

Self-employment and wage difference an analysis for Brazil

Marco Túlio Aniceto França, Gustavo Saraiva Frio and
Mariza Bethanya Dalla Vecchia Korzeniewicz
*Business School, Pontifical Catholic University of Rio Grande do Sul,
Porto Alegre, Brazil*

The wage gap
and self-
employment in
Brazil

727

Received 11 June 2019
Revised 14 November 2019
2 March 2020
Accepted 8 April 2020

Abstract

Purpose – The aim of this study is to evaluate the wage gap between men and women who seek self-employment in Brazil, whether because they want to become entrepreneurs out of necessity or because of the flexible hours.

Design/methodology/approach – The data used are from the 2015 National Household Sample Survey (PNAD) and the methods are the ordinary least squares (OLS) for the Mean and the unconditional quantile regression (RIF-regression) for the distribution of gains of both genders, both associated with the Oaxaca-Ransom decomposition in order to separate the differential between the part explained by attributes and the unexplained part.

Findings – The main results show that women earn less than men in the mean and throughout the distribution. The average difference is 27.79%, varying between 19.24 and 48.26% in the distribution. The inclusion of occupational variables shows that the glass door phenomenon exists even in self-employment, that is, women choose occupations with lower incomes.

Originality/value – Stimulating self-employment has been an alternative policy for the insertion of women in the labor market. This is the first study on the wage gap in self-employment in the Brazilian labor market. The presence of wage differentials among self-employed men and women throughout the distribution may point to the need for specific policies that not only target the mean. These policies would be related to sticky floor and to the glass ceiling. Another potential problem concerns the so-called glass door—women access the labor market via professions that pay less, otherwise, the problem points to occupational segregation against women.

Peer Review – The peer review history for this article is available at: <https://publons.com/publon/10.1108/IJSE-05-2019-0312>

Keywords Discrimination, Gender, Self-employment, Brazil

Paper type Research paper

1. Introduction

Women receive, on average, lower incomes than men, although they have the same paying occupations and have productive attributes similar to their male counterparts, such as education level, general and specific experience, as well as skills and training (Blau and Kahn, 2000; De la Rica *et al.*, 2008). A part of these wage differentials is due to the number of hours worked and occupation choice (Altonji and Blank, 1999). However, a significant part of this difference remains unaccounted for, as demonstrated by Blinder (1973) and Oaxaca (1973). This shows that there is employment discrimination against the female sex (Lechmann and Schnabel, 2012).

The neoclassical discrimination theory assumes the existence of three discrimination sources: employer, co-workers and consumer (Becker, 1957). Within a perfect competition market, individuals act on their preferences in order to maximize their utility. The employer who has discriminatory preferences will reduce the income of women in order to compensate for the disutility of employing this gender. Statistical discrimination explains that the



JEL Classification — J31, J16, J82, E20.

This study was financed in part by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior - Brasil (CAPES) Finance Code 001.

employer uses tests to reduce information asymmetries in hiring the worker. Since measures from these surveys are imperfect as measures of worker productivity, the employer uses gender as an observable characteristic to determine the level of productivity. Based on that observation, the employer will reach the conclusion that both genders are not equally productive (Arrow, 1973; Phelps, 1972).

Thus, an alternative for the female gender to avoid employer discrimination is to choose self-employment, which could reduce income inequalities between genders (Moore, 1983). Public policies aimed at self-employment are a way of tackling unemployment for groups that face barriers when entering the workforce, such as young people, immigrants and women (Minola *et al.*, 2014; Williams, 2012).

The choice of self-employment has taken on a more significant role within the labor market. Gomes (2009) points out that developing countries have a more expressive number of self-employed people compared to developed countries, since it has become an alternative mainly for unemployment.

Storey (1994), Henrekson (2004) and Parker (2004) point out that the individuals would be drawn to self-employment (the “pull effect”) when faced with a positive outlook. According to Gomes (2009), this fact happens when the individual sees an opportunity in the market due to his/her knowledge of the area and the market conditions are favorable. The individual becomes self-employed voluntarily, having flexible hours, autonomy and obtains a higher income vis à vis if he/she had a wage employment. However, individuals can be pushed (“push effect”) toward self-employment due to the lack of better opportunities. As it happens involuntarily, the opportunities of work and income are created before the shortage of jobs.

Hughes (2003) points out that until the 1990s the pull effect was more noticeable than the push effect in the United States and Canada. Gomes (2009) shows that the situation in Brazil is different. The author points out that in the country the push effect happens due to a scenario of recession, therefore, people are “pushed” toward self-employment as an alternative to unemployment.

The Brazilian unemployment rate has risen during the crisis period, which started at the end of 2014. In the fourth quarter of 2015, the unemployment rate reached 8.96%, when it was 6.86% in the fourth quarter of the previous year, according to the Institute for Applied Economic Research (IPEA, 2016). In addition, there is difference in this percentage according to age group and gender. Young people aged between 14 and 24 years old had a much higher unemployment rate (20.9%) compared to the elderly (above 60 years old), with 2.5%. The same is true for women who have an unemployment rate (10.6%) higher than men (7.9%). These estimates point to the incentives that these groups (women and young people) have to choose self-employment.

Self-employment is a self-reported work category in Brazil where the individual runs his/her own business and does not have the help of employees. According to the data from the National Household Sample Survey (PNAD), the percentage of self-employed men and women increased between 2011 and 2015. Men rose from 25.54% in 2011 to 27.38%, while women rose from 16.02% to 17.81% in the same period. The increase in self-employment is largely due to the crisis that the country has experienced since the second half of 2014. The choice for self-employment is a way of entering or returning to the Brazilian labor market, especially in times of crisis (Fusioka and Platt, 2018).

This article aims to investigate the presence of wage difference among self-employed workers, according to gender, in both the mean and the quantiles in the Brazilian labor market. The methodologies to be used will be ordinary least squares (OLS) for the mean and unconditional quantile regressions (RIF-regression) for the wage distribution, both associated with the Oaxaca–Ransom decomposition, in order to decompose the differential between the explained and unexplained portion. The database will be PNAD, which is a complex and nationally representative sample for the year 2015.

Several studies have attempted to quantify wage discrimination in Brazil, but none of them focuses on the self-employment market. The contribution of this article is that it is the first to estimate the wage differential of self-employed men and women in the Brazilian labor market and with an increase in this type of work. In addition, the presence of wage differentials among self-employed men and women throughout the distribution may point to the need for specific policies that not only target the mean. These policies would, if the evidence points out, address problems related to sticky floor (when salary differentials are higher in the lower tail compared to the median) and to glass ceiling – when the wage differential is higher in the upper tail compared to the median – (Carrillo *et al.*, 2014; Chi and Li, 2008). Another potential problem concerns the so-called glass door–women access the labor market via professions that pay less (Hassink and Russo, 2010), otherwise, the problem points to occupational segregation against women (Lechmann and Schnabel, 2012). Thus, the aim of this paper is to investigate the wage differential – explained and unexplained – between self-employed men and women in Brazil, since some people are becoming entrepreneurs out of necessity and others out of opportunity, will or a choice.

The article is organized in four sections besides this introduction. The following section will present the empirical strategy with the Oaxaca–Ransom methods for the mean and Oaxaca–Ransom with RIF for the quantiles. Subsequently, we will show the data source: the 2015 PNAD (National Household Sample Survey) with the respective descriptive statistics. In the fourth section the results will be shown and discussed. Finally, we will make the final considerations.

2. Methodology

2.1 Empirical strategy[1]

The empirical strategy consists of estimating the gender discrimination, in the mean (Oaxaca–Ransom) and in the quantiles (RIF-regression), for the Brazilian self-employed workers. There are omitted variables that would motivate the choice for this type of occupation, such as discrimination from the employer and the consumers (Becker, 1957), would be controlled because they would not correlate with gender discrimination in a self-employment situation (Williams, 2012). However, the choice for self-employment is not random, so there would be the presence of bias in unobservable variables (Lechmann and Schnabel, 2012).

2.2 Oaxaca–Blinder and ransom

Discrimination against women exists when the relative wage of men is higher than the wage that would be considered if both genders were paid considering only their productive characteristics. Hence, this wage difference is represented by equation (1) (Mincer, 1974):

$$\ln Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 educ_i + \beta_2 exp_i + \beta_3 exp_i^2 + \gamma' X_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (1)$$

The log of wage i is illustrated in equation 1 by $\ln Y_i$. The variable $educ_i$ stands for years of education, exp_i represents the years of experience that affect the individual's wage i , exp_i^2 stands for years of experience squared, X_i represents the vector of observable characteristics of each individual and ε_i represents the stochastic error. The quadratic function represents, as already pointed out, “years of potential experience” (Lemieux, 2006). Notwithstanding, there are some flaws in Mincer's equations, as the wage was not capturing the experience as if the return of experience years was the same at any education level (Patrinos, 2016). However, when the cost of hiring a new employee is higher than the usual (which depends on the area), firms take into consideration the experience coefficient by capturing it through the equation.

The methodology is based on the Oaxaca–Blinder (1973) decomposition, whose purpose is to find which percentage of the differential in wage is caused by discrimination, that is, the

percentage which is considered discrimination is the unexplained part. Furthermore, the equation is estimated for two groups (Blinder, 1973), the advantage group (high-wage group) and the disadvantage group (low-wage group). Men (superscript M) will be considered the advantage group and women (superscript W) the disadvantage group:

$$Y_i^M = \beta_0^M + \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j^M X_{ji}^M + \mu_i^M \tag{2}$$

$$Y_i^W = \beta_0^W + \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j^W X_{ji}^W + \mu_i^W \tag{3}$$

Consequently, equation (2) is for self-employed men (advantage group), hence, Y_i^M is the log of the self-employed men’s wage and equation (3) is for self-employed women (disadvantage group), where Y_i^W represents the log of women’s wage. The coefficient vectors are represented by β_0^M and β_0^W , and as it was presented previously, X_{ji}^M and X_{ji}^W represent the vectors of observables characteristics of each individual. The next step, as it was proposed by Blinder (1973), is to subtract the self-employed men’s equation (2) from the self-employed women’s equation (3), which results in equation (4):

$$\begin{aligned} (\bar{Y}^M - \bar{Y}^W) - \sum_j \beta_j^W (\bar{X}_j^M - \bar{X}_j^W) &= \beta_0^M - \beta_0^W + \sum_j \bar{X}_j^W (\beta_j^M - \beta_j^W) + \sum_j (\bar{X}_j^M \\ &\quad - \bar{X}_j^W) (\beta_j^M - \beta_j^W) \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

However, equation (4) is divided into parts, so that the differential is explained by the covariates, the part called “pure discrimination” and the difference of coefficients. $\sum_j \beta_j^W (\bar{X}_j^M - \bar{X}_j^W)$: this is the difference which is explained by the observable characteristics of the groups in the test. This difference is multiplied by the coefficient of the disadvantage group, which results in a weighted equation. In other words, it represents the portion that can be attributed to differences in endowments.

$(\beta_0^M - \beta_0^W)$: this sum of the equation is the “pure discrimination”, those coefficients exist just because there are different groups, otherwise there would be one and only β_0 for the whole equation, which represents the intercepts. It is the unexplained difference in wages. When the result of this subtraction is positive it shows how much women’s wage are lower than men’s.

$\sum_j \bar{X}_j^W (\beta_j^M - \beta_j^W)$: this equation shows the difference of the coefficients multiplied by the experience of the disadvantage group, which shows that the individuals are receiving different payments even when they have the same endowments. To put it simply, it is the existent discrepancy which can be assigned to the difference in the coefficients, also meaning differences in the intercepts. Economists have long been discussing this issue, when a group is undervalued it will result in the other group being overvalued (Jann, 2008).

$$\bar{Y}^M - \bar{Y}^W = (\beta_0^M - \beta_0^W) + \sum_j \bar{X}_j^W (\beta_j^M - \beta_j^W) + \sum_j \Delta \bar{X}_j \beta_j^M \tag{5}$$

For this reason, it is possible to split equation (5) into two parts: the first one represents discrimination – unexplained wage differential – and the second one represents the difference in endowments—differential explained by positive attributes (Oaxaca and Ransom, 1994).

The unconditional quantile regression method is called RIF-regression (recentered influence function). The model is similar to the standard regression model, but the dependent variable is replaced by an influence function (Firpo *et al.*, 2009). Thus, the conditional expectation of RIF ($Y; v$) is modeled as a linear function of the explanatory covariates:

$$E[\text{RIF}(Y; v)|X] = X\gamma + \varepsilon \tag{6}$$

Where the coefficients γ can be estimated by OLS.

In the case of the quantile regressions, the RIF ($Y; Q_\tau$) is equal to $Q_\tau + \text{IF}(Y, Q_\tau)$, thus

$$\text{RIF}(y; Q_\tau) = Q_\tau + \frac{\tau + 1\{y \leq Q_\tau\}}{f_Y(Q_\tau)} \tag{7}$$

Where $f_Y(\cdot)$ is the density of the marginal distribution of Y , Q_τ is the population τ -quantile of the unconditional distribution of Y and $1\{\cdot\}$ is an indicator function.

Computationally, the density at the point is estimated by kernel methods and the quantile sample \hat{Q}_τ is estimated first. In each group the coefficients of the unconditional quantile regression are given by:

$$\hat{\gamma}_{g,\tau} = \left(\sum_{i \in G} X_i X_i \right)^{-1} \sum_{i \in G} \widehat{\text{RIF}}(Y_{gi}; Q_{g,\tau}) X_i \tag{8}$$

where $g = A, B$.

One can write, for any unconditional quantile, equivalent to the Oaxaca–Blinder decomposition:

$$\hat{R}^\tau = E(X_A)(\hat{\gamma}_{A,\tau} - \hat{\gamma}_{B,\tau}) + (E(X_A) - E(X_B))\hat{\gamma}_{B,\tau} \tag{9}$$

Thus, \hat{R}^τ is the total wage difference between the groups in the estimated unconditional quantile. After the = sign, the first part represents the differential not explained by productive attributes (which the literature attributes to discrimination) and the second part is the component of the differential explained by observable productive characteristics.

2.3 Database

The database used was the 2015 PNAD (National Household Sample Survey), which is the latest available year. PNAD is provided by IBGE (Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics) and is a representative sample of the Brazilian population; it is annual and the survey does not occur only in the years in which demographic censuses occur (every 10 years). The information collected contributes to the analysis of the country’s situation and the implementation of public policies. In addition, it offers an insight into the transformations in home structure, socioeconomic conditions, health and aspects linked to housing, migration, fertility and wages. The population of the final sample consists of 10,476,119 people, represented by a sample of 19,004 self-employed workers.

Of the cuts made in the original database, it should be noted that all the individuals who lacked some information used in the regression were excluded, as well as people under the age of 18 and over 65 years old and public workers. Information on self-employed workers is presented in Table 1 below.

The LNWage [2] variable shows a pro-men wage differential which is statistically significant at 1%. This variable may suffer from measurement errors, since part of the income may be under-reported (Williams, 2012). The percentage of women between 18 and 30 who are self-employed is higher than that of men. It should be noted that women are less likely to

Variable	Description	Whole sample Mean (standard Deviation)	Women Mean (standard Deviation)	Men Mean (standard Deviation)	t-value
<i>Personal characteristics</i>					
Ln wage	Natural logarithm of wage in hours	1.976 (0.936)	1.801 (0.978)	2.071 (0.866)	-20.156***
Age cohort 1 18-30	Age cohort 1: from 18 to 30 years old	0.187 (0.389)	0.194 (0.395)	0.183 (0.386)	1.96**
Age cohort 2 31-40	Age cohort 2: from 31 to 40 years old	0.283 (0.450)	0.284 (0.451)	0.281 (0.449)	0.490
Age cohort 3 41-50	Age cohort 3: from 41 to 50 years old	0.283 (0.450)	0.286 (0.452)	0.278 (0.448)	1.131
Age cohort 4 51-65	Age cohort 4: from 51 to 65 years old	0.247 (0.431)	0.236 (0.424)	0.257 (0.437)	-3.469***
Caucasian	Self-declared Caucasian or Asian	0.445 (0.497)	0.416 (0.493)	0.395 (0.489)	2.941***
Urban	People who live in an urban area	0.926 (0.261)	0.931 (0.253)	0.927 (0.260)	0.997
Metropolitan	People who live in a metropolitan area	0.358 (0.479)	0.436 (0.496)	0.429 (0.495)	0.936
Married	Married/lives with the partner	0.676 (0.468)	0.673 (0.469)	0.667 (0.471)	0.869
TotalKids	Number of kids living in the same house	1.216 (1.112)	1.319 (1.107)	1.144 (1.145)	10.691***
Kid_6	Dummy which indicates if the individual has kids of the age of 6 or under	0.188 (0.391)	0.187 (0.389)	0.184 (0.388)	0.430
<i>Productive characteristics</i>					
Ystudy	Year of study	8.79 (4.076)	9.294 (3.905)	8.217 (4.148)	18.401***
Unionized	Individuals who are unionized	0.063 (0.243)	0.055 (0.228)	0.066 (0.249)	-3.384***
Yexp	Years of experience	26.809 (12.552)	25.429 (12.483)	27.811 (12.519)	-13.125***
Yexp2	Years of experience squared	876.309 (701.082)	802.486 (669.684)	930.179 (717.386)	-12.667***
SpecificExp	Specific experience in months	109.856 (109.377)	95.187 (99.974)	121.698 (115.467)	-16.881***
XtraIncome	Non-work extra income	0.045 (0.207)	0.059 (0.237)	0.030 (0.171)	9.924***
Household	Hours of household work	16.885 (13.029)	23.424 (14.019)	10.773 (8.035)	76.816***
CNPJ ^a	Dummy that indicates whether the company has CNPJ	0.219 0.413	0.219 0.414	0.218 0.413	0.22
Num_employees	Number of employees the company has	0.082 0.452	0.084 0.466	0.081 0.452	0.438

Table 1.
Description of the variables

Note(s): Significance at 1 percent level denoted by ***, significance at 5 percent level denoted by **, significance at 10 percent level denoted by *

Source(s): compiled by the authors, based on the 2015 PNAD

be self-employed when wage employment is available (Blanchflower, 2000; Blanchflower et al., 2001; Grilo and Irigoyen, 2006). Younger people are more likely to be self-employed due to their lower risk aversion (Blanchflower and Meyer, 1994; Levesque and Minniti, 2006). In

the opposite direction, young people would be less likely to become self-employed because of lesser access to physical capital (Parker, 2004).

The preference for becoming self-employed is variable throughout life and has an inverted U-shape, in which middle-aged individuals (between 25 and 45 years old) are more likely to become self-employed (Bönte *et al.*, 2009; Levesque and Minniti, 2006). In the group of older individuals (50–65 years old), the percentage of men is higher than that of women. It is important to point out that the chances of individuals opting for this type of occupation decrease. In addition, this age group is more likely to have accumulated enough experience and financial capital to become self-employed (Parker, 2004). Moreover, the incentives to become self-employed may arise from a scenario of prolonged unemployment or precarious employment as a wage earner (Moore and Mueller, 2002). However, the opportunity cost to be self-employed is high for this age group due to the shorter time for expected return on income (Verheul *et al.*, 2002).

There is no significant difference in the self-employment choice among those men and women who are married, living in the metropolitan area and living in the urban area; there are two categories with two possibilities: urban (if the domicile is located in an urban area it equals 1, if it is located in a rural area, it equals zero) and metropolitan [3] (Metropolis and cities around it equal 1, while the value 0 is given to other municipalities). Marriage can bring financial stability, giving guarantees so that the partner can take risks to become self-employed (Le, 1999). However, responsibilities resulting from family life, such as child rearing, may increase the risk aversion involved with such occupation.

There is also no statistically significant difference in having children, but the number of children of self-employed women is slightly higher than the number of men. The percentage of self-employed Caucasian women (Caucasian or Asian) was higher than the percentage of men. If among the personal characteristics there are several variables that are statistically identical between the groups, the same does not happen in the professional characteristics (except if the company has CNPJ and the number of employees in the company).

Self-employed women have, on average, an additional year of education. They get extra non-work income and work about 13 h more at home than their male counterparts. Men have more experience in the labor market (2 years more), more time in the same company (26 months more, on average) and are more unionized.

It is important to note that men in Brazil, on average, drop out of school before women. Young men are more likely to be only in the labor market, which means that they have dropped out of school (Cabanas *et al.*, 2014). At the same time, girls are more likely to stay in school. As young men enter the labor market earlier, consequently, they gain more work experience. This evidence is similar to that found for Germany (Lechmann and Schnabel, 2012). It is different, however, for self-employed women in Cameroon because they have, on average, 2 years more of labor market experience when compared to men (Mbratana and Kenne, 2018). Brazilian women spend more hours on domestic work when compared to men (Madalozzo *et al.*, 2010). The allocation of this time to this type of activity reduces the hours allocated to the labor market (Mbratana and Kenne, 2018).

Some additional covariates are also used in the models: activity cluster of the enterprise—where the type of company is considered (with workers, without workers, formal or informal)—, type of occupation (CBO), type of activity (CNAE)—both CBO and CNAE are defined by IBGE and define, respectively, the type of occupation, in order to classify it uniformly in administrative and household records and the type of activity, in order to standardize the records in all spheres of public power, avoiding tax system and federative unit (UF), the federative units are the states of Brazil and the Federal District, which are above the municipalities and below the country in a hierarchy of public power. The economic activity grouping (GAE) is more general than CBO and CNAE to define the line of work and includes the following categories: industry; trade and repair; transport, storage and communication;

education, health and social services; and other services, ill-defined activities and activities. These variables are important controls, because the problem of assigning wage differences to discrimination in different activities or occupations is avoided. Another problem is the heterogeneity of Brazilian federative units, which is controlled by dummies. More than 60% of the self-employed sample is in the extractive and civil construction industries or they are workers in the services sector or service providers to the commerce. Self-employed women are preferred by the service sector (70%), while self-employed men work in manufacturing (OECD, 2017).

As mentioned previously, there might be three reasons for this occupational segregation. The first is that the female participation is discontinuous, so it became a pattern, that is, since they are not active in the area they do not try to get in that field. The second reason was the gender roles that society imposes and the third reason is purely discrimination (Kaufman and Hotchkiss, 2006).

3. Results

The results are arranged in two stages: the first one shows a set of 3 regressions using the Oaxaca–Ransom method for the mean – in which the first regression presents a parsimonious model and the last presents a complete model – after the Oaxaca–Ransom decomposition for quantiles, using RIF regressions.

Table 2 presents the results of the Oaxaca–Ransom model, where column (1) contains the estimation of the decomposition in the most common version of the income equation, where the independent variables are: education, labor market experience (in years), experience squared, and specific experience – number of years that the person has stayed in the same job. Equation (2) contains the same covariates of equation (1), individual variables – ethnicity, age cohort, number of children in the household and whether there are any children up to 6 years old at home, whether they have a spouse, in addition to dummies of union membership, metropolitan region, urban area, whether the company has CNPJ (National Register of Legal Entities) and the number of employees in the company.

Column (3) of Table 2 shows all the above variables and dummies with the type of affiliation, dummies for each type of occupation, dummies for each type of branch of activity and dummies for each Federative Unit. The total number of observations is 19,004 (9,243 women and 9,761 men), representing 10,476,119 self-employed Brazilians. The total wage differential is 27.79% favorable to men.

	Oaxaca–Ransom (1)	(2)	(3)
<i>Difference</i>			
Prediction 1 (Men)	2.1117*** (0.01)	2.1117*** (0.01)	2.1117*** (0.01)
Prediction 2 (Women)	1.8338***0.011	1.8338***0.011	1.8338***0.011
Difference	0.2779*** (0.015)	0.2779*** (0.015)	0.2779*** (0.015)
<i>Decomposition</i>			
Explained	–0.0559*** (0.006)	0.0825*** 0.011	0.2108*** (0.012)
Unexplained	0.3339*** (0.014)	0.1954*** 0.011	0.0671*** (0.086)

Table 2.
The results difference
and decomposition

Note(s): *** $p < 0.01$. Prediction 1 represents the results for men and prediction 2 represents the results for women

Source(s): Compiled by the author, based on the 2015 PNAD

The most parsimonious model, indicated in column (1), shows that women would earn more than men by 5.59% if there were no unexplained differential. Since there is an unexplained difference of 33.39% in favor of men, the total difference is 27.79%. The model in column (2) shows that other added attributes affect wages, reducing the difference that was previously unexplained by 13.85 percentage points to 19.54%, while the difference explained by the productive attributes is 8.25% in favor of men.

Table 3 presents the results of the Oaxaca–Ransom model along the distribution of earnings of men and women through unconditional quantile regression (RIF-regression). The largest total differential is found in quantile 10 and is 48.26%, while the lowest total difference is in the upper tail of the distribution (Q.90), 19.24%. The median of the distribution presents a difference of 24.65% in favor of men.

The differential explained by the productive attributes – such as education, experience, unionization and type of occupation – also has the highest value at the beginning of the distribution (36.47%) and the lowest at the end (10.35%).

The differential component attributed to discrimination (not explained by observable productive factors) has its peak at the beginning of the distribution (11.79%), while the lowest value is in the median (5.01%). There is an increase in the difference attributed to discrimination of 3.15 percentage points from Q.70 to Q.90, showing that among self-employed workers with greatest incomes, the unexplained component plays a major role.

Tables A1 and A2 of the appendix present the variables of the explained part and the unexplained part of the differential. It is possible to observe that education reduces explained (along the entire distribution) and unexplained (in part of the distribution) differentials. This is due to the fact that women study more. As for discrimination by race, however, education exacerbates the problem, since Caucasian individuals, on average, have greater access to better education, increasing the explained and unexplained income differential.

4. Discussion

The article investigated the presence of wage discrimination in the Brazilian labor market between genders for those who are self-employed. The methodology used was OLS for the mean and unconditional quantile regressions (RIF-regression) for the wage distribution, both associated with the Oaxaca–Ransom decomposition, in order to decompose the differential between the explained and unexplained portion.

The profile of the Brazilian self-employed is generally male, poorly educated, with lower salaries than formally employed workers and is involved in small scale production businesses, with low skill requirements and unlikely to expand and hire other people (Narita, 2020). The wage gap between self-employed men and women has declined in most countries except for Slovenia, Romania, Italy and Poland (OECD, 2017). However, there is a greater gender pay gap between those who opted for self-employment compared to wage earners (Álvarez *et al.*, 2013; Boden Jr, 1999; Eastough and Miller, 2004).

Opting for self-employment may be an opportunity for women to avoid discrimination such as that arising from employers and co-workers (Moore, 1983). It is noteworthy that there is a strand that states that the choice for this type of occupation may be linked to individual preferences (Maloney, 1999). The lack of part-time jobs in organizations has pushed women toward self-employment as full-time occupations benefit men (Hipple, 2010). This option has been used as a substitute for part-time work (Georgellis and Wall, 2005) allowing flexibility in reconciling household and family tasks (Budig, 2006). Therefore, it would have positive consequences on the professional career and income (Hughes, 2003).

Women's determinants in self-employment are usually tied to need and survival because they cannot return to the labor market, as well as to the need to handle both family life and career (Zouain and Barone, 2009). Thus, although it is a means of returning to or entering the

Table 3.
The results difference
and decomposition in
the quantiles

RIF with Oaxaca-Ransom	Q.10	Q.30	Q.50	Q.70	Q.90
<i>Difference</i>					
Prediction 1 (Men)	1.1787	1.6746	2.0683	2.5182	3.2133
Prediction 2 (Women)	0.6961	1.4106	1.8218	2.2492	3.0209
Difference	0.4826*** (0.025)	0.2639*** (0.016)	0.2465*** (0.016)	0.269*** (0.017)	0.1924*** (0.03)
<i>Decomposition</i>					
Explained	0.3647*** (0.02)	0.2135*** (0.013)	0.1964*** (0.013)	0.2116*** (0.015)	0.1035*** (0.03)
Unexplained	0.1179*** (0.016)	0.0504*** (0.009)	0.0501*** (0.01)	0.0574*** 0.011	0.0889*** (0.023)

Note(s): *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$. Prediction 1 represents the results for men and prediction 2 represents the results for women
Source(s): Compiled by the author, based on the 2015 PNAD

labor market, self-employment is still subject to unexplained differentials of 6.71% in favor of men. The inclusion of occupational choices in model (3) shows that women engage in activities that pay less, a phenomenon known as a glass door (Hassink and Russo, 2010). It explains part of the wage differential between men and women due to differences when entering the labor market, where women are unable to take up more profitable occupations (Bussmann, 2017). The sector chosen by women who choose self-employment is less skill and human-capital intensive, so they pay lower wages compared to technology-intensive sectors (Boden Jr, 1999; Lawter *et al.*, 2016). These occupations are personal services, commerce and office services. Consequently, by reducing existing occupational segregation, the income gap would therefore be reduced (Lechmann and Schnabel, 2012).

In addition, they take into account aspects related to the sector and career choices, since they are less capital intensive (Mbratana and Kenne, 2018). Consequently, the level of capital invested is indicated as one of the factors affecting income (Barzel, 1987). Part of the income differential can be justified by the difference in physical capital invested as well as in the difference of human capital acquired by work experience, in addition to specific experience (Hundley, 2001).

Although self-employed workers work longer hours than wage earners (OECD, 2017), discrimination in the labor market for self-employed workers remains high because of the characteristics related to worked hours, since they need to devote more time to domestic work (Hundley, 2001; Mbratana and Kenne, 2018). Brazilian women spend, on average, almost 13 h more in domestic activities than men. Both for self-employment in the Brazilian labor market and in the United States, hours dedicated to domestic work negatively impact wages, and this impact is greater for women (Madalozzo and Segantini, 2017). Thus, women are penalized in their income for spending more hours at home than men (Hundley, 2001).

The woman is seen as the main responsible for unpaid homework, since the distribution of time dedicated to domestic and work activities between the genders is unequal in Brazil (Madalozzo and Segantini, 2017). On the other hand, attributes such as having flexible schedules, family situation and aspirations have little impact (Lechmann and Schnabel, 2012). Being married affects the hours dedicated to domestic tasks, therefore, the difference of hours dedicated to male work activities is compensated by the extra hours that the woman devotes to domestic activities (Hochschild, 1990). The dissimilarity in hours devoted to household chores in the United States demonstrates that women are still responsible for unpaid activities, even if they are providers (Bianchi *et al.*, 2000). Although the results are different for married individuals in Brazil, there is evidence that society usually thinks of certain activities as gender-determined (West and Zimmerman, 1987). This goes to show that tradition and cultural patterns play an important role, since there is the belief that each gender must do different activities, in other words, that “men must work and women must take care of the house” (Geist and Cohen, 2011).

The pressure to raise children falls on women, especially in relation to spending more time with their children (Bianchi, 2000). For society, women are primarily responsible for caring for their homes and children (Parker and Wang, 2013). Thus, they feel torn between domestic and labor market roles (Budig, 2006; Lawter *et al.*, 2016). The time they spend doing housework is two to three times longer compared to their male peers even with the absence of children at home. In the presence of children, their dedication increases by 14 h per week while for their peers there is a 7-h increase in domestic activities (Parker and Wang, 2013).

As can be seen in Table A1, in the lower quantiles, the impact of hours spent on household chores is higher in the first two quintiles, Q10 and Q30, considering that women who are part of the higher quantiles have greater bargaining power to have someone to replace them so that the trade-off between household tasks and work becomes smaller (Soberon-Ferrer and Dardis, 1991). Women with higher education levels can access better business opportunities (Fujii and Hawley, 1991; Rees and Shah, 1986). The inclusion of women in self-employment

over the years has increased, as well as their level of education (Gomes, 2009). Similarly, education affects the occupation that the individual chooses (Aronson, 1991).

In turn, education has a positive effect in reducing the wage gap. The increase in education reduces years of experience in the labor market, reducing the wage gap, however, experience increases it. Therefore, the years which women spend in the labor market gaining specific experience increase the wage differential in self-employment. However, the working life cycle of women is also affected by their reproductive life cycle. A career break due to maternity leave affects their income (Mbratana and Kenne, 2018). In Sweden the rules related to parental leave are quite generous. Thus, the choice for self-employment aims to reduce the labor market punishment imposed on women who decide to have children. In addition, the flexibility of self-employment allows them to raise their children (Joona, 2014).

The presence of children increases the chances of opting for self-employment (Lombard, 2001; Wellington, 2006), since the increase in labor participation occurs at the expense of the time dedicated to the child. When the child's age is less than six years old, the presence is positively related to the woman's option for self-employment (Boden Jr, 1999; Joona, 2014; Noseleit, 2014), having a smaller magnitude for men. However, the odds decrease as the child's age increases, proving not significant when the child reaches the age of 16–17 years (Joona, 2014).

The lower age cohort reduces the wage gap among genders to the 0.10 and 0.70 quintiles, although there are negative effects in average terms. The young person has less risk aversion and at the same time has ideas to start a venture. Young people in quintile 0.10 may be being pushed into self-employment while those in quintile 0.70 are being pulled for better business opportunities. In Brazil, there are no wage differences for self-employment in the cohorts of advanced age. It is noteworthy that in older age cohorts the chances of being in a formal job are lower and the option for self-employment increases with age (Narita, 2020). These age groups have dependence on previous occupational capital and experience as a characteristic (Caliendo *et al.*, 2014; Van der Zwan *et al.*, 2012). The differential decrease in the upper tail of the distribution goes in the same direction as the literature, since women with a higher educational level – the majority among the most well paid – have a greater perception of discrimination and tend to be more resistant to it (Ahmed and McGillivray, 2015; Chi and Li, 2008).

Some limitations should be noted, such as the absence of panel data, which could solve the problem of time-invariant variables that affect the self-employment decision and can observe the effect of different economic situations on self-employment and the wage differential contained in it. Variables such as obtaining credit and risk propensity are also, according to the literature, important for assessing the presence of people in self-employment but do not exist in the PNAD database.

5. Final considerations

Self-employment has been an alternative for minority groups (such as young people, immigrants) to enter the labor market, as well as for women. Choosing this type of occupation is a way to avoid discrimination from the employer. In addition, it can be chosen out of necessity, because of the flexible hours, or as an alternative to unemployment, as well as a business opportunity. The literature shows that, contrary to expectations, there is a gender-motivated wage differential within self-employment. The wage differential between men and women is widely debated in Brazilian and world literature. What is called discrimination is unequal treatment, in the case of wages, for people with similar productive endowments.

Thus, this article tested the hypothesis that there are wage differentials explained and unexplained in self-employment between men and women. In order to test the hypothesis, the

Oaxaca–Ransom decomposition was used in the mean and along the distribution (with the use of unconditional quantile regressions–RIF-regression).

The average differential is of 27.79% in favor of men. The most parsimonious model – using Mincer’s income equation – shows that women have 33.39 percentage points of unexplained differential – while the most complete model shows that this difference drops to 6.71 percentage points. The drop shows that women seek self-employment in federative units that pay less and in less privileged occupations when compared to men. This last explanation is the effect known as glass door, in which women find it difficult to enter the labor market in better paid occupations. The overall average difference between self-employed men and women is 27.79%, which can be mostly explained by the fact that women work, on average, 13 extra hours a week in unpaid household chores.

Other effects are due to factors such as experience, because they enter the labor market later. Part of that explanation has to do with the number of years of education, which is higher among them. However, young women also have a higher chance of not studying or working compared to male peers in the same age group. Thus, the wage differential between men and women is higher in the lower quintiles.

The use of self-employment for women to enter the labor market would be encouraged through the recent deregulation of labor laws. There should be a proposal to subsidize women with a view to starting their own business in a way that helps them run their own enterprise, therefore, reducing the chances of their giving up as entrepreneurs. Despite its beneficial nature, however, there would be an increase in the gender wage differential, especially for those in the lower income quintiles. Therefore, they are pushed toward self-employment. Thus, it would be necessary to improve their productive characteristics such as education, as well as encourage their entry into sectors belonging to the technological areas. Consequently, this reduces the glass door effect that results from choosing less profitable occupations, as they are less intensive in terms of human capital. There should be policies that allow for smaller fluctuations in the labor market, such as a shared maternity leave between men and women or greater access to day care centers. These factors would make it possible to gain specific experience in the occupation, as well as to spend less time away from the job market to take care of children. These measures would help increase specific human capital, experience time and increase the hours dedicated to the business.

There are some inherent implications of increased self-employment in Brazil in recent years. As workers no longer become formal wage earners, they have no right to some benefits that formal workers have, such as paid sick leave – the Consolidation of Brazilian Labor Laws (CLT) guarantees paid maternity leave for women – unemployment benefits, in addition to specific regulations, which may lead to precarious work. Incentives for self-employment may prove to be a fragile alternative as the gender pay gap is higher vis-à-vis formal wage earners. It should be noted that many women opt for self-employment due to the flexibility of reconciling domestic and work activities in the labor market. Therefore, this option for self-employment would reinforce gender inequality in household chores. In addition, poor access to credit for women and the choice of low-paying occupations would increase the gender pay gap. In this respect, the identification of income differentials between men and women can guide inclusive public policies for self-employed workers, so that the search for self-employment – either out of necessity or opportunity – is maintained.

Notes

1. All estimates were performed using version 15 of the Stata software.
2. Short for *Cadastro Nacional da Pessoa Jurídica* in Portuguese, or National Registry of Legal Entities.
3. Metropolitan regions are created by Federal or State laws. According to IBGE, they are useful for integrating the region’s economic dynamization policies.

References

- Ahmed, S. and McGillivray, M. (2015), "Human capital, discrimination, and the gender wage gap in Bangladesh", *World Development*, Pergamon, Vol. 67, pp. 506-524.
- Altonji, J.G. and Blank, R.M. (1999), "Race and Gender in the Labor Market", in Ashenfelter, O. and Card, D. (Eds), *Handbook of Labor Economics*, Elsevier, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, Vol. 3, pp. 3143-3259, doi: [10.1086/497045](https://doi.org/10.1086/497045).
- Álvarez, G., Gradín, C. and Otero, M.S. (2013), "Self-employment: transition and earnings differential", *Revista de Economía Aplicada*, Universidad de Zaragoza, Vol. 21 No. 62, pp. 61-90.
- Aronson, R.L. (1991), *Self-Employment: A Labor Market Perspective*, Ithaca, NY, ILR Press.
- Arrow, K. (1973), "The theory of discrimination", *Discrimination in Labor Markets*, Princeton, Vol. 3 No. 10, pp. 3-33.
- Barzel, Y. (1987), "The entrepreneur's reward for self-policing", *Economic Inquiry*, Wiley Online Library, Vol. 25 No. 1, pp. 103-116.
- Becker, G.S. (1957), *The Economics of Discrimination: An Economic View of Racial Discrimination*, University of Chicago, Chicago.
- Bianchi, S.M., Milkie, M.A., Sayer, L.C. and Robinson, J.P. (2000), "Is anyone doing the housework? Trends in the gender division of household labor", *Social Forces*, Oxford University Press, Vol. 79 No. 1, pp. 191-228.
- Bianchi, S.M. (2000), "Maternal employment and time with children: dramatic change or surprising continuity?", *Demography*, Springer, Vol. 37 No. 4, pp. 401-414.
- Blanchflower, D.G. and Meyer, B.D. (1994), "A longitudinal analysis of the young self-employed in Australia and the United States", *Small Business Economics*, Springer, Vol. 6 No. 1, pp. 1-19.
- Blanchflower, D.G., Oswald, A. and Stutzer, A. (2001), "Latent entrepreneurship across nations", *European Economic Review*, Elsevier, Vol. 45 Nos 4-6, pp. 680-691.
- Blanchflower, D.G. (2000), "Self-employment in OECD countries", *Labour Economics*, Elsevier, Vol. 7 No. 5, pp. 471-505.
- Blau, F.D. and Kahn, L.M. (2000), "Gender differences in pay", *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 14 No. 4, pp. 75-99.
- Bliner, A.S. (1973), "Wage discrimination: reduced form and structural estimates", *Journal of Human Resources*, JSTOR, Vol. 8 No. 4, pp. 436-455.
- Boden, R.J. Jr (1999), "Gender inequality in wage earnings and female self-employment selection", *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, Elsevier, Vol. 28 No. 3, pp. 351-364.
- Bönte, W., Falck, O. and Heblich, S. (2009), "The impact of regional age structure on entrepreneurship", *Economic Geography*, Taylor & Francis, Vol. 85 No. 3, pp. 269-287.
- Budig, M.J. (2006), "Gender, self-employment, and earnings: the interlocking structures of family and professional status", *Gender and Society*, Sage Publications Sage CA: Thousand Oaks, CA, Vol. 20 No. 6, pp. 725-753.
- Bussmann, T.B. (2017), *Ensaio Em Economia Do Trabalho: Uma Análise Das Minorias No Mercado de Trabalho Brasileiro*, Tese (Doutorado em Programa de Pós-Graduação em Economia)-Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul, Orientador: Paulo de Andrade Jacinto, p. 250.
- Cabanas, P., Komatsu, B.K. and Menezes Filho, N.A. (2014), *Crescimento da Renda e as Escolhas dos Jovens entre os Estudos e o Mercado de Trabalho*, Trabalho Acadêmico (Economia do Trabalho), Centro de Políticas Públicas - Insper Instituto de Ensino e Pesquisa, São Paulo.
- Caliendo, M., Fossen, F. and Kritikos, A.S. (2014), "Personality characteristics and the decisions to become and stay self-employed", *Small Business Economics*, Springer, Vol. 42 No. 4, pp. 787-814.
- Carrillo, P., Gandelman, N. and Robano, V. (2014), "Sticky floors and glass ceilings in Latin America", *The Journal of Economic Inequality*, Springer, Vol. 12 No. 3, pp. 339-361.

- Chi, W. and Li, B. (2008), "Glass ceiling or sticky floor? Examining the gender earnings differential across the earnings distribution in urban China, 1987–2004", *Journal of Comparative Economics*, Academic Press, Vol. 36 No. 2, pp. 243-263.
- De la Rica, S., Dolado, J.J. and Llorens, V. (2008), "Ceilings or floors? Gender wage gaps by education in Spain", *Journal of Population Economics*, Springer, Vol. 21 No. 3, pp. 751-776.
- Eastough, K. and Miller, P.W. (2004), "The gender wage gap in paid-and self-employment in Australia", *Australian Economic Papers*, Wiley Online Library, Vol. 43 No. 3, pp. 257-276.
- Firpo, S., Fortin, N.M. and Lemieux, T. (2009), "Unconditional quantile regressions", *Econometrica*, Wiley Online Library, Vol. 77 No. 3, pp. 953-973.
- Fujii, E.T. and Hawley, C.B. (1991), "Empirical aspects of self-employment", *Economics Letters*, Elsevier, Vol. 36 No. 3, pp. 323-329.
- Fusioka, M. and Platt, A. (2018), "Políticas públicas para O Empreendedorismo EM tempos de precarização do trabalho", *Revista Trabalho Necessário*, Vol. 12 No. 19, pp. 57-77.
- Geist, C. and Cohen, P.N. (2011), "Headed toward equality? Housework change in comparative perspective", *Journal of Marriage and Family*, Wiley Online Library, Vol. 73 No. 4, pp. 832-844.
- Georgellis, Y. and Wall, H.J. (2005), "Gender differences in self-employment", *International Review of Applied Economics*, Taylor & Francis, Vol. 19 No. 3, pp. 321-342.
- Gomes, R. (2009), *O Autoemprego No Brasil: Análise Dos Fatores Determinantes*, PUCSP, São Paulo.
- Grilo, I. and Irigoyen, J.-M. (2006), "Entrepreneurship in the EU: to wish and not to be", *Small Business Economics*, Springer, Vol. 26 No. 4, pp. 305-318.
- Henrekson, M. (2004), "Comment on David G. Blanchflower: is more self-employment good or bad?", *Swedish Economic Policy Review*, Vol. 11 No. 2.
- Hassink, W.H.J. and Russo, G. (2010), *The Glass Door: The Gender Composition of Newly-Hired Workers across Hierarchical Job Levels*, IZA Discussion Paper No. 4858, Institute for the Study of Labor, Bonn, Germany.
- Hipple, S.F. (2010), "Self-employment in the United States", *Monthly Labor Review*, JSTOR, Vol. 133 No. 9, pp. 17-32.
- Hochschild, A.R. and Mauchang, A. (1990), *The Second Shift: Working Parents and the Revolution at Home*, Avon Books, New York.
- Hughes, K.D. (2003), "Pushed or pulled? Women's entry into self-employment and small business ownership", *Gender, Work and Organization*, Wiley Online Library, Vol. 10 No. 4, pp. 433-454.
- Hundley, G. (2001), "Why women earn less than men in self-employment", *Journal of Labor Research*, Springer, Vol. 22 No. 4, pp. 817-829.
- IPEA, I.de P.E.A. (2016), *Mercado de Trabalho: conjuntura e análise*, IPEA, Brasília.
- Jann, B. (2008), "A stata implementation of the Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition", *Stata Journal*, Vol. 8 No. 4, pp. 453-479.
- Joona, P.A. (2014), "Female self-employment and children: the case of Sweden", IZA Discussion Papers.
- Kaufman, B. and Hotchkiss, J.L. (2006), *The Economics of Labor Markets*, Pub, S.-W.C. (Ed.), 7th ed., South-Western College Pub.
- Lawter, L., Rua, T. and Andreassi, J. (2016), "The glass cage: the gender pay gap and self-employment in the United States", *New England Journal of Entrepreneurship*, Emerald Publishing Limited, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 24-39.
- Le, A.T. (1999), "Empirical studies of self-employment", *Journal of Economic Surveys*, Wiley Online Library, Vol. 13 No. 4, pp. 381-416.
- Lechmann, D.S.J. and Schnabel, C. (2012), "Why is there a gender earnings gap in self-employment? A decomposition analysis with German data", *IZA Journal of European Labor Studies*, Springer, Vol. 1 No. 1, p. 6.

- Lemieux, T. (2006), "The 'Mincer equation' thirty years after schooling, experience, and earnings", *Jacob Mincer a Pioneer of Modern Labor Economics*, Springer, pp. 127-145.
- Levesque, M. and Minniti, M. (2006), "The effect of aging on entrepreneurial behavior", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Elsevier, Vol. 21 No. 2, pp. 177-194.
- Lombard, K.V. (2001), "Female self-employment and demand for flexible, nonstandard work schedules", *Economic Inquiry*, Wiley Online Library, Vol. 39 No. 2, pp. 214-237.
- Madalozzo, R. and Segantini, P. (2017), "American way of life e jeitinho brasileiro: como afetam a oferta de trabalho das mulheres?", *Pesquisa e Planejamento Economico*, Vol. 47 No. 3, pp. 71-100.
- Madalozzo, R., Martins, S.R. and Shiratori, L. (2010), "Participação no mercado de trabalho e no trabalho doméstico: homens e mulheres têm condições iguais?", *Estudos Feministas*, JSTOR, pp. 547-566.
- Maloney, W.F. (1999), "Does informality imply segmentation in urban labor markets? Evidence from sectoral transitions in Mexico", *The World Bank Economic Review*, Oxford University Press, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp. 275-302.
- Mbratana, T. and Kenne, A.F. (2018), "Investigating gender wage gap in employment: a microeconomic type-analysis for Cameroon", *International Journal of Social Economics*, Emerald Publishing Limited, Vol. 45 No. 5, pp. 848-866.
- Mincer, J. (1974), *Schooling, Experience, and Earnings. Human Behavior & Social Institutions*, Columbia University Press, New York.
- Minola, T., Criaco, G. and Cassia, L. (2014), "Are youth really different? New beliefs for old practices in entrepreneurship", *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management*, Vol. 18 Nos 2/3, pp. 233-259.
- Moore, C.S. and Mueller, R.E. (2002), "The transition from paid to self-employment in Canada: the importance of push factors", *Applied Economics*, Taylor & Francis, Vol. 34 No. 6, pp. 791-801.
- Moore, R.L. (1983), "Employer discrimination: evidence from self-employed workers", *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, JSTOR, Vol. 65 No. 3, pp. 496-501.
- Narita, R. (2020), "Self-Employment in developing countries: a search-equilibrium approach", *Review of Economic Dynamics*, Elsevier, Vol. 35, pp. 1-34.
- Noseleit, F. (2014), "Female self-employment and children", *Small Business Economics*, Springer, Vol. 43 No. 3, pp. 549-569.
- Oaxaca, R.L. and Ransom, M.R. (1994), "On discrimination and the decomposition of wage differentials", *Journal of Econometrics*, Elsevier, Vol. 61 No. 1, pp. 5-21.
- Oaxaca, R. (1973), "Male-female wage differentials in urban labor markets", *International Economic Review*, JSTOR, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 693-709.
- OECD and O.F.E.C.-O.A.D (2017), "Entrepreneurship at a glance 2017, Paris", doi: [10.1787/entrepreneur_aag-2017-en](https://doi.org/10.1787/entrepreneur_aag-2017-en).
- Parker, K. and Wang, W. (2013), *Modern Parenthood: Roles of Moms and Dads Converge as They Balance Work and Family*, Pew Research Center. Social and Demographic Trends, Washington, DC.
- Parker, S.C. (2004), *The Economics of Self-Employment and Entrepreneurship*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Patrinos, H.A. (2016), *Estimating the Return to Schooling Using the Mincer Equation*, IZA World of Labor, July, Vol. 278, pp. 1-11.
- Phelps, E.S. (1972), "The statistical theory of racism and sexism", *The American Economic Review*, JSTOR, Vol. 62 No. 4, pp. 659-661.
- Rees, H. and Shah, A. (1986), "An empirical analysis of self-employment in the UK", *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, Wiley Online Library, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 95-108.

- Soberon-Ferrer, H. and Dardis, R. (1991), "Determinants of household expenditures for services", *Journal of Consumer Research*, The University of Chicago Press, Vol. 17 No. 4, pp. 385-397.
- Storey, D.J. (1994), *Understanding the Small Business Sector*, Routledge, London.
- Van der Zwan, P., Verheul, I. and Thurik, A.R. (2012), "The entrepreneurial ladder, gender, and regional development", *Small Business Economics*, Springer, Vol. 39 No. 3, pp. 627-643.
- Verheul, I., Wennekers, S., Audretsch, D. and Thurik, R. (2002), "An electric theory of entrepreneurship: policies, institutions and culture", *Entrepreneur: Determinants and Policy in a European-US Comparison*, Springer, Boston, MA, Vol. 27 No. 2, pp. 11-81.
- Wellington, A.J. (2006), "Self-employment: the new solution for balancing family and career?", *Labour Economics*, Elsevier, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 357-386.
- West, C. and Zimmerman, D.H. (1987), "Doing gender", *Gender and Society*, Sage Publications, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 125-151.
- Williams, D.R. (2012), "Gender discrimination and self-employment dynamics in Europe", *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, Elsevier, Vol. 41 No. 2, pp. 153-158.
- Zouain, D.M. and Barone, F.M. (2009), *Small Business Através Do pan-óptico*, RAP-Revista de Administração Pública, Rio de Janeiro.

Corresponding author

Marco Túlio Aniceto França can be contacted at: marco.franca@pucrs.br

Table A1.
Explained differential

Variable	Mean	Q.10	Q.30	Q.50	Q.70	Q.90
Ystudy	0.0423*** (0.003)	0.0655*** (0.005)	0.0434*** (0.003)	0.0411*** (0.003)	0.0362*** (0.003)	0.037*** (0.004)
Yexp	-0.0166** (0.008)	-0.0467*** (0.016)	-0.0349*** (0.009)	-0.0138 (0.008)	-0.0104 (0.009)	-0.0169 (0.016)
Yexp2	0.0255*** (0.007)	0.0633*** (0.015)	0.0433*** (0.008)	0.0202 (0.007)	0.0152** (0.008)	0.0324** (0.014)
SpecificExp	-0.014*** (0.002)	-0.0198*** (0.004)	-0.0188*** (0.002)	-0.0191 (0.002)	-0.0148*** (0.002)	-0.0107* (0.004)
Age cohort 1	-0.0044** (0.002)	0.1769* (0.093)	0.0486 (0.045)	0.0481 (0.053)	0.2145*** (0.082)	0.2644 (0.171)
Age cohort 2	-0.0004 (0.001)	0.0433 (0.074)	0.0121 (0.026)	0.0127 (0.029)	0.051 (0.083)	0.0642 (0.118)
Age cohort 3	-0.0001 (0.000)	0.0208 (0.073)	0.0058 (0.025)	0.006 (0.027)	0.0249 (0.083)	0.0308 (0.115)
Caucasian	0.0022*** (0.001)	0.0031*** (0.001)	0.0023 (0.001)	0.0019*** (0.0007)	0.0024*** (0.0008)	0.0023** (0.001)
Urban	0.0004 (0.001)	0.0011 (0.001)	0.0005 (0.001)	0.0003 (0.000)	0.0000 (0.000)	0.0001 (0.0003)
Metropolitan	0.0006 (0.001)	0.0004 (0.001)	0.0004 (0.001)	0.0003 (0.000)	0.0004 (0.001)	0.0011 (0.002)
Unionized	-0.0000 (0.000)	0.0017* (0.001)	0.0004 (0.000)	0.0002 (0.000)	-0.0006* (0.000)	-0.0023 (0.001)
XtrialIncome	0.0034*** (0.001)	-0.0006 (0.001)	0.0012 (0.001)	0.0027** (0.001)	0.0043*** (0.001)	0.0098*** (0.003)
Married	0.0001 (0.001)	0.0000 (0.000)	0.0001 (0.001)	0.0001 (0.001)	0.000 (0.000)	0.0001 (0.001)
Household	-0.0648*** (0.007)	-0.0902*** (0.014)	-0.0623*** (0.008)	-0.0458*** (0.008)	-0.0043*** (0.001)	-0.054*** (0.016)
TotalKids	-0.0044*** (0.001)	-0.0063*** (0.002)	-0.0062 (0.001)	-0.0041*** (0.001)	0.0000 (0.000)	-0.0029 (0.002)
Kid_6	0.0000 (0.000)	-0.000 (0.000)	-0.000 (0.000)	0.0000 (0.000)	0.0000 (0.000)	0.0000 (0.000)
CNPJ	-0.0007 (0.002)	-0.000 (0.000)	-0.0005 (0.001)	-0.0007 (0.002)	-0.0008 (0.002)	-0.0009 (0.002)
No. employees	0.0000 (0.000)	-0.000 (0.000)	0.0000 (0.000)	0.0000 (0.000)	0.0000 (0.000)	0.0000 (0.000)
D_CBO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
D_CNAE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
D_UF	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
D_GAE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

Source(s): Compiled by the author, based on the 2015 PNAD
*** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$ and * $p < 0.1$

Variable	Mean	Q.10	Q.30	Q.50	Q.70	Q.90
Ystudy	0.092*** (0.035)	0.0697* (0.036)	0.0241 (0.02)	0.0133 (0.02)	0.04** (0.02)	-0.0288 (0.034)
Yexp	-0.0776 (0.159)	0.0333 (0.154)	-0.0884 (0.085)	-0.0614 (0.081)	0.0316 (0.083)	-0.003 (0.151)
Yexp2	-0.0173 (0.086)	-0.0426 (0.082)	-0.0115 (0.046)	0.0124 (0.043)	-0.0301 (0.043)	-0.0012 (0.075)
SpecificExp	0.0039 (0.014)	0.0209* (0.012)	0.0004 (0.007)	-0.0102 (0.007)	-0.0096 (0.007)	-0.0045 (0.013)
Age cohort 1	-0.0212 (0.016)	-0.0306*** (0.012)	-0.0214*** (0.007)	-0.0161** (0.006)	-0.0156** (0.007)	-0.044*** (0.012)
Age cohort 2	-0.0188 (0.018)	-0.0273** (0.014)	-0.012 (0.009)	-0.0271*** (0.006)	-0.0336*** (0.009)	-0.0521*** (0.016)
Age cohort 3	-0.0126 (0.013)	-0.0378** (0.015)	-0.005 (0.009)	-0.0151* (0.009)	-0.0236*** (0.009)	-0.057*** (0.018)
Caucasian	0.002 (0.012)	0.0091 (0.011)	-0.0006 (0.007)	-0.0041 (0.007)	0.0034 (0.0078)	-0.0118 (0.014)
Urban	0.1501*** (0.046)	0.2034*** (0.056)	0.0703*** (0.027)	0.0606** (0.024)	0.0259 (0.023)	-0.014 (0.032)
Metropolitan	0.016 (0.01)	0.0138 (0.009)	0.0015 (0.006)	0.0025 (0.006)	0.0047 (0.007)	0.018 (0.013)
Unionized	-0.0072** (0.003)	-0.0108*** (0.004)	-0.0049** (0.002)	-0.002 (0.002)	-0.0018 (0.002)	-0.0046 (0.004)
XtraIncome	0.0004 (0.003)	-0.0021 (0.056)	-0.0025** (0.001)	-0.0007 (0.001)	0.0013 (0.002)	0.0005 (0.004)
Married	-0.0108 (0.019)	-0.0075 (0.016)	-0.0069 (0.01)	-0.0107 (0.01)	0.0083 (0.01)	0.0019 (0.018)
Household	0.0239 (0.018)	-0.0149 (0.016)	-0.0073 (0.009)	0.0133 (0.01)	0.0162 (0.01)	0.025 (0.02)
TotalKids	0.0036 (0.015)	-0.0015 (0.013)	-0.0078 (0.007)	0.0101 (0.007)	0.0069 (0.007)	0.009 (0.013)
Kid_6	0.0078 (0.007)	-0.0016 (0.005)	0.0052 (0.003)	0.0011 (0.003)	-0.0002 (0.003)	0.0038 (0.006)
CNPJ	-0.0077 (0.007)	-0.0054 (0.006)	-0.0011 (0.005)	-0.0083 (0.005)	-0.0115* (0.006)	-0.0198 (0.012)
No. employees	-0.0023 (0.007)	-0.0014 (0.002)	-0.0022 (0.001)	-0.0026 (0.002)	-0.0035* (0.002)	0.0018 (0.004)
D_GBO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
D_CNAE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
D_UF	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
D_GAE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

Source(s): Compiled by the author, based on the 2015 PNAD

*** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$ and * $p < 0.1$

Table A2.
Unexplained
differential