Raising Network Resources While Raising Children?

Access to Social Capital by Parenthood Status, Gender, and Marital Status[*]

Lijun Song

Department of Sociology

Center for Medicine, Health, and Society

Vanderbilt University

Appears in *Social Networks* (2012)

[*] Direct correspondence to Lijun Song, Department of Sociology, Vanderbilt University, PMB 351811, Nashville TN 37235-1811, USA. Tel.: +1 615 322 1731; fax: +1 615 322 7505. Email address: lijun.song@vanderbilt.edu. An earlier version of this article was presented at the Annual Meeting of ASA in Boston, 2008 and the Annual Meeting of SSS in Richmond, 2008. Data used in this article were drawn from the thematic research project “Social Capital: Its Origins and Consequences", sponsored by Academia Sinica, Taiwan, through its Research Center for Humanities and Social Sciences, the Institute of Sociology, and Duke University. The principal investigators of the project are Nan Lin, Yang-Chih Fu, and Chih-Jou Jay Chen. The author is indebted to Nan Lin, Karen E. Campbell, and Holly McCammon for their helpful comments.

Raising Network Resources While Raising Children?

Access to Social Capital by Parenthood Status, Gender, and Marital Status

Abstract

Does raising non-adult children facilitate or restrict access to social capital as network resources? Using data from a national sample of adults in the United States, I do not find evidence for the direct effect of parenthood on the three dimensions of social capital (diversity, extensity, and quality), but instead I find evidence for its interaction effects on the quality of social capital. There is marginal evidence that parenthood status is associated with the quality of social capital positively for men but negatively for women. There is evidence that parenthood status is associated with the quality of social capital positively for the married but negatively for the unmarried. Also parenthood status is associated with the quality of social capital negatively for unmarried women but positively for the other three gender-marital groups, in particular unmarried men. These findings suggest the structural interplay of parenthood status with gender and marital status, and indicate the motherhood penalty, the fatherhood premium, the single-parenthood penalty, the married-parenthood premium, and the single-motherhood penalty in reaching higher-quality, rather than more diverse and extensive, social capital.

Key words: social capital, network resources, parenthood status, gender, marital status

Raising Network Resources While Raising Children?

Access to Social Capital by Parenthood Status, Gender, and Marital Status

1. Introduction

Social scientists have long recognized that parenting children, in particular non-adult children, is one of the most challenging life stages in the life cycle (LeMasters, 1957), and that it shapes adults' lives (Rossi, 1968). One major research interest has been the socioeconomic impact of parenthood, in particular the motherhood penalty, on the acquisition of personal capital, such as individuals' educational achievement, employment activities, job characteristics, wages, and income (Budig and England, 2001; Casper, McLanahan, and Garfinkel, 1994; Correll, Benard, and Paik, 2007; England, 2000; Hynes and Clarkberg, 2005; Teachman and Polonko, 1988; Waite, Haggstrom, and Kanouse, 1985).

Another major research area focuses on how child-rearing structures the "social world of parents" from the social network perspective (O' Donnell, 1983; Slater, 1964; Stueve and Gerson, 1977). There is substantive evidence that parenthood influences diverse forms of social connections, including social integration (e.g., participation in social activities and organizations), personal networks (e.g., network size, contact frequency, and network composition), and support networks (e.g., giving, received, perceived, and reciprocal assistance relationships) (Bost et al., 2002; Eggebeen and Knoester, 2001; Fischer and Oliker, 1983; Gallagher and Gerstel, 2001; Marks and McLanahan, 1993; Much, McPherson and Smith-Lovin, 1997; Nomaguchi and Milkie, 2003; Stolzenberg, Blair-Loy, and Waite, 1995; Wellman, 1985).

Despite the well-documented costs and rewards of parenting non-adult children in obtaining personal resources and in social networking, the attention to parental impact on access to network resources—network members' assets—is limited, and reports mixed results (Campbell, 1988; Erickson, 2004; Lin, Fu, and Hsung, 2001). Also, gender roles and marital status directly determine the amount of parental demands and the division of labor between mothers and fathers (e.g., England, 2000; Sayer, Bianchi, and Robinson, 2004; South and Spitze, 1994; Waite, 1995), and the parenthood effect on the obtainment of network resources can be simultaneously contingent on those two structural factors. But little is known about the structural interplay of parenthood with gender and marital status in the accumulation of network resources. Social capital has been one of the most popular theoretical tools in the social sciences over the last two decades (Portes, 1998). There are multiple approaches to social capital (Bourdieu, 1986 [1983]; Coleman, 1990; Lin, 2001; Putnam, 2000; Sampson, Morenoff, and Earls, 1999). This study does not attempt to resolve current debates on these different approaches (Song et al. 2010,); instead, it focuses on a network-based approach. This approach conceives social capital as resources embedded in social networks (Lin, 2001), and helps us bridge the gap between research on parenthood and on network resources.

The purpose of this study is to examine the direct effect of parenting non-adult children and its interaction effect with gender and marital status on access to multi-dimensional social capital—diversity, extensity, and quality—as network resources. This paper is organized as follows. First, I review the existing literature on social capital and parenthood status, and identify the gaps in research. I then propose hypotheses, and test

these hypotheses using data from a national U.S. sample of adults. I conclude with the theoretical and methodological implications of this study for future research.

2. Prior research on social capital and parenthood status

As an old axiom states, it is not what you know but who you know. Catching the substance of "who you know," the network-based approach defines social capital as "resources embedded in a social structure that are accessed and/or mobilized in purposive actions" (Lin, 2001: 29). Social capital is a unique resource locator. It differs from personal capital. Personal capital is individual, and refers to resources controlled by individuals themselves (e.g., economic capital, human capital, cultural capital). Social capital is relational, and indicates assets possessed by members of individuals' networks. Individuals access and use social capital only through their social ties with their network members.

Social capital is specified as the structural positions of one's network members. Structural positions in the hierarchical occupational structure determine the social allocation of scarce resources (Blau and Duncan, 1967). A position-generator methodology is created to map one's positional networks, that is, a set of ties to the occupational positions that one's network members occupy (Lin and Dumin, 1986; Lin et al., 2001). This network instrument asks egos to identify their contacts in a representative sample of hierarchical occupational positions salient in a society. If egos know several people in an occupation, they are usually asked to name the one that occurs to them first. This network instrument is flexible, reliable, valid, and economical in capturing social capital across societies (Lin, 1999; Van der Gaag et al., 2008). Three indices have been

well established and traditionally used to estimate social capital through the position generator: *total accessed positions* measuring the diversity of social capital; *range of accessed prestige* reflecting the extensity of social capital; and *highest accessed prestige* estimating the quality of social capital (Boxman, Flap, and Weesie, 1992; Campbell, Marsden, and Hurlbert, 1986; Lin and Dumin, 1986; Lin et al., 2001; Van der Gaag et al., 2008). Total accessed positions are the total number of occupations in which respondents identify one contact. Range of accessed prestige is the difference between the highest and lowest prestige scores of accessed occupations. Highest accessed prestige is the largest prestige score of accessed occupations.

The concept of social capital as network resources has stimulated substantive research on its causes and returns. Social capital is contingent on structural factors, such as gender, race/ethnicity, marital status, prior socioeconomic positions, and social integration (Campbell, 1988; Erickson, 2004; Lai, 2008; Lin, Ao, and Song, 2009; Lin, Ensel, and Vaughn, 1981; Lin et al., 2001; Magee, 2008; Marsden and Hurlbert, 1988). Social capital advances socioeconomic position, and protects health and well-being across cultures and societies (for reviews see Burt, 2000; Marsden and Gorman, 2001; Lin, 1999; Portes, 1998; Song, 2011; Song, Son, and Lin, 2010).

We know much less about whether access to social capital varies with parenthood status. Only two studies contribute to investigating this question, and they report inconsistent findings. One study (Campbell, 1988) analyzes data collected from 186 respondents working in four white-collar occupations in the Research Triangle area of North Carolina. It employs a position generator with a list of nine occupations, and measures three dimensions of social capital: diversity, extensity, and quality. It reports

that parenting young children (i.e., having children younger than six) decreases the diversity of social capital for women but not for men, and does not influence the extensity and quality of social capital for either gender group. The second study (Erickson, 2004) uses data from a national survey of Canada. It develops a position generator with a list of fifteen occupations, and constructs three scales for the diversity of social capital: diversity of contacts with anyone, diversity of contacts with men, and diversity of contacts with women. It shows that parenting non-adult children (i.e., the presence of children less than eighteen years of age) increases men's diversity of ties to women. There is no evidence that parenthood affects men's diversity of ties to either anyone or men, or that parenthood affects women's diversity of ties to anyone, men, or women. Additionally, one study in Taiwan (Lin et al., 2001) examines the grandparental effect on social capital. It uses a position generator with a list of fifteen occupations, and extracts a latent social capital factor from three observed social capital indices—diversity, extensity, and quality. This study finds that the presence of grandchildren is associated with social capital only for women in a negative direction.

The existing limited studies on parenting non-adult children and social capital have weaknesses. The North Carolina study (Campbell, 1988) explores different indicators of social capital, but uses community data and pays incomplete attention to the interplay between parenthood and gender. The study in Canada (Erickson, 2004) uses national data, but examines only the diversity of social capital. The study in Taiwan (Lin et al., 2001) focuses on grandparenthood, and analyzes social capital as one latent factor, assuming that grandparenthood exerts similar influences on different social capital dimensions. Also, none of these studies addresses whether the association between

parenthood and social capital is contingent on marital status. Both gender roles and marital status primarily affect the division of parental labor and the quantity of parental involvement (e.g., England, 2000; Sayer et al., 2004; South and Spitze, 1994; Waite, 1995). The parenthood effect on access to social capital may lie in the three-way structural interplay of parenthood with gender and marital status.

In this paper I systematically study how raising non-adult children influences access to social capital, and how that influence varies according to three dimensions of social capital (i.e., diversity, extensity, and quality), gender, and marital status. I propose hypotheses below.

3. Hypotheses: Raising social capital while raising non-adult children

This study investigates four research questions: whether parenthood facilitates or restricts access to dimensions of social capital, and whether that parenthood effect varies with gender, marital status, and both gender and marital status. Drawing on previous studies, I propose five hypotheses: children as connectors, children as constraints, gender role, marital institution, and gendered marital institution.

3.1. Children as connectors or constraints

I first ask whether child-rearing facilitates or restricts access to different dimensions of social capital. I propose a children-as-connectors perspective on the diversity and extensity of social capital, and a children-as-constraints perspective on the quality of social capital.

From the children-as-connectors perspective, people with non-adult children access more diverse and more extensive social capital because parenting expands their structural opportunities for networking in four ways. First, child-rearing increases parents' involvement in strong-tie relationships with kin and friends for the purpose of social support and social exchange (Bost et al., 2002; Fischer, 1988; Fischer and Oliker, 1983; Gallagher and Gerstel, 2001; Gottlieb and Pancer, 1988; Nomaguchi and Milkie, 2003). Second, parents are more engaged in community activities and friendship networks within the neighborhood than non-parents (Moore, 1990; Ploch and Hastings, 1998; Nomaguchi and Milkie, 2003; Stolzenberg et al., 1995). Third, parents connect to children's friends and to fellow parents. Such networks with inter-generational closure are multi-functional (Coleman, 1988). Parents' perceived support from people outside the family, for example, is positively associated with children's friendship quality (Offer and Schneider, 2007). Fourth, parents get acquainted with providers of various formal or informal children's services (Ambert, 2001; Erickson, 2004). The range of these providers is broad. Parents are in special need of the services of the lower class, such as babysitters, hotel bellboys, and taxi drivers, in addition to needing the services of the middle class, such as teachers and nurses. Therefore the children-as-connectors hypothesis argues that raising non-adult children is positively associated with the diversity and extensity of social capital (Hypothesis 1).

From the children-as-constraints perspective, however, people with non-adult children may be less likely to reach high quality social capital. Individuals perceive high-status people as having more valuable resources (Thye, 2000), and prefer to interact closely with those of higher status than those of comparable status (Laumann, 1965, 1966;

Laumann and Senter, 1976; Thye, 2000). Rearing non-adult children constrains this social interaction preference in two ways. First, structural opportunities for meeting high-status people decline when parenting. Child-centered interaction decreases parents' connection to weak-tie contacts while increasing their interaction with strong-tie and location-limited contacts such as kin, friends, neighbors, and fellow parents (Fischer and Oliker 1983; Gallagher and Gerstel 2001). Individuals are more likely to reach people in higher social positions through weak-tie contacts (Lai, Lin, and Leung 1998; Lin, Dayton, and Greenwald, 1978; Lin et al., 1981). Those strong-tie and location-limited contacts tend to occupy positions at similar hierarchical levels due to the homophily trend, and due to residential and school segregation by socioeconomic class (Jargowsky, 1996; McPherson, Smith-Lovin, and Cook, 2001; Saporito, 2003). Second, child-rearing constrains parents' investment of resources. Parenting consumes time, physical and mental energy, material goods, financial capital, and other resources. Apart from childcare and child-centered networking, parents also have to spend more time on unpaid work, such as housework and shopping (Sayer, 2005). As a consequence, parents' investment of resources in intentional networking and non–children-centered activities declines (Eggebeen and Knoester, 2001; Sayer, 2005), as do their chances of contacting higher-status people. Therefore the children-as-constraints hypothesis states that raising non-adult children is negatively associated with the quality of social capital (Hypothesis 2).

3.2. Gender role

I then analyze whether the parenthood effect varies by gender. The traditional parenting role is socially constructed to be gendered. Mothers are socially labeled as homemakers and overwhelmingly bear the primary responsibility of raising children, in contrast with fathers, who are marked as breadwinners and chief providers of family needs, in particular financial needs (Bianchi, 2000; Maume, 2008; O'Donnell, 1983; Sayer et al., 2004). From this gender role perspective, the children-as-connectors and children-as-constraints arguments applies to women while a children-as-motive argument applies to men.

To apply the children-as-connectors statement, women with non-adult children access more diverse and more extensive social capital than women without non-adult kids. To apply the children-as-constraints argument from the gender-role perspective, women with non-adult children access lower-quality social capital than women without non-adult kids or men for two reasons: reduced structural opportunities and restricted resources for meeting high-status people.

Child-rearing diminishes women's structural opportunities in three ways. First, mothers access fewer weak-tie contacts due to their more child-centered interaction with strong-tie and community-limited contacts (Bost et al., 2002; Fischer and Oliker, 1983; Kalmijn, 2007; Marks and McLanahan, 1993; Moore, 1990). Second, mothers are more likely to connect to other mothers who also suffer from the motherhood penalty and possess relatively lower social positions due to the gender homophily principle (Marsden, 1987, 1988). Third, women's chances to attain quality social capital in work contexts and through professional associates decline when parenting. Children decrease women's work

hours and activities while increasing men's (Kaufman and Uhlenberg, 2000; Sanchez and Thomson, 1997; Waite et al., 1985). Women are more likely than men to sacrifice ties to coworkers for the purpose of child-rearing (Fischer and Oliker, 1983; Wellman, 1985).

Furthermore, children consume more resources for women in three ways. First, parenting enlarges the amount of unpaid work, such as household labor, more for women or only for women (Baxter, Hewitt, and Haynes, 2008; Bianchi et al., 2000; Gupta, 1999; Nomaguchi and Milkie, 2003; Presser, 1994; Sanchez and Thomson, 1997; South and Spitze, 1994). Second, parenting consumes a greater amount of free time for women (Mattingly and Bianchi, 2003; Sayer, 2005). Third, child-rearing diminishes women's, but not men's, socioeconomic status due to the motherhood penalty (Budig and England, 2001; Correll et al., 2007; Teachman and Polonko, 1988; Waite et al., 1985; Waldfogel, 1997).

The children-as-motive argument applies to men. Men with non-adult children are more motivated and more able to obtain multi-dimensional social capital than men without non-adult kids or women. Men are socially constructed as the primary suppliers of financial resources for family members. Their breadwinner role is reinforced when parenting. Fathers have stronger motivation for economic resources. They perform more work activities with longer work hours than non-fathers or women in the job market (Kaufman and Uhlenberg, 2000; Sanchez and Thomson, 1997; Waite et al., 1985). Their access to multi-dimensional social capital increases in three ways. First, their increased work activities expand their structural opportunities to connect to contacts at diverse occupational positions and at different hierarchical statuses in working contexts. Second, with more working activities and achieved resources, fathers are better able to invest in

work-related networking opportunities through which they get to know people at various positions of the occupational hierarchy, reaching people at higher levels of that hierarchy. Third, with more active working involvement and higher achieved status, fathers are more likely to attract others at various occupational levels.

Furthermore, the gender role perspective expects that men's diversity and extensity of social capital benefit more from rearing non-adult children than women's. Children connect women to child-centered networks while motivating men to develop work-centered networks. Both kinds of networks increase the diversity and extensity of social capital, but in comparison with child-centered networks, work-centered networks are directly embedded in the hierarchical occupational structure and are composed of contacts at a wider range of diverse occupational positions. Therefore the gender role hypothesis states that raising non-adult children is positively associated with the diversity and extensity of social capital for both gender groups, particularly for men, while it is associated with the quality of social capital positively for men and negatively for women (Hypothesis 3).

3.3. Marital institution

I next investigate how the parental effect on social capital depends on marital status. Marriage is a multi-functional social institution (Waite, 1995). It structures couples' social lives through the institutionalized sharing mechanism. Spouses not only share each other's resources, including personal capital, social networks, social capital, and rewards of child-rearing, but also share expenses, including various forms of child-rearing costs. From the marital institution perspective, the children-as-connectors argument is

applicable to both marital groups, in particular to the married, and the children-as-constraints statement applies to the unmarried but not to the married.

To apply the children-as-connectors argument, parenting non-adult children has a positive effect on the diversity and extensity of social capital for both marital groups. From the marital institution perspective, that positive effect is stronger for the married than for the unmarried for three reasons. First, married parents possess one more dyadic tie to their spouses, and connect to their spouses' social circles (Kalmijn, 2003). Second, married parents are more involved with kin, neighbors, and social organizations than unmarried parents (Hurlbert and Acock, 1990; Kalmijn, 2007; Marks and McLanahan, 1993; Ploch and Hastings, 1998; Stolzenberg et al., 1995). Third, married parents share the costs of childcare and child-centered networking and are more able to afford self-centered networking and reaching contacts at different social positions outside of the family.

Also from the marital institution perspective, the children-as-constraints argument applies only to the unmarried. Unmarried parents suffer in accessing higher-quality social capital for three reasons. First, their relatively lower level of social integration reduces their structural opportunities for meeting high-status individuals. Second, as the solo heads of the family, they carry the parenting responsibilities alone. They have to invest a higher proportion of their already limited resources, particularly time and financial assets, in child-centered activities. They are less available and less able to socialize with occupants of high-status positions. Third, parenting is more demanding and stressful for the unmarried. Unmarried parents report lower self-efficacy and higher depression

(Nomaguchi and Milkie, 2003). Their lack of psychological resources may discourage them from taking purposive actions to reach high-status contacts.

In contrast, those who are married with non-adult children can still manage to reach high-status contacts in three ways. First, they benefit from their higher level of social integration. Second, they enjoy economies of scale when parenting through sharing child-rearing costs with their spouses (Waite, 1995), thus reserving more resources for their own purposive social networking with people at higher social positions. Third, they enjoy access to spouses' higher-quality social capital. The domestic division of labor allows one spouse to be the child's care-giver and the other to be the breadwinner who pursues financial resources and social connections in work contexts.

Therefore the marital institution hypothesis proposes that parenting non-adult children is positively associated with the diversity and extensity of social capital for both marital groups in particular for the married, while it is associated with the quality of social capital positively for the married but negatively for the unmarried (Hypothesis 4).

3.4. Gendered marital institution

Finally, I investigate whether the parenthood effect is contingent on both gender and marital status through the combination of the gender role perspective with the marital institution perspective.

The impact of marital status on the association between parenting non-adult kids and social capital is gendered. On the one hand, marriage serves as a crucial source of social support and social connections for mothers because their husbands are expected to

share parenting tasks as well as achieved personal and social capital with them. On the other hand, marriage acts as a constraint for fathers. Because of gendered custody patterns, less than 1 out of 4 single parent families are headed by a father (United States Census Bureau, 2001). Married fathers are more likely than unmarried fathers to live together with their non-adult children, and thus share more economic and social costs of child rearing. The motivation of married fathers to attain socioeconomic resources and accumulate social capital is less, and the amount of resources available for purposive work-related social networking is smaller, than for unmarried fathers.

From the gendered marital perspective, the positive parenthood impact on the diversity and extensity of social capital is strongest for unmarried men, followed by married men, married women, and unmarried women. Men benefit more than women according to the children-as-motive argument. Unmarried men benefit more than married men because marriage constrains the latter's social networking with more parenting responsibilities. Married women benefit more than unmarried women because they enjoy the benefits of marriage, such as the social support and social networks of their spouses.

Also from the gendered marital perspective, the negative parenthood impact on the quality of social capital is negative for unmarried women but positive for the other three gender-marital groups. The children-as-constraint argument applies to unmarried women. They face more demands when parenting non-adult children. They have fewer resources for attracting, and fewer structural opportunities to socialize with, high-status contacts for four reasons. First, they have to carry their parenting responsibility alone or with inadequate support from nonresidential fathers (McLanahan and Booth, 1989). Child care restrains their work activities and reduces their earning capacity to a greater degree

(Garfinkel and McLanahan, 1986). Second, they control fewer psychological resources such as sense of control and encounter more stressors (McLanahan, 1983; McLanahan and Booth, 1989). They may be more discouraged from taking purposive actions to reach high-status contacts. Third, they are excluded from benefits of marriage, an institutionalized source of social support and social ties in comparison with married women. Fourth, they reside in neighborhoods characterized by higher levels of poverty (Garfinkel and McLanahan, 1986; McLanahan and Garfinkel, 1989), where they have fewer chances to be neighbored by high-status residents.

Among the other three gender-marital groups, the parenthood impact on the quality of social capital is positive. That impact is positive for married and unmarried men according to the children-as-motive argument, and for married women according to the gendered marital institution argument. Unmarried men benefit more than married men because their accumulation of social capital is not constrained by marriage and is less restricted by parenting responsibilities. Unmarried men benefit more than married women according to the children-as-constraint argument. Married women benefit rather than suffer when parenting because they access their husbands' social connections and quality social capital, and they have more resources for networking with high-status contacts because of their husbands' various forms of social support.

Therefore the gendered marital institution hypothesis argues that the positive association between parenting non-adult children and the diversity and extensity of social capital is strongest for single men, followed by married men, married women, and single women, and that the association between parenting non-adult children and the quality of

social capital is negative for single women but positive for the other three gender-marital groups, in particular for single men (Hypothesis 5).

4. Data and methods

4.1. Data

Data were drawn from the research project "Social Capital: Its Origins and Consequences" (for a detailed survey procedure, see Lin and Ao, 2008). A random-digit dialing telephone survey was conducted from November 2004 to April 2005 from a. national sample of adults ages twenty-one to sixty-four in the United States, currently or previously employed. During the survey process another sampling criterion was used to aggressively recruit more qualified minorities (especially African Americans and Latinos) so that the sample would approximate the racial and ethnic distribution of the census. A dummy variable, quota, was created to identify respondents sampled after the recruitment change (value=1). All analyses in this study controlled for this variable, and found that the potential bias due to such a sampling modification was not significant. The sample consists of 3,000 respondents for a response rate of 43 percent, which is comparable to other recent national random-digit dialing surveys (Groves et al., 2004). The comparison of this sample with the March 2005 Current Population Survey in the United States shows strong correspondence in key variables with the exception that respondents in this sample were more educated (McDonald and Mair 2010). Since this research project targeted adults currently or previously employed, an elevation of education should be expected. The listwise deletion of cases with missing values on the variables of interest incurred a loss of 17 percent of the total sample. I used a multiple imputation method to

correct missing-data bias. I imputed missing values in independent variables based on ten imputations using one Stata user-written program, Ice (Royston, 2005). Each of these ten imputed data sets included 2,938 respondents. Table 1 shows the summary of sample characteristics averaged over these ten imputed data sets.

Insert Table 1 about here

4.2. Dependent variables

I measured social capital using the position generator (Lin and Dumin, 1986; Lin et al., 2001). The original wording of the question was "Next, I am going to ask some general questions about jobs some people you know may now have. These people include your relatives, friends, and acquaintances (acquaintances are people who know each other by face and name). If there are several people you know who have that kind of job, please tell me the one that occurs to you first." A list of twenty-two jobs salient in the United States was presented to respondents (see Table 2). The NORC/GSS Occupational Prestige scores were used to code the prestige of each job (Nakao, Hodge, and Treas, 1990; Nakao and Treas, 1990). The occupational prestige scores for the listed jobs range from 22 (janitor) to 75 (lawyer). The reliability test of the listed twenty-two jobs produced a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .78. This indicates good acceptable internal consistency. We further tested the reliability by calculating alpha coefficients with each listed job deleted. The alphas ranged from .75 to .77. This indicates the unidimensionality of the listed 22 jobs. As introduced earlier, I used three well-documented and traditional used indices to respectively estimate three dimensions of social capital: total accessed

positions (measuring the diversity of social capital); range of accessed prestige (reflecting the extensity of social capital); and highest accessed prestige (estimating the quality of social capital). Table 2 shows the distribution of occupational positions in the position generator and social capital indices.

Insert Table 2 about here

4.3. Independent variables

As in previous studies, parenthood status as a dummy variable indicates whether respondents were raising non-adult children. I measured parenthood status based on the age of the oldest child (1=the oldest child was younger than eighteen, 0=the oldest child was older than eighteen or the household had no children). Because the responsibility and involvement of parents is contingent on household size, I also controlled for the total number of children in statistical analyses.

All analyses in this study controlled for three groups of variables: demographic factors, socioeconomic status, and social integration. Demographic factors include five variables apart from sample quota. Gender was a dummy variable (1=female). Age was a continuous variable. Race/ethnicity had four categories: 1) white, 2) black, 3) Latino, and 4) other race/ethnicity. I created a dummy variable for each category, and used white as the reference group. Marital status was a dummy variable (1=married). Socioeconomic status had four indicators: education, employment status, occupational prestige, and annual family income. Education as years of schooling was a continuous variable. Employment status was a dummy variable (1=employed). Occupational status of the

current or the last job was a continuous variable, based on the NORC/GSS Occupational Prestige scores (Nakao et al., 1990; Nakao and Treas, 1990). Annual family income had twenty-eight ordinal ranges. I calculated medians of all ranges, and took their square roots for a normal distribution of income as the ladder of power transformations suggested (Tukey, 1977). Social integration was a continuous variable (number of memberships in voluntary organizations).

4.4. Analytic strategy

I ran a series of OLS regressions models to predict the values of the three continuous social capital indices. I first estimated the basic models containing only independent variables, and examined the direct effects of parenthood status on those three social capital indices. I then entered the two-way product term between parenthood status and gender, the two-way product term between parenthood status and marital status, and the three-way product term between parenthood status, gender, and marital status respectively into the basic models, and tested the effects of the two- and three-way interactions of parenthood status with gender and marital status on access to multi-dimensional social capital. Coefficients were estimated as the average across those ten imputed data sets using one Stata user-written program, Mim (Carlin, Galati, and Royston, 2008).

5. Results

I first estimated the basic models containing only independent variables, and examined the direct effects of parenthood status on three social capital indices (see Table 3). Net of

control variables (Model 1), parenting non-adult children exerted a positive effect on the total number of accessed positions (.193). The direction of that effect was consistent with the children-as-connectors hypothesis (H1), but that effect was not significant. As Model 2 showed, parenthood status had a positive effect on the range of accessed prestige (.745). The direction of that impact was consistent with the children-as-connectors hypothesis (H1), but that impact was not significant. As Model 3 showed, raising non-adult children was negatively associated with the highest accessed prestige (-.124). The negative direction of that association was consistent with the children-as-constraints hypothesis (H2), but that association was not significant. Thus parenthood status did not have significant direct associations with the three dimensions of social capital.

Insert Table 3 about here

I then entered the product term of parenthood status and gender (being female) into the basic models, and examined their two-way interaction effect (see Table 4). As Model 1 showed, the interaction term exerted a negative effect on the total number of accessed positions (-.403). Parenthood status was positively associated with the diversity of social capital more strongly for men (.418) than for women (.015). The directions of those associations were consistent with the gender role hypothesis (H3), but those associations were not significant. As Model 2 showed, the interaction term had a positive effect on the range of accessed prestige (.160). Parenthood status was positively associated with the extensity of social capital more strongly for women (.816) than for men (.656). The directions of those associations were inconsistent with the gender role

hypothesis (H3), but those associations were not significant. As Model 3 showed, the interaction term had a negative effect on the highest accessed prestige (-.949), and that effect was marginally significant at the level of .10. Raising non-adult children was associated with the quality of social capital positively for men (.405) but negatively for women (-.544). Men with non-adult children reached higher-quality social capital than men without non-adult children, while women raising non-adult kids had lower-quality social capital than women without non-adult kids. These marginally significant results were consistent with the gender role hypothesis (H3). Thus parenthood status had a marginally significant interaction with gender in access to the quality of social capital but not in access to its diversity and extensity.

Insert Table 4 about here

I next entered the product term of parenthood status and marital status (being married) into the basic models, and examined their two-way interaction effect (see Table 5). As Model 1 showed, that interaction term exerted a positive effect on the total number of accessed positions (.027). Parenthood status was positively associated with the diversity of social capital more strongly for the married (.202) than for the unmarried (.175). The directions of those associations were consistent with the marital institution hypothesis (H4), but those associations were not significant. As Model 2 showed, that interaction term had a positive impact on the range of accessed prestige (1.377). Parenthood status was associated with the extensity of social capital positively for the married (1.165) but negatively for the unmarried (-.212). The directions of those

associations were inconsistent with the marital institution hypothesis (H4), but those associations were not significant. As Model 3 showed, the interaction term had a positive effect on the highest accessed prestige (1.634), and that effect was significant at the level of .05. Raising non-adult children was associated with the quality of social capital positively for the married (0.374) but negatively for the unmarried (-1.260). The married with non-adult children reached higher-quality social capital than the married without non-adult children, while the unmarried raising non-adult kids had lower-quality social capital than the unmarried without non-adult kids. These significant results were consistent with the marital institution hypothesis (H4). Thus parenthood status had a significant interaction with marital status in access to the quality of social capital but not in access to its diversity and extensity.

Insert Table 5 about here

Finally, I entered the product term of parenthood status, gender, and marital status into the basic models, and examined their three-way interaction effect (see Table 6). As Models 1 and 2 showed, the three-way interaction term had positive effects on the total number of accessed positions (.996) and the range of accessed prestige (1.768), but these two effects were not significant. As Model 3 showed, that product term exerted a positive impact on the highest accessed prestige (3.726), and that effect was significant at the level of .01. Rearing non-adult children was associated with the highest accessed prestige negatively only for unmarried women (-2.731) but positively for the other three gender-marital groups: married women (.473), married men (.203), and unmarried men (.725).

Unmarried women with non-adult children had lower-quality social capital than unmarried women without non-adult children. In contrast, married women, married men, and unmarried men with non-adult children accessed higher-quality social capital than their counterparts without non-adult kids. In terms of reaching higher-quality social capital, unmarried fathers benefitted the most from parenting, followed by married women and married men. These significant results were consistent with the gendered marital institution hypothesis (H5). Thus parenthood status had a significant interaction simultaneously with both gender and marital status in access to the quality of social capital but not in access to its diversity and extensity.

Insert Table 6 about here

6. Conclusion and discussion

This study explores the direct effect of parenting non-adult children and its interaction effect with gender and marital status on access to multi-dimensional social capital using data from a national sample of adults in the United States. I find no significant evidence for the direct parenthood effect on the three dimensions of social capital, but I find evidence for its interaction effects on the quality of social capital. There is marginal evidence that parenthood status is associated with the quality of social capital positively for men but negatively for women. There is evidence that parenthood status is associated with the quality of social capital positively for the married but negatively for the unmarried. Also parenthood status is associated with the quality of social capital

negatively for unmarried women but positively for the other three gender-marital groups, in particular unmarried men.

This study is the first to systematically investigate the unequal social distribution of multi-dimensional social capital by integrating four schools of sociological traditions: the social network paradigm, the life course framework, the gender role approach, and the marital institution perspective. It extends the relevant literature theoretically and methodologically in five ways.

First, this study advances our knowledge of the dynamic life course impact on social capital as network resources (Erickson, 2004; McDonald and Mair, 2010; O'Rand, 2001; Song, 2010). Parenting non-adult children is a significant stage of the life course. It involves multiple actors and social relationships beyond the parent-child dyadic tie. It reshapes the social network contexts in which social capital is embedded. This study finds that child-rearing does not directly influence all three dimensions of social capital, but it affects the quality of social capital through its structural interplay with gender and marital status. Raising non-adult children facilitates access to quality social capital for men but restricts it for women at a marginal significance level. Rearing non-adult children assists the married but blocks the unmarried to reach quality social capital. Further, parenting non-adult kids advantages married men, unmarried men, and married women, but disadvantages unmarried women in the accumulation of quality social capital. These findings suggest that rearing non-adult children is both rewarding and punishing not only depending on the dimensions of social capital and but also depending on gender and marital status. They also indicate that unequal access to quality social

capital may be a mechanism linking parenthood to socioeconomic and health stratification by gender and marital status (Lin, 1999; Song, 2011; Song et al., 2010).

Second, this study adds to the long-lasting debate on the rewards and penalties of gendered parenthood and their influence on the social worlds and resource achievements of adults (England, 2000; O'Donnell, 1983; Waite et al., 1985). Consistent with the gender role perspective, expecting children to be constraints for women but motive for men, this study shows that rearing non-adult children hurts quality of social capital for women while benefitting quality for men at a marginal significance level. The motherhood penalty and the fatherhood premium in status attainment have been well documented (England 2000).This study affirms the motherhood penalty and the fatherhood premium in accessing higher-status contacts in a hierarchical social structure. The traditional gendered division of child-rearing responsibility channels women into social networks with lower-quality resources while driving men into relational contexts with richer assets, which helps maintain the persistent gender stratification in social mobility and status attainment. Considering the trend of the declining gender gap in terms of time spent by parents caring for children (Bianchi et al., 2000; Sayer et al., 2004), we may expect a declining gendered parenthood effect on the quality of social capital. Future research should employ longitudinal data to study this trend prediction.

Third, this study expands the research tradition on the costs and benefits of marriage (England, 2000; Waite, 1995). As this study shows, when parenting non-adult children the married benefit in reaching higher-quality social capital while the unmarried suffer. These findings on the single-parenthood penalty and the married-parenthood premium are consistent with the institutionalized marriage perspective. They indicate that

marriage as a dyadic tie plays a critical role in the social construction of social ties and the accumulation of network resources, and that marriage may help parents cope with the loss of social connections to high-status contacts due to child-rearing responsibilities. For a more complete picture of the multiple functions of marriage, future studies need to directly examine and compare the explanatory power of four possible mechanisms for the differential parenthood effect by marital status: social integration, costs and resources sharing, social capital sharing through the domestic division of labor, and psychological resources. Also note that the data I analyzed here do not allow me to consider cohabiting respondents as a separate group. Only about 1 percent of respondents (N=31) were cohabitants. The rate of cohabitation is increasing (Kennedy and Bumpass, 2008). Cohabiting unions are fragile (Cherlin, 2000). I speculate that the protective or restrictive effect of cohabitation, if any, for mothers or fathers will be lower than that of marriage. Future research needs to use large-scale data and examine this speculation.

Fourth, this study demonstrates the three-way structural interplay of parenthood status with both gender and marital status in achieving quality social capital. Consistent with the gendered marital institution perspective, results show that when parenting non-adult children only unmarried women suffer in obtaining higher-quality social capital, while the other three gender-marital groups—in particular unmarried men—benefit. These findings indicate that the motherhood penalty and the fatherhood premium in accessing high-quality social capital are contingent on marital status. Marriage functions as a source of social support and social networks for women while serving as a social constraint for men in the process of reaching high-status social contacts. Also these findings suggest that unmarried mothers form an underclass not only in terms of their

own socioeconomic status (McLanahan and Booth, 1989; McLanahan and Garfinkel, 1989) but also in terms of their network resources. The population of unmarried parents, unmarried mothers in particular, is increasing over time in the United States (Cherlin, 2010; Wojtkiewicz, McLanahan, and Garfinkel, 1990). Future research is needed to further examine the social processes through which unmarried mothers are structurally constrained within resource-poor relational contexts.

In addition to the theoretical contributions of its findings, this study also makes a methodological contribution. It advances our understanding of the different theoretical meanings between the three dimensions of social capital. We traditionally derive three social capital dimensions from the position generator: diversity, extensity, and quality. Some studies examine causes and consequences of each social capital dimension separately (e.g., Lin and Dumin, 1986; Campbell, 1988); other research analyzes sources and returns of social capital as a single latent factor derived from factor analyses of different dimensions (e.g., Lin et al., 2001; Song and Lin, 2009). This study finds that parenthood is significantly associated with only the quality dimension of social capital through its interaction with gender and marital status. This finding affirms the multi-dimensional nature of social capital, and suggests that future studies investigate each social capital dimension separately for a more complete understanding of their interesting, but probably varying, relationships to the same social factor before applying factor analysis.

As the first step to examine the interplay of parenthood, gender, and marital status in the accumulation of multi-dimensional social capital, this study has limitations that future studies should overcome. Three data limitations should be noted. First, this study is

based on cross-sectional data. Variables of interest in this study were all measured at the time of the survey. A process of social selection is possible. Men knowing contacts at higher hierarchical locations may be more likely to find mates, get married, and later become parents, or women knowing high-status contacts may be less likely to become unmarried mothers. A process of social homophily is also possible (i.e., people tend to interact with others with similar characteristics) (Mouw, 2003, 2006). For purposes of stronger causal inference, future studies should use longitudinal data to examine the competing arguments of social selection, social homophily, and social causation.

Second, the data I used are from a national sample of respondents ages twenty-one to sixty-four who were currently or previously employed. Data are not available from the elderly or adults who were never employed. The elderly are likely to have adult children. The effect of parenting non-adult children on social capital may be smaller for the elderly. Individuals with no employment history are likely to be women who possess less personal capital. They are facing a larger burden, in particular a financial burden, if they are raising children. This study may underestimate the moderating effect of gender on the association between child-rearing and social capital. Also as introduced earlier, respondents in this sample were more educated because the survey interviewed people currently or previously employed. The negative impact of parenting non-adult children on social capital may be stronger for the less educated whose social networking behaviors are more constrained by parenting duties due to their lack of personal capital. For purposes of generalizability, future studies should collect data from a national sample of respondents of all ages and employment backgrounds.

Third, the data I analyzed do not have detailed information on respondents' children. The survey did not ask respondents the age and gender of every child they had, or whether the oldest child was living together with them. The presence of non-adult children, for example, is a more direct indicator of the amount of parental involvement than having non-adult children. Also mothers are more likely to live together with non-adult children than fathers. Thus this study may underestimate the effect of parenthood and its interaction effect with gender on social capital. Future research should collect information on children's presence, and compare the social world of mothers and fathers more directly.

This study addresses the question of whether people can raise network resources while raising non-adult children. This study represents the first research effort to demonstrate that it is not parenting non-adult children per se but its complicated interplay with another two structural factors—gender and marital status—that influences people's reach for higher-quality network resources. In order for scholars and policy makers to draw a more complete dynamic picture of parenting and social capital, it is essential that we understand the complex combination of parenthood, gender roles, and marital status in the structural determination of social networking.

References

Ambert, A.M., 2001. The Effect of Children on Parents, 2nd ed. The Haworth Press, New York, NY.

Baxter, J., Hewitt, B., Haynes, M., 2008. Life Course Transitions and Housework: Marriage, Parenthood, and Time on Housework. Journal of Marriage and Family 70, 259-72.

Bianchi, S.M., 2000. Maternal Employment and Time with Children: Dramatic Change or Surprising Continuity. Demography 37(4), 401-14.

Bianchi, S.M., Milkie, M.A., Sayer, L.C., Robinson, J.P., 2000. Is Anyone Doing the Housework? Trends in the Gender Division of Household Labor. Social Forces 79(1), 191-228.

Blau, P.M., Duncan, O.D., 1967. The American Occupational Structure. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, NY.

Bost, K.K., Cox, M.J., Burchinal, M.R., Payne, C., 2002. Structural and Supportive Changes in Couples' Family and Friendship Networks Across the Transition to Parenthood. Journal of Marriage and Family 64, 517-31.

Bourdieu, P., 1986 [1983]. The Forms of Capital. In: Richardson, J.G. (ed.), Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education, Greenwood Press, Westport, CT, pp. 241–58.

Boxman, E.A.W., Hendrick, D.F., Weesie, H.M., 1992. Informeel zoeken op de arbeidsmarkt [Informal Searching on the Labour Market]. In: Jansen, S., Van den Wittenboer, G.L.H. (Eds.), Sociale Netwerken En Hun Invloed. Boom, Meppel, Amsterdam, pp.39-56.

Budig, M.J., England, P., 2001. The Wage Penalty for Motherhood. American Sociological Review 66(2), 204-25.

Burt, R.S., 2000. The Network Structure of Social Capital. Research in Organizational Behavior 22, 345-423.

Campbell, K.E., 1988. Gender Differences in Job-Related Networks. Work and Occupations 15, 179-200.

Campbell, K.E., Marsden, P.V., Hurlbert, J.S., 1986. Social Resources and Socioeconomic Status. Social Networks 8, 97-117.

Carlin, J.B., Galati, J.C., Royston, P., 2008. A New Framework for Managing and Analyzing Multiply Imputed Data in Stata. The Stata Journal 8(1), 49-67.

Casper, L.M., McLanahan, S.S., Garfinkel, I., 1994. The Gender-Poverty Gap: What We Can Learn from Other Countries. American Sociological Review 59, 594-605.

Cherlin, A.J., 2000. Demographic Trends in the United States: A Review of Research in the 2000s. Journal of Marriage and Family 72, 403-19.

Coleman, J.S., 1990. Foundations of Social Theory. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Correll, S., Benard, S., Paik, I., 2007. Getting a Job: Is There a Motherhood Penalty? American Journal of Sociology 112(5), 1297-1338.

Eggebeen, D.J., Knoester, C., 2001. Does Fatherhood Matter for Men? Journal of Marriage and the Family 63, 381-93.

England, P., 2000. Marriage, the Costs of Children, and Gender Inequality. In: Waite, L.J. (Ed.), The Ties That Bind: Perspectives on Marriage and Cohabitation. Aldine de Gruyter, New York, NY, pp. 320-42.

Erickson, B.H., 2004. The Distribution of Gendered Social Capital in Canada. In: Flap, H., Völker, B. (Eds.), Creation and Returns of Social Capital: A New Research Paradigm. Routledge, London, UK, and New York, NY, pp. 27-50.

Fischer, C.S., Oliker, S.J., 1983. A Research Note on Friendship, Gender, and the Life Cycle. Social Forces 62, 124-33.

Fischer, L.R., 1988. The Influence of Kin on the Transition to Parenthood. In: Palkovitz, R., Sussman, M.B. (Eds.), Transitions to Parenthood. The Haworth Press, New York, NY, pp. 202-19.

Gallagher, S.K., Gerstel, N., 2001. Connections and Constraints: The Effects of Children on Caregiving. Journal of Marriage and the Family 63, 265-75.

Garfinkel, I., McLanahan, S.S., 1986. Single Mothers and Their Children: A New American Dilemma. Urban Institute Press, Washington, DC.

Gottlieb, B.H., Pancer, S.M., 1988. Social Networks and the Transition to Parenthood. In: Michaels, G.Y., Goldberg, W.A. (Eds.), The Transition to Parenthood: Current Theory and Research. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, pp. 235-269.

Groves, R.M., Fowler Jr., F., Couper, M., Lepkowski, J., Singer, E., Tourangeau, R., 2004. Survey Methodology. Wiley & Sons, New York, NY.

Gupta, S., 1999. The Effects of Transitions in Marital Status on Men’s Performance of Housework. Journal of Marriage and Family 61(3), 700-11.

Hurlbert, J.S. and Acock, A.C., 1990. The Effects of Marital Status on the Form and Composition of Social Networks. Social Science Quarterly 71(1), 163-74.

Hynes, K., Clarkberg, M., 2005. Women's Employment Patterns during Early Parenthood: A Group-based Trajectory Analysis. Journal of Marriage and Family 67, 222-23.

Jargowsky, P.A., 1996. Take the Money and Run: Economic Segregation in U.S. Metropolitan Areas. American Sociological Review 61, 984-98.

Kalmijn, M., 2003. Shared Friendship Networks and the Life Course: An Analysis of Survey Data on Married and Cohabiting Couples. Social Networks 25, 231.

Kalmijn, M., 2007. Gender Differences in the Effects of Divorce, Widowhood and Remarriage on Intergenerational Support: Does Marriage Protect Fathers? Social Forces 85(3), 1079-1104.

Kaufman, G., Uhlenberg, P., 2000. The Influence of Parenthood on the Work Effort of Married Men and Women. Social Forces 78(3),931-47.

Kennedy, S., Bumpass, L., 2008. Cohabitation and Children's Living Arrangements: New Estimates from the United States. Demographic Research 19, 1663-92.

Lai, J., 2008. Marriage, Gender, and Social Capital. In: Lin, N., Erickson, B. (Eds.), Social Capital: An International Research Program. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, pp. 342-63.

Lai, G., Lin, N., Leung, S., 1998. Network Resources, Contact Resources, and Status Attainment. Social Networks 20, 159-78.

Laumann, E.O., 1965. Subjective Social Distance and Urban Occupational Stratification. American Journal of Sociology 71, 26-36.

Laumann, E.O., 1966. Prestige and Association in an Urban Community. Bobbs-Merrill, Indianapolis, IN.

Laumann, E.O., Senter, R., 1976. Subjective Social Distance, Occupational Stratification, and Forms of Status and Class Consciousness: A Cross-national Replication and Extension. American Journal of Sociology 81, 1304-38.

LeMasters, E.E., 1957. Parenthood as Crisis. Marriage and Family Living 19, 352-55.

Lin, N., 1999. Social Networks and Status Attainment. Annual Review of Sociology 25, 467-88.

———. 2001. Social Capital: A Theory of Social Structure and Action. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lin, N., Ao, D., 2008. The Invisible Hand of Social Capital: An Exploratory Study. Pp. 107-32 in Social Capital: An International Research Program, edited by N. Lin and B. Erickson. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lin, N., Ao, D., Song, L., 2009. Production and Returns of Social Capital: Evidence from Urban China. In: Hsung, R., Lin, N., Breiger, R. (Eds.), Contexts of Social Capital: Social Networks in Communities, Markets, and Organizations. Rutledge, New York, NY, pp. 107-32.

Lin, N., Dayton, P., Greenwald, P., 1978. Analyzing the Instrumental Use of Relations in the Context of Social Structure. Sociological Methods and Research 7, 149-66.

Lin, N., Dumin, M., 1986. Access to Occupations through Social Ties. Social Networks 8, 365-85.

Lin, N., Ensel, W.M., Vaughn, J.C., 1981. Social Resources and Strength of Ties: Structural Factors in Occupational Status Attainment. American Sociological Review 46, 393-405.

Lin, N., Fu, Y., Hsung, R., 2001. The Position Generator: Measurement Techniques for Investigations of Social Capital. In: Lin, N., Cook, K., Burt, R.S. (Eds.), Social Capital: Theory and Research. Aldine de Gruyter, New York, NY, pp. 57-81.

Magee, M.P., 2008. Civic Participation and Social Capital: A Social Network Analysis in Two American Counties. In: Lin, N., Erickson, B. (Eds.), Social Capital: An International Research Program. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, pp. 308-30.

Marks, N.F., McLanahan, S.S., 1993. Gender, Family Structure, and Social Support among Parents. Journal of Marriage and Family 55, 481-93.

Marsden, P.V., 1987. Core Discussion Networks of Americans. American Sociological Review 52, 122-31.

Marsden, P.V., 1988. Homogeneity in Confiding Relations. Social Networks 10, 57-76.

Marsden, P.V., Gorman, E.H., 2001. Social Networks, Job Changes, and Recruitment. In: Berg, I., Kalleberg, A.L. (Eds.), Sourcebook on Labor Markets: Evolving Structures and Processes. Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, New York, NY, pp. 467-502.

Marsden, P.V., Hurlbert, J.S., 1988. Social Resources and Mobility Outcomes: A Replication and Extension. Social Forces 66(4), 1038-59.

Mattingly, M.J., Bianchi, S.M., 2003. Gender Differences in the Quantity and Quality of Free Time: The U.S. Experience. Social Forces 81, 999-1030.

Maume, D.J., 2008. Gender Differences in Providing Urgent Childcare among Dual-Earner Parents. Social Forces 87(1), 273-97.

McDonald, S., Mair, C.A., 2010. Social Capital across the Life Course: Age and Gendered Patterns of Network Resources. Sociological Forum 25, 335-59.

McLanahan, S., 1983. Family Structure and Stress: A Longitudinal Comparison of Male and Female-headed Families. Journal of Marriage and the Family. 45(2), 347-57.

McLanahan, S., Booth, K., 1989. Mother-only Families: Problems, Prospects and Politics. Journal of Marriage and the Family. 51, 557-80.

McLanahan, S., Garfinkel, I., 1989. Single Mothers, the Underclass and Social Policy. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science (January): 92-104.

McPherson, M., Smith-Lovin, L., Cook, J.M., 2001. Birds of a Feather: Homophily in Social Networks. Annual Review of Sociology 27, 415-44.

Moore, G., 1990. Structural Determinants of Men's and Women's Personal Networks. American Sociological Review 55, 726-35.

Mouw, T., 2003. Social Capital and Finding a Job: Do Contacts Matter? American Sociological Review 68, 868-898.

Mouw, T., 2006. Estimating the Causal Effect of Social Capital: A Review of Recent Research. Annual Review of Sociology 32, 79-102.

Munch, A., McPherson, J.M., Smith-Lovin, L., 1997. Gender, Children, and Social Contact: The Effects of Childrearing for Men and Women. American Sociological Review 62, 509-20.

Nakao, K., Hodge, R.W., Treas, J., 1990. On Revising Prestige Scores for All Occupations. National Opinion Research Center, Chicago, IL.

Nakao, K., Treas, J., 1990. Computing 1989 Occupational Prestige Scores. National Opinion Research Center, Chicago, IL.

Nomaguchi, K.M., Milkie, M.A., 2003. Costs and Rewards of Children: The Effects of Becoming a Parent on Adults' Lives. Journal of Marriage and the Family 65, 356-74.

O'Donnell, L., 1983. The Social World of Parents. Marriage and Family Review 5(4), 9-36.

Offer, S., Schneider, B., 2007. Children's Role in Generating Social Capital. Social Forces 85(3), 1125-42.

O'Rand, A.M., 2001. Stratification and the Life Course: The Forms of Life Course Capital and their Interrelationships. In: Binstock, R.B., George, L.K. (Eds.), Handbook on Aging and the Social Sciences, 5th Ed. Academic Press, New York, NY, pp. 197-216.

Ploch, D.R., Hastings, D.W., 1998. Effects of Parental Church Attendance, Current Family Status, and Religious Salience on Church Attendance. Review of Religious Research 39, 309-20.

Portes, A., 1998. Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology. Annual Review of Sociology 24, 1-24.

Presser, H.B., 1994. Employment Schedules among Dual-Earner Spouses and the Division of Household Labor by Gender. American sociological review 59(3), 348-64.

Putnam, R.D., 2000. Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community. Simon and Schuster, New York, NY.

Rossi, A.S., 1968. Transition to Parenthood. Journal of Marriage and Family 30(1), 26-39.

Royston, P., 2005. Multiple Imputation of Missing Values: Update of ICE. The Stata Journal 5, 527-36.

Sampson, R.J., Morenoff, J.D., Earls, F., 1999. Beyond Social Capital: Spatial Dynamics of Collective Efficacy for Children. American Sociological Review 64, 633–60.

Sanchez, L., Thomson, E., 1997. Becoming Mothers and Fathers: Parenthood, Gender, and the Division of Labor. Gender and Society 11(6), 747-72.

Saporito, S., 2003. Private Choices, Public Consequences: Magnet School Choice and Segregation by Race and Poverty. Social Problems 50(2), 181-203.

Sayer, L.C., 2005. Gender, Time and Inequality: Trends in Women's and Men's Paid Work, Unpaid Work and Free Time. Social Forces 84(1), 285-303.

Sayer, L.C., Bianchi, S.M., Robinson, J.P., 2004. Are Parents Investing Less in Children? Trends in Mothers' and Fathers' Time with Children. American Journal of Sociology 110(1), 1-43.

Slater, P., 1964. Social Limitations of Libidinal Withdrawal. In: Coser, R.L. (Ed.), The Family: Its Structure and Functions. St. Martin's Press, New York, NY, pp. 111-33.

Song, L., 2010. The Older, the More Social: The Interaction Effect of Social Capital with Age on Health. Paper presented at the 105th Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, August 16, 2010, Atlanta, USA.

———. 2011. Social Capital and Psychological Distress. Journal of Health and Social Behavior 52(4): 478-92.

Song, L., Lin, N., 2009. Social Capital and Health Inequality: Evidence from Taiwan. Journal of Health and Social Behavior 50(2), 149-63.

Song, L., Son, J., Lin, N., 2010. Social Capital and Health. In: Cockerham, W.C. (Ed.), The New Companion to Medical Sociology. Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford, UK, pp. 184-210.

South, S.J., Spitze, G., 1994. Housework in Marital and Nonmarital Households. American Sociological Review 59(3), 327-47.

Stolzenberg, R.M., Blair-Loy, M., Waite, L.J., 1995. Religious Participation in Early Adulthood: Age and Family Life Cycle Effects on Church Membership. American Sociological Review 60, 84-103.

Stueve, C.A., Gerson, K., 1977. Personal Relations across the Life-Cycle. In: Fisher, C.S., Jackson, R.M., Steuve, C.A., Gerson, K., Jones, L.M. (Eds.) with Baldassare, M., Networks and Places: Social Relations in the Urban Setting. The Free Press, New York, NY, pp. 79-98,

Teachman, J.D., Polonko, K.A., 1988. Marriage, Parenthood, and the College Enrollment of Men and Women. Social Forces 67, 512-23.

Thye, S.R., 2000. A Status Value Theory of Power in Exchange Relations. American Sociological Review 65, 407-32.

Tukey, J.W., 1977. Exploratory Data Analysis. Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.

United States Census Bureau, 2001. Households and Families: 2000. Available at: http://www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-8.pdf.

Van der Gaag, M.P.J., Snijders, T.A.B., Flap, H.D., 2008. Position Generator Measures and Their Relationship to Other Social Capital Measures. In: Lin, N., Erickson, B.

(Eds.), Social Capital: An International Research Program. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, pp. 27-48.

Waite, L.J., 1995. Does Marriage Matter? Demography 32, 483-507.

Waite, L.J., Haggstrom, G.W., Kanouse, D.E., 1985. Changes in the Employment Activities of New Parents. American Sociological Review 50(2), 263-72.

Waldfogel, J., 1997. The Effect of Children on Women's Wages. American Sociological Review 62(2), 209-17.

Wellman, B., 1985. Domestic Work, Paid Work and Net Work. In: Duck, S., Perlman, D. (Eds.), Understanding Personal Relationships. Sage, London, UK, pp. 159-91.

Wojtkiewicz, R., McLanahan, S., Garfinkel, I., 1990. The Growth of Families Headed by Women: 1950-1980. Demography 27(1), 19-30.

Table 1. Summary of Sample Characteristics (N=2,938)

Variables	Mean/Percent	SD
Age	41.48	10.53
Gender (1=Female)	54.05	
Race/Ethnicity		
White	69.30	
Black	11.78	
Latino	13.21	
Other Race/Ethnicity	5.72	
Quota	43.53	
Marital Status (1=Married)	64.02	
Education (Years)	14.67	3.54
Employment Status (1=Employed)	77.60	
Occupational Prestige Scores (Current/Last job)	45.74	14.04
Annual Family Income		
Less than $35,000	25.55	
$35,000-60,000	27.66	
$60,000-90,000	23.67	
$90,000 and More	23.12	
Social Integration (Number of Memberships in Voluntary Organizations)	2.03	1.87
Number of Children	1.73	1.50
Parenthood Status (1=The Oldest Child < 18)	40.37	

Note: I reported the distribution of nonnormalized annual family income after dividing it from the original twenty-eight ordinal ranges into four categories based on the raw data (N=2,556).

Table 2. Distribution of Occupational Positions in the Position Generator and Social Capital Indices (N=2,938)

Position (NORC)	Respondent Accessing (Percent)
Lawyer (75)	55.38
Professor (74)	37.10
CEO (70)	20.08
Nurse (66)	70.25
Middle School Teacher (66)	48.91
Writer (63)	21.68
Computer Programmer (61)	48.94
Congressman (61)	12.08
Policeman (60)	50.51
Personnel Manager (54)	33.05
Administrative Assistant (49)	31.52
Production Manager (47)	16.95
Bookkeeper (47)	31.25
Security Guard (42)	24.57
Farmer (40)	42.58
Receptionist (39)	38.84
Hairdresser (36)	60.25
Operator in a Factory (33)	25.53
Full-Time Babysitter (29)	27.16
Taxi Driver (28)	8.82
Hotel Bellboy (27)	2.72
Janitor (22)	28.73
Social Capital Indices	
Diversity	
Total Accessed Positions	
Mean	7.37
S. D.	4.00
Extensity	
Range of Accessed Prestige	
Mean	38.00
S. D.	13.65

Quality	
Highest Accessed Prestige	
Mean	70.68
S. D.	7.67

Note: NORC =the 1989 NORC/GSS Occupational Prestige (Nakao et al. 1990; Nakao and Treas 1990).

Table 3. OLS Regression of Social Capital Indices on Parenthood Status and Control Variables (N=2,938)

	Diversity	Extensity	Quality
	Total Accessed Positions	Range of Accessed Prestige	Highest Accessed Prestige
Age	.041***	.094***	.074***
	(.007)	(.026)	(.015)
Gender (1=Female)	.318*	2.216***	.518†
	(.139)	(.495)	(.277)
Race/Ethnicity (Reference: White)			
Black	.587**	1.396†	-.057
	(.224)	(.797)	(.446)
Latino	.569*	.142	-.101
	(.224)	(.797)	(.446)
Other Race/Ethnicity	-.312	-2.502*	-.522
	(.296)	(1.053)	(.589)
Quota	-.178	-.404	.247
	(.148)	(.527)	(.295)
Marital Status (1=Married)	-.052	.350	.222
	(.162)	(.574)	(.322)
Education (Years)	.153***	.546***	.422***
	(.023)	(.082)	(.046)
Employment Status (1=Employed)	.324†	1.042†	-.138
	(.168)	(.597)	(.334)
Occupational Prestige Scores	-.001	-.045*	.006
(Current/Last job)	(.005)	(.019)	(.011)
Annual Family Income	.003**	.005	.006**
	(.001)	(.004)	(.002)
Social Integration (Number of	.679***	1.722***	.740***
Memberships)	(.039)	(.140)	(.078)
Number of Children	.034	.105	-.163
	(.052)	(.186)	(.104)
Parenthood Status (1=The Oldest	.193	.745	-.124
Child < 18)	(.159)	(.567)	(.317)
Constant	.743	20.932***	58.247***
	(.496)	(1.762)	(.985)
Adjusted R-squared	.186	.116	.127

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses; †$p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed test).

Table 4. OLS Regression of Social Capital Indices on Parenthood Status, Control Variables, and the Interaction Term between Parenthood Status and Gender (N=2,938)

	Diversity	Extensity	Quality
	Total Accessed Positions	Range of Accessed Prestige	Highest Accessed Prestige
Age	.040***	.094***	.073***
	(.007)	(.026)	(.015)
Gender (1=Female)	.475**	2.154***	.889*
	(.177)	(.629)	(.352)
Race/Ethnicity (Reference: White)			
Black	.579*	1.399†	-.074
	(.224)	(.797)	(.446)
Latino	.576*	.139	-.084
	(.224)	(.797)	(.446)
Other Race/Ethnicity	-.285	-2.513*	-.460
	(.297)	(1.055)	(.590)
Quota	-.172	-.406	.261
	(.148)	(.527)	(.295)
Marital Status (1=Married)	-.064	.354	.193
	(.163)	(.575)	(.322)
Education (Years)	.151***	.546***	.419***
	(.023)	(.082)	(.046)
Employment Status (1=Employed)	.291†	1.055†	-.216
	(.169)	(.603)	(.337)
Occupational Prestige Scores	-.001	-.045*	.006
(Current/Last job)	(.005)	(.019)	(.011)
Annual Family Income	.003**	.005	.006**
	(.001)	(.004)	(.002)
Social Integration (Number of	.680***	1.722***	.742***
Memberships)	(.039)	(.140)	(.078)
Number of Children	.030	.106	-.172†
	(.052)	(.186)	(.104)
Parenthood Status (1=The Oldest	.418†	.656	.405
Child < 18)	(.223)	(.792)	(.443)
Parenthood Status * Female	-.403	.160	-.949†
	(.279)	(.993)	(.555)
Constant	.729	20.937***	58.214***
	(.496)	(1.763)	(.984)
Adjusted R-squared	.186	.116	.127

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses; †$p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed test).

Table 5. OLS Regression of Social Capital Indices on Parenthood Status, Control Variables, and the Interaction Term between Parenthood Status and Marital Status (N=2,938)

	Diversity	Extensity	Quality
	Total Accessed Positions	Range of Accessed Prestige	Highest Accessed Prestige
Age	.041***	.097***	.078***
	(.007)	(.027)	(.015)
Gender (1=Female)	.318*	2.259***	.569*
	(.140)	(.496)	(.277)
Race/Ethnicity (Reference: White)			
Black	.587**	1.413†	-.037
	(.224)	(.797)	(.445)
Latino	.569*	.153	-.088
	(.224)	(.797)	(.445)
Other Race/Ethnicity	-.312	-2.521*	-.544
	(.296)	(1.053)	(.588)
Quota	-.178	-.400	.251
	(.148)	(.527)	(.294)
Marital Status (1=Married)	-.061	-.097	-.308
	(.192)	(.679)	(.380)
Education (Years)	.153***	.542***	.417***
	(.023)	(.082)	(.046)
Employment Status (1=Employed)	.325†	1.106†	-.062
	(.169)	(.600)	(.335)
Occupational Prestige Scores	-.001	-.045*	.005
(Current/Last job)	(.005)	(.019)	(.011)
Annual Family Income	.003**	.004	.005*
	(.001)	(.004)	(.002)
Social Integration (Number of	.679***	1.719***	.736***
Memberships)	(.039)	(.140)	(.078)
Number of Children	.034	.121	-.143
	(.052)	(.186)	(.104)
Parenthood Status (1=The Oldest	.175	-.212	-1.260*
Child < 18)	(.272)	(.966)	(.540)
Parenthood Status * Married	.027	1.377	1.634*
	(.317)	(1.125)	(.628)
Constant	.746	21.057***	58.395***
	(.497)	(1.765)	(.985)
Adjusted R-squared	.186	.116	.128

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses; †$p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed test).

Table 6. OLS Regression of Social Capital Indices on Parenthood Status, Control Variables, and the Interaction Term between Parenthood Status, Gender, and Marital Status (N=2,938)

	Diversity	Extensity	Quality
	Total Accessed Positions	Range of Accessed Prestige	Highest Accessed Prestige
Age	.040***	.097***	.075***
	(.007)	(.027)	(.015)
Gender (1=Female)	.748**	2.440**	1.832***
	(.259)	(.921)	(.513)
Race/Ethnicity (Reference: White)			
Black	.568*	1.414†	-.089
	(.224)	(.799)	(.445)
Latino	.571*	.161	-.080
	(.225)	(.799)	(.446)
Other Race/Ethnicity	-.298	-2.545*	-.526
	(.297)	(1.056)	(.589)
Quota	-.166	-.396	.285
	(.148)	(.528)	(.294)
Marital Status (1=Married)	.190	.154	.539
	(.261)	(.929)	(.518)
Education (Years)	.151***	.542***	.411***
	(.023)	(.082)	(.046)
Employment Status (1=Employed)	.293†	1.143†	-.124
	(.171)	(.608)	(.339)
Occupational Prestige Scores	-.001	-.045*	.005
(Current/Last job)	(.005)	(.019)	(.011)
Annual Family Income	.003**	.004	.005*
	(.001)	(.004)	(.002)
Social Integration (Number of	.681***	1.720***	.741***
Memberships)	(.039)	(.140)	(.078)
Number of Children	.027	.119	-.163
	(.052)	(.187)	(.104)
Parenthood Status (1=The Oldest	.784†	.447	.725
Child < 18)	(.422)	(1.502)	(.837)
Female * Married	-.502	-.469	-1.672*
	(.349)	(1.241)	(.692)
Parenthood Status * Female	-1.069*	-1.095	-3.456**
	(.540)	(1.922)	(1.072)
Parenthood Status * Married	-.549	.340	-.522
	(.490)	(1.742)	(.971)
Parenthood Status * Female * Married	.996	1.768	3.726**
	(.635)	(2.260)	(1.260)

Constant	.642	20.977***	58.065***
	(.500)	(1.779)	(.991)
Adjusted R-squared	.186	.116	.131

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses; †$p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed test).