

# The Journal of Early Adolescence

<http://jea.sagepub.com>

---

## **Sharing the Work: Mother-Child Relationships and Household Management**

Jennifer L. Romich

*The Journal of Early Adolescence* 2007; 27; 192

DOI: 10.1177/0272431606294837

The online version of this article can be found at:  
<http://jea.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/27/2/192>

---

Published by:

 SAGE Publications

<http://www.sagepublications.com>

**Additional services and information for *The Journal of Early Adolescence* can be found at:**

**Email Alerts:** <http://jea.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

**Subscriptions:** <http://jea.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

**Reprints:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

**Permissions:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

**Citations** (this article cites 41 articles hosted on the  
SAGE Journals Online and HighWire Press platforms):  
<http://jea.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/27/2/192#BIBL>

# Sharing the Work

## Mother-Child Relationships and Household Management

Jennifer L. Romich

*University of Washington, Seattle*

This manuscript reports on a study of how low-income employed single mothers and young adolescents manage household daily life. Analysis is based on longitudinal ethnographic data collected from families of 35 young adolescents over 3 years following the 1996 welfare reforms. Although mothers worked, young adolescents spent time unsupervised, performed household chores, and provided child care for younger siblings. Mother-youth relationships marked by mutual understanding acted as resources that enabled the families to successfully navigate daily life. Discussion focuses on how relationship quality moderates the impact of maternal employment and household work on young adolescent well-being. Implications for further research on children's household work are considered.

**Keywords:** *mother-child relations; maternal employment; household management; sibling care; self-care; ethnographic*

For many families, parents' time spent at work creates challenges for daily routines that also include household work and the provision of supervision and care for children. This article focuses on the daily experiences of low-income families with young adolescents and unmarried mothers, a set of families for whom resources and time are particularly scarce and policy supports are often inadequate (Edin & Lein, 1997; Polakow, 1993). Knowing about the processes whereby single-parent families with young adolescents and employed (working) mothers balance parental employment, care giving, and household work, and knowing about the roles that young adolescents play in that balance provides insight into young persons' daily lives. A specific motivation for this inquiry stems from suggestions that household responsibilities falling to adolescent children after mothers enter the labor force may be one reason that welfare reforms appear to have had negative effects on adolescents (Brooks, Hair, & Zaslow, 2001; Gennetian et al., 2004).

One way of thinking about this topic is a part of a larger domain of research on work and family issues, in which the central tension is often cast as a multiple role problem for adults—mothers in this case, who are simultaneously workers, parents, and homemakers (Perry-Jenkins, Repetti, & Crouter, 2000). An alternative strategy is to focus on young adolescents' actions and influence within the daily routine, including time spent in self-care, caring for siblings, and household work. Such a focus on children's contributions aligns with developmental views of children as actively shaping their environments (Maccoby, 2000; Magnusson & Stattin, 1998; Sameroff, 1994, 2000) and with research on the sociology of childhood, which stresses child agency in engaging with social processes (James, Jenks, & Prout, 1998; James & Prout, 1997; Marrow, 1996; Thorne, 1993).

Although these frameworks are not necessarily mutually exclusive, the two lenses suggest different interpretations of daily challenges faced by families with working parents. For instance, discussions of gap time, periods during the day when children are not at school but parents are at work, may focus on parents' strategies for knowing about and supervising children's whereabouts and activities, actions traditionally referred to as "monitoring." However, recent research on monitoring suggests that children's characteristics and voluntary disclosures may be more important than parents' actions in contributing to parents' knowledge (Kerr & Stattin, 2000; Stattin & Kerr, 2000).

Household tasks, including care for young children, are a second challenge that can be viewed as a more or less parent driven set of activities. Young adolescents with employed single mothers often end up doing house work or sibling care. This work may be ordered and directed by parents, as suggested by studies documenting that mothers "lean on" or "push" work onto young adolescents, particularly girls (Crouter, Head, Bumpus, &

---

**Author's Note:** The preparation of this manuscript was supported by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (R01 HD045635), with early analysis made possible by a Spencer Foundation Dissertation Year Grant. Data come from a fieldwork project directed by Thomas Weisner and funded by NICHD (R01 HD36068, Aletha Huston PI). Clara Berridge and Jennifer Simmelink managed data and provided excellent research assistance. The author thanks the respondent families for participating in the study and Jim Spillane, Tom Weisner, Edward (Ted) Lowe, Diane Morrison, and several anonymous reviewers for helpful suggestions and feedback. Findings from this manuscript were presented at colloquiums at the University of Washington, University of Chicago, and Johns Hopkins University. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Jennifer L. Romich, School of Social Work, University of Washington, 4101 15th Avenue NE, Seattle, WA 98105; e-mail: romich@u.washington.edu

McHale, 2001; Dodson & Dickert, 2004). A different view of young persons' work is that it is at least partially internally motivated, and to some extent voluntary. Young adolescents may do house and childcare work out of a sense of loyalty to the family (Fuligni et al., 1999) or responsibility for the household common good. Although it may be naive to view the tasks children do around the house as fully self-motivated, it is equally unlikely that children's work only occurs by direct parental decree and under immediate enforcement.

This article describes how a set of low-income families with young adolescents manages the demands of mothers' market work and daily family life. The overarching question is, what do mothers and young adolescents do to support (or hinder) their families' daily routines? The data comes from an ethnographic study with families of 35 young adolescents who were visited for 3 years following the 1996 welfare reforms. Although mothers worked, young adolescents spent time unsupervised, performed household chores, and provided child care for younger siblings. The analysis suggests that mother-youth relationships marked by mutual understanding and trust provided a resource that allowed families to successfully balance daily demands of family life and market work.

## **Background**

### **Lives of Low-Income Employed Single Mothers**

Work and family ethnographies of low-income single mother households focus on mothers' methods for balancing market and family work (Edin & Lein, 1997; Newman, 1999; Polakow, 1993). From such research, a picture of low-income working families' activities, strategies, and contexts emerges. Single mothers are disproportionately likely to be poor and work in low-wage jobs (Polakow, 1993), but job-holding alone is rarely a complete financial management strategy (Edin & Lein, 1997). Low-wage work often involves schedule conflicts and wage rates that make supporting a family difficult (Newman, 1999). Although at work, mothers have to secure care for their younger children, choosing among a set of more or less appealing options, including subsidized or unsubsidized formal care, informal care, or relative care including care by fathers (Fuller et al., 1996; Henly & Lyons, 2000; Lowe & Weisner, 2000). Mothers use social networks, including extended families and friends for supplementing finances and providing child care (Newman, 1999; Stack, 1974). Transfer programs

intended to support work fit the daily routines of some families but are not helpful to others (Gibson & Weisner, 2002). Overall, life for low-income single mother families is characterized as difficult (Polakow, 1993).

Studies that extend knowledge of family process will be implicitly or explicitly guided by a model of how tasks get done within the household. As a whole, the studies cited above take the mother as the analytic focus. Mothers' desire for and efforts toward balancing child work, house work, and market work are the central subject. Children and youth are present in these narratives primarily as a key problem—family members in need of financial support and care—but also as a central motivator or reason for mothers' efforts (e.g., "My children come first," Scott, Edin, London, & Mazelis, 2001). Mothers consider children's needs in making employment choices such as forgoing advancement opportunities that would disrupt children's lives (Lowe & Weisner, 2004). Benefits of relationships and possible remarriages are also weighed against potential costs to children (Scott et al., 2001). Although it is important to understand the role children play in motivation and constraint for mothers' choices, these studies largely focus on children as symbols or as drains on household resources. Considering children as agents raises other questions. What active roles do children play in shaping daily lives in economically poor single mother households? How do children contribute and how are these contributions managed by the family?

### **Children's Participation in Household Labor**

One contribution is household work. In families with employed mothers it is important to recognize that children are workers too, although this aspect of childhood is sometimes overlooked. Prior to the mid-20th century, child household labor was an accepted and necessary part of American family life. Across different societies, childhood tasks are a ubiquitous part of development and an important part of family participation (Weisner, 2001; White & Brinkerhoff, 1981). Children contribute to household survival and contributions often start at an early age (Munroe, Munroe, & Shimmin, 1984; Whiting, Whiting, & Longabaugh, 1975). In the past few decades, the dominant culture within Western industrialized societies has shifted from a consideration of children as valuable because of their labor to children as "priceless," valued for emotional and symbolic reasons (Zelizer, 1985). However, this perception may mask the work that many children still do in their parents' households (Brannen, 1995; Goodnow & Lawrence, 2001; Morrow, 1996). One study estimates that children contribute 15% of the work done in United States households (Goldscheider & Waite, 1991).

Dismissing children's work as chores underemphasizes the range and importance of children's contributions. Tasks such as cleaning, doing laundry, preparing meals, and taking out the trash are key factors in household management (Goodnow & Lawrence, 2001). Taking care of younger siblings is universally one of the most common tasks of childhood (Weisner & Gallimore, 1977; Whiting et al., 1975). Children provide before- and after-school care for younger siblings (Capizzano, Tout, & Adams, 2000; Laird, Pettit, Dodge, & Bates, 1998; Steinberg, 1999; Weisner & Gallimore, 1977). As with adults who perform caring labor on an informal basis, the caring work of children often goes unnoticed (Folbre, 2001; Himmelweit, 1999).

Most research on children's labor has focused on child and household characteristics associated with different patterns of household work, notably child gender, maternal employment, the number of adults in the household, and family size (Bianchi & Robinson, 1997). Overall, girls work more than boys, a fact that suggests household work is a site for the reproduction of gendered roles (Gager, Cooney, & Call, 1999). Children work more in the house when their mothers work outside the house (Crouter et al., 2001). Younger teens contribute more than older teens, who have more extra-household activities (Brannen, 1995; Weisner, 2001). Children of single mothers generally work more, but this finding is not robust (Brannen, 1995); and most studies have focused on children who live with two parents. One goal of the current study is to address this gap by describing patterns of children's work within households headed by single mothers.

A variety of reasons are invoked to explain why children work, with most explanations oriented toward one of two types of motivation. At one end of the spectrum, household work is seen as a way for children to develop skills and responsibilities (Goodnow & Lawrence, 2001). Alternatively, children work because their labor is needed (Dodson & Dickert, 2004). These two motivations are not mutually exclusive, and empirical analysis of children's work, parents' education, and parents' work hours support both explanations (Blair, 1992). From their own perspectives, children may help out around the house because their parents make them, because they want to help out the family, or because they expect to be compensated. Children may also work out of a sense of duty to contribute to the household, out of respect for or wish to help their parents, or out of concern for the well-being of siblings or other household members (Fuligni, 2001).

Although extant research documents who does what work and provides a framework of broad motivating orientations, it leaves open a question of how work actually gets done. What are the mechanisms (i.e., patterns of thought, communication, and action) through which children's household

work happens? A second goal of the current study is to build on existing research about motivations for work by trying to uncover mechanisms whereby work gets done. Given the likely need for children's labor in economically poor, single mother households, it is expected that young adolescents will work. Do children work voluntarily because they are aware of this households' need or do they work only on direct and enforceable order from a mother? At a superficial level, this can be seen as a task of documenting the strategies that are used for assigning work and making sure it gets done. At a deeper level, answering the question of what makes children work requires an understanding of family practices and members' patterns of relating to each other.

### **Consequences of Household Labor**

A set of questions arises around the implications of doing household work for children's health and well-being. One view is that work is good for children, not only instrumentally (through providing for physical needs) but also developmentally. Work is part of the household context that shapes social and emotional development (Whiting & Edwards, 1988). Children who contribute to a household may develop a sense of responsibility, learn practical and relationship skills, and otherwise gain competencies needed for productive adulthoods. Cross-cultural studies of children's work find that children in cultures in which their labor is used for household survival display greater capacity for nurturance, less antisocial behavior, and more responsible behavior than do children in societies in which children work less (Munroe et al., 1984; Whiting et al., 1975).<sup>1</sup>

An alternate view is that work can become harmful. Reflecting the tension between work as a healthy developmental practice versus work as a burdensome obligation, some research in psychology has focused on the conditions under which work becomes oppressive. Jurkovic and colleagues (Jurkovic, 1997; Jurkovic, Morrell, & Thirkield, 1999) provide guidelines for distinguishing age-appropriate caretaking and contribution practices from levels of responsibility that may be harmful to children, the latter of which may lead to "destructive parentification" (Jurkovic, 1997). Many concerns about parentification arise in cases in which children provide emotional support to parents, a topic that falls beyond the scope of the current focus on instrumental labor and caring when the object of care is the younger sibling. However, parentification is a concern when household tasks or sibling care become an important aspect of the child's identity (a "self-defining characteristic" as opposed to a "time-limited adaptation" in

Jurkovic et al., 1999, p. 95); when children or young adolescents perform age-inappropriate tasks without parental supervision; or when responsibilities are assigned or distributed in a manner that violates social or family norms of equity, fairness, or trust (Boszormenyi-Nagy & Spark, 1973).

## **Self-Care as Type of Household Labor**

The following analysis also considers care for young adolescents as a task in the daily routine, a task that commonly falls to the young adolescents themselves. An estimated 31% of 11- and 12-year-olds regularly spend time in self-care without direct adult supervision; a rate that is likely higher for slightly older children and children of single parents who are employed full time (Kerrebrock & Lewit, 1999). For young adolescents, self-care may not be considered task work in the same way that sibling care or physical housework is, but it is worklike on several dimensions. First, self-care shares attributes with sibling care and household work; it is a prosocial behavior that requires responsibility and independence. Second, were an adult present and at least nominally aware of the youth, the presumption would be that the adult was responsible for the youth's safety and behavior. In the absence of even passive adult supervision, the youth's safety becomes the youth's responsibility. Finally, self-care may also involve work that could be transferred to other household members. For instance, a child in self-care may prepare her own meals even though the task of meal preparation could be done by others. For these reasons, self-care is viewed as a challenge to working families that parallels sibling care and housework.

## **Data and Methods**

The shared family management framework requires attention to child characteristics and contributions as well as the interaction between family members. This study uses qualitative data gathered during a 3-year ethnography of low-income working families. Ethnographic methods are one valuable technique for learning about human development (Weisner, 1996).

### **The New Hope Ethnographic Study**

Data used are part of a larger research project on an evaluation of an antipoverty program in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Brock, Doolittle, Fellerath,



and Wiseman (1997) and Bos et al. (1999) describe the larger study including the program, the research design, and outcomes. Although this sample is drawn from families who volunteered for this work support program and were randomly assigned to the treatment or the control group, the ethnographic analysis presented here does not make use of the experimental design. Specific program impacts are better estimated using larger samples (Duncan & Gibson, 2000). The current work is situated within a policy environment in which low-income working families face various levels of barriers and supports in their daily lives.

Recruitment into the ethnographic study began in 1998. Contacts were randomly drawn from the families with young children and assigned to field-workers. Excluding families who had moved outside of the Milwaukee-Chicago metropolitan areas, 87% of families contacted agreed to participate in the study. Families were paid \$50 for each quarter that they remained in contact and participated in interviews and field visits. The sample for the current analysis was restricted to (a) women-headed households, (b) with no spouse or long-term co-residential partner, and (c) with children ages 8 through 14 as of June 1, 1998, the approximate date of the first field visits. This set of restrictions provides a sample of 19 families. The families include a total of 35 children who were between the ages of 10 and 14 for at least 1 year during the study. Most families also have additional children outside the target age range.

Family informants include children, mothers, other relatives, friends, and acquaintances, but women with biological or custodial children were the primary contact person in each family. Most of these mothers were in their 30s, with a mean age of 34 at the beginning of fieldwork. Nine identify as Hispanic, a category that includes Puerto Ricans, Mexican Americans, and immigrants from other Latin American countries; eight are African American; one is European American; and one woman is biracial. At the start of fieldwork, all were economically poor, with average annual individual earnings of less than \$9,000 and an average household income of less than \$15,000.

Fieldwork focused on capturing families' daily routines and the meaning and significance of members' everyday activities, resources, and constraints. Researchers collaborated to develop a set of domains, including work, child care, budgets, health care, social supports, family history, children's schooling, and related topics. See the appendix for a copy of the fieldwork template. Field-workers spoke with parents and children at home, ate meals, and ran errands with family members. They paid visits or accompanied members to workplaces, schools, churches, and other community

locations. Visits generally lasted for more than an hour, and 2- to 5-hour visits were common. Most fieldwork time was spent in informal conversations and participant observation, but field-workers probed as needed to systematically gather information on the topics on the fieldwork template.

Under the overall study design, up to two children in each family were designated as focal children. Of the 35 young adolescents in the current sample, 26 (74%) were focal children. If the child and mother agreed, each focal child met with the field-worker alone and outside the house at least once during the fieldwork period. Discussions with children were intended to elicit information about their daily routines and views of their parents, parents' work, and their own lives. Some focal children also kept and shared daily diaries at the field-workers' request. Field notes contain information about nonfocal children, as well, but this information is less systematic and is most complete for children who were particularly outgoing or friendly with field-workers.

Field notes were written at each contact. Field-workers used tape recorders when respondents felt comfortable with it and the context was appropriate. When tape recording was not feasible (in public locations, for instance), field-workers wrote reports of conversations soon after the visit. Field-workers compared families' responses on the survey and administrative data that was collected as part of the larger evaluation to field experiences and queried respondents whenever sources conflicted. These strategies of triangulation across observers, setting, and data sources increase data credibility (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Padgett, 1998).

Over the 3 years of fieldwork, the families in this study were visited or contacted on average 19 times, for a total of 359 family visits. The relationships developed between respondents and field-workers through such prolonged engagement increases the trustworthiness of data and ensures that any intentionally or unintentionally misleading reports must be sustained over time (Padgett, 1998). The novelty of having a field-worker visit a family was diminished; children in the study grew accustomed to seeing and spending time with the field-workers. This longitudinal and family-situated design provides opportunities to both hear informants' views and observe family patterns, generating a depth of data unmatched by focus groups or individual informant interviews.

These data strengths are tempered by limitations in the depth of data collected directly from children. As noted, the data collection design relied on mothers as the primary respondents. With the exception of visits with the focal children, most of the data consists of conversations with mothers and observations of the household while the mother is present. We know what families' daily routines consist of, how tasks get done within the household,

and the extent of conflict or coordination among members as visible through observed interactions and daily family achievements. We know what mothers think about their families and daily lives and what some, but not all, young adolescents think about their lives. There is no way to resolve this weakness in the current study, as analysis took place after field exit. Additional implications of these limitations for the interpretation of this study are addressed in the discussion section below.

## Analysis

Three stages of data analysis were used in the current article. This article is part of a larger study on well-being in working families, and the initial stage of work took place at the more general level. In this first stage, complete notes for each family were read and general themes were identified. Summaries were prepared to capture mothers' market work involvement and demographics at the family level, as well as daily routine participation (morning and evening supervision gaps, sibling care, household work, and communication strategies) for each youth. Table 1 displays the cases and information from this initial coding. In addition to tracking these surface-level activities, explanations of why individual young persons and families seemed to do more or less well were used to develop additional themes for analysis. These conceptualizations of family sustainability and successful youth development contain both emic and etic constructs and are the primary subject of separate analyses (Bernheimer, Weisner, & Lowe, 2003; Romich, 2002).

From these summary stories about how some families successfully combine market work and family life, the discrete theme of relationships in daily family management was identified as the focus for this article. The second stage of analysis was a systematic examination of the relationships between mothers and young adolescent children (youth). At this stage, the complete field notes were re-read to cull information about the relationships. Data used included field notes about mothers' descriptions of youth and characterizations of their relationships with their children; field-worker observations of mother-youth actions and interactions at home and in the community; and discussions with youth about topics including their mothers and families. An inductive cross-case analysis (Miles & Huberman, 1994) yielded three types of relationships, described in the findings section that follows. In most cases, information reported by the mother, field-worker observations, and discussions with youth were consistent with each other, with one type of exception discussed below.

Table 1  
Household Demographics, Employment, Daily Routines, and Management Strategies

HOUSEHOLD	AG	AH	AL	AN	BK	CE	FA	JH	KB	KC	KR	LR	MD	MH	MM	NR	RR	SG	TD	
Baseline ages of non-focal children	4	3,6	18	14,5,5		2,4,7	18	5,12	<1,4	3	6,7				14,5,<1	5	8	<1,7	4,7	
Mother's employment																				
None	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□
Part time	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□
Full time	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□
Overtime	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□
YOUTH (son, daughter)	s	s	s	d	d	d	d	d	s	d	s	d	d	d	d	d	s	d	s	d
Baseline age	12	8	11	12	10	12	10	11	12	8	10	13	9	11	13	8	14	9	12	13
Spends time without adult																				
Before school	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
After school	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Non-school days	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Formal activities	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□
Work by youth*																				
Household chores	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□
Latchkey sibling care	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□
Supervised sibling care	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□
Daily strategies**																				
Calls	■	■	■	■	■	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	■	■	■	■	■	■
Network supervision	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□
Restriction to house	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□
Leaving notes	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□
Discussion	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□

Notes: Alternate shading distinguishes family units.  
 Key: □ = never / very rarely (no instances or a single isolated instance); ■ = sometimes (occasional instances or instances for a short period);  
 ■ = always / frequently (frequent instances over at least two of the three sample years).  
 \* Hypens ( ) indicate the child does not have younger siblings (category not applicable).  
 \*\* Blank spaces indicate an absence of information on use, while never (□) indicates confirmed nonuse.

These two stages of analysis—mapping family information and characterizing relationships—provide a foundation for the third step, a description of the role of relationships with the daily life of families with employed adults and young adolescents. Drawing on the narrative nature of the qualitative data, I describe common patterns of family management within daily life. This description makes clear the role of close, understanding relationships as enabling shared management.

The analyses for this article took place after field exit, but several safeguards were employed to ensure correct interpretation. During analysis, the family and child summaries, including relationship categorizations, were checked by the field-worker assigned to each family and corrected if necessary. A staff anthropologist read and commented on the analysis, and drafts of the article were distributed to all field-workers. Because fieldwork had ended, obtaining feedback from informants, an additional suggested quality check (Miles & Huberman, 1994) was not possible.

## Findings

### Daily Life and Management Challenges

Table 1 displays a summary of the daily activities and superficial strategies used by sample families. The following three vignettes illustrate how these employment patterns, daily routine challenges, and management strategies combine for individual families. Pseudonyms are used and identifying details are masked.

#### *Shalonda Greene and Family*

At an early visit with the Greene family, 10-year-old Shalonda pored over her spelling homework and did extra math problems that the teacher did not assign. Shalonda fondly recalled when her mother, Samantha (SG in Table 1), was also in school, studying toward a general educational development. The two did their homework together then. In 1998 Samantha moved off welfare for the first time because Shalonda was born. A single mother, Samantha took a clerical job in hopes of supporting her family, which also included a 7-year-old, a 4-year-old, and an 8-month-old. During the next 2 years, Samantha had alternated work with spells using the Wisconsin Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program. Her work hours varied from part-time at a video store to overtime at a dry cleaners.

Samantha was an emotional and supportive mother to Shalonda and the younger children; she called them her “blessings.” At the same time she

acknowledged feeling “stressed out” from her financial situation and was often too tired after work to do more than sit. Field notes describe how her children work around her:

The kids will come up and ask her for help on their homework. Samantha will help them . . . she would also yell or direct them to do some chore, such as pick up the trash, heat up food to eat, put clothes in the washer. While I was there the two oldest kids were doing most of the chores . . . while Samantha just directed them from her chair.

Like Shalonda, 32 of the 35 youth in the sample did household chores. One variation of this household work was supervised child care. Shalonda cared for the younger siblings, particularly the baby, when her mother was also at home. Twelve young adolescents in the sample (41% of those with siblings young enough to require care) cared for siblings although adults were present. During a 2001 visit with the Greens, Shalonda, then 13, confided to her mother that she was worried about starting junior high. Samantha encouraged her to follow the model of school success demonstrated by the college-bound daughter of a neighbor. A few minutes later Shalonda was reading on the couch.

### *Andy Heurtes and Family*

As Ana Heurtes (AH) described the path leading up to her current situation as a working mother in Milwaukee, her 11-year-old son Andy listened quietly to the story. Born in Puerto Rico, Ana moved to Chicago as a high school student and married Andy’s father at age 19. Abuse and a divorce followed, and Ana moved to Milwaukee. After a 30-month stint on welfare that ended in 1996, Ana started working part-time. As she was buying a car in 1997, her outgoing personality won her a job offer at an auto dealer. Long hours and low pay (\$7.50/hour) led her to take a better paying 9 to 5 job as a phone operator, but she continued working at the dealership on evenings and weekends and eventually was enticed to return full time. Ana was busy all day at work, juggling multiple phone calls from 11 a.m. through 8 p.m.

Andy was his mother’s main helper, watching out for his next-oldest brother, who had been diagnosed as having a developmental delay, and the two youngest boys. Although the father of the three youngest children was involved in their lives, he spent much of the late 1990s in and out of jail. Ana felt that she could not rely on his support and considered herself a single mother.

Like all but one of the other families, Andy and his siblings spent some time without an adult present. Twelve of the 19 families had time before school

(morning gaps) and children in 17 families had some unsupervised after school time. When Andy was younger, one of Ana's friends or his brother's father would watch the children. Beginning in 1999 the children stayed home and Andy, then 12 years old, took care of the younger boys. Of the 29 youth in the sample who have younger siblings, 12 (41%) provided latchkey sibling care.

Several strategies were used to make sure her children remained safe when Ana was at work. Ana called home daily, a strategy made possible because she had her own phone at work. Eleven other families in the sample used phone calls as a frequent or occasional strategy. Ana's stepfather and friends sometimes kept an eye on the boys, an example of network supervision, which, as a strategy, was at least occasionally used by all families in the sample. Discussing daily events was a third strategy. Ana and her boys talked through their days frequently, verifying that homework and chores got finished. Ten families (53%) discussed daily activities in this way, but in four of those families not all children participated.

### *Rene Estes and Family*

Like Shalonda and Andy, 14-year-old Rene Estes took care of her younger siblings, six in all. Rene's mother, Carla (CE), left welfare and soon started working as a temporary employee at a manufacturing plant in 1997. She was hired permanently in 1998. As a woman, Carla was a rarity on the shop floor, but she enjoyed the work and was chosen to receive extra training. She frequently obtained overtime and worked up to 60 hr per week.

Shy, chubby, and a fan of pop music "boy bands," Rene was in charge of the house when her mother was at work. Carla left notes for the children—Rene had to run to the store, a younger sister was supposed to do laundry and a younger brother was to fold laundry—but these instructions were often ignored. In spite of her mothers' complaints, Rene started to regularly skip school in 8th grade. In her 8th and 9th grade years, Rene alternated between public school, a "home school" program that consisted of unsupervised self-study, and total truancy.

By the spring of 2000, Carla said Rene had become unreliable. She left the house when she was supposed to care for her younger siblings. Carla could hardly blame her, citing the disrespect and yelling that was common in the family. Carla worried about what was happening to her children, "I don't know if it's their friends, the neighborhood, what's going on. Now that I'm working, you know before I wasn't working and they didn't act this way. Now that I'm not home, not taking care of them full-time, they're getting bad." Carla blamed her children's problems on the time she spent at work.

## Relationships

In these three families, and across the families in the study, the mothers worked and the young adolescents had household and sibling care responsibilities. Households differed in how these tasks were managed. In some households, like the Heurtes family, daily tasks were more or less smoothly completed, whereas in other households, like the Estes family's, members argued about household work or tasks went undone. One difference between families was in the caliber of the relationships between mothers and young adolescents. This section describes the three relationship types that were typical for families in this study.

More than half ( $N = 20$ , 57%) of the mother-child pairs in the sample shared *understanding relationships*, defined by shared time, honest and open conversations, and sensitivity to each other's needs. Even though these families faced difficulties, such as not being able to afford certain types of clothes or food, children in these families said they "understand" why they cannot get everything they want. Mothers in understanding relationships were intuitively familiar with their children's hopes and fears and responded sensitively. Mothers knew recent details of their children's lives. These relationships were reciprocal, one mother reported that her second-oldest son would come to her when she was angry or upset and asked her what was wrong. Another girl said of her mother, "I'm proud of my mom because she is hard working. She is like a hero for me because she's gone through so much in life and then she's still standing strong."

In contrast to the harmony found in understanding relationships, some adolescents and parents were constantly at odds with each other. *Confrontational relationships* were marked by yelling, fighting, and mutual disrespect. Six mother-child pairs (17%) had confrontational relationships. For instance, one mother admitted that she is mean to her eldest daughter, "I call her b\*\*\*h so often it might as well be her name." At the same time, young adolescents acted to irk their parents. For instance, two brothers played more offensive rap music when their mother asked them to turn off their stereo after midnight. When asked about their mothers, children in confrontational relationships may not only have expressed general appreciation for their mothers as providers but also complained about specific rules or how their mother is strict or "mean."

Low levels of parent-child communication mark the third common relationship pattern, *distant relationships*. Parents described their children as "quiet" or noted that children keep their emotions to themselves in these relationships, which make up nine (26%) of the sample pairs. Rene Estes' relationship with her mother, Carla, is one example of a distant relationship.



Carla said of her oldest daughter, "I don't really know what she feels. She barely talks to me . . . She keeps things bottled up inside of her."

More than in understanding or confrontational relationships, these distant relationships were one-sided. Most parents talked to or wished they could talk with their children, but reported that the children resist. Not surprisingly, distant relationships are the only category in which mother and child assessments of the relationship diverge. In some cases, children also said that they talked to their parents less than they might like, but more commonly children in relationships characterized here as distant described the relationship as "fine" or "good." In the case of these conflicting reports, field-worker reports suggest that the children are not outgoing (for instance, not engaging or giving one word answers during one-on-one conversations), so these divergent relationship views may be a function of inadequate information collected from these less forthcoming children.

Early adolescence is a time of change in parent-child relationships and accordingly, no relationship was truly static during the 3 years spent with families. In four instances, the nature of observed interactions changed enough to warrant reclassifying the relationship from one category to another. Two relationships initially categorized as distant and two others initially deemed understanding were recategorized as confrontational. These changes were driven by other life events including changes in housing situations or drug use by a parent. In one instance, a mother-son pair shared a distant, but respectful relationship until the mother remarried. When the new husband proved to be a controlling stepfather, the mother-son relationship turned confrontational.

Although these categories reflect both mother's and children's participation, as descriptors of parent-child interactions they bear some similarity to Baumrind's (1971, 1991) four-part typology of parenting styles based on the dimensions of warmth and control. The confrontational relationships in our sample would likely be described as harsh in Baumrind's classification. Permissive parenting may be either understanding or distant, depending on the level of control. Distant relationships with low parental control may be considered "disengaged," and such relationships have been linked with moderately lower levels of academic achievement (Steinberg, Elmen, & Mounts., 1989) and more sexual activity (Resnick et al., 1997). Pittman and Chase-Lansdale (2001) find particularly large effects of disengaged mothering on low-income African American adolescent girls, suggesting that the combination of low parental involvement and high neighborhood risk is particularly detrimental.

## Work, Relationships, and Well-Being in Daily Family Life

The importance of different relationship types was evident in day-to-day life. The mother-youth relationship set parameters for how families could respond to the daily challenges presented by gaps in supervision and the need for younger sibling care. Relationships cut across these management instances, forming the backdrop against which maternal work affected family life.

### *Relationships Enable Remote Discipline*

Managing gap times was a key challenge for families, and most families used remote discipline strategies including phone calls, network supervision, or discussion to make sure household children were safe during morning and afternoon gaps. Self-care worked best when children were trustworthy. For instance, one girl was left in self-care with the family dog to protect her. She had to keep her cellular phone with her and call her mom if anything was wrong. Another woman relied on her daughter's honesty, knowing she would tell her mother if she did something that she was not supposed to do, such as lighting the gas stove without supervision.

In families with good relationships, parents relied on the young adolescents themselves or siblings to enforce the rules when they were not around. Consistent with others' observations (Kerr & Stattin, 2000; Kerr, Stattin, & Trost, 1999), child disclosure was an important contributor to mother's knowledge. Children who shared good relationships with their mothers generally were forthcoming and truthful about how they spent their time. For instance, when one mother took away her son's privilege to watch wrestling on TV, she knew she could ask him about it and get a truthful answer.

Mothers also verified child reports through siblings and observations. The mother who restricted her son's TV watching admitted that he may be tempted to be "sly" in responding to her questions, but he knows his younger sister would tell on him. In reference to a fictional children's heroine, another daughter in the study was nicknamed "Harriet The Spy" by her sisters because she always told their mother what everyone did. An understanding relationship helped to enforce the wake-up time in one family in which the older sister watched younger siblings during the summer. At first the babysitter woke at noon, but her parents told her that if she wanted the money from babysitting her sisters, she would have to get up earlier. She agreed to the change and her mom inferred that the younger children were getting up earlier too, as they were tired earlier in the evening.

In the absence of a strong relationship, mothers felt their time at work allowed their children too much leeway. This was the case with Carla Estes who thought her children had recently started cursing because she began working 60 hours a week. She knew they swore when she was not around but even in her presence they used rude language. Rules were hard to enforce in distant relationships. For example, one woman left the house at 6:15 a.m. to make it to her TANF-required work placement. She would wake her son, but suspected that he would go back to sleep. This was confirmed by a field-worker who found him home alone midmorning and asked what time his bus came. His bus came at 8:02. When asked what time he woke that morning, he answered sheepishly, "Uh, 8:02."

Moms with distant relationships often did not really know what their young adolescents were doing after school. One mother said that her son was "never at home," but she did not know where he went after school. She worried that he would do "something on the streets that will land him in jail for the rest of his life." In confrontational relationships or those with little communication, gap time allowed young adolescents the freedom to get into trouble.

In the most confrontational relationships, parents had little leverage to enforce behavior standards regardless of whether or not they were present in the house. Young adolescents disobeyed directly (one mother reported that her daughter "rolls her eyes at me") or acquiesced with no intention of following through. The level of trust and respect in the relationship set boundaries on what kind of parenting actions would and would not work. In relationships with little or no trust, a few mothers resorted to severe extra-family measures, such as calling the police.

### *Relationships and Responsibilities*

Just as mothers with understanding relationships could count on their young adolescents to follow directions for self-care, they could trust their young adolescents to complete housework. An affectionate "mama's boy," one young man fixed his own dinner and kept busy with his homework after school. In the absence of this trust, getting children's productive participation in household tasks was more difficult. A woman who had a distant relationship with her daughter and confrontational relationships with her younger children explained what happened to her family when she had a sick spell and could not "stay on" the children:

You know, I was too sick to be bothered, you know what I mean. I gave them an inch and they took over. . . . I lost attention on them for a little bit and everything started falling apart. Now I am paying attention again and getting

things back in order. The way things are suppose to be. At home, at school. Yesterday I made them clean the attic. It was a mess. They straightened and took out the garbage. You know, they know the rules, but if you're not there to constantly tell them and stay on them, they just do what they want to, you know what I mean?

The effectiveness of communication strategies vary by relationship type.

### *Sibling Care and Managing Parentification*

Moms who needed young adolescents to watch their younger siblings faced the challenge of letting their older children be “kids”—that is, maintaining developmentally appropriate freedom for play and unstructured time while counting on them as responsible near-adults. Understanding relationships helped mediate this mismatch, as evidenced by how Andy Huertes and his mother, Ana, communicated. The son told his mom when he was frustrated, particularly when his younger brothers did not listen to him. Ana wished she did not have to ask Andy to provide child care as much as she did. Field notes explain her ambivalent feelings:

Ana states that life has set that path for them. She is alone and needs his help. She realizes that she depends on her son more than on any other person. She says that she tries to buy him what he asks for because “he really deserves it.” Ana thinks that it is good for kids to learn responsibility at a young age . . . [because] it teaches them that no matter how difficult things get for them, they must do the right thing.

For Ana, doing the right thing meant working for a living. With Andy's help she could do this, but she let him know that she valued him taking on this extra role.

Without an understanding relationship, frustrations often arose. Rene Estes and mother Carla had a distant relationship. Field notes summarize Rene's view of her responsibilities:

She said that she doesn't mind watching [her younger siblings], or taking care of them too much. [She] said that sometimes it is hard because she feels like they get all of the attention, and they get babied and she never gets any attention. She can never feel like a baby or a kid, and she is only 14 years old.

Rene's feeling of not getting any attention meshed with her mother's impression of her eldest as closed-off and quiet. In this distant relationship only the daughter's adult abilities were noticed.

In some families, supervising older children who were watching younger children enabled an eventual transition to unsupervised sibling care. Mothers and youth with understanding relationships successfully shared care for younger children. Attuned to her son's needs, one mother was able to step in when a younger boy was questioning his older brother's authority. The mother asked, "Can you work together to solve this?" Both boys responded, "Yes ma'am." The mother reminded the boys that each one is not only in charge of his own behavior but also responsible for the younger brother's behavior. With this reminding, the younger brother acquiesced that his older brother is allowed to be "in charge." Here the mother reinforced patterns that helped her and her oldest son manage child care duties.

In contrast, supervised care worked less well in distant or confrontational relationships. Recall the earlier example when Samantha Greene, tired from work, gave instructions, although her older children prepared dinner and took care of a baby. This work was done in the context of an understanding relationship between Samantha and Shalonda. In a different household, the same situation led to an argument between a mother and daughter who had a confrontational relationship. The mother asked the daughter to change and bathe the youngest brother. When this did not happen, the mother repeated her demand, eventually screaming at the daughter. Later the mother asked the daughter to find pants for the younger boy. Field notes describe the reaction:

[The daughter] came into the living room, tossed what [the mom] told her was the wrong pair on the ground, and went into another room. [The mom] yelled at her, "I'm not going to have that . . . pick that shit up off the ground."

The daughter resisted doing chores on demand. The mother commented that when she was that age she was not such a "disrespectful" girl. In the context of a confrontational relationship, evening chores and supervised sibling care became an arena for a fight.

## Discussion

This examination of daily life in families with employed mothers and young adolescents suggests that the quality of mother-youth relationships is a key determinant of the family success in balancing market work and family care activities. This analysis was framed by the tension between parent-as-manager and child-agency views of family process, and was

motivated, in part, by concerns about the impact on young teens of welfare-reform-induced work by low-income mothers. Discussion here focuses on four themes: (a) youth-mother relationships as a source of value for a family, (b) questions raised about mother-young adolescent relationships, (c) implications of this research for thinking about the well-being of young adolescents with working mothers and interpreting other findings, and (d) considerations for refining orienting frameworks of work and family life.

Two features of the current study's design are important to the interpretation of the findings. First, the qualitative data used allowed for an in-depth examination of family daily activities, but it did not include systematic first-person evidence on young person's motivations and opinions. The relative scarcity of children's voices is a weakness of the study. Based on experience as a field-worker assigned to three of the families in the study and on conversations with other field-workers, the author does not feel it would fundamentally change the conclusion that good relationships serve as a resource. However, having additional data about children's feelings and thoughts on their roles in the household would make the analysis more robust in several ways, which are noted below.

Second, since the data used in the current study are from an ethnography embedded in a larger mixed-methods research project, parts of this discussion will consider the current analysis in light of the overall study's findings. A brief description of the New Hope study is warranted. Although the New Hope Project targeted working adults, the program's benefits were expected to affect family processes and child well-being directly through providing families with health insurance coverage and child care subsidies, as well as indirectly through increasing parents' employment and family earnings. The New Hope evaluation used a randomized design with measurements of child well-being and family process taken 2 and 5 years after families entered the program. Overall, the program modestly increased adult employment rates and total family income. Impacts on children and adolescents will be discussed below.

## Relationships as Social Capital

This analysis highlights an underrecognized store of social capital. The concept of social capital, defined as the capital stored in relationships between individuals, is more commonly applied to extra-household relationships, such as those formed between community members. However Coleman's 1988 exposition also posited that "the social capital of the family is the relations between children and parents" (p. 101). Such positive relations

fulfill the promise of social capital in that they “facilitate productive activity” (p. 101). For the low-income working families in this study, a trusting parent-child relationship enables a more productive balance of mothers’ market and home time. In contrast, in the context of confrontational relationships, records of family life show examples of children defying their parents or resisting efforts to help around the house. For children and mothers who have distant relationships, mothers describe needing to be physically present to influence their children’s behavior.

## Relationship Foundations and Evolution

If relationships are a source of value within the family, questions arise around the origins and trajectories of these relationships and the connection between relationships and other contexts of family life, specifically, mothers’ employment. The importance of relationships within the family motivates an interest in where the positive (and less positive) relationships come from. The interpretation of the findings is also related to the relationship origin. If strong relationships are largely a function of the mothers’ interpersonal skills or commitment, good relationships and well-managed daily routines will co-occur, but claims that relationships support routines are unwarranted.

The 3 years of data used in the current study allowed for some longitudinal examination of relationship evolution, but important relationship foundations are established before middle childhood. In our sample, some mothers report that their relationships became confrontational far before early adolescence, starting even at the toddler age. One woman said that her son has always been “a handful.” This aligns with the consensus in the literature that problematic relationships in adolescence stem from preadolescent relationship patterns (Steinberg, 2001). Additional information from the children and a longer period of longitudinal observation could help untangle the extent to which relationship quality is driven by mothers’ versus children’s characteristics, skills, and efforts.

Although earlier experiences are important, relationships are far from fixed at middle childhood. Relationships evolve throughout adolescence (Collins & Laursen, 2004) and for low-income families, it is important to consider how current life circumstances may alter relationships. This analysis largely argues that relationships enable household and market work, but it may be the case that children’s household work loads or mothers’ market work cause a strain on relationships as well. Although other factors were at play for the understanding relationships that deteriorated in the current study, even youth in understanding relationships displayed occasional or

low-level frustrations with work. Such concerns may also be more salient for adolescents who are older than our sample range and hence more drawn to activities outside the house. The effects of mothers' work conditions on relationships should be considered as well. When mothers experience workplace pressure, their stress may spill over and negatively affect relationships with children (Crouter, Bumpus, Maguire, & McHale, 1999; Galambos, Sears, Almeida, & Kolaric, 1995).

Results from the larger New Hope study suggest that larger policy contexts may matter to relationships, although the pathways whereby this happens are not clear. Five years after they qualified for the 3-year window of benefits, New Hope parents were less likely than control group parents to report discipline problems with children aged 13 through 16, such as children ignoring or disobeying them. There were no differences in measures of parenting, but there is also some evidence that 13- to 16-year-old boys in the program group had more positive relationships with their parents than did boys in the control group (this difference was not found for girls). It is not possible to conclusively determine whether the mechanisms underlying these lower degrees of management problems and more positive relationships are related to children's household work, mothers' maternal stress, or other pathways, but findings from an earlier follow-up (Huston et al., 2001, 2003) suggest several options. During the program's benefit period, New Hope benefits significantly increased the number of young children in formal child care settings, suggesting that these 13- through 16-year-olds may have had fewer sibling care responsibilities (survey questions on frequency of sibling care find insignificantly lower levels of sibling care, although these measures only roughly track intensity of care time). In terms of psychological well-being, New Hope increased parents' perceptions of emotional support in their lives and reduced the likelihood that they felt stressed much or all of the time. However, New Hope parents reported experiencing modestly more time pressure than did control group parents. Because information about family processes, parent-child relationships, and children's activities were not collected when families enrolled in the program, there is no direct way to test the hypothesis that baseline relationship quality mediated family experiences.

### **Maternal Work, Household Work, and Young Adolescent Well-Being**

This analysis suggests that relationships moderate the effect of work on child well-being; the implications of a given responsibility or task can vary



by relationship type. Household work including sibling care is a priori neither beneficial nor harmful for young adolescent workers, but rather, work may be destructive under certain conditions such as age inappropriateness or inequitable assignment (Boszormenyi-Nagy & Spark, 1973; Jurkovic, 1997; Jurkovic et al., 1999). Relationships provide pathways through which the conditions of work are clear to both parents and children. For instance, understanding relationships can support children's work by making it easier for parents to provide guidance from a distance or by making it more obvious to a parent when a task is creating too much stress or involves too much responsibility for a child. Alternatively, in the context of a confrontational relationship, it is likely that any task assigned may be seen by the young adolescent as unfair.

Knowing more about children's views would allow for a more robust exploration of this moderation effect, and understanding how young adolescents feel affected by their caregiving and house work might give hints to long-run developmental implications of household labor. The current analysis provides little evidence to support or negate claims that some household responsibilities are harmful for young adolescents. Other researchers take stronger positions. For instance, drawing largely on focus groups and individual retrospective interviews with young and adult women, Dodson and Dickert (2004) argue that girls' labor in low-income households comes at a "great cost" (p. 329) to young caretakers who must take on excessively adult responsibilities and forgo educational or age-appropriate recreational opportunities. In contrast to this largely negative depiction of child household labor in economically stressed families, the data used in the current study contained few instances of children complaining about their role as workers or limitations on other activities. The few negative views of caretaking were more likely to be expressed by children who did not share an understanding relationship with their mothers. Some of this discrepancy is certainly because of different techniques used to gather the data, the current study's reliance on mothers (not youth) as the primary respondent, and differences in the lifecycle of informants (Dodson and Dickert, for the most part, collected retrospections from adult women or interviewed older teenagers who may be more drawn to activities outside the home). It may also be the case that the conclusions of Dodson and Dickert hold more strongly for girls for whom relationships with their mothers did not reinforce the value of their work. In the current study, young adolescents who share understanding relationships with their mothers seemed not resentful, but instead willing to work out of loyalty or in support of shared goals.

The extent to which relationship types moderate the experience of work is an important dimension to keep in mind as we interpret findings about the impact of welfare reform-related policy changes on families with young adolescents. Relationship quality may, in part, determine how susceptible families are to policy-induced changes and may moderate the effect of such changes on child well-being. With understanding relationships as a foundation, families whose mothers move into the workforce are likely to manage the change in daily routines well, whereas other families with less strong relationships may have difficulties. Because the mothers in the current study were well aware of the strengths and limitations of their relationships with their young adolescents, they likely have a very good sense of how well their children would respond to changes in the family's daily routine before the change happens. An implication of this is that mothers' decisions to work or not may be in part based on their assessments of the capacity of their individual families. Mothers who can trust their children in self-care and who have a good sense that the family will be able to complete essential care and household tasks are more likely to enter work voluntarily.

Such heterogeneity in relationships may in part explain the seemingly discrepant findings between two multisite studies of welfare reform, maternal work, and adolescent well-being. A meta-analysis of several experimental studies found that maternal work induced by requirements of welfare reform caused increased problem behavior among adolescents (Gennetian et al., 2004), but a nonexperimental study found that adolescents whose mothers moved from nonwork to work had no higher level of problems, but did have better mental health than adolescents whose mothers did not enter work (Chase-Lansdale et al., 2003). Because the experimental studies induce mothers into work even though they would not have chosen to work in the absence of the experimental inducements or requirements, it is more likely that these are families in which relationships do not support the combination of mother's employment and household work. Hence, intrafamily relationship quality may also moderate the impact of policy changes on young adolescent well-being.

## **Reconsidering Work and Family Frameworks**

This work was framed by the tension between parent-as-manager and child-agency views of family process, but reflection on the families' experiences recorded in the data suggests a need for a more reciprocal model of daily life and household work. In our study, mothers acted as managers by setting family schedules; making decisions about who would complete

certain major tasks, such as child care; and initiated and practiced communication strategies for making sure tasks were completed. Children acted as agents in working and carrying out self-care tasks. This work was not always directly or even indirectly supervised by the mother, and as such required a degree of child willingness and self-direction. Even in cases when mothers were present—such as with supervised sibling care—the quality of the job done depended more on the underlying relationship than on the particular interaction. Thus, to the extent that mothers are managing family processes, the management and sustaining relationships are key; to the extent that children are agentic, they exercise agency within the context of an ongoing relationship.

From these observations emerges an alternative way to think about daily life as the set of actions and interactions whereby members define and contribute to family goals and household operation. Resources are provided by all members, and all members' decisions about their own work affect others. Management is shared, not in the active sense of management of as "the action or manner of managing," but as in a secondary sense, management as "manner of proceeding" (*Oxford English Dictionary*, 2002). In short, shared management is what allows a family to get by in day-to-day life. Shared management as an orienting perspective should not be interpreted as a diminishment of the role of parents or children, but rather, as recognition that family life is co-constructed, constituted in the interaction between parents and their children.

## Appendix

### Abridged Fieldwork Template

---

This topical outline guided ethnographic data collection and initial analysis. Thomas Weisner and Cindy Bernheimer (University of California, Los Angeles) compiled themes based on previous work with low-income and working families, focus groups, and input from the New Hope advisory boards and staff.

Family background, included presence of "family myths"  
 Role of religion/spirituality as source of instrumental and emotional support  
 Paths to employment, pattern of work at entry, and role of underground economy  
 Number of and relationships with case reps, W-2 caseworkers, other social services  
 Role of ethnicity  
 Beliefs about and use of child care  
 Gender roles, relationships with partner/spouse  
 Life goals/ambitions including attitudes/values re: work  
 Stability in participants' life across domains  
 Relative standards of success; changes relative to prior circumstances of participant.

---

*(continued)*

## Appendix (continued)

---

Multiple criteria for success

Control of the environment and evidence of planfulness versus procrastination

Participants' future orientation

Meaning of work

Equity building

Balances/tradeoffs explicit in participant's mind

Community bridging, include involvement in school and community activism

Social networks

### Children\*

a. Congruence between parents and child care provider

b. Pride in parents

c. Work seen as something to value

d. Comparisons with other kids

e. Views of own lives (self-esteem, feelings of normalcy)

f. Expansion of peer networks

g. Moves to safer schools, neighborhoods

h. Use of leisure time

### Child rearing\*

a. Beliefs about and use of child care

b. Parents' views of children

c. Beliefs re: child rearing, what's good/bad for kids

### Political ideology

Job barriers (or facilitators)

Daily routine

\*Children and Child rearing sections are expanded. Other categories have similar levels of detail in the unabridged template.

---

## Note

1. The author thanks an anonymous reviewer for helpful guidance toward this relevant anthropological literature.

## References

- Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology Monographs*, 4, (1, Pt. 2).
- Baumrind, D. (1991). Parenting styles and adolescent development. In J. Brooks-Gunn, R. M. Lerner, & A. C. Peterson (Eds.), *The encyclopedia of adolescence* (pp. 746-758). New York: Garland.
- Bernheimer, L. P., Weisner, T. S., & Lowe, E. D. (2003). Impacts of children with troubles on working poor families: Experimental and ethnographic evidence. *Mental Retardation*, 41, 403-419.

- Bianchi, S. M., & Robinson, J. (1997). What did you do today? Children's use of time, family composition, and the acquisition of social capital. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 59, 332-344.
- Blair, S. L. (1992). Children's participation in household labor: Child socialization versus the need for household labor. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 21, 241-258.
- Bos, J. M., Huston, A. C., Granger, R. C., Duncan, G., Brock, T. W., & McLoyd, V. C. (1999). *New hope for people with low incomes: Two-year results of a program to reduce poverty and reform welfare*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.
- Boszormenyi-Nagy, I., & Spark, G. M. (1973). *Invisible loyalties: Reciprocity in intergenerational family therapy*. Hagerstown, MD: Medical Dept. Harper & Row.
- Brannen, J. (1995). Young people and their contribution to household work. *Sociology*, 29, 317-338.
- Brock, T. W., Doolittle, F., Fellerath, V., & Wiseman, M. (1997). *Creating new hope: Implementation of a program to reduce poverty and reform welfare*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.
- Brooks, J. L., Hair, E. C., & Zaslow, M. J. (2001, July). *Welfare reform's impact on adolescents: Early warning signs*. Washington, DC: Child Trends.
- Capizzano, J., Tout, K., & Adams, G. (2000, September). *Child care patterns of school-age children with employed mothers* (Assessing the New Federalism Occasional Paper). Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Chase-Lansdale, P. L., Moffitt, R. A., Lohman, B. J., Cherlin, A. J., Coley, R. L., Pittman, L. D., et al. (2003). Mothers' transitions from welfare to work and the well-being of preschoolers and adolescents. *Science* 299, 1548-1552.
- Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94 (Suppl.), S95-S120.
- Collins, W. A., & Laursen, B. (2004). Changing relationships, changing youth: Interpersonal contexts of adolescent development. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 24(1), 55-62.
- Crouter, A. C., Bumpus, M. F., Maguire, M. C., & McHale, S. M. (1999). Linking parents' work pressure and adolescents' well being: Insights into dynamics in dual earner families. *Developmental Psychology*, 35, 1453-1461.
- Crouter, A. C., Head, M. R., Bumpus, M. F., & McHale, S. M. (2001). Household chores: Under what conditions do mothers lean on daughters? *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, 94, 23-41.
- Dodson, L., & Dickert, J. (2004). Girls' family labor in low-income households: A decade of qualitative research. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 66, 318.
- Duncan, G. J., & Gibson, C. (2000). Qualitative-quantitative interactions in the "new hope" experiment. *Poverty Research News: Newsletter of the Northwestern University/University of Chicago Joint Center for Poverty Research*, 4(1), 8-10.
- Edin, K., & Lein, L. (1997). *Making ends meet: How single mothers survive welfare and low-wage work*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Folbre, N. (2001). *The invisible heart: Economics and family values*. New York: New Press.
- Fuligni, A. J. (2001). Editor's notes. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, 94, 1-3.
- Fuligni, A. J., Burton, L., Marshall, S., Perez-Febles, A., Yarrington, J., Kirsh, L. B., et al. (1999). Attitudes toward family obligations among American adolescents with Asian, Latin American, and European backgrounds. *Child Development*, 70(4), 1030-1044.
- Fuller, B., Holloway, S. D., Rambaud, M., & Eggers-Pierola, C. (1996). How do mothers choose child care? Alternative cultural models in poor neighborhoods. *Sociology of Education*, 69(2), 83-104.

- Gager, C. T., Cooney, T. M., & Call, K. T. (1999). The effects of family characteristics and time use on teenagers' household labor. *Journal of Marriage & the Family*, 61, 982-994.
- Galambos, N. L., Sears, H. A., Almeida, D. M., & Kolaric, G. C. (1995). Parents' work overload and problem behavior in young adolescents. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 5, 201-223.
- Gennetian, L., Duncan, G., Knox, V., Vargas, W., Clark-Kauffman, E., & London, A. S. (2004). How welfare and work policies affect adolescents: Key findings from a synthesis of eight experimental studies. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 14, 399-423.
- Gibson, C. M., & Weisner, T. S. (2002). Rational and ecocultural circumstances of program take-up among low-income working parents. *Human Organization*, 61, 154-166.
- Goldscheider, F. K., & Waite, L. J. (1991). *New families, no families? The transformation of the american home*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Goodnow, J. J., & Lawrence, J. (2001). Work contributions to the family: Developing a conceptual and research framework. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, 94, 5-22.
- Henly, J. R., & Lyons, S. (2000). The negotiations of child care and employment demands among low-income parents. *Journal of Social Issues*, 56, 683-706.
- Himmelweit, S. (1999). Caring labor. *Annals of the American Academy of Political & Social Sciences*, 561, 27-38.
- Huston, A. C., Duncan, G. J., Granger, R. C., Bos, J. M., McLoyd, V. C., Mistry, R., et al. (2001). Work-based anti-poverty programs for parents can enhance the school performance and social behavior of children. *Child Development*, 72, 318-336.
- Huston, A. C., Miller, C., Richburg-Hayes, L., Duncan, G. J., Eldred, C. A., Weisner, T. S., et al. (2003). *New hope for families and children: Five-year results of a program to reduce poverty and reform welfare*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.
- James, A., Jenks, C., & Prout, A. (1998). *Theorizing childhood*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- James, A., & Prout, A. (1997). *Constructing and reconstructing childhoods: Contemporary issues in the sociological study of childhood*. Washington, DC: Falmer.
- Jurkovic, G. J. (1997). *Lost childhoods: The plight of the parentified child*. New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Jurkovic, G. J., Morrell, R., & Thirkield, A. (1999). Assessing childhood parentification: Guidelines for researchers and clinicians. In N. D. Chase (Ed.), *Burdened children: Theory, research, and treatment of parentification* (pp. 92-113). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kerr, M., & Stattin, H. (2000). What parents know, how they know it, and several forms of adolescent adjustment: Further support for a reinterpretation of monitoring. *Developmental Psychology*, 36(3), 366-380.
- Kerr, M., Stattin, H., & Trost, K. (1999). To know you is to trust you: Parents' trust is rooted in child disclosure of information. *Journal of Adolescence*, 22(6), 737-752.
- Kerrebrock, N., & Lewit, E. M. (1999). Children in self-care. *Future of Children*, 9(2), 151-160.
- Laird, R. D., Pettit, G. S., Dodge, K. A., & Bates, J. E. (1998). The social ecology of school-age child care. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 19(3), 341-360.
- Lowe, E. D., & Weisner, T. S. (2000). *Managing resources, meanings, conflict and predictability: Towards a holistic understanding of childcare use among low-income families*. Los Angeles: University of California.
- Lowe, E. D., & Weisner, T. S. (2004). 'You have to push it—who's gonna raise your kids?' Situating child care and child care subsidy use in the daily routines of lower income families. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 26, 143-171.
- Maccoby, E. E. (2000). Parenting and its effects on children: On reading and misreading behavior genetics. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 51, 1-27.

- Magnusson, D., & Stattin, H. (1998). Person-context interaction theories. In R. M. Lerner (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Theoretical models of human development* (pp. 685-759). New York: Wiley.
- Marrow, V. (1996). Rethinking childhood dependency: Children's contributions to the domestic economy. *Sociological Review*, 44, 58-77.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Morrow, V. (1996). Rethinking childhood dependency: Children's contributions to the domestic economy. *Sociological Review*, 44, 58-77.
- Munroe, R. H., Munroe, R. L., & Shimmis, H. S. (1984). Children's work in four cultures: Determinants and consequences. *American Anthropologist*, 86(2), 369-379.
- Newman, K. (1999). *No shame in my game: The working poor in the inner city*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Oxford English Dictionary*. (2nd ed.). (2002). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Padgett, D. K. (1998). *Qualitative methods in social work research: Challenges and rewards*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Perry-Jenkins, M., Repetti, R. L., & Crouter, A. C. (2000). Work and family in the 1990s. *Journal of Marriage & the Family*, 62, 981-998.
- Pittman, L. D., & Chase-Lansdale, P. L. (2001). African American adolescent girls in impoverished communities: Parenting style and adolescent outcomes. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 11, 199-224.
- Polakow, V. (1993). *Lives on the edge: Single mothers and their children in the other America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Resnick, M. D., Bearman, P. S., Blum, R. W., Bauman, K. E., Harris, K. M., Jones, J., et al. (1997). Protecting adolescents from harm: Findings from the national longitudinal study on adolescent health. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 278, 823-832.
- Romich, J. L. (2002). *The trade-offs of full time work: Effects of parents' work hours on young adolescents*. Unpublished dissertation, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL.
- Sameroff, A. J. (1994). Developmental systems and family functioning. In R. D. Parke & G. K. Sheppard (Eds.), *Exploring family relationships with other social contexts* (pp. 199-214). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Sameroff, A. J. (2000). Developmental systems and psychopathology. *Development and Psychopathology*, 12, 297-312.
- Scott, E. K., Edin, K., London, A. S., & Mazelis, J. M. (2001). My children come first: Welfare-reliant women's post-TANF views of work-family trade-offs and marriage. In G. Duncan & P. L. Chase-Lansdale (Eds.), *For better and for worse: Welfare reform and the well-being of children and families* (pp. 132-153). New York: Russell Sage.
- Stack, C. B. (1974). *All our kin: Strategies for survival in a black community* (1st ed.). New York: Harper & Row.
- Stattin, H., & Kerr, M. (2000). Parental monitoring: A reinterpretation. *Child Development*, 71, 1072-1085.
- Steinberg, J. E. (1999). Early adolescents as caretakers of their younger siblings: Heterogeneity in parent motives, role structuring, compensation and distal support. *Dissertation Abstracts International, A (Humanities and Social Sciences)*, 60, 258.
- Steinberg, L. (2001). We know some things: Parent-adolescent relationships in retrospect and prospect. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 11(1), 1-19.

- Steinberg, L., Elmen, J. D., & Mounts, N. S. (1989). Authoritative parenting, psychosocial maturity, and academic success among adolescents. *Child Development, 60*, 1424-1436.
- Thorne, B. (1993). *Gender play: Girls and boys in school*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Weisner, T. S. (1996). Why ethnography should be the most important method in the study of human development. In R. Jessor, A. Colby, & R. A. Shweder (Eds.), *Ethnography and human development* (pp. 305-324). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Weisner, T. S. (2001). Children investing in their families: The importance of child obligation in successful development. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development, 94*, 77-83.
- Weisner, T. S., & Gallimore, R. (1977). My brother's keeper: Child and sibling caretaking. *Current Anthropology, 18*, 169-190.
- White, L. K., & Brinkerhoff, D. B. (1981). Children's work in the family: Its significance and meaning. *Journal of Marriage & the Family 43*, 789-798.
- Whiting, B. B., & Edwards, C. P. (1988). *Children of different worlds: The formation of social behavior*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Whiting, B. B., Whiting, J. W. M., & Longabaugh, R. (1975). *Children of six cultures: A psycho-cultural analysis*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Zelizer, V. (1985). *Pricing the priceless child: The changing social value of children*. New York: Basic Books.

**Jennifer L. Romich** is an assistant professor at the University of Washington School of Social Work and a faculty affiliate of the West Coast Poverty Center and the Center for Studies in Demography and Ecology at the University of Washington.