salary workers on extended workweeks differs markedly between single and multiple jobholders. Managers and administrators who exceeded the standard workweek in May 1980 made up a far larger proportion of single than multiple jobholders (21 versus 11 percent). Salesworkers and operatives also were more heavily represented among single jobholders. In contrast, professional, technical, and service workers were more heavily represented among multiple than among single jobholders working 41 hours or more per week in May 1980. □

FOOTNOTES

¹ The Current Population Survey (CPS) is conducted for the Bureau of Labor Statistics by the Bureau of the Census. Information on the number of hours worked is collected monthly. A May supplement to the survey provided data on the receipt of premium pay for hours in excess of 40 per week and on multiple jobholding.

² Estimates of coverage under the Fair Labor Standards Act are from *Minimum Wages and Maximum Hours, Standards Under the Fair Labor Standards Act: An Economic Effects Study*, submitted to Congress in 1981 (U.S. Department of Labor, Employment Standards Administration, 1981), p. 42. For a history of the act, see Peyton K. Elder and Heidi D. Miller, "The Fair Labor Standards Act: changes of four decades," *Monthly Labor Review*, July 1979, pp. 10-16. The Federal Pay Act (U.S. Code, Title 5, ch. 61) covers Federal employees, while the Walsh-Healey Contracts Act (Public Law 74-846, June 30, 1936) and the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act (Public Law 87-581, Aug. 13, 1961) apply to workers in firms holding Federal Government contracts.

³ *Characteristics of Major Collective Bargaining Agreements, Jan. 1, 1980*, Bulletin 2095 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, May 1981), p. 60.

⁴ See H. G. Lewis, "Hours of Work and Hours of Leisure," *Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Meeting of the Industrial Relations Research Association*, 1956, pp. 196-206; Robert Shisko and Bernard Rosther, "The Economics of Multiple Job Holding," *The American Economic Review*, June 1976, pp. 298-308; and Nand K. Tanden, *Workers with Long Hours*, Special Labor Force Studies, Series A, No. 9 (Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, Ministry of Industry, Trade and Commerce, 1972), pp. 33-37. Information on the overtime provisions in collective bargaining agreements are from *Characteristics of Major Collective Bargaining Agreements*, pp. 60-61.

⁵ Joyce M. Nussbaum and Donald E. Wise, "The Overtime Pay Premium and Employment," *Work Time and Employment*, Special Report No. 28 (National Commission for Manpower Policy, October

1978), p. 322. For a discussion of the fixed costs of labor, see Walter Oi, "Labor as a Quasi-Fixed Factor," *Journal of Political Economy*, December 1962, pp. 538-55 and John D. Owen, "Why part-time workers tend to be in low-wage jobs," *Monthly Labor Review*, June 1978, pp. 11-14.

⁶ See *Minimum Wage and Maximum Hours, An Economic Effects Study* Submitted to Congress, 1979 (U.S. Department of Labor, Employment Standards Administration, 1979).

⁷ By definition, dual jobholders must hold at least one wage and salary job; they cannot be self-employed at two jobs.

⁸ Louis A. Ferman, Louise Berndt, Elaine Selo, *Analysis of the Irregular Economy: Cash Flow in the Informal Sector*, a report to the Bureau of Employment and Training, Michigan Department of Labor, March 1978, p. 3-13.

⁹ Norman N. Bowshner, "The Demand for Currency: Is the Underground Economy Undermining Monetary Policy?" *Review*, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, January 1981, p. 13.

Marital and family patterns of workers: an update

HOWARD HAYGHE

A record 18.4 million women with children under age 18 were in the labor force in March 1981, including nearly half of all mothers with preschool children. The high level indicates the continuing impact that women of the "baby boom" generation are having on the job market. Now in their 20's and early 30's, many of these women are returning to work while their children are still infants. This is also one reason why today every other married-couple family is in the dual-earner category.¹

Over-the-year changes

Wives. Labor force changes during the 12 months ending with March 1981 were typical of those that have been observed in recent years in connection with the entry or re-entry into the job market of women born after World War II. About 25.5 million wives, or 51 percent, were working or looking for work in March, 560,000 above the previous year's level. More than 2 of 3 of these net additions were mothers, and most of them had children under 6 years old. (See table 1 and 2.)

The rise in the number and proportion of working mothers, especially those with preschool children, is partly related to a small rebound in births among women 20 to 34 years old.² During the 1970's, women in this age group tended to delay marriage and postpone childbearing, often acquiring lengthy job experience and strong ties to the labor force. Now most are married

Howard Hayghe is an economist in the Division of Labor Force Studies, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Table 1. Employment status of persons 16 years and over by marital status and sex, March 1980, and March 1981

[Numbers in thousands]

Marital status and sex	Civilian labor force			Labor force participation rate (in percent)		
	March 1980		March 1981	March 1980		March 1981
	Original	Revised		Original	Revised	
Both sexes	103,339	105,449	107,721	63.2	63.2	63.6
Men ¹	59,376	60,514	61,306	76.8	76.6	76.4
Never married	15,134	15,590	15,799	70.7	70.6	70.6
Married, wife present	38,962	39,647	39,674	81.0	80.9	80.5
Married, wife absent	1,628	1,629	1,777	79.2	79.0	78.9
Widowed	565	552	544	28.7	27.9	27.9
Divorced	3,087	3,097	3,532	80.3	79.4	80.9
Women	43,963	44,934	46,414	51.1	51.1	52.0
Never married	10,911	11,242	11,628	61.2	61.5	62.3
Married, husband present	24,466	24,900	25,460	50.2	50.1	51.0
Married, husband absent	1,881	1,928	2,076	59.4	59.4	60.8
Widowed	2,359	2,421	2,416	22.5	22.5	22.3
Divorced	4,347	4,443	4,835	74.5	74.5	75.0

¹Population includes male members of the Armed Forces living off post or with their families on post.

Note: Estimates of the civilian noninstitutional population have been recalculated using updated weights based on the 1980 Census of the Population; therefore, the 1980 revised data differ from 1980 data previously published.

Because of rounding, sums of individual items may not equal totals.

and many are having children. But, unlike the preceding generation of mothers whose early marriage and childbearing was followed by prolonged withdrawal from the labor force,³ women are now either remaining in the work force or returning to it shortly after childbirth.

Reflecting these events, the labor force participation rate of wives with preschool children increased from 45 percent in March 1980 to nearly 48 percent a year later. Even though there was no change in their participation rate, divorced mothers (regardless of their youngest child's age) remained considerably more likely than mothers in any other marital status category to be in the labor force. About 78 percent of all divorced mothers were working or looking for work in March 1981, compared with around 60 percent of widowed, separated, or never-married mothers and 56 percent of married mothers. Even when they were childless, divorced women were more apt to be in the labor force than other women with no children under age 18.

Single, divorced, and separated persons. Like wives, single persons also accounted for 25 percent of the labor force growth over the year ending with March 1981. The number of single men in the labor force reached 15.8 million while that of single women grew to 11.6 million. These increases were largely because of a rise in the number of persons in their early 20's and the continuing tendency among them to delay marriage. The labor force participation rates of single men (71 percent) and of women (62 percent) remained relatively stable.

As was the case for singles, the number of divorced and separated persons in the labor force rose, primarily because the divorce rate remained high. The labor force participation rates of separated and divorced men were about the same as for husbands (80 percent) while the rates for divorced (75 percent) and separated (61 percent) women continued to be higher than for wives.

In contrast to the other marital groups, the number of husbands who were working or looking for jobs remained steady over the year ending in March 1981. The participation rate of husbands continued its long-term downward drift.

Race and Hispanic origin. Although white wives are still less likely to be in the labor force than black ones, their participation rate has been rising faster in recent years, narrowing the difference between the two groups. By March 1981, more than 50 percent of white wives and nearly 60 percent of black wives were in the work force. Ten years earlier, the proportions were about 40 and 53 percent. In contrast, the participation rate, for white husbands and black husbands were nearly identical; both rates have declined by roughly 6 percentage points since March 1971.

Hispanic men were more apt than whites or blacks to be in the labor force regardless of their marital category. This is partly because Hispanic men are, on average, younger; in March 1981, their median age (for those 16 years and over) was 32.1 years, compared with 34 years for blacks and 38 years for whites. In contrast to the men, Hispanic women traditionally have had lower participation rates than whites or blacks.⁴ (See table 3.)

Table 2. Labor force status of women 16 years and over, by marital status and presence and age of youngest child, March 1980 and March 1981

[Numbers in thousands]

Marital status and presence and age of children	Labor force			Labor force participation rate (in percent)		
	March 1980		March 1981	March 1980		March 1981
	Original	Revised		Original	Revised	
Women, 16 years and over	43,963	44,934	46,414	51.1	51.1	52.0
No children under 18	26,470	27,144	27,992	48.0	48.1	48.7
With children under 18	17,493	17,790	18,422	56.6	56.6	58.1
Children 6 to 17, none						
younger	11,168	11,252	11,490	64.4	64.3	65.5
Children under 6 years	6,325	6,538	6,933	46.6	46.8	48.9
Married, husband present	24,466	24,900	25,460	50.2	50.1	51.0
No children under 18	11,019	11,246	11,426	46.1	46.0	46.3
With children under 18	13,447	13,654	14,035	54.2	54.1	55.7
Children 6 to 17, none						
younger	8,381	8,428	8,432	61.8	61.7	62.5
Children under 6 years	5,067	5,227	5,603	45.0	45.1	47.8

Note: Estimates of the civilian noninstitutional population have been recalculated using updated weights based on the 1980 Census of the Population; therefore, the 1980 revised data differ from 1980 data previously published.

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

Because of rounding, sums of individual items may not equal totals.

Table 3. Labor force participation rates by marital status, sex, race, and Hispanic origin, March 1980 revised and March 1981

[In percent]

Sex and marital status	White		Black		Hispanic	
	Revised 1980	1981	Revised 1980	1981	Revised 1980	1981
Men						
Total	77.6	77.4	68.0	68.8	80.6	80.6
Never married	72.6	72.7	60.4	60.5	70.0	71.6
Married, wife present	81.1	80.6	78.1	78.8	87.5	86.3
Married, wife absent	83.6	82.3	67.4	71.9	85.3	83.7
Divorced	80.7	82.4	69.9	72.8	78.3	84.5
Widowed	27.3	27.3	31.6	29.6	(¹)	(¹)
Women						
Total	50.9	51.8	52.1	53.2	48.0	47.5
Never married	64.2	65.0	49.4	50.3	53.9	51.4
Married, husband present	49.3	50.3	59.0	59.5	46.1	47.0
Married, husband absent	60.4	61.8	58.0	59.9	45.3	39.9
Divorced	75.6	76.0	68.8	68.8	64.7	65.8
Widowed	22.3	21.7	24.3	26.6	26.3	22.3

¹Percent not shown where base is less than 75,000.

NOTE: Estimates of the civilian noninstitutional population have been recalculated using updated weights based on the 1980 Census of the Population; therefore, the 1980 revised data differ from 1980 data previously published.

Earners, income, and poverty

During the past decade, the dramatic increase in the proportion of working wives has led to substantial gains in the number of married-couple families where both spouses were earners during the same year. In 1980, there were approximately 25.6 million such dual-earner families, 25 percent more than in 1970.⁵ Over the same period, the traditional-earner family (married-couple families where the husband, but not the wife, was an earner) declined in importance—falling from 44 percent of all married couples in 1970 to less than 31 percent in 1980.⁶

However, despite the ongoing rise in the number of wives in the labor force, there was no change in either the number or proportion of dual-earner families from 1979 to 1980. Several factors interacted to produce this result. One was the sluggish economic climate that prevailed during 1980 which led to greater levels of unemployment than in 1979. Another was the continuing high level of divorces and the consequent breakup of many married-couple families. Also, the number of married couples without earners continued its long-term climb. From 1970 to 1980, the number of married persons 65 years and over rose by about a third, and the number of families with no earners reached 5.9 million. (See table 4.)

Income. Overall, median income in 1980 was \$23,300 for married-couple families, compared with \$10,230 for families maintained by women and \$17,740 for those maintained by men (no spouse present). A major reason for the differences is that almost 60 percent of all mar-

ried-couple families contained at least two earners, compared with 28 percent of the families maintained by women and 42 percent of those maintained by men. (This is not the entire explanation; even when there were two earners or more, families maintained by men or women had lower median annual incomes.)⁷ Who the earners are—husband, wife, children, and so forth—is also an important determinant of family income. To illustrate, median income of married-couple families in 1980 was \$20,500 where the husband was the only earner, but only \$13,600 where the wife was the sole earner. For families with two earners or more, the median was more than \$31,000 where the husband (but not the wife) was among the earners, but only \$22,700 when the husband had no earned income.

Poverty. The presence of earners does not guarantee a family freedom from poverty. In 1980, about 6.4 million, or 10.5 percent, of the Nation's families had incomes below the poverty level.⁸ These families were approximately equally divided between married couples (47 percent) and those maintained by women (49 percent), with relatively few maintained by men. (See table 5.)

The majority of married-couple families in poverty had income from the earnings of one member or more during 1980. In most of these families, the husband was an earner, but for an unusually large proportion—21 percent compared with 6 percent for families not in poverty—the earner was the wife or some other member, such as a son or daughter, whose wages were typi-

Table 4. Number of earners in families, relationship, and median family income in 1979 and 1980, by type of family, March 1980 and March 1981

Number of earners, relationship, and type of family	Number (in thousands)			Median family income		
	March 1980		March 1981	1979		1980
	Original	Revised		Original	Revised	
Married-couple families	48,199	49,132	49,316	\$21,621	\$21,545	\$23,263
No earners	5,420	5,559	5,903	8,833	8,855	10,187
One earner	13,598	13,912	13,900	18,092	18,073	19,368
Husband only	11,667	11,934	11,621	18,874	18,850	20,472
Wife only	1,463	1,499	1,707	12,504	12,527	13,612
Other relative only	468	480	573	17,061	17,072	16,148
Two earners or more	29,180	29,660	29,513	25,594	25,501	28,025
Husband and wife	25,148	25,595	25,557	25,263	25,167	27,745
Husband and others, not wife	3,448	3,476	3,380	29,146	29,121	31,031
Husband non-earner	585	591	576	20,343	20,361	22,684
Maintained by women ¹	8,834	9,009	9,416	9,773	9,719	10,233
No earners	2,041	2,084	2,216	4,267	4,245	4,494
One earner	4,290	4,391	4,612	9,567	9,513	10,350
Two earners or more	2,503	2,534	2,589	16,973	16,937	18,673
Maintained by men ¹	1,742	1,769	1,969	16,600	16,533	17,743
No earners	219	225	244	7,217	7,241	7,790
One earner	778	788	891	14,388	14,347	15,577
Two earners or more	745	755	835	23,040	22,936	23,785

¹Divorced, separated, widowed, or never-married persons.

NOTE: Estimates of the civilian noninstitutional population have been recalculated using updated weights based on the 1980 Census of the Population; therefore, the 1980 revised data differ from 1980 data previously published.

Because of rounding, sums of individual items may not equal totals.

Table 5. Families in poverty in 1980 by family type and number of earners, March 1981

Type of family, number and relationship of earners	Number in poverty (in thousands)	Percent distribution	As percent of all families
Total families	6,402	—	10.5
Married-couple families	3,036	100.0	6.2
No earners	996	32.8	16.9
One earner	1,294	42.6	9.3
Husband	945	31.1	8.1
Wife	237	7.8	13.9
Other member	113	3.7	19.7
Two earners or more	745	24.5	2.6
Husband and wife	540	17.8	2.1
Husband and other(s), not wife	137	4.5	4.1
Husband nonearner	68	2.2	11.8
Families maintained by women ¹	3,142	100.0	33.4
No earners	1,617	51.5	73.0
One earner	1,267	40.3	27.5
Householder	1,034	32.9	28.6
Other	233	7.4	23.5
Two earners or more	258	8.2	10.0
Families maintained by men ¹	224	100.0	11.4
No earners	76	33.9	31.1
One earner	115	51.3	12.9
Two earners or more	32	14.3	3.8

¹Includes only divorced, separated, widowed, or never-married persons.
 Note: Because of rounding, sums of individual items may not equal totals.

cally lower than those of the husband.

A third of all families maintained by women had incomes below the poverty level in 1980, with children in more than four-fifths of them. Less than half of these families had earnings and only 8 percent contained more than one earner.

As expected, large families face a greater likelihood of poverty than small ones with the same number of earners. For instance, among one-earner families in 1980, about 10 percent with only two members were in poverty, compared with 20 percent of five-member families. The proportions in poverty were less for families with more than one earner.

THIS REPORT HAS PRESENTED some recent data on the marital-family characteristics of workers. However, the situation may change under the pressure of demographic and other trends that are already underway. For example, recent increases in the birth rate indicate that the number of dual-earner families with young children will continue to increase. Thus, the need for adequate child care in the working parents' absence will probably expand rather than diminish. In addition, if marital breakups—currently at record levels—rise, the demand

for child care will grow even further as the number of one-parent families increases. □

— FOOTNOTES —

¹ Unless otherwise indicated, data are based on tabulations from the March 1981 Current Population Survey (CPS), conducted for the Bureau of Labor Statistics by the Bureau of the Census. The data have been inflated using population weights based on results from the 1980 Census of the Population. The March 1980 data discussed in this report also have been revised to bring them in line with the new population weights and to make them comparable with the March 1981 data. Previously published 1980 data (as they appear in Beverly L. Johnson and Elizabeth Waldman, "Marital and family patterns," *Monthly Labor Review*, October 1981, pp. 36–38) reflected population weights projected forward from the 1970 Census of the Population.

As shown in table 1, the number of married women in the labor force in March 1980 was revised upward by 434,000. Despite this, and similarly significant changes in other data for 1980, the various relationships and percentages based on new estimates are nearly the same as those based on previously published estimates.

For a more complete description of changes in labor force data stemming from the use of 1980 census population weights in the CPS, see Kenneth D. Buckley, Jennifer Marks, and Ronald J. Statt, "Revisions in the Current Population Survey Beginning in January 1982," *Employment and Earnings*, February 1982, pp. 7–15.

Estimates based on a sample, such as those shown in the tables, may vary considerably from results obtained by a complete count in those cases where the numbers are small. Therefore, differences based on them may not be significant. For more detail on the interpretation of such differences, see *Marital and Family Characteristics of Workers, March 1979*, Special Labor Force Report 237 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1981).

² Final Natality Statistics, National Center for Health Statistics, Division of Vital Statistics, Natality Statistics. Also see Allyson Sherman Grossman, "More than half of all children have working mothers," *Monthly Labor Review*, February 1982, pp. 41–43, for information on trends in numbers of children whose mothers work.

³ See Howard Hayghe, "Families and the rise of working wives—an overview," *Monthly Labor Review*, May 1976, pp. 12–19; Janet L. Norwood and Elizabeth Waldman, *Women in the Labor Force: Some New Data Series*, U.S. Department of Labor, Report 575; and George Masnich and Mary Jo Bane, *The Nation's Families, 1960–1990* (Cambridge, Mass., Joint Center for Urban Studies of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University, 1980), pp. 52–85.

⁴ For a discussion of some of the factors underlying the labor force patterns of Hispanic women, see Morris J. Newman, "A profile of Hispanics in the U.S. work force," *Monthly Labor Review*, December 1978, pp. 3–14.

⁵ Only about two-fifths of the gain in the number of dual-earner families was because of the increase in the number of married-couple families.

⁶ See Howard Hayghe, "Husbands and wives as earners: an analysis of family data," *Monthly Labor Review*, February 1981, pp. 46–53.

⁷ A forthcoming *Monthly Labor Review* article will focus on women who maintain families.

⁸ The average poverty threshold for a nonfarm family of four was \$8,414 in 1980. The level varied depending on family size, sex and age of householders, family composition, and farm-nonfarm residence. For further details, see *Current Population Reports*, Series P-60, No. 124.