Reframing the Dialogue on Female-Headed Single-Parent Families

By: Cathryne L. Schmitz

Schmitz, C. L. (1995). Reframing the dialogue on female-headed single parent families. *Affilia, 10*, 426-441.

Abstract:

The increase in female-headed single-parent families, and the high rates of poverty among them, caused by changing economic and social support structures, is an international phenomenon. The traditional negative focus on the deviance of this family structure has led to blaming unmarried women, rather than implementing economic and social support structures that could lift their families out of poverty. This article presents data on these families and suggests ways of reframing the dialogue to broaden the lens under which social work educators, students, and practitioners view single-mother families.

Article:

The number of single-parent families in the United States, as in many parts of the world, is growing and, along with it, the level of poverty among women and children. In the United States, households headed by women are the poorest demographic group (Children's Defense Fund [CDR 1991) and families headed by Hispanic and African American women have the highest level of poverty. The majority of the problems these families face are linked to their poverty and thus make them vulnerable to chronic stress from the difficulty of meeting basic needs, stereotyping, discrimination, and the lack of power. Female-headed families face a unique form of discrimination that two-parent families do not confront because rapid social change has led to their being blamed for a host of problems. The dialogue surrounding the 1994 elections, the results of the elections, and the increasing negativity since then are signs of an atmosphere in which single mothers are victimized by social and economic policies and then blamed for the consequences.

This negative focus is not useful in addressing the needs of women and children in single-parent households. A shift in focus would allow for a reexamination of the issues and a greater understanding of how these families can better be served. This article reviews national and international data and proposes such a change that could provide the basis for positive, strength-based practice, research, and policy development.

BACKGROUND

Demographic trends and patterns are evidence of changing social and economic conditions. In much of the world, including parts of Africa, Latin America, the Caribbean (Chant, 1989), Europe, and the United States (Kamerman & Kahn, 1988), demographic and social shifts have resulted in an increasing number of female-headed single-parent families. In the United States, half the children spend at least part of their lives in such households (Garfinkel, 1987). Between 1970 and 1985, the number of children living with divorced mothers more than doubled and the number living with never-married mothers increased sixfold (U.S. Children, 1989). Whereas in 1960, only 1 in 12 U.S. children lived in a single-parent household (Garfinkel, 1987), by 1988, 1 in 4 did (Ellwood, 1988).

Economic Factors

Globally, economic factors play an important role in the oppression and impoverishment of female-headed single-parent families. Studies have shown that women are not only poorer than men but are responsible for most of the unpaid household labor (Nichols-Casebolt, Krysik, & Hermann-Currie, 1994). Factors, such as the stereotyping of occupations by gender, create unequal power relations that are institutionalized by the state

(Abramovitz, 1988). This phenomenon is universally prevalent, as witnessed by its presence in such diverse areas as Malaysia (Stivens, 1985), Costa Rica (Yudelman, 1987), Britain (Nichols-Casebolt et al., 1994), the United States, and many Third World countries studied by Chant and Brydon (1989).

Female-headed families are often the poorest of the poor (Chant, 1989). In all industrialized countries, they are at risk of poverty (Karnerman, 1984), and in much of the Third World, the rise in these families is closely linked with high rates of poverty In Costa Rica, for example, the income of women is significantly lower than that of men; one fifth of the families in the lowest 20% are headed by women (Yudelman, 1987). In the United States, children in these families are more than 5 times as likely to live in poverty (with a poverty rate of 55.4%) as are children in two-parent families (with a poverty rate of only 10.6%) (CDF, 1992).

Because of the interaction among race, ethnicity and gender in the United States, female-headed African American and Hispanic families have higher rates of poverty than do their counterpart Euro-American families (Pearce, 1989). Although two thirds of the children living in poverty are Euro-American, African American and Hispanic children are 3 times more likely to be poor and to live in poverty for longer periods (CDF, 1990; Sherman, 1994). In 1991,42% of Euro-American, 63% of African American, and 64% of Hispanic female-headed families were living in poverty (CDF, 1992).

In the United States, the low earning power of women; insufficient child support; and the inadequate, counterproductive welfare system are primary contributors to poverty in female-headed households (Ehrenreich & Piven, 1984; Ellwood, 1988; Garfinkel, 1987). Conditions are worsening with declining wages, the decreasing effectiveness of governmental transfer programs, and funding cuts in governmental programs that help poor families (Center on Hunger, Poverty and Nutrition Policy, 1995; CDF, 1991). Although more women have entered the labor market in recent years, they enter in a disadvantaged position. The majority of jobs open to women in this country (Pearce, 1989) and globally (Nichols-Casebolt et al., 1994) are low paying and offer inadequate or no benefits and thus cannot lift women and their children out of poverty (DeParle, 1994b).

Income Support Programs

While economic structures keep women at a disadvantage in the labor market, neither public nor private income-transfer systems in the United States are adequate for meeting the cost of caring for children. Fewer than one fourth of fathers pay full child support (Mihaly, 1989), and public assistance benefits decreased 36% from 1970 to 1990 (Center on Hunger, Poverty and Nutrition Policy, 1995). A comparison of conditions in Canada and the United States indicates that during the 1980s, the poverty rate among children (in both female-headed single-parent and two-parent families) decreased in Canada but increased in the United States (Smeeding, 1990). Although the United States and Canada spent similar amounts on health care and education for children in poverty, Canada spent significantly more on cash income support.

With roots in the English Poor Laws, the U.S. welfare state i s a system based on historical ambivalence toward nonwidowed female-headed families and the role of work, which has a negative impact on the provision of assistance (Bane, 1988; Kamerman & Kahn, 1988). Changes in the income maintenance system have occurred incrementally, based on history and bias rather than on sound economic theory Whereas widows have been covered by a non-means-tested assistance program since 1935, Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), a large-scale means-tested program for nonwidowed single mothers, was not enacted until 1962 (Kamerman & Kahn, 1988).

And AFDC has not fared well (Children in Poverty, 1985). AFDC payments are not sufficient to meet basic needs (CDF, 1989) and fall farther behind each year (Bane, 1988). In 1993, "the average combined state AFDC and Food Stamp benefit was only 65% of [the] poverty [level]" (Abramovitz & Newdom, 1994, p, 6a).
The policies of the Reagan (Garfinkel & McLanahan, 1986) and Bush (CDF, 1992) administrations resulted in cuts in AFDC, food stamps, Medicaid, and public housing, the primary support programs for single mothers. Two thirds of the cutbacks in federal programs in the early 1980s were in programs serving the poor, most of whom were women and children (Mahaffey, 1984). The Family Support Act of 1988, an attempt at welfare

reform, focused on parental responsibility through child support, employment, and training, but did not address the underlying issue of poverty In this regard, Congress failed to address the health insurance needs of all poor children, the inadequacy of the child care system, the failure to collect sufficient child support payments, the lack of success of previous job training programs, and the insufficient pool of jobs available at wages that would bring women and children out of poverty (Segal, 1989). A review of the major points in the Clinton administration's 1994 welfare reform proposal indicates its failure to address these issues adequately (DeParle, 1994a).

The 1995 legislative debate on the Republican Contract with America has further eroded the position of female-headed families. The contract has resurrected Reaganomics (Sanger, 1995), with budget cuts and other deficit-reduction measures that will have a strong impact on these families without dealing with the basic issues surrounding poverty. The very programs that have supported primarily female-headed low-income households—AFDC, Medicaid, and food stamps, as well as those that support education, training, and employment—are the primary targets of the welfare reform debate and of the budget cuts (Gray, 1995). Even basic nutritional programs have been targeted (Dugger, 1995), and the issue of health care coverage for low-income working individuals and families has not even been discussed. Furthermore, the increasingly punitive discussion regarding welfare recipients is focusing on lifetime limits on income support without adequate reflection of the consequences for children and families (Bugger, 1995). Finally, the proposal to move funds to the states through block grants (Pear, 1995a, 1995b) would remove many of the safeguards that have already been weakened by previous cuts in programs and cost shifting.

Kamerman's (1984) study of eight industrialized nations indicates that three main factors are important for providing a higher living standard for single-mother families. These factors include (a) children's or family allowances; (b) housing allowances; and (c) advance maintenance payments by the government, so children will not suffer the consequences of their parents' nonpayment of child support. Sweden's program, for example, has a dual focus on work and assistance and provides support for all families, with added assistance for poor families (Rosenthal, 1994).

DEFINING THE ISSUES

The rapid social change encompassing single-parent families has led to confusion about how to regard them. Theories assume that two-parent families are the norm and thus are the only healthy model. In the United States the term single-parent family has become a euphemism for problem family, with single-parent families taking the blame for many social problems, as is apparent in the labels applied to them: broken, abnormal, and unstable (Schorr & Moen, 1984). As a result, single-parent families are treated as deviant.

Sociological theories, such as structural functionalism, social deviancy, and conflict theory, explain why female-headed families are experienced as a threat. By exceeding the community's accepted boundaries, they threaten traditional family styles (Kamerman & Kahn, 1988). Defining single-parent families as deviant maintains the unity and primary position of two-parent families in society. These theories, however, are inadequate for

explaining why some single-parent families thrive and many children in them function at high levels. Except for a common family structure, single-parent families are diverse; some are secure and self-directed, whereas others are in poverty isolated, and stigmatized (Kamerman & Kahn, 1988).

Interpretation of Research

Perceiving two-parent families as the norm results in a focus on single-parent families as harmful by definition and leads to research that is directed toward seeking information on the negative effects for children. Research based on negative assumptions often finds the negative effects that are expected (Tuzlak & Hillock, 1986). This research is then used to educate practitioners, skewing their understanding of the issues and thereby limiting their practice options.

Although a number of studies have found that children of divorce are prone to school problems, behavioral problems, and low achievement in young adulthood (Kinard & Reinherz, 1986; Mueller & Cooper, 1986; Peterson & Zill, 1986), many have been based on teachers' perceptions of children's cognitive and educational achievement that were influenced by teachers' expectations (Garfinkel & McLanahan, 1986) and attitudes. Given the societal expectation that children from single-parent families have more problems than do those from two-parent families, it is not surprising that teachers see these children as having more problems. Studies have typically examined the impact of divorce during the first year after divorce when the disruptive effects are the highest. These results are then generalized to all children from single-parent families.

As several studies (Bernard & Nesbitt, 1981; Kinard & Reinherz, 1986; Tuzlak & Hillock, 1986) have substantiated, divorce is a poor indicator of emotional difficulty, delinquency, achievement, and long-term detrimental results. Kurdek and Siesky (1980) concluded that children acquired both strength and responsibility from their postdivorce adjustment. Tuzlak and Hillock's (1986) study of 57 single mothers who had been divorced or separated for 1 or more years found that the children continued to perform well in school and maintained good relations with their peers and families.

An examination of the position of female-headed families in Third World countries led Chant (1989) to conclude that women in many parts of the world choose to live in such families because of the strength this structure provides. Nesto's (1994) study of poor single mothers in the United States found that in spite of significant financial hardships and difficulty obtaining basic supports, the women experienced positive change and growth following their separation or divorce.

U.S. society has failed to meet the needs of changing families. It is this lack of responsiveness, not the structure of families, that has created a social problem. Rather than being a deviant form, female-headed families can be regarded as a group that society has failed. Strength-based practice that is oriented toward empowering families to maximize their available emotional and financial resources helps them move toward a stronger position in society

SHIFTING THE FOCUS

Using a gender lens to review and analyze the issues opens avenues to an understanding of single mothers as a group that is marginalized by race, gender, and class. It helps uncover "previously ignored information, introduces new understandings of social interactions, and exposes how the construction of knowledge itself supports the status quo" (Abramovitz, 1988, p. 13). Understanding the circumstances of single mothers from this perspective could lead to practice and policy solutions that would go beyond reinscribing female-headed households as a problem. Although female-headed families face a range of difficulties, placing

> an undue emphasis on their 'vulnerability' is both pragmatically and ideologically misleading. In some instances, [these] households are not only established as a result of female initiative and decision-making, but are also eminently capable of gaining a livelihood, even when the odds are weighted heavily against them. (Chant, 1989, p. 151)

Feminist theory focuses on defining gender inequality rather than single-parent families, as the problem. The major hurdle faced by female-headed families is the economic inequality of women, compounded by racial inequality for women of color, which leads to high levels of poverty Economic expansion did not help lift these families out of poverty the way it did two-parent families, because their economic problems are rooted in the social arrangements that affect all women and cannot be dealt with in isolation (Schorr & Moen, 1984). Analyzing the issues confronted by female-headed families requires an approach based on an understanding of complex issues (Pearce, 1989) and the interaction among them.

It is the low status of women, particularly women of color, that results in the unequal position of female-headed single-parent families. Institutional structures reproduce gender inequality that reflects the interests of men and distorts and trivializes the roles and interests of women (Lengermann & Niebrugge-Brantley, 1988). An

examination of the economic and social conditions of women globally "identifies common factors that contribute to women's impoverishment and shows that the shared nature of these largely personal problems makes them global human rights issues" (Nichols-Casebolt et al., 1994, p. 9). Discrimination by race and by gender combine in complex ways to leave single mothers without adequate financial, political, and social support (McChesney, 1989; Pearce, 1989). Shifting the focus to the economic constraints on women allows for inquiry into the failure of society and its political and economic systems to address inequalities based solely on the gender of the heads of households. Single mothers in the United States, more than those in most other industrialized nations, are responsible "for both the support and care of their children ... without the assistance of either the fathers of their children or the state" (McChesney, 1989, p. 17).

New concepts regarding the support and empowerment of female-headed families are needed to describe and understand this dilemma more accurately. The orientation resulting from an analysis of the inequality and oppression experienced by female-headed families and people of color would be useful in examining and remedying conditions. Cross-cultural studies have found that in cultures where one-parent families are considered neither pathological nor inferior, the children suffered neither economic nor psychological deprivation. It is economic resources, supportive social networks, and societal attitudes, rather than the singular insular definition of family, that determine the overall level of functioning of female-headed families (Bilge & Kaufman, 1983).

The economic exploitation and gender oppression of women in both the home and the labor market empowers men while serving to keep women in a subordinate position in both spheres in the United States (Abramovitz, 1988) and globally (Nichols-Casebolt et a1.,1994). In Western Europe, the universal benefit system for families with children is offered in recognition of the need to integrate policies related to women and children (Miller, 1987). In the Caribbean, even with a longstanding tradition of women's economic independence, female-headed families are negatively affected by gender inequality in the labor force (Chant & Brydon, 1989).

Supportive Policies

There are lessons to be learned from the successes and failures of both developing and industrialized nations. In Sweden, with its dual focus on work and income support, a mix of universal supports is available to all families, with additional means-tested support for poor families. Although a high percentage of single mothers work, economic assistance is still necessary to lift their families out of poverty because of the low wages paid to women (Rosenthal, 1994). The combination of universal and means-tested supports leaves Sweden with a poverty rate of only 5.5%, compared to 55.4% in the United States. In addition, countries such as Costa Rica and India provide models of women's income-generating groups that are responsible for raising the incomes and employment of women (Nichols-Casebolt et al., 1994).

Groskind (1994) and van Wormer (1994) both pointed to the role of values in policy decisions that affect the poor. Van Wormer's examination of the Norwegian experience, which viewed poverty policy in light of basic cultural values, drew clear connections between the two. Norway, with an underlying value system that supports assistance, has the most comprehensive approach. Based on a helping ethic, rather than a work ethic; on collectivity rather than rugged individualism; and on a position of kindness toward the vulnerable, its system has eliminated poverty Furthermore, whereas Americans have historically distrusted governmental involvement in poverty policy (Groskind, 1994), Norwegians support adequate, immediate assistance and trust the social system (van Wormer, 1994).

A policy that would recognize the impact of gender and racial-ethnic inequality would address the issues that create stress for single-mother families. It would focus both on the earning power of families and income support from the government, incorporating societal and individual responsibility, and, in so doing, it would reduce the gap in income between single-parent and two-parent families.

Implications for Social Work

During conservative times such as these, social work educators and policymakers must be beacons, rather than

reactors, and play a leadership role in refraining the dialogue on female-headed families. As the political environment becomes more and more negative, the most vulnerable citizens are being increasingly marginalized. Framing the dialogue around family structure, rather than around poverty, leaves women and children at a great risk, especially in that they are viewed only as welfare recipients, which dehumanizes them and makes it easy to rationalize budget cuts to the "undeserving." The Clinton administration's initial imagery reflected an ambivalent attempt to recast the negative image of welfare of the Reagan-Bush era. Clinton's reference to mutual responsibility implies both social and personal responsibility (Fraser, 1993). The 1994 elections, however, remarginalized poor women and children through negative rhetoric and impersonal references.

Social work educators should provide leadership in setting research agendas and teaching students to interpret research and theory critically. For practitioners to shift the dialogue and, therefore, policies and services, social work education must involve a broad base of knowledge with a framework that allows students to understand the interconnection and interaction between labeling and the web of oppression.

Social workers, whether educators, practitioners, community activists, or policymakers, can provide leadership by softening and personalizing this dialogue. The majority of Americans believe that the poor need more money, and they favor greater spending to help children. However, whereas 85% of the public are concerned about poverty and 83% favor increased taxes for job training and employment programs, only 29% favor greater support for welfare mothers (Boisvert, 1994). These figures indicate both the influence of the negative debate on public opinion and the potential for support and change. Thus the profession can also take a lead in educating the general public through writing and using the mass media that structures much of the dialogue. Shifting the discussion may change public opinion and voting patterns, as well as garner greater community support.

CONCLUSION

The lack of scholarship on single-parent families as a diverse, long- term family option limits the ability of practitioners and policymakers to respond positively. Single-parent families are not the homogeneous group they are commonly portrayed to be. The diversity of family styles by race, ethnicity, economic condition, and actual circumstances is frequently unknown or ignored. New insights into both the strengths and causes of stress in these families would provide a framework for moving them away from the margins.

Because of the economic and social inequality of women globally, female-headed single-parent families face unique challenges. The stress these families face, particularly in the United States, where single mothers receive inadequate support from income, absent fathers, and stigmatized income support systems, is related to financial hardship, role functions, self-perception, and the changing need for support (Fine, Schwebel, & Myers, 1985). Continuing to approach research and theory development as if social structure is a static condition with single parents as a transitional group will not provide the information needed for understanding and empowerment. Studies that would assume that the lifestyles of these families are a viable, long-term family alternative affected by gender inequality would provide a more accurate reflection of the families' actual circumstances.

The current system of blame and stigma leaves female-headed families, and therefore children, without adequate support and resources. What is needed in this country is a combination of labor market remedies and shifting resources. Furthermore, the issues related to female-headed families must be addressed from multiple perspectives, including (a) the insufficient pool of jobs at adequate wages, (b) the unequal burden of family responsibilities, (c) the need for a child and family policy with universal supports for all families, and (d) the need for additional assistance for families who are still living below the poverty line. The policies of many countries could serve as useful frameworks for positive responses to the issues that these families face.

REFERENCES

Abramovitz, M. (1988). Regulating the lives of women: Social welfare policy from colonial times to the present. Boston: South End.

Abramovitz, M., & Newdom, F. (1994, Spring). Fighting back! Challenging AFDC myths with the facts. 13CR Reports, 6(1), 6a.
Bane, M. J. (1988). Politics and policies of the feminization of poverty. In M. Weir, A. S, Orloff, & T. Skocpol (Eds.), The politics of social policy in the United States (pp. 381-396). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press,
Bernard, J. M., & Nesbitt, S. (1981). Divorce: An unreliable predictor of children's emotional predispositions. Journal of Divorce, 4,31-42.
Bilge, B., & Kaufman, G. (1983). Children of divorce and one-parent families: Cross-cultural perspectives. Family Relations, 32,59-71.
Boisvert, B. (1994, December 26). Deserving poor. In These Times,19(3),10-11.
Center on Hunger, Poverty and Nutrition Policy. (1995). Statement on key welfare reform issues: The empirical evidence. Medford, MA: Author.
Chant, S. (1989). Gender and the urban household. In S. Chant & L. Brydon (Eds.), Women in the Third World; Gender issues in rural and urban areas (pp. 134-160). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
Chant, S., & Brydon, L. (Eds.). (1989). Women in the Third World; Gender issues in rural and urban areas. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
Children in Poverty; Hearing before the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, 99th Cong., 1st Sess. (1985).
Children's Defense Fund. (1989). A children's defense budget; An analysis of our nation's investment in children, Washington, DC: Author.
Children's Defense Fund. (1990). S.O.S. America: A children's defense budget. Washington, DC: Author.
Children's Defense Fund. (1991). Child poverty in America. Washington, DC: Author.
Children's Defense Fund. (1992, October). Child poverty hits 25-year high, growing by nearly 1 million children in 1991. CDF Reports, pp. 1-3.
DeParle, J. (1994a, July 15). The Clinton welfare bill begins trek in Congress. New York Times, pp. Al, A10.
DeParle, J. (1994b, October 24). Welfare mothers find jobs easy to get but hard to hold. New York Times, pp. Al, A10.
Dugger, C. W. (1995, February 26). Displaced by the welfare wars. New York Times, pp. 4-1,4-4.
Ehrenreich, B., & Piven, F. F. (1984). The feminization of poverty. Dissent, 31, 162-170.
Ellwood, D. T. (1988). Poor support. New York: Basic Books.
Fine, M. A., Schwebel, A. L., & Myers, L. J. (1985). The effects of world view on adaptation to single parenthood among middle-class adult women. Journal of Family Issues, 6,107-127,
Fraser, N. (1993). Clintonism, welfare, and the antisocial wage: The emergence of a neoliberal political imaginary. Rethinking Marxism, 6,7-23.
Garfinkel, I. (1987). Welfare policy in America (Discussion Paper No. 847-87). Madison, WI: Institute for Research on Poverty.
Garfinkel, I., & McLanahan, S. S. (1986). Single mothers and their children. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.
Gray, J. (1995, February 23). G.O.P. targeting social programs for budget cuts. New York Times, pp. Al, A10.
Groskind, F. (1994). Ideological influences on public support for assistance to poor families. Social Work, 39, 81-89.
Kamerman, S. B. (1984). Women, children, and poverty: Public policies and female-headed families in industrialized countries. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 10, 249-271.
Kamerman, S. B., & Kahn, A. J. (1988). Mothers alone: Strategies for a time of change. Dover, MA: Auburn House.
Kinard, E. M., & Reinherz, H. (1986). Effects of marital disruption on children's school aptitude and achievement. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48,285-293.
Kurdek, L. A., & Siesky, A. E. (1980). Effects of divorce on children: The relationship between parent and child perspectives. Journal of Divorce, 4, 85-99.
Lengeimann, P. M., & Niebrugge-Brantley, J. (1988), Contemporary feminist theory. In G. Ritzer (Ed.), Contemporary sociological theory (2nd ed., pp. 282-325). New York: Knopf.
Mahaffey, M. (1984, June). Women, work and social welfare. Paper presented at the Fifth Elizabeth Wisner

Lecture, Tulane University School of Social Work, New Orleans.
McChesney, K. Y. (1989, April). Macroeconomic issues in poverty: Implications for child and youth homelessness. Paper presented at the conference on Homeless Children and Youth: Coping with a National Tragedy, Washington, DC.
Mihaly, L. (1989, April). Beyond the numbers: Homeless families with children. Paper presented at the conference on Homeless Children and Youth: Coping with a National Tragedy, Washington, DC.
Miller, D. C. (1987). Children's policy and women's policy: Congruence or conflict? Social Work, 32, 289-292,
Mueller, D. P., & Cooper, P. W. (1986). Children of single parent families: How they fare as young adults. Family Relations, 35,169-176.
Nesto, B. (1994). Low-income single mothers: Myths and realities. Affilia, 9, 232-246.
Nichols-Casebolt, A., Krysik, J., & Hermann-Currie, R. (1994). The povertization of women: A global phenomenon. Affilia, 9,9-29.
Pear, R. (1995a, February 1). Governors agree children must get priority in debate on welfare. New York Times, p. Al2.
Pear, R. (1995b, January 31). Governors deadlocked on replacing welfare programs with grants to states. New York Times, p. A14.
Pearce, D. M. (1989, August). The feminization of poverty: A second look. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco.
Peterson, J. L., & Zill, N. (1986). Marital disruption, parent-child relationships, and behavior problems in children. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48, 295-307.
Rosenthal, M. G. (1994). Single mothers in Sweden: Work and welfare in the welfare state. Social Work, 39,270-278.
Sanger, D. E. (1995, January 15). Republicans want to renew vision of Reagan (then redo his math). New York Times, p. 18.
Schorr, A. L., & Moen, P. (1984). The single parent and public policy. In P. Voydanoff (Ed.), Work and family: Changing roles of men and women (pp. 288-297). Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.
Segal, E. A. (1989). Welfare reform: Help for poor women and children? Affilia, 4(3), 42-50.
Sherman, A. (1994). Wasting America's future: The Children's Defense Fund report on the costs of child poverty. Boston: Beacon,
Smeeding, T. M. (1990). Social thought and poor children. Focus, 12(3), 11-14.
Stivens, M. (1985). The fate of women's land rights: Gender, matriliny, and capitalism in Rembau, Negeri Sembilan, Malaysia. In H. Afshar (Ed.), Women, work, and ideology in the Third World (pp. 3-36). London: Tavistock.
Tuzlak, A., & Hillock, D. W. (1986). Single mothers and their children after divorce: A study of those "who make it." Conciliation Courts Review, 24, 79-89.
U.S. children and their families: Current conditions and recent trends, 1989: Report of the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, House of Representatives, 101st Cong., 1st Sess. (1989).
van Wormer, K. (1994). A society without poverty—The Norwegian experience. Social Work, 39,324-327,
Yudelman, S. W. (1987). Hopeful openings: A study of five women's development organizations in Latin America and the Caribbean. West Hartford, CT: Kumarian.
Cathryne L. Schmitz is Assistant Professor, School of Social Service, St, Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri.