

EMPLOYMENT

FACT SHEET

Collateral Damage: Scheduling Challenges for Workers in Low-Wage Jobs and Their Consequences

June 2015

Liz Watson, Elizabeth Johnston, Katherine Gallagher Robbins, & Anne Morrison

There are more than 23 million workers in low-wage jobs (typically paying \$10.50 per hour or less)¹ and two-thirds of these workers are women.² Low wages can make it hard for women in these jobs to support themselves and their families, but wages are not the only problem. Low-wage jobs that are primarily held by women, such as cashiers, maids and housekeepers, and restaurant servers, are marked by work scheduling policies and practices that pose particular challenges for workers with significant responsibilities outside of their job, including caregiving, pursuing education and workforce training, or holding down a second job.³ The work schedules in these jobs are often unpredictable, unstable, and inflexible. Some require working nights, weekends or even overnight, and many offer only part-time work, despite many workers' need for full-time hours.

Women are disproportionately affected by this problem because women hold two-thirds of low-wage jobs⁴ and still shoulder the majority of caregiving responsibilities.⁵ And nearly one in five families with children was headed by a single working mother in 2013,⁶ a group for whom scheduling challenges pose particularly acute problems. Many of these families struggle financially as well: single mothers make up nearly two-thirds of breadwinning moms,⁷ but in 2013 working single mother families had a median income of less than \$31,500.⁸

Challenging work schedules also cause problems for men working in low-wage jobs who are increasingly assuming a greater role in caring for their families. Between 1977 and 2008, the average workday time fathers spent with their children increased from 2 to 3.1 hours per day.⁹ Among both men and women, 75 percent of low-wage workers reported having insufficient time for their children and 61 percent reported having insufficient time to spend on themselves.¹⁰

This fact sheet outlines five of the most common scheduling challenges faced by workers in low-wage jobs and explains their prevalence and detrimental impact on workers and their families.¹¹ Understanding the work schedule challenges facing workers in low-wage jobs is an essential first step toward developing solutions to this problem that work for workers, their families, and their employers.

Common Scheduling Challenges

Lack of Control over Work Schedules

Many workers in low-wage jobs have few opportunities for meaningful input into the timing of the hours that they work, and are unable to make even minor adjustments to their work schedules without suffering a penalty.¹² This is true for low-wage workers on both set and variable schedules.¹³

- About half of low-wage workers report having limited control over the timing of their work hours.¹⁴
- Between two-thirds and three-quarters of full-time low-wage workers report that they are unable to alter the start and end times of their work days.¹⁵
- An analysis of data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth found that among early career employees (ages 26-32), about 44 percent of workers overall and half of hourly workers say that they do not have any input into when they start and finish work.¹⁶
- Between 40 and 50 percent of low-wage workers have no control over when they take breaks.¹⁷
- While some workers struggle to get enough hours, for others the work week is too long. One-quarter of U.S. workers work more than 40 hours a week and nearly 17 percent work more than 48 hours a week.¹⁸
- Overwork also negatively impacts workplace safety. In another study, the effects of mandatory overtime on autoworkers included impaired performance in attention and executive functions, and workers who worked more than 8 hours a day reported feeling more depressed and fatigued.¹⁹
- According to a survey by the Retail Action Project of workers in the retail industry, about a fifth of workers receive their schedules only three days beforehand.²⁴
- In another survey of 6,085 workers employed by a major retailer in 388 stores across the country (referred to as “the CitiSales Study”), workers receive notice of their work schedules only seven days in advance, on average.²⁵
- Between 19 and 31 percent of low-wage workers are often asked to work extra hours with little or no notice.²⁶ Roughly 40 to 60 percent of full-time, low-wage workers who are asked to work extra hours with little to no notice say they comply with the request to avoid negative consequences.²⁷
- Some retail workers report that they are routinely required to work call-in shifts, which means they must call their employer to find out whether they will be scheduled to work that day, and if they are told to report to work, they often must do so within two hours.²⁸ In a study of retail workers in New York City, 20 percent of workers surveyed reported that they always or often must be available for call-in shifts.²⁹

Unpredictable Work Schedules

Some employers adopt “just-in-time scheduling” in an effort to minimize labor costs. Just-in-time scheduling bases workers’ schedules on perceived consumer demand and often results in workers being given very little advance notice of their work schedules.²⁰ Scheduling software is frequently used to schedule workers at the last minute, matching the number of workers as closely as possible to retail traffic or other indicators of consumer demand.²¹

- Posting schedules just one week before a worker is expected to work is quite common. In a study of low-skilled, non-production jobs in the hospitality, retail, transportation, and financial services industries, only 3 of 17 corporations studied assigned schedules more than a week in advance (one retailer, one hotel, and one bank).²²
- Thirty-eight percent of early career employees (ages 26-32) overall know their work schedule 7 days or less in advance. Of these workers, 41 percent of hourly workers and 48 percent of part-time workers receive their schedules with such short notice.²³

Unstable Work Schedules

Many workers in low-wage jobs experience unstable schedules with hours that vary from week to week or month to month, or periodic reductions in work hours when work is slow.

- According to the Retail Action Project survey of workers in the retail industry, only 17 percent of all workers surveyed and 10 percent of part-time workers had a set schedule.³⁰
- According to the CitiSales Study, for 59 percent of retail employees employed by one major retailer, either the shifts or the days they worked change each week.³¹
- Between 20 and 30 percent of low-wage workers reported a reduction in hours or a layoff when work was slow.³²
- Seventy-four percent of early-career adults (ages 26-32) in both hourly and non-hourly jobs report at least some fluctuations in the numbers of hours they worked in the previous month. For these workers, on average, hours fluctuate by more than an 8-hour day of work and pay.³³

- Analysis of Social Survey data found that 83 percent of hourly part-time workers work unstable schedules.³⁴

Involuntary Part-Time Work

Workers who want full-time work but are only offered part-time hours—often described as the “underemployed”—struggle to support their families with fewer hours and less pay. The number of workers working part-time involuntarily more than doubled during the recession, growing from 4.4 million prior to the recession in 2007 to over 8.9 million in 2009, and remains substantially higher than pre-recession levels at more than 7.2 million workers in 2014.³⁵

- In 2014, 27.6 million people usually worked part-time³⁶—that’s nearly one in five (18.9 percent) workers.³⁷ Nearly twice as many women usually work part-time than men (25.8 percent as compared to 12.7 percent).³⁸
- In 2014, one in five (20.7 percent) part-time workers worked part-time involuntarily.³⁹
- Half (50.9 percent) of workers who worked part-time involuntarily in 2014 were women.⁴⁰
- More than one-third (37.2 percent) of workers who worked part-time involuntarily worked in low-wage occupations.⁴¹
- One-quarter (25.1) percent of women working part-time involuntarily are poor, compared to 11.1 percent of women who work part-time for other reasons and 5 percent of women who work full time.⁴²

Nonstandard Work Schedules

Workers on nonstandard schedules face unique challenges. “Nonstandard” schedules refers to working evenings, nights, weekends, or working on rotating shifts, irregular schedules, or on call.⁴³ Nonstandard work is also called “unsocial work” because nonstandard schedules often conflict with family time and make it difficult to maintain other social ties.⁴⁴ While the majority of workers on nonstandard schedules do not have these schedules by choice, some workers do choose nonstandard schedules in order to help juggle competing obligations.⁴⁵

- In one study, roughly half of low-wage hourly workers reported working nonstandard schedules.⁴⁶

- In comparison, an analysis of the American Time Use Survey by the Urban Institute found that 28 percent of workers with very low wages work nonstandard hours, compared to 20 percent of all workers.⁴⁷ (The difference in these findings may be accounted for by variations in the way the survey question was asked, as well as differences in the definition of low-wage work.)

- Workers have nonstandard schedules for a variety of reasons. According to the 2004 Current Population Survey Supplement, 55 percent work nonstandard schedules involuntarily because they could not find another job or “it is the nature of the job;” 23 percent work nonstandard schedules for reasons related to family or childcare arrangements or school; 10 percent of nonstandard workers prefer the schedule; and 5 percent said they do so for better pay.⁴⁸

The Fallout from Challenging Work Schedules

Impact on caregiving responsibilities. Workers in low-wage jobs often face extreme demands at home and work. These workers are more likely to be single parents,⁴⁹ more likely to have children with special needs,⁵⁰ and more likely to care for elderly or sick relatives.⁵¹ They also have higher rates of illness themselves.⁵² At the same time, they have fewer resources to pay for child and elder care than other workers, and they are far less likely to have paid sick and vacation days, or job-protected leave under the Family and Medical Leave Act.⁵³ For some workers in low-wage jobs who have little to no control over their work schedules, being able to plan for or respond to the exigencies of daily life—for example, ending a shift on time to pick up a child from school or scheduling an afternoon off to take an elderly parent to a doctor’s appointment—is simply not an option.

Impact on child care. Low-wage workers’ ability to access quality, affordable, and stable child care is often compromised by challenging work schedules.⁵⁴ With work schedules and incomes that fluctuate from week to week, many workers have no choice but to cobble together child care at the last minute.⁵⁵ Because many centers require care givers to pay a weekly or monthly fee, regardless of how often the child attends, holding a spot in a child care center is often infeasible for workers who do not know when, or even if, they will work that

week. Further, workers with unstable schedules may not qualify for child care subsidies due to fluctuations in income and work hours.⁵⁶ Relying on family, friends, and neighbors to provide child care – as most workers in low-wage jobs must do – is complicated by the fact that their child care providers may also be balancing an unpredictable part-time work schedule at their own jobs with providing child care.⁵⁷ When workers are unable to find child care or child care falls through, sometimes workers must miss work and lose pay. In one study, 40 to 60 percent of workers who reported missing work due to child care problems also reported losing pay or benefits, or being penalized in some way.⁵⁸

Impact on marriage. Working nonstandard hours has been shown to have negative outcomes for marriages and for children.⁵⁹ Research has linked nonstandard hours to higher levels of divorce, less time together as a couple, and lower relationship satisfaction.⁶⁰ Although some two-parent families in low-wage jobs cope with the child care problems outlined above by “tag teaming,”—working on opposite schedules so that one parent is available to provide child care—this results in even less time together as a couple.⁶¹

Impact on children. Workers on nonstandard schedules spend less time with their children,⁶² and their children tend to score lower on cognitive tests, have more behavioral problems, and poorer mental health.⁶³ Lesser parental involvement in children’s education has consequences for children from low-income families, who are three times more likely to drop out of school than children from middle class families.⁶⁴ One survey found that while workers holding professional jobs often reported that their jobs made it possible to be engaged in their children’s school, low-wage workers often reported not participating in children’s school activities due to a lack of flexibility and paid time off.⁶⁵ Many of the low-wage workers surveyed reported being required to give one to two weeks’ advance notice to their employers to take any time off; yet they also reported that their children’s schools did not provide this much notice of events.⁶⁶

Impact on education and workforce training. Challenging work schedules can make it nearly impossible to pursue further education or training while holding down a job. Overall, one of the most commonly cited challenges to completing a college degree is the inability to balance work and school.⁶⁷

On average, students enrolled in community college work 22 hours per week, and 26 percent of community college students at two-year public schools worked 40 hours or more during the 2011-12 school year.⁶⁸ Thirty-nine percent of working community college students report that working full time is likely to cause them to withdraw from class or from college altogether. At the same time, 30 percent of female community college students report spending 30 or more hours each week caring for dependents who live with them.⁶⁹ A survey by the Institute for Women’s Policy Research of female students attending community colleges in Mississippi found that three in ten women surveyed had taken a break from college, and 26 percent of those students reported that allowing more workplace flexibility or leave time would have helped them stay in college.⁷⁰ And students report that their jobs restricted their choice of classes, limited the number of classes they took, and limited access to campus facilities.⁷¹ Both male and female low-wage workers report a lack of opportunities to pursue additional education and training.⁷²

Impact on transportation. Just-in-time scheduling often complicates transportation for low-wage workers, who may be relying on friends or family to provide a ride to and from work, or public transportation that may run infrequently or erratically.⁷³ Workers may spend hours and precious resources commuting to and from work, to work a shift lasting only a few hours, or to be sent home unexpectedly when work is slow.⁷⁴

Impact on family economic security. Challenging work schedules make it more difficult to pay the bills. An unexpected reduction in hours means a loss of pay, and it can mean the loss of employer or government benefits that are tied to work hours, including paid and unpaid time off, health insurance, unemployment insurance, public assistance, and work supports.⁷⁵ Women working part-time involuntarily are more likely to live in poverty (more than 25 percent) than their counterparts who worked part-time voluntarily (11 percent) or worked full-time (5 percent).⁷⁶ Involuntary part-time workers are more likely to have been unemployed for a substantial portion of the previous year (more than 13 weeks)⁷⁷ and are less likely to have health care or pension coverage;⁷⁸ and part-time positions typically offer less pay pro rata and less job security than full-time positions.⁷⁹ Workers report that scheduling and family conflicts are a major reason why

they intend to leave their jobs.⁸⁰ And spells of unemployment can have disastrous financial consequences for low-income families. In fact, low-wage workers are 2.5 times more likely to be out of work than other workers, but only half as likely to receive unemployment insurance.⁸¹ Workers' inability to pursue or complete education and workforce training programs as a result of work schedule conflict also makes it much more difficult for workers to move up into higher-paying jobs.⁸²

Conclusion

The fallout from low-wage jobs characterized by unpredictability, instability, little worker-driven flexibility, nonstandard schedules, and involuntary part-time work is considerable.⁸³ These challenging work schedules have a cascade of negative consequences for both workers in low-wage jobs and their children.

In contrast, fairer work schedules benefit employees and employers alike. Low-wage workers report that more job autonomy and involvement in management decision-making led to less negative spillover from work to their non-work life.⁸⁴ Employees with flexible workplaces are less stressed and have better physical and mental well-being.⁸⁵ Less negative spillover from work also leads to greater productivity and job retention: low-wage workers with flexibility are 30 percent less likely than other workers to intend to leave their positions within two years.⁸⁶

¹ This analysis uses \$10.50 or less per hour because \$10.50 in 2014 is roughly equivalent to \$12 in 2020 (see, David Cooper, John Schmitt, and Lawrence Mishel, Economic Policy Institute, *We Can Afford a \$12.00 Federal Minimum Wage in 2020* (April 2015) available at <http://www.epi.org/publication/we-can-afford-a-12-00-federal-minimum-wage-in-2020/>), which is the proposed new federal minimum wage in the Raise the Wage Act pending in Congress (2015).

² NAT'L WOMEN'S LAW CTR. (NWLC) calculations based on Miriam King et al., *Integrated Public Use Microdata Series, CPS: Version 3.0 (IPUMS-CPS)*, (Univ. of Minn. 2010). Data are for 2013. All figures are for employed workers. Median hourly wages: Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), *Occupational Employment Statistics (OES), May 2014 National Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates*, available at http://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes_nat.htm.

³ See, e.g., RESTAURANT OPPORTUNITIES CENTER UNITED, *THE THIRD SHIFT: CHILD CARE NEEDS AND ACCESS FOR LOW-WAGE WORKING MOTHERS IN RESTAURANTS 1-2* (July, 2013), available at <http://www.scribd.com/doc/161943672/The-Third-Shift-Child-Care-Needs-and-Access-for-Working-Mothers-in-Restaurants>.

⁴ NWLC calculations based on King, *supra* note 2.

⁵ KENNETH MATOS & ELLEN GALINSKY, *WHEN WORK WORKS: WORKPLACE FLEXIBILITY IN THE UNITED STATES, A STATUS REPORT 1* (Families and Work Institute 2011) ("Mothers spend the same number of weekday hours with their children (3.8) in 2008 as they did in 1977 and the majority of married/ partnered women report doing most of the cooking (70%) and cleaning (73%) in their households."), available at <http://familiesandwork.org/downloads/WorkplaceFlexibilityinUS.pdf>; see also OXFAM AM., *HARD WORK, HARD LIVES: SURVEY EXPOSES HARSH REALITY FACED BY LOW-WAGE WORKERS 7* (OXFAM AM. 2013), available at <http://www.oxfamamerica.org/static/oa4/low-wage-worker-report-oxfam-america.pdf>.

⁶ NWLC calculations from the Census, *Current Population Survey (CPS), Annual Social and Economic Supplement, 2014, Table POV15. Families With Related Children Under 18 by Householder's Work Experience and Family Structure* available at http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/cpstables/032014/pov/pov15_100.htm. 19.1 percent of families with children were headed by working single mothers.

⁷ Wendy Wang, Kim Parker & Paul Taylor, *Pew Research Social & Demographic Trends: Breadwinner Moms* (May 2013), available at <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2013/05/29/breadwinner-moms/>.

⁸ NWLC calculations from the Census, *Current Population Survey (CPS), Annual Social and Economic Supplement, 2014, Table FINC-03. Presence of Related Children Under 18 Years Old-All Families by Total Money Income in 2013, Type of Family, Work Experience in 2013, Race and Hispanic Origin of Reference Person* available at http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/cpstables/032014/faminc/finc03_000.htm.

⁹ MATOS & GALINSKY, *supra* note 5, at 1.

¹⁰ *Id.* at 13.

¹¹ The section below describes common scheduling challenges for low-wage workers, as the term "low-wage work" is variously defined in the reports and studies referenced herein.

¹² LIZ WATSON & JENNIFER E. SWANBERG, *FLEXIBLE WORKPLACE SOLUTIONS FOR LOW-WAGE HOURLY WORKERS: A FRAMEWORK FOR A NATIONAL CONVERSATION 6* (Workplace Flexibility 2010, May 2011).

¹³ In this section, "low-wage workers" are defined as those working an hourly job that pays less than two-thirds the median wage for men, unless stated otherwise. This definition of "low-wage" is based WATSON & SWANBERG. Using 2008 National Study of the Changing Workforce data, the sample included workers paid \$15.41 or less per hour.

¹⁴ WATSON & SWANBERG, *supra* note 12, at 19-20.

¹⁵ *Id.*

¹⁶ SUSAN J. LAMBERT, PETER J. FUGIEL, & JULIA R. HENLY, *PRECARIOUS WORK SCHEDULES AMONG EARLY-CAREER EMPLOYEES IN THE US: A NATIONAL SNAPSHOT 14* (2014).

¹⁷ WATSON & SWANBERG, *supra* note 12, at 19-20.

¹⁸ Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Labor Force Statistics from the Current Population Survey Table 19. Data is for 2014. (Feb. 2015)*, available at <http://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat19.htm>.

¹⁹ Lonnie Golden & Helene Joregensen, *Time After Time: Mandatory Overtime in the U.S. Economy* (Economic Policy Institute 2002), available at http://www.epi.org/publication/briefingpapers_bp120/.

- ²⁰ See generally NANCY C. CAUTHEN, SCHEDULING HOURLY WORKS: HOW LAST MINUTE, JUST-IN-TIME SCHEDULING PRACTICES ARE BAD FOR WORKERS, FAMILIES AND BUSINESS (Demos 2011), available at http://www.demos.org/sites/default/files/publications/Scheduling_Hourly_Workers_Demos.pdf.
- ²¹ See Lonnie Golden, *Irregular Work Scheduling and Its Consequences* 4 EPA BRIEFING PAPER #394 (Economic Policy Institute Apr. 9, 2015), available at <http://s2.epi.org/files/pdf/82524.pdf>.
- ²² Susan J. Lambert, *Passing the Buck: Labor Flexibility Practices that Transfer Risk onto Hourly Workers*, Human Relations 61(9) 1217 (2008).
- ²³ SUSAN J. LAMBERT, PETER J. FUGIEL, & JULIA R. HENLY, PRECARIOUS WORK SCHEDULES AMONG EARLY-CAREER EMPLOYEES IN THE US: A NATIONAL SNAP-SHOT 6 (2014).
- ²⁴ STEPHANIE LUCE & NAOKI FUJITA, DISCOUNTED JOBS: HOW RETAILERS SELL WORKERS SHORT 8 (Retail Action Project 2012), available at http://retailactionproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/7-75_RAP+cover_lowres.pdf.
- ²⁵ Jennifer Swanberg et al., Introduction to the CitiSales Study 4 (2009), available at http://www.uky.edu/Centers/iwin/citisales/_pdfs/IB1-HourlyWorkers.pdf. See also Lambert, *supra* note 20, at 1217.
- ²⁶ WATSON & SWANBERG, *supra* note 12, at 21.
- ²⁷ *Id.*
- ²⁸ LUCE & FUJITA, *supra* note 24, at 13.
- ²⁹ *Id.*
- ³⁰ *Id.* at 8, 12.
- ³¹ Swanberg et al., *supra* note 24, at 4. ("However, only 41% of employees indicate that they have schedule consistency, i.e., working the same days and the same shift each week.")
- ³² WATSON & SWANBERG, *supra* note 12, at 22. With the exception of full-time low-wage workers with standard hours, for whom less than 20 percent reported this problem.
- ³³ SUSAN J. LAMBERT, PETER J. FUGIEL, & JULIA R. HENLY, PRECARIOUS WORK SCHEDULES AMONG EARLY-CAREER EMPLOYEES IN THE US: A NATIONAL SNAP-SHOT 10 (2014).
- ³⁴ Lonnie Golden, *supra* note 21.
- ³⁵ NWLC calculations based on Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) Current Population Survey (CPS) Annual Table 20. Persons at work 1 to 34 hours in all and in non-agricultural industries by reason for working less than 35 hours and usual full- or part-time status, 2007 through 2014, available at <http://www.bls.gov/cps/tables.htm#annual>. Figures are annual averages for those working part-time for economic reasons (also known as involuntarily part-time workers) across all industries.
- ³⁶ This figure is for workers who usually work part time. Data on involuntary part-time workers also includes workers who usually work full time but worked between 1-34 hours during the reference week of the survey. These differences mean the numbers of voluntary and involuntary part-time workers do not add to the total. However, including data on those who usually work full time but are not working full time during the reference week for noneconomic reasons captures many people who are on vacation or otherwise missed a day of work.
- ³⁷ NWLC calculations based on Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) Current Population Survey (CPS) Annual Table 8: Employed and unemployed full- and part-time workers by age, sex, race, and Hispanic or Latino ethnicity available at <http://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat08.htm> (Last visited May 28, 2015) and Annual Table 3: Employment status of the civilian noninstitutional population by age, sex, and race available at <http://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat03.htm> (Last visited May 28, 2015).
- ³⁸ NWLC calculations based on Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) Current Population Survey (CPS) Annual Table 8: Employed and unemployed full- and part-time workers by age, sex, race, and Hispanic or Latino ethnicity available at <http://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat08.htm> (Last visited May 28, 2015) and Annual Table 3: Employment status of the civilian noninstitutional population by age, sex, and race available at <http://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat03.htm> (Last visited May 28, 2015).
- ³⁹ NWLC calculations based on Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) Current Population Survey (CPS) Annual Table 20: Persons at work 1 to 34 hours in all and in non-agricultural industries by reason for working less than 35 hours and usual full- or part-time status available at <http://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat20.htm> (Last visited May 28, 2015). Note that this figure is for people at work part time during the reference week, rather than those who usually work part time. The annual average for people at work 1 to 34 hours during the reference week was 34.9m, compared to the 27.6m who usually work part time (see Table 8). As noted in footnote x, data on involuntary part-time workers also includes workers who usually work full time but worked between 1-34 hours during the reference week of the survey. These differences mean the numbers of voluntary and involuntary part-time workers do not add to the total (which is reported here as people who usually work part time). However, including data on those who usually work full time but are not working full time during the reference week for noneconomic reasons captures many people who are on vacation or otherwise missed a day of work.
- ⁴⁰ NWLC calculations based on Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) Current Population Survey (CPS) Annual Table 23: Persons at work by occupation, sex, and usual full- or part-time status available at <http://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat23.htm> (Last visited May 28, 2015).
- ⁴¹ NWLC calculations based on Current Population Survey (CPS) 2014 using Miriam King et al., Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS), Current Population Survey: Version 3.0 [Machine-readable database] (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2010). Figures are for 2013. As above, data on involuntary part-time workers also includes workers who usually work full time but worked between 1-34 hours during the reference week of the survey.
- ⁴² NWLC calculations, IPUMS, *supra* note 2. Figures are for workings during the reference week, not for usual PT/FT workers.
- ⁴³ Maria E. Enchautegui, *Nonstandard Work Schedules and the Well-Being of Low-Income Families*, Low-Income Working Families Paper 26 1 (Urban Inst. July 2013), available at <http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/412877-nonstandard-work-schedules.pdf>.
- ⁴⁴ JOAN C. WILLIAMS & HEATHER BOUSHEY, THE THREE FACES OF WORK-FAMILY CONFLICT: THE POOR, THE PROFESSIONALS, AND THE MISSING MIDDLE, CENTER FOR AMERICAN PROGRESS 25 (Work Life Law UC Hastings College of the Law January 2010) (citing Jody Heyman, *Inequalities at Work and Home: Social Class and Gender Divides in Unfinished Work: building Equality and Democracy in an Era of Working Families* 89, 102 (Jody Heyman & Christopher Bee meds. 2005)), available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/issues/2010/01/pdf/threefaces.pdf>.
- ⁴⁵ Terrence M. McMenamin, *Shift Work and Flexible Schedules: A Time to Work: Recent Trends in Shift Work and Flexible Schedules*, Monthly Labor Review, U.S. DEP'T OF LABOR, MONTHLY LABOR REVIEW (Dec. 2007), available at <http://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/2007/12/art1full.pdf>.
- ⁴⁶ WATSON & SWANBERG, *supra* note 12, at 5.
- ⁴⁷ Enchautegui, *supra* note 43, at 7 ("Very low wages" are defined in the analysis as weekly earnings lower than those of 75 percent of the population who work full time.).
- ⁴⁸ NWLC calculations based on McMenamin, *supra* note 45.
- ⁴⁹ WILLIAMS & BOUSHEY, *supra* note 44, at 12.
- ⁵⁰ Lisa Dodson et al. Keeping Jobs and Raising Families in Low-Income America: It Just Doesn't Work (2002) Radcliffe Public Policy Center and 9to5 National Association of Working Women, at 1.
- ⁵¹ ANNA DANZIGER & SHELLEY WATERS BOOTS, LOWER-WAGE WORKERS AND FLEXIBLE WORK ARRANGEMENTS, Workplace Flexibility 2010 on behalf of the Urban Institute 3 (Georgetown Univ. July 10, 2008).
- ⁵² Ellen Galinsky, James T. Bond & Eve Tahmircioglu, *What if Employers Put Women at the Center of Their Workplace Policies? When Businesses Design Workplaces*

that Support their Employees, Both the Businesses and the Employees Benefit, in THE SHRIVER REPORT: A WOMAN'S NATION PUSHES BACK FROM THE BRINK (Shriver Center 2014).

⁵³ See NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP FOR WOMEN & FAMILIES, EVERYONE GETS SICK. NOT EVERYONE HAS TIME TO GET BETTER 4 (JULY 2011); FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE IN 2012, available at http://go.nationalpartnership.org/site/DocServer/PSD_Briefing_Book.pdf; ABT ASSOCIATES, FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE IN 2012: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (prepared for the U.S. Dep't of Labor) (Updated Sept. 2013).

⁵⁴ See generally RESTAURANT OPPORTUNITIES CENTER UNITED, *supra* note 3. See generally LIZ BEN-ISHAÏ, HANNAH MATTHEWS, & JODIE LEVIN-EPSTEIN, SCRAMBLING FOR STABILITY: THE CHALLENGES OF JOB SCHEDULE VOLATILITY AND CHILD CARE (Ctr. for Law and Soc. Policy Mar. 2014), available at <http://www.clasp.org/resources-and-publications/publication-1/2014-03-27-Scrambling-for-Stability-The-Challenges-of-Job-Schedule-Volat.pdf>

⁵⁵ *Id.* at 4.

⁵⁶ See generally, KAREN SCHULMAN & HELEN BLANK, PIVOT POINT: STATE CHILD CARE ASSISTANCE POLICIES 2013 (Nat'l Women's Law Ctr. 2013).

⁵⁷ NWLC, LISTENING TO WORKERS: CHILD CARE CHALLENGES IN LOW-WAGE JOBS 5, 7- (2014), available at http://www.nwlc.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/listening_to_workers_child_care_challenges_in_low-wage_jobs_6.24.14.pdf

⁵⁸ *Id.* at 4.

⁵⁹ See Enchautegui, *supra* note 43, at 3-4.

⁶⁰ Maureen Perry-Jenkins et al., *Shift Work, Role Overload, and the Transition to Parenthood*, 69 J. of Marriage & Family Vol. 1, 123-38 (2007).

⁶¹ HEATHER BOUSHEY, TAG-TEAM PARENTING 3 (Ctr. for Econ. & Policy Research Aug. 2005), available at http://www.cepr.net/documents/work_schedules_2006_08.pdf

⁶² See Julia R. Henly, Luke Shaefer & Elaine Waxman, *Nonstandard workschedules: Employer- and employee-driven flexibility in retail jobs*, 80 SOCIAL SERVICE REVIEW 609-34 (Dec. 2006).

⁶³ Jane Waldfogel and Sara McLanahan, *Work and Family*, FUTURE OF CHILDREN 21 NO. 2 (Fall 2011).

⁶⁴ Lisa Dodson, et, al, *How Youth are Put at Risk by Parents' Low-Wage Jobs* BOSTON COLLEGE CTR, FOR SOC. POLICY (Fall 2012).

⁶⁵ Anna Hayley-Lock & Linn Posey-Maddox, *Fitting It All In: How Mothers' Employment Shapes Their School Engagement* 14-15, J. COMMUNITY, WORK & FAMILY (Dec. 2014).

⁶⁶ *Id.*

⁶⁷ EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS, WORK-LIFE BALANCE AND THE ECONOMICS OF WORKPLACE FLEXIBILITY 3 (Mar. 2010).

⁶⁸ INSTITUTE FOR WOMEN'S POLICY RESEARCH, FACT SHEET: COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENTS NEED FAIR JOB SCHEDULING PRACTICES (July 2014), available at <http://www.iwpr.org/publications/pubs/community-college-students-need-fair-job-scheduling-practices/>.

⁶⁹ *Id.*

⁷⁰ *Id.*

⁷¹ CENTER FOR LAW & SOCIAL POLICY (CLASP), JOB SCHEDULES THAT WORK FOR STUDENTS 1 (July 2014), available at http://www.clasp.org/resources-and-publications/publication-1/SchedulesThatWork_Students.pdf

⁷² OXFAM, *supra* note 5, at 4.

⁷³ JOAN C. WILLIAMS & PENELOPE HUANG, IMPROVING WORK-LIFE FIT IN HOURLY JOBS: AN UNDERUTILIZED COST-CUTTING STRATEGY IN A GLOBALIZED WORLD 13, 15, 57, (Ctr. for Work Life Law 2011); Cauthen, *supra* note 26, at 7.

⁷⁴ Cauthen, *supra* note 20, at 1, 7.

⁷⁵ Susan J. Lambert and Julia R. Henly, *Scheduling in Hourly Jobs: Promising Practices for the Twenty-First Century Economy* 9-10 (The Mobility Agenda 2009), available at http://ssascholars.uchicago.edu/work-scheduling-study/files/lambert_and_henly_scheduling_policy_brief.pdf; CTR. FOR LAW & SOC. POLICY (CLASP), RETAIL ACTION PROJECT, & WOMEN EMPLOYED, TACKLING UNSTABLE AND UNPREDICTABLE WORK SCHEDULES: A POLICY BRIEF ON GUARANTEED MINIMUM HOURS AND REPORTING PAY POLICIES 4-5 (Mar. 2014), available at <http://retailactionproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/Tackling-Unstable-and-Unpredictable-Work-Schedules-3-7-2014-FINAL.pdf>

⁷⁶ Rebecca Glauber, *Wanting More but Working Less: Involuntary Part-Time Employment and Economic Vulnerability*, Issue Brief No. 64 Carsey Institute 2-3 (Summer 2013), available at <http://scholars.unh.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1198&context=carsey>.

⁷⁷ *Id.* at 3.

⁷⁸ H. Luke Shaefer, *Part-Time Workers: Some Key Differences Between Primary and Secondary Earners*, National Poverty Center Working Paper Series #09-16 3 (Oct. 2009), available at http://npc.umich.edu/publications/u/working_paper09-16.pdf.

⁷⁹ Rebecca Glauber, *supra* note 76.

⁸⁰ LISA DODSON, TIFFANY MANUEL & ELLEN BRAVO, RADCLIFFE INST. FOR ADVANCED STUDY, KEEPING JOBS AND RAISING FAMILIES IN LOW-INCOME AMERICA: IT JUST DOESN'T WORK, AN ACROSS THE BOUNDARIES REPORT 16 (2002), available at <http://low-wage.wikispaces.com/file/view/keeping+jobs+and+raising+families.pdf>

⁸¹ U.S. GOV'T ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE, GAO-07-2247, UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE: LOW-WAGE AND PART-TIME WORKERS CONTINUE TO EXPERIENCE LOW RATES OF RECEIPT 19 (2007), available at <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d071147.pdf>

⁸² See Gregory Acs, Katherin Ross Phillips & Daniel McKenzie, *Playing by the Rules but Losing the Game: America's Working Poor*, in LOW-WAGE WORKERS IN THE NEW ECONOMY (Richard Kazis & Marc. S. Miller eds., Urban Inst. Press 2000), available at <http://www.urban.org/publications/410404.html>.

⁸³ See generally Dodson, *supra* note 64 (describing in detail the ways having parents in low-wage jobs negatively impacts youth).

⁸⁴ James T. Bond and Ellen Galinsky, *How Can Employers Increase the Productivity and Retention of Entry-Level, Hourly Employees?*, Families and Work Institute 12 (Nov. 2006), available at <http://www.familiesandwork.org/how-can-employers-increase-the-productivity-and-retention-of-entry-level-hourly-employees-brief-2/>; see also Galinsky, Bond & Tahmircioglu, *supra* note 43 ("Overall, 55 percent of low-income mothers surveyed said it would be "extremely important" to "have the flexibility I need to manage my work and personal or family life...No one surveyed said it was 'not important.'").

⁸⁵ Sloan Center on Aging and Work at Boston College, *Why Employees Need Workplace Flexibility* (citing sources), available at http://workplaceflexibility.bc.edu/need/need_employees.

⁸⁶ WFD Consulting, *Workplace Flexibility for Lower Wage Workers*, CORP. VOICES FOR WORKING FAMILIES, 17 (Oct. 2006), available at http://www.genderprinciples.org/resource_files/Workplace_flexibility_for_lower_wage_workers.pdf.