

Parental Education and Parental Time with Children

Jonathan Guryan, Erik Hurst, and Melissa Kearney

Parents invest both material resources and their time into raising their children. Time investment in children is important to the development of human capital. It is also one possible mechanism through which economic status is transmitted from generation to generation.

This paper examines parental time allocated to the care of one's children. First, using data from the recent American Time Use Surveys, we highlight what we think are the most interesting cross-sectional patterns in time spent by American parents as they care for their children. (We will refer to the concepts of parental "child care" and parental "time spent with their children" interchangeably, though we discuss in the next section that the two measures might capture different things.) We find that higher-educated parents spend more time with their children; for example, mothers with a college education or greater spend roughly 4.5 hours more per week in child care than mothers with a high school degree or less. This relationship is striking, given that higher-educated parents also spend more time working outside the home. This robust relationship holds across all subgroups examined, including both nonworking and working mothers and working fathers. It also holds across all four subcategories of child care: basic, educational, recreational, and travel related to child care. From an economic perspective, this positive education gradient in child care (and a similar positive gradient found for income)

■ *Jonathan Guryan is Associate Professor of Economics, Graduate School of Business, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois. Erik Hurst is Professor of Economics and Neubauer Family Faculty Fellow, Graduate School of Business, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois. Melissa Kearney is Assistant Professor of Economics, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland. All three authors are Faculty Research Fellows, National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, Massachusetts. Their e-mail addresses are <jonathan.guryan@chicagogsb.edu>, <erik.hurst@chicagogsb.edu>, and <kearney@econ.bsos.umd.edu>.*

can be viewed as surprising, given that the opportunity cost of time is higher for higher-educated, high-wage adults.

Second, we interpret our results in a Beckerian framework of time allocation with a view toward establishing whether the allocation of time to child care follows similar patterns to home production or leisure time (Becker, 1965). Many of the tasks constituting child care can be purchased in the market, so economists often include child care as another form of household production (for example, Burda, Hamermesh, and Weil, forthcoming). However, parents report that spending time with their children, especially in recreation or educational child care, is among their more enjoyable activities, especially when compared with other standard home production activities (Juster 1985; Robinson and Godbey, 1999, appendix Table O; Krueger, Kahneman, Schkade, Schwarz, and Stone, forthcoming). We point out that in sharp contrast to the positive education and income gradient we observe for child care, the amount of time allocated to home production and to leisure *falls* as education and income rise. Given such patterns in the data, we conclude that child care is best modeled as being distinct from either typical home production or leisure activities, and thinking about it differently points to important questions about parental inputs of time toward children that are wide open for economists to explore.

Third, we examine data from a sample of 14 countries to establish whether the patterns we observe in the United States hold across countries and within other countries. The results are strikingly similar. Both within other countries and across countries, higher income is associated with more parental time spent with children. Within all of the 14 countries for which we have data, more-educated parents spend more time with their children than less-educated parents do, all else equal.

Parental Time Use in the United States

Findings from Previous Studies

The vast empirical literature on parental time use in the United States has shown that the age of the parents' youngest child (Zick and Bryant, 1996, offer a comprehensive survey) and family structure (Sayer, Bianchi, and Robinson, 2004) are particularly important factors driving time spent by parents with their children. We do not focus on children's ages or on family structure in our discussion below. However, given the documented importance of these variables, we include age of children and marital status as control variables when explaining differences in time use across parents with different education or income.

The literature has also shown that in the United States, at least, mothers spend more time with their children than do fathers, although the gender gap is not nearly as wide as it once was. The ratio of married fathers' to married mothers' hours spent on child care increased from 0.24 in 1965 to 0.55 in 1998 (Bianchi, 2000). Mothers also spend proportionally more time in routine care of children,

while fathers spend proportionally more time in teaching or playing activities (Pleck, 1997).

Numerous examinations of U.S. time use data confirm that employed parents spend less time with their children than nonemployed parents. However, given that school-aged children are often not present in the home when the parent is working, the time that nonworking parents spend with their children is not that much greater than the time spent with children by working parents—and not nearly as large as the difference in working hours (Bianchi, 2000; Zick and Bryant, 1996; Gauthier, Smeeding, and Furstenberg, 2004; Sayer, Bianchi, and Robinson, 2004). Furthermore, employed parents can maximize their time spent with children by altering work hours to coincide with children’s available hours. For example, employment data suggests that around one-third of new mothers remain firmly attached to the labor force while two-thirds follow other patterns—perhaps working seasonally or part-time, or leaving the labor force for some period of time—during the years when childcare demands are most intense (Bianchi, 2000; see also Klerman and Liebowitz, 1999).

Finally, many previous studies have documented that highly educated mothers spend more time with children than less-educated mothers. Hill and Stafford (1974), using nationally representative data from the 1965 *Productive Americans Survey* conducted by the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan, found that high-socioeconomic-status mothers spend two to three times as much time in preschool child care as do low-socioeconomic-status mothers. More recently, Kimmel and Connelly (2007) use data from the 2003–2004 American Time Use Survey to estimate a structural model of the allocation of time for women. As part of their results, they find that a woman’s predicted wage is positively correlated to the time women allocate to child care.¹ These latter patterns are most interesting to us from an economic perspective, and we focus on them here. However, instead of estimating a structural model, we show patterns of time use for both men and women by educational attainment. The two methodologies yield similar results, but our approach facilitates our comparison of the U.S. data to the patterns found in other countries, which we document later in this paper.

Time Spent in Child Care by Subgroups: Evidence from the American Time Use Survey

We begin our data exploration by documenting total hours spent in child care by various subgroups defined by gender, marital status, employment status, and education. We use data from the 2003–2006 waves of the American Time Use Survey conducted by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. This survey uses a 24-hour recall of the previous day’s activities to elicit time diary information. Each day of the

¹ Sayer, Gauthier, and Furstenberg (2004) examine the link between education and parental time spent with children in Canada, Germany, Italy, and Norway. Bianchi and Robinson (1997) examine time diary data from a sample of children from California ages 3–11 and show that children of higher-educated parents study and read more and watch less television.

week is equally represented within the survey. We pool data from survey years 2003 through 2006.² Our primary analysis sample includes only those individuals between the ages of 21 and 55 with at least one child under age 18 and only those who had a complete 24-hour time diary. This nationally representative sample includes 22,693 individuals with children, with 13,434 of them being women.

We define “total child care” as the sum of four primary time use components. “Basic” child care is time spent on the basic needs of children, including breastfeeding, rocking a child to sleep, general feeding, changing diapers, providing medical care (either directly or indirectly), grooming, and so on. However, time spent preparing a child’s meal is included in general “meal preparation,” a component of nonmarket production. “Educational” child care is time spent reading to children, teaching children, helping children with homework, attending meetings at a child’s school, and similar activities. “Recreational” child care involves playing games with children, playing outdoors with children, attending a child’s sporting event or dance recital, going to the zoo with children, and taking walks with children. “Travel” child care is any travel related to any of the three other categories of child care. For example, driving a child to school, to a doctor, or to dance practice are all included in “travel” child care. Again, “total child care” is simply the sum of these four measures.³

Table 1 reports hours spent in child care for women and men by marital and work status. We present total time spent in any child care as well as time broken down into our four childcare categories: basic, educational, recreational, and travel. The average time spent in child care for all women with children is 14.0 hours per week. This total is dominated by time spent in basic child care (7.7 hours). The time input associated with having a young child in the household is expectedly larger. Women with at least one child under the age of five spend an average of 21.0 hours per week in child care, with 12.6 of those hours devoted to basic child care.

Women spend roughly twice as much time in child care as do men, a pattern which holds true for all subgroups. Among all men with children, average child care is 6.8 hours per week, compared to 14.0 hours for women. For both men and

² For more information on the American Time Use Survey, see Aguiar and Hurst (2007). Our creation of variables is essentially identical to that used in their paper, though they only focus on the 2003 data. We have adjusted our classification slightly relative to theirs to account for changes in the survey between 2003 and 2006. A full description of our handling of the data is described in a data appendix to this paper, available with the paper at (<http://www.e-jep.org>).

³ In our empirical work, we include the total time parents spend with both household and nonhousehold children. As discussed in the data appendix available with this paper at (<http://www.e-jep.org>), we do this for comparability with the international time use data presented later in this paper. This distinction, however, is not important empirically given that parents between the ages of 21 and 55 (our analysis sample) spend very little time with other households’ children when their own children are not present. The 75th percentile of the “time spent with nonhousehold children” distribution for our analysis sample is zero. All of the U.S. results presented in this paper were redone excluding time spent with nonhousehold children from our measure of child care, but this does not change any of our results in any significant way.

Table 1
Hours per Week Spent in Child Care by Various Subgroups within the United States: 2003–2006

	<i>All child care</i>	<i>Basic child care</i>	<i>Educational child care</i>	<i>Recreational child care</i>	<i>Travel child care</i>
All mothers (<i>n</i> = 13,434)	13.96	7.69	2.10	2.27	1.90
All fathers (<i>n</i> = 9,259)	6.81	3.17	0.88	1.83	0.93
Working mothers (<i>n</i> = 9,372)	11.64	6.40	1.72	1.66	1.86
Working fathers (<i>n</i> = 8,553)	6.53	3.05	0.82	1.76	0.91
Nonworking mothers (<i>n</i> = 4,062)	18.68	10.32	2.89	3.50	1.97
Nonworking fathers (<i>n</i> = 706)	9.90	4.65	1.55	2.54	1.15
Married working mothers (<i>n</i> = 6,323)	12.00	6.64	1.74	1.78	1.84
Married working fathers (<i>n</i> = 7,559)	6.74	3.17	0.82	1.85	0.90
Married nonworking mothers (<i>n</i> = 3,065)	19.56	10.73	2.97	3.75	2.11
Married nonworking fathers (<i>n</i> = 529)	10.59	5.27	1.64	2.46	1.22
Unmarried working mothers (<i>n</i> = 3,049)	10.76	5.80	1.66	1.39	1.91
Unmarried working fathers (<i>n</i> = 994)	4.91	2.10	0.75	1.04	1.02
Unmarried nonworking mothers (<i>n</i> = 997)	15.72	8.87	2.72	2.58	1.56
Unmarried nonworking fathers (<i>n</i> = 177)	8.03	3.09	1.50	2.51	0.93
Mothers with children under 5 (<i>n</i> = 5,220)	21.03	12.62	1.73	4.75	1.93
Fathers with children under 5 (<i>n</i> = 3,900)	9.69	4.77	0.75	3.31	0.85

Notes: This table presents means of time spent in childcare activities by different demographic subgroups in the 2003–2006 waves of the American Time Use Survey. All time use measures are expressed in units of “hours per week.” Samples include all individuals between the ages of 21 and 55 (inclusive) who had time diaries summing to a complete day and at least one child under the age of 18. The final two rows refer to individuals with at least one child under the age of 5. See Appendix Table A2 with the online version of this paper at (<http://www.e-jep.org>) and the text for time use category definitions and use of demographic weights to represent each day of the week equally within subgroups.

women, basic child care activities consume the largest amount of time spent in child care. But men do spend proportionately more of their childcare time in recreational activities. A basic examination of the data revealed no obvious differences in childcare time for either mothers or fathers based on the gender of the child.

These patterns cannot be fully explained with the belief that men tend to specialize in market production and women tend to specialize in home production, because the gender gap persists within groups of working parents. Working women devote an average of 11.6 hours per week to child care, compared to 6.5 hours among working men. These data do not, however, show whether working women with children have selected into occupations or positions that have more flexibility of hours or even lower total hours.

Nonworking women with children spend on average seven more hours in child care per week than their working counterparts. This difference is spread across the four categories of child care, with the largest differences being in basic and recreational childcare activities. As shown by others in the literature, married women and women with young children spend more time in child care than single women or women with older children.

Patterns by Education and Income

Parents with different education levels spend substantially different amounts of time in child care. Table 2 reports that women with less education than a high school degree spend an average of 12.1 hours per week in child care, while college-educated women and women with education beyond a college degree spend 16.5 and 17.0 hours in child care, respectively.

These differences do not appear to be driven by differences in employment rates. Higher-educated women with children are much more likely to be working (79 percent for women with more than a college degree compared to 42 percent for women with less than a high school degree). In addition, higher-educated women tend to have fewer children—1.8 children per household for women with more than a college degree compared to 2.2 children per household for women with less than a high school degree—making the pattern of child care across education groups even more surprising. Higher-educated women are also much more likely to be married; the fraction of women with a high school degree or less who are married is around 60 percent, compared to more than 85 percent among college-educated women.

The education gradient is also not driven by a woman's age, number of children, marital status, or age of youngest child. We estimate ordinary least squares regressions with time spent with children as the dependent variable: for the explanatory variables, we include the factors just mentioned along with dummy variables for the differing levels of completed education. "Women with less than 12 years of education" is the omitted group, so the coefficients on the other levels of education can be interpreted as additional hours spent with children relative to that group. Adjusting for these other factors makes the education gradient even steeper. These results are shown separately for working and nonworking women under the "conditional" columns in Table 2. Specifically, nonworking women with a college degree or more than a college degree spend, respectively, 6.4 and 9.7 hours per week more on child care than nonworking women with less than a high

Table 2

Hours per Week Spent in Total Child Care for Women in the United States by Educational Attainment

Years of schooling	Fraction married	Fraction working	Total market work	Number of children	Hours per week spent in total child care				
					All	Nonworking		Working	
						Conditional (relative to education < 12)		Conditional (relative to education < 12)	
<12	0.63	0.42	14.6	2.2	12.1	14.9		8.3	
12	0.69	0.65	22.3	1.9	12.6	17.6	2.9	9.8	3.1
13–15	0.69	0.74	25.3	1.9	13.3	18.9	3.9	11.4	4.2
16	0.87	0.72	23.7	1.9	16.5	22.6	6.4	14.2	6.1
16+	0.89	0.79	27.4	1.8	17.0	25.9	9.7	14.4	6.4

Notes: This table presents means of demographic characteristics, total time in market work, and total time spent caring for children by educational attainment in the 2003–2006 waves of the American Time Use Survey. All time use measures are expressed in units of “hours per week.” Samples include all women between the ages of 21 and 55 (inclusive) that have at least one child of their own under the age of 18. Samples are restricted to respondents who had time diaries summing to a complete day (i.e., 1440 minutes). Conditional differences report the coefficients from a regression of total time spent in child care on education dummies (with less than 12 years of schooling being omitted), a cubic in age, “number of children” dummies, a married dummy, and “age of youngest child” dummies. All means and regression coefficients are calculated using fixed demographic weights adjusted to equally represent each day of the week within subgroups. Total market work includes all time spent at work, in work-related activities, traveling to work, and looking for work.

school degree. The corresponding conditional educational differences for working women are 6.1 and 6.4 hours per week.

Additional analyses (which can be found in Guryan, Hurst, and Kearney, 2008) show that essentially the same education gradient holds for all four types of care (basic, educational, recreational, and travel) and for all four groups considered (nonworking and working women and men). For nonworking women, the education gradient is apparent in all four childcare categories, but is larger with respect to educational and recreational child care. For working women, the gradient is steeper, so that working women with a college degree spend 70 percent more time in child care than their counterparts with less than a high school degree, and the education gradient is even stronger in recreational child care. Working college-educated men spend about 105 percent more time in child care than working men with less than a high school degree, and this gradient is fairly consistent across childcare categories. For nonworking men, the gradient is less clear, but this fact is not surprising given that so few men, particularly college-educated men, are not working.

An important concern is that up to this point we have followed the bulk of the previous literature and focused exclusively on child care coded as a “primary” activity. However, child care is often an individual’s “secondary” activity. For example, individuals who report going grocery shopping, preparing a meal or watching

television as their primary activity may have a child in their care at the time. Furthermore, many childcare scholars have noted that child care sometimes extends to a supervisory role, which may take place when a child is not even present in the same room. For example, a parent must stay in the house while a child naps or sleeps. We made the choice to focus on primary activities in part because by categorizing the activity this way, parents are indicating something about the quality of the interaction or about the amount invested by the parent. Using this narrow definition of child care is potentially problematic, though. Parental time spent on secondary child care or in the presence of a child almost necessarily involves less active interactions than primary child care, but this time might still be quite important for a child's well-being or development.⁴

The American Time Use Survey only records an individual's primary allocation of their time for almost all activities. However, there are two other ways to measure child care in the survey. For each activity, the respondent is asked a special question about having a child "in your care" (Folbre and Yoon, 2007). Respondents are also asked who was "in the same room" (for activities at home) or "accompanying you" if not at home. Multiple individuals could be listed. It is not clear which measure provides a broader measure. If a child is playing in the backyard or in a different room, the parent's supervisory role would be captured by the "in your care" measure, but not by the "with whom" measure. On the other hand, it is not clear that caring for a child who is sleeping is what one would want to capture with a measure of child care. Because the "in your care" question is only asked of parents with children less than 13, we focus on the "with whom" question to create an alternative measure of time spent with children.

Using the "with whom" data, we find that mothers spend roughly 45 hours per week in the presence of their children (Guryan, Hurst, and Kearney, 2008). The comparable number for fathers was roughly 30 hours per week. These numbers are much higher than the roughly 14 and seven hours per week of primary child care reported by mothers and fathers, respectively (documented in Table 1). In other words, parents spent a good deal more time around their children even if they are not engaging in tasks where "child care" is the primary activity. In terms of the education gradient, high-educated parents and low-educated parents spend nearly identical amounts of total time around their children. In other words, no education gradient exists with respect to spending time around one's children.

At a minimum, the analysis above shows that even though parents of differing education spend similar total time around their children, the nature of the interactions is very different. High-educated parents spend much more time in activities

⁴ The importance of distinguishing between time spent on "primary" and "secondary" childcare activities has been discussed by Folbre, Yoon, Finnoff, and Fuligni (2005), Folbre and Yoon (2007), and Zick and Bryant (1996). Zick and Bryant note that studies utilizing time use surveys have been criticized for undercounting parents' time in child care due to the exclusion of secondary activities. They examine data from the 1977-78 Eleven State Time Use Survey, which has a sample of 2,100 families, all with two minor children in the home. They find that secondary childcare time by both parents is a sizable fraction of all child care, making up between 30 and 34 percent of the total time spent in child care.

where child care is listed as the primary activity. Additional work is warranted to assess the extent to which parental investments in children occur along other margins (secondary childcare activities, parental investments during meal time, and so on). As the discussion of the economic model of time use will highlight below, this pair of patterns may shed light on the reason why more-educated parents spend more time in which they are focused primarily on child care.

Understanding Time Spent With Children

Many economic models categorize child care as a form of home production. Can we infer something from the patterns in the time use data about the appropriateness of this assumption? Though economists tend to be skeptical about inferring too much from what people say, as opposed to what they do, it is perhaps instructive that individuals often report spending recreational or educational time with their children as being among their most enjoyable activities—particularly when compared with home production activities (for example, Juster, 1985; Robinson and Godbey, 1999; Krueger, Kahneman, Schkade, Schwarz, and Stone, forthcoming).⁵ Do the data presented here suggest whether parents treat time with their children as home production (akin to preparing meals) or as leisure (akin to going to the movies)?

It might seem foolhardy to try to classify such an activity as multifaceted as child care as being either leisure or home production, but economic principles can shed some light on the question. Below, we describe the basic elements of an economic model of time use that can help us to think about how we should expect the time spent in different types of activities to vary across people with different wages, which economists commonly take to be the opportunity cost of one's time.

An Overview of an Economic Model of Time Allocation

Consider a model in which individuals derive utility from three commodities: a home-produced good, a leisure good, and well-cared-for children. The utility derived from children may take several forms. Having well-cared-for children may contribute directly to a parent's utility; for example, parents may enjoy spending time with their children. Parents may also altruistically care about their children's future happiness and well-being and consider time with their children as an investment in their children's human capital. Or parents may care selfishly about their children's future earnings potential, knowing that high-resource children may

⁵ A recent book on family patterns by Bianchi, Robinson, and Milkie (2006) includes some survey data about how parents feel about their time allocation. Among a national sample of 1,200 parents surveyed in 2000 and 2001, 47.6 percent of parents report spending too little time with their youngest (or only) child, 57.7 percent report spending too little time with their oldest child, and 42.1 percent report too little time with both. In contrast, only about 5 percent of parents reported too much time with their children. Of course, these data do not give us insight into whether parents feel this way because of a sense of obligation or whether these responses are a window into parents' marginal utility of time with their children.

be better able to offset negative income or health shocks experienced by the parent in old age.

Each commodity is produced using a combination of market expenditures and time (as in Becker, 1965). One way to classify goods as either “home production” or “leisure” is based on the elasticity of substitution between time and goods in their production (Aguilar and Hurst, 2007). Most home production shows a fair degree of substitutability between time and goods. For example, one can order take-out or purchase preprocessed foods to reduce the time input associated with cooking, and similar substitutability exists for cleaning the house, tending to the yard, and doing laundry. However, in the case of leisure, time and goods are far less substitutable. To watch a movie, it is necessary to allocate a fixed amount of time; you cannot pay someone to watch a movie for you and expect to have a comparable experience. Other time-intensive activities include socializing with friends, playing golf, reading, and watching television.

In this framework, how might we expect time spent in home production, leisure, or child care to vary with the opportunity cost of time—that is, with a higher wage? In a traditional economic model of the choice between income (that is, wages from labor) and leisure, a higher wage has an ambiguous effect on the number of hours worked because of offsetting substitution and income effects. A similar analysis applies here. A higher wage will lead to substitution toward more hours worked and to less time in home production, leisure, or childcare activities. For goods that have a relatively high degree of substitutability between time and expenditures in the production of the commodity (for example, home-produced goods) an increase in wages will result in a greater decline in the time allocated to that good, all else equal. A higher wage also brings a positive income effect, which will lead people to desire more of all goods. The income effect will be larger for goods where the elasticity of demand for the good with respect to additional income is relatively high. In this model, there is also an interaction between the income and substitution effects, because when an income effect leads to demanding more of a consumable good for which time is an input, the degree to which individuals will choose to produce the good with time rather than market expenditures will vary. The substitution and income effects push in opposite directions. As the opportunity cost of time (the wage) increases, the time allocated to the production of a home-produced good, a leisure good, or child care can increase (if the income effect dominates) or decrease (if the substitution effect dominates).

This discussion suggests that—all else equal—the relationship between the time allocated to home production and a higher wage should be more negative than the relationship between the time allocated to leisure and the wage. This outcome arises because of a higher degree of substitutability between time and goods in the production of home-produced goods, on average, than of leisure. To the extent that home-produced goods have a higher income elasticity than leisure goods, this prediction would be mitigated.

The model as presented to this point could also be expanded to allow both productivity of time and tastes for goods to vary according to a person’s earning

capacity. For example, suppose that high-wage individuals are more efficient in the production of one of the commodities. On the one hand, the marginal return to spending another hour in home production is higher for individuals with higher nonmarket productivity. On the other hand, the more efficient worker can produce any given amount of the consumable output in less time. These effects go in opposite directions, and so the existence of such productivity differences would again have an ambiguous effect on how time spent in that activity would differ between high- and low-wage individuals (all else equal), and either could dominate.

In a related vein, tastes may differ across households in a way that is correlated with the household's opportunity cost of time. For example, lower-educated households may have a greater taste for leisure goods—for example, relatively time-intensive goods like television watching and socializing with friends—than higher-educated households.⁶

Thinking about child care in this framework will point to ways in which parents view time spent with their children as similar or different from either home production or from leisure.

Patterns of Time Spent in Leisure and Home Production

Before interpreting the trends in child care in terms of our theoretical discussion, it is useful to document the educational gradient in time spent on activities other than child care. If time spent with children follows patterns across parents with different opportunity costs of time similar to leisure, we might conclude that parents treat time spent with their children as a form of leisure. Alternatively, if time spent with children correlates in ways similar to time in home production, we might conclude that parents treat time spent with their children as a form of work.

For our empirical work here, we divide household time into five categories: market work; total nonmarket work; leisure; child care; and all other uses of time. The “market work” category is straightforward. “Total nonmarket work” includes time spent in core household chores, time spent obtaining goods and services, plus time spent on other home production such as home maintenance, outdoor cleaning, vehicle repair, gardening, and pet care. In turn, “core household chores” include meal preparation and cleanup, doing laundry, ironing, dusting, vacuuming, indoor household cleaning, and indoor design and maintenance. Examples of time spent “obtaining goods and services” include grocery shopping, shopping for other household items, comparison shopping, coupon clipping, going to the bank, going to a barber, going to the post office, and buying goods on-line; time spent acquiring medical care, education, and restaurant meals are explicitly excluded

⁶ Allowing different time use to have different disutilities would be a potential extension of the Beckerian model, as Krueger, Kahneman, Schkade, Schwarz, and Stone (forthcoming) discuss. For example, if lower-wage households derive a greater disutility from allocating time to a certain activity, they will spend less time in that activity, all else equal. The implications for the cross-sectional interpretation of the relationship between time allocated to a good and the wage would be similar if low-educated individuals simply liked the good less or if they liked the time they allocated to production of the good less.

from this category. The definition of home production that we use here is the same as used by Aguiar and Hurst (2007), which in turn is very similar to the definition used by other time researchers like Robinson and Godbey (1999), with the key exception that neither we nor Aguiar and Hurst include child care as a component of home production.

Leisure activities are harder to define. We follow the “leisure measure 2” definition used by Aguiar and Hurst (2007). It includes activities such as time spent watching television; socializing (relaxing with friends and family, playing games with friends and family); talking on the telephone, attending/hosting social events); in exercise/sports (playing sports, attending sporting events, exercising, and running); reading (books and magazines, personal mail, and personal email); in entertainment/hobbies (going to the movies or theatre, listening to music, using the computer for leisure, doing arts and crafts, playing a musical instrument); and other similar activities. We also include in our measure of leisure, activities that provide direct utility but may also be viewed as intermediate inputs, such as sleeping, eating, and personal care. We exclude own medical care, but include such activities as grooming, having sex, sleeping or napping, and eating at home or in restaurants. All other uses of time are in the residual category, which we will not discuss further here.

Table 3 reports the differences for time spent in home production and leisure for women and men across education groups. The approach here uses an ordinary least squares regression in which the dependent variable is time spent on a certain activity. One set of independent variables are dummy variables for level of education. The education level of less than 12 years is the omitted category, so the coefficients on the other variables can be interpreted as the difference in hours relative to that group. The regression also includes control variables for age (expressed as a cubic) and dummy variables for number of children, married or not, and age of youngest child. Different regressions were run for each activity as well as for nonworking women, working women, nonworking men, and working men. For women, this analysis reveals a steep negative education gradient for both leisure and home production activities. These results are similar to those documented in Aguiar and Hurst (2007), who examined leisure and home production differences across education groups for women and men but did not condition on work status.

In our analysis, nonworking women with more than a college degree spend 6.1 fewer hours per week in home production and 7.3 fewer hours per week in leisure activities relative to women with less than a high school degree.⁷ Working women with more than a college degree spend 4.4 fewer hours per week in home production and 4.8 fewer hours per week in leisure compared to the lowest educated group in the sample. For working men, there does not appear to be a strong education gradient in home production, though working men with more than a

⁷ In results not reported here, we find that there is a negative education gradient for both men and women in total sleep hours.

Table 3
Conditional Differences in Hours per Week Spent in Different Time Use Categories By Education: Relative to High School Dropouts

Years of schooling	Nonworking			Working			
	Total child care	Total nonmarket work	Leisure	Total child care	Total market work	Total nonmarket work	Leisure
Panel A: Women (relative to high school dropouts)							
12	2.85 (0.88)	-1.35 (1.15)	-3.71 (1.39)	3.09 (0.62)	-0.51 (1.83)	-2.19 (1.01)	-0.71 (1.44)
13-15	3.88 (0.87)	-1.65 (1.16)	-7.30 (1.42)	4.24 (0.61)	0.35 (1.81)	-2.45 (1.00)	-3.49 (1.41)
16	6.33 (1.08)	-3.08 (1.28)	-8.05 (1.54)	6.07 (0.64)	-0.27 (1.89)	-2.94 (1.06)	-4.39 (1.45)
16+	9.70 (1.64)	-6.08 (1.63)	-7.29 (1.88)	6.36 (0.73)	1.67 (2.04)	-4.41 (1.13)	-4.75 (1.53)
Panel B: Men (relative to high school dropouts)							
12	-2.57 (1.67)	-1.88 (3.03)	6.33 (3.57)	2.38 (0.42)	0.70 (1.64)	-0.53 (0.79)	-3.61 (1.40)
13-15	-0.13 (1.77)	2.37 (2.98)	-8.94 (3.83)	3.32 (0.46)	-0.16 (1.66)	1.09 (0.81)	-6.41 (1.38)
16	3.89 (4.48)	5.48 (3.96)	-10.38 (4.75)	4.27 (0.43)	0.81 (1.68)	0.36 (0.83)	-7.82 (1.37)
16+	-1.24 (2.57)	5.48 (3.96)	-10.37 (5.64)	4.76 (0.47)	2.16 (1.81)	-1.11 (0.85)	-7.96 (1.49)

Notes: This table presents conditional differences in time spent in total child care, market work, nonmarket work, and leisure by educational attainment in the 2003–2006 waves of the American Time Use Survey for working and nonworking women and men. The conditional differences in time use are expressed in units of “hours per week.” Samples include all men and women between the ages of 21 and 55 (inclusive) that have at least one child under the age of 18. See text for additional sample restrictions and time use definitions. Conditional differences report the coefficients from regressions of time spent in each time use category on education dummies (with less than 12 years of schooling being omitted), a cubic in age, “number of children” dummies, a married dummy, and “age of youngest child” dummies. Robust standard errors are in parentheses.

college degree spend 1.1 fewer hours per week in home production than working high school dropouts. The education gradient in home production for nonworking men appears positive, but the sample of nonworking men is too small to make strong conclusions about this relationship. There is a large negative education gradient for leisure time among men. An examination of time use patterns by earnings for those currently working—another proxy for the opportunity cost of time—reveals the same underlying trends.⁸

⁸ A full set of these results can be found in the NBER Working Paper version of our paper (Guryan, Hurst, and Kearney, 2008).

Interpreting the Data

Given the higher substitutability between expenditures and time in production, one might have predicted that individuals with a high opportunity cost of time, all else equal, should be more willing to purchase market substitutes for their home production time and thereby reduce their time input into home production tasks, as compared with leisure. As seen in Table 3, however, the education gradient for leisure is actually more negative than the gradient for home production (most noticeable for the case of working men). Apparently, all is not equal when making such cross-sectional comparisons. According to the theoretical discussion above, this implies that either: 1) home production goods have higher income elasticities; 2) the relative productivity within the home production sector differs by educational attainment; or 3) individuals with a lower opportunity cost of time have a stronger relative preference for leisure goods.

But from the perspective of this article, the key question is what do these patterns suggest about how individuals view time spent in child care relative to alternate uses of their time? The education and income gradients are negative for both leisure and home production activities. However, the education and income gradients are strikingly positive for childcare time. Time spent caring for one's children appears to be fundamentally different from these other two categories of time use.

Given our discussion above, at least four potential reasons could explain why childcare patterns relative to education and income differ from the leisure and home production patterns. First, parents may simply view the output of investing in children as being more of a luxury good than either traditional home production or leisure goods. If this reason holds true, then as income increases, the marginal utility from time invested into children must be higher than the marginal utility of an additional unit of time invested in either preparing meals (the dominant home production activity) or watching television (the dominant leisure activity). Additional support for this possibility comes from the evidence, recounted above, that adults often state that spending time with their children in recreational activities is among their most enjoyable activities (especially when compared to other home production activities).

Second, the childcare patterns in the data documented above are consistent with parents viewing market-purchased childcare options as poor substitutes for parental time, relative to the degree of substitutability between expenditures and time in the production of typical home-produced goods. Highly educated parents may be more likely to feel that market alternatives are not good substitutes for their own time spent with their children. They may not think it is possible to monitor childcare providers well enough to ensure their children spend time in the activities of their choosing, such as doing art projects or reading books, rather than watching television. Or high-education parents may believe that spending time with adults with less human capital is an imperfect substitute for spending time with themselves.

Similarly, if the demand for well-cared-for children increases in income and

education, then even if parents viewed the degree of substitutability in child care to be comparable to the degree of substitutability in traditional home production activities, we would expect highly educated parents to substitute more toward market alternatives—to pay nannies and schools to care for their children and to purchase educational aids like computers and enriching toys. Of course, many highly educated parents do some of these things, but even net of this substitution, they still spend more of their own time with their children.

Third, higher-wage parents might have a greater preference for the output generated by time spent with their children, at least relative to their preferences for home produced and leisure goods. Or conversely, lower-educated parents may have a greater relative preference for their own leisure. Allowing preferences for the consumption goods to differ by education can tautologically explain all the patterns in the data. To have preferences for leisure differ by education is not implausible, given the fact that differences in preferences are a common explanation for differences in educational attainment across households.

A fourth explanation is that perhaps the return to investment in children from higher-income/higher-education parents is higher. If the children of higher-educated parents have greater potential or greater opportunities, the marginal return on time invested in such children could be higher. (Alternatively, the marginal return to time invested in children with lower innate ability could be higher. There appears to be remarkably little evidence informing this issue.) Importantly, this explanation requires that parents do not consider market alternatives to be highly effective substitutes for their own time spent in child care.

One recent phenomenon that may have increased the return on investment in children, particularly for highly educated parents, is the large size of the cohort comprised of the children of the baby boom. Ramey and Ramey (2007) argue that the competition by this cohort for inelastically supplied slots at top-tier colleges led to a rat race. Such competition by highly educated parents to invest in their children is also mirrored in the behavior documented in the paper in this symposium by Deming and Dynarski.

Another reason why higher-educated parents may have a higher return to investing in their children is that the value or quality of their time investment may be higher. However, recall from the theoretical discussion above that such productivity differences have ambiguous effects on time spent in child care. A higher return might induce parents to spend more time with their children, but on the other hand, these more productive parents can produce the same amount of human capital in their children in less time. Future research might investigate this possibility by focusing on types of child care for which productivity might be assumed to be related directly to education, such as reading to one's child.

This final possible explanation for the educational gradient in child care points to the question of whether parental time investments in children are correlated with increased child human capital, and whether this relationship is stronger for more-educated parents. Economists have been considering this question at least since the seminal work of Leibowitz (1972, 1974, 1977). Haveman and

Wolfe (1995) provide an extensive review of the literature on the determinants of children's attainments with an emphasis on family characteristics other than parental time use, including poverty, family structure, and mother's education. In sociology, Coleman's (1988) classic work argues that if parents are absent or not involved with their children, then social capital is lacking, and as a consequence the level of human capital that parents possess is an irrelevant resource for the child because the mechanism of transferring human capital does not function. Cooksey and Fondell (1996) examine data from the 1987–88 *National Survey of Families and Households* and find a strong positive relationship between fathers' time spent with children and academic grades, which they interpret as supportive of Coleman's view.

The empirical evidence on the relationship between parental time investment and children's outcomes is only moderately convincing. Empirical papers on this issue have tended to focus on educational achievement, which is only one potential measure of child outcomes. The consensus of these studies is not clear (for example, Leibowitz, 1974; Etaugh, 1984; Steelman and Mercy, 1980; Datcher-Loury, 1988; Blau and Grossberg, 1990). Moreover, such studies are plagued with identification problems; for example, perhaps parents spend more time working on homework with children who are having trouble with their homework, so parental time will appear to be correlated with lower educational performance. Furthermore, some of the studies do not have direct measures of maternal childcare time and rely on proxy measures. As we have documented above, maternal time spent in child care often follows surprising patterns in the sense that mothers with a higher opportunity cost of time tend to spend more time on child care. Further empirical work on this issue is warranted.⁹

More empirical work is also needed to disentangle why the educational gradient with child care is positive while the educational gradients of home production and leisure are negative. The fact that there is a positive wage elasticity for time spent on child care and a negative wage elasticity for time spent on leisure and home production was also noted by Kimmel and Connelly (2007). The negative educational gradient for home production and leisure was also noted by Aguiar and Hurst (2007). Both of these papers also caution readers to treat childcare time as distinct from either home production or leisure. Given these differences, researchers measuring the allocation of time or modeling parental inputs into children should proceed by treating child care as being distinct from other leisure or home production activities.

⁹ A related literature in child development considers the effects of maternal employment in early childhood on a child's subsequent cognitive outcomes. This literature presumes that maternal employment in the early years of a child's life translates into less parental investment during that time. Han, Waldfogel, and Brooks-Gunn (2001) and Brooks-Gunn, Han, Waldfogel (2002) find that maternal employment during a child's first year of life is negatively associated with cognitive outcomes in later childhood.

Trends in Parental Child Care over Time

We have presented a snapshot picture of parental time use in the United States, with an emphasis on documenting current differences across various subgroups. An in-depth consideration of how these differences have evolved over time is beyond the scope of this article. But we would be remiss not to broach the issue of time trends in parental time use, given widespread interest in the issue. For example, if child care increases with individual income, it would not be surprising to find child care increase substantially within the United States over the last 40 years, given the large increases in income experienced by the average household.

Bianchi (2000), Sayer, Bianchi, and Robinson (2004), Aguiar and Hurst (2007), and Ramey and Ramey (2007) all report that adults in the United States are spending more time with their children currently than in the past. This pattern holds true for parents as a group as well as within subgroups—both working and nonworking parents and both mothers and fathers. Bianchi documents that from 1965 to 1998, the average amount of time spent providing “child care” has increased from 0.4 to 1.0 hour per day among married fathers and from 1.7 to 1.8 hours per day among married mothers. Aguiar and Hurst show that adjusting for changing demographics (including the aging of the population and declining fertility rates), the average time spent in child care for men and women in the United States increased by roughly 2.0 hours per week between 1965 and 2003. The cross-sectional trends documented above are consistent with the time series trends. Furthermore, Ramey and Ramey (2007) show that the increase in time spent with children was larger for more-educated individuals relative to less-educated individuals.

Gauthier, Smeeding, and Furstenberg (2004) provide evidence that the trend toward greater parental childcare time was not exclusive to the U.S. experience. The authors examine trends in child care from 1960 to 2000 using data from 16 countries included in the Multinational Time Use Study. This study administers a common 24-hour diary instrument in all sample countries. The authors include data from Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Norway, Poland, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States, and the former Yugoslavia. Examining parental time spent in child care for married/cohabiting parents with at least one child under the age of five, the authors document a notable increase in time spent in child care for all subsamples considered: working mothers, working fathers, nonworking mothers, and nonworking fathers. They further document that fathers have increased time spent in housework and reduced time spent in paid work and personal activities (including sleep), while mothers’ increased time spent in child care is coterminous with decreases in time spent on paid work, personal activities (including sleep), and housework.

An International Perspective on Parental Childcare Time

Do the patterns documented above for parental childcare time in the United States, namely the positive education and income gradients, hold across countries and within other countries? We examine data from the following countries, with the corresponding sample years in parentheses: Austria (1992), Canada (1998–1999), Chile (1999), Estonia (1999–2000), Italy, (2002–2003), France (1998–1999), Germany (1991–1992), the Netherlands (2000), Norway (1990–1991), Palestine (1999–2000), Slovenia (2000–2001), South Africa (2000), and the United Kingdom (2000–2001). Our choice of countries and time periods is limited to places and times in which the time use data is based on 24-hour time diaries, a restriction that facilitates the comparison of time use patterns across countries.¹⁰

We acknowledge that the time use surveys were conducted in a variety of different manners across the different countries and that one should proceed cautiously when comparing the exact amount of time spent in different activities across the countries. Our goals in this section are twofold: First, we wish to show that the time spent in child care within these countries correlates with per capita income. Second, we wish to show that within a diverse set of countries, we see the same educational gradient for time spent in child care. This latter approach, given its reliance on within-survey variation, is not subject to the concern that these surveys are not literally comparable across countries.

For the different countries, our measure of time spent in child care includes all time the individual spent in basic, educational, and recreational child care (as described above). Again, these surveys only focus on primary childcare activities. This harmonization of the data across countries was facilitated by the fact that activities included in the basic, educational, and recreational childcare measures were similarly categorized across the countries. The one exception is that some countries included travel time associated with child care (like taking your children to school) in a general travel time category. For these countries, we cannot separately identify childcare travel from other types of travel. For that reason, travel

¹⁰ Several on-line appendices to this paper, available with this paper at (<http://www.e-jep.org>), provide detailed information about this data, including information about each survey's sample methodology and coverage as well as the actual sample sizes used in our analysis. In the appendix, we also note how we defined child care within each of the surveys. There are three important notes about the international time use data which we want to emphasize. First, some of these datasets were accessed through the Multinational Time Use Survey (MTUS) which harmonized the time use classification and sample demographics for the participating surveys. The participating time use surveys included in the MTUS that met our inclusion criteria include the surveys from Austria, France, Germany, Norway, Slovenia, and South Africa. The remaining data were accessed directly through the organization which collected the data. Second, the Chilean data had respondents choose from a predetermined set of activity codes when filling out their time diaries. The respondents from all other countries reported their activities in their own words. Their descriptions were then converted into time use categories by the staff of the respective surveys. Third, all the surveys provide weights designed to ensure that the surveys are nationally representative. We use these weights when describing the country means.

Table 4

Hours per Week Spent in Child Care across Countries: Ranked by GDP per Capita

<i>Country</i>	<i>GDP per capita</i>	<i>All with children</i>	<i>Men with children</i>	<i>Women with children</i>
Norway	37,200	8.88	5.68	11.70
United States	34,300	8.93	5.62	11.64
United Kingdom	24,500	7.23	4.17	9.83
Netherlands	24,200	6.83	4.36	8.91
Austria	23,900	8.33	3.57	12.27
Canada	23,600	8.56	5.61	11.20
France	21,800	4.43	1.82	6.83
Germany	23,100	7.25	3.87	10.49
Italy	19,000	7.32	4.03	10.37
Slovenia	9,700	5.03	2.75	7.21
Chile	4,900	5.65	2.69	7.90
Estonia	4,100	6.64	2.97	9.37
South Africa	2,900	4.03	0.60	5.88
Palestine	1,200	6.38	2.09	12.35

Notes: This table presents average hours per week spent in total child care for all adults with children, men with children, and women with children by country. Within each country, the samples include all individuals between the ages of 21 and 55 (inclusive) with at least one child under the age of 18 present in the household who had time diaries summing to a complete day (1440 minutes). See the online appendix with this paper at (<http://www.e-jep.org>) for a description of each country's time use data and the corresponding definitions of time spent with children within each country. All means are calculated using fixed demographic weights adjusted to equally represent each day of the week within subgroups. The GDP per capita numbers are all expressed in 2000 U.S. dollars.

time associated with children was excluded from all our measures of total time spent in child care for all countries.

Table 4 reports the average hours per week spent in child care for men and women, respectively, for the countries we analyzed. We restrict the sample to include only individuals between the ages of 21 and 55 (inclusive) with at least one child under the age of 18 in the household. To facilitate comparisons, in this section we report U.S. numbers according to this sample restriction, as opposed to restricting the sample to parents, as we do above. We also restrict the analysis to individuals with a complete time diary (the sum of time across all activities totaled 1440 minutes). We further weight all country data to ensure that each day of the week (within each subsample) is equally represented. For the reasons given above, Table 4 redisplayes the U.S. childcare numbers excluding travel-related child care. The countries are listed in order of GDP per capita (measured in 2000 U.S. dollars), from the United Nation's Statistics Division National Accounts Main Aggregates Database.

The patterns of Table 4 are broadly consistent with the cross-sectional patterns found within the United States. Countries with higher GDP per capita on average spend more time on child care. The table shows that parents in the United States, Canada, and Norway spend the most amount of time caring for their children.

Parents in South Africa, France, and Slovenia spend the least amount of time in child care. The gender gap in time spent with children varies widely across countries. The ratio of time spent by mothers to time spent by fathers is the lowest in Canada, Netherlands, Norway, and the United States, with ratios of childcare hours that are approximately two to one. The ratio of time exceeds three to one in Estonia, Austria, France, Palestine, and most notably South Africa, where the ratio of mother-to-father time in child care pushes ten to one.

Of course, there are dramatic differences in the demographics of parents across the countries we examine. Maternal labor force participation ranges from a low of 12 percent in Palestine to over 65 percent in Canada, Norway, Slovenia, United Kingdom, and the United States. Countries also differ with regard to the age distribution of parents as well as number of children. To adjust for such differences across countries, we regressed time spent with children, separately for men and for women, on country indicator variables (with the United States as the excluded country); five-year age category indicators; number-of-children indicators; whether the household includes a child under the age of five; marital status indicators for the parent; an indicator for employment; and a full set of interactions between marital status and employment status indicators. This adjustment makes the relationship between per capita GDP and time spent with children even more positive. Specifically, for both men and women separately, the simple correlation between the average time spent on child care (after purging demographic differences across the countries) and GDP per capita for the 14 countries for which we have time use data is well above 0.8. Across countries, higher income is related to more time spent on child care. The patterns could in part be explained by the relationship described in the paper by Feyrer, Sacerdote, and Stern in this symposium whereby greater bargaining power by women in richer countries induces fathers to spend more time with their children, which in turn leads to greater fertility. However, we find a positive gradient between GDP per capita and time spent with children even after purging differences in the number of children across countries.

Table 5 confirms the U.S. patterns of the educational gradient of time spent with children *within* each country in our sample. We restrict this analysis to women with children. As we did with the U.S. data, we report conditional differences in time spent in child care between educational groups. The method we used to compute the conditional educational differences in time spent with children within all other countries was identical to the procedure we used to compute the conditional educational differences in the United States. Within the non-U.S. countries, however, we only segmented the population into two educational categories (high and low) as opposed to four. We chose the educational cutoff within each country such that the high-educated group comprised roughly 30 percent of the women-with-children sample.

Table 5 shows the educational difference of high-educated women relative to low-educated women, conditional on demographics, for both working women with children and nonworking women with children. In every country, high-educated

Table 5

Conditional Differences in Hours per Week Spent in Total Child Care for Women by Educational Attainment

Country	Working women with kids		Nonworking women with kids	
	Fraction high educated	Difference in time spent on child care by high educated	Fraction high educated	Difference in time spent on child care by high educated
Canada	0.36	1.21 (0.47)	0.29	2.91 (1.35)
Chile	0.47	2.18 (1.54)	0.23	-0.11 (1.21)
France	0.37	0.47 (0.35)	0.24	1.47 (0.70)
Germany	0.35	0.04 (0.34)	0.25	0.81 (0.84)
Italy	0.59	2.06 (0.44)	0.33	1.86 (0.62)
Netherlands	0.39	2.01 (1.31)	0.24	0.25 (1.33)
Norway	0.28	1.15 (0.64)	0.15	6.31 (2.06)
Palestine	0.63	1.56 (0.95)	0.27	2.89 (0.86)
Slovenia	0.31	1.52 (0.75)	0.14	2.31 (2.47)
South Africa	0.33	0.58 (0.66)	0.21	0.99 (1.12)
United Kingdom	0.35	1.87 (0.56)	0.22	4.17 (1.77)
United States	0.31	3.39 (0.33)	0.22	5.43 (0.77)

Notes: This table reports estimated hours per week differences in time spent in child care between women with high and low levels of education within each country, where “high” is defined as being in roughly the top third of educational attainment among women in one’s country. The sample includes all individuals between the ages of 21 and 55 (inclusive) with at least one child under the age of 18 present in the household who had time diaries summing to a complete day (1440 minutes). Austria and Estonia are dropped from the analysis because specific control variables are not available (for example, age of child). Differences by education are from a regression of time spent with children on a “high education” dummy and demographic controls. All regressions are estimated using fixed demographic weights to ensure equal representation across each day of the week within subgroups. Robust standard errors are in parentheses.

women spend more time on child care than low-educated women; the only exception is nonworking women in Chile, where the difference is essentially zero. Furthermore, even though the sample sizes are small in many of these surveys, the differences are usually statistically significant at standard levels.

In short, higher-educated (and presumably higher-income) individuals spend more time in child care than their lower-educated (and presumably lower-income) counterparts in all countries that we analyzed. Furthermore, the

absolute level of time spent in child care across countries is positively correlated with cross-country differences in GDP per capita.¹¹ These results are consistent with the patterns found in the United States and are consistent with the interpretation that child care is valued more by individuals with higher earnings potential.

Conclusion

We draw three major empirical conclusions about parental childcare time: 1) higher earnings or earnings potential are associated with more time spent with children; 2) this relationship appears to hold within the United States, across other countries, and within other countries examined; and 3) the positive education and income gradients in time spent in child care are the opposite of the education and income gradients observed for typical leisure and home production activities. Collectively, our results show that time spent with one's children seems to be valued more by individuals with a higher opportunity cost of time. This result could arise if child care is more of a luxury good than other consumption commodities; if higher-educated parents have a lower elasticity of substitution between own and market-based child care or just a higher relative preference for time spent with their children; or if the returns to investing in the children of higher-educated parents are higher than the returns to investing in the children of lower-educated parents. The fact that we see the education gradient in child care as a primary activity but do not see it in total time spent with children may suggest that highly-educated parents view child care as an investment in which it is important to devote their active attention. Future research should seek to differentiate between these hypotheses.

Regardless of why parents with higher levels of education and income spend more time on child care, the fact that they do so may have important implications for the intergenerational transmission of human capital. Whether it is because higher-educated parents demand more cared-for children, or because higher-educated parents are more effective at enriching their children through face to face interaction, the fact that the children of higher-educated parents enjoy more time being cared for directly by their parents may have important effects on their development, both economic and otherwise.

¹¹ Sayer, Gauthier, and Furstenberg (2004) examine the link between education and time spent with children among married parents in Canada, Germany, Italy, and Norway using MTUS data. They hypothesized that the educational differential in parental child care would be less pronounced in states with more generous welfare states. Their findings do not support this prediction. Joesch and Spiess (2006) use data from the 1996 wave of the European Community Household Panel (ECHP) to compare the time mothers spend with children across nine European countries. ECHP is based on a retrospective survey that asks each sample household member age 16 years or older about their normal daily activities. Given differences in time measurement within retrospective surveys compared to time measurement via time diaries, it is hard to compare their results directly with those we present here.

Child care is productive, like home production. Child care is also enjoyable, like leisure. But we infer from the patterns in the data that parents view time spent with their children as fundamentally different from either home production or leisure. Further studies of what makes time spent caring for and investing in children unique could prove both informative and important.

■ *The authors thank Seth Freedman for his extremely capable research assistance. We also thank Rebecca Vichniac for her help in obtaining data from various countries. We thank Bruce Sacerdote and Anna Lusardi for their assistance in translating the Italian time use documentation. We thank Susanne Bianchi, Jim Hines, Valerie Ramey, Andrei Shleifer, Tim Smeeding, Jeremy Stein, and Timothy Taylor for helpful comments on previous drafts. None of the agencies of the individual governments who provided the international time use data bear any responsibility for the analysis or interpretation of the time use data.*

References

- Aguiar, Mark, and Erik Hurst.** 2007. "Measuring Trends in Leisure: The Allocation of Time Over Five Decades." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 122(3): 969–1006.
- Becker, Gary, S.** 1965. "A Theory of the Allocation of Time." *The Economic Journal*, 75(299): 493–517.
- Bianchi, Suzanne.** 2000. "Maternal Employment and Time with Children: Dramatic Change or Surprising Continuity?" *Demography*, 37(4): 401–414.
- Bianchi, Suzanne M., John P. Robinson, and Melissa A. Milkie.** 2006. *Changing Rhythms of American Family Life*. ASA Rose Series. New York: Russell Sage.
- Bianchi, Suzanne M., and John P. Robinson.** 1997. "What Did You Do Today? Children's Use of Time, Family Composition, and the Acquisition of Social Capital." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 59(2): 332–44.
- Blau, Francine D., and Adam J. Grossberg.** 1990. "Maternal Labor Supply and Children's Cognitive Development." *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 74(3): 474–81.
- Brooks-Gunn, Jeanne, Wen-Jui Han, and Jane Waldfogel.** 2002. "Maternal Employment and Child Outcomes in the First Three Years of Life." *Child Development*, 73(4): 1052–72.
- Burda, Michael, Daniel Hamermesh, and Philippe Weil.** Forthcoming. "The Distribution of Total Work in the EU and US." In *Working Hours and Job Sharing in the EU and USA*, ed. Boeri, T., Burda, M. C., and Karmarz, F. Oxford University Press.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics and U.S. Census Bureau.** 2002–2006. The American Time Use Survey.
- Coleman, James S.** 1988. "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital." *The American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 94, Supplement: Organizations and Institutions: Sociological and Economic Approaches to the Analysis of Social Structure, pp. S95–S120.
- Cooksey, Elizabeth C., and Michelle M. Fondell.** 1996. "Spending Time with His Kids: Effects of Family Structure on Fathers' and Children's Lives." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 58(3): 693–707.
- Datcher-Loury, Linda.** 1988. "Effects of Mother's Home Time on Children's Schooling." *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 70(3):367–73.
- Etaugh, Claire.** 1984. "Effects of Maternal Employment on Children: An Updated Review." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association.
- Folbre, Nancy, and Jayoung Yoon.** 2007. "What is Child Care? Lessons from Time-Use Surveys of Major English-Speaking Countries." *Review of Economics of the Household*, 5(3): 223–8.
- Folbre, Nancy, Jayoung Yoon, Kade Finnoff,**

- and Allison Sidle Fuligni. 2005. "By What Measure? Family Time Devoted to Children in the United States." *Demography*, 42(2): 373–90.
- Gauthier, Ann H., Timothy M. Smeeding, and Frank F. Furstenberg, Jr. 2004. "Are Parents Investing Less Time in Children? Trends in Selected Industrialized Countries." *Population and Development Review*, 30(4): 647–71.
- Guryan, Jonathan, Erik Hurst, and Melissa Kearney. 2008. "Parental Education and Parental Time Spent with Children." NBER Working Paper 13993.
- Han, Wen-Jui, Jane Waldfogel, Jeanne Brooks-Gunn. 2001. "The Effects of Early Maternal Employment on Later Cognitive and Behavioral Outcomes." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 63(2): 336–54.
- Haveman, Robert, and Barbara Wolfe. 1995. "The Determinants of Children's Attainments: A Review of Methods and Findings." *Journal of Economic Literature*, 33(4): 1829–79.
- Hill, C. Russell, and Frank P. Stafford. 1974. "Allocation of Time to Preschool Children and Educational Opportunity." *The Journal of Human Resources*, 9(3): 323–41.
- Joesch, Jutta M., and Katharina Spiess. 2006. "European Mothers' Time Spent Looking after Children—Differences and Similarities across Nine Countries." *Electronic International Journal of Time Use Research*, 3(1): 1–27.
- Juster, Thomas. 1985. "Preferences for Work and Leisure." In *Time, Goods, and Well-Being*, ed. F. T. Juster and F. P. Stafford, 333–51. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
- Kimmel, Jean, and Rachel Connelly. 2007. "Mothers' Time Choices: Caregiving, Leisure, Home Production, and Paid Work." *Journal of Human Resources*, 42(3), 643–61.
- Klerman, Jacob A., and Arleen Leibowitz. 1999. "Job Continuity among New Mothers." *Demography*, 36(2): 145–55.
- Krueger, Alan, Daniel Kahneman, David Schkade, Norbert Schwarz, and Arthur Stone. Forthcoming. "National Time Accounting: The Currency of Life." In *National Time Accounting and Subjective Well-Being*, ed. Alan Krueger, chap. 1. University of Chicago Press.
- Leibowitz, Arleen. 1972. "Women's Allocation of Time to Market and Nonmarket Activities: Differences by Education." Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1972.
- Leibowitz, Arleen. 1974. "Home Investments in Children." *Journal of Political Economy*, 82(2): 111–31.
- Leibowitz, Arleen. 1977. "Parental Inputs and Children's Achievement." *Journal of Human Resources*, 12(2): 243–51.
- Multinational Time Use Study, Version 5.5.2. 2005. Created by Jonathan Gershuny, Kimberly Fisher, and Anne H. Gauthier, with Alyssa Borkosky, Anita Bortnik, Donna Dosman, Cara Fedick, Tyler Frederick, Sally Jones, Tingting Lu, Fiona Lui, Leslie MacRae, Berenice Monna, Monica Pauls, Cori Pawlak, Nuno Torres, and Charlemagne Victorino. Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex, Colchester, UK. (Released October 14). <http://www.timeuse.org/mtus/>.
- Pleck, Joseph H. 1997. "Paternal Involvement: Levels, Sources, and Consequences." In *The Role of the Father in Child Development*, 3rd edition, ed. Michael E. Lamb, 66–103 New York: Wiley.
- Ramey, Garey, and Valerie Ramey. 2007. "The Rug Rat Race." *University of San Diego Working Paper*. http://weber.ucsd.edu/~vramey/research/Rugrat_121907.pdf.
- Robinson, John, and Geoffrey Godbey. 1999. *Time for Life*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Sayer, Liana, Suzanne Bianchi, and John Robinson. 2004. "Are Parents Investing Less in Children? Trends in Mothers' and Fathers' Time with Children." *American Journal of Sociology*, 110(1): 1–43.
- Sayer, Liana C., Anne H. Gauthier, and Frank F. Furstenberg, Jr. 2004. "Educational Differences in Parents' Time with Children: Cross-National Variations." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66(5): 1152–69.
- Stelman, Lala C., and James A. Mercy. 1980. "Unconfounding the Confluence Model: A Test of the Sibship Size and Birth Order Effects on Intelligence." *American Sociological Review*, 45(4): 571–82.
- Zick, Cathleen D., and W. Keith Bryant. 1996. "A New Look at Parents' Time Spent in Child Care: Primary and Secondary Time Use." *Social Science Research*, 25(3): 260–280.

Data Appendix

We use the 2003–2006 American Time Use Surveys for our U.S. analysis. See table A1 for information about the time use surveys used in the international analysis. This table includes surveys accessed through the Multinational Time Use Survey (MTUS), a harmonized dataset with consistent time use categories and demographic variables constructed from many time use surveys. The American Time Use Survey uses a 24-hour recall of the previous day’s activities to record time diary information. This survey collects diaries for one individual per household. Below, we briefly summarize the other salient features of these surveys.

The 2003–2006 American Time Use Surveys (ATUS) were conducted by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). Participants in ATUS, which include children over the age of 15, are drawn from the existing sample of the Current Population Survey (CPS). The individual is sampled approximately 3 months after completion of the final CPS survey. At the time of the ATUS survey, the BLS updated the respondent’s employment and demographic information. Roughly 1,700 individuals completed the survey each month, yielding an annual sample of over 20,000 individuals in 2003. The size of the sample was decreased to about 13,000 individuals annually for the 2004–2006 surveys.

We restrict our sample to include only those household members who were between the ages of 21 and 55 with a child present in the household and who had a completed 24-hour time diary. The NBER working paper version of Aguiar and Hurst (2007) documents that the demographic composition of the ATUS is similar to that of the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID) once similar sample restrictions are made. The restriction that all individuals had to have a complete time diary was innocuous for the ATUS data but is relevant in surveys from the other countries that we examine. In total, our United States sample included 23,694 individuals. In Table A1, the sample sizes, given our sample restrictions, are shown for each time use survey. In surveys in which individuals completed more than a one-day survey, we counted each 24-hour diary as a separate observation. The one exception to this rule is in the Netherlands Time Use Survey in which each respondent completes a full week survey. These week-long surveys were each counted as one observation. The total pooled sample across all countries includes 88,033 diary observations.

One challenge in comparing the time use datasets with each other is the fact that the surveys report time use at differing levels of aggregation. Table A1 shows the number of different time use subcategories that are reported in the raw data of each of the surveys. To create consistent measures of time use across the surveys, we began by working with the raw ATUS data at the level of subcategories as in Aguiar and Hurst (2007). In order to render our analysis tractable we aggregated an individual’s time allocation into 21 categories described in Table A2. Travel time

Table A1
Description of Time Use Surveys

<i>Country</i>	<i>Survey (source)</i>	<i>Sample coverage</i>	<i>Survey methodology</i>	<i>Survey coverage</i>	<i>Total sample size^b</i>	<i>Analysis sample size^b</i>	<i>Number of time use categories</i>
Austria ^a	Zeitverwendung 1992 (Beitrage zur Osterreichischen Statistik (STAT))	Nationally Representative. One individual from each household over the age of 10 completes the survey.	Each individual completes one diary. Individuals complete diary throughout their day.	Mar. and Sep. 1992	25,162	5,174	197
Canada	General Social Survey Cycles 12 and 19: Time Use (Statistics Canada)	Nationally Representative. Participants chosen through random digit dialing. One individual from each household over the age of 15 completes the survey.	Each individual completes one diary. 24-hour recall of previous day's activities. Activities recorded in respondents own words and then translated into categories.	Feb. 1998–Jan. 1999	10,749	3,105	178
				Jan. 2005–Dec. 2005	19,597	4,804	182
Chile	Use of Time in Chile (Department of Social Studies, Department of Sociology of the Universidad Catolica of Chile)	Representative of population over 15 years old in Santiago.	Each individual completes two one-day diaries—one weekday (Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday) and one weekend day. Respondents complete diary using a predetermined activity codes.	Mar. 1999–May 1999	4,358	1,742	48
Estonia	Time Use Survey (State Statistical Office of Estonia, Tallinn)	Household members ages 10 and above complete survey.	Each individual completes two one-day diaries. Individuals complete diary throughout their day. Activities recorded in respondents own words and then translated into categories.	Mar. 1999–Apr. 2000	11,456	3,803	167

(continued on next page)

Table A1—continued

Description of Time Use Surveys

<i>Country</i>	<i>Survey (source)</i>	<i>Sample coverage</i>	<i>Survey methodology</i>	<i>Survey coverage</i>	<i>Total sample size^b</i>	<i>Analysis sample size^b</i>	<i>Number of time use categories</i>
Italy	National Time Use Survey (Istituto Nazionale di Statistica)	Nationally representative. All household members complete survey. Parents fill out the survey for those too young to fill it out themselves.	Each individual completes one diary. Individuals complete diary throughout the day. Activities recorded in respondents own words and then translated into categories.	Apr. 2002–Mar. 2003	51,206	12,345	265
France ^a	Time Use Survey (National Institute for Statistics and Economic Studies, (INSEE))	All individuals within household age 15 and over completed the survey.	Each individual completes one diary. Individuals complete diary throughout their day.	Feb. 1998–Feb. 1999	15,318	4,600	139
Germany ^a	The 1991/92 Time Budget Survey of the Federal Republic of Germany (Federal Ministry of Family Affairs and Senior Citizens Federal Statistical Office)	All individuals within household ages 12 and above complete survey.	Each individual completes two diaries on successive days. Individuals complete diary throughout their day. Activities recorded in respondents own words and then translated into categories.	Oct., Nov. 1991 and Feb., Mar., Apr., Jun., Jul., 1992	25,775	10,213	231
Netherlands	Time Use Survey (SCP, Cebuco, Publieke Omroep, Universiteit van Tilburg, and Adviesdienst Verkeer en Vervoer)	Nationally Representative. Participants are drawn randomly from the PTT Post address database. One individual from each household over the age of 12 completes the survey.	Each individual completes a 7-day diary. Individuals complete diary throughout their day. Respondents complete diary using a predetermined activity codes.	Oct. 2000	1,813	515	270
Norway ^a	Tidsnyttingsundersokelsen (Central Bureau of Statistics)	One individual from each household over the age of 16 completes the survey.	Each individual completes two diaries on successive days. Individuals complete diary throughout their day. Activities recorded in respondents own words and then translated into categories.	Feb. 1990–Jan. 1991	6,129	2,152	123

(continued on next page)

Table A1—continued
Description of Time Use Surveys

<i>Country</i>	<i>Survey (source)</i>	<i>Sample coverage</i>	<i>Survey methodology</i>	<i>Survey coverage</i>	<i>Total sample size^b</i>	<i>Analysis sample size^b</i>	<i>Number of time use categories</i>
Palestine	Time Use Survey (Palestine Central Bureau of Statistics)	Representative of individuals 10 years old and over who are usually resident in the Palestinian Territory. Participants are drawn from the 1997 Population, Housing and Establishments Census. Two randomly selected individuals (one male and one female) from each household over the age of 10 complete the survey.	Each individual completes one diary. Individuals complete diary throughout their day. Activities recorded in respondents own words and then translated into categories.	May 1999– May 2000	6,863	2,806	94
Slovenia ^a	Time Use Survey (Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia)	All individuals within household ages 10 and above complete survey.	Each individual completes two one-day diaries—one weekday and one weekend day. Individuals complete diary throughout their day. Activities recorded in respondents own words and then translated into categories.	Apr. 2000– Mar. 2001	12,273	3,395	174

(continued on next page)

Table A1—continued
Description of Time Use Surveys

Country	Survey (source)	Sample coverage	Survey methodology	Survey coverage	Total sample size ^b	Analysis sample size ^b	Number of time use categories
South Africa ^a	Time Use in South Africa (Statistics South Africa)	Nationally Representative. Participants drawn by sampling addresses. Two randomly selected individuals from each household over the age of 10 complete the survey.	Each individual completes one diary. 24-hour recall of the previous day's activities.	Feb., Jun., and Oct. 2000	14,217	3,767	108
United Kingdom	United Kingdom Time Use Survey (Ipsos-RSL and Office for National Statistics)	Nationally Representative. Participants are drawn randomly from the Postcode Address File. All individuals within household ages 8 and above complete survey.	Each individual completes two one-day diaries—one weekday and one weekend day. Individuals complete diary throughout their day. Activities recorded in respondents own words and then translated into categories.	Jun. 2000–Sep. 2001	20,981	4,881	250
United States	American Time Use Survey (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics)	Nationally Representative. Participants are drawn from the existing sample of the Current Population Survey (CPS). One individual from each household over the age of 15 completes the survey. Survey is conducted approximately three months after the individual's last CPS survey.	Each individual completes one diary. 24-hour recall of previous day's activities. Activities recorded in respondents own words and then translated into categories.	Jan. 2003–Dec. 2003 Jan. 2004–Dec. 2004 Jan. 2005–Dec. 2005 Jan. 2006–Dec. 2006	20,720 13,973 13,038 12,943	7,924 5,156 5,328 5,286	~400 (Some minor changes from year to year)

Note: "Analysis sample size" refers to the number of observations from each survey that we use in our main empirical analysis. We restrict the sample to include only individuals between the ages of 21 and 55 (inclusive) with at least one child under the age of 18 present in the household. We also restrict the sample to include only those individuals who had time diaries that summed to a complete day (i.e., 1440 minutes). All surveys include sample weights. All weights are adjusted to ensure each day of the week and each survey are uniformly represented.

^a Data for these countries were accessed through the Multinational Time Use Survey (MTUS). MTUS has harmonized many time use surveys into a dataset with consistent time use categories and demographic variables. This table describes the original data source utilized by the MTUS as best as possible.

^b Sample sizes refer to the number of diaries. If each respondent for a given survey completed more than one 24-hour diary, each diary is considered as a separate observation, except in the case of the Netherlands where each individual's full week diary is counted as one observation.

Table A2

Time Use Classifications

<i>Time use classification</i>	<i>Examples of activities included</i>
Core market work	Work for pay, main job (including time spent working at home); work for pay, other jobs
Total market work	“Core market work” plus other work related activities such as: commuting to/from work; meals/breaks at work; searching for a job; applying for unemployment benefits
Core nonmarket work	Food preparation; food presentation; kitchen/food cleanup; washing/drying clothes; ironing; dusting; vacuuming; indoor cleaning; indoor painting; etc.
Shopping/obtaining goods and services	Grocery shopping; shopping for other goods; comparison shopping; clipping coupons; going to bank; going to post office; meeting with lawyer; going to veterinarian; etc. (excluding any time spent acquiring medical care)
Total nonmarket work	“Core nonmarket work” plus “Shopping/obtaining goods and services” plus all other home production including: vehicle repair; outdoor repair; outdoor painting; yard work; pet care; gardening; etc.
Education	Taking classes for degree; personal interest courses; homework for coursework; research for coursework; etc.
Sleeping	Sleeping; naps
Personal care	Grooming; bathing; sex; going to the bathroom; etc. (excluding any time spent on own medical care)
Own medical care	Visiting doctor’s/dentist’s office (including time waiting); dressing wounds; taking insulin; etc.
Eating	Eating meals at home; eating meals away from home; etc.
Primary child care	Breast feeding; rocking a child to sleep; general feeding; changing diapers; providing medical care to child; grooming child; etc.
Educational child care	Reading to children; teaching children; helping children with homework; attending meetings at a child’s school; etc.
Recreational child care	Playing games with children; playing outdoors with children; attending a child’s sporting event or dance recital; going to the zoo with children, taking walks with children; etc.
Sports/exercise	Playing sports; attending sporting events; exercise
TV	Watching television
Entertainment (not TV)	Going to movies and theater; listening to music; computer use for leisure
Socializing	Attending/hosting social events; playing games; telephone calls
Reading	Reading books, magazines; personal mail; personal email
Gardening/pet care	Caring for lawn, garden, houseplants, and pets
Hobbies	Arts and crafts; collecting; playing musical instrument
Religious/civic activities	Religious practice/participation; fraternal organizations; volunteer work; union meetings; AA meetings; etc.

associated with each activity is embedded in the total time spent on the activity, except for child care in which we consider travel for the purpose of child care as a separate classification. For the purposes of classifying childcare time use in the other countries that we analyze, we attempt to include similar activities to those defined in the ATUS. As noted in the text, we only consider total childcare time in the international analysis, because some surveys do not allow classification of

childcare time into finer categories. Unfortunately, not all surveys allow for childcare-related travel time to be disaggregated from other travel time. The MTUS has already created a childcare time use category and a travel-time time use category. Because we only have access to these aggregated time use variables, we cannot include travel time related to child care in our measure of childcare time use for those surveys accessed through MTUS (Austria, France, Germany, Norway, Slovenia, and South Africa). Furthermore, the time use categories supplied by the surveys of Chile and Palestine do not allow travel time for the purpose of child care to be separated from other travel time. In the other surveys (Canada, Italy, the United States, and the United Kingdom) we can identify travel related to child care as a separate time use classification. Because we cannot always disentangle travel for the purpose of child care from other travel time, but we can separate travel from other childcare activities in Canada, Italy, the United States, and the United Kingdom, in the international analysis we will exclude travel time from our total child care measure.

Likewise, we cannot separately identify time spent caring for nonhousehold children in all countries. The U.S. data, however, does allow us to distinguish between time spent with household children and time spent with nonhousehold children. In our U.S. sample of adults with children, time spent with nonhousehold children accounts for only 0.34 hours per week, which makes up (roughly) only 3 percent of total child care documented in Table 1. Excluding time spent with nonhousehold children from our analysis does not change the income or education gradients highlighted in this paper in any way. We chose to include the time spent with nonhousehold children in our base U.S. analysis for comparability with the international data.

We also attempted to create harmonized demographic variables between the surveys that we utilized. These demographics include 5-year age categories; sex and marital status of survey respondents; the presence of children under 18 years of age in the household; the presence of children under 5 years of age in the household; the number of children under 18 years of age in the household; and the employment status of the individual. Table A3 describes the demographic variables utilized in our analysis. This table also describes any difficulties in defining consistent demographic variables between surveys by summarizing any exceptions in variable definition. For our “working” variable, this table describes how we classified an individual as working. In our international analysis, we will limit “number of children” dummies to indicators for zero children, one child, or two or more children because in the 1998 Canada survey we can only identify up to two children.

In analysis comparing the education gradient in childcare time use between countries, we define a dichotomous variable indicating highly educated individuals. Education variables are defined very differently in each survey, and the number of categories varies from as few as 5 to as many as 31 as seen in Table A4. To define our harmonized education variable we attempted to categorize the 30 percent highest educated individuals in our women-with-children sample in each country as highly educated. We chose 30 percent because this matches the fraction of women

Table A3

Demographic Variables: Definitions and Exceptions

<i>Country</i>	<i>Age:</i> <i>5-year categories:</i> ≤20, 21–25, 26–30, . . . , 56–60, ≥61	<i>Male:</i> <i>equal to 1 if</i> <i>respondent is</i> <i>male.</i>	<i>Married:</i> <i>equal to 1 if</i> <i>respondent is married.</i>	<i>Hv child:</i> <i>equal to 1 if</i> <i>there is a child</i> <i><18 years old</i> <i>present in the</i> <i>household.</i>	<i>Child_5:</i> <i>equal to 1 if</i> <i>there is a child</i> <i><5 years old</i> <i>present in the</i> <i>household.</i>	<i>Num_child:</i> <i>set of dummies for number of</i> <i>children <18 years old</i> <i>present in the household.</i>	<i>Working:</i> <i>equal to 1 if respondent</i> <i>is working.</i>
Austria*			No code indicating common law/cohab. “Married” may or may not include these individuals		Cannot identify if there are children under 5 in household.	Variable in original dataset only included children <15 and did not include all <i>respondents</i> <15. MTUS recodes variable to include all respondents <18 with relationship of child to household head. This may inflate Num_child = 1, as one cannot know if this is only child in household.	Employment status as full time, part time, or unknown job hours.
Canada	In 2005 survey, categories off by 1 year (20–24, etc.)			Equal to 1 if the <i>respondent</i> has a child <18 years old.	Equal to 1 if the <i>respondent</i> has a child <5 years old.	Number of <i>respondent’s</i> children. Also, in 2005 survey, can include children over 18 if youngest child <18.	Main activity last week was working OR paid vacation OR had a job/self-employed at any time last week.
Chile							Main activity is paid work.

(continued on next page)

Table A3—continued
Demographic Variables: Definitions and Exceptions

Country	Age: 5-year categories: ≤20, 21–25, 26–30, . . . , 56–60, ≥61	Male: equal to 1 if respondent is male.	Married: equal to 1 if respondent is married.	Ho child: equal to 1 if there is a child <18 years old present in the household.	Child_5: equal to 1 if there is a child <5 years old present in the household.	Num_child: set of dummies for number of children <18 years old present in the household.	Working: equal to 1 if respondent is working.
Estonia	Categories off by 1 year (20–24, etc.)				Cannot identify if there are children under 5 in household.	Cannot identify number of children, because we cannot see how many children <10 years old reside in the household (only know <i>if</i> there are any children <10).	Worked, produced agricultural products, or temporarily absent from work in past week.
Italy							Only or prevailing professional condition as employed.
France*			Equal to 1 if individual is married or cohabitating.				Employment status as full time, part time, or unknown job hours.
Germany*	Original survey had 5-year age groups of the form 20–24 etc. MTUS converted to a continuous age variable based on midpoints of intervals. Therefore, translation to our 5-year age groups will not be exact for all respondents.		Equal to 1 if individual is married or cohabitating.		Equal to 1 if there is a child <6 years old present in the household.	There is no age definition for children in original dataset. Also, variable in original dataset only includes children of the <i>respondent</i> . MTUS recodes variable to include all respondents <18 with status in household as child, “child in law,” or grandchild. This may inflate num_child = 1, as one cannot know if this is only child in household.	Employment status as full time, part time, or unknown job hours.

(continued on next page)

Table A3—continued

Demographic Variables: Definitions and Exceptions

<i>Country</i>	<i>Age:</i> 5-year categories: ≤20, 21–25, 26–30, . . . , 56–60, ≥61	<i>Male:</i> equal to 1 if respondent is male.	<i>Married:</i> equal to 1 if respondent is married.	<i>No child:</i> equal to 1 if there is a child <18 years old present in the household.	<i>Child_5:</i> equal to 1 if there is a child <5 years old present in the household.	<i>Num_child:</i> set of dummies for number of children <18 years old present in the household.	<i>Working:</i> equal to 1 if respondent is working.
Netherlands			Equal to 1 if respondent is living with a “Permanent Partner.”				“yes, currently employed”
Norway*	MTUS computes age by subtracting the year of birth of the respondent from the survey year (“90”). This is somewhat inaccurate given that the survey was conducted in both 1990 and 1991.		Equal to 1 if individual is married or cohabitating.		Equal to 1 if there is a child <7 years old present in the household.	Variable in original dataset does not include respondents who are <18. MTUS recodes variable to include all respondents <18 living with one or two parents. This may inflate Num_child = 1, as one cannot know if this is only child in household.	Employment status as full time, part time, or unknown job hours.
Palestine							“Worker from 1–14 hours” or “Worker 15 hours or more”

(continued on next page)

Table A3—continued

Demographic Variables: Definitions and Exceptions

Country	Age: 5-year categories: ≤20, 21–25, 26–30, . . . , 56–60, ≥61	Male: equal to 1 if respondent is male.	Married: equal to 1 if respondent is married.	Hv child: equal to 1 if there is a child <18 years old present in the household.	Child_5: equal to 1 if there is a child <5 years old present in the household.	Num_child: set of dummies for number of children <18 years old present in the household.	Working: equal to 1 if respondent is working.
Slovenia*			Equal to 1 if individual is married or cohabitating.				Employment status as full time, part time, or unknown job hours.
South Africa*			Equal to 1 if individual is married or cohabitating.		Equal to 1 if there is a child <7 years old present in the household.	Variable in original dataset had many missing cases. Those respondents aged 18+ had missing cases coded as 0 by MTUS. Those respondents <18 had missing values coded as 1 by MTUS, which may inflate Num_child = 1, as one cannot know if this is only child in household.	Employment status as full time, part time, or unknown job hours.
United Kingdom							Economically active (in employment)
United States							Employed (either employed and at work, or employed and absent)

Note: Entries in this table represent exceptions to the demographic variable definitions described in the first row. The “working” column summarizes how an individual is classified as working in each survey.

* Data for these countries were accessed through the Multinational Time Use Survey (MTUS). MTUS has harmonized many time use surveys into a dataset with consistent time use categories and demographic variables.

Table A4
Education Classification by Country

<i>Education group</i>	<i>Canada</i>	<i>Chile</i>	<i>France</i>	<i>Germany</i>	<i>Italy</i>
Low	10 Elementary school/ no schooling	1 Uneducated	0 Without a diploma or not declared	101 'lower 2ndary leaving cert, no vocational training'	9 No title (no read and/or write)
	9 Some secondary/high school	2 Basic incomplete	1 CEP, DFEO	102 'lower 2ndary leaving cert & apprenticeship'	8 No title (read and write)
	8 High school diploma	3 Basic complete	2 BEPC	103 'lower 2ndary leaving cert & traineeship'	7 Elementary school
		4 Half incomplete	3 CAP, BEP0	104 'lower 2ndary leaving cert & higher vocational diploma'	6 License middle school
		5 Half full scientific humanist	4 Bac technique	105 'lower 2ndary leaving cert & Fachschule, DDR profess diploma'	5 High School Diploma (2-3 years)
				201 'intermediate 2ndary leaving cert & no vocational'	
				202 'intermediate 2ndary leaving cert & traineeship'	
				203 'intermediate 2ndary leaving cert & traineeship'	
				204 'intermediate 2ndary leaving cert & higher voc diploma'	
				205 'intermediate 2ndary leaving cert & Fachschule, DDRprofess dip'	
				301 'AllgemeinbildendePolytechnischeOberschule, DDR, no voc'	
				302 'AllgemeinbildendePolytechnischeOberschule, DDR, apprent'	
				303 'AllgemeinbildendePolytechnische Oberschule, DDR, trnshp'	
				304 'AllgemeinbildendePolytechnischeOberschule, DDR, hgr voc'	

(continued on next page)

Table A4—continued

Education Classification by Country

<i>Education group</i>	<i>Canada</i>	<i>Chile</i>	<i>France</i>	<i>Germany</i>	<i>Italy</i>
High	7 Some trade/technical college/CEGEP/nursing	6 Half incomplete technique	5 Bac general	305 'AllgemeinbildendePolytechnischeOberschule, DDR, F DDR'	4 High School Diploma (4–5 years)
	6 Some community college/CEGEP/nursing	7 Half complete technique	6 Bac + 2	401 'tech college entry-level leaving cert, no voc'	3 University degree
	5 Some university	8 Technique incomplete higher	7 Superior a Bac + 2	402 'tech college entry-level leaving cert & apprenticeship'	2 Degree
	4 Diploma/certificate from trade/technical	9 Technique higher complete		403 'tech college entry-level leaving cert & traineeship'	1 Doctoral degree or postgraduate specialization
	3 Diploma/certificate from community college	10 Higher Education incomplete		404 'tech college entry-level leaving cert & higher voc diploma'	
	2 Bachelor's degree			405 'tech college entry-level leaving cert & F, DDR professship'	
	1 Doctorate/masters/some graduate			406 'tech college entry-level leaving cert & tech college degree'	
				501 'university entry-level leaving cert, no vocational'	
				502 'university entry-level leaving cert & apprenticeship'	
				503 'university entry-level leaving cert & traineeship'	
				504 'university entry-level leaving cert & higher voc diploma'	
				505 'university entry-level leaving cert & F, DDR profess dip'	
				506 'university entry-level leaving cert & tec college degree'	
				507 'university entry-level leaving cert & university degree'	
				601 'still without school leaving cert, no voc'	
				602 'still without school leaving cert & apprenticeship'	
				604 'still without school leaving cert & higher voc diploma'	

(continued on next page)

Table A4—continued
Education Classification by Country

<i>Education group</i>	<i>Netherlands</i>	<i>Palestine</i>	<i>South Africa</i>	<i>Slovenia</i>	<i>United Kingdom</i>	<i>United States</i>
Low	1 LA 2 LB 3 MA	1 Illiterate 2 Can read and write 3 Elementary 4 Preparatory	0 None 1 Grade 1/Sub A 2 Grade 2/Sub B 3 Grade 3/Standard 1 4 Grade 4/Standard 2 5 Grade 5/Standard 3 6 Grade 6/Standard 4 7 Grade 7/Standard 5 8 Grade 8/Standard 6/ Form 1 9 Grade 9/Standard 7/ Form 2 10 Grade 10/Standard 8/ Form 3 11 Grade 11/Standard 9/ Form 4	1 No education or incomplete basic education (1–3 grades of primary school) 2 Incomplete basic education (4–7 grades of primary school) 3 Basic education (finished primary school) 4 Short-term vocational, vocational education 5 Technical secondary education	14 Under 16 yrs—ineligible for questions 13 Eligible—No answer 12 No qualifications 11 Qualifications—Other, but DK grade/level 10 Qualifications—City & Guilds—DK level 9 Qualifications—GCSE— but DK grade 8 Qualifications—but DK which 7 Other qualification (including professional, vocational, foreign) 6 Qualification below GCSE/O level (e.g. trade apprenticeships) 5 GCSE below grade C, CSE, vocational level 1 & equivalent 4 O levels, GCSE grade A–C, vocational level 2 & equivalent 3 A levels, vocational level 3 & equivalent (e.g. AS level, NVQ 3)	31 Less than 1st grade 32 1st, 2nd, 3rd, or 4th grade 33 5th or 6th grade 34 7th or 8th grade 35 9th grade 36 10th grade 37 11th grade 38 12th grade—no diploma 39 High school graduate— diploma or equivalent (GED) 40 Some college but no degree 41 Associate degree— occupational/ vocational 42 Associate degree—academic program

(continued on next page)

Table A4—continued
Education Classification by Country

<i>Education group</i>	<i>Netherlands</i>	<i>Palestine</i>	<i>South Africa</i>	<i>Slovenia</i>	<i>United Kingdom</i>	<i>United States</i>
High	4 MB 5 HA 6 HB 7 HW	5 Secondary 6 Associate Diploma 7 Bachelor and Above	12 Grade 12/Standard 12/ Form 5/Matriculation	6 General secondary education 7 Postsecondary vocational education (vocational college, university college, university college specialization) 8 Higher undergraduate education—professional 9 Higher undergraduate education—academic 10 Higher postgraduate education (specialization, master’s degree, doctor’s degree)	2 Higher education below degree level (e.g. HNC, nursing qualification) 1 Degree level qualification or above	43 Bachelor’s degree (BA, AB, BS, etc.) 44 Master’s degree (MA, MS, MEng, MEd, MSW, etc.) 45 Professional school degree (MD, DDS, DVM, etc.) 46 Doctoral degree (PhD, EdD, etc.)

with children in the U.S. data that have 16 years of education or more—the highest category in our U.S. education gradient analysis. Table A4 lists which education categories fall into the high- and low-education groups for each country. Table 5 of the main text shows the fraction of women with children that are classified as highly educated for each country. As this table shows we were able to get close to 30 percent in most countries, except for the case of Italy, where the coarseness of the categories only allowed us to separate the top 47 percent of women with children. Table 5 also shows the fraction of the working and nonworking women-with-children samples that are classified as highly educated using the education assignments from the full women-with-children sample.

The raw time use data in most of the surveys are reported in units of “minutes per day” (totaling 1,440 minutes a day). We converted the minute-per-day reports to hours per week by multiplying the response by seven and dividing by 60. For the Netherlands, in which each observation covers a full week, we simply divide by 60 to find hours per week. When presenting the means and regression results we weighted the data using the sampling weights within each of the time use surveys. The weights account for differential response rates to ensure the samples are nationally representative. We make two adjustments to the weights provided by the various datasets. First, we adjusted weights so that each day of the week is equally represented within each demographic subcategory analyzed. Second, we adjust weights so each year of data has an equal sample size within countries with multiple years of data (Canada and the United States) and so each country has an equal sample size in the analysis that pools countries together. Like the first, this adjustment is made within each subcategory that we analyze.

This article has been cited by:

1. Chalachew Getahun Desta. 2020. Resources, Time and Gender: Determinants of Women's Housework in Bahir Dar and Nearby Rural Villages, Northwest Ethiopia. *Journal of Family Issues* 41:4, 507-541. [[Crossref](#)]
2. Elizabeth M. Caucutt, Lance Lochner. 2020. Early and Late Human Capital Investments, Borrowing Constraints, and the Family. *Journal of Political Economy* 128:3, 1065-1147. [[Crossref](#)]
3. Cristian Bortes, Mattias Strandh, Karina Nilsson. 2020. Sibling Ill Health and Children's Educational Outcomes. *Journal of School Health* 56. . [[Crossref](#)]
4. Eric D. Gould, Avi Simhon, Bruce A. Weinberg. 2020. Does Parental Quality Matter? Evidence on the Transmission of Human Capital Using Variation in Parental Influence from Death, Divorce, and Family Size. *Journal of Labor Economics* 000-000. [[Crossref](#)]
5. Zhou Yu. 2020. Homeownership attainment of adult children in urban China: parental attributes and financial support. *Housing Studies* 11, 1-33. [[Crossref](#)]
6. Lisa A. Gennetian, Christopher Rodrigues. 2020. Mothers' and Fathers' Time Spent with Children in the U.S.: Variations by Race/Ethnicity Within Income from 2003 to 2013. *Journal of Economics, Race, and Policy* 18. . [[Crossref](#)]
7. Guanyi Yang, Cynthia Bansak. 2020. Does wealth matter? An assessment of China's rural-urban migration on the education of left-behind children. *China Economic Review* 59, 101365. [[Crossref](#)]
8. Emin Gahramanov, Rashad Hasanov, Xueli Tang. 2020. Parental involvement and Children's human capital: A tax-subsidy experiment. *Economic Modelling* 85, 16-29. [[Crossref](#)]
9. Owen N. Schochet, Anna D. Johnson, Rebecca M. Ryan. 2020. The relationship between increases in low-income mothers' education and children's early outcomes: Variation by developmental stage and domain. *Children and Youth Services Review* 109, 104705. [[Crossref](#)]
10. Martin O'Flaherty, Janeen Baxter. 2020. The 'developmental gradient' revisited: Australian children's time with adult caregivers from infancy to middle childhood. *Social Science Research* 86, 102397. [[Crossref](#)]
11. Corina Mommaerts, Yulya Truskinovsky. 2020. The Cyclicity of Informal Care. *Journal of Health Economics* 102306. [[Crossref](#)]
12. Quynh-Anh N Nguyen, Thach D Tran, Tu-Anh Tran, TA Nguyen, Jane Fisher. 2020. Perceived Parenting Styles and Emotional Intelligence Among Adolescents in Vietnam. *The Family Journal* 40, 106648071989655. [[Crossref](#)]
13. Alvaro Hofflinger, Paul T. von Hippel. 2020. Does Achievement Rise Fastest with School Choice, School Resources, or Family Resources? Chile from 2002 to 2013. *Sociology of Education* 50, 003804071989935. [[Crossref](#)]
14. Juan Carlos Campaña, J. Ignacio Giménez-Nadal, José Alberto Molina. 2020. Self-employed and Employed Mothers in Latin American Families: Are There Differences in Paid Work, Unpaid Work, and Child Care?. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 122. . [[Crossref](#)]
15. Ioannis Giovos, Dimitrios K. Moutopoulos, Anastasia Charitou, Joan Gonzalvo. 2020. Primary school students' awareness about cetaceans in Greece. *Applied Environmental Education & Communication* 19:1, 101-115. [[Crossref](#)]
16. John McCollough. 2020. The impact of consumers' time constraint and conspicuous consumption behaviour on the throwaway society. *International Journal of Consumer Studies* 44:1, 33-43. [[Crossref](#)]
17. Jeehoon Han, Bruce D. Meyer, James X. Sullivan. 2020. Inequality in the joint distribution of consumption and time use. *Journal of Public Economics* 104106. [[Crossref](#)]

18. Daniel A. Hackman, Stephanie A. Robert, Jascha Grübel, Raphael P. Weibel, Eirini Anagnostou, Christoph Hölscher, Victor R. Schinazi. 2019. Neighborhood environments influence emotion and physiological reactivity. *Scientific Reports* 9:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
19. Jane Cooley Fruehwirth, Jessica Gagete-Miranda. 2019. Your peers' parents: Spillovers from parental education. *Economics of Education Review* 73, 101910. [[Crossref](#)]
20. Laurie F. DeRose, Frances Goldscheider, Javiera Reyes Brito, Andrés Salazar-Arango, Paúl Corcuera, Paúl J. Corcuera, Montserrat Gas-Aixendri. 2019. Are Children Barriers to the Gender Revolution? International Comparisons. *European Journal of Population* 35:5, 987-1021. [[Crossref](#)]
21. Tom Buchanan, Adian McFarlane, Anupam Das. 2019. The Gender Gap in Market Work Hours Among Canadians: Examining Essential(ist) Linkages to Parenting Time and Household Labour Hours. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Economics* 6, 026010791987424. [[Crossref](#)]
22. Sabine Blaurock, Katharina Kluczniok. 2019. Basic care, play, and teaching: the home learning environment and the 'developmental gradient' in time use with children. *Early Child Development and Care* 189:13, 2099-2112. [[Crossref](#)]
23. Marcus Dittrich, Bianka Mey. 2019. Time Use Choices and Volunteer Labour Supply. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 38. . [[Crossref](#)]
24. Kenneth Hemmereichs. 2019. The adjustment of home-based parental literacy involvement to the level of reading literacy of pupils in primary school: a quantitative formalisation and empirical test. *Educational Review* 71, 1-21. [[Crossref](#)]
25. Jianghong Liu, Chun Yee Natalie Au Yeung, Patrick W. L. Leung. 2019. The Mediation of Maternal Occupational Skillfulness on Maternal Education and Chinese Preschoolers' Behavior. *Child Indicators Research* 12:5, 1529-1547. [[Crossref](#)]
26. Alessandro Gavazza, Mattia Nardotto, Tommaso Valletti. 2019. Internet and Politics: Evidence from U.K. Local Elections and Local Government Policies. *The Review of Economic Studies* 86:5, 2092-2135. [[Crossref](#)]
27. Juan Carlos Córdoba, Marla Ripoll. 2019. The Elasticity of Intergenerational Substitution, Parental Altruism, and Fertility Choice. *The Review of Economic Studies* 86:5, 1935-1972. [[Crossref](#)]
28. Angela Gialamas, Dandara G Haag, Murthy N Mittinty, John Lynch. 2019. Which time investments in the first 5 years of life matter most for children's language and behavioural outcomes at school entry?. *International Journal of Epidemiology* 26. . [[Crossref](#)]
29. Simen Markussen, Knut Røed. 2019. Economic Mobility Under Pressure. *Journal of the European Economic Association* 5. . [[Crossref](#)]
30. Owen N. Schochet, Anna D. Johnson. 2019. The Impact of Child Care Subsidies on Mothers' Education Outcomes. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 40:3, 367-389. [[Crossref](#)]
31. Ying Cui, Hong Liu, Liqiu Zhao. 2019. Mother's education and child development: Evidence from the compulsory school reform in China. *Journal of Comparative Economics* 47:3, 669-692. [[Crossref](#)]
32. Iñaki Permanyer, Albert Esteve, Joan Garcia. 2019. Decomposing patterns of college marital sorting in 118 countries: Structural constraints versus assortative mating. *Social Science Research* 83, 102313. [[Crossref](#)]
33. Zexing Chen, Bing Li, Tao Li. 2019. Exports and left-behind children : Empirical evidence from the China Migrants Dynamic Survey. *Review of International Economics* 27:4, 1081-1107. [[Crossref](#)]
34. Jun Sung Kim, Jongkwan Lee. 2019. The role of intergenerational mobility in internal migration. *Economic Modelling* 81, 1-15. [[Crossref](#)]
35. Sandra Ferrando-Latorre, Jorge Velilla, Raquel Ortega. 2019. Intergenerational Transmission of Entrepreneurial Activity in Spanish Families. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 40:3, 390-407. [[Crossref](#)]

36. Slawa Rokicki, Mark E. McGovern. 2019. Heterogeneity in Early Life Investments: A Longitudinal Analysis of Children's Time Use. *Review of Income and Wealth* 5. . [[Crossref](#)]
37. Barbara Otto, Julia Karbach. 2019. The effects of private tutoring on students' perception of their parents' academic involvement and the quality of their parent-child relationship. *Educational Psychology* 39:7, 923-940. [[Crossref](#)]
38. Steven B. Caudill, Stephanie O. Crofton, João Ricardo Faria, Neela D. Manage, Franklin G. Mixon, Mary Greer Simonton. 2019. Property confiscation and the intergenerational transmission of education in post-1948 Eastern Europe. *Public Choice* 47. . [[Crossref](#)]
39. Cristina Borra, Almudena Sevilla. 2019. COMPETITION FOR UNIVERSITY PLACES AND PARENTAL TIME INVESTMENTS: EVIDENCE FROM THE UNITED KINGDOM. *Economic Inquiry* 57:3, 1460-1479. [[Crossref](#)]
40. Luca Gori, Mauro Sodini. 2019. A CONTRIBUTION TO THE THEORY OF FERTILITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT. *Macroeconomic Dynamics* 7, 1-23. [[Crossref](#)]
41. NGOC TÚ T. ĐINH, WEERACHART T. KILENTHONG. 2019. Do Parental Absence and Children's Gender Affect Early Childhood Investment? Evidence from Rural Thailand. *The Singapore Economic Review* 90, 1-26. [[Crossref](#)]
42. Giovanni Busetta, Maria Gabriella Campolo, Antonino Di Pino. 2019. Children's Use of Time and Well-Being in Italy. *Child Indicators Research* 12:3, 821-845. [[Crossref](#)]
43. Xiaoyan Youderian. 2019. HUMAN CAPITAL PRODUCTION WITH PARENTAL TIME INVESTMENT IN EARLY CHILDHOOD. *Macroeconomic Dynamics* 23:4, 1504-1527. [[Crossref](#)]
44. Fábio Saraiva Flôres, Luis P. Rodrigues, Fernando Copetti, Frederico Lopes, Rita Cordovil. 2019. Affordances for Motor Skill Development in Home, School, and Sport Environments: A Narrative Review. *Perceptual and Motor Skills* 126:3, 366-388. [[Crossref](#)]
45. Catherine Haeck, Samuel Paré, Pierre Lefebvre, Philip Merrigan. 2019. Paid Parental Leave: Leaner Might Be Better. *Canadian Public Policy* 45:2, 212-238. [[Crossref](#)]
46. Silvia Mendolia, Nga Nguyen, Oleg Yerokhin. 2019. The impact of parental illness on children's schooling and labour force participation: evidence from Vietnam. *Review of Economics of the Household* 17:2, 469-492. [[Crossref](#)]
47. Albert Cheng, Paul E. Peterson. 2019. Experimental Estimates of Impacts of Cost-Earnings Information on Adult Aspirations for Children's Postsecondary Education. *The Journal of Higher Education* 90:3, 486-511. [[Crossref](#)]
48. Sean F. Reardon, Erin M. Fahle, Demetra Kalogrides, Anne Podolsky, Rosalía C. Zárate. 2019. Gender Achievement Gaps in U.S. School Districts. *American Educational Research Journal* 000283121984382. [[Crossref](#)]
49. Jisoo Hwang, Chulhee Lee, Esther Lee. 2019. Gender norms and housework time allocation among dual-earner couples. *Labour Economics* 57, 102-116. [[Crossref](#)]
50. Patricia Cortés, Jessica Pan. 2019. When Time Binds: Substitutes for Household Production, Returns to Working Long Hours, and the Skilled Gender Wage Gap. *Journal of Labor Economics* 37:2, 351-398. [[Crossref](#)]
51. Allison Vreeland, Meredith A. Gruhn, Kelly H. Watson, Alexandra H. Bettis, Bruce E. Compas, Rex Forehand, Alexandra D. Sullivan. 2019. Parenting in Context: Associations of Parental Depression and Socioeconomic Factors with Parenting Behaviors. *Journal of Child and Family Studies* 28:4, 1124-1133. [[Crossref](#)]
52. Jade Marcus Jenkins, Sudhanshu Handa. 2019. Parenting skills and early childhood development: production function estimates from longitudinal data. *Review of Economics of the Household* 17:1, 121-147. [[Crossref](#)]

53. Christina M. Padilla, Rebecca M. Ryan. 2019. The link between child temperament and low-income mothers' and fathers' parenting. *Infant Mental Health Journal* 55. . [[Crossref](#)]
54. Katherin Barg. 2019. Why are middle-class parents more involved in school than working-class parents?. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 59, 14-24. [[Crossref](#)]
55. Long Doan, Natasha Quadlin. 2019. Partner Characteristics and Perceptions of Responsibility for Housework and Child Care. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 81:1, 145-163. [[Crossref](#)]
56. Tomás Cano, Francisco Perales, Janeen Baxter. 2019. A Matter of Time: Father Involvement and Child Cognitive Outcomes. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 81:1, 164-184. [[Crossref](#)]
57. Shu Hu, Wei-Jun Jean Yeung. 2019. Education and Childrearing Decision-Making in East Asia. *Chinese Sociological Review* 51:1, 29-56. [[Crossref](#)]
58. Eric A. Hanushek, Paul E. Peterson, Laura Talpey, Ludger Woessmann. 2019. The Unwavering SES Achievement Gap: Trends in U.S. Student Performance. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
59. Aiday Sikhova, Sven Oskarsson, Rafael Ahlskog. 2019. Better Parents or Richer Parents: Understanding Intergenerational Transmission of Human Capital. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
60. Zeldia Brutti, Daniel Montolio. 2019. Preventing Criminal Minds: Early Education Access and Adult Offending Behavior. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
61. Christos Makridis, Stephen Strosko. 2019. Refined by Fire: The Great Depression and Entrepreneurship. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
62. Pablo Gracia, Joan Garcia-Roman, Tomi Oinas, Timo Anttila. 2019. Child and Adolescent Time Use: A Cross-National Study. *Journal of Marriage and Family* . [[Crossref](#)]
63. Pierre-Richard Agénor. Health and Knowledge Externalities: Implications for Growth and Public Policy 251-293. [[Crossref](#)]
64. Luca Gori, Piero Manfredi, Mauro Sodini. HIV/AIDS, Demography and Development: Individual Choices Versus Public Policies in SSA 323-356. [[Crossref](#)]
65. J. Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, José Alberto Molina, Yu Zhu. 2018. Intergenerational mobility of housework time in the United Kingdom. *Review of Economics of the Household* 16:4, 911-937. [[Crossref](#)]
66. Greg J. Duncan, Kenneth T. H. Lee, Maria Rosales-Rueda, Ariel Kalil. 2018. Maternal Age and Child Development. *Demography* 55:6, 2229-2255. [[Crossref](#)]
67. Mari Rege, Ingeborg Foldøy Solli, Ingunn Størksen, Mark Votruba. 2018. Variation in center quality in a universal publicly subsidized and regulated childcare system. *Labour Economics* 55, 230-240. [[Crossref](#)]
68. Thomas Cornelissen, Christian Dustmann, Anna Raute, Uta Schönberg. 2018. Who Benefits from Universal Child Care? Estimating Marginal Returns to Early Child Care Attendance. *Journal of Political Economy* 126:6, 2356-2409. [[Crossref](#)]
69. Teodora Boneva, Christopher Rauh. 2018. Parental Beliefs about Returns to Educational Investments —The Later the Better?. *Journal of the European Economic Association* 16:6, 1669-1711. [[Crossref](#)]
70. Laura Betancur, Elizabeth Votruba-Drzal, Christian Schunn. 2018. Socioeconomic gaps in science achievement. *International Journal of STEM Education* 5:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
71. Bi Ying Hu, Gregory Kirk Johnson, Huiping Wu. 2018. Screen time relationship of Chinese parents and their children. *Children and Youth Services Review* 94, 659-669. [[Crossref](#)]
72. Guido Cozzi, Marco Francesconi, Shelly Lundberg, Noemi Mantovan, Robert M. Sauer. 2018. Advancing the economics of gender: New insights and a roadmap for the future. *European Economic Review* 109, 1-8. [[Crossref](#)]

73. Richard Blundell, Luigi Pistaferri, Itay Saporta-Eksten. 2018. Children, Time Allocation, and Consumption Insurance. *Journal of Political Economy* **126**:S1, S73-S115. [[Crossref](#)]
74. Gary S. Becker, Scott Duke Kominers, Kevin M. Murphy, Jörg L. Spenkuch. 2018. A Theory of Intergenerational Mobility. *Journal of Political Economy* **126**:S1, S7-S25. [[Crossref](#)]
75. Raymundo M. Campos-Vazquez. 2018. Intergenerational Persistence of Skills and Socioeconomic Status. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* **39**:3, 509-523. [[Crossref](#)]
76. Naser A. Alsharairi, Shawn Somerset. 2018. Parental work status and children's dietary consumption: Australian evidence. *International Journal of Consumer Studies* **42**:5, 522-532. [[Crossref](#)]
77. Laurie F. DeRose, Gloria Huarcaya, Andrés Salazar-Arango. 2018. Father Absence and the Reverse Gender Gap in Latin American Education. *Journal of Family Issues* **39**:13, 3508-3534. [[Crossref](#)]
78. Joseph Price, Ariel Kalil. 2018. The Effect of Mother-Child Reading Time on Children's Reading Skills: Evidence From Natural Within-Family Variation. *Child Development* **34**. . [[Crossref](#)]
79. Seth Gershenson, Erdal Tekin. 2018. The Effect of Community Traumatic Events on Student Achievement: Evidence from the Beltway Sniper Attacks. *Education Finance and Policy* **13**:4, 513-544. [[Crossref](#)]
80. Daniela Veronica Negraia, Jennifer March Augustine, Kate Chambers Prickett. 2018. Gender Disparities in Parenting Time Across Activities, Child Ages, and Educational Groups. *Journal of Family Issues* **39**:11, 3006-3028. [[Crossref](#)]
81. Ki Young Park, Soohyon Kim. 2018. Allocation of Time and Household-level Consumption Equivalent Welfare: A Case of South Korea. *Global Economic Review* **47**:3, 337-365. [[Crossref](#)]
82. Cheti Nicoletti, Kjell G. Salvanes, Emma Tominey. 2018. The Family Peer Effect on Mothers' Labor Supply. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* **10**:3, 206-234. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
83. Paula E. Gobbi. 2018. Childcare and commitment within households. *Journal of Economic Theory* **176**, 503-551. [[Crossref](#)]
84. Andrew Dickerson, Gurleen Popli. 2018. The Many Dimensions of Child Poverty: Evidence from the UK Millennium Cohort Study *. *Fiscal Studies* **39**:2, 265-298. [[Crossref](#)]
85. Daniel Schneider, Orestes P. Hastings, Joe LaBriola. 2018. Income Inequality and Class Divides in Parental Investments. *American Sociological Review* **83**:3, 475-507. [[Crossref](#)]
86. Maria Marti, Emily C. Merz, Kelsey R. Repka, Cassie Landers, Kimberly G. Noble, Helena Duch. 2018. Parent Involvement in the Getting Ready for School Intervention Is Associated With Changes in School Readiness Skills. *Frontiers in Psychology* **9**. . [[Crossref](#)]
87. Cheti Nicoletti, Kjell G. Salvanes, Emma Tominey. Response of Parental Investments to Child's Health Endowment at Birth 175-199. [[Crossref](#)]
88. JOHN A. LIST, ANYA SAMEK, DANA L. SUSKIND. 2018. Combining behavioral economics and field experiments to reimagine early childhood education. *Behavioural Public Policy* **2**:1, 1-21. [[Crossref](#)]
89. Marianne Bertrand. 2018. Coase Lecture - The Glass Ceiling. *Economica* **85**:338, 205-231. [[Crossref](#)]
90. Michelle Hatch, Dorrit Posel. 2018. Who cares for children? A quantitative study of childcare in South Africa. *Development Southern Africa* **35**:2, 267-282. [[Crossref](#)]
91. Sebastian Ellingsen, Øystein Hernæs. 2018. The impact of commercial television on turnout and public policy: Evidence from Norwegian local politics. *Journal of Public Economics* **159**, 1-15. [[Crossref](#)]
92. Francesca Carta, Marta De Philippis. 2018. You've come a long way, baby. Husbands' commuting time and family labour supply. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* **69**, 25-37. [[Crossref](#)]

93. Andrew Clarke. 2018. Age at Immigration and the Educational Attainment of Foreign-Born Children in the United States. *International Migration Review* 52:1, 209-235. [[Crossref](#)]
94. Toni Mora, Josep-Oriol Escardibul. 2018. Home Environment and Parental Involvement in Homework During Adolescence in Catalonia (Spain). *Youth & Society* 50:2, 183-203. [[Crossref](#)]
95. Warn N. Lekfuangfu, Nattavudh Powdthavee, Nele Warrinnier, Francesca Cornaglia. 2018. Locus of Control and its Intergenerational Implications for Early Childhood Skill Formation. *The Economic Journal* 128:608, 298-329. [[Crossref](#)]
96. Jeffrey Neilson, Maria Stanfors. 2018. Time Alone or Together? Trends and Trade-offs Among Dual-Earner Couples, Sweden 1990-2010. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 80:1, 80-98. [[Crossref](#)]
97. Giulia Maria Dotti Sani. Theoretical Background 11-25. [[Crossref](#)]
98. Giulia Maria Dotti Sani. Parenthood and Domestic Work: A Never-Ending Workload 79-102. [[Crossref](#)]
99. Jorge Cuartas, Dana Charles McCoy, Andrés Molano. 2018. The acute effect of community violent crime on maternal engagement in cognitive and socioemotional stimulation. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 45, 143-154. [[Crossref](#)]
100. J. Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, Jose Alberto Molina, Jorge Velilla. 2018. The commuting behavior of workers in the United States: Differences between the employed and the self-employed. *Journal of Transport Geography* 66, 19-29. [[Crossref](#)]
101. Simon Darcy, Paul Francis Burke. 2018. On the road again: The barriers and benefits of automobility for people with disability. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* 107, 229-245. [[Crossref](#)]
102. Seth Gershenson, Michael S. Hayes. 2018. The Implications of Summer Learning Loss for Value-Added Estimates of Teacher Effectiveness. *Educational Policy* 32:1, 55-85. [[Crossref](#)]
103. Francesco Agostinelli, Giuseppe Sorrenti. 2018. Money vs. Time: Family Income, Maternal Labor Supply, and Child Development. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
104. Keith Goldstein, Angela Vatalaro, Gad Yair. 2017. Parent-based early childhood interventions do make a difference! A rebuttal to See and Gorard (2015a). *Journal of Children's Services* 12:4, 224-238. [[Crossref](#)]
105. Douglas M. Teti, Pamela M. Cole, Natasha Cabrera, Sherryl H. Goodman, Vonnie C. McLoyd. 2017. Supporting Parents: How Six Decades of Parenting Research Can Inform Policy and Best Practice. *Social Policy Report* 30:5, 1-34. [[Crossref](#)]
106. Erika Arenas. 2017. Abuelos at home: Differential impact on children's education by family structure. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 52, 36-48. [[Crossref](#)]
107. Kieron Barclay, Martin Hällsten, Mikko Myrskylä. 2017. Birth Order and College Major in Sweden. *Social Forces* 96:2, 629-660. [[Crossref](#)]
108. Gerald J. Maarman, Kim Lamont-Mbawuli. 2017. A review of challenges in South African education and possible ways to improve educational outcome as suggested by decades of research. *Africa Education Review* 14:3-4, 263-289. [[Crossref](#)]
109. Rukmini Banerji, James Berry, Marc Shotland. 2017. The Impact of Maternal Literacy and Participation Programs: Evidence from a Randomized Evaluation in India. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 9:4, 303-337. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
110. Jane Greve, Marie Louise Schultz-Nielsen, Erdal Tekin. 2017. Fetal malnutrition and academic success: Evidence from Muslim immigrants in Denmark. *Economics of Education Review* 60, 20-35. [[Crossref](#)]
111. Michelle Luciano. 2017. Making Reading Easier: How Genetic Information Can Help. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 4:2, 147-154. [[Crossref](#)]

112. Patrick Bauer, Lyudmyla Sonchak. 2017. The effect of macroeconomic conditions on parental time with children: evidence from the American time use survey. *Review of Economics of the Household* 15:3, 905-924. [[Crossref](#)]
113. Katie Vinopal, Seth Gershenson. 2017. Re-Conceptualizing Gaps by Socioeconomic Status in Parental Time with Children. *Social Indicators Research* 133:2, 623-643. [[Crossref](#)]
114. Melissa S. Kearney, Phillip B. Levine. 2017. The Economics of Nonmarital Childbearing and the Marriage Premium for Children. *Annual Review of Economics* 9:1, 327-352. [[Crossref](#)]
115. Nicole M. Fortin, Brian Bell, Michael Böhm. 2017. Top earnings inequality and the gender pay gap: Canada, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. *Labour Economics* 47, 107-123. [[Crossref](#)]
116. Carrie L. Shandra, Anna Penner. 2017. Benefactors and Beneficiaries? Disability and Care to Others. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 79:4, 1160-1185. [[Crossref](#)]
117. Jere R. Behrman, Whitney Schott, Subha Mani, Benjamin T. Crookston, Kirk Dearden, Le Thuc Duc, Lia C. H. Fernald, Aryeh D. Stein. 2017. Intergenerational Transmission of Poverty and Inequality: Parental Resources and Schooling Attainment and Children's Human Capital in Ethiopia, India, Peru, and Vietnam. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 65:4, 657-697. [[Crossref](#)]
118. Mehmet Ali SOYTAŞ. 2017. ÇOCUĞA YAPILAN ZAMAN YATIRIMLARININ İŞ GÜCÜ PİYASASINDAKİ KADIN-ERKEK ÜCRET FARKLILIĞINA ETKİLERİ. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi* 35:2, 121-121. [[Crossref](#)]
119. J. Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, Jose Alberto Molina, Raquel Ortega. 2017. Like my parents at home? Gender differences in children's housework in Germany and Spain. *Empirical Economics* 52:4, 1143-1179. [[Crossref](#)]
120. Yuko Nozaki. 2017. The effects of higher education on childrearing fertility behavior in Japan. *International Journal of Social Economics* 44:5, 653-669. [[Crossref](#)]
121. Richard W. Patterson. 2017. Could trends in time children spend with parents help explain the black-white gap in human capital? Evidence from the American Time Use Survey. *Education Economics* 25:3, 219-233. [[Crossref](#)]
122. Mónica Hernández-Alava, Gurleen Popli. 2017. Children's Development and Parental Input: Evidence From the UK Millennium Cohort Study. *Demography* 54:2, 485-511. [[Crossref](#)]
123. Daniela Del Boca, Chiara Monfardini, Cheti Nicoletti. 2017. Parental and Child Time Investments and the Cognitive Development of Adolescents. *Journal of Labor Economics* 35:2, 565-608. [[Crossref](#)]
124. Seth Gershenson, Alison Jacknowitz, Andrew Brannegan. 2017. Are Student Absences Worth the Worry in U.S. Primary Schools?. *Education Finance and Policy* 12:2, 137-165. [[Crossref](#)]
125. Mette Kjærgaard Thomsen. 2017. Citizen Coproduction. *The American Review of Public Administration* 47:3, 340-353. [[Crossref](#)]
126. José Alberto Molina, Juan Carlos Campaña, Raquel Ortega. 2017. Children's interaction with the Internet: time dedicated to communications and games. *Applied Economics Letters* 24:6, 359-364. [[Crossref](#)]
127. Frank Heiland, Joseph Price, Riley Wilson. 2017. Maternal employment and time investments in children. *Review of Economics of the Household* 15:1, 53-67. [[Crossref](#)]
128. George Argyrous, Lyn Craig, Sara Rahman. 2017. The Effect of a First Born Child on Work and Childcare Time Allocation: Pre-post Analysis of Australian Couples. *Social Indicators Research* 131:2, 831-851. [[Crossref](#)]
129. Pablo Gracia, Joris Ghysels. 2017. Educational inequalities in parental care time: Cross-national evidence from Belgium, Denmark, Spain, and the United Kingdom. *Social Science Research* 63, 166-180. [[Crossref](#)]

130. Vincenzo Galasso, Paola Profeta, Chiara Pronzato, Francesco Billari. 2017. Information and Women's Intentions: Experimental Evidence About Child Care. *European Journal of Population* **33**:1, 109-128. [[Crossref](#)]
131. Tetsugen Haruyama, Hyun Park. 2017. A simple dynastic economy with parental time investment in children's patience. *Economic Modelling* **61**, 235-247. [[Crossref](#)]
132. Ling-Yi Lin, Rong-Ju Cherng, Yung-Jung Chen. 2017. Relationship between time use in physical activity and gross motor performance of preschool children. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal* **64**:1, 49-57. [[Crossref](#)]
133. Lei Fang, Cara McDaniel. 2017. Home hours in the United States and Europe. *The B.E. Journal of Macroeconomics* **17**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
134. Kenneth Hemmereichs, Orhan Agirdag, Dimokritos Kavadias. 2017. The relationship between parental literacy involvement, socio-economic status and reading literacy. *Educational Review* **69**:1, 85-101. [[Crossref](#)]
135. Evrim Altintas, Oriell Sullivan. 2017. Trends in Fathers' Contribution to Housework and Childcare under Different Welfare Policy Regimes. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society* **24**:1, 81-108. [[Crossref](#)]
136. Elizabeth M. Caucutt, Lance Lochner, Youngmin Park. 2017. Correlation, Consumption, Confusion, or Constraints: Why Do Poor Children Perform so Poorly?. *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics* **119**:1, 102-147. [[Crossref](#)]
137. David Monaghan. 2017. Does College Enrollment and Bachelor's Completion by Mothers Impact Children's Educational Outcomes?. *Sociology of Education* **90**:1, 3-24. [[Crossref](#)]
138. Nobuyoshi Kikuchi. 2017. Intergenerational Transmission of Education in Japan: Nonparametric Bounds Analysis with Multiple Treatments. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
139. Alessandro Gavazza, Mattia Nardotto, Tommaso M. Valletti. 2017. Internet and Politics: Evidence from U.K. Local Elections and Local Government Policies. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
140. Marianne Bertrand. 2017. The Glass Ceiling. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
141. Jisoo Hwang. 2016. The second shift: assimilation in housework time among immigrants. *Review of Economics of the Household* **14**:4, 941-959. [[Crossref](#)]
142. Carlos E. Yeguez, Margaret H. Sibley. 2016. Predictors of Informant Discrepancies Between Mother and Middle School Teacher ADHD Ratings. *School Mental Health* **8**:4, 452-460. [[Crossref](#)]
143. Michael Grätz, Florencia Torche. 2016. Compensation or Reinforcement? The Stratification of Parental Responses to Children's Early Ability. *Demography* **53**:6, 1883-1904. [[Crossref](#)]
144. Edward R. Berchick. 2016. The relationship between maternal education and reported childhood conditions. *Social Science & Medicine* **170**, 170-179. [[Crossref](#)]
145. Michael Baker, Kevin Milligan. 2016. Boy-Girl Differences in Parental Time Investments: Evidence from Three Countries. *Journal of Human Capital* **10**:4, 399-441. [[Crossref](#)]
146. Marc H. Bornstein. Cultural Expressions and Neurobiological Underpinnings in Mother-Infant Interactions 185-222. [[Crossref](#)]
147. Simon Calmar Andersen, Helena Skyt Nielsen. 2016. Reading intervention with a growth mindset approach improves children's skills. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **113**:43, 12111-12113. [[Crossref](#)]
148. James S. Kim, Jonathan Guryan, Thomas G. White, David M. Quinn, Lauren Capotosto, Helen Chen Kingston. 2016. Delayed Effects of a Low-Cost and Large-Scale Summer Reading Intervention on Elementary School Children's Reading Comprehension. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness* **9**:sup1, 1-22. [[Crossref](#)]

149. Emilia Del Bono, Marco Francesconi, Yvonne Kelly, Amanda Sacker. 2016. Early Maternal Time Investment and Early Child Outcomes. *The Economic Journal* **126**:596, F96-F135. [[Crossref](#)]
150. Pedro Carneiro, Rita Ginja. 2016. Partial Insurance and Investments in Children. *The Economic Journal* **126**:596, F66-F95. [[Crossref](#)]
151. Kelly Musick, Ann Meier, Sarah Flood. 2016. How Parents Fare. *American Sociological Review* **81**:5, 1069-1095. [[Crossref](#)]
152. J- F, Jeong Jin Yu. 2016. First Delinquent Behavior Among Pre-Pubescent Children. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* **60**:14, 1609-1622. [[Crossref](#)]
153. Juan Carlos Campaña, J. Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, Jose Alberto Molina. 2016. Increasing the Human Capital of Children in Latin American Countries: The Role of Parents' Time in Childcare. *The Journal of Development Studies* **15**, 1-21. [[Crossref](#)]
154. Jose Maria Fernandez-Crehuet, J. Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, Luisa Eugenia Reyes Recio. 2016. The National Work–Life Balance Index©: The European Case. *Social Indicators Research* **128**:1, 341-359. [[Crossref](#)]
155. Giulia M. Dotti Sani, Judith Treas. 2016. Educational Gradients in Parents' Child-Care Time Across Countries, 1965-2012. *Journal of Marriage and Family* **78**:4, 1083-1096. [[Crossref](#)]
156. Ingvild Almås, Alexander W. Cappelen, Kjell G. Salvanes, Erik Ø. Sørensen, Bertil Tungodden. 2016. Willingness to Compete: Family Matters. *Management Science* **62**:8, 2149-2162. [[Crossref](#)]
157. Katherine P. Dabney, Robert H. Tai, Michael R. Scott. 2016. Informal Science: Family Education, Experiences, and Initial Interest in Science. *International Journal of Science Education, Part B* **6**:3, 263-282. [[Crossref](#)]
158. Di Wang, Ah-Hwee Tan. Self-regulated incremental clustering with focused preferences 1297-1304. [[Crossref](#)]
159. Ariel Kalil, Kathleen M. Ziol-Guest, Rebecca M. Ryan, Anna J. Markowitz. 2016. Changes in Income-Based Gaps in Parent Activities With Young Children From 1988 to 2012. *AERA Open* **2**:3, 233285841665373. [[Crossref](#)]
160. Daphna Bassok, Jenna E. Finch, RaeHyuck Lee, Sean F. Reardon, Jane Waldfogel. 2016. Socioeconomic Gaps in Early Childhood Experiences. *AERA Open* **2**:3, 233285841665392. [[Crossref](#)]
161. Sean F. Reardon, Ximena A. Portilla. 2016. Recent Trends in Income, Racial, and Ethnic School Readiness Gaps at Kindergarten Entry. *AERA Open* **2**:3, 233285841665734. [[Crossref](#)]
162. Alessandra Casarico, Paola Profeta, Chiara Daniela Pronzato. 2016. On the Regional Labour Market Determinants of Female University Enrolment in Europe. *Regional Studies* **50**:6, 1036-1053. [[Crossref](#)]
163. Miki Kohara, Yusuke Kamiya. 2016. Maternal employment and food produced at home: evidence from Japanese data. *Review of Economics of the Household* **14**:2, 417-442. [[Crossref](#)]
164. Stefania Albanesi, Claudia Olivetti. 2016. Gender Roles and Medical Progress. *Journal of Political Economy* **124**:3, 650-695. [[Crossref](#)]
165. Juan Carlos Córdoba, Marla Ripoll. 2016. Intergenerational Transfers and the Fertility–Income Relationship. *The Economic Journal* **126**:593, 949-977. [[Crossref](#)]
166. Alice Schoonbroodt. 2016. Parental child care during and outside of typical work hours. *Review of Economics of the Household* **8**. . [[Crossref](#)]
167. Ingvild Almås, Alexander W. Cappelen, Kjell G. Salvanes, Erik Ø. Sørensen, Bertil Tungodden. 2016. What Explains the Gender Gap in College Track Dropout? Experimental and Administrative Evidence. *American Economic Review* **106**:5, 296-302. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]

168. Shelly Lundberg, Robert A. Pollak, Jenna Stearns. 2016. Family Inequality: Diverging Patterns in Marriage, Cohabitation, and Childbearing. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 30:2, 79-102. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
169. Nitza Davidovitch, Dan Soen. 2016. Leisure in the twenty-first century: the case of Israel. *Israel Affairs* 22:2, 492-511. [[Crossref](#)]
170. Liangshu Qi, Xiao-yuan Dong. 2016. Unpaid Care Work's Interference with Paid Work and the Gender Earnings Gap in China. *Feminist Economics* 22:2, 143-167. [[Crossref](#)]
171. Jisoo Hwang. 2016. Housewife, "gold miss," and equal: the evolution of educated women's role in Asia and the U.S. *Journal of Population Economics* 29:2, 529-570. [[Crossref](#)]
172. Gary S. Becker, Kevin M. Murphy, Jörg L. Spenkuch. 2016. The Manipulation of Children's Preferences, Old-Age Support, and Investment in Children's Human Capital. *Journal of Labor Economics* 34:S2, S3-S30. [[Crossref](#)]
173. ###. 2016. The effect of father's socio-economic characteristics on time use of the undergraduate student children. *Ewha Journal of Social Sciences* 32:1, 159-190. [[Crossref](#)]
174. Quy-Toan Do, Andrei A. Levchenko, Claudio Raddatz. 2016. Comparative advantage, international trade, and fertility. *Journal of Development Economics* 119, 48-66. [[Crossref](#)]
175. J. Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, José Alberto Molina. 2016. COMMUTING TIME AND HOUSEHOLD RESPONSIBILITIES: EVIDENCE USING PROPENSITY SCORE MATCHING. *Journal of Regional Science* 56:2, 332-359. [[Crossref](#)]
176. 2016. REFERENCES. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development* 81:1, 145-170. [[Crossref](#)]
177. Marc H. Bornstein. Determinants of Parenting 1-91. [[Crossref](#)]
178. Kei Nomaguchi, Melissa A. Milkie, Kathleen E. Denny. 2016. Quantity of Maternal Time and Child and Adolescent Development: Response to Kalil and Mayer (2016) and to Waldfogel (2016). *Journal of Marriage and Family* 78:1, 270-275. [[Crossref](#)]
179. Andrew Dickerson, Gurleen K. Popli. 2016. Persistent poverty and children's cognitive development: evidence from the UK Millennium Cohort Study. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)* 179:2, 535-558. [[Crossref](#)]
180. C. Kirabo Jackson, Rucker C. Johnson, Claudia Persico. 2016. The Effects of School Spending on Educational and Economic Outcomes: Evidence from School Finance Reforms *. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 131:1, 157-218. [[Crossref](#)]
181. Ewa Jarosz. 2016. The duration and dynamics of leisure among the working population in Poland. A time-use approach. *World Leisure Journal* 58:1, 44-59. [[Crossref](#)]
182. Ariel Kalil, Greg J. Duncan, Kathleen M. Ziol-Guest. Early Childhood Poverty: Short and Long-Run Consequences Over the Lifespan 341-354. [[Crossref](#)]
183. Timothy M. Smeeding. Gates, Gaps, and Intergenerational Mobility: The Importance of an Even Start 255-295. [[Crossref](#)]
184. M. Aguiar, E. Hurst. The Macroeconomics of Time Allocation 203-253. [[Crossref](#)]
185. David J. Purpura, Erin E. Reid. 2016. Mathematics and language: Individual and group differences in mathematical language skills in young children. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 36, 259-268. [[Crossref](#)]
186. Gábor Kertesi, Gábor Kézdi. 2016. On the test score gap between Roma and non-Roma students in Hungary and its potential causes. *Economics of Transition* 24:1, 135-162. [[Crossref](#)]
187. Jun Sung Kim, Jongkwan Lee. 2016. The Role of Intergenerational Mobility in Internal Migration. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

188. Jonathan T. Rothwell. 2016. Classroom Inequality and the Cognitive Race Gap: Evidence from 4-Year Olds in Public PreK. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
189. Geovanny Castro Aristizabal, Maribel Castillo Caicedo, Julie Carolina Mendoza. 2016. Principales Determinantes En La Adquisición De Competencias En América Latina: Un Análisis Multinivel a Partir De Los Resultados En PISA 2012 (Main Determinants Acquisition of Skills in Latin America: A Multilevel Analysis from the Results PISA 2012). *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
190. Ting Chen, James Kai-Sing Kung, Chicheng Ma. 2016. Long Live Keju! The Persistent Effects of China's Imperial Examination System. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
191. Pablo Gracia, Joris Ghysels. 2016. Educational Differences in Parental Care Time: A Study on Belgium, Denmark, Spain, and the United Kingdom. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
192. Sukanya Basu, Mike Insler. 2016. Education Outcomes of Children of Asian Inter-marriages: Does Gender of the Immigrant Parent Matter?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
193. Agnes Szabo-Morvai. 2016. Háttér tanulmány a Magyar Születési Kohorszvizsgálathoz (Background Essay to the Hungarian Birth Cohort Study). *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
194. Hui Young Chun. 2015. Relations of Smart Phone Usage Level to Developmental Characteristics and Time Diaries, and Variables Predicting the Usage Level Groups of Four Year Old Children. *Korean Journal of Childcare and Education* **11**:6, 153-175. [[Crossref](#)]
195. Shelly Lundberg. 2015. Tiger Parenting and American Inequality: An Essay on Chua and Rubenfeld's The Triple Package: How Three Unlikely Traits Explain the Rise and Fall of Cultural Groups in America. *Journal of Economic Literature* **53**:4, 945-960. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
196. Melinda Sandler Morrill, Sabrina Wulff Pabilonia. 2015. What effects do macroeconomic conditions have on the time couples with children spend together?. *Review of Economics of the Household* **13**:4, 791-814. [[Crossref](#)]
197. William S. Comanor, Mark Sarro, R. Mark Rogers. The Monetary Cost of Raising Children 209-251. [[Crossref](#)]
198. Junichi Minagawa, Thorsten Upmann. 2015. THE GENERALIZED ALCHIAN-ALLEN THEOREM: A SLUTSKY EQUATION FOR RELATIVE DEMAND. *Economic Inquiry* **53**:4, 1893-1907. [[Crossref](#)]
199. Raffaele Ciula, Curtis Skinner. 2015. Income and Beyond: Taking the Measure of Child Deprivation in the United States. *Child Indicators Research* **8**:3, 491-515. [[Crossref](#)]
200. Moshe Hazan, Hosny Zoabi. 2015. Do Highly Educated Women Choose Smaller Families?. *The Economic Journal* **125**:587, 1191-1226. [[Crossref](#)]
201. Susan E. Chen, Anke Möser, Rodolfo M. Nayga. 2015. Too Busy to Eat with the Kids? Parental Work and Children's Eating. *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy* **37**:3, 347-377. [[Crossref](#)]
202. Vikesh Amin, Petter Lundborg, Dan-Olof Rooth. 2015. The intergenerational transmission of schooling: Are mothers really less important than fathers?. *Economics of Education Review* **47**, 100-117. [[Crossref](#)]
203. Artjoms Ivlevs. 2015. Happy Moves? Assessing the Link between Life Satisfaction and Emigration Intentions. *Kyklos* **68**:3, 335-356. [[Crossref](#)]
204. Mette Kjærgaard Thomsen. 2015. Parental time investments in children. *Acta Sociologica* **58**:3, 249-263. [[Crossref](#)]
205. Nicolas Sommet, Alain Quiamzade, Mickaël Jury, Gabriel Mugny. 2015. The student-institution fit at university: interactive effects of academic competition and social class on achievement goals. *Frontiers in Psychology* **6**. . [[Crossref](#)]

206. Seth Gershenson, Laura Langbein. 2015. The Effect of Primary School Size on Academic Achievement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 37:1_suppl, 135S-155S. [[Crossref](#)]
207. Soyoung Kim, Meejung Chin. 2015. Typology of Weekend Time Use and Time Use Satisfaction of Married Working Men with a Preschool Child in Korea. *Journal of Korean Home Management Association* 33:2, 71-88. [[Crossref](#)]
208. Alessandra Casarico, Luca Micheletto, Alessandro Sommacal. 2015. Intergenerational transmission of skills during childhood and optimal public policy. *Journal of Population Economics* 28:2, 353-372. [[Crossref](#)]
209. J. Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, Jose Alberto Molina. 2015. Health status and the allocation of time: Cross-country evidence from Europe. *Economic Modelling* 46, 188-203. [[Crossref](#)]
210. Melissa A. Milkie, Kei M. Nomaguchi, Kathleen E. Denny. 2015. Does the Amount of Time Mothers Spend With Children or Adolescents Matter?. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 77:2, 355-372. [[Crossref](#)]
211. Marc H. Bornstein. Children's Parents 1-78. [[Crossref](#)]
212. Greg J. Duncan, Katherine Magnuson, Elizabeth Votruba-Drzal. Children and Socioeconomic Status 1-40. [[Crossref](#)]
213. Patricia Gabaldon, Celia De Anca, Concepcion Galdón. 2015. Measures of success for self-employed mothers in Spain. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research* 21:1, 128-145. [[Crossref](#)]
214. Hongwei Xu, Airan Liu, Yueyun Zhang. 2015. Inequality in children's well-being and development: Evidence from a national panel study. *Chinese Journal of Sociology* 1:1, 88-107. [[Crossref](#)]
215. Alison Aughinbaugh, Donna S. Rothstein. 2015. Do cognitive skills moderate the influence of neighborhood disadvantage on subsequent educational attainment?. *Economics of Education Review* 44, 83-99. [[Crossref](#)]
216. Ling-Yi Lin, Rong-Ju Cherng, Yung-Jung Chen, Yi-Jen Chen, Hei-Mei Yang. 2015. Effects of television exposure on developmental skills among young children. *Infant Behavior and Development* 38, 20-26. [[Crossref](#)]
217. Graham Daniel. 2015. Patterns of Parent Involvement: A Longitudinal Analysis of Family-School Partnerships in the Early Years of School in Australia. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood* 40:1, 119-128. [[Crossref](#)]
218. Giuseppina Autiero. 2015. Social and Personal Identities: Their Influence on Scholastic Effort. *Review of Social Economy* 73:1, 19-33. [[Crossref](#)]
219. Ariel Kalil. Inequality Begins at Home: The Role of Parenting in the Diverging Destinies of Rich and Poor Children 63-82. [[Crossref](#)]
220. Javier García-Manglano, Natalia Nollenberger, Almudena Sevilla. Gender, Time-Use, and Fertility Recovery in Industrialized Countries 775-780. [[Crossref](#)]
221. Evrim Altintas. 2015. Educational differences in fathers' time with children in two parent families: Time diary evidence from the United States. *Family Science* 6:1, 293-301. [[Crossref](#)]
222. Rebecca M. Ryan, Amy Claessens, Anna J. Markowitz. 2015. Associations Between Family Structure Change and Child Behavior Problems: The Moderating Effect of Family Income. *Child Development* 86:1, 112-127. [[Crossref](#)]
223. Katie Vinopal, Seth Gershenson. 2015. Re-Conceptualizing Gaps by Socioeconomic Status in Parental Time with Children. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
224. Stefania Albanesi, Claudia Olivetti. 2015. Gender Roles and Medical Progress. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

225. Eric Reed Nielsen. 2015. The Income-Achievement Gap and Adult Outcome Inequality. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
226. Gary S. Becker, Scott Duke Kominers, Kevin M. Murphy, Jrg L. Spenkuch. 2015. A Theory of Intergenerational Mobility. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
227. Alessandro Gavazza, Mattia Nardotto, Tommaso M. Valletti. 2015. Internet and Politics: Evidence from U.K. Local Elections and Local Government Policies. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
228. Jo-Han Chang, Tien-Ling Yeh. The Influence of Parenting Time on Children's Growth and Development 361-365. [[Crossref](#)]
229. David Figlio, Jonathan Guryan, Krzysztof Karbownik, Jeffrey Roth. 2014. The Effects of Poor Neonatal Health on Children's Cognitive Development. *American Economic Review* **104**:12, 3921-3955. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
230. Manuel Flores, Adriaan Kalwij. 2014. The associations between early life circumstances and later life health and employment in Europe. *Empirical Economics* **47**:4, 1251-1282. [[Crossref](#)]
231. Giorgio Brunello, Maria De Paola, Giovanna Labartino. 2014. More apples fewer chips? The effect of school fruit schemes on the consumption of junk food. *Health Policy* **118**:1, 114-126. [[Crossref](#)]
232. Gareth D. Leeves. 2014. Increasing returns to education and the impact on social capital. *Education Economics* **22**:5, 449-470. [[Crossref](#)]
233. Jose Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, Almudena Sevilla. 2014. Total work time in Spain: evidence from time diary data. *Applied Economics* **46**:16, 1894-1909. [[Crossref](#)]
234. Oriel Sullivan, Francesco C. Billari, Evrim Altintas. 2014. Fathers' Changing Contributions to Child Care and Domestic Work in Very Low-Fertility Countries. *Journal of Family Issues* **35**:8, 1048-1065. [[Crossref](#)]
235. A. Aizer, J. Currie. 2014. The intergenerational transmission of inequality: Maternal disadvantage and health at birth. *Science* **344**:6186, 856-861. [[Crossref](#)]
236. Thomas Gift, Erik Wibbels. 2014. Reading, Writing, and the Regrettable Status of Education Research in Comparative Politics. *Annual Review of Political Science* **17**:1, 291-312. [[Crossref](#)]
237. Massimiliano Bratti, Mariapia Mendola. 2014. Parental health and child schooling. *Journal of Health Economics* **35**, 94-108. [[Crossref](#)]
238. Tindara Addabbo, Maria Laura Di Tommaso, Anna Maccagnan. 2014. Gender Differences in Italian Children's Capabilities. *Feminist Economics* **20**:2, 90-121. [[Crossref](#)]
239. Maurizio Pugno. 2014. Scitovsky's The Joyless Economy and the economics of happiness. *The European Journal of the History of Economic Thought* **21**:2, 278-303. [[Crossref](#)]
240. J. Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, Jose Alberto Molina. 2014. Regional unemployment, gender, and time allocation of the unemployed. *Review of Economics of the Household* **12**:1, 105-127. [[Crossref](#)]
241. Christina Boll, Julian Leppin, Nora Reich. 2014. Paternal childcare and parental leave policies: evidence from industrialized countries. *Review of Economics of the Household* **12**:1, 129-158. [[Crossref](#)]
242. Almudena Sevilla. 2014. On the importance of time diary data and introduction to a special issue on time use research. *Review of Economics of the Household* **12**:1, 1-6. [[Crossref](#)]
243. Arnstein Øvrum, Geir Wæhler Gustavsen, Kyrre Rickertsen. 2014. Age and socioeconomic inequalities in health: Examining the role of lifestyle choices. *Advances in Life Course Research* **19**, 1-13. [[Crossref](#)]
244. ###, ###. 2014. The Effects of Increase in Childcare Subsidy on Time Allocation of Women - Focusing on Low-income and Moderate-income Women with Pre-school Children-. *Korean Journal of Social Welfare* **66**:1, 101-125. [[Crossref](#)]
245. Yok-Fong Paat. 2014. Family and Community Determinants of Educational Attainment in Mexico. *Child & Youth Services* **35**:1, 61-87. [[Crossref](#)]

246. Silvia Helena Barcellos, Leandro S. Carvalho, Adriana Lleras-Muney. 2014. Child Gender and Parental Investments In India: Are Boys and Girls Treated Differently?. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 6:1, 157-189. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
247. N. Schreuer, D. Sachs, S. Rosenblum. 2014. Participation in leisure activities: Differences between children with and without physical disabilities. *Research in Developmental Disabilities* 35:1, 223-233. [[Crossref](#)]
248. R. Lalive, A. Schlosser, A. Steinhauer, J. Zweimuller. 2014. Parental Leave and Mothers' Careers: The Relative Importance of Job Protection and Cash Benefits. *The Review of Economic Studies* 81:1, 219-265. [[Crossref](#)]
249. Ulrik H. Nielsen. 2014. Parents' Education and Their Adult Offspring's Other-Regarding Behavior. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
250. Martha J. Bailey. 2014. Fifty Years of Family Planning: New Evidence on the Long-Run Effects of Increasing Access to Contraception. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
251. Tamar Khitarishvili, Kijong Kim. 2014. The Great Recession and Unpaid Work Time in the United States: Does Poverty Matter?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
252. Ebru Kongar, Gunseli Berik. 2014. Time Use of Parents in the United States: What Difference Did the Great Recession Make?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
253. Gary S. Becker, Kevin M. Murphy, Jrg L. Spenkuch. 2014. The Manipulation of Children's Preferences, Old Age Support, and Investment in Children's Human Capital. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
254. J. Alberto Molina, J. Ignacio Giménez-Nadal, José A. Cuesta, Carlos Gracia-Lazaro, Yamir Moreno, Angel Sanchez. 2013. Gender Differences in Cooperation: Experimental Evidence on High School Students. *PLoS ONE* 8:12, e83700. [[Crossref](#)]
255. Junichi Minagawa, Thorsten Upmann. 2013. A note on parental time allocation. *Labour Economics* 25, 153-157. [[Crossref](#)]
256. Seth Gershenson. 2013. Do Summer Time-Use Gaps Vary by Socioeconomic Status?. *American Educational Research Journal* 50:6, 1219-1248. [[Crossref](#)]
257. Yok-Fong Paat. 2013. Working with Immigrant Children and Their Families: An Application of Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Theory. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment* 23:8, 954-966. [[Crossref](#)]
258. Torill Tverborgvik, Lene Björk Clausen, Brian Larsen Thorsted, Sigurd Mikkelsen, Elsebeth Lynge. 2013. Intergenerational Educational Mobility in Denmark. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research* 57:5, 544-560. [[Crossref](#)]
259. Leigh Tooth, Gita Mishra. 2013. Intergenerational educational mobility on general mental health and depressive symptoms in young women. *Quality of Life Research* 22:7, 1589-1602. [[Crossref](#)]
260. Guozhong Zhu, Gulfer Vural. 2013. Inter-generational effect of parental time and its policy implications. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 37:9, 1833-1851. [[Crossref](#)]
261. Morten Jakobsen, Simon Calmar Andersen. 2013. Coproduction and Equity in Public Service Delivery. *Public Administration Review* 73:5, 704-713. [[Crossref](#)]
262. Eun Jung Park, Seong-Lim Lee. 2013. Differences in Time Deficit and Time Satisfaction According to the Types of Child Care Time of Dual-earner Couples with Preschool Children. *Journal of Korean Home Management Association* 31:4, 97-111. [[Crossref](#)]
263. Mark Aguiar,, Erik Hurst,, Loukas Karabarbounis. 2013. Time Use During the Great Recession. *American Economic Review* 103:5, 1664-1696. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
264. John Ermisch, Marco Francesconi. 2013. THE EFFECT OF PARENTAL EMPLOYMENT ON CHILD SCHOOLING. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 28:5, 796-822. [[Crossref](#)]

265. Kathryn M. Yount, John A. Maluccio, Jere R. Behrman, John Hoddinott, Alexis Murphy, Usha Ramakrishnan. 2013. Parental Resources, Schooling Achievements, and Gender Schooling Gaps: Evidence of Change over 25 years in Rural Guatemala. *Population Research and Policy Review* 32:4, 495-528. [[Crossref](#)]
266. Paula England, Anjula Srivastava. 2013. Educational differences in US parents' time spent in child care: The role of culture and cross-spouse influence. *Social Science Research* 42:4, 971-988. [[Crossref](#)]
267. Günseli Berik, Ebru Kongar. 2013. Time Allocation of Married Mothers and Fathers in Hard Times: The 2007–09 US Recession. *Feminist Economics* 19:3, 208-237. [[Crossref](#)]
268. Elly-Ann Lindström. 2013. Gender Bias in Parental Leave: Evidence from Sweden. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 34:2, 235-248. [[Crossref](#)]
269. Ana María Osorio, Catalina Bolancé, Manuela Alcañiz. 2013. Measuring Intermediary Determinants of Early Childhood Health: A Composite Index Comparing Colombian Departments. *Child Indicators Research* 6:2, 297-319. [[Crossref](#)]
270. Elliot M. Tucker-Drob. 2013. How many pathways underlie socioeconomic differences in the development of cognition and achievement?. *Learning and Individual Differences* 25, 12-20. [[Crossref](#)]
271. Oriell Sullivan. 2013. What Do We Learn About Gender by Analyzing Housework Separately From Child Care? Some Considerations From Time-Use Evidence. *Journal of Family Theory & Review* 5:2, 72-84. [[Crossref](#)]
272. J. Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, Jose Alberto Molina. 2013. Parents' education as a determinant of educational childcare time. *Journal of Population Economics* 26:2, 719-749. [[Crossref](#)]
273. Sabrina Wulff Pabilonia, Younghwan Song. 2013. Single Mothers' Time Preference, Smoking, and Enriching Childcare: Evidence from Time Diaries. *Eastern Economic Journal* 39:2, 227-255. [[Crossref](#)]
274. Michela Sonego, Alicia Llácer, Iñaki Galán, Fernando Simón. 2013. The influence of parental education on child mental health in Spain. *Quality of Life Research* 22:1, 203-211. [[Crossref](#)]
275. Marianne Bertrand, Jessica Pan. 2013. The Trouble with Boys: Social Influences and the Gender Gap in Disruptive Behavior. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 5:1, 32-64. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
276. Jisoo Hwang. 2013. The Second Shift: Housework Time Among Immigrants. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
277. Seth Gershenson, Michael S Hayes. 2013. The Implications of Summer Learning Loss for Value-Added Estimates of Teacher Effectiveness. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
278. Ariel Kalil, Rebecca Ryan, Michael Corey. 2012. Diverging Destinies: Maternal Education and the Developmental Gradient in Time With Children. *Demography* 49:4, 1361-1383. [[Crossref](#)]
279. Daniel Kreisman. 2012. The source of Black–White inequality in early language acquisition: Evidence from Early Head Start. *Social Science Research* 41:6, 1429-1450. [[Crossref](#)]
280. Anne H Gauthier, Berenice DeGusti. 2012. The time allocation to children by parents in Europe. *International Sociology* 27:6, 827-845. [[Crossref](#)]
281. Oliver Wölfel, Guido Heineck. 2012. Parental risk attitudes and children's secondary school track choice. *Economics of Education Review* 31:5, 727-743. [[Crossref](#)]
282. Moshe Justman, Yaakov Gilboa. 2012. The Scope for Promoting Equal Opportunity in Education: Evidence from the Kibbutz. *Education Finance and Policy* 7:4, 489-515. [[Crossref](#)]
283. Mark Aguiar, Erik Hurst, Loukas Karabarbounis. 2012. Recent Developments in the Economics of Time Use. *Annual Review of Economics* 4:1, 373-397. [[Crossref](#)]
284. Jose Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, Almudena Sevilla. 2012. Trends in time allocation: A cross-country analysis. *European Economic Review* 56:6, 1338-1359. [[Crossref](#)]

285. Greg J. Duncan, Katherine Magnuson. 2012. Socioeconomic status and cognitive functioning: moving from correlation to causation. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science* 3:3, 377-386. [[Crossref](#)]
286. José Ignacio Giménez-Nadal, Miriam Marcén, Raquel Ortega. 2012. Substitution and Presence Effects of Children on Mothers' Adult Care Time. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 33:1, 2-10. [[Crossref](#)]
287. Elliot M. Tucker-Drob, K. Paige Harden. 2012. Early childhood cognitive development and parental cognitive stimulation: evidence for reciprocal gene-environment transactions. *Developmental Science* 15:2, 250-259. [[Crossref](#)]
288. PARANTAP BASU, KESHAB BHATTARAI. 2012. Cognitive Skills, Openness and Growth*. *Economic Record* 88:280, 18-38. [[Crossref](#)]
289. Gunseli Berik, Ebru Kongar. 2012. Time Use of Mothers and Fathers in Hard Times: The US Recession of 2007-09. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
290. Daniela Del Boca, Chiara Monfardini, Cheti Nicoletti. 2012. Self Investments of Adolescents and Their Cognitive Development. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
291. Benjamin Villena-Roldan, Cecilia Rios-Aguilar. 2012. Causal Effects of Maternal Time-Investment on Children's Cognitive Outcomes. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
292. Chikako Yamauchi, Andrew Leigh. 2011. Which children benefit from non-parental care?. *Economics of Education Review* 30:6, 1468-1490. [[Crossref](#)]
293. Margaret L. Usdansky, Wendy M. Parker. 2011. How Money Matters. *Journal of Family Issues* 32:11, 1449-1473. [[Crossref](#)]
294. Monique de Haan. 2011. The Effect of Parents' Schooling on Child's Schooling: A Nonparametric Bounds Analysis. *Journal of Labor Economics* 29:4, 859-892. [[Crossref](#)]
295. Peter Hinrichs. 2011. When the Bell Tolls: The Effects of School Starting Times on Academic Achievement. *Education Finance and Policy* 6:4, 486-507. [[Crossref](#)]
296. Margaret L. Usdansky. 2011. The Gender-Equality Paradox: Class and Incongruity Between Work-Family Attitudes and Behaviors. *Journal of Family Theory & Review* 3:3, 163-178. [[Crossref](#)]
297. Kym Simoncini, Nerina Caltabiano. 2011. Mothers' and Young Children's Satisfaction of the Time They Spend Together. *Journal of Relationships Research* 2:1, 26-32. [[Crossref](#)]
298. Jose Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, Almudena Sevilla-Sanz. 2011. The Time-Crunch Paradox. *Social Indicators Research* 102:2, 181-196. [[Crossref](#)]
299. Joost de Laat, Almudena Sevilla-Sanz. 2011. The Fertility and Women's Labor Force Participation puzzle in OECD Countries: The Role of Men's Home Production. *Feminist Economics* 17:2, 87-119. [[Crossref](#)]
300. Marte Rønning. 2011. Who benefits from homework assignments?. *Economics of Education Review* 30:1, 55-64. [[Crossref](#)]
301. J. Bonke, G. Esping-Andersen. 2011. Family Investments in Children--Productivities, Preferences, and Parental Child Care. *European Sociological Review* 27:1, 43-55. [[Crossref](#)]
302. Maurizio Pugno. Economy, People's Personal Autonomy, and Well-Being 207-239. [[Crossref](#)]
303. Anders Björklund, Kjell G. Salvanes. Education and Family Background 201-247. [[Crossref](#)]
304. Sandra E. Black, Paul J. Devereux. Recent Developments in Intergenerational Mobility 1487-1541. [[Crossref](#)]
305. Elliot M. Tucker-Drob, Mijke Rhemtulla, K. Paige Harden, Eric Turkheimer, David Fask. 2011. Emergence of a Gene \times Socioeconomic Status Interaction on Infant Mental Ability Between 10 Months and 2 Years. *Psychological Science* 22:1, 125-133. [[Crossref](#)]

306. Ari Choi Kang. 2011. Maternal and Paternal Time for a Young Child. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
307. Moshe Hazan, Hosny Zoabi. 2011. Do Highly Educated Women Choose Smaller Families?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
308. Owen Thompson. 2011. The Returns to Skill and Racial Difference in Parenting: Evidence from the Civil Rights Movement. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
309. Alessandra Casarico, Paola Profeta, Chiara Pronzato. 2011. Great Expectations: The Determinants of Female University Enrolment in Europe. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
310. Alessandra Casarico, Luca Micheletto, Alessandro Sommacal. 2011. Intergenerational Transmission of Skills During Childhood and Optimal Public Policy. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
311. Alexandra Killewald, Margaret Gough. 2010. Money isn't everything: Wives' earnings and housework time. *Social Science Research* **39**:6, 987-1003. [[Crossref](#)]
312. Almudena Sevilla-Sanz, Jose Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, Cristina Fernández. 2010. Gender Roles and the Division of Unpaid Work in Spanish Households. *Feminist Economics* **16**:4, 137-184. [[Crossref](#)]
313. Maria Gutiérrez-Domènech. 2010. Parental employment and time with children in Spain. *Review of Economics of the Household* **8**:3, 371-391. [[Crossref](#)]
314. Steven D. Silver, Randal Verbrugge. 2010. Home production and endogenous economic growth. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **75**:2, 297-312. [[Crossref](#)]
315. CHIKAKO YAMAUCHI. 2010. Parental Investment in Children: Differential Pathways of Parental Education and Mental Health*. *Economic Record* **86**:273, 210-226. [[Crossref](#)]
316. Sören Blomquist,, Vidar Christiansen,, Luca Micheletto. 2010. Public Provision of Private Goods and Nondistortionary Marginal Tax Rates. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* **2**:2, 1-27. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
317. Almudena Sevilla-Sanz. 2010. Household division of labor and cross-country differences in household formation rates. *Journal of Population Economics* **23**:1, 225-249. [[Crossref](#)]
318. Silvia Helena Barcellos, Leandro Carvalho, Adriana Lleras-Muney. 2010. Child Gender and Parental Investments in India: Are Boys and Girls Treated Differently?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
319. Torbjorn Haegeland, Lars J. Kirkeboen, Oddbjorn Raaum, Kjell G. Salvanes. 2010. Why Children of College Graduates Outperform Their Schoolmates: A Study of Cousins and Adoptees. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
320. Hildete Pereira de Melo, Marta Castilho. 2009. Trabalho reprodutivo no Brasil: quem faz?. *Revista de Economia Contemporânea* **13**:1, 135-158. [[Crossref](#)]