

# **Working from Home and Food-Related Activities: Time Allocation of Latin American Couples**

Laura Chomalí, Juan Carlos Campaña, José Alberto Molina

## **Abstract**

Gender inequality in unpaid domestic labor persists even as women's labor market participation has risen steadily across the developing world. Foodwork, defined as the daily tasks of cooking, grocery shopping, and dishwashing, sits at the intersection of this inequality and household health, given its well-documented links to dietary quality and nutritional outcomes in a region facing rising rates of diet-related chronic disease. The expansion of working from home offers a plausible pathway toward a more equitable redistribution of these responsibilities, yet the conditions under which this occurs remain poorly understood. This paper shows, using time-use survey data from four Latin American countries and a system of seemingly unrelated regressions, that what matters is not whether telework occurs within a household but who teleworks. Joint telework raises foodwork as much as 250% (Guatemala), eating time by up to 32% (Chile), and reduces paid hours by up to 0.6 daily hours (Colombia). Female-exclusive telework produces the sharpest asymmetry, with women's foodwork, eating time, and paid hours changing by up to 78%, 35%, and 10.3 hours per week, respectively (all Chile). Male-exclusive telework generates a partial and systematically smaller reversal, with men's foodwork up to 123% (Guatemala), eating time up to 36%, and paid hours down up to 6.7 hours per week (both Chile). Policies targeting telework equity should therefore move beyond access and address the gender of the teleworker directly, prioritizing joint and male-inclusive remote work arrangements as the configurations most likely to generate redistributive effects within couples.

**Keywords:** Eating, foodwork, gender, intra-household allocation, Latin America, time use, working from home.

**JEL Codes:** J16, J22, D13, O54

## 1. Introduction

Working from home (WFH) has transformed the organization of daily life for millions of households, yet its consequences for the domestic division of labor remain poorly understood, particularly in developing regions (Berniell et al., 2023; Garrote et al., 2021; Gottlieb et al., 2021). This paper examines how couples' work arrangements regarding WFH influence the time each partner spends cooking, washing dishes, buying groceries, eating, and working for pay across Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, and Guatemala. Food-related activities are performed daily with direct implications for individuals' health and nutritional outcomes, and are socially constructed as strongly feminized responsibilities, making them a domain where gender norms are actively expressed and reproduced within households (Allen & Sachs, 2007; Beagan et al., 2008; DeVault, 1991). Moreover, paid work hours provide direct evidence of whether WFH generates a genuine redistribution of total work within couples or merely reallocates time between its paid and unpaid components. Using nationally representative time-use survey data and a system of seemingly unrelated regressions, the analysis distinguishes four household configurations defined by which partner teleworks: both working from home, both working away from home, only the woman working from home, and only the man working from home. This four-group framework reveals a pattern that aggregate approaches cannot detect<sup>1</sup>.

Gender disparities in the allocation of domestic and care responsibilities represent one of the most persistent forms of inequality in both labor markets and households. Compared to men, women systematically devote more time to unpaid household production, i.e., cooking, cleaning, childcare, eldercare, household organization, and shopping, regardless of their attachment to the labor market (Gimenez-Nadal & Sevilla, 2012; Campaña et al., 2018; Campaña et al., 2024). Traditionally, these patterns have been interpreted through the lens of household specialization, whereby women are primarily responsible for routine, time-intensive domestic tasks, while men allocate relatively more time to market labor (Bianchi et al., 2020; Gronau, 1977; Hook, 2010). Within this framework, household members maximize utility subject to a time budget constraint. Nevertheless, these allocations are shaped not only by relative wages and productivity (Becker, 1993), but also by social norms, intra-household bargaining power, and expectations regarding gender roles (Sevilla-Sanz et al., 2010; Burda et al., 2013; Campaña et al., 2018; Campaña et al., 2023; Campaña et al., 2024a, 2024b). However, the empirical relevance of this specialization framework has been progressively challenged by the sustained increase in women's participation in the labor market, raising the question of whether exogenous changes in work arrangements, such as the expansion of WFH, can alter the gendered allocation of domestic and paid labor within couples, or whether normative pressures are sufficiently entrenched to persist even when time constraints are relaxed.

---

<sup>1</sup> The dimension is not whether telework occurs within the household, but who teleworks. Within the household production framework (Becker, 1993), WFH relaxes the time constraint of the teleworker and modifies the shadow cost of domestic tasks, but the direction and magnitude of the resulting reallocation depend critically on whose constraint is relaxed and under what normative conditions. When only the woman WFH, increased physical presence in the domestic space may reinforce her comparative disadvantage in market labor, leading to greater absorption of foodwork regardless of the time saved. When only the man WFH, this mechanism is tested under reversed conditions. The Both WFH configuration is analytically distinct in that the time savings accrue to both partners simultaneously, constituting the arrangement most likely to generate a negotiated redistribution of domestic tasks. The Both WAFH group provides the natural benchmark. Aggregating these four configurations into a single telework indicator conflates arrangements with opposing effects, yielding estimates that are attenuated, and uninformative for policy design.

While standard models predict that increased female labor market participation should reduce women's domestic workload, empirical evidence shows that this adjustment has not occurred. The resulting double burden of paid and unpaid work reduces women's leisure time, increases their opportunity cost of labor market participation, and contributes to persistent gender gaps in wages, employment, and career progression (Gimenez-Nadal & Sevilla, 2011; Rubiano Matulevich & Viollaz, 2019).

Exogenous changes in labor market and household conditions have opened the possibility of assessing adjustments in the gendered allocation of paid and unpaid work. In recent years, the rapid expansion of telework or WFH has gained significant traction globally, driven by advancements in technology and, more recently, by the necessity imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic. Now that the medical emergency has subsided, WFH emerges as a potential mechanism for altering the allocation of time within households (Chauhan, 2022; Leap et al., 2023; Lyttelton et al., 2022).

WFH alters the context in which paid labor is performed, bringing work into the household, modifying daily routines, and eliminating commuting time (Aksoy et al., 2023; Bloom et al., 2015; Nagler et al., 2024). In theory, this modification relaxes the time constraint and increases the flexibility with which workers can allocate time to household tasks. This implies a reduction in the shadow cost of time at home, which could enable a more equitable division of unpaid work. Particularly if men use the additional time at home to increase their contribution to domestic tasks (Allen et al., 2015; Carstensen, 2020; Chung & Van der Lippe, 2020). Yet, emerging empirical evidence suggests that this theoretical prediction may not hold in practice. Instead, WFH often reinforces pre-existing intra-household specialization, as women's greater presence in the home increases the likelihood that they absorb additional domestic work, especially in households with children (Craig & Churchill, 2021; Lyttelton et al., 2022).

This tension between theoretical efficiency and empirical persistence of inequality is particularly salient in Latin America. Countries such as Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, and Guatemala, experienced substantial increases in telework adoption during and after the COVID-19 pandemic (Maurizio, 2021). This is reflected in Chile's implementation of a comprehensive telework law in 2020, Colombia's introduction of a modern regulatory framework through Law 2121 of 2021 and Decree 555 of 2022, and Costa Rica's enactment of its Telework Law (Law 9738) in 2019, which established formal conditions for remote work in both the public and private sectors. In Chile, where 3.2% of workers were WFH in 2024, women dedicated 1.9 hours daily to domestic tasks versus 0.6 hours for men (INE, 2024). Colombia reported 6% WFH prevalence in 2023, with women spending 7.7 hours daily on unpaid labor compared to 3.1 hours for men (DANE, 2023). Costa Rica showed the highest WFH rate at 9.5% in 2025, yet rural women still devoted 43 weekly hours to domestic work versus 16 hours for men (INEC, 2025, 2017). Guatemala exhibited the widest gender disparity with women performing 7 hours of unpaid work daily versus 2 hours for men (INE, 2023). Across all four countries, WFH has become an established feature of labor markets, while gender disparities in unpaid household labor persist.

Against this backdrop, examining the relationship between WFH and time allocated to unpaid work is essential. WFH changes the context in which household production decisions are made by modifying time constraints and increasing flexibility (Arntz et al.,

2022; Wray, 2024). Whether it leads to more egalitarian outcomes depends on how this additional time and flexibility are allocated within households.

Understanding how household labor is allocated requires moving beyond aggregate measures of unpaid work and distinguishing between specific task domains, such as food-related activities. Much of the existing literature relies on broad indicators of total unpaid housework as the dependent variable (Greenstein, 1996; Bianchi et al., 2000; Yoon, 2010). However, this aggregation may mask important heterogeneity, as the extent to which gender norms shape the division of labor can differ substantially across task types (Yoon, 2010).

This study therefore concentrates on time devoted to food-related activities performed as primary activities, distinguishing between two components: foodwork, defined as time spent on grocery shopping, cooking, and dishwashing, and eating. The choice of foodwork and eating as the central outcome is motivated by three complementary considerations. First, food-related activities are performed daily by all household members, making them the most frequent and time-intensive component of routine domestic production (Yoon, 2010). Unlike episodic tasks such as home repairs or bill payment, foodwork recurs every day without exception, which means that even modest gender asymmetries in its distribution accumulate into substantial inequalities over time. Second, the time allocated to preparing and consuming food carries well-documented implications for health and well-being. Home food preparation is positively associated with dietary quality and nutritional outcomes, while time scarcity in meal preparation is linked to greater reliance on processed foods and deterioration of family eating practices (Davis, 2010; Mandemakers & Roeters, 2015; Wolfson & Bleich, 2015; Warde et al., 2007; Restrepo & Zeballos, 2020). Third, foodwork is socially constructed as a strongly feminized responsibility, which men adhering to traditional masculine norms may be less likely to undertake (Yoon, 2010; Beagan et al., 2008; DeVault, 1991), making it a domain where gender norms are not only reflected but actively reproduced.

In opposite-gender couples across the four countries studied, these dynamics give rise to persistent and sizable gender gaps. In Chile, women spend an average of 7.74 weekly hours on foodwork compared to 3.25 hours for men; in Colombia, women dedicate 1.58 daily hours versus 0.33 hours for men; in Costa Rica, women perform 12.38 weekly hours versus 6.45 hours for men; and in Guatemala, women spend 15.62 weekly hours on food-related activities compared to 2.26 hours for men.

Based on this framework, this paper examines how working from home influences time allocation in foodwork, eating, and paid work in Chile (2023), Colombia (2021), Costa Rica (2022), and Guatemala (2022). Using time-use survey data, the analysis documents gender-specific time use for men and women across four distinct household work arrangements: both partners working from home (WFH), both working away from home (WAFH), only the woman WFH, or only the man WFH. This disaggregated approach recognizes that the gender of the teleworker matters. When women work from home, they may absorb greater foodwork burdens due to persistent normative expectations, whereas men working from home may not increase their domestic labor proportionally. The simultaneous analysis of paid work alongside foodwork is deliberate: changes in market labor hours provide direct evidence of whether WFH generates a genuine redistribution of total work within couples or merely reallocates time between its paid and unpaid components, with potentially lasting consequences for women's earnings, career

progression, and economic independence. This makes it necessary to analyze each partner's time use across all three domains simultaneously, rather than assuming household-level effects are neutral or uniform across gender lines.

The econometric approach involves estimating a system of six seemingly unrelated regressions (SUR) for each country, comprising three equations for each member of the couple, to account for the correlated nature of time-use decisions within households.

This investigation contributes to the labor economics literature on working from home and gender in two ways. First, while existing research, such as Restrepo and Zeballos (2020), explores the link between WFH and food-related time-use, this paper advances the field by accounting for the complex intra-household dynamics of both partners. Specifically, it examines how time allocation shifts depending on whether both, neither, or only one member of the couple is WFH. Second, this analysis is pioneering in its focus on Latin America, a region where the relationship between WFH and domestic labor remains largely unexplored, where profound cultural norms and distinct socioeconomic structures likely shape domestic dynamics in unique ways.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 establishes the theoretical background and reviews the existing literature. Section 3 describes the dataset and summary statistics, while Section 4 outlines the econometric model employed in the analysis. Section 5 presents the empirical results. Finally, Section 6 provides a discussion of the findings, offers concluding remarks, and suggests potential avenues for future research.

## **2. Background**

Recent literature consistently shows that telework reshapes daily time allocation by eliminating commuting and increasing schedule flexibility, with heterogeneous effects across gender, household structure, and stages of the life course. Evidence from 27 countries suggests that teleworkers save on average just over one hour per day previously spent commuting, with approximately 40% of these time savings allocated to paid work and the remainder distributed between personal activities and household tasks (Aksoy et al., 2023). Consistent with this, evidence from Canada shows that working from home is associated with a substantial reduction in commuting time and certain personal care activities, partially offset by increases in unpaid work, leisure, and, in some cases, sleep and self-reported well-being (Wray, 2024). These findings suggest that WFH not only reallocates time between market and non-market activities but may also modify overall daily rhythms and subjective welfare.

Time-use evidence for the United States reported by Restrepo and Zeballos (2020) similarly indicates that on days worked from home, individuals devote fewer hours to paid work and travel and more time to leisure and sleep. Post-pandemic analyses by Pabilonia and Vernon (2022) further emphasize that WFH affects not only the distribution of time across work, household task, and leisure, but also daily organization and perceived stress. This literature highlights that telework constitutes a structural shock to intra-household time allocation, with potential implications for well-being and inequality.

A parallel strand of research examines the gendered division of unpaid work. In Korea, Yoon (2010) shows that the division of housework is a dynamic process shaped by partners' gender attitudes: husbands with egalitarian views increase their contribution to housework only when their wives also hold egalitarian beliefs. This interaction underscores that household labor allocation reflects negotiated norms rather than purely economic specialization.

Similarly, Beagan et al. (2008) argue that, despite longstanding expectations that gender inequities in domestic labor would diminish over time, traditional roles often persist in reconfigured forms. Even when domestic tasks are framed as matters of preference or personal standards, women continue to shoulder a disproportionate burden. This perspective suggests that structural changes, such as telework, may not automatically translate into more egalitarian outcomes without concurrent shifts in norms.

Focusing specifically on foodwork, Canadian evidence by Liu et al. (2022) finds that when one partner faces intense time constraints from market work and non-food household tasks, reallocating food preparation to the other partner and reducing total foodwork at the couple level become rational coping strategies. However, women still assume a larger share of foodwork than men. This has implications not only for gender equity but also for dietary quality, as time scarcity may alter meal preparation practices and nutritional outcomes.

In the United States, Taillie (2018), building on earlier work by Sayer (2005), documents a modest increase in home cooking, particularly among men, although women continue to cook more frequently and for longer durations. Cooking patterns display substantial heterogeneity by education and race/ethnicity, with lower-educated men, higher-educated women, and non-Hispanic Black men and women less likely to cook at home. Earlier evidence from Harnack et al. (1998) indicates that male heads of household are considerably less involved in family meal-related tasks than female heads, reinforcing women's central role in family nutrition. Corroborating this pattern, Flagg et al. (2014) show that women are more likely than men to report primary responsibility, rather than shared responsibility, for meal planning, preparation, and food shopping.

Evidence from Europe reveals similar trends. A comparative study by Holm et al. (2015) for Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden finds that men's participation in cooking has increased over time while women's participation has declined. Nevertheless, women continue to cook more frequently than men, and the pace of convergence varies across social classes. Taken together, this literature documents persistent gender asymmetries in food-related tasks despite gradual convergence.

Overall, the literature provides extensive evidence on the gendered division of foodwork and a growing body of research on how WFH reshapes aggregate time allocation. However, the intersection between WFH and food-related tasks remains underexplored. To date, the principal contribution linking these domains is the study by Restrepo and Zeballos (2020), which uses nationally representative U.S. time-use data (2017–2018) and a system of Seemingly Unrelated Regressions to estimate conditional differences in time devoted to market work, personal care, leisure, sleep, and food-related activities. Focusing on prime-age white-collar wage and salary workers, the authors compare individuals who worked exclusively from home on the diary day with those who worked exclusively away from home, presenting separate estimates for partnered and non-

partnered individuals. The results indicate that WFH is associated with less time in paid work, less time in personal care, and more time in leisure and sleep. WFH is also linked to increases in time spent on home food preparation and on eating and drinking at home.

Despite this contribution, two important gaps persist. First, most WFH studies examine broad categories, such as paid work, leisure, or aggregate unpaid work. Without disentangling specific components of foodwork. Second, the empirical evidence is overwhelmingly concentrated in North America and parts of Europe. There is a notable absence of systematic analyses for Latin America, where labor market informality, gender norms, and household structures differ markedly from high-income contexts. Addressing the relationship between WFH and food-related tasks in Latin American settings therefore represents both a substantive and geographic contribution.

### **3. Data**

This study utilized data from time-use surveys conducted in Chile (2023), Colombia (2021), and Costa Rica (2022), as well as from the time-use module of Guatemala's 2022 household survey. Time-use surveys and module constitute a primary data source for examining how individuals allocate their time across activities and have become the standard methodological instrument for analyzing time-allocation behavior (Aguiar & Hurst, 2007; Bianchi, 2000; Campaña et al., 2020; Folbre et al., 2005; Gershuny, 2003; Gimenez-Nadal & Sevilla, 2012). These surveys are based on the stylized approach (Budlender, 2007), which involves asking respondents to report the amount of time devoted to a predetermined set of activities during a specified reference period. All the surveys employ pre-coded activity lists that enable the systematic classification and organization of time-use categories. They are nationally representative and the targeted populations are household members aged 12 and above for Chile, 10 and above for Colombia, 12 and above for Costa Rica, and 7 and above for Guatemala. Overall, time use surveys provide comprehensive data that facilitate rigorous analyses of individual time-allocation decisions (Campaña et al., 2021).

This paper centers on the time devoted to food-related activities performed as primary activities, as these constitute the central contribution of the analysis. However, given that teleworking is inherently defined by its relationship with working time, hours dedicated to paid work are also examined.

It should be noted that the available surveys do not account for simultaneous or secondary activities, which have been found to increase the total amount of household production (Kalenkoski and Foster, 2015). Considering secondary activities is particularly relevant, as individuals may differ in their ability to multitask (Floro and Pichetpongsa, 2010). Consequently, incorporating secondary activities could potentially alter the conclusions drawn from this research (Esquivel et al., 2008; Esquivel, 2010). This consideration is especially pertinent in the context of WFH, where individuals may, for instance, attend virtual meetings while simultaneously engaging in domestic tasks such as cooking.

The definition and selection of food-related activities follows the approach proposed by Restrepo and Zeballos (2020). Activities were grouped into two categories: foodwork and eating. The foodwork category encompasses all time spent on grocery shopping, cooking, and dishwashing. For Guatemala, time spent eating was not captured in the national time

use survey, as the questionnaire does not include eating as a separately recorded activity. Consequently, the analysis of food-related time use for Guatemala is restricted to foodwork activities. While working hours are expected to take positive values due to the sample design, food-related activities may include zeros, as some respondents do not engage in these tasks on the reference day. To address the resulting right-skewness and to better approximate normality, activity variables were transformed using the inverse hyperbolic sine transformation for the estimations, which is well suited for variables that contain zero values (Restrepo and Zeballos, 2020). Descriptive statistics presented below, however, are reported in their original units (weekly hours for Chile, Costa Rica, and Guatemala, and daily hours for Colombia) to facilitate direct interpretation.

The sample of this study consists of heterosexual couples (either married or cohabiting) in which both partners are employed, meaning they report positive income and positive hours dedicated to market work. That is, each partner engages in paid labor activities. The relevance of this inclusion criterion is that neither partner has the full day available for domestic activities, given that both hold paid work obligations that compete for their time. The final sample includes 3,896 households in Chile, 3,771 households in Colombia, 662 households in Costa Rica, and 914 households in Guatemala.

Since this study draws on time-use data from different countries, it is essential to account for the methodological differences among their respective surveys. The Time-Use Survey in Chile does not employ a single reference day for all respondents. Each participant reports time use for one weekday and one weekend day, both of which are pre-assigned. A “typical day” is then constructed as a weighted weekdays and weekends by 5/7 and 2/7, respectively. Chilean data were collected between September and December 2023, as part of the second *Encuesta Nacional sobre Uso del Tiempo* (ENUT 2023) conducted by the *Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas* (National Statistics Institute - INE), surveyed 16,335 households.

Regarding Colombia, the *Encuesta Nacional de Uso del Tiempo* (ENUT 2021) used the previous day as the reference period, with data collected between September 2020 and August 2021 by the *Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística* (National Administrative Department of Statistics - DANE), surveyed 49,051 households.

In Costa Rica, the second *Encuesta Nacional de Uso del Tiempo* (ENUT 2022), carried out by the *Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas y Censos* (National Institute of Statistics and Census - INEC), employed a previous-day diary method, with data collected between October 2022 and November 2022. It was surveyed 6,744 households.

In the case of Guatemala, the first comprehensive time-use module was incorporated into the *Encuesta Nacional de Condiciones de Vida* (ENCOVI 2023), conducted between August and December 2023. Surveyed 14,682 households. This module collected information on activities undertaken during the previous day, representing the most recent available national-level data on time use, although it does not constitute a standalone Time-Use Survey or ENUT.

The selection of these databases and countries was predicated on the availability of recent time-use data, collected within the preceding five-year period, which comprehensively

includes information on time allocated to foodwork and contains specific inquiries pertaining to working from home<sup>2</sup>.

Teleworking was defined as WFH according to the operational definitions used by each country's time-use survey, based on activities performed remotely using digital technologies, and distinguishing it from individuals who work from their home in a personal space such as a garage or workshop. In Chile's ENUT (2023), respondents are asked where they performed their work, distinguishing whether it took place in an installation, factory, or workshop within the home or just WFH. For the purposes of this study, only those WFH were considered in the sense of performing their professional tasks remotely. In Colombia's ENUT (2021), respondents indicate whether any portion of their workday was conducted outside a traditional workplace using information and communication technologies (ICTs), such as computers, internet, or mobile phones. Similarly, Costa Rica's ENUT (2022) captures WFH by asking individuals to report hours worked remotely on their diary day, identifying tasks completed at home or another non-workplace location using ICTs. In Guatemala's ENCOVI, the time-use module includes a question on whether the respondent performed any paid work remotely on the diary day. This approach allows us to construct a measure of WFH that is consistent across countries while respecting the specific framing of each survey.

To provide an initial overview of time-use patterns across countries, Table 1 presents mean hours devoted to foodwork, eating, and paid work by gender in Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, and Guatemala. For Chile, Costa Rica, and Guatemala, values are expressed in weekly hours, whereas for Colombia the figures correspond to daily hours due to data availability<sup>34</sup>.

The table reveals marked cross-country and gender disparities in time allocation. Women devote substantially more time to foodwork than men in all four countries, with the largest gender gaps recorded in Guatemala and Costa Rica. In Guatemala, women report an average of 15.62 weekly hours on foodwork, nearly seven times the 2.26 weekly hours reported by men. While in Costa Rica women spend 12.38 hours per week compared to 6.45 hours among men. Chile exhibits an intermediate pattern, with women allocating 7.74 weekly hours relative to 3.25 hours for men. Colombia, where time use is measured at the daily frequency, displays a five-fold differential, with women reporting 1.58 daily hours versus 0.33 daily hours for men.

---

<sup>2</sup>Recent Time-Use Surveys (TUS) available for Latin America correspond to Argentina (2021), Chile (2023), Colombia (2021), Costa Rica (2022), Guatemala (2022), the Dominican Republic (2021), and Uruguay (2021). Historically, these surveys did not collect information on working from home, reflecting the limited consideration of teleworking in time-use data prior to the COVID-19 pandemic. While the Colombian, Costa Rican, Chilean, and Guatemalan surveys include detailed time-use records, comprehensive information on remote work is notably absent in the surveys from Argentina, the Dominican Republic, and Uruguay. Specifically, the Uruguayan survey can identify individuals engaged in working from home but does not distinguish between fully remote employment and home-based entrepreneurial activities. In addition, the Dominican Republic's survey does not provide information on food-related activities, limiting the comparability of certain household time allocations across countries.

<sup>3</sup> For a detailed overview of all variables included in the study, please see Table A.1- A.4

<sup>4</sup> The use of daily hours for Colombia is consistent with prior cross-country studies employing time use surveys in the Latin American context. Although one might consider converting Colombian figures to weekly hours by multiplying by seven, this approach would be inappropriate given that the Colombian Time Use Survey was designed to capture time allocation on a single reference day and is not intended to represent a full weekly schedule. Converting daily to weekly figures would therefore introduce measurement error and compromise comparability with the underlying survey instrument.

Conversely, gender differences in eating time are considerably narrower and, in two of the four countries, statistically indistinguishable. In Costa Rica, women report 8.02 weekly hours devoted to eating and men 8.05 weekly hours; in Colombia, women allocate 1.10 daily hours and men 1.08 daily hours. Chile exhibits a somewhat larger gap, with women spending 7.71 weekly hours eating compared to 6.24 hours for men, though the large standard deviations for both groups reflect substantial heterogeneity in eating patterns across Chilean households. This contrast between the sizable gaps in foodwork and the near-zero gaps in eating already suggests that the gendered character of foodwork is concentrated in its productive dimension rather than its consumptive one.

Regarding paid work, men consistently allocate more hours to market labor than women across all four countries. The gender gap is most pronounced in Guatemala, where men report 45.28 weekly hours compared to 32.61 hours for women (a difference of 12.67 hours), and in Costa Rica, where men work 47.58 hours per week compared to 40.00 hours for women. In Chile, the gap is 7.44 weekly hours (men: 45.14; women: 37.70), while in Colombia men report 8.60 daily hours against 7.81 daily hours for women. Consistent with the broad stylized facts documented for Latin America in prior cross-country analyses of gender and time use (Campaña et al., 2018; Campaña et al., 2024).

**Table 1.** Weekly/Daily Hours spent in food related activities in Chile Colombia, Costa Rica, and Guatemala

	Foodwork				Eating				Paid Working Hours			
	Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men	
	Mean	Sd	Mean	Sd	Mean	Sd	Mean	Sd	Mean	Sd	Mean	Sd
Chile	7.74	7.13	3.25	4.55	7.71	5.35	6.24	5.52	37.70	12.05	45.14	15.75
Colombia	1.58	1.16	0.33	0.67	1.10	0.53	1.08	0.56	7.81	2.30	8.60	2.11
Costa Rica	12.38	5.99	6.45	4.88	8.02	2.72	8.05	2.84	40.00	15.58	47.58	13.57
Guatemala	15.62	10.52	2.26	5.39	-	-	-	-	32.61	22.41	45.28	22.05
<i>Conditional &gt;0</i>												
Chile	9.79	6.66	5.78	4.71	9.53	4.25	9.32	4.10	-	-	-	-
Colombia	1.88	1.01	0.98	0.83	1.10	0.53	1.08	0.56	-	-	-	-
Costa Rica	12.52	5.88	6.93	4.71	8.05	2.72	8.05	2.84	-	-	-	-
Guatemala	17.19	9.75	5.39	6.01	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

*Note: For Colombia, values are expressed as hours per day. For Chile, Costa Rica, and Guatemala values are weekly.*

Building on the aggregate patterns presented in Table 1, Table 2 provides a more detailed descriptive analysis by disaggregating mean hours devoted to foodwork, eating, and paid work according to the specific work arrangement of each couple. This disaggregation is motivated by the need to examine whether the gendered division of time in these activities varies depending on who within the household WFH.

The analysis distinguishes four mutually exclusive groups defined at the couple level: households where both partners work from home (Both WFH), households where both partners work away from home (Both WAFH), households where only the woman works from home (Only Her WFH), and households where only the man works from home (Only Him WFH). This couple-level taxonomy extends the framework used in prior work

on telework and gender, which has largely compared individual teleworkers with on-site workers without conditioning on the partner's work arrangement (Restrepo & Zeballos, 2020; Lyttelton et al., 2022; Craig & Churchill, 2021). The present classification captures meaningful variation not only in whether telework occurs within the household, but also in which partner WFH, a distinction that is theoretically motivated by the hypothesis that the domestic consequences of remote work are mediated by gender norms rather than by time availability alone. This distinction is further grounded in the regulatory context of the countries under study. Chile's Law 21.645 (2024), Colombia's Law 2121 (2021), and Costa Rica's Law 9738 (2019) all establish the right to request telework for workers who perform unpaid caregiving responsibilities. Although these provisions are formally gender-neutral, they are more likely to be taken up by women in practice, given that women continue to hold primary responsibility for care work in Latin American households.

This institutional context implies that the Only Her WFH configuration is not merely a statistical subcategory but a policy-relevant arrangement that may be actively shaped by caregiving legislation, making its analysis particularly consequential for understanding the gendered domestic effects of remote work. Additionally, examining paid work alongside foodwork in this framework is important, as changes in market labor hours provide direct evidence of how telework arrangements alter the total work burden, both paid and unpaid, borne by each partner.

Table 2 reveals persistent gender disparities in foodwork across all work configurations, with the magnitude varying considerably by country and arrangement. A pattern emerges when comparing arrangements in which both partners share the same work location with those in which only one partner teleworks. When both partners WAFH or both WFH, the gender gap in foodwork remains broadly stable. In Chile, the gap under Both WAFH is 4.25 weekly hours and is stable under Both WFH at 4.20 weekly hours. In Colombia, the gap is 1.19 daily hours under Both WAFH and 0.99 daily hours under Both WFH. That is, shared work location, whether inside or outside the home, does not substantially alter the baseline division of foodwork between partners.

The reality changes when telework is exclusively adopted by one partner. When only the woman WFH, the gender gap in foodwork widens across countries. In Chile, it rises to 7.24 weekly hours, approximately 70% above the Both WAFH benchmark. In Colombia, the gap increases to 1.89 daily hours, approximately 59% above Both WAFH. In Guatemala, the gap reaches 16.50 weekly hours under Only Her WFH, compared with 12.64 hours under Both WAFH. In all three countries, women's foodwork hours increase while men's decrease relative to the reference category, implying a reallocation of domestic foodwork toward the partner at home. Conversely, when only the man works from home, the gender gap either narrows or becomes statistically insignificant: in Chile it falls to 1.06 weekly hours, in Colombia to 0.40 daily hours, and in Guatemala to 9.75 weekly hours.

This asymmetry is inconsistent with a pure time-availability mechanism. If whoever is at home simply cooks more regardless of gender, the effect should be symmetric across arrangements. The data contradict this prediction, because in Chile, the gap under Only Her WFH is nearly seven times larger than under Only Him WFH, in Colombia, the ratio is approximately 4.7 to one, for Guatemala it nearly doubles. This asymmetry points to the mediating role of gender norms. When women are home, normative expectations

intensify domestic demands on them; when men are home, the same normative pull is weaker. This pattern is consistent with the possibility that reductions in commuting time and increased physical presence at home lower the shadow cost of women's time in domestic production (Becker, 1993; Sevilla-Sanz et al., 2010), reinforcing rather than attenuating traditional gender specialization.

Costa Rica constitutes a partial exception. The foodwork gap is statistically significant under Both WAFH, Only Her WFH, and Only Him WFH, while the gap under Both WFH is not statistically distinguishable from zero, suggesting that joint telework in Costa Rica is associated with a near-equalization of foodwork responsibilities. This result likely reflects the different sociodemographic composition of teleworking couples in this country, where 89.78% of Both WFH couples and 70.23% of Only Her WFH couples hold university or postgraduate education, compared with 27.28% and 30.21% in the Both WAFH reference group. This educational gradient may proxy for more egalitarian gender norms among higher-educated couples, attenuating the domestic reallocation effects observed elsewhere.

Gender differences in eating time are generally small and often statistically insignificant across arrangements and countries, in contrast to the disparities in foodwork. A notable exception arises in Chile, where the gap reaches 2.49 additional weekly hours for women under Only Her WFH, while it reverses sign under Only Him WFH. This asymmetry between foodwork and eating time underscores the analytical importance of disaggregating food-related activities into its productive and consumptive components, because aggregating both would mask the inequalities concentrated in the more time-intensive and normatively gendered task of preparation. The near-zero eating gaps observed across most countries and arrangements may also in part reflect a measurement limitation of the stylized time-use surveys used here, which do not record simultaneous activities. In the context of WFH, individuals frequently eat while performing paid work, for instance during virtual meetings, so that measured eating time captures only primary-activity eating and likely underestimates true consumption time, particularly for teleworkers.

With respect to paid work, men allocate more hours to market labor than women across all arrangements and countries, but the magnitude of this gap is not constant across configurations. It expands under Only Her WFH, producing a double reallocation for women in this group. They simultaneously increase foodwork and reduce paid work relative to the Both WAFH benchmark. In Chile, the gender gap in paid work is 6.00 weekly hours under Both WAFH and widens to 18.22 weekly hours under Only Her WFH, nearly tripling in magnitude. Women in this group report only 28.38 weekly hours of paid work compared with 46.60 hours for their male partners, while men in the same group increase their market labor relative to the reference category. In Colombia, the gap approximately doubles under Only Her WFH, rising from 0.72 to 1.51 daily hours. In Guatemala, it goes from 10.53 to 21.29 weekly hours. Unlike the previous pattern, when only the man WFH, men reduce their paid hours, but this reduction is not accompanied by a symmetric increase in their foodwork time, suggesting that men benefit from a time dividend that is only partly redirected toward household production.

Taken together, the descriptive evidence in Table 2 reveals a regularity: gender gaps in foodwork and paid work are broadly stable when both partners occupy the same work location, whether inside or outside the home, but become sensitive to which partner

teleworks. Symmetry in location appears to preserve the baseline division of domestic and market labor; asymmetry in location amplifies it, and the direction of amplification is determined by gender. These figures are descriptive and do not account for the sociodemographic and economic characteristics that jointly determine work arrangements and time allocation. Cross-country differences in education, labor market structures, household composition, and location are likely to contribute to the observed variation in gender gaps, which motivates the econometric analysis presented in Section 4.

**Table 2.** Weekly/Daily Hours spent in food related activities in Chile Colombia, Costa Rica, and Guatemala

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	Foodwork				Eating				Paid Working Hours			
	Both WFH	Both WAFH	Only Her WFH	Only Him WFH	Both WFH	Both WAFH	Only Her WFH	Only Him WFH	Both WFH	Both WAFH	Only Her WFH	Only Him WFH
<b>Chile</b>												
Women	7.65	7.40	9.70	6.67	7.80	7.62	8.25	7.29	37.74	39.58	28.38	40.87
Men	3.45	3.14	2.46	5.60	6.84	6.10	5.76	7.88	44.41	45.58	46.60	39.04
Difference	4.20***	4.25***	7.24***	1.06	0.96*	1.52***	2.49***	-0.59	-6.67***	-6.00***	-18.22***	1.82
<b>Colombia</b>												
Women	1.56	1.49	2.10	1.16	1.30	1.08	1.07	1.16	7.70	8.01	7.05	7.91
Men	0.57	0.29	0.21	0.76	1.31	1.06	1.08	1.11	8.21	8.73	8.56	7.74
Difference	0.99***	1.19***	1.89***	0.40***	-0.01	0.03**	-0.01	0.05	-0.51***	-0.72***	-1.51***	0.17
<b>Costa Rica</b>												
Women	9.89	12.75	11.04	12.55	8.48	7.96	8.35	7.82	45.54	38.95	43.77	41.06
Men	8.80	5.93	7.61	8.16	8.38	7.93	8.00	9.05	44.00	48.25	48.27	43.40
Difference	1.08	6.81***	3.43***	4.39***	0.01	0.04	0.35	-1.22**	1.54	-9.30***	-4.50**	-2.34
<b>Guatemala</b>												
Women	18.27	14.82	18.80	13.38	-	-	-	-	32.88	34.22	26.05	35.91
Men	5.14	2.18	2.30	3.63	-	-	-	-	51.15	44.74	47.33	40.72
Difference	13.13***	12.64***	16.50***	9.75***	-	-	-	-	-18.27	-10.53***	-21.29***	-4.81

*Note:* For Colombia, values are expressed as hours per day. For Chile, Costa Rica, and Guatemala values are weekly. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

## 4. Econometric Strategy

Linear regressions were estimated for the time devoted to foodwork, eating, and paid work<sup>5</sup>, which are interdependent activities by nature. Since total amount of time available in a day is fixed, spending more time on one activity necessarily reduces the time available for others. Furthermore, unobserved factors such as individual preferences or social norms may simultaneously influence multiple time-use decisions. Consequently, the error terms across the equations are likely to be correlated.

To address these interdependencies and to obtain efficient estimates, this study employs a Seemingly Unrelated Regression (SUR) model developed by Zellner (1962), applied to the time devoted to paid work, foodwork and eating. This framework allows for the joint estimation of a system of equations with contemporaneously correlated residuals, improving the efficiency of the parameter estimates relative to equation-by-equation Ordinary Least Squares (OLS). Additionally, the individual time in any specific activity was not used as an explanatory variable of other uses of time, because that would lead to endogeneity problems.

The following system of equations was estimated separately for each country in the sample. The system is estimated separately for each country rather than pooling the four samples, given that labor market structures, gender norms, and telework prevalence differ substantially across countries. Pooling would impose common coefficients on these heterogeneous contexts, masking cross-country variation. Resulting in four independent estimations:

$$FW_{ihc} = \alpha_{FP} + \beta_1 Couple_{ihc} + \beta_2 X_{ihc} + \beta_3 Z_{hc} + \varepsilon_{FWihc} \quad (1)$$

$$E_{ihc} = \alpha_E + \beta_1 Couple_{ihc} + \beta_2 X_{ihc} + \beta_3 Z_{hc} + \varepsilon_{Eihc} \quad (2)$$

$$WH_{ihc} = \alpha_{WH} + \beta_1 Couple_{ihc} + \beta_2 X_{ihc} + \beta_3 Z_{hc} + \varepsilon_{WHihc} \quad (3)$$

The system comprises six equations per country. Equations (1), (2), and (3) are estimated separately for women and for men within each couple, yielding six jointly estimated equations. This joint estimation accounts for the correlated nature of intra-household time-use decisions, as the unobserved determinants of one partner's time allocation are likely correlated with those of the other.

For each individual  $i$ , living in a household  $h$  in the country  $c$  ( $c=1,2,3,4$ ),  $FW_{ihc}$ ,  $E_{ihc}$ , and  $WH_{ihc}$  represent the hours that each individual report performing foodwork, eating, and paid work respectively. Since food-related activity variables are transformed using the inverse hyperbolic sine (IHS), the estimated coefficients do not have a direct hours interpretation. Paid working hours, by contrast, are retained in their original units and coefficients are interpreted directly as hour differences.  $Couple_{hc}$  denote a categorical variable indicating the

---

<sup>5</sup> Following Campaña et al. (2020), the Tobit model (Tobin, 1958) was not selected, since previous studies (Gershuny, 2012; Frazis and Stewart, 2012; Foster and Kalenkoski, 2013) demonstrated that OLS models provide accurate estimates of average time allocation in sample analysis and yield qualitatively similar conclusions to those obtained with Tobit estimations.

couple's work arrangement within each household, that is, both partners working away from home, both working from home, only her working from home, or only him working from home. The reference category for the couple's work arrangement variable is the Both WAFH configuration, so all estimated coefficients capture deviations from the baseline in which both partners work away from home.  $X_{ihc}$  a vector of individual socio-demographic characteristics, and  $Z_{hc}$  a vector of household characteristics. And  $\varepsilon_{FWihc}$ ,  $\varepsilon_{Eihc}$ , and  $\varepsilon_{WHihc}$  are the residuals term capturing unmeasured factors.

The selection of control variables follows prior empirical studies in this field, including Campaña et al. (2017, 2020, 2021), and Restrepo and Zeballos (2020).

The vector  $X_{ihc}$  includes age, age squared, education, the logarithm of the hourly predicted wage rate and its squared term, an indicator for Indigenous identity, and the sector of employment. Following Campaña et al. (2017, 2020), predicted wages are used to approximate individuals' potential earnings and, consequently, their opportunity cost of time. Observed wages are available only for those who participate in the labor market, which may generate selection bias if labor force participation is correlated with time allocation decisions. In addition, wages and time devoted to unpaid activities are jointly determined, giving rise to concerns of endogeneity. The use of predicted wages helps mitigate both selection and simultaneity biases.

Predicted wages are estimated using the Heckman two-step procedure proposed by Heckman (1979), based on the full dataset prior to applying the study's inclusion criteria, that is, before restricting the sample to heterosexual dual-earner couples. The corresponding estimation results are reported in Table A.5.

The vector  $Z_{hc}$  includes the number of household members, the number of children, presence of children (aged 0 to 4 years, aged 5 to 12 years and aged 13 to 17 years), a rural residence indicator, and the region of residence. Since predicted wages are generated regressors, bootstrap standard errors with 1,000 replications are applied to account for the additional sampling variability introduced by the first-stage estimation.

Correlations in the unobserved determinants of activities were accommodated by allowing the residuals to be jointly normally distributed, with no restrictions on the structure of these correlations. This specification account for the time constraint that may require individuals to spend more time on one activity and, therefore, less time on another. The residuals were assumed to be independent across individuals:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_{FWihc} \\ \varepsilon_{Eihc} \\ \varepsilon_{WHihc} \end{bmatrix} \sim N \left[ \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{FWihc}^2 & \rho_{FWihcEihc}\sigma_{FWihc}\sigma_{Eihc} & \rho_{FWihcWHihc}\sigma_{FWihc}\sigma_{WHihc} \\ \rho_{EihcFWihc}\sigma_{Eihc}\sigma_{FWihc} & \sigma_{Eihc}^2 & \rho_{EihcWHihc}\sigma_{Eihc}\sigma_{WHihc} \\ \rho_{WHihcFWihc}\sigma_{WHihc}\sigma_{FWihc} & \rho_{WHihcEihc}\sigma_{WHihc}\sigma_{Eihc} & \sigma_{WHihc}^2 \end{bmatrix} \right]$$

Although the three equations may appear to be unrelated, in the sense that there is no simultaneity among the dependent variables in the system and each equation explains a distinct time-use activity, the equations are related stochastically through their residuals.

These disturbances are assumed to be temporally uncorrelated both within and across equations, but contemporaneously correlated across the equations of the model.

It should be noted that the couple's work arrangement variable may be subject to selection. Couples who telework are likely to differ from those who do not in unobserved characteristics such as preferences for domestic task sharing or flexibility-seeking behavior. The SUR estimates should therefore be interpreted as conditional associations rather than causal effects. Addressing this limitation would require instruments for the telework decision that are plausibly exogenous to time allocation, which are not available in the current data.

## 5. Results

Table 3 through 6 present the results of the SUR model for Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, and Guatemala, estimated as specified in Equations (1), (2) and (3). For each table, columns (1) and (2) report the estimates for women's and men's foodwork time, respectively; columns (3) and (4) report the estimates for women's and men's eating time; and columns (5) and (6) report the estimates for women's and men's paid working hours. Given that generated regressors were used to predict wages, bootstrap standard errors with 1,000 replications were applied (Campaña et al., 2017, 2020; Gimenez-Nadal and Molina, 2013, 2015; Murphy and Topel, 1985; Pagan, 1984). Paid working hours are expressed in their original units, while foodwork and eating coefficients are reported in IHS-transformed units. The approximate percentage effect for food-related activities is computed as  $\exp(\hat{\beta}) - 1$  (Restrepo & Zeballos, 2020).

The key explanatory variable is the couple's work arrangement, specified as a categorical variable. All coefficients are interpreted relative to the reference category in which both partners work away from home (WAFH). Accordingly, the estimated coefficients capture deviations from the benchmark situation where both partners WAFH.

**Table 3.** SUR estimates on the time devoted to food-related activities and paid work in Chile

	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)		(6)	
	Foodwork				Eating				Paid Working Hours			
	Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men	
Both WFH	0.195**	(0.093)	0.156	(0.098)	0.189**	(0.087)	0.281***	(0.099)	-1.153	(1.527)	-1.528	(1.407)
Only Her WFH	0.578***	(0.066)	-0.266***	(0.062)	0.307***	(0.056)	-0.248***	(0.077)	-10.320***	(1.070)	1.217	(0.887)
Only Him WFH	-0.208*	(0.114)	0.447***	(0.106)	-0.205*	(0.116)	0.311***	(0.104)	0.708	(1.258)	-6.688***	(1.388)
Age	0.061	(0.038)	-0.038	(0.033)	0.058*	(0.032)	-0.036	(0.037)	-0.083	(0.474)	0.590	(0.418)
Age squared	-0.001	(0.001)	0.000	(0.000)	-0.001*	(0.000)	0.000	(0.001)	0.001	(0.006)	-0.008	(0.006)
Elementary ed.	-0.817*	(0.487)	0.642	(0.428)	-1.036**	(0.430)	0.509	(0.495)	8.396	(6.439)	-4.667	(5.272)
High School degree	-1.350	(0.970)	1.026	(0.847)	-1.733**	(0.852)	0.861	(0.970)	18.646	(12.257)	-7.655	(10.488)
Technical/post-secondary ed.	-1.899	(1.318)	1.260	(1.153)	-2.249*	(1.153)	1.047	(1.319)	24.437	(16.602)	-9.304	(14.298)
University/postgraduate ed.	-2.263	(1.587)	1.639	(1.384)	-2.672*	(1.381)	1.305	(1.578)	28.137	(19.702)	-13.177	(16.988)
Log predicted wage	-2.500	(2.739)	0.142	(2.093)	-1.943	(2.360)	2.939	(2.394)	-15.941	(33.630)	48.356*	(27.802)
Log predicted wage squared	0.805	(0.573)	-0.179	(0.475)	0.762	(0.480)	-0.619	(0.519)	-1.636	(6.781)	-5.446	(5.813)
N household members	-0.109***	(0.031)	-0.125***	(0.027)	-0.131***	(0.030)	-0.204***	(0.033)	0.626	(0.383)	0.313	(0.364)
Younger child 0-4	0.065	(0.092)	-0.126	(0.085)	-0.036	(0.082)	-0.033	(0.095)	-2.553**	(1.132)	-0.701	(1.167)
Younger child 5-12	0.100	(0.088)	0.056	(0.084)	-0.030	(0.079)	0.057	(0.096)	-2.231*	(1.251)	-0.977	(1.168)
Younger child 13-17	0.085	(0.085)	-0.088	(0.082)	-0.015	(0.075)	-0.102	(0.091)	-0.675	(1.107)	-0.962	(1.048)
N Children	0.181***	(0.066)	0.071	(0.065)	0.190***	(0.058)	0.120*	(0.071)	-0.701	(0.914)	0.574	(0.845)
Indigenous	0.364**	(0.171)	-0.170	(0.151)	0.396***	(0.150)	-0.133	(0.172)	-1.652	(2.237)	0.581	(1.942)
Rural area	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

*Notes:* Bootstrap standard errors in parentheses. The sample is restricted to heterosexual couples (married or cohabiting) in which both partners are employed. For the couple's work arrangement, the reference category is both working away from home (WAFH). Foodwork and eating time are estimated using inverse hyperbolic sine (IHS)-transformed variables. Education levels are compared to the category "no education". Technical or post-secondary education correspond to non-tertiary education. Foodwork includes time spent preparing food, washing dishes, and buying groceries. In the Chilean dataset, there is no variable distinguishing between urban and rural areas.  $p < 0.10$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ,  $p < 0.01$ .

**Table 4.** SUR estimates on the time devoted to food-related activities and paid work in Colombia

	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)		(6)	
	Foodwork				Eating				Paid Working Hours			
	Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men	
Both WFH	0.165***	(0.041)	0.146***	(0.031)	0.055**	(0.023)	0.066***	(0.024)	-0.557***	(0.152)	-0.287**	(0.139)
Only Her WFH	0.314***	(0.029)	-0.043**	(0.018)	0.002	(0.015)	0.009	(0.015)	-1.009***	(0.125)	-0.024	(0.092)
Only Him WFH	-0.149***	(0.048)	0.296***	(0.044)	0.037*	(0.023)	0.013	(0.025)	-0.213	(0.142)	-0.711***	(0.155)
Age	-0.000	(0.011)	-0.004	(0.007)	0.000	(0.004)	0.005	(0.005)	0.034	(0.037)	0.034	(0.032)
Age squared	0.000	(0.000)	0.000	(0.000)	0.000	(0.000)	-0.000	(0.000)	-0.001	(0.001)	-0.001	(0.001)
Elementary ed.	-0.172	(0.203)	0.108	(0.094)	-0.197*	(0.110)	0.097	(0.084)	1.495*	(0.800)	1.085*	(0.596)
High School degree	-0.305	(0.304)	0.126	(0.160)	-0.323**	(0.144)	0.116	(0.128)	1.420	(1.154)	1.069	(0.847)
Technical/post-secondary ed.	-0.367	(0.358)	0.211	(0.195)	-0.374**	(0.165)	0.146	(0.154)	1.644	(1.344)	0.953	(0.998)
University/postgraduate ed.	-0.604	(0.392)	0.250	(0.219)	-0.388**	(0.180)	0.161	(0.172)	1.458	(1.476)	0.815	(1.106)
Log predicted wage	-2.179*	(1.254)	-0.965	(0.678)	-0.822	(0.623)	-0.087	(0.576)	-5.154	(4.872)	0.857	(3.607)
Log predicted wage squared	0.144*	(0.078)	0.117***	(0.039)	0.007	(0.043)	0.016	(0.036)	0.517*	(0.298)	-0.017	(0.222)
N household members	-0.061***	(0.014)	-0.052***	(0.008)	-0.006	(0.007)	-0.006	(0.007)	-0.022	(0.061)	0.038	(0.043)
Younger child 0-4	-0.100**	(0.040)	-0.083***	(0.023)	-0.021	(0.019)	-0.041**	(0.020)	0.008	(0.137)	0.094	(0.128)
Younger child 5-12	-0.066*	(0.039)	-0.053**	(0.025)	-0.019	(0.019)	-0.046**	(0.019)	0.288**	(0.138)	0.127	(0.127)
Younger child 13-17	0.009	(0.039)	-0.002	(0.024)	-0.002	(0.019)	-0.030	(0.020)	0.201	(0.140)	0.000	(0.121)
N Children	0.102***	(0.031)	0.046**	(0.018)	0.001	(0.015)	0.020	(0.016)	-0.211*	(0.118)	-0.032	(0.091)
Indigenous	-0.081	(0.103)	0.099	(0.064)	0.036	(0.047)	-0.019	(0.042)	-0.324	(0.386)	-0.293	(0.295)
Rural area	0.441	(0.366)	-0.145	(0.211)	0.291*	(0.158)	-0.021	(0.159)	-0.330	(1.360)	-0.455	(1.056)

*Notes:* The Colombian data are available at an hourly daily frequency. Bootstrap standard errors in parentheses. The sample is restricted to heterosexual couples (married or cohabiting) in which both partners are employed. For the couple's work arrangement, the reference category is both working away from home (WAFH). Foodwork and eating time are estimated using inverse hyperbolic sine (IHS)-transformed variables. Education levels are compared to the category "no education". Technical or post-secondary education correspond to non-tertiary education. Foodwork includes time spent preparing food, washing dishes, and buying groceries.  $p < 0.10$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ,  $p < 0.01$ .

**Table 5.** SUR estimates on the time devoted to food-related activities and paid work in Costa Rica

	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)		(6)	
	Foodwork				Eating				Paid Working Hours			
	Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men	
Both WFH	-0.163	(0.116)	0.382***	(0.147)	0.018	(0.060)	-0.044	(0.059)	3.160*	(1.648)	-2.121	(1.396)
Only Her WFH	-0.186	(0.121)	0.143	(0.133)	-0.009	(0.055)	-0.054	(0.048)	2.026	(1.397)	0.908	(1.542)
Only Him WFH	-0.070	(0.122)	0.139	(0.158)	-0.046	(0.058)	0.064	(0.061)	0.040	(2.683)	-2.725	(1.811)
Age	-0.063*	(0.036)	-0.091	(0.065)	-0.008	(0.018)	0.004	(0.020)	1.424	(1.090)	1.970**	(0.883)
Age squared	0.001*	(0.000)	0.001	(0.001)	0.000	(0.000)	-0.000	(0.000)	-0.015	(0.010)	-0.021**	(0.008)
Elementary ed.	-0.995	(0.644)	-1.195	(1.096)	-0.148	(0.319)	0.262	(0.333)	11.699	(20.063)	21.279	(17.623)
High School degree	-1.777	(1.110)	-1.849	(1.857)	-0.093	(0.553)	0.424	(0.576)	20.782	(34.842)	36.461	(29.525)
Technical/post-secondary ed.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
University/postgraduate ed.	-2.551*	(1.542)	-2.428	(2.537)	0.006	(0.762)	0.590	(0.799)	26.180	(48.069)	46.195	(39.915)
Log predicted wage	1.850	(2.143)	4.153	(3.964)	0.497	(1.063)	-1.037	(1.113)	-35.698	(67.059)	-86.174	(61.563)
Log predicted wage squared	0.099	(0.276)	-0.360	(0.523)	-0.113	(0.126)	0.128	(0.142)	2.892	(7.685)	8.915	(7.477)
N household members	-0.008	(0.030)	-0.060	(0.038)	-0.027**	(0.013)	-0.033***	(0.012)	0.017	(0.739)	0.536	(0.518)
Younger child 0-4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Younger child 5-12	0.101	(0.166)	0.012	(0.304)	0.036	(0.085)	0.059	(0.109)	-2.868	(5.263)	2.985	(4.791)
Younger child 13-17	-0.164	(0.161)	-0.044	(0.282)	0.014	(0.070)	-0.016	(0.073)	3.602	(4.567)	1.224	(3.711)
N Children	0.195	(0.127)	0.076	(0.247)	-0.014	(0.057)	-0.005	(0.055)	-3.783	(3.801)	-1.962	(3.199)
Indigenous	0.096	(0.174)	0.571**	(0.269)	-0.004	(0.127)	-0.205**	(0.095)	-0.460	(4.402)	10.630*	(5.677)
Rural area	0.532**	(0.266)	0.431	(0.443)	-0.078	(0.136)	-0.087	(0.144)	-4.341	(8.270)	-8.213	(6.964)

*Notes:* Bootstrap standard errors in parentheses. The sample is restricted to heterosexual couples (married or cohabiting) in which both partners are employed. For the couple's work arrangement, the reference category is both working away from home (WAFH). Foodwork and eating time are estimated using inverse hyperbolic sine (IHS)-transformed variables. Education levels are compared to the category "no education". There are no households with children aged 0 years in the Costa Rican sample. In addition, the category "Technical or post-secondary education", which corresponds to non-tertiary education, is not available for this country. Foodwork includes time spent preparing food, washing dishes, and buying groceries.  $p < 0.10$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ,  $p < 0.01$ .

**Table 6.** SUR estimates on the time devoted to food-related activities and paid work in Guatemala

	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)		(6)	
	Foodwork				Eating				Paid Working Hours			
	Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men	
Both WFH	0.745***	(0.242)	1.252**	(0.553)	-	-	-	-	0.913	(8.126)	10.949	(10.811)
Only Her WFH	0.413***	(0.105)	-0.044	(0.120)	-	-	-	-	-7.253***	(2.298)	3.879*	(2.158)
Only Him WFH	0.272	(0.219)	0.803**	(0.325)	-	-	-	-	3.355	(2.997)	-10.616**	(4.544)
Age	0.226	(0.195)	0.195	(0.170)	-	-	-	-	1.854	(2.915)	-0.328	(2.894)
Age squared	-0.002	(0.001)	-0.001	(0.001)	-	-	-	-	-0.014	(0.020)	0.001	(0.019)
Elementary ed.	4.299	(3.989)	4.327	(3.623)	-	-	-	-	27.775	(61.170)	2.439	(62.654)
High School degree	7.653	(6.854)	7.477	(6.308)	-	-	-	-	48.935	(105.228)	2.413	(106.977)
Technical/post-secondary ed.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
University/postgraduate ed.	10.195	(9.376)	10.203	(8.626)	-	-	-	-	67.045	(143.953)	1.853	(145.424)
Log predicted wage	-11.459	(9.904)	-9.629	(9.441)	-	-	-	-	-19.625	(151.825)	-27.167	(155.866)
Log predicted wage squared	0.944	(0.816)	0.658	(0.818)	-	-	-	-	-4.286	(12.524)	5.730	(13.545)
N household members	0.010**	(0.004)	0.001	(0.005)	-	-	-	-	-0.103	(0.083)	-0.153*	(0.083)
Younger child 0-4	0.087	(0.121)	-0.002	(0.128)	-	-	-	-	-0.720	(2.289)	-1.879	(2.314)
Younger child 5-12	0.187	(0.132)	-0.173	(0.147)	-	-	-	-	-1.510	(2.335)	2.414	(2.449)
Younger child 13-17	0.086	(0.128)	-0.158	(0.135)	-	-	-	-	1.137	(2.453)	0.952	(2.298)
N Children	-0.031	(0.069)	0.125	(0.077)	-	-	-	-	-0.689	(1.313)	-0.182	(1.224)
Indigenous	-1.124	(1.139)	-1.105	(1.049)	-	-	-	-	-4.541	(17.067)	-1.297	(16.664)
Rural area	-0.197	(0.385)	-0.510	(0.342)	-	-	-	-	-0.609	(5.932)	2.821	(5.644)

*Notes:* Bootstrap standard errors in parentheses. The sample is restricted to heterosexual couples (married or cohabiting) in which both partners are employed. For the couple's work arrangement, the reference category is both working away from home (WAFH). Foodwork and eating time are estimated using inverse hyperbolic sine (IHS)-transformed variables. Education levels are compared to the category "no education". The category "Technical or post-secondary education", which corresponds to non-tertiary education, is not available for this country. Foodwork includes time spent preparing food, washing dishes, and buying groceries. Time-use data related to eating was not available for this country.  $p < 0.10$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ,  $p < 0.01$ .

### **Both partners working from home**

When both partners work from home, the reallocation of time between foodwork, eating, and paid work differs across countries, though a common pattern of relatively balanced adjustment emerges in three of the four countries studied.

In Chile, women significantly increase foodwork time (approximately 22%<sup>6</sup>) relative to when both WAFH. Unlike the other work arrangements, Both WFH configuration distributes the additional foodwork more evenly between partners, consistent with the idea that when both partners are simultaneously present at home, the shared visibility of domestic tasks may reduce the extent to which women disproportionately absorb them. Both partners also significantly increase eating time (approximately 21% for women and 32% for men), which may reflect a greater opportunity to engage in shared meals at home when neither partner is required to commute. No statistically significant differences are observed in paid working hours for either partner.

In Colombia, both partners significantly increase foodwork time (approximately 18% for women and 16% for men), reinforcing the interpretation that joint telework is associated with a more balanced reallocation of foodwork relative to the WAFH benchmark. Regarding eating, the effects exhibit minor gender differences. Women increase eating time by approximately 6%, while men show a slightly larger increase of about 7%. Although modest, this difference may be consistent with a substitution pattern in which women reallocate time saved from commuting toward food-related tasks rather than consumption, whereas men devote a somewhat greater share of that time to eating. Both partners also significantly reduce paid working hours (0.557 daily hours for women and 0.287 for men), indicating that joint telework in Colombia is associated with a simultaneous contraction of market labor and an expansion of domestic production.

In Costa Rica, only men significantly increase foodwork time (approximately 47%), while no significant effect is found for women, suggesting a partial rebalancing in a country where gender gaps in foodwork are generally smaller than in the rest of the sample. No significant differences are observed in eating time for either partner. Women significantly increase paid working hours (approximately 3.2 hours per week) while no significant change is found for men, a result that may reflect the particular sociodemographic composition of the Costa Rican sample, where WFH couples are disproportionately highly educated.

In Guatemala, both women and men significantly increase foodwork time (approximately 111% for women and 250% for men). The magnitudes reflect the very low baseline levels of men's foodwork participation in this country, such that even modest absolute increases

---

<sup>6</sup> Percentage effects for food-related activities are derived from the IHS-transformed dependent variables using the formula  $\% \Delta = \exp(\hat{\beta}) - 1$  where  $\hat{\beta}$  is the estimated coefficient on the relevant work arrangement dummy (Restrepo & Zeballos, 2020). As an illustration, consider the Both WFH coefficients for Chile (Table 3). For women's foodwork,  $\hat{\beta} = 0.195$ , which implies  $\exp(0.195) - 1 \approx 0.215$ , or approximately a 21.5% increase relative to the Both WAFH benchmark. For men's eating time,  $\hat{\beta} = 0.281$ , yielding  $\exp(0.281) - 1 \approx 0.324$ , or approximately a 32.4% increase. The IHS transformation  $\text{asinh}(y) = \ln(y + \sqrt{y^2 + 1})$  is preferred over the natural logarithm because it accommodates zero values, which are common in time-use data.

translate into large proportional changes. Eating data are unavailable for Guatemala. No statistically significant differences in paid working hours are detected for either partner, suggesting that the increases in foodwork under joint telework occur without measurable adjustments in market labor.

### **Only the woman working from home**

When only the woman works from home, the estimates reveal the most pronounced pattern of gendered specialization, with consistent results across three of the four countries.

In Chile, women significantly increase foodwork time (approximately 78%) while men significantly reduce it (approximately 23%), implying a reallocation of foodwork toward the partner at home and away from the partner in the office. The same directional pattern holds for eating, with women increasing (approximately 35%) and men reducing (approximately 22%) time devoted to this activity, suggesting that female-exclusive telework reorganizes the entire food-related time budget within the household rather than affecting foodwork in isolation. Women also reduce paid working hours by 10.3 hours per week, while men simultaneously increase theirs by 1.7 hours. These results are consistent with the hypothesis that women's physical presence at home lowers the shadow cost of their time in domestic production, activating traditional role expectations that lead to a reallocation of foodwork toward women even within dual-earner couples. The simultaneous increase in men's paid hours further suggests that when the woman works from home, her male partner may intensify his labor market involvement, reinforcing pre-existing specialization rather than moving toward a more equitable division of total work.

In Colombia, the directional pattern is consistent with Chile, albeit with smaller magnitudes. Women significantly increase foodwork time (approximately 37%) while men reduce it (approximately 4%), confirming that the mechanism operates across different national and institutional contexts. No statistically significant differences are found in eating time for either partner. Women reduce paid working hours by approximately 1.0 daily hour while no significant change is observed for men, a pattern that, while more modest than in Chile, points in the same direction and raises similar concerns about the labor market consequences of female-exclusive telework within dual-earner households.

In Costa Rica, no statistically significant differences are found in foodwork, eating, or paid working hours for either partner under this arrangement, indicating that female-exclusive telework does not substantially alter intra-household time allocation in this country. This result stands in contrast to the patterns observed in Chile, Colombia, and Guatemala, and is consistent with the relatively more egalitarian gender norms and higher educational attainment of the WFH groups in the Costa Rican sample, as documented in Table A.3.

In Guatemala, women significantly increase foodwork time (approximately 51%) while the coefficient for men is not statistically significant, suggesting that men's foodwork contribution remains largely unchanged even as women's rises substantially. Eating data are unavailable for Guatemala. Women significantly reduce paid working hours by 7.3 hours per week while men increase theirs by 3.9 hours, mirroring the Chilean pattern and reinforcing the conclusion that female-exclusive telework generates a gendered reallocation of both domestic and market labor across Latin American contexts.

### **Only the man working from home**

When only the man works from home, the results partially reverse the pattern observed under female-exclusive telework, although the reversal is incomplete and asymmetric across gender.

In Chile, women significantly reduce foodwork time (approximately 19%) while men significantly increase it (approximately 56%), suggesting that the partner with greater physical presence absorbs a larger share of domestic foodwork, consistent with a time-availability mechanism. The same directional pattern holds for eating, with women reducing (approximately 19%) and men increasing (approximately 36%) time devoted to this activity. Men significantly reduce paid working hours by 6.7 hours per week while women's paid hours do not significantly differ from the WAFH reference. However, the magnitude of men's increases in foodwork under Only Him WFH is smaller than the magnitude of women's increases under Only Her WFH, indicating that the reallocation of domestic labor is not symmetric across gender even when time availability would predict full symmetry. Men increase their domestic contribution when they stay home, but to a lesser extent than women do under the equivalent arrangement.

In Colombia, women significantly reduce foodwork time (approximately 14%) while men significantly increase it (approximately 34%), consistent with the time-availability mechanism. Women show a small but statistically significant increase in eating time (approximately 4%), while no significant effect is found for men. Men significantly reduce paid working hours by 0.7 daily hours while no significant change is observed for women. As in Chile, men's reductions in paid work under Only Him WFH are smaller than women's reductions under Only Her WFH, suggesting that men's response to being the sole teleworker is primarily a time-availability adjustment, whereas women's response under the equivalent arrangement reflects a combination of time-availability and normative pressures that together generate a larger and more consequential contraction of market labor.

In Costa Rica, no statistically significant differences are found in foodwork, eating, or paid working hours for either partner under this arrangement, consistent with the pattern of limited adjustment observed in this country across all configurations.

In Guatemala, no significant effect is found for women's foodwork, while men significantly increase it (approximately 123%) relative to when both WAFH. Eating data are unavailable for Guatemala. Men significantly reduce paid working hours by 10.6 hours per week while no significant change is observed for women. The absence of a significant effect on women's foodwork under this arrangement, in contrast to the significant increases observed for women under Only Her WFH, underscores the asymmetric nature of how gender mediates the domestic consequences of telework.

Table 7 shows the correlation matrix of residuals of the estimated models, that provides insights into the interdependence among the estimated equations (1), (2), and (3), within each country. The correlation matrix of residuals indicates that the disturbances across the equations are not independent, as several off-diagonal elements differ from zero. In particular, the correlations between foodwork and eating equations, especially for women in

Chile and men in Colombia, suggest the presence of unobserved common factors influencing these activities.

**Table 7.** Correlation matrix of residuals

		Foodwork		Eating		Working Hours	
		Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
<b>Chile</b>							
Foodwork	Women	1					
	Men	-0.167	1				
Eating	Women	0.740	-0.161	1			
	Men	-0.179	0.619	-0.147	1		
Working Hours	Women	-0.120	0.046	-0.067	0.022	1	
	Men	-0.018	-0.130	-0.018	-0.048	0.147	1
<b>Colombia</b>							
Foodwork	Women	1					
	Men	-0.103	1				
Eating	Women	0.079	0.035	1			
	Men	0.091	0.034	0.605	1		
Working Hours	Women	-0.026	0.076	-0.093	-0.026	1	
	Men	-0.009	-0.113	-0.046	-0.046	0.182	1
<b>Costa Rica</b>							
Foodwork	Women	1					
	Men	0.034	1				
Eating	Women	0.045	0.028	1			
	Men	-0.030	0.028	0.349	1		
Working Hours	Women	-0.292	0.104	-0.119	-0.065	1	
	Men	0.062	-0.275	-0.093	-0.135	0.153	1
<b>Guatemala</b>							
Foodwork	Women	1					
	Men	0.152	1				
Eating	Women	-	-	-			
	Men	-	-	-	-		
Working Hours	Women	-0.063	0.073	-	-	1	
	Men	0.051	-0.008	-	-	0.230	1

Notes: Correlation matrix of residuals obtained from Tables 3, 4, 5, and 6.

To formally test the null hypothesis of residual independence, the Breusch-Pagan test (Breusch & Pagan, 1980) of independence of equations was applied to each country. The null hypothesis of uncorrelated residuals is rejected in all cases: Chile (LM = 3144.43,  $p < 0.000$ ), Colombia (LM = 1804.58,  $p < 0.000$ ), Costa Rica (LM = 245.94,  $p < 0.000$ ), and Guatemala (LM = 68.94,  $p < 0.000$ ). This interdependence across equations supports the relevance of a SUR framework rather than estimating each equation separately, because of the observed

covariance structure, SUR model delivers more efficient inference than separate OLS estimations.

## 6. Discussion and Conclusions

This paper examined how couples' work arrangements shape the allocation of time devoted to foodwork, eating, and paid work across Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, and Guatemala, using as the reference category couples in which both partners work away from home. Foodwork, defined as time spent on grocery shopping, cooking, and dishwashing, is usually performed daily, as well as eating, carries well-documented implications for dietary quality and nutritional outcomes (Davis, 2010; Mandemakers & Roeters, 2015; Wolfson & Bleich, 2015; Warde et al., 2007), and is socially constructed as a strongly feminized responsibility, making it a domain where gender norms are actively expressed and reproduced (DeVault, 1991; Yoon, 2010). The analysis centers on four mutually exclusive household configurations defined by which partner teleworks: both WFH, both WAFH as the reference category, only the woman WFH, and only the man WFH. This framework uncovers a pattern that individual-level analyses cannot detect, namely that the domestic consequences of telework depend critically on whose telework it is.

The analysis yields five main insights. First, when both partners share the same work location, gender gaps in foodwork and paid work remain broadly stable; when telework is asymmetric, they shift substantially. Whether both partners work at home or both commute to the office, gender gaps in foodwork are broadly similar in magnitude across all four countries. This stability disappears the moment telework becomes asymmetric. When only the woman works from home, foodwork gaps widen substantially, reaching 7.24 weekly hours in Chile (approximately 70% above the Both WAFH benchmark), 1.89 daily hours in Colombia, and 16.50 weekly hours in Guatemala. When only the man works from home, the gap narrows or becomes statistically insignificant. This asymmetry is inconsistent with a time-availability mechanism, under which whoever is at home would simply cook more regardless of gender. Instead, it points to the persistence of normative expectations that assign domestic responsibilities to women when they are physically present in the household, and that do not impose equivalent demands on men under the same conditions.

When telework is a shared experience, its domestic externalities are more equitably distributed, likely because the simultaneous physical presence of both partners increases the visibility of domestic tasks and reduces the extent to which women are expected to absorb them unilaterally.

Second, female-exclusive telework generates a double reallocation with potentially lasting labor market consequences for women. In Chile, Colombia, and Guatemala, when only the woman works from home, she simultaneously increases foodwork and reduces paid working hours. The gender gap in market labor nearly triples in Chile, from 6.00 to 18.22 weekly hours, and approximately doubles in Colombia and Guatemala. Because the sample is restricted to dual-earner households, this finding is particularly concerning because the employed woman ends up absorbing a disproportionate share of unpaid domestic labor while simultaneously withdrawing from the labor market, a combination that may have lasting consequences for her earnings, career progression, and long-term economic independence.

Costa Rica constitutes a notable exception, displaying no significant adjustments under female-exclusive telework across any of the three outcomes, a result consistent with the relatively more egalitarian gender norms and higher educational attainment characteristic of the WFH groups in that country's sample.

This finding has particular relevance given the nutritional implications of foodwork documented in the literature. To the extent that increased foodwork at home is associated with healthier dietary outcomes (Wolfson & Bleich, 2015), women in female-exclusive telework arrangements may be disproportionately bearing the productive burden of household nutrition, with limited recognition of this contribution in either labor market or domestic terms.

Third, when only the man works from home, the results partially reverse the pattern observed under female-exclusive telework, though the reversal is incomplete and asymmetric. In Chile, Colombia, and Guatemala, men significantly increase foodwork time while women reduce theirs, consistent with a time-availability mechanism whereby the partner at home absorbs a larger share of domestic production. Even so, the magnitude of men's increases in foodwork and decreases in paid work is consistently smaller than the equivalent adjustments made by women under Only Her WFH. This asymmetry is inconsistent with a pure time-availability explanation and instead points to the mediating role of gender norms.

When men stay home, they increase domestic contributions out of practical necessity, yet the normative pressure to take on household responsibilities is weaker than what women experience under the equivalent arrangement, producing a partial but incomplete redistribution of domestic labor that falls short of full symmetry.

Fourth, across all countries and configurations, the partner who works from home reduces their paid labor relative to the Both WAFH benchmark, but this reduction is not symmetric across gender. It is largest and most consistent for women under Only Her WFH, where it co-occurs with the largest increases in domestic labor. Rather than combining paid and unpaid work, women who exclusively telework appear to substitute market labor for domestic labor, a dynamic that may deepen existing gender gaps in earnings and career progression over time. For men, reductions in paid work under Only Him WFH are more modest, and they are not accompanied by equivalent increases in domestic labor, suggesting that men benefit from a time dividend that is only partially redirected toward the household.

Fifth, eating time does not increase when partners telework, contrary to what might be expected as a benefit of remote work. One anticipated advantage of WFH is the potential for more shared meal time, given that commuting is eliminated and workers spend more time at home. The data do not support this expectation. Gender differences in eating time are generally small and statistically insignificant across all four countries and work configurations, and no consistent increase in eating time is observed among teleworkers relative to the Both WAFH benchmark. The social potential of telework to improve family meal practices and dietary quality thus appears largely unrealized in these data, which is particularly relevant in a regional context of rising obesity rates. To the extent that shared meals and home cooking are associated with healthier diets (Wolfson & Bleich, 2015), the absence of a significant increase in eating time under WFH suggests that one of the most

direct nutritional channels through which telework could benefit household health remains largely untapped.

Overall, the findings indicate that WFH has the potential to reshape intra-household time allocation but operates within the boundaries of long-standing gender norms. Flexible work arrangements alter time constraints but do not automatically shift the social organization of household responsibilities, and the gendered structure of unpaid work adapts to new work modalities rather than being transformed by them.

Policies aimed at promoting more equitable outcomes should therefore consider not only expanding telework access broadly but also actively encouraging joint or male-exclusive telework arrangements, which appear more likely to generate redistributive effects within the household. Complementary measures targeting workplace cultures, parental leave policies, and domestic norm change may be necessary to realize the full equalizing potential of flexible work in Latin American contexts.

Future research should extend this line of inquiry by incorporating secondary or simultaneous activities (Rinderknecht et al., 2023), as failing to account for multitasking may underestimate the true intensity and overlap of productive and consumptive activities within the household, particularly with respect to eating time among teleworkers. Additionally, the cross-sectional nature of the data prevents causal identification of the effects of telework on time allocation. Future work employing quasi-experimental designs or longitudinal data would allow researchers to more credibly isolate the causal impact of WFH on the gendered division of foodwork and paid labor within couples, and to assess whether the patterns documented here are stable over time or reflect a transitional period of adjustment to new work modalities.

## References

- Aguiar, M., & Hurst, E. (2007). Measuring trends in leisure: The allocation of time over five decades. *The quarterly journal of economics*, 122(3), 969-1006.
- Aksoy, C. G., Barrero, J. M., Bloom, N., Davis, S. J., Dolls, M., & Zarate, P. (2023, May). Time savings when working from home. In *AEA Papers and Proceedings* (Vol. 113, pp. 597-603). 2014 Broadway, Suite 305, Nashville, TN 37203: American Economic Association.
- Allen, T. D., Golden, T. D., & Shockley, K. M. (2015). How effective is telecommuting? Assessing the status of our scientific findings. *Psychological science in the public interest*, 16(2), 40-68.
- Allen, P., & Sachs, C. (2007). Women and food chains: The gendered politics of food. *The International Journal of Sociology of Agriculture and Food*, 15(1), 1-23.
- Arntz, M., Yahmed, S. B., & Berlingieri, F. (2022). Working from home, hours worked and wages: Heterogeneity by gender and parenthood. *Labour Economics*, 76, 102169.
- Beagan, B., Chapman, G. E., D'sylva, A., & Bassett, B. R. (2008). It's just easier for me to do it': Rationalizing the family division of foodwork. *Sociology*, 42(4), 653-671.
- Becker, G. S. (1993). *A treatise on the family: Enlarged edition*. Harvard university press.
- Berniell, I., Gasparini, L., Marchionni, M., & Viollaz, M. (2023). The role of children and work-from-home in gender labor market asymmetries: evidence from the COVID-19 pandemic in Latin America. *Review of Economics of the Household*, 21(4), 1191-1214.
- Bianchi, S. M. (2000). Maternal employment and time with children: Dramatic change or surprising continuity?. *Demography*, 37(4), 401-414.
- 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.
- Bloom, N., Liang, J., Roberts, J., & Ying, Z. J. (2015). Does working from home work? Evidence from a Chinese experiment. *The Quarterly journal of economics*, 130(1), 165-218.
- Breusch, T. S., & Pagan, A. R. (1980). The Lagrange multiplier test and its applications to model specification in econometrics. *Review of Economic Studies*, 47(1), 239-253. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2297111>
- Budlender, D. (2007). A critical review of selected time use surveys.
- Burda, M., Hamermesh, D. S., & Weil, P. (2013). Total work and gender: facts and possible explanations. *Journal of population economics*, 26(1), 239-261.

Campaña, J. C., Gimenez-Nadal, J. I., & Molina, J. A. (2017). Increasing the human capital of children in Latin American countries: the role of parents' time in childcare. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 53(6), 805-825.

Campaña, J. C., Gimenez-Nadal, J. I., & Molina, J. A. (2018). Gender norms and the gendered distribution of total work in Latin American households. *Feminist Economics*, 24(1), 35-62.

Campaña, J. C., Gimenez-Nadal, J. I., & Molina, J. A. (2020). Self-employed and employed mothers in Latin American families: Are there differences in paid work, unpaid work, and child care?. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 41(1), 52-69.

Campaña, J. C., Gimenez-Nadal, J. I., & Molina, J. A. (2021). Sex-ratios and work in Latin American households: evidence from Mexico, Peru, Ecuador, Colombia, and Chile. *Latin American Economic Review*, (1), 1-25.

Campaña, J. C., Gimenez-Nadal, J. I., & Velilla, J. (2023). Measuring gender gaps in time allocation in Europe. *Social Indicators Research*, 165(2), 519-553.

Campaña, J. C., Gimenez-Nadal, J. I., & Velilla, J. (2024). Measuring gender gaps in work time in Latin American countries. *Applied Economics Letters*, 31(17), 1721-1725.

Campaña, J. C., Gimenez-Nadal, J. I., Molina, J. A., & Velilla, J. (2024). The shifters of intrahousehold decision-making in European countries. *Empirical Economics*, 66(3), 1055-1101.

Carstensen, T. (2020). Flexibility in working time and place of work: Old gender inequalities and new patterns of division of labor through digital transformations. *Zeitschrift für Arbeitswissenschaft*, 74(3), 195-205.

Chauhan, P. (2022). "I have no room of my own": COVID-19 pandemic and work-from-home through a gender lens. *Gender Issues*, 39(4), 507-533.

Chung, H., & Van der Lippe, T. (2020). Flexible working, work-life balance, and gender equality: Introduction. *Social indicators research*, 151(2), 365-381.

Craig, L., & Churchill, B. (2021). Dual-earner parent couples' work and care during COVID-19. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 28, 66-79.

DANE. (2023). Encuesta Nacional de Uso del Tiempo 2020-2021: Resultados definitivos. Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística. <https://www.dane.gov.co>

Davis, G. C., & You, W. (2010). The time cost of food at home: general and food stamp participant profiles. *Applied Economics*, 42(2), 2537-2552.

DeVault ML (1991) *Feeding the Family: The Social Organization of Caring as Gendered Work*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Esquivel, V. (2010). Lessons from the Buenos Aires time-use survey: A methodological assessment. In *Unpaid Work and the Economy: Gender, Time Use and Poverty in Developing Countries* (pp. 181-214). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Esquivel, V., Budlender, D., Folbre, N., & Hirway, I. (2008). Explorations: Time-use surveys in the south. *Feminist Economics*, 14(3), 107-152.
- Flagg, L. A., Sen, B., Kilgore, M., & Locher, J. L. (2014). The influence of gender, age, education and household size on meal preparation and food shopping responsibilities. *Public health nutrition*, 17(9), 2061-2070.
- Floro, M. S., & Pichetpongsa, A. (2010). Gender, work intensity, and well-being of Thai home-based workers. *Feminist Economics*, 16(3), 5-44.
- Folbre, N., Yoon, J., Finnoff, K., & Fuligni, A. S. (2005). By what measure? Family time devoted to children in the United States. *Demography*, 42(2), 373-390.
- Foster, G., & Kalenkoski, C. M. (2013). Tobit or OLS? An empirical evaluation under different diary window lengths. *Applied Economics*, 45(20), 2994-3010.
- Frazis, H., & Stewart, J. (2012). How to think about time-use data: What inferences can we make about long-and short-run time use from time diaries?. *Annals of Economics and Statistics/Annales d'économie et de statistique*, 231-245.
- Garrote Sanchez, D., Gomez Parra, N., Ozden, C., Rijkers, B., Viollaz, M., & Winkler, H. (2021). Who on earth can work from home?. *The world bank research observer*, 36(1), 67-100.
- Gershuny, J. (2003). *Changing times: Work and leisure in postindustrial society*. OUP Oxford.
- Gershuny, J. (2012). Too many zeros: A method for estimating long-term time-use from short diaries. *Annals of Economics and Statistics/Annales d'économie et de statistique*, 247-270.
- Gimenez-Nadal, J. I., & Molina, J. A. (2013). Parents' education as a determinant of educational childcare time. *Journal of population economics*, 26(2), 719-749.
- Gimenez-Nadal, J. I., & Molina, J. A. (2015). Voluntary activities and daily happiness in the United States. *Economic Inquiry*, 53(4), 1735-1750.
- Gimenez-Nadal, J. I., & Sevilla-Sanz, A. (2011). The time-crunch paradox. *Social indicators research*, 102(2), 181-196.
- Gimenez-Nadal, J. I., & Sevilla, A. (2012). Trends in time allocation: A cross-country analysis. *European Economic Review*, 56(6), 1338-1359.

- Greenstein, T. N. (1996), "Husbands' Participation in Domestic Labor: Interactive Effects of Wives' and Husbands' Gender Ideologies," *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 58(3): 585-95.
- Gronau, R. (1977). Leisure, home production, and work--the theory of the allocation of time revisited. *Journal of political economy*, 85(6), 1099-1123.
- Gottlieb, C., Grobovšek, J., Poschke, M., & Saltiel, F. (2021). Working from home in developing countries. *European Economic Review*, 133, 103679.
- Harnack, L., Story, M., Martinson, B., Neumark-Sztainer, D., & Stang, J. (1998). Guess who's cooking? The role of men in meal planning, shopping, and preparation in US families. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*, 98(9), 995-1000.
- Heckman, J. J. (1979). Sample selection bias as a specification error. *Econometrica: Journal of the econometric society*, 153-161.
- Holm, L., Ekström, M. P., Hach, S., & Lund, T. B. (2015). Who is cooking dinner? Changes in the gendering of cooking from 1997 to 2012 in four Nordic countries. *Food, Culture & Society*, 18(4), 589-610.
- Hook, J. L. (2010). Gender inequality in the welfare state: Sex segregation in housework, 1965–2003. *American journal of sociology*, 115(5), 1480-1523.
- INE. (2023). Encuesta Nacional de Condiciones de Vida 2023: Módulo uso del tiempo. Instituto Nacional de Estadística Guatemala. <https://www.ine.gob.gt>
- INE. (2024). Encuesta Nacional de Empleo: Principales resultados trimestre mayo-julio 2024. Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas Chile. <https://www.ine.gob.cl>
- INEC. (2017). Encuesta Nacional de Uso del Tiempo 2017: Resultados generales. Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Censos Costa Rica. <https://www.inec.cr>
- INEC. (2025). Encuesta Continua de Empleo: Resultados II trimestre 2025. Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Censos Costa Rica. <https://www.inec.cr>
- Kalenkoski, C. M., & Foster, G. (2015). Measuring the relative productivity of multitasking to sole-tasking in household production: experimental evidence. *Applied Economics*, 47(18), 1847-1862.
- Leap, B., Stalp, M. C., & Kelly, K. (2023). Reorganizations of gendered labor during the COVID-19 pandemic: A review and suggestions for further research. *Sociological Inquiry*, 93(1), 179-200.
- Liu, B., Widener, M. J., Smith, L. G., Farber, S., Gesink, D., Minaker, L. M., ... & Gilliland, J. (2022). Who's cooking tonight? A time-use study of coupled adults in Toronto, Canada. *Time & society*, 31(4), 480-507.

- Lyttelton, T., Zang, E., & Musick, K. (2022). Telecommuting and gender inequalities in parents' paid and unpaid work before and during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 84(1), 230-249.
- Mandemakers, J. J., & Roeters, A. (2015). Fast or slow food? Explaining trends in food-related time in the Netherlands, 1975–2005. *Acta Sociologica*, 58(2), 121-137.
- Maurizio, R. (2021). Challenges and opportunities of teleworking in Latin America and the Caribbean.
- Murphy, K. M., & Topel, R. H. (1985). Estimation and inference in two-step econometric models. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 3(4), 370–379.
- Nagler, M., Rincke, J., & Winkler, E. (2024). Working from home, commuting, and gender. *Journal of Population Economics*, 37(3), 58.
- Pabilonia, S. W., & Vernon, V. (2022). Telework and time use. *Handbook of Labor, Human Resources and Population Economics*, 1-26.
- Pagan, A. (1984). Econometric issues in the analysis of regressions with generated regressors. *International economic review*, 221-247.
- Restrepo, B. J., & Zeballos, E. (2020). The effect of working from home on major time allocations with a focus on food-related activities. *Review of Economics of the Household*, 18(4), 1165-1187.
- Rinderknecht, R. G., Doan, L., & Sayer, L. C. (2023). Secondary Activities: Their Proximity to Primary Activities and Their Importance for Understanding Reports of Preparing and Consuming Meals. *Survey Methods: Insights from the Field (SMIF)*.
- Rubiano Matulevich, E. C., & Viollaz, M. (2019). Gender differences in time use: Allocating time between the market and the household. *World bank policy research working paper*, (8981).
- Sayer, L. C. (2005). Gender, time and inequality: Trends in women's and men's paid work, unpaid work and free time. *Social forces*, 84(1), 285-303.
- Sevilla-Sanz, A., Gimenez-Nadal, J. I., & Fernández, C. (2010). Gender roles and the division of unpaid work in Spanish households. *Feminist Economics*, 16(4), 137-184.
- Taillie, L. S. (2018). Who's cooking? Trends in US home food preparation by gender, education, and race/ethnicity from 2003 to 2016. *Nutrition journal*, 17(1), 41.
- Tobin, J. (1958). Estimation of relationships for limited dependent variables. *Econometrica: journal of the Econometric Society*, 24-36.

Warde A, Cheng S, Olsen W and Southerton D (2007) Changes in the practice of eating: A comparative analysis of time-use. *Acta Sociologica* 50(4): 363–385.

Wolfson JA, Bleich SN. (2015) Is cooking at home associated with better diet quality or weight-loss intention? *Public Health Nutrition* 18(8): 1397–1406.

Wray, D. (2024). Telework, time use, and well-being: Evidence from the 2022 Time Use Survey. Statistics Canada = Statistique Canada.

Yoon, J. (2010). Gender norms, housework, and class: A study of Korean time use survey. *Asian Journal of Women's Studies*, 16(3), 112-138.

Zellner, A. (1962). An efficient method of estimating seemingly unrelated regressions and tests for aggregation bias. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 57(298), 348-368.

## Appendix

**Table A.1** Descriptive statistics for Chile

	Both WFH	Both WAFH	Only Her WFH	Only Him WFH	Total	
N	7.80%	67.77%	16.46%	7.97%	3896	
Age	44.57	43.57	42.96	42.85	43.49	
Without formal education	1.40%	1.90%	1.43%	0.75%	1.69%	
Elementary education	14.49%	12.86%	12.90%	3.23%	12.23%	
High School degree	19.30%	22.30%	20.76%	12.12%	21.00%	
Technical or post-secondary non-tertiary education	29.10%	28.50%	30.86%	23.09%	28.51%	
University and postgraduate education	35.71%	34.44%	34.05%	60.81%	36.58%	
Log hourly predicted wage	3.12	3.15	3.13	3.23	3.14	
Number of household members	3.55	3.62	3.78	3.43	3.62	
Number of children	0.91	0.99	1.15	0.99	1.01	
	<i>0-4 years</i>	21.61%	20.89%	24.57%	19.13%	21.41%
	<i>5-12 years</i>	43.13%	38.75	42.13%	43.26%	40.01%
	<i>13 to 17 years</i>	15.16%	23.25%	26.41%	15.86%	22.55%
Indigenous	6.41%	8.67%	7.50%	6.98%	8.17%	
Rural	-	-	-	-	-	
Sector composition						
	<i>Armed forces occupations</i>	0.14%	0.62%	0.56%	0.00%	0.52%
	<i>Managers</i>	35.26%	30.01%	28.07%	59.19%	32.43%
	<i>Professionals</i>	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Technicians and associate professionals</i>	12.67%	12.36%	9.23%	10.92%	11.76%
	<i>Clerical support workers</i>	34.38%	37.83%	35.15%	21.13%	35.79%
	<i>Service and sales workers</i>	11.58%	9.87%	18.12%	6.08%	11.06%
	<i>Skilled agricultural, forestry and fishery workers</i>	1.05%	0.77%	1.01%	0.07%	0.78%
	<i>Craft and related trades workers</i>	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Plant and machine operators, and assemblers</i>	4.92%	8.53%	7.86%	2.60%	7.66%
	<i>Elementary occupations</i>	-	-	-	-	-

**Table A.1 (continued)** Descriptive statistics for Chile

Region	Both WFH	Both WAFH	Only Her WFH	Only Him WFH	Total
<i>Antofagasta</i>	2.79%	4.21%	4.57%	2.23%	4.00%
<i>Arica y Parinacota</i>	0.80%	1.13%	1.05%	0.59%	1.05%
<i>Atacama</i>	1.29%	1.49%	1.32%	0.82%	1.39%
<i>Aysen</i>	1.04%	0.62%	0.50%	0.33%	0.61%
<i>Biobío</i>	1.70%	8.79%	4.69%	4.99%	7.26%
<i>Coquimbo</i>	4.46%	1.82%	3.83%	1.65%	3.70%
<i>La Araucanía</i>	2.61%	3.91%	3.26%	2.84%	3.62%
<i>Libertador Bernardo O'higgins</i>	3.35%	3.87%	2.52%	3.19%	3.55%
<i>Los Lagos</i>	1.88%	3.84%	3.65%	4.81%	3.73%
<i>Los Ríos</i>	2.37%	1.63%	1.91%	1.15%	1.69%
<i>Magallanes y la Antártica Chilena</i>	0.32%	1.21%	0.62%	0.41%	0.98%
<i>Maule</i>	5.32%	4.86%	3.71%	1.99%	4.48%
<i>Metropolitana</i>	58.59%	45.51%	55.58%	65.29%	49.76%
<i>Tarapacá</i>	2.12%	2.80%	1.47%	0.83%	2.37%
<i>Valparaíso</i>	7.02%	10.68%	10.17%	7.86%	10.08%
<i>Ñuble</i>	4.34%	1.63%	1.16%	1.02%	1.71%

**Table A.2** Descriptive statistics for Colombia

	Both WFH	Both WAFH	Only Her WFH	Only Him WFH	Total	
N	8.04%	68.94%	17.49%	5.52%	3771	
Age	43.10	39.48	41.73	40.71	40.23	
Without formal education	0.00%	0.89%	1.51%	0.00%	0.88%	
Elementary education	4.32%	11.59%	13.76%	6.76%	11.13%	
High School degree	9.89%	46.83%	34.98%	24.83%	40.66%	
Technical or post-secondary non-tertiary education	8.84%	19.05%	19.53%	20.14%	18.39%	
University and postgraduate education	76.95%	21.65%	30.21%	48.27%	28.94%	
Log hourly predicted wage	4.82	4.80	4.84	4.83	4.81	
Number of household members	3.15	3.67	3.62	3.43	3.60	
Number of children	0.72	1.13	1.01	0.97	1.07	
	<i>0-4 years</i>	14.29%	17.35%	21.04%	23.35%	21.89%
	<i>5-12 years</i>	29.00%	42.68%	37.47%	31.74%	40.02%
	<i>13 to 17 years</i>	15.78%	20.98%	27.39%	29.13%	27.31%
Indigenous	1.08%	1.80%	4.11%	1.63%	2.03%	
Rural	4.37%	8.71%	19.72%	9.68%	10.95%	
Sector composition						
	<i>Armed forces occupations</i>	2.26%	0.60%	1.26	1.81%	0.92%
	<i>Managers</i>	15.10%	6.55%	7.87	10.82%	7.70%
	<i>Professionals</i>	48.85%	12.72%	17.61%	30.43%	17.46%
	<i>Technicians and associate professionals</i>	13.11%	8.96%	9.74%	10.83%	9.53%
	<i>Clerical support workers</i>	3.57%	5.22%	4.85%	7.88%	5.17%
	<i>Service and sales workers</i>	9.76%	26.42%	25.30%	21.55%	24.62%
	<i>Skilled agricultural, forestry and fishery workers</i>	1.84%	4.50%	4.23%	1.28%	4.06%
	<i>Craft and related trades workers</i>	4.38%	8.63%	11.64%	6.54%	8.70%
	<i>Plant and machine operators, and assemblers</i>	0.59%	10.59%	7.97%	1.39%	8.82%
	<i>Elementary occupations</i>	0.53%	15.80%	9.51%	7.48%	12.02%

**Table A.2** Descriptive statistics for Colombia

Region	Both WFH	Both WAFH	Only Her WFH	Only Him WFH	Total
<i>Caribe</i>	9.76%	14.34%	17.33%	14.47%	14.50%
<i>Central</i>	20.22%	24.83%	25.18%	21.15%	24.31%
<i>Oriental</i>	8.73%	23.69%	19.48%	14.04%	21.22%
<i>Pacífica</i>	7.85%	16.90%	12.52%	17.86%	15.48%
<i>Bogotá</i>	53.41%	20.04%	25.34%	32.46%	24.33%
<i>San Andrés</i>	0.02%	0.21%	0.05%	0.02%	0.15%

**Table A.3** Descriptive statistics for Costa Rica

	Both WFH	Both WAFH	Only Her WFH	Only Him WFH	Total
N	7.38%	76.76%	8.42%	7.44%	662
Age	37.97	41.95	39.09	39.08	41.20
Without formal education	0.00%	7.73%	0.58%	0.00%	5.98%
Elementary education	0.00%	23.69%	4.82%	1.07%	18.67%
High School degree	10.22%	41.30%	24.38%	15.06%	35.63%
Technical or post-secondary non-tertiary education	-	-	-	-	-
University and postgraduate education	89.78%	27.28%	70.23%	83.87%	39.72%
Log hourly predicted wage	2.96	2.52	2.85	2.91	2.61
Number of household members	2.85	3.46	3.06	3.29	3.37
Number of children	0.20	0.32	0.23	0.15	0.29
<i>0-4 years</i>	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
<i>5-12 years</i>	1.58%	3.66%	0.00%	3.02%	3.15%
<i>13 to 17 years</i>	16.99%	24.57%	22.61%	10.00%	22.67%
Indigenous	0.89%	2.20%	0.00%	0.60%	1.80%
Rural	3.02%	27.98%	12.23%	12.78%	23.68%
Sector composition					
<i>Armed forces occupations</i>	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Managers</i>	15.15%	1.14%	6.53%	2.62%	2.74%
<i>Professionals</i>	45.33%	13.85%	32.41%	45.62%	20.10%
<i>Technicians and associate professionals</i>	23.41%	9.35%	26.08%	25.26%	12.98%
<i>Clerical support workers</i>	16.11%	5.86%	12.90%	9.19%	7.46%
<i>Service and sales workers</i>	0.00%	25.50%	8.51%	13.88%	21.31%
<i>Skilled agricultural, forestry and fishery workers</i>	0.00%	2.83%	0.00%	0.00%	2.17%
<i>Craft and related trades workers</i>	0.00%	9.70%	5.80%	3.44%	8.19%
<i>Plant and machine operators, and assemblers</i>	0.00%	6.33%	6.28%	0.00%	5.39%
<i>Elementary occupations</i>	0.00%	25.44%	1.50%	0.00%	19.65%

**Table A.3** Descriptive statistics for Costa Rica

Region	Both WFH	Both WAFH	Only Her WFH	Only Him WFH	Total
<i>Central</i>	96.74%	61.18%	86.19%	85.50%	67.72%
<i>Chorotega</i>	1.79%	7.95%	2.52%	1.80%	6.58%
<i>Pacífico Central</i>	0.00%	4.57%	0.00%	0.00%	3.51%
<i>Brunca</i>	1.47%	7.46%	7.36%	3.24%	6.70%
<i>Huetar Caribe</i>	0.00%	9.35%	0.00%	2.02%	7.33%
<i>Huetar Norte</i>	0.00%	9.49%	3.92%	7.44%	8.17%

**Table A.4** Descriptive statistics for Guatemala

	Both WFH	Both WAFH	Only Her WFH	Only Him WFH	Total	
N	1.24%	77.75%	19.66%	1.34%	914	
Age	40.60	41.22	39.95	43.52	40.22	
Without formal education	0.00%	1.88%	0.34%	0.00%	1.53%	
Elementary education	69.53%	39.28%	53.39%	25.55%	42.15%	
High School degree	30.47%	43.24%	41.79%	29.70%	42.65%	
Technical or post-secondary non-tertiary education	-	-	-	-	-	
University and postgraduate education	0.00%	15.61%	4.49%	44.75%	13.67%	
Log hourly predicted wage	2.03	2.26	2.11	2.50	2.23	
Number of household members	38.67	34.58	37.62	32.59	35.20	
Number of children	1.50	1.58	2.17	1.75	1.70	
	<i>0-4 years</i>	29.62%	28.94%	46.44%	43.22%	32.58%
	<i>5-12 years</i>	30.89%	52.08%	63.67%	77.16%	54.43%
	<i>13 to 17 years</i>	45.47%	35.37%	37.64%	25.85%	35.81%
Indigenous	57.11%	20.71%	41.41%	33.49%	25.40%	
Rural	43.73%	30.91%	56.34%	44.41%	46.57	
Sector composition						
	<i>Armed forces occupations</i>	0.00%	0.16%	0.00%	0.00%	0.13%
	<i>Managers</i>	0.00%	1.77%	0.59%	0.00%	1.49%
	<i>Professionals</i>	0.00%	10.20%	2.36%	31.78%	8.82%
	<i>Technicians and associate professionals</i>	5.25%	5.69%	2.63%	7.86%	5.11%
	<i>Clerical support workers</i>	0.00%	5.35%	3.86%	3.98%	4.97%
	<i>Service and sales workers</i>	33.87%	23.24%	23.38%	21.17%	23.37%
	<i>Skilled agricultural, forestry and fishery workers</i>	0.00%	5.37%	8.64%	0.00%	5.87%
	<i>Craft and related trades workers</i>	52.14%	15.20%	27.96%	15.98%	18.00%
	<i>Plant and machine operators, and assemblers</i>	4.37%	5.67%	7.45%	0.00%	5.93%
	<i>Elementary occupations</i>	4.37%	27.34%	24.04%	19.23%	26.30%

**Table A.5** Heckman's Model for Predicted Wages in Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, and Guatemala

	Chile		Colombia		Costa Rica		Guatemala	
	Hourly wage	Participation	Hourly wage	Participation	Hourly wage	Participation	Hourly wage	Participation
Years of education	0.072*** (0.002)	0.023*** (0.002)	-0.016** (0.008)	0.028*** (0.002)	0.075*** (0.003)	-0.004 (0.004)	0.100*** (0.004)	0.050*** (0.005)
Potential experience	-0.008*** (0.002)	0.063*** (0.002)	-0.002 (0.006)	0.023*** (0.001)	0.016*** (0.003)	0.037*** (0.003)	0.022*** (0.004)	0.031*** (0.003)
Potential experience squared	0.0003*** (0.000)	-0.001*** (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	-0.001*** (0.000)	-0.0001*** (0.000)	-0.001*** (0.000)	-0.0001** (0.000)	-0.001*** (0.000)
Indigenous	-0.092*** (0.019)	-0.018 (0.026)	0.060 (0.144)	-0.038 (0.034)	-0.046 (0.073)	-0.200* (0.000)	-0.170*** (0.033)	-0.156*** (0.036)
Rural Area	-	-	0.415*** (0.062)	-0.016 (0.014)	-0.195*** (0.027)	-0.084** (0.034)	-0.054*** (0.010)	-0.174*** (0.035)
Head of family		0.642*** (0.019)		0.441*** (0.012)		0.555*** (0.033)		0.844*** (0.034)
In partner		0.212*** (0.018)		0.019* (0.011)		0.073** (0.031)		- -
Children under 18		0.016 (0.012)		-0.085*** (0.007)		-0.031 (0.031)		-0.059*** (0.011)
N household members		-0.007 (0.007)		0.020*** (0.005)		-0.038 (0.011)		0.005*** (0.002)
Constant	2.315*** (0.058)	-0.569*** (0.055)	4.859*** (0.252)	-1.127*** (0.033)	1.601*** (0.078)	0.266*** (0.079)	0.935*** (0.100)	-0.948*** (0.094)
Mills Ratio		-0.543*** (0.038)		-0.764*** (0.136)		0.386*** (0.071)		-0.146** (0.056)
Observations	16,119	27,916	22,240	28,265	5,011	9,220	3,835	8,938

*Note: Regional fixed effects were included*



