

University of Amsterdam



**AMSTERDAM INSTITUTE FOR
ADVANCED LABOUR STUDIES**

**WOMEN'S WORKING PREFERENCES
IN THE NETHERLANDS,
GERMANY AND THE UK**

**Mara Yerkes
Amsterdam School for Social Science Research
Amsterdam Institute for Advanced Labour Studies
Universiteit van Amsterdam**

Working Papers Number 06/43

Acknowledgement:

Earlier and modified versions of the research presented here can be found in:

Yerkes, M. Forthcoming (2006). "Women's Working Preferences in the Netherlands, Germany and the UK." In *Articuler vie familiale et vie professionnelle. Quelles politiques en Europe ?* B. Le Bihan and C. Martin (eds). Rennes, éditions ENSP, collection Lien social et politiques.

Yerkes, M. 2006. *What Women Want: Individual Preferences, Heterogeneous Patterns? Women's Labour Market Participation Patterns in Comparative Perspective*. Doctoral Thesis, Ponsen and Looijen, Amsterdam.

The data used in this study were made available to me by the British Household Panel Study (BHPS; computer file) principle investigator, The Institute for Social and Economic Research, Colchester, The Data Archive (distributor) 1992-2002 data files and associated documentation; the German Socio-Economic Panel Study (SOEP) 1992-2002 at the German Institute for Economic Research (DIW) Berlin; the OSA Labour Supply Panel 1992-2002

This research was funded by the Willem Drees Foundation (Stichting Willem Drees Lezing) and SNS Reaal.

Supervisors:

Prof. Jelle Visser

Prof. Frans Leijnse

Information for the library:

Yerkes, Mara (2006), Women's working preferences in the Netherlands, Germany and the UK, working paper 2006-43. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam

August 2006

© All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form, or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the auteur.

© M. Yerkes, Amsterdam, August 2006

This paper can be downloaded:

www.uva-aias.net/files/aias/WP43.pdf

ABSTRACT

This paper focuses on the effect of women's individual working preferences on female employment patterns in the Netherlands, Germany and the UK for the period 1992-2002. Female patterns of labour market participation vary not only within these countries but between them as well. Is this variation due to individual socio-economic differences, or could it be attributable to a variation in women's individual working preferences? With the use of longitudinal panel data, this paper outlines the significant individual differences among women in paid work, considering the explanatory effect of individual preferences. The results show that individual working preferences are not *the* determining factor for explaining the variation in women's average weekly working hours. More importantly, preferences show themselves to be context driven, dependent upon individual and household level constraints. Finally, cross-country variation is evident.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	3
1 INTRODUCTION	7
2 THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES	9
3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESES	13
4 INDIVIDUAL WORKING PREFERENCES	19
4.1 Control Variables	22
4.2 Convergence or Divergence?	23
4.3 Macro-Level Effects	27
4.4 Preferences Moderated by Pattern Dependency?	27
4.5 Sector Self-Selection	28
5 CONCLUSION	31
REFERENCES	33
APPENDIX I: SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR THE NETHERLANDS, THE UK AND GERMANY	35

I INTRODUCTION

Women's labour market participation increased dramatically throughout the 1970s and 1980s in most European countries as a result of a series of demographic and societal changes, such as the postponement of motherhood, a decrease in average household size and a decrease in the amount of time spent on household work. At the same time, women increasingly took part in higher education, and changes at the national level, such as tax policies, encouraged women to take part in paid employment. As women's labour market participation increased, however, so did the heterogeneity of women's working patterns. While some women worked full-time, levels of part-time work increased throughout Western Europe, and at the same time a large percentage of women remained inactive in the labour market. Consequently, women exhibit a great variation in labour market participation patterns. What is the explanation for these heterogeneous labour market participation patterns among women?

This variation in female labour market behaviour receives a great deal of scholarly attention (Plantenga 1997; Smith, Fagan et al. 1998; Tijdens 2002; Visser 2002; Warren 2004). From studies on part-time work and gender inequality to the combination of paid employment with outside responsibilities, a debate continues among scholars whether the structural deficits women experience in the labour market are a result of macro forces, labour market discrimination, constraints or individual choices. While many scholars can now agree that these situations are a result of some combination of the above-mentioned factors, there is no easy answer. However, in sociological attempts to explain the diversity of women's labour market participation patterns, the role of individual preferences is often ignored. Individual preferences are often viewed with a great deal of scepticism, particularly given the variety of constraints women face in the labour market. Yet, as social scientists, we should be willing to consider the role preferences play in determining women's labour market participation patterns, given that in current labour markets, women are no longer relegated to being a housewife, and flexible working policies often increase the 'choices' that individuals face in taking up paid employment.

This paper examines the causal effect of preferences on one aspect of women's labour market participation patterns, namely women's average weekly working hours. In a comparative analysis of the Netherlands, Germany and the UK, longitudinal panel data is used to analyse the average weekly working hours of women from 1992-2002, pooling respondents across these eleven years. A fixed effects model is used to estimate the effect of preferences on average weekly working hours, while controlling for individual and household level constraints, including educational level, marital status, motherhood, age, previous labour market pattern, and sector and contract type. A fixed effects

model is preferable to other empirical models because it helps reduce the problems associated with pooling individuals across time. When using pooled panel data, regular OLS assumptions cannot be met, as the error terms are likely to be strongly correlated, producing smaller error terms and inflated coefficients. The use of fixed effects models corrects this problem.¹ Using this model, I intend to test some of the merits of preference theory, an attempt by sociologist Hakim to further the theoretical understanding of women's labour market participation patterns. The foundation of this theory is outlined in the next section.

¹ Both fixed and random effects models correct these problems. However, an analysis of the data using the Hausman test shows that the data do not meet the assumptions needed to use a random effects model.

2 THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

Social scientists must approach women's labour market participation patterns from two perspectives: the individual and the social, via the opportunity structures (both opportunities and constraints) and individual working preferences that shape individual behaviour. As social scientists, it has shown to be difficult to find a theoretical framework that allows us to consider women's working patterns in terms of individual preferences and constraints on both an individual and aggregate (social) level. From both an economic and sociological perspective, social scientists often fail to understand the mechanism between individual preferences, behaviour and opportunity structures, as well as their interaction, which creates phenomena on a macro level, such as women's labour market participation. Moreover, theories of work still fail to capture the heterogeneity of women's labour market participation (Becker 1981; Dickens and Lang 1993; Abbott and Wallace 1997; Hantrais and Ackers 2005). Preference theory represents the most recent sociological effort to provide a theoretical framework for understanding women's working patterns and preferences on an individual and aggregate level, and while controversial, deserves further consideration and testing to help us understand the influence individual preferences may have on women's decisions to take up paid work or remain outside the labour market. Because this paper focuses solely on the possible influence of individual working preferences on women's labour market participation patterns, I limit the theoretical discussion here to an explanation of preference theory along with some of the main criticisms against this theory.

PREFERENCE THEORY

Preference theory, developed by Hakim in the late 1990s (Hakim 2000), argues that macro changes in society have given women more choices in today's labour markets. These changes lead Hakim to theorize that individual preferences are the primary determinant of women's labour market behaviour. She contends that previous theories attempting to explain female labour market choices focused solely on male labour force participation and are therefore inadequate in explaining women's behaviour. Hakim's theory is intended to be both explanatory and predictive, providing a framework for understanding women's decisions in both paid and family work and reintroducing the importance of preferences as a causal factor in these analyses. Hakim warns, however, that preference theory is not applicable in all countries; a number of changes must have occurred in order for the theory to be relevant. These changes include the contraceptive revolution, the equal opportunities revolution, the growth of the service sector with the increasing importance of white collar occupations, a growth in the importance of secondary earners and an increasing recognition that attitudes, values and preferences are important determinants of people's lifestyle choices in rich, modern societies. Together, these five changes in society produce what Hakim terms a 'qualitative different' set of opportunities for women in society, leading to an increased importance

of individual preferences in determining individual behaviour. These five changes have indeed occurred in the three case countries to be studied.

The five societal changes described by Hakim constitute the first of four principles of preference theory. The other three tenets are: women's working patterns and preferences are heterogeneous; this heterogeneity causes conflict among women; this heterogeneity also causes women to respond differently to public policy.² Aggregate statistics on labour force participation, employment, unemployment and inactivity for Germany, the Netherlands and the UK show that women's working patterns are indeed heterogeneous (OECD 2004; Yerkes 2006). Not all women choose to take up paid work, and of those who do, there is a significant amount of variation in working hours. This heterogeneity is imperative to understanding women's working patterns and lifestyle choices because, as Hakim contends, there are frictions between a life centred on a career, or part-time working, or motherhood, and given the increase in voluntary childlessness (noted by Hakim) more consideration of various lifestyle choices/preferences is necessary.

Therefore, Hakim delineates women into three 'ideal' categories: home-centred, adaptive or work-centred. Home-centred women represent twenty per cent of women, (varying 10-30 per cent) with a main focus on children and family, not paid employment. The size and variation of the group of work-centred women is the same, but with an emphasis on a career in paid employment, these women do not focus on children or family responsibilities. Finally, Hakim contends there is a large group of 'adaptive' women, with diverse family and employment goals who represent the other sixty per cent, but this group can vary between forty and sixty per cent.

While preference theory provides a thought-provoking starting point for analysing women's labour market behaviour, a number of shortcomings are visible. Firstly, Hakim fails to account for the high level of variation among the three groups of women. Furthermore, given the variety in these categories as suggested by Hakim, the theory lacks dynamism. No reference is made to how long

² From a policy perspective, the assumption of homogeneity of women's labour market participation patterns is problematic. In this light, Hakim considers the difference between production and reproduction and questions whether policies aimed at women to combine work and family life can actually eliminate this conflict between two very different priorities (family or employment), so that women who choose to eschew employment, choosing for family and then returning to employment, are not systematically disadvantaged. She argues these policies are practically impossible. This assumption of homogeneity is also a methodological problem, according to Hakim. By assuming that most women either want or need to combine work and family life, social science methodology creates two shortcomings. Firstly, a focus on central tendencies (statistical averages) does not adequately reveal the heterogeneity in women's working patterns. Furthermore, the temporal dimension in many analyses is often too short (often only 12 months or less when looking at female labour market participation), which also conceals the heterogeneity of women's labour market participation. This study attempts to remedy one of these shortcomings by looking at women's average weekly working hours *across time*. However, while the heterogeneity of women's working patterns is something that continues to receive more recognition, the concept of women having different working preferences remains controversial, particularly as Hakim formulates it as groups of women having conflicting interests. In Hakim's theory, gender becomes less important; it is not so much the conflicting interests between men and women that can explain women's varying labour market patterns, but the conflict between groups of women themselves, contradictory to feminist ideas that see women as having homogenous interests.

women remain in one preference category or whether or not women transition between preference categories. But the more acute problem with preference theory is the sole focus on individual preferences, regardless of constraints, an aspect which receives a great deal of criticism (see Fagan 2001; McRae 2003; Procter and Padfield 1999). This criticism largely follows critiques of Hakim's earlier work, which suggests that women's labour market participation patterns are largely a result of women's different orientation to work (Hakim 1995; Ginn et al 1996; Hakim 1996a; Hakim 1996b; Bruegel 1996; Crompton and Harris 1998a; Crompton and Harris 1998b; Daly 2000). In this sense, one wonders whether sociologist Hakim tends towards a more traditional economic analysis without giving consideration to the opportunity structures that surround women's labour market decisions. Constraints affect any decision-making process, and in terms of labour market decisions, attention should be paid to individual, household and structural constraints, as well as the effect of cultural and social norms, which are not always visible.

Furthermore, by dismissing the importance of constraints, Hakim fails to address the issue of cognitive dissonance (Festinger 1970). Cognitive dissonance is a theoretical concept within social psychology, which outlines how individuals will attempt to remain consistent in their behaviour or ideas because inconsistency, or *dissonance*, is psychologically uncomfortable. If a dissonance exists, individuals will most likely attempt to rationalise the inconsistency. The importance of this concept when researching preferences is clear. Individuals may find themselves in a certain pattern of employment preferring a wholly different pattern but unable to realise this preference. The reasons an individual may not be able to realise their preference could include individual or household level constraints. Unrealised preferences can also be a result of an individual's environment. When individuals are not able to realise their preferences, this state of cognitive dissonance could lead an individual to adjust their preference to their behaviour or environment. In other words, if an individual works 40 hours a week and would prefer to work 30 hours a week, if they are unable to realise this preference for whatever reason, they may eventually rationalise to themselves they *prefer* to work 40 hours a week. Despite the critique given to Hakim's theory, individual preferences should not be cast aside. Preferences need to be investigated as a possible causal factor, with equal consideration being given to opportunity structures and individual and household level constraints. This study empirically investigates the role individual working preferences may play in determining women's average weekly working hours, but contrary to preference theory, simultaneously allows for the possibility that individual and household level constraints also play a role.

3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESES

This paper looks closely at women's labour market preferences and their effect as a possible causal factor behind individual labour market behaviour. The following question is addressed: (I) what causal effect, if any, do individual working preferences have on women's average weekly working hours across time? Do these effects vary across the Netherlands, Germany and the UK? If so, why? The research question addresses the ability of individual working preferences to explain the women's average weekly working hours alongside individual and household level constraints. The analysis expects to confirm the following hypothesis:

- (I) As Hakim argues, individual working preferences have a strong, significant influence on women's average weekly working hours. Specifically:
- a. A preference for more hours should lead to an increase in average weekly working hours across time.
 - b. A preference for fewer hours should lead to a decrease in average weekly working hours across time.
 - c. In accordance with preference theory, the effects of these preferences should vary slightly across countries, given differing institutional contexts.
 - d. In contrast to preference theory, individual and household constraints will affect women's average weekly working hours even when controlling for the effect of preferences. Holding preferences and all else constant, a lack of education, being married or cohabitating, being a mother and being over the age of 45 will negatively influence women's average weekly working hours across time.

The operationalisation of the variables used in testing these hypotheses is outlined below. Summary statistics for these variables can be found in Appendix I.

INDIVIDUAL WORKING PREFERENCES

The analysis in this paper is based on the explanatory power of individual working preferences across time, using single country longitudinal panel data for the Netherlands (OSA), Germany (GSOEP) and the UK (BHPS). Respondents are asked to consider the current hours they work per week and whether or not they would prefer a different workweek. In the BHPS, respondents have been asked to provide a categorical answer of preferring more, fewer or the same hours, instead of providing an actual number of hours per week, limiting the categorisation of preferences for the analyses performed here. Therefore, all individual working preference data have been classified as preferring more hours, the same hours or fewer hours.

The preference questions as asked in the three datasets are:

BHPS: Thinking about the hours you work, assuming that you would be paid the same amount per hour, would you prefer to: work fewer hours than you do now; work more hours than you do now; or carry on working the same number of hours?

GSOEP: If you could choose your own number of working hours, taking into account that your income would change according to the number of hours: how many hours would you want to work?

OSA3: (1) *Stelt u zich eens voor dat u zelf zou mogen bepalen hoeveel uur u per week werkt. Het gaat dus om het aantal uren dat u met uw werkgever overeen zou willen komen. Hoeveel uur zou u graag willen werken in uw huidige werkkring, als u per uur gemiddeld hetzelfde zou verdienen als nu? Kiest u voor minder werken, dan betekent dat dus minder netto inkomen; bij méér werken krijgt u ook meer inkomen.* Imagine that you can decide how many hours you work per week. In other words, the number of agreed upon hours you want with your employer. How many hours would you like to work in your current job, if, on average, you would earn the same amount per hour as you do now? If you choose to work less, that means a smaller net income; more work means more income.⁴

(2) *Ik wil u vragen of u tevreden bent over uw huidige aanstellingsomvang of dat u juist meer of minder zou willen werken. Wilt u evenveel als nu werken of juist meer of minder uren? (2a) Hoeveel uur méér per week? (2b) Hoeveel uur minder per week?* I'd like to ask you if you are satisfied with the current breadth of your workweek or if you would like to work more or less. Would you like to continue to work the same amount of hours you work now, or more or less? (2a) How many hours more per week? (2b) How many hours less per week?

(3) *Ik wil u vragen of u tevreden bent over uw huidige aanstellingsomvang of dat u juist meer of minder zou willen werken. Veronderstel daarbij dat uw uurloon gelijk blijft en dat anderen binnen uw huishouden niet meer of minder gaan werken. Wilt u evenveel als nu werken of juist meer of minder uren? (3a) Hoeveel uur méér per week? (3b) Hoeveel uur minder per week?*

I'd like to ask you if you are satisfied with the current breadth of your workweek or if you would like to work more or less. Imagine that your hourly wage remains the same and that other members within your household do not start working more or fewer hours. Would

³ The preference question in the OSA dataset changed in 2000 and again in 2002. (1) Refers to the question as asked from 1992-1998, (2) refers to 2000 and (3) refers to 2002.

⁴ Author's own translations.

you like to continue working the same amount of hours you work now, or more or less?

(3a) How many hours more per week? (3b) How many hours less per week?

For both the GSOEP and OSA data, preference variables are created by subtracting preferred hours from a person's contractual hours and then coding them as more, fewer or same.⁵ To minimize causality problems between labour market behaviour and preferences, preferences from the previous period are used in the analyses. A preference for the same hours is the reference category. In other words, I am interested in knowing whether a preference for more, fewer or the same hours in one year affects women's average weekly working hours in the next year.

PREVIOUS LABOUR MARKET PATTERN

In the analysis, I control for the effect of women's previous labour market patterns. A lagged variable is used, with four different working hours categories: 0-11 hours a week, 12-19 hours a week, 20-34 hours a week and 35+ hours a week. The reference category is 0-11 hours a week.

EDUCATION

The classification of education level is based on the internationally comparable CASMIN scale (Müller 2004; Kerckhoff et al 2002; Bernardi et al 2004) creating three levels of education: high (university), intermediate (secondary) or low (less than secondary), corresponding to Casmin levels 1, 2 and 3. A high level of education is the reference category.

MOTHERHOOD

Motherhood is measured by the number of children in the household (under the age of 16) and the age of the youngest child in the household. These two variables are used as proxy variables for the possible influence of welfare state policies on women's labour market participation patterns, while controlling for preferences (Ortiz 2005). The reference categories for both variables are 'no children'.

MARITAL STATUS

Respondents' marital status, a proxy variable for household decision-making while controlling for individual preferences, is based upon respondent self-definition and the classification used in this study includes married/cohabitating and single (including separated, widowed and divorced). The reference category is single.

⁵ The question on preferences is not asked in the GSOEP panel in 1996. However, the remaining ten waves of data provide enough information for robust analyses.

AGE GROUPS⁶

The analyses include women aged 15-64, categorised into five age groups: 15-24; 25-34; 35-44; 45-54; 55-64. Women aged 35-44 are used as a reference category, given that these women are more likely to reduce their working hours, work part-time or be inactive at this stage in their life cycle.

SECTOR: PUBLIC VERSUS PRIVATE

Women's employment is at times concentrated in public employment, where working hours and the organization of work are often more compatible with other non-work related commitments. In other words, the public sector is often viewed as more female-friendly than the private sector. However, it is difficult to determine whether working in a female-friendly environment is likely to cause an increase or decrease in average weekly working hours. Furthermore, the proportion of women in public employment for this time period varies across the three case countries from roughly one-third in the Netherlands to one-half in Germany, to nearly two-thirds in the UK (OECD 2002; Hicks et al 2005). Therefore, sector type (public versus private) is included in the analysis of women's average weekly working hours as a control variable.

CONTRACT TYPE: PERMANENT VERSUS TEMPORARY

Temporary contracts are seen as a means of adding flexibility to the labour market, particularly when trying to avoid strict hiring and firing regulations. As part-time work increased throughout Europe, so did the number of temporary contracts (Houwing 2005). However, temporary contracts are not necessarily incompatible with full-time work. Therefore, I also include contract type (permanent versus temporary) as a control variable when analysing women's average weekly working hours.

METHODOLOGICAL CONCERNS

Before moving on to the analyses, it is important to note a number of problems related to measuring preferences through surveys, not in the least that most do not obtain preference information on non-working women. As an indicator, preference questions are sensitive to other variables that cannot be measured, for example, whether or not someone is providing a socially acceptable answer or if the answer is individual or household based. Respondents are often asked to consider the change in income that would correspond to an increase or decrease in working hours. So although an individual might like to work fewer hours, this may not be financially feasible, in which case the respondent may provide a different answer. Furthermore, individuals will either realise their preference or maintain an unfulfilled preference. And among the individuals whose

⁶ It is not possible to distinguish between life cycle (age) effects and cohort (generational) effects in these analyses. Cohorts do not vary across time and therefore cannot be tested in a fixed effects model.

preferences are not fulfilled, a difference exists between people who continually experience unfulfilled preferences, and those individuals who change their preference because they are unable to fulfil it. Finally, there is an important difference between salaried workers and hourly-wage workers. Hourly-wage workers are more likely to prefer an increase in working hours, as they will receive more wages for extra hours, whereas this is not the case for salaried workers.⁷ These methodological concerns remind us to be aware that preferences, in the end, are often a reflection of what is desirable and what is feasible for an individual, particularly given that most individuals will try and avoid a state of cognitive dissonance. Given these difficulties, we must do what we can with the data available.

⁷ I am grateful to Kea Tijdens for this addition.

4 INDIVIDUAL WORKING PREFERENCES

In this section, I analyse whether or not a preference for more or fewer hours actually does cause a change in average weekly working hours across time. Starting with a test of the sole effect of individual working preferences on women's average weekly working hours, we see that the effects of preferences do not follow expectations, except in the Netherlands (see Figure 1). In the Netherlands, a preference for more working hours leads to an eight per cent increase in women's average weekly working hours across time. Remarkably, a preference for fewer hours does not significantly influence Dutch women's working hours.

In contrast, preferences as the sole causal factor of women's average weekly working hours produces puzzling results in the UK and Germany. In both countries, having a preference for more hours leads to a *decrease* in working hours, whereas a preference for fewer hours leads to an *increase* in average weekly working hours. These perplexing results could suggest that the measurement of preferences here is not vigorous enough to produce robust results. But there is a plausible, alternative possibility. Namely, the ability of preferences to act as a causal determinant of women's labour market participation patterns is dependent upon controlling for constraints at the individual and household level.

Figure 1: The Effect of Preferences on Women's Average Weekly Working Hours

Average weekly working hours			
	Netherlands	UK	Germany
	Coef. (SE)	Coef. (SE)	Coef. (SE)
Lagged preference (ref: same hours)			
More hours	.079*** (.018)	-.034*** (.008)	-.006*** (.004)
Fewer hours	-.015 (.015)	.027*** (.005)	.024*** (.004)
N	5350	27304	23875
R ² within	.010	.003	.004
R ² between	.021	.082	.134
R ² overall	.020	.060	.073

-p<.10, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001.

Source: British Household Panel Study, German Socio-Economic Panel, OSA Labour Supply Panel 1992-2002.

To explore this possibility, I measure the effect of individual and household constraints in combination with individual preferences. The results of this analysis are presented below (see Figure 2).⁸ After controlling for individual and household level constraints, a preference for more hours

⁸ In a fixed effects model, we are interested in *time-varying* characteristics, which can be problematic when trying to measure the effects of certain attributes such as education or sector type in this model, variables that may remain relatively stable over a period of ten years. However, some variation can occur and excluding these variables from the model has little

now leads to a small, but significant increase in working hours in all three case countries. The data demonstrate that the largest effect is in the Netherlands, where Dutch women who prefer more working hours increase their average weekly working hours by seven per cent across time. Notably, a preference for fewer hours still does not have a significant effect on women's working hours in the Netherlands or the UK.

However, if individual working preferences can be trusted as a causal factor, a preference for fewer hours may lead to a significant decrease in working hours over the next few years, as all three countries recently introduced flexible working policies⁹ making it easier to reduce individual working hours. While it has always been possible for individuals to adjust their working hours by changing jobs, the introduction of flexible working hours legislation makes it easier for individuals to adjust working hours in an *existing* job. In the Netherlands and Germany (in medium to large companies) all employees can request a reduction in working time, but in the UK this option is only available to the parents of young children. As it becomes relatively easier for individuals to request a reduction in working hours, a preference for fewer hours may become a significant determining factor of women's average weekly working hours. For now, however, individual working preferences have only a small effect. But at the same time, after controlling for individual working preferences, the effects of individual and household level constraints remain visible.

Of all the individual and household level constraints measured in this analysis, motherhood is the largest constraint on women's average weekly working hours, even after taking individual working preferences into account. Holding preferences and all else constant, we see a clear trend that nearly all mothers reduce their weekly working hours across time. The size and significance of these effects do vary across countries, however. For example, in the Netherlands, the move from no children to one child means a *twenty-six* per cent reduction in average weekly working hours, all else being equal. As long as these individual and household constraints remain, individual working preferences are less relevant as determinants of women's labour market behaviour.

effect. The inclusion of these characteristics does not further jeopardize the robustness of the model, but the results should be interpreted with caution.

⁹ The individual right to reduce working time was introduced in the Netherlands in 2000, in 2001 in Germany and in 2003 in the UK (see Yerkes 2006). However, prior to the introduction of Dutch legislation in 2000, a vast majority of Dutch employees were able to reduce their working hours through collective agreements between employers and trade unions.

Figure 2: Fixed Effects Results

Average weekly working hours			
	<i>Netherlands</i>	<i>UK</i>	<i>Germany</i>
	<i>Coef. (SE)</i>	<i>Coef. (SE)</i>	<i>Coef. (SE)</i>
Previous working hours (ref: 0-11 hours)			
12-19 hours	-.054 (.034)	.171*** (.011)	.044** (.013)
20-34 hours	-.049 (.034)	.289*** (.011)	.151*** (.013)
35+ hours	-.050 (.035)	.353*** (.011)	.246*** (.013)
Lagged preference (ref: same hours)			
More hours	.077*** (.019)	.034*** (.007)	.018*** (.005)
Fewer hours	-.001 (.017)	.003 (.005)	.009* (.004)
Educational level (ref: high)			
Low	-.024 (.036)	-.084*** (.017)	-.030 (.016)
Intermediate	-.013 (.031)	-.045*** (.012)	-.019 (.010)
Age (ref: 35-44)			
15-24	.092 (.052)	-.012 (.015)	.001 (.014)
25-34	-.025 (.029)	-.021* (.009)	.004 (.008)
45-54	-.029 (.030)	.007 (.010)	.015 (.008)
55-64	-.168** (.057)	-.043** (.016)	.015 (.013)
Number of children in HH under 16 (ref: none)			
1 child	-.262*** (.028)	-.091*** (.014)	-.036*** (.009)
2 children	-.286*** (.028)	-.198*** (.016)	-.062*** (.013)
3+ children	-.203*** (.044)	-.305*** (.021)	-.061** (.023)
Age of youngest child (ref: no children)			
0-2 years old	-.023 (.027)	-.170*** (.015)	-.276*** (.018)
3-5 years old	-.072* (.029)	-.135*** (.015)	-.128*** (.013)
5-15 years old	-.048* (.022)	.025 (.014)	-.034*** (.009)
Marital status (ref: single)			
Married/cohabitating	.026 (.046)	-.007 (.008)	-.048*** (.008)
Contract type (ref: permanent)			
Temporary	-.067** (.024)	-.092*** (.009)	.007 (.008)
Sector (ref: private)			
Public	.023 (.026)	-.021* (.009)	.107*** (.027)
Period effect (linear)			
	.006 (.004)	.001 (.001)	-.004*** (.001)
Intercept			
	3.248*** (.064)	3.181*** (.018)	3.327*** (.020)
N	3299	26163	18656
R ² within	.141	.152	.096
R ² between	.092	.383	.518
R ² overall	.077	.368	.463

~p<.10, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001.

Source: British Household Panel Study, German Socio-Economic Panel, OSA Labour Supply Panel 1992-2002.

4.1 CONTROL VARIABLES

Alongside variables measuring individual and household level constraints, this analysis also includes three control variables: previous labour market pattern, contract type and sector. Starting with the effect of previous labour market participation pattern, we do not see a general trend in all three countries of pattern dependency after controlling for preferences. Remarkably, previous labour market patterns do not significantly affect Dutch women's average weekly working hours. In contrast, all German and British women exhibit a degree of pattern dependency. In comparison to women who work 0-11 hours a week, British and German women who previously worked more than 12 hours a week will, on average, work a significant amount more in the next year, all else being equal. In other words, even after taking preferences into account, women's average weekly working hours are still affected by their previous labour market pattern in Germany and the UK.

Moreover, individual working preferences and all else being equal, the data demonstrate that the effect of having a temporary contract significantly reduces British and Dutch women's average weekly working hours by nine and seven per cent respectively. In contrast, controlling for contract type in Germany produces no significant effects. This cross-country variation is possibly explained by the fact that the temporary employment sector of the German labour market is relatively small in comparison to the Netherlands and the UK (Houwing 2005), making it feasible that no effect is found in Germany. Temporary work in Germany is growing, however, so an effect could be visible in a few years time.

At the same time, even after taking individual working preferences into account, a significant sector effect can be found in the UK and Germany. The data show that public sector employment significantly increases German women's average weekly working hours by eleven per cent. In contrast, women employed in the public sector in the UK work, on average, two per cent less than female employees in the private sector, all else being equal. I am careful to interpret the results here, however. The variation in sector type from 1992 to 2002 may be insufficient to act as a time-varying characteristic. Moreover, it is difficult to know if the net effect of an increase in working hours for public sector employment reflects an increase in working hours for *all* women in the public sector or a decrease for some and a simultaneous greater increase for others. The effect of working in the public sector in Germany could be due to a higher level of collective bargaining, where collective agreements regulate the size of the conventional workweek in both the public and private sector. In contrast, the decrease in women's average weekly working hours in Britain could be due to self-selection into public sector employment, an important factor to consider when analysing the influence of individual preferences on average weekly working hours. In comparison to the private sector, public sector employment exists in a context of 'soft' labour markets, usually

with more generous leave arrangements, (e.g. emergency leave to care for a sick child) and flexible working times. I test for this possibility of sector self-selection in the next section.

4.2 CONVERGENCE OR DIVERGENCE?

Many of the results in this model follow expectations, yet a number of them are intriguing, if not puzzling. What explains the seemingly spurious relationship between individual working preferences and women's average weekly working hours? The explanatory power of individual working preferences differs across the three case countries, suggesting a variation in institutional contexts. In other words, given the presence of significant results in the Netherlands – with coefficients that follow expectations – it could be that the Dutch institutional context is qualitatively different from the German and British contexts. From the first step in empirical testing, Dutch individual working preferences follow expectations. Despite the insignificance of a preference for fewer hours, the expected causal direction is evident. Does this suggest that Dutch women are more able or likely to realise their preferences? In other words, are preferences only a determining factor of labour market participation patterns when the context of individual and household level constraints (such as motherhood) are not *too constraining*? Or when the institutional context helps reduce the effect of these constraints, creating an environment conducive to realising preferences?

The data here show that individual working preferences have a greater influence on women's working hours in the Netherlands than in either the UK or Germany. Moreover, recent findings show that Dutch women are likely to adjust their working times throughout various life stages (Baaijens 2006), thereby *realising* their preferences. Further research demonstrates that Dutch women experience only a negligible gap between actual and preferred working hours (Baaijens 2006; Tijdens 2000; Yerkes 2003). Therefore, an investigation into the possibility of macro-level effects and their variation across the three case countries is warranted.

One way of testing for possible macro-level effects is to include a number of proxy variables in the model.¹⁰ Two additions are made here: the inclusion of one variable measuring annual standardised unemployment rates and one variable measuring annual female labour market participation rates (OECD 2005). Standardised unemployment rates function as a measure of economic vigour. Unemployment is generally low in periods of economic growth and increases in times of economic decline. By including a measure of unemployment, I can establish whether significant differences exist among the three case countries in terms of economic opportunity structures. Female labour market participation rates, on the other hand, act as a proxy for the cultural context of women's

¹⁰ These proxy variables replace year variables measuring period effects.

employment. High female labour market participation suggests a cultural acceptance of female employment, also for mothers, and is indicative of opportunity structures at the macro level.

At the same time, I consider a number of possible interaction terms. Given the somewhat suspicious relationship between preferences and working hours, I now include an interaction term of previous labour market patterns*preferences to determine whether certain groups of workers are more or less likely to have a significant relationship between individual working preferences and average weekly working hours.¹¹ I also measure for the possibility of self-selection into the public sector by including sector*presence of children and sector*marital status. The hypothesis is that if self-selection takes place, women with children are more likely to be employed in the public sector, wanting a 'softer' labour market for combining paid work and caring tasks. At the same time, another possibility is explored, namely that self-selection may take place at an earlier stage, at the point in time when an individual finds a partner (Ortiz 2005). The full model with macro-level variables and the three interaction terms is presented in Figure 3.

¹¹ The inclusion of another interaction term of this type, looking for a possible effect of motherhood on the relationship between individual working preferences and average weekly working hours produces only two sporadic significant results, and is therefore not included here. The empirical results of the model including this interaction term are available from the author.

Figure 3: Fixed Effects Results with Macro-level Variables and Interaction Terms

Average weekly working hours			
	<i>Netherlands</i>	<i>UK</i>	<i>Germany</i>
	<i>Coef. (SE)</i>	<i>Coef. (SE)</i>	<i>Coef. (SE)</i>
Previous working hours (ref: 0-11 hours)			
12-19 hours	-.027 (.044)	.192*** (.013)	.085*** (.023)
20-34 hours	-.019 (.041)	.314*** (.013)	.204*** (.021)
35+ hours	-.013 (.041)	.384*** (.013)	.305*** (.021)
Lagged preference (ref: same hours)			
More hours	.140*** (.040)	.061*** (.017)	.084*** (.020)
Fewer hours	-.185 (.216)	.224*** (.033)	.091** (.026)
Educational level (ref: high)			
Low	-.017 (.036)	-.085*** (.017)	-.030 (.016)
Intermediate	-.008 (.031)	-.045*** (.012)	-.019 (.010)
Age (ref: 35-44)			
15-24	.089 (.052)	-.012 (.015)	-.002 (.014)
25-34	.024 (.030)	-.021* (.009)	.003 (.008)
45-54	-.023 (.030)	.009 (.010)	.016* (.008)
55-64	-.159** (.057)	-.039*** (.016)	.016 (.013)
Number of children in HH under 16 (ref: none)			
1 child	-.276*** (.030)	-.098*** (.015)	-.032** (.009)
2 children	-.284*** (.030)	-.212*** (.017)	-.058*** (.013)
3+ children	-.188*** (.047)	-.325*** (.024)	-.057* (.023)
Age of youngest child (ref: no children)			
0-2 years old	-.022 (.027)	-.167*** (.015)	-.276*** (.018)
3-5 years old	-.072* (.029)	-.135*** (.015)	-.129*** (.013)
5-15 years old	-.046* (.022)	.025 (.014)	-.034*** (.009)

Figure 3 (cont): Fixed Effects Model with Macro-level Variables and Interaction Terms

Average weekly working hours			
	Netherlands	UK	Germany
	Coef. (SE)	Coef. (SE)	Coef. (SE)
Marital status (ref: single)			
Married/cohabitating	.056 (.049)	-.005 (.009)	-.050*** (.008)
Contract type (ref: permanent)			
Temporary	-.067** (.024)	-.092*** (.009)	.007 (.008)
Sector (ref: private)			
Public	.102* (.049)	-.003 (.014)	.113** (.033)
Unemployment	-.017 (.010)	-.002 (.002)	-.002 (.002)
Female labour market participation	-.004 (.005)	-.003 (.003)	-.009*** (.002)
Sector*Number of children (ref: private; none)			
Public; 1 child	.084 (.064)	.020 (.013)	-.089** (.029)
Public; 2 children	-.029 (.058)	.041* (.016)	-.113* (.046)
Public; 3+ children	-.085 (.082)	.054* (.027)	-.138 (.122)
Sector*Marital status (ref: private; single)			
Public; married/cohabitating	-.112* (.055)	-.043** (.014)	.049 (.033)
Preference*Previous working hours (ref: same; 0-11)			
More; 12-19	-.066 (.053)	.001 (.022)	-.045 (.025)
Less; 12-19	.249 (.228)	-.239*** (.037)	-.070* (.031)
More; 20-34	-.067 (.052)	-.028 (.021)	-.066** (.022)
Less; 20-34	.188 (.218)	-.219*** (.034)	-.077** (.027)
More; 35+	-.139* (.065)	-.061** (.023)	-.076*** (.021)
Less; 35+	.173 (.217)	-.227*** (.033)	-.087** (.027)
Intercept	3.541*** (.353)	3.363*** (.227)	3.820*** (.137)
N	3299	26163	18656
R ² within	.151	.155	.098
R ² between	.077	.388	.513
R ² overall	.066	.374	.461

~*p*<.10, **p*<.05, ***p*<.01, ****p*<.001.

Source: British Household Panel Study, German Socio-Economic Panel, OSA Labour Supply Panel 1992-2002.

4.3 MACRO-LEVEL EFFECTS

Remarkably, the data demonstrate only one significant macro-level effect on women's average weekly working hours. An increase in German female labour market participation results in a small, but significant decrease in women's average weekly working hours across time, all else being equal. This effect could be a result of the simultaneous growth of female labour market participation and female part-time work, indicating that even though women's labour market participation increased in absolute terms, women, on average, are working fewer hours. We do not, however, see a similar effect in the UK or the NL. However, an absence of significant effects here does not imply that the growth in female labour market participation did not go hand-in-hand with a growth in female part-time work in these two countries. On the contrary, part-time work played a large role in the development of female labour market participation in both the Netherlands and the UK. The data seem to suggest, rather, that shorter part-time workweeks may be on the rise in Germany, causing an overall decrease in average weekly working hours as German female labour market participation rises. Notably, unemployment rates are not significant in any of the case countries.

4.4 PREFERENCES MODERATED BY PATTERN DEPENDENCY?

The data demonstrate a number of interesting results for the first interaction term, with one general trend visible across all three countries. Women who previously worked full-time and expressed a preference for more hours decrease their average weekly working hours across time. This result seems rather paradoxical, particularly given the large decrease in Dutch women's average weekly working hours of fourteen per cent. On the one hand, the explanation for these effects is the still seemingly problematic empirical relationship between individual working preferences and average weekly working hours. On the other hand, the reduction in average weekly working hours for full-time workers could reflect decreases in the standard workweek, particularly true in the Netherlands, where a standard workweek is now 36 hours a week.

Looking further now to the variation across the three countries, we see that a woman's previous working pattern has no other effect on the relationship between preferences and average weekly working hours in the Netherlands. This is not the case with the British and German analyses, however. Surprisingly, all but one of the results for this interaction term show a *negative* effect on women's average weekly working hours in Germany and the UK, even a preference for *more* hours. In other words, when a woman's previous labour market pattern affects the relationship between preferences and average weekly working hours, the produced effect is a decrease in average weekly working hours across time, no matter what the preference. These results once again suggest that

the relationship between individual working preferences and average weekly working hours is not directly evident.

At the same time, there is a distinct divergence between the empirical evidence for the Netherlands versus Germany and the UK. First, in the original analysis without controlling for other factors, individual working preferences had little effect on women's average weekly working hours. Only in the Dutch case did we see logical coefficients for the effect of preferences on average weekly working hours. We only saw a similar predictive effect of individual working preferences across the three case countries after controlling for individual and household level constraints. The divergence between the Netherlands on the one hand, and Germany and the UK on the other, continued after controlling for an interaction of preferences and previous labour market pattern. In Germany and the UK, the main effects for previous labour market pattern increased, meaning that women with a preference for the *same* hours *increase* their average weekly working hours over time. Furthermore, women in marginal part-time jobs increase their average weekly working hours across time, no matter whether they prefer an increase or decrease in average weekly working hours. Similar effects were not evident in the Netherlands. These results support the idea that individual working preferences in the Netherlands differ from individual working preferences in the UK and Germany. It seems plausible that women in the Netherlands are more able to realise their preferences given the high acceptance of part-time work and the relative ease with which an individual can adjust her working hours. Moreover, the Netherlands witnessed a decrease in the size of the standard workweek and a simultaneous increase in the size of substantial part-time workweeks, which could help to explain the absence of interaction effects in the Dutch model.

4.5 SECTOR SELF-SELECTION

Turning now to the possibility of self-selection, we see that the data show a number of significant results for the possibility of self-selection into the public sector for both German and British mothers. German women employed in the public sector with one or two children work considerably less than women in the private sector with no children. At the same time, the main effects for the number of children in the household (which now reflect the effect of motherhood for women working in the private sector, all else being equal) show that German mothers in the private sector also reduce average weekly working hours across time. In contrast, British mothers working in the public sector increase their average weekly working hours slightly across time. Remarkably, the interaction effect of marital status with sector type seems to capture the possibility of self-selection for the Netherlands, as well as in the UK. Dutch married or cohabitating women work on average, eleven per cent less than single women working in the private sector. British married or cohabitating women work four per cent less. More research is needed, however, to determine to

what extent these results are evidence of self-selection. A large public sector, as is evident in many Scandinavian countries, could increase the possibility of self-selection. At the same time, readily available part-time work can substitute for a large public sector, a factor that could be affecting all three case countries given high rates of female part-time work.

5 CONCLUSION

This paper empirically investigated the effect of individual preferences on women's labour market participation patterns, testing theoretical assumptions of preference theory. Are individual preferences *the* determining factor of women's labour market participation? No. Women's individual preferences influence their labour market participation patterns, but the inclusion of individual preferences in this empirical model does not render individual and household level constraints insignificant. In contrast, after controlling for individual preferences, the effects of constraints such as motherhood remain stronger than preferences.

Another important conclusion to be made in this paper is that preferences have shown themselves to be context driven. In other words, the role individual preferences play in determining women's labour market participation patterns is dependent upon the barriers of individual and household constraints present in individual countries. Moreover, the data demonstrate a clear division in these analyses – when it comes to the role played by preferences in determining women's labour market participation patterns, the Netherlands differs from Germany and the UK. Taking welfare state contexts into consideration, these results appear to suggest that institutional and policy structures in the Netherlands are more conducive to realising individual working preferences, despite the existence of constraints. In Germany and the UK, previous labour market patterns are a greater predictor of working hours than individual preferences, suggesting women may have adjusted their preferences to suit their environment.

Notably, the effect of individual working preferences on women's labour market participation patterns appears to be questionable at times, leading to effects in the direction opposite of expectations. In combination with the continued effect of individual and household level constraints after controlling for preferences, the analyses here suggest that the relationship between preferences and labour market activity is not as simple as preferences being the *sole* determinant of women's labour market participation patterns. While these issues will require further research, two possible factors can be mentioned here. The analyses in this paper do not take preference duration or realisation into account (see Baaijens 2006). Individuals who prefer more hours are likely to be overrepresented in any sample if requests to *increase* working hours are not honoured as often as requests to *decrease* individual working hours. In other words, the duration of a preference for more hours is longer than the duration of a preference for fewer hours. Furthermore, we must remember another aspect of the context in which preferences are formed, shaped and realised. People learn from their environment, and if the environment does not learn from the preferences of individuals within it, we may see an aggregate effect of individuals adjusting their preferences to their

environment. It seems to be the case that individuals have a greater amount of flexibility in determining their working hours in the Netherlands, thereby increasing the predictive power of preferences in the Dutch case. In comparison, in the absence of an environment conducive to realising individual preferences, British and German women appear to have adjusted their preferences. More research is needed in this area, however, to determine which institutional contexts are most conducive to realising individual working preferences and which policies can contribute towards reducing the effect of individual and household level constraints.

REFERENCES

- Abbott, P. and C. Wallace (1997). *An Introduction to Sociology: Feminist Perspectives*. London, Routledge.
- Baaijens, C. (2006). *Arbeidstijden: tussen wens en werkelijkheid*. Doctoral Thesis. Amsterdam, Ponsen en Looijen.
- Becker, G. S. (1981). *A Treatise on the Family*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press.
- Bernardi, F., M. Gangl and H. van de Werfhorst. (2004). "The From School-to-work Dynamics. Timing of work and quality of work in Italy, the Netherlands and the United States, 1980-1998". *Working paper 2004/201*. Madrid, Instituto Juan March de Estudios e Investigaciones.
- British Household Panel Study, Waves 1992-2002. Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex, Colchester, England.
- Bruegel, I. (1996). "Whose myths are they anyway?: a comment." *British Journal of Sociology* 47(1): 175-177.
- Crompton, R. and F. Harris. (1998a). "Explaining women's employment patterns: 'orientations to work' revisited." *British Journal of Sociology* 49(1): 118-136.
- Crompton, R. and F. Harris. (1998b). "A reply to Hakim." *British Journal of Sociology* 49(1): 144-149.
- Daly, M. (2000). A fine balance: Women's labour market participation in international comparison. In *Welfare and Work in the open economy. Diverse responses to common challenges*. F. W. Scharpf and V.A. Smith. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Dickens, W. T. and K. Lang (1993). *Labor Market Segmentation Theory: Reconsidering the evidence. Labor Economics: problems in analyzing labour markets*. W. Darity, Jr., Boston, Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Fagan, C. (2001). "Time, Money and the Gender Order: Work Orientations and Working-Time Preferences in Britain." *Gender, Work and Organization* 8(3): 239-266.
- Festinger, L. (1970). *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. Evanston and White Plains, Row, Peterson and Company.
- German Socio Economic Panel Data. Waves 1992-2002. German Institute for Economic Research, Berlin, Germany.
- Ginn, J., S. Arber, et al. (1996). "Feminist Fallacies: a reply to Hakim on women's employment." *British Journal of Sociology* 47(1): 167-174.
- Hakim, C. (2000). *Work-lifestyle choices in the 21st century : preference theory*. Oxford and New York, Oxford University Press.
- Hakim, C. (1996a). *Key Issues in Women's Work: Female heterogeneity and the polarization of women's employment*. London and Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Athlone publishing.
- Hakim, C. (1996b). "The sexual division of labour and women's heterogeneity." *British Journal of Sociology* 47(1): 178-188.
- Hakim, C. (1995). "Five feminist myths about women's employment." *British Journal of Sociology* 46(3): 429-455.
- Hantrais, L. and P. Ackers (2005). "Women's Choices in Europe: Striking the Work-life Balance." *European Journal of Industrial Relations* 11(2): 197-212.
- Hicks, S., A. Walling, D. Heap and D. Livesey. (2005). *Public Sector Employment Trends 2005*. London, Office of National Statistics.
- Houwing, H. (2005). "Variations in Flexibility and Security - agency work and the role of collective bargaining institutions." Paper presented at the 2nd European Doctoral Conference of PhD students in Labour Studies and Industrial Relations, 19-20 September 2005, University of Milan.
- Kerckhoff, A. C., E. D. Ezell and J.S.Brown. (2002). "Toward an improved measure of educational attainment in social stratification research." *Social Science Research* 31(1): 99-123.

- McRae, S. (2003). "Constraints and Choices in Mothers' Employment Careers: A Consideration of Hakim's Preference Theory." *The British Journal of Sociology* 54(3): 317-338.
- Müller, W. (2005). *Casmin Education Classification*. <http://www.nuff.ox.ac.uk/Users/Yaish/NPSM/Casmin%20Education.htm>. Accessed online 10 February 2005. Oxford, Internet.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2005). Labour Force Statistics (online data). www.oecd.org. Internet.
- OECD. (2004). Labour Force Statistics (online data). www.oecd.org. Internet.
- OECD. (2002). *Highlights of Public Sector Pay and Employment Trends: 2002 Update*. Paris, OECD.
- Organisatie voor Strategisch Arbeidsmarktonderzoek, Institute for Labour Studies. Labour Supply Panel, Waves 1992-2002, Tilburg, the Netherlands.
- Ortiz, L. (2005). "Leaving the Labour Market: Event-History Analysis of Female Workers' Transition to Housework in Denmark, Germany, Great Britain and Spain." *Working paper 2005/215*. Madrid, Instituto Juan March de Estudios e Investigaciones.
- Plantenga, J. (1997). Part-Time Work in the Netherlands: Facts, Figures and Policies. *Part-time Work in Europe: Gender, Jobs and Opportunities*. M. Klein. Frankfurt/Main and New York, Campus Verlag: 151-167.
- Procter, I. and M. Padfield. (1999). "Work Orientations and Women's Work: A Critique of Hakim's Theory of the Heterogeneity of Women." *Gender, Work and Organization* 6(3): 152-162.
- Smith, M., C. Fagan, et al. (1998). Where and why is part-time work growing in Europe. *Part-Time Prospects: An International Comparison of Part-Time Work in Europe, North America and the Pacific Rim*. J. O'Reilly and C. Fagan. London and New York, Routledge Publishing: 35-56.
- Tijdens, K. G. (2002). "Gender Roles and Labor Use Strategies: Women's Part-Time Work in the European Union." *Feminist Economics* 8(1): 71-99.
- Tijdens, K. (2000). Employment Options of the Future-Actual and Preferred Working Hours. *National Working Paper for the Netherlands*. Dublin, European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions.
- Visser, J. (2002). "The First Part-time Economy in the World: a model to be followed." *Journal of European Social Policy* 12(1): 23-42.
- Warren, T. (2004). "Working part-time: achieving a successful 'work-life' balance?" *British Journal of Sociology* 55(1): 99-122.
- Yerkes, M. (2006, forthcoming). *What Women Want: Individual Preferences, Heterogeneous Patterns? Women's Labour Market Participation Patterns in Comparative Perspective*. Doctoral Thesis. Publisher yet unknown.
- Yerkes, M. (2003). "Actual versus Preferred Working Times in the Netherlands: Part-time Patterns or Preferences?" Conference Paper for EspaNNet 1st Annual Conference, Copenhagen, Denmark.

APPENDIX I: SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR THE NETHERLANDS, THE UK AND GERMANY

Means of Independent Variables in the Netherlands, the UK and Germany: pooled waves 1992-2002¹

		NL	UK	GER
Preference				
	More hours	0.15	0.08	0.25
	Same hours	0.64	0.61	0.3
	Fewer hours	0.21	0.31	0.45
Previous working pattern				
	0-11	0.09	0.06	0.04
	12-19	0.12	0.12	0.07
	20-34	0.34	0.25	0.25
	34+	0.45	0.57	0.63
Ed. Qual.				
	High	0.19	0.41	0.13
	Intermediate	0.39	0.37	0.56
	Low	0.43	0.22	0.31
Marital status				
	Single	0.21	0.27	0.36
	Married/cohabitating	0.79	0.73	0.64
Age				
	15-24	0.11	0.13	0.07
	25-34	0.30	0.28	0.25
	35-44	0.30	0.27	0.32
	45-54	0.25	0.23	0.26
	55-64	0.05	0.09	0.10
Number of children				
	none	0.64	0.60	0.61
	1 child	0.09	0.20	0.23
	2 children	0.18	0.16	0.13
	3 or more	0.09	0.04	0.02
Age of youngest child*				
	no kids	0.63	0.64	0.64
	0-2 years	0.09	0.09	0.01
	3-5 years	0.08	0.07	0.05
	6-15 years	0.21	0.21	0.30
Sector				
	Public	0.19	0.37	0.05
	Private	0.82	0.63	0.95
Contract type				
	Permanent	0.88	0.94	0.94
	Temporary	0.12	0.06	0.06
Number of observations		3299	26163	18656

Source: Author's own calculations based on BHPS 1992, 1998, 2002.

*The mean percentage of women without children is slightly higher for this variable in some cases because of some women who report having children but do not provide the child's age. To create the variable of youngest age of the child, it was necessary to include all 'inapplicable' responses as no children.

¹Due to rounding differences, some totals may not equal 100 per cent.

Recent publications of the Amsterdam Institute for Advanced Labour Studies

WORKING PAPERS

- 05-42 "Wage Bargaining Institutions in Europe: a happy Marriage or preparing for Divorce?"
December 2005
Jelle Visser
- 05-41 "The Work-Family Balance on the Union's Agenda"
December 2005
Kilian Schreuder
- 05-40 "Boxing and Dancing: Dutch Trade Union and Works Council Experiences Revisited"
November 2005
Maarten van Klaveren & Wim Sprenger
- 05-39 "Analysing employment practices in Western European Multinationals: coordination, industrial relations and employment flexibility in Poland"
October 2005
Marta Kahancova & Marc van der Meer
- 05-38 "Income distribution in the Netherlands in the 20th century: long-run developments and cyclical properties"
September 2005
Emiel Afman
- 05-37 "Search, Mismatch and Unemployment"
July 2005
Maite Blazques & Marcel Jansen
- 05-36 "Women's Preferences or Delineated Policies? The development of part-time work in the Netherlands, Germany and the United Kingdom"
July 2005
Mara Yerkes & Jelle Visser
- 05-35 "Vissen in een vreemde vijver: Het werven van verpleegkundigen en verzorgenden in het buitenland"
May 2005
Judith Roosblad
- 05-34 "Female part-time employment in the Netherlands and Spain: an analysis of the reasons for taking a part-time job and of the major sectors in which these jobs are performed"
May 2005
Elena Sirvent Garcia del Valle
- 05-33 "Een Functie met Inhoud 2004 - Een enquête naar de taakhoud van secretaresses 2004, 2000, 1994"
April 2005
Kea Tijdens
- 04-32 "Tax evasive behavior and gender in a transition country"
November 2004
Klarita Gërkhani
- 04-31 "How many hours do you usually work? An analysis of the working hours questions in 17 large-scale surveys in 7 countries"
November 2004
Kea Tijdens
- 04-30 "Why do people work overtime hours? Paid and unpaid overtime working in the Netherlands"
August 2004
Kea Tijdens
- 04-29 "Overcoming Marginalisation? Gender and Ethnic Segregation in the Dutch Construction, Health, IT and Printing Industries"
July 2004
Marc van der Meer
- 04-28 "The Work-Family Balance in Collective agreements. More Female employees, More Provisions?"
July 2004
Killian Schreuder
- 04-27 "Female Income, the Ego Effect and the Divorce Decision: Evidence from Micro Data"

- March 2004
Randy Kesselring (Professor of Economics at Arkansas State University , USA) was quest at AIAS in April and May 2003
- 04-26 “Economische effecten van Immigratie – Ontwikkeling van een Databestand en eerste analyses
Januari 2004
Joop Hartog (FEE) & Aslan Zorlu
- 03-25 ”Wage Indicator” – Dataset Loonwijzer
Januari 2004 dr Kea Tijdens
- 03-24 “Codeboek DUCADAM Dataset”
December 2003 Drs Kilian Schreuder & dr Kea Tijdens
- 03-23 “Household Consumption and Savings Around the Time of Births and the Role of Education”
December 2003 Adriaan S. Kalwij
- 03-22 “A panel data analysis of the effects of wages, standard hours and unionisation on paid overtime work in Britain”
October 2003 Adriaan S. Kalwij
- 03-21 “A Two-Step First-Difference Estimator for a Panel Data Tobit Model”
December 2003 Adriaan S. Kalwij
- 03-20 “Individuals’ Unemployment Durations over the Business Cycle”
June 2003 dr Adriaan Kalwei
- 03-19 Een onderzoek naar CAO-afspraken op basis van de FNV cao-databank en de AWWN-database”
December 2003 dr Kea Tijdens & Maarten van Klaveren
- 03-18 “Permanent and Transitory Wage Inequality of British Men, 1975-2001: Year, Age and Cohort Effects”
October 2003 dr Adriaan S. Kalwij & Rob Alessie
- 03-17 “Working Women’s Choices for Domestic Help”
October 2003 dr Kea Tijdens, Tanja van der Lippe & Esther de Ruijter
- 03-16 “De invloed van de Wet arbeid en zorg op verlofregelingen in CAO’s”
October 2003 Marieke van Essen
- 03-15 “Flexibility and Social Protection”
August 2003 dr Ton Wilthagen
- 03-14 “Top Incomes in the Netherlands and The United Kingdom over the Twentieth Century”
September 2003 Sir dr A.B. Atkinson and dr. W. Salverda
- 03-13 “Tax Evasion in Albania: an Institutional Vacuum”
April 2003 dr Klarita Gërzhani
- 03-12 “Politico-Economic Institutions and the Informal Sector in Albania”
May 2003 dr Klarita Gërzhani
- 03-11 “Tax Evasion and the Source of Income: An experimental study in Albania and the Netherlands”
May 2003 dr Klarita Gërzhani
- 03-10 "Chances and limitations of "benchmarking" in the reform of welfare state structures - the case of pension policy"
May 2003 dr Martin Schludi
- 03-09 "Dealing with the "flexibility-security-nexus: Institutions, strategies, opportunities and barriers"
May 2003 prof. Ton Wilthagen en dr. Frank Tros
- 03-08 “Tax Evasion in Transition: Outcome of an Institutional Clash -Testing Feige’s Conjecture”
March 2003 dr Klarita Gërzhani
- 03-07 “Teleworking Policies of Organisations- The Dutch Experience”
February 2003 dr Kea Tijdens en Maarten van Klaveren
- 03-06 “Flexible Work- Arrangements and the Quality of Life”
February 2003 drs Cees Nierop
- 01-05 Employer’s and employees’ preferences for working time reduction and working time differentiation – A study of the 36 hours working week in the Dutch banking industry”
2001 dr Kea Tijdens
- 01-04 “Pattern Persistence in European Trade Union Density”
October 2001 prof. dr Danielle Checchi, prof. dr Jelle Visser
- 01-03 “Negotiated flexibility in working time and labour market transitions – The case of the Netherlands”
2001 prof. dr Jelle Visser
- 01-02 “Substitution or Segregation: Explaining the Gender Composition in Dutch Manufacturing Industry 1899 – 1998”
June 2001 Maarten van Klaveren – STZ Advies en Onderzoek , Eindhoven, dr Kea Tijdens

- 00-01 "The first part-time economy in the world. Does it work?"
June 2000 prof. dr Jelle Visser

RESEARCH REPORTS

- 02-17 "Industrial Relations in the Transport Sector in the Netherlands"
December 2002 dr Marc van der Meer & drs Hester Benedictus
- 03-16 "Public Sector Industrial Relations in the Netherlands: framework, principles, players and Representativity"
January 2003 drs Chris Moll, dr Marc van der Meer & prof.dr Jelle Visser
- 02-15 "Employees' Preferences for more or fewer Working Hours: The Effects of Usual, Contractual and Standard Working Time, Family Phase and Household Characteristics and Job Satisfaction"
December 2002 dr Kea Tijdens
- 02-13 "Ethnic and Gender Wage Differentials – An exploration of LOONWIJZERS 2001/2002"
October 2002 dr Aslan Zorlu
- 02-12 "Emancipatie-effectrapportage belastingen en premies – een verkenning naar nieuwe mogelijkheden vanuit het belastingstelsel 2001"
August 2002 dr Kea Tijdens, dr Hettie A. Pott-Buter
- 02-11 "Competenties van Werknemers in de Informatiemaatschappij – Een survey over ICT-gebruik"
June 2002 dr Kea Tijdens & Bram Steijn
- 02-10 "Loonwizers 2001/2002. Werk, lonen en beroepen van mannen en vrouwen in Nederland"
June 2002 Kea Tijdens, Anna Dragstra, Dirk Dragstra, Maarten van Klaveren, Paulien Osse, Cecile Wetzels, Aslan Zorlu
- 01-09 "Beloningsvergelijking tussen markt en publieke sector: methodische kanttekeningen"
November 2001 Wiemer Salverda, Cees Nierop en Peter Mühlau
- 01-08 "Werken in de Digitale Delta. Een vragenbank voor ICT-gebruik in organisaties"
June 2001 dr Kea Tijdens
- 01-07 "De vrouwenloonwijzer. Werk, lonen en beroepen van vrouwen."
June 2001 dr Kea Tijdens
- 00-06 "Wie kan en wie wil telewerken?" Een onderzoek naar de factoren die de mogelijkheid tot en de behoefte aan telewerken van werknemers beïnvloeden."
November 2000 dr Kea Tijdens, dr Cecile Wetzels en Maarten van Klaveren
- 00-05 "Flexibele regels: Een onderzoek naar de relatie tussen CAO-afspraken en het bedrijfsbeleid over flexibilisering van de arbeid."
Juni 2000 dr Kea Tijdens & dr Marc van der Meer
- 00-04 "Vraag en aanbod van huishoudelijke diensten in Nederland"
June 2000 dr Kea Tijdens
- 00-03 "Keuzemogelijkheden in CAO's"
June 2000 Caroline van den Brekel en Kea Tijdens
- 00-02 "The toelating van vluchtelingen in Nederland en hun integratie op de arbeidsmarkt."
Juni 2000 Marloes Mattheijer
- 00-01 "The trade-off between competitiveness and employment in collective bargaining: the national consultation process and four cases of enterprise bargaining in the Netherlands"
Juni 2000 Marc van der Meer (ed), Adriaan van Liempt, Kea Tijdens, Martijn van Velzen, Jelle Visser.

AIAS

AIAS is a young interdisciplinary institute, established in 1998, aiming to become the leading expert centre in the Netherlands for research on industrial relations, organisation of work, wage formation and labour market inequalities.

As a network organisation, AIAS brings together high-level expertise at the University of Amsterdam from five disciplines:

- Law
- Economics
- Sociology
- Psychology
- Health and safety studies

AIAS provides both teaching and research. On the teaching side it offers a Masters in Advanced Labour Studies/Human Resources and special courses in co-operation with other organizations such as the National Trade Union Museum and the Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael'. The teaching is in Dutch but AIAS is currently developing a MPhil in Organisation and Management Studies and a European Scientific Master programme in Labour Studies in co-operation with sister institutes from other countries.

AIAS has an extensive research program (2000-2004) building on the research performed by its member scholars. Current research themes effectively include:

- The impact of the Euro on wage formation, social policy and industrial relations
- Transitional labour markets and the flexibility and security trade-off in social and labour market regulation
- The prospects and policies of 'overcoming marginalisation' in employment
- The cycles of policy learning and mimicking in labour market reforms in Europe
- Female agency and collective bargaining outcomes
- The projects of the **LoWER** network.



**AMSTERDAMS INSTITUUT
VOOR ARBEIDSSTUDIES**

Universiteit van Amsterdam

**Plantage Muidergracht 4
1018 TV Amsterdam
the Netherlands**

tel +31 20 525 4199
aias@uva.nl

fax +31 20 525 4301
www.uva-aias.net