

Parental Education and Parental Time with Children

Jonathan Guryan, Erik Hurst, and Melissa Kearney

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

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

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

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

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

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

Parental Time Use in the United States

Findings from Previous Studies

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Patterns by Education and Income

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

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

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

Table 2

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Understanding Time Spent With Children

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

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

An Overview of an Economic Model of Time Allocation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Patterns of Time Spent in Leisure and Home Production

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Interpreting the Data

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Trends in Parental Child Care over Time

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

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

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

An International Perspective on Parental Childcare Time

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

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

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

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

Table 4

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Table 5
Conditional Differences in Hours per Week Spent in Total Child Care for Women by Educational Attainment

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

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

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

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

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

Conclusion

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

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

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

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

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

References

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

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

Data Appendix

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

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

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

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

Table A1
Description of Time Use Surveys

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

(continued on next page)

Table A1—continued

Description of Time Use Surveys

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

(continued on next page)

Table A1—continued
Description of Time Use Surveys

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

(continued on next page)

Table A1—continued
Description of Time Use Surveys

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

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

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

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

Table A2

Time Use Classifications

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

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

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

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

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

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

Table A3

Demographic Variables: Definitions and Exceptions

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

(continued on next page)

Table A3—continued
Demographic Variables: Definitions and Exceptions

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

(continued on next page)

Table A3—continued

Demographic Variables: Definitions and Exceptions

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

(continued on next page)

Table A3—continued

Demographic Variables: Definitions and Exceptions

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

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

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

Table A4
Education Classification by Country

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

(continued on next page)

Table A4—continued

Education Classification by Country

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

(continued on next page)

Table A4—continued
Education Classification by Country

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

(continued on next page)

Table A4—continued
Education Classification by Country

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

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

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

This article has been cited by:

1. Paul N. Thompson, Emily J. Tomayko, Katherine B. Gunter, John Schuna, Megan McClelland. 2025. Impacts of the four-day school week on early elementary achievement. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* **63**, 264-277. [[Crossref](#)]
2. Steven J. Bosworth, José Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, Almudena Sevilla. 2025. Parental time investments and instantaneous well-being in the United States. *Scottish Journal of Political Economy* **72**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
3. Xin Li, Regena F. Nelson, Jianping Shen. 2025. The Effect of Ecological Environment on Language-Minority Students' Math and Reading Development: A Hierarchical Linear Analysis of a Longitudinal Study. *Early Education and Development* **36**:1, 235-248. [[Crossref](#)]
4. Frédérique Gayraud, Jean-Louis Lanoë, Maria De Agostini. 2025. Factors influencing language performance in boys and girls at age 2 in the French ELFE birth cohort. *Brain Research* **1847**, 149305. [[Crossref](#)]
5. Elena Mack, Vsevolod Scherrer, Franzis Preckel. 2025. How smart is my child? The judgment accuracy of parents regarding their children's cognitive ability. *Child Development* **96**:1, 122-140. [[Crossref](#)]
6. Juanita Bloomfield, Ana Balsa, Alejandro Cid, Philip Oreopoulos. 2025. Calling All Parents: Leveraging Behavioral Insights to Boost Early Childhood Outcomes in the Developing World. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **93**. . [[Crossref](#)]
7. Ziyue Chen, Jing Yang, Bingbo Gao, Zuyi Fang, Weihua Dong, Wenchong Du, Manchun Li, Xiao Chen, Chaoqun Zhang, Jing Hua. 2025. Multi-scale social-economic-environmental inequities lead to heterogeneity of Developmental Coordination Disorder risk across China. *The Innovation Medicine* 100109. [[Crossref](#)]
8. Santiago Acerenza, Nestor Gandelman, Daniel Misail. 2025. Neighborhood impacts on human capital accumulation of adolescents and young adults in Montevideo. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* **14**, 104085. [[Crossref](#)]
9. Yakup Yildirim. 2024. Engaging Families in the Education of Children with Special Needs: Challenges and Strategic Recommendations. *Early Childhood Education Journal* **58**. . [[Crossref](#)]
10. Aihui Wu, Cuntong Wang. 2024. Maternal Self-Employment: Empowering Children's Human Capital in Contemporary China. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* **74**. . [[Crossref](#)]
11. Maria Marti-Castaner, Emily C. Merz, Cynthia A. Wiltshire, Samantha A. Melvin, Kimberly Henry, Cassie Landers, Kimberly G. Noble, Helena Duch. 2024. Effects of the Getting Ready for School intervention on children's school readiness skills. *Frontiers in Developmental Psychology* **2**. . [[Crossref](#)]
12. Lifeng Zhang, Yanhua Xu. 2024. A Simple Model of Intergenerational Mobility Under the Heterogeneous Effects of Public Expenditure. *The Manchester School* . [[Crossref](#)]
13. Jeanne Lafortune, Laura Salisbury, Aloysius Siow. 2024. The Changing Identities of American Wives and Mothers. *Journal of Economic Literature* **62**:4, 1538-1588. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
14. Pier-André Bouchard St-Amant, Nicolas Marceau, Jean-Denis Garon. 2024. Uncovering Gatsby Curves. *The Journal of Economic Inequality* **22**:4, 833-864. [[Crossref](#)]
15. Md. Tuhin Ahmed, Sayed Arafat Zubayer. 2024. What determines the accessibility of early childhood education in Bangladesh?. *Discover Education* **3**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
16. Simen Markussen, Maria Nareklishvili, Knut Røed. 2024. Overeducation and economic mobility. *Economics of Education Review* **103**, 102595. [[Crossref](#)]

17. Ignacio Belloc, José Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, José Alberto Molina. 2024. The gasoline price and the commuting behavior of US commuters: Exploring changes to green travel mode choices. *Journal of Transport Geography* **121**, 104006. [[Crossref](#)]
18. Deborah J. Wu, Tracie M. Gibson, Linda M. Ziegenbein, Randall W. Phillis, Caralyn B. Zehnder, Elizabeth A. Connor, Nilanjana Dasgupta. 2024. An identity-based learning community intervention enhances the lived experience and success of first-generation college students in the biological sciences. *Scientific Reports* **14**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
19. Karen Z. Kramer, Qijie Gong, Hanjin Bae, Esra Şahin. 2024. Gender and resources' role in parents' time with children in South Korea and the United States. *Family Relations* **73**:5, 3214-3231. [[Crossref](#)]
20. Anna Helgøy. 2024. What sustains feminized part-time work at the gender equality frontier? Evidence from a vignette experiment. *Journal of European Social Policy* **34**:5, 542-555. [[Crossref](#)]
21. Chunyu Xin, Xuemei Cui, Yuxin Song, Ruixue Zhang, Ning Ding, Deliang Wen. 2024. The cultural adaptation and validation of the Self-Regulated Learning Perception Scale (SRLPS) and the development of its short version in Chinese medical students. *BMC Medical Education* **24**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
22. Nirmal Gautam, Mohammad Mafizur Rahman, Rubayyat Hashmi, Apiradee Lim, Rasheda Khanam. 2024. Socioeconomic inequalities in child and adolescent mental health in Australia: the role of parenting style and parents' relationships. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Mental Health* **18**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
23. Kevin Schoenholzer, Kaspar Burger. 2024. Welfare state policy and educational inequality: a cross-national multicohort study. *European Sociological Review* **40**:6, 996-1012. [[Crossref](#)]
24. Anna Aizer, Adriana Lleras-Muney. 2024. The safety net and child health and well-being: evidence from the United States and the United Kingdom. *Fiscal Studies* **710**. . [[Crossref](#)]
25. N. Sagidolda, A. N. Zhanbyrbaeva, Zh. Zh. Argynbaeva. 2024. SOCIO-ECONOMIC DETERMINANTS OF EDUCATIONAL INEQUALITY IN KAZAKHSTAN: QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS. *Central Asian Economic Review* :4, 84-97. [[Crossref](#)]
26. José Ignacio Giménez-Nadal, José Alberto Molina, Jorge Velilla. 2024. Work from home, time allocation, and well-being: the impact of lockdowns. *Review of Economics of the Household* **122**. . [[Crossref](#)]
27. Cynthia Bansak, Jun Hyung Kim. 2024. Medical marijuana legalization and parenting behaviors: An analysis of the time use of parents. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* **39**:7, 1245-1259. [[Crossref](#)]
28. Nan Zhang, Hongmin Fan. 2024. The intergenerational mobility effects of higher education expansion in China. *International Journal of Educational Development* **111**, 103169. [[Crossref](#)]
29. Diane L. Putnick, Neil J. Perkins, Edwina Yeung, Shyamal D. Peddada. 2024. Do maternal and paternal education protect against developmental delays?. *Research in Developmental Disabilities* **154**, 104848. [[Crossref](#)]
30. Terri J. Sabol, Elise Chor, Teresa Eckrich Sommer, Lauren A. Tighe, P. Lindsay Chase-Lansdale, Amanda Sheffield Morris, Jeanne Brooks-Gunn, Hirokazu Yoshikawa, Christopher King. 2024. Does adding parent education and workforce training to Head Start promote or interfere with children's development?. *Child Development* **95**:6, 2102-2118. [[Crossref](#)]
31. Seung-Eun Cha, Ito Peng, Hyuna Moon. 2024. Unpacking Family Caregiving Types for Older Adults in South Korea: Insights from Time Use Indicators. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* **55**:1, 84-106. [[Crossref](#)]
32. Sayed Arafat Zubayer, Md. Tuhin Ahmed, Md Nazmus Sadekin. Wealth and Geographical Inequalities in Access to Early Childhood Education 135-170. [[Crossref](#)]

33. Sadia Farzana, Suyong Song. The Maternal and Sibling Spillover Effects in Educational Attainment 45. . [[Crossref](#)]
34. Klara Kantova. 2024. Parental involvement and education outcomes of their children. *Applied Economics* 56:48, 5683-5698. [[Crossref](#)]
35. Ji Min Lee, Byung In Lim. 2024. The effects of Korea's free childcare policy on women's time use allocation. *Applied Economics Letters* 31:17, 1716-1720. [[Crossref](#)]
36. Ariel Kalil, Susan E. Mayer, William Delgado, Lisa A. Gennetian. 2024. Education gradients in parental time investment and subjective well-being. *Review of Economics of the Household* 129. . [[Crossref](#)]
37. Elif Bahar, Natasha Bradshaw, Nathan Deutscher, Maxine Montaigne. 2024. Children and the Gender Earnings Gap: Evidence for Australia*. *Economic Record* 84. . [[Crossref](#)]
38. Nolan M. Kavanagh, Margaret McConnell, Natalie Slopen. 2024. State Minimum Wage and Mental Health Among Children and Adolescents. *JAMA Network Open* 7:10, e2440810. [[Crossref](#)]
39. Gozde Corekcioglu, Marco Francesconi, Astrid Kunze. 2024. Expansions in paid parental leave and mothers' economic progress. *European Economic Review* 169, 104845. [[Crossref](#)]
40. Daniela Del Boca, Chiara Daniela Pronzato, Lucia Schiavon. 2024. The impact evaluation of short repeated programs: The case of parenting skills programs. *Evaluation and Program Planning* 106, 102476. [[Crossref](#)]
41. Elena Fabrizi, Antonella Rocca. 2024. "NEET status duration and socio-economic background". *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences* 95, 101986. [[Crossref](#)]
42. Barbara van der Ent, Meta van der Linden, Jaco Dagevos. 2024. Parents and children in resettled refugee families: What are determinants of informational parental support?. *International Migration* 62:5, 3-18. [[Crossref](#)]
43. Hao Liu, Dongxia Yang, Shangran Nie, Xi Chen. 2024. Identifying key factors of reading achievement: A machine learning approach. *iScience* 27:10, 110848. [[Crossref](#)]
44. Patrick Agte, Arielle Bernhardt, Erica Field, Rohini Pande, Natalia Rigol. 2024. Investing in the Next Generation: The Long-Run Impacts of a Liquidity Shock. *American Economic Review* 114:9, 2792-2824. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
45. Benjamin Cowan. 2024. Time use, college attainment, and the working-from-home revolution. *Journal of Population Economics* 37:3. . [[Crossref](#)]
46. Ilse Laurijssen, Julie Verbeylen, Francisca Mullens, H el ene Lembl e. 2024. The Trap of Flexibility in 'family-friendly' Professions: Assessing Teachers' Quality of Family Time Through Temporal Indicators. *Journal of Child and Family Studies* 33:9, 2887-2899. [[Crossref](#)]
47. Martin Boďa, Mariana Povařanov a, Gabriela Nedelov a, Anna Valluřov a. 2024. Gendered Division of Housework in Slovak Couples: Life Course and Other Factors. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 45:3, 649-671. [[Crossref](#)]
48. Jos e Ignacio Gim enez-Nadal, Jos e Alberto Molina, Jorge Velilla. 2024. Intermediate activities while commuting. *Review of Economics of the Household* 22:3, 1185-1220. [[Crossref](#)]
49. Mosammat Zamilun Nahar, Mohammad Salim Zahangir. 2024. The role of parental education and occupation on undernutrition among children under five in Bangladesh: A rural-urban comparison. *PLOS ONE* 19:8, e0307257. [[Crossref](#)]
50. Eid Abo Hamza, Richard Tindle, Simon Pawlak, Dalia Bedewy, Ahmed A. Moustafa. 2024. The impact of poverty and socioeconomic status on brain, behaviour, and development: a unified framework. *Reviews in the Neurosciences* 35:6, 597-617. [[Crossref](#)]
51. Thiago Henrique Leite, Marina Silva da Cunha. 2024. Intergenerational Educational Mobility in Brazil: Trends and Patterns. *Social Indicators Research* 174:1, 19-45. [[Crossref](#)]

52. Lisa A. Gennetian, Greg J. Duncan, Nathan A. Fox, Sarah Halpern-Meekin, Katherine Magnuson, Kimberly G. Noble, Hirokazu Yoshikawa. 2024. Effects of a monthly unconditional cash transfer starting at birth on family investments among US families with low income. *Nature Human Behaviour* 8:8, 1514-1529. [[Crossref](#)]
53. Catherine Armstrong Asher, Ethan Scherer, James S. Kim, Johanna Norshus Tvedt. 2024. Understanding Heterogeneous Patterns of Family Engagement With Educational Technology to Inform School-Family Communication in Linguistically Diverse Communities. *Educational Researcher* 53:6, 348-358. [[Crossref](#)]
54. Fiona M. Lee, Ryan S. Baker, Pradip Singh Tomar, Krishna Kumari, Qimu Liang, Zhanlan Wei. Videos for Parents and Child Performance 265-268. [[Crossref](#)]
55. Christine Farquharson, Sandra McNally, Imran Tahir. 2024. Education inequalities. *Oxford Open Economics* 3:Supplement_1, i760-i820. [[Crossref](#)]
56. Youngsoo Jang, Minchul Yum. 2024. Aggregate and Intergenerational Implications of School Closures: A Quantitative Assessment. *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics* 16:3, 90-130. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
57. Audrey-Ann Deneault, Natasha Cabrera, Rachel A. Ghosh, Ann-Sophie Tölle, Jenny Seethaler, Mirjana Majdandžić, Stephanie M. Reich. 2024. Challenging parenting behavior in ethnically diverse two-parent families in the United States: Association with infants' social competence and behavior problems. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 58, 115-124. [[Crossref](#)]
58. Kate Ellis-Davies, Loes Van Rijn-van Gelderen, Alice Winstanley, Katrien O.W. Helmerhorst, Bérengère Rubio, Olivier Vecho, Michael E. Lamb, Henny M.W. Bos. 2024. Parental sensitivity and intrusiveness in gay-, lesbian-, and heterosexual-parent families with infants conceived using artificial reproductive techniques: Do parents' gender and caregiver role matter?. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 58, 177-187. [[Crossref](#)]
59. Nan Xu, Shuyue Xiong, Yunjun Kong. 2024. Unveiling English Reading Literacy: Insights from Senior High School Students in Chongqing, China. *Sage Open* 14:3. . [[Crossref](#)]
60. Jose Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, Almudena Sevilla. 2024. Trends in effort at work in the UK. *Oxford Economic Papers* 76:3, 628-646. [[Crossref](#)]
61. David K Evans, Pamela Jakiela. 2024. The Role of Fathers in Promoting Early Childhood Development in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A Review of the Evidence. *The World Bank Research Observer* 44. . [[Crossref](#)]
62. Seongeun Kim, Michèle Tertilt, Minchul Yum. 2024. Status Externalities in Education and Low Birth Rates in Korea. *American Economic Review* 114:6, 1576-1611. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
63. Yefeng Chen, Wenyan Yang, Gansong Luo, Jun Luo. 2024. Choosing tournament for children: Parenting style and information intervention. *China Economic Review* 85, 102164. [[Crossref](#)]
64. Xiaoliu Jiang, Kuo Zhang. 2024. Family Environmental Risk and Perceived Stress in Adolescent Depressive Symptoms: A Network Analysis. *Child Psychiatry & Human Development* 379. . [[Crossref](#)]
65. Andra Hiriscau, Mihaela Pinteau. 2024. Birth order, socioeconomic background and educational attainment. *Education Economics* 32:3, 395-412. [[Crossref](#)]
66. Zhong Han, Hongyu Zhao, Yixiang Zhang. 2024. Educational difference in parents' childcare time: evidence from CTUS. *Asian Population Studies* 20:2, 124-143. [[Crossref](#)]
67. Sijia Du, Yaojun Li. 2024. Unequal parenting in China: A study of socio-cultural and political effects. *The Sociological Review* 72:3, 691-713. [[Crossref](#)]
68. Allison Logan, Daniel Schneider. 2024. Parental Exposure to Work Schedule Instability and Child Sleep Quality. *Work, Employment and Society* 48. . [[Crossref](#)]

69. José Ignacio Giménez-Nadal, Jorge Velilla. Work from home, time allocations, and wellbeing: The impact of lockdowns **122**, . [[Crossref](#)]
70. Xue-qing Liu, Mei-ling Liu, Zhuo-wen Wu, Jing-hong Liang. 2024. Secular trends in the prevalence of meeting 24-hour movement guidelines among U.S. adolescents: evidence from NHANES 2007–2016. *Frontiers in Public Health* **12**. . [[Crossref](#)]
71. Margot Jackson, Haoming Song, Ariel Kalil. 2024. State-level safety net spending and educational gaps in maternal time with children. *Journal of Marriage and Family* **86**:2, 412-432. [[Crossref](#)]
72. Antony Fute, Mohamed Oubibi, Binghai Sun, Yueliang Zhou, Mustapha Bassiri, Gaoyu Chen. 2024. Parenting for Success: Exploring the Link Between Parenting Styles and Adolescents' Academic Achievement Through Their Learning Engagement. *Sage Open* **14**:2. . [[Crossref](#)]
73. Sándor Istváné Radó, Mónika Molnár, Róbert Széll, Gergő József Szöllösi, Viktória Törő, Bashar Shehab, Yannis Manios, Costas Anastasiou, Violeta Iotova, Kaloyan Tsochev, Nevena Chakarova, Natalia Giménez-Legarre, Maria Luisa Miguel Berges, Peter E. H. Schwarz, Imre Rurik, Attila Sárváry. 2024. Association between Screen Time and Sociodemographic Factors, Physical Activity, and BMI among Children in Six European Countries (Feel4Diabetes): A Cross-Sectional Study. *Children* **11**:4, 458. [[Crossref](#)]
74. Rabia Nur KODAK, Halime Şenay GÜZEL. 2024. Aggression among Preschool Children within the Framework of Temperament, Attachment and Parental Attitudes. *Psikiyatride Güncel Yaklaşımlar* **16**:1, 48-57. [[Crossref](#)]
75. Rajan Bishwakarma, Alok K. Bohara. Effect of Maternal Time Inputs on Child Outcomes: Does the Gender Matter? **35**, . [[Crossref](#)]
76. Francesca Zanasi, Inge Sieben. 2024. Income and educational differences in grandparental childcare: evidence from English grandmothers and grandfathers. *Community, Work & Family* **27**:2, 188-207. [[Crossref](#)]
77. Ilya Espino, Ana Hermeto, Luciana Luz. 2024. Gender differences in time allocation to paid and unpaid work: evidence from urban households in Guatemala, 2000–2014. *Community, Work & Family* **27**:2, 154-169. [[Crossref](#)]
78. Kei Nomaguchi, Melissa A. Milkie, Veena S. Kulkarni, Amira Allen. 2024. Beyond intensive mothering: Racial/ethnic variation in maternal time with children. *Social Science Research* **119**, 102989. [[Crossref](#)]
79. Gum-Ryeong Park, Hyunseo Rim, Jinho Kim. 2024. Partner's contribution to housework and couple bonding activities among Korean working women: Heterogeneity by socioeconomic status. *Women's Studies International Forum* **103**, 102887. [[Crossref](#)]
80. Farzana Afridi, Monisankar Bishnu, Kanika Mahajan. 2024. What determines women's labor supply? The role of home productivity and social norms. *Journal of Demographic Economics* **90**:1, 55-87. [[Crossref](#)]
81. Pearl S. Kyei, Nana Yaa Nyarko. 2024. Care-giver child interactions and early cognitive development in West and Central Africa. *Early Child Development and Care* **194**:3, 414-423. [[Crossref](#)]
82. Ariel Kalil, Susan Mayer, William Delgado, Lisa Gennetian. Education Gradients in Parental Time Investment and Subjective Well-being **129**, . [[Crossref](#)]
83. Yusuf Canbolat. 2024. Early Warning for Whom? Regression Discontinuity Evidence From the Effect of Early Warning System on Student Absence. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* **78**. . [[Crossref](#)]
84. John Jerrim, Laura Zieger. 2024. How robust are socio-economic achievement gradients using PISA data? A case study from Germany. *British Educational Research Journal* **50**:1, 438-453. [[Crossref](#)]

85. Shu Cai, Wei Li. 2024. On the origin of cognition: How childhood conditions shape cognitive function in old age. *China Economic Review* **83**, 102079. [[Crossref](#)]
86. Carolina Caetano, Gregorio Caetano, Eric Nielsen. 2024. Are children spending too much time on enrichment activities?. *Economics of Education Review* **98**, 102503. [[Crossref](#)]
87. Jere R. Behrman, C. Simon Fan, Naijia Guo, Xiangdong Wei, Hongliang Zhang, Junsen Zhang. 2024. TUTORING EFFICACY, HOUSEHOLD SUBSTITUTION, AND STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT: EXPERIMENTAL EVIDENCE FROM AN AFTER-SCHOOL TUTORING PROGRAM IN RURAL CHINA. *International Economic Review* **65**:1, 149-189. [[Crossref](#)]
88. Marco Tosi, Raffaele Guetto. 2024. The social stratification in parent-child relationships after separation: Evidence from Italy. *Journal of Family Research* **36**, 25-42. [[Crossref](#)]
89. Isabelle Fischer, Pia S. Schober, Benjamin Nagengast. 2024. Stimulation beliefs, parental reading involvement, and social inequalities in children's language development. *Journal of Family Research* **36**, 283-304. [[Crossref](#)]
90. Leonardo Letelier S., Hector Ormeño C.. 2024. A quest for Selective Decentralization. The case of Municipal Schools in Chile. *Cuadernos de Gobierno y Administración Pública* **10**:2, e85991. [[Crossref](#)]
91. Romi Bhakti Hartarto, Claudia Aravena, Arnab Bhattacharjee. 2024. Parental risk attitudes and child cognitive outcome in Indonesia. *Education Economics* **32**:1, 96-113. [[Crossref](#)]
92. Inshirah Ahmed, Priyankar Singha. Parental Investment: Abandonment of Children 1-5. [[Crossref](#)]
93. Roy van der Weide, Christoph Lakner, Daniel Gerszon Mahler, Ambar Narayan, Rakesh Gupta. 2024. Intergenerational mobility around the world: A new database. *Journal of Development Economics* **166**, 103167. [[Crossref](#)]
94. Daniela Del Boca, Chiara Pronzato, Lucia Schiavon. 2024. When Randomization is Not Feasible: The Case of Parenting Skills Programs. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **28**. . [[Crossref](#)]
95. Erin Giffin, Jessica Hoel, Prachi Jain. Ill-Informed Beliefs: Misperceptions of the Costs of Unplanned Parental Absences **92**, . [[Crossref](#)]
96. Sagiri Kitao, Kanato Nakakuni. On the Trends of Technology, Family Formation, and Women's Time Allocation **127**, . [[Crossref](#)]
97. Anna Claire Flowers, Vincent Geloso, Clara Piano, Lyman Stone. 2024. Childcare Regulation and the Fertility Gap. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **131**. . [[Crossref](#)]
98. Sudong Hua. 2024. Business Cycle Adaptations. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **72**. . [[Crossref](#)]
99. Sudong Hua. 2024. Home Production, Skill Heterogeneity and the Labor Wedge. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **89**. . [[Crossref](#)]
100. Fenglian Du, Yunxia Zhao. A Social-Stratification Perspective of Time Use Among Urban Chinese Women **38**, . [[Crossref](#)]
101. Silke Anger, Bernhard Christoph, Agata Galkiewicz, Shushanik Margaryan, Frauke Peter, Malte Sandner, Thomas Siedler. 2024. A Library in the Palm of Your Hand? A Randomized Reading Intervention with Low-Income Children. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **49**. . [[Crossref](#)]
102. Joaquin Fuenzalida, Felipe Vial, Harrison Wheeler. 2024. The Effect of a Homebuyer Subsidy on Children. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **9**. . [[Crossref](#)]
103. Tennenia Dacass, Elif Dilden, Yang Jiao. How Does the Child Tax Credit Change the Time Allocation of Parents? Evidence from American Time Use Data **78**, . [[Crossref](#)]
104. Valentina Massaroni, Valentina Delle Donne, Camillo Marra, Valentina Arcangeli, Daniela Pia Rosaria Chieffo. 2024. The Relationship between Language and Technology: How Screen Time Affects Language Development in Early Life—A Systematic Review. *Brain Sciences* **14**:1, 27. [[Crossref](#)]

105. Aleksander Kucel, Montserrat Vilalta-Bufi. 2023. Overeducation and childcare time. *International Journal of Manpower* 44:9, 108-127. [[Crossref](#)]
106. José Ignacio Giménez-Nadal, José Alberto Molina, Almudena Sevilla. Effort at Work and Worker Well-Being 35-53. [[Crossref](#)]
107. Sulagna Mookerjee, John D. Pedersen, David Slichter. Time Use and the Geography of Economic Opportunity 89-104. [[Crossref](#)]
108. Anja Gruber. The Impact of Job Loss on Parental Time Investment 105-134. [[Crossref](#)]
109. Kjell G. Salvanes. 2023. What Drives Intergenerational Mobility? The Role of Family, Neighborhood, Education, and Social Class: A Review of Bukodi and Goldthorpe's Social Mobility and Education in Britain. *Journal of Economic Literature* 61:4, 1540-1578. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
110. Patricia Cortés, Jessica Pan. 2023. Children and the Remaining Gender Gaps in the Labor Market. *Journal of Economic Literature* 61:4, 1359-1409. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
111. Héctor Bellido, J. Ignacio Giménez-Nadal, José Alberto Molina. 2023. Body mass index and the distribution of housework among British couples. *Review of Economics of the Household* 21:4, 1247-1268. [[Crossref](#)]
112. Weiguang Deng, Xue Li, Junsen Zhang. 2023. Marriage, gender, and premiums from cadre parents. *China Economic Review* 82, 102042. [[Crossref](#)]
113. Philipp Jaufenthaler, Oliver Koll, Maximilian Lude, Reinhard Prügl. 2023. Country Differences in Family Firm Reputation: An Exploration in Germany, India, and the United States. *Family Business Review* 36:4, 352-374. [[Crossref](#)]
114. Emaj Uddin, Abdul Wohab, Awal Kabir, Khadezatul Kobra. Family Income Inequality and Primary Math Achievement in Bangladesh 184-208. [[Crossref](#)]
115. Seung-Eun Cha, Eunhye Kang, Maria Floro, Shirin Arslan, Arnob Alam. 2023. When Caregiving Becomes Burden: The Gap Between Preferred Amount of Care Time and Actual Amount of Care Time. *Social Indicators Research* 170:2, 375-397. [[Crossref](#)]
116. Francesca Barigozzi, Cesare Di Timoteo, Chiara Monfardini. 2023. The Gender Gaps in Time-Use Within Italian Households During 2002–2014. *Italian Economic Journal* 9:3, 1263-1296. [[Crossref](#)]
117. Jared N. Schachner, Geoffrey T. Wodtke. 2023. Environmental inequality and disparities in school readiness: The role of neurotoxic lead. *Child Development* 94:6. . [[Crossref](#)]
118. Simona Rasciute. 2023. Parental education and child health: The exploration of the cross-gender intergenerational transmission mechanism. *Kyklos* 76:4, 642-658. [[Crossref](#)]
119. Nicola Daniele Coniglio, Rezart Hoxhaj, Hubert Jayet. 2023. Coping with education supply shocks: how COVID-19 affected parents' time spent on children's education. *Applied Economics Letters* 36, 1-5. [[Crossref](#)]
120. Bram De Rock, Guillaume Périlleux. 2023. Time Use and Life Satisfaction within Couples: A Gender Analysis for Belgium. *Feminist Economics* 29:4, 1-35. [[Crossref](#)]
121. Kierra M.P. Sattler, Toria Herd, Sarah A. Font. 2023. Foster care, kinship care, and the transition to adulthood: Do child welfare system processes explain differences in outcomes?. *Children and Youth Services Review* 153, 107098. [[Crossref](#)]
122. David Knapp, Tiit Tammaru, Kadri Leetmaa, Kadi Kalm. 2023. Family, school, neighbourhood or all three: Differences in tertiary educational achievement among the Russian ethno-linguistic minority in Tallinn Urban Region, Estonia. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 87, 100845. [[Crossref](#)]
123. Pieter Vanhuyse, Márton Medgyesi, Róbert Iván Gál. 2023. Taxing reproduction: the full transfer cost of rearing children in Europe. *Royal Society Open Science* 10:10. . [[Crossref](#)]

124. Given Hapunda. 2023. Caregiving roles of female guardians, older siblings, and time spent on child activities. *Family Relations* 72:4, 2010-2021. [[Crossref](#)]
125. Galia Meoded Karabanov, Dorit Aram, Carmen López-Escribano, Katerina Shtereva, Merav Asaf, Margalit Ziv, Michele Lee Stites, Susan Sonnenschein. 2023. The COVID-19 Pandemic: Changes in Parent–Child Activities at Home from Spring 2020 to Spring 2021 from a Cross-Cultural View. *Education Sciences* 13:10, 1013. [[Crossref](#)]
126. Idunn Brekke, Andreea Alecu, Elisabeth Ugreninov, Pål Surén, Miriam Evensen. 2023. Educational achievement among children with a disability: do parental resources compensate for disadvantage?. *SSM - Population Health* 23, 101465. [[Crossref](#)]
127. Janne Salminen, Hannu Lehti. 2023. Parental background and daughters' and sons' educational outcomes – application of the Trivers-Willard hypothesis. *Journal of Biosocial Science* 55:5, 853-872. [[Crossref](#)]
128. Tanya Byker, Elena Patel, Shanthi Ramnath. 2023. Who Cares? Paid Sick Leave Mandates, Caregiving, and Gender. *National Tax Journal* 76:3, 649-677. [[Crossref](#)]
129. Fenglian Du, Xiao-yuan Dong, Yinyu Zhang. 2023. Educational differences in parental time devoted to childcare in China. *China Economic Review* 80, 102001. [[Crossref](#)]
130. Xiqian Cai, Jingcheng Fu, Mengna Luan, Xiangming Tang. 2023. Assessing inequality in the school closure response to COVID-19. *China Economic Review* 80, 102008. [[Crossref](#)]
131. Viviana Salinas, Eduardo A. Valenzuela, Daniela P. Aranis. 2023. Cognitive development and parenting during early childhood among Mapuche and non-indigenous Chileans. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 55, 165-178. [[Crossref](#)]
132. Zhongbin Chen, Yongqi Zhang, Hongjie Yuan. 2023. Compulsory schooling system and equity in education: An analysis on intergenerational transmission of education. *Heliyon* 9:8, e18933. [[Crossref](#)]
133. William Bruno, Rebecca Dehnel, Wael Al-Delaimy. 2023. The impact of family income and parental factors on children's resilience and mental well-being. *Journal of Community Psychology* 51:5, 2052-2064. [[Crossref](#)]
134. Lindsey Macmillan, Emma Tominey. 2023. Parental inputs and socio-economic gaps in early child development. *Journal of Population Economics* 36:3, 1513-1543. [[Crossref](#)]
135. Aiday Sikhova. 2023. Understanding the Effect of Parental Education and Financial Resources on the Intergenerational Transmission of Income. *Journal of Labor Economics* 41:3, 771-811. [[Crossref](#)]
136. Jessica Yarmolovsky, Maya Sabag, Or Lipschits, Ronny Geva. 2023. Parents regulate arousal while sharing experiences with their child: a study of pupil diameter change responses. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience* 17. . [[Crossref](#)]
137. Bruno Benevit, Daniel Uhr, Júlia Ziero Uhr. The Impact of Parents' Entrepreneurial Attitudes on Children's Educational Choices in Brazil: A Propensity Score Matching Analysis 19, . [[Crossref](#)]
138. Taryn W. Morrissey. 2023. The Earned Income Tax Credit and Short-Term Changes in Parents' Time Investments in Children. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 44:2, 412-433. [[Crossref](#)]
139. Tine L. Mundbjerg Eriksen, Amanda P. Gaulke, Niels Skipper, Jannet Svensson, Peter Thingholm. 2023. Educational consequences of a sibling's disability: Evidence from type 1 diabetes. *Economics of Education Review* 94, 102407. [[Crossref](#)]
140. Claudia Hupkau, Jenifer Ruiz-Valenzuela, Ingo E. Ispording, Stephen Machin. 2023. Labour Market Shocks and Parental Investments during the Covid-19 Pandemic. *Labour Economics* 82, 102341. [[Crossref](#)]
141. Tyler W. Watts, Jade M. Jenkins, Kenneth A. Dodge, Robert C. Carr, Maria Sauval, Yu Bai, Maya Escueta, Jennifer Duer, Helen Ladd, Clara Muschkin, Ellen Peisner-Feinberg, Elizabeth Ananat.

2023. Understanding Heterogeneity in the Impact of Public Preschool Programs. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development* **88**:1, 7-182. [[Crossref](#)]
142. Eunjeong Bae, Eun Kyoung Choi, Hyejung Lee, Heejung Kim. 2023. Factors Associated With Media Addiction in Korean Elementary School Children. *The Journal of School Nursing* **39**:3, 206-218. [[Crossref](#)]
143. José De Sousa, Guillaume Hollard. 2023. From Micro to Macro Gender Differences: Evidence from Field Tournaments. *Management Science* **69**:6, 3358-3399. [[Crossref](#)]
144. Jijian Fan, Runquan Guan. 2023. Estimating the Cost of Internet Censorship in China: Evidence from a Gamified Remote Platform. *Journalism and Media* **4**:2, 413-429. [[Crossref](#)]
145. Corina Mommaerts, Yulya Truskinovsky. 2023. Is All Caregiving Created Equal? A Comparison of Caregiving to Children and Adults. *AEA Papers and Proceedings* **113**, 627-631. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
146. Yunsen Li, Guochang Zhao, Yunlu Li, Liang Luo. 2023. School Boarding and Students' Prosocial Behaviors: Evidence from Rural China. *China & World Economy* **31**:3, 115-139. [[Crossref](#)]
147. Xiang-xiang He, Yi-ping Deng, Jian-hua Liu, Guang-yu Sun, Jian-wen Xiong, Yang Xiao. 2023. THE CHAIN MEDIATING ROLE OF PERCEIVED FAMILY SUPPORT FOR FORMAL AND INFORMAL SCIENCE LEARNING IN THE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN FAMILY SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND INFORMAL SCIENCE LEARNING EXPERIENCES. *Journal of Baltic Science Education* **22**:2, 232-253. [[Crossref](#)]
148. Yuanyuan Chen, Meng Yuan, Min Zhang. 2023. Income inequality and educational expenditures on children: Evidence from the China Family Panel Studies. *China Economic Review* **78**, 101932. [[Crossref](#)]
149. Yang Hu, Yue Qian. 2023. Gender, education expansion and intergenerational educational mobility around the world. *Nature Human Behaviour* **7**:4, 583-595. [[Crossref](#)]
150. Cheti Nicoletti, Kjell G. Salvanes, Emma Tominey. 2023. Mothers Working during Preschool Years and Child Skills: Does Income Compensate?. *Journal of Labor Economics* **41**:2, 389-429. [[Crossref](#)]
151. Melody Ge Gao. 2023. Converging trends in developmental child care time by fathers' education? Comment on Cha and Park (2021). *Journal of Marriage and Family* **85**:2, 603-615. [[Crossref](#)]
152. Xi Chen, Li-Chung Hu. 2023. Parental Investment on a Socioeconomic Basis: A Comparative Study of Southeast China and Taiwan. *Chinese Education & Society* **56**:2, 141-162. [[Crossref](#)]
153. Nur Islamiah, Sonja Breinholst, Monika A. Walczak, Barbara H. Esbjörn. 2023. The role of fathers in children's emotion regulation development: A systematic review. *Infant and Child Development* **32**:2. . [[Crossref](#)]
154. Nadzeya Kardash, Lauren E. Coleman-Tempel, Meghan E. Ecker-Lyster. 2023. The Role of Parental Education in Financial Socialization of Children. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* **44**:1, 143-155. [[Crossref](#)]
155. Juanita Bloomfield, Ana Balsa, Alejandro Cid. 2023. Using behavioral insights in early childhood interventions: the effects of Crianza Positiva e-messaging program on parental investment. *Review of Economics of the Household* **21**:1, 95-130. [[Crossref](#)]
156. Sergi Sánchez-Coll. 2023. Born this way: the effect of an unexpected child benefit at birth on longer-term educational outcomes. *SERIEs* **14**:1, 105-141. [[Crossref](#)]
157. Alexandr Kopytov, Nikolai Roussanov, Mathieu Taschereau-Dumouchel. 2023. Cheap Thrills: The Price of Leisure and the Global Decline in Work Hours. *Journal of Political Economy Macroeconomics* **1**:1, 80-118. [[Crossref](#)]
158. Sébastien Fontenay, Thomas Murphy, Ilan Tojerow. 2023. Child penalties across industries: why job characteristics matter. *Applied Economics Letters* **30**:4, 488-495. [[Crossref](#)]

159. Kalena E. Cortes, Hans Fricke, Susanna Loeb, David S. Song, Benjamin N. York. 2023. When behavioral barriers are too high or low – How timing matters for text-based parenting interventions. *Economics of Education Review* **92**, 102352. [[Crossref](#)]
160. Minchul Yum. 2023. PARENTAL TIME INVESTMENT AND INTERGENERATIONAL MOBILITY. *International Economic Review* **64**:1, 187-223. [[Crossref](#)]
161. Huade Huo, Jiashan Cui, Sarah Hein, Zoe Padgett, Mark Ossolinski, Ruth Raim, Jijun Zhang. 2023. Predicting Dropout for Nontraditional Undergraduate Students: A Machine Learning Approach. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice* **24**:4, 1054-1077. [[Crossref](#)]
162. Melvin A. Jabar. 2023. Child-related factors and parental involvement among parents in select public elementary and high schools in the Philippines. *Education 3-13* **51**:1, 72-86. [[Crossref](#)]
163. Elisa Taveras. 2023. The effect of spouses' relative education on household time allocation. *Southern Economic Journal* **89**:3, 788-829. [[Crossref](#)]
164. Elsa Fontinha. Parental Time and Child Well-Being 4962-4965. [[Crossref](#)]
165. Jonathan Gershuny, Kimberly Fisher. Multinational Time Use Study 4525-4530. [[Crossref](#)]
166. Muneer Kalliyil, Srividya Aluru, Soham Sahoo. Regional Patterns and Dynamics of Learning Outcomes in India 261-288. [[Crossref](#)]
167. Matthias Doepke, Anne Hannusch, Fabian Kindermann, Michèle Tertilt. The economics of fertility: a new era 151-254. [[Crossref](#)]
168. Greg Duncan, Ariel Kalil, Magne Mogstad, Mari Rege. Investing in early childhood development in preschool and at home 1-91. [[Crossref](#)]
169. Aritz Aranbarri, Alazne Aizpitarte, Enrique Arranz-Freijo, Eduardo Fano, Manuel Sánchez de Miguel, Aubyn C. Stahmer, Jesus Maria Ibarluzea. 2023. What influences early cognitive development? Family context as a key mediator. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology* **84**, 101480. [[Crossref](#)]
170. Sam Cosaert, Veerle Hennebel. 2023. Parental Childcare with Process Benefits. *Economica* **90**:357, 339-371. [[Crossref](#)]
171. Preeya Pandya Mbekeani. 2023. Income-Based Gaps in College-Going Activities: High School Classes of 1992 and 2004. *Sociology of Education* **96**:1, 62-79. [[Crossref](#)]
172. Jordana Cristina de Jesus, Cassio Maldonado Turra, Simone Wajnman. 2023. An Empirical Method for Adjusting Time Use Data in Brazil. *Dados* **66**:4. . [[Crossref](#)]
173. Martino Pelli, Jeanne Tschopp. 2023. Storms, Early Education and Human Capital. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **56**. . [[Crossref](#)]
174. Martino Pelli, Jeanne Tschopp. Storms, Early Education and Human Capital **56**, . [[Crossref](#)]
175. Alexander Ahammer, Ulrich Glogowsky, Martin Halla, Timo Hener. 2023. The Parenthood Penalty in Mental Health: Evidence from Austria and Denmark. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **115**. . [[Crossref](#)]
176. Eric D. Gould. 2023. The Return to College, Marriage, and Intergenerational Mobility. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **1**. . [[Crossref](#)]
177. Jose L. Casco. 2023. COVID-19, Crises and Women's Control of Resources: Evidence from Mexico. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **189**. . [[Crossref](#)]
178. Erin Giffin, Jessica Hoel, Prachi Jain. 2023. Ill-informed Beliefs: Misperceptions of the Costs of Unplanned Parental Absences. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **92**. . [[Crossref](#)]
179. Maria Bigoni, Stefania Bortolotti, Margherita Fort, Annalisa Guarini, Daniela Iorio, Chiara Monfardini, Alessandra Sansavini, Davide Sansone. 2023. A New Time-Use Diary App to Measure Parental Investments. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **110**. . [[Crossref](#)]

180. Hardika, Tomas Iriyanto, Dila Umnia Soraya, Eny Nur Aisyah. Model Training for Involving Children in Housework as Formation of Children's Strong and Independent Characters in the Family Environment 552-561. [[Crossref](#)]
181. Renske Marianne Verweij, Renske Keizer. 2022. The intergenerational transmission of educational attainment: A closer look at the (interrelated) roles of paternal involvement and genetic inheritance. *PLOS ONE* 17:12, e0267254. [[Crossref](#)]
182. Federico Favata, Julian Leone, Jorge Lo Cascio. 2022. Determinantes del empleo joven en Argentina 2004-2018. *Cuadernos de Economía* 41:87, 482-508. [[Crossref](#)]
183. Daniela Del Boca, Enrica Maria Martino, Chiara Pronzato. 2022. Non cognitive skills and childcare attendance. *Review of Economics of the Household* 20:4, 1059-1085. [[Crossref](#)]
184. Joel Kaiyuan Han. 2022. Parental involvement and neighborhood quality: evidence from public housing demolitions in Chicago. *Review of Economics of the Household* 20:4, 1193-1238. [[Crossref](#)]
185. Cynthia Bansak, Xuan Jiang, Guanyi Yang. 2022. Sibling spillovers in rural China: A story of sisters. *China Economic Review* 76, 101873. [[Crossref](#)]
186. James Kai-sing Kung. 2022. On the Origins and Persistent Effects of the World's First Meritocratic Institution. *Comparative Economic Studies* 64:4, 563-581. [[Crossref](#)]
187. Jonas Jessen, Christa Katharina Spieß, Sevrin Waights. 2022. Centre-Based Care and Parenting Activities*. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* 84:6, 1356-1379. [[Crossref](#)]
188. Flóra Kenyhercz, Karolina Kósa, Beáta Erika Nagy. 2022. Perinatal, neonatal, developmental and demographic predictors of intelligence at 4 years of age among low birth weight children: a panel study with a 2-year follow-up. *BMC Pediatrics* 22:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
189. Uchechi Shirley Anaduaka. 2022. Multilevel analysis of individual- and community-level determinants of birth certification of children under-5 years in Nigeria: evidence from a household survey. *BMC Public Health* 22:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
190. Tanja A. J. Houweling, Joost Oude Groeniger, Pauline W. Jansen, Pol van Lier, Nil Horoz, Marieke Buil, Frank J. van Lenthe. 2022. Trajectories of socioeconomic inequality in early child development: a cohort analysis. *International Journal for Equity in Health* 21:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
191. Nemes Madocsa NANDOR. 2022. Impactul nivelului educațional parental asupra agresivității la preadolescenți. *Psihologie. Revista științifico-practică = Psychology. Scientific-practical journal* 41:2, 25-33. [[Crossref](#)]
192. Tamás Hajdu, Gábor Kertesi, Gábor Kézdi. 2022. Idő és pénz a gyermeknevelésben Magyarországon, 1993–2010. *Közgazdasági Szemle* 69:11, 1255-1297. [[Crossref](#)]
193. Mirjana Đorđević, Nenad Glumbić, Haris Memisevic, Branislav Brojčin, Ana Krstov. 2022. Parent-teacher interactions, family stress, well-being, and parental depression as contributing factors to parental involvement mechanisms in education of children with autism. *International Journal of Developmental Disabilities* 68:6, 838-849. [[Crossref](#)]
194. Sohae Eve Oh, Tomislav Vukina. 2022. Estimating Parental Demand for Children's Screen Time in a Model of Family Labor Supply. *International Advances in Economic Research* 28:3-4, 69-89. [[Crossref](#)]
195. Jorge Valero-Gil, Magali Valero. 2022. Why has there been a fall in child labour and an increase in school attendance in Mexico?. *Development Policy Review* 40:6. . [[Crossref](#)]
196. Silvia Spaggiari, Virginia Forlini, Silvia Carraro, Valentina Agnese Ferraro, Stefania Zanconato, Maria Montanaro, Valerio Cecinati, Silvana Zaffani, Claudio Maffei, Daniela Di Riso. 2022. Spending Time with Mothers as a Resource for Children with Chronic Diseases: A Comparison of Asthma, Type 1 Diabetes, and Cancer during COVID-19 Pandemic. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 19:21, 14126. [[Crossref](#)]

197. Jocelyn Wikle, Elizabeth Ackert. 2022. Child Citizenship Status in Immigrant Families and Differential Parental Time Investments in Siblings. *Social Sciences* 11:11, 507. [[Crossref](#)]
198. Bünyamin Sarıkaya, Süleyman Aydeniz, Yunus Şakiroğlu. 2022. Türkçe Öğretmeni Adaylarının Akademik Dinleme Becerisi Yeterliliklerinin İncelenmesi. *Academia Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi* 7:2, 148-159. [[Crossref](#)]
199. Dorien Emmers, Juan Carlos Caro, Scott Rozelle, Sean Sylvia. 2022. Early Parenting Interventions to Foster Human Capital in Developing Countries. *Annual Review of Resource Economics* 14:1, 169-192. [[Crossref](#)]
200. Leif Andreassen, Maria Laura Di Tommaso, Anna Maccagnan. 2022. Do Men Care? Estimating Men's Preferences for Spending Time with Their Children. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities* 23:4, 562-592. [[Crossref](#)]
201. Adam Blandin, Christopher Herrington. 2022. Family Heterogeneity, Human Capital Investment, and College Attainment. *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics* 14:4, 438-478. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
202. Susan B. Neuman, Jillian Knapczyk. 2022. Early Literacy in Everyday Settings: Creating an Opportunity to Learn for Low-income Young Children. *Reading Research Quarterly* 57:4, 1167-1186. [[Crossref](#)]
203. Maria F. Hoen, Simen Markussen, Knut Røed. 2022. Immigration and economic mobility. *Journal of Population Economics* 35:4, 1589-1630. [[Crossref](#)]
204. Antonio L. Pérez-Corral, Almudena Moreno Mínguez. 2022. Single-Parent Families, Educational Gradient, and Child Deprivation: The Cases of Italy and Spain. *Child Indicators Research* 15:5, 1821-1846. [[Crossref](#)]
205. Eric A. Hanushek, Jacob D. Light, Paul E. Peterson, Laura M. Talpey, Ludger Woessmann. 2022. Long-run Trends in the U.S. SES—Achievement Gap. *Education Finance and Policy* 17:4, 608-640. [[Crossref](#)]
206. Gabriella Pusztai, Hajnalka Fényes. 2022. Religiosity as a Factor Supporting Parenting and Its Perceived Effectiveness in Hungarian School Children's Families. *Religions* 13:10, 945. [[Crossref](#)]
207. Hao Liu, Xi Chen, Xiaoxiao Liu. 2022. Factors influencing secondary school students' reading literacy: An analysis based on XGBoost and SHAP methods. *Frontiers in Psychology* 13. . [[Crossref](#)]
208. Giorgio Di Gessa, Karen Glaser, Paola Zaninotto. 2022. Is grandparental childcare socio-economically patterned? Evidence from the English longitudinal study of ageing. *European Journal of Ageing* 19:3, 763-774. [[Crossref](#)]
209. Barbara Broadway, Tessa LoRiggio, Chris Ryan, Anna Zhu. 2022. Literature review on the impact of welfare policy design on children and youth. *Journal of Economic Surveys* 36:4, 809-840. [[Crossref](#)]
210. Yong-Kwan Lee. 2022. What Makes Adolescents Free Time Use Differently?. *Youth & Society* 54:6, 982-999. [[Crossref](#)]
211. Connie Qun Guan, Youjia Wang, Yao Wang. 2022. Grandparenting Role on Math Online Learning in Chinese Multigenerational Households. *Sustainability* 14:18, 11551. [[Crossref](#)]
212. Fiona Carmichael, Christian K. Darko, Shireen Kanji, Nicholas Vasilakos. 2022. School closures and educational attainment in Ethiopia: Can extra classes help children to catch up?. *British Educational Research Journal* 48:4, 640-664. [[Crossref](#)]
213. Sara Scrimin, Libera Ylenia Mastromatteo, Ani Hovnanyan, Benedetta Zagni, Enrico Rubaltelli, Tiziana Pozzoli. 2022. Effects of Socioeconomic Status, Parental Stress, and Family Support on Children's Physical and Emotional Health During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Journal of Child and Family Studies* 31:8, 2215-2228. [[Crossref](#)]

214. Lindsey Rose Bullinger, Kerri M. Raissian, William Schneider. 2022. The power of the future: Intergenerational income mobility and child maltreatment in the United States. *Child Abuse & Neglect* **130**, 105175. [[Crossref](#)]
215. Paul Bingley, Lorenzo Cappellari, Konstantinos Tatsiramos. 2022. Parental assortative mating and the intergenerational transmission of human capital. *Labour Economics* **77**, 102047. [[Crossref](#)]
216. Isabelle Fischer. 2022. The role of gender ideology, intensive parenting, educational resources, and psychological well-being for parent-child reading frequency. *Journal of Family Studies* **28**:3, 1040-1057. [[Crossref](#)]
217. Anja Steinbach, Aušra Maslauskaitė. 2022. Childcare in Lithuania and Belarus: how gendered is parenting in Eastern European countries?. *Journal of Family Studies* **28**:3, 1181-1197. [[Crossref](#)]
218. Owen N. Schochet, Christina M. Padilla. 2022. Children Learning and Parents Earning: Exploring the Average and Heterogeneous Effects of Head Start on Parental Earnings. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness* **15**:3, 413-444. [[Crossref](#)]
219. Jessica L. Arnup, Nicole Black, David W. Johnston. 2022. Changes in children's time use during periods of financial hardship. *Journal of Population Economics* **35**:3, 1133-1162. [[Crossref](#)]
220. Md. Emaj Uddin. 2022. RETRACTED: Parental investment mediates associations between lower family income and primary math achievement. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology* **81**, 101422. [[Crossref](#)]
221. Jacob Bastian, Lance Lochner. 2022. The Earned Income Tax Credit and Maternal Time Use: More Time Working and Less Time with Kids?. *Journal of Labor Economics* **40**:3, 573-611. [[Crossref](#)]
222. Natsuko Imai, Akiko Shikano, Tetsuhiro Kidokoro, Shingo Noi. 2022. Risky Play and Social Behaviors among Japanese Preschoolers: Direct Observation Method. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* **19**:13, 7889. [[Crossref](#)]
223. Federico Favata, Julián Leone, Jorge Lo Cascio. 2022. Youth employment in Argentina (2004-2020): First effect of the pandemic. *Revista del CESLA: International Latin American Studies Review* :29, 69-96. [[Crossref](#)]
224. Anja Steinbach, Florian Schulz. 2022. Stability and Change in German Parents' Childcare Patterns Across Two Decades. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society* **29**:2, 428-445. [[Crossref](#)]
225. Giulia M. Dotti Sani. 2022. The Intrinsic Value of Childcare: Positive Returns of Childcare Time on Parents' Well-Being and Life Satisfaction in Italy. *Journal of Happiness Studies* **23**:5, 1901-1921. [[Crossref](#)]
226. Liat Raz-Yurovich. 2022. Leisure: Definitions, Trends, and Policy Implications. *Population Research and Policy Review* **41**:3, 981-1019. [[Crossref](#)]
227. Punyabeet Sarangi, M. Manoj. 2022. Analysis of activity participation and time use decisions of partners: the context of low-and high-income households. *Transportation* **49**:3, 1017-1058. [[Crossref](#)]
228. Tianyu Sun, Sichao Wei. 2022. Longer parental time and lower fertility rate. *The Journal of the Economics of Ageing* **22**, 100382. [[Crossref](#)]
229. Ylenia Brilli. 2022. Mother's Time Allocation, Childcare, and Child Cognitive Development. *Journal of Human Capital* **16**:2, 233-272. [[Crossref](#)]
230. Stefani Milovanska-Farrington. 2022. Education in the times of a pandemic: parental socioeconomic characteristics and time spent educating children. *Journal of Economic Studies* **49**:4, 716-734. [[Crossref](#)]
231. Shervin Assari. Parental Education, Ethnicity, and Functional Connectivity between Nucleus Accumbens and Frontoparietal Network . [[Crossref](#)]

232. Shu Wang, Xiao Yu, Kuo Zhang, Jipeng Pei, Karlis Rokpelnis, Xuelong Wang. 2022. How does education affect intergenerational income mobility in Chinese society?. *Review of Development Economics* 26:2, 774-792. [[Crossref](#)]
233. Guy Barokas, Tal Shavit, Arie Sherman. 2022. Can Parents Manage Their Children's Future Happiness?—: A Retrospective Inquiry. *Journal of Family Issues* 43:5, 1386-1408. [[Crossref](#)]
234. Tianli Feng, Xiyuan Jia, Lucy Pappas, Xiaojun Zheng, Teresa Shao, Letao Sun, Charlie Weisberg, Madeline Lu Li, Scott Rozelle, Yue Ma. 2022. Academic Performance and the Link with Depressive Symptoms among Rural Han and Minority Chinese Adolescents. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 19:10, 6026. [[Crossref](#)]
235. Emma Cameron, Antonia Delius, Amanda Devercelli, Utz Pape, Samuel Siewers. The Consequences of the COVID-19 Pandemic for Children in Kenya 14, . [[Crossref](#)]
236. Renske Verweij, Renske Keizer. The intergenerational transmission of educational attainment: A closer look at the (interrelated) roles of paternal involvement and genetic inheritance 2017, . [[Crossref](#)]
237. Jing Liu, Liangshu Qi, Yanyan Xiong. 2022. Non-Parental Childcare Services and Time Allocation of Mothers with Young Children in China. *Feminist Economics* 28:2, 303-328. [[Crossref](#)]
238. Teresa M. Ober, Patricia J. Brooks. 2022. Identifying direct and indirect influences on vocabulary development of children from low-income families from infancy to grade 5. *Cognitive Development* 62, 101163. [[Crossref](#)]
239. Ningning Guo. 2022. Hollowing out of opportunity: Automation technology and intergenerational mobility in the United States. *Labour Economics* 75, 102136. [[Crossref](#)]
240. Xiyuan Jia, Xinwu Zhang, Jiangchao Jing, Ming Zhou, Haoyang Li, Dimitris Friesen, Yue Ma. 2022. The impact of nonboarding on the development of disadvantaged boarding students in western rural China. *Asia Pacific Education Review* 23:1, 131-150. [[Crossref](#)]
241. Sabine Walper, Michaela Kreyenfeld. 2022. The Intensification of Parenting in Germany: The Role of Socioeconomic Background and Family Form. *Social Sciences* 11:3, 134. [[Crossref](#)]
242. Ling-Yi Lin, Wen-Hao Yu, Wei-Pin Lin, Chih-Chia Chen, Yi-Fang Tu. 2022. Agreement Between Caregivers' Concerns of Children's Developmental Problems and Professional Identification in Taiwan. *Frontiers in Pediatrics* 10. . [[Crossref](#)]
243. Cristian F. Sepulveda. 2022. Time-saving goods, time inequalities and optimal commodity taxation. *International Tax and Public Finance* 29:1, 84-109. [[Crossref](#)]
244. Pierre-Loup Beauregard, Marie Connolly, Catherine Haeck, Tímea Laura Molnár. 2022. Primary school reopenings and parental work. *Canadian Journal of Economics/Revue canadienne d'économique* 55:S1, 248-281. [[Crossref](#)]
245. Giulia M Dotti Sani. 2022. Is it “Good” to Have a Stay-at-Home Mom? Parental Childcare Time and Work–Family Arrangements in Italy, 1988–2014. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society* 28:4, 896-920. [[Crossref](#)]
246. Hirotaka Ito, Isamu Yamamoto. 2022. Do comprehensive and diverse childcare services affect women's labour supply and well-being?. *Applied Economics Letters* 29:2, 173-178. [[Crossref](#)]
247. Muharrem Koç, Nilüfer Koçtürk, Tolga Zencir. 2022. ANNE-BABA EĞİTİMİ: EBEVEYNLERİN EĞİTİM DENEYİMLERİ VE GEREKSİNİMLERİ. *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 32:1, 111-120. [[Crossref](#)]
248. José Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, José Alberto Molina, Almudena Sevilla. Temporal Flexibility, Breaks at Work, and the Motherhood Wage Gap 83-105. [[Crossref](#)]
249. José Ignacio Giménez-Nadal, José Alberto Molina. Time Use Surveys 1-18. [[Crossref](#)]
250. Hikaru Hasegawa, Kazuhiro Ueda. 2022. Empirical analysis of a time-use model incorporating correlations among three household members. *Behaviormetrika* 49:1, 69-89. [[Crossref](#)]

251. Sophie Nicole Cave, Megan Wright, Sophie von Stumm. 2022. Change and stability in the association of parents' education with children's intelligence. *Intelligence* **90**, 101597. [[Crossref](#)]
252. Maiken Skovrider Aaskoven, Trine Kjær, Dorte Gyrd-Hansen. 2022. Effects of parental health shocks on children's school achievements: A register-based population study. *Journal of Health Economics* **81**, 102573. [[Crossref](#)]
253. Christos Makridis, Clara Piano, Corey DeAngelis. 2022. The Effects of School Closures on Homeschooling and Mental Health: Evidence from the Covid-19 Pandemic. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **36**. . [[Crossref](#)]
254. Astrid Krenz, Holger Strulik. 2022. Automation and the Fall and Rise of the Servant Economy. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **4**. . [[Crossref](#)]
255. Matthias Doepke, Anne Hannusch, Fabian Kindermann, Michèle Tertilt. 2022. The Economics of Fertility: A New Era. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **131**. . [[Crossref](#)]
256. José Ignacio Giménez, Jose Alberto Molina Chueca, Almudena Sevilla. 2022. Effort at Work and Worker Well-Being in the Us. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **115**. . [[Crossref](#)]
257. José Ignacio Giménez, Almudena Sevilla. 2022. Work Effort in the UK: Trends and Explanations. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **4**. . [[Crossref](#)]
258. Xiqian Cai, Jingcheng Fu, Yi Lu, Xiangming Tang, Songfa Zhong. 2022. Assessing Inequality in the School Closure Response to Covid-19. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **123**. . [[Crossref](#)]
259. Sulagna Mookerjee, John Pedersen, David Slichter. 2022. Time Use and the Geography of Economic Opportunity. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **108**. . [[Crossref](#)]
260. Qinyou Hu, Yiming Xia. 2022. Helping Parents Combat Middle-School Blues: Evidence from a Parental Involvement Program. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **136**. . [[Crossref](#)]
261. Gabriela Cárdenas-Fuentes, Clara Homs, Catalina Ramírez-Contreras, Charlotte Juton, Rafael Casas-Esteve, Maria Grau, Isabel Aguilar-Palacio, Montserrat Fitó, Santiago F. Gomez, Helmut Schröder. 2022. Prospective Association of Maternal Educational Level with Child's Physical Activity, Screen Time, and Diet Quality. *Nutrients* **14**:1, 160. [[Crossref](#)]
262. Junko NISHIMURA. 2022. Educational Gradient in Parental Involvement. *Japanese Sociological Review* **72**:4, 522-539. [[Crossref](#)]
263. Keya Ding, Chuanjiang Li, Yanwei Li, Hongan Wang, Dongchuan Yu. 2021. The Effect of Socioeconomic Disparities on Prefrontal Activation in Initiating Joint Attention: A Functional Near-Infrared Spectroscopy Evidence From Two Socioeconomic Status Groups. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience* **15**. . [[Crossref](#)]
264. Lin Zhang. 2021. Education Expenditure and Parenting Styles: Evidence from Cognitive Development in China. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* **42**:4, 729-744. [[Crossref](#)]
265. Joseph Price, Luke P. Rodgers, Jocelyn S. Wikle. 2021. Dinner timing and human capital investments in children. *Review of Economics of the Household* **19**:4, 1047-1075. [[Crossref](#)]
266. Marcus Dittrich, Bianka Mey. 2021. Time Use Choices and Volunteer Labour Supply. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* **32**:6, 1299-1319. [[Crossref](#)]
267. Seung-Eun Cha, Ki-Soo Eun. 2021. Family Dynamics of Child Care in Korea: Strategies to Relieving the Gap Between Mother's Actual and Preferred Hours of Care. *Journal of Population Ageing* **14**:4, 487-506. [[Crossref](#)]
268. Simon Calmar Andersen, Maria Koch Gregersen, Helena Skyt Nielsen, Mette Kjærgaard Thomsen. 2021. Parent Involvement, Socioeconomic Status and Reading Performance. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research* **65**:7, 1279-1294. [[Crossref](#)]
269. Flávio Cunha. Human Capital and Long-Run Economic Growth 41-77. [[Crossref](#)]

270. Cheng Chou, Ruoyao Shi. 2021. What time use surveys can (and cannot) tell us about labor supply. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 36:7, 917-937. [[Crossref](#)]
271. Zelda Brutti, Daniel Montolio. 2021. Preventing criminal minds: Early education access and adult offending behavior. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 191, 97-126. [[Crossref](#)]
272. Terpsichori Korpa, Theodora Pappa, Giorgos Chouliaras, Anastasia Sfinari, Anna Eleftheriades, Matthaïos Katsounas, Christina Kanaka-Gantenbein, Panagiota Pervanidou. 2021. Daily Behaviors, Worries and Emotions in Children and Adolescents with ADHD and Learning Difficulties during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Children* 8:11, 995. [[Crossref](#)]
273. Joe LaBriola, Daniel Schneider. 2021. Class Inequality in Parental Childcare Time: Evidence from Synthetic Couples in the ATUS. *Social Forces* 100:2, 680-705. [[Crossref](#)]
274. Edward M. Sosu, Shadrach Dare, Claire Goodfellow, Markus Klein. 2021. Socioeconomic status and school absenteeism: A systematic review and narrative synthesis. *Review of Education* 9:3. . [[Crossref](#)]
275. José Ignacio Giménez-Nadal, José Alberto Molina, Jorge Velilla. 2021. Testing urban efficiency wages in France and Spain. *Empirical Economics* 61:4, 2205-2236. [[Crossref](#)]
276. Lukas Kiessling. 2021. How do parents perceive the returns to parenting styles and neighborhoods?. *European Economic Review* 139, 103906. [[Crossref](#)]
277. Sébastien Goudeau, Camille Sanrey, Arnaud Stanczak, Antony Manstead, Céline Darnon. 2021. Why lockdown and distance learning during the COVID-19 pandemic are likely to increase the social class achievement gap. *Nature Human Behaviour* 5:10, 1273-1281. [[Crossref](#)]
278. Neda Mortaji, John E Krzeczowski, Khrista Boylan, Linda Booij, Maude Perreault, Ryan J Van Lieshout. 2021. Maternal pregnancy diet, postnatal home environment and executive function and behavior in 3- to 4-y-olds. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition* 114:4, 1418-1427. [[Crossref](#)]
279. Jaehee Kim, Jiwon Lee. 2021. Paternal Influence on the Developmental Pathways of Maternal Parenting Stress, Home Learning Stimulation, and Children's Social Skills in the U.S. and Korea: A Moderated Mediation Model. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 52:3, 344-372. [[Crossref](#)]
280. Yujin Jang, Youngmeen Suh. 2021. Longitudinal Effects of Parental Academic Support on Academic Achievement in Korea: Will You Be a Companion or a Manager in Your Children's Academic Support?. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 18:20, 10823. [[Crossref](#)]
281. Kenneth Hemmereichs. 2021. The adjustment of home-based parental literacy involvement to the level of reading literacy of pupils in primary school: a quantitative formalisation and empirical test. *Educational Review* 73:5, 617-637. [[Crossref](#)]
282. David Jaume, Alexander Willén. 2021. The effect of teacher strikes on parents. *Journal of Development Economics* 152, 102679. [[Crossref](#)]
283. Armin Falk, Fabian Kosse, Pia Pinger, Hannah Schildberg-Hörisch, Thomas Deckers. 2021. Socioeconomic Status and Inequalities in Children's IQ and Economic Preferences. *Journal of Political Economy* 129:9, 2504-2545. [[Crossref](#)]
284. NGỌC TÚ T. ĐINH, WEERACHART T. KILENTHONG. 2021. Do Parental Absence and Children's Gender Affect Early Childhood Investment? Evidence from Rural Thailand. *The Singapore Economic Review* 66:05, 1443-1468. [[Crossref](#)]
285. Lijin ZHANG, Qing BAO, Lei CHEN, Yuan LIANG. 2021. Dynamic adaptation of the Inventory of Piaget's Developmental Task (IPDT) and the application for children with low socioeconomic status. *Acta Psychologica Sinica* 53:9, 960-975. [[Crossref](#)]
286. Ardina Hasanbasri, Talip Kilic, Gayatri Koolwal, Heather Moylan. Individual Wealth and Time Use: Evidence from Cambodia . [[Crossref](#)]

287. Panpan Yang, Gabriel L. Schlomer, Melissa A. Lippold, Mark E. Feinberg. 2021. Longitudinal Discrepancy in Adolescent Aggressive Behavior Problems: Differences by Reporter and Contextual Factors. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 50:8, 1564-1581. [[Crossref](#)]
288. Ariel J. Binder. 2021. Rising Inequality in Mothers' Employment Statuses: The Role of Intergenerational Transmission. *Demography* 58:4, 1223-1248. [[Crossref](#)]
289. Zhou Yu. 2021. Homeownership attainment of adult children in urban China: parental attributes and financial support. *Housing Studies* 36:6, 789-821. [[Crossref](#)]
290. Laura Helena Kivi, Janno Järve, Sten Anspal, Marko Sõmer, Indrek Seppo. 2021. Are we there yet? Intergenerational mobility and economic assimilation of second-generation immigrants in Estonia. *Baltic Journal of Economics* 21:2, 158-183. [[Crossref](#)]
291. Ha Trong Nguyen, Huong Thu Le, Luke B Connelly. 2021. Weather and children's time allocation. *Health Economics* 30:7, 1559-1579. [[Crossref](#)]
292. José Ignacio Giménez-Nadal, José Alberto Molina, Jorge Vellilla. 2021. Two-way commuting: Asymmetries from time use surveys. *Journal of Transport Geography* 95, 103146. [[Crossref](#)]
293. Tom Buchanan, Adian McFarlane, Anupam Das. 2021. The Gender Gap in Market Work Hours Among Canadians: Examining Essential(ist) Linkages to Parenting Time and Household Labour Hours. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Economics* 33:2, 167-189. [[Crossref](#)]
294. Jiwon Seo, Jung-eun Lee. 2021. Paternal Child Care Time of Dual-Income and Single-Income Families with Preschool Children. *Journal of Families and Better Life* 39:2, 29-45. [[Crossref](#)]
295. Roy van der Weide, Christoph Lakner, Daniel Gerszon Mahler, Ambar Narayan, Rakesh Ramasubbaiah. Intergenerational Mobility around the World 7, . [[Crossref](#)]
296. Juan Carlos Campaña, J. Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, Jose Alberto Molina. 2021. Sex-ratios and work in Latin American households: Evidence from Mexico, Peru, Ecuador, Colombia, and Chile. *Latin American Economic Review* 1-25. [[Crossref](#)]
297. Umair Ali, Chris M. Herbst, Christos A. Makridis. 2021. The impact of COVID-19 on the U.S. child care market: Evidence from stay-at-home orders. *Economics of Education Review* 82, 102094. [[Crossref](#)]
298. Sanjiv Gupta, Liana C. Sayer, Jessica Pearlman. 2021. Educational and Type of Day Differences in Mothers' Time Availability for Child Care and Housework. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 83:3, 786-802. [[Crossref](#)]
299. Kate C. Prickett, Jennifer March Augustine. 2021. Trends in Mothers' Parenting Time by Education and Work From 2003 to 2017. *Demography* 58:3, 1065-1091. [[Crossref](#)]
300. Alberto Jacinto, Seth Gershenson. 2021. The Intergenerational Transmission of Teaching. *American Educational Research Journal* 58:3, 635-672. [[Crossref](#)]
301. Ekaterina Hertog, Man-Yee Kan, Kiyomi Shirakawa, Ryota Chiba. 2021. Do Better-Educated Couples Share Domestic Work More Equitably in Japan? It Depends on the Day of the Week. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 52:2, 271-310. [[Crossref](#)]
302. Nikolay Veraksa, Aleksander Veraksa, Margarita Gavrilova, Daria Bukhalenkova, Ekaterina Oshchepkova, Apollinaria Chursina. 2021. Short- and Long-Term Effects of Passive and Active Screen Time on Young Children's Phonological Memory. *Frontiers in Education* 6. . [[Crossref](#)]
303. Cristina Borra, Martin Browning, Almudena Sevilla. 2021. Marriage and housework. *Oxford Economic Papers* 73:2, 479-508. [[Crossref](#)]
304. Guanfu Fang, Yu Chen. 2021. Sibling Rivalry: Evidence from China's Compulsory Schooling Reform. *The B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy* 21:2, 611-656. [[Crossref](#)]
305. Martin Browning, Olivier Donni, Mette Gørtz. 2021. Do you have time to take a walk together? Private and joint time within the household. *The Economic Journal* 131:635, 1051-1080. [[Crossref](#)]

306. Tom Buchanan, Adian McFarlane, Anupam Das. 2021. Examining the family dynamics of the Canadian gender income gap. *SN Social Sciences* 1:4. . [[Crossref](#)]
307. Luca Gori, Mauro Sodini. 2021. A CONTRIBUTION TO THE THEORY OF FERTILITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT. *Macroeconomic Dynamics* 25:3, 753-775. [[Crossref](#)]
308. Rupa Ghosh, Sudeshna Lahiri. 2021. Academic Involvement in Children's Education: An Investigation into the Lives of Domestic Worker Parents of Kolkata. *Issues and Ideas in Education* 9:1, 21-32. [[Crossref](#)]
309. Claudia Schmiedeberg, Christiane Bozoyan. 2021. Do Economic Hardship and Pressure Really Influence Parenting?. *European Sociological Review* 37:2, 287-304. [[Crossref](#)]
310. Cynthia Bansak, Martha Starr. 2021. Covid-19 shocks to education supply: how 200,000 U.S. households dealt with the sudden shift to distance learning. *Review of Economics of the Household* 19:1, 63-90. [[Crossref](#)]
311. Lisa A. Gennetian, Christopher Rodrigues. 2021. Mothers' and Fathers' Time Spent with Children in the U.S.: Variations by Race/Ethnicity Within Income from 2003 to 2013. *Journal of Economics, Race, and Policy* 4:1, 34-46. [[Crossref](#)]
312. Irina Hondralis, Corinna Kleinert. 2021. Do children influence their mothers' decisions? Early child development and maternal employment entries after birth. *Advances in Life Course Research* 47, 100378. [[Crossref](#)]
313. Soo Hyun Cho, Roudi Nazarinia Roy, Nancy Dayne. 2021. Student-Parents' Mental Health: Factors Affecting Anxiety and Depression. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal* 49:3, 254-269. [[Crossref](#)]
314. Qiang Gao, Mingfeng Lin, D. J. Wu. 2021. Education Crowdfunding and Student Performance: An Empirical Study. *Information Systems Research* 32:1, 53-71. [[Crossref](#)]
315. Sandra E Black, Sanni Breining, David N Figlio, Jonathan Guryan, Krzysztof Karbownik, Helena Skyt Nielsen, Jeffrey Roth, Marianne Simonsen. 2021. Sibling Spillovers. *The Economic Journal* 131:633, 101-128. [[Crossref](#)]
316. Andrea Pellegrini, Abdul Rawoof Pinjari, Rico Maggi. 2021. A multiple discrete continuous model of time use that accommodates non-additively separable utility functions along with time and monetary budget constraints. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* 144, 37-53. [[Crossref](#)]
317. Terri J. Sabol, Teresa Eckrich Sommer, P. Lindsay Chase-Lansdale, Jeanne Brooks-Gunn. 2021. Intergenerational Economic Mobility for Low-Income Parents and Their Children: A Dual Developmental Science Framework. *Annual Review of Psychology* 72:1, 265-292. [[Crossref](#)]
318. James Kai-Sing Kung. The World's First Meritocracy Through the Lens of Institutions and Cultural Persistence 159-184. [[Crossref](#)]
319. Nicole Hiekel. Understanding the Mechanisms of Intergenerational Social Inequality in Demographic Behavior 141-153. [[Crossref](#)]
320. Konstantina Rentzou. The Case of a Self-Developed Community of Learners Outdoors: Benefits and Challenges for Stay-at-Home-Moms and Their Toddlers 241-267. [[Crossref](#)]
321. Brian Asquith, Judith K. Hellerstein, Mark J. Kutzbach, David Neumark. 2021. Social capital determinants and labor market networks. *Journal of Regional Science* 61:1, 212-260. [[Crossref](#)]
322. Markus Klein, Michael Kühhirt. 2021. Direct and Indirect Effects of Grandparent Education on Grandchildren's Cognitive Development: The Role of Parental Cognitive Ability. *Sociological Science* 8, 265-284. [[Crossref](#)]
323. Sudong Hua. 2021. The Roles of Home Production and Skill Heterogeneity in the Labor Wedge. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 55. . [[Crossref](#)]

324. José Ignacio Giménez-Nadal, Jose Alberto Molina Chueca, Jorge Velilla. 2021. Two-Way Commuting: Asymmetries from Time Use Surveys. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **122**. . [[Crossref](#)]
325. Seongeun Kim, Michèle Tertilt, Minchul Yum. 2021. Status Externalities and Low Birth Rates in Korea. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **104**. . [[Crossref](#)]
326. Anson Zhou. 2021. Building Future Generations: The Macroeconomic Consequences of Family Policies. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **127**. . [[Crossref](#)]
327. Chun Wang. 2021. The Effects of Intergenerational Transmission on Education. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **2011**. . [[Crossref](#)]
328. Daniela Del Boca, Chiara Daniela Pronzato, Lucia Schiavon. 2021. How do parenting courses affect families' time use? Evidence from an RCT experiment in Italy. *RIV Rassegna Italiana di Valutazione* **79**, 39-59. [[Crossref](#)]
329. Job Boerma, Loukas Karabarbounis. 2021. Inferring Inequality With Home Production. *Econometrica* **89**:5, 2517-2556. [[Crossref](#)]
330. Maya Escueta, Andre Joshua Nickow, Philip Oreopoulos, Vincent Quan. 2020. Upgrading Education with Technology: Insights from Experimental Research. *Journal of Economic Literature* **58**:4, 897-996. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
331. Christian K. Darko, Nicholas Vasilakos. 2020. Picking winners: An empirical analysis of the determinants of educational outcomes in India. *British Educational Research Journal* **46**:6, 1445-1467. [[Crossref](#)]
332. Francine D. Blau, Lawrence M. Kahn, Matthew Comey, Amanda Eng, Pamela Meyerhofer, Alexander Willén. 2020. Culture and gender allocation of tasks: source country characteristics and the division of non-market work among US immigrants. *Review of Economics of the Household* **18**:4, 907-958. [[Crossref](#)]
333. Meera Choi, Hannah Tessler, Grace Kao. 2020. Arts and crafts as an educational strategy and coping mechanism for Republic of Korea and United States parents during the COVID-19 pandemic. *International Review of Education* **66**:5-6, 715-735. [[Crossref](#)]
334. Cristian Bortes, Mattias Strandh, Karina Nilsson. 2020. Parental Illness and Young People's Education. *Child Indicators Research* **13**:6, 2069-2091. [[Crossref](#)]
335. Janne Mikkonen, Hanna Remes, Heta Moustgaard, Pekka Martikainen. 2020. Evaluating the Role of Parental Education and Adolescent Health Problems in Educational Attainment. *Demography* **57**:6, 2245-2267. [[Crossref](#)]
336. Teevrat Garg, Matthew Gibson, Fanglin Sun. 2020. Extreme temperatures and time use in China. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **180**, 309-324. [[Crossref](#)]
337. Emine Kübra Usta. 2020. Effects of Maternal Education on Early Nonmonetary Investments in Child Development. *Journal of Human Capital* **14**:4, 535-583. [[Crossref](#)]
338. Jeehoon Han, Bruce D. Meyer, James X. Sullivan. 2020. Inequality in the joint distribution of consumption and time use. *Journal of Public Economics* **191**, 104106. [[Crossref](#)]
339. Ting Chen, James Kai-sing Kung, Chicheng Ma. 2020. Long Live Keju! The Persistent Effects of China's Civil Examination System. *The Economic Journal* **130**:631, 2030-2064. [[Crossref](#)]
340. Weidong Wang, Yongqing Dong, Xiaohong Liu, Yunli Bai, Linxiu Zhang. 2020. The effect of parents' education on the academic and non-cognitive outcomes of their children: Evidence from China. *Children and Youth Services Review* **117**, 105307. [[Crossref](#)]
341. Jorge Cuartas, Dana Charles McCoy, Andrés Molano. 2020. The acute effect of community violent crime on maternal engagement in cognitive and socioemotional stimulation. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* **45**, 143-154. [[Crossref](#)]

342. Angela Gialamas, Dandara G Haag, Murthy N Mittinty, John W Lynch. 2020. Educational activities on language and behavioural outcomes at school entry are more important for socioeconomically disadvantaged children: a prospective observational study of Australian children. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* **74**:10, 770-777. [[Crossref](#)]
343. Deni Mazrekaj, Kristof De Witte, Sofie Cabus. 2020. School Outcomes of Children Raised by Same-Sex Parents: Evidence from Administrative Panel Data. *American Sociological Review* **85**:5, 830-856. [[Crossref](#)]
344. Christine M.T. Pitts, Megan Kuhfeld. 2020. Mind the kinder-gap: New data on children's math and reading skills as they enter kindergarten. *Phi Delta Kappan* **102**:2, 36-39. [[Crossref](#)]
345. Quynh-Anh N. Nguyen, Thach D. Tran, Tu-Anh Tran, T. A. Nguyen, Jane Fisher. 2020. Perceived Parenting Styles and Emotional Intelligence Among Adolescents in Vietnam. *The Family Journal* **28**:4, 441-454. [[Crossref](#)]
346. Christina M. Padilla. 2020. Beyond Just the Average Effect: Variation in Head Start Treatment Effects on Parenting Behavior. *AERA Open* **6**:4. . [[Crossref](#)]
347. Yılmaz SARIER, Şengül UYSAL. 2020. Ortaöğretim Kurumlarında Yönetime Katılım: Okul Paydaşlarının Görüşleri. *Trakya Eğitim Dergisi* **10**:3, 950-965. [[Crossref](#)]
348. Sharmila Jayasingam, Safiah Omar, Norizah Mohd Mustamil, Rosmawani Che Hashim, Raida Abu Bakar. Feeling Stressed at Work, Behaving Badly at Home 63-105. [[Crossref](#)]
349. Slawa Rokicki, Mark E. McGovern. 2020. Heterogeneity in Early Life Investments: A Longitudinal Analysis of Children's Time Use. *Review of Income and Wealth* **66**:3, 647-676. [[Crossref](#)]
350. Cheti Nicoletti, Valentina Tinei. 2020. Do parental time investments react to changes in child's skills and health?. *European Economic Review* **127**, 103491. [[Crossref](#)]
351. Francesca Barigozzi, Helmuth Cremer, Kerstin Roeder. 2020. Having it all, for all: Child-care subsidies and income distribution reconciled. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **176**, 188-211. [[Crossref](#)]
352. Simen Markussen, Knut Røed. 2020. Economic Mobility Under Pressure. *Journal of the European Economic Association* **18**:4, 1844-1885. [[Crossref](#)]
353. Pablo Gracia, Joan Garcia-Roman, Tomi Oinas, Timo Anttila. 2020. Child and Adolescent Time Use: A Cross-National Study. *Journal of Marriage and Family* **82**:4, 1304-1325. [[Crossref](#)]
354. Steven B. Caudill, Stephanie O. Crofton, João Ricardo Faria, Neela D. Manage, Franklin G. Mixon, Mary Greer Simonton. 2020. Property confiscation and the intergenerational transmission of education in post-1948 Eastern Europe. *Public Choice* **184**:1-2, 1-41. [[Crossref](#)]
355. Christina M. Padilla, Caitlin T. Hines, Rebecca M. Ryan. 2020. Infant temperament, parenting and behavior problems: Variation by parental education and income. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology* **70**, 101179. [[Crossref](#)]
356. Lan Wei. 2020. Trends in Parental Time Allocated to Child Care: Evidence from Canada, 1986-2010. *Canadian Public Policy* **46**:2, 236-252. [[Crossref](#)]
357. Corina Mommaerts, Yulya Truskinovsky. 2020. The cyclicity of informal care. *Journal of Health Economics* **71**, 102306. [[Crossref](#)]
358. Cristian Bortes, Mattias Strandh, Karina Nilsson. 2020. Sibling Ill Health and Children's Educational Outcomes. *Journal of School Health* **90**:5, 407-414. [[Crossref](#)]
359. Nigar Hashimzade. 2020. Endogenous preferences for parenting and macroeconomic outcomes. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **172**, 267-279. [[Crossref](#)]
360. Eric D. Gould, Avi Simhon, Bruce A. Weinberg. 2020. Does Parental Quality Matter? Evidence on the Transmission of Human Capital Using Variation in Parental Influence from Death, Divorce, and Family Size. *Journal of Labor Economics* **38**:2, 569-610. [[Crossref](#)]

361. Angela Gialamas, Dandara G Haag, Murthy N Mittinty, John Lynch. 2020. Which time investments in the first 5 years of life matter most for children's language and behavioural outcomes at school entry?. *International Journal of Epidemiology* 49:2, 548-558. [[Crossref](#)]
362. Alvaro Hofflinger, Paul T. von Hippel. 2020. Does Achievement Rise Fastest with School Choice, School Resources, or Family Resources? Chile from 2002 to 2013. *Sociology of Education* 93:2, 132-152. [[Crossref](#)]
363. Chalachew Getahun Desta. 2020. Resources, Time and Gender: Determinants of Women's Housework in Bahir Dar and Nearby Rural Villages, Northwest Ethiopia. *Journal of Family Issues* 41:4, 507-541. [[Crossref](#)]
364. Ryosuke Nakamura, Jun Yamashita, Hideo Akabayashi, Teruyuki Tamura, Yang Zhou. 2020. A comparative analysis of children's time use and educational achievement: Assessing evidence from China, Japan and the United States. *Chinese Journal of Sociology* 6:2, 257-285. [[Crossref](#)]
365. Juan Carlos Campaña, J. Ignacio Giménez-Nadal, José Alberto Molina. 2020. Self-employed and Employed Mothers in Latin American Families: Are There Differences in Paid Work, Unpaid Work, and Child Care?. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 41:1, 52-69. [[Crossref](#)]
366. Elizabeth M. Caucutt, Lance Lochner. 2020. Early and Late Human Capital Investments, Borrowing Constraints, and the Family. *Journal of Political Economy* 128:3, 1065-1147. [[Crossref](#)]
367. Guanyi Yang, Cynthia Bansak. 2020. Does wealth matter? An assessment of China's rural-urban migration on the education of left-behind children. *China Economic Review* 59, 101365. [[Crossref](#)]
368. Owen N. Schochet, Anna D. Johnson, Rebecca M. Ryan. 2020. The relationship between increases in low-income mothers' education and children's early outcomes: Variation by developmental stage and domain. *Children and Youth Services Review* 109, 104705. [[Crossref](#)]
369. Emin Gahramanov, Rashad Hasanov, Xueli Tang. 2020. Parental involvement and Children's human capital: A tax-subsidy experiment. *Economic Modelling* 85, 16-29. [[Crossref](#)]
370. Martin O'Flaherty, Janeen Baxter. 2020. The 'developmental gradient' revisited: Australian children's time with adult caregivers from infancy to middle childhood. *Social Science Research* 86, 102397. [[Crossref](#)]
371. Ioannis Giovos, Dimitrios K. Moutopoulos, Anastasia Charitou, Joan Gonzalvo. 2020. Primary school students' awareness about cetaceans in Greece. *Applied Environmental Education & Communication* 19:1, 101-115. [[Crossref](#)]
372. John McCollough. 2020. The impact of consumers' time constraint and conspicuous consumption behaviour on the throwaway society. *International Journal of Consumer Studies* 44:1, 33-43. [[Crossref](#)]
373. José Ignacio Giménez-Nadal, Jose Alberto Molina Chueca, Jorge Velilla. 2020. Short- vs Long-Term Intergenerational Correlations of Employment and Self-Employment in Europe. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 122. . [[Crossref](#)]
374. Umair Ali, Chris M. Herbst, Christos Makridis. 2020. The Impact of COVID-19 on the U.S. Child Care Market: Evidence from Stay-at-Home Orders. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 50. . [[Crossref](#)]
375. Xiqian Cai, Jingcheng Fu, Yi Lu, Xiangming Tang, Songfa Zhong. 2020. Assessing Inequality in the School Closure Response to COVID-19. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 123. . [[Crossref](#)]
376. Alexandr Kopytov, Nikolai L. Roussanov, Mathieu Taschereau-Dumouchel. 2020. Cheap Thrills: the Price of Leisure and the Global Decline in Work Hours. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 58. . [[Crossref](#)]
377. Minchul Yum. 2020. Parental Time Investment and Intergenerational Mobility. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 127. . [[Crossref](#)]
378. Laurie F. DeRose, Frances Goldscheider, Javiera Reyes Brito, Andrés Salazar-Arango, Paul Corcuera, Paul J. Corcuera, Montserrat Gas-Aixendri. 2019. Are Children Barriers to the Gender Revolution? International Comparisons. *European Journal of Population* 35:5, 987-1021. [[Crossref](#)]

379. Jane Cooley Fruehwirth, Jessica Gagete-Miranda. 2019. Your peers' parents: Spillovers from parental education. *Economics of Education Review* **73**, 101910. [[Crossref](#)]
380. Daniel A. Hackman, Stephanie A. Robert, Jascha Grübel, Raphael P. Weibel, Eirini Anagnostou, Christoph Hölscher, Victor R. Schinazi. 2019. Neighborhood environments influence emotion and physiological reactivity. *Scientific Reports* **9**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
381. Sean F. Reardon, Erin M. Fahle, Demetra Kalogrides, Anne Podolsky, Rosalía C. Zárate. 2019. Gender Achievement Gaps in U.S. School Districts. *American Educational Research Journal* **56**:6, 2474-2508. [[Crossref](#)]
382. Sabine Blaurock, Katharina Kluczniok. 2019. Basic care, play, and teaching: the home learning environment and the 'developmental gradient' in time use with children. *Early Child Development and Care* **189**:13, 2099-2112. [[Crossref](#)]
383. Joseph Price, Ariel Kalil. 2019. The Effect of Mother–Child Reading Time on Children's Reading Skills: Evidence From Natural Within-Family Variation. *Child Development* **90**:6. . [[Crossref](#)]
384. Jianghong Liu, Chun Yee Natalie Au Yeung, Patrick W. L. Leung. 2019. The Mediation of Maternal Occupational Skillfulness on Maternal Education and Chinese Preschoolers' Behavior. *Child Indicators Research* **12**:5, 1529-1547. [[Crossref](#)]
385. Alessandro Gavazza, Mattia Nardotto, Tommaso Valletti. 2019. Internet and Politics: Evidence from U.K. Local Elections and Local Government Policies. *The Review of Economic Studies* **86**:5, 2092-2135. [[Crossref](#)]
386. Juan Carlos Córdoba, Marla Ripoll. 2019. The Elasticity of Intergenerational Substitution, Parental Altruism, and Fertility Choice. *The Review of Economic Studies* **86**:5, 1935-1972. [[Crossref](#)]
387. Sandra Ferrando-Latorre, Jorge Velilla, Raquel Ortega. 2019. Intergenerational Transmission of Entrepreneurial Activity in Spanish Families. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* **40**:3, 390-407. [[Crossref](#)]
388. Owen N. Schochet, Anna D. Johnson. 2019. The Impact of Child Care Subsidies on Mothers' Education Outcomes. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* **40**:3, 367-389. [[Crossref](#)]
389. Jun Sung Kim, Jongkwan Lee. 2019. The role of intergenerational mobility in internal migration. *Economic Modelling* **81**, 1-15. [[Crossref](#)]
390. Ying Cui, Hong Liu, Liqiu Zhao. 2019. Mother's education and child development: Evidence from the compulsory school reform in China. *Journal of Comparative Economics* **47**:3, 669-692. [[Crossref](#)]
391. Iñaki Permanyer, Albert Esteve, Joan Garcia. 2019. Decomposing patterns of college marital sorting in 118 countries: Structural constraints versus assortative mating. *Social Science Research* **83**, 102313. [[Crossref](#)]
392. Zexing Chen, Bing Li, Tao Li. 2019. Exports and left-behind children : Empirical evidence from the China Migrants Dynamic Survey. *Review of International Economics* **27**:4, 1081-1107. [[Crossref](#)]
393. Barbara Otto, Julia Karbach. 2019. The effects of private tutoring on students' perception of their parents' academic involvement and the quality of their parent-child relationship. *Educational Psychology* **39**:7, 923-940. [[Crossref](#)]
394. Cristina Borra, Almudena Sevilla. 2019. COMPETITION FOR UNIVERSITY PLACES AND PARENTAL TIME INVESTMENTS: EVIDENCE FROM THE UNITED KINGDOM. *Economic Inquiry* **57**:3, 1460-1479. [[Crossref](#)]
395. Silvia Mendolia, Nga Nguyen, Oleg Yerokhin. 2019. The impact of parental illness on children's schooling and labour force participation: evidence from Vietnam. *Review of Economics of the Household* **17**:2, 469-492. [[Crossref](#)]
396. Giovanni Busetta, Maria Gabriella Campolo, Antonino Di Pino. 2019. Children's Use of Time and Well-Being in Italy. *Child Indicators Research* **12**:3, 821-845. [[Crossref](#)]

397. Xiaoyan Youderian. 2019. HUMAN CAPITAL PRODUCTION WITH PARENTAL TIME INVESTMENT IN EARLY CHILDHOOD. *Macroeconomic Dynamics* 23:4, 1504-1527. [[Crossref](#)]
398. Fábio Saraiva Flôres, Luis P. Rodrigues, Fernando Copetti, Frederico Lopes, Rita Cordovil. 2019. Affordances for Motor Skill Development in Home, School, and Sport Environments: A Narrative Review. *Perceptual and Motor Skills* 126:3, 366-388. [[Crossref](#)]
399. Catherine Haeck, Samuel Paré, Pierre Lefebvre, Philip Merrigan. 2019. Paid Parental Leave: Leaner Might Be Better. *Canadian Public Policy* 45:2, 212-238. [[Crossref](#)]
400. Albert Cheng, Paul E. Peterson. 2019. Experimental Estimates of Impacts of Cost-Earnings Information on Adult Aspirations for Children's Postsecondary Education. *The Journal of Higher Education* 90:3, 486-511. [[Crossref](#)]
401. Allison Vreeland, Meredith A. Gruhn, Kelly H. Watson, Alexandra H. Bettis, Bruce E. Compas, Rex Forehand, Alexandra D. Sullivan. 2019. Parenting in Context: Associations of Parental Depression and Socioeconomic Factors with Parenting Behaviors. *Journal of Child and Family Studies* 28:4, 1124-1133. [[Crossref](#)]
402. Jisoo Hwang, Chulhee Lee, Esther Lee. 2019. Gender norms and housework time allocation among dual-earner couples. *Labour Economics* 57, 102-116. [[Crossref](#)]
403. Patricia Cortés, Jessica Pan. 2019. When Time Binds: Substitutes for Household Production, Returns to Working Long Hours, and the Skilled Gender Wage Gap. *Journal of Labor Economics* 37:2, 351-398. [[Crossref](#)]
404. Christina M. Padilla, Rebecca M. Ryan. 2019. The link between child temperament and low-income mothers' and fathers' parenting. *Infant Mental Health Journal* 40:2, 217-233. [[Crossref](#)]
405. Jade Marcus Jenkins, Sudhanshu Handa. 2019. Parenting skills and early childhood development: production function estimates from longitudinal data. *Review of Economics of the Household* 17:1, 121-147. [[Crossref](#)]
406. Katherin Barg. 2019. Why are middle-class parents more involved in school than working-class parents?. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 59, 14-24. [[Crossref](#)]
407. Long Doan, Natasha Quadlin. 2019. Partner Characteristics and Perceptions of Responsibility for Housework and Child Care. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 81:1, 145-163. [[Crossref](#)]
408. Tomás Cano, Francisco Perales, Janeen Baxter. 2019. A Matter of Time: Father Involvement and Child Cognitive Outcomes. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 81:1, 164-184. [[Crossref](#)]
409. Shu Hu, Wei-Jun Jean Yeung. 2019. Education and Childrearing Decision-Making in East Asia. *Chinese Sociological Review* 51:1, 29-56. [[Crossref](#)]
410. Luca Gori, Piero Manfredi, Mauro Sodini. HIV/AIDS, Demography and Development: Individual Choices Versus Public Policies in SSA 323-356. [[Crossref](#)]
411. Pierre-Richard Agénor. Health and Knowledge Externalities: Implications for Growth and Public Policy 251-293. [[Crossref](#)]
412. Eric A. Hanushek, Paul E. Peterson, Laura Talpey, Ludger Woessmann. 2019. The Unwavering SES Achievement Gap: Trends in U.S. Student Performance. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 56. . [[Crossref](#)]
413. Aiday Sikhova, Sven Oskarsson, Rafael Ahlskog. 2019. Better Parents or Richer Parents: Understanding Intergenerational Transmission of Human Capital. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 36. . [[Crossref](#)]
414. Zeldia Brutti, Daniel Montolio. 2019. Preventing Criminal Minds: Early Education Access and Adult Offending Behavior. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 69. . [[Crossref](#)]
415. Christos Makridis, Stephen Strosko. 2019. Refined by Fire: The Great Depression and Entrepreneurship. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 91. . [[Crossref](#)]

416. Qiang Gao, Mingfeng Lin, D. J. Wu. 2019. Minuscule but Impactful: The Effects of Educational Crowdfunding on Student Performance. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 25. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
417. J. Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, José Alberto Molina, Yu Zhu. 2018. Intergenerational mobility of housework time in the United Kingdom. *Review of Economics of the Household* 16:4, 911-937. [\[Crossref\]](#)
418. Greg J. Duncan, Kenneth T. H. Lee, Maria Rosales-Rueda, Ariel Kalil. 2018. Maternal Age and Child Development. *Demography* 55:6, 2229-2255. [\[Crossref\]](#)
419. Mari Rege, Ingeborg Foldøy Solli, Ingunn Størksen, Mark Votruba. 2018. Variation in center quality in a universal publicly subsidized and regulated childcare system. *Labour Economics* 55, 230-240. [\[Crossref\]](#)
420. Thomas Cornelissen, Christian Dustmann, Anna Raute, Uta Schönberg. 2018. Who Benefits from Universal Child Care? Estimating Marginal Returns to Early Child Care Attendance. *Journal of Political Economy* 126:6, 2356-2409. [\[Crossref\]](#)
421. Teodora Boneva, Christopher Rauh. 2018. Parental Beliefs about Returns to Educational Investments —The Later the Better?. *Journal of the European Economic Association* 16:6, 1669-1711. [\[Crossref\]](#)
422. Laura Betancur, Elizabeth Votruba-Drzal, Christian Schunn. 2018. Socioeconomic gaps in science achievement. *International Journal of STEM Education* 5:1. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
423. Bi Ying Hu, Gregory Kirk Johnson, Huiping Wu. 2018. Screen time relationship of Chinese parents and their children. *Children and Youth Services Review* 94, 659-669. [\[Crossref\]](#)
424. Guido Cozzi, Marco Francesconi, Shelly Lundberg, Noemi Mantovan, Robert M. Sauer. 2018. Advancing the economics of gender: New insights and a roadmap for the future. *European Economic Review* 109, 1-8. [\[Crossref\]](#)
425. Richard Blundell, Luigi Pistaferri, Itay Saporta-Eksten. 2018. Children, Time Allocation, and Consumption Insurance. *Journal of Political Economy* 126:S1, S73-S115. [\[Crossref\]](#)
426. Gary S. Becker, Scott Duke Kominers, Kevin M. Murphy, Jörg L. Spenkuch. 2018. A Theory of Intergenerational Mobility. *Journal of Political Economy* 126:S1, S7-S25. [\[Crossref\]](#)
427. Jude Ball, Dalice Sim, Richard Edwards. 2018. Why has adolescent smoking declined dramatically? Trend analysis using repeat cross-sectional data from New Zealand 2002–2015. *BMJ Open* 8:10, e020320. [\[Crossref\]](#)
428. Raymundo M. Campos-Vazquez. 2018. Intergenerational Persistence of Skills and Socioeconomic Status. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 39:3, 509-523. [\[Crossref\]](#)
429. David J. Purpura, Erin E. Reid. 2018. Mathematics and language: Individual and group differences in mathematical language skills in young children. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 36, 259-268. [\[Crossref\]](#)
430. Naser A. Alsharairi, Shawn Somerset. 2018. Parental work status and children's dietary consumption: Australian evidence. *International Journal of Consumer Studies* 42:5, 522-532. [\[Crossref\]](#)
431. Laurie F. DeRose, Gloria Huarcaya, Andrés Salazar-Arango. 2018. Father Absence and the Reverse Gender Gap in Latin American Education. *Journal of Family Issues* 39:13, 3508-3534. [\[Crossref\]](#)
432. Seth Gershenson, Erdal Tekin. 2018. The Effect of Community Traumatic Events on Student Achievement: Evidence from the Beltway Sniper Attacks. *Education Finance and Policy* 13:4, 513-544. [\[Crossref\]](#)
433. Daniela Veronica Negraia, Jennifer March Augustine, Kate Chambers Prickett. 2018. Gender Disparities in Parenting Time Across Activities, Child Ages, and Educational Groups. *Journal of Family Issues* 39:11, 3006-3028. [\[Crossref\]](#)
434. Ki Young Park, Soohyon Kim. 2018. Allocation of Time and Household-level Consumption Equivalent Welfare: A Case of South Korea. *Global Economic Review* 47:3, 337-365. [\[Crossref\]](#)

435. Cheti Nicoletti, Kjell G. Salvanes, Emma Tominey. 2018. The Family Peer Effect on Mothers' Labor Supply. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 10:3, 206-234. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
436. Paula E. Gobbi. 2018. Childcare and commitment within households. *Journal of Economic Theory* 176, 503-551. [[Crossref](#)]
437. Andrew Dickerson, Gurleen Popli. 2018. The Many Dimensions of Child Poverty: Evidence from the UK Millennium Cohort Study *. *Fiscal Studies* 39:2, 265-298. [[Crossref](#)]
438. Daniel Schneider, Orestes P. Hastings, Joe LaBriola. 2018. Income Inequality and Class Divides in Parental Investments. *American Sociological Review* 83:3, 475-507. [[Crossref](#)]
439. Maria Marti, Emily C. Merz, Kelsey R. Repka, Cassie Landers, Kimberly G. Noble, Helena Duch. 2018. Parent Involvement in the Getting Ready for School Intervention Is Associated With Changes in School Readiness Skills. *Frontiers in Psychology* 9. . [[Crossref](#)]
440. Cheti Nicoletti, Kjell G. Salvanes, Emma Tominey. Response of Parental Investments to Child's Health Endowment at Birth 175-199. [[Crossref](#)]
441. JOHN A. LIST, ANYA SAMEK, DANA L. SUSKIND. 2018. Combining behavioral economics and field experiments to reimagine early childhood education. *Behavioural Public Policy* 2:1, 1-21. [[Crossref](#)]
442. Marianne Bertrand. 2018. Coase Lecture – The Glass Ceiling. *Economica* 85:338, 205-231. [[Crossref](#)]
443. Michelle Hatch, Dorrit Posel. 2018. Who cares for children? A quantitative study of childcare in South Africa. *Development Southern Africa* 35:2, 267-282. [[Crossref](#)]
444. Sebastian Ellingsen, Øystein Hernæs. 2018. The impact of commercial television on turnout and public policy: Evidence from Norwegian local politics. *Journal of Public Economics* 159, 1-15. [[Crossref](#)]
445. Francesca Carta, Marta De Philippis. 2018. You've come a long way, baby. Husbands' commuting time and family labour supply. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 69, 25-37. [[Crossref](#)]
446. Andrew Clarke. 2018. Age at Immigration and the Educational Attainment of Foreign-Born Children in the United States. *International Migration Review* 52:1, 209-235. [[Crossref](#)]
447. Toni Mora, Josep-Oriol Escardibul. 2018. Home Environment and Parental Involvement in Homework During Adolescence in Catalonia (Spain). *Youth & Society* 50:2, 183-203. [[Crossref](#)]
448. Andrew Clarke. 2018. Age at Immigration and the Educational Attainment of Foreign-Born Children in the United States. *International Migration Review* 52:1, 209-235. [[Crossref](#)]
449. Warn N. Lekfuangfu, Nattavudh Powdthavee, Nele Warrinnier, Francesca Cornaglia. 2018. Locus of Control and its Intergenerational Implications for Early Childhood Skill Formation. *The Economic Journal* 128:608, 298-329. [[Crossref](#)]
450. Jeffrey Neilson, Maria Stanfors. 2018. Time Alone or Together? Trends and Trade-offs Among Dual-Earner Couples, Sweden 1990–2010. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 80:1, 80-98. [[Crossref](#)]
451. Giulia Maria Dotti Sani. Theoretical Background 11-25. [[Crossref](#)]
452. Giulia Maria Dotti Sani. Parenthood and Domestic Work: A Never-Ending Workload 79-102. [[Crossref](#)]
453. J. Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, Jose Alberto Molina, Jorge Velilla. 2018. The commuting behavior of workers in the United States: Differences between the employed and the self-employed. *Journal of Transport Geography* 66, 19-29. [[Crossref](#)]
454. Simon Darcy, Paul Francis Burke. 2018. On the road again: The barriers and benefits of automobility for people with disability. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* 107, 229-245. [[Crossref](#)]
455. Seth Gershenson, Michael S. Hayes. 2018. The Implications of Summer Learning Loss for Value-Added Estimates of Teacher Effectiveness. *Educational Policy* 32:1, 55-85. [[Crossref](#)]

456. Ewout Verriest. 2018. Household Labor Supply, Child Development and Childcare Policies in the United States. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 44. . [[Crossref](#)]
457. Keith Goldstein, Angela Vatalaro, Gad Yair. 2017. Parent-based early childhood interventions do make a difference! A rebuttal to See and Gorard (2015a). *Journal of Children's Services* 12:4, 224-238. [[Crossref](#)]
458. Douglas M. Teti, Pamela M. Cole, Natasha Cabrera, Sherryl H. Goodman, Vonnie C. McLoyd. 2017. Supporting Parents: How Six Decades of Parenting Research Can Inform Policy and Best Practice. *Social Policy Report* 30:5, 1-34. [[Crossref](#)]
459. Erika Arenas. 2017. Abuelos at home: Differential impact on children's education by family structure. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 52, 36-48. [[Crossref](#)]
460. Kieron Barclay, Martin Hällsten, Mikko Myrskylä. 2017. Birth Order and College Major in Sweden. *Social Forces* 96:2, 629-660. [[Crossref](#)]
461. Gerald J. Maarman, Kim Lamont-Mbawuli. 2017. A review of challenges in South African education and possible ways to improve educational outcome as suggested by decades of research. *Africa Education Review* 14:3-4, 263-289. [[Crossref](#)]
462. Rukmini Banerji, James Berry, Marc Shotland. 2017. The Impact of Maternal Literacy and Participation Programs: Evidence from a Randomized Evaluation in India. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 9:4, 303-337. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
463. Jane Greve, Marie Louise Schultz-Nielsen, Erdal Tekin. 2017. Fetal malnutrition and academic success: Evidence from Muslim immigrants in Denmark. *Economics of Education Review* 60, 20-35. [[Crossref](#)]
464. Michelle Luciano. 2017. Making Reading Easier: How Genetic Information Can Help. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 4:2, 147-154. [[Crossref](#)]
465. Patrick Bauer, Lyudmyla Sonchak. 2017. The effect of macroeconomic conditions on parental time with children: evidence from the American time use survey. *Review of Economics of the Household* 15:3, 905-924. [[Crossref](#)]
466. Katie Vinopal, Seth Gershenson. 2017. Re-Conceptualizing Gaps by Socioeconomic Status in Parental Time with Children. *Social Indicators Research* 133:2, 623-643. [[Crossref](#)]
467. Melissa S. Kearney, Phillip B. Levine. 2017. The Economics of Nonmarital Childbearing and the Marriage Premium for Children. *Annual Review of Economics* 9:1, 327-352. [[Crossref](#)]
468. Nicole M. Fortin, Brian Bell, Michael Böhm. 2017. Top earnings inequality and the gender pay gap: Canada, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. *Labour Economics* 47, 107-123. [[Crossref](#)]
469. Carrie L. Shandra, Anna Penner. 2017. Benefactors and Beneficiaries? Disability and Care to Others. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 79:4, 1160-1185. [[Crossref](#)]
470. Jere R. Behrman, Whitney Schott, Subha Mani, Benjamin T. Crookston, Kirk Dearden, Le Thuc Duc, Lia C. H. Fernald, Aryeh D. Stein. 2017. Intergenerational Transmission of Poverty and Inequality: Parental Resources and Schooling Attainment and Children's Human Capital in Ethiopia, India, Peru, and Vietnam. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 65:4, 657-697. [[Crossref](#)]
471. Mehmet Ali SOYTAŞ. 2017. ÇOCUĞA YAPILAN ZAMAN YATIRIMLARININ İŞ GÜCÜ PİYASASINDAKİ KADIN-ERKEK ÜCRET FARKLILIĞINA ETKİLERİ. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi* 35:2, 121-121. [[Crossref](#)]
472. Juan Carlos Campaña, J. Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, Jose Alberto Molina. 2017. Increasing the Human Capital of Children in Latin American Countries: The Role of Parents' Time in Childcare. *The Journal of Development Studies* 53:6, 805-825. [[Crossref](#)]

473. J. Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, Jose Alberto Molina, Raquel Ortega. 2017. Like my parents at home? Gender differences in children's housework in Germany and Spain. *Empirical Economics* 52:4, 1143-1179. [[Crossref](#)]
474. Yuko Nozaki. 2017. The effects of higher education on childrearing fertility behavior in Japan. *International Journal of Social Economics* 44:5, 653-669. [[Crossref](#)]
475. Richard W. Patterson. 2017. Could trends in time children spend with parents help explain the black-white gap in human capital? Evidence from the American Time Use Survey. *Education Economics* 25:3, 219-233. [[Crossref](#)]
476. Mónica Hernández-Alava, Gurleen Popli. 2017. Children's Development and Parental Input: Evidence From the UK Millennium Cohort Study. *Demography* 54:2, 485-511. [[Crossref](#)]
477. Daniela Del Boca, Chiara Monfardini, Cheti Nicoletti. 2017. Parental and Child Time Investments and the Cognitive Development of Adolescents. *Journal of Labor Economics* 35:2, 565-608. [[Crossref](#)]
478. Seth Gershenson, Alison Jackowitz, Andrew Brannegan. 2017. Are Student Absences Worth the Worry in U.S. Primary Schools?. *Education Finance and Policy* 12:2, 137-165. [[Crossref](#)]
479. Mette Kjærgaard Thomsen. 2017. Citizen Coproduction. *The American Review of Public Administration* 47:3, 340-353. [[Crossref](#)]
480. José Alberto Molina, Juan Carlos Campaña, Raquel Ortega. 2017. Children's interaction with the Internet: time dedicated to communications and games. *Applied Economics Letters* 24:6, 359-364. [[Crossref](#)]
481. Frank Heiland, Joseph Price, Riley Wilson. 2017. Maternal employment and time investments in children. *Review of Economics of the Household* 15:1, 53-67. [[Crossref](#)]
482. George Argyrous, Lyn Craig, Sara Rahman. 2017. The Effect of a First Born Child on Work and Childcare Time Allocation: Pre-post Analysis of Australian Couples. *Social Indicators Research* 131:2, 831-851. [[Crossref](#)]
483. Pablo Gracia, Joris Ghysels. 2017. Educational inequalities in parental care time: Cross-national evidence from Belgium, Denmark, Spain, and the United Kingdom. *Social Science Research* 63, 166-180. [[Crossref](#)]
484. Vincenzo Galasso, Paola Profeta, Chiara Pronzato, Francesco Billari. 2017. Information and Women's Intentions: Experimental Evidence About Child Care. *European Journal of Population* 33:1, 109-128. [[Crossref](#)]
485. Tetsugen Haruyama, Hyun Park. 2017. A simple dynastic economy with parental time investment in children's patience. *Economic Modelling* 61, 235-247. [[Crossref](#)]
486. Ling-Yi Lin, Rong-Ju Cherng, Yung-Jung Chen. 2017. Relationship between time use in physical activity and gross motor performance of preschool children. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal* 64:1, 49-57. [[Crossref](#)]
487. Lei Fang, Cara McDaniel. 2017. Home hours in the United States and Europe. *The B.E. Journal of Macroeconomics* 17:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
488. Kenneth Hemmereichs, Orhan Agirdag, Dimokritos Kavadias. 2017. The relationship between parental literacy involvement, socio-economic status and reading literacy. *Educational Review* 69:1, 85-101. [[Crossref](#)]
489. Evrim Altintas, Oriel Sullivan. 2017. Trends in Fathers' Contribution to Housework and Childcare under Different Welfare Policy Regimes. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society* 24:1, 81-108. [[Crossref](#)]
490. Elizabeth M. Caucutt, Lance Lochner, Youngmin Park. 2017. Correlation, Consumption, Confusion, or Constraints: Why Do Poor Children Perform so Poorly?. *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics* 119:1, 102-147. [[Crossref](#)]

491. David Monaghan. 2017. Does College Enrollment and Bachelor's Completion by Mothers Impact Children's Educational Outcomes?. *Sociology of Education* **90**:1, 3-24. [[Crossref](#)]
492. Nobuyoshi Kikuchi. 2017. Intergenerational Transmission of Education in Japan: Nonparametric Bounds Analysis with Multiple Treatments. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **87**. . [[Crossref](#)]
493. Alessandro Gavazza, Mattia Nardotto, Tommaso M. Valletti. 2017. Internet and Politics: Evidence from U.K. Local Elections and Local Government Policies. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **113**. . [[Crossref](#)]
494. Marianne Bertrand. 2017. The Glass Ceiling. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **122**. . [[Crossref](#)]
495. Jisoo Hwang. 2016. The second shift: assimilation in housework time among immigrants. *Review of Economics of the Household* **14**:4, 941-959. [[Crossref](#)]
496. Carlos E. Yeguez, Margaret H. Sibley. 2016. Predictors of Informant Discrepancies Between Mother and Middle School Teacher ADHD Ratings. *School Mental Health* **8**:4, 452-460. [[Crossref](#)]
497. Michael Grätz, Florencia Torche. 2016. Compensation or Reinforcement? The Stratification of Parental Responses to Children's Early Ability. *Demography* **53**:6, 1883-1904. [[Crossref](#)]
498. Edward R. Berchick. 2016. The relationship between maternal education and reported childhood conditions. *Social Science & Medicine* **170**, 170-179. [[Crossref](#)]
499. Michael Baker, Kevin Milligan. 2016. Boy-Girl Differences in Parental Time Investments: Evidence from Three Countries. *Journal of Human Capital* **10**:4, 399-441. [[Crossref](#)]
500. Marc H. Bornstein. Cultural Expressions and Neurobiological Underpinnings in Mother-Infant Interactions 185-222. [[Crossref](#)]
501. Simon Calmar Andersen, Helena Skyt Nielsen. 2016. Reading intervention with a growth mindset approach improves children's skills. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **113**:43, 12111-12113. [[Crossref](#)]
502. James S. Kim, Jonathan Guryan, Thomas G. White, David M. Quinn, Lauren Capotosto, Helen Chen Kingston. 2016. Delayed Effects of a Low-Cost and Large-Scale Summer Reading Intervention on Elementary School Children's Reading Comprehension. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness* **9**:sup1, 1-22. [[Crossref](#)]
503. Emilia Del Bono, Marco Francesconi, Yvonne Kelly, Amanda Sacker. 2016. Early Maternal Time Investment and Early Child Outcomes. *The Economic Journal* **126**:596, F96-F135. [[Crossref](#)]
504. Pedro Carneiro, Rita Ginja. 2016. Partial Insurance and Investments in Children. *The Economic Journal* **126**:596, F66-F95. [[Crossref](#)]
505. Kelly Musick, Ann Meier, Sarah Flood. 2016. How Parents Fare. *American Sociological Review* **81**:5, 1069-1095. [[Crossref](#)]
506. J- F, Jeong Jin Yu. 2016. First Delinquent Behavior Among Pre-Pubescent Children. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* **60**:14, 1609-1622. [[Crossref](#)]
507. Jose Maria Fernandez-Crehuet, J. Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, Luisa Eugenia Reyes Recio. 2016. The National Work-Life Balance Index©: The European Case. *Social Indicators Research* **128**:1, 341-359. [[Crossref](#)]
508. Giulia M. Dotti Sani, Judith Treas. 2016. Educational Gradients in Parents' Child-Care Time Across Countries, 1965-2012. *Journal of Marriage and Family* **78**:4, 1083-1096. [[Crossref](#)]
509. Ingvild Almås, Alexander W. Cappelen, Kjell G. Salvanes, Erik Ø. Sørensen, Bertil Tungodden. 2016. Willingness to Compete: Family Matters. *Management Science* **62**:8, 2149-2162. [[Crossref](#)]
510. Katherine P. Dabney, Robert H. Tai, Michael R. Scott. 2016. Informal Science: Family Education, Experiences, and Initial Interest in Science. *International Journal of Science Education, Part B* **6**:3, 263-282. [[Crossref](#)]

511. Di Wang, Ah-Hwee Tan. Self-regulated incremental clustering with focused preferences 1297-1304. [[Crossref](#)]
512. Ariel Kalil, Kathleen M. Ziol-Guest, Rebecca M. Ryan, Anna J. Markowitz. 2016. Changes in Income-Based Gaps in Parent Activities With Young Children From 1988 to 2012. *AERA Open* 2:3. . [[Crossref](#)]
513. Daphna Bassok, Jenna E. Finch, RaeHyuck Lee, Sean F. Reardon, Jane Waldfogel. 2016. Socioeconomic Gaps in Early Childhood Experiences. *AERA Open* 2:3. . [[Crossref](#)]
514. Sean F. Reardon, Ximena A. Portilla. 2016. Recent Trends in Income, Racial, and Ethnic School Readiness Gaps at Kindergarten Entry. *AERA Open* 2:3. . [[Crossref](#)]
515. Alessandra Casarico, Paola Profeta, Chiara Daniela Pronzato. 2016. On the Regional Labour Market Determinants of Female University Enrolment in Europe. *Regional Studies* 50:6, 1036-1053. [[Crossref](#)]
516. Miki Kohara, Yusuke Kamiya. 2016. Maternal employment and food produced at home: evidence from Japanese data. *Review of Economics of the Household* 14:2, 417-442. [[Crossref](#)]
517. Stefania Albanesi, Claudia Olivetti. 2016. Gender Roles and Medical Progress. *Journal of Political Economy* 124:3, 650-695. [[Crossref](#)]
518. Juan Carlos Córdoba, Marla Ripoll. 2016. Intergenerational Transfers and the Fertility–Income Relationship. *The Economic Journal* 126:593, 949-977. [[Crossref](#)]
519. Alice Schoonbroodt. 2016. Parental child care during and outside of typical work hours. *Review of Economics of the Household* 8. . [[Crossref](#)]
520. Ingvild Almås, Alexander W. Cappelen, Kjell G. Salvanes, Erik Ø. Sørensen, Bertil Tungodden. 2016. What Explains the Gender Gap in College Track Dropout? Experimental and Administrative Evidence. *American Economic Review* 106:5, 296-302. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
521. Shelly Lundberg, Robert A. Pollak, Jenna Stearns. 2016. Family Inequality: Diverging Patterns in Marriage, Cohabitation, and Childbearing. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 30:2, 79-102. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
522. Nitza Davidovitch, Dan Soen. 2016. Leisure in the twenty-first century: the case of Israel. *Israel Affairs* 22:2, 492-511. [[Crossref](#)]
523. Liangshu Qi, Xiao-yuan Dong. 2016. Unpaid Care Work's Interference with Paid Work and the Gender Earnings Gap in China. *Feminist Economics* 22:2, 143-167. [[Crossref](#)]
524. Jisoo Hwang. 2016. Housewife, “gold miss,” and equal: the evolution of educated women’s role in Asia and the U.S. *Journal of Population Economics* 29:2, 529-570. [[Crossref](#)]
525. Gary S. Becker, Kevin M. Murphy, Jörg L. Spenkuch. 2016. The Manipulation of Children’s Preferences, Old-Age Support, and Investment in Children’s Human Capital. *Journal of Labor Economics* 34:S2, S3-S30. [[Crossref](#)]
526. ###. 2016. The effect of father’s socio-economic characteristics on time use of the undergraduate student children. *Ewha Journal of Social Sciences* 32:1, 159-190. [[Crossref](#)]
527. Quy-Toan Do, Andrei A. Levchenko, Claudio Raddatz. 2016. Comparative advantage, international trade, and fertility. *Journal of Development Economics* 119, 48-66. [[Crossref](#)]
528. J. Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, José Alberto Molina. 2016. COMMUTING TIME AND HOUSEHOLD RESPONSIBILITIES: EVIDENCE USING PROPENSITY SCORE MATCHING. *Journal of Regional Science* 56:2, 332-359. [[Crossref](#)]
529. 2016. REFERENCES. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development* 81:1, 145-170. [[Crossref](#)]

530. C. Kirabo Jackson, Rucker C. Johnson, Claudia Persico. 2016. The Effects of School Spending on Educational and Economic Outcomes: Evidence from School Finance Reforms *. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 131:1, 157-218. [[Crossref](#)]
531. Kei Nomaguchi, Melissa A. Milkie, Kathleen E. Denny. 2016. Quantity of Maternal Time and Child and Adolescent Development: Response to Kalil and Mayer (2016) and to Waldfogel (2016). *Journal of Marriage and Family* 78:1, 270-275. [[Crossref](#)]
532. Ewa Jarosz. 2016. The duration and dynamics of leisure among the working population in Poland. A time-use approach. *World Leisure Journal* 58:1, 44-59. [[Crossref](#)]
533. Ariel Kalil, Greg J. Duncan, Kathleen M. Ziol-Guest. Early Childhood Poverty: Short and Long-Run Consequences Over the Lifespan 341-354. [[Crossref](#)]
534. Timothy M. Smeeding. Gates, Gaps, and Intergenerational Mobility: The Importance of an Even Start 255-295. [[Crossref](#)]
535. M. Aguiar, E. Hurst. The Macroeconomics of Time Allocation 203-253. [[Crossref](#)]
536. Gábor Kertesi, Gábor Kézdi. 2016. On the test score gap between Roma and non-Roma students in Hungary and its potential causes. *Economics of Transition* 24:1, 135-162. [[Crossref](#)]
537. Jun Sung Kim, Jongkwan Lee. 2016. The Role of Intergenerational Mobility in Internal Migration. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 115. . [[Crossref](#)]
538. Jonathan T. Rothwell. 2016. Classroom Inequality and the Cognitive Race Gap: Evidence from 4-Year Olds in Public PreK. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 104. . [[Crossref](#)]
539. Geovanny Castro Aristizabal, Maribel Castillo Caicedo, Julie Carolina Mendoza. 2016. Principales Determinantes En La Adquisición De Competencias En América Latina: Un Análisis Multinivel a Partir De Los Resultados En PISA 2012 (Main Determinants Acquisition of Skills in Latin America: A Multilevel Analysis from the Results PISA 2012). *SSRN Electronic Journal* 19. . [[Crossref](#)]
540. Ting Chen, James Kai-Sing Kung, Chicheng Ma. 2016. Long Live Keju! The Persistent Effects of China's Imperial Examination System. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 122. . [[Crossref](#)]
541. Pablo Gracia, Joris Ghysels. 2016. Educational Differences in Parental Care Time: A Study on Belgium, Denmark, Spain, and the United Kingdom. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 37. . [[Crossref](#)]
542. Sukanya Basu, Mike Insler. 2016. Education Outcomes of Children of Asian Inter marriages: Does Gender of the Immigrant Parent Matter?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 87. . [[Crossref](#)]
543. Agnes Szabo-Morvai. 2016. Háttér tanulmány a Magyar Születési Kohorszvizsgálathoz (Background Essay to the Hungarian Birth Cohort Study). *SSRN Electronic Journal* 301. . [[Crossref](#)]
544. Hui Young Chun. 2015. Relations of Smart Phone Usage Level to Developmental Characteristics and Time Diaries, and Variables Predicting the Usage Level Groups of Four Year Old Children. *Korean Journal of Childcare and Education* 11:6, 153-175. [[Crossref](#)]
545. Shelly Lundberg. 2015. Tiger Parenting and American Inequality: An Essay on Chua and Rubenfeld's The Triple Package: How Three Unlikely Traits Explain the Rise and Fall of Cultural Groups in America. *Journal of Economic Literature* 53:4, 945-960. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
546. Melinda Sandler Morrill, Sabrina Wulff Pabilonia. 2015. What effects do macroeconomic conditions have on the time couples with children spend together?. *Review of Economics of the Household* 13:4, 791-814. [[Crossref](#)]
547. William S. Comanor, Mark Sarro, R. Mark Rogers. The Monetary Cost of Raising Children 209-251. [[Crossref](#)]
548. Junichi Minagawa, Thorsten Upmann. 2015. THE GENERALIZED ALCHIAN-ALLEN THEOREM: A SLUTSKY EQUATION FOR RELATIVE DEMAND. *Economic Inquiry* 53:4, 1893-1907. [[Crossref](#)]

549. Raffaele Ciuta, Curtis Skinner. 2015. Income and Beyond: Taking the Measure of Child Deprivation in the United States. *Child Indicators Research* 8:3, 491-515. [[Crossref](#)]
550. Susan E. Chen, Anke Möser, Rodolfo M. Nayga. 2015. Too Busy to Eat with the Kids? Parental Work and Children's Eating. *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy* 37:3, 347-377. [[Crossref](#)]
551. Moshe Hazan, Hosny Zoabi. 2015. Do Highly Educated Women Choose Smaller Families?. *The Economic Journal* 125:587, 1191-1226. [[Crossref](#)]
552. Vikesh Amin, Petter Lundborg, Dan-Olof Rooth. 2015. The intergenerational transmission of schooling: Are mothers really less important than fathers?. *Economics of Education Review* 47, 100-117. [[Crossref](#)]
553. Artjoms Ivlevs. 2015. Happy Moves? Assessing the Link between Life Satisfaction and Emigration Intentions. *Kyklos* 68:3, 335-356. [[Crossref](#)]
554. Mette Kjærgaard Thomsen. 2015. Parental time investments in children. *Acta Sociologica* 58:3, 249-263. [[Crossref](#)]
555. Nicolas Sommet, Alain Quiamzade, Mickaël Jury, Gabriel Mugny. 2015. The student-institution fit at university: interactive effects of academic competition and social class on achievement goals. *Frontiers in Psychology* 6. . [[Crossref](#)]
556. Eric R. Nielsen. 2015. The Income-Achievement Gap and Adult Outcome Inequality. *Finance and Economics Discussion Series* 2015.0:41, 1-60. [[Crossref](#)]
557. Seth Gershenson, Laura Langbein. 2015. The Effect of Primary School Size on Academic Achievement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 37:1_suppl, 135S-155S. [[Crossref](#)]
558. Soyung Kim, Meejung Chin. 2015. Typology of Weekend Time Use and Time Use Satisfaction of Married Working Men with a Preschool Child in Korea. *Journal of Korean Home Management Association* 33:2, 71-88. [[Crossref](#)]
559. Alessandra Casarico, Luca Micheletto, Alessandro Sommacal. 2015. Intergenerational transmission of skills during childhood and optimal public policy. *Journal of Population Economics* 28:2, 353-372. [[Crossref](#)]
560. J. Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, Jose Alberto Molina. 2015. Health status and the allocation of time: Cross-country evidence from Europe. *Economic Modelling* 46, 188-203. [[Crossref](#)]
561. Melissa A. Milkie, Kei M. Nomaguchi, Kathleen E. Denny. 2015. Does the Amount of Time Mothers Spend With Children or Adolescents Matter?. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 77:2, 355-372. [[Crossref](#)]
562. Marc H. Bornstein. Children's Parents 1-78. [[Crossref](#)]
563. Greg J. Duncan, Katherine Magnuson, Elizabeth Votruba-Drzal. Children and Socioeconomic Status 1-40. [[Crossref](#)]
564. Hongwei Xu, Airan Liu, Yueyun Zhang. 2015. Inequality in children's well-being and development: Evidence from a national panel study. *Chinese Journal of Sociology* 1:1, 88-107. [[Crossref](#)]
565. Alison Aughinbaugh, Donna S. Rothstein. 2015. Do cognitive skills moderate the influence of neighborhood disadvantage on subsequent educational attainment?. *Economics of Education Review* 44, 83-99. [[Crossref](#)]
566. Ling-Yi Lin, Rong-Ju Cherng, Yung-Jung Chen, Yi-Jen Chen, Hei-Mei Yang. 2015. Effects of television exposure on developmental skills among young children. *Infant Behavior and Development* 38, 20-26. [[Crossref](#)]
567. Graham Daniel. 2015. Patterns of Parent Involvement: A Longitudinal Analysis of Family-School Partnerships in the Early Years of School in Australia. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood* 40:1, 119-128. [[Crossref](#)]

568. Giuseppina Autiero. 2015. Social and Personal Identities: Their Influence on Scholastic Effort. *Review of Social Economy* **73**:1, 19-33. [[Crossref](#)]
569. Ariel Kalil. Inequality Begins at Home: The Role of Parenting in the Diverging Destinies of Rich and Poor Children 63-82. [[Crossref](#)]
570. Jo-Han Chang, Tien-Ling Yeh. The Influence of Parenting Time on Children's Growth and Development 361-365. [[Crossref](#)]
571. Javier García-Manglano, Natalia Nollenberger, Almudena Sevilla. Gender, Time-Use, and Fertility Recovery in Industrialized Countries 775-780. [[Crossref](#)]
572. Evrim Altintas. 2015. Educational differences in fathers' time with children in two parent families: Time diary evidence from the United States. *Family Science* **6**:1, 293-301. [[Crossref](#)]
573. Rebecca M. Ryan, Amy Claessens, Anna J. Markowitz. 2015. Associations Between Family Structure Change and Child Behavior Problems: The Moderating Effect of Family Income. *Child Development* **86**:1, 112-127. [[Crossref](#)]
574. Katie Vinopal, Seth Gershenson. 2015. Re-Conceptualizing Gaps by Socioeconomic Status in Parental Time with Children. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **4**. . [[Crossref](#)]
575. Stefania Albanesi, Claudia Olivetti. 2015. Gender Roles and Medical Progress. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **12**. . [[Crossref](#)]
576. Eric Reed Nielsen. 2015. The Income-Achievement Gap and Adult Outcome Inequality. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **122**. . [[Crossref](#)]
577. Gary S. Becker, Scott Duke Kominers, Kevin M. Murphy, Jrg L. Spenkuch. 2015. A Theory of Intergenerational Mobility. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **43**. . [[Crossref](#)]
578. Alessandro Gavazza, Mattia Nardotto, Tommaso M. Valletti. 2015. Internet and Politics: Evidence from U.K. Local Elections and Local Government Policies. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **113**. . [[Crossref](#)]
579. David Figlio, Jonathan Guryan, Krzysztof Karbownik, Jeffrey Roth. 2014. The Effects of Poor Neonatal Health on Children's Cognitive Development. *American Economic Review* **104**:12, 3921-3955. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
580. Manuel Flores, Adriaan Kalwij. 2014. The associations between early life circumstances and later life health and employment in Europe. *Empirical Economics* **47**:4, 1251-1282. [[Crossref](#)]
581. Giorgio Brunello, Maria De Paola, Giovanna Labartino. 2014. More apples fewer chips? The effect of school fruit schemes on the consumption of junk food. *Health Policy* **118**:1, 114-126. [[Crossref](#)]
582. Gareth D. Leeves. 2014. Increasing returns to education and the impact on social capital. *Education Economics* **22**:5, 449-470. [[Crossref](#)]
583. Jose Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, Almudena Sevilla. 2014. Total work time in Spain: evidence from time diary data. *Applied Economics* **46**:16, 1894-1909. [[Crossref](#)]
584. Oriel Sullivan, Francesco C. Billari, Evrim Altintas. 2014. Fathers' Changing Contributions to Child Care and Domestic Work in Very Low-Fertility Countries. *Journal of Family Issues* **35**:8, 1048-1065. [[Crossref](#)]
585. Anna Aizer, Janet Currie. 2014. The intergenerational transmission of inequality: Maternal disadvantage and health at birth. *Science* **344**:6186, 856-861. [[Crossref](#)]
586. Thomas Gift, Erik Wibbels. 2014. Reading, Writing, and the Regrettable Status of Education Research in Comparative Politics. *Annual Review of Political Science* **17**:1, 291-312. [[Crossref](#)]
587. Massimiliano Bratti, Mariapia Mendola. 2014. Parental health and child schooling. *Journal of Health Economics* **35**, 94-108. [[Crossref](#)]
588. Tindara Addabbo, Maria Laura Di Tommaso, Anna Maccagnan. 2014. Gender Differences in Italian Children's Capabilities. *Feminist Economics* **20**:2, 90-121. [[Crossref](#)]

589. Maurizio Pugno. 2014. Scitovsky's The Joyless Economy and the economics of happiness. *The European Journal of the History of Economic Thought* 21:2, 278-303. [[Crossref](#)]
590. J. Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, Jose Alberto Molina. 2014. Regional unemployment, gender, and time allocation of the unemployed. *Review of Economics of the Household* 12:1, 105-127. [[Crossref](#)]
591. Christina Boll, Julian Leppin, Nora Reich. 2014. Paternal childcare and parental leave policies: evidence from industrialized countries. *Review of Economics of the Household* 12:1, 129-158. [[Crossref](#)]
592. Almudena Sevilla. 2014. On the importance of time diary data and introduction to a special issue on time use research. *Review of Economics of the Household* 12:1, 1-6. [[Crossref](#)]
593. Arnstein Øvrum, Geir Wæhler Gustavsen, Kyrre Rickertsen. 2014. Age and socioeconomic inequalities in health: Examining the role of lifestyle choices. *Advances in Life Course Research* 19, 1-13. [[Crossref](#)]
594. ###, ###. 2014. The Effects of Increase in Childcare Subsidy on Time Allocation of Women - Focusing on Low-income and Moderate-income Women with Pre-school Children-. *Korean Journal of Social Welfare* 66:1, 101-125. [[Crossref](#)]
595. Yok-Fong Paat. 2014. Family and Community Determinants of Educational Attainment in Mexico. *Child & Youth Services* 35:1, 61-87. [[Crossref](#)]
596. Silvia Helena Barcellos, Leandro S. Carvalho, Adriana Lleras-Muney. 2014. Child Gender and Parental Investments In India: Are Boys and Girls Treated Differently?. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 6:1, 157-189. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
597. N. Schreuer, D. Sachs, S. Rosenblum. 2014. Participation in leisure activities: Differences between children with and without physical disabilities. *Research in Developmental Disabilities* 35:1, 223-233. [[Crossref](#)]
598. R. Lalive, A. Schlosser, A. Steinhauer, J. Zweimuller. 2014. Parental Leave and Mothers' Careers: The Relative Importance of Job Protection and Cash Benefits. *The Review of Economic Studies* 81:1, 219-265. [[Crossref](#)]
599. Ulrik H. Nielsen. 2014. Parents' Education and Their Adult Offspring's Other-Regarding Behavior. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 99. . [[Crossref](#)]
600. Martha J. Bailey. 2014. Fifty Years of Family Planning: New Evidence on the Long-Run Effects of Increasing Access to Contraception. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 4. . [[Crossref](#)]
601. Tamar Khitarishvili, Kijong Kim. 2014. The Great Recession and Unpaid Work Time in the United States: Does Poverty Matter?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 3. . [[Crossref](#)]
602. Ebru Kongar, Günseli Berik. 2014. Time Use of Parents in the United States: What Difference Did the Great Recession Make?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 122. . [[Crossref](#)]
603. Gary S. Becker, Kevin M. Murphy, JJrg L. Spenkuch. 2014. The Manipulation of Children's Preferences, Old Age Support, and Investment in Children's Human Capital. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 82. . [[Crossref](#)]
604. J. Alberto Molina, J. Ignacio Giménez-Nadal, José A. Cuesta, Carlos Gracia-Lazaro, Yamir Moreno, Angel Sanchez. 2013. Gender Differences in Cooperation: Experimental Evidence on High School Students. *PLoS ONE* 8:12, e83700. [[Crossref](#)]
605. Junichi Minagawa, Thorsten Upmann. 2013. A note on parental time allocation. *Labour Economics* 25, 153-157. [[Crossref](#)]
606. Seth Gershenson. 2013. Do Summer Time-Use Gaps Vary by Socioeconomic Status?. *American Educational Research Journal* 50:6, 1219-1248. [[Crossref](#)]
607. Yok-Fong Paat. 2013. Working with Immigrant Children and Their Families: An Application of Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Theory. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment* 23:8, 954-966. [[Crossref](#)]

608. Torill Tverborgvik, Lene Björk Clausen, Brian Larsen Thorsted, Sigurd Mikkelsen, Elsebeth Lynge. 2013. Intergenerational Educational Mobility in Denmark. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research* 57:5, 544-560. [[Crossref](#)]
609. Leigh Tooth, Gita Mishra. 2013. Intergenerational educational mobility on general mental health and depressive symptoms in young women. *Quality of Life Research* 22:7, 1589-1602. [[Crossref](#)]
610. Guozhong Zhu, Gulfer Vural. 2013. Inter-generational effect of parental time and its policy implications. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 37:9, 1833-1851. [[Crossref](#)]
611. Morten Jakobsen, Simon Calmar Andersen. 2013. Coproduction and Equity in Public Service Delivery. *Public Administration Review* 73:5, 704-713. [[Crossref](#)]
612. Eun Jung Park, Seong-Lim Lee. 2013. Differences in Time Deficit and Time Satisfaction According to the Types of Child Care Time of Dual-earner Couples with Preschool Children. *Journal of Korean Home Management Association* 31:4, 97-111. [[Crossref](#)]
613. Mark Aguiar,, Erik Hurst,, Loukas Karabarbounis. 2013. Time Use During the Great Recession. *American Economic Review* 103:5, 1664-1696. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
614. John Ermisch, Marco Francesconi. 2013. THE EFFECT OF PARENTAL EMPLOYMENT ON CHILD SCHOOLING. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 28:5, 796-822. [[Crossref](#)]
615. Kathryn M. Yount, John A. Maluccio, Jere R. Behrman, John Hoddinott, Alexis Murphy, Usha Ramakrishnan. 2013. Parental Resources, Schooling Achievements, and Gender Schooling Gaps: Evidence of Change over 25 years in Rural Guatemala. *Population Research and Policy Review* 32:4, 495-528. [[Crossref](#)]
616. Paula England, Anjula Srivastava. 2013. Educational differences in US parents' time spent in child care: The role of culture and cross-spouse influence. *Social Science Research* 42:4, 971-988. [[Crossref](#)]
617. Günseli Berik, Ebru Kongar. 2013. Time Allocation of Married Mothers and Fathers in Hard Times: The 2007-09 US Recession. *Feminist Economics* 19:3, 208-237. [[Crossref](#)]
618. Elly-Ann Lindström. 2013. Gender Bias in Parental Leave: Evidence from Sweden. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 34:2, 235-248. [[Crossref](#)]
619. Ana María Osorio, Catalina Bolancé, Manuela Alcañiz. 2013. Measuring Intermediary Determinants of Early Childhood Health: A Composite Index Comparing Colombian Departments. *Child Indicators Research* 6:2, 297-319. [[Crossref](#)]
620. Elliot M. Tucker-Drob. 2013. How many pathways underlie socioeconomic differences in the development of cognition and achievement?. *Learning and Individual Differences* 25, 12-20. [[Crossref](#)]
621. Oriel Sullivan. 2013. What Do We Learn About Gender by Analyzing Housework Separately From Child Care? Some Considerations From Time-Use Evidence. *Journal of Family Theory & Review* 5:2, 72-84. [[Crossref](#)]
622. J. Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, Jose Alberto Molina. 2013. Parents' education as a determinant of educational childcare time. *Journal of Population Economics* 26:2, 719-749. [[Crossref](#)]
623. Sabrina Wulff Pabilonia, Younghwan Song. 2013. Single Mothers' Time Preference, Smoking, and Enriching Childcare: Evidence from Time Diaries. *Eastern Economic Journal* 39:2, 227-255. [[Crossref](#)]
624. Michela Sonogo, Alicia Llácer, Iñaki Galán, Fernando Simón. 2013. The influence of parental education on child mental health in Spain. *Quality of Life Research* 22:1, 203-211. [[Crossref](#)]
625. Marianne Bertrand,, Jessica Pan. 2013. The Trouble with Boys: Social Influences and the Gender Gap in Disruptive Behavior. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 5:1, 32-64. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
626. Jisoo Hwang. 2013. The Second Shift: Housework Time Among Immigrants. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 15. . [[Crossref](#)]

627. Seth Gershenson, Michael S Hayes. 2013. The Implications of Summer Learning Loss for Value-Added Estimates of Teacher Effectiveness. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 23. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
628. Lisa Barrow, Diane Whitmore Schanzenbach. Education and the Poor 316-343. [\[Crossref\]](#)
629. Ariel Kalil, Rebecca Ryan, Michael Corey. 2012. Diverging Destinies: Maternal Education and the Developmental Gradient in Time With Children. *Demography* 49:4, 1361-1383. [\[Crossref\]](#)
630. Daniel Kreisman. 2012. The source of Black–White inequality in early language acquisition: Evidence from Early Head Start. *Social Science Research* 41:6, 1429-1450. [\[Crossref\]](#)
631. Anne H Gauthier, Berenice DeGusti. 2012. The time allocation to children by parents in Europe. *International Sociology* 27:6, 827-845. [\[Crossref\]](#)
632. Oliver Wölfel, Guido Heineck. 2012. Parental risk attitudes and children's secondary school track choice. *Economics of Education Review* 31:5, 727-743. [\[Crossref\]](#)
633. Moshe Justman, Yaakov Gilboa. 2012. The Scope for Promoting Equal Opportunity in Education: Evidence from the Kibbutz. *Education Finance and Policy* 7:4, 489-515. [\[Crossref\]](#)
634. Mark Aguiar, Erik Hurst, Loukas Karabarbounis. 2012. Recent Developments in the Economics of Time Use. *Annual Review of Economics* 4:1, 373-397. [\[Crossref\]](#)
635. Jose Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, Almudena Sevilla. 2012. Trends in time allocation: A cross-country analysis. *European Economic Review* 56:6, 1338-1359. [\[Crossref\]](#)
636. Greg J. Duncan, Katherine Magnuson. 2012. Socioeconomic status and cognitive functioning: moving from correlation to causation. *WIREs Cognitive Science* 3:3, 377-386. [\[Crossref\]](#)
637. José Ignacio Giménez-Nadal, Miriam Marcén, Raquel Ortega. 2012. Substitution and Presence Effects of Children on Mothers' Adult Care Time. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 33:1, 2-10. [\[Crossref\]](#)
638. Elliot M. Tucker-Drob, K. Paige Harden. 2012. Early childhood cognitive development and parental cognitive stimulation: evidence for reciprocal gene–environment transactions. *Developmental Science* 15:2, 250-259. [\[Crossref\]](#)
639. PARANTAP BASU, KESHAB BHATTARAI. 2012. Cognitive Skills, Openness and Growth*. *Economic Record* 88:280, 18-38. [\[Crossref\]](#)
640. Gunseli Berik, Ebru Kongar. 2012. Time Use of Mothers and Fathers in Hard Times: The US Recession of 2007-09. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 122. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
641. Daniela Del Boca, Chiara Monfardini, Cheti Nicoletti. 2012. Self Investments of Adolescents and Their Cognitive Development. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 23. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
642. Benjamin Villena-Roldan, Cecilia Rios-Aguilar. 2012. Causal Effects of Maternal Time-Investment on Children's Cognitive Outcomes. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 122. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
643. Chikako Yamauchi, Andrew Leigh. 2011. Which children benefit from non-parental care?. *Economics of Education Review* 30:6, 1468-1490. [\[Crossref\]](#)
644. Margaret L. Usdansky, Wendy M. Parker. 2011. How Money Matters. *Journal of Family Issues* 32:11, 1449-1473. [\[Crossref\]](#)
645. Monique de Haan. 2011. The Effect of Parents' Schooling on Child's Schooling: A Nonparametric Bounds Analysis. *Journal of Labor Economics* 29:4, 859-892. [\[Crossref\]](#)
646. Peter Hinrichs. 2011. When the Bell Tolls: The Effects of School Starting Times on Academic Achievement. *Education Finance and Policy* 6:4, 486-507. [\[Crossref\]](#)
647. Margaret L. Usdansky. 2011. The Gender-Equality Paradox: Class and Incongruity Between Work-Family Attitudes and Behaviors. *Journal of Family Theory & Review* 3:3, 163-178. [\[Crossref\]](#)
648. Kym Simoncini, Nerina Caltabiano. 2011. Mothers' and Young Children's Satisfaction of the Time They Spend Together. *Journal of Relationships Research* 2:1, 26-32. [\[Crossref\]](#)

649. Jose Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, Almudena Sevilla-Sanz. 2011. The Time-Crunch Paradox. *Social Indicators Research* **102**:2, 181-196. [[Crossref](#)]
650. Joost de Laat, Almudena Sevilla-Sanz. 2011. The Fertility and Women's Labor Force Participation puzzle in OECD Countries: The Role of Men's Home Production. *Feminist Economics* **17**:2, 87-119. [[Crossref](#)]
651. Marte Rønning. 2011. Who benefits from homework assignments?. *Economics of Education Review* **30**:1, 55-64. [[Crossref](#)]
652. J. Bonke, G. Esping-Andersen. 2011. Family Investments in Children--Productivities, Preferences, and Parental Child Care. *European Sociological Review* **27**:1, 43-55. [[Crossref](#)]
653. Maurizio Pugno. Economy, People's Personal Autonomy, and Well-Being 207-239. [[Crossref](#)]
654. Anders Björklund, Kjell G. Salvanes. Education and Family Background 201-247. [[Crossref](#)]
655. Sandra E. Black, Paul J. Devereux. Recent Developments in Intergenerational Mobility 1487-1541. [[Crossref](#)]
656. Elliot M. Tucker-Drob, Mijke Rhemtulla, K. Paige Harden, Eric Turkheimer, David Fask. 2011. Emergence of a Gene \times Socioeconomic Status Interaction on Infant Mental Ability Between 10 Months and 2 Years. *Psychological Science* **22**:1, 125-133. [[Crossref](#)]
657. Ari Choi Kang. 2011. Maternal and Paternal Time for a Young Child. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
658. Moshe Hazan, Hosny Zoabi. 2011. Do Highly Educated Women Choose Smaller Families?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **20** . [[Crossref](#)]
659. Owen Thompson. 2011. The Returns to Skill and Racial Difference in Parenting: Evidence from the Civil Rights Movement. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **84** . [[Crossref](#)]
660. Alessandra Casarico, Paola Profeta, Chiara Pronzato. 2011. Great Expectations: The Determinants of Female University Enrolment in Europe. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **30** . [[Crossref](#)]
661. Alessandra Casarico, Luca Micheletto, Alessandro Sommacal. 2011. Intergenerational Transmission of Skills During Childhood and Optimal Public Policy. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **97** . [[Crossref](#)]
662. Francesco Avvisati, Bruno Besbas, Nina Guyon. 2011. Parental Involvement in School : A Literature Review. *Revue d'économie politique* **Vol. 120**:5, 759-778. [[Crossref](#)]
663. Alexandra Killewald, Margaret Gough. 2010. Money isn't everything: Wives' earnings and housework time. *Social Science Research* **39**:6, 987-1003. [[Crossref](#)]
664. Almudena Sevilla-Sanz, Jose Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, Cristina Fernández. 2010. Gender Roles and the Division of Unpaid Work in Spanish Households. *Feminist Economics* **16**:4, 137-184. [[Crossref](#)]
665. Maria Gutiérrez-Domènech. 2010. Parental employment and time with children in Spain. *Review of Economics of the Household* **8**:3, 371-391. [[Crossref](#)]
666. Steven D. Silver, Randal Verbrugge. 2010. Home production and endogenous economic growth. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **75**:2, 297-312. [[Crossref](#)]
667. CHIKAKO YAMAUCHI. 2010. Parental Investment in Children: Differential Pathways of Parental Education and Mental Health*. *Economic Record* **86**:273, 210-226. [[Crossref](#)]
668. Sören Blomquist,, Vidar Christiansen,, Luca Micheletto. 2010. Public Provision of Private Goods and Nondistortionary Marginal Tax Rates. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* **2**:2, 1-27. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
669. Almudena Sevilla-Sanz. 2010. Household division of labor and cross-country differences in household formation rates. *Journal of Population Economics* **23**:1, 225-249. [[Crossref](#)]
670. Silvia Helena Barcellos, Leandro Carvalho, Adriana Lleras-Muney. 2010. Child Gender and Parental Investments in India: Are Boys and Girls Treated Differently?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **52** . [[Crossref](#)]

671. Torbjorn Haegeland, Lars J. Kirkebøen, Oddbjorn Raaum, Kjell G. Salvanes. 2010. Why Children of College Graduates Outperform Their Schoolmates: A Study of Cousins and Adoptees. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **95**. . [[Crossref](#)]
672. Hildete Pereira de Melo, Marta Castilho. 2009. Trabalho reprodutivo no Brasil: quem faz?. *Revista de Economia Contemporânea* **13**:1, 135-158. [[Crossref](#)]