Discussion Papers
Statistics Norway
Research department

No. 757
October 2013

Statistics Norway

Statistisk sentralbyrå

Ragni Hege Kitterød and Marit Rønsen

Does parenthood imply less specialization than before?

Tales from the Norwegian time use surveys 1980-2010



Discussion Papers No. 757, October 2013
Statistics Norway, Research Department

Ragni Hege Kitterød and Marit Rønsen

Does parenthood imply less specialization than before?

Tales from the Norwegian time use surveys 1980-2010

Abstract:
The presence of children still tends to reinforce a traditional division of labour in couples in many countries. This paper explores possible changes in the relationship between parenthood and the division of labour in Norway from 1980 to 2010 – a period with reduced gender differences in time spent on paid and unpaid work and the implementation of several work-family policy reforms. Parenthood intensified a traditional division of labour less in 2010 than in 1980, but there was no linear time trend. In 1980, parents with children in all age groups had a more traditional division of labour than those with no resident children. In 2010, this was the case only for parents with very young children (0-1 years), and even for this group, the difference compared to people without resident children was more modest than previously. As for household work, the presence of children in most age groups still strengthened a traditional division of labour in 2010, although less so than before.

Keywords: Gender equality, paid and unpaid work, time use, work-family balance.

JEL classification: D13, J18, J22

Acknowledgements: The paper has been presented at seminars in the Research department, Statistics Norway. We thank our colleagues for useful comments and discussions. The work is part of a project analyzing changes in women's and men's time use in Norway, funded by the Ministry of Children, Equality and Social Inclusion.

Address: Ragni Hege Kitterød, Statistics Norway, Research Department. E-mail: rhk@ssb.no

Marit Rønsen, Statistics Norway, Research Department. E-mail: mrr@ssb.no

Discussion Papers	comprise research papers intended for international journals or books. A preprint of a Discussion Paper may be longer and more elaborate than a standard journal article, as it may include intermediate calculations and background material etc.

Abstracts with downloadable Discussion Papers
in PDF are available on the Internet:
http://www.ssb.no
http://ideas.repec.org/s/ssb/dispap.html

For printed Discussion Papers contact:
Statistics Norway
Telephone: +47 62 88 55 00
E-mail: Salg-abonnement@ssb.no

ISSN 0809-733X
Print: Statistics Norway

Sammendrag

Par med barn i husholdningen har vanligvis en mer tradisjonell arbeidsdeling enn par uten hjemmeboende barn, ved at kvinner bruker mer tid på ulønnet familiearbeid og menn mer tid til yrkesarbeid. Utformingen av familiepolitikken antas å ha stor betydning for i hvilken grad barn forsterker en tradisjonell arbeidsdeling. Ordninger som gjør det lettere å kombinere jobb og familie, slik som lang betalt foreldrepermisjon og god tilgang til barnehager, samt ordninger som stimulerer menns deltakelse hjemme, for eksempel fedrekvoten, ansees som særlig viktige. I Sverige er det vist at små barn medførte en mindre spesialisert arbeidsdeling innen par i 2000 enn i 1990. Det var fremdeles klare forskjeller mellom kvinners og menns tid til yrkes- og familiearbeid i 2000, men forskjellene var ikke så mye større blant dem som hadde små barn, enn blant dem uten barn.

I dette arbeidet undersøker vi hvorvidt det å ha barn i husholdingen innebærer mindre spesialisering enn tidligere i Norge. Analysen er basert på tidsbruksundersøkelser fra 1980, 1990, 2000 og 2010. I denne perioden skjedde det store endringer i både menns og kvinners tidsbruk, og det ble innført en rekke familiepolitiske reformer. Noen av disse legger til rette for en likere arbeidsdeling i par, mens andre, særlig kontantstøtte for små barn, kan gi en mer tradisjonell tilpasning.

Som ventet, finner vi at det å ha barn i husholdningen innebærer mindre grad av spesialisering i 2010 enn i 1980, men endringsmønsteret varierer fra tiår til tiår og også med alderen på det yngste barnet. Videre ser vi ulike mønstre for yrkesarbeid og ulønnet familiearbeid, her kalt husholdsarbeid. I 1980 hadde foreldre med barn i alle aldersgrupper en klarere kjønnsmessig fordeling av yrkesarbeidet enn par uten hjemmeboende barn. I 2010 var det kun barn under to år som innebar en sterkere spesialisering av yrkesarbeidet, og også her var spesialiseringen mer moderat enn tidligere. Endringen var særlig markant fra 2000 til 2010, noe som blant annet bunner i at fedre reduserte tiden til yrkesarbeid i dette tiåret, mens mødre brukte mer tid til yrkesarbeid i 2010 enn i 2000. Når små barn fremdeles innebar en klarere kjønnsmessig fordeling av yrkesarbeidet i 2010, må dette blant annet sees i lys av at mødre oftest tar mer foreldrepermisjon enn fedre.

Par med barn i husholdningen har fremdeles en klarere kjønnsmessig fordeling av husholdsarbeidet enn par uten barn hjemme, og mønsteret er særlig markant for dem med barn under to år. Små barn innebærer imidlertid mindre spesialisering enn før. Endringen skjedde i hovedsak på 1980-tallet og bunner blant annet i en økning i fedres husholdsarbeid og en reduksjon i mødres husholdsarbeid. Selv om fedre økte tiden til husholdsarbeid også på 2000-tallet, medførte små barn omtrent like sterk spesialisering i 2010 som i 2000. Dette har blant annet sammenheng med at mødre brukte minst like mye tid til husholdsarbeid i 2010 som i 2000. Husholdsarbeid består av ulike oppgaver, blant annet rutinemessig husarbeid og omsorgsarbeid for barn. I 2010 innebar små barn ikke lengre en sterkere spesialisering av husarbeidet sammenlignet med det å ikke ha barn. Når det gjelder omsorgsarbeidet, var det derimot en sterkere spesialisering i barnefasen også i 2010. Dette gjelder særlig når barna er under to år, og må blant annet sees i sammenheng med at mødre tar mest foreldrepermisjon.

1. Introduction

With the advance of the dual-earner family, many Western countries have witnessed a notable reduction in gender differences in paid and unpaid work in couples in recent decades. Still, women on average spend more time on domestic work and less time on paid employment than men (Anxo et al. 2011, Fisher et al. 2007, Gershuny 2000), and in most countries, parenthood still seems to reinforce a traditional division of labour. The presence of children in the household, and particularly small children, tends to imply more paid work for fathers, while mothers usually decrease their paid work and increase their domestic work, and sometimes also spend less time on leisure activities (Anxo et al. 2011, Stalker 2011, Craig et al. 2010, Craig and Bittman 2008, Sayer 2005, Blossfeld and Drobnic 2001, Sanchez and Thomson 1997). However, the gender difference in time allocated to employment and unpaid family work has been shown to vary significantly across countries depending on societal and institutional factors (Hook and Wolfe 2012, Hook 2006, Geist 2005, Fuwa 2004), and the same is true for the extent to which parenthood intensifies a traditional division of labour (Anxo et al. 2011). In particular, work-family policies that promote mothers' paid work and fathers' family involvement are seen as important in order to lessen the impact of children on gender differences in time allocation (Cooke and Baxter 2010, Gornick and Mayers 2008). As for Sweden, a typical social-democratic society with high gender-equality ambitions and generous work-family reconciliation policies, Dribe and Stanfors' (2009) showed that although there were still notable gender differences in time use in 2000, parenthood did not augment a traditional division of labour to the same extent as in 1990. In 2000, fatherhood changed the time use for men more similarly to the way motherhood changed the time use for women, with less time in paid work and more time in unpaid family work.

In Norway, as in many other countries, politicians and researchers have been concerned with the crystallization of more traditional gender roles in couples when children arrive, since reduced employment for mothers may have significant negative consequences such as poorer career prospects, lower lifetime earnings and smaller pension disbursements. Besides, both fathers and children are believed to benefit from more involved fathering practices (NOU 2012:15, St. Meld 44 (2012-2013), St. Meld 6 (2010-2011), Halrynjo and Lyng 2009, NOU 2008:6). Inspired by Dribe and Stanfors (2009) the present paper employs time use surveys to explore whether, and to what extent, the association between parenthood and the time allocation of men and women has changed in Norway in recent decades. In lack of longitudinal data, we use cross-sectional studies, like Dribe and Stanfors did. We examine changes from 1980 to 2010, which is a longer time span than in Dribe and Stanfors's (2009) study. The trends may differ between decades and also depending on the age of the youngest child. Since some work-family policy measures such as extended parental leave rights and the father's

quota in the parental leave scheme have been directed particularly at parents with small children, we believe it is important to single out parents with children in the age group 0-1 years in the analysis. This may give a more nuanced picture of changes in the association between parenthood and couples' time allocation than one gets with a broader category for the age of the youngest child, which is often used in analyses in the field. For instance, Dribe and Stanfors (2009) single out parents with a youngest child 0-4 years of age, and Anxo et al. (2011) and Esping-Andersen et al. (2013) single out parents with a youngest child 0-5 years of age. We focus primarily on paid labour and unpaid family work, but also provide some results for leisure and personal activities such as sleep, meals etc.

Although Norway and Sweden are both regarded as social-democratic welfare states with a strong commitment to egalitarian ideals, universal social services and the goal of full employment (Esping-Andersen 1990), Norwegian work-family policies have been characterised as more ambivalent than those in Sweden (Ellingsæter 2003). Alongside policies that promote gender equality in the division of labour, such as subsidised childcare, generous parental leave schemes and individual taxation, there are also policies that may facilitate a more traditional division of labour in couples, such as a cash for childcare benefit (ibid) and the possibility to claim larger deductable allowances in the taxes for couples where one partner has no income or a very low income (Thoresen, 1996). Moreover, the expansion of the parental leave scheme and the childcare sector has been slower in Norway than in Sweden. The changes in parents' distribution of paid and unpaid labour may therefore be more complex and less linear than in a country like Sweden that opted for more unambiguous dual-earner policy measures already in the early 1970s (Dribe and Stanfors 2009). At present, however, Norway offers generous public childcare facilities and parental leave opportunities and was also the first country in the world to introduce a father's quota in the parental leave scheme in the early 1990s.

Diary based time use surveys, where people report their activities in the course of one of more days, offer a unique opportunity to study the allocation of paid and unpaid work as well as time spent on leisure activities in different population groups (Robinson and Godbey 1997). In Norway, representative time use studies have been conducted every tenth year since the early 1970s. In the present paper, the studies from 1980, 1990, 2000 and 2010[1] are used to explore possible changes in the relationship between parenthood and the gendered division of labour in couples in the course of a thirty year period with huge changes in both women's and men's time use patterns and in parents' organization of daily life, and with the introduction of several work-family-policy measures that may

[1] Since the 1970-survey has less detailed information on the age of the youngest child residing in the household, we do not use it in the present paper.

affect parents' time allocation. Like in many other countries, women in Norway spend more time in the labour market than previously and less time on domestic work, particularly routine housework, while men's time use has moved in the opposite direction (Vaage 2012). Similar changes have been observed for parents, but, as will be discussed in more detail later, the patterns vary across decades, depending on the age of the youngest child and between mothers and fathers (Kitterød 2013).

2. Theoretical perspectives

Theories that try to explain couples' division of labour usually predict a traditional distribution of employment and family work. Since the arrival of children involves a need for more childcare as well as income, it is likely to strengthen such an arrangement. This may particularly be the case in countries with few policy measures to facilitate the combination of paid work and family involvement for both women and men. According to (Becker 1991), partners specialize in the domains in which they have a comparative advantage to maximize the household's joint utility. By comparing their marginal utility in paid and unpaid production, the partners decide how to allocate market work and unpaid family work between them. It is assumed that a person's labour market participation and work hours are positively affected by his or her own labour market resources and negatively affected by those of the partner. The partner with lower labour market resources relative to domestic resources is likely to perform most domestic work. The partners' labour market resources are usually measured by their relative wage rates. Since men often have higher wages than women, while women acquire grater skills in housework and childcare, men often spend more time in the labour market and women more time in the home.

In sociology literature, couples' distribution of unpaid work, particularly routine housework, has often been explained by the so-called relative resource perspective (for instance Coltrane 2000). It assumes more disagreement between the partners than the theory on comparative advantages. However, the two perspectives tend to produce similar predictions regarding couples' housework allocations, although the mechanisms assumed to generate the outcomes are different. According to the relative-resource perspective, housework is boring and something that both partners seek to avoid. The partner that brings most resources to the negotiations is likely to do less housework. The partners' resources are usually measured by income or education, but in principle, all types of resources may be relevant. Since most parents perceive childcare as more enjoyable than routine housework, the relative resource perspective is less applicable when it comes to the distribution of childcare in couples (Bianchi et al. 2012).

The so-called doing gender perspective has also been central in studies of couples' allocations of work (West and Zimmermann 1987). It assumes that both women and men continuously construct and reconstruct their gender identity. For men, this involves performing typical masculine tasks and avoiding activities with female connotations, such as routine housework. Household chores may, on the other hand, strengthen women's gender identity. The theory has received some support in studies of couples' division of family work (Bittman et al. 2003), and may also have some relevance when it comes to understanding the allocation of paid work. If paid work is still more important in men's than in women's identity construction, and men are expected to be the main breadwinners in families, they may prefer to work longer hours than their partners. While the doing gender perspective applies to the distribution of work among all couples, Walzer (1997) argues that new parents also "do parenthood" in that mothers adhere to the cultural ideals of good mothering and fathers to the ideals of good fathering. Mothers and fathers still often face different normative expectations when it comes to childcare and breadwinning responsibilities (Wall and Arnold 2007).

Although the above theories tend to predict a traditional division of labour in couples, comparative studies show that the national context affects couples' time allocations by influencing the benefits of specialization, the terms of bargaining and the possibility to adhere to, or diverge from, gender ideologies and norms (Esping-Andersen et al. 2013, Anxo et al. 2011, Cooke and Baxter 2010, Hook 2006, Geist 2005, Fuwa 2004). The type of employment regime, the design of work-family policies and the tax system as well as prevalent social norms concerning the appropriate roles for men and women may affect gender differences across countries. For instance, generous work-family reconciliation policies such as long parental leaves with wage compensation and ample provision of subsidised childcare facilitate mothers' full-time employment and boost their career and income prospects. In addition, a long paid parental leave period for parents reduces the need for fathers to generate more income when children arrive. Policy measures that stimulate an enhanced father's role may further promote more active fathering practices and less gendered expectations directed at parents. It has also been pointed out that women's higher educational level in recent decades decreases the benefits of specialization in couples (Dribe and Stanfors 2009), and that the doing gender perspective may be less relevant in countries with a high level of gender equality, than in countries with more traditional gender practices and norms (Cooke and Baxter 2010, Deutsch 2007, Cooke 2006).

Recent family-policy initiatives in Norway have strengthened measures that promote a so-called dual-earner/dual-carer model of parenting (Gornick and Mayers 2008), which could lead to more symmetrical gender roles for parents. However, as will be discussed below, some measures may also

stimulate more traditional gender practices, at least when the children are small. Hence, it is not obvious what patterns we may expect when it comes to the association between parenthood and specialization in Norway in recent decades.

3. Work-family policies and practices in Norway

Gender equality in paid and unpaid work has long been an important goal of Norwegian work-family policies. In the 1970s and 1980s, the combination of employment and children was usually framed as a challenge for mothers, but now fathers too are expected to combine paid work, and childcare and more involved fathering practices are encouraged. However, since the work-family policy measures that have been introduced in recent decades are meant to serve a mixture of purposes, they do not necessarily lead to more symmetrical gender roles for parents. In addition to stimulating a more equal sharing of paid and unpaid work between mothers and fathers, important aims have been to ensure parents' flexibility and freedom of choice regarding time spent in employment and childcare, enabling parents to spend considerable time with their children and conferring increased recognition to unpaid family work.

Historically, there has been a large excess demand for formal day-care in Norway, particularly for the youngest children, and in this regard Norway lagged behind the other Nordic countries (Leira 2002). However, the coverage has greatly improved, particularly in the last decade. In 1980 only 7 percent of children 1-2 years attended a day-care centre, while in 1990 and 2000 the corresponding proportions were 15 and 37 percent. Following a political agreement in 2003 that resulted in an ambitious plan for the escalation of publicly subsidised childcare, Norway witnessed a tremendous growth in children's day-care attendance. The parental payment for a place in the day-care has also been substantially reduced. From 2009, all children who became one year old by the end of August in the year of application were guaranteed a place in publicly subsidised day care. In 2010 as much as 79 percent of children 1-2 years and 97 percent of children 3-5 years attended a day-care centre, mostly on a full-time basis. It is now widely recognized in Norway that publicly subsidised day-care centres are good pedagogical institutions that provide ample opportunities for development, activity and socialisation, give vital preparation for formal schooling and contribute to reducing social inequality (St.meld. No 41:2008-2009, NOU 2009:10, Drange and Telle 2010). Parents have also become more positive to very young children being cared for in day-care centres (Kitterød et al. 2012, Ellingsæter and Gulbrandsen 2007) and children sometimes attend day-care even though one of their parents (usually the mother) is not in paid employment (Kitterød et al. 2012, table 1b).

In Norway, both mothers and fathers have had the right to job-protected paid leave in connection with childbirth since 1977, but the leave period was very short at that time and was rarely used by fathers. It was considerably extended in the late 1980s and early 1990s, from 18 weeks to 42 weeks with full pay or 52 weeks with 80 percent wage compensation in 1993. In connection with the extension in 1993, four weeks were reserved for the father (the father's quota), nine weeks were reserved for the mother while the parents could choose how to share the remaining 39 weeks. All further extensions have been reserved for the father, resulting in a father's quota of five weeks in 2005, six weeks in 2006, 10 weeks in 2009, 12 weeks in 2011 and 14 weeks in 2013. At present, the total leave period amounts to 49 weeks with full pay or 59 weeks with 80% pay. Like most of the parental leave, the father's quota is flexible in that it may be divided into shorter blocs or even single days that can be spread out until the child is three years old. An important aim of the father's quota is to enhance men's involvement in unpaid family work both during his reserved period and beyond. Moreover, the quota is supposed to facilitate mothers' return to paid work following childbirth (NOU 2008:6). In addition to the paid parental leave, each parent is entitled to one year of unpaid leave. The father's quota has been a success in the sense that the large majority of eligible fathers use the whole quota or at least a part of it, and each extension of the quota has resulted in fathers taking a longer leave (Bringedal and Lappegård 2012, Fougner 2012, Brandth and Kvande 2013). There are also studies that point to a positive long-term effect on fathers' family involvement in that men who became fathers after the implementation of the father's quota in 1993 had lower income in subsequent years than those who became fathers before the reform (Rege and Solli 2010).

In the late 1990s, a cash-for-childcare benefit was introduced.[2] The stated purpose was to enable parents to spend more time with their children, give parents more flexibility in their work and childcare choices, and distribute public transfers more equally between users and non-users of subsidised childcare, which at the time was in short supply (Ministry of Children and Family Affairs, 1998). It has also been argued that the benefit would upgrade the status of women's traditional unpaid work (Ellingsæter 2003). All parents of 1-2 years old children who did not use state-sponsored childcare were entitled to the benefit, and children in part-time care received a reduced benefit proportional to stipulated weekly attendance. Prior to the implementation of the reform, voices in the public debate argued that parents should spend more time with their children and that full-time work for both parents might be stressful for the family (Ellingsæter 2005). However, parents were not required to look after children themselves in order to receive the benefit. The great majority of parents of eligible children did indeed use the benefit, but the high take-up rate was associated with the low

[2] The benefit was introduced for one year old children in 1998 and for two years old children in January 1999.

coverage of public childcare in the late 1990s. Many parents actually spent the benefit on private nannies (Pettersen 2003). Still, most researchers agree that the introduction of the cash-for-childcare benefit had a negative effect on mothers' labour supply (Rønsen 2009, Naz 2004, Schøne 2004, Håkonsen et al. 2001). In 1999, the parents of 73 percent of 1-2 years old children received the benefit, but later, the percentage has diminished in tandem with the growth in publicly approved childcare places. In 2012, the parents of 22 percent of 1-2 years old children received the benefit (Egge-Hoveid 2012). In 2006, the maximum age for eligible children was reduced from 36 to 35 months, and in August 2012 it was further reduced to 24 months. However, the size of the benefit was substantially increased for children 13-18 months.

In Norway, women's employment rate has risen significantly in recent decades and is now almost as high as men's. In the age group 25-54 years, 82 percent of women and 87 percent of men are employed (Statistics Norway 2013). However, as much as one third of the women work part time, and few, only about one out of ten, work longs hours, i. e. at least 40 hours per week. For men, the corresponding figures are 7 and 24 percent (Statistics Norway 2012). In dual-earner couples, it is now quite common that both partners spend approximately the same amount of time in the labour market, but still, few women work more than their partner and about half work less (Kitterød and Rønsen 2012a). As for married/cohabiting mothers with a youngest child below 16 years of age, 62 percent was in the labour force in 1980 compared to 87 percent in 2010. For mothers with a youngest child 0-2 years old, the corresponding figures were 46 and 83 percent respectively (Kitterød and Rønsen 2012b), but a significant proportion of employed mothers with young children is on parental leave and does not actually perform any paid work (ibid). Although most fathers now make use of the father's quota in the parental leave scheme, and some take even longer leaves, mothers still take a longer leave than fathers in most couples (Bringedal and Lappegård 2012). Recent analyses suggest that mothers enter paid work faster after birth at present than at the turn of the century. However, after the introduction of the cash-for-childcare benefit in 1998/99 the trend in mothers' work entry following birth was actually negative and quite stable until a turn-around in the mid 2000s (Rønsen and Kitterød 2012). Attitudes towards working mothers have become more positive recently (Ellingsæter and Gulbrandsen 2007) and there is now less focus on time pressure in dual-earner families than in the late 1990s. Life-long full-time careers for both women and men are now encouraged by the authorities (NOU 2004:1).

Like the other Scandinavian countries, Norway has a strongly gender-segregated labour market with high percentages of women in the public sector and in education, health and social work, and men more concentrated in the private sector and in manufacturing and finance (Jensberg et al. 2012). Public

sector jobs are usually portrayed as more family-friendly than private-sector jobs, with more flexibility and less expectations of very long work hours (Halrynjo and Lyng 2009). The Norwegian Working Environment Act guarantees parents' rights to reduced hours, unless this puts the interest of the employer at risk. Although many mothers work part time in Norway, this is usually long part time, i. e. at least 20 hour per week (Kitterød and Rønsen 2012b). As for fathers, very long work hours are less common than previously, but still, few fathers work part time (Kitterød and Kjeldstad 2006). As more fathers than mothers work in the private sector, they are often better paid. Thus, the couple may lose less if the mother rather than the father works reduced hours.

Previous analyses of the Norwegian Time Use Surveys show that fathers' and mothers' time-use patterns have become more similar in recent decades although there are still significant gender differences. Fathers have reduced their time on paid work and enhanced their family work, while the opposite changes have taken place in mothers' time-use patterns (Kitterød 2013). For mothers, the re-adjustments were particularly large in the 1970s with a significant reduction in routine housework and a considerable increase in paid work hours. The decline in housework has levelled off in the last decade, however. Mothers' paid work hours continued to increase though. After some levelling off in the 1990s, fathers' paid hours decreased again from 2000 to 2010, while their unpaid hours expanded significantly. In previous decades, smaller gender differences in household work has been more due to changes in mothers' than in fathers' time use, but since the turn of the millennium the diminishing gender gap is solely due to the increase in fathers' household work. The increase was most notable for fathers with children below school age (ibid).

Comparisons of the time use patterns of parents with older and younger children show a weaker association between the age of the youngest child and mothers' paid and unpaid work than previously, but the pattern varies depending on the child's age (Kitterød 2013). Mothers with the youngest children (0-1 years) still spend significantly less time on paid work and more time on household work than those with the oldest children (13-19 years of age), but mothers with older pre-schoolers spend almost the same amount of time in employment as those with older children. In 1980, fathers with small children devoted approximately the same hours to paid work as did fathers with older children, while in 2010, fathers with small children (0-1 years of age) spent less time on paid work than those with the oldest children. Fathers with small children spend more time on household work than those with older children, and the association between age of youngest child and fathers' household work was stronger in 2010 than in previous surveys (ibid).

Whether the relationship between parenthood and couples' division of labour has changed or not, depends on the time use patterns of people without resident children as well as people with resident children. In this paper we explore whether parenthood strengthens a traditional division of labour in couples less at present than in previous decades, by comparing the distribution of labour among married or cohabiting fathers and mothers with children in different age groups with that of married or cohabiting men and women with no resident children. We look at the period 1980 to 2010, which is a longer time span than has been included in previous analyses in the field. Moreover, we use a more detailed categorisation of the age of the youngest child. Hence, we may capture different changes across decades and for parents with children in different age groups.

4. Data, measurement issues and analysis strategy

Data source

The empirical analysis is based on the Norwegian time use surveys 1980, 1990, 2000 and 2010. Time diaries are usually regarded as a superior source of data on people's time allocation because all types of activities are recorded, including paid and unpaid work, and because the diary format forces respondents to adhere to a 24 hours time constraint (Robinson and Godbey 1997). The Norwegian surveys have captured people's time use by asking a representative sample of individuals to keep a diary for two consecutive days. The total samples have been spread evenly throughout the year so that all days are equally represented. The diaries had fixed time intervals (10 or 15 minutes depending on the survey), and for each time-slot participants were asked to write down their most important activity and possible simultaneous (secondary) activities. Activities where subsequently coded according to a detailed coding list, which in the last survey had approximately 165 codes. For each time-slot, respondents were also asked to indicate whether they were alone or with other people. The four time use surveys differ somewhat when it comes to sample size, response rate, diary design and some other aspects, but the comparability across surveys is fairly good, at least as regards the broader activity categories. Information on some main aspects of the four surveys is provided in table 1.[3]

Prior to keeping the diary, an interview mapping demographic and socio-economic background information was carried out, either by telephone or by a personal visit. In the 2000- and 2010-surveys some background information was linked to the survey data from Statistics Norway's registers. Such

[3] The 1980-survey is documented in Statistics Norway (1983), the 1990-survey is documented in Statistics Norway (1992), the 2000-survey is documented in Rønning (2002), and the 2010-survey is documented in Holmøy et al. (2012).

interview or register information is used to construct our independent variables. The dependent variables in the analyses, namely parents' time spent on paid work, household work, personal activities and leisure, are taken from the time diary. Only information on main activities is used.

Table 1. Some details of the data collection in the Norwegian time use surveys 1980, 1990, 2000 and 2010

	1980	1990	2000	2010
Age groups included in the sample	16-74 years	16-79 years	9-79 years	9-79 years
Size of net sample, days	6,600	6,174	6,801	7,932
Period of data collection	01.10.1980-30.09.1981	01.02.1990-30.01.1991	20.02.2000-10.02.2001	15.02.2010-14.02.2011
Response rate for diary	65%	64%	50%	48%
Weight to adjust for non-response	No	No	Yes	Yes
Time slots in the diary	15 minutes (30 minutes at night)	15 minutes (30 minutes at night)	10 minutes	10 minutes
Mode of interviewing	Two personal visits (One before and one after the diary days)	Two personal visits (One before and one after the diary days)	One interview, visit or telephone	One interview, mainly telephone
What was registered in the time diary				
Main activity	X	X	X	X
Secondary activity	-	X (second day only)	X	X
Location, mode of travelling	X	X	X	X
Time spent with others	X	X	X	X
Time alone		X	X	X
Time spent in the neighbourhood	X	X	-	-
Responsibility for children/sick people	X	-	-	-

The unit of analysis is the single day. Since each participant kept a diary for two days, the number of days is twice the number of respondents. In each survey, a small number of respondents completed only one day. In the interview section, there is, of course, only one observation per respondent. We present people's time use as the average number of minutes per day spent on specific activities. The average covers all days of the year, including weekdays, weekends and holidays. We also present some results for weekdays and weekends separately.

Analysis sample

From each of the four time use surveys (from 1980, 1990, 2000 and 2010) we use a subsample of married/cohabiting women and men in couples where both partners are in the age group 20-59 years.[4] The upper age limit is chosen in order to exclude retirees. We considered using a lower age limit of 25 years in order to exclude students, but since people married and had children earlier in the 1970s and 1980s than in later decades (Rønsen 2005), we might exclude more young couples in the first than in later surveys. Since the survey samples comprise individuals rather than households, we have information from only one of the partners in a couple and not from both partners, which would, of

[4] Dribe and Stanfors (2009) also included single individuals in the analysis sample, but since most theories on specialization discuss the time allocation of couples, we exclude single respondents from the analysis. We have also considered excluding people without children from the analyses and use parents with the oldest children as reference group, but this does not allow us to address our research question of the way parenthood impacts the gender division of labour.

course, have been preferable.[5] Our analysis samples comprise 3,472 diary days from the 1980-survey, 3,191 diary days from the 1990-survey, 2,978 diary days from the 2000-survey and 3,319 diary days from the 2010-survey.

Dependent variables

Our dependent variables are taken from the time diary. We look at time spent on paid work, household work, personal activities and leisure activities. In addition, we look at two subcategories of household work, namely routine housework and direct childcare.

- *Paid work* comprises time spent on work in main and secondary occupations (including overtime and paid work done at home), meals at the workplace and travelling time to and from work. Since both holidays and weekends are included in the averages, and the analysis sample comprises employed as well as non-employed respondents, the average time spent on paid work is considerably lower than the time people usually spend on work on a normal working day.[6]
- *Household work* encompasses routine housework, family care (for children as well as adults who need help), purchase of goods and services (mainly shopping), maintenance work (mainly repairs, construction work and gardening), travels in connection with household work, and other household work such as the administration of daily routines etc. All these are unpaid duties related to the management and up-keep of a household.
- *Routine housework* is one subcategory of "household work" and comprises food preparation, baking, dish washing, laundry, house cleaning and mending cloths.
- *Direct childcare* is also as subcategory of "household work" and encompasses time-slots when caring for children in the household is the main activity. Activities such as nursing and dressing children, putting children to bed, escorting children to and from various activities, helping children with homework, reading for children, playing and talking with children etc. are included.[7]

---

[5] While most time use surveys have information from individuals, like for instance the Swedish one (Dribe and Stanfors 2009), some also provide information from all household members, which makes it possible to include "real" couples in the analyses. For instance, this was the case in the latest Danish time use survey (Bonke and Esping-Andersen 2012).

[6] Researchers sometimes exclude commuting time in analyses of specialization in couples. Some argue that it cannot be considered as paid work time in a proper sense (Anxo et al. 2011) and others hold that travel time tends to inflate working time for part timers disproportionally (Dribe and Stanfors 2009). However, we prefer to include travel time since it is the total amount of time that people spend on paid work and commuting that restricts the time they can allocate to other activities. Moreover, one partner's travel time may impact the other partner's time allocation. For instance, if one partner spends much time commuting, the other partner may have to take more responsibility for domestic duties.

[7] This is, of course, a very narrow measure of parents' childcare time. It does not capture childcare done as secondary activities (for instance if meal preparation is the main activity), activities done on behalf of children (for instance washing cloths), parents' on-the-call time or periods when children have been put to bed and the parents have to stay at home to supervise them (see Craig 2006 and 2007, and Folbre et al. 2005 for further discussions). Moreover, parents are usually responsible for their children during the night when they themselves are sleeping.

- *Personal activities* comprise sleep, personal hygiene, dressing and meals, including shorter breaks with for instance coffee and tea drinking.
- *Leisure activities* include time spent on sport and outdoor life activities, entertainment such as going to the cinema, theatre, concerts, sport events and restaurants, television viewing, socializing, reading, travel in connection with leisure activities and other leisure such as hobbies, listening to the radio etc.[8]

Some activities are also coded as *education* (school and homework) and *other and unknown activities*. Since very little time is spent on these activities in our sample, we do not include them in the analysis. Hence, the activity categories that we look at (paid work, household work, personal activities and leisure activities) add to a little less than 24 hours per day.[9]

Independent variables

Our independent variables (explanatory variables and controls) are taken from the interview section of the surveys and from added register information.

Our main explanatory variables are *gender* and *age of the youngest child in the* household. As for youngest child in the household we believe it is important to single out parents with very small children, since many work-family-policy measures have been directed particularly at this group. For instance, parental leave policies, including the father's quota, probably have most influence on the time allocation of parents with children 0-1 years of age, the cash-for-childcare benefit has most influence on parents with somewhat older children, while improved public childcare policies influence all parents with children below 6 years. We distinguish between those with a youngest child 0-1 years of age, 2-3 years of age, 4-6 years of age, 7-19 years of age and those with no resident children (reference category).[10] In order to capture possible gender differences in the association between

[8] Dribe and Stanfors (2009) distinguish between individual leisure activities on one hand and non-individual leisure activities (which they include in a residual category together with for instance meals, dressing and different forms of travel) on the other. They want to single out activities that are individually oriented and done for personal benefit rather than being part of family life more generally. Individual leisure includes hunting, fishing, playing sports, watching sport events, going to the cinema, theatre, music parties, dancing, restaurants visiting friends, reading books, newspapers and magazines, entertaining friends and doing hobbies. Non-individual leisure includes watching television, listening to the radio, going to church, voluntary work, excursions and walks. We believe it is problematic to decide which activities are done for personal benefit without asking the respondents about this. For instance, both walks and television viewing are important recreational activities, although they sometimes are done with children present. Hence, we lump all leisure activities into one category in the analyses.

[9] In 1980, 13 minutes per day were allocated to education + other activities in our analysis sample. I 1990, 2000 and 2010 the corresponding figures were 16 minutes, 19 minutes and 15 minutes respectively.

[10] Ideally, we would prefer to differentiate between those with a youngest child 0 years, 1 year, 2 years, 3 years and so on, but this would give very few observations in each category.

parenthood and time use, we include interaction terms between gender and age of youngest child (woman*youngest child 0-1 years, woman*youngest child 2-3 years, woman*youngest child 4-6 years and woman*youngest child 7-19 years). The interaction effects capture the degree of specialization of various tasks (for instance paid work and household work), and by comparing how these estimates develop across time we get an impression of changes in the association between parenthood and the division of labour during the three decades from 1980 to 2010.

In order to adjust for compositional changes in the analysis sample (for instance, for higher levels of education and employment in the more recent surveys) and for factors that may affect the relationship between parenthood and the extent of specialization, we include the following control variables:[11]

Day of week: We distinguish between weekdays (Monday-Friday) and weekends (Saturday-Sunday).

Respondent's age and *age squared* are used as continuous variables.

Respondent's education is based on register information for the 2000- and 2010-surveys and on the interview section for the 1980-and 1990-surveys. We differentiate between primary or secondary school (≤ 13 years), short university education (14-17 years) and long university education (≥ 18 years). In addition, we include a category for missing values.

Partner's employment is taken from the interview part of the surveys. In the 1980-, 1990-, and 2000-surveys respondents were asked whether the partner had income producing work at present (at the time of the survey). In the 2010-surevy they were asked whether the partner had spent at least one hour on income-producing work last week, and if not, whether he/she was absent from a job because of holidays, sickness or some other reason last week. Partners who either had performed income producing work, or were temporarily absent from such work, were categorized as employed.

We have considered including more control variables such as whether the respondents are students or not and whether they receive a disability pension or not.[12] However, we regard these variables as endogenous since they are strongly correlated with people's time use, particularly with time spent on

[11] We also show results from models with no controls, except for weekday.

[12] Dribe and Stanfors (2009) use several controls in their analysis, including respondent's main activity (employed, unemployed, retired, student and other), and household income (low, middle and high). We have experimented with models that include variables on whether the respondent is a student or not and whether he/she receives a disability pension or not. Although these variables had significant effects on the time spent on most activities, they did not significantly alter our main estimators, namely the interaction terms between gender and age of youngest child.

paid work. We trust that the variables age and age squared adjust for compositional changes in the analysis sample as well as for differences in employment status across respondents with and without resident children. As for the partner, we would have preferred to control for his/her age and/or educational level. However the partner's age is strongly correlated with respondents' age, and the variable on partner's education has a high number of missing observations in some surveys. We therefore include a variable on partner's employment (whether he/she is employed or not), in order to adjust for compositional changes over time and across groups of women and men with and without resident children. However, the partner's employment status turns out to have only modest impact on both women's and men's time use patterns in most models and also rarely impacts the estimators of principal interest, namely the interaction terms between gender and age of youngest child.

Analysis strategy

After presenting some descriptive statistics for the sample, we describe changes in time use patterns from 1980-2010 for men and women with children in different age groups as well as for those with no resident children. We then present the analyses that explore possible changes in the association between parenthood and the division of labour from 1980 to 2010. The main focus is on paid work and household work although personal activities and leisure activities are also briefly commented upon. Finally we present some results for weekdays and weekends separately. Since each respondent kept a diary for two consecutive days, we controlled for this dependence by using an estimation procedure that yields robust standard errors.[13]

5. Results

Descriptive statistics

Some descriptive statistics on the dependent and independent variables in the analysis are provided in table 2. Both for men and women the proportion of respondents with no resident children was somewhat lower in the 1980-survey that in the subsequent surveys. On average, respondents were older in the two latest than in the two first surveys, and the proportion with a university education rose substantially in the period, particularly for women.

[13] Because time use data often contain a high number of zero observations, researchers often use Tobit regression modelling (for instance, Dribe and Stanfors 2009, Anxo et al. 2011). However, many experts on time use research recommend OLS rather than Tobit, because the zero observation data based on time diaries are usually not a result of censoring or truncation, but rather stems from the fact that the respondent did not conduct a certain activity on the diary day. For instance, even though most men perform some housework in the course of a week, they may not have done housework on the assigned diary days. According to Steward (2009) and Brown and Dunn (2011), OLS is more appropriate than Tobit in analyses of time use data since Tobit models may produce biased results.

While men, on average, spent somewhat less time on paid work in 2010 than in 1980, women increased their paid work substantially, from 153 minutes per day in 1980 to 229 minutes per day in 2010. Men's household work rose from 162 minutes per day in 1980 to 203 minutes per day in 2010, and the growth was particularly strong in the last decade. Men now spend more time on both routine housework and childcare than previously. Women's time devoted to household work decreased considerably from 332 minutes per day in 1980 to 261 minutes per day in 2010, and it is above all routine housework time that has been reduced. In spite of some variation across surveys, both men and women spent approximately as much time on personal activities in 2010 as in 1980, and the same is true for leisure activities.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics for men and women in the analysis sample. Percentage and average

	Men				Women			
	1980	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**
Age of youngest child								
0-1 years	10	12	10	11	9	10	12	9
2-3 years	13	11	11	11	12	13	9	10
4-6 years	14	11	11	10	13	12	12	12
7-19 years	41	35	30	34	41	36	32	36
No resident children	23	31	37	34	24	30	35	34
Respondent's age, average	40.5	40.4	42.12	42.5	38.6	37.0	39.6	41.0
Respondent's age square, average	1742.1	1729.1	1869.7	1888.8	1589.0	1461.9	1659.5	1772.3
Respondent's education								
Secondary school or less	75	70	56	60	83	74	66	54
University, short	17	21	29	28	15	22	29	34
University, long	6	7	10	8	1	3	4	6
Unknown	1	2	1	4	1	1	1	6
Partner employed	65	77	84	87	96	91	93	93
Day of week								
Weekday (Monday-Friday)	72	71	68	72	74	72	72	73
Weekend (Saturday-Sunday)	28	29	32	28	26	28	28	27
Time spent on various activities. Average per day in minutes								
Paid work	341.0	340.8	330.4	314.1	152.5	190.5	221.1	228.9
Household work	161.7	168.2	177.2	203.0	332.4	301.4	259.5	261.1
Routine housework	44.4	44.5	50.2	60.8	200.5	153.1	123.9	114.6
Direct childcare	26.9	31.5	27.0	35.3	62.4	71.2	54.7	56.4
Personal activities	590.0	578.0	572.5	583.7	609.3	604.1	595.9	606.1
Leisure activities	335.2	337.7	345.7	324.2	331.9	326.2	345.8	330.0
N	1,642	1,488	1,514	1,670	1,830	1,703	1,464	1,649

Possible changes in the association between parenthood and the division of labour is a result of changes in both fathers' and mothers' time use, as well as in the time-use patterns of those with no resident children. Tables 3 and 4 provide an overview of changes in time spent on various activities for men and women with children in different age groups and also for men and women with no children in the household. The results are estimates from a series of separate regression analyses with the 1980-survey as reference and without any controls. When it comes to men's paid work time, the picture is

rather complex. The pattern varies across decades and depending on the age of the youngest child (table 3). For instance, for men with a youngest child aged 0-1 years, there was an upward (although not significant) trend in time spent on paid work from 1980 till 2000, but a steep downward trend from 2000 till 2010. Additional analyses (not shown) revealed that the latter trend is statistically significant. Compared with 1980, men with a youngest child 7-19 years of age spent less time on paid work at all subsequent time points, although the changes are not statistically significant. Most groups of men spent more time on household work in 2010 than in 1980. The growth was most remarkable for those with young children and resulted from an increase in routine housework as well as direct childcare. Also men with no resident children spent considerably more time on household work in 2010 than in 1980. Changes in time spent on personal activities and leisure activities vary across decades and depending on the age of the youngest child.

Table 3. Regression estimates (minutes per day) that show changes in men's time spent on various activities from 1980-2010. Average, all days.[1, 2]

	Youngest child 0-1 years	Youngest child 2-3 years	Youngest child 4-6 years	Youngest child 7-19 years	No resident children
Paid work					
Intercept (=baseline 1980)	295.7	350.4	319.5	366.1	323.3
1990	19.7	17.8	19.1	-30.9	24.6
2000	23.0	-20.0	44.9	-28.2	-5.9
2010	-56.8	-53.0	4.2	-18.6	-16.2
Household work					
Intercept (=baseline 1980)	182.4	184.8	190.0	156.2	131.8
1990	**45.8**	11.2	3.7	-0.3	9.3
2000	**53.0**	22.2	17.4	16.8	15.7
2010	**101.3**	**88.6**	**64.6**	15.1	**38.1**
Routine housework					
Intercept (=baseline 1980)	39.5	38.1	49.8	45.2	45.0
1990	4.6	-7.0	0.4	5.6	-4.6
2000	10.8	**19.3**	-0.7	**10.2**	-1.1
2010	**28.2**	**32.3**	10.4	**15.3**	**10.8**
Childcare					
Intercept (=baseline 1980)	75.9	67.4	38.5	13.1	0.7
1990	**23.3**	5.1	**20.2**	2.7	-0.4
2000	**31.3**	-3.6	**13.2**	-2.4	0.4
2010	**29.6**	**26.3**	**38.0**	0.6	2.0
Personal activities					
Intercept (=baseline 1980)	595.5	557.1	587.1	587.0	602.0
1990	*-24.8*	-19.6	-18.6	-5.7	-14.7
2000	**-31.8**	-2.4	**-36.0**	**-26.1**	-12.1
2010	-6.6	2.6	-14.9	-5.9	-12.6
Leisure activities					
Intercept (=baseline 1980)	351.1	300.9	336.5	323.2	363.0
1990	-34.6	-5.2	-11.8	**29.1**	-18.4
2000	-33.8	1.6	**-50.7**	**36.6**	6.3
2010	-27.3	*-40.4*	**-62.0**	11.1	-16.1
N	638	713	736	2,258	1,969

Most women spent more time on paid work in 2010 than in 1980, but the pattern of change varies across decades and different groups of women (table 4). For the 30-years period as a whole, paid work time increased most for women with a youngest child 4-6 years of age and those with a youngest child 2-3 years of age. In spite of extended parental leave rights, mothers with a youngest child below 2

years of age spent more time on paid work in 1990, 2000 and 2010 than in 1980, but there was no further increase after 1990. Irrespective of the age of the youngest child, all women spend less time on household work than previously, and the reduction is mainly related to a decrease in routine housework. It is worth noticing, however, that women in most groups devoted at least as much time to household work in 2010 as in 2000, which indicates a levelling off, and perhaps even a turnaround, in women's, and particularly mothers', shrinking household work. Similar to men, the patterns of change in women's time spent on personal activities and leisure activities vary across decades and depending on the age of the youngest child.

Table 4. Regression estimates (minutes per day) that show changes in women's time spent on various activities from 1980-2010. Average, all days.[1, 2]

	Youngest child 0-1 years	Youngest child 2-3 years	Youngest child 4-6 years	Youngest child 7-19 years	No resident children
Paid work					
Intercept (=baseline 1980)	42.6	98.5	106.7	173.3	210.0
1990	**53.8**	-4.5	*43.7*	**50.0**	29.7
2000	**43.0**	**60.1**	**127.6**	**75.5**	**45.8**
2010	**56.3**	**114.7**	**155.7**	**71.6**	29.9
Household work					
Intercept (=baseline 1980)	511.2	401.1	362.1	313.3	247.8
1990	**-71.0**	-1.7	-11.6	**-27.6**	**-35.3**
2000	**-90.1**	**-76.3**	**-68.3**	**-71.8**	**-56.8**
2010	**-74.6**	**-54.7**	**-68.1**	**-61.7**	**-60.2**
Routine housework					
Intercept (=baseline 1980)	208.6	200.9	204.8	209.8	178.8
1990	**-73.8**	**-36.8**	**-42.3**	**-39.3**	**-49.6**
2000	**-80.0**	**-72.5**	**-82.9**	**-79.4**	**-62.8**
2010	**-97.5**	**-81.6**	**-81.7**	**-81.1**	**-82.6**
Childcare					
Intercept (=baseline 1980)	233.6	126.2	90.7	33.7	0.4
1990	1.3	**38.2**	**23.3**	4.2	*-0.3*
2000	-23.5	-10.5	**-15.3**	**-7.0**	2.4
2010	7.7	13.3	1.3	**-8.4**	2.4
Personal activities					
Intercept (=baseline 1980)	582.7	613.0	623.7	609.7	609.2
1990	1.1	4.1	**-19.4**	*-11.5*	3.0
2000	9.5	0.3	**-42.6**	**-23.1**	-3.5
2010	19.9	*-20.9*	**-33.9**	*-12.8*	**17.4**
Leisure activities					
Intercept (=baseline 1980)	296.1	318.5	336.5	330.1	352.4
1990	9.5	-2.6	-25.5	-12.5	1.4
2000	*34.9*	6.2	*-31.2*	19.1	14.5
2010	-4.3	**-54.4**	**-53.9**	7.9	15.0
N	670	738	816	2,423	1,999

Associations between parenthood and gender differences in time use

Although we are primarily interested in the effects of the interaction terms between gender and age of youngest child, we also provide results from models for men and women separately and from models for both men and women, but without interaction terms. We have run separate regressions for each year and for each activity (paid work, household work, routine housework, direct childcare, personal activities and leisure activities). Results from models with all controls included are shown in the tables 5-10. Although the control variables produce some interesting effects, we will not comment upon them

here. Appendix tables 1-6 provide results from models with only day of week as a control variable. By and large, the interaction terms have the same effects in these reduced models as in those with all controls included. We have tested whether the interaction terms in 2010 differ significantly from those in previous surveys. The tests apply to the models with all controls included. Results are reported in appendix tables 11 and 12.

As for men's time spent on paid work, there are no significant effects of age of youngest child in 1980 and 1990, but in 2000 fathers with a youngest child 0-1 years of age spent more time on paid work than men with no resident children (significant at the 10% level), and in 2010, they spent less time than men with no resident children (significant at the 10% level) (table 5). While the latter relationship may be a result of the father's quota, the positive effect of youngest child's age in 2000 is not easily explainable. The introduction of the cash-for-care-benefit in the late 1990s may be a factor, though, in that the father may have spent more time on employment as a response to the mother's reduced labour supply in some couples. For women, there is a negative association between time spent on paid work and age of the youngest child both in 1980, 1990, 2000 and 2010, but the effects become smaller over time. In 2010, women with a youngest child 2 years or older did not spend significantly less time on employment than women with no resident children, while there was a significant negative effect for women with children 0-1 years of age. The latter probably mainly reflects that many mothers were on parental leave. Regression results from models for men and women taken together suggest that the gender difference in paid work time has been somewhat reduced, although the trend is not linear.

Looking at the interaction terms between gender and age of youngest child, we see that having children did not strengthen the gendered division of paid work to the same extent in 2010 as in previous decades, but the trend is not linear, at least not for those with a youngest child 0-1 years of age (table 5). The interaction term between gender and having a youngest child 0-1 years of age was actually larger in 2000 than in 1980. However, in 2010 it was smaller than in all pervious years, but the difference between 2010 and 2000 is the only one that is statistically significant at conventional levels (see appendix table 11). Those with older children did not have a significantly more gendered division of paid work than those with no resident children in 2010, while this was clearly the case in 1980. The changes are statistically significant for parents with a youngest child 2-3 years and 4-6 years (see appendix table 11).

The analyses reported in table 6 suggest a somewhat stronger association between parenthood and time spent on household work for men in 2010 than in 1980, but the trend is not strictly linear and the effects

vary depending on age of youngest child. For women there is a strong positive association between age of youngest child and time spent on household work at all the time points studied, and contrary to expectations, the estimated effects were almost as large in 2010 as in 1980. The gender difference in household work time was, however, smaller in 2010 than in 1980, although women still spent considerably more time on household work than men. The declining interaction terms between gender and age of youngest child indicate that parenthood intensified a gendered division of household work less in 2010 than in 1980. Again, the trend is not linear and does not apply to all groups of parents. However, children below two years of age clearly reinforced a gendered division of household work less in 2010 than in 1980, although the gender difference in time spent on household work was still considerably larger for people with small children than for people with no resident children. The change took mainly place in the 1980s. The interaction term in 2010 differs significantly from the one in 1980, but not from those in 1990 and 2000 (see appendix table 11). The presence of children 2-3 years and 4-6 years also implied less specialization in 2010 than previously, but the interaction terms in 2010 differ significantly only from those in 1990.

The gender division of time devoted to routine housework was smaller in 2010 than in 1980 (table 7), which stems from a downward trend in women's housework and an upward trend in men's housework. For men, there are only modest and mostly insignificant associations between parenthood and time spent on housework in all the years studied, while for women, having resident children implied more housework at all the four time points. However, there is no clear pattern of very young children involving considerably more housework than older children. Shrinking interaction terms in later years compared to 1980 may suggest that having young children impacts the gendered division of routine housework less than previously, but few of the differences are statistically significant at conventional levels (see appendix table 11). The interaction terms between gender and having a child below 2 years of age were small and insignificant both in 1990, 2000 and 2010 and larger and clearly significant in 1980, but the difference between 2010 and 1980 is not statistically significant. The interaction terms between gender and having a youngest child 2-3 years of age were small and insignificant in 2000 and 2010, but larger and significant in 1980 and 1990. However, the 2010-estimate differs significantly only from the 1990-estimate. Having older children (4-19 years of age) still seems to imply a less gender equal division of housework compared to not having resident children, and the difference between those with and without children in the household was not reduced in 2010 compared to 1980 and 1990. A different pattern is observed for the 2000-study, though, in that there were no significant interaction terms between gender and age of youngest child.

Table 5. Estimates (minutes per day) from regressions on time spent on paid work. 1980-2010 . Average all days. [1, 2]

	Men				Women				All				All, with interactions			
	1980	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**
Intercept	157.4	321.1	-49.4	314.6	144.2	77.2	-49.1	67.2	298.4	257.3	-54.3	202.0	277.3	263.0	13.6	192.0
Age of youngest child (ref: none)																
0-1 years	-8.1	-35.7	*61.0*	*-57.8*	**-196.2**	**-197.6**	**-182.3**	**-137.9**	**-110.2**	**-120.6**	**-68.8**	**-91.4**	-36.4	-43.4	39.4	*-59.2*
2-3 years	26.7	18.0	27.3	11.6	**-152.1**	**-179.7**	**-107.2**	-24.7	**-69.1**	**-92.3**	-35.2	-7.6	6.8	6.0	16.7	1.3
4-6 years	-4.2	5.6	33.3	13.1	**-126.2**	**-132.5**	**-49.8**	3.0	**-64.6**	**-76.0**	-11.2	4.9	-16.5	-7.9	27.5	5.5
7-19 years	22.0	-4.0	0.9	31.2	**-54.3**	**-61.4**	-32.1	-9.1	-12.7	**-37.6**	-18.7	8.1	30.5	-9.6	1.5	26.2
Gender (ref: men)																
Women									**-109.7**	**-153.0**	**-117.9**	**-87.7**	**-122.9**	**-88.6**	**-69.3**	**-64.5**
Interaction gender * age of youngest child																
Woman * child 0-1 years													**-135.0**	**-146.6**	**-200.9**	**-74.7**
Woman * child 2-3 years													**-140.3**	**-169.5**	**-101.0**	-20.0
Woman * child 4-6 years													**-85.9**	**-117.5**	*-66.5*	-3.6
Woman * child 7-19 years													**-76.4**	*-47.6*	-29.6	-38.3
Respondent's age	**13.8**	7.7	**20.4**	4.5	9.4	**14.8**	**18.7**	9.7	**9.1**	**13.0**	**22.8**	8.9	*7.8*	**10.1**	**17.3**	9.0
Respondent's age squared	*-0.2*	-0.1	**-0.2**	-0.1	-0.1	**-0.2**	**-0.2**	-0.1	**-0.1**	**-0.2**	**-0.3**	-0.1	*-0.1*	**-0.1**	**-0.2**	-0.1
Respondent's education (ref: secondary school or less)																
University 1-4 years	**-43.6**	-1.4	-19.7	-27.4	16.1	**46.8**	27.51	**43.9**	-13.3	*21.8*	-0.4	5.8	-12.6	**24.9**	1.8	6.4
University 5 years +	**0.2**	**75.0**	9.3	-4.3	**168.5**	**121.7**	*51.1*	**67.7**	30.7	**97.6**	31.3	25.9	27.9	**95.7**	*35.5*	27.3
Unknown	**77.2**	-71.0	5.5	**-180.0**	*122.2*	53.7	176.7	41.0	**110.7**	-45.7	48.3	*-60.9*	**108.6**	-35.0	80.0	*-61.6*
Partner employed (ref: no)																
Yes	11.3	-7.9	**51.4**	13.1	-21.7	1.0	10.6	12.0	-11.3	-17.8	*34.6*	14.5	-1.1	-6.6	**44.3**	13.9
Day of week (ref: weekday)																
Weekend	**-367.1**	**-338.2**	**-361.4**	**-341.1**	**-137.6**	**-202.2**	**-216.6**	**-222.4**	**-249.5**	**-262.8**	**-292.6**	**-286.2**	**-249.6**	**-267.4**	**-294.4**	**-286.2**
R^2	0.36	0.30	0.34	0.30	0.15	0.23	0.20	0.19	0.32	0.30	0.28	0.25	0.33	0.31	0.30	0.26
N	1,642	1,488	1,514	1,670	1,830	1,703	1,464	1,649	3,472	3,191	2,978	3,319	3,472	3,191	2,978	3,319

[1] Estimates in bold are significant at the 5%-level, and estimates in italics are significant at the 10%-level.

[2] Estimates from all control variables are reported. We have run separate regressions for each year for 1) all men in the analysis sample, 2) all women in the analysis sample, 3) all men and women in the analysis sample with gender as a control variable but no interactions, and 4) all men and women in the analysis sample with interactions between gender and age of youngest child.

Table 6. Estimates (minutes per day) from regressions on time spent on household work. 1980-2010. Average all days. [1, 2]

	Men				Women				All				All, with interactions			
	1980	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**
Intercept	126.1	16.3	66.9	11.1	88.9	85.5	38.7	-39.8	9.7	-32.9	70.8	-50.3	5.1	-22.1	17.6	-39.3
Age of youngest child (ref: none)																
0-1 years	**52.9**	**94.1**	**84.0**	**107.7**	**298.5**	**256.9**	**259.5**	**274.2**	**186.4**	**177.8**	**178.2**	**-177.3**	**71.9**	**103.9**	**94.2**	**116.6**
2-3 years	**55.9**	**58.3**	**65.2**	**90.9**	**179.5**	**213.4**	**155.2**	**173.8**	**124.6**	**143.3**	**107.1**	**126.8**	**69.1**	**67.3**	**67.5**	**100.0**
4-6 years	**60.7**	**50.0**	**69.5**	**73.3**	**135.4**	**149.9**	**111.7**	**116.5**	**101.3**	**105.6**	**93.7**	**89.5**	**66.1**	**57.0**	**70.0**	**77.5**
7-19 years	**25.6**	4.9	*24.5*	-7.4	**62.2**	**66.2**	46.4	**53.4**	**44.0**	**36.0**	**38.6**	**19.8**	17.7	2.4	*22.2*	-10.1
Gender (ref: men)																
Women									**168.5**	**136.6**	**84.2**	**62.5**	**116.0**	**75.3**	**47.6**	17.8
Interaction gender * age of youngest child																
Woman * child 0-1 years													**211.8**	**143.0**	**155.9**	**140.3**
Woman * child 2-3 years													**97.6**	**133.4**	**77.4**	**59.6**
Woman * child 4-6 years													**58.1**	**85.6**	*39.0*	27.6
Woman * child 7-19 years													**42.3**	**61.1**	24.6	**62.5**
Respondent's age	-1.6	4.7	2.7	7.0	5.0	**3.7**	5.1	**9.1**	1.7	4.5	0.8	**8.6**	4.2	**6.1**	5.0	**9.0**
Respondent's age squared	0.0	-0.0	-0.0	-0.1	-0.0	-0.0	-0.0	-0.1	-0.0	-0.0	0.0	**-0.1**	-0.0	-0.1	-0.0	**-0.1**
Respondent's education (ref: secondary school or less)																
University 1-4 years	**45.6**	-14.5	**24.6**	*20.0*	-10.0	**-29.1**	*-19.4*	-16.3	*16.9*	**-19.0**	5.9	3.8	*16.4*	**-22.2**	4.3	2.3
University 5 years +	26.1	-11.3	-5.2	20.6	**-130.9**	**-77.2**	-26.0	**-34.9**	-3.7	**-38.0**	-16.1	-0.3	1.1	**-37.2**	*-19.4*	-2.6
Unknown	*-38.5*	-13.7	44.8	16.4	-6.3	42.2	-105.4	-4.8	-27.0	10.0	1.8	4.5	-32.9	2.5	-22.3	*4.7*
Partner employed (ref: no)																
Yes	1.1	9.3	*-29.2*	1.9	24.0	5.2	16.5	-0.3	**25.2**	*16.8*	-10.3	0.3	10.3	8.4	-17.7	0.5
Day of week (ref: weekday)																
Weekend	**51.6**	**41.3**	**73.2**	**51.7**	**-51.1**	-2.8	**7.8**	**31.7**	-1.3	**15.7**	**42.2**	**42.0**	-0.9	**18.3**	**43.7**	**42.1**
R^2	0.06	0.06	0.10	0.10	0.23	0.23	0.22	0.22	0.30	0.26	0.18	0.16	0.32	0.29	0.20	0.17
N	1,642	1,488	1,514	1,670	1,830	1,703	1,464	1,649	3,472	3,191	2,978	3,319	3,472	3,191	2,978	3,319

[1] Estimates in bold are significant at the 5%-level, and estimates in italics are significant at the 10%-level.

[2] Estimates from all control variables are reported. We have run separate regressions for each year for 1) all men in the analysis sample, 2) all women in the analysis sample, 3) all men and women in the analysis sample with gender as a control variable but no interactions, and 4) all men and women in the analysis sample with interactions between gender and age of youngest child.

Table 7. Estimates (minutes per day) from regressions on time spent on routine housework. 1980-2010. Average all days. [1, 2]

	Men				Women				All				All, with interactions			
	1980	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**
Intercept	60.9	0.5	4.7	14.6	65.6	42.7	4.9	-4.8	-75.8	-93.3	-61.8	-41.3	-60.8	-77.9	-64.6	-29.0
Age of youngest child (ref: none)																
0-1 years	-6.6	3.6	5.2	*13.3*	**69.2**	**36.3**	**41.6**	**37.1**	**32.8**	**19.1**	**21.4**	**21.7**	**14.7**	**17.3**	**15.5**	**19.2**
2-3 years	-7.5	**-10.2**	*13.4*	*13.0*	**56.7**	**62.2**	**35.4**	**39.2**	**24.0**	**25.3**	**20.8**	**23.2**	9.2	0.7	**19.8**	**18.5**
4-6 years	4.3	6.8	6.1	3.0	**52.8**	**49.3**	**19.4**	**40.3**	**24.7**	**25.9**	*10.9*	**17.6**	*12.7*	*14.2*	*11.7*	5.3
7-19 years	1.7	7.0	*9.2*	2.4	**32.4**	**39.2**	*14.3*	**30.1**	**12.0**	**18.3**	**9.2**	**13.6**	-5.2	1.6	7.3	0.2
Gender (ref: men)																
Women									**154.5**	**112.2**	**76.3**	**55.6**	**131.8**	**92.4**	**74.1**	**40.7**
Interaction gender * age of youngest child																
Woman * child 0-1 years													**34.0**	3.1	11.1	6.1
Woman * child 2-3 years													**27.9**	**45.2**	1.9	11.2
Woman * child 4-6 years													**22.7**	**23.3**	-1.9	**26.9**
Woman * child 7-19 years													**32.3**	**32.7**	3.4	**29.2**
Respondent's age	-1.3	1.7	1.6	1,2	3.0	1.1	3.0	3.1	**3.8**	**4.6**	**3.9**	**3.3**	**3.7**	**4.3**	**4.1**	**2.9**
Respondent's age squared	0.0	-0.0	-0.0	-0.0	-0.0	0.0	-0.0	-0.0	-0.0	*-0.0*	*-0.0*	-0.0	-0.0	*-0.0*	*-0.0*	-0.0
Respondent's education (ref: secondary school or less)																
University 1-4 years	**13.8**	-4.0	3.8	**8.3**	**-32.1**	**-24.5**	*-10.0*	**-12.1**	*-10.6*	**-14.9**	-2.8	-1.8	*-10.7*	**-14.8**	-2.8	-1.6
University 5 years +	-0.7	-0.8	-0.5	**13.8**	**-104.7**	**-57.4**	*-21.9*	**-22.7**	**-19.1**	**-24.1**	-9.1	-1.6	**-18.8**	**-24.3**	-9.3	-1.3
Unknown	-8.3	3.9	51.4	9.0	-8.7	16.0	-6.1	1.3	-13.2	2.3	26.3	2.4	-12.8	1.9	25.2	4.4
Partner employed (ref: no)																
Yes	3.7	3.1	*-2.8*	0.7	5.3	8.3	4.3	-3.7	**10.4**	5.7	-0.2	-0.8	**9.2**	5.1	-0,6	-1,2
Day of week (ref: weekday)																
Weekend	**24.5**	**17.6**	**18.4**	**23.1**	**-32.6**	5.0	**12.0**	**21.3**	-4.5	**10.9**	**15.3**	**22.1**	-4.6	**11.6**	**15.4**	**22.1**
R^2	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.08	0.11	0.06	0.07	0.42	0.32	0.22	0.14	0.42	0.32	0.22	0.15
N	1,642	1,488	1,514	1,670	1,830	1,703	1,464	1,649	3,472	3,191	2,978	3,319	3,472	3,191	2,978	3,319

[1] Estimates in bold are significant at the 5%-level, and estimates in italics are significant at the 10%-level.

[2] Estimates from all control variables are reported. We have run separate regressions for each year for 1) all men in the analysis sample, 2) all women in the analysis sample, 3) all men and women in the analysis sample with gender as a control variable but no interactions, and 4) all men and women in the analysis sample with interactions between gender and age of youngest child.

Table 8. Estimates (minutes per day) from regressions on time spent on direct childcare. 1980-2010. Average all days. [1, 2]

	Men				Women				All				All, with interactions			
	1980	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**
Intercept	-41.8	-45.0	-73.3	-73.1	-42.1	-68.6	-17.4	-55.0	-20.8	-41.7	5.1	-48.3	0.53	-52.2	-32.1	-62.5
Age of youngest child (ref: none)																
0-1 years	**70.8**	**97.2**	**101.5**	**97.4**	**224.6**	**227.5**	**202.2**	**224.0**	**154.9**	**164.8**	**156.6**	**156.5**	**69.7**	**93.8**	**100.3**	**97.8**
2-3 years	**61.2**	**69.4**	**58.2**	**81.8**	**114.9**	**157.4**	**107.0**	**130.8**	**93.9**	**121.6**	**83.4**	**105.0**	**59.5**	**66.3**	**56.8**	**83.4**
4-6 years	**31.4**	**54.3**	**46.5**	**65.6**	**80.9**	**104.8**	**65.5**	**83.6**	**62.0**	**86.2**	*59.3*	**75.0**	**30.4**	**52.0**	**44.9**	**66.8**
7-19 years	**9.0**	**12.2**	**4.5**	**6.7**	**27.7**	**29.0**	**20.1**	**18.9**	**22.7**	**24.7**	**16.3**	**13.9**	**9.1**	**11.8**	**6.6**	**7.5**
Gender (ref: men)																
Women									**33.3**	**38.5**	**24.0**	**23.0**	-0.3	0.1	0.6	-0.3
Interaction gender * age of youngest child																
Woman * child 0-1 years													**157.4**	**137.4**	**104.3**	**134.9**
Woman * child 2-3 years													**58.6**	**93.8**	**51.9**	**46.3**
Woman * child 4-6 years													**53.0**	**56.7**	**22.9**	15.5
Woman * child 7-19 years													**19.4**	**20.2**	**13.8**	**10.5**
Respondent's age	*2.3*	*2.3*	**3.7**	**4.0**	2.1	**5.0**	1.8	**3.5**	-0.1	1.0	-0.7	*2.3*	**2.1**	**3.3**	*2.1*	**3.6**
Respondent's age squared	**-0.0**	**-0.0**	**-0.0**	**-0.1**	*-0.0*	**-0.1**	-0.0	**-0.0**	-0.0	-0.0	*0.0*	**-0.0**	**-0.0**	**-0.0**	**-0.0**	**-0.0**
Respondent's education (ref: secondary school or less)																
University 1-4 years	5.3	0.7	5.0	*6.3*	**17.6**	-1.2	-4.7	3.6	**11.6**	3.0	1.6	**7.1**	**11.4**	-0.4	0.5	*5.1*
University 5 years +	**19.8**	3.5	0.9	**22.5**	-4.6	12.1	*0.0*	-3.7	**14.1**	5.7	1.4	**14.6**	**17.9**	6.9	-0.9	**12.0**
Unknown	*18.7*	7.1	22.2	8.4	32.4	**-24.1**	**-81.4**	16.3	**29.0**	6.8	-5.5	16.5	**23.8**	-1.0	-22.1	13.2
Partner employed (ref: no)																
Yes	2.0	2.1	*-1.5*	1.7	**17.6**	-9.7	5.3	-3.9	**15.3**	6.4	4.9	0.1	3.8	-2.0	-0.1	-0.1
Day of week (ref: weekday)																
Weekend	**6.0**	4.4	**10.6**	3.9	**-6.4**	*-7.3*	**-8.8**	-0.9	-0.6	-3.5	0.8	1.3	-0.4	-1.8	1.8	1.4
R^2	0.27	0.34	0.36	0.37	0.59	0.57	0.55	0.57	0.46	0.48	0.46	0.45	0.54	0.54	0.50	0.51
N	1,642	1,488	1,514	1,670	1,830	1,703	1,464	1,649	3,472	3,191	2,978	3,319	3,472	3,191	2,978	3,319

[1] Estimates in bold are significant at the 5%-level, and estimates in italics are significant at the 10%-level.

[2] Estimates from all control variables are reported. We have run separate regressions for each year for 1) all men in the analysis sample, 2) all women in the analysis sample, 3) all men and women in the analysis sample with gender as a control variable but no interactions, and 4) all men and women in the analysis sample with interactions between gender and age of youngest child.

Table 9. Estimates (minutes per day) from regressions on time spent on personal activities. 1980-2010. Average all days. [1, 2]

	Men				Women				All				All, with interactions			
	1980	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**
Intercept	564.4	582.5	628.1	605.6	682.2	684.4	700.2	735.3	624.2	633.2	647.1	687.4	631.4	631.6	640.5	682.0
Age of youngest child (ref: none)																
0-1 years	-6.3	-9.9	**-56.0**	-2.2	*-21.0*	-15.3	-15.2	**-43.5**	-12.9	-12.3	**-34.3**	*-18.6*	-3.5	-11.6	**-47.6**	-8.2
2-3 years	*-20.3*	**-25.3**	**-32.9**	-13.5	15.8	11.8	6.1	**-50.8**	-0.6	-4.5	-14.4	**-27.3**	*-17.1*	**-24.0**	**-24.9**	-16.3
4-6 years	-13.7	*-19.6*	**-46.6**	-14.2	**21.1**	4.0	-16.6	**-40.0**	5.3	-5.1	**-32.4**	**-21.7**	-8.5	-17.3	**-40.3**	-13.7
7-19 years	-14.4	-9.6	**-30.1**	-4.4	9.6	1.8	-11.6	**-22.2**	-1.7	-2.0	**-21.9**	-9.9	**-10.0**	-5.5	**-27.6**	-0.0
Gender (ref: men)																
Women									**23.9**	**26.5**	**28.5**	**22.0**	11.7	**18.6**	-18.7	**36.1**
Interaction gender * age of youngest child																
Woman * child 0-1 years													-18.6	-3.0	25.2	-24.0
Woman * child 2-3 years													**32.0**	**33.8**	21.5	-24.8
Woman * child 4-6 years													**26.3**	21.4	14.7	-17.3
Woman * child 7-19 years													**15.4**	5.7	10.3	*-20.9*
Respondent's age	0.2	-2.4	-1.5	-1.9	**-6.1**	*-5.4*	-5.2	-4.5	-3.0	**-4.7**	-3.1	*-4.8*	-3.1	**-4.3**	-2.5	*-4.8*
Respondent's'age squared	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	**0.1**	*0.1*	0.1	0.0	*0.0*	**0.7**	0.0	0.0	*0.0*	**0.1**	0.0	0.0
Respondent's education (ref: secondary school or less)																
University 1-4 years	-1.4	3.5	0.9	2.3	-5.2	*-12.5*	7.5	-7.4	-3.9	-5.6	4.5	-2.3	-4.0	-5.4	4.1	-2.1
University 5 years +	-12.3	-10.0	7.5	-13.2	-11.5	*-34.2*	3.9	*-22.2*	-12.2	**-19.8**	4.7	**-16.9**	-12.6	**-19.3**	4.3	**-16.9**
Unknown	-17.4	*50.0*	**-54.6**	23.2	-25.4	-23.1	**60.2**	19.3	-25.8	29.6	-0.5	**25.1**	-22.3	28.2	-4.1	**24.5**
Partner employed (ref: no)																
Yes	*-12.3*	10.7	*-17.0*	-19.4	**-14.4**	0.7	*-23.4*	-3.2	-8.2	9.4	**-19.7**	-13.7	-7.8	8.1	**-20.7**	-13.4
Day of week (ref: weekday)																
Weekend	**92.9**	**95.5**	**116.0**	**121.4**	**60.3**	**67.1**	**81.5**	**83.9**	**76.4**	**80.5**	**99.4**	**104.0**	**76.3**	**80.7**	**99.6**	**104.0**
R^2	0.15	0.17	0.22	0.20	0.09	0.10	0.12	0.14	0.12	0.14	0.18	0.17	0.12	0.14	0.18	0.17
N	1,642	1,488	1,514	1,670	1,830	1,703	1,464	1,649	3,472	3,191	2,978	3,319	3,472	3,191	2,978	3,319

[1] Estimates in bold are significant at the 5%-level, and estimates in italics are significant at the 10%-level.

[2] Estimates from all control variables are reported. We have run separate regressions for each year for 1) all men in the analysis sample, 2) all women in the analysis sample, 3) all men and women in the analysis sample with gender as a control variable but no interactions, and 4) all men and women in the analysis sample with interactions between gender and age of youngest child.

Table 10. Estimates (minutes per day) from regressions on time spent on leisure activities. 1980-2010. Average all days.[1, 2]

	Men				Women				All				All, with interactions			
	1980	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**
Intercept	450.5	512.2	623.2	0.21	422.1	450.7	639.6	503.7	407.4	488.1	641.4	417.2	421.4	476.1	631.8	418.1
Age of youngest child (ref: none)																
0-1 years	-20.1	-30.4	**-69.7**	-15.7	**-61.1**	-26.4	**-39.7**	**-77.5**	**-42.9**	**-28.5**	**-53.8**	**-41.7**	-15.8	*-31.7*	**-66.6**	-19.2
2-3 years	**-49.2**	*-38.3*	**-56.3**	**-77.3**	*-25.2*	**-31.1**	**-43.9**	**-102.0**	**-38.0**	**-34.3**	**-50.2**	**-85.9**	**-46.7**	*-38.4*	**-54.5**	**-74.8**
4-6 years	-27.5	-25.2	**-68.4**	**-63.8**	-20.6	-24.1	**-46.6**	**-73.6**	**-27.4**	*-21.9*	**-57.1**	**-63.7**	-25.4	-25.6	**-68.4**	**-60.4**
7-19 years	**-27.9**	13.0	4.5	-10.3	-14.8	-8.6	1.1	-20.2	**-24.1**	4.0	3.9	**-11.9**	**-30.3**	11.2	5.9	-5.0
Gender (ref: men)																
Women									-2.8	-9.6	4.3	6.1	-6.8	-5.7	0.4	19.2
Interaction gender * age of youngest child																
Woman * child 0-1 years													**-50.9**	5.3	22.9	**-51.6**
Woman * child 2-3 years													19.2	5.2	7.3	-24.4
Woman * child 4-6 years													-1.4	4.6	21.0	-6.9
Woman * child 7-19 years													13.6	-15.2	-5.6	-13.6
Respondent's age	-7.5	**-11.8**	**-15.1**	-2.0	-5.4	*-7.4*	**-15.4**	-8.7	*-4.7*	**-9.8**	**-15.9**	-6.5	*-5.5*	**-9.2**	**-15.2**	*-6.9*
Respondent's age squared	0.1	**0.1**	**0.2**	0.0	0.1	*0.1*	**0.2**	0.1	0.1	**0.1**	**0.2**	*0.1*	*0.1*	**0.1**	**0.2**	*0.1*
Respondent's education (ref: secondary school or less)																
University 1-4 years	-14.6	18.9	-8.6	2.7	*-21.2*	**-21.2**	-15.4	-12.3	**-17.1**	-2.7	-11.3	-4.8	**-17.3**	-2.8	-11.5	-4.1
University 5 years +	-11.6	**-51.2**	-5.4	6.0	-39.1	-29.0	-28.7	-4.7	-14.4	**-46.0**	-14.9	-0.4	-15.8	**-45.4**	-15.4	0.5
Unknown	-13.3	43.8	14.1	**99.4**	**-107.1**	**-50.0**	-114.5	-34.6	*-59.1*	16.9	-35.5	26.2	*-54.8*	15.5	-40.4	26.9
Partner employed (ref: no)																
Yes	6.9	-6.5	-2.3	4.1	1.8	-12.4	-0.7	11.5	4.1	-6.9	1.4	6.0	7.3	-8.2	-2.9	6.0
Day of week (ref: weekday)																
Weekend	**225.0**	**208.6**	**181.5**	**181.0**	**135.6**	**150.3**	**139.1**	**113.2**	**179.1**	**178.6**	**161.3**	**149.9**	**179.1**	**178.4**	**161.4**	**149.8**
R^2	0.29	0.25	0.22	0.21	0.16	0.20	0.15	0.13	0.21	0.22	0.19	0.16	0.22	0.22	0.19	0.16
N	1,642	1,488	1,514	1,670	1,830	1,703	1,464	1,649	3,472	3,191	2,978	3,319	3,472	3,191	2,978	3,319

[1] Estimates in bold are significant at the 5%-level, and estimates in italics are significant at the 10%-level.

[2] Estimates from all control variables are reported. We have run separate regressions for each year for 1) all men in the analysis sample, 2) all women in the analysis sample, 3) all men and women in the analysis sample with gender as a control variable but no interactions, and 4) all men and women in the analysis sample with interactions between gender and age of youngest child.

Table 11. Estimates (minutes per day) from regressions on time spent on paid work and household work on weekdays and weekends. 1980-2010.[1, 2]

	Paid work, weekdays				Paid work, weekends				Household work, weekdays				Household work, weekends			
	1980	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**
Interaction gender * age of youngest child																
Woman * child 0-1 years	**-177.1**	**-169.8**	**-287.7**	**-108.3**	-37.7	-41.4	-28.6	-11.2	**202.9**	**143.4**	**184.5**	**164.3**	**232.6**	**133.6**	**103.1**	**90.5**
Woman * child 2-3 years	**-177.2**	**-244.9**	**-158.8**	-55.5	-16.6	-27.1	-2.1	43.5	**106.0**	**174.2**	**123.8**	**87.7**	47.8	47.4	-13.4	6.3
Woman * child 4-6 years	**-106.3**	**-165.1**	**-115.7**	-5.3	*-65.2*	-10.1	56.8	14.9	**78.2**	**129.1**	**65.1**	31.3	29.7	-14.0	-29.1	20.1
Woman * child 7-19 years	**-99.4**	**-66.6**	*-59.3*	-39.4	-8.1	-4.8	*20.9*	-32.7	**50.5**	**74.2**	**51.2**	**59.2**	18.7	27.5	-30.0	**73.5**
N	2,531	2,281	2,095	2,306	941	910	883	959	2,531	2,281	2,095	2,360	941	910	883	959

[1] Estimates in bold are significant at the 5%-level, and estimates in italics are significant at the 10%-level.

[2] The estimates are net effects from models that also controls for age of youngest child, respondent's gender, age and education and the partner's employment status. Results from the full models are shown in Appendix tables 7-10.

Concerning direct childcare, the presence of children in the household affected men's time use almost in the same ways in 2010 and in 1980, although the estimates may have become slightly larger over time (table 8). For instance, in 2010, men with a youngest child 0-1 years spent 97 minutes more per day on direct childcare than men with no resident children, while the corresponding difference in 1980 was 71 minutes. Women's childcare time is more strongly affected by the presence of children than men's, and the effects of the age of the youngest child for women were mainly unaltered from 1980 to 2010. For instance, in 2010, mothers with a youngest child 0-1 years of age spent 224 minutes more per day on childcare than women with no resident children, and in 1980, the corresponding difference was 225 minutes. Although the trends vary somewhat across decades and depending on the age of the youngest child, the presence of children seems to affect women's direct childcare time almost as much in 2010 as in 1980. Since there have been only modest changes in the way children affect both men's and women's time spent on direct childcare, the presence of children strengthens a gendered division of childcare almost to the same extent at present as in 1980. The presence of a youngest child 4-6 years old may be an exception, though. The interaction term between gender and having a youngest child in this age group was small and insignificant in 2010, but fairly large and significant in 1980 and 1990, and the difference between the 2010-estimate and those for 1980 and 1990 are statistically significant (see appendix table 11). The interaction term between gender and having a youngest child 0-1 years showed a downward trend in the two first decades of our study period, but not in the third one. If anything, there was a turnaround in 2000, but the change from 2000 to 2010 is not statistically significant.

The effect of the presence of children on men's and women's time spent on personal activities varies across studies and with the age of the youngest child and are mostly modest and statistically insignificant (table 9). However, in 2000, men with resident children spent less time on personal activities than men with no resident children, and in 2010, women with resident children spent less time on personal activities than women with no resident children. All the four studies show that women spend some more time on personal activities than men. The interaction terms between gender and age of youngest child suggest that children have less impact on the gender difference in time spent on personal activities in 2010 than in 1980, but the pattern varies depending on the age of the youngest child.

The presence of children tends to imply somewhat less time spent on leisure activities for both men and women, but there is no consistent pattern across surveys and the age of the youngest child (table 10). There are few significant interaction terms between gender and age of youngest child, which

suggests that the presence of children impacts men's and women's leisure time in almost the same way. However, in 1980 and 2010, the interaction terms between gender and having a youngest child 0-1 years of age were large and significant, which suggests that the presence of young children reduced women's time spent on leisure activities more than men's.

Since people's time use differ significantly across weekdays and weekends, and patterns of change may vary for women and men and depending on the age of the youngest child, we show some results for weekdays and weekends separately. As we are mainly interested in the allocation of labour, we look at paid work and household work only. The number of observations is, of course, lower for weekends than weekdays, since all days of the year have been equally represented in the survey samples and respondents have kept time diaries for two consecutive days. Results from the full models are reported in appendix tables 7 to 10, while the interaction terms only are shown in table 11.

As for paid work, there are a lot of strong and significant interaction terms between gender and age of youngest child on weekdays, while the there are few significant interaction terms on weekends (table 11). The interaction terms are also somewhat larger on weekdays than for all days taken together (table 5), which suggests that the gender difference in the impact of children on time spent on paid work is mainly present on weekdays. On weekends, the presence of children in the household impacts men's and women's paid work hours fairly similarly, and the pattern is largely consistent across studies. However, the interaction term between gender and having a youngest child 4-6 years of age was negative, large and significant in 1980, but positive, small and insignificant in 2010, which points to a smaller gender difference in the impact of children 4-6 years on people's paid work during weekends 2010. However, the difference is not statistically significant at conventional levels (see appendix table 12). As for weekdays, the presence of children 0-1 years of age still strengthened the gendered division of paid work in 2010. This is consistent with expectations since mothers usually take more parental leave than fathers. However, the presence of older children did not reinforce a gendered division of paid labour in 2010, which is different from the patterns observed in the previous surveys.

The gender differences in time spent in household work seems to be more affected by the presence of children on weekdays than on weekends (table 11) although the presence of small children (0-1 years of age) has a stronger positive effect on women's than on men's household work also in weekends. The interaction term between gender and having small children was, however, clearly lower in 2010 than in 1980, which points to a more modest gender difference in the effect of having small children in

weekends in 2010 than previously (see appendix table 12). However, in 2010, the presence of older children (7-19 years of age), had a significantly stronger positive effect on women's than on men's household work time on weekends. This pattern was not observed in the previous surveys. The 2010-estimate differs significantly only from the 2000-estimate, though. On weekdays, the presence of children in most age groups still clearly intensifies a traditional division of household labour in Norway, although the effects may have become somewhat smaller than previously. There is, however, no linear downward trend, and the patterns of change differ depending on the age of the youngest child.

6. Summary and discussion

Although gender differences in time spent on paid and unpaid labour have been considerably reduced in many Western countries in recent decades, men's and women's time-use patterns still tend to diverge when children arrive. The birth of a child usually implies more paid work for men, while women scale back on their employed hours and increase their domestic work. Since reduced employment for mothers may lead to lower lifetime earnings and poorer career prospects, and long paid hours may result in less time with children for men, researchers and politicians often look for policy measures that may counteract the strengthening of traditional gender roles among parents (for instance Gornick and Mayers 2008). However, the degree to which children involve an intensification of traditional gender roles in couples differ across countries depending on a range of contextual factors. In particular, policy measures that encourage mothers' labour market participation and fathers' family involvement are seen as central for lessening the influence of children on gender differences in time allocation (ibid). For example in Sweden - a typical social-democratic society with high gender-equality ambitions and extensive work-family-reconciliation policies that promote gender-equal time-use practices for parents - parenthood did not reinforce a traditional division of labour to the same extent in 2000 as in 1990, although there were still significant gender differences in time use (Dribe and Stanfors 2009).

In Norway, too, a more equal division of labour in couples has been a central political goal in the work-family policies, but the importance of parental choice and flexibility has also been emphasized. Using four Norwegian time use surveys, we explore possible changes in the association between parenthood and the division of labour in Norway from 1980 to 2010, a period with significant changes in both men's and women's time use patterns, and with the implementation of numerous work-family-policy reforms. Along with policy measures that facilitate mothers' employment and fathers' family involvement, there are also measures that promote a more traditional division of labour, and the

expansion of parental-leave schemes and the childcare sector have been slower in Norway than in Sweden. However, by 2010 parents in Norway had extensive parental leave rights and good access to high-quality day-care centres at a reasonable price. Since some family-policy measures are directed primarily at parents with very young children, we single out parents with the smallest children in the analysis.

Possible changes in the relationship between parenthood and the division of paid and unpaid labour is a result of changes in both fathers' and mothers' time use in both areas, as well as in the time use of people with no resident children. The empirical analyses show that there was clearly a weaker association between parenthood and the division of labour in 2010 than in 1980, but the presence of children still reinforces a traditional distribution of work, particularly unpaid family work. The pattern of change varies significantly across decades and depending on the age of the youngest child. For parents with resident children, the gender difference in time spent on both paid work and household work was clearly smaller in 2010 than in 1980, but this was also the case for coupled men and women with no resident children, particularly when it comes to time spent on household work.

As for paid work, large interaction effects between gender and the age of the youngest child suggest that in 1980, the presence of children in all age groups strengthened a gendered time allocation in couples, although the association was particularly strong for couples with a youngest child 0-3 years of age. In 2010, however, it was only the presence of children 0-1 years of age that reinforced a gendered division of paid work. Even the effect of having such small children has been reduced compared to what was found in previous decades, but only the reduction since 2000 is statistically significant. This is, among other things, a result of a decrease in fathers' time spent on paid work combined with an increase in mothers' paid work time. Although we cannot single out effects of particular family-policy measures on the basis of our data, we argue that the extension of the father's quota combined with strong expectations of involved fathering practices both during the paternity leave and beyond have probably played an important role. As for paid work, then, we may conclude almost like Dribe and Stanfors (2009), that even though there are still considerable gender differences in time use in Norway, parenthood does not intensify a gendered division of labour as much as it did previously. However, while Dribe and Stanfors's conclusion applied to the 1990's in Sweden, it is not until the subsequent decade that a similar trend may be discerned in Norway for parents with the smallest children. Having children older than one year, however, seemed to strengthen a traditional division of labour somewhat less in 2000 than in 1990.

Concerning household work, the presence of small children reinforced a gendered division of labour less in 2010 than in 1980, but the trend over time is not linear and also varies depending on the age of the youngest child. The shrinking effect of having very young children (0-1 years of age) was most prevalent in the 1980s and resulted from a considerable increase in fathers' household work combined with a noticeable decrease in mothers' household work. Although fathers with small children spent much more time on household work in 2010 than in 2000, there was only a modest reduction in the effects of having small children on the gendered division of household work in this decade. This is, among other things, a result of a levelling out, or even turnaround, in mothers' household work time in this decade. In spite of a diminishing effect of having resident children since the early 1980s, the presence of children in the household, and particularly children below 2 years of age, still involves a more traditional division of household labour in couples in Norway. The fact that having very small children still reinforces a traditional division of labour, is as expected since mothers still take more parental leave than fathers in most couples.

Household work encompasses different types of unpaid family work, of which routine housework and direct childcare constitute the larger part for parents. The reduction in mothers' household work mainly results from a considerable decrease in time spent on routine housework, while fathers spend more time than previously on both routine housework and childcare. The gender difference in time spent on routine housework has been reduced in Norway, but women still spend some more time than men. However, the presence of children 0-3 years does not any longer intensify the gendered distribution of housework, while having older children still does to a certain extent. The presence of children below 2 years of age still significantly reinforces a gendered division of time spent on direct childcare almost as much as it did in 1980. There is some variation across decades, though. The presence of a child aged 2-4 years also enhances the gender division of childcare, while this is hardly longer the case for the presence of older children.

As for paid work, the gender difference in the impact of children is mainly present on weekdays and the same is true for household work. However, the presence of children 0-1 years of age implies a more gender traditional allocation of household work on weekends as well.

The present paper contributes to the discussion on parenthood and specialization by showing a more complex picture than what is found in previous studies. We analyze a longer time span and single out parents with very small children, and also use data from a social-democratic country with more ambivalent work-family policies than Sweden. Although the broad picture shows that the presence of

children in the household involves less specialization in couples than in 1980, the trends vary across decades, for paid and unpaid work, and also depending on the age of the youngest child.

However, the analyses in the paper have certain limitations. Since we do not have longitudinal data, we cannot follow individuals over time, but have to compare people with and without children in the household based on cross-sectional data. In particular, we cannot fully distinguish time, age and cohort effects. It would also be advantageous with real couple data and not data from individuals, as in the Norwegian time use studies, and of course, larger samples would give more precise estimates.

Literature

Anxo, Dominique, Letizia Mencarini, Ariane Pailhé, Anne Solaz, Maria Letizia Tanturri and Lennart Flood (2011): Gender Difference in Time Use over the Life Course in France, Italy, Sweden, and the US. *Feminist Economics* 17 (3): 159-195.

Becker, Gary (1991): *A treatise on the family*. Enlarged edition. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Bianchi, Suzanne, Liana C. Sayer, Melissa A. Milkie and John P. Robinson (2012): Housework: Who Did, Does or Will Do It, and How Much Does It Matter? *Social Forces* 91 (1): 55-63.

Bittman, Michael, Paula England, Nancy Folbre, Liana Sayer and George Matheson (2003): When Does gender Trump Money? Bargaining and Time in Household Work. *American Journal of Sociology* 109 (1): 186-214.

Blossfeld, Hans-Peter and Sonja Drobnic (eds) (2001): *Careers of Couples in Contemporary Society: From Male Breadwinner to Dual-Earner Families.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Bonke, Jens and Gøsta Esping-Andersen (2011): Family Investments in Children – Productivities, Preferences and Parental Child Care. *European Sociological Review* 27 (1): 43-55.

Brandth, Berit and Elin Kvande (eds) (2013): *Den farsvennlige velferdsstaten*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Bringedal, Kristin Horn and Trude Lappegård (2012): Likere deling av foreldrepermisjonen, *Samfunnsspeilet* 26 (1): 13-18.

Brown, Judith E. and Peter K. Dunn (2011): Comparisons of Tobit, Linear, and Poisson-Gamma Regression Models: An Application of Time Use Data. *Sociological Methods & Research* 40 (3): 511-535.

Coltrane, Scott (2000): Research on Household Labor: Modeling and Measuring the Social Embeddedness of Routine Family Work. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 62 (4): 1208-1233.

Cooke, Lynn Prince (2006): Doing gender in context: Household bargaining and the risk of divorce in Germany and the United States. *American Journal of Sociology* 112 (2): 442-472.

Cooke, Lynn and Janeen Baxter (2010): "Families" in International Context: Comparing Institutional Effects Across Western Societies. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 72 (3): 516-636.

Craig, Lyn (2006): Children and the revolution. A time-diary analysis of the impact of motherhood on daily workload. *Journal of Sociology* 42 (2): 125-143.

Craig, Lyn (2007): Is there really a second shift, and if so, who does it? A time-diary investigation. *Feminist review* 86: 149-170.

Craig, Lyn, Killian Mullan and Megan Blaxland (2010): Parenthood, policy and work-family time in Australia 1992-2006. *Work, employment and society* 24 (1): 27-45.

Craig, Lyn and Michael Bittman (2008): The Incremental Time Costs of Children: An Analysis of Children's Impact on Adult Time Use in Australia. *Feminist Economics* 14 (2): 59-88.

Deutsch, Francine M. (2007): Undoing gender. *Gender and Society* 21 (1): 106-127.

Drange, Nina and Kjetil Telle (2010): *The effect of preschool on the school performance of children from immigrant families. Results from an introduction of free preschool in two districts in Oslo.* Discussion Papers no 631, Statistics Norway.

Dribe, Martin and Maria Stanfors (2009): Does parenthood Strengthen a Traditional Household Division of Labour? Evidence From Sweden. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 71 (1): 33-45.

Egge-Hoveid, Kristin (2012): Stadig færre mottakere av kontantstøtte. http://www.ssb.no/vis/magasinet/slik_lever_vi/art-2012-03-05-01.html (accessed September 2013).

Ellingsæter, Anne Lise (2003): The complexity of family policy reform. The case of Norway. *European Societies* 5 (4): 419-443.

Ellingsæter, Anne Lise (2005): "Tidsklemme" - metafor for vår tid. *Tidsskrift for samfunnsforskning* 46 (3): 297-326.

Ellingsæter, Anne Lise and Lars Gulbrandsen (2007): Closing the childcare gap: The interaction of childcare provision and mothers' agency in Norway. *Journal of Social Policy* 35 (6): 469-669.

Esping-Andersen, Gøsta (1990): *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Esping-Andersen, Gøsta, Diederik Boertien, Jens Bonke and Pablo Gracia (2013): Couple specialization in Multiple Equilibria. *European Sociological Review* 10 (0). 1-15. DOI: 10.1093/esr/jct004, available online at www.esr.oxfordjournals.org

Fisher, Kimberly, Muriel Egerton, Jonathan I. Gershuny and John. P. Robinson (2007): Gender Convergence in the American Heritage Time Use Study. *Social Indicators Research* 82 (1): 1-33.

Folbre, Nancy, Jayoung Yoon, Kade Finnoff and Allison Sidle Fuligni (2005): By what measure? Family time devoted to children in the United States. *Demography* 42 (2): 373-390.

Fougner, Elisabeth (2012): Fedre tar ut hele fedrekvoten – også etter at den ble utvidet til ti uker. *Arbeid og velferd* 2: 71-77.

Fuwa, Makiko (2004): Macro-level Gender Inequality and the Division of Household Labor in 22 Countries. *American Sociological Review* 69 (6): 751-767.

Geist, Claudia (2005): The Welfare State and the Home: Regime Differences in the Domestic Division of Labour. *European Sociological Review* 21 (1): 23-41.

Gershuny, Jonathan (2000): *Changing Times. Work and Leisure in Postindustrial Society.* Oxford University Press.

Gornick, Janet C. and Maricia K. Mayers (2008): Creating Gender Egalitarian Societies: An Agenda for Reform. *Politics & Society* 36 (3): 313-349.

Halrynjo, Sigtona and Selma Lyng (2009): Preferences, constraints or schemas of devotion? Exploring Norwegian mothers' withdrawal from high-commitment careers. *The British Journal of sociology* 60 (2): 321-343.

Holmøy, Aina, Magnar Lillegård and Tora Löfgren (2012): Tidsbruksundersøkelsen 2010. Dokumentasjon av datainnsamling, analyse av datakvalitet og beregning av frafallsvekter. Notater 2/2012, Statistics Norway.

Hook, Jennifer L. (2006): Care in Context: Men's Unpaid Work in 20 Countries, 1965-2003. *American Sociological Review* 71 (4): 639-660.

Hook, Jennifer L. and Christina M. Wolfe (2012): New fathers? Residential Fathers' Time With Children in Four Countries. *Journal of Family Issues* 33 (4): 415-450.

Håkonsen, Lars, Tom Kornstad, Knut Løyland and Thor Olav Thoresen (2001): *Kontantstøtten - effekter på arbeidstilbud og inntektsfordeling,* Reports 2001/5, Oslo: Statistics Norway.

Jensberg, Heidi, Roland Mandal and Erling Solheim (2012): *Det kjønnsdelte arbeidsmarkedet 1990-2010. Kontinuitet eller endring?* Report A21906. Trondheim: SINTEF.

Kitterød, Ragni Hege (2013): Mer familiearbeid og mindre jobb blant småbarnsfedre. In Berit Brandth and Elin Kvande (eds) (2013): *Fedrekvoten og den farsvennlige velferdsstaten*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Kitterød, Ragni Hege and Randi Kjeldstad (2006): Kortere arbeidstid for fedre - men fremdeles et tosporet foreldreskap. *Søkelys på arbeidsmarkedet* 23 (2): 159-171.

Kitterød, Ragni Hege, Erik Nymoen and Jan Lyngstad (2012): *Endringer i bruk av barnetilsyn fra 2002 til 2010. Tabellrapport*. Rapporter 23/2012, Statistics Norway.

Kitterød, Ragni Hege and Marit Rønsen (2012a): Untraditional dual earners in Norway: When does she work at least as much as he? *Work, Employment and Society* 26 (4): 657-675.

Kitterød, Ragni Hege and Marit Rønsen (2012b): Kvinner i arbeid ute og hjemme. Endring og ulikhet. In Anne Lise Ellingsæter and Karin Widerberg (eds): *Velferdsstatens familier. Nye sosiologiske perspektiver*. Oslo: Gyldendal akademisk.

Leira, Arnlaug (2002): *Working Parents and the Welfare State. Family Change and Policy Reform in Scandinavia.* Cambridge University Press.

Ministry of Children and Family Affairs. 1998. *Stortingsproposisjon* 53, 1997-98.

Naz, Gahzala (2004): The impact of cash-benefit reform on parents' labour force participation. *Journal of Population Economics* 17 (2): 369-383.

NOU 2004:1: *Modernisert folketrygd. Bærekraftig pensjon for framtida*.

NOU 2008:6: *Kjønn og lønn*. *Fakta, analyser og virkemidler for likelønn*.

NOU 2009:10: *Fordelingsutvalget*.

NOU 2012:15: *Politikk for likestilling*.

Pettersen, Silje Vatne (2003): *Barnefamiliers tilsynsordninger, yrkesdeltakelse og bruk av kontantstøtte våren 2002.* Reports 2003/9, Statistics Norway.

Rege, Mari and Ingeborg F. Solli (2010): *The impact of paternity leave on long-term father involvement*. CESifo, Center for Economic Studies & Ifo Institute for Economic Research.

Robinson, John P. and Geoffrey Godbey (1997): *Time for Life. The Surprising Ways Americans Use Their Time*. Pennsylvania, The Pennsylvania State University Press, University Park.

Rønning, Elisabeth (2002): Statistisk sentralbyrås tidsbruksundersøkelse 2000/01. Dokumentasjon og resultater fra intervjuet. Notater 2002/26.

Rønsen, Marit (2005): Fruktbarhetsutviklingen i Norge. *Økonomiske analyser* 6/2005: 50-55.

Rønsen, Marit (2009): Long-term effects of cash for childcare on mothers' labor supply. *Labor* 23 (3): 507-533.

Rønsen, Marit and Ragni Hege Kitterød (2012): *Entry into work following childbirth among mothers in Norway. Recent trends and variation.* Discussion Papers no. 702, Statistics Norway, Research department.

Sanchez, Laura and Elizabeth Thomson (1997): Becoming Mothers and Fathers. Parenthood, Gender, and the Division of Labor. *Gender & Society* 11 (6): 747-772.

Sayer, Liana 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.

Schøne, Pål (2004): Labour supply effects of a cash-for-care subsidy. *Journal of Population Economics* 17 (4): 703-727.

Stalker, Glenn J. (2011): A Widening Parental Leisure Gap: The Family as a Site for Late Modern Differentiation and Convergence in Leisure Time within Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States. *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 36 (1): 25-58.

Statistics Norway (1983): Tidsnyttingsundersøkelsen 1980-81. NOS B 378.

Statistics Norway (1992): Tidsbruk og tidsorganisering 1970-90. NOS C 10.

Statistics Norway (2012): Basic tables, 2011. The Labour Force Survey. Can be accessed by contacting the Division for Labour Market Statistics, Statistics Norway.

Statistics Norway (2013): StatBank Norway, table 05111, https://www.ssb.no/statistikkbanken

Steward, Jay (2009): *Tobit or not Tobit?* IZA DP NO. 4588. Forschungsinstitut zur Zukunft der Arbeit Institute for the study of Labour.

St. Meld 6 (2010-2011): *Likestilling for likelønn*. Barne-, likestillings- og inkluderingsdepartementet.

St. Meld 41 (2008-2009): *Kvalitet i barnehagen*. Kunnskapsdepartementet.

St. Meld 44 (2012-2013): *Likestilling kommer ikke av seg selv*. Barne-, likestillings- og inkluderingsdepartementet.

Thoresen, Thor Olav (1996). Virkninger på proveny og inntektsfordeling av endringer i skatter og overføringer av særlig betydning for barnefamiliene. Appendix No 4 in NOU 1996:12: *Offentlige overføringer til barnefamilier.*

Wall, Glenda and Stephanie Arnold (2007): How Involved is Involved Fathering? An Exploration of the Contemporary Culture of Fatherhood. *Gender and Society* 21 (4): 508-527.

Walzer, Susan (1997): Contextualizing the employment decisions of new mothers. *Qualitative Sociology* 20 (2): 211-227.

West, Candace and Don. H. Zimmerman (1987): Doing gender. *Gender and Society* 1 (2): 125-151.

Vaage, Odd Frank (2012): *Tidene skifter. Tidsbruk 1971-2010*. Statistiske analyser 125, Statistisk sentralbyrå.

Appendix

Appendix table 1. Estimates (minutes per day) from regressions on time spent on paid work. 1980-2010. Average all days. [1, 2]

	Men				Women				All				All, with interactions			
	1980	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**
Intercept	424.2	433.9	424.6	398.9	242.9	304.6 2	314.0	299.3	432.0	448.3	427.1	394.1	392.2	415.6	404.0	383.7 1
Age of youngest child (ref: none)																
0-1 years	-11.7	-16.4	43.9	*-52.4*	**-160.6**	**-162.8**	**-168.7**	**-133.8**	**-90.1**	**-94.2**	**-71.1**	**-88.7**	-16.7	-19.8	35.8	*-55.0*
2-3 years	30.1	40.2	32.6	14.5	**-114.5**	**-141.7**	**-86.5**	-16.7	**-47.7**	**-62.7**	-21.6	-0.8	29.1	35.9	28.8	10.5
4-6 years	12.1	25.3	40.9	18.5	**-91.6**	**-102.4**	-22.1	16.7	**-41.1**	**-49.1**	11.6	17.3	7.1	18.0	42.1	18.2
7-19 years	**40.5**	2.7	30.1	*38.9*	**-33.7**	**-33.1**	-3.9	5.3	1.7	-19.7	14.2	*23.2*	**41.3**	-0.6	28.3	*39.2*
Gender (ref: men)																
Women									**-196.1**	**-154.2**	**-119.0**	**-89.2**	**-123.0**	**-89.9**	**-68.4**	**-67.0**
Interaction gender * age of youngest child																
Woman * child 0-1 years													**-138.4**	**-149.4**	**-204.0**	**-76.7**
Woman * child 2-3 years													**-146.1**	**-176.4**	**-111.3**	-24.2
Woman * child 4-6 years													**-89.2**	**-124.7**	*-64.5*	-3.2
Woman * child 7-19 years													**-72.5**	-38.0	-31.0	-33.8
Day of week (ref: weekday)																
Weekend	**-366.2**	**-338.6**	**-364.5**	**-342.1**	**-139.1**	**-201.1**	**-214.7**	**-220.6**	**-249.8**	**-264.3**	**-292.5**	**-285.6**	**-250.0**	**-266.5**	**-294.6**	**-285.6**
R^2	0.35	0.29	0.33	0.29	0.14	0.21	0.19	0.18	0.31	0.28	0.27	0.25	0.32	0.30	0.29	0.25
N	1,642	1,488	1,514	1,670	1,830	1,703	1,464	1,649	3,472	3,191	2,978	3,319	3,472	3,191	2,978	3,319

[1] Estimates in bold are significant at the 5%-level, and estimates in italics are significant at the 10%-level.

[2] Estimates from all control variables are reported. We have run separate regressions for each year for 1) all men in the analysis sample, 2) all women in the analysis sample, 3) all men and women in the analysis sample with gender as a control variable but no interactions, and 4) all men and women in the analysis sample with interactions between gender and age of youngest child.

Appendix table 2. Estimates (minutes per day) from regressions on time spent on household work. 1980-2010. Average all days. [1, 2]

	Men				Women				All				All, with interactions			
	1980	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**
Intercept	117.6	130.7	125.3	156.1	259.8	213.1	188.4	179.0	101.0	104.7	117.7	138.1	132.0	136.4	134.3	158.6
Age of youngest child (ref: none)																
0-1 years	**48.4**	**85.2**	**79.1**	**111.4**	**265.8**	**227.4**	**230.0**	**248.0**	**161.5**	**157.6**	**159.8**	**171.6**	**50.6**	**86.2**	**82.7**	**111.8**
2-3 years	**52.5**	**52.5**	**55.4**	**99.7**	**152.3**	**187.0**	**133.3**	**157.4**	**106.0**	**127.2**	**90.9**	**126.4**	**52.9**	**53.8**	**57.0**	**100.4**
4-6 years	**55.9**	**48.4**	**61.2**	**84.4**	**118.6**	**137.9**	**102.8**	**107.2**	**88.9**	**97.7**	**80.6**	**94.6**	**58.2**	**50.7**	**60.6**	**84.4**
7-19 years	**24.7**	13.0	**23.5**	1.5	**66.6**	**73.0**	**50.3**	**63.9**	**47.0**	**45.4**	**36.0**	**30.9**	**24.4**	14.0	**24.3**	1.5
Gender (ref: men)																
Women									**173.0**	**132.6**	**80.8**	**61.2**	**115.9**	**70.1**	**44.5**	17.6
Interaction gender * age of youngest child																
Woman * child 0-1 years													**212.8**	**143.1**	**147.1**	**135.8**
Woman * child 2-3 years													**100.4**	**132.8**	**74.5**	**56.5**
Woman * child 4-6 years													**56.1**	**88.5**	*42.3*	23.1
Woman * child 7-19 years													**41.3**	**60.7**	25.5	**62.4**
Day of week (ref: weekday)																
Weekend	**51.6**	**40.7**	**75.8**	**51.8**	**-50.6**	-1.9	9.7	**32.1**	-1.0	**16.0**	**43.4**	**42.6**	**-0.7**	**18.4**	**45.0**	**42.6**
R^2	0.04	0.06	0.09	0.10	0.21	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.29	0.25	0.18	0.17	0.31	0.27	0.19	0.17
N	1,642	1,488	1,514	1,670	1,830	1,703	1,464	1,649	3,472	3,191	2,978	3,319	3,472	3,191	2,978	3,319

[1] Estimates in bold are significant at the 5%-level, and estimates in italics are significant at the 10%-level.

[2] Estimates from all control variables are reported. We have run separate regressions for each year for 1) all men in the analysis sample, 2) all women in the analysis sample, 3) all men and women in the analysis sample with gender as a control variable but no interactions, and 4) all men and women in the analysis sample with interactions between gender and age of youngest child.

Appendix table 3. Estimates (minutes per day) from regressions on time spent on routine housework. 1980-2010. Average all days. [1, 2]

	Men				Women				All				All, with interactions			
	1980	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**
Intercept	38.3	35.9	38.5	49.6	186.2	127.3	112.4	90.5	33.8	27.3	38.4	43.5	46.1	37.5	39.2	49.9
Age of youngest child (ref: none)																
0-1 years	-6.6	2.8	4.1	10.8	**31.3**	6.0	12.5	*14.2*	**13.5**	5.5	8.7	**12.8**	-5.4	3.1	4.4	10.9
2-3 years	-7.2	**-10.3**	12.4	**12.9**	*21.4*	**34.7**	11.8	**22.2**	8.6	**14.7**	*12.2*	**17.4**	-6.9	**-10.0**	12.6	**12.9**
4-6 years	3.7	7.9	5.4	4.3	**28.6**	**33.6**	5.9	**27.4**	**16.6**	**22.0**	5.6	**15.4**	4.9	8.6	5.4	4.3
7-19 years	0.3	*9.6*	**11.0**	4.8	**31.7**	**41.8**	**14.2**	**32.5**	**16.9**	**26.9**	**12.6**	**17.9**	0.2	**9.8**	**11.1**	4.8
Gender (ref: men)																
Women									**156.2**	**108.1**	**74.2**	**53.9**	**133.6**	**88.1**	**72.4**	**40.4**
Interaction gender * age of youngest child																
Woman * child 0-1 years													**35.3**	3.5	8.1	3.3
Woman * child 2-3 years													**28.9**	**44.6**	-1.0	9.2
Woman * child 4-6 years													*21.4*	**25.4**	0.5	**23.2**
Woman * child 7-19 years													**31.0**	**32.4**	3.1	**27.7**
Day of week (ref: weekday)																
Weekend	**24.4**	**17.7**	**18.7**	**23.0**	**-31.0**	**6.1**	**13.2**	**21.14**	**-3.8**	**11.0**	**16.0**	**22.2**	-3.9	**11.6**	**16.1**	**22.2**
R^2	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.04	0.41	0.30	0.20	0.13	0.41	0.30	0.21	0.14
N	1,642	1,488	1,514	1,670	1,830	1,703	1,464	1,649	3,472	3,191	2,978	3,319	3,472	3,191	2,978	3,319

[1] Estimates in bold are significant at the 5%-level, and estimates in italics are significant at the 10%-level.

[2] Estimates from all control variables are reported. We have run separate regressions for each year for 1) all men in the analysis sample, 2) all women in the analysis sample, 3) all men and women in the analysis sample with gender as a control variable but no interactions, and 4) all men and women in the analysis sample with interactions between gender and age of youngest child.

Appendix table 4. Estimates (minutes per day) from regressions on time spent on direct childcare. 1980-2010. Average all days. [1, 2]

	Men				Women				All				All, with interactions			
	1980	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**
Intercept	1.0	-0.9	-2.0	1.7	2.1	2.4	5.2	3.0	-19.8	-19.3	-9.9	-8.9	0.9	0.7	0.6	2.1
Age of youngest child (ref: none)																
0-1 years	**75.0**	**98.7**	**104.9**	**102.7**	**233.5**	**234.1**	**207.3**	**238.4**	**157.4**	**165.8**	**159.2**	**161.6**	**75.3**	**99.0**	**105.9**	**102.8**
2-3 years	**66.7**	**72.0**	**62.1**	**90.8**	**125.6**	**164.4**	**113.3**	**136.7**	**98.1**	**123.4**	**85.4**	**111.6**	**66.7**	**72.3**	**62.6**	**90.9**
4-6 years	**37.5**	**57.9**	**50.7**	**73.9**	**90.9**	**113.4**	**72.5**	**89.2**	**66.0**	**87.8**	**60.8**	**80.8**	**37.8**	**58.5**	**50.5**	**73.9**
7-19 years	**12.5**	**15.3**	**9.3**	**11.2**	**33.5**	**37.2**	**24.0**	**22.4**	**24.1**	**26.7**	**16.1**	**16.3**	**12.5**	**15.6**	**9.6**	**11.1**
Gender (ref: men)																
Women									**37.7**	**39.3**	**24.9**	**24.0**	-0.3	-0.1	1.8	0.2
Interaction gender * age of youngest child																
Woman * child 0-1 years													**157.9**	**135.7**	**101.3**	**135.6**
Woman * child 2-3 years													**59.0**	**92.0**	**50.1**	**45.6**
Woman * child 4-6 years													**52.5**	**55.3**	**22.0**	15.4
Woman * child 7-19 years													**20.9**	**22.1**	**14.3**	**11.3**
Day of week (ref: weekday)																
Weekend	**6.0**	4.7	**10.7**	3.7	**-7.3**	*-7.4*	**-8.6**	-0.7	-1.0	-3.2	0.6	1.4	-0.8	-1.7	1.7	1.7
R^2	0.26	0.34	0.35	0.36	0.58	0.56	0.54	0.57	0.45	0.47	0.46	0.44	0.53	0.54	0.50	0.50
N	1,642	1,488	1,514	1,670	1,830	1,703	1,464	1,649	3,472	3,191	2,978	3,319	3,472	3,191	2,978	3,319

[1] Estimates in bold are significant at the 5%-level, and estimates in italics are significant at the 10%-level.

[2] Estimates from all control variables are reported. We have run separate regressions for each year for 1) all men in the analysis sample, 2) all women in the analysis sample, 3) all men and women in the analysis sample with gender as a control variable but no interactions, and 4) all men and women in the analysis sample with interactions between gender and age of youngest child.

Appendix table 5. Estimates (minutes per day) from regressions on time spent on personal activities. 1980-2010. Average all days. [1, 2]

	Men				Women				All				All, with interactions			
	1980	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**
Intercept	576.4	562.9	555.8	556.7	594.8	590.7	584.0	604.3	575.9	562.7	556.1	568.1	580.9	566.9	560.7	561.6
Age of youngest child (ref: none)																
0-1 years	-10.5	*-21.2*	**-39.7**	-6.2	**-29.5**	**-21.9**	-14.1	*-26.7*	**-19.9**	**-20.2**	**-25.7**	*-15.3*	-9.8	*-20.5*	**-37.8**	-5.3
2-3 years	**-25.7**	**-35.5**	**-21.5**	*-18.4*	5.2	3.7	3.6	**-38.3**	-9.4	*-13.0*	-10.1	**-27.3**	**-25.6**	**-34.6**	*-20.6*	-17.1
4-6 years	*-19.0*	**-28.7**	**-36.8**	*-17.9*	9.3	-3.6	**-24.4**	**-34.7**	-4.4	**-13.7**	**-31.1**	**-25.6**	*-18.3*	**-27.1**	**-37.1**	*-17.8*
7-19 years	*-14.5*	-10.5	**-32.1**	-7.8	-0.9	-8.5	**-20.3**	**-29.9**	-7.3	-8.6	**-26.5**	**-18.3**	*-14.6*	-9.8	**-31.7**	-7.9
Gender (ref: men)																
Women									**21.1**	**27.4**	**28.0**	**23.1**	10.1	**19.3**	**18.1**	**37.1**
Interaction gender * age of youngest child																
Woman * child 0-1 years													-20.5	-0.1	23.6	-22.1
Woman * child 2-3 years													**31.1**	**38.0**	23.2	-22.1
Woman * child 4-6 years													*26.3*	*24.5*	12.8	-16.4
Woman * child 7-19 years													13.4	2.5	11.1	*-22.0*
Day of week (ref: weekday)																
Weekend	**93.0**	**96.1**	**115.9**	**122.0**	**60.9**	**66.6**	**80.3**	**82.9**	**76.6**	**80.6**	**99.1**	**103.9**	**76.6**	**80.6**	**99.3**	**103.9**
R^2	0.14	0.16	0.21	0.19	0.08	0.10	0.12	0.12	0.11	0.13	0.17	0.16	0.12	0.14	0.17	0.16
N	1,642	1,488	1,514	1,670	1,830	1,703	1,464	1,649	3,472	3,191	2,978	3,319	3,472	3,191	2,978	3,319

[1] Estimates in bold are significant at the 5%-level, and estimates in italics are significant at the 10%-level.

[2] Estimates from all control variables are reported. We have run separate regressions for each year for 1) all men in the analysis sample, 2) all women in the analysis sample, 3) all men and women in the analysis sample with gender as a control variable but no interactions, and 4) all men and women in the analysis sample with interactions between gender and age of youngest child.

Appendix table 6. Estimates (minutes per day) from regressions on time spent on leisure activities. 1980-2010 [1, 2]

	Men				Women				All				All, with interactions			
	1980	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**
Intercept	301.1	291.5	315.8	298.4	320.1	305.7	329.7	337.2	311.3	302.07	319.4	313.7	313.5	299.5	321.9	307.0
Age of youngest child (ref: none)																
0-1 years	-21.6	**-38.0**	**-73.19**	-31.4	**-63.0**	**-33.7**	**-36.6**	**-79.3**	**-42.8**	**-34.0**	**-52.9**	**-52.1**	-19.7	**-36.5**	**-70.8**	-30.0
2-3 years	**-53.9**	**-51.1**	**-66.5**	**-89.3**	**-31.0**	**-40.8**	**-49.1**	**-108.4**	**-41.5**	**-44.3**	**-58.6**	**-97.5**	**-53.6**	**-49.3**	**-65.4**	**-87.0**
4-6 years	**-36.2**	**-41.2**	**-80.4**	**-73.4**	*-27.5*	**-33.1**	**-61.2**	**-81.9**	**-32.5**	**-34.0**	**-71.2**	**-76.7**	**-34.3**	*-38.0*	**-80.7**	**-73.3**
7-19 years	**-38.4**	-1.8	-14.2	-11.8	**-25.3**	**-23.7**	-19.7	**-29.5**	**-32.0**	-11.5	*-16.9*	**-20.3**	**-38.7**	-0.3	-13.7	-12.0
Gender (ref: men)																
Women									0.5	-8.2	6.8	5.9	-3.6	-3.0	1.4	20.3
Interaction gender * age of youngest child																
Woman * child 0-1 years													*-45.5*	5.6	33.8	*-50.6*
Woman * child 2-3 years													23.6	7.9	15.2	-23.1
Woman * child 4-6 years													3.1	6.8	19.6	-7.7
Woman * child 7-19 years													12.4	-21.0	-6.4	-17.6
Day of week (ref: weekday)																
Weekend	**224.8**	**209.1**	**181.7**	**180.9**	**136.5**	**149.1**	**137.4**	**112.3**	**179.6**	**177.9**	**160.7**	**149.0**	**179.6**	**177.6**	**161.0**	**149.0**
R^2	0.28	0.24	0.21	0.20	0.15	0.19	0.14	0.13	0.21	0.21	0.18	0.16	0.21	0.21	0.18	0.16
N	1,642	1,488	1,514	1,670	1,830	1,703	1,464	1,649	3,472	3,191	2,978	3,319	3,472	3,191	2,978	3,319

[1] Estimates in bold are significant at the 5%-level, and estimates in italics are significant at the 10%-level.

[2] Estimates from all control variables are reported. We have run separate regressions for each year for 1) all men in the analysis sample, 2) all women in the analysis sample, 3) all men and women in the analysis sample with gender as a control variable but no interactions, and 4) all men and women in the analysis sample with interactions between gender and age of youngest child.

Appendix table 7. Estimates (minutes per day) from regressions on time spent on paid work on weekdays. 1980-2010 [1, 2]

	Men				Women				All				All, with interactions			
	1980	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**
Intercept	-12.3	306.7	-148.7	334.7	159.7	44.5	-100.4	215.8	243.2	236.4	-122.1	94.8	212.8	250.0	-40.2	87.1
Age of youngest child (ref: none)																
0-1 years	-27.0	-59.2	**100.1**	-45.7	**-249.7**	**-246.9**	**-221.2**	**-158.2**	**-154.3**	**-156.8**	**-79.1**	**-92.6**	-54.6	*-65.8*	**85.8**	-45.6
2-3 years	30.3	38.6	47.4	33.5	**-189.7**	**-230.3**	**-138.2**	-49.3	**-91.0**	**-110.5**	-42.6	-5.0	9.0	28.3	38.6	19.8
4-6 years	-36.8	25.1	**81.3**	36.6	**-156.6**	**-160.9**	-52.4	7.8	**-103.0**	**-80.5**	7.7	20.7	-41.7	15.5	*73.4*	21.7
7-19 years	14.0	4.8	9.6	39.9	**-70.8**	**-74.8**	*-49.4*	-19.3	*-31.3*	**-35.2**	-23.1	8.2	26.3	1.6	14.1	27.0
Gender (ref: men)																
Women									**-253.0**	**-192.9**	**-155.2**	**-118.1**	**-164.7**	**-106.7**	**-79.4**	**-88.1**
Interaction gender * age of youngest child																
Woman * child 0-1 years													**-177.1**	**-169.8**	**-287.7**	**-108.3**
Woman * child 2-3 years													**-177.2**	**-244.9**	**-158.8**	-55.5
Woman * child 4-6 years													**-106.3**	**-165.1**	**-115.7**	-5.3
Woman * child 7-19 years													**-99.4**	**-66.6**	*-59.3*	-39.4
Respondent's age	**22.8**	7.8	**22.4**	1.7	10.2	**17.5**	**20.3**	23.2	**14.9**	**15.5**	**25.8**	**13.6**	**13.2**	*11.3*	**18.5**	*13.4*
Respondent's age squared	**-0.3**	-0.1	*-0.2*	-0.0	-0.2	**-0.3**	*-0.2*	-0.3	**-0.2**	**-0.2**	**-0.3**	-0.1	**-0.2**	**-0.1**	**-0.2**	-0.1
Respondent's education (ref: secondary school or less)																
University 1-4 years	**-48.7**	15.6	-18.9	31.6	27.7	**65.4**	*36.8*	**49.7**	-4.5	**42.0**	3.9	5.9	-4.8	**43.0**	8.3	7.4
University 5 years +	15.8	**82.6**	19.4	4.1	**205.9**	**166.4**	**133.0**	**103.8**	*53.7*	**120.5**	*49.5*	*42.7*	49.0	**116.3**	**52.6**	**45.0**
Unknown	**76.2**	-133.8	65.3	**-222.8**	*160.3*	82.3	104.3	41.6	**116.1**	-57.9	47.7	*-74.3*	**109.3**	-42.4	90.1	*-74.6*
Partner employed (ref: no)																
Yes	14.7	4.3	**79.5**	24.2	-29.6	1.3	25.3	4.7	-13.2	-14.3	*43.8*	16.4	2.4	1.9	**60.1**	15.4
R^2	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.04	-29.6	0.13	0.10	0.07	0.26	0.18	0.12	0.08	0.27	0.20	0.15	0.08
N	1,175	1,052	1,035	1,190	1,356	1,229	1,060	1,170	2,531	2,281	2,095	2,360	2,531	2,281	2,095	2,360

[1] Estimates in bold are significant at the 5%-level, and estimates in italics are significant at the 10%-level.

[2] Estimates from all control variables are reported. We have run separate regressions for each year for 1) all men in the analysis sample, 2) all women in the analysis sample, 3) all men and women in the analysis sample with gender as a control variable but no interactions, and 4) all men and women in the analysis sample with interactions between gender and age of youngest child.

Appendix table 8. Estimates (minutes per day) from regressions on time spent on paid work on weekends. 1980-2010 [1, 2]

	Men				Women				All				All, with interactions			
	1980	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**
Intercept	286.0	-14.5	-184.8	-126.9	-176.5	43.6	-81.0	546.7	53.3	76.6	-99.0	201.8	62.6	71.2	-76.2	183.2
Age of youngest child (ref: none)																
0-1 years	23.9	11.5	-15.4	**-93.2**	-20.4	-40.2	**-89.2**	**-105.0**	2.7	-11.4	**-42.6**	**-93.5**	21.7	8.2	-29.3	**-88.9**
2-3 years	16.8	-33.1	-12.4	-45.7	-20.5	**-65.7**	-42.0	24.3	-2.0	**-48.8**	-19.7	-13.7	7.4	-31.2	-18.0	-32.3
4-6 years	*67.6*	-47.3	-77.3	**-66.0**	-33.2	**-54.3**	-38.2	-14.5	17.5	**-50.6**	**-55.1**	-37.7	52.2	-44.1	**-81.2**	-45.9
7-19 years	*39.3*	-26.5	-9.0	-0.6	-5.0	-20.6	8.1	13.1	21.2	-25.3	1.9	6.2	26.5	-21.8	-6.6	21.0
Gender (ref: men)																
Women									**-34.4**	**-53.0**	-20.1	-5.8	-15.9	-42.7	-29.2	-0.2
Interaction gender * age of youngest child																
Woman * child 0-1 years													-37.7	-41.4	-28.6	-11.2
Woman * child 2-3 years													-16.6	-27.1	-2.1	43.5
Woman * child 4-6 years													*-65.2*	-10.1	56.8	14.9
Woman * child 7-19 years													-8.1	-4.8	*20.9*	-32.7
Respondent's age	-11.7	9.8	14.7	14.4	**12.1**	2,7	12.9	**-22.7**	1.1	5.4	*11.8*	-2.9	0.0	5.2	*10.7*	-2.1
Respondent's age squared	0.1	-0.1	*-0.2*	-0.2	**-0.2**	-0.1	-0.2	*0.2*	-0.0	-0.1	**-0.2**	0.0	-0.0	-0.1	*-0.1*	-0.0
Respondent's education (ref: secondary school or less)																
University 1-4 years	-28.5	*-40.1*	-18.3	-20.2	**-35.6**	-1.7	-0.3	**32.6**	**-30.4**	**-22.5**	-8.5	2.4	**-31.2**	-20.6	-9.7	2.1
University 5 years +	-36.0	52.8	-31.4	-34.3	65.5	4.6	**-64.1**	-19.1	-25.4	36.3	**-46.1**	-32.5	-27.1	35.6	**-43.9**	-32.8
Unknown	**96.2**	20.3	**-114.3**	**-91.3**	*-54.0*	**-60.9**	**-581.2**	76.1	4.4	9.2	83.5	-17.2	15.2	11.8	93.8	-16.7
Partner employed (ref: no)																
Yes	-1.1	-46.4	8.9	-14.1	19.4	19.8	-29.7	24.4	0.4	-28.6	-1.2	3.3	3.1	-26.8	1.5	1.8
R^2	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.08	0.08	0.02	0.05	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.05	0.03	0.04
N	467	436	479	480	474	474	404	479	941	910	883	959	941	910	883	959

[1] Estimates in bold are significant at the 5%-level, and estimates in italics are significant at the 10%-level.

[2] Estimates from all control variables are reported. We have run separate regressions for each year for 1) all men in the analysis sample, 2) all women in the analysis sample, 3) all men and women in the analysis sample with gender as a control variable but no interactions, and 4) all men and women in the analysis sample with interactions between gender and age of youngest child.

Appendix table 9. Estimates (minutes per day) from regressions on time spent on household work on weekdays. 1980-2010 [1, 2]

	Men				Women				All				All, with interactions			
	1980	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**
Intercept	163.0	73.0	11.0	-21.0	100.7	60.0	5.7	23.4	36.2	-22.2	71.0	-29.8	36.3	-16.0	18.3	-20.3
Age of youngest child (ref: none)																
0-1 years	**65.8**	**106.0**	**57.4**	**98.1**	**297.6**	**266.4**	**248.7**	**284.1**	**197.4**	**187.1**	**166.1**	**176.1**	**84.6**	**111.6**	**61.2**	**104.8**
2-3 years	**61.4**	**43.2**	**32.9**	**53.9**	**192.0**	**234.2**	**159.0**	**164.0**	**138.2**	**146.2**	**94.5**	**101.9**	**75.8**	**49.0**	*32.5*	**62.7**
4-6 years	**57.6**	25.9	30.7	**66.8**	**144.2**	**163.8**	**93.1**	**115.4**	**108.2**	**102.5**	**67.2**	**85.9**	**61.6**	*29.1*	29.8	**72.5**
7-19 years	22.7	2.7	13.5	-10.3	**65.6**	**70.6**	**55.7**	**51.7**	**47.9**	**34.8**	**38.4**	*17.6*	16.1	-4.6	7.8	-10.8
Gender (ref: men)																
Women									**189.9**	**149.2**	**98.1**	**66.2**	**132.5**	**74.4**	**44.3**	18.0
Interaction gender * age of youngest child																
Woman * child 0-1 years													**202.9**	**143.4**	**184.5**	**164.3**
Woman * child 2-3 years													**106.0**	**174.2**	**123.8**	**87.7**
Woman * child 4-6 years													**78.2**	**129.1**	**65.1**	31.3
Woman * child 7-19 years													**50.5**	**74.2**	**51.2**	**59.2**
Respondent's age	-3.7	1.6	2.9	9.2	3.0	5.2	8.0	5.2	-0.9	3.3	1.9	*7.7*	1.6	*5.7*	*6.7*	**8.2**
Respondent's age squared	0.1	-0.0	-0.1	-0.1	-0.0	-0.0	-0.1	-0.0	0.0	-0.0	-0.0	*-0.1*	-0.0	-0.0	*-0.1*	*-0.1*
Respondent's education (ref: secondary school or less)																
University 1-4 years	**38.5**	-9.2	10.5	13.6	-18.4	**-46.5**	-18.7	*-22.8*	5.1	**-28.3**	-0.1	-2.0	6.0	**-29.6**	-3.3	-4.4
University 5 years +	-17.0	-11.9	-24.3	6.6	**-160.0**	**-100.8**	**-49.1**	-27.4	-17.4	**-49.6**	**-32.1**	-4.3	-11.3	**-46.8**	**-34.2**	-7.3
Unknown	17.5	19.3	-12.2	37.2	-47.9	41.8	-51.8	-9.0	-33.1	32.5	-9.2	9.5	-30.8	23.5	-36.6	10.0
Partner employed (ref: no)																
Yes	12.2	13.7	**-37.6**	1.6	50.8	-0.8	17.2	30.5	**38.4**	*19.9*	-7.6	10.9	22.3	8.6	-17.9	12.1
R^2	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.07	0.44	0.25	0.23	0.22	0.36	0.29	0.20	0.15	0.38	0.32	0.24	0.17
N	1,175	1,052	1,035	1,190	1,356	1,229	1,060	1,170	2,531	2,281	2,095	1,410	2,531	2,281	2,095	2,360

[1] Estimates in bold are significant at the 5%-level, and estimates in italics are significant at the 10%-level.

[2] Estimates from all control variables are reported. We have run separate regressions for each year for 1) all men in the analysis sample, 2) all women in the analysis sample, 3) all men and women in the analysis sample with gender as a control variable but no interactions, and 4) all men and women in the analysis sample with interactions between gender and age of youngest child.

Appendix table 10. Estimates (minutes per day) from regressions on time spent on household work on weekends. 1980-2010 [1, 2]

	Men				Women				All				All, with interactions			
	1980	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010**
Intercept	107.8	-30.9	51.3	144.7	68.9	146.2	97.3	-193.0	18.1	-55.8	78.4	-64.9	-6.1	-21.9	26.1	-48.4
Age of youngest child (ref: none)																
0-1 years	27.7	**68.7**	**135.4**	**127.2**	**284.2**	**236.2**	**285.8**	**251.0**	**157.0**	**148.9**	**201.6**	**181.2**	*40.5*	**88.3**	**153.2**	**141.4**
2-3 years	45.4	**93.6**	**135.2**	**168.0**	**123.5**	**169.9**	**148.8**	**192.9**	**82.9**	**135.5**	**138.9**	**178.7**	**56.7**	**107.3**	**140.6**	**173.7**
4-6 years	**66.3**	**99.1**	**162.9**	**94.4**	**112.7**	**116.3**	**156.8**	**120.2**	**89.5**	**108.7**	**159.1**	**96.7**	**71.0**	**112.7**	**169.1**	**87.0**
7-19 years	*39.1*	16.4	*42.6*	0.8	**57.0**	**58.3**	22.9	**60.8**	**43.4**	**32.2**	**34.6**	26.0	31.2	17.9	*45.5*	-9.2
Gender (ref: men)																
Women									**110.0**	**105.4**	**47.5**	**52.0**	**71.8**	**78.4**	**49.4**	14.5
Interaction gender * age of youngest child																
Woman * child 0-1 years													**232.6**	**133.6**	**103.1**	**90.5**
Woman * child 2-3 years													47.8	47.4	-13.4	6.3
Woman * child 4-6 years													29.7	-14.0	-29.1	20.1
Woman * child 7-13 years													18.7	27.5	-30.0	**73.5**
Respondent's age	2.7	9.7	2.5	1.1	7.8	-0.5	-1.0	20.2	4.4	7.8	-0.3	*10.5*	7.4	*7.1*	2.9	10.7
Respondent's age squared	-0.0	-0.1	0.0	-0.0	-0.1	0.0	0.1	-0.2	-0.0	-0.1	0.0	-0.1	-0.1	-0.1	0.0	-0.1
Respondent's education (ref: secondary school or less)																
University 1-4 years	**60.6**	-22.4	**52.3**	*38.3*	19.1	14.9	-17.1	0.0	**48.9**	1.9	18.5	21.0	**43.6**	-3.2	21.9	20.7
University 5 years +	*47.8*	-4.8	**64.1**	*63.1*	**-65.6**	-11.5	0.5	*-61.9*	32.0	-7.9	*40.9*	10.2	32.2	-6.3	**33.8**	9.9
Unknown	**-169.3**	-60.4	**167.4**	-30.4	*98.8*	29.1	**-348.9**	-4.6	41.0	-40.3	38.5	-7.6	-3.4	-48.7	10.7	-10.8
Partner employed (ref: no)																
Yes	-22.8	-1.5	-22.7	9.7	*-55.7*	27.7	21.1	**-72.7**	-9.3	10.2	-8.8	-18.1	-21.8	7.4	-15.1	-19.8
R^2	0.05	0.08	0.12	0.16	0.22	0.21	0.26	0.23	0.17	0.21	0.16	0.17	0.21	0.22	0.17	0.18
N	467	436	479	480	474	474	404	479	941	910	883	959	941	910	883	959

[1] Estimates in bold are significant at the 5%-level, and estimates in italics are significant at the 10%-level.

[2] Estimates from all control variables are reported. We have run separate regressions for each year for 1) all men in the analysis sample, 2) all women in the analysis sample, 3) all men and women in the analysis sample with gender as a control variable but no interactions, and 4) all men and women in the analysis sample with interactions between gender and age of youngest child.

Appendix table 11. Significance tests of the change in interaction estimates (women*age of youngest child) across surveys in tables 5-10. Estimates (minutes per day) from regressions with interaction terms between year and all independent variables[1]

	Paid work	Household work	Routine housework	Direct childcare	Personal activities	Leisure activities
Woman * child 0-1 years * 1980	-60.3	*71.5*	27.9	22.4	5.3	0.7
	(49.7)	(37.0)	(17.2)	(21.2)	(24.1)	(35.6)
Woman * child 0-1 years * 1990	-72.0	2.8	-3.0	2.5	21.0	56.9
	(51.6)	(39.0)	(15.6)	(22.5)	(23.6)	(35.9)
Woman * child 0-1 years * 2000	**-126.2**	15.6	5.0	-30.6	**49.2**	**74.5**
	(52.6)	(39.0)	(15.6)	(22.9)	(23.9)	(35.6)
Woman * child 0-1 years * 2010 (ref)						
Woman * child 2-3 years * 1980	**-120.2**	38.0	16.7	12.3	**56.8**	43.7
	(53.0)	(33.5)	(15.9)	(15.9)	(20.3)	(33.5)
Woman * child 2-3 years * 1990	**-149.5**	**73.7**	**34.0**	47.5	**58.6**	29.6
	(52.8)	(33.2)	(14.6)	(16.5)	(20.9)	(34.9)
Woman * child 2-3 years * 2000	-81.0	17.7	-9.3	5.6	**46.3**	31.7
	(57.1)	(36.7)	(16.5)	(17.7)	(21.6)	(35.8)
Woman * child 2-3 years * 2010 (ref)						
Woman * child 4-6 years * 1980	*-82.3*	30.6	-4.2	**37.5**	**43.6**	5.5
	(49.7)	(32.0)	(15.6)	(11.5)	(20.4)	(33.2)
Woman * child 4-6 years * 1990	**-113.9**	*58.0*	-3.7	**41.1**	*38.7*	11.5
	(51.8)	(32.8)	(15.5)	(12.8)	(20.0)	(35.1)
Woman * child 4-6 years * 2000	-62.9	11.33	*-28.8*	7.4	32.0	27.9
	(52.8)	(32.7)	(14.8)	(12.8)	(20.2)	(33.9)
Woman * child 4-6 years * 2010 (ref)						
Woman * child 7-19 years * 1980	-38.1	-20.2	3.1	*8.9*	**36.3**	27.2
	(37.2)	(21.6)	(12.1)	(4.6)	(16.0)	(25.1)
Woman * child 7-19 years * 1990	-9.3	-1.4	3.6	9.7	*26.6*	-1.6
	(37.5)	(21.5)	(11.3)	(5.0)	(15.7)	(24.9)
Woman * child 7-19 years * 2000	8.7	*-37.9*	**-25.8**	3.3	*31.2*	8.0
	(39.0)	(22.3)	(11.0)	(5.1)	(16.1)	(26.3)
Woman * child 7-19 years * 2010 (ref)						

[1] Estimates in bold are significant at the 5%-level, and estimates in italics are significant at the 10%-level.

Appendix table 12. Significance tests of the change in interaction estimates (women*age of youngest child) across surveys in table 11 and appendix tables 7-10. Estimates (minutes per day) from regressions with interaction terms between year and all independent variables [1]

	Paid work		Household work	
	Weekdays	**Weekends**	**Weekdays**	**Weekends**
Woman * child 0-1 years * 1980	-68.8	-26.5	38.6	**142.1**
	(64.7)	(50.3)	(43.3)	(58.9)
Woman * child 0-1 years * 1990	-61.5	-30.1	-21.0	43.2
	(66.1)	(62.4)	(44.4)	(65.9)
Woman * child 0-1 years * 2000	**-179.4**	-17.3	20.2	12.6
	(70.3)	(49.3)	(44.8)	(63.8)
Woman * child 0-1 years * 2010 (ref)				
Woman * child 2-3 years * 1980	*-121.7*	-60.1	18.1	41.6
	(66.0)	(63.2)	(37.7)	(58.6)
Woman * child 2-3 years * 1990	*-189.4*	-70.6	**86.4**	41.1
	(65.6)	(65.0)	(37.1)	(58.6)
Woman * child 2-3 years * 2000	-103.3	45.6	35.9	-19.7
	(71.7)	(69.7)	(40.6)	(62.4)
Woman * child 2-3 years * 2010 (ref)				
Woman * child 4-6 years * 1980	-101.1	-80.1	46.9	9.6
	(64.1)	(56.7)	(37.3)	(56.1)
Woman * child 4-6 years * 1990	**-159.8**	-25.0	**97.8**	-34.1
	(67.3)	(58.6)	(38.1)	(57.9)
Woman * child 4-6 years * 2000	-110.5	41.9	33.8	-49.2
	(68.9)	(55.1)	(37.6)	(60.5)
Woman * child 4-6 years * 2010 (ref)				
Woman * child 7-19 years * 1980	-60.1	24.5	-8.7	-54.8
	(46.8)	(45.6)	(25.3)	(37.6)
Woman * child 7-19 years * 1990	-27.2	27.9	15.0	-46.1
	(47.3)	(49.2)	(25.4)	(36.4)
Woman * child 7-19 years * 2000	-20.0	53.6	-8.0	**-103.6**
	(49.4)	(51.1)	(25.8)	(39.5)
Woman * child 7-19 years * 2010 (ref)				

[1] Estimates in bold are significant at the 5%-level, and estimates in italics are significant at the 10%-level.

B

Return to:
Statistisk sentralbyrå
NO-2225 Kongsvinger

From:
Statistics Norway

Postal address:
PO Box 8131 Dept
NO-0033 Oslo

Office address:
Kongens gate 6, Oslo
Oterveien 23, Kongsvinger

E-mail: ssb@ssb.no
Internet: www.ssb.no
Telephone: + 47 62 88 50 00

ISSN 0809-733X

Statistisk sentralbyrå
Statistics Norway

Design: Siri Boquist