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Stylized facts: Important advances in gender equity in Mexico in the last three decades

- Female labor force participation increased from 17% in 1970 to 35% in 2000
- The percentage of women with college studies increased from 30% in 1980 to 47% in 2000
- The percentage of women in the Senate increased from 7% in the 1991-1994 period, to 24% in the 2006-2004 period (UNDP 2007)
However, the gender division of labor is still very traditional.
Objectives

Identify whether there are any groups that show liberal time-use patterns and can later serve as change diffusors

Justification

It is imperative to analyze time-use patterns to understand changes in gender roles and expectations
Why is it important to identify innovators?

- Analysis of time use in Mexico shows little variation in time use patterns (Hernández and Rivero 2014)
- With the exception of few educated and young men, men have only slightly increased participation in domestic activities (Hernández and Rivero 2014)
- Despite increased female education, many young women spend their time in domestic activities (Pederzini and Rivero 2013)
- Youth unemployment has many young men out of school and employment (Pederzini and Rivero 2013)
What explains time-use patterns in Mexico?

- **Economics**: Comparative advantage of men in market work and women in nonmarket work. Household Maximization (Becker, 1981)
- **Relative Resources**: The individual with the most resources negotiates its way out of it (Shelton & John, 1996)
- **Time availability**: Men and women participate in housework and childcare to the extent that there are demands on them to do so and they have available time
- **Ideology**: women and men with more egalitarian attitudes will have a more equal division of household labor
Hypotheses

- As adults show few variation in patterns, the **probability of finding innovators among the youngsters will be higher**
- These innovators are more educated than their cohort
- Schooling will have a larger effect on differentiating time-use patterns among youngsters than among other adults
Data

- National Time Use Survey (INEGI 2009)
- 17,000 Households
- All individuals 12 years old and older
- Questionnaire form
- Information on daily-life activities for week prior to the survey
Methodology

1) Latent class analysis run to distinguish groups with liberal time use patterns
   ◦ Separate groups distinguished for each sex/age group

2) Logistic models for men and women to weight the effect of age, schooling and its interaction on the probability of being in a liberal time-use pattern
Methodology

1) Latent class analysis run to distinguish groups with liberal time use patterns
   - Separate groups distinguished for each sex/age group

2) Logistic models for men and women to weight the effect of age, schooling and its interaction on the probability of being in a liberal time-use pattern
Methodology

1) Latent class analysis run to distinguish groups with liberal time use patterns
   - Separate groups distinguished for each sex/age group
2) Descriptive analysis of difference in schooling level between liberal and non-liberal time-use patterns, by age and sex
Mean daily number of hours dedicated to various activities, by sex and age group
### Characteristics of liberal time users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12-19</th>
<th>20-29</th>
<th>30-44</th>
<th>45-64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>φ</td>
<td>δ</td>
<td>φ</td>
<td>δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Market work</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domestic work</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caregiving</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal time</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leisure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of population</strong></td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **φ**: Female
- **δ**: Male
Differences in school achievement between liberal and conservative groups - youngsters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School achievement</th>
<th>12-19</th>
<th>20-29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lib Ψ</td>
<td>Cons Ψ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear underachievers</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underachievers</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overachievers</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of population</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All differences are significant with $p<0.01$
Conclusions

- Presence of “innovator” groups among youngsters is questionable.
- Differences in behavior in these age groups is more a question of social class and education – (but reverse causation) than of changes in behavior.
- Pretty pessimistic future for private changes in the short run.
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