The Effects of Family Disruption on Social Mobility

Timothy J. Biblarz; Adrian E. Raftery

American Sociological Review, Vol. 58, No. 1 (Feb., 1993), 97-109.

Stable URL:
http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0003-1224%28199302%2958%3A1%3C97%3ATEOFDO%3E2.0.CO%3B2-1

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at
http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you
have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and
you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or
printed page of such transmission.

American Sociological Review is published by American Sociological Association. Please contact the publisher for
further permissions regarding the use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at
http://www.jstor.org/journals/asa.html.

American Sociological Review
©1993 American Sociological Association

JSTOR and the JSTOR logo are trademarks of JSTOR, and are Registered in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.
For more information on JSTOR contact jstor-info@umich.edu.

©2003 JSTOR

http://www.jstor.org/
Tue Oct 14 20:37:40 2003

THE EFFECTS OF FAMILY DISRUPTION
ON SOCIAL MOBILITY*

TIMOTHY J. BIBLARZ
University of Southern California

ADRIAN E. RAFTERY
University of Washington

The experience of family disruption during childhood substantially increases men's odds of ending up in the lowest occupational stratum as opposed to the highest. Family disruption also weakens the association between dimensions of men's occupational origins and destinations. The socioeconomic destinations of men from nonintact family backgrounds bear less resemblance to their socioeconomic origins than those of men from intact backgrounds. Men from traditional two-parent homes exhibit a stronger pattern of intergenerational occupational inheritance than do men from disrupted families. These effects are the same for blacks and whites. Recent changes in family structure may lead to greater universalism in contemporary American society.

A lthough much social mobility occurs in the United States, men are more likely to remain near the socioeconomic stratum into which they were born than to move substantial distances up or down. However, since the early 1970s, the association between men's socioeconomic origins and destinations has weakened substantially (Hout 1988; DiPrete and Grusky 1990; Grusky and DiPrete 1990). During this period, the family has undergone important changes, including an increase in divorce (National Center for Health Statistics 1991) and in the number of families headed by women (Wojtkiewicz, McLanahan, and Garfinkel 1990). We develop some hypotheses about the relationship between family disruption and socioeconomic inheritance, and examine empirical evidence that suggests how changes in the association between origins and destinations may be related to changes in the family.

THE MECHANISMS OF SOCIOECONOMIC INHERITANCE

Our central hypothesis is simple: The association between the origins and destinations of sons raised in intact, traditional, two-parent families is stronger than the association between the origins and

destinations of sons who have experienced family disruption in childhood. The tendency of researchers on social mobility to combine these two groups when analyzing patterns of intergenerational (father/son) inheritance may mask the effect of family disruption on the association between socioeconomic origins and destinations.

Socioeconomic inheritance between fathers and sons occurs in part through processes of role modeling, socialization, and value transmission (Hout 1984). Through role modeling, a son may aspire to an occupation similar to that of his father, i.e., he may choose to be immobile (Hout 1984). Through socialization he learns about the skills that lead to security and success in that occupation. Generally, parents expect that their children, as adults, will be faced with similar life conditions (Han 1968,1969; Kerckhoff 1976). Parents value traits for their children that will facilitate adaptation to the kinds of life conditions, especially occupational conditions, that they themselves face (Kohn 1969). For example, fathers working in occupations that require self-directedness (typically fathers in high social strata) tend to value autonomy or self-direction in their children, while fathers working in occupations that require high levels of conformity (typically fathers in low social strata) tend to value conformity (Kohn 1969). Children may internalize these values and as adults pursue like occupations (Kohn and Slomczynski 1990).

Variation in the levels of economic resources available to families in different social strata also influences socioeconomic inheritance. Parents in high social strata have more economic resources available to invest in their children. Greater pa-

rental investment in their children's human capital usually leads to children's greater success as adults (typically measured in terms of wages and income) (Becker 1964; Becker and Tomes 1986). Working-class parents, for example, are less able to pay for their children's college education (Steelman and Powell 1991), and they are less able to afford costly or specialized educational resources in the earlier stages of their offspring's life course. As a consequence, children are more likely to end up in a social stratum similar to that of their parents. Of course, the direct inheritance of property, particularly in farming occupations, also contributes to immobility.

Class-based discrimination by extra-family institutions also offers an explanation of socioeconomic inheritance. For example, in early stages of the education process, teachers tend to treat pupils from low socioeconomic strata less favorably than children from high socioeconomic strata (Eder 1982; Alexander, Entwisle, and Thompson 1987). Distinctions in the appearances, social mannerisms, and classroom social behaviors of children from different strata influence teachers' judgments about their students' competence and abilities (Eder 1982). As a consequence, teachers place students from different strata in different academic tracks, ultimately contributing to the reproduction of inequality. Also, children take culture from the family and bring it with them into the educational system. The cultural capital that parents transmit to their children varies by socioeconomic status and influences children's educational experiences (Lareau 1989).

These mechanisms of intergenerational transmission are probably most effective for sons raised in traditional two-parent families. In predicting that a son will model his behavior on his father's behavior — that he will develop occupational goals based on his father's occupational conditions and will internalize his father's values — and that the father will invest in his son's human capital, we assume that the father is present in the household, is around during the son's infancy, childhood, and adolescence, and is transmitting these resources throughout the son's preadult socialization period.

For many sons, however, family disruption has removed the father from the household during childhood. Traditionally, a significant proportion of children in the United States experienced this disruption because of their fathers' death. For pre-1930 birth cohorts, over one-half of all individuals who did not live continuously with both parents prior to age 16 experienced a parental death; for post-1940 birth cohorts, parental divorce replaces death as the primary cause of separation from the father (Bumpass and Sweet 1989).

Estimates suggest that about 60 percent of recent first marriages will end in divorce (Martin and Bumpass 1989; Bumpass 1990). Almost one-half of today's children will spend some portion of their childhood in a single-parent (usually female-headed) household. Although over 80 percent of those who divorce will subsequently remarry, most children of divorce will spend over five years living with their mothers only (Bumpass 1984), and noncustodial fathers tend to invest relatively little of their time and money in their biological children (Cassety 1978; Chambers 1979; Weiss and Willis 1985). Among a National Survey of Children sample of children who had experienced family disruption, nearly one-half had not seen their noncustodial fathers in the past year (Furstenberg and Nord 1985). Furstenberg and Nord (1985) concluded that "marital disruption effectively destroys the ongoing relationship between the children and the biological parents living outside the home in a majority of families" (p. 902).

Given the diminished role of noncustodial fathers in the socialization of their sons, we expect less intergenerational resemblance between fathers and sons who have experienced geographic, social, and emotional separation than that between fathers and sons from intact families. We also expect less intergenerational resemblance between sons and biological fathers who died during their sons' childhoods, because paternal death ends the daily economic and noneconomic investments and transfers fathers give to sons. Death also ends fathers' behavioral (although perhaps not psychological) role in the socialization of their sons.

Most social mobility research has assumed that patterns of intergenerational transmission between biological fathers and sons from intact homes are essentially the same as those between custodial-family heads and sons from nonintact homes. Hout (1988) and Grusky and DiPrete (1990) use the General Social Survey's (Davis and Smith 1987) measure of origins; the measure reads, "what kind of work did your father (father substitute) normally do while you were growing up?" The term "father substitute" refers to "stepfather," "uncle," or other adult male household head. In these studies, father/son and father substitute/son patterns of inheritance were not distinguished (or analyzed separately). Featherman

and Hauser (1978) also combined respondents from different family structures in their analysis.

Traditional social mobility research assumes that the son "gets" whatever the household has to offer — if not from the father, then from whomever is the household head. However, when the custodial household head is the mother, stepfather, or other adult, we would expect a more problematic and less effective intergenerational transmission process compared with that in traditional families.

The two most prevalent types of nontraditional, or nonintact, family structures are single-parent families and stepfamilies. The parenting practices and child outcomes associated with both types of nonintact family structures differ from those characteristic of an intact (two biological parents) family structure.

Children from single-parent families (and stepfamilies) report less overall parental supervision and less parental monitoring of schoolwork (Astone and McLanahan 1991). Often custodial parents (usually mothers) increase their labor force participation to offset the lost income of the absent spouse, resulting in less time spent with children. The variety of logistic and other difficulties single parents face — managing the household, providing for the material and emotional needs of children and themselves, and maintaining order — may place greater demands on children to direct themselves. Family disruption and the subsequent "task overload" faced by single parents may weaken parental control over children and lead to less consistent, or "diminished," parenting, at least for a limited period of time (Weiss 1979; Hetherington, Cox, and Cox 1978; Dawson 1991).

Children in single-parent families are less likely than children in intact families to report that a parent is the most influential person in their lives (Sandefur, McLanahan, and Wojtkiewicz 1989); and they are less likely to report wanting to be like their mothers or fathers when they grow up (Furstenberg and Nord 1985). These findings suggest a weaker parental influence and a lower level of parental involvement, authority, and control in nonintact families compared to that in intact families. As a consequence, single parents may be less able than married parents to secure their children's futures. When the family is in transition, its ability to reproduce the family's social standing through the intergenerational transmission mechanisms of role modeling, value transmission, and economic investment may be reduced. While family disruption may negatively affect children's attainments because of subsequent declines in income (and therefore in parental investments) (McLanahan 1985), disruption may also weaken the family's ability to circumscribe children's behavior and, in this sense, "free" children from their origins.

The level of warmth and support given to children by stepparents is generally lower than the amount given by biological parents (Thomson, McLanahan, and Curtin 1992). In light of the ambiguities and unique difficulties stepparents and children face in developing intimate relationships with each other, as well as the lack of well-defined institutional prescriptions to guide the formation of these relationships (Cherlin 1978), we would expect a weaker socioeconomic status and occupational resemblance between stepfathers and stepsons than that between biological fathers and sons raised in an intact family context.

We expect the intergenerational transmission of status and occupation to be more effective for sons raised by two original parents than for sons raised in any other kind of family structure (Duncan and Duncan 1969). However, intergenerational transmission may also be influenced by the particular processes that produce nonintact family structures: the death of a parent, the divorce (and potential remarriage) of parents, and out-of-wedlock childbearing. A family disruption resulting from separation or divorce may have stronger effects on children's adjustment and future attainments than a family disruption resulting from the death of a parent (Acock and Kiecolt 1989; Marino and McCowen 1976; Felner, Farber, Ginter, Boike, and Cowen 1981). Widows may receive more economic and noneconomic aid from friends and relatives than do divorcees (Acock and Kiecolt 1989). Thus, the experience of parental divorce may introduce unique "stressors" into parent/child relationships that do not occur when a parent dies. Declines in the custodial parents' attention and control may be greater following divorce than death (Felner et al. 1981).

While stepparent/stepchild relationships in reconstituted family structures are often problematic, they may be less so in the case of death than divorce. In the case of death, the stepparent has to compete with the children's sentiments toward the deceased parent; in the case of divorce, the stepparent has to compete not only with the children's sentiment toward the absent parent, but with the actual presence of the noncustodial parent and with some type of continuing relationship between the children and the noncustodial parent.

Table 1. Percentage Distribution of Father's Occupation by Son's First Full-Time Civilian Occupation: U.S. Men Ages 20 to 64 in March 1973

Father's (or Other Family Head's) Occupation	Son's First Occupation					Total	Number of cases
	Upper Nonmanual	Lower Nonmanual	Upper Manual	Lower Manual	Farm		
White men, intact family background							
Upper nonmanual	49	18	11	21	1	100	2,577
Lower nonmanual	34	24	11	29	2	100	1,773
Upper manual	20	16	21	40	2	100	3,597
Lower manual	13	16	14	53	4	100	4,240
Farm	10	9	10	32	40	100	3,437
Total	22	16	14	37	11	100	15,624
White men, nonintact family background							
Upper nonmanual	38	18	10	31	3	100	233
Lower nonmanual	27	21	12	39	1	100	367
Upper manual	15	15	18	47	5	100	276
Lower manual	14	15	14	52	5	100	863
Farm	8	6	11	37	39	100	427
Total	18	15	13	44	11	100	2,166
Black men, intact family background							
Upper nonmanual	43	22	3	29	3	100	44
Lower nonmanual	15	20	14	50	2	100	47
Upper manual	13	15	11	59	2	100	145
Lower manual	9	12	8	66	4	100	505
Farm	3	4	7	49	37	100	490
Total	8	10	8	57	17	100	1,231
Black men, nonintact family background							
Upper nonmanual	29	19	11	41	0	100	20
Lower nonmanual	17	16	9	58	0	100	19
Upper manual	·11	8	13	68	0	100	25
Lower manual	6	10	7	73	4	100	316
Farm	3	4	5	49	39	100	173
Total	6	9	7	64	15	100	554

Note: Rounding the weighted frequencies may affect sums.

Single-parent families created by out-of-wedlock childbearing also exhibit difficulties in parent/child relationships not typically found in two-biological-parent families, owing in part to differences in parents' age-based experience and socioeconomic resources (Marino and McCowan 1976; Jones, Kahn, Parnell, Rindfuss, and Swicegood 1985). Never-married single parents provide less parental control over children than do married parents (Thomson et al. 1992). The parenting practices of never-married single parents are more similar to the parenting practices of single parents who have experienced divorce than they are to the practices of married parents. In fact, the contrasts between the parenting be-

haviors of never-married single parents and married parents are particularly sharp (Thomson et al. 1992).

Intergenerational socioeconomic resemblance may be weakest among sons who experienced the separation or divorce of their parents, followed by sons who were born out-of-wedlock, followed by sons who experienced the death of a parent, and strongest among sons raised in traditional two-parent families. We test empirically the prediction that associations between socioeconomic and occupational attributes of fathers and sons among sons from intact families are stronger than associations between attributes of family heads and sons among sons from any kind

of disrupted or reconstituted families. Also, we expect family disruption to have a direct negative effect on the destinations of sons, independent of origins.

SAMPLE AND METHODS

Using data from the 1973 Occupational Changes in a Generation Survey (OCG), we reproduce the 17 × 17 occupational mobility tables analyzed by Featherman and Hauser (1978) and Hout (1984) (see Featherman and Hauser [1978] for a comprehensive discussion of OCG survey data).[1] Like these researchers, we recode the 1960 Census occupational codes assigned to the fathers' and sons' occupations to the 17-category occupational classification scheme (Blau and Duncan 1967) and weight the data (see Featherman and Hauser 1978, p. 511). Data are available for son's first full-time civilian occupation and current full-time civilian occupation. The analysis is limited to men ages 20 to 64 in the civilian labor force.

We then stratify the tables by the "intactness" (intact/nonintact) of the respondent's family background and race (white/black) of the respondent. Following Hout (1984), we exclude men of "other" races because of the small number of cases. Intact families include sons who were "living with both parents most of the time up to age 16;" nonintact families include sons who did not live with both parents most of the time up to age 16.[2] (The 17 × 17 mobility tables are available from the authors on request.)[3]

Family disruption may be the result of marital disruption, parental death, or an out-of-wedlock

___

[1] Data were made available by the Data and Program Library Service at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. The data for *Occupational Changes in a Generation — Replicate Master File, 1962 and 1973* were originally collected by the U.S. Bureau of the Census under grants from the National Science Foundation to Peter M. Blau and Otis Dudley Duncan, at the University of Chicago, and to David L. Featherman and Robert M. Hauser, at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. The Bureau of the Census, National Science Foundation, principal investigators, and DPLS do not bear any responsibility for the analyses or interpretations presented.

[2] This measure of family intactness may fail to capture a large proportion of the disruption experience, particularly among respondents who experienced disruption in adolescence.

[3] The 17 × 17 × 2 × 2 tables of counts are available free of charge by e-mail from the StatLib archive. Send the one-line message, "Send SOCMOB from data," to STATLIB@ STAT.CMU.EDU.

birth, but the specific causes cannot be determined from these data. Applying the distributions of causes of family nonintactness for birth cohorts provided by Bumpass and Sweet (1989) to the OCG sample, we estimate that approximately 42 percent of the "nonintact" OCG respondents analyzed here experienced the death of a parent, 45 percent experienced the separation or divorce of their parents or were born out-of-wedlock, and the remaining 13 percent experienced family disruption for other reasons. Because we cannot stratify the nonintact subgroup by cause of family disruption, we cannot estimate the conditioning effect on occupational inheritance of any particular type of family disruption.[4]

Table 1 presents the percentage distribution of father's occupation by son's first occupation. The occupational classification is a collapsed (5 × 5) form of the 17 × 17 cross-tabulation used in the analysis.[5] A higher percentage of sons from nonintact family backgrounds begin their working lives in lower manual occupations, regardless of origin and race, than do sons from intact family backgrounds. The trade-off seems to be primarily between the upper nonmanual and lower manual destination categories: Among sons from nonintact backgrounds, generally smaller percentages from each origin category flow out to upper nonmanual first destinations, and higher percentages flow out to lower manual first destinations. Although not as dramatic, this pattern of outflow for men from nonintact family backgrounds resembles the well-known pattern of outflow for blacks documented by Duncan (1968) in the 1960s, suggesting that family disruption weakens the ability of parents in high socioeconomic strata to pass on advantages to their chil-

___

[4] The primary source of mobility data that includes the causes of family disruption, the General Social Survey (GSS), does not contain enough nonintact cases to conduct a meaningful analysis on the 17 × 17 mobility table. The pooled 1972–1975 GSS has 194 male respondents ages 20 to 64 from nonintact families with the relevant occupational information (48 experienced divorce); the 1976–1980 GSS has 178 (71 experienced divorce); the 1982–1985 GSS has 187 (86 experienced divorce); and the 1986–1990 has 213 (94 experienced divorce).

[5] The occupation classification is: Upper nonmanual = self-employed and salaried professionals, managers, nonretail salespersons; lower nonmanual = proprietors, clerical workers, retail salespersons; upper manual = craftsmen in manufacturing, construction, and other industries; lower manual = service workers, operatives, and laborers; farm = farm managers and laborers.

Table 2.   Percentage Distribution of Son's First Occupation by Father's Occupation: U.S. Men Ages 20 to 64 in March
           1973

Father's (or Other Family Head's) Occupation	Son's First Occupation					
	Upper Nonmanual	Lower Nonmanual	Upper Manual	Lower Manual	Farm	Total
White men, intact family background						
Upper nonmanual	36	19	13	9	2	16
Lower nonmanual	17	18	9	9	2	11
Upper manual	21	24	36	24	5	23
Lower manual	16	28	27	39	9	27
Farm	10	12	16	19	81	22
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number of cases	3,499	2,430	2,160	5,843	1,692	15,624
White men, nonintact family background						
Upper nonmanual	23	13	8	8	3	11
Lower nonmanual	26	24	15	15	2	17
Upper manual	11	13	18	14	6	13
Lower manual	31	42	43	48	17	40
Farm	8	8	17	16	72	20
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number of cases	382	319	282	953	231	2,166
Black men, intact family background						
Upper nonmanual	19	8	1	2	1	4
Lower nonmanual	7	8	7	3	0	4
Upper manual	18	18	16	12	2	12
Lower manual	44	49	43	48	10	41
Farm	12	18	34	34	87	40
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number of cases	102	122	100	696	211	1,231
Black men, nonintact family background						
Upper nonmanual	. 16	8	6	2	0	4
Lower nonmanual	9	6	5	3	0	3
Upper manual	8	4	9	5	0	5
Lower manual	50	68	59	66	16	57
Farm	17	14	22	24	84	31
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number of cases	35	47	37	353	81	554

Note: Rounding the weighted frequencies may affect sums.

dren. The patterns of outflow from father's occupation to son's current occupation are generally similar, although not as strong (not shown, available from authors on request).

Table 2 presents the origin occupational distributions of sons in each first occupation. Among white men from intact backgrounds, the highest percentage in each occupation is for sons with the same occupation as their fathers (with the exception of lower nonmanual). However, among white men from nonintact family backgrounds, the highest percentage in each occupation is for sons whose fathers were in lower manual occupations (with the exception of farming). Among black men from intact or nonintact backgrounds, the highest percentage in each occupation have lower manual origins (with the exception of farming). This pattern is particularly strong for black men from nonintact backgrounds. The patterns of inflow to sons' current occupations are generally similar (not shown).

The patterns revealed in Tables 1 and 2 may simply be the result of differences in the marginal distributions of black sons and white sons,

and sons with intact family backgrounds as opposed to sons with nonintact family backgrounds. Differences in the marginal distributions of sons of different races and from different family structures are taken into account in the loglinear analysis that follows.

The Model

Hout's (1984) status, autonomy, and training (SAT) model parsimoniously captures the main variables that give rise to the association between fathers' and sons' occupations in contemporary U.S. mobility tables. The model proposes that the observed cell frequencies in a 17×17 matrix of son's occupation by father's occupation are primarily the result of the associations between the socioeconomic status of the father's and son's occupations, the level of autonomy characterizing the father's and son's occupations, and the effect of status, autonomy, and occupational training (specific vocational preparation) at origin on son's immobility, or direct occupational inheritance. Using a measure based on Duncan's (1961) socioeconomic index and measures of occupational autonomy and training calculated from pooled General Social Survey data, Hout calculated an average status, autonomy, and training score for each occupational stratum.

The socioeconomic status measure reflects the influence of parental socioeconomic resources on sons' socioeconomic destinations. It may also reflect a role modeling and socialization mechanism to the extent that sons' conceptions of desirable status are shaped by parental example. The autonomy measure reflects theory about how role modeling, socialization, and value transmission processes shape a son's "orientation toward what makes up 'earning a living'" (Hout 1984, p. 1384). The training measure reflects the father's ability to secure specific vocational training to prepare his son for entry into the same occupation as the father.

Hout's (1984) SAT model is a loglinear model of the mobility table. In extending Duncan's (1979) work, Hout used substantive covariates to parsimoniously capture the main sources of association between fathers' and sons' occupations. His SAT model takes the form:

$$\log(F_{ij}) = a + a_{1(i)} + a_{2(j)} + b_1 S_i S_j + b_2 A_i A_j$$
$$+ d_1 D_{ij} S_i^2 + d_2 D_{ij} A_i^2 + d_3 D_{ij} T_i. \quad (1)$$

The model says that the expected cell frequency, F_{ij}, of father's occupation by son's occupation, is

a result of the main effect of father's occupation $(a_{1(i)})$, the main effect of son's occupation $(a_{2(j)})$, the interaction between fathers' and sons' socioeconomic statuses $(S_i S_j)$, the interaction between the autonomies of the fathers' and sons' occupations $(A_i A_j)$, and the effect of status (d_1), autonomy (d_2), and training (d_3) on immobility $(D_{ij} S_i^2, D_{ij} A_i^2,$ and $D_{ij} T_i$ respectively, where $D_{ij} = 1$ if $i = j$ and 0 otherwise).[6] Hout (1984) found that cells involving farm occupations had significantly larger residuals than other cells, and so he added to the equation four dummy variables that apply to mobility into and out of farming.

We generalize Hout's SAT model to test the hypothesis that family disruption conditions the associations between dimensions of occupational origins and destinations. This is a model for the four-way table of father's occupation i, by son's occupation j, by race k (white = 1 and black = 2), by family type l (intact family = 1 and nonintact family = 2). The extended SAT model includes the anticipated effects of family disruption and race:

$$\log(F_{ijkl}) = a + a_{1(i)} + a_{2(j)} + a_{3(k)} + a_{4(l)} + a_{13(ik)}$$
$$+ a_{23(jk)} + a_{14(il)} + a_{24(jl)} + a_{34(kl)}$$
$$+ b_1 S_i S_j + b_2 A_i A_j + d_1 D_{ij} S_i^2$$
$$+ d_2 D_{ij} A_i^2 + d_3 D_{ij} T_i + b_{1l} S_i S_j$$
$$+ b_{2l} A_i A_j + d_{1l} D_{ij} S_i^2 + d_{2l} D_{ij} A_i^2$$
$$+ d_{3l} D_{ij} T_i, \quad (2)$$

where $a_{3(k)}$ and $a_{4(l)}$ represent the main effects of race and family structure, respectively; $a_{13(ik)}$, $a_{23(jk)}$, $a_{14(il)}$, and $a_{24(jl)}$ represent variation in the marginal distributions of origin and destination occupational categories by race and family structure; and $a_{34(kl)}$ represents the interaction between race and family structure. The b_{1l} and b_{2l} parameters are the conditioning effects of family structure on the status $(S_i S_j)$ and autonomy $(A_i A_j)$ associations. The d_{1l}, d_{2l}, and d_{3l} parameters are the conditioning effects of family structure on the origin socioeconomic status/immobility $(D_{ij} S_i^2)$, origin occupational autonomy/immobility $(D_{ij} A_i^2)$, and origin occupational training/immobility $(D_{ij} T_i)$ relationships.

Although SAT mobility patterns do not vary significantly by race in these data (Hout 1984), the association between race and family disrup-

---

[6] The T_i are not squared in the diagonal effects because the linear form T_i fits better than T_i^2 (Hout 1983).

Table 3.   Goodness-of-Fit Statistics for Selected Hierarchical Loglinear Models of the Effects of Family Structure on
            Occupational Inheritance: U.S. Men Ages 20 to 64 in March 1973

Model	Son's First Occupation			Son's Current Occupation		
	L^2	Degrees of Freedom	BIC Statistic	L^2	Degrees of Freedom	BIC Statistic
Model 1	11,149	1,121	71	8,419	1,121	–2,740
Model 2	1,228	1,061	–9,257	1,227	1,061	–9,335
Model 3	1,207	1,060	–9,268	1,212	1,060	–9,340

Note: Model 1 is the independence model; Model 2 is the basic SAT model that includes race and family structure interaction terms; Model 3 is Model 2 with an additional term for the interaction between family structure and the SAT origin/destination association.

tion is large. By including race in our model, we can separate and assess the distinctive effects of family structure and race.

RESULTS

Table 3 shows fit statistics for selected models for the cross-classification of father's (or family head's) occupation by son's first occupation and current occupation by family background (intact/nonintact) and race (black/white). The BIC statistic (Raftery 1986a, 1986b) is the criterion for model selection (BIC = L^2 – df(logN), where N is the total sample size). The lower the BIC, the better the model captures the main features of the data relative to other models.

Model 1 is the independence model, which includes the main effects of father's (or family head's) occupation, son's occupation, race, and family structure. Model 2 is the basic SAT model. Model 2 includes the main effects from Model 1, the five SAT terms, the four dummy variables for farm origins and destinations, and adds the following six interaction terms: (1) origin occupation × race, which represents racial differences in the marginal distributions of origin occupations; (2) destination occupation × race, which represents racial differences in the marginal distributions of destination occupations; (3) family structure × race, which represents racial differences in the marginal distributions of family structure; (4) origin occupation × family structure, which represents differences in the marginal distributions of origin occupations by family structure; (5) destination socioeconomic index × family structure, which represents the direct effect of family structure on destination socioeconomic status; and (6) destination autonomy × family structure, which represents the direct effect of family structure on destination autonomy. (The

latter two terms fit the data better than a destination occupation × family structure term.)

As expected, Model 2 fits the data much better than the independence model (Model 1). Model 3 adds an interaction term to Model 2 — family structure × score for SAT origin/destination association — that represents the conditioning effect of family structure on the overall association between origin and destination. Our theoretical arguments suggest that disruption weakens this overall association and a preliminary analysis bore this out — family structure reduced each of the SAT associations by a similar proportion. We therefore fit Model 3:

$$\begin{aligned}
\log(F_{ijkl}) = {} & a + a_{1(i)} + a_{2(j)} + a_{3(k)} + a_{4(l)} \\
& + a_{13(ik)} + a_{23(jk)} + a_{14(il)} + lS_j + lA_j \\
& + a_{34(kl)} + b_1 S_i S_j + b_2 A_i A_j + d_1 D_{ij} S_i^2 \\
& + d_2 D_{ij} A_i^2 + d_3 D_{ij} T_i + \delta\,(l-1) \\
& \times \{ b_1 S_i S_j + b_2 A_i A_j + d_1 D_{ij} S_i^2 \\
& + d_2 D_{ij} A_i^2 + d_3 D_{ij} T_i \}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

This model says that family disruption weakens the overall association between origin and destination by the proportion ($-\delta$), where δ is negative.

This is not a loglinear model, but we estimated it using an iterative scheme combined with standard loglinear modeling methods. First, the SAT parameters b_1, b_2, d_1, d_2, and d_3 were estimated from Model 2. Then δ was estimated from Model 3, treating the SAT parameters as known. The SAT parameters were then re-estimated from Model 3, then δ was re-estimated, and so on to convergence. In practice, the scheme converged immediately and the iteration made no difference.

Model 3 fits the data better than Model 2. Thus, a model that says that all of the SAT origin/destination associations are uniformly different for men from nonintact backgrounds than for men from intact backgrounds fits the data better than a model that says that origin/destination associations are unaffected by family structure.[7]

Table 4 presents parameter estimates for Model 3 for son's first occupation and son's current occupation. The "marginal interaction" coefficients for origin occupation × race show that blacks are significantly less likely than whites to come from all except the lowest occupational strata (service workers and laborers in manufacturing and nonmanufacturing industries). The marginal interaction coefficients for destination occupation × race show that blacks are significantly more likely than whites to have service worker and laborer destinations, and they are significantly less likely than whites to enter professional, managerial, sales, and skilled manual (craftsmen) occupations. These effects are independent of black/white differences in family structure and origin socioeconomic status, and the patterns are similar for son's first occupation and current occupation. The effects can be viewed as the direct costs of race on the occupational destinations of men (Siegel 1965; Duncan 1969).

The marginal interaction coefficients for family structure × race show that blacks are significantly more likely than whites to come from a nonintact family structure. The coefficients indicate that blacks have over twice the odds of experiencing family disruption when compared to whites, independent of socioeconomic origins.

The marginal interaction coefficients for origin occupation × family structure indicate that sons from nonintact families are less likely to have self-employed professional, managerial, nonretail sales, craftsmen, laborer, and farm origins than are sons from intact families. Sons from nonintact families are more likely to come from clerical, retail sales, and service origins than are sons from intact families. Because the occupational origin reported by sons from nonintact backgrounds is often the mother's occupation, this association may be explained by the traditional overrepresentation of women in these occupations.

The marginal interaction coefficient for destination socioeconomic status × family structure shows that a nonintact background strongly reduces the socioeconomic status of sons' first destinations, independent of sons' origins and race. Coming from a nonintact background increases the odds of ending up in the lowest socioeconomic stratum as against the highest stratum by over 50 percent, i.e., $\exp(-.0057 \times 73) = .66 = 1/1.52$, where 73 is the socioeconomic index scale range. The odds of becoming a laborer in a manufacturing industry rather than a self-employed professional are 52 percent greater for a son from a nonintact background than for a son with the same origin and race who is from an intact background. This finding reveals succinctly the direct costs of family disruption on the socioeconomic status destinations of men. Although the direct effect of family disruption on son's current occupation is somewhat weaker (sons from nonintact backgrounds have more than 30 percent greater odds of currently occupying the lowest occupation as against the highest status occupation), it remains strong and statistically significant. The effect of family disruption on the socioeconomic status destinations of sons is similar for blacks and whites.[8] Family disruption does not, however, directly affect the autonomy dimensions of son's occupational destinations.

Coefficients for the SAT "covariates" show strong associations between socioeconomic index at origin and destination socioeconomic index, and between origin and destination levels of autonomy. Origin levels of autonomy and training positively affect immobility, but origin socioeconomic status is negatively associated with immobility. Hout (1988, pp. 1380–81) suggested that "expanding universalism within high status occupations" may explain this negative relationship between origin socioeconomic status and immobility.

The coefficients for "interactions involving farm cells" indicate significantly less movement into and out of farming than would be expected under the SAT model. Hout (1984, 1988) also found these effects, as well as the effects of the SAT covariates, using these data and other data. Hout showed that the SAT model (or some modification of it) adequately explains the patterns of mobility and immobility of subgroups stratified by age, race, sex, and education.

---

[7] Several other models (not shown) were tested and rejected in favor of Model 3, on the basis of the BIC criterion.

[8] Including a race × family structure × destination socioeconomic index term produced a trivial reduction in deviance and the parameter estimate was not statistically significant.

Table 4. Parameter Estimates for the Effects of Family Structure on Occupational Inheritance: U.S. Men Ages 20 to 64 in March 1973

Interaction Term	Parameter Estimate		t-value	
	First Occ.	Current Occ.	First Occ.	Current Occ.
Marginal Interactions				
Professional, self-employed origins × race	-2.09*	-1.88*	4.92	4.84
Professional, salaried origins × race	-1.60*	-1.48*	8.66	8.69
Manager origins × race	-2.70*	-2.57*	9.85	9.77
Salesmen, nonretail origins × race	-3.26*	-3.01*	6.01	6.57
Proprietor origins × race	-2.44*	-2.23*	9.91	9.59
Clerk origins × race	-1.75*	-1.52*	9.42	9.14
Salesmen, retail origins × race	-2.82*	-2.79*	7.05	7.09
Craftsmen, manufacturing origins × race	-2.02*	-1.96*	11.11	11.23
Craftsmen, other origins × race	-1.62*	-1.40*	10.56	9.89
Craftsmen, construction origins × race	-1.45*	-1.38*	9.43	9.16
Service worker origins × race	-.27	-.20	2.40	1.88
Operative, nonmanufacturing origins × race	-1.09*	-1.03*	8.83	8.70
Operative, manufacturing origins × race	-1.29*	-1.24*	10.27	10.35
Laborer, manufacturing origins × race	-.07	.05	.48	.38
Laborer, nonmanufacturing origins × race	-.10	-.03	.84	.21
Farmer/farm manager origins × race	-.63*	-.56*	6.60	5.95
Farm laborer origins × race	—	—	—	—
Professional, self-employed destinations × race	-.75	-1.12*	1.50	3.07
Professional, salaried destinations × race	-.60*	-.76*	4.48	4.10
Manager destinations × race	-.60*	-1.45*	2.72	6.95
Salesmen, nonretail destinations × race	-1.04*	-1.90*	3.55	5.97
Proprietor destinations × race	-.78	-1.33*	1.41	4.81
Clerk destinations × race	-.18	.04	1.47	.22
Salesmen, retail destinations × race	-.89*	-1.05*	4.37	3.84
Craftsmen, manufacturing destinations × race	-.42*	-.70*	2.42	3.67
Craftsmen, other destinations × race	-.66*	-.82*	4.05	4.36
Craftsmen, construction destinations × race	-.41*	-.86*	2.29	4.28
Service worker destinations × race	1.07*	.27	9.61	1.58
Operative, nonmanufacturing destinations × race	.04	.00	.41	.03
Operative, manufacturing destinations × race	.00	.17	.04	.99
Laborer, manufacturing destinations × race	.55*	.51*	4.52	2.53
Laborer, nonmanufacturing destinations × race	.42*	.60*	3.97	3.39
Farmer/farm manager destinations × race	-.41*	-1.88*	2.46	6.44
Farm laborer destinations × race	—	—	—	—
Marginal Interactions (Continued)				
Family structure × race	.98*	.97*	15.98	15.91
Professional, self-employed origins × family structure	-.48*	-.60*	2.02	2.53
Professional, salaried origins × family structure	-.05	-.15	.39	1.18
Manager origins × family structure	-.77*	-.80*	5.15	5.58
Salesmen, nonretail origins × family structure	-.96*	-.88*	4.39	4.43
Proprietor origins × family structure	-.38*	-.40*	2.76	3.00
Clerk origins × family structure	.61*	.66*	5.07	5.69
Salesmen, retail origins × family structure	.35*	.38*	2.30	2.55
Craftsmen, manufacturing origins × family structure	-.90*	-.90*	6.29	6.40
Craftsmen, other origins × family structure	-.77*	-.76*	5.89	5.98
Craftsmen, construction origins × family structure	-.77*	-.76*	5.58	5.65
Service worker origins × family structure	1.28*	1.28*	12.12	12.54
Operative, nonmanufacturing origins × family structure	-.21	-.17	1.87	1.57
Operative, manufacturing origins × family structure	.11	.15	1.04	1.36
Laborer, manufacturing origins × family structure	-.85*	-.83*	4.67	4.59
Laborer, nonmanufacturing origins × family structure	-.65*	-.56*	4.51	4.08
Farmer/farm manager origins × family structure	-.52*	-.48*	5.21	4.84
Farm laborer origins × family structure	—	—	—	—
Destination socioeconomic status × family structure	-.57*	-.40*	5.44	4.02
Destination autonomy × family structure	.04	.02	.82	.45
Covariates				
Origin SES × destination SES	.62*	.53*	29.40	26.82
Origin autonomy × destination autonomy	.37*	.35*	12.00	12.63
Origin SES × destination SES, if on diagonal	-.19*	-.13*	12.22	8.70
Origin autonomy × destination autonomy, if on diagonal	.11*	.13*	4.39	5.43
Origin training × destination training, if on diagonal	.20*	.15*	23.85	17.20
Interactions Involving Farm Cells				
Farm with upper nonmanual origin or destination = 1	-1.13*	-1.12*	18.02	17.88
Farm with lower nonmanual origin or destination = 1	-1.32*	-1.03*	21.82	15.16
Farm with upper manual origin or destination = 1	-1.05*	-.72*	20.37	12.67
Farm with lower manual origin or destination = 1	-1.03*	-.79*	27.99	15.10
Interaction Between Family Structure and SAT Association				
SAT origin/destination association score × family structure	-.23*	-.24*	4.60	3.86

* $p < .05$

Note: The origin socioeconomic status × destination socioeconomic status coefficients were multiplied by 1,000; the origin autonomy × destination autonomy coefficients were multiplied by 100; the destination socioeconomic status × destination socioeconomic status coefficient was multiplied by 100; and the destination autonomy × family structure coefficient was multiplied by 100; the origin autonomy × family structure coefficient was multiplied by 10.

The final coefficients for the SAT origin/destination association score × family structure represent the conditioning effect of family structure on the origin/destination association. The interactions between origins and sons' first occupational destinations are 23 percent weaker for sons from nonintact backgrounds compared to sons from intact backgrounds. Thus, family disruption weakens the overall association by 23 percent, i.e., reduces each of the SAT parameters by 23 percent. (This result is highly significant: t-value = 4.6, $p < .00001$.) The interaction between origins and current destinations are 24 percent weaker for sons from nonintact backgrounds. Overall, we conclude that intergenerational association varies by family type and is weaker for men from nonintact homes.

While the SAT associations vary significantly by family structure, they do not vary by race.[9] Hout's (1984) results using these data also showed a general convergence in the patterns of SAT mobility and inheritance among blacks and whites.

The parameter estimates for first occupation and current occupation tell similar stories: Coming from a nonintact family structure directly lowers men's occupational destinations and weakens the association between their occupational origins and occupational destinations.

DISCUSSION

Family disruption affects occupational mobility in contemporary American society in two ways. First is the direct effect of family disruption: Men from nonintact family backgrounds have greater odds of entering low status occupations as opposed to high status occupations. Second is the conditional effect of family disruption: Family disruption weakens intergenerational inheritance and resemblance, even after disruption's direct effects are taken into account. Hence, including family structure in studies of social mobility adds to our understanding of the present distribution of occupations and changes in the association between occupational origins and destinations.

"In an open society, occupational success is independent of both the constraints that arise from a disadvantaged social class background and the

privileges that accompany an advantaged origin" (Hout 1988, p. 1358). The inability of families to pass on advantages or disadvantages to their children may result from greater equality of opportunity in social institutions, i.e., from selection based on achievement rather than on the markers of class; but it may also result from a weakening of intrafamily processes that contribute to socioeconomic inheritance. Our results suggest that, holding the opportunity structure constant, family disruption is associated with reductions in the association between origins and destinations. Thus greater universalism may also reflect change in the structure of the family.

The greater universalism observed between 1962 and 1986, indicated by a weakened association between occupational origins and destinations (Hout 1984, 1988), was not a result of changes in the family — the overall proportion of adults from nonintact backgrounds remained relatively stable over this period while children of the divorce boom that started in the mid-1960s had not yet entered the labor force. Our findings suggest that as these children of divorce come of age, we may see an increased universalism, but a universalism driven by changes in the family rather than by (or in addition to) changes in other social institutions.

Using a large, nationally representative survey, we have provided a provisional baseline model of the overall difference in intergenerational inheritance between intact families and nonintact families. The importance of such models was emphasized by Grusky and Hauser (1984). An important next step for research is to further stratify nonintact families by type of disruption and, if possible, by the timing of disruption and duration in each kind of nonintact state (Wojtkiewicz 1992; Wu and Martinson 1990). The death of a parent, for example, may affect patterns of intergenerational transmission differently than parental divorce; the effects of either disruption may vary depending on the timing of its occurrence in a child's life. The growing proportion of single-parent families and stepfamilies also suggests the importance of stratifying mobility tables by the gender and parental role of the "family head" whose occupation is the measure of social origin in mobility analysis.

---

[9] Adding a race × score for SAT origin/destination association term did not produce a better model; its coefficient was not significant, and it did not substantially change the coefficient for the family structure × score for SAT origin/destination association term.

TIMOTHY J. BIBLARZ is Assistant Professor of Sociology at the University of Southern California. His research focuses on the relationship of the family to stratification and mobility patterns. He is currently working on a project concerning the socioeconomic bases of contemporary child rearing values and behavior.

ADRIAN E. RAFTERY is Professor, Department of Statistics and Sociology, at the University of Washington. His recent sociological research focuses on trends in educational inequality in Ireland and the United States, and on new methods for fertility analysis, with application to the Iranian World Fertility Survey Data. He is also working on several problems in theoretical and applied statistics, including model selection, and the estimation of population size and demographic structure for the Western Arctic stock of bowhead whales.

REFERENCES

Acock, Alan C. and K. Jill Kiecolt. 1989. "Is It Family Structure or Socioeconomic Status? Family Structure During Adolescence and Adult Adjustment." *Social Forces* 68:553–71.

Alexander, Karl L., Doris R. Entwisle and Maxine S. Thompson. 1987. "School Performance, Status Relations, and the Structure of Sentiment: Bringing the Teacher Back In." *American Sociological Review* 52:665–82.

Astone, Nan Marie and Sara S. McLanahan. 1991. "Family Structure, Parental Practices, and High School Completion." *American Sociological Review* 56:309–20.

Becker, Gary S. 1964. *Human Capital*. New York: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Becker, Gary S. and Nigel Tomes. 1986. "Human Capital and the Rise and Fall of Families." *Journal of Labor Economics* 4:S1–S39.

Blau, Peter M. and Otis Dudley Duncan. 1967. *The American Occupational Structure*. New York: Wiley.

Bumpass, Larry L. 1984. "Children and Marital Disruption: A Replication and Update." *Demography* 21:71–82.

————. 1990. "What's Happening to the Family? Interactions between Demographic and Institutional Change." *Demography* 27:483–98.

Bumpass, Larry L. and James A. Sweet. 1989. "Children's Experience in Single-Parent Families: Implications of Cohabitation and Marital Transitions." *Family Planning Perspectives* 21:256–60.

Cassetty, Judith. 1978. *Child Support and Public Policy: Securing Support from Absent Husbands*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Chambers, David L. 1979. *Making Fathers Pay: The Enforcement of Child Support*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Cherlin, Andrew. 1978. "Remarriage as an Incomplete Institution." *American Journal of Sociology* 84:634–50.

Davis, James A. and Tom Smith. 1987. *General Social Surveys, 1972–1987: Cumulative Codebook*. Storrs, CN: Roper Center.

Dawson, Deborah A. 1991. "Family Structure and Children's Health and Well-Being: Data From the 1988 National Health Interview Survey on Child Health." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 53:573–84.

DiPrete, Thomas A. and David B. Grusky. 1990. "Structure and Trend in the Process of Stratification for American Men and Women." *American Journal of Sociology* 96:107–43.

Duncan, Beverly and Otis Dudley Duncan. 1969. "Family Stability and Occupational Success." *Social Problems* 16:273–85.

Duncan, Otis Dudley. 1961. "A Socioeconomic Index for All Occupations." Pp. 109–38 in *Occupations and Social Status*, edited by A. J. Reiss, Jr. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

————. 1968. "Patterns of Occupational Mobility Among Negro Men." *Demography* 5:11–22.

————. 1969. "Inheritance of Poverty or Inheritance of Race?" Pp. 85–110 in *On Understanding Poverty: Perspectives from the Social Sciences*, edited by D. P. Moynihan. New York: Basic.

————. 1979. "How Destination Depends on Origin in the Occupational Mobility Table." *American Journal of Sociology* 84:793–804.

Eder, Donna. 1982. "Family Background and Ability Group Assignments." Pp. 29–46 in *Social Structure and Behavior: Essays in Honor of William Hamilton Sewell*, edited by R. M. Hauser, D. Mechanic, A. O. Haller, and T. S. Hauser. New York: Academic Press.

Featherman, David L. and Robert M. Hauser. 1978. *Opportunity and Change*. New York: Academic Press.

Felner, Robert D., Stephanie S. Farber, Melanie A. Ginter, Mary F. Boike, and Emory L. Cowen. 1981. "Family Stress and Organization Following Parental Divorce or Death." *Journal of Divorce* 4:67–76.

Furstenburg, Frank F. and Christine Winquist Nord. 1985. "Parenting Apart: Patterns of Childrearing After Marital Disruption." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 47:893–904.

Grusky, David B. and Thomas A. DiPrete. 1990. "Recent Trends in the Process of Stratification." *Demography* 27:617–38.

Grusky, David B. and Robert M. Hauser. 1984. "Comparative Social Mobility Revisited: Models of Convergence and Divergence in 16 Countries." *American Sociological Review* 49:19–38.

Han, Wan Sang. 1968. "Discrepancy in Socioeconomic Level of Aspiration and Perception of Illegitimate Expediency." *American Journal of Sociology* 74:240–47.

————. 1969. "Two Conflicting Themes: Common Values Versus Class Differential Values." *American Sociological Review* 34:679–90.

Hetherington, E. Mavis, Martha Cox and Roger Cox. 1978. "The Aftermath of Divorce." Pp. 149–76 in *Mother-Child Father-Child Relationships*, edited by J. H. Stevens, Jr. and M. Mathews. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young People.

Hout, Michael. 1983. *Mobility Tables*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

————. 1984. "Status, Autonomy, and Training in Occupational Mobility." *American Journal of Sociology* 89:1397–1409.

————. 1988. "More Universalism, Less Structural Mobility: The American Occupational Structure in the 1980s." *American Journal of Sociology* 93:1358–1400.

Jones, Jo Ann, Joan R. Kahn, Allan Parnell, Ronald R. Rindfuss, and C. Gray Swicegood. 1985. "Nonmarital Childbearing: Divergent Legal and Social Concerns." *Population and Development Review* 11:677–93.

Kerckhoff, Alan C. 1976. "The Status Attainment Process: Socialization or Allocation?" *Social Forces* 55:368–81.

Kohn, Melvin L. 1969. *Class and Conformity: A Study in Values*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.

Kohn, Melvin L. and Kazimierz M. Slomczynski. 1990. *Social Structure and Self-Direction: A Comparative Analysis of the United States and Poland*. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.

Lareau, Annette. 1989. *Home Advantage: Social Class and Parental Intervention in Elementary Education*. London, England: Falmer Press.

Marino, Cena D. and Richard J. McCowan. 1976. "The Effects of Parent Absence on Children." *Child Study Journal* 6:165–82.

Martin, Teresa Castro and Larry L. Bumpass. 1989. "Recent Trends in Marital Disruption." *Demography* 26:37–51.

McLanahan, Sara S. 1985. "Family Structure and the Reproduction of Poverty." *American Journal of Sociology* 90:873–901.

National Center for Health Statistics. 1991. "Advance Report of Final Divorce Statistics, 1988." *Monthly Vital Statistics Report*. Vol. 39, no. 12, supp. 2. Hyattsville, MD: U.S. Public Health Service.

Raftery, Adrian E. 1986a. "A Note on Bayes Factors for Log-Linear Contingency Table Models With Vague Prior Information." *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, Series B, 48:249–50.

Raftery, Adrian E. 1986b. "Choosing Models for Cross-Classifications." *American Sociological Review* 51:145–46.

Sandefur, Gary D., Sara S. McLanahan, and Roger A. Wojtkiewicz. 1989. "Race and Ethnicity, Family Structure, and High School Completion " (Discussion Paper No. 893–89). Institute for Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Siegel, Paul M. 1965. "On the Cost of Being a Negro." *Sociological Inquiry* 35:41–57.

Steelman, Lala Carr and Brian Powell. 1991. "Sponsoring the Next Generation: Parental Willingness to Pay for Higher Education." *American Journal of Sociology* 96:1505–29.

Thomson, Elizabeth, Sara S. McLanahan, and Roberta Braus Curtin. 1992. "Family Structure, Gender, and Parental Socialization." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 54:368–78.

Weiss, R. 1979. "Growing Up a Little Faster: The Experience of Growing Up in Single-Parent Households." *Journal of Social Issues* 35:97–111.

Weiss, Yoram and Robert J. Willis. 1985. "Children as Collective Goods and Divorce Settlements." *Journal of Labor Economics* 3:268–92.

Wojtkiewicz, Roger A. 1992. "Diversity in Experiences of Parental Structure During Childhood and Adolescence." *Demography* 29:59–68.

Wojtkiewicz, Roger A., Sara S. McLanahan, and Irwin Garfinkel. 1990. "The Growth of Families Headed by Women: 1950–1980." *Demography* 27:19–30.

Wu, Lawrence L. and Brian C. Martinson. 1990. "Parent Histories: Patterns of Early Life " (Working Paper No. 37). National Survey of Families and Households. Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin, Madison.