REWORK – Can remote work make the labor market more inclusive for women (#)

Author(s)
Beata Wozniak-Jechorek (Poznan University of Economics and Business) - beata.wozniak-jechorek@ue.poznan.pl
Michał Pilc (Poznan University of Economics and Businessss) - michal.pilc@ue.poznan.pl
Sławomir Kuźmar (Poznan University of Economics and Business) - slawomir.kuzmar@ue.poznan.pl

Pre-registered on:

1) Have any data been collected for this study already?
No, no data have been collected for this study yet.

2) What's the main question being asked or hypothesis being tested in this study?
This study examines the labor supply of mothers with young children and of women living in metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas, assessing their willingness to increase their work hours through remote work options. It focuses on women aged 25–49 in France, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, and Sweden.
The analysis is based on a CAWI survey with an experimental conjoint design. Respondents evaluate randomly generated job offers. Findings will be presented in two manuscripts:

Study 1: Is Remote Work More Attractive for Mothers?
H1. As mothers devote more time to caregiving responsibilities, the difference in job-attractiveness impact between hybrid and fully remote job offers increases.
H2. Remote work does not increase job attractiveness for mothers who are unable to find an alternate caregiver for their children.
H3. The greater the possibility of working remotely, the more attractive a 40-hour workweek becomes.
H4. Mothers with young children are likely to substitute the possibility of working from home for their salary, and the substitution rate is higher for job offers with high temporal flexibility.
H5. In countries with low maternal activity rates, the possibility of working remotely increases job attractiveness more than in countries with high maternal activity rates.

Study 2: Is Remote Work More Attractive for Women Living in Peripheral Areas?
H1. Women are willing to accept a lower salary in exchange for the possibility of working from home, and the substitution rate is higher in peripheral areas than in metropolitan areas.
H2. Commuting time has a larger negative effect on job attractiveness in peripheral areas than metropolitan ones; however, this effect decreases with the number of days that can be worked remotely
H3. Remote work increases job attractiveness among women who are economically inactive or underemployed to a larger extent in peripheral than in metropolitan areas
H4. The difference in the impact of remote working on the attractiveness of job offers between women living in non-metropolitan areas and those living in metropolitan areas is expected to be greatest in Romania, followed by Poland, and then by the remaining analyzed countries.
H5. The possibility of increasing digital skills raises the attractiveness of job offers more strongly among women living in non-metropolitan areas, and this effect is amplified in countries where remote work is more prevalent.

3) Describe the key dependent variable(s) specifying how they will be measured.
Two dependent variables: (i) a dummy variable indicating whether an offer was chosen or not; (ii) a subjective assessment of an offer's attractiveness on a 7-point scale. Job offers vary across eight attributes:
1. Work location: fully remote, up to 3 days remote, up to 1 day remote, or fully onsite.
2. Compensation: net wage set at 50%, 58%, 67%, or 75% of a country-specific reference level (based on Eurostat data, adjusted for taxes and inflation).
3. Working time: full-time or part-time.
4. Schedule flexibility: employee-chosen hours, flexible within 7–7, fixed with some flexibility, or fixed hours.
5. Commute time: 30, 50, or 70 minutes.
6. Childcare support: free daycare, 50% reimbursement, nearby private childcare, or none available.
7. Digital skills training: none, 45-hour, or 90-hour package.
8. Career counselling: yes or no.

4) How many and which conditions will participants be assigned to?
Respondents are shown two job offers and asked which job offer they would prefer. This task is repeated 6 times (however, the 6th is a repeat of the 1st). Each job offer differs across 8 attributes, with 2-4 potential options per attribute.

5) Specify exactly which analyses you will conduct to examine the main question/hypothesis.
We will estimate average marginal component effects (AMCEs) and marginal means (MM) for work-from-home attributes, correcting for measurement error using the method of Clayton et al. (2023), based on a repeated-task design with swapped profiles.
After presenting the main findings, we will examine how work-from-home preferences depend on respondents' sociodemographic traits.

6) Describe exactly how outliers will be defined and handled, and your precise rule(s) for excluding observations.
We will exclude any participants who fall more than 2 standard deviations below the mean completion time. This is because the time would be too short to complete the survey accurately, particularly the conjoint tasks. In addition, the survey includes four attention checks.

7) How many observations will be collected or what will determine sample size? No need to justify decision, but be precise about exactly how the number will be determined.
The study includes at least 600 respondents per country (except the Netherlands), focusing on women aged 25–49 across five overlapping groups: mothers of children under 6, mothers of children aged 6–11, and women living in large urban, medium urban/functional rural, or rural/small-town municipalities. All groups will complete the same questionnaire.
Up to 100 respondents per country may be excluded. With five tasks and an effect size of 0.05, the design achieves 0.8 statistical power per country (except the Netherlands).

8) Anything else you would like to pre-register? (e.g., secondary analyses, variables collected for exploratory purposes, unusual analyses planned?)
-