

# THE EFFECT OF OCCUPATIONAL SEX- COMPOSITION ON WOMEN'S FERTILITY IN SPAIN



Teresa Martín García

Institute of Economy, Geography and Demography. Depart. Population. SPANISH  
COUNCIL FOR SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH (IEGD-CSIC)

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE “Can Policies Enhance Fertility in Europe?” Vienna, 6-7 Dec. 2007.



# Objectives

- Research on the effect of sex segregation on labour market outcomes (e.g. the gender wage gap) has been very prolific. However, the extent to which occupational sex-segregation impacts on women's demographic behaviour is poorly explored.



# Research question

- Are there differences among women regarding their demographic behaviour according to their occupational category in the labour market?

# Expectations

- *H1: A negative relationship is expected between a woman's participation in the labour market and her reproductive behaviour (New Home Economics Theory).*
- However, the woman's participation in the labour market *per se* does not result in lower fertility. The choice of occupation may reflect:
  - a) each woman's specific preferences and attitudes to childbearing;
  - b) the woman's work-place environment during her reproductive years;
  - c) the capability of harmonising family and work.
- *H2: Working in typical female occupations (mostly those that draw on supposedly "feminine" skills and/or that facilitate a combination of employment and caring responsibilities) is expected to support a life-course orientation that includes both having children and a professional career. This should work in higher fertility levels.*



# Data

- I use retrospective data from the FFS (1995)
- Sample sizes: 3,997 (First Birth); 2,428 (Second Birth); 1,692 (Third Birth).
- Control variables: Birth Cohorts (1945-1977); Number of Siblings; Residence (Rural/Urban); Civil Status; Educational Enrolment; Educational Attainment; Activity Status; Type of Employment.
  - Traditional Erikson and Goldthorpe's Class Classification based on Occupational Status (1987).

**Table 1: Woman's Type of Employment**

	ERIKSON & GOLDTHORPE (1987)	FFS, 1995 [variable 816]
<b>I + II SERVICE</b>	Higher-grade professionals, administrators and officials; managers in large industrial establishments; large proprietors	Legislators and senior officials; corporate managers; general managers; physical, mathematical and engineering science programmers; <b>life science and health professionals; teaching, professionals</b> ; other professionals; physical, mathematical and engineering science associate professionals; <b>life science and health associate professionals; teaching associate professionals</b> ; other associate professionals
	Lower grade professionals, administrators and officials; higher-grade technicians; managers in small industrial establishments; supervisors of non-manual employees	
<b>III ROUTINE NON-MANUAL</b>	Routine non-manual employees in administration and commerce; sales personnel; other rank-and-file service workers	Armed forces; office clerks; customers services clerks; personal and protective service workers; models, sales persons and demonstrators; sales and services elementary occupations
<b>IVa + IVb PETTY BOURGEOISE</b>	Small proprietors, artisans, etc. with/without employees	Precision, handicraft, printing and related trade workers; other crafts and related trades workers
<b>IVc FARMERS + VIIb FARM WORKERS</b>	Farmers and small holders; other self-employed workers in primary production; agricultural and other workers in primary production	Subsistence agricultural and fishery workers (if self-employed); agricultural, fishery and related labourers (if self-employed); subsistence agricultural and fishery workers; agricultural, fishery and related labourers
<b>IV &amp; VI SKILLED WORKERS</b>	Lower-grade technicians, supervisors of manual workers; skilled manual workers	Market-oriented skilled agricultural and fishery workers
<b>VIIa NON-SKILLED WORKERS</b>	Semi- and unskilled manual workers	Extraction and building trade workers; metal, machinery and related trades workers; stationary-plant and related operators; machine operators and assemblers; drivers and mobile-plant operators; labourers in mining, construction and transport



# Methods

- I use proportional hazard models

$$\ln h(t) = y(t) + \sum_j a_j x_j + \sum_i \alpha_i w_i(t)$$

**Table 3: Hazard of First Birth (Conception)**

	MODEL 1	MODEL 2	MODEL 3
<b>EDUCATIONAL ENROLMENT</b>			
In education	0.37***	0.37***	0.37***
Out education (0-2 years)	0.98	0.99	0.99
Out education (2-5 years)	1.15**	1.15**	1.16**
Out education (5+ years) [Ref.]			
<b>EDUCATIONAL LEVEL</b>			
Primary / Lower Secondary	1.50***	1.51***	1.51***
Upper Secondary [Ref.]			
University	1.01	0.95	0.94
<b>ACTIVITY STATUS</b>			
Not employed [Ref.]			
Employed	0.69***		
<b>WOMAN'S TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT</b>			
Not employed [Ref.]			
Service class		0.78**	
Health and Teaching professionals			0.86
Others			0.67**
Routine non-manual		0.67***	0.67***
Petty bourgeoisie		0.64***	0.64***
Farmers & farm workers		0.88	0.88
Skilled workers		1.46	1.46
Non-skilled workers		0.72***	0.72***

\*\*\*=p<.01, \*\*=p<.05, \*=p<.10.

**Table 4: Hazard of Second Birth (Conception)**

	MODEL 1	MODEL 2	MODEL 3
<b>EDUCATIONAL ENROLMENT</b>			
In education	0.90	0.90	0.90
Out education [Ref.]			
<b>EDUCATIONAL LEVEL</b>			
Primary / Lower Secondary	1.15*	1.15*	1.14*
Upper Secondary [Ref.]			
University	0.99	1	0.93
<b>ACTIVITY STATUS</b>			
Not employed [Ref.]			
Employed	0.81***		
<b>WOMAN'S TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT</b>			
Not employed [Ref.]			
Service class		0.76	
<b>Health and Teaching professionals</b>			0.99
Others			0.41
Routine non-manual		0.82***	0.82***
Petty bourgeoisie		0.73***	0.73***
Farmers & farm workers		0.98	0.98
Skilled workers		0.42	0.41
Non-skilled workers		0.88	0.87

\*\*\*=p<.01, \*\*=p<.05, \*=p<.10.

**Table 5: Hazard of Third Birth (Conception)**

	MODEL 1	MODEL 2	MODEL 3
<b>EDUCATIONAL ENROLMENT</b>			
In education	0.90	0.89	0.89
Out education [Ref.]			
<b>EDUCATIONAL LEVEL</b>			
Primary / Lower Secondary	1.20	1.20	1.20
Upper Secondary [Ref.]			
University	0.65	0.53	0.50
<b>ACTIVITY STATUS</b>			
Not employed [Ref.]			
Employed	0.82**		
<b>WOMAN'S TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT</b>			
Not employed [Ref.]			
Service class		1.57	
Health and Teaching professionals			1.98*
Others			0.74
Routine non-manual		0.77**	0.77**
Petty bourgeoisie		0.68**	0.68**
Farmers & farm workers		1.11	1.11
Skilled workers		1.31	1.31
Non-skilled workers		0.93	0.93

\*\*\*=p<.01, \*\*=p<.05, \*=p<.10.



# Conclusions (1)

- Women who participate in the labour market do not always have the lowest probability of becoming mothers and of having a higher number of children.
- Both structural and individual “choice” factors contribute to the determination of fertility levels.



## Conclusions (2)

- The main argument why it is important to take the type of occupations into account, is the fact that employed women cannot be treated as a uniform group with a similar career orientation. There may be specific intra-women differences among employed women with respect to family formation which may result in gender-typical occupational choices.



## Conclusions (3)

- Empirical results shown here should be taken with caution and read only as preliminary due to data limitations.