

Female part-time work in the European Union :

An empirical study based on the ECHP

Sabine Chaupain-Guillot
Olivier Guillot
Eliane Jankeliowitch-Laval *

*Paper presented at the Second International Conference of ECHP Users (EPUNet 2004)
Berlin, 24-26 June 2004*

[This version : June 2004]

Abstract

In this paper, the question of female part-time work in the EU is explored using cross-sectional and longitudinal data from the European Community Household Panel (ECHP). Our empirical study has two main objectives : first, to describe the labour market transitions of women working part-time and, second, in the case of mothers with young children, to identify the determinants of the choice between full-time work, part-time work and non-employment.

In many countries, part-time employees, especially those working less than 20 hours per week, tend to be concentrated in low-skilled, low-paid jobs. Starting from this observation, in the first part of our study, we put the emphasis on the transition into full-time employment : Does the transition rate from part-time to full-time work vary from country to country ? What are the characteristics of female part-time workers who are more likely than others to move into full-time employment ? Rather than studying the subsequent changes in employment status among a subsample of employees working part-time in a given year, we are interested in the (short-term) occupational trajectories of individuals who entered into part-time work in year t . Based on data from waves 1-7 (1994-2000) of the ECHP, this analysis of labour market transitions is carried out for all EU-15 countries except Sweden.

In the second part of the study, attention is focused on the labour supply decisions of mothers with young children in each of the EU-15 member States. For these women, part-time work is more likely to be voluntary, i.e. "chosen" for family reasons, than involuntary. Here, we attempt to answer the following questions : Do the effects of individual and family characteristics on the part-time / full-time choice vary across EU countries ? To what extent can the differences observed in the impact of such factors be explained by the specificities of national family policies, regarding the reconciliation of work and family life ? To analyse the employment choices of mothers, we use a set of multinomial logit models. These models are estimated on data from the seventh wave (2000) of the ECHP.

Key words : Female labour market participation, part-time work, reconciliation of work and family life, labour market transitions

JEL Classification : J22, J13

* ADEPS – EPS (CNRS et Université Nancy 2)

1. Introduction

In this paper, the question of female part-time work in the EU is explored using cross-sectional and longitudinal data from the *European Community Household Panel* (ECHP). Our empirical study has two main objectives : first, to describe the labour market transitions of women working part-time and, second, in the case of mothers with young children, to identify the determinants of the choice between full-time work, part-time work and non-employment.

In many countries, part-time employees, especially those working less than 20 hours per week, tend to be concentrated in low-skilled, low-paid jobs (Corral and Isusi, 2003 ; Tijdens, 1999). Starting from this observation, in the first part of our study, we put the emphasis on the transition into full-time employment : Does the transition rate from part-time to full-time work vary from country to country ? What are the characteristics of female part-time workers who are more likely than others to move into full-time employment ? This analysis is carried out for all EU-15 countries except Sweden¹.

In the second part of the study, attention is focused on the labour supply decisions of mothers with young children in each of the EU-15 member States. For these women, part-time work is more likely to be voluntary, i.e. “chosen” for family-related reasons, than involuntary. Here, we attempt to answer the following questions : Do the effects of individual and family characteristics on the part-time / full-time choice vary across EU countries ? To what extent can the differences observed in the impact of such factors be explained by the specificities of national family policies, regarding the reconciliation of work and family life ?

A number of international comparative studies, using micro-level data, have recently been conducted on these two aspects of the question of female part-time work. However, to our knowledge, most of these studies have focused on a limited number of EU countries².

The remainder of this paper is organized in the following way. The data are briefly described in Section 2. Section 3 presents the results of the descriptive analysis of labour market transitions among women working part-time. Section 4 presents the models used to examine the employment choices of mothers with young children and provides the main results of this analysis. Some final remarks are given in Section 5.

2. Data

The data come from the *European Community Household Panel* (ECHP). The ECHP is a harmonised longitudinal survey which provides comparable information on the living conditions of individuals and households in the European countries. Employment, incomes, housing, education and health are the main topics covered by this survey. Under the coordination of EUROSTAT, eight successive waves were collected, from 1994 to 2001.

Our analysis of labour market transitions among part-time workers is based on data from waves 1-7 (1994-2000). Each wave of the ECHP provides information on the individual’s employment status both at the survey date and for each month of the previous year. In the present paper, transitions are analysed on an annual basis, using only the information on the situation at each of the successive

¹ For Sweden, only cross-sectional data are available in the ECHP.

² On the transitions into or out of part-time employment, see Anxo et al. (2000), Cebrián et al. (2000), O’Reilly and Bothfeld (2002) and Smith et al. (2000). On the employment choices of mothers with young children, see Ariza et al. (2003), Bardasi and Gornick (2000), Gustafsson et al. (2001), Hu and Tijdens (2003), Kenjoh (2003), Lohmann (2001) and Muehlberger (2000).

interviews³. The sample is restricted to individuals whose employment status was observed each year from 1994, or at least from 1997, until 2000. Rather than studying the subsequent changes in employment status among a subsample of employees working part-time in a given year, we are interested in the (short-term) occupational trajectories of individuals who *entered* into part-time work in year t . The data relating to all entrants into part-time jobs of years 1995 to 1998 are pooled to obtain sufficient sample sizes⁴.

In the second part of our study, where we examine the employment choices of women with young children, we use the data from the seventh wave (2000). The population studied consists of mothers, aged 18-59, whose youngest child is under 12 years old⁵. Given the small size of some national samples, it was not possible to focus on the case of women with younger children.

In our study, individuals economically active (according to the ILO definition) are considered as part-time employed if they work less than 30 hours per week. The use of this definition of part-time work is recommended by OECD for international comparisons. It is also imposed by the data source. Indeed, in the *ECHP Users' Database (UDB)* provided by EUROSTAT, the distinction between part-time and full-time is essentially based on this 30-hours threshold⁶. The rates of part-time work derived from the ECHP, using this definition, are generally lower than those which can be observed in the *European Labour Force Survey*, on the sole basis of individual responses to the questionnaire, as can be seen in Table 1.

3. Labour market transitions among women working part-time

3.1. Descriptive analysis of transition rates⁷

Table 2 shows the employment status in years $t+1$ and $t+2$ of women who entered into part-time work in year t . The corresponding figures for men are also given⁸ for comparison purposes⁹.

In most countries of the EU-15, the exit rate from part-time work is very high. Indeed, according to the ECHP data, between one third and two thirds of women entered into part-time work in year t were no longer in this status in the following year.

If we focus on transitions between year t and year $t+2$, we see that the proportion of exits from part-time work varies quite noticeably within the EU. The lowest rates are observed in the Netherlands and

³ The monthly data from the ECHP "calendar of activities" were not used here because, in this calendar, no distinction is made between part-time and full-time work.

⁴ For individuals who experienced more than one entry into part-time work during the observation period, only the first entry was taken into consideration. Hence, in the pooled samples, there is only one observation per individual.

⁵ Teachers were excluded from this sample, owing to the likely heterogeneity of working time measures for this profession across EU countries.

⁶ The variable PE005C takes the value 1 if the main job of the individual is a full-time job and the value 2 if it is a part-time job. For all persons economically active who work at least 30 hours per week, this variable is coded 1. It is also the case for those working less than 30 hours but whose job is "not considered part-time" (as specified in EUROSTAT, 2001, p. 74). These individuals are not very numerous, except in the Italian and Greek samples. In the present study, they are classified as part-time workers.

⁷ All results in this study are based on weighted data. We used the weights provided by EUROSTAT (i.e. individual "base weights" [PG003] for the analysis of transitions and cross-sectional individual weights [PG002] for the analysis of the employment choices of mothers with young children).

⁸ Except for Luxembourg, where the number of observations is too small.

⁹ The sample studied consists of all persons (among those whose employment status was recorded each year from 1994, or at least from 1997, to 2000) observed as entering into part-time work (either as employees or self-employed) in the years 1995-1998, whatever their age.

Luxembourg, where around 40 % of female entrants of year t were no longer in part-time work two years later. In all other countries, at least half of these women moved from part-time work to another status. It is in Spain, Greece and Finland that we find the highest rates of exit : in these three countries, about 75 % of female entrants were no longer employed part-time in year $t+2$.

In Finland and, to a lesser extent, in Portugal and Luxembourg, it seems that women leaving part-time work are more likely to move to full-time work than to non-employment (when transitions between year t and year $t+2$ are considered). In Germany, Austria, Spain and Italy, on the contrary, transitions to non-employment are more frequent than transitions to full-time work, while in the other countries, the proportions of transitions to full-time work and to non-employment are quite similar.

Two years after their entry into part-time work, between one fifth and one third of women were in full-time jobs¹⁰. Finland is the only country where the transition rate from part-time to full-time work is not in this range. In this country, 44 % of female entrants into part-time work in year t were employed full-time in year $t+2$. Among the other EU member States, the highest rates of transition from part-time to full-time work are observed in two South European countries, namely in Greece and Portugal (with 35 % of women working at least 30 hours per week in year $t+2$). By contrast, the lowest rates are found in the Netherlands and Austria (less than 20 %).

When we compare the transitions among women with those observed among male workers (between year t and year $t+2$), it appears that the proportion of exits from part-time work is higher for men than for women in Belgium, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Austria and the United Kingdom. In the other countries, the observed exit rates are similar for both genders. As expected, in most countries, men entering into part-time work are more likely than women to move from part-time to full-time work. The gap between the transition rates to full-time employment for men and women is greater in the UK (with 54 % of male entrants working full-time in year $t+2$, as against 24 % of women), Belgium (54 % vs. 31 %) and the Netherlands (39 % vs. 18 %) than in the other European countries studied. The two Nordic countries (i.e. Denmark and Finland) are the only States where there is no gender difference in the transition to full-time work.

As can be seen in Table 3, in all countries except the Netherlands (where the exit rates from part-time and full-time work are almost identical), women entering into part-time work are less likely to stay in the same status in the two following years than those entering into full-time jobs. It also appears that the proportion of women unemployed or out of the labour market in year $t+2$ is higher among the former¹¹. Finally, we note that in most countries, transitions from part-time to full-time work are more frequent than the reverse transitions. The Netherlands and the United Kingdom are exceptions. In the Netherlands, female entrants into full-time jobs who move to part-time work are proportionally more numerous than women going from part-time to full-time employment. In the case of the UK, the same transition rates (from one working status to the other) are observed among women who entered into part-time work and among female entrants into full-time jobs (if we focus on transitions between year t and year $t+2$).

3.2. Characteristics of women moving from part-time to full-time work

Table 4 allows to compare the characteristics of female entrants into part-time work who moved to full-time work (i.e. who were employed full-time in year $t+1$ and/or in year $t+2$) with those of women who remained in part-time work (in years $t+1$ and $t+2$) or who moved to non-employment (i.e. who

¹⁰ In the case of France, the transition rate from part-time to full-time employment observed here is somewhat higher than that reported by Bourreau-Dubois et al. (2001) and Galtier (1999) (29 % as against 21 % and 23 %, respectively). However, these authors have examined transitions (between year t and year $t+2$) among all women working part-time in year t , while our analysis is centered on female entrants into part-time jobs.

¹¹ Except perhaps in Luxembourg, but the numbers are too small to draw any conclusion.

were unemployed or out of the labour market in year $t+1$ and/or in year $t+2$ – but never employed full-time)¹². The characteristics taken into account are the following : age, education level, employment status in year $t-1$, working time in year t and reason for working part-time.

In most countries, women moving from part-time to full-time employment are younger on average than female entrants into part-time work who stay in this status and than those who move to non-employment. The situation is different in Italy and France. In Italy, these women, though younger than those leaving part-time work for non-employment, are roughly the same age as those who remain employed part-time. In France, the mean age of women going from part-time to full-time work is a little higher than that of female part-time workers who move to non-employment.

In Belgium, France, Spain, Ireland and the United Kingdom, female workers with a high education level are more numerous among women who move from part-time to full-time work than in the two other subgroups. By contrast, in the other countries studied, the percentage of high-educated female workers among these women, though higher than among those who experience a transition to non-employment, is quite close to the proportion observed in the subsample of women remaining in part-time employment.

In most countries – Ireland and Italy are exceptions – women who moved from part-time to full-time work were in “long” part-time jobs (i.e. in jobs of at least 20 hours) more often than the others. In the year prior to their entry into part-time employment, these women were also more often employed full-time¹³ (in all countries except the Netherlands). Finally, if we look at the main reason for working part-time (in year t), we note that the proportion of involuntary part-timers (i.e. working part-time because they “cannot find a full-time job”) was significantly higher among these female workers who moved from part-time to full-time employment, at least in some countries (Belgium, Spain, Ireland, the Netherlands and Portugal).

4. Employment choices of mothers with young children

4.1. Methodological aspects

To analyse the employment choices of mothers with young children in the European countries, we use a set of multinomial logit models¹⁴. The qualitative dependent variable (common to all fifteen models), denoted by Y_i , is coded 1 if the mother is not employed, 2 if she works part-time and 3 if she has a full-time job¹⁵.

In a multinomial logit model, when the dependent variable consists of J categories j ($j = 1, \dots, J; J \geq 3$), one can form $J(J-1)/2$ equations to contrast these J categories in a pairwise fashion. There are only $J-1$ independent equations (i.e. $J-1$ sets of non-redundant parameters to be estimated) : one of the J categories being taken as the reference, the independent equations are those which contrast each of the other categories with this reference (the coefficients of the other equations can be obtained by simple subtraction, from the estimated parameters of the $J-1$ independent equations).

¹² Due to the small size of the samples, Denmark, Luxembourg, Austria and Finland are excluded from this comparison.

¹³ This confirms the results of previous studies : see O'Reilly and Bothfeld (2002) (in the case of Germany and the UK) and Blank (1994) (for the US).

¹⁴ On this type of model, see, for example, DeMaris (1992) and Liao (1994).

¹⁵ Ordered logit models were also estimated. Because the “proportional odds assumption” is clearly rejected in most cases, the results of these models (quite close to those of multinomial logit models) are not presented here.

Thus, in the present case, each model consists of three equations, among which two independent equations. If the first situation (where the mother does not work) is chosen as the reference, the models are of the following form :

$$\text{Log} \left[\frac{\text{Pr}(Y_i=j)}{\text{Pr}(Y_i=1)} \right] = \alpha_j + \sum_{k=1}^K \beta_{jk} Z_{ik} \quad j = 2,3$$

Where Z_{ik} denotes the k^{th} explanatory variable ($k = 1, \dots, K$), β_{jk} is the coefficient of Z_{ik} in equation j (to be estimated) et α_j is the intercept of equation j (to be estimated) ; $\exp(\beta_{jk})$ gives the effect of Z_{ik} on the odds of being in situation j rather than being in the reference situation¹⁶.

The explanatory variables are the following : the mother's hourly wage (estimated by regression, using Heckman's two-step procedure¹⁷ to correct for possible sample selection bias)¹⁸, marital / cohabiting status, number of children (aged 0-17), age of youngest child, employment status and earnings level of the husband or partner, presence of other adults in the household (including children aged 18 or older), and several control variables (citizenship, presence of a chronic health problem or disability, housing tenure status, existence of debts or loans)¹⁹. The specification is approximately the same for all fifteen countries²⁰.

4.2. Descriptive analysis

In the European Union as a whole, about 60 % of mothers whose youngest child is under 12 years old are employed, either full-time or part-time. However, this employment rate varies strongly across countries (from 40.5 % in Spain to 80.9 % in Denmark ; see Table 5).

In North European countries and in Portugal, at least three out of four mothers have a job. The high employment rate of mothers in Nordic countries is a well-known fact. In these countries, where the "dual-earner" model prevails, the participation of women in the labour market is encouraged by the individualisation of social security rights and the separate taxation of spouses, as well as by measures aiming at facilitating the reconciliation of work and family life. The situation in Portugal is quite different. The high participation rate of women is partly explained by the lack of male workers in the years 1960-70 and, more recently, by the high level of job creations (Ruivo et al., 1998). Furthermore, wages are relatively low, which may make necessary the presence of a second earner in the couple, especially in the case of households with dependent children.

¹⁶ These models were estimated by the maximum likelihood method (using LIMDEP).

¹⁷ For a description of this procedure, see Heckman (1979) and Vella (1998).

¹⁸ The following variables were included in the wage equations (whose dependent variable is the log of hourly wage rate) : age (as a proxy for work experience), age-squared, education level, regional female unemployment rate (for countries where information on region of residence was available), and the selection term (lambda). The estimated parameters of the wage equations are given in Table 7 (the full results are available from the authors). It should be noted that the selection effect proved to be significant (at the 5 % level) only in five countries, namely in Belgium, Italy, Austria, Portugal and Sweden. In the three latter countries, a negative effect was found, which is quite unexpected. Indeed, this suggests that women with lower expected wages, due to unobservable characteristics, are more likely to be employed. Such an effect may reflect the fact that the financial necessity to work is greater among these women, as pointed out by Madalozzo (2002).

¹⁹ The means of explanatory variables are reported in Table 8.

²⁰ Apart from the introduction of a dummy variable to take account of the higher percentage of missing data on husband's earnings in the model estimated for the UK, the only differences concern the control variables. Thus, the citizenship dummy variable (coded 1 if foreigner, 0 otherwise) was only included in six of the fifteen models, i.e. those relating to Germany, France, Luxembourg, Austria, Sweden and the UK. For the other countries, owing to the small number of foreign women in the samples studied, this characteristic could not be taken into account. Similarly, it was not possible to introduce the health variable in the models for Luxembourg (information not available) and Greece (few women having a health problem in the sample studied), nor to include the dummy variable relating to loan repayments in the model for Sweden (information not available).

In Southern Europe, with the exception of Portugal, as well as in Germany, Luxembourg and Ireland²¹, less than half of mothers with young children are employed. In these countries, the traditional family model (with a « breadwinner » father and a stay-at-home mother) is still strong. In accordance with this representation, only a small proportion of young children are cared for in public day care (or preschool) facilities²². Other factors may explain why the employment rate among mothers is low : for example, the characteristics of the labour market (job opportunities for women may be more limited, as is the case in Spain) or a lower incentive for married mothers to engage in paid work, given the high level of their spouse's earnings and the existence of a taxation system which penalises dual-earner couples (in the case of Luxembourg).

About one third of mothers whose youngest child is under 12, in the EU as a whole, have a part-time job (i.e. work less than 30 hours per week). Not surprisingly, the highest rates of part-time work among mothers with young children are found in countries where female part-time employment is the most widespread, namely in the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and Germany. In the Netherlands, almost 80 % of employed mothers work part-time. In the UK and Germany, this proportion is close to 60 %. By contrast, in Portugal and Greece, as well as in Finland, few employed mothers (only one in ten) are in part-time jobs (see Table 5).

It is also in the Netherlands, the UK and Germany that the proportion of “short” part-time workers, among mothers working less than 30 hours per week, is the highest. Indeed, in these three countries, 55 % to 60 % of mothers employed part-time are in jobs of less than 20 hours (see Table 5). In a context where mothers with young children are less encouraged to use child care services than in other countries, part-time work appears as a compromise between family life and work life, particularly when the number of working hours is low.

In the Netherlands and Austria, according to the ECHP data, 90 % of mothers with young children who work part-time do so for family reasons (i.e. “[doing] housework, looking after children or other persons”). In Italy, Ireland, France, Belgium and Spain, this proportion is lower, but family-related reasons also predominate²³ (see Table 6). Thus, most of these mothers seem to have voluntarily chosen to work part-time ; or at least, among these women, part-time work is made more acceptable by the presence of young children in the household.

4.3. Estimation results

The estimated parameters of the multinomial logit models are reported in Table 9.

The mother's predicted wage has the expected positive impact on labour market participation, except in Austria (where no significant effect is found). In the majority of countries (Belgium, Greece, Spain, Ireland, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Finland, Sweden and the United Kingdom), when the hourly wage rate increases, the chances that the mother will work full-time rather than part-time become higher, other things being equal. An interpretation in terms of a dominant substitution effect could be suggested here.

Table 10 contains the estimated elasticities of the probabilities of part-time and full-time work with respect to wage²⁴. These elasticities vary noticeably across countries. The (positive) impact of hourly

²¹ In Ireland, the employment rate among mothers with young children, though low (compared to the EU average), has noticeably increased since the beginning of the 1990s.

²² In the 1990s, this proportion was at most 5 % (Gauthier, 2000).

²³ The information on the main reason for working part-time is incomplete for Germany and not available for Luxembourg, Sweden and the UK. In the case of Denmark, Greece, Portugal and Finland, sample size is insufficient.

²⁴ Each of the elasticities reported in Table 10 is an average of individual elasticities. The elasticities were computed for each mother i given a 1 % increase in their predicted wage (at the observed values of the other characteristics Z_i).

wage on the probability of working full-time is particularly marked in Ireland and the Netherlands. In Finland, Sweden, Belgium and the UK, the estimated elasticity of the probability of part-time work with respect to wage is negative²⁵.

In Ireland, Luxembourg, and in three South European countries (Spain, Italy and Portugal), mothers living alone with their young children are more likely to work full-time than the reference category – i.e. than mothers living with a spouse or partner employed, whose monthly wage or self-employment income is in the first quartile of the earnings distribution – or, more generally, than married mothers as a whole²⁶. It does not seem to be the case in Germany and the Netherlands, where, on the contrary, the probability of non-employment is higher for lone mothers (when compared to the reference category). In the other EU countries, the probabilities of part-time and full-time work for these mothers are not significantly different from those of the reference category.

In eight of the fifteen European countries (Belgium, Germany, Greece, Spain, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and the UK), mothers with young children have a greater probability of not working when their husband's (or partner's) earnings are relatively high (i.e. in the last quartile of the distribution), other things being equal. In the rest of the EU²⁷, on the other hand, this factor does not seem to play a major role. It should be noted that it is in Germany and Luxembourg, where the “male breadwinner” model has been less eroded than in other countries (Southern Europe excepted), that the strongest effects are observed (see Table 11). In some member States (particularly in Belgium and Germany), the husband's unemployment (or husband's economic inactivity) is also associated to a higher probability of non-employment for the mother.

Spain is the only country where neither the presence of at least three children (aged 0-17) nor the age of the youngest child has a significant effect on the labour market participation of mothers. In most countries, women with at least three dependent children are more likely to be non-employed (when compared to the reference category – i.e. those with only one child). According to our results, it is in France and Luxembourg that family size has the strongest impact on labour market participation. In Denmark, mothers with three children have a greater probability to work part-time. It is also the case, but to a lesser extent, in Ireland and Sweden. In Germany, Finland and Greece, as well as in Spain, this variable did not prove to be significant.

Having a child under 3 years old does not seem to be a major factor for mothers living in the following countries : Denmark, Spain, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and Sweden. In the rest of the EU, with the exception of Belgium (where, curiously, the presence of a child under 3 is associated to a higher probability of working full-time), a positive effect on the probability of non-employment is observed. This effect is more pronounced in Germany, the UK and Ireland than in the other member States, except Finland. This seems to illustrate the fact that child care constraints are particularly strong in these three countries (the supply of child care services for children aged 0-2 is more limited and, at least in the UK and Ireland, the cost of care is rather high)²⁸. In the case of Finland, the greater probability of non-employment, for mothers having at least one child under 3, is probably due to a high take-up rate of parental leave.

It is interesting to note that in none of the fifteen countries studied is the probability of working part-time significantly higher for mothers whose youngest child is less than 3 years old (compared to the

²⁵ In the case of Belgium and the UK, however, this elasticity is close to zero.

²⁶ Marginal effects are given in Table 11. The marginal effect of a dichotomous variable Z_{ik} on $P_j = Pr(Y_i=j)$ was calculated as the average of changes in probability (ΔP_{ij}) estimated for each mother i ($\Delta P_{ij} = P_{ij}|Z_i, Z_{ik}=1 - P_{ij}|Z_i, Z_{ik}=0$).

²⁷ With the exception of Sweden, where, on the contrary, we find a positive, but small, effect on the probability of full-time work.

²⁸ In South European countries, the (formal) supply of child care for children under 3 is quite scarce. Yet, according to our results, the presence of a young child has little effect on the employment choices of mothers : the estimated effect is relatively low in Greece and Portugal, and non significant in Spain and Italy. Two elements of explanation may be suggested here : first, the role of family solidarities in caring for children ; second, the higher percentage of self-employed women (who may be more able to care for their own children while working).

reference situation, where the youngest child is aged 6-11). And it seems that Italy is the only country where mothers whose youngest child is aged 3-5 are more likely to choose part-time work (though the estimated effect is small).

In Austria and, to a lesser extent, in Germany, the presence of other adults in the household (including children aged 18 or older) is associated to a higher probability of full-time work (owing to the role of these other household members in caring for young children?). In other countries (Denmark, France, Ireland, Italy and Finland), on the contrary, a negative effect on this probability is found. It is probably again the impact of children on labour market participation which is observed here (since, in most cases, these “other adults” are children aged 18 or older).

5. Conclusion

In the first part of this empirical study, longitudinal data from waves 1-7 (1994-2000) of the ECHP were used to describe the labour market transitions of women entering into part-time work in EU-15 countries. The results show that mobility out of part-time employment is high : in all countries except the Netherlands and Luxembourg, at least half of women entered into part-time work in year t were no longer in this status two years later. It also appears that the transition rate from part-time to full-time work varies noticeably across European countries : two years after their entry into part-time work, less than 20 % of Dutch and Austrian women were employed full-time, while this proportion was about 35 % in Greece and Portugal, and over 40 % in Finland.

The second part of this study aimed to analyse the choice between full-time work, part-time work and non-employment among women with young children in each of the EU-15 member States, using a set of multinomial logit models. Based on data from wave 7 (2000) of the ECHP, the estimation results reveal that the effects of individual and family characteristics on mothers' employment choices are far from uniform across EU countries. However, some of the differences in these estimated effects have proved difficult to interpret.

Several extensions to this work can be envisaged. First, our descriptive analysis of the labour market transitions among female part-timers should be complemented by an exploration of the determinants of the passage from part-time to full-time employment in the EU. Second, when focusing on women with young children, an attempt should be made to examine the possible interdependence of fertility and labour supply decisions. Finally, in this analysis of the employment choices of mothers, the role of child care costs should be taken into account more explicitly.

References

- Anxo D., Stancanelli E., Storrie D. (2000), "Transitions between different working-time arrangements : a comparison of Sweden and the Netherlands", in O'Reilly J. et al. (eds.), *Working-Time Changes. Social Integration Through Transitional Labour Markets*, Cheltenham : Edward Elgar, pp. 93-131.
- Ariza A., de la Rica S., Ugidos A. (2003), "The effect of flexibility in working hours on fertility : A comparative analysis of selected European countries", *DFAEII Working Paper*, n° 2003-08, Bilbao : Universidad del País Vasco – Departamento de Fundamentos del Analisis Economico II, 42 p.
- Bardasi E., Gornick J. C. (2000), "Women and Part-Time Employment : Workers' 'Choices' and Wage Penalties in Five Industrialized Countries", *ISER Working paper*, 2000-11, Colchester : University of Essex, 45 p. + tables.
- Blank R. M. (1994), "The Dynamics of Part-Time Work", *NBER Working paper*, n° 4911, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Bourreau-Dubois C., Guillot O., Jankeliowitch-Laval E. (2001), "Le travail à temps partiel féminin et ses déterminants", *Economie et Statistique*, n° 349-350, pp. 41-61.
- Cebrián I., Gash V., Moreno G., O'Connell P.J., Toharia L. (2000), "Peripheral labour in peripheral markets ? Mobility and working time within transitional labour markets among women in Ireland and Spain", in O'Reilly J. et al. (eds.), *Working-Time Changes. Social Integration Through Transitional Labour Markets*, Cheltenham : Edward Elgar, pp. 205-248.
- Corral A., Isusi I. (2003), *Part-time work in Europe*, Dublin : European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, 19 p.
- DeMaris A. (1992), "Logit Modeling : Practical Applications", *Sage University Paper Series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences*, n° 86, Newbury Park, CA : Sage, 87 p.
- EUROSTAT (2001), *ECHP UDB. Construction of variables. From ECHP questions to UDB variables*, Doc. PAN 167/01, Luxembourg : EUROSTAT.
- Franco A., Jouhette S. (2001), "Labour Force Survey. Principal results 2000", *Statistics in focus*, n° 10/2001, Theme 3 – Population and social conditions, Luxembourg : EUROSTAT.
- Galtier B. (1999), "Le temps partiel est-il une passerelle vers le temps plein ?", *Economie et Statistique*, n° 321-322, pp. 79-87.
- Gauthier A.H. (2000), "Public policies affecting fertility and families in Europe : A survey of the 15 member states", *Paper prepared for the European Observatory on Family Matters – Annual Seminar 2000 : 'Low Fertility, Families and Public Policies'*, Sevilla, 15-16 Sept. 2000, 43 p.
- Gornick J.C., Meyers M.K., Ross K.E. (1996), "Public Policies and the Employment of Mothers : A Cross-National Study", *LIS Working Paper*, n° 140, Luxembourg, 36 p. + tables
- Gustafsson S., Kenjoh E., Wetzels C. (2001), "Employment Choices and Pay Differences between Non-Standard and Standard Work in Britain, Germany, Netherlands and Sweden", *Tinbergen Institute Discussion Paper*, Amsterdam / Rotterdam : Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam / Universiteit van Amsterdam / Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, n° 01-086/3, 35 p.
- Gutiérrez-Domènech M. (2003), "Employment After Motherhood : A European Comparison", *CEP Discussion Paper*, n° 0567, London : Centre for Economic Performance, London School of Economics and Political Science, 31 p.
- Heckman J.J. (1979), "Sample Selection Bias as a Specification Error", *Econometrica*, vol. 47, n° 1, pp. 153-161.
- Hu Y., Tijdens K. (2003), "Choices for part-time jobs and the impacts on the wage differentials : A comparative study for Great Britain and the Netherlands", *IRISS Working Paper Series*, n° 2003-05, Differdange : CEPS / INSTEAD, 36 p.
- Kenjoh E. (2003), "Women's Employment around Birth of the First Child in Britain, Germany, The Netherlands, Sweden and Japan", *ISER Working Paper*, 2003-16, Colchester : University of Essex, 37 p.
- Lohmann H. (2001), "Self-employed or employee, full-time or part-time ? Gender differences in the determinants and conditions for self-employment in Europe and the US", *MZES Working Paper*, n° 38, Mannheim : Mannheimer Zentrum für Europäische Sozialforschung, 22 p.

Liao T.F. (1994), "Interpreting Probability Models : Logit, Probit, and Other Generalized Linear Models", *Sage University Paper Series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences*, n° 101, Thousand Oaks, CA : Sage, 88 p.

Madalozzo R. (2002), "An Analysis of Income Differentials by Marital Status", *Ibmec Working Paper*, São Paulo : Ibmecc Business School, 31 p.

Muehlberger U. (2000), "Women's Labour Force Attachment in Europe : An Analytical Framework and Empirical Evidence for the Household", *IRISS Working Paper Series*, n° 2000-07, Differdange: CEPS / INSTEAD, 35 p.

O'Reilly J., Bothfeld S. (2002), "What happens after working part-time ? Integration, maintenance or exclusionary transitions in Britain and Western Germany", *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, vol. 26, n° 4, pp. 409-439.

Ruivo M., González M.P., Varejao J.M. (1998), "Why is part-time work so low in Portugal and Spain ?", in O'Reilly J., Fagan C. (eds.), *Part-Time Prospects : International Comparisons of Part-Time Work in Europe, North-America and the Pacific Rim*, London : Routledge, pp. 199-213.

Smith M., Cebrián I., Davia M.A., Hernanz V., Malo M.A. (2000), "Transitions through part-time work in Spain and the United Kingdom : a route into secure employment ?", in O'Reilly J. et al. (eds.), *Working-Time Changes. Social Integration Through Transitional Labour Markets*, Cheltenham : Edward Elgar, pp. 173-204.

Tijdens K. (1999), "Are Secondary Part-Time Jobs Marginalized ? Job Characteristics of Women Employed less than 20 hours per week in the European Union", *ISER Working paper*, 1999-20, Colchester : University of Essex, 23 p.

Vella F. (1998), "Estimating Models with Sample Selection Bias : A Survey", *Journal of Human Resources*, vol. 33, n° 1, pp. 127-169.

Table 1 :
Proportion of female part-time workers

	%															
Country	B	DK	D	EL	E	F	Irl	I	L	NL	A	P	Fin	S	UK	EU-15
(1)	30.6	22.5	35.1	17.5	19.2	20.3	39.3	24.5	26.4	55.9	28.0	13.9	13.3	18.7	38.9	27.0
(2)	39.9	35.2	37.9	7.9	17.2	31.0	30.5	17.4	26.0	70.6	33.0	16.4	16.9	36.3	44.5	33.7

(1) Sample : All employed women (according to the ILO definition) – definition of part-time work : less than 30 hours per week.
Source : ECHP UDB – version of June 2003, Wave 7.

(2) Sample : All employed women, aged 15-64 (according to the ILO definition) – definition of part-time work : self-classification of respondents.
Source : Labour Force Survey 2000 (Franco and Juhette, 2001).

B = Belgium ; DK = Denmark ; D = Germany ; EL = Greece ; E = Spain ; F = France ; Irl = Ireland ; I = Italy ; L = Luxembourg ; NL = Netherlands ; A = Austria ; P = Portugal ; Fin = Finland ; S = Sweden ; UK = United Kingdom.

Table 2 :
Short-term evolution of the employment status of individuals who entered into part-time work in year t

Country	Employment status in year t+1				Employment status in year t+2				
	Working part-time	Working full-time	Not employed	Total	Working part-time	Working full-time	Not employed	Total	
Belgium	Men (N = 97)	25.6	46.5	27.9	100.0	22.7	53.6	23.7	100.0
	Women (N = 274)	50.3	23.9	25.8	100.0	36.7	31.4	31.9	100.0
Denmark	Men (N = 100)	46.0	22.1	31.9	100.0	42.9	29.2	27.9	100.0
	Women (N = 187)	44.9	21.6	33.5	100.0	38.6	27.1	34.3	100.0
Germany	Men (N = 368)	38.3	30.2	31.5	100.0	32.6	33.9	33.5	100.0
	Women (N = 585)	45.4	18.6	36.0	100.0	34.4	24.6	41.0	100.0
Greece	Men (N = 323)	29.4	37.4	33.2	100.0	20.7	43.0	36.3	100.0
	Women (N = 429)	37.4	30.7	31.9	100.0	26.6	35.7	37.7	100.0
Spain	Men (N = 311)	21.0	36.8	42.2	100.0	18.8	46.8	34.4	100.0
	Women (N = 494)	32.5	23.6	43.9	100.0	22.5	32.3	45.2	100.0
France	Men (N = 144)	33.0	40.3	26.7	100.0	18.6	43.9	37.5	100.0
	Women (N = 311)	49.6	22.9	27.5	100.0	34.2	29.3	36.5	100.0
Ireland	Men (N = 227)	48.4	26.8	24.8	100.0	39.2	37.5	23.3	100.0
	Women (N = 346)	52.1	20.9	27.0	100.0	43.2	26.8	30.0	100.0
Italy	Men (N = 345)	29.5	29.8	40.7	100.0	23.3	39.0	37.7	100.0
	Women (N = 467)	41.2	26.0	32.8	100.0	37.8	26.6	35.6	100.0
Luxembourg	Men (N = 25)	//	//	//	//	//	//	//	//
	Women (N = 126)	67.1	12.2	20.7	100.0	55.6	25.3	19.1	100.0
Netherlands	Men (N = 186)	56.8	26.1	17.1	100.0	37.5	39.0	23.5	100.0
	Women (N = 556)	69.3	12.8	17.9	100.0	62.5	18.0	19.5	100.0
Austria	Men (N = 95)	32.5	29.0	38.5	100.0	20.6	30.1	49.3	100.0
	Women (N = 273)	58.8	16.4	24.8	100.0	47.5	19.1	33.4	100.0
Portugal	Men (N = 277)	35.2	38.5	26.3	100.0	30.4	40.7	28.9	100.0
	Women (N = 533)	47.1	26.6	26.3	100.0	36.8	35.3	27.9	100.0
Finland	Men (N = 111)	33.6	31.5	34.9	100.0	23.7	46.2	30.1	100.0
	Women (N = 192)	40.9	32.7	26.4	100.0	23.3	44.0	32.7	100.0
United Kingdom	Men (N = 269)	35.2	48.1	16.7	100.0	27.2	53.8	19.0	100.0
	Women (N = 631)	57.2	21.8	21.0	100.0	49.9	24.4	25.7	100.0

Sample : Individuals whose employment status was observed each year (at the survey date) from 1994, or at least from 1997, until 2000.

// Insufficient sample size.

Source : ECHP UDB – version of June 2003, Waves 1-7.

Table 3 :
Short-term evolution of the employment status of individuals who entered into full-time work in year t

Country	Employment status in year t+1				Employment status in year t+2				%
	Working full-time	Working part-time	Not employed	Total	Working full-time	Working part-time	Not employed	Total	
Belgium									
Men (N = 120)	83.7	1.8	14.5	100.0	83.6	6.7	9.7	100.0	
Women (N = 171)	71.0	20.4	8.6	100.0	66.1	22.2	11.7	100.0	
Denmark									
Men (N = 144)	70.3	9.6	20.1	100.0	81.5	6.3	12.2	100.0	
Women (N = 244)	67.8	9.9	22.3	100.0	59.7	18.3	22.0	100.0	
Germany									
Men (N = 460)	77.8	7.1	15.1	100.0	71.7	8.0	20.3	100.0	
Women (N = 518)	63.6	18.5	17.9	100.0	59.7	20.7	19.6	100.0	
Greece									
Men (N = 454)	74.9	7.0	18.1	100.0	72.2	6.1	21.7	100.0	
Women (N = 610)	62.1	12.6	25.3	100.0	55.7	12.9	31.4	100.0	
Spain									
Men (N = 649)	67.4	8.0	24.6	100.0	68.8	7.0	24.2	100.0	
Women (N = 616)	60.8	7.2	32.0	100.0	56.0	9.1	34.9	100.0	
France									
Men (N = 268)	69.6	8.6	21.8	100.0	75.8	5.4	18.8	100.0	
Women (N = 404)	69.7	13.5	16.8	100.0	65.9	11.1	23.0	100.0	
Ireland									
Men (N = 254)	70.2	9.9	19.9	100.0	73.9	9.2	16.9	100.0	
Women (N = 274)	69.3	17.8	12.9	100.0	63.0	17.9	19.1	100.0	
Italy									
Men (N = 637)	78.3	7.0	14.7	100.0	75.6	6.2	18.2	100.0	
Women (N = 592)	65.3	12.3	22.4	100.0	59.1	14.2	26.7	100.0	
Luxembourg									
Men (N = 37)	//	//	//	//	//	//	//	//	
Women (N = 74)	71.6	12.1	16.3	100.0	67.2	15.8	17.0	100.0	
Netherlands									
Men (N = 232)	78.2	7.6	14.2	100.0	82.5	8.2	9.3	100.0	
Women (N = 345)	65.2	25.4	9.4	100.0	63.3	27.3	9.4	100.0	
Austria									
Men (N = 123)	85.5	5.4	9.1	100.0	76.7	6.5	16.8	100.0	
Women (N = 205)	65.3	17.5	17.2	100.0	65.7	14.7	19.6	100.0	
Portugal									
Men (N = 454)	79.6	3.5	16.9	100.0	77.2	3.6	19.2	100.0	
Women (N = 692)	74.6	7.9	17.5	100.0	72.7	9.2	18.1	100.0	
Finland									
Men (N = 199)	73.3	2.8	23.9	100.0	74.2	5.4	20.4	100.0	
Women (N = 255)	64.1	10.0	25.9	100.0	63.5	11.4	25.1	100.0	
United Kingdom									
Men (N = 346)	78.2	10.7	11.1	100.0	77.2	9.7	13.1	100.0	
Women (N = 523)	65.9	24.9	9.2	100.0	64.3	24.5	11.2	100.0	

Sample : Individuals whose employment status was observed each year (at the survey date) from 1994, or at least from 1997, until 2000.

// Insufficient sample size.

Source : ECHP UDB – version of June 2003, Waves 1-7.

Table 4 :

Characteristics of women who entered into part-time work in year t, according to the type of trajectory in years t+1 and t+2

Country	Belgium				Germany				Greece				Spain				France				
	Part-time work in years t+1/t+2	Transition to non-employment	full-time work	All	Part-time work in years t+1/t+2	Transition to non-employment	full-time work	All	Part-time work in years t+1/t+2	Transition to non-employment	full-time work	All	Part-time work in years t+1/t+2	Transition to non-employment	full-time work	All	Part-time work in years t+1/t+2	Transition to non-employment	full-time work	All	
Age in t (%)																					
< 30 years old	31.8	35.8	54.3	41.1	19.5	31.3	36.6	29.9	28.3	27.8	30.8	29.2	35.3	42.6	44.2	42.2	32.6	50.3	35.7	40.3	
30-50 years old	52.9	38.8	41.2	44.0	57.3	30.2	45.7	41.7	51.8	29.0	48.3	42.3	50.8	34.8	40.3	39.0	53.4	39.1	54.9	48.6	
>= 50 years old	15.3	25.4	4.5	14.9	23.2	38.5	17.7	28.4	19.9	43.2	20.9	28.5	13.9	22.6	15.5	18.8	14.0	10.6	9.4	11.1	
Mean age (in years)	35.8	37.9	32.0	35.2	40.7	42.9	36.4	40.4	40.6	43.7	38.5	40.7	35.0	36.5	33.8	35.3	37.3	32.8	35.2	34.9	
Education level (%)																					
Third level	39.4	33.3	65.6	46.7	29.2	12.9	32.4	22.9	28.6	19.3	25.7	24.0	26.0	19.2	33.4	25.6	28.7	33.2	42.2	35.2	
2 nd stage of secondary ed.	41.5	33.0	26.0	33.1	57.7	50.9	57.0	54.4	13.4	22.0	18.8	18.9	21.3	20.0	20.5	20.3	39.8	33.0	36.5	36.1	
Lower level	19.1	33.7	8.4	20.2	13.1	36.2	10.6	22.7	58.0	58.7	55.5	57.1	52.7	60.8	46.1	54.1	31.5	33.8	21.3	28.7	
Activity status in t-1 (%)																					
Working full-time	47.2	12.7	56.4	38.8	23.1	8.4	59.4	27.3	45.0	26.5	61.7	46.1	21.9	11.3	38.7	23.2	37.1	34.1	57.5	43.2	
Unemployed	26.4	12.2	15.2	17.7	19.1	9.7	12.7	13.0	12.0	11.4	13.1	12.3	37.5	35.4	35.6	35.8	19.8	31.8	16.8	23.2	
In education or training	8.0	28.6	24.1	20.7	14.4	16.1	21.2	17.2	2.9	8.2	4.8	5.6	5.9	16.9	8.9	12.3	7.7	14.7	6.1	9.8	
Other inactive	18.4	46.5	4.3	22.8	43.4	65.8	6.7	42.5	40.1	53.9	20.4	36.0	34.7	36.4	16.8	28.7	35.4	19.4	19.6	23.8	
Working at least 20 hours per week in t (%)	49.7	12.7	58.7	40.4	30.7	16.7	49.8	30.1	53.1	41.3	70.7	56.9	55.3	19.7	61.1	40.3	72.6	66.6	77.3	72.0	
Reason for PT work (%)																					
Undergoing educ./training	8.2	31.8	18.5	19.5	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.0	6.4	0.7	2.7	10.7	15.3	6.5	11.4	1.7	5.7	0.9	2.9	
Family reasons	37.9	29.3	30.3	32.4					22.5	24.6	38.6	30.4	31.8	25.4	18.3	23.6	42.4	27.3	21.4	29.7	
Personal illness / disability	1.1	2.8	0.5	1.4					5.2	3.4	2.1	3.2	0.0	2.9	5.6	3.5	6.8	10.6	7.5	8.5	
Cannot find a full-time job	23.9	18.3	38.3	27.3					39.9	28.5	28.7	30.7	32.0	30.6	41.0	34.7	29.8	44.3	40.4	38.8	
Other reasons	28.9	17.8	12.4	19.4					32.4	37.1	29.9	33.0	25.5	25.8	28.6	26.8	19.3	12.1	29.8	20.1	
N	95	85	94	274	166	216	203	585	78	157	194	429	69	247	178	494	87	114	110	311	

	Ireland				Italy				Netherlands				Portugal				United Kingdom			
	Part-time work in years t+1/t+2	Transition to non-employment	full-time work	All	Part-time work in years t+1/t+2	Transition to non-employment	full-time work	All	Part-time work in years t+1/t+2	Transition to non-employment	full-time work	All	Part-time work in years t+1/t+2	Transition to non-employment	full-time work	All	Part-time work in years t+1/t+2	Transition to non-employment	full-time work	All
	19.6	42.6	46.4	36.0	32.6	29.7	38.9	33.7	28.0	30.5	50.9	33.9	13.9	15.9	26.0	19.6	19.7	30.4	36.8	28.0
	65.8	41.2	48.7	52.0	52.9	43.7	45.1	47.0	61.1	50.8	38.7	53.5	34.1	26.1	44.6	36.3	60.4	40.3	50.6	51.8
	14.6	16.2	4.9	12.0	14.5	26.6	16.0	19.3	10.9	18.7	10.4	12.6	52.0	58.0	29.4	44.1	19.9	29.3	12.6	20.2
	38.9	35.5	29.9	34.8	36.1	39.6	35.9	37.3	35.5	36.7	32.7	35.2	48.9	50.9	40.6	46.0	39.7	39.1	35.1	38.1
	14.5	14.7	28.1	19.1	15.6	5.2	12.3	10.8	18.9	11.1	15.6	16.3	18.1	1.2	17.1	12.9	29.8	24.3	45.5	33.2
	39.1	41.7	34.4	38.4	57.1	32.2	50.7	46.0	59.2	60.5	54.3	58.4	4.5	11.4	6.6	7.3	26.9	24.8	25.3	25.8
	46.4	43.6	37.5	42.5	27.3	62.6	37.0	43.2	21.9	28.4	30.1	25.3	77.4	87.4	76.3	79.8	43.3	50.9	29.2	41.0
	32.3	11.2	40.5	28.0	44.7	23.8	58.5	41.9	38.9	18.5	38.5	34.0	44.5	17.4	55.8	41.6	39.0	29.0	66.5	44.7
	11.7	18.6	21.1	17.1	20.4	19.8	20.7	20.3	15.1	15.7	12.7	14.7	1.9	2.6	6.2	3.9	7.1	9.5	5.6	7.3
	0.8	12.3	19.9	10.9	9.8	9.7	8.8	9.4	11.6	8.5	36.8	16.7	7.0	8.9	10.2	8.9	3.8	6.2	13.3	7.4
	55.2	57.9	18.5	44.0	25.1	46.7	12.0	28.4	34.4	57.3	12.0	34.6	46.6	71.1	27.8	45.6	50.1	55.3	14.6	40.6
	60.3	36.1	55.4	50.7	67.7	41.3	62.6	56.6	37.1	25.1	47.5	36.7	44.6	44.1	53.9	48.4	39.2	29.3	50.7	40.0
	0.6	12.5	25.9	12.6	14.9	9.6	5.1	9.3	9.5	15.9	35.7	17.1	0.8	7.0	7.3	5.4	(b)	(b)	(b)	(b)
	51.2	55.8	21.7	43.5	39.7	27.5	31.8	31.8	58.1	40.4	21.7	45.5	23.1	29.9	21.2	24.4				
	1.3	0.0	0.1	0.5	1.2	1.5	3.2	2.0	2.6	4.0	1.0	2.5	24.7	21.1	14.2	19.1				
	24.3	16.4	40.2	26.6	24.0	23.4	26.9	24.8	9.2	9.5	21.2	12.1	17.1	19.3	31.9	24.1				
	22.6	15.3	12.1	16.8	20.2	38.0	33.0	32.1	20.6	30.2	20.4	22.8	34.3	22.7	25.4	27.0				
	139	103	104	346	127	179	161	467	304	134	118	556	159	164	210	533	258	178	195	631

Sample : Individuals whose employment status was observed each year from 1994, or at least from 1997, until 2000. (a) : information incomplete (b) : not available Source : ECHP UDB – version of June 2003, Waves 1-7.

Table 5 :

Employment rate, proportion of part-time workers and proportion of “short” part-time workers among mothers with young children

Country	B	DK	D	EL	E	F	Irl	I	L	NL	A	P	Fin	S	UK	EU-15
Employment rate	73.0	80.9	53.5	48.6	40.5	57.0	49.0	46.5	49.7	64.8	71.2	77.0	74.6	78.2	61.9	60.8
Proportion of part-time workers ⁽¹⁾	32.4	12.6	58.1	10.8	23.0	22.1	53.5	24.3	41.8	79.0	46.4	8.4	9.8	19.1	58.8	33.0
Proportion of “short” part-time workers ⁽²⁾	50.2	//	60.4	//	45.7	18.7	31.7	33.2	11.9	57.5	34.7	42.3	//	20.1	54.9	43.9

Sample : Mothers, aged 18-59, whose youngest child is under 12 years old (teachers are excluded from the sample).

Statistics based on the ILO definition of the activity status. “Short” part-time workers are defined as those working less than 20 hours per week.

⁽¹⁾ Among employed mothers.

⁽²⁾ Among mothers working part-time.

// Insufficient sample size.

Source : ECHP UDB – version of June 2003, Wave 7.

Table 6 :

Main reason for working part-time

Country	B	E	F	Irl	I	NL	A
Undergoing education or training	0.2	0.1	0.0	1.7	0.3	0.0	0.4
Housework, looking after children or other persons	67.6	58.8	73.9	71.9	75.1	90.3	95.2
Personal illness or disability	0.8	0.3	0.2	1.7	0.0	1.2	0.0
Want but cannot find a full-time job	12.4	20.4	14.2	6.0	4.1	0.4	1.7
Do not want to work more hours	14.1	6.6	5.7	16.9	20.0	5.2	0.9
Other reasons	4.9	13.8	6.0	1.8	0.5	2.9	1.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Sample : Mothers, aged 18-59, whose youngest child is under 12 years old, working part-time (teachers are excluded from the sample).

Information incomplete for Germany and not available for Luxembourg, Sweden and the UK. Insufficient sample size for Denmark, Greece, Portugal and Finland.

Source : ECHP UDB – version of June 2003, Wave 7.

Table 7 :
Estimated parameters of the wage equations

Variables	B	DK	D	EL	E	F	Irl	I	L	NL	A	P	Fin	S	UK
Intercept	0.727 ** (0.163)	0.956 ** (0.107)	0.271 ** (0.127)	-0.952 ** (0.252)	0.040 (0.148)	0.032 (0.194)	0.679 ** (0.140)	0.228 (0.146)	0.846 ** (0.303)	0.465 ** (0.112)	0.828 ** (0.157)	0.169 ** (0.045)	0.944 ** (0.171)	0.807 ** (0.266)	0.860 ** (0.097)
Age	0.042 ** (0.008)	0.052 ** (0.005)	0.070 ** (0.007)	0.090 ** (0.010)	0.062 ** (0.007)	0.080 ** (0.009)	0.051 ** (0.007)	0.053 ** (0.006)	0.059 ** (0.017)	0.073 ** (0.006)	0.036 ** (0.008)	0.017 ** (0.001)	0.045 ** (0.008)	0.044 ** (0.012)	0.059 ** (0.005)
Age-squared	-0.000 ** (0.000)	-0.001 ** (0.000)	-0.001 ** (0.000)	-0.001 ** (0.000)	-0.001 ** (0.000)	-0.001 ** (0.000)	-0.001 ** (0.000)	-0.001 ** (0.000)	-0.001 ** (0.000)	-0.001 ** (0.000)	-0.001 ** (0.000)	-0.001 ** (0.000)	-0.000 ** (0.000)	-0.000 ** (0.000)	-0.001 ** (0.000)
Education level															
Third level of education	0.405 ** (0.040)	0.266 ** (0.031)	0.440 ** (0.036)	0.683 ** (0.050)	0.569 ** (0.042)	0.548 ** (0.032)	0.568 ** (0.039)	0.637 ** (0.038)	0.691 ** (0.059)	0.267 ** (0.026)	0.271 ** (0.051)	0.962 ** (0.030)	0.260 ** (0.034)	0.170 ** (0.057)	0.302 ** (0.021)
Second stage of secondary education	0.198 ** (0.034)	0.137 ** (0.029)	0.170 ** (0.027)	0.312 ** (0.040)	0.242 ** (0.035)	0.198 ** (0.028)	0.256 ** (0.030)	0.294 ** (0.027)	0.374 ** (0.048)	0.017 (0.020)	0.142 ** (0.028)	0.366 ** (0.027)	0.045 (0.032)	0.040 (0.053)	0.118 ** (0.023)
Less than second stage of secondary education	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>
Place of residence															
Dublin	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.113 ** (0.026)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other cases	-	-	-	-	-	-	<i>ref.</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Information not available	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.033 (0.043)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Regional female unemployment rate	0.000 (0.002)	-	-0.016 ** (0.002)	-0.009 (0.008)	-0.007 ** (0.001)	-0.017 ** (0.004)	-	-0.004 ** (0.001)	-	-	0.016 (0.010)	0.022 ** (0.006)	-0.014 ** (0.003)	-0.019 * (0.010)	0.005 (0.005)
<i>lambda</i>	0.112 ** (0.052)	-0.036 (0.049)	-0.056 (0.040)	0.103 * (0.057)	0.011 (0.055)	0.041 (0.051)	0.007 (0.043)	0.103 ** (0.045)	0.022 (0.067)	-0.016 (0.039)	-0.204 ** (0.057)	-0.310 ** (0.048)	-0.088 (0.064)	-0.605 ** (0.103)	-0.035 (0.035)
Adjusted R-square	0.210	0.313	0.159	0.430	0.356	0.278	0.294	0.365	0.174	0.164	0.140	0.562	0.193	0.101	0.142
Mean of dependent variable	1.976	2.262	1.779	1.327	1.608	2.017	2.021	1.748	2.293	1.997	1.812	1.028	1.905	1.800	2.147
<i>N</i>	1 009	1 070	2 499	905	1 629	1 882	885	1 866	869	2 280	1 111	1 960	1 379	2 371	2 277

** : significant at 5 % level ; * : significant at 10 % level (standard errors in brackets)

Sample : Female employees, aged 18-59 (women who are undergoing education or training are excluded from the sample).

Source : ECHP UDB – version of June 2003, Wave 7.

Table 8 :
Means of explanatory variables

Variables	B	DK	D	EL	E	F	Irl	I	L	NL	A	P	Fin	S	UK
Log of hourly wage (predicted, wage in euros)	1.908 ($\sigma = 0.165$)	2.257 ($\sigma = 0.129$)	1.805 ($\sigma = 0.185$)	1.183 ($\sigma = 0.329$)	1.510 ($\sigma = 0.264$)	1.927 ($\sigma = 0.260$)	1.963 ($\sigma = 0.204$)	1.577 ($\sigma = 0.239$)	2.286 ($\sigma = 0.270$)	2.027 ($\sigma = 0.133$)	1.879 ($\sigma = 0.118$)	1.045 ($\sigma = 0.372$)	1.926 ($\sigma = 0.160$)	1.891 ($\sigma = 0.155$)	2.177 ($\sigma = 0.147$)
Citizenship : not national	-	-	0.139	-	-	0.053	-	-	0.492	-	0.078	-	-	0.078	0.036
Chronic health problem, illness or disability	0.094	0.236	0.224	-	0.080	0.109	0.148	0.038	-	0.215	0.083	0.112	0.251	0.194	0.255
Health : information missing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.402	-
Number of children (< 18 years old)															
1	0.275	0.372	0.326	0.295	0.338	0.323	0.299	0.414	0.342	0.269	0.371	0.423	0.260	0.287	0.313
2	0.489	0.426	0.484	0.576	0.497	0.473	0.351	0.438	0.447	0.523	0.474	0.419	0.452	0.484	0.458
3 or more	0.236	0.201	0.190	0.129	0.165	0.204	0.350	0.148	0.211	0.208	0.155	0.158	0.288	0.229	0.229
Age of youngest child															
Less than 3 years old	0.271	0.403	0.148	0.253	0.232	0.337	0.324	0.271	0.219	0.256	0.296	0.220	0.354	0.272	0.308
3-5 years old	0.261	0.245	0.295	0.269	0.256	0.252	0.228	0.281	0.278	0.263	0.237	0.315	0.242	0.287	0.247
6-11 years old	0.468	0.352	0.557	0.478	0.512	0.411	0.448	0.448	0.503	0.481	0.467	0.465	0.404	0.441	0.445
Marital (or cohabiting) status / husband's (or partner's) employment status and earnings level															
Lone mother	0.087	0.064	0.144	0.040	0.053	0.081	0.224	0.054	0.098	0.111	0.121	0.124	0.090	0.151	0.205
Married / not employed	0.098	0.104	0.143	0.048	0.098	0.065	0.091	0.059	0.037	0.093	0.038	0.034	0.079	0.098	0.069
Married / employed – first quartile	0.201	0.209	0.178	0.228	0.213	0.213	0.168	0.216	0.229	0.198	0.211	0.211	0.209	0.187	0.161
Married / employed – second quartile	0.207	0.208	0.179	0.227	0.212	0.214	0.168	0.226	0.202	0.199	0.210	0.210	0.205	0.188	0.157
Married / employed – third quartile	0.205	0.208	0.177	0.228	0.212	0.211	0.178	0.228	0.222	0.199	0.210	0.209	0.208	0.188	0.162
Married / employed – fourth quartile	0.202	0.207	0.179	0.229	0.212	0.216	0.171	0.217	0.212	0.200	0.210	0.212	0.209	0.188	0.159
Married / employed – earnings missing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.087
Presence of other adults in the household (including children aged 18 or older)	0.079	0.093	0.165	0.197	0.289	0.102	0.232	0.174	0.133	0.041	0.240	0.320	0.070	0.066	0.093
Housing tenure status															
Tenant / subtenant	0.229	0.217	0.425	0.150	0.085	0.402	0.253	0.217	0.274	-	0.357	0.242	0.227	-	0.264
Homeowner – with loan payments	0.682	0.729	0.414	0.123	0.399	0.493	0.560	0.188	0.625	0.669	0.338	0.267	0.618	0.687	0.636
Homeowner – without loan payments (or rent-free housing)	0.089	0.054	0.161	0.727	0.516	0.105	0.187	0.595	0.101	-	0.305	0.491	0.155	-	0.100
Repayment of debts or loans (other than housing-related loans)	0.351	0.642	0.275	0.199	0.289	0.516	0.470	0.204	0.500	0.327	0.230	0.281	0.576	-	0.410
N	614	490	995	782	1 101	1 143	538	1 368	576	976	593	1 101	635	1 204	1 077

Sample : Mothers, aged 18-59, whose youngest child is under 12 years old (teachers are excluded from the sample).

Source : ECHP UDB – version of June 2003, Wave 7.

Table 9 :
Estimated parameters of the multinomial logit models – Part-time work vs. non-employment

Variables	B	DK	D	EL	E	F	Irl	I	L	NL	A	P	Fin	S	UK
Intercept	-5.306 ** (1.480)	-14.073 ** (4.174)	-5.270 ** (0.990)	-3.059 ** (0.939)	-5.036 ** (0.782)	-3.654 ** (0.846)	-5.930 ** (1.376)	-6.575 ** (0.727)	-3.238 ** (1.143)	-3.531 ** (1.314)	-0.037 (2.099)	-1.438 ** (0.626)	-2.976 (2.374)	-4.694 ** (1.517)	-1.899 (1.217)
Log of hourly wage	2.847 ** (0.800)	5.753 ** (1.823)	2.765 ** (0.542)	1.198 ** (0.573)	1.598 ** (0.452)	1.458 ** (0.425)	2.907 ** (0.675)	3.107 ** (0.436)	1.294 ** (0.503)	2.217 ** (0.651)	0.637 (1.086)	0.687 (0.429)	1.145 (1.227)	2.257 ** (0.792)	1.078 * (0.559)
Citizenship : not national	-	-	-0.084 (0.260)	-	-	-0.464 (0.526)	-	-	-0.149 (0.280)	-	-1.303 ** (0.478)	-	-	-0.911 ** (0.359)	-0.809 * (0.419)
Chronic health problem, illness, disability	-0.996 ** (0.440)	-0.570 (0.461)	-0.125 (0.196)	-	0.262 (0.377)	-0.788 ** (0.361)	-1.093 ** (0.339)	0.248 (0.428)	-	-0.898 ** (0.182)	0.431 (0.421)	0.064 (0.452)	0.146 (0.384)	-0.034 (0.273)	-0.551 ** (0.178)
Health : information missing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0.360 (0.241)	-
Number of children (< 18 years old)															
1	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>
2	-0.141 (0.317)	0.537 (0.493)	-0.093 (0.199)	-0.395 (0.392)	0.512 * (0.269)	-0.167 (0.247)	-0.043 (0.353)	-0.402 ** (0.204)	-0.071 (0.276)	-0.138 (0.189)	-0.434 * (0.262)	-0.436 (0.314)	0.218 (0.471)	0.269 (0.259)	-0.388 ** (0.187)
3 or more	-0.693 * (0.360)	1.402 ** (0.559)	-0.033 (0.242)	0.339 (0.514)	0.287 (0.362)	-0.776 ** (0.299)	-0.074 (0.366)	-0.599 ** (0.283)	-1.994 ** (0.428)	-0.642 ** (0.228)	-1.139 ** (0.362)	-0.879 ** (0.430)	0.315 (0.494)	-0.064 (0.301)	-0.619 ** (0.216)
Age of youngest child															
Less than 3 years old	0.305 (0.311)	-0.153 (0.513)	-1.010 ** (0.275)	-1.476 ** (0.580)	-0.226 (0.289)	-0.467 * (0.239)	-1.488 ** (0.297)	0.230 (0.236)	-0.489 (0.330)	-0.370 * (0.200)	-1.483 ** (0.301)	-0.908 ** (0.379)	-1.388 ** (0.424)	-0.577 * (0.296)	-1.059 ** (0.190)
3-5 years old	0.312 (0.300)	-0.003 (0.591)	-0.392 ** (0.186)	-0.363 (0.403)	-0.208 (0.272)	0.042 (0.248)	-0.224 (0.287)	0.427 * (0.220)	-0.366 (0.288)	-0.378 ** (0.187)	-0.313 (0.282)	-1.031 ** (0.328)	-0.595 (0.507)	0.334 (0.254)	-0.701 ** (0.191)
6-11 years old	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>
Marital (or cohabiting) status / husband's (or partner's) employment status and earnings level															
Lone mother	-0.197 (0.497)	-0.348 (0.900)	-1.002 ** (0.381)	1.204 * (0.722)	1.599 ** (0.568)	-0.743 (0.509)	0.435 (0.441)	0.048 (0.503)	-0.341 (0.693)	-0.811 ** (0.295)	-0.525 (0.460)	-1.546 * (0.875)	-0.484 (0.762)	-0.551 (0.378)	-0.119 (0.257)
Married / not employed	-1.274 ** (0.454)	-1.132 (0.828)	-0.495 (0.317)	0.485 (0.677)	0.130 (0.495)	-0.808 (0.573)	-1.266 ** (0.556)	-0.324 (0.485)	1.033 (0.714)	-0.398 (0.309)	-1.713 ** (0.737)	-1.809 (1.355)	-0.388 (0.734)	-0.742 ** (0.370)	-0.613 * (0.356)
Married / employed – first quartile	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>
Married / employed – second quartile	-0.382 (0.404)	-0.552 (0.688)	1.028 ** (0.291)	-0.063 (0.524)	0.460 (0.380)	-0.086 (0.311)	0.142 (0.402)	-0.792 ** (0.311)	-0.344 (0.397)	0.324 (0.254)	-0.167 (0.343)	0.552 (0.393)	0.887 * (0.500)	0.083 (0.317)	0.593 ** (0.291)
Married / employed – third quartile	-0.205 (0.403)	0.500 (0.630)	0.160 (0.286)	-0.661 (0.589)	0.473 (0.376)	0.420 (0.296)	0.285 (0.390)	-0.283 (0.281)	-0.307 (0.422)	-0.589 ** (0.247)	0.044 (0.353)	-0.135 (0.393)	-0.914 (0.643)	0.092 (0.349)	0.220 (0.281)
Married / employed – fourth quartile	-0.893 ** (0.402)	0.489 (0.572)	-0.909 ** (0.299)	-0.101 (0.529)	0.379 (0.394)	-0.228 (0.321)	-0.157 (0.398)	-0.094 (0.277)	-0.422 (0.427)	-0.709 ** (0.256)	0.245 (0.347)	-0.458 (0.459)	0.168 (0.566)	-0.352 (0.366)	-0.233 (0.276)
Married / employed – earnings missing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0.062 (0.320)
Presence of other adults in the household (including children aged 18 or older)	-0.975 ** (0.495)	-2.132 ** (0.695)	-0.060 (0.245)	-0.009 (0.419)	-0.148 (0.276)	-0.864 ** (0.402)	0.260 (0.286)	-0.008 (0.245)	0.084 (0.396)	-0.565 (0.373)	-0.556 * (0.306)	-0.316 (0.334)	-0.592 (0.696)	0.287 (0.437)	-0.774 ** (0.292)
Housing tenure status															
Tenant / subtenant	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	0.982 ** (0.348)	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>
Homeowner – with loan payments	0.952 ** (0.317)	0.738 (0.565)	0.467 ** (0.198)	-0.035 (0.718)	0.188 (0.244)	0.439 * (0.228)	0.022 (0.331)	0.636 ** (0.304)	0.038 (0.317)	0.425 ** (0.193)	0.116 (0.292)	0.582 (0.458)	0.012 (0.444)	0.864 ** (0.238)	0.824 ** (0.202)
Homeowner – without loan payments (or rent-free housing)	0.086 (0.455)	1.207 (0.901)	0.076 (0.257)	-0.000 (0.525)	<i>ref.</i>	-0.016 (0.352)	-0.177 (0.374)	0.325 (0.258)	-0.082 (0.476)	-	-0.200 (0.321)	0.751 ** (0.377)	0.035 (0.608)	-0.345 (0.282)	-0.345 (0.282)
Repayment of debts or loans (other than housing-related loans)	0.038 (0.258)	0.171 (0.429)	0.578 ** (0.195)	-0.030 (0.453)	-0.025 (0.248)	0.197 (0.203)	0.382 (0.233)	0.448 ** (0.223)	0.541 ** (0.237)	0.470 ** (0.169)	0.452 (0.275)	0.163 (0.344)	0.213 (0.360)	-	0.459 ** (0.161)

Table 9 (continued)

Estimated parameters of the multinomial logit models – Full-time work vs. non-employment

Variables	B	DK	D	EL	E	F	Irl	I	L	NL	A	P	Fin	S	UK
Intercept	-7.855 ** (1.397)	-11.999 ** (2.916)	-5.417 ** (1.077)	-2.020 ** (0.427)	-5.177 ** (0.516)	-2.938 ** (0.598)	-9.811 ** (1.503)	-5.274 ** (0.509)	-5.824 ** (1.157)	-8.604 ** (1.805)	-0.240 (1.887)	0.500 (0.353)	-6.162 ** (1.440)	-5.835 ** (1.186)	-6.167 ** (1.415)
Log of hourly wage	4.502 ** (0.751)	5.721 ** (1.289)	3.168 ** (0.593)	2.236 ** (0.274)	2.817 ** (0.309)	2.009 ** (0.305)	4.152 ** (0.722)	3.200 ** (0.316)	2.474 ** (0.514)	4.419 ** (0.886)	0.778 (0.977)	0.512 ** (0.259)	3.852 ** (0.742)	3.692 ** (0.623)	2.999 ** (0.648)
Citizenship : not national	-	-	-0.139 (0.304)	-	-	-0.250 (0.323)	-	-	0.866 ** (0.291)	-	-0.345 (0.384)	-	-	-1.512 ** (0.276)	-1.230 ** (0.537)
Chronic health problem, illness, disability	-0.527 (0.356)	-0.653 * (0.335)	-0.435 * (0.227)	-	-0.262 (0.280)	-0.750 ** (0.232)	-1.488 ** (0.455)	-0.208 (0.341)	-	-1.348 ** (0.303)	-0.026 (0.418)	0.091 (0.270)	-0.532 ** (0.247)	-0.249 (0.219)	-0.568 ** (0.204)
Health : information missing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0.089 (0.189)	-
Number of children (< 18 years old)															
1	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>
2	-0.779 ** (0.283)	0.096 (0.328)	0.058 (0.226)	-0.077 (0.185)	-0.135 (0.168)	-0.994 ** (0.166)	-0.955 ** (0.342)	-0.410 ** (0.140)	-1.157 ** (0.275)	-0.764 ** (0.260)	-0.464 * (0.247)	-0.435 ** (0.178)	-0.079 (0.270)	-0.234 (0.193)	-0.983 ** (0.208)
3 or more	-1.339 ** (0.321)	0.008 (0.434)	-0.464 (0.303)	0.202 (0.267)	0.128 (0.220)	-2.017 ** (0.217)	-1.448 ** (0.367)	-0.836 ** (0.205)	-2.615 ** (0.387)	-1.471 ** (0.353)	-0.887 ** (0.321)	-0.749 ** (0.219)	-0.474 (0.292)	-0.693 ** (0.228)	-1.276 ** (0.252)
Age of youngest child															
Less than 3 years old	0.777 ** (0.280)	-0.275 (0.391)	-1.398 ** (0.339)	-0.231 (0.201)	0.236 (0.184)	-0.777 ** (0.172)	-0.608 ** (0.297)	-0.114 (0.159)	0.181 (0.308)	-0.493 * (0.291)	-0.342 (0.259)	-0.448 ** (0.209)	-1.697 ** (0.261)	-0.283 (0.219)	-1.245 ** (0.217)
3-5 years old	0.518 * (0.277)	0.475 (0.432)	-0.646 ** (0.224)	0.079 (0.194)	0.139 (0.178)	-0.086 (0.179)	-0.314 (0.347)	-0.064 (0.155)	0.257 (0.291)	-0.606 ** (0.283)	-0.471 (0.291)	-0.757 ** (0.177)	-0.016 (0.315)	-0.046 (0.209)	-0.983 ** (0.227)
6-11 years old	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>
Marital (or cohabiting) status / husband's (or partner's) employment status and earnings level															
Lone mother	0.097 (0.450)	-0.009 (0.575)	-0.625 ** (0.302)	0.472 (0.451)	1.496 ** (0.352)	-0.199 (0.292)	1.785 ** (0.527)	1.109 ** (0.335)	1.473 ** (0.487)	-0.777 * (0.406)	0.233 (0.389)	0.477 * (0.287)	0.054 (0.433)	-0.046 (0.289)	-0.377 (0.298)
Married / not employed	-1.854 ** (0.459)	-0.760 (0.479)	-1.326 ** (0.311)	-1.211 ** (0.446)	0.062 (0.279)	-0.092 (0.315)	0.447 (0.592)	0.328 (0.290)	0.981 (0.625)	0.009 (0.374)	-0.343 (0.527)	-0.217 (0.399)	-0.167 (0.411)	-0.948 ** (0.287)	-0.669 * (0.406)
Married / employed – first quartile	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>
Married / employed – second quartile	0.068 (0.363)	0.883 * (0.454)	-0.987 ** (0.313)	-0.585 ** (0.237)	-0.334 (0.223)	0.082 (0.217)	0.861 * (0.468)	0.036 (0.194)	-1.146 ** (0.344)	-0.353 (0.318)	-0.201 (0.318)	0.549 ** (0.237)	0.428 (0.336)	0.095 (0.256)	0.619 ** (0.313)
Married / employed – third quartile	-0.327 (0.374)	1.048 ** (0.484)	-1.992 ** (0.332)	-0.808 ** (0.240)	-0.634 ** (0.231)	0.057 (0.223)	0.665 (0.478)	-0.085 (0.198)	-1.326 ** (0.413)	-1.958 ** (0.404)	0.085 (0.325)	-0.023 (0.231)	0.002 (0.317)	1.504 * (0.280)	0.085 (0.307)
Married / employed – fourth quartile	-1.063 ** (0.370)	0.519 (0.457)	-3.591 ** (0.417)	-0.812 ** (0.245)	-0.789 ** (0.240)	-0.379 (0.232)	-0.469 (0.498)	-0.452 ** (0.212)	-2.316 ** (0.467)	-1.837 ** (0.380)	-0.337 (0.352)	0.239 (0.257)	-0.046 (0.355)	0.232 (0.281)	-1.286 ** (0.331)
Married / employed – earnings missing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0.512 (0.371)
Presence of other adults in the household (including children aged 18 or older)	-0.300 (0.376)	-2.337 ** (0.454)	0.530 ** (0.261)	0.013 (0.215)	0.301 * (0.170)	-0.671 ** (0.241)	-1.327 ** (0.402)	-0.926 ** (0.195)	0.040 (0.364)	-1.060 (0.645)	0.250 (0.273)	-0.109 (0.180)	-0.891 ** (0.412)	-0.052 (0.367)	-0.160 (0.295)
Housing tenure status															
Tenant / subtenant	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	-0.087 (0.298)	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>
Homeowner – with loan payments	1.471 ** (0.294)	0.977 ** (0.368)	0.499 ** (0.229)	0.134 (0.312)	0.695 ** (0.157)	0.724 ** (0.164)	1.880 ** (0.458)	0.705 ** (0.207)	0.274 (0.295)	0.724 ** (0.280)	-0.713 ** (0.283)	1.026 ** (0.244)	0.816 ** (0.278)	0.962 ** (0.179)	1.182 ** (0.237)
Homeowner – without loan payments (or rent-free housing)	0.009 (0.422)	0.323 (0.694)	0.099 (0.310)	-0.412 * (0.226)	<i>ref.</i>	0.167 (0.243)	1.768 ** (0.499)	0.242 (0.168)	-0.007 (0.496)	-	-0.212 (0.293)	0.563 ** (0.191)	0.541 (0.381)	-	-0.520 (0.373)
Repayment of debts or loans (other than housing-related loans)	-0.275 (0.237)	0.097 (0.319)	1.481 ** (0.216)	0.300 (0.202)	0.348 ** (0.158)	0.257 * (0.145)	0.292 (0.261)	0.225 (0.163)	0.939 ** (0.247)	0.873 ** (0.242)	-0.046 (0.265)	0.364 * (0.186)	0.480 ** (0.219)	-	0.810 ** (0.182)
Log-Likelihood	-559.20	-308.75	-864.24	-612.91	-893.48	-1 005.4	-460.96	-1 171.5	-473.55	-873.36	-588.42	-781.91	-435.80	-969.02	-1 028.1
N	614	490	995	782	1 101	1 143	538	1 368	576	976	593	1 101	635	1 204	1 077

** : significant at 5 % level ; * : significant at 10 % level (standard errors in brackets) Sample : Mothers, aged 18-59, whose youngest child is under 12 years old (teachers are excluded from the sample). Source : ECHP UDB – version of June 2003.

Table 10 :

Elasticities of the probabilities of part-time work (ε_1) and full-time work (ε_2) with respect to wage

	B	DK	D	EL	E	F	Irl	I	L	NL	A	P	Fin	S	UK
ε_1	-0,1	1,1	1,2	0,2	0,6	0,4	1,2	1,6	0,3	0,5	0,1	0,3	-1,5	-0,4	-0,1
ε_2	1,6	1,1	1,6	1,2	1,8	0,9	2,5	1,7	1,5	2,7	0,3	0,1	1,2	1,0	1,8

Sample : Mothers, aged 18-59, whose youngest child is under 12 years old (teachers are excluded from the sample).

Source : ECHP UDB – version of June 2003, Wave 7.

Table 11 :

Marginal effects (multinomial logit models)

Country	Marital status / husband's employment status and earnings level (ref. : married / employed – first quartile)														
	Lone mother			Married / not employed			Married / employed – second quartile			Married / employed – third quartile			Married / employed – fourth quartile		
	ΔP_0	ΔP_1	ΔP_2	ΔP_0	ΔP_1	ΔP_2	ΔP_0	ΔP_1	ΔP_2	ΔP_0	ΔP_1	ΔP_2	ΔP_0	ΔP_1	ΔP_2
B	0.002	-0.048	0.046	0.279	-0.035	-0.244	0.012	-0.074	0.062	0.039	0.005	-0.044	0.159	-0.037	-0.122
DK	0.008	-0.034	0.026	0.126	-0.052	-0.074	-0.083	-0.093	0.176	-0.104	-0.038	0.142	-0.061	0.007	0.054
D	0.143	-0.088	-0.055	0.191	0.025	-0.216	-0.034	0.326	-0.292	0.144	-0.199	-0.343	0.383	0.035	-0.418
EL	-0.112	0.055	0.057	0.202	0.067	-0.269	0.116	0.011	-0.127	0.173	-0.009	-0.164	0.161	0.014	-0.175
E	-0.313	0.060	0.253	-0.016	0.006	0.010	0.036	0.041	-0.077	0.080	0.050	-0.130	0.107	0.046	-0.153
F	0.063	-0.055	-0.008	0.046	-0.062	0.016	-0.009	-0.013	0.022	-0.032	0.049	-0.017	0.070	-0.004	-0.066
Irl	-0.198	-0.036	0.234	0.082	-0.185	0.103	-0.083	-0.021	0.104	-0.085	0.018	0.067	0.050	-0.010	-0.040
I	-0.183	-0.054	0.237	-0.037	-0.047	0.084	0.030	-0.069	0.039	0.029	-0.025	-0.004	0.071	0.011	-0.082
L	-0.176	-0.128	0.304	-0.173	0.077	0.096	0.155	0.016	-0.171	0.166	0.031	-0.197	0.248	0.046	-0.294
NL	0.161	-0.122	-0.039	0.051	-0.098	0.047	-0.032	0.113	-0.081	0.165	-0.006	-0.159	0.186	-0.039	-0.147
A	0.008	-0.119	0.111	0.164	-0.226	0.062	0.036	-0.010	-0.026	-0.012	-0.002	0.014	0.009	0.089	-0.098
P	-0.061	-0.070	0.131	0.058	-0.066	0.008	-0.086	0.010	0.076	0.006	-0.008	0.002	-0.031	-0.037	0.068
Fin	0.001	-0.028	0.027	0.031	-0.017	-0.014	-0.073	0.050	0.023	0.014	-0.043	0.029	0.002	0.014	-0.016
S	0.023	-0.064	0.041	0.155	-0.014	-0.141	-0.013	0.002	0.011	-0.054	-0.040	0.094	-0.016	-0.065	0.081
UK	0.043	0.012	-0.055	0.127	-0.065	-0.062	-0.106	0.058	0.048	-0.031	0.039	-0.008	0.114	0.056	-0.170

	Number of children (ref. : one child)						Age of youngest child (ref. : 6-11 years old)						Presence of other adults in the household			
	2 children			3 children or more			Less than 3 years old			3-5 years old						
	ΔP_0	ΔP_1	ΔP_2	ΔP_0	ΔP_1	ΔP_2	ΔP_0	ΔP_1	ΔP_2	ΔP_0	ΔP_1	ΔP_2	ΔP_0	ΔP_1	ΔP_2	
	0.077	0.070	-0.147	0.172	0.032	-0.204	-0.092	-0.037	0.129	-0.069	-0.005	0.074	0.084	-0.114	0.030	B
	-0.016	0.031	-0.015	-0.027	0.138	-0.111	0.029	0.007	-0.036	-0.042	-0.032	0.074	0.345	-0.034	-0.311	DK
	0.007	-0.021	0.014	0.036	0.021	-0.057	0.238	-0.110	-0.128	0.102	-0.034	-0.068	-0.036	-0.045	0.081	D
	0.025	-0.017	-0.008	-0.049	0.015	0.034	0.077	-0.052	-0.025	-0.005	-0.022	0.027	-0.002	-0.001	0.003	EL
	-0.005	0.044	-0.039	-0.034	0.017	0.017	-0.026	-0.025	0.051	-0.011	-0.021	0.032	-0.041	-0.020	0.061	E
	0.165	0.046	-0.211	0.358	0.026	-0.384	0.146	-0.007	-0.139	0.011	0.010	-0.021	0.148	-0.049	-0.099	F
	0.096	0.053	-0.149	0.135	0.072	-0.207	0.215	-0.207	-0.008	0.052	-0.024	-0.028	0.055	0.115	-0.170	Irl
	0.088	-0.021	-0.067	0.163	-0.023	-0.140	0.007	0.026	-0.033	-0.013	0.045	-0.032	0.134	0.036	-0.170	I
	0.126	0.063	-0.189	0.449	-0.138	-0.311	0.032	-0.081	0.049	0.014	-0.069	0.055	-0.012	0.011	0.001	L
	0.051	0.031	-0.082	0.164	-0.048	-0.116	0.079	-0.052	-0.027	0.084	-0.046	-0.038	0.137	-0.075	-0.062	NL
	0.082	-0.031	-0.051	0.200	-0.121	-0.079	0.157	-0.232	0.075	0.071	-0.011	-0.060	0.013	-0.128	0.115	A
	0.068	-0.006	-0.062	0.129	-0.018	-0.111	0.075	-0.033	-0.042	0.130	-0.028	-0.102	0.021	-0.013	-0.008	P
	0.007	0.015	-0.022	0.057	0.042	-0.099	0.285	-0.018	-0.267	0.009	-0.037	0.028	0.144	-0.001	-0.143	Fin
	0.018	0.051	-0.069	0.081	0.051	-0.132	0.049	-0.039	-0.010	-0.007	0.051	-0.044	-0.004	0.044	-0.040	S
	0.113	0.021	-0.134	0.164	-0.006	-0.158	0.217	-0.111	-0.106	0.151	-0.057	-0.094	0.100	-0.141	0.041	UK

ΔP_0 : marginal effect on the probability of non-employment

ΔP_1 : marginal effect on the probability of part-time work

ΔP_2 : marginal effect on the probability of full-time work

Marginal effects of the variables significant at 5 % level (in at least one of the three equations of the model) appear in bold type.

Sample : Mothers, aged 18-59, whose youngest child is under 12 years old (teachers are excluded from the sample).

Source : ECHP UDB – version of June 2003, Wave 7.