Institute for Research on Poverty
Discussion Paper no. 1021-93

Trends in Wages, Underemployment, and Mobility among Part-Time Workers

Jerry A. Jacobs
Department of Sociology
University of Pennsylvania

September 1993

The research presented in this report was funded by a grant from the Institute for Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin-Madison. The author wishes to acknowledge the excellent research assistance of Zhenchao Qian on this project.

Abstract

This study examines three trends in the labor market experiences of part-time workers: (1) trends in real earnings; (2) trends in the extent of involuntary part-time work (underemployment); and (3) trends in the rate of exit from part-time work. Data are from Current Population Surveys from the 1970s and 1980s. It considers whether observed changes in the position of part-time workers are due to changes in the attributes of part-time workers, the occupational and industrial location of part-time jobs, the process of selectivity into part-time employment, or changes in the returns to these factors. The questions addressed in this study have significant implications for research on poverty because, unless supplemented by other family earners, the low earnings levels of part-time job holders make them vulnerable to poverty and dependency.

Trends in Wages, Underemployment, and Mobility among Part-Time Workers

The percentage of the U.S. labor force working part-time gradually increased during the 1970s and 1980s, from 11.9 percent in 1968 to 17.2 percent in 1988 (Blank, 1990; U.S. Department of Labor, 1971–1990). In 1988, 19.754 million workers were employed for fewer than thirty-five hours per week. The United States ranked fifth highest of fifteen industrial countries included in a recent study of the level of part-time employment (Thurman and Trah, 1990). Part-time workers, then, are a sizable and growing component of the labor force, a trend observed in other countries, such as Britain, as well (Beechey and Perkins, 1987). The labor market experiences of part-time workers are receiving increased attention.

This paper examines three trends in part-time work. The first is the low real earnings of part-time workers, which put them at risk of poverty unless the earnings of other family members are available. As is documented in Table 1, part-time workers earned an average of $3,000 dollars annually in 1987. This represented approximately one-sixth of the earnings of full-time workers (based on the calculations from the same CPS data reported in Table 1). Sixty-nine percent of part-time workers earned less than $5,000, with another 20 percent earning between $5,000 and $10,000, and 97.2 percent earned less than $20,000. "Underemployed" workers--part-time workers who are involuntarily part-time--earned only slightly more (median earnings $3,630, with 86.7 percent earning less than $10,000). The gap between part-time and full-time earnings has narrowed somewhat since 1969, but the fact remains that, for women in particular, part-time employees earn very little. The initial goal of this study is to examine the part-time/full-time earnings gap, and to see if changes in the attributes of part-time workers and/or changes in the distribution of occupations and industries have contributed to the continuing earnings differential.

TABLE 1

Trends in the Annual Earnings of Part-Time Workers

	1969	1987
All		
Part-time workers	$808	$3,000
Full-time workers	$6,000	$18,000
Part-time/full-time	13.5%	16.7%
Men		
Part-time workers	$936	$2,600
Full-time workers	$7,682	$22,000
Part-time/full-time	12.2%	11.8%
Women		
Part-time workers	$750	$3,270
Full-time workers	$3,800	$14,500
Part-time/full-time	19.7%	22.6%

Source: Calculations based on an analysis of individual-level data from the March 1970 and March 1988 Current Population Surveys.

A second troublesome fact is the sharp growth in the proportion of underemployed workers (Ichniowski and Preston, 1986; Blank, 1990). As shown in Table 2, in 1989, 21.5 percent of part-time workers were underemployed, up from 11.4 percent in 1970. While the rate of underemployment is related to the business cycle, these data clearly demonstrate a secular trend toward increasing rates of underemployment. During the 1980s, the average annual percentage of underemployed workers was 25.3.

The rise in underemployment is not due to the changing sex composition of part-time workers, but rather reflects rising rates for both men and women. Blank (1990) presents time-trend data indicating that men's rates of involuntariness are consistently higher than women's, yet both sexes experienced sharp rises in involuntary part-time employment in the 1980s (see Table 3). (Blank's figures are consistently higher than those I have obtained from published data [U.S. Department of Labor, 1971–1990] and from the analysis of CPS data I have conducted.) The second goal of this paper is to attempt to explain this rise in underemployment.

The increase in the rate of underemployment among part-time workers is an area of clear concern for employment policy. Just as the involuntary nature of unemployment justly draws substantial public-policy interest and research, so too should underemployment, since the underemployed are involuntarily placed in a position of low income and potential dependency. Furthermore, evidence suggests that underemployed workers have even lower earnings than other part-time workers (Blank, 1990).

The third issue is the extent of mobility out of part-time jobs. An analysis of mobility patterns into and out of part-time jobs is important for assessing the social consequences of this type of employment. Our concern for the plight of part-time workers would be greater if part-time employment were permanent rather than temporary. Similarly, we would be more concerned if exit rates from part-time employment were decreasing instead of increasing.

TABLE 2

Trends in Involuntary Part-Time Employment, 1970–1989

	Percent Involuntary, 1–34 Hours Worked	Percent Involuntary, 30–34 Hours Worked
1970	9.6%	11.4%
1971	11.7	13.6
1972	11.8	12.6
1973	10.7	12.0
1974	11.8	13.1
1975	15.0	17.3
1976	15.2	17.6
1977	15.1	18.1
1978	14.2	17.2
1979	13.8	16.6
1980	15.7	19.6
1981	18.0	22.7
1982	22.8	27.6
1983	25.1	30.5
1984	23.4	29.0
1985	22.1	27.3
1986	21.5	26.5
1987	20.2	25.1
1988	18.6	22.8
1989	16.9	21.5

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Earnings, January 1971–1990.

TABLE 3

Trends in Involuntary Part-Time Employment by Sex, 1970–1987

	Percent Involuntary	
	Men	Women
1970	35.3%	15.2%
1971	36.5	16.6
1972	33.2	15.9
1973	31.7	15.0
1974	36.1	16.9
1975	43.2	20.1
1976	40.0	18.6
1977	37.2	18.9
1978	35.0	18.4
1979	35.5	18.6
1980	41.3	20.5
1981	43.8	22.3
1982	51.1	26.8
1983	49.9	27.9
1984	47.1	26.3
1985	45.2	25.4
1986	44.9	24.8
1987	43.4	23.6

Source: Blank, 1990, p. 125.

This study may also help to shed light on the transformation of the income distribution. The decline in the position of young men and those with limited educations in the labor market may be related to and reflected in the position of part-time workers (Blackburn, Bloom, and Freeman, 1990; see also Murphy and Welch, 1990, 1992; Katz and Murphy, 1992). Thus, in addition to being a significant topic in its own right, the situation of part-time workers is related to one of the central issues in current research on inequality.

A final point to note is the wide international variation in the level of part-time employment and policies related to part-time workers (Thurman and Trah, 1990). Protective legislation regarding pay, overtime, annual leave, dismissal, sick pay, pensions, unemployment insurance, collective bargaining rights, and other issues varies across countries. Thus, if part-time work were viewed as an issue of increasing concern, models for the treatment of part-time workers in other countries would be available for scrutiny.

In this paper, I investigate whether the changing attributes of part-time workers or the changing location of part-time jobs contribute to the persisting part-time versus full-time wage differential, the rise in underemployment, and the changing rates of mobility out of part-time employment. The procedure involves an examination of Current Population Survey data from the 1970s and 1980s.

I. RELATED STUDIES

I became interested in these issues while working on a comparative study of the growth of the service sector in six post-industrial economies (Jacobs, 1993). In surveying the literature on part-time employment, I found (a) few studies in the entire area; (b) no studies of trends in the earnings of part-time workers; (c) only two papers on the rise in underemployment; and (d) no studies of mobility

into and out of part-time employment. This review convinced me of the need for a longitudinal study of part-time employment.

A great deal has been written on the growth of inequality in the United States during the 1970s and 1980s. Much of this research has examined only full-time, full-year workers, or, alternatively, has estimated the "full-time equivalent" earnings that part-time and part-year workers could be expected to earn if they worked full-time over the course of a year (Levy, 1988; Harrison and Bluestone, 1988; Blackburn, Bloom and Freeman, 1990). While part-time workers are not infrequently included in these analyses, the trends unique to part-time workers have not been the subject of sustained scrutiny. (Indeed, the analyses that include part-time workers [e.g., Levy, 1988] generally show a greater trend toward wage inequality than identical analyses restricted to full-time, full-year workers.)

Blank (1990) carefully assessed the position of part-time workers in 1988, but did not explore the trajectory of earnings levels of part-time workers over the last two decades. As far as trends in underemployment are concerned, Blank demonstrated that there has been a substantial increase in the rate of underemployment among part-time workers even after cyclical fluctuations are controlled, but she did not attempt a more sustained analysis of the causes of this phenomenon. Ichniowski and Preston (1986) showed that there has been a net rise in underemployment which is not due to changes in worker attributes or job opportunities, yet they did not indicate the extent to which these factors may have contributed to explaining the time trend, nor did they explore potential changes in the influence of these factors in promoting underemployment.

Poterba and Summers (1984) investigated flows between employment, unemployment, and being out of the labor force, but they did not include part-time employment as one of the origin or destination categories (see also Flaim and Hogue, 1985). Landry, Clogg, and Lichter (1991) conducted a similar analysis, but their combination of categories limited the interpretability of their

results. They combined voluntary part-time work with full-time work, both of which were distinguished from low-income full-time jobs. Thus, underemployed workers who move to full-time employment were not distinguished from those who decided voluntarily to remain in part-time jobs.

Two studies have examined mobility from part-time to full-time jobs. A Department of Labor report showed that about half of the surveyed women aged 29 to 33 in 1978 who were working part-time in 1978 were still employed part-time in 1983. The same pattern was evident for the subsequent five-year interval. The report also showed that the likelihood of exiting part-time jobs was only loosely connected to changes in marital status and the presence of children under age five. The present study extends this analysis by considering the mobility patterns of all part-time workers, by comparing the mobility patterns of underemployed and voluntary part-time workers, and by conducting a multivariate analysis of the determinants of exit from part-time jobs. Williams (1991) analyzed the correlates of the gross flows from part-time to full-time employment. He found a secular trend toward increasing mobility from part-time to full-time jobs, after unemployment rates were controlled. Unfortunately, his aggregate analysis could not distinguish whether this trend was due to changes in the composition of part-time workers, the extent of the desire for part-time work, or other factors. I am not aware of any multivariate, individual-level analysis of trends over time in the determinants of exits from part-time employment.

II. HYPOTHESES

My preliminary research in this area has indicated an increase in part-time employment among new entrants to the labor force (aged 16 to 24), those with a high school degree or less, and those employed in the retail sales and consumer service industries. Consequently, I anticipate that the low wages of part-time workers may be due to the concentration of younger, less-educated workers in these low-wage industries. My research on the service economy thus far (Jacobs, 1993) has found that

industry shifts have had smaller effects on changes in the earnings distribution than have changes in the attributes of individuals, while a significant portion of the observed trends remain unexplained.

The growth of involuntariness may also be related to the changing demographics of part-time workers. However, I hypothesize that industrial shifts may be more important in the rise of underemployment than in the fall in wages. I expect this because of the high underemployment rates in certain fast-growing industries, such as retail sales and consumer services.

As far as mobility patterns are concerned, I suspect that changes in women's roles may account for much of the change in mobility. I expect that women's increasing attachment to the labor force has reduced the rate of exit from the labor force and increased the rate of entry into full-time positions.

III. METHODS

To conduct my study, I analyzed March Current Population Survey data from 1970 and 1988. Data for 1976 and 1980 were also consulted for certain analyses, in part because more complete information on hours worked and underemployment is available in the 1976 and 1980 CPS. Part-time employment is defined here as a job in which the respondent worked between one and thirty-four hours per week. Underemployed individuals are those who, for "economic" reasons, worked only part-time during the year prior to the survey year. When asked why they were working part-time, these respondents answered "could only find part-time work" or "slack work or material shortage." Voluntary part-time workers are those who responded "wanted or could only work part time" or "worked part time for other reasons." In this analysis, part-time workers have four possible destinations: they may remain in part-time jobs, they may enter full-time employment, they may become unemployed, or they may leave the labor force.

The mobility analysis in this paper consisted of a comparison of the job held the week prior to the CPS survey date with the longest-held job in the previous year. This does not represent a comprehensive mobility analysis, in that it does not contain complete information on all jobs held in the past year. Specifically, the present report may well understate the rate of mobility for those employed in part-time jobs because it ignores part-time jobs held for short periods during the previous year.

For the 1987–1988 transition, I compared data from the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) with the CPS data. The SIPP data represent interviews with a sample of about 6,000 households conducted every four months for 2 1/2 years. I selected Wave 2 of the 1987 SIPP panel in order to have data pertaining to the same period as the March 1988 Current Population Survey. The principal difference between the CPS and SIPP data is that the CPS data are based on a retrospective question about the respondent's longest-held job in the prior year, whereas the SIPP data refer to the respondent's job during the survey week for both the origin and destination job. Analyzing both sets of data enabled me to increase my confidence in the results, or, alternatively, to pinpoint what patterns were the result of a certain method of data collection.

Three dependent variables were modeled: the log of annual earnings, the odds of being underemployed, and the odds of leaving part-time employment. I decomposed the change in each of the three dependent variables into the following components: (1) the attributes of part-time workers; (2) the process of selection into part-time employment; (3) shifts in the distribution of part-time employment across occupations and industries; (4) shifts in the impact of attributes, selectivity, or locations on wages; and (5) changes that are net of these factors.

My statistical approach was a pooled regression analysis with tests for period interaction terms. This is a standard technique for the analysis of time trends, employed, for example, by Blackburn, Bloom, and Freeman (1990) in their analysis of the increasing earnings gap associated with

skill differentials. In the wage analysis, my goal was to explain the expected year by part-time interaction term. I estimated a series of models, adding to each subsequent model a group of variables that may have helped to attenuate or explain the decline in the earnings of part-time workers. The sequence of models was as follows:

(1) ln wages = part-time, year, year*part-time

(2) ln wages = part-time, year, year*part-time,
selectivity measures

(3) ln wages = part-time, year, year*part-time,
selectivity measures, vector of individual attributes

(4) ln wages = part-time, year, year*part-time,
selectivity measures, vector of individual attributes,
vector of occupation and industry dummies

(5) ln wages = part-time, year, year*part-time,
selectivity measures, vector of individual attributes,
vector of occupation and industry dummies,
interaction terms.

By comparing Models 1 and 2, I ascertained the extent to which selectivity factors explained the decline in the earnings of part-time workers (i.e., reduced the size of the year*part-time interaction term). Similarly, by comparing subsequent models, I determined the impact of individual attributes and industrial and occupational shifts on the change in earnings of part-time workers. Interaction terms were added to test for changes in the returns to particular attributes, such as age or educational levels.

The underemployment analysis followed the same logic. The principal difference was that the dependent variable for underemployment was the log-odds of underemployment instead of the log of

wages. Mobility rates were modeled with logistic regression analyses that were conducted separately for each type of move.

Selectivity issues are highlighted by Blank (1990), who argues that an analysis of part-time employment requires two selectivity measures: one for labor force participation, and a second for part-time employment. She finds that the selectivity considerations are generally more important for women than for men. This study adopted her approach to examine changes in the impact of selectivity into part-time jobs. The odds of labor force participation were estimated from a pooled sample combining 1976 and 1988 data. Independent variables included education, marital and family status, age, sex, and race. A similar analysis was performed to estimate part-time employment among employed individuals. The predicted values of these equations, in exponentiated form, were employed as selectivity measures.

IV. RESULTS

Earnings Trends

Table 4 summarizes the analysis that decomposes the trend in the earnings gap between part-time and full-time workers. The period 1975 to 1987 was examined because more detailed data on hours worked in the previous year were available in the March 1976 CPS than in the March 1970 CPS. For each model, two coefficients are presented: the coefficient for part-time work and the coefficient for the trends in part-time work (year*part-time.) The results indicate that part-time workers earned less per year than full-time workers even after hours and weeks worked are controlled. However, the results do not indicate that the part-time/full-time earnings gap widened (the year*part-time interaction term is close to zero and is not statistically significant.) When the attributes of part-time workers are taken into consideration (Models 3 through 5), the "cost" of part-time work decreases by one-fourth; in other words, nearly 25 percent of why part-time workers

TABLE 4

Explaining Trends in the Part-Time/Full-Time Wage Gap, 1975–1987

Controls	All		Men		Women	
	Net Effect of Part-Time Employment on Log of Annual Earnings	Trend in Part-Time Effect, 1975–1987	Net Effect of Part-Time Employment on Log of Annual Earnings	Trend in Part-Time Effect, 1975–1987	Net Effect of Part-Time Employment on Log of Annual Earnings	Trend in Part-Time Effect, 1975–1987
Model 1.						
Hours Worked	-.5314	.0094	-.8797	-.0299	-.1641	-.0341
Weeks Worked	(.0173)	(.0165)	(.0260)	(.0261)	(.0233)	(.0219)
Model 2.						
Lambda (Labor Force)	-.4247	-.0240	-.6016	-.1026	-.1452	-.0452
Lambda (Part-Time)	(.0167)	(.0158)	(.0254)	(.0248)	(.0228)	(.0214)
Model 3.						
Female, Black	-.4187	-.0291	-.6071	-.1019	-.1451	-.0501
	(.0165)	(.0157)	(.0253)	(.0247)	(.0228)	(.0214)
Model 4.[a]						
Children Under 1 (0,1)	-.3997	-.0428	-.5829	-.1144	-.1491	-.0497
Children Under 18 (0,1)	(.0165)	(.0156)	(.0253)	(.0246)	(.0227)	(.0214)
Female * Children Under 1						
Female * Children Under 18						
Married (0,1)						
Female * Married						
Model 5.						
High School (0,1)	-.4170	-.0288	-.6258	-.0936	-.1492	-.0350
Some College (0,1)	(.0162)	(.0153)	(.0249)	(.0241)	(.0222)	(.0209)
Four Years College (0,1)						
Experience (Age-Ed-6)						

(table continues)

TABLE 4, continued

Controls	All		Men		Women	
	Net Effect of Part-Time Employment on Log of Annual Earnings	Trend in Part-Time Effect, 1975–1987	Net Effect of Part-Time Employment on Log of Annual Earnings	Trend in Part-Time Effect, 1975–1987	Net Effect of Part-Time Employment on Log of Annual Earnings	Trend in Part-Time Effect, 1975–1987
Model 6.						
Eight Occupation	-.4061	.0280	-.6159	-.0342	-.1470	.0135
Dummy Variables	(.0161)	(.0154)	(.0246)	(.0241)	(.0221)	(.0212)
Model 7.						
Seven Industry	-.3768	.0264	-.5797	-.0299	-.1245	.0123
Dummy Variables	(.0162)	(.0155)	(.0246)	(.0241)	(.0222)	(.0212)
Model 8.						
Period Interactions:	-.3928	.0630	-.6185	.0535	-.1291	.0243
Age Less than 25	(.0163)	(.0161)	(.0252)	(.0265)	(.0223)	(.0216)
Less than H.S. Ed.						
High School Education						

[a]The female interaction terms were not included in the sex-specific analyses.

earned less than full-time workers was due to the race, sex, number of children, marital status, and education of part-time workers. Another 10 percent was associated with changing occupation and industry composition. However, the time trend was basically unaffected by the inclusion of these measures in the analysis.

Two selectivity measures were included in the analysis: estimated labor force participation and estimated probability of part-time employment (Model 2). These measures accounted for the bulk of the explained portion of the cost of part-time employment, but again did little to account for the time trend. Interaction terms were included to test if the earnings of part-time workers were associated with the decline in the earnings of new labor force entrants, especially those with low educational levels (Model 8). Earnings have been particularly depressed for those under twenty-four and those with high school educations or less. The introduction of these interaction terms suggests that the wages of part-time workers would have improved slightly had it not been for the increasing concentration of young, low-educated workers in part-time jobs.

Table 4 also presents the same models estimated separately by sex. It is interesting to note that the net cost in earnings of part-time work was larger for men than for women. The time trend for women was slightly negative, but not statistically significant. The inclusion of the interaction terms for young individuals with limited educations improved the picture more for men than for women.

Trends in Underemployment

The results of the analysis designed to explain trends in underemployment are presented in Table 5. The coefficients are those for the time-trend measure. The results indicate a significant increase in underemployment between 1975 and 1987. This increase in underemployment was sharper for women than for men. Surprisingly, the net time trend tended to increase in size as control variables were added. Thus, the increase in underemployment is not explained by the

TABLE 5

Explaining Trends in Underemployment, 1975–1987

Controls	All: Trend in Log-Odds of Underemployment	Men: Part-Time Effect, 1975–1987	Women: Part-Time Effect, 1975–1987
Model 1.			
None	.3133	.1162	.6115
	(.0575)	(.0749)	(.0929)
Model 2.			
Lamda (Labor Force)	.2781	.0596	.7391
Lamda (Part-Time)	(.0589)	(.0786)	(.0967)
Model 3.			
Female, Black	.2834	.0395	.7612
	(.0594)	(.0788)	(.0971)
Model 4.[a]			
Married (0,1)	.3757	.1980	.7651
Female* Married	(.0636)	(.0888)	(.1003)
Model 5.			
High School (0,1)	.5339	.2742	.8484
Some College (0,1)	(.0652)	(.0891)	(.1004)
Four Years College (0,1)			
Experience (Age-Ed-6)			
Model 6.			
Eight Occupation	.4888	.2320	.8179
Dummy Variables	(.0668)	(.0919)	(.1027)
Model 7.			
Seven Industry	.4815	.1693	.8392
Dummy Variables	(.0684)	(.0955)	(.1036)
Model 8.			
Period Interactions:	.4422	.2768	.7055
Age Less than 25	(.0877)	(.1162)	(.1397)
Less than H.S. Ed.			
High School Education			

[a]The female interaction terms were not included in the sex-specific analyses.

inclusion of these variables; rather, changes in worker attributes and occupational and industrial distributions have tended to suppress rather than cause the observed increase in underemployment. Underemployment increased especially sharply for young women (under age twenty-four) while it declined for young men. As we will see in the mobility analyses, these patterns reflect an increasing attachment to the labor market on the part of women while young men, especially those with limited educational backgrounds, have become less tied to the labor market.

Mobility

The final goal of this paper is to investigate mobility rates of part-time workers. How long do people stay in part-time employment? Who moves? Do workers use part-time jobs as stepping stones to full-time employment? How have mobility rates changed over the last twenty years? Mobility rates clearly have a bearing on our evaluation of the distributive consequences of part-time jobs. In other words, the low pay of part-time jobs might be considered a less serious issue if part-time employees rarely stayed in part-time jobs for more than a year; we would worry more if these workers remained employed in part-time jobs for decades.

The mobility analysis in this paper entailed a comparison of the job held the week prior to the CPS survey date with the longest-held job in the previous year. I begin by documenting persistence rates in the 1969–1970, 1975–1976, 1979–1980, and the 1987–1988 periods, and then explain the observed changes between 1975–1976 and 1987–1988. Mobility rates for these four periods are presented in Table 6. As noted above, four destinations are examined: individuals may stay in their part-time jobs; they may move into full-time employment; they may become unemployed; and they may leave the labor force.

The first striking finding in Table 6 is that part-time employment tended to be a short-term endeavor for most people rather than an enduring career choice. Only a bare majority of part-time workers remained in part-time jobs for two consecutive years. An extrapolation of these results over

TABLE 6

Trends in Mobility Rates of Part-Time Workers

	Stayed Part-Time (%)	To Full-Time (%)	To Unemployment (%)	To NILF (%)
All Part-Time Workers				
1969–1970	52.6	9.9	2.9	34.6
1975–1976	56.1	12.4	6.1	25.3
1979–1980	56.5	13.2	5.2	25.1
1987–1988	58.2	14.8	4.8	22.2
Women				
1969–1970	52.7	8.8	2.4	36.1
1975–1976	58.7	10.6	5.0	25.8
1979–1980	57.8	12.3	4.4	25.5
1987–1988	60.9	13.9	3.8	21.4
Men				
1969–1970	52.5	11.9	3.7	31.9
1975–1976	51.2	16.0	8.5	24.4
1979–1980	53.8	15.1	6.7	24.4
1987–1988	52.4	16.8	6.9	23.9

Source: Calculations based on an analysis of individual-level data from the March 1970, March 1976, March 1980, and March 1988 Current Population Surveys.

NILF = Not in labor force.

a two- to three-year period would imply that only a distinct minority of part-time workers would be so employed for several consecutive years. This finding is consistent with a BLS study of high mobility rates of women from part-time work over a five-year period (U.S. Department of Labor, 1992).

A second clear pattern in Table 6 is that moves into full-time jobs were less common than exits from the labor force. (The SIPP data, presented in Table 8 and discussed below, are not in agreement on this point.) There was a modest increase in mobility into full-time jobs during the 1970s and 1980s, yet only one in six of those working part-time in 1987 was found in a full-time job one year later, compared with over one in five who left the labor force after working part-time.

A third notable finding is that persistence in part-time employment increased somewhat during the 1970s and 1980s. In the 1987–1988 period, 58.2 percent of part-time workers remained so employed, up from 52.6 percent in the 1969–1970 period. The sex-specific analysis indicated that this change was the product of two contradictory trends: one, part-time workers became less likely to leave the labor force; and two, they became more likely to move into full-time employment. This was particularly the case among women. The percentage of women who worked part-time in 1969 but who were out of the labor force in 1970 was 36.1; by the 1987–1988 period, the percentage had fallen to 21.4. And whereas one in twelve part-time-working women in 1969 moved into full-time jobs the next year, one in seven did so in the 1987–1988 period. The net effect was that 60.9 percent of women who worked part-time in 1987 still worked part-time in 1988, up from 52.7 for the 1969–1970 period. As discussed below, the increased persistence of part-time work reflected the greater commitment of part-time workers (especially women) to the labor force and a concomitant reduction in the flows of part-time employees out of the labor force.

As a result of these trends, women now persist in part-time jobs longer than men, a gap not evident in 1970. In 1970, men and women exited part-time work at a nearly identical rate, although women were more likely to leave the labor force and men were more likely to enter full-time work.

By 1988, the proportion of women with at least one-year spells in part-time work surpassed that for men, because women's rate of leaving the labor force declined sharply, and because women trailed men in their ability to move into full-time work. (On a more positive note, women were less likely than men to become unemployed upon leaving part-time work.)

The mobility rates of underemployed workers are presented in Table 7. In this analysis, the initial period is 1975–1976 because of the lack of available data on underemployment during the 1969–1970 period.

Not surprisingly, underemployed individuals were more likely to move into full-time jobs than part-time workers who were not seeking full-time employment. Yet the great majority of those seeking full-time jobs failed to achieve this goal after one year. Even during the 1987-1988 period, when mobility into full-time jobs was greatest, three-quarters of those seeking full-time work did not reach their objective. Nearly half of underemployed individuals (46.8 percent in 1987–1988) persisted in part-time jobs for two consecutive years. One in ten underemployed workers lost their jobs and became unemployed, and another one in six left the labor force, becoming "discouraged workers."

It should be noted that this evidence clearly indicates that spells of underemployment are much longer than spells of unemployment. In 1987, unemployed workers remained unemployed an average (median) of 6.5 weeks, and only 8.1 percent remained unemployed for more than one year (U.S. Department of Labor, 1989). Thus, the percentage of underemployed workers who stay underemployed for two straight years is five times greater than the percentage of unemployed workers who remain unemployed.

A second striking finding in Table 7 is that the duration of underemployment increased. As we saw in the case of all part-time workers, this increasing persistence was the product of two

TABLE 7

Trends in Mobility Rates of Underemployed Workers

	Stayed Part-Time (%)	To Full-Time (%)	To Unemployment (%)	To NILF (%)
All Underemployed Workers				
1975–1976	40.2	20.1	13.1	26.6
1979–1980	44.0	18.6	11.1	26.3
1987–1988	46.8	25.6	11.3	16.2
Women				
1975–1976	43.9	16.5	11.6	27.9
1979–1980	46.3	17.0	9.2	27.5
1987–1988	49.8	23.8	9.3	17.1
Men				
1975–1976	35.3	24.9	14.9	24.9
1979–1980	40.4	21.0	14.2	24.4
1987–1988	42.8	28.1	14.1	15.0

Source: Calculations based on an analysis of individual-level data from the March 1976, 1980, and 1988 Current Population Surveys.

NILF = Not in labor force.

contradictory trends. Underemployed workers became more likely to obtain full-time jobs, yet, because they also became less likely to leave the labor force, the percentage remaining in part-time jobs increased by 6.6 percentage points between 1975–1976 and 1987–1988.

A third important result in Table 7 is that underemployed men are more likely to move into full-time jobs than are underemployed women. A smaller gap in the same direction was evident for all part-time workers in Table 6.

Mobility patterns were reexamined for the 1987–1988 period with data from the SIPP surveys. These results are presented in Table 8 and, in general, are remarkably consistent with those obtained with CPS data. For example, the proportion of part-time workers persisting in part-time jobs for one year is 55.5 percent for the SIPP sample and 58.2 for the CPS data. Another area of agreement is the sex gap in mobility into full-time work, which is even larger in the SIPP data (a 14.4 percentage point differential) than in the CPS analysis (where there was a 2.9 percentage point gap).

One clear difference, however, is in the destination of part-time workers. The CPS data indicate that the most common type of move was an exit from the labor force. This would lead one to conclude that part-time work is typically temporary and does not lead to full-time employment. After one year only one in six part-time workers had landed a position in full-time work, and even among those seeking full-time jobs, only one in four had succeeded in making such a move.

The SIPP data, however, point in a somewhat different direction, despite the agreement on overall exit rates. They indicate that part-time workers are about twice as likely to end up in full-time jobs as out of the labor force, the opposite pattern of the CPS results. Thus, the SIPP data indicate that part-time jobs are much more likely to be stepping stones to full-time work than do the CPS data. Of those seeking full-time employment, half of SIPP men and one-third of SIPP women succeeded in moving into full-time work after one year.

TABLE 8

Comparison of CPS and SIPP Data, 1987–1988

	Stayed Part-Time (%)	To Full-Time (%)	To Unemployment (%)	To NILF (%)
1. All Part-Time Workers				
All				
CPS 1987–1988	58.2	14.8	4.8	22.2
SIPP 1987–1988	55.5	27.5	2.3	14.7
Women				
CPS 1987–1988	60.9	13.9	3.8	21.4
SIPP 1987–1988	59.5	23.1	1.6	15.8
Men				
CPS 1987–1988	52.4	16.8	6.9	23.9
SIPP 1987–1988	46.4	37.5	3.8	12.3
2. Underemployed Workers				
Total				
CPS 1987–1988	46.8	25.6	11.3	16.2
SIPP 1987–1988	41.8	39.4	5.2	13.6
Women				
CPS 1987–1988	49.8	23.8	9.3	17.1
SIPP 1987–1988	47.1	33.3	3.6	16.0
Men				
CPS 1987–1988	42.8	28.1	14.1	15.0
SIPP 1987–1988	34.2	48.1	7.6	10.1

Source: Calculations based on an analysis of individual-level data from the March 1988 Current Population Survey and Wave II of the 1987 Survey of Income and Program Participation.

NILF = Not in labor force.

My interpretation is that this discrepancy is due to the different definition of the "origin" or "reference" job in the two data sets. The CPS data are based on a retrospective question referring to the "longest job held last year," whereas the SIPP data are based on panel data and refer to the job held during the survey week. Consequently, the CPS data exclude some individuals who temporarily worked part-time last year but for whom the longest-held job was a full-time job. Since the SIPP data include these individuals, it reports a higher rate of mobility into full-time employment. In other words, both data may be correct, but they refer to different groups of part-time workers.

Mobility rates are presented for a range of individual attributes and labor market locations in Table 9 for part-time-working CPS women and in Table 10 for part-time-working men. The results are hard to summarize briefly because of the many variables considered and the variety of destinations. Nonetheless, one generalization that emerges from the many distinct patterns in Tables 9 and 10 is that those groups most likely to enter full-time jobs were those groups least likely to leave the labor force. Those with the most attachment to the labor market, those with the most skills, and those in the most favorable occupations and industries were most likely to pursue full-time work and least likely to leave the labor force. The result of these offsetting relationships was that the proportion remaining in part-time jobs sometimes varied in unexpected ways. When one considers the routes of exits separately, however, the overall pattern becomes much clearer. The following discussion of results, consequently, emphasizes particular types of exits rather than overall persistence in part-time work.

For both men and women, college graduates were more likely than those with less education to move into full-time jobs and were least likely to leave the labor force. The same pattern was evident for individuals employed in high-status occupations--professionals and managers. (Two partial exceptions to this generalization were women operatives and male craft-workers.) Industrial

(text continues on p. 31)

TABLE 9

Mobility of Female Part-Time Workers, by Social Characteristics, 1975–1976 and 1987–1988

	Mobility, 1975–1976						Mobility, 1987–1988					
	No.	(%)	Stayed Part-Time (%)	To Full-Time (%)	To Unempl. (%)	To NILF (%)	No.	(%)	Stayed Part-Time (%)	To Full-Time (%)	To Unempl. (%)	To NILF (%)
Female	8,739	(100.0)	58.66	10.61	4.95	25.78	1,529	(100.0)	59.67	14.40	4.14	21.80
Race												
White	7,813	(89.4)	59.08	10.50	4.62	25.79	10,296	(89.3)	60.44	14.18	3.56	21.82
Black	804	(9.2)	54.91	11.49	8.02	25.59	936	(8.1)	52.23	16.24	10.20	21.33
Other	122	(1.4)	56.32	11.70	5.53	26.45	297	(2.6)	56.24	16.01	5.13	22.61
Marital Status												
Married	5,048	(57.8)	60.66	10.67	3.37	25.29	6,504	(56.4)	62.54	14.50	2.69	20.27
Div/Wid	1,043	(11.9)	59.68	11.61	6.52	22.19	1,374	(11.9)	55.95	18.62	5.24	20.19
Single	2,648	(30.3)	54.44	10.09	7.33	28.14	3,650	(31.7)	55.95	12.62	6.31	25.12
Relation to Head of Household												
Head	521	(6.0)	60.34	12.56	6.62	20.47	1,115	(9.7)	53.55	20.85	6.18	19.42
Single head	656	(7.5)	60.37	12.33	5.02	22.28	875	(7.6)	58.15	20.09	3.43	18.33
Spouse	4,943	(56.6)	61.09	10.63	3.29	24.99	6,020	(52.2)	63.38	14.22	2.59	19.82
Children	2,249	(25.7)	53.58	8.24	7.50	30.68	2,906	(25.2)	56.81	9.37	6.02	27.80
Non-relative	369	(4.2)	51.72	18.92	9.04	20.32	613	(5.3)	50.14	20.09	7.73	22.05
Kids Under 1?												
Yes	235	(2.7)	31.42	2.78	4.97	60.82	442	(3.8)	40.34	9.15	6.87	43.64
No	8,504	(97.3)	59.42	10.82	4.95	24.81	1,086	(96.2)	60.44	14.60	4.03	20.93
Kids Under 18?												
Yes	5,319	(60.9)	58.68	8.68	4.99	27.64	6,368	(55.2)	60.01	12.21	4.66	23.12
No	3,420	(39.1)	58.63	13.61	4.87	22.89	5,161	(44.8)	59.25	17.09	3.49	20.17

(table continues)

TABLE 9, continued

	Mobility, 1975–1976						Mobility, 1987–1988					
	No.	(%)	Stayed Part-Time (%)	To Full-Time (%)	To Unempl. (%)	To NILF (%)	No.	(%)	Stayed Part-Time (%)	To Full-Time (%)	To Unempl. (%)	To NILF (%)
Age												
16–19	1,917	(21.9)	50.92	7.00	8.43	33.66	2,096	(18.2)	55.01	6.21	6.56	32.23
20–24	1,179	(13.5)	48.34	17.22	7.49	26.96	1,657	(14.4)	51.49	19.68	6.96	21.86
25–29	787	(9.0)	53.01	12.45	4.50	30.04	1,097	(9.5)	55.57	19.29	4.18	20.95
30–34	824	(9.4)	59.96	10.14	3.64	26.26	1,344	(11.7)	62.58	14.34	3.95	19.13
35–44	1,414	(16.2)	65.57	11.72	2.43	20.28	2,199	(19.1)	64.11	17.62	3.24	15.03
45–54	1,217	(13.9)	66.28	11.75	3.47	18.50	1,365	(11.8)	64.70	17.71	2.49	15.10
55–64	864	(9.9)	70.44	7.90	2.80	18.86	1,090	(9.5)	65.74	11.58	0.97	21.71
65 and more	537	(6.1)	60.86	5.84	3.02	30.28	682	(5.9)	60.63	6.40	1.38	31.60
Schooling												
Less than 11	2,889	(33.1)	58.30	6.76	6.52	28.42	2,655	(23.1)	57.49	8.65	5.73	28.13
12	3,471	(39.8)	58.61	12.21	4.85	24.32	4,620	(40.2)	58.41	15.63	4.53	21.43
13–15	1,522	(17.5)	59.18	10.60	3.64	26.58	2,620	(22.8)	62.50	14.56	2.92	20.01
16 and above	839	(9.6)	58.90	17.29	2.41	21.41	1,599	(13.9)	62.09	20.06	2.43	15.41
Employment Class												
Private	6,394	(73.2)	57.71	10.45	5.74	26.09	8,790	(76.2)	58.26	14.50	24.80	22.4
Government	1,533	(17.6)	60.11	11.14	3.87	24.88	1,613	(14.0)	63.43	14.54	2.67	19.3
Self-Emp.	544	(6.2)	63.07	11.26	0.72	24.95	1,000	(8.7)	64.58	14.10	1.16	20.17
No pay	268	(3.1)	64.14	9.91	0.69	25.26	127	(1.1)	71.22	6.65	0.41	21.72
Industry												
Extractive	302	(3.5)	47.77	8.94	2.81	40.49	256	(2.2)	56.52	15.25	2.85	25.38
Construction	94	(1.1)	64.72	10.98	4.82	19.47	139	(1.2)	58.54	15.02	5.75	20.69
Manufacturing	467	(5.4)	49.19	21.59	8.97	20.25	486	(4.2)	49.05	22.12	7.56	21.27
Transportation	169	(2.0)	70.66	13.63	2.80	12.92	264	(2.3)	57.04	21.03	4.56	17.37
Wholesale	128	(1.5)	66.68	11.99	6.81	14.52	202	(1.8)	56.30	16.61	4.57	22.53
Retail	2,836	(33.0)	56.98	9.17	6.24	27.61	3,818	(33.1)	58.10	12.07	5.42	24.41
Business services	572	(6.7)	59.05	13.72	4.14	23.09	1,298	(11.3)	57.64	16.53	4.42	21.41
Consumer services	1,217	(14.2)	59.82	7.03	4.66	28.49	1,350	(11.7)	56.04	12.26	4.31	27.38
Social services	2,576	(30.0)	63.34	11.19	3.44	22.03	3,456	(30.0)	66.09	14.99	2.12	16.80
Administration	235	(2.7)	46.98	13.60	3.75	35.68	260	(2.3)	55.17	16.88	3.07	24.89

(table continues)

TABLE 9, continued

	Mobility, 1975–1976						Mobility, 1987–1988					
	No.	(%)	Stayed Part-Time (%)	To Full-Time (%)	To Unempl. (%)	To NILF (%)	No.	(%)	Stayed Part-Time (%)	To Full-Time (%)	To Unempl. (%)	To NILF (%)
Occupation												
Managers	209	(2.4)	55.30	21.18	1.06	22.46	436	(3.8)	62.29	21.82	0.24	15.65
Professionals	1,030	(11.8)	61.79	13.47	2.28	22.47	1,563	(13.6)	64.02	17.39	2.62	15.97
Sales	1,070	(12.3)	56.11	8.75	4.32	30.81	2,377	(20.6)	58.27	12.56	5.14	24.04
Clerical	2,488	(28.5)	61.18	11.86	4.98	21.97	2,655	(23.1)	62.95	14.65	3.12	19.28
Service	2,993	(34.3)	58.48	7.69	5.67	28.16	3,517	(30.5)	58.61	12.79	4.91	23.70
Farming	233	(2.7)	46.66	8.00	3.64	41.70	182	(1.6)	49.42	15.82	4.56	30.20
Craft	82	(0.9)	64.95	11.73	4.65	18.67	170	(1.5)	46.63	14.86	2.99	35.51
Operatives	529	(6.1)	54.24	16.37	8.78	20.61	432	(3.8)	50.86	17.58	6.25	25.30
Laborers	104	(1.2)	49.87	9.68	7.76	32.70	189	(1.6)	50.36	13.57	9.04	27.03

Source: Calculations based on an analysis of individual-level data from the March 1976 and March 1988 Current Population Surveys.

NILF = Not in labor force.

TABLE 10

Mobility of Male Part-Time Workers, by Social Characteristics, 1975–1976 and 1987–1988

	Mobility, 1975–1976						Mobility, 1987–1988					
	No.	(%)	Stayed Part-Time (%)	To Full-Time (%)	To Unempl. (%)	To NILF (%)	No.	(%)	Stayed Part-Time (%)	To Full-Time (%)	To Unempl. (%)	To NILF (%)
Male	4,458	(100.0)	51.17	16.02	8.47	24.35	5,773	(100.0)	51.58	17.64	7.25	23.53
Race												
White	3,937	(88.3)	52.59	16.07	7.82	23.52	4,946	(85.7)	51.93	17.92	6.59	23.55
Black	442	(9.9)	38.02	16.22	14.01	31.75	620	(10.8)	48.13	15.36	12.63	23.88
Other	80	(1.8)	53.76	12.51	9.53	24.21	207	(3.6)	53.57	17.66	6.79	21.98
Marital Status												
Married	1,341	(30.1)	51.67	21.20	6.23	20.90	1,756	(30.4)	52.11	22.01	4.43	21.44
Div/Wid	251	(5.6)	46.56	18.43	10.18	24.83	441	(7.6)	47.87	21.81	7.68	22.65
Single	2,866	(64.3)	51.33	13.38	9.36	25.92	3,577	(62.0)	51.78	14.97	8.58	24.67
Relation to Head of Household												
Head	1,328	(29.8)	52.14	21.14	5.82	20.89	1,686	(29.2)	52.19	20.96	5.26	21.60
Single head	366	(8.2)	46.60	23.69	9.59	20.11	610	(10.6)	50.88	26.02	5.92	17.18
Spouse	0	(0.0)					116	(2.0)	50.99	23.77	3.63	21.61
Children	2,447	(54.9)	52.39	10.66	9.68	27.27	2,861	(49.6)	51.85	12.10	8.60	27.45
Non-relative	317	(7.1)	42.88	27.03	8.90	21.19	500	(8.7)	48.99	26.43	8.70	15.87
Kids Under 1?												
Yes	78	(1.7)	32.81	32.84	16.17	18.18	81	(1.4)	32.60	36.86	13.08	17.46
No	4,380	(98.3)	51.49	15.72	8.33	24.46	5,692	(98.6)	51.85	17.36	7.17	23.62
Kids under 18?												
Yes	2,300	(51.6)	52.44	12.86	10.13	24.57	2,268	(39.3)	51.90	20.20	6.12	21.78
No	2,158	(48.4)	49.81	19.38	6.69	24.12	3,505	(60.7)	51.08	13.69	8.99	26.24

(table continues)

TABLE 10, continued

	Mobility, 1975–1976						Mobility, 1987–1988					
	No.	(%)	Stayed Part-Time (%)	To Full-Time (%)	To Unempl. (%)	To NILF (%)	No.	(%)	Stayed Part-Time (%)	To Full-Time (%)	To Unempl. (%)	To NILF (%)
Age												
16–19	1,884	(42.3)	52.75	7.78	9.99	29.48	1,905	(33.0)	51.11	7.80	8.79	32.30
20–24	878	(19.7)	48.11	24.27	9.61	18.02	1,184	(20.5)	52.15	23.36	6.84	17.65
25–29	269	(6.0)	43.48	37.27	9.11	10.15	460	(8.0)	50.45	30.71	8.54	10.30
30–34	141	(3.2)	40.39	36.35	8.90	14.36	287	(5.0)	44.80	32.08	12.92	10.20
35–44	171	(3.8)	51.84	31.04	9.24	7.87	413	(7.2)	49.35	30.90	10.84	8.92
45–54	199	(4.5)	47.89	31.35	7.06	13.70	254	(4.4)	52.51	32.09	5.58	9.81
55–64	300	(6.7)	54.74	15.58	6.93	22.76	476	(8.2)	56.75	17.56	6.19	19.50
65+	616	(13.8)	55.63	6.60	2.79	34.98	794	(13.8)	52.73	8.40	0.66	38.21
Schooling												
Less than 11	2,230	(50.6)	52.97	8.92	9.10	29.02	2,293	(39.9)	50.72	11.13	9.25	28.90
12	933	(21.2)	42.31	26.07	11.38	20.25	1,556	(27.1)	47.85	23.01	8.24	20.90
13–15	799	(18.1)	56.89	16.38	5.92	20.81	1,186	(20.7)	56.96	16.43	4.89	21.72
16 and above	444	(10.1)	50.75	30.49	3.99	14.77	708	(12.3)	53.13	28.81	2.76	15.30
Employment Class												
Private	3,327	(74.6)	50.22	15.80	9.42	24.56	4,353	(75.4)	49.79	17.83	8.28	24.09
Government	513	(11.5)	50.33	14.26	9.05	26.36	586	(10.2)	53.12	14.78	5.53	26.57
Self-Emp.	542	(12.2)	57.15	19.93	3.25	19.67	801	(13.9)	59.99	18.46	3.19	18.36
No pay	76	(1.7)	55.58	9.35	0.00	35.07	34	(0.6)	55.92	22.78	0.00	21.30
Industry												
Extractive	462	(10.6)	50.21	9.65	4.33	35.81	437	(7.6)	45.69	14.25	8.47	31.59
Construction	329	(7.6)	38.08	25.46	15.66	20.80	457	(7.9)	43.57	24.51	8.80	23.13
Manufacturing	382	(8.8)	44.49	25.05	7.42	23.04	397	(6.9)	44.17	32.11	5.57	18.16
Transportation	199	(4.6)	50.12	20.54	9.89	19.46	277	(4.8)	53.01	27.24	7.33	12.42
Wholesale	117	(2.7)	57.01	19.24	6.36	17.40	143	(2.5)	59.95	16.48	7.71	15.86
Retail	1,398	(32.2)	55.88	14.14	9.26	20.73	1,931	(33.5)	53.95	14.66	8.76	22.63
Business services	382	(8.8)	55.98	18.55	5.08	20.38	675	(11.7)	54.36	18.76	5.38	21.51
Consumer services	313	(7.2)	37.90	12.46	11.74	37.90	497	(8.6)	42.62	10.98	10.15	36.30
Social services	641	(14.8)	59.14	12.79	6.59	21.48	824	(14.3)	60.08	14.86	2.83	22.23
Administration	118	(2.7)	36.56	24.07	7.56	31.81	135	(2.3)	40.75	22.79	6.61	29.85

(table continues)

TABLE 10, continued

	Mobility, 1975–1976						Mobility, 1987–1988					
	No.	(%)	Stayed Part-Time (%)	To Full-Time (%)	To Unempl. (%)	To NILF (%)	No.	(%)	Stayed Part-Time (%)	To Full-Time (%)	To Unempl. (%)	To NILF (%)
Occupation												
Managers	158	(3.6)	54.89	25.63	4.08	15.40	257	(4.5)	58.64	22.20	1.38	17.78
Professionals	417	(9.4)	53.13	23.05	5.40	18.42	565	(9.8)	56.97	21.18	4.09	17.76
Sales	335	(7.5)	59.64	13.34	6.10	20.92	688	(12.0)	55.23	19.94	4.23	20.60
Clerical	303	(6.8)	56.42	17.24	8.74	17.60	380	(6.6)	53.87	16.52	5.35	24.27
Service	1,039	(23.3)	54.00	11.95	8.91	25.15	1,412	(24.6)	50.76	14.03	9.37	25.84
Farming	384	(8.6)	51.18	8.97	4.28	35.56	540	(9.4)	41.01	12.36	8.49	38.14
Craft	429	(9.6)	41.13	26.86	12.79	19.22	567	(9.9)	46.93	23.61	8.76	20.70
Operatives	573	(12.9)	47.89	20.27	10.57	21.27	502	(8.7)	55.62	19.84	7.10	17.44
Laborers	819	(18.4)	47.98	11.04	9.41	31.57	840	(14.6)	51.09	16.67	9.34	22.90

Source: Calculations based on an analysis of individual-level data from the March 1976 and March 1988 Current Population Surveys.

NILF = Not in labor force.

differentials were less clear cut. For both men and women, whites were more likely to remain in part-time jobs than blacks because blacks were more likely to become unemployed.

The most notable differences between men and women were found where there may have been differences in the extent of attachment to the labor force. Duration in part-time work increased gradually with age for women, principally because exits from the labor force declined. Rates of movement into full-time work, however, were not greater for women in their forties than for women in their twenties. Men's exit rates from part-time jobs followed a U-shaped pattern, with both young and old men--the least attached to the labor force--being more likely to leave the labor force than those between age twenty-five and fifty-five. The rates of movement into full-time jobs were also lowest for young and old men, and highest for prime-working-age men.

Married women were more likely to remain part-time because they were less likely to move into full-time jobs than widowed or divorced women. Women with children under age one were less likely to remain part-time because they were less likely to remain in the labor force. In contrast, men who were married or had been married and those with children were more likely than single men or men with no children to move into full-time jobs.

Let us turn now to the issue of change over time. For women, the increase in entry into full-time work pertains to all races, age groups (except 16 to 19 year olds), marital and family statuses, educational levels, employment classes (except "No pay"), industries, and occupations. The decline in exits from the labor force was also quite general, with a few scattered exceptions (the relation status "Non-relative," women aged 55 to 64, and a few occupations and industries where women are poorly represented). However, because the overall change in persistence in part-time work was the product of countervailing trends, and because the extent of change varied for particular subgroups, the net change sometimes canceled out.

Since these trends were principally driven by changes for women, there were more exceptions to the above generalizations for men. For men, the increased rate of entry into full-time work was not evident in age-specific rates: a compositional decline in the proportion of 16- to 19-year-old part-time workers, who had the lowest rate of entry into full-time work, accounted for the increased entry into full-time jobs. For most groups of men, there was no net change in overall persistence rates, although a number of groups experienced modest increases or declines. Black men, for example, experienced a 10 percentage point increase in persistence in part-time jobs.

The patterns of mobility for CPS underemployed workers are documented in Tables 11 and 12 for women and men, respectively. The increased proportion of underemployed women remaining in part-time jobs was due to the sharp decline in labor force exits, which overshadowed the increased rate of movement into full-time jobs. These two countervailing trends applied across the board for women, with very few exceptions. The decline in labor force exits and the increase in mobility into full-time work were evident for nearly all groups of women except those working in a few occupations and industries where women are poorly represented.

For men, these two trends were also evident, but more exceptions were also evident, especially for entry into full-time work. Black men did not experience an increase in mobility into full-time work, nor did those who were self-employed, those with twelve years of schooling, those working in the construction industry, and those employed as managers. Perhaps more notably, the age patterns indicate that only four of eight male age groups (particularly those under age twenty-four) experienced an increased rate of mobility into full-time jobs.

Table 13 presents the mobility rates by the length of employment in the previous year for all part-time workers and for underemployed workers. Table 13 shows that persistence in part-time employment is strongly related to weeks worked in the previous year. Those who worked 50 to 52 weeks in the previous year were especially likely to remain in part-time jobs. In other words, having

(text continues on p. 40)

TABLE 11

Mobility of Female Underemployed Workers, by Social Characteristics, 1975–1976 and 1987–1988

	Mobility, 1975–1976						Mobility, 1987–1988					
	No.	(%)	Stayed Part-Time (%)	To Full-Time (%)	To Unempl. (%)	To NILF (%)	No.	(%)	Stayed Part-Time (%)	To Full-Time (%)	To Unempl. (%)	To NILF (%)
Female	1,513	(100.0)	43.91	16.51	11.64	27.94	1,956	(100)	49.76	23.78	9.32	17.13
Race												
White	1,234	(81.6)	44.40	17.21	11.55	26.84	1,556	(79.5)	51.45	23.95	8.42	16.18
Black	261	(17.2)	42.73	14.02	12.03	31.22	340	(17.4)	42.55	22.50	13.83	21.11
Other	18	(1.2)	27.22	4.61	12.01	56.16	60	(3.1)	46.96	26.84	6.95	19.24
Marital Status												
Married	701	(46.3)	47.80	17.85	9.08	25.28	953	(48.7)	54.43	22.74	7.13	15.70
Div/Wid	240	(15.9)	53.00	15.37	15.13	16.48	408	(20.9)	47.84	28.66	10.59	12.91
Single	572	(37.8)	35.32	15.35	13.31	36.01	596	(30.4)	43.61	22.12	11.94	22.33
Relation to Head of Household												
Head	166	(11.0)	56.53	14.21	9.52	19.74	381	(19.5)	45.48	26.64	11.75	16.12
Single head	113	(7.5)	52.77	18.35	15.72	13.16	175	(8.9)	52.80	29.88	7.89	9.44
Spouse	674	(44.5)	48.20	17.88	8.69	25.23	847	(43.3)	55.27	22.73	6.63	15.38
Children	464	(30.7)	31.87	13.40	14.36	40.37	389	(19.9)	43.35	18.59	12.64	25.42
Non-relative	95	(6.3)	39.64	23.88	18.06	18.42	165	(8.4)	43.32	28.40	11.19	17.09
Kids Under 1?												
Yes	41	(2.7)	30.75	3.55	9.82	55.89	71	(3.6)	24.14	13.05	14.15	48.66
No	1,472	(97.3)	44.27	16.87	11.69	27.16	1,885	(96.4)	50.73	24.19	9.14	15.95
Kids Under 18?												
Yes	885	(58.5)	42.57	13.49	11.61	32.33	1,005	(51.4)	48.53	21.21	9.93	20.32
No	628	(41.5)	45.79	20.77	11.68	21.76	951	(48.6)	51.07	26.50	8.67	13.76

(table continues)

TABLE 11, continued

	Mobility, 1975–1976						Mobility, 1987–1988					
	No.	(%)	Stayed Part-Time (%)	To Full-Time (%)	To Unempl. (%)	To NILF (%)	No.	(%)	Stayed Part-Time (%)	To Full-Time (%)	To Unempl. (%)	To NILF (%)
Age												
16–19	395	(26.1)	30.38	10.18	15.02	44.42	228	(11.7)	34.32	14.54	11.79	39.35
20-24	281	(18.6)	34.21	22.52	14.50	28.77	365	(18.7)	42.45	22.60	13.50	21.44
25–29	153	(10.1)	44.23	18.47	12.26	25.05	257	(13.1)	51.56	26.80	8.59	13.05
30–34	143	(9.4)	53.02	19.25	9.26	18.47	238	(12.2)	51.84	26.62	10.34	11.20
35–44	192	(12.7)	52.01	20.37	6.70	20.92	417	(21.3)	52.34	26.23	9.03	12.40
45–54	186	(12.3)	59.25	16.75	9.00	15.00	247	(12.6)	58.63	25.56	6.02	9.79
55–64	125	(8.3)	59.65	14.68	8.16	17.51	155	(7.9)	60.93	26.06	3.64	9.36
65+	39	(2.6)	53.05	5.42	11.02	30.51	49	(2.5)	54.69	8.97	2.52	33.82
Schooling												
Less than 11	604	(40.1)	42.02	12.78	12.27	32.94	491	(25.3)	44.92	21.16	10.51	23.41
12	602	(39.9)	45.72	18.44	12.85	22.99	953	(49.1)	49.76	23.17	10.73	16.34
13–15	187	(12.4)	40.47	16.56	8.02	34.95	335	(17.3)	51.78	27.25	5.75	15.22
16 and above	114	(7.6)	49.36	26.01	8.43	16.20	162	(8.3)	58.41	28.75	5.62	7.22
Employment Class												
Private	1,199	(79.3)	42.99	16.97	12.35	27.69	1,553	(79.4)	47.64	23.32	10.67	18.37
Government	252	(16.7)	46.44	12.67	10.87	30.01	278	(14.2)	56.81	25.74	4.87	12.58
Self-Emp.	45	(3.0)	52.54	15.61	1.21	30.64	117	(6.0)	60.74	26.38	2.62	10.25
No pay	16	(1.1)	48.24	44.67	0.00	7.08	8	(0.4)	56.60	8.62	0.00	34.77
Industry												
Extractive	64	(4.1)	32.42	12.46	5.76	49.36	32	(1.6)	36.93	37.27	6.15	19.64
Construction	18	(1.2)	40.30	17.85	8.89	32.96	26	(1.3)	33.78	21.56	26.19	18.47
Manufacturing	166	(11.2)	34.80	33.43	15.00	16.77	114	(5.8)	31.25	35.18	16.10	17.46
Transportation	24	(1.6)	41.73	25.10	7.10	26.07	41	(2.1)	48.15	30.94	10.73	10.18
Wholesale	19	(1.3)	31.66	31.72	27.55	9.07	16	(0.8)	25.47	30.63	11.06	32.84
Retail	502	(33.9)	43.75	14.10	13.75	28.40	721	(36.8)	49.07	21.13	10.41	19.40
Business services	78	(5.3)	42.07	16.92	9.20	31.81	229	(11.7)	50.00	24.30	9.70	16.00
Consumer services	261	(17.7)	52.31	10.43	11.31	25.95	284	(14.5)	52.30	20.91	8.65	18.15
Social services	316	(21.4)	48.05	16.49	9.08	26.38	440	(22.5)	57.77	23.17	5.73	13.33
Administration	34	(2.3)	36.59	18.49	4.45	40.48	54	(2.8)	42.50	38.85	3.70	14.95

(table continues)

TABLE 11, continued

	Mobility, 1975–1976						Mobility, 1987–1988					
	No.	(%)	Stayed Part-Time (%)	To Full-Time (%)	To Unempl. (%)	To NILF (%)	No.	(%)	Stayed Part-Time (%)	To Full-Time (%)	To Unempl. (%)	To NILF (%)
Occupation												
Managers	21	(1.4)	46.98	26.00	10.61	16.42	57	(2.9)	45.05	44.61	0.00	10.34
Professionals	123	(8.2)	50.97	15.75	8.32	24.96	156	(8.0)	52.90	30.32	6.16	10.62
Sales	146	(9.6)	39.06	16.42	9.99	34.53	410	(21.0)	50.27	23.97	8.67	17.08
Clerical	330	(21.8)	41.51	18.28	14.68	25.53	316	(16.2)	50.52	25.18	8.56	15.74
Service	607	(40.1)	46.45	12.83	10.62	30.10	775	(39.7)	52.09	18.73	10.36	18.83
Farming	46	(3.0)	32.28	9.60	7.73	50.39	29	(1.5)	22.64	34.45	10.19	32.72
Craft	10	(0.6)	64.70	19.87	5.76	9.67	35	(1.8)	40.13	30.00	7.37	22.50
Operatives	197	(13.0)	42.18	26.66	13.79	17.37	125	(6.4)	40.46	31.16	15.23	13.15
Laborers	34	(2.2)	34.68	11.96	14.55	38.81	51	(2.6)	43.96	20.02	10.38	25.64

Source: Calculations based on an analysis of individual-level data from the March 1976 and March 1988 Current Population Surveys.

NILF = Not in labor force.

TABLE 12

Mobility of Male Underemployed Workers, by Social Characteristics, 1975–1976 and 1987–1988

	Mobility, 1975–1976						Mobility, 1987–1988					
	No.	(%)	Stayed Part-Time (%)	To Full-Time (%)	To Unempl. (%)	To NILF (%)	No.	(%)	Stayed Part-Time (%)	To Full-Time (%)	To Unempl. (%)	To NILF (%)
Male	1,147	(100.0)	35.34	24.89	14.91	24.85	622	(100.0)	42.79	28.11	14.11	14.98
Race												
White	910	(79.3)	35.94	25.81	14.50	23.75	1,148	(79.0)	42.33	30.03	13.39	14.25
Black	208	(18.1)	31.01	21.80	17.10	30.09	263	(18.1)	43.73	20.62	17.57	18.09
Other	29	(2.5)	47.61	18.30	12.15	21.95	41	(2.9)	49.66	22.46	12.23	15.65
Marital Status												
Married	367	(32.0)	41.28	31.77	15.05	11.90	480	(33.0)	44.89	37.32	11.99	5.80
Div/Wid	99	(8.6)	38.60	25.30	16.71	19.38	181	(12.5)	48.80	26.57	14.68	9.94
Single	681	(59.4)	31.67	21.13	14.58	32.62	792	(54.5)	40.15	22.89	15.27	21.69
Relation to Head of Household												
Head	359	(31.3)	41.63	32.34	14.18	11.85	469	(32.3)	43.82	36.23	14.11	5.84
Single head	118	(10.3)	37.55	28.01	16.75	17.69	202	(13.9)	47.25	31.34	13.01	8.40
Spouse	0	(0.0)					38	(2.6)	52.07	31.99	8.35	7.59
Children	563	(49.1)	31.92	17.13	15.04	35.91	565	(38.9)	40.53	19.63	14.79	25.05
Non-relative	108	(9.4)	29.87	37.25	14.66	18.22	179	(12.3)	40.25	29.16	14.45	16.14
Kids under 1?												
Yes	35	(3.0)	22.91	30.83	27.70	18.56	40	(2.7)	29.47	36.42	22.80	11.31
No	1,113	(97.0)	35.73	24.71	14.52	25.05	1,413	(97.3)	43.17	27.88	13.87	15.08
Kids under 18?												
Yes	612	(53.3)	32.97	21.17	16.61	29.26	541	(37.2)	36.85	28.59	14.86	19.70
No	536	(46.7)	38.05	29.15	12.98	19.82	912	(62.8)	46.31	27.83	13.67	12.18

(table continues)

TABLE 12, continued

	Mobility, 1975–1976						Mobility, 1987–1988					
	No.	(%)	Stayed Part-Time (%)	To Full-Time (%)	To Unempl. (%)	To NILF (%)	No.	(%)	Stayed Part-Time (%)	To Full-Time (%)	To Unempl. (%)	To NILF (%)
Age												
16–19	385	(33.6)	31.60	11.71	14.88	41.82	257	(17.7)	25.56	15.54	18.02	40.88
20–24	261	(22.8)	32.87	28.93	18.45	19.75	293	(20.2)	38.61	33.89	12.17	15.33
25–29	98	(8.6)	24.88	50.23	15.84	9.05	198	(13.6)	50.03	31.59	12.73	5.65
30–34	79	(6.9)	37.52	38.62	10.48	13.39	172	(11.8)	46.34	30.96	16.86	5.84
35–44	84	(7.4)	49.00	32.01	13.06	5.93	236	(16.2)	47.74	33.38	14.65	4.23
45–54	97	(8.4)	46.81	33.97	10.00	9.22	131	(9.0)	52.08	30.21	8.79	8.93
55–64	99	(8.6)	40.01	22.73	16.52	20.74	124	(8.5)	45.62	26.67	16.55	11.15
65 and more	43	(3.7)	40.42	6.00	10.77	42.81	43	(2.9)	63.49	5.27	5.58	25.65
Schooling												
Less than 11	589	(52.4)	33.90	17.77	16.32	32.00	543	(37.7)	40.55	22.40	17.67	19.38
12	309	(27.4)	34.42	34.94	17.65	12.98	554	(38.5)	43.16	29.52	14.63	12.68
13–15	160	(14.2)	40.98	25.18	9.04	24.80	220	(15.3)	42.45	31.43	8.75	17.36
16 and above	68	(6.0)	34.78	39.30	8.73	17.19	124	(8.6)	49.72	40.07	7.16	3.05
Employment Class												
Private	899	(78.4)	33.73	24.98	16.12	25.17	1,109	(76.3)	39.93	28.03	15.35	16.70
Government	107	(9.4)	31.38	16.05	14.14	38.43	114	(7.9)	42.69	25.24	14.00	18.07
Self-Emp.	139	(12.1)	49.29	31.46	7.87	11.39	227	(15.6)	56.87	30.00	8.31	4.81
No pay	2	(0.2)	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	3	(0.2)	42.64	27.22	0.00	30.15
Industry												
Extractive	113	(10.1)	34.78	15.66	8.78	40.78	127	(8.8)	35.58	21.70	18.26	24.47
Construction	178	(15.9)	36.29	31.30	19.65	12.76	233	(16.1)	47.93	28.33	10.86	12.89
Manufacturing	132	(11.8)	30.91	37.57	10.09	21.44	127	(8.8)	35.90	45.80	12.28	6.02
Transportation	72	(6.5)	36.70	32.23	16.00	15.07	111	(7.7)	48.02	35.60	10.49	5.89
Wholesale	25	(2.3)	24.23	28.80	21.86	25.11	37	(2.5)	40.70	26.50	20.12	12.67
Retail	286	(25.5)	36.34	22.41	14.73	26.52	352	(24.2)	39.90	24.55	17.85	17.69
Business services	88	(7.9)	42.37	34.18	7.13	16.32	179	(12.4)	50.34	24.71	10.25	14.69
Consumer services	98	(8.8)	26.52	15.98	23.44	34.06	125	(8.6)	38.61	21.79	23.05	16.55
Social services	100	(9.0)	47.08	16.91	12.67	23.33	124	(8.5)	48.72	31.19	4.62	15.47
Administration	27	(2.4)	21.79	10.40	8.93	58.88	36	(2.5)	30.22	28.48	16.45	24.84

(table continues)

TABLE 12, continued

	Mobility, 1975–1976						Mobility, 1987–1988					
	No.	(%)	Stayed Part-Time (%)	To Full-Time (%)	To Unempl. (%)	To NILF (%)	No.	(%)	Stayed Part-Time (%)	To Full-Time (%)	To Unempl. (%)	To NILF (%)
Occupation												
Managers	29	(2.6)	29.59	54.79	3.35	12.27	35	(2.5)	36.04	52.85	5.68	5.44
Professionals	79	(6.9)	35.61	26.19	15.05	23.15	96	(6.7)	47.33	39.48	9.18	4.01
Sales	50	(4.4)	28.55	26.00	9.00	36.45	101	(7.0)	50.08	31.19	8.07	10.67
Clerical	46	(4.1)	53.41	13.05	11.22	22.32	55	(3.8)	33.16	28.93	14.86	23.04
Service	212	(18.5)	39.03	20.65	14.35	25.97	341	(23.5)	38.54	25.71	18.01	17.74
Farming	88	(7.6)	31.62	14.44	10.11	43.83	149	(10.3)	33.65	20.39	20.26	25.70
Craft	189	(16.5)	35.77	36.33	18.80	9.11	247	(17.1)	48.09	28.79	13.08	10.04
Operatives	186	(16.2)	31.40	31.09	17.95	19.56	181	(12.5)	53.55	27.76	8.77	9.92
Laborers	267	(23.3)	34.78	17.47	15.05	32.70	243	(16.8)	38.96	26.72	15.57	18.74

Source: Calculations based on an analysis of individual-level data from the March 1976 and March 1988 Current Population Surveys.

NILF = Not in labor force.

TABLE 13
Mobility of Part-Time Workers, by Weeks Worked in Previous Year, 1975–1976 and 1987–1988

	Mobility, 1975–1976						Mobility, 1987–1988					
	No.	(%)	Stayed Part-Time (%)	To Full-Time (%)	To Unempl. (%)	To NILF (%)	No.	(%)	Stayed Part-Time (%)	To Full-Time (%)	To Unempl. (%)	To NILF (%)
A. All Part-Time Workers												
Males, Weeks Worked												
1-9	599	(20.3)	14.96	10.57	20.13	54.34	799	(13.5)	18.60	10.68	13.99	56.73
10-19	492	(20.6)	28.00	19.05	17.59	35.35	898	(15.6)	35.58	8.95	12.01	43.46
20-29	396	(16.9)	38.78	24.87	20.68	15.66	866	(15.0)	46.11	16.06	9.89	27.94
30-39	320	(10.7)	41.83	26.50	13.67	18.00	574	(10.0)	55.56	18.71	6.78	18.96
40-49	227	(7.9)	36.23	46.78	12.60	4.38	677	(11.7)	61.53	23.98	5.61	8.88
50-52	647	(23.7)	53.55	34.07	5.36	7.02	1,978	(34.3)	69.68	22.53	1.97	5.82
Females, Weeks Worked												
1-9	1,322	(15.0)	22.71	6.00	9.02	62.27	1,372	(11.9)	24.34	7.66	8.35	59.64
10-19	1,221	(13.9)	41.47	8.02	8.49	42.02	1,414	(12.3)	39.10	9.03	7.84	44.02
20-29	1,012	(11.5)	47.26	9.75	7.91	35.08	1,437	(12.5)	51.87	11.93	6.19	30.01
30-39	1,112	(12.6)	60.87	9.56	4.06	25.51	1,184	(10.3)	59.14	15.63	4.34	20.88
40-49	1,003	(11.4)	71.62	13.70	3.43	11.25	1,295	(11.2)	70.62	17.32	3.25	8.81
50-52	3,141	(35.7)	79.27	13.15	1.71	5.87	4,828	(42.9)	75.24	17.53	1.43	5.80
B. Underemployed Workers												
Males, Weeks Worked												
1-9	234	(20.3)	14.96	10.57	20.13	54.34	217	(15.0)	16.64	17.28	28.84	37.24
10-19	238	(20.6)	28.00	19.05	17.59	35.35	216	(14.9)	28.70	16.47	18.85	35.98
20-29	195	(16.9)	38.78	24.87	20.68	15.66	241	(16.6)	39.68	26.25	20.31	13.77
30-39	124	(10.7)	41.83	26.50	13.67	18.00	163	(11.2)	47.90	37.42	9.06	5.62
40-49	91	(7.9)	36.23	46.78	12.60	4.38	199	(13.7)	54.71	32.90	8.39	4.00
50-52	274	(23.7)	53.55	34.07	5.36	7.02	416	(28.7)	57.87	34.96	5.09	2.08
Females, Weeks Worked												
1-9	365	(23.9)	19.00	7.36	17.69	55.95	293	(15.0)	23.87	13.68	17.91	44.54
10-19	254	(16.7)	31.68	11.82	15.38	41.12	255	(13.0)	36.43	14.73	15.41	33.42
20-29	201	(13.2)	42.03	17.66	17.60	22.71	232	(11.9)	47.59	22.63	10.04	19.74
30-39	197	(12.9)	53.13	17.71	9.44	19.72	217	(11.1)	53.57	24.77	8.24	13.42
40-49	136	(8.9)	58.81	25.76	4.94	10.49	237	(12.1)	57.05	27.10	9.62	6.23
50-52	373	(24.5)	67.30	24.04	3.56	5.11	722	(36.9)	62.17	30.07	3.66	4.09

Source: Calculations based on an analysis of individual-level data from the March 1976 and March 1988 Current Population Surveys.

NILF = Not in labor force.

a steady part-time job was an excellent predictor of persistence in part-time employment. At the same time, however, those who worked the most weeks were also most likely to move into full-time jobs. In other words, those who were most attached to the labor force were most likely to make the transition to full-time work. Those who worked the least were most likely to leave the labor force or become unemployed. These patterns were found for all part-time workers as well as for the underemployed.

Another notable finding in Table 13 is that the share of part-time workers who worked 50 to 52 weeks increased markedly for both males and females. This finding reflects the increased persistence rates in underemployment and also reinforces this trend. Increasing persistence in part-time jobs increased durations, and these increased durations in turn increased persistence, and so on.

Additional analyses were conducted on mobility between 1969 and 1970, and 1979 and 1980 (data not shown). These analyses indicated that the observed time trends occurred gradually, with the 1975–1976 and 1979–1980 results generally falling between those in 1969–1970 and 1987–1988.

The bivariate results presented in Tables 9 and 10 suggest that the three notable changes observed during the 1970s and 1980s--increasing persistence in part-time jobs, due to lower labor force exits and greater entry into full-time work--reflected general changes in the nature of part-time work and were not simply due to changes in the attributes of workers or shifts in the composition of occupations and industries. Tables 11 and 12 reinforced this conclusion for underemployed workers. I explore this question more systematically with a regression analysis. Table 14 presents results of this analysis for exits to full-time work and for exits from the labor force. The analysis focuses on the 1975–1976 versus 1987–1988 comparison. The results for the 1969–1970 period were generally similar to those presented here for comparable variables. The first panel of Table 14 presents the analysis of all part-time workers, and the second panel presents the analysis of the exit patterns of

TABLE 14
Explaining Trends in Exits from Part-Time Jobs, 1975–1976 through 1987–1988

	Model 1. Controls: None	Model 2. Controls: Weeks Worked	Model 3. Controls: Marital and Family Variables	Model 4. Controls: Education and Experience	Model 5. Controls: Occupation andControls: Industry	Model 6. Selectivity
1. All exits						
A. All part-time workers						
Total	-.026 (.023)	.031 (.025)	.006 (.025)	.014 (.025)	-.006-.002 (.026)(.026)	
Men	.004 (.040)	-.016 (.042)	-.048 (.043)	-.080 (.040)	-.074-.060 (.045)(.045)	
Women	-.037 (.028)	.062 (.030)	.038 (.031)	.020 (.031)	.031.037 (.033)(.033)	
B. Underemployed workers						
Total	-.274 (.053)	-.098 (.055)	-.096 (.056)	-.087 (.057)	-.052-.049 (.059)(.060)	
Men	-.285 (.084)	-.162 (.087)	-.139 (.088)	-.146 (.089)	-.125-.129 (.092)(.093)	
Women	-.265 (.068)	-.052 (.072)	-.057 (.073)	-.042 (.074)	.004.008 (.079)(.079)	
2. Exits to full-time jobs						
A. All part-time workers						
Total	.277 (.049)	.255 (.049)	.238 (.049)	.180 (.050)	.205.209 (.053)(.053)	
Men	.193 (.078)	.204 (.079)	.166 (.080)	.094 (.082)	.118.144 (.086)(.086)	
Women	.332 (.062)	.298 (.063)	.296 (.063)	.240 (.064)	.266.279 (.069)(.069)	
B. Underemployed workers						
Total	.374 (.063)	.258 (.065)	.246 (.065)	.246 (.066)	.269.281 (.070)(.070)	
Men	.286 (.092)	.194 (.094)	.180 (.096)	.137 (.098)	.186.192 (.102)(.102)	
Women	.461 (.088)	.325 (.090)	.320 (.090)	.290 (.091)	.360.360 (.099)(.099)	

(table continues)

TABLE 14, continued

	Model 1. Controls: None	Model 2. Controls: Weeks Worked	Model 3. Controls: Marital and Family Variables	Model 4. Controls: Education and Experience	Model 5. Controls: Occupation andControls: Industry	Model 6. Selectivity
3. Exits from the labor force						
A. All part-time workers						
Total	-.141 (.038)	-.085 (.042)	-.104 (.042)	-.087 (.043)	-.088-.093 (.045)(.045)	
Men	-.003 (.066)	-.041 (.073)	-.059 (.073)	-.029 (.074)	-.061-.064 (.077)(.078)	
Women	-.211 (.047)	-.107 (.052)	-.133 (.052)	-.1114 (.053)	-.095-.096 (.056)(.056)	
B. Underemployed workers						
Total	-.636 (.064)	-.397 (.071)	-.378 (.071)	-.329 (.072)	-.369-.379 (.076)(.076)	
Men	-.653 (.102)	-.490 (.112)	-.436 (.115)	-.365 (.117)	-.385-.381 (.123)(.124)	
Women	-.628 (.083)	-.334 (.091)	-.346 (.092)	-.303 (.093)	-.341-.329 (.099)(.099)	

Marital and Family Control Variables: Married, Presence of Children Under 1, Presence of Own Children Under 18. Education and Experience Measures: 12 Years of School Completed; Some College; College Graduate. Occupation Measures: Managers, Professionals, Sales, Clerical Service, Farming, Craft, Operatives, Laborers. Industry Measures: Extractive, Construction, Manufacturing, Transportation, Wholesale, Retail, Business Services, Consumer Services, Social Services, Administration.

Note: Coefficients reported are net time-trend measures.

underemployed workers. Table 14 presents an analysis of change, and thus only the year coefficient is produced.

The results in Table 14 indicate a marked increase between 1975–1976 and 1987–1988 in entry into full-time jobs. This trend was attenuated by the inclusion of various control measures, but the preponderance of the time trend remained even after weeks worked, family and household measures, education, occupation, industry, and selectivity measures were controlled for. This finding held for both men and women, and for underemployed as well as other part-time workers.

A decline in exits from the labor force was also statistically significant, but here the underemployed differed from the voluntarily employed. The decline in exits from the labor force was large for both male and female underemployed workers, and the addition of the control variables accounted for about half of this trend for both groups. However, for the voluntarily part-time, there was no significant time trend for men, and for women, it was mostly accounted for by the increase in weeks worked.

Table 15 presents an analysis of the gender gap in mobility into full-time work for the 1987–1988 period. About one-quarter of the gender gap in mobility into full-time jobs was accounted for by the inclusion of the control variables. However, for underemployed workers, the gender gap remained as large after controls were included in the analysis. A similar pattern emerged for exits from the labor force. The decline in labor force exits was explained for all part-time workers by the inclusion of the measure of weeks worked last year. However, for underemployed workers, the decline in labor force exits was even larger after controls were imposed than in the zero-order relationship.

TABLE 15

Explaining the Gender Gap in Exits from Part-Time Jobs, 1987–1988

	Model 1. Controls: None	Model 2. Controls: Weeks Worked	Model 3. Controls: Marital and Family Variables	Model 4. Controls: Education and Experience	Model 5. Controls: Occupation and Industry	Model 6. Controls: Selectivity
1. Exits to full-time jobs						
A. All part-time workers	-.228	-.293	-.252	-.252	-.202	-.159
	(.044)	(.046)	(.046)	(.048)	(.053)	(.058)
B. Underemployed workers	-.291	-.359	-.350	-.375	-.308	-.304
	(.081)	(.081)	(.082)	(.083)	(.106)	(.106)
2. Exits from the labor force						
A. All part-time workers	-.151	.008	.016	.020	.009	.004
	(.038)	(.044)	(.045)	(.046)	(.056)	(.051)
B. Underemployed workers	.143	.377	.330	.371	.446	.319
	(.096)	(.107)	(.108)	(.110)	(.129)	(.142)

Note: Coefficients reported are net effect of being female.

Control variables are the same as in Table 14.

V. DISCUSSION

This paper documented and examined trends in the part-time versus full-time earnings differential; the increase in underemployment, especially for women; and the increased spells in part-time jobs, especially for women. These trends persisted after relevant controls were introduced; the proportion of variance explained by individual attributes versus changing occupational and industrial structure varied for each of these three, and between men and women.

Earnings and underemployment both worsened for the young and especially those with limited educational backgrounds, while persistence in part-time jobs declined for this group due to a sharp increase in labor force exits. A more detailed examination of the situation of recent labor market entrants is clearly in order.

The trends in part-time work described here are part of a general transformation of the wage structure. The increasing attachment of women to the labor market paradoxically increases their underemployment and spells in part-time work, as their labor force exits decline faster than do moves into full-time work. For men, the declining situation of new labor market entrants is associated with a significant proportion, but by no means all, of the low earnings of part-time workers.

The analysis presented here focused on economically prosperous years. A reexamination of the same issues for periods including recessions might be revealing. The analysis was also limited to an examination of the direct effects of shifting attributes of workers and shifting occupational and industrial composition. A more complete analysis would include an examination of the indirect effect of these changes on wages, underemployment, and mobility.

Hypotheses

A great deal has been written on the growth of inequality in the United States during the 1970's and 1980's (for example, Levy, 1988; Harrison and Bluestone, 1988; Blackburn, Bloom and Freeman, 1990). Researchers have documented a growing earnings differential between highly educated workers and less educated worker. Among men, new entrants to the labor market, especially those with limited educational credentials, have had less success in obtaining employment in high-wage jobs. There is also evidence of the decline in high-wage manufacturing jobs which limits employment prospects for less-educated men. One of our principal questions, then, is whether these trends are implicated in the experiences of part-time workers. I will examine whether the changing patterns of persistence in part-time work reflect these larger trends in the labor market. The labor-market structure hypothesis would predict that young, less educated male workers would be fare the worst in terms a growing incidence of underemployment and increasing difficulty in moving into full-time jobs. A compositional change in the makeup of part-time work which reflected the growth of these groups could account for the change in persistence in part-time work.

A second expectation is that mobility out of part-time jobs is related to the degree of labor-force attachment. Those groups with relatively low attachment to the labor force will be more likely to leave the labor force and less likely to enter full-time jobs. In contrast, those groups with relatively high attachment to the labor force will be more likely to enter full-time jobs and less likely to leave the labor force. This expection means that underemployment should be a powerful predictor of movement to full-time jobs. In other words, those who are involuntarily working part-time should be more likely to move to full time jobs than those who are employed in part-time jobs by choice.

What does the above reasoning imply about changes over time in mobility patterns? The growth of underemployment means that there is a growing proportion of part-time workers who seek full-time work. Thus, we would expect and increase in the rate of mobility from part-time to full-time jobs. Also consistent with this analysis is the expectation that changes in women's roles would contribute to increasing mobility between part-time and full-time jobs. I expect that women's increasing attachment to the labor force has reduced the rate of exit from the labor force and increased the rate of entry into full-time positions.

As we will see below, there is evidence of a gender gap in mobility to full-time jobs. Our analysis explores whether this gap is due to women being less likely to want to work full time, differences in education, occupation, industry, etc. Again, one would expect that differences in commitment to the labor force might explain some or all of the gender gap in mobility into full-time jobs. Another possibility is that women work in occupations or industries with fewer opportunities for full-time work. Our analysis is designed to explore how much of the gender gap in mobility into full-time jobs persists after individual-level factors related to desire for full time work, and structural attributes of occupations and industries are controlled.

4. Methods

This paper analyzes March Current Population Survey (CPS) data from 1970, 1976, 1980 and 1988. The March CPS data include questions on the respondent's employment status in the survey week, and also information about employment and earnings in the previous calendar year. One series of questions pertains to the respondent's longest job in the previous year. This question forms the basis of the information regarding the initial or "origin" employment status, while the current survey week question is used to construct the "destination" status.

The first set of analyses are designed to identify the factors that

account for variation in part-time work and underemployment. Variables considered include race, education, marital status, relationship to household head, the presence of own children under 1 and under 18, age, education, class of worker, industry and occupation and weeks worked last year. Men and women are examined separately. These factors are also targetted as potential explanations of change in mobility rates during the 1970's and 1980's.

The multivariate analysis seeks to identify the net contribution of these variables to a change over time in mobility patterns. The procedure employs regression analysis to identify the contribution of: 1) the attributes of part-time workers; 2) shifts in the distribution of part-time employment across occupations and industries; and 3) change which is net of these factors.

The multi-variate analysis is divided into two parts, one designed to explain time trends in mobility, and the other designed to examine gender differences in mobility during the 1987–1988 period. The statistical approach employed for the analysis of time trends is a pooled logistic regression analysis with tests for period interaction terms. Data from the 1975–76 and 1987–88 transition periods are combined. (Data for underemployment in the previous year date from 1976, and so this year is a natural starting point for the analysis of time trends.) This is a standard technique for the analysis of time trends, employed, for example, by Blackburn, Bloom and Freeman (1990) in their analysis of increasing earnings gap associated with skill differentials. Consider the following sequence of models:

1) mobility = year
2) mobility = year, vector of individual attributes
3) mobility = year, vector of individual attributes, vector of occupation and industry dummies
4) mobility = year, vector of individual attributes, vector of occupation and industry dummies, interaction terms

By comparing models 1 and 2, the extent to individual attributes explain the observed changes in the mobility of part-time workers (i.e., a reduction in the size of the coefficient on the "year" term) can be ascertained. Similarly, a comparison of subsequent models allows a determination of the impact of industrial and occupational shifts on the mobility of part-time workers. Interaction terms may be added to test for changes in the influence of particular attributes, such as age or educational levels.

The gender analysis follows the same logic. Here the analysis begins with a term for being female, and groups of variables are added in order to see their effect in explaining the size of the gender coefficient. Initially all part-time workers are included in the analysis, and then the analyis is restricted to underemployed workers.

Selectivity issues are highlighted by Blank (1990), who argues that an analysis of part-time employment requires two selectivity measures: one for labor force participation, and a second for part-time employment. She finds that the selectivity considerations are generally more important for women than for men. This study will employ her approach to examine the question of changes in the impact of selectivity into part-time jobs. The odds of labor force participation were estimated from a pooled sample combining 1976 and 1988 data. Independent variables education, marital and family status measures, age, sex and race. Similar analysis was performed to estimate part-time employment among employed individuals. The predicted values of these equations, in exponentiated form, were employed as selectivity measures.

5. Results

6. Discussion

Nearly half of those employed in part-time jobs do not remain so employed after one year. However, this paper documents an increase in the proportion of workers, particularly women, remaining in part-time jobs for a one-year period over the last 20 years. Underemployed individuals are experiencing increasing persistence in part-time jobs despite the increasing rate of entry into full-time employment. These findings persist when controls for workers' demographic characteristics and occupational and industry employment opportunities are controlled.

We have also documented an increasing gender gap in persistence in part-time jobs. This is due to a decline in the rate of labor force exit of women working part-time, as well as a continuing gender gap in the rate of entry into full-time jobs.

Persistence in part-time jobs declined for the young and especially for those with limited educational credentials due to a sharp increase in labor-force exits. A more detailed examination of the situation of recent labor market entrants is clearly in order.

The trends in part-time work described here are a part of a general transformation of the labor market. The increasing attachment of women to the labor market paradoxically increases their underemployment and spells in part-time work, as their labor force exits decline faster than do moves into full-time work. For men, the declining situation of new labor market entrants is associated with a significant proportion, but by no means all, of the low in earnings of part-time workers.

The analysis presented here focused on economically prosperous years. A reexamination of the same issues for periods including recessions might be revealing. The analysis is also limited to an examination of the direct effects of shifting attributes of workers and shifting occupational and industrial composition. A more complete analysis would include an examination of the indirect effect of these changes on wages, underemployment and mobility.

Those with less attachment to the labor force include young individuals who are just entering the labor force or those who have been employed for a short period of time, women with young children who find it difficult to combine work and parenting, and individuals who have retired and who only seek temporary employment.

that respondents to the SIPP survey were more likely to move to full time jobs than were respondents to the SIPP survey. Over one third of the men, and nearly one quarter of the women, moved to full time jobs a year later. This difference may well be due to differences in the workding of the mobility question. CPS uses longest job last year, SIPP refers to current job. Those whose longest job last year was a part-time job may have been less likely to move to a full time job than those who happened to be in a part-time job during one the SIPP survey weeks.

A great deal has been written on the growth of inequality in the United States during the 1970's and 1980's. Much of this research has examined only full-time, full-year workers, or, alternatively, has estimated the "full-time equivalent" earnings that part-time and part-year workers could be expected to earn if they worked at a full-time schedule over the course of the year (Levy, 1988; Harrison and Bluestone, 1988; Blackburn, Bloom and Freeman, 1990). While part-time workers are sometimes included in these analyses, the trends unique to part-time workers have not been the subject of sustained scrutiny. Indeed, the analyses which include part-time workers (eg. Levy, 1988) generally show a greater trend toward wage inequality than identical analyses restricted to full-time, full-year workers.

5.1 Heterogeneity

Part-time work is defined as individuals who work between 1 and 34 hours per week. This is a wide range. Are these folks similar, or widely divergent? What is the distribution across numbers of hours worked? A plurality of part-time workers work 20–29 hours. Only a small fraction work under 10 hours a week. In 1988, workers working 1–9 hours were slightly older than other part-time workers, were slightly less be

Black or hispanic, were slightly less educated, were more likely to be veterans, were less likely to be married, Much more likely to be single, to have kids under 18 and especially to be self-employed.

mobility: report proportion who changed 3 digit occs; major occs, inds
see if proportion remaining with same employer is available

to do:
-polish discussion
-compare to britain?
-discuss implications for mommy track?
-netter to

References

Beechey, Veronica and Tessa Perkins. 1987. A Matter of Hours: Women, Part-Time Work, and the Labour Market. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Blackburn, McKinley L., David E. Bloom, and Richard B. Freeman. 1990. "The Declining Economic Position of Less Skilled American Men." In Gary Burtless, ed., A Future of Lousy Jobs? The Changing Structure of U.S. Wages, pp. 31–76. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.

Blank, Rebecca. 1990. "Are Part-Time Jobs Bad Jobs?" In Gary Burtless, ed., A Future of Lousy Jobs? The Changing Structure of U.S. Wages, pp. 123–164. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.

Flaim, Paul O. and Carma R. Hogue. 1985. "Measuring Labor Force Flows: A Special Conference Examines the Problems." Monthly Labor Review 108(7): 7–17.

Harrison, Bennett and Barry Bluestone. 1988. The Great U-Turn: Corporate Restructuring and the Polarizing of America. New York: Basic Books.

Ichniowski, Bernard E. and Anne E. Preston. 1986. "New Trends in Part-Time Employment." Industrial Relations Research Association 38th Annual Proceedings, pp. 60–67.

Jacobs, Jerry A. 1993. "Careers in the U.S. Service Economy, 1969–1987." Forthcoming in Gosta Esping-Andersen, ed., A Post-Industrial Proletariat? Beverly Hills: Sage Press.

Katz, Lawrence F. and Kevin M. Murphy. 1992. "Changes in Relative Wages, 1963–1987: Supply and Demand Factors." Quarterly Journal of Economics 107: 35–78.

Levy, Frank. 1988. Dollars and Dreams: The Changing American Income Distribution. New York: W. W. Norton.

Landry, David J., Clifford C. Clogg, and Daniel T. Lichter. 1991. "Measuring Short-Term Labor Force Mobility with the Labor Utilization Framework." Social Science Research 20: 329–354.

Murphy, Kevin and Finis Welch. 1990. "Empirical Age-Earnings Profiles." Journal of Labor Economics 8(2): 202–229.

_____. 1992. "The Structure of Wages." Quarterly Journal of Economics 107: 285–326.

Poterba, James M. and Lawrence H. Summers. 1984. "Response Variation in the CPS: Caveats for the Unemployment Analyst." Monthly Labor Review 107(3): 37–43.

Thurman, Joseph E. and Gabriele Trah. 1990. "Part-Time Work in International Perspective." International Labor Review 129(1): 23–42.

U.S. Department of Labor. 1971–1990. Employment and Earnings. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. 1992. Work and Family: Part-Time Employment Transitions among Young Women. Report #824. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Williams, Donald R. 1991. "A Dynamic Analysis of Recent Changes in the Rate of Part-Time Employment." Working Paper #9120. Cleveland: Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland.