



# **IRISS at CEPS/INSTEAD**

An Integrated Research  
Infrastructure in the Socio-Economic  
Sciences

## **SELF-EMPLOYMENT AND CARING FOR CHILDREN: EVIDENCE FROM EUROPE**

by

Vincent Hildebrand & Donald R. Williams

IRISS WORKING PAPER SERIES

No. 2003-06



*Please pay a visit to <http://www.ceps.lu/iriss>*



## **IRISS-C/I**

An Integrated Research Infrastructure in the  
Socio-Economic Sciences at CEPS/Institute,  
Luxembourg

Project supported by the European Commission and the  
Ministry of Culture, Higher Education and Research  
(Luxembourg)

### **RESEARCH GRANTS**

for individual or collaborative research projects  
(grants awarded for periods of 2-12 weeks)

#### **What is IRISS-C/I?**

IRISS-C/I is a project funded by the European Commission in its 'Access to Major Research Infrastructures' programme. IRISS-C/I funds short visits at CEPS/Institute for researchers willing to undertake collaborative and/or internationally comparative research in economics and other social sciences.

#### **Who may apply?**

We encourage applications from all interested individuals (doing non-proprietary research in a European institution) who want to carry out their research in the fields of expertise of CEPS/Institute.

#### **What is offered by IRISS-C/I?**

Free access to the IRISS-C/I research infrastructure (office, computer, library...); access to the CEPS/Institute archive of micro-data (including e.g. the ECHP); technical and scientific assistance; free accommodation and a contribution towards travel and subsistence costs.

#### **Research areas**

Survey and panel data methodology; income and poverty dynamics; gender, ethnic and social inequality; unemployment; segmentation of labour markets; education and training; social protection and redistributive policies; impact of ageing populations; intergenerational relations; regional development and structural change.

#### **Additional information and application form**

IRISS-C/I  
B.P. 48 L-4501 Differdange (Luxembourg)  
Email: [iriss@ceps.lu](mailto:iriss@ceps.lu)  
Homepage: <http://www.ceps.lu/iriss>

**Self-employment and Caring for Children:  
Evidence from Europe**

Vincent Hildebrand  
York University  
and  
CEPS/INSTEAD

Donald R. Williams<sup>\*</sup>  
Kent State University  
and  
CEPS/INSTEAD

March 2003

---

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding Author: Department of Economics, Kent State University, Kent OH 44242 USA, phone 330-672-1095, email [dwilliam@bsa3.kent.edu](mailto:dwilliam@bsa3.kent.edu). A portion of this research was conducted while Williams was an IRISS-C/I visitor at CEPS/INSTEAD in Differdange, Luxembourg. He is grateful for additional support from the Kent State University Office of Research and Graduate Studies, and to Martha W. Williams for helpful comments.

## **Caring for Children and Self-employment: Evidence from Europe**

### **Abstract**

Using data unique to the European Community Household Panel survey (ECHP), we examine the hypothesis that self-employed workers spend more time caring for children than do those in other forms of employment. Our results, for eleven western-European countries, provide little support for the hypothesis, except in one or two countries, and only for women. Indeed, in many European nations, self-employed women on average spend *less* time caring for children than do other employed women.

## **1. Introduction:**

The growth of self-employment among men and women in the 1970s and 80s brought about a large body of economic literature examining the determinants of entrepreneurial behavior.<sup>1</sup> One commonly held view of the motive for self-employment among women is a desire for flexible hours and the ability to spend more time caring for children. At the same time child-care expenses are of major concern to public policy makers worldwide, as they are a primary deterrent to female labor force participation in general. Consequently programs to encourage self-employment are sometimes put forth as a way to encourage greater female economic activity.

Given the immense amounts of time and effort required to make a venture into self-employment successful, however, it is possible that the presumed relationship between self-employment and time spent caring for children does not hold. Unfortunately the evidence regarding self-employment and child-care activities is weak. In this paper, we examine the relationship directly, using a set of variables unique to the European Community Household Panel (ECHP) survey. Using data for eleven western European countries, our results indicate, first, that the time spent caring for children varies considerably across nations, among households and for both males and females. The data confirms that males spend less time caring for children than females, in all of the countries studied and regardless of self-employment status. Second, the results provide little support for the hypothesis that the self-employed spend more time caring for children than do other employed workers. Self-employment of either the household head or spouse is associated with less time spent caring for children across the European

---

<sup>1</sup> Some of the most important early work on this issue includes Blau (1987), Evans and Jovanovich (1989), and Evans and Leighton (1989). For a recent summary of much of that literature, see Blanchflower (2000).

nations studied. There are slight gender differences. In some European nations, self-employed women on average spend *less* time caring for children than do other employed women. Among men, self-employment is correlated with less time spent caring for children in nearly all of the nations studied. These results suggest that policies to encourage female employment through self-employment should also have a child-care component.

## **2. Previous Work**

The notion that the desire for self-employment among women is related to their household responsibilities, including caring for children, is well established in the literature (Boden 1999, Cuputo and Dolinsky 1998, Connely 1992, Hundley 2000, Presser 1989). The hypothesized relationship stems from several sources. First, an individual in self-employment is perceived as having greater control over the *timing* of work (flexible hours). An individual might therefore be able to work while the children are at school, or after they have gone to bed. Alternatively, the self-employed individual might more easily work odd shifts or part-time, when a spouse or other family member is available to care for the children.<sup>2</sup> Second, the self-employed individual might be able to *work at home*, which allows even greater flexibility. Third, self-employment is perceived as offering greater flexibility in the *quantity* of hours worked. That is, the individual can work part-time in self-employment where he or she might be required to work full-time in the wage-employment sector. Finally, the self-employed individual might have greater control over the *effort* expended at work, allowing him or her to conserve energy required for childcare.

---

<sup>2</sup> Both of these can be utilized by the wage-employed, as well. The idea is that the self-employed have more flexibility in this regard. See Golden (2001) for an analysis of flexible hours in the United States.

There is evidence in support of at least some of these hypotheses. For example, the self-employed are more likely to work part-time than are the wage-employed (Devine 1994, Williams 2000). In addition, the majority of workers who are “home-based” are self-employed (Edwards and Field-Hendrey 1996).

There is little evidence in the self-employment literature regarding self-employment and child-care in particular, however. What we do know is that the number of children in the home is positively related to the probability of self-employment, at least among women, as is the number of young children (Boden 1999, Caputo and Dolinsky 1998, Connelly 1992). Similarly, the number of children at home is correlated with home-based work (Edwards and Field-Hendrey 1996). From this evidence, authors have inferred that the self-employed are in that state in order to spend more time with their children. None of the above work answers directly, however, the question of whether self-employed individuals indeed spend more time caring for their children.

The time use literature offers some evidence in this regard. Gustafsson and Kjulin (1994) include a control variable for male self-employment in their analysis of childcare activity among parents in Sweden. They find that females spend less time on child-care when the spouse is self-employed.<sup>3</sup> Our paper expands on this earlier work first by including the self-employment status of the female family member and also by examining the effect for a broader set of countries.

### **3. Data and Methodology**

The data used in this paper is from the European Community Household Panel

---

<sup>3</sup> For recent analyses of other determinants of time spent caring for children, see Bianci (2000), Sousa-Poza et al. (2001) and Sandberg and Hofferth (2001).

(ECHIP) survey.<sup>4</sup> The ECHIP includes person- and household-level data regarding income, living conditions, housing, health and work for residents of member states in the European Union. It is a longitudinal survey beginning in 1994. In 1995 over 60,000 households were surveyed. The data used in the present analysis is from the 1994-1998 time period, the most recent available. One advantage of the ECHIP over other data sets is that the survey is intended to generate variables that are similarly defined and comparable across countries, although not all variables are available for all countries in all years. The countries used in this study are Germany, the Netherlands, Austria, Belgium, France, the United Kingdom, Ireland, Italy, Greece, Spain, and Portugal.<sup>5</sup>

The key variables of concern for this analysis are the definition of self-employment (versus wage and salary sector employment) status and time spent caring for children. The self-employment variable is constructed from the “status in employment” variable from the person-level file, such that individuals who were classified as normally or currently working and who give self-employment as their main activity status are categorized as self-employed. Workers engaged in “paid employment,” “paid apprenticeship,” or “training related to employment,” and unpaid family workers were classified as wage and salary employed.<sup>6</sup>

There are two variables related to caring for children that are employed in this paper, also from the personal files. First is the number of hours per week spent looking after children. Second is a variable based on the response to the question of why the individual is working part-time (defined as less than 30 hours) in his or her main job, and

---

<sup>4</sup> A description of the data and on-line user’s manual are available at the Resource Center for Access to Data on Europe, <http://www-rcade.dur.ac.uk/echp/>. See also the excellent description found in Peracchi (2002).

<sup>5</sup> Denmark and Luxembourg are excluded from the analysis due to very small sample sizes. Sweden is excluded due to lack of data availability for all years.

<sup>6</sup> Inclusion of the unpaid family workers in this way does not affect the results.



is coded as one if the response is “housework, looking after children or other persons” and zero otherwise.

Other variables that are used in the analysis include gender, marital status, employment status, hours worked, educational level, household income, number of children in the household, and presence of children under age 12. Using information presented in the “relationship” files, we also construct variables for spouses, including spousal education, hours of work, self-employment status, and time spent caring for children. Using this latter variable we construct a variable for the total time spent caring for children by both the head and spouse.

The empirical approach taken here is fairly straightforward. First, we compare sample means for the key variables of interest, by country, gender, and self-employment status. Simple t-tests are employed to identify significant differences in child-caring behavior. Second, we conduct random effects panel regression analyses with hours of time spent caring for children as the dependent variable (using both the total household and individual care variables).

In particular, we estimate the parameters of the following models:

- (1)  $\text{HHCARE} = f(\text{EDUC}, \text{HRS}, \text{KIDS}, \text{KIDSLT12}, \text{HHINC}, \text{SELFEMP})$ , and
  - (2)  $\text{CARE} = f(\text{EDUC}, \text{HRS}, \text{KIDS}, \text{KIDSLT12}, \text{HHINC}, \text{SPSECARE}, \text{SELFEMP})$ ,
- where HHCARE is the sum of the hours spent caring for children by the head and spouse, CARE represents the individual number of hours spent caring for children by a head or spouse, EDUC represents measures of educational attainment for both the head and spouse (three levels are used), HRS represents two hours worked variables (by head and spouse), KIDS is the number of children in the household, KIDSLT12 indicates that

some of the children are less than 12 years old, HHINC is a measure of household income, SPSECARE is the number of hours spent caring for children by the spouse, and SELFEMP represents a set of dummy variables indicating self-employment status.<sup>7</sup> Linear specifications of both models are estimated, allowing for household level random effects.<sup>8</sup> For model (2), we estimate the parameters separately by gender.

The education, kids, and kids less than 12 variables are all expected to have positive effects on time spent caring for children. Parents with higher levels of education might spend greater time caring for their children due to different attitudes about child rearing or expectations of their children. Increases in the number of children in the household directly increase, though perhaps not linearly, the opportunities and demands for care. The demand for care is also seen as higher for younger children. The household income and hours worked variables are expected to be inversely related to time spent caring for children. Households with greater incomes, *ceteris paribus*, can more easily afford to purchase care from other providers. Those in which the head or spouse is engaged in greater hours of work will necessarily have fewer hours available for childcare, which should reduce the hours devoted to it.<sup>9</sup> Finally, in model (2) we control for the level of care provided by the individual's spouse.

Several variables are employed to capture the effects of self-employment, depending on the model used. In the household care model (1), dummy variables are defined according to the joint employment status of the head and spouse, as follows:

---

<sup>7</sup> Tables with definitions and summary statistics for all of the variables used in the analysis are presented in an appendix, available from the authors upon request.

<sup>8</sup> Simple cross-sectional OLS regressions and Tobit regressions yield the same qualitative results as are presented here. The random effects model is used in order to fully exploit the panel nature of the data.

<sup>9</sup> We also estimated the models without the hours worked variables, which yielded results consistent with those presented here. A model which controls for the endogeneity of the hours worked variable has not been estimated.

hw\_sw = 1 if both the head and spouse are wage employed,  
hw\_ss = 1 if the head is wage employed, spouse self employed,  
hw\_sn = 1 if the head is wage employed, spouse not employed,  
hs\_sw = 1 if the head is self-employed and the spouse is wage employed,  
hs\_ss = 1 if both the head and spouse are self-employed, and  
hs\_sn = 1 if the head is self-employed and the spouse is not employed.

We include hw\_ss, hs\_ss, hw\_sw, and hs\_sn in the regressions, such that the excluded categories include only the households where neither the head nor spouse is self-employed. The predicted effects of these variables are indeterminate, however, as suggested above. In the individual care model (2), we include separate dummy variables indicating the self-employment status of the individual and spouse.

As was noted above, the data set covers the 1994 to 1998 time period (waves I – V). Data for Germany and the UK are used only for 1995 and 1996, however, and for Austria only since 1995. We use an unbalanced panel in this analysis, such that individuals or households are not required to be in the sample in all years. The sample is restricted to individuals who are married, and households without children are excluded from the sample.<sup>10</sup> With these restrictions, and the exclusion of observations with missing values, the sample is made up of a total of over 55,000 observations at the household level for all countries and waves combined.

---

<sup>10</sup> The child care behavior of single parents is significantly different from that of married couples (see, e.g., Blau 1991). We have chosen to exclude the single parents here.

## 4. Results

### 4.1 Descriptive Statistics

Summary statistics for the self-employment and caring for children variables are presented in Tables 1 through 3, by country and gender. Referring first to Table 1, the patterns of self-employment rates (percentage of workers) across countries and genders are consistent with those found in other data sets (see, e.g., Blanchflower 2000). Rates of self-employment tend to be highest in the southern European states and lowest in the north, with Ireland and Belgium notable exceptions, in all three years, 1994, 1996, and 1998. Greece and Portugal have the highest self-employment rates, while the Netherlands and Germany have the lowest. Males have higher self-employment rates than do females in all the countries studied, although the relative magnitude of the difference varies considerably. Males are only slightly more likely than females to be self-employed in Portugal, for example, and much more likely in Ireland.

The average hours spent caring for children are presented in Table 2, for 1996, a year in which data is available for all countries. Again considerable differences are found by gender and country. As is well known, males on average spend less time caring for children than do females. The range of average responses is from about 2 hour per week among males in Portugal to 15 hours per week among males in the Netherlands, and from 15 hours per week among females in Portugal to more than 60 hours per week among females in the UK.

Referring to the primary focus of this study, there also are significant differences in hours spent caring for children according to self-employment status. For men, the difference is that the self-employed spend *less* time caring for children than do those who are not self-employed. This is consistent with the argument made by Hundley (2000),

that self-employed males specialize in market based, income generating activities. This finding is consistent across all of the countries studied, and the difference is statistically significant in all countries except The Netherlands and Austria.

Among females, the results are mixed. In only two countries (The Netherlands and the U.K.) do we find that self-employed women spend significantly more time caring for children than other employed women. No significant differences are found in Germany, Belgium, France, Ireland, Italy or Portugal. On the other hand, in Austria, Greece and Spain, we find that self-employed women spend significantly fewer hours caring for children than do other employed women.

One explanation for this finding is that a high proportion of the self-employed businesses may be new starts, which require an inordinate amount of time and effort until the business is well established. It is possible that after the firm is better established, then the men and women will adjust their child-care behavior. To assess this hypothesis, we calculated the average hours caring for children for a sample limited to individuals who were self-employed in at least three consecutive years, which we term the “long-term self-employed.” The results, not presented here, are similar to those in Table 2. That is, males tend to spend less time caring for children if they are self-employed in nearly all countries, as do females in Italy, Greece and Spain. In this restricted sample, only in the Netherlands do we find the hypothesized (positive) relationship between self-employment and time spent caring for children, and only for females.

The results are basically the same when presented at the household level. The total hours spent caring for children for both the household head and spouse are presented in Table 3, by combined employment status. The sample is restricted to households in which the household head is employed. First, note that generally the highest hours are

found when the head is wage employed and the spouse is not employed (column 2). The exceptions are in The Netherlands and the U.K, where the most hours spent caring for children is when the head is self-employed and the spouse is not employed (column 6). Except in those two countries, the hours spent caring for children is also consistently lower when either the head or spouse is self-employed (columns 3, 4, or 5), compared to when both are wage employed (column 1). From tables 2 and 3, then, we conclude that in most countries the self-employed spend less time caring for children than do the wage employed.

A similar conclusion is drawn when we examine the part-time employment status variable. Table 4 presents the proportion of females working part-time who indicate they do so in order to care for children or others, by country and self-employment status.<sup>11</sup> Only in the Netherlands do we find that the self-employed are significantly more likely to give this response than are those who are not self-employed. Therefore, the self-employed who work part-time are no more likely than the part-time wage-employed to do so in order to care for children (or others).

## 4.2 Regression Results

The estimated coefficients for the household care model (1) are presented in Table 5, by country. Referring first to the control variables, several important determinants of time spent caring for children stand out. First, the number of children in the household is positively related to time in childcare, as expected. The presence of young children also has a strong, positive effect, in all countries. The hours worked by the spouse of the head are significantly *negatively* related to household time spent caring or children, except in

Ireland and the U.K. The results for the education variables are mixed, with positive, but often insignificant, coefficients in most countries. Household income has a negative, but often insignificant, effect on time spent caring for children.

The effect of self-employment appears to be fairly consistent: self-employment, whether of the head or spouse in a household, tends to decrease the total amount of time spent with children in the household. The significance of this effect is highest in the southern European countries, consistent with the descriptive statistics presented above. Only in the Netherlands do we find consistently insignificant or positive effects of self-employment.

Gender differences in the effects of self-employment are examined in Table 6, where the results for model (2) are presented. The dependent variable is the individual male or female's time spent caring for children. For males (panel "a"), we find again that self-employment is negatively related to time spent caring for children. Interestingly, self-employment of a spouse also significantly reduces childcare activities among males in some countries, as evidenced by the coefficients on the SPSESELF variable. The positive and significant SPSECARE coefficients perhaps suggest that married couples share attitudes regarding caring for children.

The number of children has little or no effect on hours of care by males, but the presence of young children increases care significantly. An increase in a male's own hours of work is seen to reduce time spent caring for children, while an increase in his spouse's hours increases it.

The results presented for females in panel (b) suggest that many of the same forces are at work. Time spent caring for children is higher when the spouse also

---

<sup>11</sup> The results for males are not presented, since the proportion that gives this response among males is

provides more care, when the children are younger, and when the spouse works more hours. The effect of younger children is especially strong for females (the coefficients are much larger than those found for males). One difference between women and men, however, is that for women there is a positive and significant relationship between the number of children and time spent caring for them.

The results regarding self-employment also are different from those for males. In the Netherlands and Portugal, for example, self-employment is positively related to time spent caring for children. The negative relationship found for males is only seen to hold in Greece and in Austria. We do find, however, that women spend significantly less time caring for children when their spouse is self-employed, especially in the southern countries (and also in Ireland). This is consistent with the results presented by Gustafsson and Kjulin (1994), and highlights the importance of the joint (household) self-employment and childcare decisions.

Finally, in Tables 7 and 8, we present the estimated coefficients on the self-employment variables for specifications that include occupational control variables. The coefficients in Table 7 are from regressions with eight occupational dummies, for managerial; professional; technical; clerk; service; craft; operative; and agricultural/labor occupations. The dummies are defined only for the head of household, however, in panel (a), or for the responding male or female in panels (b) and (c). The coefficients in Table 8 are from regressions that include occupational dummies for both the head of household and spouse in panel (a) or the individual and spouse in panels (b) and (c). The complete set of regression results is available from the authors on request.

---

nearly zero in all of the countries studied.



The regressions with occupational controls yield essentially the same qualitative results as those presented previously. Generally speaking, we find little evidence that self-employed workers spend significantly more time caring for children, except in the Netherlands and perhaps Portugal.

#### 4.3 Discussion

There are some caveats that must be considered when interpreting these results. First, there might be some difficulty with the “caring for children” variable. In particular, an individual might choose self-employment in order simply to be at home when the children are at home, especially for older children. It is not clear whether the individual survey respondent would classify this as time spent “caring” for children. If there is a difference between the self-employed and other employed in the propensity to classify “care” in this way, then our results would be biased. This is not very likely, however. Second, there might be cross-national differences in the interpretation of the caring for children question, which lead to some difficulty in interpreting the cross-national results. Third, because the time measure is weekly, it might hide the fact that the time the self-employed spend with their children could be more flexibly arranged. This could allow the self-employed individual to spend more time on a given day caring for their children, but less time overall.

Another issue is that we have ignored the potential self-selection of workers into the self-employment sector of the labor market. If there are unobserved factors that are correlated both with the probability of being self-employed and with time spent caring for children, then the estimated coefficients might be biased. Unfortunately we have not

found any useful instruments in the ECHP data that would allow us to estimate such a model.

Assuming the results are valid despite these caveats, the cross-national differences in the effects of self-employment on time spent caring for children should be explored. Differences in national child-care policies or programs might offer some explanation for these differences. Despite having a common minimum, the countries studied here differ in the maximum duration of maternal/parental leave provisions, for example, and in the provision of childcare services.<sup>12</sup> To some extent these reflect cultural differences that also manifest themselves in differential take-up rates or labor force participation rates. Self-employed women in countries where child-care is heavily subsidized or required of employers, or where the use of such child-care is quite common, would not be expected to spend any more time caring for children than would wage-employed women. The hypothesized positive relationship between self-employment and time spent caring for children, then, would be stronger in countries with weaker public support for child-care. How such institutional differences might affect the self-employment/wage employment differential is a topic for further research.

Another possible explanation for the cross-national differences in the effect of self-employment on time spent caring for children would be cross-national differences in the availability of other household members (grandparents, for example) to care for children, which reduces the role that self-employment plays as an option for child-care. We have not attempted to control for this possibility in our analysis.

In addition, we should note that the results presented here are still consistent with the idea that women choose self-employment in order to obtain greater *flexibility*. This

desire stems from the fact that women have greater responsibilities in the home than do men, and greater flexibility makes it easier to accomplish the combined home and work responsibilities. As Arai (2000) puts it, women must put in the “double day.” We suspect that the observed correlation between the number of children in the home and the probability of self-employment found in other work arises not because having more children increases the desire to spend more time with them. Rather, having more children increases the amount of home work and responsibilities, which increases the demand for flexibility.

## **5. Conclusions**

A commonly held view of the self-employed, and self-employed females in particular, is that they choose self-employment in order to spend more time caring for children. Using data from the European Community Household Panel, we find little support for these hypotheses. Indeed, the evidence suggests that self-employed males spend less time caring for children than do other employed males, and among females the expected result is found only in one or two nations. In addition, females in many southern European nations are found to spend significantly less time caring for children when their spouses are self-employed.

As is often the case, these results raise new questions. For example, what cultural differences contribute to the north/south differential that we find? Do previous studies confuse the demand for flexibility with the demand for time with children? How are cross-national differences in child-care policies related to the results presented here?

---

<sup>12</sup> For analyses of cross-national differences in child-care and other related topics, see Kamerman (2000) and Lilja and Hamalainen (2001).

In addition to trying to answer these questions, further research should also address the problem of simultaneity bias that might exist in the model, to the extent that the self-employment variable and hours worked variables are jointly determined with a (latent or unobserved) desire to spend time with children. This issue is ignored in the present analysis.

## **6. References**

- Arai, A. Bruce. 2000. Self-employment as a response to the double day. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 125-42.
- Bianchi, Suzanne M. 2000. Maternal Employment and Time with Children: Dramatic Change or Surprising Continuity? *Demography*, 37, no. 4, pp. 401-14.
- Blanchflower, David G. 2000. Self-employment in OECD countries. *Labour Economics* (7) 5, pp. 471-505.
- Blau, David M. 1991. *The Economics of Child-Care*, New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Blau, David M. 1987. A time series analysis of self-employment in the United States. *Journal of Political Economy* 95, pp. 445-467.
- Boden, Richard J., Jr. 1999. Flexible Working Hours, Family Responsibilities, and Female Self-employment. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, vol. 58, no. 1, pp. 71-83.
- Caputo, Richard K., and Arthur Dolinsky. 1998. Women's Choice to Pursue Self-Employment: The Role of Financial and Human Capital of Household Members. *Journal of Small Business Management*, July, pp. 8-17.
- Connely, Rachel. 1992. Self-employment and Providing Child Care. *Demography*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 17-29.
- Devine, Theresa. 1994. Characteristics of self-employed women in the United States. *Monthly Labor Review*, vol. 117, no. 3, pp. 20-34.
- Edwards, Linda N., and Elizabeth Field-Hendrey. 1996. Home-Based Workers: Data from the 1990 Census of Population. *Monthly Labor Review*, vol. 119, no. 11.

Evans, D. S., and Boyan Jovanovich. 1989. An estimated model of entrepreneurial choice under liquidity constraints. *Journal of Political Economy* 97, pp. 808-827.

Evans, D. S., and L. S. Leighton. 1989. Some empirical aspects of entrepreneurship. *American Economic Review* 79, pp. 519-535.

Golden, Lonnie. 2001. Flexible Work Schedules. *Monthly Labor Review*, vol. 124, no. 3, pp. 50-67.

Gustafsson, Bjorn, and Urban Kjulin. 1994. Time use in child care and housework and the total cost of children. *Journal of Population Economics*, vol. 7, pp. 287-306.

Hofferth, Sandra, and Nancy Collins. 2000. Child-care and employment turnover. *Population Research and Policy Review* 19, pp. 357-395.

Hundley, Greg. 2000. Male/Female Earnings Differences in Self-Employment: The Effects of Marriage, Children, and the Household Division of Labor. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, October, pp.95-114.

Kamerman, Sheila B. 2000. Early Childhood Education and Care (ECEC): An Overview of Developments in the OECD Countries. Unpublished mimeo, Columbia University.

Lilja, Reija, and Ulla Hamalainen. 2001. Working Time Preferences at Different Phases of Life. European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Peracchi, Franco. 2002. The European Community Household Panel: A Review. *Empirical Economics*, vol. 27, pp. 63-90.

Presser, Harriet B. 1989. Can We Make Time for Children? The Economy, Work Schedules, and Child Care. *Demography*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 523-543.

Sandberg, John F., and Sandra L. Hofferth. 2001. Changes in Children's Time with Parents: United States, 1981-1997. *Demography*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 423-36.

Sousa-Poza, Alfonso, Hans Schmid, and Rolf Widmer. 2001. The allocation and value of time assigned to housework and child-care: An analysis for Switzerland. *Journal of Population Economics*, vol. 14, pp. 599-618.

Williams, Donald R. 2000. Consequences of Self-employment among Men and Women in the United States. *Labour Economics*, vol. 7, no. 5.

**Table 1**

**Self-employment Rates, 1994-1998**  
(self-employed as percent of total employed)

<b>Country</b>	<b>Females</b>			<b>Males</b>		
	<b>1994</b>	<b>1996</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1994</b>	<b>1996</b>	<b>1998</b>
Germany	5.47	5.33	n.a.	8.95	8.97	n.a.
Netherlands	5.28	5.78	5.33	7.43	7.79	7.42
Belgium	10.34	9.31	8.62	15.83	15.91	15.56
France	6.87	6.53	5.61	12.08	12.70	12.29
Austria	n.a.	10.27	10.00	n.a.	12.87	14.60
UK	9.11	9.03	n.a.	19.77	22.20	n.a.
Ireland	7.19	7.15	6.11	27.63	25.06	22.51
Italy	14.97	17.20	16.24	27.78	29.08	27.94
Greece	22.30	19.39	18.09	44.52	39.53	40.46
Spain	17.68	16.75	14.32	24.09	23.51	23.83
Portugal	22.23	21.96	21.01	27.80	27.82	27.31

Source: calculated from European Community Household Panel survey (weighted).

**Table 2**

**Hours Spent Caring for Children, 1996  
By Self-employment Status**

<b>Country</b>	<b>Males</b>		<b>Females</b>	
	<b>Not Self-employed</b>	<b>Self-employed</b>	<b>Not Self-employed</b>	<b>Self-employed</b>
Germany	11.2	7.3*	39.6	36.4
Netherlands	15.1	14.0	44.6	50.7*
Belgium	10.2	5.4*	31.0	31.7
France	6.0	3.8*	19.7	21.6
Austria	7.0	5.8	43.6	29.6*
UK	12.6	5.2*	49.6	61.0*
Ireland	8.0	6.2*	42.4	48.6
Italy	8.9	6.2*	29.1	28.0
Greece	6.8	4.6*	26.8	22.8*
Spain	8.2	3.8*	31.9	23.9*
Portugal	3.4	1.7*	16.9	15.5

Source: calculated from European Community Household Panel survey (weighted).

\* Indicates significantly different from not self-employed (.05 level).

Table 3  
Total Household Hours Spent Caring For Children, 1996  
By Household Employment Status

country	Household employment status					
	hw_sw	hw_sn	hs_ss	hs_sw	hw_ss	hs_sn
Germany	56.7	66.1	49.3	53.6	52.4	55.4
The Netherlands	66.1	72.8	42.7	61.2	78.3	74.3
Belgium	43.1	52.2	38.2	31.0	49.0	60.2
France	26.2	36.9	21.2	25.2	23.7	22.5
Austria	48.4	59.2	33.4	31.3	50.3	37.8
United-Kingdom	51.3	51.3	40.1	43.2	51.0	53.3
Ireland	50.8	47.6	23.5	48.4	53.4	39.1
Italy	44.7	47.7	40.0	37.6	36.3	45.8
Greece	41.9	45.8	28.8	31.3	31.1	42.4
Spain	47.8	49.0	38.6	42.0	36.4	40.6
Portugal	17.8	29.8	14.2	15.3	18.8	19.7



**Table 4**

**Percent Part-time due to Caring for Others, 1996  
(Females)**

<b>Country</b>	<b>Not Self-employed</b>	<b>Self-employed</b>
Germany	13.49	8.06
Netherlands	14.36	19.64
Belgium	9.43	7.67
France	4.40	4.07
UK	10.88	6.48
Ireland	8.74	3.69
Italy	4.96	5.54
Greece	2.13	2.32
Spain	3.98	3.01
Portugal	1.47	2.41

Source: calculated from European Community Household Panel survey (weighted).

**Table 5: Regression Results**  
**Dependent Variable = Household Hours Spent Caring for Children**  
**By Country**

	<b>Germany</b>	<b>Netherla</b>	<b>Belgium</b>	<b>France</b>	<b>UK</b>	<b>Ireland</b>	<b>Italy</b>	<b>Greece</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>Portugal</b>	<b>Austria</b>
<b>Hs_sw</b>	1.2248 (0.375)	-1.3884 (0.582)	-9.3365 (2.428)*	-3.0205 (1.261)	-8.3137 (2.698)**	-3.2433 (1.412)	-4.4129 (3.082)**	-7.1176 (6.123)**	-7.4697 (3.609)**	-3.3410 (2.302)*	-10.6039 (4.041)**
<b>Hs_snwk</b>	-10.4426 (2.344)*	-0.1164 (0.043)	5.3436 (0.860)	-1.1216 (0.409)	-4.3758 (0.920)	-4.2411 (2.147)*	-0.9276 (0.769)	-2.1324 (2.085)*	-7.3699 (5.269)**	-3.0756 (1.935)	-17.3832 (4.241)**
<b>s_s</b>	-9.3467 (1.104)	-2.5559 (0.698)	-9.1729 (1.468)	1.6681 (0.311)	-7.2686 (1.466)	-21.5101 (4.310)**	-3.6884 (1.849)	-8.4880 (4.643)**	-7.7858 (2.683)**	-0.3295 (0.198)	-15.2256 (4.284)**
<b>hw_ss</b>	-2.0065 (0.560)	4.0175 (1.608)	-4.0555 (0.896)	-1.9238 (0.522)	0.3802 (0.093)	2.0116 (0.551)	-5.5179 (2.803)**	-4.5975 (2.683)**	-7.2143 (2.592)**	-3.0987 (1.750)	-8.0755 (2.773)**
<b>ed2</b>	3.1330 (1.350)	1.1319 (0.994)	1.5005 (0.590)	2.5674 (1.740)	2.5045 (1.105)	1.7175 (1.156)	4.4845 (4.772)**	3.7675 (4.042)**	4.6975 (3.662)**	3.1391 (1.932)	4.2355 (2.052)*
<b>ed3</b>	3.5388 (1.378)	-0.5769 (0.398)	5.3684 (1.955)	0.8721 (0.456)	4.7416 (1.819)	-1.1558 (0.546)	2.2644 (1.363)	5.6455 (4.817)**	3.4778 (2.434)*	12.6831 (4.909)**	10.5065 (3.203)**
<b>Sped2</b>	2.2580 (1.110)	3.4739 (3.010)**	3.8376 (1.425)	4.6155 (3.116)**	5.0408 (2.300)*	1.9952 (1.303)	1.7185 (1.789)	3.4318 (3.658)**	6.4991 (4.961)**	3.3980 (2.033)*	4.0993 (2.238)*
<b>Sped3</b>	2.3023 (0.863)	1.3808 (0.846)	1.2507 (0.444)	7.3888 (3.999)**	4.1523 (1.561)	3.7776 (1.609)	0.1227 (0.070)	4.8617 (4.113)**	10.8239 (7.068)**	0.8274 (0.343)	7.3527 (2.243)*
<b>Kids</b>	3.7311 (3.599)**	3.3710 (5.417)**	4.5154 (3.542)**	4.1489 (5.812)**	2.1440 (1.845)	3.8851 (6.154)**	2.9333 (4.940)**	2.8413 (5.226)**	2.7644 (4.018)**	2.8153 (5.123)**	6.1401 (6.865)**
<b>Kidslt12</b>	32.8447 (16.096)**	16.3435 (14.750)**	22.7228 (12.431)**	24.6603 (17.919)**	34.0230 (13.284)**	25.5901 (15.745)**	13.6159 (14.486)**	14.4853 (17.714)**	33.9006 (29.831)**	13.4186 (14.024)**	20.9262 (12.456)**
<b>Hhinc</b>	-0.5477 (2.469)*	-0.3351 (2.966)**	-0.0045 (0.499)	-0.0941 (2.338)*	-0.8328 (1.206)	0.2936 (0.909)	-0.1898 (1.041)	-0.0036 (3.515)**	-0.0129 (4.883)**	-0.0083 (2.659)**	-0.1323 (4.685)**
<b>Hrs</b>	-0.1583 (2.653)**	-0.1832 (4.018)**	-0.0341 (0.392)	-0.1314 (2.415)*	-0.0429 (0.638)	-0.0032 (0.071)	0.0326 (0.897)	0.0282 (1.128)	-0.0519 (1.482)	0.0756 (2.162)*	-0.0546 (1.171)
<b>Sphrs</b>	-0.2757 (6.582)**	-0.2648 (6.968)**	-0.2042 (3.336)**	-0.2201 (6.831)**	0.0064 (0.118)	-0.0374 (0.896)	-0.0870 (3.419)**	-0.1642 (7.164)**	-0.1979 (6.440)**	-0.2282 (9.733)**	-0.0895 (2.552)*
<b>Constant</b>	37.8625 (9.005)**	58.1841 (23.510)**	30.5087 (6.058)**	12.0933 (3.980)**	30.0706 (6.166)**	32.0751 (11.931)**	29.8453 (15.484)**	23.0369 (14.457)**	27.9106 (13.172)**	12.6116 (6.177)**	26.7414 (7.476)**
<b>Obs.</b>	2021	4258	2466	4550	1774	3568	6820	5252	6334	4913	2707
<b>Pid</b>	1280	1545	993	1963	1115	1293	2693	1884	2432	1988	1258

Absolute value of z-statistics in parentheses

\* significant at 5% level; \*\* significant at 1% level

**Table 6: Regression Results**  
**Dependent Variable = individual hours spent caring for children (CARE)**  
**By Country and Gender**

**(a) Males**

	<b>Germany</b>	<b>Netherla</b>	<b>Belgium</b>	<b>France</b>	<b>UK</b>	<b>Ireland</b>	<b>Italy</b>	<b>Greece</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>Portugal</b>	<b>Austria</b>
<b>Selfemp</b>	-1.9807 (1.514)	0.6126 (0.745)	-4.2408 (2.964)**	-0.7450 (1.125)	-3.5185 (2.849)**	-1.6206 (2.354)*	-2.1162 (5.361)**	-1.5044 (4.815)**	-1.3205 (2.515)*	-0.2084 (0.578)	-0.8653 (0.972)
<b>Spseself</b>	1.6967 (1.004)	-2.1930 (2.297)*	-3.0202 (1.798)	-1.3822 (1.295)	-3.2087 (1.802)	-2.2157 (1.669)	-0.7035 (1.128)	-0.9911 (2.038)*	-5.0781 (5.671)**	-0.9903 (2.203)*	-5.0646 (5.142)**
<b>Sp scare</b>	0.1635 (11.449)**	0.0881 (10.282)**	0.2431 (18.584)**	0.1625 (25.021)**	0.1065 (7.445)**	0.0342 (4.645)**	0.1666 (25.476)**	0.1454 (21.623)**	0.1020 (15.350)**	0.1143 (20.146)**	0.0405 (4.580)**
<b>ed2</b>	0.8543 (0.758)	-0.0764 (0.148)	1.1101 (0.983)	0.4882 (0.973)	-0.6547 (0.556)	-0.7874 (1.258)	0.3575 (0.916)	0.5215 (1.462)	1.9097 (3.397)**	1.3367 (2.382)*	-1.4156 (1.519)
<b>ed3</b>	1.6722 (1.366)	-0.2752 (0.423)	0.9171 (0.753)	0.0449 (0.069)	2.2414 (1.661)	-1.1443 (1.246)	0.4312 (0.626)	1.7500 (3.911)**	1.5251 (2.423)*	1.8818 (2.014)*	2.4909 (1.750)
<b>sped2</b>	2.8112 (2.969)**	0.2963 (0.572)	0.7590 (0.628)	-0.0137 (0.027)	1.8792 (1.651)	1.3642 (2.059)*	2.4316 (6.080)**	0.2913 (0.805)	1.8269 (3.178)**	1.5629 (2.720)**	2.3124 (3.124)**
<b>Sped3</b>	2.7867 (2.158)*	0.2290 (0.312)	0.7715 (0.618)	1.1171 (1.765)	1.6013 (1.156)	3.6864 (3.629)**	2.0977 (2.891)**	1.2113 (2.677)**	4.8705 (7.255)**	1.9707 (2.403)*	5.1650 (3.880)**
<b>Kids</b>	0.2782 (0.561)	0.5114 (1.880)	-0.1631 (0.290)	-0.5464 (2.211)*	0.7636 (1.276)	0.5842 (2.149)*	0.3007 (1.214)	-0.3191 (1.523)	-0.0306 (0.101)	-0.3890 (2.035)*	0.8916 (2.396)*
<b>Kidslt12</b>	4.8069 (4.665)**	3.0051 (5.864)**	1.3280 (1.506)	1.9723 (3.979)**	6.6057 (4.895)**	5.6436 (8.171)**	2.4457 (6.166)**	0.7959 (2.438)*	3.6568 (6.952)**	0.6836 (2.057)*	4.0115 (5.774)**
<b>Hhinc</b>	-0.1563 (1.465)	-0.1057 (2.007)*	0.0007 (0.178)	-0.0050 (0.358)	-0.1244 (0.364)	0.0782 (0.585)	0.0665 (0.872)	-0.0004 (1.122)	0.0002 (0.138)	0.0011 (1.075)	-0.0447 (3.907)**
<b>Hrs</b>	-0.1883 (6.228)**	-0.3267 (16.016)**	-0.2091 (5.266)**	-0.0934 (4.995)**	-0.2397 (7.087)**	-0.0988 (5.473)**	-0.1079 (7.508)**	-0.0581 (6.269)**	-0.1463 (10.582)**	-0.0352 (3.100)**	-0.1064 (5.317)**
<b>Spsehrs</b>	0.2609 (11.539)**	0.2672 (15.799)**	0.2455 (9.030)**	0.1229 (11.329)**	0.2415 (8.314)**	0.1876 (11.561)**	0.1378 (13.966)**	0.0744 (10.111)**	0.1683 (13.709)**	0.0592 (7.675)**	0.0900 (6.092)**
<b>Constant</b>	2.2105 (1.086)	18.2081 (15.961)**	4.1637 (1.830)	2.3091 (2.210)*	7.1070 (2.871)**	3.3188 (2.914)**	1.8926 (2.401)*	1.4033 (2.320)*	3.9057 (4.453)**	0.0027 (0.004)	5.6101 (3.776)**
<b>Obs.</b>	2021	4258	2466	4550	1774	3568	6820	5252	6334	4913	2707
<b>pid</b>	1280	1545	993	1963	1115	1293	2693	1884	2432	1988	1258

Absolute value of z-statistics in parentheses

\* significant at 5% level; \*\* significant at 1% level

Table 6, continued

## (b) Females

	Germany	Netherla	Belgium	France	UK	Ireland	Italy	Greece	Spain	Portugal	Austria
<b>Selfemp</b>	-2.7941 (1.103)	4.3803 (2.562)*	2.0288 (0.780)	0.2621 (0.118)	3.0468 (1.115)	-2.0184 (0.736)	-1.3444 (1.253)	-1.9180 (1.993)*	1.3532 (0.846)	1.7038 (1.687)	-6.0891 (3.008)**
<b>Spseself</b>	-1.9665 (1.008)	-1.7961 (1.203)	0.7036 (0.315)	0.2191 (0.158)	-1.6138 (0.861)	-3.0338 (2.182)*	1.3494 (1.997)*	-1.0551 (1.698)	-3.6613 (3.981)**	-1.8063 (2.296)*	-5.7198 (3.181)**
<b>Sp scare</b>	0.3777 (11.570)**	0.2610 (9.782)**	0.4975 (18.355)**	0.7521 (25.281)**	0.2681 (7.126)**	0.1795 (4.833)**	0.5308 (26.020)**	0.5618 (21.552)**	0.3581 (15.705)**	0.7041 (21.858)**	0.2049 (4.998)**
<b>ed2</b>	-1.8424 (1.105)	0.7462 (0.812)	1.6369 (0.961)	0.5563 (0.533)	1.1627 (0.657)	3.0435 (2.379)*	2.1523 (3.241)**	2.4159 (3.420)**	1.5122 (1.526)	0.3182 (0.255)	4.3233 (2.366)*
<b>ed3</b>	-0.7871 (0.434)	-0.5845 (0.501)	2.4004 (1.278)	0.1891 (0.140)	0.3931 (0.194)	0.0113 (0.006)	0.5821 (0.501)	2.0182 (2.270)*	1.0360 (0.946)	4.8546 (2.433)*	6.4811 (2.305)*
<b>sped2</b>	0.7477 (0.532)	2.8932 (3.116)**	0.0657 (0.036)	4.2024 (3.995)**	3.9021 (2.286)*	0.1085 (0.081)	-0.7761 (1.137)	2.4233 (3.381)**	3.7626 (3.725)**	0.4690 (0.376)	1.9152 (1.318)
<b>Sped3</b>	-0.6965 (0.364)	1.2396 (0.942)	0.2477 (0.129)	4.2126 (3.200)**	2.7590 (1.322)	0.2475 (0.122)	-2.2118 (1.801)	2.4515 (2.731)**	3.4141 (2.917)**	0.6452 (0.366)	1.3165 (0.500)
<b>Kids</b>	2.4292 (3.306)**	2.1984 (4.426)**	3.3652 (3.878)**	3.6552 (7.079)**	1.0801 (1.190)	3.1110 (5.706)**	1.9106 (4.511)**	2.6707 (6.454)**	2.3597 (4.432)**	2.7530 (6.733)**	4.7310 (6.281)**
<b>Kidslt12</b>	20.6988 (14.059)**	12.3963 (13.811)**	14.0900 (11.487)**	16.5298 (16.159)**	21.9696 (10.841)**	18.2858 (12.747)**	7.4372 (10.964)**	10.6046 (16.862)**	25.8452 (28.556)**	10.8614 (14.655)**	15.6060 (10.615)**
<b>Hhinc</b>	-0.2900 (1.803)	-0.2180 (2.368)*	-0.0048 (0.810)	-0.0636 (2.132)*	-0.6060 (1.127)	0.1062 (0.379)	-0.2177 (1.642)	-0.0020 (2.617)**	-0.0115 (5.559)**	-0.0099 (4.102)**	-0.0812 (3.349)**
<b>Hrs</b>	0.1645 (3.593)**	0.1943 (5.181)**	0.2426 (4.134)**	0.0570 (1.435)	0.2292 (4.327)**	0.1337 (3.462)**	0.1631 (6.513)**	0.1004 (5.490)**	0.1590 (6.321)**	0.0999 (3.818)**	0.1098 (2.611)**
<b>Spsehrs</b>	-0.5563 (16.976)**	-0.5509 (18.181)**	-0.4790 (11.711)**	-0.3666 (16.235)**	-0.2695 (5.947)**	-0.2773 (8.028)**	-0.2723 (16.094)**	-0.2761 (19.455)**	-0.3975 (18.343)**	-0.2884 (17.029)**	-0.1944 (6.358)**
<b>Constant</b>	26.6736 (8.948)**	31.9019 (15.525)**	17.1455 (5.011)**	5.1257 (2.328)*	18.9554 (5.010)**	26.5877 (11.541)**	21.1161 (15.820)**	17.1226 (14.577)**	18.3630 (11.814)**	11.1171 (7.365)**	18.0247 (5.979)**
<b>Obs.</b>	2021	4258	2466	4550	1774	3568	6820	5252	6334	4913	2707
<b>pid</b>	1280	1545	993	1963	1115	1293	2693	1884	2432	1988	1258

Absolute value of z-statistics in parentheses

\* significant at 5% level; \*\* significant at 1% level

Table 7: Regression Coefficients for Self-employment Variables  
(with occupational controls)

(a) Dependent Variable: Household Hours Spent Caring For Children

	Germany	Netherla	Belgium	France	UK	Ireland	Italy	Greece	Spain	Portugal	Austria
hs_sw	1.5564 (0.474)	-1.0985 (0.459)	-8.907 (2.284)*	-2.5261 (1.022)	-8.5335 (2.703)**	-1.7293 (0.713)	-4.5074 (3.117)**	-6.2175 (5.049)**	-7.4656 (3.527)**	-3.657 (2.442)*	-10.3596 (3.817)**
hs_snwk	-10.6936 (2.375)*	0.4351 (0.161)	5.7539 (0.918)	-0.9241 (0.331)	-4.4748 (0.931)	-2.9434 (1.403)	-1.095 (0.898)	-1.5093 (1.405)	-7.0937 (4.832)**	-3.5099 (2.159)*	-18.4395 (4.396)**
s_s	-9.2273 (1.087)	-2.0625 (0.562)	-8.5587 (1.359)	2.7731 (0.512)	-6.7922 (1.358)	-20.0421 (3.966)**	-3.5692 (1.775)	-7.6806 (4.102)**	-7.4206 (2.531)*	-0.7401 (0.429)	-15.1 (4.107)**
hw_ss	-2.1248 (0.592)	3.9045 (1.562)	-3.7644 (0.828)	-2.2396 (0.607)	0.1887 (0.046)	2.1703 (0.594)	-5.4246 (2.752)**	-4.6145 (2.692)**	-7.4354 (2.677)**	-3.1798 (1.798)	-8.2211 (2.826)**

(b) Dependent Variable: Hours spent caring, Males

	Germany	Netherla	Belgium	France	UK	Ireland	Italy	Greece	Spain	Portugal	Austria
SELF	-1.6288 (1.224)	0.818 (0.989)	-4.1114 (2.829)**	-0.4827 (0.698)	-3.0645 (2.414)*	-0.7328 (0.984)	-2.0493 (5.092)**	-1.0978 (3.201)**	-0.9054 (1.616)	-0.1562 (0.409)	-0.9882 (1.04)
SPSELF	1.6106 (0.952)	-2.1876 (2.291)*	-2.9664 (1.769)	-1.3029 (1.221)	-3.5113 (1.962)*	-2.0729 (1.57)	-0.8506 (1.361)	-0.9607 (1.973)*	-5.0286 (5.627)**	-1.0095 (2.240)*	-5.1449 (5.206)**

© Dependent Variable: Hours spent caring, Females

	Germany	Netherla	Belgium	France	UK	Ireland	Italy	Greece	Spain	Portugal	Austria
SELF	-3.0747 (1.179)	4.3426 (2.416)*	0.4526 (0.171)	0.7633 (0.33)	3.3448 (1.177)	-2.9181 (1.016)	-0.8878 (0.792)	-2.1002 (1.939)	-0.122 (0.066)	1.8782 (1.76)	-6.4247 (2.951)**
SPSELF	-1.89 (0.964)	-1.625 (1.084)	0.5261 (0.235)	0.1994 (0.144)	-1.6514 (0.875)	-2.8783 (2.052)*	1.3696 (2.023)*	-1.0556 (1.696)	-3.6502 (3.966)**	-1.9372 (2.451)*	-5.7492 (3.184)**

Absolute value of z-statistics in parentheses: \* significant at 5% level; \*\* significant at 1% level

Table 8: Regression Coefficients for Self-employment Variables  
(with occupational controls for both spouses)

(a) Dependent Variable: Household Hours Spent Caring For Children

	Germany	Netherla	Belgium	France	UK	Ireland	Italy	Greece	Spain	Portugal	Austria
hs_sw	1.29 (0.39)	-1.043 (0.434)	-8.6853 (2.218)*	-1.9654 (0.791)	-7.5771 (2.352)*	-2.1376 (0.871)	-4.3708 (3.006)**	-6.0867 (4.796)**	-7.4873 (3.494)**	-2.9908 (1.982)*	-9.9938 (3.654)**
hs_snwk	-9.7772 (2.141)*	0.6289 (0.23)	4.2985 (0.674)	-1.6831 (0.602)	-4.9496 (1.004)	-2.4936 (1.166)	-1.226 (1.001)	-1.5228 (1.406)	-7.0988 (4.808)**	-4.4657 (2.715)**	-19.4837 (4.601)**
s_s	-9.5481 (1.114)	-0.7431 (0.194)	-10.1334 (1.591)	4.7938 (0.875)	-6.7325 (1.296)	-22.5582 (4.318)**	-3.1401 (1.531)	-7.2526 (3.608)**	-7.0434 (2.264)*	-0.3655 (0.206)	-14.4973 (3.784)**
hw_ss	-1.7148 (0.468)	4.1819 (1.621)	-6.0338 (1.303)	-0.8026 (0.212)	0.5998 (0.144)	1.0092 (0.272)	-4.8908 (2.428)*	-4.2598 (2.322)*	-7.152 (2.334)*	-2.9029 (1.601)	-7.8258 (2.582)**

(b) Dependent Variable: Hours spent caring, Males

	Germany	Netherla	Belgium	France	UK	Ireland	Italy	Greece	Spain	Portugal	Austria
SELF	-1.5366 (1.153)	0.8165 (0.984)	-4.1501 (2.835)**	-0.4242 (0.612)	-2.9566 (2.313)*	-0.6667 (0.899)	-2.0703 (5.136)**	-1.0798 (3.154)**	-0.9572 (1.713)	-0.1459 (0.382)	-0.9536 (1.003)
SPSELF	1.8658 (1.073)	-1.6529 (1.645)	-2.3282 (1.347)	-0.6125 (0.553)	-3.7385 (2.013)*	-3.351 (2.458)*	-0.8874 (1.366)	-0.7966 (1.451)	-3.5015 (3.444)**	-1.0938 (2.322)*	-4.4854 (4.273)**

© Dependent Variable: Hours spent caring, Females

	Germany	Netherla	Belgium	France	UK	Ireland	Italy	Greece	Spain	Portugal	Austria
SELF	-2.993 (1.144)	4.2211 (2.346)*	0.5227 (0.197)	0.7074 (0.305)	3.7738 (1.316)	-2.8304 (0.983)	-0.6433 (0.573)	-2.2282 (2.053)*	0.2283 (0.124)	1.8723 (1.751)	-6.5476 (3.000)**
SPSELF	-2.1171 (1.06)	-1.5175 (1.006)	0.649 (0.286)	-0.0535 (0.037)	-2.5083 (1.287)	-1.6958 (1.105)	1.1882 (1.719)	-0.7943 (1.168)	-3.977 (4.020)**	-2.2586 (2.679)**	-5.2822 (2.723)**

Absolute value of z-statistics in parentheses: \* significant at 5% level; \*\* significant at 1% level

**IRISS-C/I is currently supported by the  
European Community under the  
*Transnational Access to Major Research  
Infrastructures* action of the *Improving the  
Human Research Potential and the Socio-  
Economic Knowledge Base* programme (5<sup>th</sup>  
framework programme)**

**[contract HPRI-CT-2001-00128]**



**Please refer to this document as**

**IRISS Working Paper 2003-06, CEPS/INSTEAD, Differdange, G.-D. Luxembourg**

*(CEPS/INSTEAD internal doc. #07-03-0023-E)*