ALAP 2020

IX Congreso de la Asociación Latinoamericana de Poblacion

9 a 11 diciembre

EL ROL DE LOS ESTUDIOS DE POBLACIÓN TRAS LA PANDEMIA DE COVID-19 Y EL DESAFÍO DE LA IGUALDAD EN AMÉRICA LATINA Y EL CARIBE

Victoria San Juan Bernuy (Corresponding Author), Centre d'Estudis Demogràfics,

vsanjuan@ced.uab.cat

Diederik Boertien, Centre d'Estudis Demogràfics, dboertien@ced.uab.es

EFFECTS OF PARTNER'S EDUCATION AND SOCIOECONOMIC RESOURCES ON OCCUPATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF WOMEN IN MEXICO

1 Introduction

Income inequality has been increasing over the last decades in Europe and the United States (Alvaredo et al. 2018; Iammarino et al. 2019; McCall & Percheski 2010). Changes in family formation dynamics have been marked as a possible contributor to these trends because they determine how individual incomes and other earnings are distributed across families (McCall & Percheski 2010). The rise in divorce rates and decreases in marriage rates have contributed to growing income inequality between families, by generating an increase in single-parent families or other arrangements that are likely to be more vulnerable (Gonalons-Pons & Schwartz 2017). Likewise, selective increases in women labor force participation have made partners more homogamous in economic terms, increasing inequality between households. Consequently, there has emerged a polarization between households with dual high-earners and households with dual low-earners or only with one provider (Gonalons-Pons & Schwartz 2017).

A commonly cited explanation of economic homogamy within relationships is assortative mating (Eika et al. 2019; Blossfeld & Timm 2003). A large body of literature on homogamy within relationships (Kalmijn 1994, 1998), has concluded that resourceful individuals form couples together, and people with less resources partner each other too (Blossfeld & Timm 2003). Other studies have pointed at the division of paid labor as the key explanation for increasing economic homogamy over time (Breen & Andersen 2012; Greenwood et al. 2014). More specifically, Gonalons-Pons and Schwartz (2017) have shown how women with high earnings potential and high-earning partners have particularly increased labor supply over the last years in the US, making it the primary factor driving up economic homogamy within couples. This moves the question of how partner resources relate to labor force participation to the forefront. Besides the relevance of this question in regards to homogamy and income inequality, the main focus of this thesis, it is also relevant more generally to understand couple dynamics and processes that affect gender inequality within couples. There are three main ideas about how men's resources can affect women's labor market outcomes. The first approach is based on Becker's "New Home Economics" where individuals who have a resourceful partner will specialize in domestic work in order to obtain the maximum benefit for the family. Given men's higher earnings on average, women's labor participation will decrease. The second approach is based on gender equality. Where both members of the couple have more egalitarian values, the division of paid work will be more equal and women's labor participation will rise. The third approach is based on the social capital concept. Couples may be using characteristics of partner's such as motivation, college prestige or networks to access higher incomes (Coleman 1988) and women will have more opportunities to participate in the labor market.

Empirical evidence conducted in industrialized societies has found a negative relationship between a partner's earnings and labor market participation (Bernasco et al. 1998; Henz & Sundström 2001; Sundström & Duvander 2002; Bernardi 1999; Verbakel & De Graaf 2009). On the other hand, these studies have also found a positive relationship between partner resources and social status or job achieved among employed women (Bernasco et al., 1998; Bernardi 1999; Verbakel & De Graaf 2009).

In this article, we raise the question to what extent this evidence can be generalized to less rich countries. What happens in a context where both members of the couple have to work due to necessity, or where gender egalitarian values are not yet as widespread as in industrialized societies?
Existing studies on developing countries have focused on understanding women's labor participation, the influence of social capital on family, new types of double-earner families, and gender and social inequalities faced by women (Casique 2008; Cerrutti & Zenteno 2000; Leija et al., 2018; Martínez Jasso & Acevedo Flores 2004; Castro et al., 2011). Nevertheless, there are few studies which examining the relationship between women`s labor participation and partner's resources.

The current study contributes to filling this void in the literature by examining how men's economic and educational characteristics affect their female partners work status in a not industrialized societies as is the case of Mexico.

Mexico is characterised by a high level of inequality. The Gini coefficient reached the value of 45.4 in 2019, which is a level above any EU country or the United States (41.4 in 2016). This inequality affects women in particular, who are more exposed to job dismissal and poverty (Horbath & Gracia 2014). As some data shows, the female rate participation in the formal sector was 47% in 2018 as compared to 58% for men in 2018 (World Bank, 2020). Moreover, the gap in income between men and women is about 18% and access for women to highly skilled jobs are still limited (Hidalgo 2017).

Women's situation in the labor market is a reflection of wider gender inequality in society. For instance. women's labor participation is not followed by important changes in the pattern of power or in the division of domestic work (Hernández Limonchi & Ibarra Uribe 2019; de Oliveira & García 2012; Reyes 2008; Chant 1991; García Guzmán & Olivera 1994; Casique 2000; Casique 2000b) which implies that women have to combine domestic work with paid work. In short, traditional gender roles are still strongly marked in Mexico (Aguilar Montes de Oca et al., 2013).

In this context characterised by high economic and social inequality for women, we structure our study around three main research questions to test whether men's resources affects women's labor market status 1. Are women more likely to work when their partners earn relatively little income? 2. Does men's education influence women's work status within couples? 3. Do male partners' economic resources positively affect employed women's earnings? To answer these questions, we use data from the National Survey of Occupation and Employment of Mexico (ENOE) collected in 2005 and 2017.

The article is structured as follows. In the first section of the study, we review the theories of partner effects on employment outcomes. In the second section, we briefly review the Mexican context in economic, social and gender terms. In the third section, we expose the data and methods followed by our results and a final conclusion.

2 Background

There are three main ideas about how men's resources can affect women's labor market outcomes. The first approach is based on Becker's "New Home Economics". The second approach is based on the theory of gender equality and the third on the concept of social capital.

1.2.1 New Home Economics approach

Becker's "New home economics theory" focuses on human capital and productivity. In a family context, the household becomes the unit of analysis and the family members pool their resources and take decisions in favour of maximizing the benefit of the family (Bernardi 1999). In other words, partners have to decide how to distribute their time between paid work and domestic work for obtaining the most joint utility. As there are benefits to specializing within couples (domestic work or paid work), the decision of which member will work or will do domestic work is taken by the marginal productivity of each partner in the two different areas (Bernardi 1999).

Taking into account the theory of comparative advantage, a wife whose husband has better conditions in the labor market will be more likely to specialize in domestic work. This fact leads women to have a disadvantage in the labor market when it comes to accessing jobs or in terms of occupational status. If women have to specialize in domestic work, this complicates the access to a full-time job because they have to combine their career with household responsibilities. However, it is necessary to highlight that this neoclassical economic model has been criticized in the literature for several reasons. One of them is to the lack of attention for social norms and institutions in the dynamics of domestic units. This means that the theory does not adequately represent the ways of functioning of many households (Benería 2008). An example of this is the work of Wolf (1990) in which it is shown how task-sharing decisions vary from one culture to another, while in Taiwan the power of the parent provider is vital, in Java the same is not the case, women develop work strategies to survive and not be dependent on their parents. In Guatemala, Katz (1995) examined the different processes that characterized domestic economies in which the separation of male and female economic spheres was complex.

Moreover, this theory does not consider the economic context of the country. For instance, in Latin America disadvantaged women who live in a precarious family income context, are driven to develop a series of strategies to survive. These strategies lead them to carry out a series of works that, although different, are linked. These strategies confuse the barriers –in time and space- between domestic and extra-domestic work (remunerated and communal); activities which acquire meaning in their role as

wife-mother-housewife (Fernández et al., 1991). Therefore, considering the urgent family need to obtain more resources, women's work becomes a survival strategy (de la Rocha 1986). The work and wages of many of them are fundamental to maintaining family living standards when men are unable or unwilling to take the role of breadwinner (Humphries & Sarasúa 2012).

Hence, in general this theoretical perspective suggests that the larger the difference in earnings potential between male and female partners within couples, the less likely women are to work. This would lead us to expect a negative correlation between men's economic resources and women's employment in our first hypothesis. However, in families where men's earnings potential is low (but still higher than their partner's) this relationship might not hold.

1.2.2 Gender equality approach

The second approach to determining how men's economic resources can affect women's status and labor participation is based on considerations of gender equality. The incorporation of women in the public sphere through education, politics and paid work (Astelarra 1990; Durán Heras 1986) has been widely accepted in society except for some countries and social classes (Durán Heras 2006). This fact has caused in most households a reconfiguration in which the classic model of male economic provider and female housewife has been weakened giving rise to a model where both members of the couple work. However, the mere fact that women work does not imply gender equality at home. Several authors have pointed out that while women have joined the labor market in a massive way, men have not adopted a proportional load of household tasks (England 2010). This unequal progress in the domestic sphere has been described as an "incomplete revolution" (Esping-Andersen 2009). Whereas women have achieved more status on a public level, the same has not happened in the private sphere.

The literature suggests that households formed by couples in which both members have more equal gender attitudes, domestic work is assigned in a more equal way (Kamo 1988; Pittman & Blanchard 1996). Both members of the couple share the domestic tasks and also both are longer in the labor market.

Esping-Andersen (2007) showed that education is an important factor in the division of household tasks. In particular, he suggests that men with high levels of education participate more in the home and care of their young children than those with low levels of education. This argument has also been corroborated by other authors (Anxo 2002; Bianchi et al., 2000). Therefore, if education is a key factor that determines an egalitarian division of household tasks, women with higher educated partners might spend more time in the labor market. Hence, our second hypothesis states that we should find a positive relationship between partner education and the decision of women to remain in or enter into the labor market, if we consider education as an important factor in the division of household tasks.

This prediction stands in contrast with the specialization hypothesis formulated above if one considers education as increasing productivity in the labor market. There are two other theoretical perspectives that would likewise suggest a negative rather than positive correlation between men's resources and women's labor force participation. Firstly, scholars have emphasized how couples behave according to beliefs of how men and women are expected to behave, or "do gender" (Coltrane 1989). Couples might therefore avoid situations that are different from traditional roles taken on by men and women, such as women taking on the breadwinner role. Men with few economic resources might therefore push against the incorporation of their partners in the labor market. A second argument is based on "bargain models", the power to get the other partner to do housework is based on economic resources (Becker 1981; Van Der Lippe & Siegers 1994). From this perspective, men with high economic resources will bargain for their female partners to focus on domestic rather than paid work.

1.2.3 Social capital

A third theory of how men's characteristics can affect women's status in the labor market focuses on social capital. This theory poses that people can obtain more resources if they have access to a network whose members can provide access to such resources (Coleman 1988). Applied to the case of a couple, we expect that partner's resources are shared. Not only in economic terms, but also in terms of human and social capital (experience, contacts and skills). A counterargument that can be made is that family and close friends are sometimes less able to provide new information because they form part of the same network (Granovetter 2018). Nevertheless, in general, it is the partner and relatives that offer types of support that require more commitment and energy (Bernasco et al., 1998). Therefore, this theory suggests that partners can help each other to achieve higher levels of occupational attainment (Bernardi 1999).

In sum, our third hypothesis suggests a positive relation between partner resources and women's labor force participation. We expect that the higher the income or education of men, the higher the labor income of working women.

1.2.4 Existing empirical evidence

Empirical studies conducted in Europe and USA about the influence of the partner on labor market outcomes have found a negative relationship between a partner's earnings and labor market participation (Bernasco et al. 1998; Henz & Sundström 2001; Sundström & Duvander 2002; Bernardi 1999; Verbakel & De Graaf 2009). On the other hand, these studies have also found a positive relationship between partner resources and social status or job achieved among employed women (Bernasco et al. 1998; Bernardi 1999; Verbakel & De Graaf 2009). In the case of partner's education as a resource, most of the research has found a positive relationship between education and occupational

attainments (Bernasco et al. 1998). However, Van Der Lippe & Siegers (1994) have found a negative relationship between these components based on economic terms.

These results suggest that the applicability of the theories previously developed, depends on the exact outcome considered. When the partner's income is higher, the other member of the couple is more likely to specialize in home duties and reduce participation in the labor market. However, education appears to be more important as an enhancer of egalitarian values than an economic resource given the positive relationship between men's education and women's employment.

The literature on the employment status of women according to the resources of their partner has mainly focused on Europe and the United States. Studies on this topic in Latin America are comparatively limited. Most of them do not focus on determining how the resources of men influence women's outcomes, but they deal with issues of equality in the distribution of household tasks, the influence of social capital on the family, the new types of double-earner families, the gender and social inequalities that women face (Cerrutti & Zenteno 2000; Casique 2008; Martínez Jasso & Acevedo Flores 2004; Leija et al. 2018; Castro et al. 2011). The main goal of our empirical analysis is to test these hypotheses in terms of women's labor market careers in a Mexican context characterized by strong inequality and where the common family model is the man as an economic provider and the women as a housewife.

1.2.5 The Mexican Context

During the last decade Mexico has been affected by the financial crisis that has had negative consequences for employment, inequality and poverty. In the year 2006, the rate of unemployment was 3.2% and in 2009 the same rate was 5.5% (INEGI 2020). These percentages translate into a loss of more than one million jobs since September 2008 (Castro & Nevárez 2015). In addition to unemployment, the crisis also affected levels of inequality and poverty. The Gini coefficient reached the value of 46.3 in 2016 (World Bank 2019) and the number of poor people exceeded 50 million in 2012 (CONEVAL 2012).These data reflect job insecurity and informality. The unemployment rate is lower than the data offered by other European countries such as Spain (13.78%; INE 2019), however, this is due to the informal work that is generally not accounted for and reflected in national statistics.

This context of economic inequality is joined by gender inequality. As some data shows, the female rate participation in the formal sector was 47% in 2018 as compared to 58% for men in 2018 (World Bank 2020). Moreover, the gap in income between men and women is about 18% and access for women to highly skilled jobs are still limited (Hidalgo 2017). In addition, Mexico is characterized by being mainly a patriarchal society where men assume authority in the family and the role of main economic provider, women are considered responsible for household chores and childcare (Ballén Granados 2012). Violations of these norms can generate discrimination and violence against those who try to change them (Gracia & Herrero 2006). Although this is not always the case, sometimes, due to the

economic household's precariousness, women enter the labor market due to the need to generate additional income (Lustig 1990). In contrast to what has been observed in rich countries, this raises the possibility that Mexican women will be more likely to work when their partners earn little income.

On the other hand, it should be noted that in recent decades, Mexican society has undergone a series of transformations such as an increase in the educational level, a reduction in the number of children and an rise in women's labor participation which have contributed to transforming the role of men, gender relations in the family and the meaning of masculinity (Fuller 2001). The most evident changes have occurred among people with more schooling in which macho values are less persistent (del Castillo & Castillo 2012). If education is related to more equal values within the couple (Esping-Andersen 2007), we expect to find a positive relationship between education and women's work status in Mexico too.

Additionally, egalitarian values within the couple can influence women's work status. The existence of trust in the relationship will increase the exchange of network and resources between partners (Coleman 1988). Moreover, as (Kugler 2003) suggests in high-wage sectors, employers prefer to rely on personal social networks to fill their vacancies. Conversely for sectors or low-paid jobs, formal schemes are used, which are easier to access for people with few connections (Wial 1991). Therefore, when the partner has high networking and financial resources, the woman is expected to achieve similar income levels. This trait of the Mexican context might render partner resources as social capital more important as compared to other contexts.

In this study, we also consider how the effect of partner resources might have changed over time. Because of the increases in female labor force participation and educational expansion, we assume that the effects of education and socio-economic resources of the partners on the job status of women in Mexico will not be the same for 2005 as for 2017. We expect a greater effect in 2017 in terms of education due to an increase in gender equality, women will be more likely to enter in labor market. Moreover, we also expect a higher effect between partner resources and job status of women in 2017. As a result of the financial crisis described above, millions of people lost their jobs. In this context of inequality, households that lost the economic stability provided by partners who now earn little income might increase women's participation in the labor market to generate additional income to survive. This might further strengthen an eventual negative relationship between partner resources and women's employment.

1.3 Data and Methodology

The analysis is based on data from the National Survey of Occupation and Employment of Mexico (ENOE 2019). This survey is the main source of information on the Mexican labor market, offering monthly and quarterly data on labor force, occupation, informal employment, underemployment and unemployment. It is also the largest continuous statistical project in the country to provide sub-national figures for each of the 32 states and for a total of 36 cities. The survey follows habitual residents of selected dwellings for five three-month periods.

In this study, we analyze two periods of time to compare whether the role of men's resources in women's careers has changed. The first period of analysis goes from the first quarter of 2005 to the first quarter of 2006 and the second period goes from the first quarter of 2017 until the first quarter of 2018. We select households where the woman of the couple is between 20 and 49[1] years old. Since the purpose of the study is to investigate the effect of partners' resources on women's careers, we considered both married and cohabiting partners. Moreover, we exclude same sex couples, women with missing or unknown information about employment status, disabled individuals, the retired and students. The sample sizes obtained for the two periods are 35,318 couples in 2005 and 31,472 couples in 2017.

In order to facilitate a comparative analysis across time we have equivalized labor income using Purchasing Power Parity deflators to adjust income variables to 2011 levels expressed in US dollars.[2]

We start by focusing on women's transitions into or out of the labor market during the five quarterly periods. The panel data gives us information about women's labor market status in each quarter, and therefore does not capture short spells of non-employment or employment that occurred between waves. Having no specific information or detailed dates, we cannot use a continuous time event-history approach. Therefore, we apply a discrete time event history model that allows us to work with panel data.

For this analysis we use two binary dependent variables indicating transitions from i) employment[3] to non-employment, and ii) non-employment to employment. For this purpose, we restricted the analysis to individuals who were employed in the first quarter of observation in the former case and to individuals who were non-employed individuals in wave one in the latter case. We coded the event as having happened if there is a transition in the subsequent quarters. We run logistic regressions for each period (2005 and 2017) and event (entry into and exit from the labor market) to understand how the male partner's characteristics affect women's labor market characteristics. This type of logistic model

[1] We establish this age range to have a high percentage of women in a relationship and who are also of working age.

[2] Parity of purchasing power (PPP) harmonized see: http://www.lisdatacenter.org/data-access/ppp-deflators/

[3] We define employment when during the reference week of the interview they carried out some economic activity for at least one hour. It includes the employed that had a job, but did not work temporarily for some reason, without losing the employment relationship with it; as well as those who helped in some economic activity without receiving a salary or salary. Informal work is included and we do not distinguish between formal and informal work. We do not make a distinction because we are interested in the transitions from employment to unemployment and vice versa. In addition, we are interested in the salary received by both partners, regardless of the origin of the activity.

is used to analyze dichotomous or qualitative dependent variables. The objective of this technique is that a set of variables collected in a vector X =($X_{1, \dots}$,X_K) explain the probability that an event occurs $P[Y = 1]$. In this study the $P[Y = 1]$ refers to the transitions from employment to unemployment or vice versa.

Mathematically, the probability that the event occurs is defined as follows:

$$P[Y = 1|X_1, \dots\dots, X_K\ ] = \frac{1}{1+e^{(-\beta_0-\beta_1 X_1,\dots,-\beta_K X_K)}} \quad [1]$$

in which $\beta = (\beta_0, \beta_1,\dots,\beta_k)$ is the vector of parameters to be estimated.

In the analysis we use two kinds of independent variables:

i) Women's characteristics: age divided into three groups (20-30 reference category, 31-40, 41-50); women's income pre-taxes that includes commissions and all work income (measured in logarithmic scale); women's income measured in quintiles and women's education divided into four groups (less than primary, primary complete, secondary complete, and university complete).

ii) Male partner's characteristics: partner's earnings (measured in logarithmic scale); partner's earnings measured in quintiles and an indicator of women's earnings relative to the earnings of their partner, measured as a dummy variable (taking a value of 1if the income of the male partner is higher than her income, and 0 otherwise); men's education divided into four groups (less than primary reference category, primary complete, secondary complete and university complete). Finally, we control for wave (it goes from 1 to 5 referring to the different waves of the survey).

In order to estimate the influence of men's economic resources on women's earnings, we use standard linear regressions. We include the same set of independent variables as in the case of the logistic regressions explaining employment.

1.4 Results

1.4.1 Sample Description

Table 1.1 provides descriptive statistics for the sample of years 2005 and 2017. Both women's employment and education increased across the observation period. The percentage of women with secondary and tertiary education increased from 36% in 2005 to 41% in 2017 and 20% in 2005 to 34% in 2017, respectively. We observe a decrease in the percentage of women who have more than three children, from 55% in 2005 to 47% in 2017.

In terms of income, the table shows that woman's income and their partners' incomes measured in Mexican pesos has increased over time. However, if we compare the income in dollars, we observe that the purchasing power of women and their partners has decreased. This is in line with previous research

showing that the purchasing power of a worker in Mexico today is 80.8% of their purchasing power three decades ago (Hernández 2018).

Table 1-1 Descriptive statistics for the sample.

	2005 Average / Share	2017 Average / Share
Women's employment status		
Employment	.43	.48
Non- employment	.57	.52
Women's age		
[20,30]	.24	.23
[30,40]	.43	.40
[40,50]	.33	.37
Women's Education		
Less than primary	.18	.09
Primary Complete	.26	.16
Secondary Complete	.36	.41
Tertiary Complete	.20	.34
Number of Children		
None	.04	.05
1-3	.41	.48
>3	.55	.47
Women's average income (unadjusted mexican pesos)	1330	1952
Women's average income (adjusted income to 2011 levels expressed	108.2	86.58
Men's average income (unadjusted mexican pesos)	4765	5424
Men's average income (adjusted income to 2011 levels expressed in	385.54	238.9
Men's income > women's income	.76	.64
Men's Education		
Less than primary	.17	.10
Primary Complete	.24	.17
Secondary Complete	.31	.37
Tertiary Complete	.28	.36

Source: Authors elaborated based on ENOE database

1.4.2 Transition out of the labor market

In Table 1.2 we present the analysis explaining transitions from employment to unemployment in 2005. The first three regressions of the table include women's characteristics, whereas the subsequent models incorporate the resources of the male partner. The first three models suggest that women's economic resources and education decrease the likelihood to leave the labor market. The effect of age is also significant; women older than 30 years are less likely to leave the labor market. This result is different from the evidence found from other countries where the likelihood of exiting the labor market increases with women's age (Bernardi 1999; Bernasco 1994). This might reflect younger ages at childbearing in Mexico.

As regards the effects of partner's resources, Model 4 shows that men's income is related to an increased likelihood for women to exit the labor market, even though this continuous effect is not statistically significant. Once using quintiles of income for Model 5, we see that women whose male partners have earnings in the lowest quintile of the distribution are statistically significantly less likely to exit the labor market as compared to all other groups. Model 6 shows how women are also more likely to leave the labor market when the man earns more than his partner. In contrast to these results, Model 7 shows how education of the male partner acts positively on the women's permanence in the labor market. The higher the education of the partner, the less likely the woman is to leave work. In the case of the 2017 period (Table A- appendix), the results obtained are similar to those found for 2005.

Table 1-2 Discrete-time event history models explaining transition from employment to non-employment year 2005 [4].

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7
Women's age (30,40]	0.92***	0.84***	0.70***	0.84***	0.84***	0.85***	0.84***
Women's age (40,50]	0.67***	0.61***	0.56***	0.61***	0.63***	0.64***	0.61***

[4] We use logistic regressions models, coefficient are expressed in odds ratio. Signif. codes: '***' p < 0.001 '**'p< 0.01 '*'p< 0.05

Women's Education Primary Complete	0.99	0.90	0.93	0.96	0.89	0.89*	0.96
Women's Education Secondary Complete	1.00	0.84**	0.75***	0.93**	0.83**	0.84**	0.93
Women's Education Tertiary Complete	0.88*	0.75***	0.48***	0.87***	0.73***	0.76***	0.86
Nª of Children 1-3	1.14	1.15	1.16	1.15	1.14	1.13	1.15
Nª of Children >3	1.11	1.12	1.25*	1.11	1.11	1.09	1.11
Period 2	0.09***	0.08***	0.09***	0.07***	0.07***	0.07***	0.07***
Period 3	0.04***	0.03***	0.08***	0.03***	0.03***	0.03***	0.03***
Period 4	0.03***	0.02***	0.04***	0.02***	0.02***	0.02***	0.02***
Period 5	0.02***	0.02***	0.02***	0.02***	0.02***	0.02***	0.02***
Women's income	0.39***						
Women's income q.2		0.94		0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94
Women's income q.3		0.84**		0.84**	0.86**	0.85**	0.82***
Women's income q.4		0.07***		0.07***	0.07***	0.07***	0.06***
Women's income q.5		0.0***		0.0***	0.0***	0.0***	0.0***
Men's income				1.00			
Men's income q.2					1.12		
Men's income q.3					1.16*		
Men's income q.4					1.15*		
Men's income q.5					1.19**		
Men's income > women's income						1.49***	
Men's Education Primary Complete							0.85*
Men's Education Secondary Complete							0.81**
Men's Education Tertiary Complete							0.76***
Log-likelihood	14566	16692	23462	16695	16683	16640	16678
Number of Event	35318	35318	35318	35318	35318	35318	35318

Source: Authors elaborated based on ENOE database [4]. We use logistic regressions models, coefficient are expressed in odds ratio. Signif. codes: '***' p < 0.001 '**'p< 0.01 '*'p< 0.05

In Table 1.3 we test to what extent effect sizes of partner characteristics changed across periods by pooling cases from both periods and interacting our main variables of interest with the period. We observe that the impact of partner characteristics (men's income and education), on the probability for women to leave the labor market has become stronger over time. Model 1 shows how men's income increases the likelihood for women to exit the labor market more so in 2017 than in 2005. Differences in the probability to leave the labor market between those women with partners in the lowest quintile, and partners in higher quintiles increased across periods (Model 2). This also applies to the case where men earn more than women (Model 3).

In terms of education, as in the case of income, the impact of partner status on the probability for women to leave the labor market has become stronger over time. The probability that women remain in the labor market when their partner has tertiary education is higher in 2017 compared to 2005 (Model 4).

Table 1-3 Discrete-time event history models explaining transition from employment to non-employment (interaction model 2005- 2017)[5]

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Women's age (30,40]	0.80***	0.82***	0.82***	0.80***
Women's age (40,50]	0.62***	0.65***	0.66***	0.61***
Women's Education Primary Complete	0.90*	0.89*	0.90*	0.95
Women's Education Secondary Complete	0.86**	0.86**	0.86**	0.94
Women's Education Tertiary Complete	0.67***	0.73***	0.72***	0.81***
Nª of Children 1-3	1.18*	1.17*	1.16*	1.18*
Nª of Children >3	1.18*	1.16*	1.16*	1.17*
Period 2	0.08***	0.03***	0.10***	0.10***
Period 3	0.04***	0.04***	0.04***	0.04***
Period 4	0.02***	-0.02***	0.02***	0.02***
Period 5	0.01***	0.01***	0.01***	0.01***
Women's income q.2	1.03	1.02	1.02	1.03
Women's income q.3	1.00	0.87***	0.98	0.96
Women's income q.4	0.08***	0.07***	0.07***	0.07***
Women's income q.5	0.00***	0.00***	0.00***	0.00***
Year	0.78***	0.50***	0.78***	0.98***
Men's income	1.00			
Men's income (Interaction with year 2005 as reference)	1.08***			
Men's income q.2		1.11		
Men's income q.3		1.13*		
Men's income q.4		1.12*		
Men's income q.5		1.14*		
Men's income q.2 (Interaction with year 2005 as		2.27***		
Men's income q.3 (Interaction with year 2005 as		1.95***		
Men's income q.4 (Interaction with year 2005 as		1.93***		
Men's income q.5 (Interaction with year 2005 as		1.95***		
Men's income > women's income			1.43***	
Men's income > women's income (Interaction with year			1.28***	
Men's Education Primary Complete			0.94	0.87*
Men's Education Secondary Complete			0.85*	0.84**
Men's Education Tertiary Complete			0.70***	0.83**
Men's Education (Interaction with year 2005 as reference)				1.04
Men's Education (Interaction with year 2005 as reference)				0.95
Men's Education (Interaction with year 2005 as reference)				0.77**
Log-likelihood	33309	33099	33135	33301
Number of Event	66779	66779	66779	66779

Source: Authors elaborated based on ENOE database [5]We use logistic regressions models, coefficient are expressed in

1.4.3 Transition into the Labor market

Table 1.4 presents results for the transition from non-employment to employment in 2005. In contrast to the results for exits from the labor market, the characteristics of partners are not significant in any regression for the entry of women into the labor market. Women's own characteristics acquire a fundamental relevance. In models 1 to 3, the results suggest that age is a significant variable when women are over 30 years old. In this case, women are more likely to enter the labor market than women

[5] We use logistic regressions models, coefficient are expressed in odds ratio. Signif. codes: '***' $p < 0.001$ '**'$p< 0.01$ '*'$p< 0.05$

under this age. On the other hand, the secondary and tertiary levels of education relate positively to entering the labor market.

The variables that have a negative impact for entering in the labor market are: i) number of children: women who have children are more likely to remain out of the labor market than women who have no children ii) duration of non-employment, if women are out of the labor market for two subsequent periods, the probability of accessing the labor market again is dramatically lower.

Table 1-4 *Discrete-time event history models explaining transition from non-employment to employment to year 2005*[6]

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Women's age (30,40]	1.34***	1.34***	1.34***	1.34***
Women's age (40,50]	1.29***	1.30***	1.30***	1.30***
Women's Education Primary Complete	1.04	1.04	1.05	1.05
Women's Education Secondary Complete	1.29***	1.30***	1.30***	1.33***
Women's Education Tertiary Complete	1.73***	1.75***	1.75***	1.80***
Nª of Children 1-3	0.81*	0.81*	0.81*	0.81*
Nª of Children >3	0.80*	0.80*	0.80**	0.80*
Period 2	0.06***	0.07***	0.07***	0.07***
Period 3	0.12***	0.12***	0.12***	0.12***
Period 4	0.06***	0.06***	0.06***	0.06***
Period 5	0.05***	0.05***	0.05***	0.05***
Men's income		1.00		
Men's income q.2			1.00	
Men's income q.3			1.00	
Men's income q.4			1.00	
Men's income q.5			1.00	
Men's Education Primary Complete				1.02
Men's Education Secondary Complete				1.04
Men's Education Tertiary Complete				1.06
Log-likelihood	23990	23989	23986	23989
Number of Event	35318	35318	35318	35318

Source: Authors elaborated based on ENOE database [6] We use logistic regressions models, coefficient are expressed in odds ratio. Signif. codes: '***' p < 0.001 '**'p< 0.01 '*'p< 0.05

In the year 2017 (table B- appendix), we observe exactly the same pattern as in 2005, women older than 30 years, more educated and childless are most likely to enter the labor market. A priori, the characteristics of the partner's in the entry event do not have an effect in the 2017 either. However, if we compare both periods (Table 1.5) it can be concluded that again, as in the case of the exit event, partner's economic resources and the level of education have become more important over time. While men's education has become more positively associated to women's labor market entry (Model 3), the opposite is observed for economic resources where the effect became more negative over time (Model 1 and Model 2).

[6] We use logistic regressions models, coefficient are expressed in odds ratio. Signif. codes: '***' p < 0.001 '**'p< 0.01 '*'p< 0.05

Tabla 1-5 Discrete-time event history models explaining transition from non-employment to employment (interaction model 2005- 2017)[7].

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Women's age (30,40]	1.33***	1.33***	1.33***
Women's age (40,50]	1.32***	1.30***	1.30***
Women's Education Primary Complete	1.07	1.07	1.07
Women's Education Secondary Complete	1.29***	1.27***	1.28***
Women's Education Tertiary Complete	1.76***	1.71***	1.76***
Nª of Children 1-3	0.77***	0.77***	0.77***
Nª of Children >3	0.72***	0.73***	0.73***
Period 2	0.12***	0.12***	0.12***
Period 3	0.12***	0.12***	0.12***
Period 4	0.06***	0.06***	0.06***
Period 5	0.04***	0.04***	0.04***
Year	1.03	1.03	1.02
Men's income	1.00		
Men's income (Interaction with year 2005 as reference)	1.00**		
Men's income q.2		1.00	
Men's income q.3		0.92	
Men's income q.4		1.00	
Men's income q.5		0.96	
Men's income q.2 (Interaction with year 2005 as reference)		0.99	
Men's income q.3 (Interaction with year 2005 as reference)		0.89*	
Men's income q.4 (Interaction with year 2005 as reference)		0.92	
Men's income q.5 (Interaction with year 2005 as reference)		0.88*	
Men's Education Primary Complete			1.05
Men's Education Secondary Complete			1.03
Men's Education Tertiary Complete			1.02
Men's Education Primary Complete*year			1.05
Men's Education Secondary Complete*year			1.08*
Men's Education Tertiary Complete*year			1.09*
Log-likelihood	46468	46460	46460
Number of Event	66779	66779	66779

Source: Authors elaborated based on ENOE database [7.]We use logistic regressions models, coefficient are expressed in odds ratio. Signif. codes: '***' p < 0.001 '**'p< 0.01 '*'p< 0.05

1.4.4 Labor income of employed women

Table 1.6 presents the results of linear regression models explaining labor income for the subsample of women who are employed in the year 2005. First, Model 1 shows that women's age, educational level and number of children impact income. We observe that earnings are higher for women over 30 years, without children and with higher levels of educational attainment. When we consider the resources of the partner (Model 2 to Model 4), we see that both economic and educational resources, affect women's

[7] We use logistic regressions models, coefficient are expressed in odds ratio. Signif. codes: '***' p < 0.001 '**'p< 0.01 '*'p< 0.05

income in a positive way. The higher the male partner's resources the greater the female partner's income. For instance, in Model 3 which considers economic resources, shows that the main difference is between having a male partner in the first quintile of earnings or a higher quintile. The higher the partner's income, the higher the impact on women's income. Model 4 points out that employed women who have a partner with secondary or tertiary education earn more than women with a non- or primary school educated partner. In the case of 2017 period (Table C- appendix), the results obtained are similar to those found in 2005. Women's age and levels of education attainment affect women's income in a positive way. The higher the level attainment, the higher the impact on women's income. Nevertheless, the number of children have a negative impact on women's income. The higher the number of children the lower the income. Regarding the resources of the partner, as in the case of 2005, men's income and men's educational level increase women's income, especially if the man has a tertiary education or an income reflected in the fifth quintile.

Table 1-6 Linear models regression explaining the effect in women's income to year 2005[8].

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Women's age (30,40]	0.26***	0.27***	0.27***	0.26***
Women's age (40,50]	0.34***	0.35***	0.35***	0.34***
Women's Education Primary Complete	0.07***	0.06***	0.05**	0.04**
Women's Education Secondary Complete	0.32***	0.29***	0.27***	0.26***
Women's Education Tertiary Complete	0.71***	0.67***	0.65***	0.63***
Nª of Children 1-3	-0.12***	-0.13***	-0.14***	-0.12***
Nª of Children >3	-0.21***	-0.22***	-0.22***	-0.21***
Period 2	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Period 3	-0.00	-0.00	-0.00	-0.00
Period 4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Period 5	-0.00	-0.00	-0.00	-0.00
Men's income		0.11***		
Men's income q.2			0.20***	
Men's income q.3			0.24***	
Men's income q.4			0.28***	
Men's income q.5			0.30***	
Men's Education Primary Complete				0.04*
Men's Education Secondary Complete				0.11***
Men's Education Tertiary Complete				0.12***
Number of Event	35318	35318	35318	35318

Source: Authors elaborated based on ENOE database [8.] We use linear regressions models. Signif. codes: '***' p < 0.001 '**'p< 0.01 '*'p< 0.05

Table 1.7 describes changes over time in the effect of partner characteristics on employed women's earnings. Once again, their importance has increased over time in the case of earnings, the impact is higher in 2017. As we can see, Model 2 shows that the impacts on earnings of employed women are

[8] We use linear regressions models. Signif. codes: '***' p < 0.001 '**'p< 0.01 '*'p< 0.05

greater when the male partner is in a higher income quintile. In contrast, men's education has become less relevant for employed women's earnings over time, the impact is more relevant in 2005 than 2017.

Table 1-7 Linear models regression explaining the effect in women's income (interaction model 2005-2017)[9].

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Women's age (30,40]	0.26***	0.26***	0.24***
Women's age (40,50]	0.32***	0.31***	0.27***
Women's Education Primary Complete	0.06***	0.05***	0.04***
Women's Education Secondary Complete	0.23***	0.22***	0.19***
Women's Education Tertiary Complete	0.56***	0.55***	0.51***
Nª of Children 1-3	-0.21***	-0.22***	-0.21***
Nª of Children >3	-0.29***	-0.30***	-0.29***
Period 2	-0.00	-0.00	-0.01
Period 3	-0.00	-0.00	-0.01
Period 4	-0.00	-0.00	-0.00
Period 5	-0.00	-0.01	-0.00
Year	-0.23***	-0.28***	0.02
Men's income	0.11***		
Men's income (Interaction with year 2005 as reference)	0.09***		
Men's income q.2		0.19***	
Men's income q.3		0.23***	
Men's income q.4		0.28***	
Men's income q.5		0.33***	
Men's income q.2 (Interaction with year 2005 as reference)		0.07**	
Men's income q.3 (Interaction with year 2005 as reference)		0.25***	
Men's income q.4 (Interaction with year 2005 as reference)		0.28***	
Men's income q.5 (Interaction with year 2005 as reference)		0.29***	
Men's Education Primary Complete			0.04**
Men's Education Secondary Complete			0.14***
Men's Education Tertiary Complete			0.19***
Men's Education Primary Complete (Interaction with year 2005 as reference)			-0.07**
Men's Education Secondary Complete (Interaction with year 2005 as reference)			-0.13***
Men's Education Tertiary Complete (Interaction with year 2005 as reference)			-0.22***
Number of Event	66779	66779	66779

9. **Source:** Authors elaborated based on ENOE database [9.] We use linear regressions models Signif. codes: '***' p < 0.001 '**'p< 0.01 '*'p< 0.05

1.5 Discussion

In this article, we studied the influence of men's education and economic characteristics on their female partners' work status in two periods of time, 2005 and 2017. Previous studies conducted for Europe and the USA have pointed to the negative impact of men's economic characteristics on their partners' work (Bernardi 1999; Bernasco et al. 1998; Henz & Sundström 2001; Sundström & Duvander 2002;

[9] We use linear regressions models Signif. codes: '***' p < 0.001 '**'p< 0.01 '*'p< 0.05

Verbakel & De Graaf 2009). On the other hand, these studies have found a positive relationship between partner resources and social status or job achievement (Bernardi 1999; Bernasco et al. 1998; Verbakel & De Graaf 2009). In the case of education, most of the research showed a positive relationship between high education and social mobility of the partner (Bernardi 1999; Bernasco et al. 1998). In line with these previous findings, our results suggest a negative association between men's earning and their partners' work status in Mexico. Moreover, as previous studies suggested, we found a positive relationship between partners' resources and women's earnings. Regarding education, we found that the more educated her male partner is, the more likely a woman is to work in the labor market.

Our results indicated the possible coexistence of two types of processes in Mexico. On the one hand, we suggest the existence of traditional couples in which men are the economic providers and women are housewives. Male partners' economic resources were proved to be an important variable that conditions women's labor market access and permanence in the labor market. This type of process was related to our first hypothesis and was based on Becker's economic theory. Furthermore, in disagreement with previous studies, which found that the partners' economic resources is significant only for higher positions in the social stratification system (Bernardi 1999; Bernasco et al. 1998), we found that the strongest effect of partners' economic resources is given in the lowest quintile. Women whose male partners have earnings in the lowest quintile are statistically significantly less likely to exit the labor market as compared to all other groups. The explanation between these differences of results, can be related with the inequality and poverty registered in Mexico, which differs from the European countries used in other studies. When partners are on a low income, Mexican women are more likely to work because there is an economic need for survival. On the contrary, when men earns enough money to support the family, women are more likely to leave the labor market.

On the other hand, we pointed out the possible existence of couples that followed more egalitarian patters in which education is an important resource of the division of unpaid work. In general terms, and as some authors suggest, these egalitarian couples have a lower social presence and are more concentrated in higher educational groups (Rivero & Hernández 2014) therefore, men with lower education might follow less equitable patterns in the household and the division of unpaid work is not egalitarian. This premise is in line with our second hypothesis, where we suggested that men with more education have a positive impact on women's labor participation. Concerning the time periods, in 2017 greater impacts of both variables could be observed. This may be explained by Mexico's educational expansion in the recent decades which has caused an increase in the educational level of the population and awareness of gender equity. In addition, gender differences in income also increased due to the recent economic crisis, which, in turn, deepened unbalanced bargaining power within couples. This might increase the importance of partners' resources and characteristics over time. Mexican women are more exposed to job dismissal and poverty (Horbath & Gracia 2014) and, as a result, they are more likely to adhere to the role of housewife.

Our third research question inquired the potential influence of partner's resources on women's income. We found that, in line with past studies, the higher the income of the man, the higher the income of woman was. The impact of this variable was larger in 2017. One possible explanation is that in high-wage industries, employers prefer to rely on personal social networks to fill their vacancies (Kugler 2003). Moreover, as Bernasco et al. (1998) suggested, higher-educated individuals create a more stimulating family climate for their partner to pursue occupational status.

Nonetheless, our study has some limitations. First, panel data gives us information on women's labor market status in each quarter, and, hence, it does not capture short spells of non-employment or employment episodes that occurred between waves. Second, we do not have retrospective data and cannot collect events that occurred before the survey. This would have provided more detailed information on women's labor market attachment.

To sum up, in Mexico, like in other regions, economic resources and partner's education play an important role in the decision-making process of women to leave or remain in the labor market.

Lastly, we verified that the impact of the economic and educational resources of the partner were more significant to the decision of women to leave in the labor market than to entry in it. This fact may be related to the traditional norms in force in Mexico, in which the culture of the male provider continues having a great weight in society. When couples married and have children, women feel more pressured to leave work and take care of them and do household chores (Oliveira & Ariza, 2002). In addition, the reconciliation between work and household tasks is complicated due to the precariousness of women's income and access to low-skilled jobs, all this ends up generating a dynamic that ends with the decision to leave the labor market for women.

The increasing importance of partner characteristics over time also justifies the closer attention for couple's processes in the study of gender and income inequality (Boertien & Permanyer 2019; Bredemeier & Juessen 2013; Schwartz 2010). Various interpretations can be given of these changes over time. On the one hand, increases in economic inequalities could have increased the importance of economic resources in society more generally. For example, in a period of high inequality, the possibility of having the choice to leave the labor market might be limited to those households where one partner has high earnings. Similarly, in many cases, the absence or insufficiency of household income requires the incorporation of women in the labor market as a secondary worker (Cerrutti 2000). This premise can de observed especially in the higher quintiles where women are more likely to leave the labor market when their partners earn enough resources to support the family economically.

Another interpretation is that improvements in women's economic position have increased the importance of partner characteristics and the interplay between them in the couple's decision-making. Whereas the decision about the participation of women in the labor market might have been dictated by traditional norms in the past, today, it might depend more on the relative bargaining power and value

of both partners' economic resources. Future studies can look further into why the importance of partner characteristics has increased over time, and what are the consequences for the marriage market, assortative mating and gender inequality more generally.

Annex 1-A *Discrete*-time event history models explaining transition from employment to non-employment to year 2017[10]

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7
Women's age (30,40]	0.70***	0.81***	0.76***	0.77***	0.81***	0.81***	0.76***
Women's age (40,50]	0.63***	0.65***	0.61***	0.62***	0.68***	0.67***	0.61***
Women's Education Primary Complete	0.91	0.93	0.87	0.86	0.91	0.88	0.93
Women's Education Secondary Complete	0.84**	0.96	0.83*	0.81**	0.89	0.85*	0.93

[10] We use logistic regressions models, coefficient are expressed in odds ratio. Signif. codes: '***' p. < 0.001 '**'p< 0.01 '*'p< 0.05

Women's Education Tertiary Complete	0.55***	0.71***	0.63***	0.61***	0.75***	0.69***	0.77**
Nª of Children 1-3	1.53***	1.20	1.23	1.22*	1.19	1.18	1.22*
Nª of Children >3	1.61***	1.19	1.25*	1.22*	1.20	1.20*	1.22*
Period 2	0.11***	0.08***	0.09***	0.09***	0.08***	0.09***	0.09***
Period 3	0.098***	0.05***	0.05***	0.05***	0.05***	0.05***	0.05***
Period 4	0.04***	0.02***	0.02***	0.02***	0.02***	0.02***	0.02***
Period 5	0.03***	0.01***	0.02***	0.02***	0.01***	0.02***	0.02***
Women's income		0.44**					
Women's income q.2			0.88*	0.89*	0.91	0.90*	0.89*
Women's income q.3			0.86**	0.86**	0.86*	0.91*	0.90
Women's income q.4			0.09***	0.09***	0.07***	0.08***	0.09***
Women's income q.5			0.00***	0.00***	0.00***	0.00***	0.00***
Men's income				1.00***			
Men's income q.2					2.50***		
Men's income q.3					2.18***		
Men's income q.4					2.09***		
Men's income q.5					2.13***		
Men's income > women's						1.73***	
Men's Education							0.94
Men's Education							0.85*
Men's Education							0.70***
Log-likelihood	21867	14938	16534	16484	16313	16378	16500
Number of Event	31472	31472	31472	31472	31472	31472	31472

Source: Authors elaborated based on ENOE database. 10.We use logistic regressions models, coefficient are expressed in odds ratio. Signif. codes: '***' p < 0.001 '**'p< 0.01 '*'p< 0.05

Annex 2-B Discrete-time event history models explaining transition from non-employment to employment to year 2017[11]

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Women's age (30,40]	1.30***	1.30***	1.30***	1.32***
Women's age (40,50]	1.30***	1.32***	1.30***	1.32***
Women's Education Primary Complete	1.12	1.12	1.11	1.11
Women's Education Secondary Complete	1.27***	1.27***	1.24**	1.24**
Women's Education Tertiary Complete	1.75***	1.75***	1.69***	1.73***
Nª of Children 1-3	0.74***	0.74***	0.74***	0.74***
Nª of Children >3	0.67***	0.67***	0.67***	0.67***
Period 2	0.13***	0.12***	0.12***	0.12***

[11] We use logistic regressions models, coefficient are expressed in odds ratio Signif. codes: '***' p < 0.001 '**'p< 0.01 '*'p< 0.05

Period 3	0.12***	0.11***	0.11***	0.11***
Period 4	0.08***	0.06***	0.06***	0.06***
Period 5	0.06***	0.02***	0.02***	0.04***
Men's income		1.00		
Men's income q.2			0.92	
Men's income q.3			0.97	
Men's income q.4			0.99	
Men's income q.5			0.99	
Men's Education Primary Complete				1.02
Men's Education Secondary Complete				1.05
Men's Education Tertiary Complete				1.04
Log-likelihood	23993	23989	23986	23989
Number of Event	31472	31472	31472	31472

Source: Authors elaborated based on ENOE database 11.We use logistic regressions models, coefficient are expressed in odds ratio Signif. codes: '***' p < 0.001 '**'p< 0.01 '*'p< 0.05

Annex 3-C Linear models regression explaining the effect in women's income to year 2017[12]

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Women's age (30,40]	0.22***	0.25***	0.25***	0.22***
Women's age (40,50]	0.20***	0.27***	0.26***	0.20***
Women's Education Primary Complete	0.04*	0.04*	0.04	0.04
Women's Education Secondary	0.12***	0.12***	0.11***	0.10***
Women's Education Tertiary Complete	0.41***	0.42***	0.40***	0.38***
Nª of Children 1-3	-0.26***	-0.27***	-0.28***	-0.26***
Nª of Children >3	-0.35***	-0.35***	-0.36***	-0.356***
Period 2	-0.03*	-0.02	-0.02	-0.03*
Period 3	-0.02	-0.01	-0.01	-0.02
Period 4	-0.02	-0.01	-0.01	-0.02
Period 5	-0.01	-0.01	-0.02	-0.01
Men's income		0.21***		
Men's income q.2			0.23***	
Men's income q.3			0.46***	
Men's income q.4			0.55***	
Men's income q.5			0.62***	
Men's Education Primary Complete				0.01*
Men's Education Secondary Complete				0.04**
Men's Education Tertiary Complete				0.03***
Number of Event	31472	31472	31472	31472

Source: Authors elaborated based on ENOE database 12.We use linear regressions models, coefficient are expressed in odds ratio. Signif. codes: '***' p < 0.001 '**'p< 0.01 '*'p< 0.05

[12] .We use linear regressions models, coefficient are expressed in odds ratio. Signif. codes: '***' p < 0.001 '**'p< 0.01 '*'p< 0.05

Aguilar Montes de Oca, Y. P., Valdez Medina, J. L., & González Arratia López Fuen, N. I. (2013). Satisfacción con los roles de género. *Revista Electrónica de Psicología Iztacala*, *15*(4).

Alvaredo, F., Chancel, L., Piketty, T., Saez, E., & Zucman, G. (2018). *World inequality report 2018*. Belknap Press.

Anxo, D. (2002). Time allocation and the gender division of labour in France and Sweden. *Symposium France ILO*, *2002*, 99–108.

Astelarra, J. (1990). *Participación política de las mujeres* (Vol. 109). CIS.

Ballén Granados, K. P. (2012). *"Ser hombre": un acercamiento desde las representaciones sociales sobre masculinidad en jóvenes de Ciudad Bolívar y la configuración de sus subjetividades políticas.*

Becker, G. S. (1981). *1981 A Treatise on the Family, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press*.

Benería, L. (2008). De la "armonía" a los "conflictos cooperativos". La contribución de Amartya Sen a la Teoría de la unidad doméstica. *Araucaria*, *10*(20).

Bernardi, F. (1999). Does the Husband Matter?: Married Women and Employment in Italy. *European Sociological Review*, *15*(3), 285–300. http://www.jstor.org/stable/522732

Bernasco, W. (1994). *Coupled careers: The effects of spouse's resources on success at work* (Vol. 23). Purdue University Press.

Bernasco, W., de Graaf, P. M., & Ultee, W. C. (1998). Coupled Careers: Effects of Spouse's Resources on Occupational Attainment in the Netherlands. *European Sociological Review*, *14*(1), 15–31. http://www.jstor.org/stable/522478

Bianchi, S. M., Milkie, M. A., Sayer, L. C., & Robinson, J. P. (2000). Is Anyone Doing the Housework? Trends in the Gender Division of Household Labor. *Social Forces*, *79*(1), 191–228. https://doi.org/10.2307/2675569

Blossfeld, H.-P., & Timm, A. (2003). *Who Marries Whom? Educational Systems as Marriage Markets in Modern Societies*. Springer Netherlands.

Boertien, D., & Permanyer, I. (2019). Educational Assortative Mating as a Determinant of Changing Household Income Inequality: A 21-Country Study. *European Sociological Review*, *35*(4), 522–537. https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jcz013

Bredemeier, C., & Juessen, F. (2013). Assortative Mating and Female Labor Supply. *Journal of Labor Economics*, *31*(3), 603–631. https://doi.org/10.1086/669820

Breen, R., & Andersen, S. H. (2012). Educational Assortative Mating and Income Inequality in Denmark. *Demography*, *49*(3), 867–887. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-012-0111-2

Casique, I. (2008). Participación en el trabajo doméstico de hombres y mujeres en México . In *Papeles de población* (Vol. 14, pp. 173–200). scielomx .

CASIQUE, I. (2000). Determinantes de la participación del esposo en el trabajo doméstico. *Ponencia Presentada En La VI Reunión Nacional de Investigación Demográfica En México, México*.

Casique, R. I. (2000). *Power, autonomy and division of labor in Mexican dual-earner families.*

Castro, E., García, G., & Badillo, E. (2011). La participación laboral de la mujer casada y su cónyuge en Colombia: Un enfoque de decisiones relacionadas . In *Lecturas de Economía* (pp. 171–201). scieloco .

Castro, M. C., & Nevárez, J. B. (2015). Las crisis económicas y sus efectos en el mercado de trabajo, en la desigualdad y en la pobreza de México. *Contaduría y Administración*, *60*, 219–249.

Cerrutti, M. (2000). Economic Reform, Structural Adjustment and Female Labor Force Participation in Buenos Aires, Argentina. *World Development*, *28*(5), 879–891. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X(99)00163-1

Cerrutti, M., & Zenteno, R. (2000). Cambios en el papel económico de las mujeres entre las parejas mexicanas. *Estudios Demográficos y Urbanos*, *15*(1 (43)), 65–95. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40315022

Chant, S. H. (1991). *Women and survival in Mexican cities: perspectives on gender, labour markets, and low-income households*. Manchester University Press.

Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, *94*, S95–S120. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2780243

Coltrane, S. (1989). Household Labor and the Routine Production of Gender. *Social Problems*, *36*(5), 473–490. https://doi.org/10.2307/3096813

CONEVAL. (2012). *Informe de pobreza en México*. Consejo Nacional de Evaluación de La Política de Desarrollo Social. Informe de Pobreza En México.

de la Rocha, M. G. (1986). *Organización y reproducción de las unidades domésticas de la clase trabajadora en Guadalajara* (Vol. 6). Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores en Antropología Social.

de Oliveira, O., & García, B. (2012). Familia y trabajo: un recorrido por las diversas perspectivas de análisis. *Estudios Sociológicos*, 191–211.

del Castillo, A., & Castillo, M. (2012). *Amar a Madrazos: El doloroso rostro de la violencia entre jóvenes*. Grijalbo.

Durán Heras, M. A. (1986). *La jornada interminable*.

Durán Heras, M. Á. (2006). *El valor del tiempo¿ cuántas horas te faltan al día?*

Eika, L., Mogstad, M., & Zafar, B. (2019). Educational Assortative Mating and Household Income Inequality. *Journal of Political Economy*, *127*(6), 2795–2835. https://doi.org/10.1086/702018

England, P. (2010). The gender revolution: Uneven and stalled. *Gender & Society*, *24*(2), 149–166.

ENOE. (2019). *Encuesta Nacional de Ocupación y Empleo (ENOE), población de 15 años y más de edad*. https://www.inegi.org.mx/programas/enoe/15ymas/default.html#Metadatos

Esping-Andersen, G. (2007). A New Welfare Equilibrium. *Spanish Translation Published in: Política y Sociedad*, *44*(2), 11–30.

Esping-Andersen, Gosta. (2009). *Incomplete revolution: Adapting welfare states to women's new roles*. Polity.

Fernández, M. C. S.-M., Mora, M. T. T., Aguilar, C., Alonso, J. A., Blanco, M., Cano, G., Gamboa, J., González, S., Peña, F., Radkau, V., Rapold, D., Sánchez-Mejorada, M. C., Sandoval, E., Selva, B., Tarrés, M. L., Torres, M. T., & Zapata, F. (1991). COTIDIANIDAD Y MODALIDADES DE TRABAJO DE LAS MUJERES DE UNA COLONIA POPULAR. In V. Salles & E. Mc Phail (Eds.), *Textos y pre-textos* (1st, reimpre ed., pp. 167–200). El Colegio de Mexico. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv512zhz.11

Fuller, N. (2001). Masculinidades. Cambios y permanencias. *Lima: Pontificia Universidad Católica de*

Perú Fondo Editorial.

García Guzmán, B., & Olivera, O. de. (1994). *Trabajo femenino y vida familiar en México* (Issue 305.4372 G3).

Gonalons-Pons, P., & Schwartz, C. R. (2017). Trends in Economic Homogamy: Changes in Assortative Mating or the Division of Labor in Marriage? *Demography*, *54*(3), 985–1005. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-017-0576-0

Gracia, E., & Herrero, J. (2006). Public attitudes toward reporting partner violence against women and reporting behavior. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *68*(3), 759–768.

Granovetter, M. (2018). *Getting a job: A study of contacts and careers*. University of Chicago press.

Greenwood, J., Guner, N., Kocharkov, G., & Santos, C. (2014). Marry your like: Assortative mating and income inequality. *American Economic Review*, *104*(5), 348–353. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.104.5.348

Henz, U., & Sundström, M. (2001). Partner Choice and Women's Paid Work in Sweden. The Role of Earnings. *European Sociological Review*, *17*(3), 295–316. https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/17.3.295

Hernández Limonchi, M. del P., & Ibarra Uribe, L. M. (2019). Conciliación de la vida familiar y laboral. Un reto para México . In *Iztapalapa. Revista de ciencias sociales y humanidades* (Vol. 40, pp. 159–184). scielomx .

HERNÁNDEZ, M. (2018). PÉRDIDA ACUMULADA DE 80% DEL PODER ADQUISITIVO. ANÁLISIS DE LA FACULTAD DE ECONOMÍA DE 30 AÑOS. *Gaceta UNAM (2010-2019)*, *4931*, 6.

Hidalgo, P. H. (2017). Brechas de desigualdad en México. *Pluralidad y Consenso*, *7*(31), 192–197.

Horbath, J. E., & Gracia, A. (2014). Discriminación laboral y vulnerabilidad de las mujeres frente a la crisis mundial en México . In *Economía, sociedad y territorio* (Vol. 14, pp. 465–495). scielomx .

Humphries, J., & Sarasúa, C. (2012). Off the Record: Reconstructing Women's Labor Force Participation in the European Past. *Feminist Economics*, *18*(4), 39–67. https://doi.org/10.1080/13545701.2012.746465

Iammarino, S., Rodriguez-Pose, A., & Storper, M. (2019). Regional inequality in Europe: Evidence, theory and policy implications. *Journal of Economic Geography*, *19*(2), 273–298. https://doi.org/10.1093/jeg/lby021

INE. (2019). *Tasas de paro por distintos grupos de edad, sexo y comunidad autónoma*. https://www.ine.es/jaxiT3/Tabla.htm?t=4247

INEGI. (2020). *Unemployment rate*. https://en.www.inegi.org.mx/temas/empleo/

Kalmijn, M. (1994). Assortative Mating by Cultural and Economic Occupational Status. *American Journal of Sociology*, *100*(2), 422. https://doi.org/10.1086/230542

Kalmijn, M. (1998). INTERMARRIAGE AND HOMOGAMY: Causes, Patterns, Trends. *Annu. Rev. Sociol*, *24*, 395–421.

KAMO, Y. (1988). Determinants of Household Division of Labor: Resources, Power, and Ideology. *Journal of Family Issues*, *9*(2), 177–200. https://doi.org/10.1177/019251388009002002

Katz, E. G. (1995). Gender and trade within the household: Observations from rural guatemala. *World Development*, *23*(2), 327–342. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X(94)00118-I

Kugler, A. D. (2003). Employee referrals and efficiency wages. *Labour Economics*, *10*(5), 531–556.

Leija, H. C., García, A. T., & Lugo, D. C. (2018). Efectos del capital social en el empleo en México. *Revista de Economía Institucional*, *20*(38 SE-Artículos). https://doi.org/10.18601/01245996.v20n38.11

Lustig, N. (1990). Economic crisis, adjustment and living standards in Mexico, 1982–85. *World Development*, *18*(10), 1325–1342.

Martínez Jasso, I., & Acevedo Flores, G. J. (2004). La brecha salarial en México con enfoque de género: capital humano, discriminación y selección muestral. *Ciencia Uanl*, *7*(1).

McCall, L., & Percheski, C. (2010). Income Inequality: New Trends and Research Directions. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *36*(1), 329–347. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.012809.102541

Oliveira, O. de, & Ariza, M. (2002). Transiciones familiares y trayectorias laborales femeninas en el México urbano. *Cadernos Pagu*, *17–18*, 339–366.

Pittman, J. F., & Blanchard, D. (1996). The Effects of Work History and Timing of Marriage on the Division of Household Labor: A Life-Course Perspective. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *58*(1), 78–90. https://doi.org/10.2307/353378

Reyes, R. M. (2008). *Violencia de género en las relaciones de pareja en las (los) jóvenes estudiantes de la Universidad Pedagógica Nacional: una propuesta pedagógica: taller: noviazgo sin violencia. Novio... lencia*. UPN-Ajusco.

Rivero, E., & Hernández, A. (2014). Rivero, E., & Hernández, A. (2014). No todo el tiempo es igual: variaciones en los patrones de uso del tiempo en México. B. García y E. Pacheco (coords.),. *Uso Del Tiempo y Trabajo No Remunerado En México, 221-262*.

Schwartz, C. R. (2010). Pathways To Educational Homogamy in Marital and Cohabiting Unions. *Demography*, *47*(3), 735–753.

Sundström, M., & Duvander, A.-Z. E. (2002). Gender Division of Childcare and the Sharing of Parental Leave among New Parents in Sweden. *European Sociological Review*, *18*(4), 433–447. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3559546

Van Der Lippe, T., & Siegers, J. J. (1994). Division of household and paid labour between partners: effects of relative wage rates and social norms. *Kyklos*, *47*(1), 109–136.

Verbakel, E., & De Graaf, P. M. (2009). Partner effects on labour market participation and job level: opposing mechanisms. *Work, Employment and Society*, *23*(4), 635–654.

Wial, H. (1991). Getting a good job: Mobility in a segmented labor market. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, *30*(3), 396–416.

Wolf, D. L. (1990). Daughters, Decisions and Domination: An Empirical and Conceptual Critique of Household Strategies. *Development and Change*, *21*(1), 43–74. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7660.1990.tb00367.x

World Bank. (2019). *GINI index (World Bank estimate) - Mexico*. https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SI.POV.GINI?locations=MX

World Bank. (2020). *Labor force participation rate, female*. https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SL.TLF.CACT.FE.ZS