



HAL
open science

Self-employed Mothers and the Work-Family Conflict

Jose Alberto Molina, Jose Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, Raquel Ortega

► **To cite this version:**

Jose Alberto Molina, Jose Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, Raquel Ortega. Self-employed Mothers and the Work-Family Conflict. Applied Economics, 2011, pp.1. 10.1080/00036846.2011.558486 . hal-00687811

HAL Id: hal-00687811

<https://hal.science/hal-00687811>

Submitted on 15 Apr 2012

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Self-employed Mothers and the Work-Family Conflict

Journal:	<i>Applied Economics</i>
Manuscript ID:	APE-2010-0421.R1
Journal Selection:	Applied Economics
Date Submitted by the Author:	21-Jan-2011
Complete List of Authors:	Molina, Jose Alberto; University of Zaragoza; Institute for the Study of Labor-IZA Gimenez-Nadal, Jose; University of Zaragoza; Centre for Time Use Research, University of Oxford Ortega, Raquel; University of Zaragoza
JEL Code:	C14 - Semiparametric and Nonparametric Methods < C1 - Econometric and Statistical Methods: General < C - Mathematical and Quantitative Methods, D13 - Household Production and Intrahousehold Allocation < D1 - Household Behavior and Family Economics < D - Microeconomics, J12 - Marriage Marital Dissolution Family Structure < J1 - Demographic Economics < J - Labor and Demographic Economics, J13 - Fertility Family Planning Child Care Children Youth < J1 - Demographic Economics < J - Labor and Demographic Economics, J22 - Time Allocation and Labor Supply < J2 - Time Allocation, Work Behavior, and Employment Determination/Creation < J - Labor and Demographic Economics
Keywords:	Self-employment, Market Work, Child care, Timing

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

For Peer Review

Self-employed Mothers and the Work-Family Conflict

Jose Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal^{1,2} Jose Alberto Molina^{1,3} Raquel Ortega¹

¹ University of Zaragoza (Spain)

² Centre for Time Use Research, University of Oxford (UK)

³ Institute for the Study of Labor-IZA (Germany)

Abstract

We analyze how self-employed and employed mothers allocate their time throughout the day in order to balance their work and family responsibilities. To that end, we use time diary information from Spain, a country with a low level of women's participation in the labor market (Spanish Time Use Survey, 2002-2003). We find that self-employed mothers devote less time to market work, and more time to tertiary (e.g., sleeping, eating) and leisure activities, than employed mothers in a working day. We also find differences between employed and self-employed mothers in the timing of market work, child care and housework throughout the day, and we find complementarities between the timing of market work of working mothers and the timing of child care of their male partners. Our results on timing are consistent with the hypothesis that self-employment stands as a possible way for mothers to have greater control over the timing of work (flexible hours), and that they may therefore be able to work odd shifts, when the spouse is available to care for the children.

JEL: C14, D13, J12, J13, J22

Keywords: Self-employment, Market Work, Child Care, Timing.

We are grateful for comments from the European Society for Population Economics Conference (2008), the Spanish Applied Economics Meeting (2008), the European Economic Association Conference (2008) and from the Annual Conference of the European Association of Labour Economics (2008), as well as the financial support provided by the Spanish Ministry of Education and Science (Project ECO2008-01297), and the Ramon Areces Foundation.

Correspondence: J. Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, Department of Economic Analysis, Faculty of Economics, Gran Via 2. 50005 – Zaragoza (Spain). Tel.: +34 976 76 10 00 ext. 46 53 Fax: +34 976 76 19 96. E-mail: ngimenez@unizar.es

1. Introduction

Recent decades have brought about a noticeable change in the role of women in the labor market. The female labor force participation rate in the United States, as in Northern European countries, is approximately 70%, significantly higher than in Southern European countries, such as Spain, which has a participation rate of around 58% (OECD, 2005). These figures point to changes in social and gender roles (Layard, 2005) and indicate that roles taken by married/cohabiting women have changed during recent decades, with many such women having now become paid workers as well as homemakers.

However, most women continue to do more of the housework and parenting (Robinson and Godbey, 1997; Bianchi et al., 2000; Coltrane, 2000; Aliaga, 2006), with this creating an extra strain, the so-called “double burden” or “second shift” (Hochschild and Machung, 1989; Schor, 1991; Hochschild, 1997).¹ Thus, women show discontent with the amount of free time available to them (Robinson and Godbey, 1997; Bittman and Wajcman, 2000; Mattingly and Bianchi, 2003; Sayer, 2005; Mattingly and Sayer, 2006), and the increased popularity of workplace flexibility programs and supportive work-family policies reflects the intensification of the conflict between working and household responsibilities usually associated with negative consequences for workers’ health and workplace performance (Netemeyer et al., 1996; Kossek and Ozeki, 1999; Allen et al., 2000; Grzywacz and Bass, 2003; Byron, 2005; Mesmer-Magnus and Viswesvaran, 2005a, 2005b).

Given these realities, one commonly-held view of women’s motives to choose self-employment is a desire for greater flexibility, and the ability to spend more time caring for children (Presser, 1989; Connelly, 1992; Loscocco, 1997; Caputo and Dolinsky, 1998; Boden, 1999; Hundley, 2000; Lombard, 2007; Arai, 2008). Within this framework, the objective of this paper is to analyze whether self-employment stands as a possible way for mothers to have greater control over the hours they work (flexible hours) and we examine how self-employed and employed mothers deal with conflicting family and work pressures.

¹ For instance, by the end of the 1990’s, men in some OECD countries devoted 3.29 hours per day to household production activities (housework plus child care), whereas women devoted 6.04 hours per day to such activities (Gauthier et al., 2004). Poortman and van der Lippe (2009) show that women have more favorable attitudes toward cleaning, cooking and child care than do men, a finding associated with women’s greater contribution to household labor.

1
2
3 To that end, we use data from Spain, where labor markets remain highly
4 regulated, with strict rules concerning the hiring and firing of workers, and the types of
5 employment arrangements permitted. This contributes to the emergence of obstacles to
6 leaving and re-entering the labor market, while becoming a parent and raising children,
7 and results in women in Spain participating less in the labor market and having fewer
8 children (Del Boca, 2002). Furthermore, child care services in Spain are typically
9 inadequate and characterized by extreme rigidity in the number of weekly hours available.
10 Only 2% of child care slots for children up to age 3 are publicly funded, which is the
11 lowest percentage in Europe. Parental leave in Spain is granted to families rather than to
12 individuals, for a maximum of 36 weeks, unpaid, and offers no flexibility at work.²
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 We contribute to the existing US literature on the relationship between self-
22 employment and the work-family conflict by providing evidence for a European country,
23 Spain, representing the Mediterranean rim. Although North American studies focusing on
24 self-employment have indicated that self-employed women find it easier to combine work
25 and family responsibilities than employed women (Goffee and Scase, 1983; Scott, 1986;
26 Kaplan, 1988; Buttner, 1993; DeMartino and Barbato, 2003; Lombard, 2007), little actual
27 empirical work has been carried out in this area in the European context. Likewise, given
28 previous evidence hypothesizing that self-employed mothers spend less time in the labor
29 market and more time caring for their children than do employed mothers, we analyze
30 whether self-employed mothers devote more time to child care activities than employed
31 mothers. We also analyze whether the timing of activities for self-employed mothers
32 differs from that of employed mothers, allowing self-employed mothers to shift part of
33 their working responsibilities to unusual hours, and to devote more time to child care
34 activities during the mornings.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 We find that self-employed mothers devote less time to market work and more time
47 to tertiary activities (e.g., sleeping, eating) and leisure activities than employed mothers in
48 a working day. This evidence is in line with Reynolds (2005) who finds that ‘work-life
49 conflict makes women want to decrease the number of hours they work whether the
50 conflict originates at home or at work.’ Given the desire to reduce the amount of work
51 hours for mothers who are dealing with conflicting family and work pressures, self-
52 employment allows for such reduction.
53
54
55
56
57
58

59 ² The Spanish institutional context has improved somewhat in recent years, with the implementation of certain family-
60 friendly policies and, although the portion of GDP devoted by the government to gender equality policies has increased
from 0.5 % in 1998 to 1.1 % in 2005, this is still the lowest in the European Union (EUROSTAT). Such policies
include the “baby-check” (€2,500), and the Spanish law “Ley para la igualdad efectiva de hombres y mujeres 2007/3”.

1
2
3 Additionally, we find no difference in the amount of time devoted to child care
4 activities between employed and self-employed mothers, which contrasts with the existing
5 literature hypothesizing a positive relationship between self-employment and time
6 devoted to child care by mothers (Connelly, 1992; Caputo and Dolinsky, 1998; Boden,
7 1999; Edwards and Field-Hendrey, 1996). We do find, however, that, compared to
8 employed mothers, self-employed mothers devote more time to child care activities
9 during the mornings and afternoons, while they devote more time to market work
10 activities during the evening (from 5 p.m. to 9 p.m.). These results are consistent with the
11 hypothesis that self-employment stands as a possible way for mothers to have greater
12 control over the timing of their work (flexible hours) and, therefore, mothers are able to
13 work odd shifts, when the spouse is available to care for their children.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 2. Data and Variables

26 We use the Spanish Time Use Survey-STUS (2002-2003), where each household
27 member over 9 years old fills in a time sheet, covering the 24 hours of a day, from 6 a.m.
28 to 6 a.m. the following day. This dataset allows us to accurately compute the total
29 effective hours devoted to different activities, and to analyze the timing of these activities
30 to identify changes in the underlying 'time-profiles' throughout the day (for studies
31 analyzing the timing of activities, see Hamermesh (1998, 1999) and Fisher et al. (2007) for
32 the US; Bonke et al. (2004) for Denmark; Hyttinen and Ruskanen (2007) for Finland).
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 The sample is restricted to include employed and self-employed working mothers
41 of children under 18, living in heterosexual couples (married or cohabiting), with no
42 other restrictions concerning the presence of other family member, health status, or
43 rural/ urban status.³ Additionally, we look at working days, defined as days where people
44 devote at least 60 minutes to market work activities, excluding commuting. The time
45 constraint is more likely to become binding during a working day, when people must
46 devote time to their work responsibilities, and, hence, the work-family conflict is more
47 likely on such days.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

59 ³ Despite the inherent diversity of the term "self-employed", we use the generally accepted meaning, which refers to
60 those individuals who are either entrepreneurs with no employees, or independent workers, since our data set does not
allow us to distinguish between these two categories. Self-employed women can also define themselves as working part-
time.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Dependent variables

Since there are a large number of different activities, we need to devise some way to aggregate these activities into useful economic categories, and thus we have chosen the 4 main categories used by Burda et al. (2008): *Market Work*, *Household Production*, *Tertiary Activities* and *Leisure*.

Market Work refers to activities for which people are paid. *Household Production* refers to activities in which we engage at home, using our own time and some purchased goods, and have the common characteristic that we could pay someone to perform them for us, while we are not paid for performing them. The third group is *Tertiary Activities*, which refers to things that we cannot pay other people to do for us, but that we must do for ourselves, at least to some extent (e.g., sleeping, eating). Finally, *Leisure* includes all activities that we cannot pay someone else to do for us, and that we do not really have to do at all if we do not wish to. What distinguishes *Leisure* from other types of home activities is that one can function perfectly well, albeit not necessarily happily, with no leisure whatsoever. In other words, *Leisure* is not necessary for survival.⁴

Regarding these activities, while employed mothers may consider time spent with co-workers, colleagues, and clients, other than while working, as *Leisure*, self-employed mothers may consider such time as part of the job, since the success of their economic activities or business depends on their ability to win clients (networking). This may result in the self-employed considering some activities as *Market Work*, while the employed consider the same activities as *Leisure*. Thus, the potential difference in the time devoted to *Market Work* by both groups may be upwardly biased. We also find a downward bias in commuting time. Travel to/from work may make a difference in the time devoted to *Market Work* between employee and self-employed mothers, since the self-employed can be working at home and, therefore, we do not include commuting time in *Market Work*.

Additionally, *Child Care* poses a conceptual challenge (Aguar and Hurst, 2007). It has been argued that *Child Care* differs from *Housework* in terms of the utility generated. For example, when asked to assess the satisfaction they receive from various activities, individuals consistently rank time spent playing with and reading to their children as being among the most enjoyable (Robinson and Godbey, 1997). Furthermore, individuals consistently report that general *Child Care* is more enjoyable than activities such as

⁴ All these activities are measured as primary activities. Väisänen (2006) shows that the amount of time reported as secondary activity in the STUS is 82 minutes (out of 1440 minutes per day), the lowest among the UK, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Norway and Sweden, which makes the inclusion of secondary activities in the analysis not relevant.

1
2
3 housework, grocery shopping, yard work, cleaning, doing dishes and laundry. Such survey
4 evidence suggests that it may be appropriate to examine *Child Care* separately from other
5 categories of time use, such as leisure and housework.
6
7
8
9

10 11 *Explanatory variables*

12 We control for age and age squared divided by 100 (Kalenkoski et al., 2005;
13 Aguiar and Hurst, 2007), in order to account for the allocation of time over the life-cycle.
14 For instance, we should expect an inverted U-shaped effect of age on *Child Care* activities,
15 since the majority of Spanish women have children when in their early 30s, and the time
16 required for *Child Care* decreases as children grow older.⁵ We also consider the effects of
17 family structure (Kalenkoski et al., 2005), controlling for the number of children in the
18 household, breaking down children's age according to school cycles (*Number of children 0-*
19 *2, Number of children 3-5, Number of children 6-12, Number of children 13-17*). We also control
20 for the number of members in the family, since it is possible that the presence of
21 grandparents (especially grandmothers) reduces the time devoted to *Household Production*
22 and *Child Care* activities.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 We control for whether mothers live in an urban or rural area (Kalenkoski et al.,
33 2005). The availability of child care services, which may be more limited in rural areas,
34 may condition the time allocation of mothers, and they may find more difficulty
35 combining work and family responsibilities, making self-employment a viable way to
36 alleviate this conflict. Additionally, Kalenkoski et al. (2005) find that, if women have any
37 health limitations, they devote less time to *Market Work*. For this reason, we control for
38 the self-reported health status of the mothers (5= very poor, ..., 1=very good).
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 We also control for the educational level of the mothers (Kalenkoski et al., 2005;
46 Aguiar and Hurst, 2007). Aguiar and Hurst (2007) show a dispersion of *Leisure* favoring
47 the less-educated, while Kalenkoski et al. (2005) find that highly-educated women devote
48 more time to *Market Work* and *Child Care*. We use two dummy variables to control for
49 university and secondary levels of education (the reference category is primary education).
50 We also control for marital status (Kalenkoski et al., 2005), with the reference category
51 being cohabiting (vs. married).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

⁵ According to EUROSTAT, the mean age of women at first birth in 2002 was 30.77 years in Spain.

1
2
3 Additionally, we need to control for the work characteristics of the mother.
4 Hence, we control for part-time (self-reported) and self-employment (self-reported)
5 status, occupation, and own hourly wage. First, we acknowledge that the part-time and
6 self-employment status are choice variables (e.g., Lombard (2007) finds that a woman is
7 more likely to choose self-employment the greater her demand for flexibility), although
8 we consider them to be exogenous variables, since we are interested in whether these
9 choices affect the mothers' allocation of time. Second, we need to control for the
10 occupation of the individual (type of work), since it could be that the number of hours
11 devoted to *Market Work*, and the timing of these activities, is in fact a function of the type
12 of work, rather than of an individual choice.⁶ Third, according to Altman (2001), whether
13 labor supply increases or decreases, as a consequence of a change in real wages, depends
14 on whether or not the substitution effect outweighs the income effect. But such a link is
15 analytically suspect, since we do not know, a priori, the reasonable circumstances under
16 which one effect should outweigh the other, nor the circumstances under which the
17 elasticities of price and income effects can be expected to be large or small.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 Thus, we use two dummies to control for the part-time (1=yes; 0=no) and self-
31 employment status (1=yes; 0=no). For occupation, we have considered the 11 categories
32 used in Hersh (2009).⁷ Finally, we include the (log) hourly wage rate to control for
33 income and substitution effects. To compute the own wage rate, since income in the
34 STUS is defined in intervals, we first assume an underlying normal distribution of the
35 earnings variable, and apply interval regression techniques to compute the expected value
36 (mean) of earnings in each of the earnings intervals. Once we obtain the expected value
37 of earnings, we divide such earnings by the hours per week devoted to market work
38 activities. To allow for non-linear effects, we use the logarithm of wage rate.⁸
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 ⁶ For instance, if the self-employed mother is opening a new restaurant, she would be less likely to be flexible than a
54 regular employee. Furthermore, the type of commitment required by so-called 'high-powered' jobs, such as law or
55 medicine, may require a significant amount of up-front time in order to become established, so being self-employed
56 may also predict working longer hours, less time spent with children, and less flexibility. Thus, a comparison between
57 the self-employed and the employed, without controlling for the type of job, may be misleading.

58 ⁷ We control for the following occupations: Management, business, financial; Professional and related; Healthcare
59 support; Protective service; Food Preparation and serving related; Building and grounds cleaning and maintenance;
60 Personal care and service; Sales and related; Office and administrative support; Natural resources, construction and
maintenance; and Production, transportation and material moving.

⁸ The same imputation technique is used in Sevilla-Sanz et al. (2010).

Descriptive evidence

Panel A in Table 1 shows means and standard deviations of the time use variables for employed and self-employed mothers of children under 18 in a working day. Although we find differences in the time devoted to their daily activities between employed and self-employed mothers, most such differences are not statistically significant at the 5% level. We only find a statistically significant difference between employed and self-employed mothers in the amount of time devoted to *Tertiary Activities*, since self-employed mothers devote 16.93 more minutes per working day to *Tertiary Activities*, compared to employed mothers. This result is consistent with Hyytinen and Ruskanen (2007) who find that Finnish self-employed individuals get more sleep.

Panel B in Table 1 shows summary statistics of the explanatory variables in our sample. We find no statistically significant differences at the 5% level among employed and self-employed mothers in age, number of family members, health status, civic status and number of children. However, we do find statistically significant differences at the 5% level for other demographic characteristics. Spanish self-employed mothers are less likely to live in urban areas than Spanish employed mothers (34.58% and 46.95%, respectively), are less likely to have university education (24.34% and 38.38%, respectively), have a lower (log) wage rate (2.05 and 2.85, respectively), and are less likely to work part-time (3.20% and 12.10%, respectively). Regarding differences in occupations, compared to employed mothers, self-employed mothers are more likely to work in “Management, business, financial” and “Natural resources, construction, maintenance”, while those same mothers are less likely to work in “Professional and related”, “Healthcare support”, “Protective services”, “Building and grounds cleaning and maintenance” and “Office and administrative support”.

In summary, we find no statistically significant differences in the time devoted to *Market Work*, *Child care*, *Household Production* and *Leisure*, although we do find a statistically significant difference in *Tertiary Activities*, favoring the self-employed mothers. However, in this analysis, we need to control for other demographic and household characteristics, such as the number and age of the children, the wage rate, and occupation. For instance, Gimenez-Nadal and Sevilla-Sanz (2011) find that working mothers have leisure levels that are much lower than comparable working fathers or singles. Thus, such mothers may use self-employment as a way to reduce conflicting family and work pressures.

3. Empirical Strategy and Results

Empirical Strategy

We condition the time allocation decisions of mothers on demographics. Thus, we estimate the following OLS model for each time use category (*Market Work, Household Production, Tertiary Activities, Leisure and Child Care*):⁹

$$Y_i = \alpha + \gamma_{\text{Personal}} \text{Personal}_i + \gamma_{\text{family}} \text{Family}_i + \beta_1 \text{Part-Time}_i + \beta_2 \text{Self-Employed}_i + \beta_3 \text{Occup}_i + \beta_4 \text{Children} * \text{Part-Time}_i + \beta_5 \text{Children} * \text{Self-Employed}_i + \beta_6 \text{Part-Time} * \text{Self-Employed}_i + \gamma_{\text{day}} \text{Day}_i + \xi_i \quad (1)$$

where Y_i is the time use category for individual “i”; Personal_{it} is a vector of personal characteristics (*age, age squared, urban/rural, health status and civic status*); Family_i is a vector of family characteristics (*Number of children 0-2, Number of children 3-5, Number of children 6-12, Number of children 13-17, and Number of family members*); Self_Employed_i is a “dummy” variable to control for self-employment status; Part_Time_i is a “dummy” variable to control for part-time status; and Occup_i is a vector of dummy variables that controls for occupation (type of work). Given previous evidence that self-employed women are more likely to have multiple children (Connelly, 1992; Caputo and Dolinsky, 1998; Boden, 1999), we include the interaction terms between the number and age of the children and being self-employed (and working part-time). Finally, we include an interaction term between “self-employment” and “working part-time”, to avoid conflating part-time and self-employment status.¹⁰

Results

Table 2 shows the results of estimating an OLS regression for each dependent variable. We observe that *Age* and *Age squared* have statistically significant positive and negative associations, respectively, with the time devoted to *Child Care*, with these associations being statistically significant at the 1% level. Thus, age has an inverted u-shaped effect on *Child Care*, with the maximum being reached at the age of 37. This result is consistent with the life cycle of the family, in that, when children are young, the parents spend more time caring for them. Furthermore, *Number of family members* has a negative

⁹ We have also used several additional indicators to take advantage of contextual information included in the survey, such as the information about who else was present during an activity, and where the activity occurred. However, there are data limitations, and these additional indicators add little to the analysis (available upon request).

¹⁰ We do not include interaction terms between the number of children and ‘part-time* self-employed’, since the low percentage of ‘part-time self-employed’ mothers leads to multicollinearity problems. We estimate OLS regressions for each time use category, and we obtain robust estimates using the population weights included in the survey. Day_{it} is a variable scaling the day of the week when the survey took place (ref.: Monday), and the omitted occupation is “Medical professionals”. We do not show results for the day of the week and occupational dummies.

1
2
3 association with the time devoted to *Child Care*, since an additional adult member in the
4 household reduces the time devoted to *Child Care* by the mother by 10.06 minutes in a
5 working day, with this association being statistically significant at the 1% level.
6
7

8
9 Education has statistically significant effects on the time devoted to both *Market*
10 *Work* and *Household Production*. Thus, university education has a statistically significant
11 negative association with the time devoted to *Household Production* at the 5% level, with
12 highly educated women devoting 25.98 fewer minutes to *Household Production* per working
13 day than women with primary education. Furthermore, education has a statistically
14 significant positive association with the time devoted to *Market Work*, with highly and
15 medium educated women devoting 24.96 (statistically significant at the 10% level) and
16 35.75 (statistically significant at the 5% level) more minutes to *Market Work* activities per
17 working day, respectively.
18
19

20
21 The number of children has important effects on the allocation of time in a
22 working day. In the case of full-time employed mothers (reference group), children under
23 13 have statistically significant positive associations with the time devoted to *Child Care*,
24 with the highest effect being found for children under age 3, where an additional child
25 increases the time devoted to *Child Care* by 87.40 minutes per day, and the lowest effect is
26 found for the number of children between 6 and 12 years, where an additional child
27 increases the time devoted to *Child Care* by 12.63 minutes per day. The number of
28 children under 18 has statistically significant negative associations with the time devoted
29 to *Market Work*, with the greatest effect being found for children under 3, while the
30 number of children between 6 and 17 has statistically significant positive correlations
31 with the time devoted to *Household Production*, with the greatest effect being found for
32 children between 13 and 17 years old. All these associations are statistically significant at
33 the 5% level.
34
35

36
37 Regarding the effects of children for part-time employed mothers, such effects
38 are similar to the case of full-time employed mothers, the only statistically significant
39 difference at the 5% level being that children under age 3 have a negative association with
40 the time devoted to *Household Production*, decreasing the time devoted to these activities by
41 52.95 minutes per working day. In the case of full-time self-employed mothers, children
42 have similar effects to the case of full-time employed mothers, with the difference being
43 that the number of children between 6 and 12, and between 13 and 17, have positive
44 associations with the time devoted to *Market Work*; and the number of children between
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 13 and 17 has a negative association with the time devoted to *Leisure*, with these
4 associations being statistically significant at the 5% level.
5
6

7 We now turn to the variables controlling for work status. On the one hand,
8 compared to full-time employed mothers, working part-time has a statistically significant
9 negative association with the time devoted to *Market Work* (150.52 fewer minutes per
10 working day), while it has a statistically significant positive association with the time
11 devoted to *Household Production* at the 1% level (113.21 more minutes per working day).
12 Hence, we find a trade-off between the time devoted to *Market Work* and *Household*
13 *Production* in a working day with part-time employment of mothers. On the other hand,
14 being full-time self-employed has a statistically significant negative association with the
15 time devoted to *Market Work* (97.34 fewer minutes per working day), and statistically
16 significant positive associations with the time devoted to *Tertiary Activities* (43.17 more
17 minutes per working day) and *Leisure* (47.32 more minutes per working day), with these
18 associations being statistically significant at the 5% level. Finally, compared to full-time
19 employed mothers, being part-time self-employed has a statistically significant positive
20 association with the time devoted to *Tertiary Activities* at the 5% level, with part-time self-
21 employed mothers devoting 101.40 more minutes per day to *Tertiary Activities* than full-
22 time employed mothers.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 The analysis of aggregates of time use reveals that, when we control for observed
35 heterogeneity, self-employed mothers devote less time to *Market Work*, and more time to
36 *Tertiary Activities* and *Leisure* than full-time employed mothers in a working day. These
37 results are consistent with Hyttinen and Ruskanen (2007), who find that self-employed
38 people get more sleep, and also with Biddle and Hamermesh (1990), who find that sleep
39 is very much a choice variable. This evidence is also in line with Reynolds (2005), who
40 finds that 'work-life conflict makes women want to decrease the number of hours they
41 work whether the conflict originates at home or at work.' Given the desire to reduce the
42 amount of work hours for mothers who are dealing with conflicting family and work
43 pressures, self-employment appears to allow for such reduction.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 Furthermore, prior research has shown that the number of children in the home
54 is positively related to the probability of self-employment, at least among women, as is
55 the number of young children (Connelly, 1992; Caputo and Dolinsky, 1998; Boden,
56 1999). Similarly, the number of children at home is correlated with home-based work in
57 the United States (Edwards and Field-Hendrey, 1996). From this evidence, authors have
58 inferred that self-employment is chosen in order to spend more time with the children.
59
60

None of the above studies answer directly, however, the question of whether self-employed individuals do indeed spend more time caring for their children. We find no evidence of this relationship between child care and self-employment. Although full-time self-employed mothers devote less time to *Market Work* activities than full-time employed mothers, we find no statistically significant association between self-employment and *Child Care*, which is in line with the findings of Hildebrand and Williams (2003).

4. Self-employment and Child Care

One of the arguments for the hypothesized relationship between self-employment and child care is that an individual in self-employment is perceived as having greater control over the timing of work (flexible hours), so the self-employed mother may be able to work during school hours, after the children have gone to bed, at odd shifts or part-time, when a spouse or other family member is available to care for the children. In such a case, we would observe a different timing in *Child Care* and *Household Production*, given that self-employed mothers with children are able to devote time to these activities at times when they otherwise could not, if they were working for a firm. Thus, we now analyze the timing of such activities throughout a working day, comparing employed and self-employed mothers.

For this analysis, we follow Hamermesh (1999) and we construct the series T_{it} , where “i” refers to the individual, and “t” refers to the time band of the day. We divide the 24 hours of the working day into 24 time bands ($t= 1, 2, 3 \dots 24$), and we compute the amount of time devoted to the reference activity (*Market Work*, *Child Care*...) in each time band “t”. We estimate the following OLS model for each time band:

$$T_{it} = \alpha + \gamma_{age} Age_i + \gamma_{educ} Educ_i + \gamma_{family} Family_i + \beta_1 T_i + \beta_2 Self_Employed_i + \beta_3 Occup_i + \beta_4 Partner_i + \gamma_{day} Day_i + \xi_{it} \quad (2)$$

where Age_i controls for the age of the individual ‘i’ (and its square), $Educ_i$ controls for education (ref.: primary education), $Family_i$ is a vector of family characteristics (*Number of children 0-2*, *Number of children 3-5*, *Number of children 6-12*, and *Number of Family Members, married*), T_i is the total amount of time devoted to the reference activity for the individual “i”, $Self_Employed_i$ indicates whether the person is self-employed or not, $Occup_i$ controls for the occupation of the individual, $Partner_i$ is a vector of partner’s work characteristics

(partner is in a working day, and partner is self-employed), and Day_i is a vector scaling the day of the week (ref.: Monday).¹¹

Graph 1 shows the estimated coefficients of the self-employment dummy on the timing regressions for *Market Work*, *Household Production*, *Child Care* and *Aggregate Housework* (*Household Production* plus *Child Care*). First, we observe that there are statistically significant negative associations between being self-employed and the timing of *Market Work*, *Household Production* and *Child Care* from 6 a.m. to 11 a.m., from 6 a.m. to 7 a.m., and from 6 a.m. to 8 a.m., respectively. At the same time, we find statistically significant positive associations between being self-employed and *Household Production* and *Child Care* from 7 a.m. to 11 a.m., and from 9 a.m. to 12 a.m., respectively. Second, we find that being self-employed has statistically significant negative associations with *Market Work* from 1 p.m. to 3 p.m., while it has significant positive associations with *Household Production* and *Child Care* in the same period. Third, being self-employed has statistically significant positive associations with *Market Work* from 5 p.m. to 9 p.m., while it has statistically significant negative associations with both *Household Production* and with *Child Care* from 5 p.m. to 7 p.m.

Thus, we find that, compared to employed mothers, self-employed mothers devote 11.40 and 9.26 percentage points more of their time to *Child care* (6.36 more minutes out of 55.767 minutes, see Table 1) and *Household Production* (19.30 more minutes out of 208.48 minutes, see Table 1), respectively, in the period from 8 a.m. to 3 p.m. Additionally, we find that self-employed mothers devote less time to *Market Work* in the morning and afternoon (e.g., from 8 a.m. to 3 p.m.) compared to employed mothers, since they devote 10.54 percentage points less time to these activities (41.97 fewer minutes out of 398.27 minutes). Second, compared to employed mothers, we find that self-employed mothers devote 8.75 and 5.99 percentage points less of their time to *Child care* and *Household Production* in the evening (e.g., from 5 p.m. to 9 p.m.), respectively, while self-employed mothers devote 11.23 percentage points more time to *Market Work* in the evening compared to employed mothers.

These results are consistent with the hypothesized relationship between self-employment and child care, that self-employed mothers are perceived as having greater

¹¹ Since we find differences in the amount of time devoted to *Market Work*, *Tertiary Activities* and *Leisure* between employed and self-employed mothers, we need to control for such differences in our timing regressions, so we include the total time devoted to each activity. Controlling for whether the husband/partner is in a working day or not is also important, since the fact that the husband/partner is in a working day may require the mother to devote more time to *Child Care*, and less time to *Market Work* during the morning, than when the husband/partner does not have to work.

1
2
3 control over the timing of work (flexible hours), so they may devote more time to the
4 children in the mornings and afternoons, and they more easily work odd shifts, when a
5 spouse or other family member is available to care for the children. Hyytinen and
6 Ruskanen (2007) also find that the self-employed with younger children are more likely to
7 work after 5 p.m., when the majority of communal day-care centers close. Additionally, in
8 the United States, Stewart and Allard (2008) find that part-time employment allows
9 mothers to spend more time with their children during the mornings and afternoons,
10 compared to full-time employment.
11
12
13
14
15
16

17
18 Given the hypothesized relationship between child care and self-employment,
19 that self-employed mothers may more easily work odd shifts, when a spouse or other
20 family member is available to care for the children, we now analyze the correlations
21 between the timing of *Child Care* for men and the timing of *Market Work* of their
22 employed spouses. To that end, we regress, for each time band, the proportion of time
23 devoted to *Child Care* by men in the reference time band, conditioned on whether their
24 female partners devoted time to *Market Work* (1) or not (0) during the same time band.
25 For instance, considering the first time band of the day (12 p.m. to 1 a.m.), we estimate
26 the probability (in percentage points) of devoting time to *Child Care* by men, conditioned
27 on own demographics, family characteristics, total own time devoted to *Child Care*, own
28 self-employment status, and whether the wife is devoting any time to *Market Work* (1) or
29 not (0) in this time band.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 Graph 2 shows the associations between *Child Care* of men, and *Market Work* of
40 their female partners. We find statistically significant positive associations from 7 a.m. to
41 10 a.m., from 2 p.m. to 3 p.m., and from 5 p.m. to 7 p.m., with these associations being
42 statistically significant at the 5% level. Thus, we find that, if the mother is devoting time
43 to *Market Work* activities, the spouses of such working mothers are 4.90, 7.30, 2.00, 3.10,
44 4.30, 3.20 and 3.70 percentage points more likely to be devoting time to *Child Care* from 7
45 to 8 a.m., 8 to 9 a.m., 9 to 10 a.m., 2 to 3 p.m., 5 to 6 p.m., 6 to 7 p.m. and 7 to 8 p.m.,
46 respectively. Thus, we find complementarities between the time devoted to child care
47 activities by men and the time devoted to market work activities by their spouses, since
48 men devote more time to child care activities, if their spouses are working, than if their
49 spouses are not, in most of the hours in the middle of the day.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 Given such positive correlations, and since we find that, compared to employed
59 mothers, self-employed mothers devote less time to market work activities from 8 a.m. to
60 11 a.m. and from 1 p.m. to 3 p.m., and more time from 5 p.m. to 9 p.m., we interpret

1
2
3 these results as indicating that the spouses of self-employed mothers are more likely to
4 devote time to child care activities from 5 p.m. to 7 p.m., and less likely to do so from 8
5 a.m. to 11 a.m. and from 1 p.m. to 3 p.m., compared to the spouses of employed
6 mothers.
7
8
9

10 Thus, our results on timing support the hypothesized relationship between child
11 care activities and self-employment. Mothers may choose self-employment as a way to
12 have greater control over the timing of work, so that the self-employed mother may be
13 able to work at odd shifts, when the spouse is available to care for the children.
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 5. Conclusions

21 This paper deals with an important subject for policy decision-making, that is,
22 how working conditions and work status interact with family responsibilities, especially
23 with the time devoted to child care. We focus on self-employment as a possible way for
24 mothers to have greater control over their allocation of time, using time diary data from
25 the Spanish Time Use Survey 2002-2003 (STUS).
26
27
28
29
30

31 Despite differences in the time devoted to *Market Work*, *Tertiary Activities* and
32 *Leisure* between employed and self-employed mothers in a working day, we find no
33 support for the hypothesis that self-employed mothers spend more time caring for
34 children than do employed mothers. However, we do find that self-employed mothers
35 devote more time to *Child Care* and less time to *Market Work* during the morning and
36 afternoon, and less time to *Child Care* and more time to *Market Work* during the evening,
37 compared to employed mothers. We also find complementarities between the time
38 devoted to *Child Care* and *Market Work* by the members of the couple.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 These differences in the timing of activities between employed and self-employed
47 mothers, together with the complementarities between the time allocations of both
48 members of the couple, are consistent with the hypothesis that self-employed mothers
49 have greater control over the timing of work compared to employed mothers, since they
50 are able to shift part of their market work responsibilities to the evening, when the
51 spouse is available to care for the children. Given these differences, self-employment
52 appears to be one significant strategy to improve the balance between work and family
53 responsibilities. These findings are in accordance with the European Union employment
54 agenda for 2010, established in Lisbon in 2000, where one target was increasing female
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 labor participation rates to more than 60% by 2010, with a special emphasis on
4 promoting entrepreneurship and self-employment.
5
6

7 Furthermore, since working women with children face a “double burden”
8 (Gimenez-Nadal and Sevilla-Sanz, 2011), public policies aimed at a more egalitarian
9 distribution of non-market work by gender (e.g., Noonan, 2004) will help women to
10 reduce levels of stress, and to have more time to devote to other activities, such as leisure
11 and personal care.
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 REFERENCES

- 19
20
21 Aguiar, M., and E. Hurst (2007), “Measuring Trends in Leisure: The Allocation of Time
22 Over Five Decades,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 122(3), 969-1006.
23
24
25 Aliaga, C. (2006), “How is the time of women and men distributed in Europe?” *Statistics*
26 *in Focus, Population and Social Conditions N 4/2006*, EUROSTAT.
27
28
29 Allen, T., D. Herst, C. Bruck, and M. Sutton (2000), “Consequences associated with
30 work-to-family conflict: A review and agenda for future research,” *Journal of*
31 *Occupational Health Psychology*, 5, 278–308.
32
33
34
35 Altman, M. (2001), “A Behavioral model of labor supply: casting some light into the
36 black box of income-leisure choice,” *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 33, 199-219.
37
38
39 Arai, B. (2008), “Self-Employment as a Response to the Double Day for Women and
40 Men in Canada,” *Canadian Review of Sociology*, 37, 125-142.
41
42
43 Bianchi, S.M., M.A. Milkie, L.C. Sayer, and J.P. Robinson (2000), “Is Anyone Doing the
44 Housework? Trends in the Gender Division of Household Labor,” *Social Forces*,
45 79, 191-228.
46
47
48
49 Biddle, J. and D. Hamermesh (1990), “Sleep and the Allocation of Time,” *Journal of*
50 *Political Economy*, 98(5), 922-943.
51
52
53 Bittman, M. and J. Wajcman (2000), “The Rush Hour: The Character of Leisure Time
54 and Gender Equity,” *Social Forces*, 79(1), 165-189.
55
56
57 Boden, R. J. (1999), “Flexible Working Hours, Family Responsibilities, and Female Self-
58 employment,” *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 58(1), 71-83.
59
60

- 1
2
3 Bonke, J., N. Datta-Gupta and N. Smith (2004), "Timing and Flexibility of Housework
4 and Men's and Women's Wages," in *Contributions to Economic Analysis*, Vol. 271,
5 D.S. Hamermesh and G.A. Pfann (eds.), Elsevier Press, 2004.
6
7
8
9 Burda, M., D. Hamermesh and P. Weil (2008), "The Distribution of Total Work in the
10 Us and EU," in Tito Boeri, Michael Burda, Francis Kramarz (eds.), *Working Hours
11 and Job Sharing in the EU and USA: Are Americans Crazy? Are Europeans Lazy?*
12 Oxford Univ. Press, 2008.
13
14
15
16 Buttner, E. (1993), "Female Entrepreneurs: how far have they come?" *Business Horizons*,
17 2, 59-65.
18
19
20 Byron, K. (2005), "A meta-analytic review of work-family conflict and its antecedents,"
21 *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 67, 169-198.
22
23
24 Caputo, R.K. and A. Dolinsky (1998), "Women's Choice to Pursue Self-Employment:
25 The Role of Financial and Human Capital of Household Members," *Journal of
26 Small Business Management*, July, 8-17.
27
28
29
30 Coltrane, S (2000), "Research on household labor: Modeling and measuring the social
31 embeddedness of routine family work," *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 62, 1208-
32 1233.
33
34
35
36 Connelly, R. (1992), "Self-employment and Providing Child Care," *Demography*, 29(1), 17-
37 29.
38
39
40 Del Boca, D. (2002), "Low Fertility and Labour Force Participation of Italian Women:
41 Evidence and Interpretations", *OECD Labour Market and Social Policy Occasional
42 Papers*, N. 61, OECD Publishing
43
44
45
46 DeMartino, R. and R. Barbato (2003), "Differences between women and men MBA
47 entrepreneurs: Exploring family flexibility and wealth creation as career
48 motivators," *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18(5), 815-832.
49
50
51
52 Edwards, L. N. and E. Field-Hendrey (1996), "Home-Based Workers: Data from the
53 1990 Census of Population," *Monthly Labor Review*, 119(11).
54
55
56 Fisher, K. M. Egerton, J.I. Gershuny and J. P. Robinson (2007), "Gender Convergence in
57 the American Heritage Time Use Study (AHTUS)," *Social Indicators Research* 82(1),
58 1-33.
59
60

- 1
2
3 Gauthier, A. H., T. Smeeding and F. Furstenberg (2004), "Are Parents Investing Less
4 Time in Children? Trends in Selected Industrialized Countries," *Population and*
5 *Development Review*, 30, 647–671.
6
7
8
9 Gimenez-Nadal, I., and A. Sevilla-Sanz (2011), "The Time-Crunch Paradox," *Social*
10 *Indicators Research*, in press ([10.1007/s11205-010-9689-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-010-9689-1)).
11
12
13 Goffee, R. and R. Scase (1983), "Business Ownership and Women's Subordination: A
14 Preliminary Study of Female Proprietors," *The Sociological Review*, 31, 625-648.
15
16
17 Grzywacz, J., and B. Bass. (2003), "Work, Family, and Mental Health: Testing Different
18 Models of Work-Family Fit," *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 65, 248 - 261
19
20
21 Hamermesh, D. (1998), "When We Work," *The American Economic Review, Papers and*
22 *Proceedings of the hundred and Tenth Annual Meeting of the American Economic Association*,
23 88(2), 321-325.
24
25
26
27 Hamermesh, D. (1999), "The timing of work over time," *The Economic Journal*, 109(1), 37-
28 66.
29
30
31 Hersh, J. (2009), "Home Production and Wages: Evidence from the American Time Use
32 Survey" *Review of Economics of the Household*, 9(2), 159-178
33
34
35 Hildebrand, V. and D. Williams (2003), "Self-employment and Caring for Children:
36 Evidence from Europe," *IRISS Working Paper Series 2003-06*.
37
38
39 Hochschild, A. R., and A. Machung (1989), *The Second Shift: Working Parents and the*
40 *Revolution at Home* (New York: Viking).
41
42
43 Hochschild, A. R. (1997), *The Time Bind: When Work Becomes Home and Home Becomes Work*
44 (New York: Metropolitan Books).
45
46
47 Hundley, G. (2000), "Male/Female Earnings Differences in Self-Employment: The
48 Effects of Marriage, Children, and the Household Division of Labor," *Industrial*
49 *and Labor Relations Review*, 54(1), 95-114.
50
51
52
53 Hyytinen, A. and O. P. Ruskanen (2007), "Time Use of the Self-Employed," *Kyklos*,
54 60(1), 105-122.
55
56
57 Kalenkoski, C., D. Ribar, and L. Stratton (2005), "Parental Child Care in Single Parent,
58 Cohabiting, and Married Couple Families: Time Diary Evidence from the United
59 Kingdom," *American Economic Review papers and proceedings, May*.
60

- 1
2
3 Kaplan, E. (1988), *Women entrepreneurs: Constructing a framework to examine venture success and*
4 *business failure* (Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research, Wellesley, MA: Babson
5 College).
- 6
7
8
9 Kossek, E., and C. Ozeki (1999), "Work-family conflict, policies, and the job-life
10 satisfaction relationship: A review and directions for organizational behavior
11 human resources research," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 139–149.
- 12
13
14
15 Layard, R. (2005), *Happiness: Lessons from a new Science* (The Brookings Institution, Allen
16 Lane, London).
- 17
18
19 Lombard, K. (2007), "Female self-employment and demand for flexible, nonstandard
20 work schedules," *Economic Inquiry*, 39, 214–237.
- 21
22
23 Loscocco, K. (1997), "Work–Family Linkages among Self-Employed Women and Men,"
24 *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 50, 204–226.
- 25
26
27 Mattingly, M. J., and S. M. Bianchi (2003), "Gender differences in the quantity and quality
28 of free time: The US experience," *Social Forces*, 81, 999–1029.
- 29
30
31 Mattingly, M. J., and L. C. Sayer (2006), "Under Pressure: Gender Differences in the
32 Relationship Between Free Time and Feeling Rushed," *Journal of Marriage and*
33 *Family*, 68, 205–221.
- 34
35
36 Mesmer-Magnus, J. R., and C. Viswesvaran (2005a), "Convergence between measures of
37 work-to-family and family-to-work conflict: A meta-analytic examination," *Journal*
38 *of Vocational Behavior*, 67, 215–232.
- 39
40
41
42 Mesmer-Magnus, J. R., and C. Viswesvaran (2005b), "How family-friendly work
43 environments affect work/family conflict: A meta-analytic examination," *Journal of*
44 *Labor Research*, 27, 555–574.
- 45
46
47
48 Netemeyer, R. G., J. S. Boles, and R. McMurrin (1996), "Development and validation of
49 work-family conflict and family-work conflict scales," *Journal of Applied Psychology*,
50 81, 400–410.
- 51
52
53
54 Noonan, M. (2004), "The Impact of Domestic Work on Men's and Women's Wages,"
55 *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63, 1134–1145.
- 56
57
58
59
60 OECD (2005), *Employment Outlook 2005*.
- Presser, H. B. (1989), "Can We Make Time for Children? The Economy, Work
Schedules, and Child Care," *Demography*, 26(4), 523–543.

- 1
2
3 Poortman, A-R., and T. van der Lippe (2009), "Attitudes Toward Housework and Child
4 Care and the Gendered Division of Labor," *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 71, 526-
5 541.
6
7
8
9 Reynolds, J. (2005), "In the Face of Conflict: Work-Life Conflict and Desired Work
10 Hour Adjustments," *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67, 1313-1331.
11
12
13 Robinson, J.P. and G. Godbey (1997), *Time for Life: The Surprising Ways Americans Use their*
14 *Time* (University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press).
15
16
17 Sayer, L. C. (2005), "Gender, time, and inequality: Trends in women's and men's paid
18 work, unpaid work and free time," *Social Forces*, 84, 285–303.
19
20
21 Schor, J. (1991), *The Overbooked American: The Unexpected Decline of Leisure* (New York:
22 Basic Books).
23
24
25 Scott, C.E. (1986), "Why more women are becoming entrepreneurs," *Journal of Small*
26 *Business Management*, 24, 37-44.
27
28
29 Sevilla-Sanz, A., J.I. Gimenez-Nadal and C. Fernandez (2010), "Gender Roles and the
30 Household Division of Unpaid Work: Evidence from the Spanish Time Use
31 Survey" *Feminist Economics*, 16(4), 137-184.
32
33
34 Stewart, J. and M. D. Allard (2008), "How Does Employment Affect the Timing of Time
35 with Children?" *U.S Bureau of Labor Statistics, Working Paper N 419, May 2008*.
36
37
38 Väisänen, P. (2006), "Mean of episode lengths as a quality indicator of time use diaries,"
39 Paper presented at the 28th IATUR Annual Conference, Copenhagen.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Unconditional Means for Employed and Self-Employed Mothers ^{1,2,3,4}


	(1)		(2)		(3)	(4)
<i>Panel A: Time Use Variables</i>	<i>Self-employed</i>		<i>Employed</i>		<i>Diff. Self-Employed - Employed</i>	<i>p-value Diff.</i>
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
<i>Market Work</i>	398.274	(14.396)	394.345	(3.935)	3.930	0.790
<i>Child Care</i>	55.767	(6.745)	66.626	(2.281)	-10.860	0.130
<i>Household Production</i>	208.482	(9.997)	205.884	(3.168)	2.600	0.800
<i>Tertiary Activities</i>	599.273	(7.515)	582.344	(2.473)	16.930	0.030
<i>Leisure</i>	142.298	(8.224)	139.126	(2.730)	3.170	0.710
<i>Panel B: Explanatory Variables</i>	<i>Self-employed</i>		<i>Employed</i>		<i>Diff. Self-Employed - Employed</i>	<i>p-value Diff.</i>
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
<i>Age</i>	39.105	(0.501)	38.237	(0.182)	0.870	0.100
<i>Number of family members</i>	3.959	(0.065)	3.856	(0.023)	0.100	0.140
<i>Urban household</i>	34.574	(3.744)	46.959	(1.429)	-12.390	0.000
<i>Health status</i>	1.897	(0.057)	1.850	(0.019)	0.050	0.430
<i>Married (vs. cohabiting)</i>	97.007	(1.353)	96.214	(0.565)	0.790	0.590
<i>University education</i>	24.343	(3.407)	38.380	(1.397)	-14.040	0.000
<i>Secondary education</i>	62.243	(3.819)	50.208	(1.433)	12.040	0.000
<i>Log hourly wage rate</i>	2.051	(0.072)	2.848	(0.026)	-0.800	0.000
<i>Number of children</i>	1.550	(0.058)	1.566	(0.019)	-0.020	0.800
<i>Number of children 0-2</i>	0.220	(0.034)	0.222	(0.013)	0.000	0.950
<i>Number of children 3-5</i>	0.217	(0.036)	0.275	(0.014)	-0.060	0.140
<i>Number of children 6-12</i>	0.584	(0.057)	0.631	(0.020)	-0.050	0.430
<i>Number of children 13-17</i>	0.531	(0.050)	0.438	(0.017)	0.090	0.080
<i>Working part-time</i>	3.18	(1.35)	11.14	(0.87)	-8.050	0.000
<i>Management, business, financial</i>	30.980	(3.645)	4.291	(0.565)	26.690	0.000
<i>Professional and related</i>	17.966	(3.016)	27.734	(1.279)	-9.770	0.000
<i>Healthcare support</i>	4.198	(1.595)	9.635	(0.826)	-5.440	0.000
<i>Protective service</i>	0.000	(0.000)	0.597	(0.232)	-0.600	0.010
<i>Food preparation and serving related</i>	5.519	(1.829)	5.921	(0.682)	-0.400	0.840
<i>Building and grounds cleaning and maintenance</i>	3.277	(1.469)	14.048	(0.995)	-10.770	0.000
<i>Personal care and service</i>	5.432	(1.780)	2.961	(0.483)	2.470	0.180
<i>Sales and related</i>	10.871	(2.461)	8.354	(0.810)	2.520	0.330
<i>Office and administrative support</i>	3.228	(1.429)	13.609	(0.998)	-10.380	0.000
<i>Natural resources, construction, maintenance</i>	11.402	(2.385)	3.569	(0.515)	7.830	0.000
<i>Production, transportation, material moving</i>	7.127	(2.086)	9.144	(0.836)	-2.020	0.370

Notes: ¹Standard deviations in parenthesis ² Sample consists of non-retired/non-student partnered working mothers of children under 18 in the STUS (2002-2003) ³ Time use variables are measured in minutes per day ⁴ Column (4) shows the p-value of the differences, with a p-value lower than 0.05 meaning that the difference is statistically significant at the 5 % level.

Table 2. Time Use Regressions for Working Mothers in Working Days ^{1,2,3,4}

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Minutes per day	Market Work	Hhld. Production	Tertiary Activities	Leisure	Childcare
Age	-6.419 (6.052)	3.200 (4.727)	-5.625 (4.268)	0.049 (3.732)	8.366*** (1.970)
Age squared	7.559 (7.823)	-1.583 (6.323)	5.953 (5.334)	0.062 (4.803)	-11.297*** (2.419)
Number of family members	7.896 (6.746)	-1.135 (5.866)	5.176 (4.531)	-2.147 (4.455)	-10.057*** (1.863)
Urban household	-2.066 (7.499)	-10.447* (6.084)	0.814 (4.829)	-3.522 (5.099)	6.060* (3.542)
Health status	-8.222 (5.546)	5.046 (4.655)	2.019 (3.611)	-1.817 (3.983)	0.320 (2.375)
Married (ref: cohabiting)	-7.448 (20.414)	-5.236 (16.870)	-6.689 (11.429)	0.820 (11.703)	12.857 (8.896)
University education	24.956* (15.093)	-25.978** (12.710)	-1.536 (9.386)	5.750 (10.576)	7.501 (6.235)
Secondary education	35.752*** (12.441)	-11.206 (11.125)	-13.659* (8.003)	-6.014 (8.955)	0.463 (4.771)
Log hourly wage rate	(3.310) (5.279)	(4.784) (3.974)	(1.989) (3.111)	(0.601) (3.523)	(2.261) (2.061)
Number of children 0-2	-42.483*** (12.584)	2.251 (10.939)	-16.516* (8.766)	-22.115** (8.708)	87.396*** (7.140)
Number of children 3-5	-21.232* (11.140)	2.462 (9.360)	-11.442 (7.538)	-11.663 (7.527)	42.215*** (5.682)
Number of children 6-12	-31.073*** (8.380)	24.922*** (7.300)	-4.061 (5.569)	3.179 (6.121)	12.626*** (3.657)
Number of children 13-17	-25.212** (10.350)	29.473*** (8.552)	-1.702 (6.849)	12.175 (7.765)	-7.831** (3.595)
Number of children 0-2*Working part-time	38.975 (29.251)	-52.947** (22.371)	-5.878 (18.974)	1.436 (22.567)	-7.838 (15.430)
Number of children 3-5*Working part-time	29.359 (28.130)	-45.360* (23.276)	-10.247 (14.429)	-0.607 (20.773)	15.318 (13.771)
Number of children 6-12*Working part-time	-0.011 (22.057)	-24.305 (18.348)	9.050 (10.493)	-12.047 (16.143)	7.771 (8.320)
Number of children 13-17*Working part-time	18.568 (21.018)	-35.143 (23.683)	-10.509 (11.349)	19.654 (25.478)	-10.039 (9.038)
Number of children 0-2*Working self-employed	38.304 (34.718)	-7.256 (24.099)	-36.071* (21.082)	-29.589 (19.287)	29.254 (22.062)
Number of children 3-5*Working self-employed	39.281 (32.301)	-3.445 (23.766)	-20.682 (16.315)	-8.655 (18.204)	-8.526 (13.483)
Number of children 6-12*Working self-employed	43.088** (20.594)	-4.559 (15.314)	-16.655 (12.932)	-19.777* (12.008)	-5.500 (6.800)
Number of children 13-17*Working self-employed	73.321*** (24.274)	-25.133 (18.602)	-15.296 (12.373)	-37.838** (15.222)	2.629 (7.449)
Working part-time	-150.523*** (31.425)	113.214*** (27.417)	21.205 (16.105)	38.088 (24.403)	12.915 (13.592)
Working self-employed	-97.339*** (31.272)	26.362 (22.635)	43.174** (17.872)	47.316** (21.356)	-0.616 (10.013)
Working self-employed*Working part-time	-68.887 (58.027)	30.385 (69.703)	58.225** (29.160)	-41.848 (29.914)	16.331 (22.054)
Constant	522.751*** (120.861)	49.013 (93.006)	748.116*** (84.432)	215.882*** (76.773)	-125.244*** (42.747)
Observations	1,433	1,433	1,433	1,433	1,433
R-squared	0.139	0.121	0.069	0.101	0.436


Notes: ¹ Robust standard errors in parenthesis ² Sample consists of non-retired/non-student partnered working mothers of children under 18 in the STUS (2002-2003) ³ Time use variables are measured in minutes per day ⁴ * Significant at 10% level ** Significant at 5% level *** Significant at 1% level.



38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Notes: ¹ This figure plots the coefficients of self-employment dummy from regressions of timing of activities on age, day-of-week, family composition, mother's occupation and spouse's working controls ² Sample consists of non-retired/non-student partnered working mothers of children under 18 in the STUS (2002-2003) ³ Each value represents timing-deviations from the employed mothers, conditional on demographics.

Graph 2. Correlations between *Market Work* of Mothers and *Child Care* of Fathers ^{1,2,3,4}



Notes: ¹ This figure plots the coefficients of women's participation in Market Work activities (1=yes;0=no) on men's percentage of time devoted to Child Care in each time band, conditioned on age, day-of-week, family composition, father's occupation and women's working characteristics ² Sample consists of non-retired/non-student fathers in couple with working mothers of children under 18 in the STUS (2002-2003) ³ Each value represents correlations with the time devoted to Market Work activities by the wife, conditional on demographics ⁴ Coefficients are multiplied by 100.

APPENDIX

Table A1 – Timing of Mothers^{1,2,3,4}

<i>Timing of Mothers</i>	<i>0-1 a.m.</i>	<i>1-2 a.m.</i>	<i>2-3 a.m.</i>	<i>3-4 a.m.</i>	<i>4-5 a.m.</i>	<i>5-6 a.m.</i>	<i>6-7 a.m.</i>	<i>7-8 a.m.</i>	<i>8-9 a.m.</i>	<i>9-10 a.m.</i>	<i>10-11 a.m.</i>	<i>11-12 a.m.</i>
<i>Market Work</i>	0.612 (0.829)	0.862 (0.834)	0.196 (0.686)	-0.349 (0.516)	-0.532 (0.483)	-0.812 (0.497)	-1.691*** (0.625)	-2.943** (1.188)	-11.929*** (1.686)	-9.940*** (2.119)	-4.498** (2.038)	-2.801 (1.956)
<i>Hhld Production</i>	-0.247 (0.422)	-0.429* (0.225)	-0.007 (0.007)	-0.034 (0.030)	0.077 (0.081)	-0.039 (0.062)	-0.552** (0.250)	1.946* (1.099)	4.522*** (1.313)	5.472*** (1.421)	2.988** (1.522)	0.599 (1.329)
<i>Child care</i>	0.293 (0.434)	0.279 (0.357)	-0.073 (0.162)	0.185 (0.243)	-0.109 (0.165)	-0.145 (0.106)	-0.400*** (0.123)	-1.287*** (0.479)	0.330 (0.905)	1.772*** (0.623)	1.113* (0.653)	1.572* (0.802)
<i>Aggregated Housework</i>	0.049 (0.649)	-0.157 (0.427)	-0.148 (0.159)	0.121 (0.251)	-0.081 (0.189)	-0.220* (0.128)	-1.001*** (0.284)	0.632 (1.251)	4.875*** (1.553)	7.375*** (1.561)	4.260*** (1.637)	2.283 (1.505)
<i>N. Obs</i>	1,433	1,433	1,433	1,433	1,433	1,433	1,433	1,433	1,433	1,433	1,433	1,433
<i>Timing of Mothers</i>	<i>12-1 p.m.</i>	<i>1-2 p.m.</i>	<i>2-3 p.m.</i>	<i>3-4 p.m.</i>	<i>4-5 p.m.</i>	<i>5-6 p.m.</i>	<i>6-7 p.m.</i>	<i>7-8 p.m.</i>	<i>8-9 p.m.</i>	<i>9-10 p.m.</i>	<i>10-11 p.m.</i>	<i>11-12 p.m.</i>
<i>Market Work</i>	-1.251 (1.957)	-4.694** (2.033)	-10.907*** (1.829)	-0.597 (1.921)	3.626 (2.207)	11.215*** (2.099)	14.720*** (2.201)	12.919*** (2.230)	5.889*** (1.783)	1.689 (1.366)	2.770** (1.286)	0.147 (0.107)
<i>Hhld Production</i>	-0.031 (1.285)	2.311* (1.364)	4.006*** (1.312)	1.257 (1.553)	-1.473 (1.510)	-3.165** (1.428)	-3.684*** (1.263)	-5.639*** (1.386)	-2.522 (1.663)	-0.450 (1.541)	-0.223 (1.320)	-0.016 (0.097)
<i>Child care</i>	-0.315 (0.442)	1.904** (0.918)	0.905 (0.612)	0.568 (0.605)	-1.226* (0.708)	-2.957*** (0.854)	-1.926* (1.036)	-0.970 (1.128)	0.186 (1.193)	-0.037 (0.994)	0.485 (0.701)	-0.015 (0.042)
<i>Aggregated Housework</i>	-0.252 (1.373)	4.290*** (1.601)	4.952*** (1.435)	1.962 (1.641)	-2.683 (1.632)	-6.502*** (1.520)	-6.090*** (1.563)	-7.087*** (1.750)	-2.803 (1.918)	-0.684 (1.597)	0.270 (1.456)	-0.032 (0.105)
<i>N. Obs</i>	1,433	1,433	1,433	1,433	1,433	1,433	1,433	1,433	1,433	1,433	1,433	1,433

Notes: ¹ Robust standard errors in parenthesis ² Sample consists of non-retired/non-student partnered working mothers of children under 18 in the STUS (2002-2003) ³ The time devoted to each activity is measured in minutes per day ⁴ * Significant at 10% level ** Significant at 5% level *** Significant at 1% level.

Table A2 – Correlations between *Child Care* of Men and *Market Work* of Mothers^{1,2,3,4}

<i>Timing of Child Care for Men</i>	<i>0-1 a.m.</i>	<i>1-2 a.m.</i>	<i>2-3 a.m.</i>	<i>3-4 a.m.</i>	<i>4-5 a.m.</i>	<i>5-6 a.m.</i>	<i>6-7 a.m.</i>	<i>7-8 a.m.</i>	<i>8-9 a.m.</i>	<i>9-10 a.m.</i>	<i>10-11 a.m.</i>	<i>11-12 a.m.</i>
<i>Wife devotes time to Market Work in time band (1,0)</i>	0.039 (0.028)	-0.013* (0.007)	-0.014* (0.008)	-0.024** (0.011)	0.023 (0.030)	-0.006 (0.004)	0.005 (0.012)	0.049** (0.021)	0.073*** (0.017)	0.020* (0.011)	0.006 (0.011)	-0.008 (0.012)
<i>Observations</i>	1,448	1,448	1,448	1,448	1,448	1,448	1,448	1,448	1,448	1,448	1,448	1,448
<i>Timing of Child Care for Men</i>	<i>12-1 p.m.</i>	<i>1-2 p.m.</i>	<i>2-3 p.m.</i>	<i>3-4 p.m.</i>	<i>4-5 p.m.</i>	<i>5-6 p.m.</i>	<i>6-7 p.m.</i>	<i>7-8 p.m.</i>	<i>8-9 p.m.</i>	<i>9-10 p.m.</i>	<i>10-11 p.m.</i>	<i>11-12 p.m.</i>
<i>Wife devotes time to Market Work in time band (1,0)</i>	0.009 (0.010)	0.017 (0.012)	0.031*** (0.011)	0.016 (0.012)	0.001 (0.012)	0.043*** (0.015)	0.032** (0.015)	0.037** (0.019)	0.018 (0.023)	0.008 (0.030)	0.022 (0.033)	-0.040 (0.059)
<i>Observations</i>	1,448	1,448	1,448	1,448	1,448	1,448	1,448	1,448	1,448	1,448	1,448	1,448

Notes: ¹ Robust standard errors in parenthesis ² consists of non-retired/non-student fathers in couple with working mothers of children under 18 in the STUS (2002-2003) ³ *Child Care* is measured in percentage points (e.g., proportion of *Child Care* in each time band) ⁴ * Significant at 10% level ** Significant at 5% level *** Significant at 1% level.