

The impact of accessing childcare centers on Chilean mothers' probability of employment*

Andrea Bentancor[†]

November 23, 2012

Abstract

In order to reduce poverty and to enhance equality, increasing female labor force participation (FLFP) is a major Chilean public policy goal. Nevertheless, it is not entirely clear how to achieve this objective. Public policy and private provision of childcare and educative services may play a significant role. The impact of childcare center availability on FLFP is under continuous evaluation. This paper contributes to this relevant and very present analysis, providing evidence that supports the hypothesis that the availability of those centers has a positive impact on mothers' probability of employment. Unobserved heterogeneity among mothers makes difficult to isolate the impact of daycare centers availability on mothers' decisions. Some of the regressors are likely to be correlated with some of her unobserved characteristics. The author controlled for such unobserved heterogeneity by using a panel of data on mothers who have raised at least two children since 1995. Accessing childcare centers determines an increase in mothers' probability of employment close to 15 percentage points. This is a quite important result, since employment among women with babies and toddlers is particularly low (around 40 percent). The result is driven by partnered mothers. For them the effect of accessing childcare is significant and positive; while such is not the case for single ones. When education is considered, the result is due to the response of mothers that have achieved some secondary studies or have graduated from high school. For them accessing childcare has a significant and positive effect; while no effect is detected in the case of mothers with tertiary studies. Finally, the author shows that there is high persistence in mothers' decisions: working six months before delivery is strongly associated with working after that.

Keywords: female employment, childcare, panel analysis. informal

JEL codes: J21, J22, J13

*I thank Damian Clarke for his research assistance. I also thank Virginia Robano, Pablo Pincheira, participants at the Sociedad de Economía de Chile (Sechi) 2011 seminar series and the Lacea Meetings 2011 for helpful comments and suggestions, which have improved the presentation of this paper. In this study I used Voz de Mujer Survey, that was carried on by the NGO ComunidadMujer and supported by the Interamerican Development Bank. Correspondence may be addressed to andrea@comunidadmujer.cl. The standard disclaimers apply.

[†]ComunidadMujer and UAI.

1 Introduction

Despite a significant increase over the past twenty years, the rate of Chilean female labor force participation (FLFP) is still one of the lowest (43 percent) among both the OECD (62 percent) and the Latin-American countries (53 percent) ¹. Although it is unclear exactly what causes such poor performance in a country that shines in so many areas -especially from the point of view of macroeconomic indicators- there is agreement that many elements play a role in this puzzle. Notably, FLFP is extremely low among the poorest and least educated women, while FLFP of the richest and most educated does not fall substantially short of OECD indicators. Since achieving greater FLFP rates in lower income deciles can contribute to a reduction in poverty (Ganuza, Paes de Barros, Taylor, and Vos 2001; Bravo and Contreras 2004), Chile has considered several policy reforms to address this issue.

Women that do not participate in the labor market often cite the need to do housework and the lack of childcare as barriers to employment (see CASEN and Voz de Mujer surveys). According to the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), the National Institute of Statistics (INE), and ComunidadMujer studies, Chilean women allocate more hours weekly to childcare than men, and they are typically primarily responsible for housework though they often work full-time. Such reality constitutes an obstacle, especially for middle class and poor women, since they cannot afford to purchase childcare, cleaning, cooking and other services as other women may be able.

Nevertheless, lack of affordable childcare and housework are not the only barriers that women face, Contreras and Plaza (2010) and Puentes and Ruiz-Tagle (2012) show that those who have internalized “machista” and conservative cultural values tend to participate less in the labor market.

In 1997, Chilean President Eduardo Frei started the Full Day Schooling Program, which was gradually implemented over the following years. Due to the program’s high cost, the deadline for its implementation was extended to 2007 for public schools and 2010 for voucher schools. Assuming that such implementation was exogenous to women’s decisions, Hernando (2009) measured the impact of the program on FLFP. He found that the program had a positive effect on mothers’ labor participation; indicating that the lack of affordable childcare prior to the program was indeed an obstacle to employment for Chilean women with school children between the ages of eight and thirteen.

In 2006, Chilean President Michelle Bachelet created “Chile Crece Contigo”, a program that provides free childcare centers for pre-school children between the ages of four months to four years old who come from economically low-income households. In recent years this program has substantially increased public childcare centers with the dual objective of providing equal opportunities to all children regardless of their background while simultaneously allowing mothers to work (or study). Though this policy is recent and its evaluation is very complex due to the endogenous decisions involved, some researchers have already explored its impact. Medrano and Martínez (2009), using the University of Chile’s Gran Santiago Employment Survey, and Encina and Martínez (2009), using the government’s CASEN Survey, found that the increase in the amount of childcare centers have no effect on FLFP. However, Medrano and Bravo (2010), using the ComunidadMujer’s Voz de Mujer Survey, found mixed evidence regarding the effect that using formal childcare has on the mother’s probability of being employed. Notably, this survey was specifically designed to explore female labor decisions. Indeed, the survey participants were asked about subjects that CASEN and other Chilean surveys did not cover. The authors, therefore, were able to apply different instruments for the independent endogenous variable “using formal childcare” (such as auto-reported availability of formal childcare centers close to their home or work and distance from the closest center to their home) ².

¹Cepal, 2009.

²Another public policy related to childcare has been recently approved by the Chilean Congress (Law Project introduced in March 2011): an increase of the current 12 weeks maternity leave to 24 weeks that is being promoted with multiple objectives such as, increasing child and mother wellbeing, reducing the use of paid sick leave (which is paid until the newborn

Several studies, particularly throughout the developed world, have estimated the effect of childcare policies on female labor supply. For instance, Lefebvre and Merrigan (2008) reviewed evidence from the United States, Canada and Europe on the effect that the cost of purchased childcare and subsidies has on mothers' labor participation. They concluded that an important part of the differences across studies, from those that found a small elasticity of employment to childcare prices and subsidies (for instance, Blau and Currie 2004) to those that found higher responses (for instance, Blau and Tekin 2007), yields on econometric problems that determine biased estimates. Other studies throughout the world only find effects of childcare policies on the labor supply of single mothers, but not on married mothers (Lundin et al 2008, Cascio 2009 and Gouxa and Maurin 2010). Nollenberger and Rodriguez-Plana (2011) show the Spanish child-care expansion led to a sizable increase in employment and hours worked of mothers with age-eligible children. Heterogeneity matters: persistence is strong among mothers with a high-school degree, but quickly fades away among those without a high-school degree.

In the developing world, the link between childcare policies and female labor supply is also being analyzed, beyond the recent studies already mentioned for Chile, for Argentina Berlinsky et al (2008) found that pre-school attendance of the youngest child in the household increases the probability of full-time employment. Nevertheless, they do not find effects of preschool attendance on labor supply for children that are not the youngest in the household.

This paper contributes to the analysis of the effect that childcare public policy has on mothers' probability of employment in Chile. Unobserved heterogeneity among mothers makes difficult to isolate the impact of daycare centers availability on mothers' decisions. Some of the regressors are likely to be correlated with some of her unobserved characteristics. Following a similar strategy as Abrevaya (2006), the author controlled for such unobserved heterogeneity by using a panel of data on mothers who have raised at least two children since 1995 ³. A traditional fixed effects (FE) linear probability model is used in order to estimate the impact of accessing childcare and other observables on mothers' employment probability. It is shown through the paper that many significant results, that appear in panel regressions, were hidden by cross section analyses. Accessing childcare centers determines an increase in mothers' probability of employment close to 15 percentage points. This is a quite important result, since employment among women with babies and toddlers is particularly low (around 40 percent). Such result is driven by partnered mothers. For them the effect of accessing childcare is significant and positive; while such is not the case for single ones. When education is considered, the result is due to the response of mothers that have achieved some secondary studies or have graduated from high school. For them accessing childcare has a significant and positive effect; while no effect is detected in the case of mothers with tertiary studies. This paper makes an additional contribution. Indeed, the author shows that there is high persistence in mothers' decisions: working six months before delivery is strongly associated with working after that. The structure of the paper is as follows: section II addresses the current Chilean childcare system for babies and toddlers; section III briefly explores the empirical strategy the paper used; section IV presents the data used and section V explores the econometric results; at the end of the paper, the author concludes and summarizes the main results.

2 Childcare for babies and toddlers in Chile

As mentioned, most of the women that do not participate in the labor market, when asked about the reasons of their labor inactivity, say that they must take care of their children. The lack of affordable

is one year old), increasing national birthrate, and giving women greater incentive to return to work after childbirth.

³Voz de Mujer survey deeply analyzes childcare decisions only for those children born after 1995.

formal (or informal) childcare services constitutes an obstacle especially for middle class and poor women. In Chile babies and toddlers may assist to public or private childcare centers that provide educational and care services. Those institutions are called “salas cunas”. In 2006, President Michelle Bachelet created a program (“Chile Crece Contigo”) that provides free childcare centers for pre-school children who come from economically low-income households. Since this was one of her presidency’s flagship programs, the number of public “salas cunas” boosted from 2006 to 2009. Though this huge increase (more than 300 percentage points in four years according to information provided by Medrano and Bravo 2010), more resources are currently required to completely cover vulnerable population. In 2009 there were 58,816 slots for those that satisfy vulnerability conditions. Public “salas cunas” are still far from cover all babies and toddlers that belong to the poorest households in Chile (approximately 223,000 considering both quintiles I and II and close to 300,000 including quintiles I to III, as it is shown in Table A.1 ⁴). Non working, working and student vulnerable mothers may have probably competed for the available public slots ⁵.

Around 400,000 women in Chile are mothers of at least one baby or toddler; 114,000 of them work (less than 70% of those that work have a contract, see Table A.1). What is available for working mothers? For those that live in a household that qualifies as vulnerable, a public slots may be available ⁶. Some working mothers (vulnerable and not vulnerable) may prefer to pay private childcare centers. Though possible, market provision of childcare in a full-day basis costs close to one minimum wage ⁷. Alternatively, some of the mothers that have no access to public provision may have the right to use private childcare centers owned or paid by their employers ⁸. Finally, there are family members, informal and formal providers: grandmothers, brothers and sisters, neighbors or baby-sitters. All of them are frequently reported as options of care provision by working mothers when surveyed. It is reasonable to suppose that a proportion of young mothers (vulnerable or not vulnerable) lacking family members or other affordable informal or formal care providers may want to participate in the labor market but be unable to do it. Then, providing any of these mothers a childcare center close to her home or most likely work may induce them to participate ⁹. The author explores this statement in the sections that follow.

3 The empirical strategy

A mother has to solve an utility maximization problem that includes two time constraints and a budget constraint. The first one considers baby or toddler’s day, he/she can be cared by her mother or he/she can be cared by professionals at a childcare center. The second one takes account for mother’s day distribution between working and non-working hours. The third constrain is the usual budget constraint. Besides, childcare has a cost, that can be zero if provision is public for the mother (for instance, if she qualifies as vulnerable or if she is able to be hired by an employer that pays childcare). In this framework,

⁴From 2006 to 2009 the goal of “Chile Crece Contigo” was to cover the 40% most vulnerable households. However, the law established that it should extend the assistance to the 60% in 2010.

⁵Teenage pregnancy reaches 25% of all pregnancies and it is one of the most relevant problems among the poorest. Being pregnant is the main cause of high school drop out. Because of that, the system places high priority on teenage mothers.

⁶Though a vulnerable working mother may be eligible for a public slot, it may not be available where she needs it.

⁷So, though an option, market provision is out of reach of many mothers in Chile since close to half of women employed in Chile earn less than such amount.

⁸The Work Code in Chile states that any firm that hires 20 or more women is required to provide or pay for the childcare of each female employee’s children until they are two years old. How many working mothers of babies and toddlers have such right and, from those that have it, how many do exercise this right, it is not clear.

⁹Such childcare center must also be affordable. Public childcare centers are free for vulnerable children but they do not always have an available spot.

and conditional on the fact that mothers consider childcare a good “enough” substitute of their own care, everything else constant:

- Extensions of public (0 cost) and adequate quality childcare coverage may induce inactive mothers to look for a job, determining an increase in FLFP.
- Increases in private provision, as long as they are subsidized or completely paid by the employer (low “enough” or free), may induce inactive mothers to look for a job, determining an increase in FLFP ¹⁰.
- A greater autonomous income in the household (like rents or the presence of other members working) is expected to reduce the response of women’s labor supply to the augment of the coverage of childcare services (public, private but subsidized by the employer or private).

More than 85% of Chilean urban women 18-65 years old are mothers. From them, 23% have a child, while 62% have more than two children (Table A.2).

Ordinary least square estimates (OLS) from a cross section analysis of the impact of accessing childcare on mothers’ probability of employment will likely be biased. Indeed, some of the regressors may be correlated with some of her unobserved characteristics. Nevertheless, first as it is usual, the author runs a complete set of OLS regressions. The equation of interest is thus:

$$Y_i = \beta CC_i + X_i' \delta + \varepsilon_i \quad (1)$$

The same analysis is done using the whole sample of mothers and using the subsample of those that have more than two kids. Table A.4 suggests that there is selection. Mothers of one child may not behave as the others, which makes sense since the decision of having children and work are endogenous. Nevertheless, this analysis is shown for the sake of comparison because the focus and main results of the paper are relevant for the 62% of Chilean women that have more than one kid.

Then with the subsample of mothers with more than two children the author builds panel data to linearly estimate the marginal effects of accessing formal childcare services over mothers’ probability of employment (the variable inquires into the availability of childcare centers close to mother’s neighborhood or job when her baby was 4, 6, 12 and 24 months old). The equation of interest is thus:

$$Y_{i,k} = \beta CC_{i,k} + X_{i,k}' \delta + \alpha_i' + \varepsilon_{i,k} \quad (2)$$

The author explores the impact of childcare availability on employment, while controlling for fixed effects and for different variables that represent non-fixed characteristics that may also affect women’s decision of work.

This exercise is run four times, since women’s decisions when the baby was four, six, 12 and 24 months old are being analyzed ¹¹.

Finally, the author explores different subgroups of mothers: single-partnered mothers and secondary-tertiary educated mothers.

¹⁰Private provision in counties/neighborhoods where there were no services before, though not subsidized or paid by the employer, may also determine an increase in FLFP. However, this is not a very likely case, since private childcare provision is too expensive, in comparison with Chilean median female salaries. Only high qualified women are able to afford it, and among them FLFP is already similar to OECD countries.

¹¹Each mother was asked about what she did when each of her children (born after 1995) was four months old, six months old, 12 months old and 24 months old. The author presents in detail in the results’ section the econometric analysis built upon the 12 months old set of questions. The econometric results for the other stages are similar

4 Data description

ComunidadMujer’s Voz de Mujer survey was used to define the variables for the empirical model. This survey was conducted in-person by Microdatos (Economics Department of Universidad of Chile) interviewers, who explained the questions, so the quality of its data is more reliable than it would be if it was a mail or phone interview. The data set includes responses from 2992 women throughout Chile (they were interviewed from September through November 2009). The complete survey contains three data bases: households (N=11618; women and others in the household), women (N=2992; women) and children (N=2121; sons and daughters of interviewed women that were born from 1995 to 2009). Voz de Mujer is considered representative at the national urban level ¹². The author’s builds a data that regards to childcare availability for children born from 1995 to 2009 (the children data base) ¹³. The whole data contains information of childcare decisions of mothers of 2121 kids. The second column of Table A.4 shows 2061 (when the children are 4 months old), 2010 (6 months old), 1946 (12 months old), 1810 (24 months old) observations for OLS regressions of the different stages considered. The core of this paper does not include information all of these children (and their mothers) because some of them are only child and the objective is to control for unobserved heterogeneity using a FE analysis. Then, mothers with just one child were dropped. After cleaning, the main data contains 556 mothers with at least two children; 415 of those mothers had two children and 141 of those mothers had three or more children.

There are four dependent dummy variables:

- a binary variable that takes value 1 if mother worked when baby was 4 months old (6 months/12 months/24 months).

The independent variables used in all regressions include:

- a binary variable that takes value 1 if mother worked 6 months before delivery
- a binary variable that takes value 1 if other person was working in the household when baby was 4 months old (6 months/12 months/24 months)
- economic growth (both in the year of baby’s birth and in the previous year)
- years between mother’s deliveries

¹²The Voz de Mujer survey was carried out by the NGO ComunidadMujer (<http://www.comunidadmujer.cl/>). The sampling method was randomized and probabilistic in each of the three stages (block-home-interviewee). Precision was estimated at approximately 2 percent, considering maximum variance and 95 percent confidence levels.

¹³1995 was established in the questionnaire, only for children born after this year baby and toddler childcare decisions were deeply explored.

- a binary variable that takes value 1 if there was a childcare center close to mother’s home or work when baby was 4 months old (6 months/12 months/24 months)
- a binary variable that takes value 1 if mother was a teenager when she deliver the baby

For instance, in the case of the 12 months old decision, the author runs the regression with the complete set of independent variables and the binary variable that provides information about availability of a childcare center close to mother’s home or work at this stage ¹⁴.

5 Results

Tables are presented at the end of the paper and results examined before concluding.

Results from regression analysis are reported. In the interest of space, the main results are summarized in Table A.4 (more detail is available in Tables A.5 to A.8). The dependent variable is a binary variable that takes value 1 whenever mother worked when her baby was four, six, 12 or 24 months old. The independent variables are those already described.

- The coefficient of the independent variable “worked six months before delivery” is statistically significant at 1 percent level, indicating a positive effect that goes from 4 percentage points (OLS for the whole data) to 12 percentage points (FE panel data) depending on the econometric analysis (see that the 12 months old row of Table A.4 is being discussed here). Then, moving from the state “did not work 6 months before delivery” ($x=0$) to the state “worked 6 months before delivery” ($x=1$) has a significant and positive effect.
- The coefficient of the independent variable “other income at home when the baby was 12 (or four, six, 24) months old” is statistically significant at 1 percent level, indicating a large negative effect of moving from the state “there was no other income at home when the baby was 12 months old” ($x=0$) to the state “there was other income at home” ($x=1$) (see Tables A.5 to A.8).
- The coefficient of the independent variable “a childcare center was available close to mother’s home or work when her baby was 12 (and six) months old” is statistically significant at 10 percent level, suggesting a positive effect of 17 percentage points from the state “a childcare center was not available close to mother’s home or work when her baby was 12 (and six) months old” ($x=0$) to the state “a childcare center was available close to mother’s home or work when her baby was 12 (and six) months old” ($x=1$) (see Table A.4). Pool analyses, both with the whole sample and

¹⁴Though unobserved heterogeneity is well thought-out by the construction of a panel, it may be argued that there is still a source of bias given by the presence of a simultaneous decision (to realize about childcare center availability so work // to work so realize about childcare center availability). Nevertheless, the author works as if these independent variables (availability at four, six, 12, 24 months) were exogenous to the woman’s labor decision.

the subsample of mothers with two or more children, show more significant, but smaller, results. However, given the unobserved heterogeneity problem, at least for mothers of two or more the most reliable results are those from the FE study.

Availability of childcare centers is uniform across different type of women, but employment condition is not. Actually, as it is well documented, employment is quite low among partnered mothers, while it increases among single mothers. When such condition is considered, the highest significance levels and most important marginal effects are detected for partnered mothers (tables for different subgroups are available upon request). Availability of childcare centers is uniform across different type of women, but employment condition is not. Actually, as it is well documented, employment is quite low among women with at most secondary education, while it increases for women with college education. When women's education achievement is considered, the highest significance levels and most important marginal effects are detected for those with at most secondary education, which would be consistent with the "Chile Crece Contigo" program since its target was providing free childcare to the most vulnerable women (tables for different subgroups are available upon request).

6 Conclusions

In order to reduce poverty and to enhance equality, increasing women employment is a major Chilean public policy goal. Nevertheless, it is not entirely clear how to achieve this goal in the most efficient way. Public policy and private provision of childcare and educative services may play a significant role favoring this goal. The impact of childcare center availability on mothers' employment is under continuous evaluation. This paper contributes to this relevant and very present analysis, providing evidence that supports the hypothesis that the availability of those centers has a positive impact on mothers' probability of employment.

Unobserved heterogeneity among mothers makes difficult to isolate the impact of daycare centers availability on mothers' decisions. Some of the regressors are likely to be correlated with some of her unobserved characteristics. The author controlled for such unobserved heterogeneity by using a panel of data on mothers who have raised at least two children since 1995. Accessing childcare centers determines an increase in mothers' probability of employment close to 16 percentage points. This is a quite important result, since employment among women with babies and toddlers is particularly low (around 40 percent). The result is driven by partnered mothers. For them the effect of accessing childcare is significant and positive; while such is not the case for single ones. When education is considered, the result is due to the response of mothers that have achieved some secondary studies or have graduated from high school. For them accessing childcare has a significant and positive effect; while no effect is detected in the case of mothers with tertiary studies. Such result is consistent with the "Chile Crece Contigo" program's target, since it was to provide free childcare to the most vulnerable women.

Finally, the author shows that there is high persistence in mothers' decisions: working six months before delivery is strongly associated with working after that. Indeed, working before delivery increases probability of employment in fifteen percentage points (average) according to FE analyses. Such results were hidden by non panel data regressions. Using the same sub-samples (mothers of two or more children) the OLS estimates on pool data show effects close to five percentage points.

7 References

Abrevaya, J., 2006, Estimating the effect of smoking on birth outcomes using a matched panel-data approach, *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 21, 489–519.

Berlinsky, S. and S. Galiani, 2008, Pre-school and maternal labour outcomes: evidence from a regression discontinuity design, IFS Working Paper W09/05.

Blau, D. and J. Currie, 2004, Preschool, day care and afterschool care: Whos minding their kids?, *Handbook of the Economics of Education*, Volume 2, 1163-1268.

Blau, D. and E. Tekin, 2007, The determinants and consequences of child care subsidies for single mothers in the USA. *Journal of Population Economics* 20, 719-741

Cascio, E., 2006, Public preschool and maternal labor supply: Evidence from the introduction of kindergartens into American public schools, NBER Working Paper 12179, 1-45.

Cascio, E., 2009, Maternal Labor Supply and the Introduction of Kindergartens into American Public Schools, *Journal of Human Resources*. 74, 140-170.

ComunidadMujer 2010, Principales resultados de la Encuesta Voz de Mujer del Bicentenario, Chile

Contreras, D. and G. Plaza, 2010, Cultural factors in women’s labor force participation in Chile. *Feminist Economics* 16(2), April 2010, 27–46

Encina, J. y C. Martínez, 2009, Efecto de una mayor cobertura de salas cuna en la participación laboral femenina: Evidencia de Chile, *Serie Documentos de Trabajo*, Departamento de Economía, Universidad de Chile, SDT 303.

Ganuzza, E., R. Paes de Barros, L. Taylor, and R. Vos, 2001. *Liberalization, Inequality and Poverty: Latin America and the Caribbean in the 90s*, ed. Eudeba. PNUD y CEPAL. New York: Edward Elgar.

Goux, D. and E. Maurin, 2010. Public school availability for two-year olds and mothers’ labour supply. *Labour Economics*. 17(6), 951-962.

Hernando, A., 2009, Female Labor Participation and Childcare in Chile, a Natural Experiment, Chapter 3, PhD Thesis. Harvard University

Lefebvre, P. and P. Merrigan, 2008, Child-care policy and the labor supply of mothers with young children: A natural experiment from Canada. *Journal of Labor Economics* 26(3), 519-548

Lundin, D., E. Mork and B. Ockert, 2008. How far can reduced childcare prices push female labour supply. *Labour Economics* 15(4), 647-659.

Medrano, P. and C. Martínez, 2009, Public Day care and female force participation: Evidence from Chile, Serie Documentos de Trabajo, Departamento de Economía, Universidad de Chile SDT 3006.

Medrano, P. y D. Bravo, 2010, Cuidado Infantil y Participación Laboral Femenina en Chile, Documento de trabajo.

Mideplan, 2010, CASEN. Resultados de la Encuesta de Caracterización Económica.

National Institute of Statistics, 2009, Enfoque Estadístico - Uso del tiempo - Boletín Informativo del Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas

Nollenberger N. y N. Rodríguez-Planas, 2011, Child Care, Maternal Employment and Persistence: A Natural Experiment from Spain. IZA DP No. 5888.

Puentes, E. and J. Ruiz-Tagle, 2012, Acceso laboral de las mujeres y la distribución de roles al interior del hogar, Documento de trabajo.

UNDP, 2010, Informe sobre el Desarrollo Humano en Chile 2010 – Género: los desafíos de la igualdad

Wooldridge, J. M., 2002, *Econometric analysis of cross section and panel data*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

8 Appendix

Table A.1: Babies and toddlers; public provision of childcare services

Quintiles	All working mothers	Working mothers with contracts	Working mothers with no contracts	All babies and toddlers (until they are 2 years old)
I Quintil	17,964	7,811	10,153	134,182
II Quintil	22,125	14,625	7,500	89,195
III Quintil	22,688	17,103	5,585	76,694
IV Quintil	24,012	18,270	5,742	60,854
V Quintil	27,673	21,650	6,023	48,724
All	114,462	79,459	35,003	409,649
Source: Babies and toddlers, working mothers of babies and toddlers, own estimates from CASEN 2009.				

Table A.2: Mothers

Percentage	
Non_mother	13,4%
Mother of 1	23,1%
Mother of 2	32,1%
Mother of 3	17,8%
Mother of 4	7,7%
Mother of 5	5,9%
National survey 2011 (EVM), urban zones	

Table A.3: Tabla Variables

Variables used in the regression (for the 12th months stage)	
econ_growth_1	economic growth during the previous year of baby's birth
econ_growth	economic growth during the year of baby's birth
sixmonth_before	1 if mother worked 6 months before delivery
teenmother	1 if mother was a teenager when baby born
otherinc12	1 if there was other person working in the household when baby was 12 months old
birthspace	years between mother's deliveries
childcare_center12	1 if there was a childcare center close to mother's home or work when baby was 12 months old
FLFP12	1 if mother worked when baby was 12 months old

Table A.4: Linear probability model – Sintesis

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable: Mother worked - Linear Probability Model					
	Whole sample			Sub-sample (mothers with 2 or more kids)		
	N	Coefficient pool	N	Coefficient pool	N/n	Coefficient FE panel
Childcare center (4 months old)	2061	0,045	1247	0,101***	1247/556	0,130
Childcare center (6 months old)	2010	0,062**	1217	0,121***	1217/555	0,166*
Childcare center (12 months old)	1946	0,082***	1186	0,117***	1186/555	0,164*
Childcare center (24 months old)	1810	0,054	1106	0,059	1106/552	0,119
Six months before (4 months old)	2061	0,039***	1247	0,042***	1247/556	0,206***
Six months before (6 months old)	2010	0,043***	1217	0,054***	1217/555	0,166***
Six months before (12 months old)	1946	0,057***	1186	0,058***	1186/555	0,122***
Six months before (24 months old)	1810	0,049***	1106	0,048***	1106/552	0,104***

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A.5: Linear probability model – 4 months old

VARIABLES	(1) All FLFP4	(2) secondary FLFP4	(3) tertiary_all FLFP4	(4) tertiary_complete FLFP4	(5) two_kids FLFP4	(6) more2_kids FLFP4
econ_growth_1	-0.0313 (0.579)	-0.187 (0.697)	-0.449 (1.594)	0.901 (0.697)	-0.798 (0.916)	0.608 (0.623)
econ_growth	0.702 (0.539)	0.666 (0.747)	1.205 (0.869)	0.988 (0.712)	0.698 (0.566)	0.535 (0.933)
sixmonth_before	0.207*** (0.0723)	0.204** (0.0860)	0.236* (0.137)	0.313* (0.180)	0.150** (0.0691)	0.394*** (0.0827)
teenmother	-0.0398 (0.0475)	-0.0613 (0.0647)	0.0878 (0.118)	-0.0956 (0.119)	-0.0744 (0.0565)	0.0536 (0.0736)
otherinc4	-0.235** (0.114)	-0.408*** (0.155)	0.119 (0.145)	0.0211 (0.0860)	-0.417*** (0.148)	-0.00544 (0.136)
birthspace	0.0148 (0.0122)	0.0340** (0.0166)	-0.00888 (0.0155)	-0.0180 (0.0159)		0.00963 (0.0109)
childcare_center4	0.129 (0.0928)	0.146 (0.120)	0.328 (0.214)	0.374 (0.276)	0.197* (0.111)	-0.0296 (0.134)
Constant	0.252* (0.142)	0.261 (0.177)	0.0619 (0.210)	0.0742 (0.215)	0.471*** (0.162)	0.122 (0.178)
Observations	1,247	752	254	184	803	444
R ²	0.124	0.183	0.093	0.178	0.145	0.198
Number of idencuesta	556	335	113	82	415	141

Robust standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A.6: Linear probability model – 6 meses

VARIABLES	(1) All FLFP6	(2) secondary FLFP6	(3) tertiary_all FLFP6	(4) tertiary_complete FLFP6	(5) two_kids FLFP6	(6) more2_kids FLFP6
econ_growth_1	-1.084 (1.155)	-0.398 (0.692)	-3.330 (2.189)	-3.571 (2.370)	-2.567 (1.658)	1.054* (0.548)
econ_growth	1.482 (1.320)	0.276 (0.617)	4.633* (2.617)	5.803** (2.694)	2.290 (1.777)	-0.266 (0.604)
sixmonth_before	0.169*** (0.0635)	0.139** (0.0651)	0.341** (0.146)	0.437** (0.193)	0.127** (0.0620)	0.338*** (0.0848)
teenmother	-0.0504 (0.0412)	-0.0554 (0.0541)	0.122 (0.0952)	0.0945 (0.134)	-0.0467 (0.0457)	-0.0573 (0.0724)
otherinc6	-0.388*** (0.110)	-0.447*** (0.152)	-0.0886 (0.165)	0.0557 (0.185)	-0.422*** (0.140)	-0.317* (0.176)
birthspace	-0.00632 (0.00948)	0.0114 (0.0124)	-0.00760 (0.0167)	-0.00762 (0.0194)		-0.00802 (0.00989)
childcare_center6	0.163* (0.0868)	0.241** (0.114)	0.267 (0.209)	0.396 (0.243)	0.225* (0.115)	0.00560 (0.0739)
Constant	0.565*** (0.134)	0.454** (0.183)	0.269 (0.247)	-0.0670 (0.272)	0.542*** (0.151)	0.558*** (0.192)
Observations	1,217	731	250	182	787	430
R^2	0.131	0.157	0.242	0.332	0.162	0.187
Number of idencuesta	555	335	113	82	415	140

Robust standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A.7: Linear probability model – 12 meses

VARIABLES	(1) All FLFP12	(2) secondary FLFP12	(3) tertiary_all FLFP12	(4) tertiary_complete FLFP12	(5) two_kids FLFP12	(6) more2_kids FLFP12
econ_growth_1	0.347 (0.465)	-0.240 (0.691)	0.568 (0.645)	1.329 (0.916)	-0.237 (0.735)	1.051** (0.512)
econ_growth	-0.229 (0.488)	0.683 (0.616)	-1.683* (0.927)	-1.866 (1.167)	-0.230 (0.655)	-0.0525 (0.660)
sixmonth_before	0.122** (0.0515)	0.105* (0.0544)	0.167 (0.135)	0.172 (0.187)	0.0739 (0.0454)	0.331*** (0.0800)
teenmother	-0.0248 (0.0353)	0.00595 (0.0487)	-0.0800 (0.0895)	-0.110 (0.115)	-0.00698 (0.0403)	-0.0947 (0.0645)
otherinc12	-0.436*** (0.120)	-0.381** (0.170)	-0.595*** (0.199)	-0.450** (0.216)	-0.522*** (0.157)	-0.349** (0.171)
birthspace	-0.00889 (0.0103)	0.000746 (0.0140)	0.00677 (0.0121)	-0.000737 (0.0149)		-0.0119 (0.0103)
childcare_center12	0.164* (0.0874)	0.300*** (0.115)	0.0827 (0.214)	0.0843 (0.267)	0.0992 (0.0919)	0.340* (0.187)
Constant	0.675*** (0.139)	0.395** (0.195)	1.102*** (0.247)	0.981*** (0.277)	0.773*** (0.169)	0.382* (0.213)
Observations	1,186	710	246	179	774	412
R ²	0.109	0.136	0.123	0.111	0.096	0.228
Number of idencuesta	555	335	113	82	415	140

Robust standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A.8: Linear probability model – 24 meses

VARIABLES	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	All FLFP24	secondary FLFP24	tertiary_all FLFP24	tertiary_complete FLFP24	two_kids FLFP24	more2_kids FLFP24
econ_growth_1	0.690 (0.606)	-0.0970 (0.788)	1.181 (1.061)	1.535 (1.107)	0.748 (1.080)	0.682 (0.531)
econ_growth	-0.347 (0.531)	0.969 (0.627)	-3.592*** (1.248)	-3.793*** (1.342)	-0.560 (0.741)	-0.0270 (0.688)
sixmonth_before	0.104** (0.0501)	0.0795* (0.0465)	0.182 (0.166)	0.186 (0.232)	0.0623 (0.0435)	0.295*** (0.0871)
teenmother	0.00142 (0.0492)	-0.0127 (0.0539)	0.238 (0.209)	0.246 (0.286)	0.00886 (0.0668)	-0.0237 (0.0643)
otherinc24	-0.330** (0.143)	-0.338* (0.197)	-0.0153 (0.146)	0.154 (0.109)	-0.399* (0.226)	-0.256* (0.139)
birthspace	-0.0194 (0.0140)	-0.0195 (0.0201)	0.0160 (0.0164)	0.0153 (0.0230)		-0.0230* (0.0138)
childcare_center24	0.121 (0.0928)	0.178 (0.129)	0.138 (0.248)	0.0613 (0.306)	0.0666 (0.0874)	0.247 (0.211)
Constant	0.646*** (0.165)	0.547** (0.226)	0.460* (0.234)	0.336 (0.236)	0.655*** (0.235)	0.425*** (0.212)
Observations	1,106	657	229	167	723	383
R ²	0.073	0.087	0.135	0.143	0.059	0.166
Number of idencuesta	552	333	113	82	412	140

Robust standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1