

Dept. of Social Welfare
Library
Wellington, N.Z.

A PROFILE OF SOLE PARENTS FROM THE 1986 CENSUS

PRESERVATION

MIKE ROCHFORD
NITI PAWAKAPAN
SHANE MARTIN
MARION NORRIS



Research Section
Department of Social Welfare
Head Office
Wellington
New Zealand

DSW
306
.856
PRO

Series 13

DEPT OF SOCIAL WELFARE, W'TON



A00323683B

ISSN 0112-7721
ISBN 0-477-07299-2

17761

PRESERVATION

A PROFILE OF SOLE PARENTS FROM THE 1986 CENSUS

MIKE ROCHFORD
NITI PAWAKAPAN
SHANE MARTIN
MARION NORRIS

Research Report Series No. 13

**Library (WSS)
Department of Social Welfare
Private Bag 21
Postal Centre
Wellington**

Research Section
Department of Social Welfare
Head Office
Wellington
NEW ZEALAND

1992

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank Rowan Taylor and Vasantha Krishnan for their assistance in producing the tables.

We also thank Cathy Wylie, Heather Roberts, Carolyn Adams and Mary Mowbray for their suggestions and advice, and Ross Mackay for editing the report.

Opinions expressed in this report are those of the authors. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Social Welfare.

Copies of this report may be obtained from:

Research Section
Department of Social Welfare
Head Office
Private Bag
Wellington
New Zealand

Enquiries concerning its contents should be addressed to

"Director Research"

at the above address.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 METHODOLOGY	3
2.1 The Census family file	3
2.2 Missing data	3
2.3 Sampling error	4
2.4 Family definitions	4
2.5 Variables	5
2.6 Education	5
2.7 Ethnicity of parents	6
2.8 Marital status	6
2.9 Household type	7
2.10 Tenure of dwelling	7
2.11 Location of dwelling	7
2.12 Hours employed	8
2.13 Occupation of parent	8
2.14 Employment status	8
2.15 Income	9
2.16 Social Welfare benefits received	10
3 TRENDS IN THE NUMBERS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF SOLE PARENT FAMILIES FROM 1976 TO 1986	13
3.1 A note on the figures	13
3.2 Incidence of sole parenthood	13
3.3 Proportion of sole parents on benefit	14
3.4 Marital status	16
3.5 Number of dependent children	17
3.6 Age of youngest child	18
3.7 Housing tenure	18
3.8 Household type	18
3.9 Location of dwelling	19
3.10 Ethnicity	19
3.11 Sex	20
3.12 Hours employed	20
4 COMPARISON BETWEEN ONE PARENT AND TWO PARENT FAMILIES	22
4.1 One and two parent families	22
4.2 Ethnicity of families	22
4.3 Number and age of children	24
4.4 Rate of employment	24
4.5 Income	25
4.6 Education	26
4.7 Occupation type	26
4.8 Location	26
4.9 Household type	27
4.10 Housing tenure	27

5	A PROFILE OF SOLE PARENTS BY ETHNICITY	28
5.1	A note on sole parents of "other" origin	28
5.2	Sole parents of European origin	28
5.3	Sole parents of Maori origin	30
5.4	Sole parents of Pacific Island origin	33
6	A PROFILE OF SOLE PARENTS BY MARITAL STATUS	36
6.1	Routes to sole parenthood	36
6.2	Never married sole parents	36
6.3	Separated or divorced sole parents	37
6.4	Widowed sole parents	39
7	SOLE PARENTS AND EMPLOYMENT	41
7.1	Employment of sole parents	41
7.2	Sole parents who were not employed at the time of the 1986 Census	42
7.3	Sole parents who were employed at the time of the 1986 Census	43
7.4	Factors associated with sole parents' employment	45
8	DISCUSSION	49
	REFERENCES.....	51
	APPENDIX 1: TABLES	52

1 INTRODUCTION

The sole parent population has been growing in recent years, due primarily to an increase in marriage breakdown, and secondarily to an increased proportion of children born ex-nuptially being kept by their birthmothers, rather than being adopted. The majority of sole parents receive income support in the form of Domestic Purposes Benefits, Widow's Benefits or (in recent years) Unemployment Benefits, so that the sole parent population is of considerable interest to the Department of Social Welfare. This report uses 1986 Census data to draw a profile of the sole parent population.

Some earlier New Zealand work has examined the sole parent population, but has tended to concentrate on specific issues (such as income or employment) rather than providing a general profile of the sole parent population. This project was designed to expand and update information available from previous New Zealand studies.

Two prior studies have used Census data: one to make comparisons between sole parents in employment and those not employed; and the other to make comparisons between sole parent and two parent families. Mowbray and Khan (1983) used 1976 and 1981 Census data to make comparisons between sole parent families and two parent families with regard to their material standard of living. Dominick, Rochford, and Robb (1988) also used 1981 Census data, along with Department of Social Welfare records, to examine factors which were associated with the employment status of sole parents. That report, which brought together for publication a collection of papers which had originally been produced in 1984, also contained a review of literature concerning sole parents and employment.

In addition to these studies using Census data, the Statistics Unit of the Department of Social Welfare occasionally produces profiles of the Domestic Purposes Beneficiary population based on its own collection of benefit statistics¹. The most current completed profile is for the year ending 31 March 1985. This profile was limited by the variables collected as part of the Department's statistical collection system (for example, ethnic information was not collected until recently), and was

¹These profiles are produced as in-house documents for internal use within the Department of Social Welfare, but copies are available from the Statistics Unit of the Department on request.

restricted to those members of the sole parent population who were receiving benefits. For a more general picture of sole parents, these statistics would need to be put alongside the characteristics of sole parents who do not receive Social Welfare benefits.

Some interview studies of sole parents have also been carried out in New Zealand, which have been directed at in-depth investigation of particular issues. Wylie (1980) interviewed 82 female sole parents, and examined factors affecting the present and planned employment of these women. Shipley (1982) interviewed 12 sole parents who wanted paid work, as part of a wider study of the relationship between employment and women's domestic and family roles. She explored the characteristics and work histories of women in the labour force, and examined the effects of unemployment on the women and their children.

The present study takes the whole of the sole parent population, and has a more general intention, aiming to provide a socio-demographic profile of that population. Using data from previous Censuses, a picture of trends in the sole parent population over the ten years from 1976 to 1986 is built up. Since the sole parent population is not homogeneous, the report also makes some comparisons between various sub-groups of sole parents, so that the characteristics of particular sub-groups can be identified. Marital status, ethnic group, and employment status comparisons have been made in this way.

Before going on to describe the findings of the study, the next section provides an account of the methodology used to extract the data from the Census file, and gives details of the definitions of the variables reported upon in later sections.

2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 The Census Family Files

The tables presented in this report were obtained from the Department of Statistics' Census family files. These files contain samples of Census data that have been reorganized so that the family (rather than the household) is the unit of observation. Thus, the number of one and two parent families and their characteristics can be tabulated.

The 1976 and 1981 family files were produced from 10% samples and weighted up to give estimates of total population figures. As a result, the totals for 1976 given in tables in the Appendix and reported in the following section on trends in the sole parent population do not always exactly match those published by the Department of Statistics. The 1986 family file comprises a 10% sample of European-only families which was weighted up to produce total population estimates, plus a full count of families of persons from other ethnic groups. The tables have been randomly rounded to the nearest multiple of 3 in order to protect the confidentiality of the non-Europeans in each cell. In consequence, the 1986 totals do not always exactly match those previously published by the Department of Statistics.

2.2 Missing Data

There is also some apparent inconsistency between the totals for 1986 in different 1986 tables presented in the Appendix to the report. This is due to missing data or the random rounding procedure. One cause of missing data deserves special mention. In order to accommodate several of the required variables (Household Type, Location of Dwelling, Highest Educational Qualification and Employment Status) the family file was further reorganised by the Department of Statistics, and in this process approximately 500 cases were excluded. The Department of Statistics was not able to readily identify the cause of this exclusion. It was decided that a more detailed investigation of the cause would not be a worthwhile use of resources. Other variables are not affected. The missing cases all fall into the "Other" ethnic group category and have "Nil" employment hours. The missing cases represent more than a quarter of the "Other" ethnic group, and this category is consequently prone to serious error. Therefore, tables which present an analysis of ethnicity for the four affected variables should be interpreted with caution.

For ease of interpretation, only percentage values have been included in the tables. Numbers are given for column totals so that the approximate numbers in each cell can be calculated if required. The percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole value, and as a result they do not always sum exactly to 100%.

2.3 Sampling Error

Due to the sampling procedure used in creating the family files, the number in any cell of the tables presented in this report may be in error. In general terms, the smaller the cell size is, the greater the expected error would be. Hence, small percentage differences between cells containing a small number of cases may not be statistically significant and should be treated with caution. The tables from the 1976 and 1981 Census files are most affected by sampling error. The 1986 tables include a full count of non-European families (which amounts to 33% of all one parent families and 26% of all two parent families). This eliminates the chance of error among the non-European groups, and reduces it for the overall study sample.

2.4 Family Definitions

The following definitions were adopted for the purposes of the present study. It was decided that the definition of "family" would be based on the presence of dependent children. This is at variance with the standard Census definition of family, but it was considered that these families were of most interest to the Department of Social Welfare.

Sole parent. A parent without a spouse, and with one or more dependent children.

Sole parent family. A sole parent and dependent children, with or without adult children. A sole parent living with adult children only was not defined as a family for the purposes of the present study. If adult children were present in addition to dependent children, however, they were counted as members of the family.

Two parent family. To qualify as a family for the purposes of this study, a couple must have had one or more dependent children. In this event, adult children (if present) were also counted in the family. However, a couple living with adult children only was not defined as a family for the purposes of this study.

Dependent children. Persons present in the dwelling at the date of the Census and aged less than 16 years, or aged

16-18 years and still at school. Also included were those temporarily absent from the dwelling and aged less than 16 years.

Adult children. Persons present in the dwelling at the date of the Census aged 19 years and over, or aged 16-18 years and not at school. Also included were those temporarily absent from the dwelling and over 15 years of age.

2.5 Variables

In extracting the tables for this study from the Census family files, 16 variables were defined. These variables fell into four broad groupings, as follows:

Family Type

1. Number of parents
2. Number of dependent children
3. Age of youngest child

Demographic

4. Sex
5. Age
6. Education
7. Ethnicity of parent/s
8. Marital status

Living Arrangements

9. Household type
10. Tenure of dwelling
11. Location of dwelling

Employment and Income

12. Hours employed
13. Employment status
14. Occupation
15. Income of parent/s
16. Social welfare benefits received

2.6 Education

The education variable defined for this study has three categories. The first category contains all those who had completed a tertiary qualification. The second category contains those who had not gained a tertiary qualification, but had gained a secondary school qualification. A secondary qualification refers to completed courses only and may include one or two passes in School Certificate, a full pass in School Certificate, 6th Form Certificate, Matriculation,

University Entrance, Higher School Certificate, Higher Leaving Certificate, University Bursary or Scholarship. A tertiary qualification means a qualification gained since leaving school, including all completed certificates, degrees or diplomas obtained, regardless of the nature of the qualification, i.e., educational, vocational or personal interest.

Those who have gained no secondary school or tertiary qualification form the third category in the tables. It should be noted that persons who did not specify whether they had a secondary, tertiary or no qualification are also included in this category. The inference was made that the absence of a qualification would have been the major reason for not responding to this Census question, and the close similarity of the "no qualification" and "not specified" groups on other characteristics supported this view.

2.7 Ethnicity of Parent/s

Four categories of ethnicity were defined for sole parents: European, Maori origin, Pacific Island Polynesian origin, and other origin. In cases of mixed ethnic origin, the following rules were used: any person of Maori descent was classified as a Maori. Any person who was not classified as Maori and who was of Pacific Island Polynesian descent was classified as Pacific Island Polynesian. Those who were of mixed descent excluding Maori and Pacific Island Polynesian were classified as being of "other" ethnic origin. No one of mixed descent (in terms of these categories) was classified as European.

The same basic classification was used for the ethnicity of parents in two parent families where both parents were of the same ethnicity. Where the parents were from different ethnic groups they were classified as "Maori and non-Maori" if one parent was Maori; as Pacific Island Polynesian if neither parent was Maori and one was Pacific Island Polynesian; and as "other" ethnic origin if neither parent was Maori or Pacific Island Polynesian. They were categorised as European only if both parents were of European ethnicity.

2.8 Marital Status

This variable has three categories: "never married", "separated/divorced" and "widowed". The Department of Social Welfare has another category in its DPB statistics, that of "living apart from de facto spouse". However, the Census classification of marital status uses the legal definition of marriage which excludes de facto relationships. Therefore, sole parents who became sole parents through the

break up of de facto relationships, will be classified by their legal marital status. Judging by Census information on those in de facto relationships, in the majority of cases this is likely to be "never married".

2.9 Household Type

Five household types have been generated in the tables:

- i One family with dependent child/ren only
- ii One family with dependent and adult children
- iii One family with dependent children (with or without adult children), plus individual relatives
- iv One family with dependent children (with or without adult children), plus unrelated individuals
- v Two or more families

If a family lives in a household which does not include any other persons or families, then it will fall into one of the first two categories, as appropriate. If the household includes other person/s but not another family, then it will appear in either of categories iii or iv, as appropriate. If the household includes both relatives and non-relatives of the family, then it will appear in category iii. In any case where a household includes more than one family, regardless of whether the families are related and regardless of any other relatives and/or non-relatives who might also be living in the household, that household will appear in category v.

The definition of a family is somewhat broader with respect to the second family in a two family household than it is in the case of single family households. Married couples without dependent children and sole parents living with adult children only also qualify as second families for the purpose of defining two family households.

2.10 Tenure of Dwelling

This variable describes the nature of the tenure on the dwelling in which the family resides. The five categories of tenure are: owned with mortgage; owned without mortgage; rented privately; rented from a public authority; and rent free. Where a dwelling was owner-occupied, it does not necessarily follow that it was the sole parent who held the mortgage or freehold title.

2.11 Location of Dwelling

The location of dwellings was classified into rural and urban areas, with the urban areas being further classified

into main, secondary and minor urban areas. These locations are defined as follows:

Main urban areas. These are population centres of 30,000 or more encompassing a major city or borough and the suburban areas belonging to the centre.

Secondary urban areas. These are defined in a similar way to main urban areas except that the population ranges between 10,000 and 29,999.

Minor urban areas. All other towns with a population of 1,000 or more which are not included in a main or secondary urban area fall into this category.

Rural areas. These comprise areas not classified as urban, including towns of less than 1,000 population, county territory not classified as urban, and extra-county islands.

2.12 Hours Employed

In the 1986 Census, hours employed were defined as the total usual hours worked in all jobs for wages, salary and other financial reward, including part-time and overtime hours. Hours worked in unpaid jobs were excluded except where a person was an unpaid worker in a family business. The definitions of part-time and full-time work pertaining in the tables are as follows:

Full-time work. 30 hours or more per week.

Part-time work. 1 to 29 hours per week.

2.13 Occupation of Parent

The classification of occupations derives from the New Zealand Standard Classification of Occupations at the one digit (major group) level. The full titles of the occupational categories which appear in the tables are:

- Professional, technical and related workers
- Administrative and managerial workers
- Clerical and related workers
- Sales workers
- Service workers
- Agricultural, animal husbandry and forestry workers, fishermen and hunters
- Production and related workers, transport equipment operators and labourers

2.14 Employment Status

The three categories for this variable are: employed; unemployed but seeking employment; and not in the labour force and not seeking employment. Persons "employed" are defined as those who stated an occupation on the Census questionnaire. The numbers of employed people have been calculated by aggregating the appropriate data from the occupation variable table. The definitions of "seeking employment" and "not in the labour force" are the same as used in the Census. The labour force consists of persons who regularly work for one or more hours per week for financial gain, or who are unemployed and seeking either full or part-time work, according to the definition used in the Census.

2.15 Income

The income question in the 1986 Census measured income before tax from all sources including wages, salary, Social Welfare payments, Family Care, Family Benefit, interest, dividends, rent, commission, fringe benefits, income in kind, business and farming income, Accident Compensation weekly payments, Bursary, Scholarship, superannuation.

The income of each person was recorded in categories representing income ranges rather than in specific dollar amounts. To calculate the combined income of parenting couples, therefore, each range has been transformed into a median income imputed from Household Expenditure and Income Survey data and the amounts thus arrived at for each partner aggregated to produce an estimate of their total income. This imputed dollar amount is then reallocated to the appropriate income range.

Cases in which income was not specified have been allocated to the below \$10,000 income category because it was assumed that most of these cases would have been low-income families. In most other respects this group shared the characteristics of low-income families. Not all of these cases would have been low-income families, however, so this allocation will have involved some error. Approximately 9% of sole parents, and 2% of couples did not specify an income.

Another 14% of couples specified only one income. In these cases the missing income was assumed to be nil, and the joint income was thus equated to the income that was specified. This also will have involved some error, but the effects of this will be reduced by the broad income ranges, and the fact that a substantial proportion (Census tables indicate about 65%) of partners who did not specify an income were not working and so would be likely to have nil or low incomes.

The grouped income data from the Census have been further grouped into four broad income ranges so as to distinguish roughly between income levels approximating to Domestic Purposes Benefit, average earnings of women, overall average earnings, and average earnings of men. The categories were as follows:

- Below \$10,000... Sole Parent Benefits.
(\$9349 one child and \$9869 two children in 12 months to 31 March 1986)
- \$10,000 - \$15,000... Total Average Earnings for Women.
(\$14,574 averaged over 4 Quarterly Employment Surveys to Feb 1986)
- \$15,000 - \$20,000... Total Average Earnings for All Persons.
(\$18,101 averaged over 4 Quarterly Employment Surveys to Feb 1986)
- Above \$20,000... Total Average Earnings for Men.
(\$20,510 averaged over 4 Quarterly Employment Surveys to Feb 1986)

2.16 Social Welfare Benefits Received

This variable describes the type(s) of Social Welfare benefits received by the sole parent (if any) during the 12 months prior to the Census. In the tables the following abbreviations have been used:

- WB = Widows Benefit
DPB = Domestic Purposes Benefit
UB = Unemployment Benefit
FB = Family Benefit
FC = Family Care

(Family Care was introduced in November 1984 and replaced by Family Support from 1 October 1986. Thus Family Care was operating at the time of the 1986 Census. It was payable to wage and salary earners who had dependent children and who worked for at least 30 hours per week. The maximum grant of \$10 per week for each dependent child was subject to abatement above certain levels of weekly family income.)

A comparison of Social Welfare and Census data by age groups provides strong evidence that some parents who were receiving DPB or WB at the time of the Census were not classified as sole parents in the Census family file. According to the 1986 Census, there were 27,831 sole parents aged 16-29 living in permanent or temporary private

dwellings. This figure is derived from the Census Series C Report 13 (entitled "Families"), so it comes from the 100% file and there is no sampling error. More than 3,000 of these sole parents reported that they were employed full-time.

According to Department of Social Welfare statistics, a total of 29,935 sole parents aged 16-29 were receiving DPB or WB as at 31 March 1986. Therefore, a minimum of 2,104 sole parent beneficiaries aged under 30 years were not identified by the Census as sole parents among people living in private dwellings. This number is probably over 5,000, given that full-time employment is rarely compatible with receipt of DPB or WB. While some sole parents may have been living in non-private dwellings at the time of the Census, it is unlikely that more than a few hundred were in this situation. Only 2% of the total population were in a hotel, motel, boarding house or motor camp on Census night, and most other types of non-private dwellings contained occupants less likely to be sole parents (such as the elderly, prisoners or student hostel residents).

It seems likely that the Census under-estimated the sole parent population by several thousand. One contributing factor would have been the fact that sole parent families could not always be identified if they were living with others and if relationships within the household were unclear. For example, a household consisting of a couple, their two adult children and a grandchild would not have been coded as including a sole parent unless one of the adult children was identifiable as the parent of the grandchild.

Another factor which possibly contributed to this discrepancy is the fact that the definition of sole parent in the Census did not match the definition which operated in practice in the benefit system. The Census definition was based on usual family composition, including persons temporarily absent for less than three months. In cases where a relationship had recently broken down, a person may have been receiving DPB, but have classified their former partner as temporarily absent because of hopes of an eventual reconciliation. When applications for DPB are assessed, information on the nature of relationships, living arrangements and degrees of parental responsibility is considered. This information is more detailed than that in the Census, so an exact match between the populations would not be expected.

It is also possible that some people were receiving DPB incorrectly when they were not actually sole parents. In May 1987, just over a year after the Census, a benefit amnesty was in force for a month. About 2,000 DPBs were surrendered during this period, although it is not known how many of

these people had not actually been sole parents while receiving the benefit (some, for example, will have been sole parents in employment who were earning more than the allowable income). However, the overall number of benefits surrendered does suggest that the number of people receiving DPB while not a sole parent may have made a significant contribution to this discrepancy.

Whatever the source of this discrepancy between Census and Social Welfare data, it makes for difficulties in estimating the proportion of the sole parent population who were reliant on benefits, as will be seen in the next section.

3 TRENDS IN THE NUMBERS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF SOLE PARENT FAMILIES FROM 1976 TO 1986

3.1 A Note on the Figures

This section examines trends in the number and characteristics of sole parent families with dependent children, by comparing data from the 1976, 1981, and 1986 Censuses. The results reported in this section draw on Tables 1 to 12 in the Appendix.

The figures in these tables are subject to some uncertainty due to the likelihood that some sole parents aged under 30 were omitted from the Census family file (as noted in the preceding section of the report on Methodology). Between 2,000 and 5,000 more people were receiving sole parent benefits at the time of the 1986 Census than were included in the Census family file. It is likely that some of these people were not actually sole parents and were receiving the benefit fraudulently, but there is also reason to believe that some were genuine sole parents who were missed in the creation of the Census family file.

This means that estimates of the number and proportion of sole parent families in the total population, the proportion of the sole parent population who are receiving benefits, and the size of the non-beneficiary sole parent population, and, consequently, any forward projections of these numbers and proportions are only approximate.

The analysis of the characteristics of sole parent families may also have been affected if those families which were omitted from the Census family file had a markedly dissimilar character to the bulk of sole parent families which were included in the file. If such a dissimilarity existed, this would also have affected the trends reported here, especially if the dissimilarity varied in nature between Census enumerations.

It has not been possible to make any corrections for these problems so that the numbers and trends presented in the tables should be regarded as indicative approximations only.

3.2 Incidence of Sole Parenthood

Over the three Censuses 1976, 1981, and 1986, the number of sole parent families increased absolutely and as a proportion of the number of Family Benefits in force.

Between 1976 and 1981 the number of sole parents rose from 46,000 to 61,000; an increase of approximately 15,000 or 32%. Between 1981 and 1986 the number increased at a

slightly higher rate, by approximately 21,000 (34%), to 82,000. Over the whole 1976-86 period, the number of sole parents grew by an average of 6% per year. Forward projections from these figures indicate that by March 1991 the number of sole parents would have reached approximately 116,000.

As a proportion of Family Benefits in force, sole parent families also increased from 10% in 1976 to 13% in 1981, 18% in 1986, and 26% in 1991 (estimated).

3.3 Proportion of Sole Parents on Benefit

The Census tables underestimate the number of sole parents receiving Domestic Purposes Benefit and Widows Benefit. According to the 1976 Census, there were 11,460 sole parents who had received Domestic Purposes Benefit, and 5,530 who had received Widows Benefit, in the year prior to the Census. Yet, the statistical records of the Department of Social Welfare show that sole parents were receiving 21,299 of the Domestic Purposes Benefits and 6,389 of the Widows Benefits in force at 31 March 1976. An exact match in the figures is not to be expected because the Social Welfare statistics record the number of benefits in force as at 31 March, while the Census estimate is based on the number of persons having received these benefits in the 12 month period prior to the date of the Census. But this difference in definition should result in a Census figure which is higher than the Social Welfare figure. Therefore, a Social Welfare figure which is over 10,000, or nearly 40%, higher than the Census figure requires some explanation.

Much of the discrepancy may have resulted from the different ways of measuring numbers in receipt of Domestic Purposes Benefit in the two sources of the figures: whereas Social Welfare records include all people receiving DPB as well as those on related emergency benefits, the 1976 Census questionnaire classified emergency benefits in a distinct "Other" category. Sole parents received 10,069 of the DPB-related emergency benefits in force at 31 March 1976.

The 1986 Census figures also underestimated the number of sole parents receiving DPB by 15,551. This time, the shortfall cannot be explained by the number of related emergency benefits in force. In the first place, sole parent DPB-related emergency benefits were no longer classified in a separate "Other" category in the Census enumeration, and in any case, there were only 6,188 of them in force. (Comparable figures are not available for 1981.)

Part of this discrepancy could be due to the way in which the benefits received by sole parents were categorised in the 1986 Census family file. One of the categories grouped

together all those sole parents who had received "Over 2 Benefits", without specifying which particular benefits each had received. It is likely that the majority of the nearly 5,000 sole parents in this group would have received DPB because that is the most common benefit among sole parents. Yet, it is not possible to identify and count these cases in with the rest of the sole parents who received DPB, and so it follows that the family file count could be out by a substantial number.

Another part of the discrepancy could be explained by the probable 2,100 or more (and possibly over 5,000) sole parent families not represented in the Census family file (see the preceding section on Methodology).

A degree of under-reporting on the Census questionnaire is another possible contributing factor which cannot be ruled out.

While the Social Welfare figures may have been affected by errors in statistical collection or by fraud, it is unlikely that these errors were of the same magnitude as the various factors, such as omissions from the family file, conflation of two or more benefits into a single category, and under-reporting, which affected the Census figures. Overall, it is considered that departmental records provide better estimates of the number of sole parent beneficiaries than do the Census tables. It should be noted, however, that this report covers only those sole parents who were receiving Domestic Purposes Benefits (including related emergency benefits) or Widows Benefits, and excludes sole parent beneficiaries who were receiving income support through other benefits such as Unemployment Benefit.

Social Welfare records indicate that the number of sole parents receiving DPB or WB more than doubled between 1976 and 1986, from 27,688 to 63,380. The average annual increase was 9%. As a proportion of all sole parents the beneficiary population also expanded. In 1976 the proportion was already quite large: well over half (60%) of sole parents were collecting either Domestic Purposes or Widows Benefits. By 1986 more than three quarters of sole parents (77%) were receiving these benefits.

An estimate of the number of non-beneficiary sole parents can be calculated by subtracting the number of beneficiaries from the total number of sole parents. Table 3 shows that the non-beneficiary sole parent population changed very little (only a fraction of a percent) between the Census years. However, it should be noted that sole parents in receipt of ACC payments or benefits other than DPB or Widows Benefits are included in the non-beneficiary population by this definition.

The apparent stability in the non-beneficiary population allows the series to be projected forward. This has been done (see Table 3) for 1987, 1989 and 1991 in line with the compound average growth rate for the previous five year period. Since the number of sole parent beneficiaries is already known for these years from the annual reports of the Department of Social Welfare, estimates of the total number of sole parents can be derived by summing the two quantities. The sole parent population in March 1991 is estimated by this method to have been approximately 115,700. Because not all of those who received the DPB in 1986 as sole parents were included in the Census sole parent population (as previously noted), this may be an under-estimate.

While the estimated number of non-beneficiary sole parents remained stable at around eighteen and a half thousand, the number and proportion of sole parents receiving Widows Benefit declined from 6,389 (14%) in 1976, to 5,264 (9%) in 1981, 3,897 (5%) in 1986, and 3,511 (3%) in 1991 (estimated). Therefore, the increase in the number of DPB beneficiaries appeared to account for the whole increase in total sole parent numbers. However, given the partial mis-match between the beneficiary and Census populations, it should be concluded only that the increase in DPB numbers accounted for the great majority of the increase in sole parent numbers. The proportion of sole parents receiving DPB increased from 46% in 1976 to 61% in 1981, 73% in 1986, and 81% in 1991 (estimated). The increase was more rapid in the 1976-81 period, and slower between 1981 and 1986. If the number of Domestic Purposes and Widows Benefits are combined they account for 84% of the sole parent population in 1991 (estimated).

3.4 Marital Status

Most sole parents were separated/divorced. In 1986, about 50,000 or 62% of sole parents fell into this category. Less than half this number (26%) had never been married, and the smallest number of sole parents fell into the "widowed" category (11%).

The numbers of sole parents reporting widowed status declined from around 11,000 in 1976 to 10,000 in 1981, and 9,000 in 1986. Over the same period, the total number of sole parents increased by 77% from 46,000 odd to nearly 82,000. Hence, as a proportion of all sole parents, the widowed group more than halved, falling from one in four to about one in ten.

The increase in the number of never married sole parents also seems remarkable. In both intercensal periods the number more than doubled, increasing fivefold over the

decade between 1976 and 1986 from around 4,500 to over 21,000. In 1976 one out of every ten sole parents had never been legally married. In 1986 the figure was one out of four.

The Census classification of marital status is based on the legal definition of marriage. Sole parents originating from broken de facto relationships are thus often classified as "never married". Using Department of Social Welfare benefit statistics, it is possible to break down further the never married group into those who were previously living in a de facto relationship ("living apart from de facto") and those who were not previously living in a de facto relationship ("unmarried"). The statistics show that, of those sole parents who received DPB, the proportion who were "living apart from de facto" was rising (from 7% in 1977 to 22% in 1986) while the proportion who were "unmarried" was more stable (21% in 1977, 20% in 1986). It is likely, therefore, that the increasing proportion of never married sole parents reported in the Census tables resulted from the expansion of the "living apart from de facto" subgroup. Little is known about the demographic characteristics of this subgroup from the benefit statistics. One characteristic on which information is available is age. At 31 March 1985, the average age of the subgroup "living apart from de facto" (27 years) was similar to the "unmarried" subgroup (25 years). This is consistent with the Census tables, where the under-30s predominate among never married sole parents (see Table 43). Yet, in another obvious respect, namely the formation of sole parent families through the breakup of relationships, those "living apart from de facto" more closely resemble separated/divorced sole parents (who are concentrated on the other side of 30 years of age). The growth of this subgroup may reflect an underlying trend for increasing numbers of young people to live in de facto relationships.

3.5 Number of Dependent Children

Table 5 shows that there was a clear swing toward smaller one parent families. The biggest families ("five or more" children) declined most as a proportion of all sole parent families. Four child families declined by a lesser degree, and three child families by a lesser degree again. The proportion of two child families was fairly stable, and the number and proportion of one child families increased markedly. In 1986, for the first time, the majority of one parent families (52%) included only one dependent child. Thirty two percent of one parent families had two dependent children, while only 16% had more than two dependent children (down from 24% in 1976).

3.6 Age of Youngest Child

The age distribution of youngest children did not change markedly over the two inter-censal periods, and the small changes which did occur tended to be self-correcting (those age groups which expanded in one inter-censal period usually contracted in the next). At each Census approximately the same proportion (1/3) of sole parents cared for a preschool aged child.

3.7 Housing Tenure

In 1976, 54% of sole parents lived in owner-occupied homes, while 44% were renting, and 2% lived rent free. In subsequent Censuses these proportions remained virtually unchanged.

Within the former category, however, there was an increase in the proportion living in homes owned with mortgages (from 37% to 41%) and a corresponding decrease in the proportion living in homes owned outright (from 17% down to 12 %) between 1976 and 1981. This might be explained by the decrease (noted earlier) in the proportion of widowed sole parents, who were more likely to own mortgage free homes. Yet, there was virtually no change in the proportions of mortgaged and mortgage-free homes at the 1986 Census, even though the proportion of widowed sole parents continued to decline. It is possible that outright home ownership increased among sole parents of other marital status between 1981 and 1986.

Among the whole population of sole parents, homes owned with a mortgage was the most common housing situation (encompassing 41% of sole parents) in both 1981 and 1986. Some 12 to 13 percent lived in homes which were mortgage-free in 1981 and 1986.

In 1981, a greater proportion of sole parents lived in public rental accommodation (25%) than in private rental accommodation (21%). In 1986, the same proportion were in private rental accommodation, and there was a small decrease in the proportion in public rental accommodation - from 25 to 23 percent.

3.8 Household Type

By far the greatest number of sole parents live in households with their dependent children only and with no other families, relatives, or unrelated persons present. This was true of a little over half of sole parent families in each Census year. This was the only household type to grow as a proportion of one parent family households from

1976 to 1981, in which time it increased from 55 to 61 percent. All other household types shrank relatively, with "family and non-relative" households, and "two family" households most affected.

Between 1981 and 1986 the trends seem to have reversed, with "one parent and dependent children" households settling back to 56% of the total, and most other household types experiencing a relative increase. The household types that gained most were "family and relatives" and "two families".

In both 1976 and 1981, the "one family, dependent and adult children" household was clearly the second most common type. In 1986, however, "two family" households had gained parity with this household type.

3.9 Location of Dwelling

There were only small changes in the geographic distribution of sole parent families over the period. There was a consistent, although small, decline in the proportion of one parent families living in Auckland. This was reflected by an increase in the proportion living in other urban areas, which was also small but consistent. The proportion living in rural areas was fairly constant, with a slight dip between 1976 and 1981 being partially compensated by a subsequent rise between 1981 and 1986.

3.10 Ethnicity

Between 1976 and 1981, there was little change in the ethnic distribution (as defined on page 6) of sole parents. As a proportion of all sole parents, the biggest ethnic group, Europeans, fell slightly from 76 to 73 percent. The proportion of sole parents of Maori descent rose slightly from 19 to 20 percent. Although the number of Pacific Island sole parents more than doubled, from 1,290 to 2,900, these numbers were relatively small, representing only 3 to 5 percent of the total. Taken together, other ethnic groups accounted for only 2% of sole parents in both of these Census years.

At the 1986 Census the proportion of Pacific Island and other ethnic groups among the sole parent population had not changed. There was, however, a substantial fall in the proportion of European sole parents, matched by an equivalent rise in the proportion of Maori sole parents. Europeans, who had made up approximately three-quarters of sole parents in 1976 and 1981, had now dropped to two-thirds (67%) of the population. The proportion of sole parents of Maori descent had increased markedly from 20 to 26 percent.

This increase in the proportion of sole parents who were Maori is also apparent when population-adjusted rates of sole parenting are calculated for the Maori and non-Maori populations aged 15 and over, and was not simply due to an increase in the proportion of Maoris of parenting age in the general population. (In 1976 8.5% of the population 15 years and over was Maori; in 1986 the figure was 10%.) Table 11 shows that between 1976 and 1986 the population-adjusted rate of sole parenting among both Maoris and non-Maoris increased. Yet, among Maoris it had increased by 80%, while among non-Maoris it had increased by 50%. The Maori rate of 47 sole parents for every thousand persons aged 15 and over was already relatively high in 1976 - 2.5 times that in the non-Maori population. In 1986 it was considerably higher again - 85 per thousand adult population - and it had increased to 3.1 times the non-Maori rate.

3.11 Sex

Over the three Censuses under examination, the proportion of male sole parents decreased slightly, from 16% in 1976, to 14% in 1981 and 13% in 1986.

3.12 Hours Employed

A majority of sole fathers were in full-time employment. The trend, however, was toward a relative decline in full-time employment of sole fathers and an increase in the proportion who were not employed. In 1976, 81% of sole fathers were employed for 30 hours or more per week, compared with 74% in 1981 and 61% in 1986. The proportion who were not employed increased from 17% to 24% between 1976 and 1981, and to 35% in 1986. The number of sole fathers employed part-time (1-29 hours per week) is noteworthy for its smallness - it remained at 2 to 4 percent in each Census from 1976 to 1986.

The majority of sole mothers were not in employment, and the trend was toward an increase in the proportion who were not employed. In 1976, 60% were not employed, in 1981, 65%, and in 1986, 68%. Unlike sole fathers a significant proportion of female sole parents were in part-time employment, although the proportion had declined from 15% in 1976 to 11% in 1986. A much smaller proportion of women than men were employed for 30 hours or more per week: 25% in 1976, and 22% at the two subsequent Censuses.

The decline in rates of employment for both sole mothers and sole fathers needs to be considered in the context of a more general trend of rising unemployment and a decline in the availability of jobs. The 1976-86 period saw a significant increase in the overall rate of unemployment in New Zealand.

Although declining as a proportion of all sole parents, the number of sole parents employed full-time grew from 15,440 in 1976 to 17,630 in 1981, and then to 21,981 in 1986. This provides evidence that the non-beneficiary sole parent population was not as static as it had appeared in earlier analyses (see pages 14-16). However, trends in the non-beneficiary population were not necessarily identical to trends in the full-time employed population, because not all non-beneficiary sole parents were employed full-time.

The number of non-beneficiary sole parents who were not employed full-time may have declined in tandem with the decline in the widowed sole parent population. There is evidence, presented later on page 40, that widowed sole parents were more likely to be neither employed full-time nor receiving a benefit, with some receiving ACC payments instead. Their relative decline may have offset, to some extent, the increase in the number of sole parents who were employed full-time.

Since 1986 there has been a big increase in the number of sole parents receiving benefits other than DPB or Widows Benefits. As at 31 March 1991, there were 5,872 sole parents receiving Unemployment, Invalids, Sickness or Training Benefits, with 4,535 of these receiving Unemployment Benefits. This number of sole parents receiving Unemployment Benefits compares with 628 in March 1983 and 1,825 in March 1988. Unemployment Benefit is now more important than Widows Benefit as a source of income for sole parents. With the increase in numbers receiving Unemployment Benefits, it is possible that the number of sole parents in full-time paid employment has declined from the 21,981 recorded in 1986, reversing the ten year trend of increasing numbers (noted above).

4 COMPARISONS BETWEEN ONE PARENT AND TWO PARENT FAMILIES

4.1 One and Two Parent Families

More than one in every six families was a sole parent family in 1986. One parent families made up 18% of all families with dependent children, the other 82% being two parent families. All families were classified as either one or two parent families, although either family may have been part of an extended family household (where other adults may also have had parenting roles). This section compares the characteristics of one and two parent families, drawing on Tables 13 to 27 in the Appendix. These tables all relate to the 1986 Census, so that all of the following findings (except where otherwise indicated) are for the year 1986.

4.2 Ethnicity of Families

According to the 1986 Census, 82% of the general population were of solely European ethnic origin. Families in which the parents were of solely European origin were less predominant in the family population, with Europeans making up 67% of sole parents and 74% of two parent families (where both parents were of solely European origin). A sole parent was more likely to be a Maori than a parent in a two parent family (26% and 11% respectively). However, comparisons of ethnicity between one and two parent families are complicated by the high incidence of intermarriage between ethnic groups. For example, families with two Maori parents were outnumbered by families with one Maori and one non-Maori parent.

It is of some interest to know what proportion of Maori families are one parent families, but in order to do this it is first necessary to define what we mean by a "Maori family". The definition adopted here for the purposes of this study is as follows: a family was considered to be a Maori family if either parent was of Maori origin.

For two parent families this is straightforward enough, but for one parent families it raises a difficulty where the absent or deceased parent was Maori, while the remaining parent was non-Maori. Such families should probably still be considered to be Maori families, since the children will be (almost always) of Maori origin.

This means that it is necessary to make an estimate of the number of one parent families headed by a non-Maori, but where the absent or deceased partner was Maori. We can base this estimate on the fact that, in 1986, 38% of Maori parents in two parent families had a non-Maori partner. If

we assume that the percentage of Maori parents with non-Maori partners is relatively constant no matter whether the parents remain together as a couple, have separated, or had only a short-term relationship; and if we further assume that, whenever such relationships end up producing a one parent family, the remaining parent is equally likely to be the Maori or the non-Maori parent; we can infer that in 38% of one parent families headed by a Maori there was a non-Maori non-custodial parent. In 1986 there were an estimated 7,912 such families. Given our assumptions, we can infer that in an equal number of one parent families headed by a non-Maori there was a Maori non-custodial parent.

This yields the estimate that there were, in 1986, 7,912 one parent families in which the sole parent was non-Maori, the non-custodial parent was of Maori origin and therefore the children were of Maori origin. Adding this number to the 20,913 Maori sole parents gives a total of 28,825 sole parent families with children of Maori descent. This represents 35% of all one parent families and 34% of all families with children of Maori descent. That is, approximately one in every three Maori families was a sole parent family in 1986.

Table 13b in the Appendix shows a breakdown of one and two parent families by the ethnicity of the children, based on the assumption that children had the same ethnic origin as their parents. This table can be compared with Table 13a, which shows the same families by the ethnicity of the parent or parents (as defined on page 6). For two parent families, the results are the same in both tables (because of the previous assumption). For one parent families, the differences arise through the estimation (as described above) of the ethnicity of the non-custodial parent, which in part defines the ethnicity of the children.

The assumptions used in making the above estimates may be suspect. If we omit from consideration all one parent families where the parent is non-Maori but the children are of Maori origin, the remaining 20,913 one parent families headed by a Maori parent represent one in four of all Maori families.

Since 1986, the overall proportion of one parent families is estimated to have increased from 18% to 26% of all families in 1991. Given the 1976-1986 trend for an increasing proportion of sole parents to be Maori, it is likely that the proportion of Maori families headed by a sole parent is now more than one in three, and may even be approaching one in two. This has implications for future family policies, particularly policies aimed at one parent families. It is important for such policies to be appropriate to Maori people, since so many Maori families will be affected.

The proportion of sole parents who were of Pacific Island Polynesian origin (5%) indicates a slight over-representation of this ethnic group among the sole parent population, but not to the same extent as for Maori. In the 1986 Census, 3% of all persons aged 15-59 years were of Pacific Island Polynesian origin. Of the two parent families, 4% included at least one parent of Pacific Island Polynesian origin. This figure will be a slight under-estimate, in that it excludes families with one Maori and one Pacific Island parent, which have been coded as Maori for the purposes of the above analysis.

Sole parents of "Other" ethnic origin seemed to be under-represented at 2%, compared with 6% of two parent families where at least one parent was of "Other" origin. (Again this latter figure will be a slight under-estimate, in that it excludes families with one parent of "Other" origin and one Maori or Pacific Island parent.) The comparable proportion of all adults who were of "Other" origin was not available, but under-representation amongst sole parents seems highly likely from a comparison of the one parent and two parent figures above. The majority of those in this "Other" category were probably of Asian origin (particularly Indian or Chinese). A lower rate of marriage breakdown and a lower rate of ex-nuptial births may therefore be indicated for these ethnic groups.

4.3 Number and Age of Children

Mowbray and Khan (1983) found that one parent families, on average, had older and fewer children than two parent families in 1981. This was also true in 1986. Sole parents were more likely to have only one child than two parent families (52% and 32% respectively). Children of pre-school age (0-4 years) were present in 41% of two parent families, compared with 35% of one parent families.

4.4 Rate of Employment

One of the greatest differences between one and two parent families is the rate of employment of the parents, and consequently the income sources of the family. A majority of two parent families had two sources of labour force income, with 92% of fathers and 56% of mothers engaged in paid employment either full-time or part-time. In contrast, only a minority of sole parents had any labour force income, with 37% engaged in paid employment (either full-time or part-time).

Sex differences in the number of paid hours worked are evident in both types of family. A majority of fathers, but a minority of mothers, were employed full-time in both one and two parent families. These sex differences can be

related to traditional sex roles and the particular difficulties faced by mothers in the labour force, such as lack of affordable childcare and occupational segregation. However, both sole mothers and sole fathers had rates of employment which were substantially lower than partnered mothers and partnered fathers respectively. This has not always been the case (at least for sole mothers), as a comparison with 1976 and 1981 Census figures shows. The following table is based on figures presented in the report "Solo Parents, Benefits and Employment" described in the introduction to this report, with comparable 1986 figures added.

Table A : Trends in Parents' Employment 1976-1986

<u>Census</u>	<u>%Employed 20 Hours Per Week or More</u>			
	<u>Sole Mothers</u> (%)	<u>Partnered Mothers</u> (%)	<u>Sole Fathers</u> (%)	<u>Partnered Fathers</u> (%)
1976	31	29	82	97
1981	26	34	75	95
1986	26	41	63	91

In 1976 sole mothers had a slightly higher rate of paid labour force participation than partnered mothers, but in 1981 this situation was reversed and by 1986 the gap had widened to 15 percentage points. The gap between the employment rates of sole fathers and partnered fathers also widened over the ten year period, from 15 to 28 percentage points. This indicates an increasing tendency for both mothers and fathers to reduce their paid labour force participation upon becoming sole parents, given that most one parent families were originally two parent families.

It is interesting to note from Table 17 that, in 1986, 27% of mothers in two parent families were working part-time (less than 30 hours a week), but only 11% of sole mothers worked part-time. In other words, sole mothers tended to be employed full-time or not at all, rather than part-time. Of those mothers who were not in employment, sole mothers were more likely than mothers in two parent families to be seeking employment (16% compared with 11%). Factors associated with sole parents' employment are examined later in this report.

4.5 Income

Given the differences in rates of employment, it might be expected that sole parent income would be much lower, on average, than the combined income of two parents, and this was indeed the case. When comparing the incomes of one and

two parent families, it should be borne in mind that sole parent families have fewer children on average, as well as one less adult, to be supported by the family income. A more detailed comparison should take this into account through some technical adjustment to the data, for example by applying an equivalence scale to the income data. As this was not done in this study, the comparison is only broadly indicative.

To put the reported annual income figures in context, \$15,000 was close to average female earnings and \$20,000 was close to average male earnings in 1986. Whereas 83% of sole parents reported an income below \$15,000, this was the case for only 18% of two parent families (when both incomes were combined). For 68% of two parent families the parents' income was above \$20,000, compared with just 9% of one parent families. Even without the application of an equivalence scale, it is clear that two parent families were generally in a better financial position than one parent families.

4.6 Education

The tables show that the two parent population, both female and male, had gained higher levels of education than those who were sole parents. Thirty per cent of mothers in two parent families, for instance, had a tertiary qualification and 45% had no qualifications, against only 20% of sole mothers who had a tertiary qualification and 59% who had no qualification at all.

By comparison, almost half of the total of fathers in two parent families (45%) had completed a tertiary qualification and 38% had no qualification, while 34% of sole fathers had a tertiary qualification and 51% had no qualification. Males, in both one parent and two parent families, were more likely to have a tertiary qualification than females.

4.7 Occupation Type

The type of occupation held by parents who were employed was examined. Similar distributions of occupation types were found when sole and partnered mothers were compared, and when sole and partnered fathers were compared. The biggest difference amongst mothers was that sole mothers were less likely to have a job in the area of farming, forestry or fishing (5% compared with 11% of partnered mothers). This undoubtedly relates to the more urban distribution of sole parents (see below). A higher proportion of sole fathers (47%) than partnered fathers (42%) had a production, transport or labouring occupation. Apart from this result and despite the fact that sole parents were less likely to

have secondary or higher educational qualifications, those who were in employment were not markedly more likely to be employed in lower skilled occupations.

4.8 Location

About three-quarters of the sole parent population (74%) was living in the main urban areas, compared with less than two thirds (64%) of two parent families. The Auckland area had a particular concentration of sole parent families, which made up 21% of all families there. By contrast, only 11% of sole parent families (compared with 19% of two parent families) were dwelling in rural areas, making up just 11% of rural families.

4.9 Household Type

When household type was examined, it emerged that 92% of two parent families, as against 68% of sole parent families, were living in parents-and-children-only households. Sole parent families were thus more likely to reside with other people, either relatives or non-relatives, or with other families. This is perhaps related to the fact that many sole parents were living in rented accommodation, that is, 21% lived in privately rented residences and 23% lived in publicly rented ones, compared with 10% and 8% of two parent families. Sharing a rental dwelling is one way in which those on lower incomes can reduce their housing costs. Another factor may be the different ethnic composition of the two family types. Maori and Pacific Islands families are more likely to share their households with other relatives for cultural as well as economic reasons.

4.10 Housing Tenure

On the other hand, 79% of two parent families and 54% of single parents were living in owner-occupied houses, with or without mortgages. It should be borne in mind, however, that 15% of sole parents were living in multi-family households (compared with 3% of two parent families), and in those situations the sole parent was often not the owner of an owner-occupied dwelling.

5 A PROFILE OF SOLE PARENTS BY ETHNICITY

5.1 A Note on Sole Parents of "Other" Origin

The following section sketches out profiles of sole parents of European origin, of Maori origin, and of Pacific Island origin. It draws on Tables 28 to 42 in the Appendix, which, again, all come from the 1986 Census. Sole parents classified as being of "other" ethnic origin were a heterogeneous group, and for a quarter of these sole parents (510 cases) data were missing on household type, location of dwelling, highest educational qualification received, and employment status. For these reasons, sole parents of "other" origin were not profiled. While figures for sole parents of "other" origin are included in the tables in Appendix 1, the particular figures given in Tables 33, 34, 35, and 42 for this group should be regarded with caution because of the large number of cases for which information was missing.

When considering the profiles described below, it should be remembered that the ethnicity of children living in sole parent households may differ from that of the parent. These profiles are based on the recorded ethnicity of the sole parent, so that they cannot be regarded as describing the ethnicity of the family as a whole.

5.2 Sole Parents of European Origin

The sole parent population of exclusively European origin comprised 54,600 individuals, two-thirds (67%) of all sole parents at the 1986 Census.

About three-quarters of these sole parents were aged over thirty at the time of the Census. The age distribution was quite peaked, with nearly half (43%) of all European sole parents being aged between 30 and 39 years of age, and another quarter (24%) in each of the 20-29 and 40-49 year age groups. Only 2% of the sole parents were under twenty years of age.

As might be expected from the age distribution, most (71%) of these sole parents were separated or divorced, while another 10% were widowed. The proportion recorded as never married (19%) was smaller than the figure (42%) for sole parents who were not of exclusively European origin. However, the interpretation of these figures is complicated by the exclusion of de facto relationships from the Census definition of marriage, so that some sole parents recorded as "never married" will have come from broken de facto relationships.

Sole parents of European origin tended to have only one (53%) or two (34%) dependent children. Most of these children were of school age, since only 28% of youngest children were aged less than five years.

While 62% of these sole parents lived in households with dependent children only living with them, another 14% had both adult and dependent children living with them. The quarter who did not live in a one-family-only household were most likely to be sharing their accommodation with unrelated individuals (9%), although almost as many shared with other families (8%) or with other relatives (6%).

The majority (61%) lived in an owner-occupied dwelling, although many (47%) of these properties were mortgaged. Of those who were living in rental accommodation, a slightly greater proportion were in private rather than in public rental accommodation. The proportion who lived in public rental accommodation was slightly higher among those sole parents who had never married, while the proportion who lived in an owner-occupied dwelling was greater among those who had been widowed. Sole parents of European origin were most likely to be living in a main urban area (75%), with 25% living in the Auckland area.

Sole parents of European origin were more likely to have educational qualifications than sole parents of Maori or Pacific Island Polynesian origin. Just over a quarter (27%) had a tertiary qualification, while just under a quarter (22%) had a secondary qualification. The remaining half (51%) were without any educational qualification.

While the proportion having a tertiary qualification may seem high, these sole parents actually had lower levels of educational qualifications than other individuals of similar age (and the same ethnic origin) who were not sole parents. For example, 43% of all individuals of European origin between 25 and 45 years of age had a tertiary qualification, while only 42% had no qualification at all. If the age range is extended to all individuals of European origin aged between 20 and 59 years, then the proportion with a tertiary qualification drops to 39%. This figure can be broken down to 33% for women and 46% for men, but both figures are still above the 27% figure for sole parents of European origin.

About half (48%) of the sole parents of European ethnic origin were not in the labour force and not actively looking for work, while an additional 9% were unemployed and seeking work. The other 43% were in employment. Census records indicate that 60% of the European sole parents had received Domestic Purposes Benefit at some time in the year preceding

the Census². However, as noted earlier (in the Methodology section), Census records may under-estimate numbers in the sole parent beneficiary population.

Sole parents of European ethnic origin who were employed at the time of the Census were most likely to be in a professional/technical (22%) or clerical (26%) occupation. Production/transport (16%), service (15%) and sales (11%) occupations were also fairly common amongst the European sole parents who were employed. Some 28% worked part-time (less than 30 hours), while 72% of those who were employed at the time of the 1986 Census were working full-time.

5.3 Sole Parents of Maori Origin

Sole parents of mixed ethnic origin who reported any Maori origin, together with those of exclusively Maori origin, were classified as being of Maori ethnic origin. The 1986 Census recorded that 20,913 sole parents were of Maori origin using this definition, comprising a quarter (26%) of all sole parents.

The proportion of Maori sole parents who had never married (44%) was the same as the proportion who were separated or divorced, although those recorded as never married may have been separated from a de facto partner. The remaining 13% had been widowed. The proportion who had never married was considerably higher than among the European sole parent population (19%). This was partially due to age differences in the two populations, but Maori sole parents were more likely to have never married regardless of age. For example, in the 25-29 year age group, 55% of Maori sole parents had never married compared with 36% of European sole parents. It should be noted that Maori have different cultural norms and attitudes in relation to de facto and de jure marriages. De facto marriages have long been more prevalent and accepted in Maori communities compared with European.

Sole parents of Maori origin tended to be younger than European sole parents, reflecting the younger age distribution of the whole Maori population compared with the non-Maori one, and the higher fertility rate (and

²52% were recorded as having received Domestic Purposes Benefit and Family Benefit only, while another 7% were recorded as having received at least three Social Welfare benefits in the year preceding the Census. The figure of 60% assumes that all those recorded as having received three or more benefits had received Domestic Purposes Benefit.

particularly ex-nuptial fertility) for young Maori women compared with non-Maori women (Pool and Pole, 1987). Nearly half (43%) of the Maori sole parents were between 20 and 29 years of age, and a further 26% were aged between 30 and 39 years of age at the time of the Census. A small proportion of the Maori sole parents were aged less than 20 (7%), or aged 60 or more (4%).

The overwhelming majority (80%) of sole parents of Maori origin had only one or two dependent children. However, families with four or more children were more likely to be headed by a Maori or Pacific Island sole parent than by a sole parent of any other ethnic origin. Sole parents with four or more dependent children comprised 7% of all sole parents of Maori origin.

Maori and Pacific Island Polynesian sole parents were more likely to have a child below school age than were parents of other ethnic origins. Half of the Maori sole parents had a child aged less than five years.

Just over half of the Maori sole parents lived in households with their children only and with no other persons present. Some 9% of households included both dependent and adult children, while another 43% contained dependent children only. Those Maori sole parents who lived in a household containing other individuals most often lived with another family or families (29%), or with individual relatives (11%). The proportion of Maori sole parents sharing accommodation with other families is much higher than among European sole parents (8%).

The majority (65%) of the sole parents of Maori ethnic origin lived in a major urban area, with 25% located in the Auckland area, and 40% located in some other main urban area. However, a higher proportion of Maori sole parents lived in a town of less than 10,000 (14%), or in a rural area (14%), than among sole parents of any other ethnic origin.

Regardless of marital status, Maori sole parents were less well off than European sole parents with respect to both housing tenure and income. While the proportion of Maori sole parents living in an owner-occupied mortgage-free home (13%) was as high as the proportion of European sole parents doing so, the proportion living in a mortgaged home (28%) was lower than among European sole parents (47%). Over half (57%) of sole parents of Maori descent lived in rental accommodation, more often with a public (36%) than a private (21%) tenancy. At the time of the 1986 Census, 68% of Maori sole parents had received an income of less than \$10,000 in

the last year³, while only 9% had received more than \$15,000. Comparable figures for sole parents of European origin were 45% and 21% respectively.

Nearly two-thirds of the sole parents of Maori origin were not in the labour force and were not seeking work, which was higher than among the European sole parent population (48%). The proportion who were not employed but were actively seeking work (13%) was marginally greater than the proportion seeking work among sole parents of any other ethnic origin.

The proportion of Maori sole parents who had received a full income maintenance benefit (such as Domestic Purposes Benefit, Widows Benefit or, in a smaller number of cases, Unemployment Benefit) from the Department of Social Welfare at some time in the year preceding the Census (75%) was similar to the proportion who were not currently in paid employment (78%) and more than among the European group (64%). A small proportion (6%) had received Family Care payments in the year preceding the Census. This was smaller than among European sole parents (14%) which reflects the lower proportion of Maori sole parents who were in full-time paid employment. It may also reflect a lower take-up rate among employed Maori sole parents eligible for Family Care.

Maori sole parents who were in paid employment at the time of the Census were most likely to be employed in the production/transport (39%) or service (20%) sectors. A further 16% were employed as clerical workers, while 11% were in professional or technical occupations. Over three-quarters (78%) of those who worked did so full-time. Thus Maori sole parents who were employed were more likely to be working full-time than European sole parents, but less likely to be in white-collar jobs and more likely to be in the production/transport sector.

Three-quarters (76%) of the sole parents of Maori ethnic origin had no school qualification, while 9% had a tertiary qualification. These figures would not have been greatly different from those for a comparable group of people who were not sole parents, since 66% of all individuals of Maori descent aged between twenty and forty had no educational qualification. They are, though, at a much lower level than those for European sole parents, of whom nearly half had qualifications.

³As a benchmark for comparative purposes, a Domestic Purposes Benefit would have generated an income of around \$10,000, depending on the number of dependent children a sole parent had.

5.4 Sole Parents of Pacific Island Origin

Sole parents of mixed ethnic origin who reported any Pacific Island origin and no Maori origin, together with those reporting exclusively Pacific Island origin, were classified as being of Pacific Island Polynesian origin. The Pacific Island sole parent population, using this definition, contained a total of 4,386 individuals, making up 5% of the total sole parent population at the time of the 1986 Census.

Sole parents of Pacific Island origin were most likely to be aged between 20 and 29 years (36%), or between 30 and 39 years (32%). Only a small proportion (4%) were aged less than 20 years, while another 4% were aged 60 or more. This means that Pacific Island sole parents were younger, on average, than European sole parents, but not as young as Maori sole parents.

Like sole parents of other ethnic origins, the majority of Pacific Island sole parents had only one or two children, with nearly half (48%) having only one dependent child. However, the proportion having four or more dependent children (9%) was larger than that for sole parents of any other ethnic origin. Half (49%) of the Pacific Island sole parents had at least one child aged less than five years, and another 22% had a youngest child aged between five and eight, which was almost exactly the same distribution as for Maori.

While 35% of Pacific Island sole parents lived only with dependent children, and a further 9% with both adult and dependent children, the majority lived in a household containing individuals other than dependent or adult children. Many Pacific Island sole parents lived with another family or families (35%), or with individual relatives (14%). Both of these proportions were higher than for any other ethnic group.

Pacific Island sole parents were about as likely to have been separated or divorced from a de jure partner (44%) as never married or separated from a de facto partner (42%). The remaining 13% had been widowed. These proportions were almost identical to those for Maori sole parents, although in each age group Pacific Island sole parents were more likely to have never married.

Regardless of marital status, fewer Pacific Island sole parents lived in owner-occupied dwellings than did sole parents of any other ethnic origin. Just over a quarter (28%) lived in an owner-occupied mortgaged dwelling, while another 6% lived in a house which was owned outright by one of the occupants (not necessarily the sole parent). Conversely, the proportion in public rental accommodation

(42%) was larger than that among sole parents of any other origin.

Pacific Island sole parents were highly concentrated in the Auckland urban area and were highly unlikely to be living outside major urban areas. Almost three-quarters (71%) lived in the Auckland urban area, while another 23% lived in other major urban centres. This is in considerable contrast to both Maori and European sole parents: a quarter of both of these groups lived in the Auckland urban area, while 28% of Maori sole parents lived outside centres with 10,000 or more people.

A large proportion (71%) of the sole parents of Pacific Island Polynesian origin had no educational qualification, while 17% had a secondary qualification and 11% a tertiary qualification. Even so, Pacific Island sole parents were slightly better qualified than Maori sole parents, of whom 76% had no qualifications.

Pacific Island sole parents had received about the same level of income as Maori sole parents in the year preceding the Census, and were less well off than sole parents of European ethnic origin. Two-thirds (66%) of the Pacific Island sole parents were in the lowest income category (less than \$10,000).

Over half (59%) of the Pacific Island sole parents were not in the labour force and were not seeking work, while 11% were unemployed and reported actively seeking work in the week preceding the Census. Pacific Island sole parents who were in paid employment at the time of the 1986 Census were most likely to be working full-time (84%) rather than part-time (16%), and were most likely to be employed in the production/ transport sector (49%). Service (23%) and clerical (16%) occupations were also fairly common. This means that more Pacific Island than Maori sole parents were employed and, of those in work, more were working full-time.

Pacific Island sole parents were less likely than parents of either European or Maori ethnic origin to report having received a full income maintenance benefit (that is Domestic Purposes, Widows or Unemployment Benefit) from the Department of Social Welfare. The proportion with neither employment nor a full income maintenance benefit was greater for Pacific Island sole parents than it was for either Maori or European sole parents. Although 70% of the sole parents of Pacific Island origin were not in employment, only 58% reported receiving a full income maintenance benefit at any time in the year preceding the Census, while 32% reported receiving only Family Benefit. This may indicate that Pacific Island sole parents relied more on income support from family or other private sources than did sole parents of Maori or European origins, or that Pacific Island sole

parents under-reported receipt of income maintenance benefits in the Census to a greater degree than did Maori or European sole parents. Those who relied on income support from family or other private sources may have been unaware of their eligibility for a benefit, or unwilling to apply for one. For some who had settled in New Zealand more recently, there may have been a lack of eligibility for benefits on residential grounds.

6 PROFILES OF SOLE PARENTS BY MARITAL STATUS

6.1 Routes to Sole Parenthood

Marital status of sole parents is of interest because it corresponds to the different routes by which people become sole parents. Three marital status groups are examined in this section, which draws on Tables 43 to 56 in the Appendix. Again these tables all relate to the 1986 Census. The three groups are sole parents who were never married, those who had formerly been married but were now separated or divorced, and those who had been widowed (26%, 62% and 11% respectively of the total population of sole parents).

These groups represent the three main routes to sole parenthood:

- (a) the birth of a first child outside marriage;
- (b) the break-up of a marriage relationship;
- (c) the death of a spouse.

As previously noted in the section on methodology, the Census classification is based on legal marital status. Therefore, the never married group probably includes the majority of those who were formerly living in a de facto relationship with the other parent of their children. This means that the match between the above causes of sole parenthood and these marital status groups is far from perfect.

6.2 Never Married Sole Parents

In the 1986 Census, around a quarter of all sole parents (26%) were recorded as having never married. Most of those who were never married were aged from 20 to 29 years (64%) or from 30 to 39 years (20%). Although the unmarried teenage mother is a common stereotype, only 12% of this group were under 20 years old. Teenage sole parents made up only 3% of the total sole parent population. Nearly three-quarters of never married sole parents had only one child and another one-fifth had two children. Two-thirds had a child of pre-school age. Five per cent of never married sole parents were male. A majority (52%) were of non-European origin and 42% were Maori.

Sixty-six per cent of never married sole parents did not have any educational qualification, while twenty-one per cent had a secondary qualification and thirteen per cent had completed a tertiary qualification.

Almost half of the total of never married sole parent households comprised parent and dependent child (or children) only. It is interesting to note, however, that 32% were living in households comprising two or more families and a further 21% resided with other individuals, who were either relatives or non-relatives.

A majority (59%) of never married sole parents lived in rented accommodation, with approximately equal proportions in public (30%) and private (29%) rental dwellings. Although 39% lived in an owner-occupied dwelling, in 9% of cases without a mortgage, the proportion who actually owned a dwelling was probably much lower, given that one in three never married sole parents lived with another family. Where the other family consisted of the parents of the sole parent, it seems particularly unlikely that the sole parent owned the home. Some 29% of never married sole parents lived in Auckland, while only 9% lived in rural areas, the lowest proportion of any marital status group.

Most never married sole mothers (79%) were not in paid employment, although 7% were employed part-time and 14% were employed full-time. About half of never married sole fathers were employed full-time. Of the never married sole parents who were employed, about half were working either in production, transport or labouring occupations or in clerical occupations. Of those who were not employed, one in six were seeking employment at the time of the Census.

Nearly all never married sole parents (93%) had an income below \$15,000, which represents average female earnings in the 1985-86 year. About two-thirds had an income below \$10,000, indicating an income at sole parent benefit level or below. Four out of five reported receiving an income-tested Social Welfare benefit, most often Domestic Purposes Benefit.

6.3 Separated or Divorced Sole Parents

At the 1986 Census, close to two thirds of sole parents (62%) were recorded as separated or divorced. By comparison with the never married group, most sole parents who were separated or divorced were older: specifically, 49% were aged between 30 and 39 years and 26% were aged 40-49 years, while only 20% were under 30 years old. Some 15% were male, which is higher than among the never married group.

Less than half (43%) of separated/divorced sole parents had only one child, while about one-fifth had three or more children, which again is higher than among the never married group. At 76%, the proportion who were of solely European origin was higher than for other marital status groups. However, the proportion who were Maori (17%) still indicates

a slight over-representation compared with parents in two parent families (11% of whom were Maori), suggesting a higher rate of marriage breakdown among couples where one or both partners were Maori. This is confirmed by Census information which shows a higher than average proportion of Maori adults were divorced or separated.

Separated/divorced sole parents were more likely to have a higher educational qualification than those in other marital status groups (26% had completed a tertiary qualification), although 54% had not completed any educational qualification.

Seventy-six per cent of separated/divorced sole parents were living with their children only, while only eight per cent shared their accommodation with another family. These figures are in considerable contrast to those for never married sole parents (of whom under half lived with their children only, and a third lived with other families). Also in contrast to never married sole parents, the majority (58%) of separated/divorced sole parents lived in owner-occupied dwellings. Some 48% lived in dwellings owned with mortgage, while 10% lived in mortgage-free dwellings. Those in rental dwellings were evenly split between public and private renting (with 20% in each). Like never married sole parents, separated/divorced sole parents were concentrated in urban areas (in contrast to two parent families, who were somewhat more geographically dispersed). Three-quarters lived in main urban areas. We can surmise that either these two routes to sole parenthood (ex-nuptial births and marriage breakdown) were more common in urban areas, or else sole parents had a tendency to move to urban areas upon becoming sole parents.

Separated/divorced sole parents had the highest rate of employment of any marital status group. In this group, 26% of mothers and 65% of fathers were in full-time employment. Amongst those employed, about one-quarter were in professional or administrative occupations, a higher proportion than for the other two marital status groups. Amongst those not employed, one in six were seeking employment.

In contrast to the never married group, less than half of the separated/divorced sole parents had an income of less than \$10,000. As might be expected from their higher rate of employment, a higher proportion had incomes above benefit level, with 20% above \$15,000. Nearly two-thirds reported receipt of an income-tested benefit at some time over the past year (63%), which, again as expected, is lower than for the never married group.

6.4 Widowed Sole Parents

In the 1986 Census, 11% of sole parents were recorded as widowed. Widowed sole parents were usually older than other sole parents. Nearly three-quarters were aged over 40 years old, while, on the other hand, only five per cent were under 30 years old. The average age of youngest child was also older. Forty-seven per cent were living with a youngest child aged over 12 years and twenty-five per cent with a youngest child aged between 9 and 12 years. More than four-fifths of the widowed group had only one or two dependent children. This means that widowed sole parents had more children, on average, than never married sole parents, but less than separated or divorced sole parents. The proportion of widowed sole parents who were male, 20%, was higher than for any other marital status group.

Maori sole parents made up 29% of the widowed group, which means that they are over-represented in all three marital status groups. The high proportion of widowed Maori sole parents can be attributed to the lower life expectancy of Maori, and to the tendency for Maori women to have given birth at an older age, leading to parenthood continuing later in life. This latter tendency existed up until about 1980, and is not so apparent today, but was recent enough to affect the 1986 population of widows.

More widowed sole parents possessed a tertiary qualification than those who had a secondary qualification, i.e. 20% against 14%. However, as many as 66% of this group had completed no educational qualification, which is more than among the separated/divorced group and similar to the never married group.

Like separated/divorced sole parents, about three-quarters of the widowed were living only with their children, including those who also had adult children living with them. As might be expected with this older group, adult children were more likely to be present. Thirteen per cent were sharing accommodation with other adults and eleven per cent were living with another family or families. These figures were also similar to those for separated/divorced sole parents.

About three-quarters of widowed sole parents (74%) lived in owner-occupied dwellings (a higher rate than for either of the other two groups), while 17% were living in public rental and 7% in privately rented dwellings. The proportion who were living in mortgage-free homes (42%) was particularly high compared with other sole parents. This was also high compared with two parent families, only 13% of whom lived in mortgage-free homes. Widowed sole parents were also more likely to live in rural areas (16%). Their geographic distribution (in terms of the urban/rural split)

was more like that of two parent families than that of other sole parents.

Some 17% of widows and 54% of widowers were employed full-time. Their rate of employment was therefore intermediate between the lower rate for the never married group and the higher rate for the separated/divorced group. Of those employed, the proportion in agricultural occupations (13%) was higher than for other sole parents (6%). This corresponds to the higher proportion of widowed sole parents living in a rural area. Amongst those not employed, the proportion of the widowed who were seeking employment (8%) was about half that for other marital status groups.

The proportion of widowed sole parents with an income above \$15,000 (20%) was the same as for separated/divorced sole parents, even though widowed sole parents had a lower rate of employment. This suggests that some of the widowed may have sources of income apart from benefits or employment. This is also indicated by the fact that the proportion of widowed sole parents who reported that they had not received an income-tested benefit in the past year was higher (at 45%) than for either of the other two marital status groups. It seems that a number of the widowed were neither employed nor in receipt of a benefit. It is not possible to say precisely how large this group was, but there are indications that it was in the range of 10%-20% of widowed sole parents. Although there was no information available on other income sources, it is likely that some were supported by investments, an occupational pension, or life insurance payouts following the death of their spouse.

Another significant income source for some would have been earnings-related compensation from the Accident Compensation Corporation because of the accidental death of their spouse. Figures are not available for 1986, but in the year ended 31 March 1991 the ACC made payments to 2,257 widows, including payments for 3,643 dependent children. If similar figures applied in 1986 then more than 10% of widowed sole parents may have received an income from ACC.

When income was examined by housing tenure, it was found that those in higher income groups were the ones most likely to have mortgaged homes, while those in lower income groups were the ones most likely to be in rental housing, particularly public rental housing. This was true for all three marital status groups.

7 SOLE PARENTS AND EMPLOYMENT

7.1 Employment of Sole Parents

This section is concerned with the paid employment of sole parents. It draws on Tables 55 to 87 in the Appendix, which are based on 1986 Census data.

In 1986, a third of sole mothers and two thirds of sole fathers were employed. Sole fathers were, in most cases, working full-time (only 6% of those in paid employment worked part-time), while a third of sole mothers who were in paid employment were working part-time. The definitions of full-time and part-time employment used here are as follows: persons working 30 hours or more per week were considered to be working full-time and persons working 1 to 29 hours per week were considered to be working part-time.

In the following discussion, and in the corresponding tables, males and females are generally treated separately. This is because males and females have divergent rates of employment, so that to investigate rates of participation of sole parents in the labour market, it is necessary to examine the employment rates of male and female sole parents separately.

Sole parents who were not employed at the time of the 1986 Census are profiled in the first part of this section, and those who were employed at that time are profiled in the second part of the section. Sole parents who were employed part-time are not profiled separately, but as Tables 54-83 show, they were a smaller group with characteristics generally intermediate between those of the full-time employed and those who were not employed. In the third part of this section, factors associated with the employment of sole parents are examined.

In comparing the characteristics of full-time employed sole parents with those who were not employed, the results are very similar to those which would result from a comparison between non-beneficiary and beneficiary sole parents. This is because of the considerable congruence between these two partitions of sole parents into two groups. The great majority of sole parents who were not employed full-time (including those employed part-time) were beneficiaries, and conversely the great majority of those who were employed full-time were not beneficiaries. For this reason, and because people who were currently receiving a benefit were not identified in the Census, this report does not include profiles of beneficiary and non-beneficiary sole parents. As mentioned in the introduction, a statistical profile of

Domestic Purposes Benefit recipients is available from the Statistics Unit of the Department of Social Welfare.

7.2 Sole Parents who were Not Employed at the Time of the 1986 Census

In 1986, two thirds of sole mothers (68%) and one third of sole fathers (35%) were not employed. These two groups were different from each other in some respects, but there were also differences between sole parents who were employed and those who were not.

For example, sole mothers who were not employed tended to be younger (44% were aged less than 30) than both sole mothers who were employed (16% were under 30) and sole fathers who were not employed (17% were under 30). And sole fathers who were not employed tended to be more widely spread over the age range than those who were employed (17% were under 30 and 25% were at least fifty, compared with 9% and 15% respectively of employed sole fathers.)

In terms of marital status, sole fathers generally were more likely to be separated/divorced or widowed and less likely to be never married than sole mothers. However, among those who were not employed, both sole mothers and sole fathers were more likely to be never married or widowed and less likely to be separated/divorced than those who were employed.

Some 39% of sole mothers who were not employed were of ethnic origins other than European, compared with 21% of employed sole mothers. Sole fathers who were not employed were even more likely to be of other ethnic origin than European (47%). About half of sole mothers and one quarter of sole fathers who were not employed had a child of pre-school age, whereas employed sole parents were less likely to have a child of this age. About half of the sole parents who were not employed lived in rented accommodation, sole mothers being marginally more likely to do so. Sole parents who were not employed were also more likely to live in a multi-family household (18%) than were employed sole parents.

While a majority reported receiving DPB, 13% of sole mothers and 27% of sole fathers who were not employed did not report receiving any income-tested benefit. While some under-reporting of benefits is a possibility (as noted on page 15), it also seems likely that some sole fathers, in particular, had incomes which derived neither from employment nor from Social Welfare benefits. Some widowed sole mothers were also likely to have been in this situation (see page 40), and possibly some Pacific Island sole parents as well (see page 34).

Turning to income, 69% of sole mothers and 64% of sole fathers who were not employed had an income below \$10,000. The fact that more sole fathers than sole mothers had incomes above \$10,000 again indicates that sole fathers who were not employed were more likely to have extra sources of income compared with sole mothers who were not employed. These other income sources may have put some (although only a small minority) of the sole fathers who were not employed above the level of benefit payments, which were likely to be the main source of income for sole mothers who were not employed.

7.3 Sole Parents who were Employed at the Time of the 1986 Census

One in every eight sole parents was a sole father, and members of this sub-group were more likely to be employed (65%, compared with 32% of sole mothers in 1986). Among those who had paid jobs, sole fathers were more likely than sole mothers to be employed full-time. One-third of employed sole mothers were employed part-time, compared with only one in twenty employed sole fathers.

Employed sole parents were more likely to be of European ethnic origin, and this was particularly true for mothers who were employed part-time (83%).

The likelihood of employment varied according to marital status, although the picture was complicated by differential sex effects. The highest rate of employment, whether full-time or part-time, was among separated or divorced sole parents, while the lowest employment rate was among never married sole parents. It should be borne in mind, however, that within this pattern there were also different rates of employment among males and females.

Thus, although more never married sole parents were outside the workforce than among other marital status groups, nearly half of never married sole fathers (49%) were employed full-time, while only 14% of never married sole mothers had full-time jobs. Sex was also an important factor in the employment rates of widowed sole parents (55% of the males and 17% of the females were employed full-time) and separated or divorced sole parents (65% of the males and 26% of the females were employed full-time).

Almost nine-tenths of both male and female sole parents who were employed full-time had either one or two children, while sole parents who were not employed were slightly more likely to have larger families. Sole parents who had paid jobs were also more likely to have older children. For example, only 14% of sole mothers who were employed full-time had youngest children aged less than 5 years old.

This is in contrast to sole mothers who were not employed, about half of whom had a child of pre-school age. The pattern for sole fathers was similar, although less marked: 13% of those who were employed full-time had youngest children aged less than 5, while more than a quarter of sole fathers who were not employed had children aged less than 5.

Employed sole mothers were more likely to live in Auckland and less likely to live in secondary or minor urban areas than those who were not employed. This finding did not hold for sole fathers. A majority of employed sole parents lived in an owner-occupied dwelling with mortgage, unlike those who were not employed, who were more likely to live in rental accommodation. Employed sole parents were more likely to live in a household which included adult children, which reflects the fact that their children were generally older, or, in other words, they were at a later stage in the family life cycle. Employed sole parents were also less likely to live in a multi-family household.

It is clear from Tables 57 and 58 that sole mothers and sole fathers aged between 30 and 49 years old made up the majority of those who worked either part-time or full-time. It is interesting, nonetheless, to observe that 22% of sole mothers who were employed part-time and 16% of those employed full-time were aged under 30 years old. In contrast, employed sole fathers tended to be older, with 18% of those in part-time employment and 14% of those in full-time employment being aged over 49 years.

Overall then, female sole parents in the workforce tended to be younger and male sole parents in the workforce tended to be older. A probable explanation of these differences is that, on the one hand, sole mothers were generally younger than sole fathers, reflecting differences by gender in the route to sole parenthood, and, on the other hand, among older sole mothers who had been widowed, many would not have been employed for some time and probably did not intend to take up employment.

As might be expected, employed sole parents had incomes which were generally higher than those who were not employed. For example, 46% of full-time employed sole mothers had an income above \$15,000, compared with just 2% of sole mothers who were not employed. Of particular interest is the extent to which sole fathers who were employed full-time had higher incomes than sole mothers who were employed full-time. An income above \$20,000 was reported by 20% of sole mothers and 48% of sole fathers who were employed full-time. This was despite the fact that the educational levels of the two groups were broadly similar. Lower average incomes of full-time employed sole mothers were also indicated by the higher proportion who reported receiving Family Care (43%, compared with 21% of sole

fathers who were employed full-time). This indicates lower earnings because Family Care was a family income supplement available to employed parents on an income-tested basis.

There was a sizeable group of full-time employed sole parents (comprising 21% of mothers and 6% of fathers) who reported receiving an income-tested benefit such as DPB, at some time in the twelve months prior to the Census. This gives some indication of movement on and off the DPB. If 21% of full-time employed sole mothers had been on benefit in the previous twelve months, it is reasonable to assume that a larger proportion of the total sole parent population will have been on benefit at some time during the whole period of their sole parenthood than is indicated by the proportion at any particular date.

Amongst sole mothers who were employed full-time, occupations in the professional/technical and clerical areas were the most common. Such occupations were less common amongst part-time employed sole mothers, however, where service and, to a lesser degree, sales occupations were more common. Employed sole fathers were likely to be in production, transport or labouring occupations.

7.4 Factors Associated With Sole Parents' Employment

A survey of female sole parents by Wylie (1980) found a link between education and work skills and the probability of being in employment. A strong association between sole parents' educational qualifications and their rate of employment was also found in a previous study of 1981 Census data (Dominick, Rochford and Robb, 1988). Comparative figures from the 1986 Census confirm that this association remained just as strong five years on. For example, 41% of sole mothers with a tertiary qualification were employed full-time, compared with 14% of sole mothers with no educational qualification.

Another strong association found in 1981 was that between employment and age of youngest child. Again this association remained strong in 1986. The full-time employment rate of sole mothers rose steadily with age of youngest child, from 8% for sole mothers with a pre-school age child to 46% when the youngest child was aged over 15. The employment rate of sole fathers also increased with age of youngest child, but it began, and remained, at a considerably higher level, from 45% when the youngest child was a pre-schooler to 75% where the youngest child was over 15.

Another study, concerned with the labour force participation of married women in New Zealand (Hall, 1987), also showed a strong association between rates of employment and both women's education and the age of their youngest dependent

child. In 1984-85, married women with no secondary qualifications had had a full-time employment rate of 17%, compared with 28% for those with secondary qualifications. Married mothers with a pre-school aged child had a full-time employment rate of 8%, compared with 32% for those whose youngest dependent child was aged thirteen or over. The strong influence of age of children and education on labour force participation is not unique to sole parents, therefore, and is similarly strong for mothers in two parent families.

When education was cross-tabulated by employment within different categories of age of youngest child (Table 72), it was found that the association between education and employment was similar in each category. Within each category of age of youngest child, a majority of sole parents employed full-time reported having a qualification, while about two thirds of those not employed had no educational qualification. This indicates that the twin effects of education and age of youngest child on employment rates are relatively independent of each other. The combined effect of these two factors resulted in full-time employment rates which ranged from 7% among those with a pre-school child and no educational qualification to 66% among those who had a tertiary qualification and whose youngest child was aged thirteen or over. When these rates of full-time employment were also broken down by sex the range was extended further, from 5% among sole mothers with a pre-school child and no educational qualifications to 75% among sole fathers with an educational qualification and a youngest child aged thirteen or over.

The sex of the sole parent remained a key influence on the likelihood of employment in 1986. However, as shown in Table 12, the gap between male and female sole parent employment rates has decreased since 1976. This is due to the faster declining employment rate of sole fathers. In fact, benefit figures show that sole fathers make up the fastest growing component of the DPB population, increasing by 118% between 1981 and 1986, and by a further 167% between 31 March 1986 and 31 March 1991. As at 31 March 1991 there were 9,047 sole fathers in receipt of DPB, which indicates that more than half of all sole fathers may now be beneficiaries (compared with one in six in 1981). It seems that sole fathers are moving towards the same pattern of benefit take-up as sole mothers.

Ethnicity was also associated with employment of sole parents. European sole parents were most likely to be in employment (38% of sole mothers and 72% of sole fathers were employed full-time or part-time in 1986), while Maori sole parents were least likely to be employed (18% of sole mothers and 50% of sole fathers). Pacific Island sole

parents had intermediate rates of sole parenthood (24% of sole mothers and 57% of sole fathers).

When age of youngest child and education were also taken into account, however, differences in employment rates between ethnic groups were not as great (see Table 85). Maori and European sole parents had similar rates of employment if their youngest child was aged eight years or under, while Pacific Island sole parents had distinctly higher rates. A large majority of Maori and Pacific Island sole parents had a youngest child aged eight years or under (72% and 71% respectively). Where the youngest child was aged nine years or over, Maori sole parents had lower rates of employment than Pacific Island and European sole parents with similar educational backgrounds. European sole parents had the highest rates of employment when the youngest child was aged thirteen years or over.

Marital status, too, showed an association with employment (as noted above), separated/divorced sole parents having the highest employment rate (38% of sole mothers and 68% of sole fathers), followed by widowed sole parents (30% and 59% respectively), while never married sole parents were least likely to be employed (21% and 53% respectively). It should be noted that some of this effect may be due to the above results for ethnicity, since there were different distributions of marital status within different ethnic groups. The age of youngest child would also have had an influence, since never married sole parents were more likely to have younger children. However, even within age groups of youngest child, never married sole parents had lower rates of employment than those who were separated or divorced, as shown by Table 86 (with the exception of the less than 1% of never married sole parents whose youngest child was aged 16-18 years, who had a higher rate).

Widowed sole parents had the highest rate of employment amongst those with a child of pre-school age, but the lowest rates where the youngest child was aged five years or older. In fact, their employment rates were markedly lower than those of both never married and separated/divorced sole parents with a youngest child aged nine years or over. It is not clear why this pattern applied to widowed sole parents in particular, but it may be that those with older children were more likely to have received an insurance payout or a significant inheritance from the deceased spouse, making it possible for them to have an income above benefit level without being in paid employment.

There may also have been an age cohort effect with this group. Widowed sole parents had an older age structure than other sole parents, and widows with older children were likely to be the oldest of them. These women would have been from a generation with less experience and subject to less

expectation of paid labour force participation than more recent generations.

Another factor associated with employment was the number of children in the family. The more children a sole parent had, the less likely the sole parent was to be employed. Those with one child had a full-time employment rate of 30%, compared with 26% for those with two children and 18% for those with three or more children.

However, these rates are partially due to those with several children being more likely to have at least one aged under five years. When employment rates are examined within age groups of youngest child, the effect of number of children is not as great. Having two children rather than one reduced the employment rate only of those sole parents who had a child aged under five years, or a youngest child aged 16-18 years. The reduction in employment rate for the former group was from 13% (with one child, aged under five) to 9% (with two children, at least one aged under five).

The employment rates of sole parents whose youngest child was aged nine years or over were not affected by the number of children they had, except for the small number with four or more children, or the very small number with two children aged 16-18 years. Number of children mainly affected the employment rates of sole parents with younger children, therefore.

Age also influenced employment. The peak age for employment was 40-49 years at the time of the 1986 Census, with the lowest rates occurring amongst those aged over 60 and under 30. Location was also associated with employment, with sole parents who were located outside the main urban areas having a lower rate of employment.

8 DISCUSSION

One of the clearest things which has emerged from this profile of sole parents is that sole parents cannot be regarded as a homogeneous population. Whatever they might have in common by virtue of being sole parents, in terms of demographic characteristics several different sub-groups can be discerned. For example, never married Maori sole mothers are very different from separated or divorced European sole mothers in terms of age structure, housing tenure, household type, educational background, rate of employment and income. Sole fathers were different again, producing another dimension of diversity.

This diversity has implications for policy formation in relation to sole parents. Policies aimed at sole parents should have regard to the diverse nature of the target population and, ideally, policies should be tailored to meet the needs of particular sub-groups. This need not compromise principles of equity, in fact equity can often best be served by giving particular attention to those groups who would be most disadvantaged under a uniform policy framework.

Maori sole parents were a large group, in relation both to the total sole parent population and to the total Maori population. An important finding of the study is that even within the relatively disadvantaged population of sole parents, Maori sole parents formed a disadvantaged group relative to European sole parents. This was indicated by their lower levels of income, employment, education, occupation and housing tenure.

A notable feature of the marital status groups was the considerable degree of age separation between them. Three quarters of the never married were aged under 30, three quarters of the separated/divorced were aged 30-49 and nearly half the widowed were over 50 years of age. This age separation was probably a key influence on many of the other differences between the groups, for example on characteristics such as age of children and housing tenure.

The three most important factors associated with sole parents' employment were identified as gender, education and age of youngest child. This suggests that the most promising policy approaches to promote the employment of sole parents might lie in the areas of vocational training and childcare.

If policies are to be designed to increase the rate of employment of sole parents, however, the diversity of the population would be an important consideration. For example, a policy designed to encourage those who already have a

minimum level of educational qualifications to gain further skills, for example in the use of computer technology, may improve the employment prospects of this group, but it would do nothing for those who have no qualifications to start with. Since Maori and Pacific Island sole parents are less likely to have educational qualifications, such a policy would advantage European sole parents most.

As another example, a policy which promoted after-school childcare for older children might assist sole parents with such children to take up employment, but again European sole parents would be more likely to benefit because they are more likely to have older children. In both of the above examples, a conflict can be seen between targeting those most easily facilitated into employment and assisting those groups which are most disadvantaged. When considering new policies, therefore, the question needs to be asked: "Which groups will benefit most from the policy?". To improve the overall employment rate of sole parents, several different approaches may be necessary to meet the needs of different groups.

With an estimated one in every four families now a one parent family in 1991, and one in every five families being a one parent family supported by an income-tested benefit, interest in the sole parent population has never been greater. This study provides an information base, previously lacking, which can be regarded as a starting point for further research and development of policy options aimed at enabling sole parents, ultimately, to compete for positions in the labour market on equal terms with other groups.

REFERENCES

- Allan, Linda
Domestic Purposes Benefit Statistical Profile: 31 March 1985. Statistics Unit, New Zealand Department of Social Welfare, 1985. (Unpublished)
- Department of Social Welfare
Report of the Department of Social Welfare. Government Printer, Wellington, 1976-1991.
- Department of Statistics
1986 New Zealand Census of Population and Dwellings: Series C and D. Department of Statistics, Wellington, 1988.
- Dominick, C.H., Rochford, M.W. and Robb, M.J.
Solo Parents, Benefits, and Employment. Research Report Series No. 5, Department of Social Welfare, Wellington, 1988.
- Hall, Georgie
Two-Income Families in New Zealand. Research Report Series No. 6, Department of Social Welfare, Wellington, 1987.
- Mowbray, M.J. and Khan, A.R.
One and Two Parent Families: A Comparison of Selected Characteristics. Demographic Bulletin, Vol. 6 No. 1, New Zealand Department of Statistics, 1984.
- Pool, Ian and Pole, Nicholas.
The New Zealand Population to 2011: Demographic Change and its Implications. Technical Paper No. 1, New Zealand Demographic Society, Wellington, 1987.
- Shipley, S.M.
Women's Employment and Unemployment. Massey University and S.R.O.W. Inc., 1982.
- Wylie, C.R.
Factors Affecting the Participation in the Workforce of Female Heads of One Parent Families. Department of Social Welfare, Wellington, 1980.

APPENDIX ONE

	Page
Table 1: Incidence of Sole Parenthood Per Cent Family Benefits in Force, 1976 to 1991.....	58
Table 2a: Rate of DPB/WB Take-Up Among Sole Parents, 1976 to 1991 (Census Family File Tables).....	58
Table 2b: Rate of DPB/WB Take-Up Among Sole Parents, 1976 to 1991 (Department of Social Welfare Figures).....	59
Table 3: Projected Rates of DPB/WB Take-Up Among Sole Parents, 1976 to 1991.....	59
Table 4: Marital Status of Sole Parent, 1976 to 1986.....	60
Table 5: Number of Dependent Children of Sole Parent, 1976 to 1986.....	60
Table 6: Age of Youngest Child of Sole Parent, 1976 to 1986.....	61
Table 7: Tenure of Sole Parent's Dwelling, 1976 to 1986.....	61
Table 8: Household Type of Sole Parent Family, 1976 to 1986.....	62
Table 9: Location of Sole Parent's Dwelling, 1976 to 1986.....	62
Table 10: Sole Parents, 1976 to 1986, by Ethnicity of Parent.....	63
Table 11: Population Rates of Sole Parenthood for Maori and Non-Maori, 1976 to 1986.....	63
Table 12: Hours Employed by Sex of Sole Parent, 1976 to 1986.....	64
Table 13a: One and Two Parent Families by Parents' Ethnicity in the 1986 Census.....	64
Table 13b: One and Two Parent Families by Children's Ethnicity in the 1986 Census.....	65
Table 14: One and Two Parent Families by Age of Youngest Child in the 1986 Census.....	65

	Page
Table 15: One and Two Parent Families by Number of Dependent Children in the 1986 Census.....	66
Table 16: One and Two Parent Families by Income in the 1986 Census.....	66
Table 17: One and Two Parent Families by Hours Employed of Mother in the 1986 Census.....	67
Table 18: One and Two Parent Families by Hours Employed of Father in the 1986 Census.....	67
Table 19: One and Two Parent Families by Educational Qualification of Mother in the 1986 Census....	68
Table 20: One and Two Parent Families by Educational Qualification of Father in the 1986 Census....	68
Table 21: One and Two Parent Families by Occupation of Employed Mothers in the 1986 Census.....	69
Table 22: One and Two Parent Families by Employment Status of Mother in the 1986 Census.....	69
Table 23: One and Two Parent Families by Occupation of Employed Fathers in the 1986 Census.....	70
Table 24: One and Two Parent Families by Employment Status of Father in the 1986 Census.....	70
Table 25: One and Two Parent Families by Location of Dwelling in the 1986 Census.....	71
Table 26: One and Two Parent Families by Household Type in the 1986 Census.....	71
Table 27: One and Two Parent Families by Housing Tenure in the 1986 Census.....	72
Table 28: Ethnicity by Age of Sole Parent in the 1986 Census.....	73
Table 29: Ethnicity by Sex of Sole Parent in the 1986 Census.....	73
Table 30: Ethnicity by Marital Status of Sole Parent in the 1986 Census.....	74
Table 31: Ethnicity of Sole Parent by Age of Youngest Child in the 1986 Census.....	74
Table 32: Ethnicity of Sole Parent by Number of Dependent Children in the 1986 Census.....	75

	Page
Table 33: Ethnicity of Sole Parent by Household Type in the 1986 Census.....	75
Table 34: Ethnicity of Sole Parent by Location of Dwelling in the 1986 Census.....	76
Table 35: Ethnicity by Highest Educational Qualification of Sole Parent in the 1986 Census.....	76
Table 36: Ethnicity by Income by Marital Status of Sole Parent in the 1986 Census.....	77
Table 37: Ethnicity of Sole Parent by Housing Tenure by Marital Status in the 1986 Census.....	78
Table 38: Ethnicity of Sole Parent by Age by Marital Status in the 1986 Census.....	79
Table 39: Ethnicity of Sole Parent by Social Welfare Benefits Received in the 1986 Census.....	80
Table 40: Ethnicity of Sole Parent by Hours Employed in the 1986 Census.....	80
Table 41: Ethnicity by Occupation of Employed Sole Parents in the 1986 Census.....	81
Table 42: Ethnicity of Sole Parent by Employment Status in the 1986 Census.....	81
Table 43: Marital Status by Sex of Sole Parent in the 1986 Census.....	82
Table 44: Marital Status by Age of Sole Parent in the 1986 Census.....	82
Table 45: Marital Status of Sole Parent by Age of Youngest Child in the 1986 Census.....	83
Table 46: Marital Status of Sole Parent by Number of Dependent Children in the 1986 Census.....	83
Table 47: Marital Status by Educational Qualification of Sole Parent in the 1986 Census.....	84
Table 48: Marital Status of Sole Parent by Location of Dwelling in the 1986 Census.....	84
Table 49: Marital Status of Sole Parent by Household Type in the 1986 Census.....	85

	Page
Table 50: Marital Status of Sole Parent by Social Welfare Benefits Received in the 1986 Census..	85
Table 51: Marital Status by Occupation of Employed Sole Parents in the 1986 Census.....	86
Table 52: Marital Status of Sole Parent by Employment Status in the 1986 Census.....	86
Table 53: Marital Status of Sole Parent by Income in the 1986 Census.....	87
Table 54: Income by Housing Tenure by Marital Status of Sole Parent in the 1986 Census.....	88
Table 55: Hours Employed by Marital Status of Sole Mother in the 1986 Census.....	89
Table 56: Hours Employed by Marital Status of Sole Father in the 1986 Census.....	89
Table 57: Hours Employed by Age of Sole Mother in the 1986 Census.....	90
Table 58: Hours Employed by Age of Sole Father in the 1986 Census.....	90
Table 59: Hours Employed by Ethnicity of Sole Mother in the 1986 Census.....	91
Table 60: Hours Employed by Ethnicity of Sole Father in the 1986 Census.....	91
Table 61: Hours Employed by Ethnicity by Marital Status of Sole Parent in the 1986 Census.....	92
Table 62: Hours Employed of Sole Mother by Age of Youngest Child in the 1986 Census.....	93
Table 63: Hours Employed of Sole Father by Age of Youngest Child in the 1986 Census.....	93
Table 64: Age of Youngest Child by Sole Mother's Full-Time Employment in the 1986 Census.....	94
Table 65: Age of Youngest Child by Sole Father's Full-Time Employment in the 1986 Census.....	94
Table 66: Hours Employed of Sole Mother by Number of Dependent Children in the 1986 Census.....	95

	Page
Table 67: Hours Employed of Sole Father by Number of Dependent Children in the 1986 Census.....	95
Table 68: Hours Employed by Educational Qualification of Sole Mother in the 1986 Census.....	96
Table 69: Hours Employed by Educational Qualification of Sole Father in the 1986 Census.....	96
Table 70: Educational Qualification by Sole Mother's Full-Time Employment in the 1986 Census.....	97
Table 71: Educational Qualification by Sole Father's Full-Time Employment in the 1986 Census.....	97
Table 72: Hours Employed by Educational Qualification of Sole Parent by Age of Youngest Child in the 1986 Census.....	98
Table 73: Hours Employed of Sole Mother by Household Type in the 1986 Census.....	99
Table 74: Hours Employed of Sole Father by Household Type in the 1986 Census.....	99
Table 75: Hours Employed of Sole Mother by Location of Dwelling in the 1986 Census.....	100
Table 76: Hours Employed of Sole Father by Location of Dwelling in the 1986 Census.....	100
Table 77: Hours Employed of Sole Mother by Housing Tenure in the 1986 Census.....	101
Table 78: Hours Employed of Sole Father by Housing Tenure in the 1986 Census.....	101
Table 79: Hours Employed of Sole Mother by Social Welfare Benefits Received in the 1986 Census.....	102
Table 80: Hours Employed of Sole Father by Social Welfare Benefits Received in the 1986 Census.....	102
Table 81: Hours Employed by Occupation of Employed Sole Mothers in the 1986 Census....	103
Table 82: Hours Employed by Occupation of Employed Sole Fathers in the 1986 Census....	104

	Page
Table 83: Hours Employed of Sole Mother by Income in the 1986 Census.....	105
Table 84: Hours Employed of Sole Father by Income in the 1986 Census.....	105
Table 85: Rate of Full-Time Employment of Sole Parent by Ethnicity by Age of Youngest Child by Secondary Qualification in the 1986 Census..	106
Table 86: Rate of Full-Time Employment of Sole Parent by Marital Status by Age of Youngest Child in the 1986 Census.....	107
Table 87: Rate of Full-Time Employment of Sole Parent by Age of Youngest Child by Number of Children in the 1986 Census.....	107

Table 1: Incidence of Sole Parenthood Per Cent Family Benefits in Force, 1976 to 1991

Year	One Parent Families	Inter-Censal Increase	Inter-Censal Increase Per Cent	Average Annual Increase Per Cent	Family Benefits In Force	One Par Families Per Cent Fam Ben
1976	46,360	NA	NA	NA	463,006	10
1981	61,030	14,670	32	6	461,211	13
1986	81,867	20,837	34	6	455,330	18
1991*	115,716	33,849	41	7	447,000	26

*Estimated.

Table 2a: Rate of DPB/WB Take-Up Among Sole Parents, 1976 to 1991 (Census Family File Tables)

Social Welfare Benefits Received	Year			
	1976 (%)	1981 (%)	1986 (%)	1991* (%)
DPB	25	49	54	NA
Widows Benefit	12	8	5	NA
Non-DPB/WB	63	43	42	NA
Total n	100 (46360)	100 (61030)	100 (81867)	NA NA

*Estimated.

Table 2b: Rate of DPB/WB Take-Up Among Sole Parents, 1976 to 1991 (Department of Social Welfare Records)

Social Welfare Benefits Received	Year			
	1976 (%)	1981 (%)	1986 (%)	1991* (%)
DPB	46	61	73	81
Widows Benefit	14	9	5	3
Non-DBP/WB	40	31	23	16
Total n	100 (46360)	100 (61030)	100 (81867)	100 (115716)

*Estimated.

Table 3: Projected Rates Of DPB/WB Take-Up Among Sole Parents, 1976 to 1991

Year	All Sole Parents (Census) (1)	DPB plus Widows Ben (D.S.W.) (2)	DPB/WB Per Cent All Sole Parents	Non-DPB/WB Sole Parents (1)-(2)
1976	46,360	27,688	60	18,672
1981	61,030	42,348	69	18,682
1986	81,867	63,380	77	18,487
		Projected		
1987	88,261	69,813	79	18,448
1989	104,579	86,027	82	18,372
1991	115,716	97,420	84	18,296

Table 4: Marital Status of Sole Parent, 1976 to 1986

Marital Status	Year		
	1976 (%)	1981 (%)	1986 (%)
Never Married	10	15	26
Separated/Divorced	66	68	62
Widowed	24	17	11
Total n	100 (46260)	100 (60420)	100 (80619)
Missing Values =	100	610	1248

Table 5: Number of Dependent Children of Sole Parent, 1976 to 1986

Number of Dependent Children	Year		
	1976 (%)	1981 (%)	1986 (%)
1	45	49	52
2	31	32	32
3	14	13	12
4	6	5	3
5 or More	4	2	1
Total n	100 (46360)	100 (61030)	100 (81867)

Table 6: Age of Youngest Child of Sole Parent, 1976 to 1986

Age of Youngest Child	Year		
	1976 (%)	1981 (%)	1986 (%)
0-4 Years	33	32	35
5-8 Years	24	24	22
9-12 Years	21	24	21
13-15 Years	17	15	17
16-18 Years	6	5	4
Total n	100 (46360)	100 (61030)	100 (81867)

Table 7: Tenure of Sole Parent's Dwelling, 1976 to 1986

Type of Tenure	Year		
	1976 (%)	1981 (%)	1986 (%)
Mortgage Free	17	12	13
Mortgaged	37	41	41
TOTAL OWNING	54	53	54
Private Rental	NA	21	21
Public Rental	NA	25	23
TOTAL RENTING	44	45	44
Rent Free	2	2	2
Total n	100 (46090)	100 (60720)	100 (81210)
Missing Values =	270	310	657

Table 8: Household Type of Sole Parent Family, 1976 to 1986

Household Type	Year		
	1976 (%)	1981 (%)	1986 (%)
One Family, Dependent Children Only	55	61	56
One Family, Dependent and Adult Children	15	15	13
One Family and Individual Relatives	7	6	8
One Family and Unrelated Individuals	11	9	9
Two Families	11	9	13
More Than Two Families	1	1	2
Total n	100 (46360)	100 (61030)	100 (81357)
Missing Values =	-	-	510

Table 9: Location of Sole Parent's Dwelling, 1976 to 1986

Location of Dwelling	Year		
	1976 (%)	1981 (%)	1986 (%)
Auckland	30	29	28
Other Urban*	59	61	62
Rural	12	10	11
Total n	100 (46360)	100 (61030)	100 (81357)
Missing Values =	-	-	510

* Other Main Urban Areas, Secondary Urban Areas, and Minor Urban Areas combined.

Table 10: Sole Parents, 1976 to 1986, by Ethnicity of Parent

Ethnicity of Parent	Year		
	1976 (%)	1981 (%)	1986 (%)
European	76	73	67
Maori	19	20	26
Pacific Island	3	5	5
Other	2	2	2
Total n	100 (46360)	100 (61030)	100 (81867)

Table 11: Population Rates of Sole Parenthood for Maori and
Non-Maori, 1976 to 1986

Ethnicity	Year		Increase in Rate Per Cent
	1976	1986	
Maori			
Sole Parents	8,890	20,913	
Total Sub-Pop	188,490	247,017	
Rate/1000	47	85	80%
Non-Maori			
Sole Parents	37,470	60,954	
Total Sub-Pop	2,012,688	2,221,284	
Rate/1000	19	27	50%
Ratio Maori to Non-Maori Rate	2.5	3.1	

Table 12: Hours Employed by Sex of Sole Parent, 1976 to 1986

Sex	Hours Employed	Year		
		1976 (%)	1981 (%)	1986 (%)
Female	Nil	60	65	68
	Part-Time	15	13	11
	Full-Time	25	22	22
	Total n	100 (38280)	100 (51660)	100 (71001)
Male	Nil	17	24	35
	Part-Time	2	2	4
	Full-Time	81	74	61
	Total n	100 (7030)	100 (8580)	100 (10866)
Missing Values =		1050	790	-

Table 13a: One and Two Parent Families by Parents' Ethnicity in the 1986 Census

Parents' Ethnicity	One Parent (%)	Two Parents (%)
European	67	74
Maori	26	7
Maori and Non-Maori	NA	9
Pacific Island	5	4
Other	2	6
Total n	100 (81867)	100 (363174)

Table 13b: One and Two Parent Families by Children's Ethnicity in the 1986 Census

Children's Ethnicity	One Parent (%)	Two Parents (%)
European	57	74
Maori	35	16
Pacific Island	6	4
Other	2	6
Total n	100 (81867)	100 (363174)

Table 14: One and Two Parent Families by Age of Youngest Child in the 1986 Census

Age of Youngest Child	One Parent (%)	Two Parents (%)
0-4 Years	35	41
5-8 Years	22	20
9-12 Years	21	19
13-14 Years	12	10
15 Years	5	5
16-17 Years	4	4
18 Years	0	0
Total n	100 (81867)	100 (363174)

Table 15: One and Two Parent Families by Number of Dependent Children in the 1986 Census

Number of Dependent Children	One Parent (%)	Two Parents (%)
1	52	32
2	32	40
3	12	20
4	3	6
5 or More	1	2
Total n	100 (81867)	100 (363174)

Table 16: One and Two Parent Families by Income in the 1986 Census

Income	One Parent (%)	Two Parents (%)
Below \$10,000	52	8
\$10,000 - \$15,000	31	10
\$15,001 - \$20,000	8	14
Above \$20,000	9	68
Total n	100 (81867)	100 (363174)

Table 17: One and Two Parent Families by Hours Employed of Mother in the 1986 Census

Hours Employed of Mother	One Parent (%)	Two Parents (%)
Nil	68	44
1-19 Hours	7	15
20-29 Hours	4	11
30 Hours or More	22	30
Total n	100 (71001)	100 (363174)

Table 18: One and Two Parent Families by Hours Employed of Father in the 1986 Census

Hours Employed of Father	One Parent (%)	Two Parents (%)
Nil	35	8
1-19 Hours	2	1
20-29 Hours	2	1
30 Hours or More	61	90
Total n	100 (10866)	100 (363174)

Table 19: One and Two Parent Families by Educational Qualification of Mother in the 1986 Census

Highest Educational Qualification of Mother	One Parent (%)	Two Parents (%)
None	59	45
Secondary	21	25
Tertiary	20	30
Total n	100 (70596)	100 (358236)

Missing Values = 5343

Table 20: One and Two Parent Families by Educational Qualification of Father in the 1986 Census

Highest Educational Qualification of Father	One Parent (%)	Two Parents (%)
None	51	38
Secondary	15	16
Tertiary	34	45
Total n	100 (10761)	100 (353208)

Missing Values = 10071

Table 21: One and Two Parent Families by Occupation of Employed Mothers in the 1986 Census

Occupation of Mother	One Parent (%)	Two Parents (%)
Professional/ Technical	21	18
Administrative/ Managerial	2	2
Clerical	29	27
Sales	11	11
Service	19	18
Agricultural/ Forestry/Fishing	5	11
Production/ Transport	13	12
Total n	100 (22818)	100 (204282)

Missing Values = 687

Table 22: One and Two Parent Families by Employment Status of Mother in the 1986 Census

Employment Status of Mother	One Parent (%)	Two Parents (%)
Employed	33	57
Seeking Employment	11	5
Not Seeking Employment	57	38
Total n	100 (70476)	100 (357312)

Missing Values = 6387

Table 23: One and Two Parent Families by Occupation of
Employed Fathers in the 1986 Census

Occupation of Father	One Parent (%)	Two Parents (%)
Professional/ Technical	15	15
Administrative/ Managerial	6	9
Clerical	7	6
Sales	8	9
Service	5	5
Agricultural/ Forestry/Fishing	12	14
Production/ Transport	47	42
Total n	100 (7020)	100 (333036)

Missing Values = 1887

Table 24: One and Two Parent Families by Employment Status
of Father in the 1986 Census

Employment Status of Father	One Parent (%)	Two Parents (%)
Employed	66	95
Seeking Employment	7	2
Not Seeking Employment	27	3
Total n	100 (10731)	100 (351951)

Missing Values = 11358

Table 25: One and Two Parent Families by Location of Dwelling in the 1986 Census

Location of Dwelling	One Parent (%)	Two Parents (%)
Auckland Urban	28	24
Other Main Urban	46	40
Secondary Urban	6	7
Minor Urban	10	10
Rural	11	19
Total n	100 (81360)	100 (362253)

Missing Values = 1428

Table 26: One and Two Parent Families by Household Type in the 1986 Census

Household Type	One Parent (%)	Two Parents (%)
One Family, Dependent Children only	56	77
One Family, Dependent and Adult Children	13	15
One Family and Individual Relatives	8	3
One Family and Unrelated Individuals	9	2
Two or more Families	15	3
Total n	100 (81357)	100 (362274)

Missing Values = 1410

Table 27: One and Two Parent Families by Housing Tenure in the 1986 Census

Housing Tenure	One Parent (%)	Two Parents (%)
Mortgaged	41	66
Mortgage Free	13	13
Private Rental	21	10
Public Rental	23	8
Rent Free	2	3
Total n	100 (81213)	100 (361764)

Missing Values = 2064

Table 28: Ethnicity by Age of Sole Parent in the 1986 Census

Age of Sole Parent	Ethnicity of Sole Parent			
	European (%)	Maori (%)	Pacific Is. (%)	Other (%)
15-19 Years	2	7	4	2
20-24 Years	9	22	17	8
25-29 Years	15	21	19	12
30-39 Years	43	26	32	38
40-49 Years	24	13	17	23
50-59 Years	6	7	7	10
60+ Years	1	4	4	6
Total n	100 (54600)	100 (20913)	100 (4386)	100 (1968)

Table 29: Ethnicity by Sex of Sole Parent in the 1986 Census

Sex of Sole Parent	Ethnicity of Sole Parent			
	European (%)	Maori (%)	Pacific Is. (%)	Other (%)
Male	13	12	13	20
Female	87	88	87	80
Total n	100 (54600)	100 (20913)	100 (4386)	100 (1968)

Table 30: Ethnicity by Marital Status of Sole Parent in the 1986 Census

Marital Status of Sole Parent	Ethnicity of Sole Parent			
	European (%)	Maori (%)	Pacific Is. (%)	Other (%)
Never Married	19	44	42	15
Separated/divorced	71	44	44	63
Widowed	10	13	13	22
Total n	100 (54132)	100 (20421)	100 (4308)	100 (1758)

Missing Values = 1248

Table 31: Ethnicity of Sole Parent by Age of Youngest Child in the 1986 Census

Age of Youngest Child	Ethnicity of Sole Parent			
	European (%)	Maori (%)	Pacific Is. (%)	Other (%)
0-4 Years	28	50	49	30
5-8 Years	23	22	22	20
9-12 Years	23	16	17	21
13-15 Years	21	11	9	20
16-18 Years	5	2	2	10
Total n	100 (54600)	100 (20913)	100 (4386)	100 (1968)

Table 32: Ethnicity of Sole Parent by Number of Dependent Children in the 1986 Census

Number of Dependent Children	Ethnicity of Sole Parent			
	European (%)	Maori (%)	Pacific Is. (%)	Other (%)
1	53	51	48	59
2	34	29	29	25
3	11	13	14	13
4	2	5	6	3
5 or More	1	2	3	1
Total n	100 (54600)	100 (20913)	100 (4386)	100 (1968)

Table 33: Ethnicity of Sole Parent by Household Type in the 1986 Census

Household Type	Ethnicity of Sole Parent			
	European (%)	Maori (%)	Pacific Is. (%)	Other (%)
One Family, Dependent Children only	62	43	35	56
One Family, Dependent and Adult Children	14	9	10	15
One Family and Individual Relatives	6	11	14	9
One Family and Unrelated Individuals	9	8	6	8
Two or more Families	8	29	35	13
Total n	100 (54600)	100 (20913)	100 (4386)	100 (1458)

Missing Values = 510

Table 34: Ethnicity of Sole Parent by Location of Dwelling in the 1986 Census

Location of Dwelling	Ethnicity of Sole Parent			
	European (%)	Maori (%)	Pacific Is. (%)	Other (%)
Auckland Urban	25	25	71	33
Other Main Urban	50	40	23	47
Secondary Urban	6	7	3	7
Minor Urban	9	14	2	5
Rural	10	14	1	9
Total n	100 (54600)	100 (20913)	100 (4386)	100 (1458)

Missing Values = 510

Table 35: Ethnicity by Highest Educational Qualification of Sole Parent in the 1986 Census

Highest Educational Qualification	Ethnicity of Sole Parent			
	European (%)	Maori (%)	Pacific Is. (%)	Other (%)
None	51	76	71	56
Secondary	22	15	17	21
Tertiary	27	9	11	24
Total n	100 (54600)	100 (20913)	100 (4386)	100 (1458)

Missing Values = 510

Table 36: Ethnicity by Income by Marital Status of Sole Parent in the 1986 Census

Marital Status	Income	Ethnicity of Sole Parent			
		European (%)	Maori (%)	Pacific Is. (%)	Other (%)
Never Married					
	Below \$10,000	61	75	71	85
	\$10,000 - \$15,000	29	20	23	9
	\$15,001 - \$20,000	5	4	5	4
	Above \$20,000	4	2	1	1
	Total	100	100	100	100
	n	(10299)	(8904)	(1827)	(267)
Separated/Divorced					
	Below \$10,000	40	61	61	68
	\$10,000 - \$15,000	37	28	27	20
	\$15,001 - \$20,000	11	7	7	4
	Above \$20,000	12	5	4	9
	Total	100	100	100	100
	n	(38373)	(8907)	(1911)	(1107)
Widowed					
	Below \$10,000	44	70	69	64
	\$10,000 - \$15,000	29	19	21	28
	\$15,001 - \$20,000	11	7	6	3
	Above \$20,000	15	6	4	6
	Total	100	100	100	100
	n	(5460)	(2607)	(567)	(381)
All					
	Below \$10,000	45	68	66	73
	\$10,000 - \$15,000	35	23	24	18
	\$15,001 - \$20,000	10	5	6	3
	Above \$20,000	11	3	3	6
	Total	100	100	100	100
	n	(54600)	(20913)	(4386)	(1968)

Missing Values = 1257 for figures by Marital Status

Table 37: Ethnicity of Sole Parent by Housing Tenure by Marital Status in the 1986 Census

Marital Status	Housing Tenure	Ethnicity of Sole Parent			
		European (%)	Maori (%)	Pacific Is. (%)	Other (%)
Never Married					
	Mortgaged	35	24	24	28
	Mortgage Free	8	12	5	15
	Private Rental	31	26	28	40
	Public Rental	24	36	42	16
	Rent Free	2	2	1	1
	Total	100	100	100	100
	n	(10251)	(8772)	(1806)	(267)
Separated/Divorced					
	Mortgaged	53	31	30	45
	Mortgage Free	11	9	4	19
	Private Rental	20	21	20	18
	Public Rental	15	37	44	17
	Rent Free	1	2	1	1
	Total	100	100	100	100
	n	(38226)	(8814)	(1890)	(1095)
Widowed					
	Mortgaged	33	27	34	31
	Mortgage Free	49	33	18	37
	Private Rental	5	8	10	23
	Public Rental	11	28	37	9
	Rent Free	1	3	1	0
	Total	100	100	100	100
	n	(5415)	(2553)	(561)	(369)
All					
	Mortgaged	47	28	28	38
	Mortgage Free	14	13	6	21
	Private Rental	21	21	22	22
	Public Rental	17	36	42	18
	Rent Free	1	2	1	1
	Total	100	100	100	100
	n	(54339)	(20619)	(4329)	(1923)

Missing Values = 1848 for figures by Marital Status, 657 for 'All' category

Table 38: Ethnicity of Sole Parent by Age by Marital Status in the 1986 Census

Ethnicity	Marital Status	Age of Sole Parent in Years				
		15-19 (%)	20-24 (%)	25-29 (%)	30-39 (%)	40+ (%)
European	Never Married	93	70	36	10	3
	Separated/Divorced	6	29	61	84	74
	Widowed	1	1	3	6	23
	Total n	100 (1065)	100 (5139)	100 (8070)	100 (23130)	100 (16728)
Maori	Never Married	93	79	55	26	7
	Separated/Divorced	6	20	43	67	50
	Widowed	0	1	2	7	43
	Total n	100 (1383)	100 (4467)	100 (4251)	100 (5379)	100 (4948)
Pacific Island	Never Married	94	81	58	33	11
	Separated/Divorced	5	19	39	60	52
	Widowed	1	1	3	7	37
	Total n	100 (186)	100 (717)	100 (825)	100 (1362)	100 (1218)
Other	Never Married	-	63	23	13	5
	Separated/Divorced	-	37	71	77	51
	Widowed	-	0	6	11	44
	Total n	100 (15)	100 (126)	100 (228)	100 (711)	100 (675)

Missing Values = 1245

Percentages have been omitted where n is less than 20

Table 39: Ethnicity of Sole Parent by Social Welfare Benefits Received in the 1986 Census

Social Welfare Benefits Received	Ethnicity of Sole Parent			
	European (%)	Maori (%)	Pacific Is. (%)	Other (%)
FB only	22	19	32	56
FB and FC	14	6	10	7
DPB	52	61	47	26
UB	1	2	3	3
Widows'	4	6	6	4
Over 2 Benefits	7	5	2	4
Total n	100 (54600)	100 (20913)	100 (4386)	100 (1968)

Table 40: Ethnicity of Sole Parent by Hours Employed in the 1986 Census

Hours Employed	Ethnicity of Sole Parent			
	European (%)	Maori (%)	Pacific Is. (%)	Other (%)
Nil	57	78	70	71
1-29 Hours	12	5	5	10
30 Hours or more	31	17	26	19
Total n	100 (54600)	100 (20913)	100 (4386)	100 (1968)

Table 41: Ethnicity by Occupation of Employed Sole Parents in the 1986 Census

Occupation	Ethnicity of Sole Parent			
	European (%)	Maori (%)	Pacific Is. (%)	Other (%)
Professional/ Technical	22	11	7	19
Administrative/ Managerial	4	1	1	5
Clerical	26	16	16	14
Sales	11	4	3	10
Service	15	20	23	10
Agricultural/ Forestry/Fishing	6	9	1	4
Production/ Transport	16	39	49	38
Total n	100 (23358)	100 (4617)	100 (1305)	100 (564)

Missing Values = 157

Table 42: Ethnicity of Sole Parent by Employment Status in the 1986 Census

Employment Status	Ethnicity of Sole Parent			
	European (%)	Maori (%)	Pacific Is. (%)	Other (%)
Employed	43	22	30	39
Seeking Employment	9	13	11	7
Not Seeking Employment	48	64	59	53
Total n	100 (54528)	100 (20865)	100 (4359)	100 (1455)

Missing Values = 660

Table 43: Marital Status by Sex of Sole Parent in the 1986 Census

Sex of Sole Parent	Marital Status		
	Never Married (%)	Separated/ Divorced (%)	Widowed (%)
Female	95	85	80
Male	5	15	20
Total n	100 (21303)	100 (50304)	100 (9015)

Missing Values = 1245

Table 44: Marital Status by Age of Sole Parent in the 1986 Census

Age of Sole Parent	Marital Status		
	Never Married (%)	Separated/ Divorced (%)	Widowed (%)
15-19 Years	12	0	0
20-24 Years	37	5	1
25-29 Years	27	14	4
30-39 Years	20	49	21
40-49 Years	4	26	32
50-59 Years	1	5	25
60+ Years	0	1	17
Total n	100 (21303)	100 (50304)	100 (9015)

Missing Values = 1245

Table 45: Marital Status of Sole Parent by Age of Youngest Child in the 1986 Census

Age of Youngest Child	Marital Status of Sole Parent		
	Never Married (%)	Separated/ Divorced (%)	Widowed (%)
0-4 Years	66	25	11
5-8 Years	20	25	17
9-12 Years	9	25	25
13-15 Years	4	20	35
16-18 Years	1	4	12
Total n	100 (21303)	100 (50304)	100 (9015)

Missing Values = 1245

Table 46: Marital Status of Sole Parent by Number of Dependent Children in the 1986 Census

Number of Dependent Children	Marital Status of Sole Parent		
	Never Married (%)	Separated/ Divorced (%)	Widowed (%)
1	72	43	56
2	21	38	28
3	6	14	11
4	2	4	3
5 or More	0	1	1
Total n	100 (21303)	100 (50304)	100 (9015)

Missing Values = 1245

Table 47: Marital Status by Educational Qualification of Sole Parent in the 1986 Census

Highest Educational Qualification of Sole Parent	Marital Status		
	Never Married (%)	Separated/ Divorced (%)	Widowed (%)
None	66	54	66
Secondary	21	21	14
Tertiary	13	26	20
Total n	100 (21240)	100 (50019)	100 (8937)

Missing Values = 1671

Table 48: Marital Status of Sole Parent by Location of Dwelling in the 1986 Census

Location of Dwelling	Marital Status of Sole Parent		
	Never Married (%)	Separated/ Divorced (%)	Widowed (%)
Auckland Urban	29	27	26
Other Main Urban	45	48	40
Secondary Urban	6	6	6
Minor Urban	11	9	12
Rural	9	10	16
Total n	100 (21240)	100 (50019)	100 (8937)

Missing Values = 1671

Table 49: Marital Status of Sole Parent by Household Type in the 1986 Census

Household Type	Marital Status of Sole Parent		
	Never Married (%)	Separated/ Divorced (%)	Widowed (%)
One Family, Dependent Children only	46	62	46
One Family, Dependent and Adult Children	1	15	30
One Family and Individual Relatives	12	6	6
One Family and Unrelated Individuals	9	9	7
Two or more Families	32	8	11
Total n	100 (21240)	100 (50019)	100 (8937)

Missing Values = 1671

Table 50: Marital Status of Sole Parent by Social Welfare Benefits Received in the 1986 Census

Social Welfare Benefits Received	Marital Status of Sole Parent		
	Never Married (%)	Separated/ Divorced (%)	Widowed (%)
FB only	15	23	35
FB and FC	6	14	10
DPB	69	56	8
UB	2	1	1
Widows'	0	0	42
Over 2 Benefits	7	6	4
Total n	100 (21303)	100 (50304)	100 (9015)

Missing Values = 1245

Table 51: Marital Status by Occupation of Employed Sole Parents in the 1986 Census

Occupation	Marital Status of Sole Parent		
	Never Married (%)	Separated/ Divorced (%)	Widowed (%)
Professional/ Technical	15	21	17
Administrative/ Managerial	1	4	3
Clerical	24	25	18
Sales	8	10	11
Service	21	15	17
Agricultural/ Forestry/Fishing	6	6	13
Production/ Transport	26	20	22
Total n	100 (4812)	100 (21534)	100 (3186)

Missing Values = 120

Table 52: Marital Status of Sole Parent by Employment Status in the 1986 Census

Employment Status	Marital Status of Sole Parent		
	Never Married (%)	Separated/ Divorced (%)	Widowed (%)
Employed	23	43	36
Seeking Employment	13	10	5
Not Seeking Employment	64	47	59
Total n	100 (21219)	100 (49944)	100 (8913)

Missing Values = 1791

Table 53: Marital Status of Sole Parent by Income in the 1986 Census

Income	Marital Status of Sole Parent		
	Never Married (%)	Separated/ Divorced (%)	Widowed (%)
Below \$10,000	68	45	54
\$10,000 - \$15,000	25	35	25
\$15,001 - \$20,000	4	10	9
Above \$20,000	3	11	11
Total n	100 (21303)	100 (50304)	100 (9015)

Missing Values = 1245

Table 54: Income by Housing Tenure by Marital Status of Sole Parent in the 1986 Census

Marital Status	Housing Tenure	Income of Sole Parent			
		Below \$10,000 (%)	\$10,000-\$15,000 (%)	\$15,001-\$20,000 (%)	Above \$20,000 (%)
Never Married	Mortgaged	29	27	39	51
	Mortgage Free	11	5	13	12
	Private Rental	25	41	26	17
	Public Rental	34	25	21	19
	Rent Free	2	1	1	1
	Total n	100 (14334)	100 (5205)	100 (933)	100 (618)
Separated/Divorced	Mortgaged	39	51	59	66
	Mortgage Free	11	7	15	12
	Private Rental	20	24	15	13
	Public Rental	28	17	9	8
	Rent Free	2	1	2	1
	Total n	100 (22497)	100 (17343)	100 (4803)	100 (5388)
Widowed	Mortgaged	27	35	35	45
	Mortgage Free	41	40	49	45
	Private Rental	7	9	7	4
	Public Rental	24	14	7	6
	Rent Free	2	2	1	0
	Total n	100 (4806)	100 (2268)	100 (843)	100 (981)
All	Mortgaged	34	44	53	62
	Mortgage Free	15	9	19	17
	Private Rental	20	27	16	12
	Public Rental	29	19	11	8
	Rent Free	2	1	1	1
	Total n	100 (41637)	100 (24816)	100 (6579)	100 (6987)

Missing Values = 1848

Table 55: Hours Employed by Marital Status of Sole Mother
in the 1986 Census

Marital Status of Sole Mother	Hours Employed		
	Nil (%)	Part-Time (%)	Full-Time (%)
Never Married	34	19	19
Separated/Divorced	56	69	73
Widowed	11	12	8
Total n	100 (47247)	100 (7587)	100 (15162)

Missing Values = 1005

Table 56: Hours Employed by Marital Status of Sole Father
in the 1986 Census

Marital Status of Sole Father	Hours Employed		
	Nil (%)	Part-Time (%)	Full-Time (%)
Never Married	14	13	8
Separated/Divorced	66	67	77
Widowed	20	20	15
Total n	100 (3699)	100 (372)	100 (6549)

Missing Values = 246

Table 57: Hours Employed by Age of Sole Mother in the 1986 Census

Age of Sole Mother	Hours Employed		
	Nil (%)	Part-Time (%)	Full-Time (%)
15-19 Years	5	1	1
20-24 Years	19	6	5
25-29 Years	21	15	10
30-39 Years	33	48	47
40-49 Years	14	24	32
50-59 Years	5	5	4
60+ Years	3	1	0
Total n	100 (48039)	100 (7632)	100 (15327)

Missing Values = 3

Table 58: Hours Employed by Age of Sole Father in the 1986 Census

Age of Sole Father	Hours Employed		
	Nil (%)	Part-Time (%)	Full-Time (%)
15-19 Years	1	1	0
20-24 Years	5	2	3
25-29 Years	11	5	6
30-39 Years	40	33	38
40-49 Years	18	41	39
50-59 Years	12	13	13
60+ Years	13	5	2
Total n	100 (3828)	100 (387)	100 (6651)

Table 59: Hours Employed by Ethnicity of Sole Mother in the 1986 Census

Ethnicity of Sole Mother	Hours Employed		
	Nil (%)	Part-Time (%)	Full-Time (%)
European	61	83	77
Maori	31	12	16
Pacific Island	6	2	5
Other	2	3	2
Total n	100 (48039)	100 (7632)	100 (15327)

Missing Values = 3

Table 60: Hours Employed by Ethnicity of Sole Father in the 1986 Census

Ethnicity of Sole Father	Hours Employed		
	Nil (%)	Part-Time (%)	Full-Time (%)
European	53	65	75
Maori	34	28	18
Pacific Island	7	7	5
Other	6	0	2
Total n	100 (3828)	100 (387)	100 (6651)

Table 61: Hours Employed by Ethnicity by Marital Status of Sole Parent in the 1986 Census

Marital Status	Ethnicity	Hours Employed of Sole Parent		
		Nil (%)	Part-Time (%)	Full-Time (%)
Never Married				
	European	46	67	51
	Maori	45	25	35
	Pacific Island	8	5	13
	Other	1	3	1
	Total n	100 (16452)	100 (1452)	100 (3390)
Separated/Divorced				
	European	71	87	83
	Maori	23	9	12
	Pacific Island	4	2	4
	Other	3	2	2
	Total n	100 (28686)	100 (5487)	100 (16125)
Widowed				
	European	53	78	73
	Maori	35	14	20
	Pacific Island	7	3	5
	Other	5	5	3
	Total n	100 (5799)	100 (1017)	100 (2193)
All				
	European	61	82	77
	Maori	31	13	16
	Pacific Island	6	3	5
	Other	2	2	2
	Total n	100 (50937)	100 (7956)	100 (21708)

Missing Values = 1266

Table 62: Hours Employed of Sole Mother by Age of Youngest Child in the 1986 Census

Age of Youngest Child	Hours Employed of Sole Mother		
	Nil (%)	Part-Time (%)	Full-Time (%)
0-4 Years	48	20	14
5-8 Years	22	30	20
9-12 Years	17	26	28
13-15 Years	11	20	29
16-18 Years	2	4	8
Total n	100 (48039)	100 (7632)	100 (15327)

Missing Values = 3

Table 63: Hours Employed of Sole Father by Age of Youngest Child in the 1986 Census

Age of Youngest Child	Hours Employed of Sole Father		
	Nil (%)	Part-Time (%)	Full-Time (%)
0-4 Years	26	20	13
5-8 Years	26	13	20
9-12 Years	24	35	26
13-15 Years	20	24	33
16-18 Years	4	8	8
Total n	100 (3828)	100 (387)	100 (6651)

Table 64: Age of Youngest Child by Sole Mother's Full-Time Employment in the 1986 Census

Sole Mother's Full-Time Employment	Age of Youngest Child				
	0-4 (%)	5-8 (%)	9-12 (%)	13-15 (%)	16-18 (%)
Employed	8	19	30	40	46
Not Employed	92	81	70	60	54
Total n	100 (26577)	100 (15948)	100 (14448)	100 (11223)	100 (2808)

Table 65: Age of Youngest Child by Sole Father's Full-Time Employment in the 1986 Census

Sole Father's Full-Time Employment	Age of Youngest Child				
	0-4 (%)	5-8 (%)	9-12 (%)	13-15 (%)	16-18 (%)
Employed	45	56	62	71	75
Not Employed	55	44	38	29	25
Total n	100 (1956)	100 (2358)	100 (2808)	100 (3075)	100 (672)

Table 66: Hours Employed of Sole Mother by Number of Dependent Children in the 1986 Census

Number of Dependent Children	Hours Employed of Sole Mother		
	Nil (%)	Part-Time (%)	Full-Time (%)
1	50	49	58
2	32	35	32
3	13	13	8
4	4	2	1
5 or More	1	1	0
Total n	100 (48039)	100 (7632)	100 (15327)

Missing Values = 3

Table 67: Hours Employed of Sole Father by Number of Dependent Children in the 1986 Census

Number of Dependent Children	Hours Employed of Sole Father		
	Nil (%)	Part-Time (%)	Full-Time (%)
1	55	64	59
2	28	24	29
3	11	5	10
4	4	4	2
5 or More	1	2	1
Total n	100 (3828)	100 (387)	100 (6651)

Table 68: Hours Employed by Educational Qualification of Sole Mother in the 1986 Census

Highest Educational Qualification of Sole Mother	Hours Employed		
	Nil (%)	Part-Time (%)	Full-Time (%)
None	68	47	40
Secondary	19	25	23
Tertiary	13	28	37
Total n	100 (47643)	100 (7632)	100 (15327)

Missing Values = 399

Table 69: Hours Employed by Educational Qualification of Sole Father in the 1986 Census

Highest Educational Qualification of Sole Father	Hours Employed		
	Nil (%)	Part-Time (%)	Full-Time (%)
None	65	57	43
Secondary	12	11	17
Tertiary	23	32	40
Total n	100 (3720)	100 (387)	100 (6651)

Missing Values = 108

Table 70: Educational Qualification by Sole Mother's Full-Time Employment in the 1986 Census

Sole Mother's Full-Time Employment	Educational Qualification		
	No Qualification (%)	Secondary (%)	Tertiary (%)
Employed	14	24	41
Not Employed	86	76	59
Total n	100 (41955)	100 (14637)	100 (14010)

Missing Values = 399

Table 71: Educational Qualification by Sole Father's Full-Time Employment in the 1986 Census

Sole Father's Full-Time Employment	Educational Qualification		
	No Qualification (%)	Secondary (%)	Tertiary (%)
Employed	52	70	73
Not Employed	48	30	27
Total n	100 (5520)	100 (1572)	100 (3666)

Missing Values = 108

Table 72: Hours Employed by Educational Qualification of Sole Parent by Age of Youngest Child in the 1986 Census

Age of Youngest Child	Highest Educational Qualification	Hours Employed of Sole Parent		
		Nil (%)	Part-Time (%)	Full-Time (%)
0-4 Years	None	67	41	42
	Secondary	22	29	25
	Tertiary	12	30	33
	Total n	100 (23787)	100 (1566)	100 (3075)
5-8 Years	None	66	44	38
	Secondary	20	29	24
	Tertiary	14	27	39
	Total n	100 (11562)	100 (2328)	100 (4368)
9-12 Years	None	69	53	39
	Secondary	14	19	21
	Tertiary	17	29	40
	Total n	100 (8856)	100 (2145)	100 (6108)
13-15 Years	None	73	54	45
	Secondary	12	21	17
	Tertiary	15	25	38
	Total n	100 (5907)	100 (1614)	100 (6642)
16-18 Years	None	65	46	34
	Secondary	14	16	23
	Tertiary	21	39	42
	Total n	100 (1242)	100 (366)	100 (1791)

Missing Values = 510

Table 73: Hours Employed of Sole Mother by Household Type in the 1986 Census

Household Type	Hours Employed of Sole Mother		
	Nil (%)	Part-Time (%)	Full-Time (%)
One Family, Dependent Children only	55	63	53
One Family, Dependent and Adult Children	10	14	17
One Family and Individual Relatives	9	6	7
One Family and Unrelated Individuals	8	10	12
Two or more Families	18	7	11
Total n	100 (47643)	100 (7632)	100 (15327)

Missing Values = 399

Table 74: Hours Employed of Sole Father by Household Type in the 1986 Census

Household Type	Hours Employed of Sole Father		
	Nil (%)	Part-Time (%)	Full-Time (%)
One Family, Dependent Children only	61	63	54
One Family, Dependent and Adult Children	12	13	19
One Family and Individual Relatives	6	4	6
One Family and Unrelated Individuals	5	6	8
Two or more Families	17	14	13
Total n	100 (3720)	100 (387)	100 (6651)

Missing Values = 108

Table 75: Hours Employed of Sole Mother by Location of Dwelling in the 1986 Census

Location of Dwelling	Hours Employed of Sole Mother		
	Nil (%)	Part-Time (%)	Full-Time (%)
Auckland Urban	27	21	33
Other Main Urban	47	51	47
Secondary Urban	7	7	4
Minor Urban	11	10	7
Rural	9	11	9
Total n	100 (47643)	100 (7632)	100 (15327)

Missing Values = 399

Table 76: Hours Employed of Sole Father by Location of Dwelling in the 1986 Census

Location of Dwelling	Hours Employed of Sole Father		
	Nil (%)	Part-Time (%)	Full-Time (%)
Auckland Urban	27	14	27
Other Main Urban	38	45	39
Secondary Urban	7	4	7
Minor Urban	9	9	10
Rural	19	28	18
Total n	100 (3720)	100 (387)	100 (6651)

Missing Values = 108

Table 77: Hours Employed of Sole Mother by Housing Tenure in the 1986 Census

Housing Tenure	Hours Employed of Sole Mother		
	Nil (%)	Part-Time (%)	Full-Time (%)
Mortgaged	34	50	52
Mortgage Free	12	16	14
Private Rental	24	16	18
Public Rental	28	17	14
Rent Free	1	1	2
Total n	100 (47622)	100 (7584)	100 (15210)

Missing Values = 585

Table 78: Hours Employed of Sole Father by Housing Tenure in the 1986 Census

Housing Tenure	Hours Employed of Sole Father		
	Nil (%)	Part-Time (%)	Full-Time (%)
Mortgaged	36	52	57
Mortgage Free	16	19	16
Private Rental	23	14	15
Public Rental	23	11	10
Rent Free	1	4	2
Total n	100 (3792)	100 (387)	100 (6618)

Missing Values = 69

Table 79: Hours Employed of Sole Mother by Social Welfare Benefits Received in the 1986 Census

Social Welfare Benefits Received	Hours Employed of Sole Mother		
	Nil (%)	Part-Time (%)	Full-Time (%)
FB only	11	21	36
FB and FC	2	8	43
DPB	73	59	13
UB	1	1	1
Widows'	7	6	1
Over 2 Benefits	7	5	5
Total n	100 (48039)	100 (7632)	100 (15327)

Missing Values = 3

Table 80: Hours Employed of Sole Father by Social Welfare Benefits Received in the 1986 Census

Social Welfare Benefits Received	Hours Employed of Sole Father		
	Nil (%)	Part-Time (%)	Full-Time (%)
FB only	26	61	73
FB and FC	1	8	21
DPB	60	19	3
UB	6	9	2
Widows'	0	0	0
Over 2 Benefits	7	3	1
Total n	100 (3828)	100 (387)	100 (6651)

Table 81: Hours Employed by Occupation of Employed
Sole Mothers in the 1986 Census

Occupation	Hours Employed of Sole Mother	
	Part-Time (%)	Full-Time (%)
Professional/ Technical	17	23
Administrative/ Managerial	1	3
Clerical	20	33
Sales	13	10
Service	33	12
Agricultural/ Forestry/Fishing	6	4
Production/ Transport	10	15
Total n	100 (7596)	100 (15159)

Missing Values = 204

Table 82: Hours Employed by Occupation of Employed
Sole Fathers in the 1986 Census

Occupation	Hours Employed of Sole Father	
	Part-Time (%)	Full-Time (%)
Professional/ Technical	17	15
Administrative/ Managerial	1	7
Clerical	3	7
Sales	2	8
Service	3	5
Agricultural/ Forestry/Fishing	10	13
Production/ Transport	64	46
Total n	100 (387)	100 (6597)

Missing Values = 54

Table 83: Hours Employed of Sole Mother by Income in the 1986 Census

Income	Hours Employed of Sole Mother		
	Nil (%)	Part-Time (%)	Full-Time (%)
Below \$10,000	69	48	20
\$10,000 - \$15,000	29	43	34
\$15,001 - \$20,000	1	5	26
Above \$20,000	1	3	20
Total n	100 (48039)	100 (7632)	100 (15327)

Missing Values = 3

Table 84: Hours Employed of Sole Father by Income in the 1986 Census

Income	Hours Employed of Sole Father		
	Nil (%)	Part-Time (%)	Full-Time (%)
Below \$10,000	64	22	11
\$10,000 - \$15,000	30	28	20
\$15,001 - \$20,000	4	16	20
Above \$20,000	2	34	48
Total n	100 (3828)	100 (387)	100 (6651)

Table 85: Rate of Full-Time Employment of Sole Parent by Ethnicity by Age of Youngest Child by Secondary Qualification in the 1986 Census

Age of Youngest Child	Secondary Qualification	Ethnicity of Sole Parent			
		European	Maori	Pacific Is.	Other
		(% Employed Full-Time)			
0-4 Years	No Qualification	7	8	14	8
	Qualification	16	15	21	6
5-8 Years	No Qualification	18	16	30	19
	Qualification	32	30	37	30
9-12 Years	No Qualification	28	23	30	16
	Qualification	50	38	49	31
13-18 Years	No Qualification	43	29	36	21
	Qualification	62	52	51	41
Total		31	17	26	19
n		(54600)	(20913)	(4386)	(1968)

Table 86: Rate of Full-Time Employment of Sole Parent by Marital Status by Age of Youngest Child in the 1986 Census

Age of Youngest Child	Marital Status of Sole Parent		
	Never Married (% Employed Full-Time)	Separated/ Divorced	Widowed
0-4 Years	10	11	17
5-8 Years	20	26	19
9-12 Years	33	38	23
13-15 Years	47	53	28
16-18 Years	66	60	32
Total n	16 (21303)	32 (50304)	24 (9015)

Missing Values = 1245

Table 87: Rate of Full-Time Employment of Sole Parent by Age of Youngest Child by Number of Children in the 1986 Census

Age of Youngest Child	Number of Children			
	1	2	3	4+
	(% Employed Full-Time)			
0-4 Years	13	9	8	7
5-8 Years	25	25	22	19
9-12 Years	35	36	35	29
13-15 Years	46	48	46	-
16-18 Years	53	29	-	-
Total n	30 (42783)	26 (26148)	20 (9465)	14 (3474)

Percentages have been omitted where n is less than 20

Date Due

Date Due			