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## Background

- Student absenteeism is an "ecological" issue, shaped by a combination of individual, school, family, and contextual factors (Gottfried \& Gee, 2017; Lenhoff \& Singer, 2022; Opara et al., 2022; Sugrue et al., 2016)
- A parent's work schedule is an "exosystemic factor" (Singer et al., 2021)
- Why does it matter?
- Student attendance has a significant association with academic (e.g., achievement, graduation) and socioemotional outcomes
- Regular school attendance can also be viewed as a proxy for family/child wellbeing


## Associations with Parent Work Schedule

## Connections between Schedule and School

- NS Schedules
- Worse school achievement \& behavior (Hsueh \& Yoshikawa, 2007)
- Less expressive language at 36 months (Han, 2005; Odom et al., 2013)
- Mixed findings regarding impact on academic achievement (Han \& Fox, 2011; Cho \& Coulton, 2016; Baker 2016)
- Schedule Flexibility
- Inflexibility associated with child behavior problems (Pilarz, 2021)
- Inflexibility increases parent stress (Nomaguchi \& Johnson, 2016)
- Inflexibility creates barriers in food preparation and feeding, arranging childcare, time with children, and school engagement (Haley-Lock \& Posey-Maddox, 2016; Agrawal et al., 2018; Henly et al., 2006; Katras et al., 2015)


## Research Questions

(1) What is the relationship between parents' self-reported work schedule (e.g., standard, nonstandard) and their children's attendance and chronic absenteeism?
(2) How do these relationships differ by family structure and, in two-parent households, the various combinations of both parents' work schedules?

## Method

- Sample: Detroit parents, random stratified sampling approach to select students within 3 school types (DPSCD neighborhood, DPSCD magnet, charter)
- Instrument: Online parent survey in January 2022 focused on socioeconomic conditions of families
- Linked with child's school records from 2021-22 school year, including attendance
- Analysis: Linear probability regression models predicting attendance and chronic absence ( $10 \%$ or more days missed)
- All family structures
- Two-parent family structures
- One-parent family structures


## Parental Schedule Configurations

One Parent Families:

- Standard (ref group)
- Non-Standard

Two Parent Families

- Both standard (ref grp)
- Both nonstandard
- One standard, one nonstandard
- One standard, one unemployed
- One nonstandard, one unemployed


## Measures

- IV: parent work schedules within family structure
- DVs: chronic absenteeism and average daily attendance rates
- CVs: highest occupational prestige score, household income-to-poverty ratio, total number of children in household, total number of adults in household, grade band, special education, parent race, and student gender

| Variable | \% ( n ) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parent Work Schedules x Family Structure |  |  |  |
| Both Nonstandard | 3\% (39.39) |  |  |
| Both Standard | 13\% (170.69) |  |  |
| One Standard, One Nonstandard | 9\% (118.17) |  |  |
| One Standard, One Unemployed | 10\% (131.30) |  |  |
| One Nonstandard, One Unemployed | 5\% (65.65) |  |  |
| One Parent Standard | 40\% (525.20) |  | Mean (Range) |
| One Parent Nonstandard | 20\% (262.60) | Highest Employed Parent Prestige Score | 37.95 (29.51-43.69) |
| Parent Race/Ethnicity |  | Income | \$29,357.85 (\$20,154.65-41,794.86) |
| Black | 77\% (1011.01) | Income-to-Poverty Ratio | 1.04 (0.87-1.40) |
| Hispanic | 16\% (210.08) | Number of Children in Household | 2.91 (2.65-3.64) |
| Other Race | 7\% (91.91) | Number of Adults in Household | 1.71 (1.39-2.17) |
| Student Characteristics |  |  |  |
| Elementary School Student | 50\% (656.50) |  |  |
| Middle School Student | 21\% (262.60) |  |  |
| High School Student | 28\% (367.64) |  |  |
| Special Education Student | 8\% (105.04) |  |  |
| Female | 50\% (656.50) |  |  |
| Chronically Absent | 70\% (919.1) |  |  |

 $\square$

## Detroit PEER All Families Model

| Variable | $\begin{array}{c}(\mathbf{1}) \\ \text { Chronically Absent }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}(\mathbf{2}) \\ \text { Chronically Absent }\end{array}$ | (3) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Attendance Rate |  |  |  |$)$

In the full model, both parents
working a nonstandard schedule was associated with 19\% greater likelihood of chronic absence.

# In the full model, one parent 

 working a nonstandard schedule and one being unemployed was associated with $19 \%$ lower likelihood of chronic absence.Detroit
PEER One-Parent Families Model

| Variable | (5) <br> Chronically Absent | (6) <br> Chronically Absent | (7) <br> Attendance Rate | (8) <br> Attendance Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule |  |  |  |  |
| One Parent Standard (reference group) | - | - | - | - |
| One Parent Nonstandard | $0.090^{* *}(0.030)$ | 0.052(0.032) | $-0.048^{* * *}(0.015)$ | -0.019(0.014) |
| Household Characteristics |  |  |  |  |
| Highest Employed Parent Prestige Score | - | 0.002(0.001) | - | 0.000(-0.001) |
| Income-to-Poverty Ratio | - | -0.165*** (0.018) | - | $0.052^{* * *}(0.007)$ |
| Total Number of Children | - | 0.010(0.009) | - | $-0.008+(0.005)$ |
| Total Number of Adults | - | -0.016(0.018) | - | $0.014+(0.007)$ |
| Parent Race/Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |
| Black | - | 0.236+(0.138) | - | $-0.075+(0.038)$ |
| Hispanic | - | 0.225(0.150) | - | -0.057(0.043) |
| Student Characteristics |  |  |  |  |
| Middle School | - | -0.013(0.039) | - | -0.009(0.014) |
| High School | - | 0.049(0.034) | - | -0.081*** (0.019) |
| Special Education | - | -0.027(0.059) | - | 0.018(0.020) |
| Female | - | -0.027(0.030) | - | $0.001(0.013)$ |
| Constant | $0.741^{* * *}$ | $0.614^{* * *}$ | $0.783^{* * *}$ | $0.810^{* * *}$ |
| Adjusted R ${ }^{2}$ | 0.009 | 0.132 | 0.016 | 0.144 |
| $N$ | 867 | 800 | 867 | 800 |

[^0]
## The model including only oneparent families yielded no significant results after adding covariates.

## DETROIT PEER <br> Two-Parent Families Model

| Variable | (9) <br> Chronically Absent | (10) <br> Chronically Absent | (11) Attendance Rate | $\begin{gathered} \text { (12) } \\ \text { Attendance Rate } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule |  |  |  |  |
| Both Standard (reference group) |  |  |  |  |
| Both Nonstandard | 0.270*** (0.069) | $0.182^{*}(0.078)$ | -0.067* (0.028) | -0.045(0.028) |
| One Standard One Nonstandard | 0.009(0.065) | -0.083(0.062) | 0.002(0.016) | 0.018(0.016) |
| One Standard One Unemployed | -0.041(0.066) | -0.069(0.064) | 0.008(0.017) | 0.017(0.017) |
| One Nonstandard One Unemployed | -0.145(0.099) | $-0.188^{*}(0.087)$ | -0.002(0.027) | $0.017(0.025)$ |
| Household Characteristics |  |  |  |  |
| Highest Employed Parent Prestige Score | - | -0.003(0.002) | - | 0.001+(0.001) |
| Income-to-Poverty Ratio | - | -0.104*** (0.029) | - | $0.040^{* * *}(0.008)$ |
| Total Number of Children | - | -0.004(0.015) | - | 0.008+(0.004) |
| Total Number of Adults | - | $-0.074+(0.038)$ | - | $0.027^{* *}(0.010)$ |
| Parent Race/Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |
| Black | - | $0.294 * *(0.083)$ | - | $-0.073^{* * *}(0.021)$ |
| Hispanic | - | -0.023(0.093) | - | 0.000(0.022) |
| Student Characteristics $\quad$ [ |  |  |  |  |
| Middle School | - | -0.006(0.061) | - | -0.009(0.017) |
| High School | - | 0.024(0.056) | - | -0.025(0.016) |
| Special Education | - | $0.121(0.085)$ | - | -0.055(0.036) |
| Female | - | -0.057(0.047) | - | 0.018(0.013) |
| Constant | $0.578^{* * *}$ | 0.889** | 0.850*** | $0.721^{* * *}$ |
| Adjusted R ${ }^{2}$ | 0.029 | 0.143 | 0.015 | 0.161 |
| N | 514 | 496 | 514 | 496 |

Similar to the full model, both parents working nonstandard was associated with greater likelihood of chronic absence.

Meanwhile one working nonstandard and one unemployed was associated with lower likelihood of chronic absence.

## Limitations

- Population may not be generalizable
- Schedule variable did not measure variation within day shift
- We could not measure social capital (e.g., availability and reliability of social support network to support attendance)
- Data collected during the official COVID-19 pandemic



## Implications

- Schedule flexibility may be a form of economic capital families can use to improve children's attendance
- Schools might consider a broader set of solutions in and out of school to improve student attendance
- How do bell schedules align with parent work schedules?
- Is advocacy in chambers of commerce for alignment or flexibility possible?
- Can before- and after-care be expanded?
- Is advocacy for fair scheduling policies possible?
- Aspects of parental employment (e.g., schedule) might be important to conceptualizations of student SES
- Work-related inequities tied to race and class may contribute to the racial and economic education gap
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[^0]:    $* p<0.05, * * p<0.01, * * * p<0.001,+p<0.10$.

