Why Do Women Opt-Out?
The Ideological & Economic Determinants of Women's Employment Status

Katrina M. Leupp

Department of Sociology
University of Washington

2010

ABSTRACT: *Popular culture indicates that the cultural model of intensive mothering, which prizes full-time, maternal care for children, remains salient despite women's high employment rates (Douglas & Michaels 2004). This saliency suggests that women's employment decisions are shaped by cultural pressures to devote themselves to childrearing as much, or more so, than financial considerations or employment preference. This paper examines the conceptual relevance of perspectives implied by 1) cultural ideologies about mothering, and 2) financial resources, for understanding mothers' return to employment after first birth. Results indicate that holding an intensive mothering ideology, and family income other than women's own earnings, are negatively associated with the risk of return to employment. Yet at the same time, mothers' incomes have significant, positive effects on their returns to employment. In sum, the competing effects of own income and other family income on mothers' employment suggest a more complicated relationship between class privilege and mothering practices than is commonly described.*

I. INTRODUCTION

The mass entrance of women into the paid labor force during the second half of the 20th century has made the employment of mothers now commonplace. According to 2006 Current Population Survey Data, 65 percent of mothers of young children, and 80 percent of women with children over the age of 5 are employed (Cotter, England, and Hermsen 2007). As many scholars have recognized (Hochschild 1989; Sanchez and Thompson 1997), mother's increased employment has not been accompanied by a comparable change in the gendered division of domestic labor. Though time diaries indicate that married men doubled the time they spent with their children between 1965 and 2000, women continue to perform the majority of housework and childcare even when employed full-time (Bianchi, Robinson, and Milkie 2006). The difficult task of juggling employment and family care falls primarily upon women. The conflict between

employment and childrearing is especially acute in the United States, where families receive little childrearing aid in the form of paid parental leave or subsidized childcare, as compared to women in European social welfare states (Gornick 2004).

Despite these difficulties, the estimated marginal effect of children on the probability of women's employment has declined sharply in the past two decades (Boushey 2008). After dramatically increasing during the 1970's and 1980's, women with children of all ages have experienced more or less stable employment rates for the past 17 years[1]. There was a small dip in women's employment between 2000 and 2004. Though this temporary decrease may have fueled media attention on women's labor force exits (Williams, Manvell, and Bornstein 2006), the dip in women's employment largely mirrored low employment rates for all workers during the economic recession (Boushey 2008). Overall, figures suggest that mother's employment is steady and unlikely to decrease if past trends continue. Moreover, a longitudinal study of 1979-2002 data showed that the increased labor-force attachment of young women has improved women's job stability, even while average job stability for young men has declined (Bernhardt, et al. 2001.)

In contrast to the empirical evidence of mothers' high employment rates, trends in the popular media indicate that there is considerable public attention around the idea that privileged women are forgoing wage labor in order to practice intensive mothering. This attention is hardly new; as early as 1953, *The New York Times* featured an article entitled "The Case History of an Ex-Working Mother" (Williams, Manvell, and Bornstein 2006). Articles about women voluntarily leaving the paid labor force in order to care for their children full-time have been

[1] Since 1990. Though only 30 percent of mothers with children under the age of five were employed in 1970, this figure peaked at 65 percent in 1995. Mothers of older children follow a similar pattern. In 1970, 56 percent of mothers of older children were employed. By 1990, 77 percent were in the paid labor force (Cotter, England, and Hermsen 2007).

especially prevalent in the past decade, appearing as cover stories for both *Time* and *Newsweek* magazines (Williams, Manvell, and Bornstein 2006). In 2003, New York Times columnist Lisa Belkin declared that an "opt-out revolution" was occurring as professional women increasingly valued mothering over a professional career. Her report became the most e-mailed *New York Times* article of the year (Belkin 2003; Percheski 2008). Though the Opt-Out Revolution has not been supported by quantitative analyses (Boushey 2008; Percheski 2008), subsequent news articles and even some scholarly work have credited women's opting out as an explanation for gender inequalities in the labor market (Percheski 2008 e.g. Hill et al. 2006; Still 2006).

I suggest that the prominence of the Opt-Out storyline points to the cultural tensions under which mothers' labor force participation decisions are made. Qualitative research indicates that child-rearing standards vary by class (Lareau 2003), with middle and upper-class parenting practices being more time intensive than those of working class parents. Thus, we might expect higher-class women to be more likely to forgo employment for full-time childcare than are working class women. Yet at the same time, there are also reasons why privilege may increase the likelihood for mothers to be employed. First, the satisfaction women gain from employment may largely depend upon the quality of their job, so that privileged women enjoy greater job satisfaction than their less privileged peers. Additionally, there is indication that women in high-skill jobs face greater wage penalties for gaps in employment than low-skill workers (Budig & England 2006).

The impact of class-varying parenting practices may be further offset by the perceived impact of mothers' earnings on child wellbeing. While middle-income women may conceptualize their employment as ultimately benefiting their children by increasing family resources, the relationship between mothers' employment and child wellbeing changes when families have less

economic need or when the cost of childcare relative to mothers' earning potential is high. Given these complexities, the relationships among of work-family tensions, mothering ideologies, and family finances is unclear and warrants further investigation.

A body of scholarly work has investigated the mutual, often gendered, effects of employment and the family. Less attention in the form of quantitative research has sought to understand how the ideological contradictions between wage labor and mothering shape women's employment decisions. This paper examines the effects of mothering ideology and family finances on women's employment during their early childrearing years. Specific attention is given to the roles mothering ideology, women's own income, and other sources of family income, as well as their corresponding interactions, play in shaping mother's return to employment after childbirth.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Work-Family: Balance and Conflict

Women's ability to choose employment after the birth of a child requires that they are able to balance employment and childcare responsibilities with some degree of success. Despite a large body of research documenting work-family conflict (Grzywacz, Almeida, and McDonald 2002, Glass and Estes 1997), there are some indicators that women feel successful combining employment with family. For example, a 1999 study reported that women and men have similar levels of self-reported success in managing family and career demands. Using a 5 point scale measuring success in balancing family and work, where 3 is "somewhat successful" and 4 is "very successful," employed women and men have almost identical mean responses: 3.29 for

men and 3.28 for women (Milkie and Peltola 1999)[2]. Work-family balance can also be measured using the idea of spillover, or the extent to which participation in one domain impacts participation in another. Though women report more negative work to family and family to work spillover than do men, there is also a highly significant correlation between being female and reporting *positive* work to family spillover (Grzywacz, Almeida, and McDonald 2002). This positive impact of work on women's family life may indicate that women experience some degree of balance between the negative and positive aspects of combining employment and family care. Thus, while work-family time conflicts undoubtedly complicate women's employment, indicators that women are able to successfully juggle work and family suggests that researchers would do well to consider additional factors in women's employment decisions.

Ideological Forces

In addition to juggling the competing time demands of work and family, employment requires mothers to manage the ideological contradictions posed by mothering and paid labor. The dominant cultural model of an ideal mother prizes *intensive mothering*, where mothers devote full attention to meeting children's needs whenever possible (Eyer 1996; Hays 1996; Williams 2000). The value of intensive mothering has been bolstered by attachment theory, which posits that constant mother-child attachment is an essential foundation for children's emotional development (Bowlby 1969). Attachment theory has been publicly used by doctors, social workers, and childrearing experts to encourage women to stay home rather than return to

[2] When women employed full-time are grouped separately, their mean response is slightly lower than that of women employed part-time: 3.22 (full-time) versus 3.45 (part-time) (Milkie & Peltola 1999).

work after childbirth, despite criticisms on methodological and conceptual grounds by many in the scientific community (Eyer 1992; Hays 1998). Though actual childrearing practices deviate from the intensive mothering ideal, many scholars assert that intensive mothering remains "the normative standard, culturally and politically, by which mothering practices and arrangements are evaluated" (Arendell 2000:1195, see also Eyer 1996; Hays 1996; Williams 2000).

The intensive mothering model is inherently at odds with mothers' employment. Like the family, work is also a "greedy institution" (Coser and Coser 1974). Current employment models maintain that the ideal worker is able to completely devote himself to work without being hindered by family caretaking responsibilities. Because the model of an unencumbered worker pervades social, work, and legal institutions, employees with family caretaking responsibilities are marginalized (Williams 2000). The inherent contradictions between the ideals of intensive mothering and the unencumbered worker make it impossible for employed women with children to meet workplace and mothering expectations simultaneously.

The idea that young children are especially in need of full-day maternal care may partially explain why studies consistently demonstrate that the presence of young children heightens work-family conflict for women. Milkie & Petola (1999) report that having young children is imbalancing for women, but not for men. Alternately, Grzywacz, et al, finds that having a child under the age of six significantly increases negative family to work spillover and significantly decreases positive family to work spillover, even when holding gender constant (Grzywacz, Almeida, and McDonald 2002). Flexible hours and the ability to work from home when necessary are linked to positive outcomes for both family and business ((Hill et al. 2001), and have been encouraged as policies to decrease work-family conflict (Glass 2000). However, data from a survey of International Business Machines (IBM) employees (n=6,451) indicate that

preschoolers increase the likelihood of reporting work-family conflict for both men and women, even when employees have flexible time and work location arrangements. Notably, mothers of preschoolers reported difficulty with work family balance at higher rates (53%) than men with preschoolers (38%) (Hill et al. 2001).

Cultural pressures for mothers to devote themselves to childcare and fathers to employment may also explain some of the gendered differences in how parents experience work-family balance. For example, men who report having no personal time are 22 percent less likely than women without personal time to report feeling very balanced between work and family (Keene and Quadagno 2004). If women place a higher priority on time with their children than do men, women may be more willing to forgo personal time. Neglecting work demands also differentially impacts men and women; the probability of women who refuse overtime to feel balanced is .93, while for men is only .72. This finding supports the idea that fathering expectations prize wage earning (Townsend 2002), unlike mothering expectations, which prize unpaid care-giving (Hays 1996).

Though there is much merit in the idea that motherhood and employment are culturally assumed to be oppositional, there is reason to consider the existence of alternative mothering ideologies that hold employment and childrearing as complimentary. Indeed, the now normative nature of mother's employment undermines the claim that oppositional mothering and employment ideals are hegemonic. Based on qualitative research with Swedish mothers, Elvin-Nowak and Thomsson (2001) describe discursive positions on childrearing and mothers' employment. The first described position bears resemblance to intensive mothering practices in the expectation for physical closeness early on in a child's life, but conceptualizes motherhood in general as a constant *emotional* state of availability rather than a physical act of caretaking. An

alternate position stresses the role of well-being transfers from mothers to their children. Mothers believe they should be available for their children, but also, that they will ultimately be better mothers if their own needs and desires are met. The well-being transfer position echoes Hays' description of American mothers, who manage the contradiction between their roles as workers and mothers by arguing that their employment is ultimately good for their children (1996).

Socio-economic class may vary how mothers conceptualize and manage the relationship between motherhood and employment. For example, some argue that among African-American women, the long-standing necessity of wage earning encouraged an alternate conceptualization of motherhood that does not conflict with paid employment (Zinn 1989). Variations in parenting styles by social class support the argument that the demand for intensive mothering increases with economic privilege. As Annette Lareau outlines in *Unequal Childhoods: Class, Race, and Family Life* (2003), middle and upper-class parents follow a childrearing model whereby parents must carefully and deliberately shape their children's cognitive and social skills. This approach contrasts with that of working-class parents, whose "natural growth" model of parenting places value on basic supports for children but holds faith in children's ability to flourish without vigilant adult management (Lareau 2003).

Notably, women themselves may experience shifts in their mothering practices and ideologies as their employment status and opportunities change. Longitudinal data suggests that women follow diverse life paths, shifting in and out of employment, rather than remaining in a stable employment or homemaking role. Examining 1972-1986 data, VandenHuevel (1997) found that only 11 and 13 percent of white mothers were either continuously out of the labor force or employed over a ten-year time period. Black women were more likely to hold continuous employment (35%), and unlikely to maintain a homemaker role (2%). Routes in and out of

employment varied. Of those who remained in the sample throughout the observation period, white women took 225 different employment/non-employment routes while Black mothers followed 73 sequences. A less-restrictive analysis of employment routes would likely suggest that employment trajectories are even more varied, as VandenHeuvel's analysis measured employment at one-year intervals, and did not differentiate between full and part-time work (Vandenheuvel 1997).

Financial Considerations

Exercising a choice to exit employment during childrearing requires mothers to have a means of financial support separate from their own earnings. The decline in real wages for men, paired with increased housing and educational costs, has created an economic climate where many families can't afford to lose a second income, even temporarily, without making substantial standard of living adjustments. In *The Two-Income Trap: Why Middle Class Mothers & Fathers are Going Broke,* Harvard law professor and bankruptcy expert Elizabeth Warren argues that the extra household income gained via women's employment has driven up the costs of housing and education as middle-class families essentially attempt to out-bid each other for access to quality public schools. Decreased job security and increased health costs have combined with high mortgages to put families at great financial risk: adjusted for inflation, families' fixed costs (mortgage, childcare, health insurance, taxes, transportation) increased almost $30,000 between the early 1970's and early 2000's (Warren and Tyagi 2003). According to Warren and Tyagi, if mothers of the average family were to "opt-out" of their wages, their single-income family would be 60% worse off than a single-income family of the 1970's. Thus, even middle-class women face considerable financial constraint against exiting employment.

Women's integral contributions to family income encourage researchers to measure the effect of husbands' earnings in tandem with the effect of women's own earnings. In 2005, employed women's wages were 35 percent of their total family income (median), and 26 percent of working wives earn more than their employed husbands (Boushey 2008). Wenk and Garrett (1992) find that women who out-earn their spouses are more likely to remain employed during pregnancy and childbirth, leave their jobs more slowly, return to employment more quickly, and be employed one year following childbirth.

Finally, low-income women's employment may be greatly effected by the ratio of their earnings to the price of childcare, as childcare costs reduce the net financial benefit of having both partners employed. Though estimates of the effect's magnitude vary, most recent studies indicate that childcare costs decrease mothers' employment (Baum II, Charles L. 2002; Connelly and Kimmel 2003). Using 1988-1994 NLSY data, Baum (2002) found that childcare costs reduce the probability of employment for low-income women but not for non-low-income women (Baum 2002). Though some low-income families may use shift work to mitigate the costs of childcare, childcare costs may in fact weaken the response of low-wage women to their own earnings.

Demographic Changes

One of the most striking changes in women's labor force participation has been the reversal of employment trends by race and class. As industrialization shifted production out of the home and into factories during mid-1800's, husbands' abilities to fully support their family financially came to serve as a marker of middle class status (Coontz 1992). Historically, Black men's exclusion from "family wage" jobs forced married Black women into wage labor at much higher

rates than among white women. In 1880, only 15 percent of white married women had jobs outside the home, while about 50 percent of Black women were employed (Zinn 1989). Black women's labor force participation rates remained far ahead of whites' for the first portion of the 20th century. In the 1980's racial employment patterns converged: Black and white women's employment rates met at 47 percent, while 44 percent of Mexican women were employed (England, Garcia-Beaulieu, and Ross 2004).

Now, recent data indicate that women who are more privileged by race, national origin, and educational status have higher employment rates than less privileged groups. Based on 2001 CPS data, England, et al., report that white women are employed 36.01 weeks per year, while Mexican women work 29.03 weeks, and Black women 34.61 weeks. For Mexican women, less education, higher fertility levels, and the likelihood of being a recent immigrant appear to account for their lower employment rate than white women. For Black women, England estimates that lower education levels explain 84 percent of the Black/white employment gap (England, Garcia-Beaulieu, and Ross 2004). Black women's lower employment levels relative to white's may also be due, to their higher rates of employment exit (Reid 2002). While it appears that Black women use temporary and seasonal work, in part, to accommodate childcare needs, Black women are no more likely to terminate employment because of pregnancy or family reasons. Instead, Reid argues that occupational segregation by race makes Black women more vulnerable to layoffs and employment exits due to seasonal or temporary work (Reid 2002).

Despite media scrutiny, professional women's labor force participation remains high. In an examination of five cohorts of professional women, Percheski (2008) reports that the percentage of women employed in predominately male professions or with advanced degrees who leave the labor force has declined substantially. Of Generation X women (born 1966 to 1975), only 6

percent in male professions and 5 percent with advanced degrees report not working or enrolled in school between the ages of 25 and 39[3]. Yet at the same time, of all non-employed mothers, an increasing proportion hold advanced degrees (28.8%) or were formerly employed in traditionally male professions (15.4%) (Percheski 2008, see also Boushey 2008). This trend likely reflects the increasing number of women with advanced degrees and employment in male professions. Nevertheless, the increasing likelihood for non-employed mothers to be either the least or most educated or all women is intriguing, and merits further investigation

III. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK & HYPOTHESES

Women's employment decisions may be shaped by cultural pressures to devote themselves to childrearing just as much, or more so, than financial considerations. This paper examines the conceptual relevance of perspectives implied by 1) ideologies about mothering, and 2) financial resources, for understanding mothers' return to employment after first birth.

The first hypothesis focuses on women's individual attitude towards the value of intensive mothering. To truly practice intensive mothering, women must provide full-time, direct care to their infants and young children, and are therefore unable to maintain employment outside the home. Thus, holding a belief that intensive mothering is the best form of childrearing is expected to decrease the likelihood of employment after childbirth.

> **H1: Intensive Mothering Ideology Hypothesis:** Women who exhibited an attitude in support of the superiority of intensive mothering prior to childbearing will be less likely to be employed after childbirth than women who did not exhibit attitudes congruent with intensive mothering practices.

[3] Percheski uses data through 2005, when the youngest Generation X members were 30 years old. This figure might be downwardly biased, as professional women tend to delay childbearing. The Generation X figures are similar to and have overlapping confidence intervals with figures for the Early and Late Baby Boom generations.

Yet others argue that the practice of intensive mothering is a cultural standard by which all mothers are evaluated, regardless of women's personal attitudes around childrearing (Arendell 2000:1195, see also Eyer 1996; Hays 1996; Williams 2000). The idea that mothers' employment deprives children of necessary maternal care appears to have persisted well after the 1970's and 80's mass entrance of women into the paid labor force. In 1991, 48 percent of Americans agreed that preschool children suffer when their mothers work (Rindfuss, Brewster, and Kavee 1996). Given the push for federal legislation granting new mothers job protected maternity leave during the 1990s, it seems safe to assume the notion of infants needing maternal care persisted through the twentieth century, even if attitudes towards rearing older children changed.

Qualitative research indicates that the childcare expectations society places on mothers determine women's feelings, and importantly, their behavior. Anita Garey argues that when women largely identify themselves as mothers, they necessarily "perform motherhood" for identity maintenance. As Garey describes, "To explain who they are, [mothers] talk about what they do" (1999, p. 29). For example, participating in a child's school field trip indicates to themselves and others what *kind* of mother they are—an attentive mother who is not too busy to be involved in her child's education (Gary 1999). This idea is a variation on West and Zimmerman's (1986) assertion that people "do gender," or produce a social identity as men or women through continual symbolic actions. For example, Brines (1994) found that men actually decrease their household labor when their wife is the primary breadwinner. As Brines argues, unemployed men affirm their masculinity by decreasing their performance of "feminine" domestic labor (Brines 1994). Similarly, to the extent that the intensive mothering ideal is hegemonic, we can expect that women will assert their identities as mothers by decreasing employment when financially possible.

H2: Financial Hypothesis: Mothers will be less likely to be employed as family income from sources other than their own wages increases.

Finally, income may interact with ideology in determining employment. Women require income from sources other than their own earnings in order forgo wage labor and act upon a desire to perform intensive mothering. The nature of the relationship between family income and mothering ideology depends upon whether or not the ideology of intensive mothering affects the employment decisions of all women or only of those women who hold the belief that intensive mothering is best for children. The third hypothesis tests whether or not family finances enable mothers who hold an intensive mothering ideology to withdraw from the paid labor force while raising children.

H3: Enabling Hypothesis: Family income from sources other than their own wages enables mothers who value intensive maternal childrearing to act upon a desire to withdraw from employment after childbirth. Thus, mother's risk of returning to employment will decrease as the interaction between mothering ideology and other family income increases.

IV. DATA & METHODS

Sample

This study uses the 1979 to 2006 waves of National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY79) because it is the best source of nationally representative, longitudinal data with detailed employment information. Additionally, it provides the exact timing of marriage, divorce, and changes in parental status, as well as data on respondents' education, family background, and attitudes about employment and childrearing. In 1979, NLSY first surveyed approximately

12,000 youth ages 14-22, born between January 1, 1957 and December 31, 1964, and living in the United States. The sample includes a nationally representative cross-sectional sample of youth, an over-sampling of black, Hispanic, and economically disadvantaged youth[4], as well as youth enlisted in the military[5]. Respondents were interviewed annually from 1979-1994, and biennially thereafter. As of 2002, the sample response rate was 80.9 percent.

I focus on married women's employment history during the first two years after their first childbirth. Previous research suggests that the effects of fertility of women's employment are highest during this time period (Cramer 1980). There is a documented negative effect of time out of the labor force and parental status on women's wages (Budig & England 2001). Looking at labor force participation rates after first birth allows me to better isolate the effects of parents' wages prior to having children on their employment decisions while parents. Because the specialization model assumes that couples pool resources and earnings, the sample for analysis is limited to women who are married at the time of their first childbirth.

Dependent Variable

Return to Work: The event of interest is the women's return to employment during the first two years after childbirth. The NLSY provides the weekly labor force status for each respondent, constructed from annual questions about the starting and ending points of jobs, and any gaps in employment at a particular firm. NLSY surveyors asked if respondents had experienced "any periods of a full week or more during which [they] did not work for employer, not counting paid vacations or paid sick leave." Respondents reported the starting and stopping dates of employment for each job they held since their last interview, and any periods of not working

[4] Low-income white sample was dropped in 1990.
[5] Dropped in 1984.

while still employed by a particular employer. For this study, employment records were formatted so that the child's week of birth is time zero. Mothers are at risk for employment beginning in the first week after childbirth.

Independent Variables

Income: Income for the past calendar year is used as a measure of women's earnings and other sources of family income, including spousal income. Parenthood is associated with decreased wages for women and increased wages for men. Thus, all income calculations for this study draw upon income for the year prior childbirth.

The biennial survey frequency from 1994 to 2006 complicates income calculations. The NLSY79 asks respondents to report all sources of family income during the past calendar year at each interview. There is annual income data available for respondents from 1979 to 1993. For 1994 through 2006, there is no income information for odd-numbered years. In a study on the effect of marriage on men's annual wage flows, Ahituv and Lerman (2007) deal with the missing data by creating a "quasi-interview" data 52 weeks before the most recent interview. Ahituv and Lerman then assign these "quasi-interview" dates for odd-numbered years with wage rates based on wages from the following even-numbered survey year. Following Ahituv and Lerman's model, I substitute income figures from even-numbered years for the missing odd-numbered year income figures. However, because I am looking at income prior to pregnancy, I fill missing data years with income data from the preceding rather than following survey years.

To measure women's financial resources beyond their own earnings, women's income is subtracted from total family income for the year prior to birth. For categorical analysis, annual income for women and their alternate sources of family income are divided into quadrants,

where the second quadrant is used as the referent income level. For analysis as a continuous variable, pre-birth annual income amounts are divided by the U.S. median household income for the year prior to the child's birth, and then logged. This transformation controls for variations in purchasing power across years, and allows multiple income measures to be included in the same model.

Mothering Attitude*:* Respondents were asked if they agreed, strongly agreed, disagreed, or strongly disagreed with statements about the employment of wives in 1979, 1982, and 1987. Four of these questions reflect holding an intensive mothering ideology. They are *a) A wife who carries out her full family responsibilities doesn't have time for outside employment, b) The employment of wives leads to more juvenile delinquency, c) It is much better for everyone concerned if the man is the achiever outside the home and the woman takes care of home and family, and d) Women are much happier if they stay at home and take care of their children.* For this study, all responses were coded either zero, for disagreeing, or one, for agreeing, and then added together to produce a single variable ranging from 0 to 4[6]. All calculations were made using responses from the survey year most closely preceding their child's birth.

Plans for Employment*:* Respondents were asked what they would like to be doing at age 35 in survey years 1979, 1982, and 1984. Responses are coded as "present job," "some occupation," "married, family," and "other." If the respondent stated that they would like to be married with a family, the respondent was then asked a second follow-up question asking if they wanted to work outside the home at age 35 in addition to being married, keeping house, or raising a family. A dummy variable was used for this analysis, equaling one if the respondent answered that she

[6] To allow for greater variation in the explanatory variable, an alternate variable for congruence with an intensive mothering ideology was constructed using the full range of responses to the four questions on attitudes. Models using the more heterogeneous mothering ideology variable did not yield substantively different results.

wanted to be employed in either the first or follow-up question, and zero if she responded that she did not want to work outside the home.

Employed Prior to Birth: I control for being employed within 6 months prior to the birth, as previous research indicates that previous employment is a strong predictor for women's post-birth employment returns (Desai & Waite 1991).

Education: Education, in the form of highest grade completed, is conceptualized as reflective of a woman's investment in her career. Additionally, education confers an advantage in earnings *capabilities* that may not be fully captured by measures of women's annual income, particularly if women reduce employment in the year preceding childbirth. Education is measured using a series of dummy variables, where those with less than a high school diploma comprise the referent group.

Socio-demographic Controls: The model includes dummy variables for being African-American and for being Hispanic, as some research indicates that attitudes towards mothering vary by race (Zinn 1989). Additional demographic controls include living in the south, living in an urban area, and mothers' age at birth.

[See Table 1]

[See Table 2]

Method of Analysis

This study utilizes event history analysis to estimate the risk of returning to employment after birth. All women are assumed to be out of the labor force, albeit temporarily, at the time of birth. Because there is theoretical reason to believe that the forces of change are not constant over time, a piecewise model is utilized. The piecewise model allows the effects of time-constant covariates

to vary across time periods, as first proposed by Tuma (1980). I split the two years following first childbirth into two time periods, defined by $\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \ldots \tau_l$. The transition rate to destination $\boldsymbol{k}$ is expressed,

$$r_k(t) = \exp\{\overline{\alpha}_l^{(k)} + A^{(k)}\alpha_l^{(k)}\} \text{ if } \tau_l < t \leq \tau_{l+1}$$

where $\overline{\alpha}_l^{(k)}$ is a constant coefficient associated with the *l*th time period, and $A^{(k)}$ is the row vector of covariates. $\alpha_l^{(k)}$ represents covariates associated with the *l*th time period (Blossfeld, Golsch, and Rohwer 2007). Time period one spans from the week after birth to 13 weeks post-childbirth, and time period two spans 14 to 104 weeks after childbirth.

V. RESULTS

The results support the intensive mothering ideology hypothesis and the financial hypothesis: holding an intensive mothering ideology and having other sources of family income are both negatively correlated with the risk of returning to employment. The study does not support the enabling hypothesis, as the effect of the ideology-income interaction term on the risk of return to employment is generally non-significant in the context of the model's covariates. Interestingly, while an increase in other sources of income decreases the risk of return to employment, women's own earnings increase returns to employment. Combined, these findings suggest that characteristics commonly associated with socio-economic class have competing effects on mothers' employment, and call for a more nuanced examination of the relationships among class characteristics and mothering ideologies.

[See Table 3]

[See Table 4]

Intensive Mothering Ideology: Displaying attitudes congruent with an intensive mothering ideology is negatively associated with the return to employment within the first three months after birth and within 4-24 months post-birth. The negative effect of the intensive mothering ideology is significant in all but one of the specified models. The interaction between mothering ideology and other family income is generally non-significant with 95% confidence intervals spanning zero for both categorical and continuous income interactions. The lack of significant effects for the ideology-income interaction terms is surprising given the significant effect of both other family income and mothering ideology, and suggests that an ideology-family income interaction is not a driving force in employment decisions.

Family Income: The effect of family income, net of a woman's own earnings, is negative and highly significant when measured continuously. Categorical analysis indicates that returns to employment are negatively correlated with other family income. The effect is greatest in magnitude between 4-24 months post-birth, for all income quantiles. This makes sense if we expect couples to prioritize maternal care for newborn infants even in the face of financial strain.

Own Income: When measured continuously, women's income is significantly, positively correlated with a return to employment during both time periods. When measured by quadrant, women's income has a significant, increasingly positive effect at all time periods. Relative to the lowest wage women, women in all other quadrants experience a stronger income effect in the second time period. When measured continuously, the effect of own income is greater in the months directly after childbirth.

One plausible explanation for the positive association between own earnings and employment is that high pay jobs may offer greater flexibility and work-family accommodations than jobs held by lower-income women. The NLSY does not have measures of maternity benefits for all

survey years, so this study could not test a hypothesis regarding the effect of maternity leave benefits. However, there is information for whether or not women's employers offer maternity leave for some years of the survey. Alternate analysis on women with maternity benefit information (N=870) still produced significant, positive effects of own income on returns to employment.

Additional Covariates: The socio-demographic covariates indicate some variation in the risk of return to employment by race and geographic region. Hispanic women are approximately thirty percent more likely to return to full-time employment between 4 and 12 months post-birth than are non-Black, non-Hispanic women. African-American women do not have a significantly higher risk for returning to employment than white women after controlling for other characteristics. Living in the southern states significantly increases the risk of return to employment in the first three months after childbirth, but not thereafter.

The observed effect of age is small but consistently significant across model specifications. The direction of the effect of age changes between time periods. Age is positively associated with returning to employment in the first three months after childbirth, but negatively associated with the return to employment in the following moths. This may reflect the dual likelihood for older mothers to have increased levels of labor force experience and job training, which likely increase incentive to maintain continuous employment, and greater financial resources, which increase women's ability to forgo employment for long periods of time if desired.

While categorical dummy variables for education produce positive coefficients, the effects of education on returns to employment are generally non-significant, oftentimes with 95% confidence intervals often spanning zero. Relative to having only a high school diploma, having graduate education significantly increases the risk of returning to employment from 3-24 months

post birth in some model specifications. This is not surprising given that women who attend graduate school usually do so as a career investment. The overall lack of significant educational effects is somewhat unexpected in light of the highly significant and increasingly positive effect of education on employment returns in bivariate analysis. Results of the full models suggest that the observed bivariate associations of education with employment returns are largely spurious.

From the exponential survival models, mothers' own income and other sources of family income prior to birth emerge as essential covariates for understanding the relationship between socio-economic status and mothers' returns to employment. To the extent that husbands' earnings reflect social class, the results indicate that class privilege increases the likelihood of employment. Yet at the same time, higher levels of family income from sources other than women's own wages decrease the likelihood of employment. The inverse effects of women's own earnings and other family income on returns to employment present a complicated relationship between socio-economic status and maternal employment.

[See Table 5]

[See Table 6]

[See Table 7]

To further investigate the relationship between socio-economic class and the intensive mothering ideology, the relative risk of returning to employment as intensive mothering ascription increases is considered by other family income, own income, and educational attainment. Though hazard ratios were largely insignificant, within-group comparisons give some suggestion that women with similar levels of alternate income are increasingly less likely to return to employment as affinity with an intensive mothering ideology increases. Hazard ratios for the risk of return to employment for women with high levels of family income and strong

intensive mothering ideologies are curiously non-significant, even given the hazard model's control for covariates. This could be due to a bimodal return pattern, if women in the high family income, high ideology category either remain completely out of the labor force, or return to employment quite quickly for unmeasured reasons. In sum, relative risks by family income and ideology support aggregate analyses that find little support for the enabling hypothesis.

Women with similar levels of own income tend to have a lower risk of returning to employment as an intensive mothering ideology increases. Notably, the ideology effect is strongest and most significant for women in the first income quartile. Such women display a moderately high support for intensive mothering, and have half the risk of an employment return than those with no evidence of an intensive mothering ideology.

Similarly, the effect of mothering ideology by educational groups tends to be stronger and more significant in lower educational categories. For women with intensive mothering scores of 2 (moderate) or 4 (strongest), mothering ideology reduces the risk of employment by over seventy percent and roughly thirty percent, for women with less than or only a high school education, respectively. Though educational categories might serve as a rough approximation of socio-economic class characteristics beyond income, the frequency of women with college and graduate educations displaying high mothering ideologies is too low to draw conclusions as to whether the saliency of the intensive mothering ideal varies across broad class categories. Nevertheless, the infrequency itself of highly educated women with strong intensive mothering ideologies undermines claims that the most privileged women are "opting-out" of employment by a maternal pull to provide full-day mothering.

VI. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Overall, this study finds the effects of holding an intensive mothering ideology on women's labor force participation to be limited. Though holding an intensive mothering ideology is negatively correlated with returns to employment, the study does not find traditionally minded women to be more likely to abstain from employment when married to high-income men. However, researchers should be cautious about misinterpreting the limited ideological effects to infer that mothering ideologies bear little weight on women's employment decisions. Rather, the limited effect of ideology on employment status points to the need for closer examination of the conditions under which intensive mothering ideologies become salient. On the one hand, the intensive mothering ideal may be so culturally enshrined that it effects all women's employment decisions, regardless of personal mothering attitudes. On the other, women's ability to make choices reflecting their individual childrearing beliefs may be highly constrained by economic circumstance, reducing the observed effect of mothering attitudes on employment.

The positive relationship between women's earnings and employment status is consistent with the idea that intensive mothering is the normative standard to which all women are held, *if* intensive mothering is based on the requirement that women put the needs of their children before their own desires. If so, women may experience pressure to remain in employment when their high incomes afford financial benefits to their children. In contrast, low-income women's earnings may yield few benefits for child wellbeing that compensate for reduced maternal care, perhaps encouraging low-wage mothers to perform full-day childcare themselves.

The saliency of culturally dominant or alternative ideologies is subject to contextual constraints. Correll and Ridgeway (2004) argue that dominant gender beliefs are effectively salient unless contexts specifically allow for alternative gender beliefs to exist and be acted upon.

Similarly, all women may evaluate behavior against a dominant intensive mothering ideal *unless* a social context allows alternative mothering models to gain currency. For mothers seeking to balance paid work and childcare, contexts in which employment can be legitimated as ultimately good for children may be venues where alternative mothering ideologies prevail. In such contexts, we might observe the effect of variations in *personal* mothering ideologies on the risk of return to employment. Yet when nuanced contexts are blurred by aggregate measures, an observed saliency of individuals' personal attitudes may be displaced by the saliency of culturally dominant beliefs.

Close examination of cases at the far ends of the ideological and labor force participation distributions suggests that women's mothering ideology is congruent with their employment behavior when the practice of intensive mothering is economically rational. Regardless of adherence to an intensive mothering ideal, women continuously out of the labor force are characterized by low earnings, both in actual income and earnings relative to other sources of family income. In contrast, high absolute and relative earnings characterize continuously employed women, regardless of ideology. Notably, in this sample, traditionally minded women with continuous employment have greater family financial support than traditionally minded women who are out of the labor force. In sum, the characteristics of women whose behavior and attitudes are either highly congruent or highly contradictory suggest that women's own income is a strong predictor of employment status, and can counteract the effects of husbands' income and personal mothering beliefs.

The positive effect of women's income on employment calls for a reframing of the relationship between stay-at-home motherhood and class status. The decision to "opt-out" of employment has been presented in popular media as a choice available to women of high socio-

economic statuses. This representation aligns with the notion that upper and upper-middle class women's leisure functions as a status symbol (Veblen 1899), and that the practice of intensive mothering accordingly serves as a marker of families' wealth. The act of mothering may particularly confer status to women with limited prospects for gaining social standing beyond the domestic sphere (Luker 1985).

The relationships among choice, intensive mothering, and status are complicated when women derive status from their role as mothers *and* from their role as employees. Though high husbands' incomes grant married mothers employment choices, these same women have often made considerable investments in education and employment, and presumably derive worth from their professional positions[7]. Like low-wage women, high earning mothers might gain status by engaging in intensive mothering. But, unlike intensive mothering among low-wage women, the practice of intensive mothering by high-wage women jeopardizes status derived from earnings and professional positions.

The varying probabilities of returning to employment by mothering ideology, income, and education suggest that socio-economic status still mediates the effect of mothering ideologies on mothering practices. However, this study calls for greater attention to women's economic position as differentiated from that of her husband. Though social class can be conceptualized as an individual or family-level variable, recent research indicates that the conventional use of fathers' social class as a proxy for family class background is increasingly inappropriate for studies of intergenerational class mobility (Beller 2009). Similarly, this study points to the inadequacy of family-level conceptions of social class for understanding the relationships among

[7] The increase in assortative mating by education in recent decades has increased the likelihood that women with high earnings capabilities are married to high-income men (Schwartz and Mare 2005).

socio-economic status, family ideologies, and behavior. Previous research has highlighted differentiation in parenting practices by class (Garey 1999, Lareau 2003). This study encourages researchers to consider that while parenting ideas may vary across broadly defined socio-economic classes, closer examination also reveals a differentiated effect of ideology *within* class categories.

References

Ahituv, Avner and Robert Lerman. 2007. "How do Marital Status, Work Effort, and Wage Rates Interact?" *Demography* 44(3): 632-647.

Allison, Paul D. 1984. *Event History Analysis: Regression for Longitudinal Event Data.* Newberry Park, Sage Publications.

Arendell, Terry. 2000. "Conceiving and Investigating Motherhood: The Decade's Scholarship." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 62(4):1192-1207.

Baum II, Charles L. 2002. "A Dynamic Analysis of the Effect of Child Care Costs on the Work Decisions of Low-Income Mothers with Infants." *Demography* 39(1):139-164.

Becker, Gary S. 1981. *A Treatise on the Family.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Beller, Emily. 2009. "Bringing Intergenerational Social Mobility Research into the Twenty-first Century: Why Mothers Matter." *American Sociological Review* 74(4):507-528.

Belkin, Lisa. 2003. "The Opt-Out Revolution." *New York Times Magazine.*

Bianchi, Suzanne, John P. Robinson and Melissa A. Milkie. 2006. *Changing Rhythms of American Family Life.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Blair Loy, Mary. 2003. *Competing Devotions.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University

Press.

Boushey, Heather. 2008. "'Opting Out' The Effects of Children on Women's Employment in the United States." *Feminist Economics* 14(1):1-36.

Bowlby, John. 1969. *Attachment.* New York: Basic Books.

Blossfield, Hans-Peter, Katrin Golsch and Gotz Röhwer. 2007. *Event History Analysis with Stata.* Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Brines, Julie. 1994. "Economic Dependency, Gender, and the Division of Labor at Home." *The American Journal of Sociology* 100(3):652-688.

Budig, Michelle and Paula England. "The Wage Penalty for Motherhood." *American Sociological Review* 66:204-225.

Connelly, Rachel and Jean Kimmel. 2003. "The Effect of Child Care Costs on the Employment and Welfare Recipiency of Single Mothers." *Southern Economic Journal* 69(3):498-519.

Coontz, Stephanie. 1992. *The Way We Never Were: American Families and the Nostalgia Trap.* New York: Basic Books.

Coser, Lewis A. and Rose L. Coser. 1974. "Greedy Institutions." New York: Free Press.

Cotter, David, Paula England and Joan Hermsen. 2007. "Moms and Jobs: Trends in Mothers' Employment and Which Mothers Stay Home." *Council on Contemporary Families.*

Cramer, James C. 1980. "Fertility and Female Employment: Problems of Casual Direction." American Sociological Review 45:167-90.

Desai, Sonalde and Linda J. Waite. 1991. "Women's Employment During Pregnancy and After the First Birth: Occupational Characteristics and Work Commitment," *American Sociological Review* 56 (4): 551-566.

Douglas, Susan and Meredith W. Michaels. 2004 The Mommy Myth: The Idealization of

Motherhood and How It Has Undermined Women. New York: Free Press.

Elvin-Nowak, Ylva and Heléne Thompsson, 2001. “Motherhood as Idea and Practice: A Discursive Understanding of Employed Mothers in Sweden,” *Gender & Society* 15(3):407-428.

England, Paula and George Farkas. 1986. *Households, Employment, and Gender: A Social, Economics, and Demographic View.* New York: Aldine De Gruyter.

England, Paula, Carmen Garcia-Beaulieu and Mary Ross. 2004. "Women's Employment among Blacks, Whites, and Three Groups of Latinas: Do More Privileged Women Have Higher Employment?" *Gender and Society* 18(4):494-509.

Eyer, Diane. 1996. *Motherguilt: How Our Culture Blames Mothers for What's Wrong With Society.* New York: Random House.

Eyer, Diane E. 1992. *Mother-infant Bonding.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Fuller, Sylvia. 2008. "Job Mobility and Wage Trajectories for Men and Women in the United States.” *American Sociological Review* 73(1):158-183.

Gary, Anita I. 1999. *Weaving Work and Motherhood.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Glass, Jennifer. 2000. "Envisioning the Integration of Family and Work: Toward a Kinder, Gentler Workplace." *Contemporary Sociology* 29(1, Utopian Visions: Engaged Sociologies for the 21st Century):129-143.

Glass, Jennifer L. and Sarah B. Estes. 1997. "The Family Responsive Workplace." *Annual Review of Sociology* 23:289-313.

Gornick, Janet. 2004. "Women's economic outcomes, gender inequality and public policy: findings from the Luxembourg Income Study." *Socio-Economic Review* 2(2):213.

Grzywacz, Joseph G., David M. Almeida and Daniel A. McDonald. 2002. "Work-Family

Spillover and Daily Reports of Work and Family Stress in the Adult Labor Force." *Family Relations* 51(1):28-36.

Hays, Sharon. 1998. "The Fallacious Assumptions and Unreaslistic Prescriptions of Attachment Theory: A Comment on "Parents' Socioemotional Investment in Children"." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 60(3):782-790.

------. 1996. *The Cultural Contradictions of Motherhood.* New York: Yale University Press.

Hill, E. J., Nicole T. Mean, Lukas R. Dean, Dawn M. Hafen, Robyn Gadd, Alexis A. Palmer and Maria S. Ferris. 2006. "Researching the 60-Hour Dual Earner Workweek: An Alternative to the "Opt-Out Revolution"." *American Behavioral Scientist* 49(9):1184-1203.

Hill, E. J., Alan J. Hawkins, Maria Ferris and Michelle Weitzman. 2001. "Finding an Extra Day a Week: The Positive Influence of Perceived Job Flexibility on Work and Family Life Balance." *Family Relations* 50(1):49-58.

Hochschild, Arlie. 1989. *The Second Shift: Working Parents and the Revolution at Home.* New York: Viking.

Keene, Jennifer R. and Jill Quadagno. 2004. "Predictors of Perceived Work-Family Balance: Gender Difference or Gender Similarity?" *Sociological Perspectives* 47(1):1-23.

Lareau, Annette. 2003. *Unequal Childhoods: Class, Race, and Family Life.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Luker, Kristen. 1985. *Abortion and the Politics of Motherhood.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Milkie, Melissa A. and Pia Peltola. 1999. "Playing All the Roles: Gender and the Work-Family Balancing Act." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 61(2):476-490.

Percheski, Christine. 2008. "Opting Out? Cohort Differences in Professional Women's

Employment Rates from 1960 to 2005." *American Sociological Review* 73(June):497-517.

Presser, Harriet B. 2000. "Nonstandard Work Schedules and Marital Instability." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 62(1):93-110.

------. 1999. "Toward a 24-Hour Economy." *Science* 284(5421):1778-1779.

------. 1988. "Shift Work and Child Care among Young Dual-Earner American Parents." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 50(1):133-148.

Reid, Lori L. 2002. "Occupational Segregation, Human Capital, and Motherhood: Black Women's Higher Exit Rates from Full-Time Employment." *Gender and Society* 16(5):728-747.

Ridgeway, Celia L. and Shelley J. Correll. 2004. “Unpacking the Gender System: A Theoretical Perspective on Gender Relations,” *Gender and Society* 18(4):510-531.

Rindfuss, Ronald R., Karin L. Brewster and Andrew L. Kavee. 1996. "Women, Work, and Children: Behavioral and Attitudinal Change in the United States." *Population and Development Review* 22(3):457-482.

Sanchez, Laura and Elizabeth Thompson. 1997. "Becoming Mothers and Fathers: Parenthood, Gender, and the Division of Labor." *Gender & Society* 11(6):747.

Sayer, Liana C., Suzanne M. Bianchi and John P. Robinson. 2004. "Are Parents Investing Less in Children? Trends in Mother's and Fathers' Time with Children." *The American Journal of Sociology* 110(1):1-43.

Schwartz, Christine R. and Robert D. Mare. 2005. "Trends in Educational Assortative Marriage from 1940 to 2003." *Demography* 42(4):621-646.

Still, Mary C. 2006. "The Opt-Out Revolution in the United States: Implications for Modern

Organizations." *Managerial and Decision Economies* 27(2-3):159-71.

Stone, Pamela and Meg Lovejoy. 2004. "Fast-Track Women and the "Choice" to Stay Home." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 596(Mommies and Daddies on the Fast Track: Success of Parents in Demanding Professions):62-8.

Stone, Pamela. 2007. *Opting Out: Why women really quit careers and Head Home.* Berkeley, University of California Press.

Townsend, Nicholas. 2002. *The Package Deal: Marriage, Work and Fatherhood in Men's Lives.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Tuma, Nancy. "When Can Interdependence in a Dynamic System of Qualitative Variables Be Ignored?" *Sociological Methodology*, Vol. 11, (1980), pp. 358-391.

Veblen, Thorstein. 1899. *The Theory of the Leisure Class.*

Vandenheuvel, Audrey. 1997. "Women's Roles after First Birth: Variable or Stable?" *Gender and Society* 11(3):357-368.

Warren, Elizabeth and Amelia W. Tyagi. 2003. *The Two-Income Trap: Why Middle-Class Mothers & Fathers Are Going Broke.* New York: Basic Books.

Wenk, Deeann and Patricia Garrett. 1992. "Having a Baby: Some Predictions of Maternal Employment around Childbirth." *Gender and Society* 6(1):49-65.

West, Candace and Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. "Doing Gender." *Gender and Society* 1(2):125-151.

Williams, Joan. 2000. *Unbending Gender: Why Family and Work Conflict and What to do About It.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Williams, Joan C., Jessica Manvell and Stephanie Bornstein. 2006. *"Opt Out" or Pushed Out?: How the Press Covers Work/Family Conflict.* The Center for Work-Life Law, University

of California, Hastings College of Law.

Zinn, Maxine B. 1989. "Family, Feminism, and Race in America." *Gender & Society* 4(1):68-82.

Table 1: Sample Means & Percentages

Variable		Mean, %
Unemployment Rate		6.998
Black		20.61%
Hispanic		14.01%
South		37.21%
Urban		80.23%
Age		25.470
Employed Prior to Birth		72.94%
Plan to Be Employed at Age 35		88.27%
Education:	Less Than High School	5.71%
	High School Diploma	39.75%
	Some College	26.69%
	Bachelor's Degree	15.49%
	Graduate Degree	12.26%
Woman's Income / Median Household Income		.430
Other Family Income / Median Household Income		1.273
Intensive Mothering Ideology		.781
N		1892

Table 2: Bivariate Analysis

Variable		Hazard Ratio	s.e.
Unemployment Rate		.887***	.167
Black		.877*	.056
Hispanic		1.124	.082
South		1.040	.055
Urban		1.051	.068
Age		1.040***	.004
Employed Prior to Birth		3.144***	.211
Intensive Mothering Ideology		.821***	.020
Plans for Employment at Age 35		1.387***	.118
Education:	Less Than High School	.464***	.061
	High School Diploma	.753***	.040
	Some College	1.160**	.066
	Bachelor's Degree	1.249**	.087
	Graduate School	1.630***	.122
Woman's Own Income:	Quartile 1	.476***	.030
	Quartile 2	.989	.058
	Quartile 3	1.418***	.083
	Quartile 4	1.661***	.097
Other Family Income:	Quartile 1	1.208***	.071
	Quartile 2	1.214***	.071
	Quartile 3	.976	.058
	Quartile 4	.711***	.043

Figures generated using a Cox Proportional Hazards Model.
** Significant at .05 level, ** .01 level, ***.001 level.*

Table 3: Effect of Covariates on Returns to Employment, Other Income Categorical

Variable	Model 1		Model 1 With Interactions	
	0-3 Months	**4-24 Months**	**0-3 Months**	**4-24 Months**
Constant	-5.360***	-2.146***	-5.420***	-2.143***
	(.490)	(.552)	(.493)	(.555)
Unemployment Rate	.027	-.085*	.024	-.086*
	(.029)	(.039)	(.029)	(.039)
Black	.082	.114	.076	.117
	(.087)	(.115)	(.087)	(.115)
Hispanic	.148	.305**	.149	.303*
	(.096)	(.130)	(.096)	(.130)
South	.295***	-.056	.292***	-.053
	(.068)	(.096)	(.068)	(.096)
Urban	-.062	-.054	-.059	-.052
	(.085)	(.114)	(.085)	(.114)
Age	.034***	-.072***	.034***	-.072***
	(.009)	(.013)	(.009)	(.013)
Employed Prior to Birth	1.879***	.662***	1.822***	.621***
	(.130)	(.096)	(.130)	(.098)
Education: High School Diploma	.141	.091	.164	.093
	(.249)	(.176)	(.249)	(.176)
Some College	.216	.339	.239	.342
	(.252)	(.185)	(.252)	(.185)
Bachelor's Degree	.267	.206	.278	.206
	(.260)	(.224)	(.260)	(.224)
Graduate School	.459	.614**	.474	.608**
	(.262)	(.238)	(.262)	(.238)
Intensive Mothering Ideology	-.099**	-.163***	-.005	-.155*
	(.035)	(.041)	(.063)	(.077)
Plans for Employment at Age 35	.483***	.097	.482***	.098
	(.121)	(.135)	(.121)	(.135)
Log (Woman's Income / Median Household Income)	.421***	.084*	.419***	.086*
	(.046)	(.037)	(.046)	(.037)
Other Family Income: Quartile 2	-.022	-.294*	.022	-.213
	(.088)	(.131)	(.104)	(.163)
Quartile 3	-.325***	-.537***	-.197	-.514***
	(.093)	(.127)	(.108)	(.158)
Quartile 4	-.558***	-.693**	-.487***	-.713***
	(.095)	(.122)	(.109)	(.150)
Mothering Ideology x Quartile 2			-.071	-.033
			(.084)	(.107)
x Quartile 3			-.216	-.024
			(.095)	(.105)
x Quartile 4			-.115	-.115
			(.102)	(.102)
Log-Likelihood	-3431.156		-3428.154	

** Significant at .05 level, ** .01 level, ***.001 level. Standard errors in parentheses.*

Table 4: Effect of Covariates on Returns to Employment, Woman's Income Categorical

Variable	Model 2		Model 2 With Interactions	
	0-3 Months	**4-24 Months**	**0-3 Months**	**4-24 Months**
Constant	-7.097***	-3.118***	-7.094***	-3.114***
	(.483)	(.550)	(.483)	(.550)
Unemployment Rate	-.002	-.099**	-.001	-.099**
	(.030)	(.039)	(.030)	(.039)
Black	.074	.157	.071	.159
	(.086)	(.115)	(.086)	(.115)
Hispanic	.140	.353**	.146	.350**
	(.096)	(.129)	(.097)	(.130)
South	.299***	-.035	.297**	-.034
	(.068)	(.096)	(.068)	(.096)
Urban	-.039	-.081	-.037	-.084
	(.084)	(.114)	(.084)	(.114)
Age	.070***	-.055***	.070***	-.055***
	(.009)	(.013)	(.009)	(.013)
Employed Prior to Birth	1.778***	.486***	1.781***	.484***
	(.131)	(.101)	(.131)	(.101)
Education: High School Diploma	.067	-.022	.071	-.019
	(.247)	(.176)	(.247)	(.177)
Some College	.142	.247	.147	.241
	(.250)	(.186)	(.250)	(.187)
Bachelor's Degree	.149	.041	.151	.036
	(.259)	(.227)	(.259)	(.227)
Graduate School	.344	.432	.349	.423
	(.261)	(.242)	(.261)	(.242)
Intensive Mothering Ideology	-.104**	-.161***	-.117**	-.155***
	(.035)	(.041)	(.038)	(.044)
Plans for Employment at Age 35	.413***	.052	.442***	.049
	(.118)	(.133)	(.121)	(.137)
Log (Other Family Income / Median Household Income)	-.215***	-.316***	-.196***	-.333***
	(.142)	(.056)	(.047)	(.070)
Woman's Own Income: Quartile 2	.383***	.278**	.381***	.280**
	(.105)	(.118)	(.105)	(.118)
Quartile 3	.586***	.517***	.582***	.521***
	(.104)	(.130)	(.104)	(.130)
Quartile 4	.777***	.631***	.774***	.634***
	(.106)	(.144)	(.106)	(.144)
Mothering Ideology x Log (Other Family Income / Median Household Income)			-.039	.021
			(.045)	(.051)
Log-Likelihood	-3449.340		-3448.893	

** Significant at .05 level, ** .01 level, ***.001 level. Standard errors in parentheses.*

Table 5: Relative Risk of Returning to Employment, by Family Income & Ideology

	Mothering Ideology				
Other Family Income	**0**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
Quartile 1	1	1.185	0.726	0.821	0.863
Quartile 2	1	1.02	1.11	0.529*	0.960
Quartile 3	1	0.710*	0.748	0.954	1.083
Quartile 4	1	0.889	0.661	0.591	1.082

Hazard ratios generated using Cox Proportional Hazard Models, controlling for covariates.
** Significant at .05 level, ** .01 level, ***.001 level.*

Table 6: Relative Risk of Returning to Employment, by Own Income & Ideology

	Mothering Ideology				
Own Income	**0**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
Quartile 1	1	0.993	0.856	0.499***	0.941
Quartile 2	1	0.894	0.639**	1.032	0.443
Quartile 3	1	1.005	0.688*	0.677	0.741
Quartile 4	1	0.808	0.827	1.011	0.535

Hazard ratios generated using Cox Proportional Hazard Models, controlling for covariates.
** Significant at .05 level, ** .01 level, ***.001 level.*

Table 7: Relative Risk of Returning to Employment, by Education & Ideology

	Mothering Ideology				
Highest Grade Completed	**0**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
Less Than High School	1	1.071	0.257**	0.714	0.270*
High School	1	0.856	0.715**	0.888	0.617*
Some College	1	1.000	1.126	0.576*	0.546*
College	1	0.969	0.731	0.418	1.265
Graduate School	1	0.976	0.598	0.467	1.331

Hazard ratios generated using Cox Proportional Hazard Models, controlling for covariates.
** Significant at .05 level, ** .01 level, ***.001 level.*

Appendix A

Table 1:
Mothering Ideology Distribution

Scale	Frequency	Percent
0	1109	58.62
1	379	20.03
2	203	10.73
3	124	6.55
4	77	4.07
Total	1892	100

Table 2:
Own Income Distribution

Quartile	Frequency	Percent
1	509	26.90
2	486	25.69
3	470	24.84
4	427	22.57
Total	1892	100

Table 3: Other Family Income Distribution

Quartile	Frequency	Percent
1	464	24.52
2	451	23.84
3	461	24.37
4	516	22.57
Total	1892	100

Table 4: Joint Distribution of Mothering Ideology & Own Income

		Mothering Ideology					
Own Income		**0**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**Total**
	Quartile 1	250	109	56	57	37	509
	2	282	102	56	36	10	486
	3	306	86	44	18	16	470
	4	271	82	47	13	14	427
	Total	1109	379	203	124	77	1892

Table 5: Joint Distribution of Mothering Ideology & Other Family Income

	Mothering Ideology					
Other Family Income	**0**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**Total**
Quartile 1	256	106	54	31	17	464
2	251	95	52	28	25	451
3	272	85	43	41	20	461
4	330	93	54	24	15	516
Total	1109	379	203	124	77	1892

Table 6: Joint Distribution of Mothering Ideology & Education

	Mothering Ideology					
Highest Grade Completed	**0**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**Total**
Less Than High School	31	26	15	18	18	108
High School	370	179	103	65	32	749
Some College	325	99	40	25	18	507
College	209	45	32	6	2	294
Graduate School	174	30	13	10	7	234
Total	1109	379	203	124	77	1892