

THE EFFECTS OF MOTHER'S PAID OCCUPATION ON THE WELL-BEING OF
CHILDREN IN DUTCH SECONDARY EDUCATION

M. van Doornik and J. Dronkers

Paper presented at the European Conference on Educational Research, Seville (Spain), 25-28
september 1996

THE EFFECTS OF MOTHER'S PAID OCCUPATION ON THE WELL-BEING OF CHILDREN IN DUTCH SECONDARY EDUCATION

M. van Doornik and J. Dronkers¹

Work and children

Since the sixties the interest in the relation between work and care for children has strongly increased. This was mainly caused by an increasing group of women participating on the labour market. Between 1900 en 1960 the percentage of working women in the age of 15 to 64 years remained stable between 25% and 29%. In 1992 this percentage has grown to 57%. This means a doubling of working women compared to the first half of this century. This growth of the female working population seems to be realised especially by married women. When we compare the percentage of married women between the age of 15 to 64 with a paid job, there is an increase from 7% to 47% in the years from 1960 to 1990. Even in 1990, a high percentage women stops working when they have children, but this percentage is obviously decreasing. Nine percent of women who had their first baby in the end of the seventies, continues working. In the end of the eighties this percentage is 29% and in 1990 41% (Van der Lippe, Van Dam en Ganzeboom, 1995). In the Netherlands the discussion about the combination of work and care for children concentrates itself mainly on the consequences for the working mother, like a double weight resulting from the combination of work and care for children, the hindrances in mother's career caused by this combination, etc. The combination of work and care for children can also have effects on other members of her family, especially children. In the Netherlands much less attention is paid to this issue then in the USA. The possible negative effects for the children caused by mother working outdoors are discussed strongly in the American discussion about family values.

Scholars don't agree about the effect of an outdoor working mother on the social position of the other members of her family. At this topic the conventional view in contrary with the feminist view. The conventional view, represented by Goldthorpe (1983, 1984) and Erikson and Goldthorpe (1992), have proved with empirical research that the level mothers' occupation does not contribute principally to the improvement of the social position of her family. However, the feminist view is also supported by empirical research. Researchers proved that mothers working outside the home do have a significant effect on the social position of her family and this effect is comparable with the effect of fathers' occupation.

Kalmijn (1994) found that in the USA mother's occupational status has a substantial effect on children's schooling. This effect is independent from, and as strong as, the effects of father's occupation. This effect is especially positive when the mother has an occupation of

¹The first author made the analyses and wrote the article as an additional course to her doctorate study in Educational Sciences at the University of Amsterdam. The second author was supervisor. The first version of this article was a paper for the Educational Research Days 1996, 5-7 june 1996 in Tilburg. Direct all correspondence to: J. Dronkers, SCO/Kohnstamm Institute, University of Amsterdam, Wibautstraat 4, 1091 GM Amsterdam, the Netherlands. Phone: +31-20-5251327. Fax: +31-20-5251300. E-mail: jaapd@sco.educ.uva.nl.

high status. Older American studies do affirm especially the influence of the mother on the schooling of young children. Kalmijn's analyses show that this influence still is noticeable in secondary education. The income of mother gains is now as important as the income earned by the father. The same holds for the role-model of a working mother. This is as important as the role-model of a working father. While in American research most children in secondary education have a working mother, the influence of the social-economic status of the mother has can be interpreted as a factor which increases or constrains the unequal chances in education, dependent of the conjunction of the occupational status of both parents. According to Kalmijn children with parents with high social-economic status have better chances to achieve well in education because these parents firstly earn an high income, secondly they provide for cultural capital and thirdly they have high expectations of their children. In this research we want to investigate whether Kalmijn's findings are also valid in the Dutch situation if we focus on the broader concept well-being of children instead of their schooling.

In American research, Parcel and Menaghan (1994) found an interaction-effect between the occupation of both parents. If there are two working parents in a family, the effect caused by the work of the one parent is weakened or strengthened by the work of the other parent. The effect of the salary of the mother, which is significant and positive, is also effected by the amount of hours the father works. If father works less then fulltime the level of his wages influences the (positive) effect of the level of mothers wages. Arguing the other way round, the negative effect of a badly paid job of the father can be abolished when mother earns a lot of money. While Parcel and Menaghan focus only on children of working mothers, they cannot give an answer to the question if having a job by the mother has positive or negative effects on the well-being of her children. In this research we will try to answer that question, not for the USA but for the Netherlands.

In the Netherlands the debate between supporters of the conventional vision and supporters of the feminist vision is less sharp then in the US. There has been some research to determine the effect of the work of the mother on the schooling of children (Dronkers, 1989, 1995; Schrasser, 1990). These studies show that having a paid job by a mother does not have a negative effect on the level of educational achievement by her children. However, no positive effects were found either. The most important explanation for this absence of any effect resulting from mothers working outside the home lies in the nature of the work done outside the home. Because women, like men, work at different levels, the dichotomy between working/not working outside the home is too crude. From these analyses, it emerged that the level of the work done by women outside the home did have an influence on the educational attainment of their children. Compared with the job of housewife, certain jobs had a negative effect while other jobs had a positive effect. This makes the dilemma working/not working outdated. The debate about the question if a mother should or should not work should change its direction towards questioning the level of her paid job. In this article we focus, next to the amount of hours mother works, on the level of her occupation. The three mentioned Dutch studies studied the effect of mother working outside the home on the educational attainment of her children. In this research like Dronkers (1996), we measure the effects on the well-being of the pupils. We think that school is not the only thing in the life of pupils which can be affected by family characteristics. There are more indicators which we can use to measure whether certain family characteristics have a positive or negative influence on the chances in a child's life. Our concept of well-being consists of ten of these indicators.

Following the mentioned publications we test the following hypothesis:

1. *The well-being of pupils in secondary education in two parent families in which the father works full-time and the mother works too, is higher than in two parent families in which the father works full-time and the mother does not work.* This hypothesis is based on the study of Kalmijn: the more financial and cultural capital, the better for the children. Work means more income, more cultural capital and higher expectations of the children which result in more well-being.

2. *The well-being of pupils in secondary education in two parent families in which the father works full-time and the mother works part-time or not at all, is higher than in two parent families in which the father works full-time and the mother works full-time or more.* This hypothesis is based on the work of Parcel and Menaghan: if parents work less, they have more contact with their children and can transmit more cultural capital which increases the well-being of their children. There should be taken into account that most of the mothers studied by Parcel and Menaghan must work to survive financially. This means that the most jobs of these mothers do not contribute to the education and development of these mothers. This American situation is not comparable to the Dutch, because the Dutch welfare and fiscal facilities do not force the average woman to work in order to survive financially.

3. *The well-being of pupils in secondary education in two parent families in which the father works full-time and the mother has a job with high status or does not work at all, is higher than in two parent families in which the father works full-time and the mother has a job with low or average status.* This hypothesis is based on the studies of Dronkers (1989, 1995) and Kalmijn (1994). These three studies show that school attainments of children with mothers who do not work are as good and sometimes even better as those of children with mothers with jobs of average or low status. Children with mothers in high status occupations have the highest educational attainment. In this article we want to test if the same conclusion can be drawn for well-being of children as well.

Data and methods

In this article we use the data of the Secondary Education Pupils' Survey 1994 conducted by NIBUD (Netherlands' Institute for Budget Research) in cooperation with the SCO-Kohnstamm Institute, the SCP and the SEO Institute under 25,000 pupils from all types of secondary education. In a questionnaire taken at school, the pupils answered a lot of questions with regards to home and school, income and spending, time spending, studying, independent living, work, political preference, religion, health and well-being. Also all the information about work and education of the parents was given by the pupils themselves. This way of gaining information is reliable according to the methodological literature (for example De Leeuw & Otter, 1995). From 17,770 pupils useful questionnaires were sent back and processed. The survey was reweighed for region, religion, school type and level to make it representative for the total population of pupils in secondary education.

All pupils who said not to live at home and those who live in any other form of household than a two parent family with both natural parents were deleted. This is done to exclude the

possibility that effects are caused by the family structure instead of the occupation of the mother or the amount of hours she works (for the analysis of the effect of family-form, see Dronkers, 1996) Also, only the families in which the father works 40 hours or more per week were used in the analysis. We selected this way to prevent disturbing effects being caused by unemployment of the father firstly. Secondly, it is to prevent that effects caused by mother working outside the home are weakened or strengthened because the father works part-time and is a lot of time at home where he can fulfil the mothers role. Pupils older than 21 were deleted, because they could be outliers. Finally, we only used pupils in the analyses who were born in the Netherlands, have the Dutch nationality and call themselves Dutch. We do this to prevent our results from distortion by different cultural traditions (Islam, Caribbean area).

Our chosen indicators for measuring well-being are the same as in Dronkers (1996). These indicators are:

1. *Drug abuse*. This scale is the sum of four questions about the use of tranquilizers, softdrugs, mind expanding drugs and harddrugs during the past 12 months. Cronbach's Alpha of this scale is not high but yet acceptable: 0.64.

2. *Physical health*. This scale is the sum of 9 questions about the occurrence of disease: Headache, a sore throat, stomach ache, colds, sickness, sleeplessness, staying home, visiting family doctor, visiting medical specialist. Cronbach's Alpha of this scale is not high but yet acceptable: 0.64.

3. *Violence and crime*. This scale is the sum of 13 questions about being affected by violence and crime in the past 12 months: took part in serious fighting at school, took part in serious fighting outside the school, hit someone so badly that this person needed first aid or a doctor, stole a bike, shoplifted, stole something below 50 guilders, stole something above 50 guilders, damaged something in school purposefully, damaged something on the street purposefully, own bike was stolen, something that belonged to pupil was stolen at school, pupil was beaten or wounded so badly that pupil needed first aid or visiting a doctor, pupil did something wrong that brought him in contact with the police. Cronbach's Alpha is satisfying: 0.76.

4. *Psychical health*. This scale is the sum of 31 questions in which the pupil had to indicate if certain statements applied to him or her: I dislike being at home, I often feel lonely, I often feel gloomy, in most of the things I'm just as good as many others, sometimes I think I never will be good in anything, people like me don't have much chance to succeed in life, I can not get along very well with my father, I think it's exciting to do dangerous things, what I miss is a good friend, sometimes I think nobody cares about me, I'm regularly harassed by classmates, it's easy for me to make friends, I can't get along with my mother very well, when I go out most of the times I carry a weapon with me, I'm not happy with the way I look, I think others think I'm ugly, I'm bored outside school, I have the feeling I don't have my life in my own hands, I have a positive image of myself, I feel insecure when I have to make a decision, I'm afraid to fail, I'm afraid things don't turn out as expected, I'm insecure in company, sometimes I get frightened without a reason, when I go to school I often carry a weapon, I often have nightmares, sometimes I get so tempered I loose all self-control, in general I'm happy with myself, it's hard for me to show my emotions, I tend to control the things I do several times, when I'm nervous I get physical complaints. This scale is developed by Kienhorst (1988) and is a combination of six subscales (Self-rating Depression Scale,

Depression Adjective Check List, Hopelessness-scale, Self-esteem scale, Family scale, Rational Behaviour Inventory). Cronbach's Alpha of this scale is satisfying: 0.79.

5. *School success compared with own class.* This question runs from bad (1) till good (4).
6. *Truancy during past month.*
7. *Suicidal thoughts during last year.* This question runs from never (1) till very often (5).
8. *Average amount of money the pupil gets from his or her parents per month* (the sum of pocket money, money for clothes and extra money).
9. *Average number of hours spend on housekeeping per day.*
10. *Average number of hours watching television per day.*

The seven groups of occupations of the mother, which also are distinguished in the questionnaire and had to be scored by the pupil, are: labourer (building/construction industry, factory, harbour, etc.); lower white-collar job; middle white-collar job; higher white-collar job; self-employed person with own company; free profession (attorney, dentist, doctor, etc.); farmer/market gardener/fisherman. No paid occupation we use as the reference group.

Based on the amount of hours the mother works according to the pupil, these families are also divided into four categories. These are families in which the mother works few (1-12 hours per week), families in which the mother works more (13-24 hours per week), families in which the mother works a lot (25-40 hours per week) and families in which the mother works more than full-time (more than 40 hours per week). Families in which the mother does not work out side her home is again the reference group.

In the analyses, the next background characteristics of parents and pupils are used as control variables:

1. Highest educational level of the mother (1=primary education to 8=university);
2. Highest educational level of the father (1=primary education to 8=university);
3. Occupational level of the father (the same classification as for mother);
4. Age of the pupil;
5. Gender of the pupil;
6. School type attended by the pupil (1=junior vocational school to 5=grammar school);
7. Urbanization level of pupil's domicile;
8. The importance of religion for the pupil (1=very important to 4=not important at all);

Results

Table 1 gives the average well-being of pupils in Dutch secondary education, divided by the amount of hours their mothers are working in paid occupations.

Table 1

It is clear from table 1 that children with mothers who work more than full-time have the highest scores on many of the indicators. These children have been more in contact with violence and crime, their physical condition is less good, they judge their own school success to be less good, they play truant more often, they consider suicide more often, they have to help in the housekeeping more often and they watch longer television. This results however are not yet controlled by the other background differences of the pupils and their families.

Table 2 gives the average well-being of pupils in Dutch secondary education, divided by the level of their mothers occupation.

Table 2

The results for the non-working mothers are not repeated in table 2 because they are already presented in table 1. The results from table 2 indicate that children with mothers who are labourers or farmers or have their own company, often have the highest or lowest score on the well-being indicators. It seems that children with mothers who are farmer experience the most well-being. The lowest (psychic) well-being is experienced by children who have mothers who are labourers or have lower white-collar jobs. This results also are not yet controlled for other background differences of the pupils and their families.

Table 3

In table 3 we test the differences given in tables 1 and 2 on their significance after controlling for the other background variables of the pupils and their families. The 'no paid occupation' is used as reference group, which means that we compare the differences in well-being between pupils with non-working mothers on the one hand and pupils with working mothers on the other hand.

In the regression analyses the variables are admitted in a fixed order. In the first step of the analyses we add the four groups families divided by the amount of hours mother works. This makes it possible to measure the significant effects on pupils well-being, which can be ascribed to the amount of hours the mother works compared to pupils whose mothers do not work.

In the second step we add the seven groups of occupations. By comparing the effects of these occupations, controlled for the amount of hours mother works, we can measure their positive or negative effects on the well-being of the children.

In the third step we control for possible differences in other background factors by adding the control variables stepwise to the analyses. Doing this we prevent the occurrence of spurious correlations between hours of work and occupations on the one hand and well-being on the other hand.

In the fourth step, interaction variables are added stepwise. This interaction variables

are combinations of occupation of mother and the amount of hours she works. By this procedure we can control for possible effects of specific combinations of working hours and occupation. Some combinations may cause more or less effect than the occupation or the amount of hours separately.

We applied these multivariate regression analyses with pairwise deletion of cases with missing values. Table 3 shows the final results of these analyses, after the fourth and final step. On the basis of these controlled effects we can now test the three hypothesis, controlled for working hours, occupation, background differences and interactions between working hours and occupation.

Hypotheses 1 (The well-being of pupils in secondary education in two parent families in which the father works full-time and the mother works too, is higher than in two parent families in which the father works full-time and the mother does not work) must be rejected based on the first panel of table 3. When mother works, independent of the number of hours, does that produce no any significant difference regarding mothers who do not work on the indicators physical health, violence and crime, psychical health, school success, truancy, suicidal thoughts and watching television. The well-being of children of working mothers is, measured by this indicators, equal to the well-being of children with mothers who do not have paid work outside their homes.

There are two exceptions which contradicts hypotheses 1 more than confirms this hypothesis:

1. The first panel of table 3 shows a higher drug abuse and more money when mother works full-time. The other significant difference is found in the number of hours pupils helping in the household when the mother works more than full-time.

2. The fourth panel of table 3 shows some significant effects of number of working hours in combination with some occupations. If mother works many hours in a low white-collar occupation pupils play truant more often and they think of suicide more often. If mother works many hours in a high white-collar occupation we find a higher level of drug abuse and a lower school success. These pupils also have to work more hours in the household, just like pupils with mothers who work full-time in middle white-collar jobs.

Summarizing: the first hypotheses must be rejected entirely. The few case of significant effects seem to indicate that only working for a high number of hours can be harmful for pupils outside the home.

Hypotheses 2 (The well-being of pupils in secondary education in two parent families in which the father works full-time and the mother works part-time or not at all is higher than in two parent families in which the father works full-time and the mother works full-time or more) is rather confirmed by the exceptions to hypothesis 1. The number of significant effects however is very small as a result of which we can not say that they uphold the second hypotheses totally.

The rejection of hypotheses 3 (The well-being of pupils in secondary education in two parent families in which the father works full-time and the mother has a job with high status or does not work at all is higher than in two parent families in which the father works full-time and the mother has a job with low or average status) depends on the classification of the seven

groups of occupations. In the second panel of table 3 four groups of occupations have no or almost no significant effect on the indicators of well-being. These are the occupations labourer, middle white-collar job, free profession and farmer. This means that the well-being of their children doesn't deviate significantly from the well-being of pupils whose mother is only housewife. Only when mother works many hours in low white-collar job there are some negative effects (fourth panel table 3).

There are also exceptions to the general non-significance of occupation for the pupils well-being in the second panel of table 3. Children with mothers with their own company score negative on four indicators. These children experience less well-being than children with comparable background characteristics but with a mother without a paid job. This result can be interpreted as another rejection of hypothesis 3.

Contrary, children who have a mother who is higher white-collar job score positive on the indicators twice. These children experience more well-being than children with comparable background factors but whose mothers do not have a paid job, although they play more often truant than other children. This result can be interpreted as the only confirmation of hypothesis 3.

Conclusion

The discussion about working outside the home or working as a housewife regarding the well-being of children seems to be outdated. First, regarding the well-being of children it does not matter whether mother works. Secondly, generally it does not matter how many hours she works. However, there are certain combinations of occupation and working hours which cause small but yet significant negative effects on the well-being of children. Instead of focusing on the false dilemma of working or non-working, the discussion should be concentrated on the question of the nature of mothers occupation, in combination with the number of working hours. This is desirable while some occupations have positive or negative effects on the well-being of the children, compared with not working mothers.

Returning to the debate in the introduction mentioned between conventional and feminists we can conclude that both parties can use the results presented in this article in their advantage. This is probably the reason why the debate in the past was not very fruitful.

Different scores on indicators often are determined by background factors of the pupil. Especially age and gender cause huge significant effects on the indicators. Next to this, schooltype and the importance of religion for the pupil provide significant contributions to the well-being of the pupil. Except for schooltype, religion and the amount of work of the parents, all the other background factors of the pupil are unchangeable. When we aim to enlarge the well-being of the children something in the changeable characteristics of the pupil must be changed instead of focusing on the working mother. The schooltype the pupil visits has a positive effect on his or her well-being (third panel of table 3). The higher the educational level of the pupil, the higher his or her scores on the indicators of well-being. The same holds for the importance of religion for the pupil (third panel of table 3). The more important religion is for the pupil, the more well-being the pupil experiences. This all means that the job of the mother is not at all the most important factor for the well-being of pupils in secondary education. If policy makers really want to promote the well-being of children, this

study provides better starting points than a reopening of the debate about possible disadvantages caused by mothers working outside the home.

Literature

Dronkers, J., 1989. "Working mothers and the educational achievements of their children". In K. Hurrelman and U. Engel (Ed.), *The social world of adolescents; international perspectives* 185-198. Berlin, New York

Dronkers, J., 1995. "The effects of the occupations of working mothers on the educational inequality." *Educational Research and Evaluation* 1:226-246.

Dronkers, J., 1996. The effects of parental conflicts and divorce on the average well-being of pupils in secondary education. Amsterdam, SCO-Kohnstamm Institute, University of Amsterdam. Paper presented for the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, New York, August 16-21, 1996.

Erikson, J.G. and J.G. Goldthorpe. 1992. *The constant flux. A study of class mobility in industrial societies*. Oxford

Kalmijn, M. 1994. "Mother's occupational status and children's schooling". *American Sociological Review* 59, 257-275

Kienhorst, C.M.W. 1988. *Suïcidaal gedrag bij jongeren. Onderzoek naar omvang en kenmerken*. Dissertation University of Leiden.

Lippe, T. van der, M. van Dam and H. Ganzeboom. 1995 "De tweede sekse in stratificatie-onderzoek. De invloed van de moeder op de kinderen naast die van de vader." *Mens en Maatschappij*, 1:41-53

Leeuw, E. D. de, en M.E. Otter. 1995 "The Reliability of Children's Responses on Questionnaire Items; Question Effects in Children's Questionnaire Data" in: J.J. Hox, B.F. van der Meulen, J.M.A.M. Janssens, J.J.F. ter Laak & L.W.C. Tavecchio (eds.) *Advances in Family Research*, pp. 251-259. Amsterdam.

Parcel, T. L. and E. G. Menaghan. 1994. *Parents' Jobs and Children's lives*. New York.

Schrasser, M.J. 1990. Moeders op de arbeidsmarkt: een empirische bijdrage aan een discussie. Een onderzoek naar de effecten van betaalde beroepsarbeid door vrouwen op de school- en beroepsloopbaan van hun kinderen. Paper for the congres Vrouwen/Mannen, Sociaal-Wetenschappelijke Studiedagen 1990. Tilburg: Catholic University Brabant

Table 1: The average scores of pupils in Dutch secondary education on the 10 indicators of well-being for the five categories of families, distinguished by number of hours mother works.

	Drugs	Physic	Violence	Psych.	School	Truancy	Suicide	Money	Household TV	N	
mother does not work	4.2	16.6	3.5	55.5	3.1	0.8	1.3	81.5	0.5	2.4	1317
mother works little	4.2	17.2	3.1	55.5	3.1	0.8	1.3	84.3	0.5	2.5	1112
mother works average	4.3	17.0	3.3	55.9	3.0	1.0	1.3	97.4	0.5	2.4	1688
mother works full-time	4.4	17.0	3.9	55.8	3.0	1.1	1.3	107.7	0.5	2.5	1497
mother works overtime	4.3	16.9	3.9	55.3	3.0	1.3	1.4	98.1	0.6	2.5	572
ave. tot. population	4.3	16.9	3.3	55.7	3.0	1.0	1.3	93.3	0.5	2.4	
stand.dev. tot. pop.	0.8	19.2	13.3	4.2	0.8	2.8	0.7	90.3	0.7	1.7	
N	7234	6878	7123	6829	7800	7322	7435	7490	6506	6536	7867

Table 2: The average scores of pupils in Dutch secondary education on the 10 indicators of well-being for the seven categories of families, distinguished by the occupation mother works in.

	Drugs	Physic	Violence	Psych.	School	Truancy	Suicide	Money	Household TV	N	
labourer	4.3	17.1	3.4	54.7	3.0	0.8	1.4	92.1	0.5	2.8	207
lower white-collar	4.3	17.3	3.1	54.8	3.0	1.0	1.4	95.2	0.5	2.6	813
middle white-collar	4.3	16.8	3.3	55.4	3.0	1.1	1.3	101.7	0.5	2.4	1609
higher white-collar	4.4	16.8	4.0	55.2	3.1	1.4	1.3	107.6	0.6	2.3	381
own company	4.4	19.2	3.4	55.2	2.9	1.5	1.4	107.3	0.5	2.4	613
free profession	4.3	17.2	3.5	55.1	3.0	1.0	1.3	117.1	0.5	2.3	164
farmer	4.2	11.2	5.8	55.9	3.0	0.9	1.2	83.6	0.5	2.1	164
N	3610	3467	3485	3452	3916	3496	3824	3780	3269	3291	3951

Table 3: De significant (5% level) unstandardized parameters of the different categories of families, distinguished by the number of hours mother works and by the occupation mother works in, controlled by background characteristics of parents and pupils. *Mother does not work* is the reference category.

	Drugs	Physic	Violence	Psych.	School	Truancy	Suicide	Money	Household TV	
mother works little	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
mother works average n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	
mother works full-time0.08	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	13.41	n.s.	n.s.	
mother works overtime	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	0.08	n.s.
mother labourer	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
mother lower white-collar	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-0.36	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
mother middle white-collar	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	0.27	n.s.	n.s.	-0.14	n.s.
mother higher white-collar	-0.26	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	0.34	0.45	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
mother has own company	0.09	2.76	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	0.46	0.14	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
mother has free profession	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
mother farmer	n.s.	-4.75	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
education mother	n.s.	-0.25	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-0.007	n.s.
education father	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
age pupil	0.04	-0.36	-0.24	0.20	-0.02	0.33	n.s.	8.10	n.s.	-0.04
gender pupil	-0.10	9.21	-3.03	-0.95	-0.02	-0.20	0.07	6.84	0.21	-0.12
urbanisation level domicile	n.s.	-0.41	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-3.87	n.s.	-0.06
importance religion	0.06	n.s.	0.66	n.s.	-0.05	n.s.	0.03	8.32	-0.05	0.21
school type n.s.	-0.57	-0.41	0.31	0.02	-0.09	-0.03	-4.73	-0.03	-0.19	
father labourer	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-0.29	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	0.08	0.15
father lower white-collar	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
father middle white-collar	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
father higher white-collar	n.s.	2.22	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	0.25	n.s.	16.47	n.s.	n.s.
father has own company	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	0.30	n.s.	15.10	n.s.	n.s.
father has free profession	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	0.65	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
father farmer	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
(labourer*hours)	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
(lower white-collar*hours)	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	0.01	0.02	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
(middle white-collar*hours)	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	0.007	n.s.
(higher white-collar*hours)	0.01	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-0.01	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	0.003	n.s.
(own company*hours) n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-0.001	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	
(free profession*hours)	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	1.22	n.s.	n.s.
(farmer*hours)	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Adj. R ²	0.02	0.06	0.02	0.03	0.01	0.06	0.01	0.07	0.04	0.05