

Do We Invest Less Time In Children? Trends in Parental Time in Selected Industrialized Countries since the 1960s*

Anne H. Gauthier
Associate professor and Canada Research Chair in Comparative Public Policy
University of Calgary
(gauthier@ucalgary.ca)

Timothy Smeeding
Maxwell Professor of Public Policy, Professor of Economics and
Public Administration
Syracuse University
(tmsmeed@maxwell.syr.edu)

Frank F. Furstenberg Jr.
Zellerbach Family Professor of Sociology
University of Pennsylvania
(fff@pop.upenn.edu)

October 2004

Address all correspondence to: Dr. Anne H. Gauthier
Department of Sociology
University of Calgary
2500 University Dr. NW
Calgary, Alberta
Canada, T2N 1N4
Phone: 403-220-6520
Fax: 403-282-9298
gauthier@ucalgary.ca

*The authors would like to thank several persons including Cara Fedick, Esther Gray, Kati Foley, Tingting Lu, Leslie MacRae, Shelley Pacholok, Monica Pauls, Cori Pawlak, and Charlemagne Victorino. Funding for this research was provided by the MacArthur Foundation Network on the Family and the Economy and by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Population Association of America (March 2001) and at the world conference of the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population (August 2001). We are grateful to the discussants for their comments. We are also grateful to the reviewers of PDR for their excellent comments. The conclusions, and any errors of commission and omission, are solely those of the authors.

Abstract

This paper examines trends in parental time in selected industrialized countries since the 1960s using time-use survey data. Despite the time pressures to which today's families are confronted, parents appear to be devoting more time to children than they did some 40 years ago. Results also suggest a decrease in the differences between fathers and mothers in time devoted to children. Mothers continue to devote more time to childcare than fathers, but the gender gap has been reduced. These results are observed in several countries and therefore suggest a large global trend towards an increase in parental time investment in children.

Introduction

The time devoted by parents to their children is a major form of investment: an investment that is strongly linked with children's well-being and development. Time spent by parents with children, including parent-child shared activities, has been shown to have a positive impact on children's development (Büchel and Duncan 1998; Furstenberg, Morgan, and Allison 1987; Cooksey and Fondell 1996). Yet, the time pressures to which today's families are confronted would suggest that parents are devoting less time to their children, as compared to some 30 or 40 years ago. The expressions "time crunch," "time poor," "time squeeze", and "time famine" have routinely been used in the popular and academic press to characterize today's families (Bunting 2000; Gershuny 2000; Daly 2000; Clarkberg undated).¹

Time-use data from the United States and other countries suggests however exactly the opposite. In the United States, between 1965 and 1998, time devoted by married fathers to childcare has increased from 0.4 hour to 1.0 hour per day, while time devoted by married mothers has increased from 1.7 to 1.8 hours (Bianchi 2000). Evidence obtained on the basis of children's time diaries, rather than parents' diaries, comes also to a similar conclusion. A

comparison of 1981 and 1997 American data suggests that children are not spending less time with parents. In the case of two-parent families, today's children are in fact spending substantially more time with their parents than in 1981 (Sandberg and Hofferth 2001). Time-use data from the United Kingdom suggests similar trends. Between 1961 and 1999, time spent on childcare by mothers has increased from 0.7 hour per day to 1.7, while for fathers it has increased from 0.2 hour per day to 0.8 hour (Fisher, McCulloch and Gershuny 1999).

Evidence from other countries is more limited, and in some cases, even suggests an opposite trend. The analysis by Zuzanek (2001) on Canadian data suggests an increase in parental time between 1981 and 1998. Gershuny (2000) employs time-use data from twenty countries and concludes that time spent on childcare activities by men and women decreased between 1960 and 1984, but that it has increased since then. In contrast, research by Klevmarken and Stafford (1999) suggests that time spent by parents with their children has decreased in Sweden between 1984 and 1993.

This paper contributes new findings to this literature by examining historical trends in parental time in selected industrialized countries. Extending the work of Bianchi (2000) and Sayer, Bianchi and Robinson (2004), we ask the question of how much more, or less, time are today's parents devoting to their children as compared to parents some 40 years ago. As suggested below, these trends are difficult to predict theoretically. While the increase in women's labor force participation since the 1960s suggests a reduction in the time available for children (and for other non-work activities), reductions in family size and the overall increase in education suggest an increase in time devoted to each child.

This paper measures trends in the time devoted by parents to childcare activities, thereafter referred to as parental time. To do so, we rely on time-use surveys collected in various countries between 1961 and 2000. These surveys collected data on parents' allocation of time to various activities, including childcare activities. They allow us to estimate parental time by gender, labor force status, and family type in a cross-national context. They also allow detailed estimates by type of childcare activities.

The paper is divided into four sections. Section 1 reviews the literature on parental time. We discuss the evidence related to historical trends in parental time, and discuss the links between parental time and various determinants of parental time including parents' education and mothers' labor force status. Section 2 introduces our theoretical framework, taking as a starting point the quality-quantity argument in classical family economics theory. We present our data and methods in Section 3 and our results in Section 4. We conclude our paper by summarizing our results and suggesting future avenues of research.

Literature

The observed increase in time devoted to children by parents in the United States and the United Kingdom is somewhat surprising given the large and sustained increase in female labor force participation since the 1960s (United Nations 2000). Despite less availability, today's parents appear to have been able to preserve the time that they spend with their children by 'taxing' other activities, including sleep (Hill and Stafford 1985). This process of time re-

allocation has been observed by Bittman (1999) on the basis of Australian data. Bittman writes: “it is noteworthy that parents’ increasing use of child care centers has been accompanied by increases in the time both mothers and fathers spend in face-to-face activities with their children” (p. 11). Data from children’s time-use diaries in the United States led to the same conclusion. While children are indeed spending today more time in preschools and school programs than in the past, they are nonetheless spending more time with their parents (Hofferth and Sandberg 2001). Other scattered findings corroborate this result. Research based on the 1992 Australian time-use survey reveals that while employed parents devote less time to childcare than non-employed parents, the difference in time devoted to childcare between the two groups is much less than the difference in time devoted to work. In 1992, employed parents devoted 2.1 hours per day on childcare as compared to 3.0 hours for non-employed parents (Miller and Mulvey 2000). If these results, observed on the basis of cross-sectional data, were also valid longitudinally, they would suggest that the increase in female labor force participation and in dual-earner families have not led to a major decline in parental time.

Estimates from a longer time-series suggest however a different conclusion. Analyses by Bryant and Zick (1996) for the United States suggest that time spent by parents on childcare has remained relatively stable between 1924 and 1981, but that it is instead the time spent per child that has significantly increased. For married mothers, time spent on childcare per child increased from 0.6 hour per day in 1924-31 to 1.0 hour in 1981, while for married fathers, it increased from 0.2 hour in 1975 (earliest year available) to 0.3 in 1981. Unfortunately, no such long time-series is available in other countries.

As to gender differences in parental time, mothers continue to devote more time to childcare than fathers. Results for the United States suggest however that the gender gap has been substantially reduced. While the ratio of married fathers' to married mothers' hours spent on childcare was 0.24 in 1965, it was 0.55 in 1998 (Bianchi 2000). Data from Sweden for the period 1984 to 1993 also suggests that men and women have become more alike in both market work and household work, including childcare activities (Hallberg and Klevmarken 2003). In Britain, estimates of parental time suggest that fathers' share of total parental time has increased from about 12 percent in 1961 to 30 percent in 1999 (Fisher, McCulloch, and Gershuny 1999).

Numerous studies have confirmed that more educated parents tend to devote more time to childcare and to provide a richer variety of caring activities to their children (Hill and Stafford 1973, 1985; Leibowitz 1974; Gronau 1977). Similarly, studies have confirmed that mothers from higher socioeconomic groups were devoting significantly more time to their preschool children as compared to mothers from lower socioeconomic groups (Hill and Stafford 1973; Sayer, Gauthier and Furstenberg 2004). Estimates for British fathers go however counter to those observed in the United States. In 1999, professional fathers in Britain were devoting the least time to childcare (about 30 minutes per day), while fathers in manual occupations were devoting the most time to childcare (about 50 minutes per day) (Fisher, McCulloch, and Gershuny 1999).

Most of the above results come from studies carried out individually in Australia, Britain, and the United States where there is a long tradition of time-use research. Whether these results hold for other countries when simultaneously analyzed is unclear. As mentioned above, Gershuny (2000) examined historical trends in time allocation patterns since the 1960s in a

cross-national context , but no detailed analysis for childcare was provided. This paper fills that lacunae and addresses the question of parental time by providing estimates of time spent by parents on childcare activities since the early 1960s using time-use data from sixteen countries (Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Norway, Poland, Sweden, the United Kingdom, the United States, and the former Yugoslavia). And while this subset of countries prevents us from generalizing our results to all industrialized countries, our subset includes countries belonging to various welfare state regimes as well as various economic, social and political cultures. The heterogeneous characteristics of our sample thus give us some confidence in stating that the results are not specific to one or few countries but that they capture a more general societal trend.

Building on earlier work, and especially the American results by Bianchi (2000) and Sayer, Bianchi and Robinson (2004), we ask three main questions: (1) What are the trends in parental time devoted to children in industrialized countries since the 1960s? And, how has the increase in parental time (if any) been ‘financed’ by sacrifices in other activities? (2) What type of childcare activities have most benefited from an increase (if any) in parental time? And (3) What has been the trend in the gender gap, that is, in the difference between the time that mothers and fathers devote to childcare? We thus go beyond the current literature by examining both the ‘quantitative investment’ into children (measured by the number of hours devoted to childcare) and the nature of this investment as captured by the type of childcare activities. The paper, thus, aims at broadening our understanding of how parents devote time to their children, and how they manage to preserve time for children by eliminating other daily activities.

Theoretical Framework

Major demographic changes have taken place in industrialized countries since the 1960s. These changes include an increasing diversity of family forms and a postponement of key demographic transitions especially the transition to parenthood. They have taken place with different degrees of magnitude in industrialized countries and at a different pace, but they have “spared” no country (Kohler, Billari, Ortega 2001). These demographic changes have furthermore not happened in isolation but have instead been accompanied by an increase in female labor force participation, an increase in the education levels of populations, and a trend towards greater gender equality (again with some differences across countries). These demographic changes are frequently referred to as the Second Demographic Transition: a transition that has been widespread across the industrialized world but that has also maintained some of the inter-country differences (Van De Kaa DJ. 1987; Billari and Wilson 2001). This transformation has dramatically altered the demographic, social, and economic context in which children grow-up, and by extension, possibly the investment of parents in children.

The “New Home Economics “ theory and its quality-quantity tradeoff argument provide a useful starting point to link demographic changes (especially the decline in fertility) with changes in parental investment in children (Becker and Lewis 1973; Becker and Tomes 1976; Willis 1987).² Parents, it is argued, may decide to have fewer children, but to have children of higher “quality” by devoting more resources to them. In one version of this theory, parental resources are restricted to financial resources. Parents who aim at higher “quality” consequently spend more money on their children. They may, for instance, send their children to private school, may hire a private tutor, or may pay for extracurricular lessons. The resources devoted to

children may however also be understood in terms of greater investment of parental time. In the previous examples, parents were spending more money by paying “experts” to devote their time to children. Parents may also invest more of their own time to children in order to increase their children’s “quality.”³ Of course, other factors may also influence children’s development and achievement, including the families’ income, access to resources (such as other relatives), and so on. We confine our attention in this paper to parental time itself and leave aside the issue of the impact of parental time investment on children, as well as the monetary resources devoted to children (for more on this topic see Bainbridge and Garfinkel 2000; Garfinkel, Rainwater and Smeeding, 2004).

From the onset, we should draw a distinction between changes in the overall parental time that are due to compositional or structural effects (i.e. changes in the structure of the population) and changes that are due to behavioral effects (i.e. changes in parenting style and in time investment into children). In terms of compositional effects, several economic and demographic changes may be expected to have affected parental time. First the fertility decline observed from the 1960s may have permitted an increase in the time devoted by parents to each child (simply because there are fewer of them). Most observers contend however that the relationship between fertility and parental time is not a simple causal one because reduced family size did not take place in isolation of other changes. The decline in fertility was accompanied by a major increase in women’s labor force participation: a trend that has likely reduced the time available by mothers for their children.⁴ From a joint household perspective, it is possible that fathers may have reacted to this situation by increasing their own time with children. However,

this would have been a costly time reallocation for families considering that fathers normally earn higher wages than mothers.

Other structural factors may have also influenced trends in parental time. As mentioned earlier, better educated parents tend to devote more time to childcare. They do so because they are more aware of the positive impact of parent-child shared activities on children's development and because they believe that they are producing "higher quality" children who are better prepared to make a successful transition to adulthood. As a result of the increase in the average educational level of the population, we might therefore expect to see an increase in the average time devoted to children.

Age of parents at children's birth is another factor that may affect parental time. There is evidence that middle-age husbands devote more time to housework than do younger husbands (South and Spitze 1994). It is however unclear if the same phenomenon is observed for childcare. If this were the case, the rapid increase since the 1960s in the age at entry into parenthood would suggest an increase in parental time, especially for fathers (everything else being equal).

Finally, there is the increasing instability of families: a factor that may also have affected historical trends in parental time—at least at the aggregate level. For instance, recent studies suggest that stepfathers may not have the same level of commitment to their non-biological children than biological fathers (McLanahan and Sandefur 1994). Whether this difference in the level of commitment is translated into a lower number of hours devoted to children is unknown.⁵

The lower level of commitment nevertheless suggests that the increase in the proportion of blended families may have resulted in an overall decrease in time spent by fathers on childcare (since a higher proportion of them are stepfathers than in the past).

The net effect of these compositional changes is difficult to assess. On the one hand, the decline in family size, the increase in parental education levels, and the increase in the age at entry into parenthood, can all be expected to have increased parental time in recent decades – at least in two-biological parent families. On the other hand, the increase in female labor force participation, the increase in family instability, and the rise in the proportion of single and blended families, might have resulted in decreased parental time.

In addition to the compositional effects discussed above, changes in parenting styles (i.e. behavioral effects) may also have affected the trends in parental time. The switch from quantity to quality in the classical economic fertility theory suggests such a behavioral effect. Unfortunately, we have very little information on individual preferences regarding time investment into children, versus other activities, and little information on the related changes over time. Similarly, we know little about changes in societal norms that may have affected time investment into children. For instance, it is possible that societal norms have called for increasing time reading to, or playing with, children, and for fathers to be more involved in their children's lives. We know, for example, that many parents express a desire to spend more time with their children than they are able to do and many children want more time with their parents (Galinsky 2000). It is also possible that societal norms have motivated parents to devote more time to their children as a way of protecting them from street dangers and other potentially dangerous

environments (the practice of driving kids to and from school would be an example of such a protective behavior).

The net effect of these compositional and behavioral effects is unclear.⁶ As noted earlier, it is possible that parents may have compensated for the increase in female labor force participation by reducing time on other activities in order to preserve the time that they spend with their children. If this were the case, parental time may have been unaffected by the increase in female labor force participation. The results presented below are a first attempt at shedding light on the impact of these different forces, and at distinguishing trends in different types of childcare activities.

Data and Methods

This paper relies on time diaries to estimate parental time. We used surveys carried out in sixteen industrialized countries between 1961 and 2000 (in the second part of the paper we focus on Canada). The choice of these countries was mainly dictated by data availability in that the related surveys have all been harmonized into a common set of demographic and time-use variables as part of the Multinational Time Use Study. And while these countries represent only a subset of all industrialized countries, they include countries belonging to very different social, political, and welfare state regimes. Unfortunately, we do not have data for the whole 1961—2000 period for each country. Instead, what we have is a set of surveys that covers the last four decades and that allows us to capture general trends.

All the surveys used the same instrument to capture people's allocation of time, namely the 24-hour diary. Such an instrument has been shown to provide more accurate estimates of people's allocation of time, as compared to other survey techniques, such as recall questions about time spent on specific activities during a fixed period of time (Robinson and Godbey 1997). Other differences across the surveys used in this paper may however affect their degree of comparability. This includes the different response rates (especially the lower response rate of some of the surveys), the coverage of the twelve months of the year, and the sampling frame. Details on these surveys appear in Appendix. And while some of these differences may account for some of the cross-national differences in parental time as well as some of the 'noise' in our time trends, the dataset is nonetheless unique and provides a so far unexploited opportunity to analyze historical trends in parental time across a large number of countries.

On the basis of these surveys, we provide estimates of time spent on five main categories of activities: (1) paid work and education; (2) housework; (3) childcare; (4) leisure; and (5) personal activities (including sleeping and eating). Childcare activities encompass activities such as reading to children, playing with children, putting children to bed, and providing general care to children, including medical care. The sum of all activities recorded in the diaries is equal to 24 hours. We restrict the analysis to primary activities only, that is, the main activity that is carried out at any time during the day. Simultaneous activities (i.e. secondary activities) were collected in some of the surveys analyzed in this paper, but not in all of them and are moreover not part of the current version of the multinational dataset. This limitation is important to keep in mind since estimates of parental time based on primary activities only are known to under-estimate the total time devoted by parents to children since a large fraction of childcare activities are carried out in

parallel to other activities (Zick and Bryant 1996). Our argument is however that childcare activities reported as primary activities in time diaries possibly capture more intense parent-child interactions than childcare activities reported as secondary activities (e.g. supervising children while carrying out another activity).⁷

This analysis provides estimates of parental time for two-parents families (married or cohabiting). Historical trends for one-parent families would be interesting to analyze but there are too few cases in our dataset to carry out this analysis.⁸ We also provide estimates by labor force status of the respondents. We restrict the analysis to parents with at least one child under the age of five. We selected the ‘under five’ category simply because it likely corresponds to a period of high childcare demand. We however did not restrict the analysis to parents with only children under the age of five to avoid the problem of small number of cases. In the last section of the paper, we come back to these restrictions and reflect on their consequences on our findings (especially the restriction of our observations to two-parent families).

Empirically, we proceed in two steps. We first present results based on the multi-country dataset. The analysis is essentially descriptive and focuses on the mean number of hours per day devoted to childcare. These estimates are daily averages and are weighted to ensure an equal representation of every day of the week. This first part of the analysis provides results for all countries in an attempt at capturing global trends in parental time. Then, we focus on Canada, which long time-series allows us to understand better the nature of parental time activities and the way these activities are “financed”. In addition to the descriptive results, we also present results from multivariate analysis, using a Tobit regression model, in order to control for some of

the historical changes in the characteristics of the population. Because of the non-negligible proportion of parents report spending zero minutes on childcare activities on any diary day (more so among fathers than mothers) a Tobit model is regarded as the most appropriate way of analyzing time-use data.

Empirical Results

We first start our analysis by examining historical trends in parental time using our full multinational dataset. The aim is to capture general trends that would supercede country-specific explanations. In the second part, we then turn our attention to the Canadian case which, because of its long time-series and detailed dataset, offers opportunities to examine in greater depth the actual nature of parental time.

Multinational trends in parental time

Estimates of parental time for married (or cohabiting) parents by gender and employment status appear in Figure 1 for the full dataset.⁹ We report results for full-time employed fathers, full-time employed mothers, non-employed mothers, and all mothers (all employment statuses combined). Part-time employed parents as well as non-employed fathers had too few cases to provide reliable estimates. We also fitted a linear trend in order to capture the overall historical trend.¹⁰ Contrary to the popular belief that today's parents devote less time to children, data suggest exactly the opposite trend – at least for married parents with children under the age of five. For married fathers employed full-time, time devoted to childcare increased from around 0.4 hours

per day in 1960 to 1.2 hours in 2000 (based on the regression line). An upward trend was also observed for women, with an increase of about 1.1 hours per day for mothers who are employed full-time, and 1.3 hours for those who are not-employed. These results are both remarkable and puzzling. According to the time availability theory, we would have expected today's parents to have less time to devote to their children than in the past. The fact that non-employed mothers are those having increased most the time that they devote to children suggest that factors other than time availability is at work including possibly a desire to invest more in children. As we will discuss in the final section of this paper, there are however other reasons that may explain these findings.

Results for all mothers (all employment statuses combined) are also fascinating. Despite the increase in female labor force participation since the 1960s, and despite the fact that employed mothers devote less time to childcare than non-employed mothers, the overall trend is nonetheless positive. In other words, the increase in female labor force participation has not led to an overall decrease in parental time. We should also note that these results provide mixed results regarding the gender gap. The results do reveal a stronger upward trend for mothers than for fathers. However, when we look at the ratio of fathers' to mothers' time, the data instead suggest a reduced gender gap. For full-time employed parents, the ratio increased from .36 in the 1960s to .53 in the 1990s. A similar trend (although stronger) was observed by Bianchi (2000) on the basis of American data. Finally, we should note that, with the exception of full-time employed fathers, the results display considerable cross-national variations.

[Figure 1 here]

The above results are based on analyses that use each survey as a unit of analysis. An alternative way of analyzing the multinational dataset is to examine historical trends for countries with multiple time-use surveys. Results appear in Figure 2 and confirm our earlier conclusion that time spent by parents on childcare activities has increased since the 1960s. The magnitude of the increase varies by country and the related slopes are slightly larger than those observed above on the basis of the full dataset. For a 40-year period, they suggest an increase in parental time ranging from 1.0 hour per day (for full-time employed fathers) to 1.8 hours per day (for non-employed mothers). It is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss the reasons why increases in parental time appear to be stronger in some countries than in others. Some of these reasons may include policies and institutions regarding work hours and leave arrangements, age and education level of parents, as well as methodological differences in the survey instruments. We will investigate the sources of cross-national variations in a forthcoming paper.

[Figure 2 here]

Returning now to the full dataset, a key question is how has time been reallocated in order to “finance” the increase in parental time. Table 1 reports the mean patterns of time-use of parents by decade. Again, it should be remembered that the data for each of these decades pertain to different countries and that the trends are consequently not based on national time-series. For fathers with at least one child under the age of five, the data suggest that not only has childcare increased but fathers have also devoted more time to housework. This result is in fact in line with those reported by Gershuny and Robinson (1988) and Gershuny (2000). The data also suggest

that fathers' increase in housework and childcare has been financed from a reduction in paid work and a reduction of time devoted to personal activities (mainly sleep). Results for full-time employed mothers suggest that the increase in time devoted to childcare has also been financed through a reduction in time devoted to paid work and personal activities. However, and in contrast to fathers, mothers have decreased rather than increased the time that they devote to housework. Again, this was a trend observed by other authors (e.g. Gershuny 2000) and which suggest a reduction in the gender allocation of time to non-paid work.¹¹

[Table 1 here]

In all countries, the increase in the total time devoted to childcare activities may have been the result of an increase in the proportion of parents who devote time to childcare activities (as mentioned earlier not all parents devote time to childcare activity on the diary day) and/or an increase in the time devoted to childcare activities by the “caregivers” (i.e. parents who devote a non-zero amount of time to childcare). We provide below estimates for these two components of parental time (Table 2). Results show that both the participation rates (for men) and the mean time of caregivers has increased over time. The results for the participation rates are particularly interesting as they reveal a large increase in the proportion of fathers who participate in childcare. Their participation rates are still lower than those of mothers, but they have substantially increased. While only 51 percent of full-time employed fathers reported any childcare activities in the 1960s (weekly average), this figure had reached 72 percent in the 1990s. Mothers' participation rates have remained above 90 percent for the whole period (with the exception of the 1960s when a lower figure was observed for full-time employed mothers).

Consequently, while for women the increase in time devoted to children has resulted from an increase in the time allocation by all mothers, for men it has resulted from a combination of both an increase in the proportion of fathers who devote time to childcare and an increase in time devoted to childcare by those who do participate in childcare.

[Table 2 here]

The case of Canada

We now turn our attention to Canada in order to examine in more detail the nature of the increase in parental time. We cannot claim that the results for Canada can be generalized to all industrialized countries. However, and as shown above, the historical trends for Canada appear to be in line with those observed in other countries. Full-time employed married (or cohabiting) fathers whose youngest child is under five have increased their allocation to childcare activities from 0.6 hours per day in 1971 to 1.4 hours in 1998. The increase for mothers is of a similar magnitude, from 1.2 hours per day in 1971 to 2.1 hours in 1998 for full-time employed mothers and from 2.7 hours per day in 1971 to 3.5 for non-employed mothers in 1998.¹²

Trends in specific types of childcare activities

Most studies of parental time group all childcare activities into a single category. However, if there have been behavioral changes in parenting and in time investment into children, as suggested above, it is possible that some activities may have benefited from an increase in

parental time more than others. In particular, if parents have been emphasizing ‘quality’ time with children, we may expect activities that involve a high level of interaction between parents and children, such as playing, to have most benefited from the increase in parental time. An additional suggestion offered in the literature is that the move to suburbs, together with an increase in perceived street dangers, may have prompted parents to spend more time ‘ferrying’ children to school, friends’ homes, etc (Robinson and Godbey 1997; Hillman et al. 1990). If this were the case, we would expect to observe an increase in travel related to children.

In order to analyze trends in parental time by specific types of activities, we went back to the original Canadian datasets and extracted data on separate categories of childcare activities (since the detailed data is not included in the harmonized version of the dataset). We were able to distinguish six main types of activities: 1) Personal care to children (including medical care); 2) ‘Help’ including helping, teaching and reprimanding children; 3) ‘Read’ including reading to, and conversing with, children; 4) Playing with children; 5) Other care; and 6) Travel related to children. Results appear in Table 3. They suggest that time spent on playing with children and personal care to children have both benefited from a systematic increase since 1971 (similar results were reported by Sayer, Bianchi and Robinson 2004). There is also evidence that time spent on travel for child-related reasons has increased but only for non-employed mothers. What is also particularly interesting is that the increase in playing with children and in personal care to children was observed for both mothers and fathers and for both employed and non-employed parents (the trends are however not statistical significant for all groups). The increasing time pressure on parents may restrict their time availability, but working full-time has not prevented mothers and fathers from increasing the time that they devote to childcare (just as their non-

working counterpart). A further finding of interest is that while there is a large gender gap in the amount of time devoted to personal care to children, full-time employed mothers and fathers devote about the same time playing with children.

[Table 3 about here]

Multivariate analysis

The results presented so far were strictly descriptive and did not systematically test whether or not the observed trends were statistically significant. As discussed in the theoretical section of the paper, changes in the composition of the population (e.g. educational level, age of parents) may have driven the trends in parental time. To see if a significant trend in parental time remains after controlling for these compositional effects, we carried out a series of multivariate analyses on the pooled 1971-1998 Canadian dataset. We included as independent variables the age of the parent, his/her education and employment status, the number of children under the age of 18, and the diary day (weekday vs. weekend).^{13,14} We also included dummies for the year of the survey and used the year 1971 as the reference category.¹⁵ Descriptive sample statistics are reported in Appendix. We carried out regression analysis separately for men and women, and for employed and non-employed mothers, since the descriptive statistics suggested different historical trends for these different subgroups of parents.

Results appear in Table 4. Before commenting on these results, a note of caution about the interpretation of the regression coefficients is warranted. More specifically, the interpretation of the Tobit regression coefficients is the same as for those in ordinary least-squares regression

models only if one looks at the Tobit model as modeling a latent variable for which the ‘true’ value of time spent on childcare activities was observed for all individuals in our sample (Breen 1996; Long 1997).¹⁶ Since almost all parents may be assumed to spend time on childcare activities at one point in time (as opposed to the diary day), the interpretation in terms of latent variable seems reasonable.

[Table 4 about here]

Results from the regression analysis suggest that, after controlling for various individual-level determinants, parental time in 1998 still exceeded that in 1971 by over 1 hour per day for men but only by ½ hour for women. The trend for men suggests a gradual increase since 1971 while for women the earlier years suggest a decrease in parental time (but not a statistically significant one) and an increase in the 1990s. The analysis for employed and non-employed mothers reveals however a more complex story with the historical trend being statistically significant only for non-employed mothers. As discussed at the end of the paper, a selectivity effect may be operating by which non-employed mothers have been increasingly composed of mothers with a higher “taste” for spending time on childcare. In contrast in the 1960s, and in the context of limited employment opportunities for mothers, the non-employed category would have been a much more heterogeneous group.

In terms of individual characteristics, and contrarily to what was expected, an increase in family size was not found to significantly increase the time devoted to childcare. In fact, every additional child decreases the time devoted to childcare by mothers, by about 10 minutes per

day. One possible explanation is that each additional child increases the amount of housework and consequently decreases the time availability of mothers. This result, thus, supports the suggestion made by other authors regarding the dilution of parental time and resources with increased family size (Blake 1989; Downey 2001). With regard to the age of the parents, older employed mothers appear to devote slightly more time to childcare than younger ones, but the regression coefficients are not statistically significant. In contrast, the education of parents appears to impact parental time in the expected direction, namely that more highly educated parents devote more time to childcare than parents with lower levels of education. The difference is about 40 to 50 minutes per day, with very large differences by gender and employment status. Having a higher level of education appears to have a particularly large impact for employed mothers (much less so for non-employed mothers).

Parents' employment status also affects their allocation of time to childcare. Being employed full-time or part-time reduces the allocation of time to childcare by $\frac{1}{2}$ hour per day for men and $1\frac{1}{2}$ hours per day for women. The historical series for Canada unfortunately does not allow us to see the difference between full-time and part-time work, nor does it allow us to test the possible interaction between the respondent's employment status and that of his/her spouse (the relevant data was not collected in all surveys). Type of the day (weekday vs. weekend) also significantly affects the allocation of time to childcare but in a very different way for mothers and fathers. While fathers devote more time to childcare on weekends, the opposite is observed for non-employed mothers. This suggests an interesting division of labor between parents with fathers possibly giving a little "break" to mothers on weekends by increasing their own allocation of

time to childcare. We would however need couples' data in order to test empirically this joint household behavior hypothesis.

Overall, what these multivariate results show is that the increase in parental time observed on the basis of simple descriptive statistics still holds when we control for individual-level characteristics that may have affected the historical trends. In other words, even after controlling for characteristics such as employment status and education, a statistically significant historical increase in parental time is still observed (apart for employed mothers). And in line with the descriptive results, the multivariate analysis suggests a decrease in the gender gap, with fathers having increased their allocation of time to childcare to a larger extent than mothers.

Conclusion

Time spent by parents on their own children does not enter traditional measures of productivity nor is it factored in national accounts. Yet, it is a major form of investment into children, and one that appears to have increased throughout the rich OECD world since the 1960s. Despite the increase in women's labor force participation, and despite the time pressures from work, today's parents appear to be devoting more time to childcare than they were 40 years ago. In other words, the demographic, economic, and social changes that have taken place since the 1960s have not only changed the environment in which children grow up, they have also changed parental investment into children in a very positive way.

Results presented in this paper suggest four additional conclusions. First, paid work does not appear to substantially impinge on the time investment that parents are making in children—at least not directly. Employed parents do devote slightly less time to their children than non-employed parents, but the difference is small compared to the difference in time devoted to paid work. Evidently, parents appear to be preserving their time with children, mainly by reducing time devoted to leisure and personal activities (including sleep). Paid work may however have the consequence of lowering the “taste” for children because it involves devoting more time to paid and non-paid work. For example, our results show that employed mothers in the 1990s devoted 10.4 hours per day to paid and non-paid work (housework and childcare) as compared to 8.6 hours for non-employed mothers (Table 1).

Secondly, activities that involve a higher degree of parent-child interactions, such as playing, appear to have mostly driven the overall increase in time spent on childcare (along with personal care to children). Thirdly, both mothers and fathers have increased their time investment in children. Fathers still devote less time to childcare than mothers, but the gender difference has narrowed in many nations including Canada. Finally, the results for employed and non-employed mothers suggest that a selectivity effect may be operating involving a greater concentration of mothers with a higher “taste” for spending time with children among the non-employed mothers. An alternative explanation for the different historical trends among employed and non-employed mothers may be that greater social pressure exists on parents to devote more time to their children. However, employed mothers may already be so time-crunched that they may be unable to devote much more time to their children.

Proponents of the time-famine thesis may be right in that today's parents are hurried and under significant time pressure. But despite these pressures, parents have managed to preserve time devoted to children and have even increased time devoted to children. For sure, employed mothers do indeed spend less time on childcare activities than housewives --- but the difference is much less than the difference in the number of hours of paid work. For working mothers, the expression 'second shift' seems indeed to apply (Hochschild 1989). What is also particularly interesting is that both employed mothers and housewives have increased the time that they spend on childcare. These trends suggest some major behavioral changes in the population: changes that have resulted in more time being devoted to children and not less. Theoretically, what these results also suggest is that the quantity-quality trade-off argument regarding children may well apply in each of these nations. Since the 1960s fertility rates have decreased in all industrialized countries, but the time investment in children has increased. In contrast, our results provide little support for the time availability perspective. Women have increased their labor force participation since the 1960s, and have thus seen their time availability reduced but these trends have not resulted in a decrease in parental time. Instead, our results are indicative of global trends, possibly motivated by societal norms, towards investing more time on children – even if this means cutting down on one's own personal time and leisure.

The observed increase in parental time must however be seen in relation to some of the limitations of this paper. First of all, the results of this paper are based on cross-sectional data and prevent us from observing dynamic changes that occur within families following the birth of a child: changes that may involve a total or partial withdrawal from the labor market, a reallocation of the division of labor between spouses, and an outsourcing of some of the

domestic work and childcare. Second, by focusing on two-parent families, our analysis has ignored the fact that today's children grow up in diverse family forms (Heuveline, Timberlake, Furstenberg 2003). As mentioned earlier, the number of single-parents was too small in our dataset to allow an analysis of their historical trends in parental time. The evidence from American data is that the time devoted to childcare by single-mothers has also increased since the 1960s (Sayer, Bianchi, and Robinson 2004). Unfortunately, we were not able to test this on a larger set of countries. An additional selectivity bias that has affected our analysis is the increase in childlessness during the past decades. This increase in childlessness means that young adults who decide to have children have formed an increasingly selective group of individuals: an one which may be argued to have a larger 'taste' for children and possibly a larger 'taste,' or, at least a perceived obligation, to devote time to children, perhaps owing to the more voluntary nature of parenthood. The increase in childlessness (predicted to reach as much as 15 and 20 percent in some countries (Billari 2004)) may have ultimately contributed to the observed increase in parental time.

Our analysis was not able to pick up possible changes in the non-parental provision of childcare. We have referred in the paper to the outsourcing of childcare (to nannies, childcare centers, day homes, etc.). But there may also have been changes in the provision of childcare by older siblings and by relatives (including grandmothers). For instance, the decrease in fertility during the past decades has obviously reduced the number of siblings who are available to provide childcare. The analysis of parents' diaries did not allow us to measure non-parental time investment into children.

Finally, it is also clear that while the countries included in our analysis have experienced similar demographic, economic, and social changes since the 1960s, the magnitude and rapidity of these changes have varied across countries. Perhaps not surprisingly, our paper has revealed large variations across countries in the time devoted to childcare by parents. This is something that we were not able to fully analyze in the context of this paper but which calls for further examination. In particular, it is important to explore whether country-level characteristics, such as work hour legislations and parental leave schemes, translate into more, or less, time being devoted to children, but that is the subject of another paper.

References

- Bainbridge, J. and I. Garfinkel. (2000). "Who Supports Our Children? Private and Public Shares by Income Quintile," unpublished manuscript, School of Social Work. New York: Columbia University, September.
- Becker, Gary S. (1965). "A Theory of the Allocation of Time," *The Economic Journal*, 75(299) (September): 493-517.
- Becker, Gary S., Lewis, H.G. (1973). "On the Interaction between the Quantity and Quality of Children". *Journal of Political Economy*. 81, 2: s279—88.
- Becker, Gary S., Tomes, N. (1976). "Child Endowments and the Quantity and Quality of Children". *Journal of Political Economy*. 84, 4: s143—62.
- Bianchi, S. (2000). "Maternal Employment and Time with Children: Dramatic Change or Surprising Continuity?" *Demography*. 37, 4: 401—14.
- Billari, F. (2004). "Choices, opportunities and constraints of partnership, childbearing and parenting: the patterns in the 1990s". Background paper for the session on: Childbearing and parenting in low fertility countries: Enabling choices. European Population Forum 2004: Population Challenges and Policy Responses (Geneva, January 2004).
- Billari, F., Wilson, C. (20010). "Convergence towards diversity? Cohort dynamics in the transition to adulthood in contemporary Western Europe". MPIDR WORKING PAPER WP 2001-039.
- Bittman, Michael. (1999). "Parenthood without Penalty: Time Use and Public Policy in Australia and Finland," *Feminist Economics*, 5(3) (November): 27-42.
- Blake, J. (1989). *Family size and achievement*. (Berkeley: University of California Press).
- Breen, R. (1996). *Regression models: censored, sample selected, or truncated data*. (Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications).
- Bryant, Keith W. and Cathleen D. Zick. (1996). "Are We Investing Less in the Next Generation? Historical Trends in Time Spent Caring for Children," *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 17(3/4): 365-392.
- Büchel, Felix and Greg J. Duncan. (1998). "Do Parents' Social Activities Promote Children's School Attainments? Evidence from the German Socioeconomic Panel," *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 60(1) (February): 95-108.
- Bunting, M. (2000). No right to be idle; Working mothers and others are suffering time famine: we all need to reclaim control over our lives. Monday April 17, 2000. *The Guardian*. On-line: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/Print/0,3858,4008791,00.html>.
- Clarkberg, M. (undated). The Time-Squeeze in American Families: From Causes to Solutions. On-line: http://www.dol.gov/dol/asp/public/futurework/conference/families/families_toc.htm.
- Cooksey, Elizabeth C. and Michelle M. Fondell. (1996). "Spending Time with His Kids: Effects of Family Structure on Fathers' and Children's Lives," *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 58 (August): 693-707.
- Daly, K. (2000). The Family Time Crunch. *The Transition Magazine*. The Vanier Institute of the Family. 30, 4: On-line: <http://www.vifamily.ca/tm/304/2.htm>.

- Douthitt, R.A., Zick, C.D., McCullough, J. (1990). "The role of economic and demographic factors in explaining time-use of single and married mothers". *Lifestyles: Family and Economic Issues*. 11, 1: 23—51.
- Downey, D.B. (2001). "Number of siblings and intellectual development: the resource dilution explanation". *American Psychologist*. 65, 6/7: 497—504.
- Fisher, K. (2000). Technical Details of Time Use Studies, Release 2, 30 June, 2000. Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex. On-line: <http://www.iser.essex.ac.uk/mtus/technical.php>.
- Fisher, K., McCulloch, A., Gershuny, J. (1999). 'British fathers and children; a report for Channel 4 "Dispatches"'. On-Line: <http://www.iser.essex.ac.uk/press/doc/2000-12-15.pdf>.
- Furstenberg, Frank F., Morgan S. Philip, and Paul D. Allison. (1987). "Paternal Participation and Children's Well-Being after Marital Dissolution," *American Sociological Review*, 52 (October): 695-701.
- Galinsky, Ellen (2000). *Ask the Children: The Breakthrough Study That Reveals How to Succeed at Work and Parenting*. (Quill).
- Garfinkel, I., L. Rainwater, and T.M. Smeeding. 2004. "Welfare State Expenditures and the Distribution of Child Opportunities." First presented to the Princeton University Conference on Support for Children, January 9, Unpublished manuscript, June.
- Gershuny, Jonathan. (2000). *Changing Times: Work and Leisure in Postindustrial Society*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gershuny, J. and J. Robinson (1988). Historical changes in the household division of labor. *Demography*, 25, 537-551.
- Gronau, Reuben. (1977). "Leisure, Home Production, and Work: The Theory of the Allocation of Time Revisited," *Journal of Political Economy*, 85(6) (December): 1099-1123.
- Hallberg, D. and N.A. Klevmarcken. (2000). "Time for Children?—A Study of Parents' Time Allocation," *Journal of Population Economics*. 16: 205-26.
- Hayden, Anders (2003). "International work-time trends: the emerging gap in hours". *Just Labour*. 2 (Spring): 23-35.
- Heuveline, P.; Timberlake, J.M.; Furstenberg, F.F. Jr. (2003). "Shifting Child Rearing to Single Mothers: Results from 17 Western Nations." *Population and Development Review* 29(1): 47-71.
- Hill, C. Russell and Frank P. Stafford. (1973). "Allocation of Time to Preschool Children and Educational Opportunity," *The Journal of Human Resources*, 9(3): 323-341.
- Hill, C. Russell and Frank P. Stafford. (1985). "Parental Care of Children: Time Diary Estimates of Quantity, Predictability, and Variety." In F. Thomas Juster and Frank P. Stafford (eds.), *Time, Goods, and Well-Being*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan, pp. 415-437.
- Hillman, M et al (1990). *One false move...A study of Children's independent mobility*, PSI Publishing, London.
- Hirschman, A. O. (1973). "An Alternative Explanation of Contemporary Harriedness," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*. November: 634-637.
- Hofferth, S.L., Sandberg, J. (2001). 'Changes in American's children's time, 1981—1997'. In In T. Owens and S. Hofferth (Eds.), *Children at the Millennium: Where Have We Come From, Where are we Going?* Advances in Life Course Research Series, New York: Elsevier Science: 193—229.

- Hochschild, A. (1989). *The second shift*. (Avon Books).
- Klevmarcken, N.A. and F.P. Stafford. (1999). "Measuring Investment in Young Children with Time Diaries." In J.P. Smith and R.J. Willis (eds.), *Wealth, Work, and Health: Innovations in Measurement in the Social Sciences*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press, pp. 34-63.
- Kohler, Hans-Peter Billari, Francesco C. Ortega, Jose Antonio (2002). "The emergence of lowest-low fertility in Europe during the 1990s." *Population and Development Review*.
- Leibowitz, A. (1974). 'Home investments in children'. *The Journal of Political Economy*. 82, 2 Part 2: S111-131.
- Linder, S. B. (1970). "The Acceleration of Consumption," *The Harried Leisure Class*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Long, J. Scott (1997). *Regression Models for categorical and limited dependent variables*. (Thousand Oaks: Sage publications).
- McLanahan, Sara and Gary Sandefur. (1994). *Growing Up with a Single Parent: What Hurts, What Helps*. Cambridge, Ma: Harvard University Press.
- Miller, P. and C. Mulvey. (2000). "Women's Time Allocation to Childcare: Determinants and Consequences," *Australian Economic Papers*, 39(1): 1-24.
- Presser, Harriet B. (1989). "Can We Make Time for Children? The Economy, Work Schedules, and Child Care," *Demography*, 26(4): 523-543.
- Robinson, J.P., Godbey, G. (1997). *Time for Life; The Surprising Ways Americans Use Their Time*. (College Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press).
- Sandberg, I. and S. Hofferth. (2001). "Changes in Parental Time with Children, US 1981-1977". *Demography*. 38: 423—36.
- Sanik, M.M., Mauldin, T. (1996). "Single versus two parent families: a comparison of mothers' time". *Family Relations*. 35: 53—6.
- Sayer, L., C., Bianchi, S.M., Robinson, J.P. (2004). "Are parents investing less in children? Trends in mothers' and fathers' time with children". *American Journal of Sociology*. 10, 1: 1—43.
- Sayer, Liana C., Anne H. Gauthier, and Frank F. Furstenberg. 2004. "Educational Differences in Parents' Time with Children: Cross-National Variations." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66 (December):1149-1166.
- South, S.J., Spitze, G. (1994). 'Housework in marital and nonmarital households'. *American Sociological Review*. 59: 327—47.
- United Nations (2000). *World's Women 2000, The: Trends and Statistics*. (New York: UN).
- Van De Kaa DJ. (1987). "Europe's second demographic transition". *Population Bulletin*. Mar;42(1):1-59.
- Willis, (1987). What have we learned from the economics of the family? *American Economic Review*. 68—81.
- Whitman, D. (1996). The myth of AWOL parents. US News. On-line: <http://www.usnews.com/usnews/issue/famine.htm>.
- Zick, C.D., Bryant, W.K. (1996). "A new look at parents' time spent in child care: primary and secondary time use". *Social Science Research*. 25: 260—80.

Zuzanek, J. (2001). "Parenting time: enough or too little?". *Isuma*. 2, 2.

Appendix

The Multinational Time Use Study (MTUS) is a harmonized version of dataset from more than 20 countries and covering the period 1961 to 2000. Information on the variables and information on how to access the data is available on the MTUS website:

<http://www.iser.essex.ac.uk/mtus/index.php>. Information on the surveys included in this paper appears in Table A1 below.

[Table A1 here]

Details on the Canadian sample statistics are reported in Table A2.

[Table A2 here]

NOTES

1. For a summary of the controversy concerning the trends in parental time in the United States involving William Mattox and John Robinson, see Whitman (1996). Interestingly, some 20 years earlier, trends in leisure time also became the subject of much controversy, see: Linder (1970) and Hirschman (1973).

². The classic reference in the theory of time allocation is Becker (1965). However, Becker's fertility theory provides us with a better framework to examine parenting time.

3. And just like the quantity-quality tradeoff, parents are also confronted to a time–money tradeoff: a tradeoff involving allocating time to work versus time to their children, and allocating time to their own children versus paying others to devote their time to their children.

4. Mothers' participation in the labor force may also have increased monetary resources that could be devoted to children. However, as mentioned earlier, we are not focusing on monetary resources in this paper.

5. The Canadian 1998 data distinguishes biological and step-parents and would allow estimates of the respective time devoted to childcare. The data was however not collected in earlier surveys.

6. Sandberg and Hofferth (2001) use a decomposition technique to estimate the respective effects of changes in the composition of the population and changes in behavior to explain the overall changes in children's time spent with parents in the United States between 1981 and 1997. They conclude that changes in behavior translated into an increase in children's time spent with parents, and by far outweigh the decrease associated with compositional changes.

7. We do not formally test this assumption in this paper. In fact, some forms of non-childcare activities may also involve a high level of parent-child interaction. Going shopping with a child would be an example. Another very important point to stress is that we are measuring time spent on childcare activities. While time spent on childcare activities most often involve spending time with children, time spent with children is broader as it includes other non-childcare activities (e.g. shopping with children). The literature is unfortunately not always clear about this. For example the title of the recent paper by Sayer, Bianchi and Robinson (2004) refers to parental time with children while they are measuring, just like us, time spent on childcare activities.

⁸. Some of the recent datasets have sufficient cases but not the earlier ones therefore preventing any historical analysis. For information on single- vs. two-parent families and their respective time allocation see Sayer, Bianchi and Robinson (2004); Sanik and Mauldin (1986) and Douthitt, Zick, and McCullough (1990).

9. In the graphs based on the multinational dataset, we only retained surveys with a minimum of 20 cases for the specific subgroup (gender and employment status). We also carried

out additional analyses (not reported here) on a smaller subset of countries (using only data from the World5.5 version of the dataset and excluding Eastern European countries). The general trends are the same as those reported here although the slopes (i.e. the increase in parental time) are steeper.

10. The linear trend may not be the best way of describing the data. Fitting a lowess curve instead suggest no trend in the earlier period, and an increase since 1980. We take this problem into account in the multivariate analysis by adding dummies for specific years and therefore by allowing a non-linear trend.

11. Obviously, without longitudinal data it is impossible to observe the possible reallocation of time after the birth of a child. Empirical evidence on the number of hours of paid work suggests however an overall decline since the 1960s (the annual number of work hours may have however increased in some countries in recent years, Hayden 2003).

¹² Slightly larger increases were observed for women based on the multinational dataset. Canada is not claimed here to be exactly representative of all industrialized countries. But as the other countries, it displays an increase in parental time during the past decades.

13. We should note that it was impossible to distinguish full-time from part-time work in the 1986 survey, therefore forcing us to only contrast employed and non-employed parents.

¹⁴ We also ran the model using the year 1998 as the reference category. The results were unchanged.

15. One concern was that because the earlier surveys did not cover the twelve months of the year, seasonal variations may affect the historical trend. This would be the case if there were strong monthly variations in parental time. In order to check this, we carried out a series of additional regression models in which we included a series of monthly dummy variables. For fathers, the results suggested that there were no monthly variations. The historical trends with or without these monthly dummies were therefore very similar. For mothers, however, the result did suggest monthly variations in time devoted to childcare. Consequently, the historical trends with or without the monthly dummies differed to some extent. In particular, the inclusion of the monthly dummies reduced the historical trend. However, since the monthly variations did not reveal any meaningful seasonal patterns, we decided to report in this paper the results without the monthly dummies.

16. In reality our data is censored at zero minutes: some of the individuals who spent zero minutes on childcare on the diary day may spend time on childcare on other days, while others may never spend time on childcare, or would even devote negative time if this were possible! Results not reported here show that the OLS results are very similar to the Tobit ones in terms of the statistical significance of the regression coefficients. However, the magnitude of the regression coefficients differs somewhat between the two regression models.

Figure 1: Mean time spent on childcare activities (in hours per day) for married or cohabiting parents aged 20-49 years old with at least one child under the age of five, by gender and employment status, 1961-2000.






Figure 1: continued.



Note: For the country codes, see Table A1 in Appendix.

Source: Authors' computation from MTUS data.

Figure 2: Mean time spent on childcare activities (in hours per day) for married or cohabiting parents aged 20-49 years old with at least one child under the age of five, by gender and employment status for selected countries, 1961-2000.





Figure 2 (continued)



Note: Only the results for the year 2000 are reported for the UK for full-time employed mothers because of too few cases for the earlier years. Data for UK 1995 is excluded from all graphs because of seasonal biases.

Source: Authors' computation from MTUS data.

Table 1. Mean time spent on selected activities (in hours per day) for married or cohabiting parents aged 20-49 years old with at least one child under the age of five, by gender and employment status and historical period, average across selected countries^{1,2} (total = 24 hours)

Gender	Employment Status ³	Historical Period ⁴	PAID	EDUC	HOUSE	CCARE	TV	FREE	SLEEP	EAT	PERS	TOTAL ⁵
Men	Full-time	1960s	8.06	0.21	1.54	0.50	1.23	2.49	8.07	1.15	0.74	24.0
		1970s	6.84	0.18	1.59	0.49	1.67	2.86	8.06	1.24	0.86	24.0
		1980s	6.68	0.08	1.84	0.75	1.76	3.08	6.96	1.01	1.71	24.0
		1990s	6.69	0.09	2.13	1.16	1.73	2.69	7.77	1.08	0.65	24.0
Women	Full-time	1960s	5.66	0.10	4.67	1.40	0.79	1.71	7.83	1.06	0.78	24.0
		1970s	4.71	0.14	3.90	1.31	1.07	2.43	8.16	1.13	0.97	24.0
		1980s	4.08	0.06	3.85	1.90	1.22	2.85	6.88	0.97	2.04	24.0
		1990s	4.81	0.11	3.44	2.20	1.14	2.41	7.98	1.09	0.80	24.0
	Non-employed	1960s	0.19	0.01	7.21	2.36	1.16	2.26	8.59	1.47	0.74	24.0
		1970s	0.21	0.10	5.76	2.26	1.72	3.09	8.40	1.39	0.91	24.0
		1980s	0.27	0.15	5.13	2.77	1.63	3.48	7.43	1.15	1.83	24.0
		1990s	0.29	0.15	4.96	3.36	1.58	3.29	8.27	1.27	0.79	24.0
	All employment statuses	1960s	1.81	0.05	6.36	2.08	1.10	2.14	8.35	1.36	0.76	24.0
		1970s	1.43	0.10	5.21	1.97	1.58	2.99	8.29	1.33	0.93	24.0
		1980s	1.85	0.10	4.62	2.38	1.49	3.18	7.35	1.10	1.78	24.0
		1990s	2.12	0.12	4.44	2.80	1.39	2.94	8.19	1.18	0.78	24.0

Where: FT: full-time employed (30 or more hours per week); NE: not employed; PAID: paid work; EDUC: Education; HOUSE: Housework; CCARE: Childcare; TV: Television; Free: Other leisure; SLEEP: sleep and naps; EAT: Meals and snacks at home; PERS: other personal care activities (bathing, dressing, receiving medical care).

Notes:

- 1- The average was not adjusted to take into account the size of the sample size in each survey.
- 2- This is an average across the seven days of the week.

- 3- The employment status was coded from a question about the respondent's main activity during the week prior to the survey. Although some people may reply that they were not-employed, they may have devoted time to paid work on the diary day.
- 4- The 1990s surveys also include UK 2000.
- 5- The total may not exactly add up to 24 hours because of a small number of activities that could not be classified and which were placed in a 'miscellaneous' category (not reported here).

Source: Authors' computation from MTUS data.

Table 2. Participation rate in childcare activities and mean time spent on childcare activities (in hours per day) by participants, married or cohabiting parents aged 20-49 years old with at least one child under the age of five by gender and employment status and historical period, average across selected countries¹

Gender	Employment Status	Historical Period	Participation rate ²	Mean hours for participants ³	Overall mean time spent on childcare
Men	Full-time	1960s	.51	.96	0.50
		1970s	.54	.93	0.49
		1980s	.62	1.22	0.75
		1990s	.72	1.62	1.16
Women	Full-time	1960s	.85	1.64	1.40
		1970s	.91	1.44	1.31
		1980s	.90	2.10	1.90
		1990s	.93	2.36	2.20
	Non-employed	1960s	.95	2.47	2.36
		1970s	.96	2.35	2.26
		1980s	.96	2.89	2.77
		1990s	.97	3.48	3.36
	All employment statuses	1960s	.92	2.24	2.08
		1970s	.95	2.08	1.97
		1980s	.95	2.52	2.38
		1990s	.95	2.94	2.80

Notes:

- 1- Participation rate refers to the proportion of parents who devoted at least 1 minute to childcare on the diary day.
- 2- Participants refer here to parents who devoted at least 1 minute to childcare on the diary day.
- 3- This is an average across the seven days of the week.

Source: Authors' computation from MTUS data.

Table 3: Mean time spent on selected childcare activities (in minutes per day) for married or cohabiting parents aged 20-49 years old with at least one child under the age of five, by gender and employment status, Canada 1971—98.¹

Gender	Employment status	Year	Personal care	Help	Read	Play	Other	Travel
Men	Full-time	1971	14.8**	0.6	1.2	15.4	0.8	3.9
		1986	27.5**	1.6	1.8	21.5	0.5	2.8
		1992	34.2**	1.3	2.7	26.5*	0.7	5.6
		1998	44.9**	3.0**	2.5	32.3**	1.8	4.8
Women	Full-time	1971	59.2	2.4	4.2	6.2	2.8	8.8
		1986	59.7	3.4	7.2	15.1	0.4	9.3
		1992	71.0	4.6	5.5	27.1**	3.3	12.5
		1998	85.9	4.1	3.1	31.4**	1.5	10.9
Women	Not employed	1971	137.3	2.2	4.2	16.1	1.9	3.5
		1986	126.3	4.6	8.6	27.3	1.3	8.2*
		1992	120.7	5.1	9.9**	48.4**	4.1	8.9*
		1998	135.7	12.1**	8.1	52.8**	3.6	10.0**

Where ** = $p < .01$ and * = $p < .05$ (obtained by running an ANOVA with Games-Howell post-hoc test without equal variances assumed).

Note:

1- This is an average across the seven days of the week.

Source: Authors' computation from MTUS data.

Table 4. Tobit regression results for time spent on childcare activities (in number of minutes per day) for married or cohabiting parents aged 20-49 years old with at least one child under the age of five by gender, Canada 1971—98.

	All fathers		All mothers		Employed mothers		Non-employed mothers	
	b	Robust z	b	Robust z	b	Robust z	b	Robust z
Age = 30 and over¹	-3.68	(0.43)	3.03	(0.43)	13.36	(1.53)	-3.64	(0.39)
Education = Med²	20.14	(1.76)	27.70	(2.92)**	58.45	(3.95)**	19.96	(1.74)
Education = High²	46.22	(4.26)**	36.60	(4.15)**	65.28	(5.02)**	27.02	(2.50)*
Employed³	-35.55	(3.22)**	-88.67	(13.17)**				
Weekend (yes=1)	29.60	(3.29)**	-18.78	(2.58)**	12.82	(1.25)	-35.91	(3.70)**
Number of kids	4.57	(1.15)	-10.82	(2.46)*	-2.97	(0.48)	-12.47	(2.21)*
Year=1981⁴	24.65	(1.82)	-1.28	(0.11)	4.57	(0.28)	-11.56	(0.82)
Year=1986	18.95	(1.48)	-11.20	(1.10)	-39.05	(2.52)*	-3.80	(0.30)
Year=1992	42.57	(3.75)**	14.11	(1.37)	-5.15	(0.33)	17.74	(1.41)
Year=1998	67.56	(5.30)**	31.08	(2.84)**	3.85	(0.24)	39.48	(2.85)**
Constant	-16.58	(0.94)	174.10	(14.04)**	52.52	(2.97)**	188.08	(12.55)**
N cases	1953		2136		739		1397	
Left-censored	707		130		78		52	
Log likelihood	-855.74		-11314.04		-3740.44		-7536.23	
Wald chi-square	80.29**		211.34**		47.70**		52.70**	

* significant at the .05 level; ** significant at the .01 level

Notes:

- 1- Age 20-29 as reference category.
- 2- Less than high education as reference category.
- 3- Not employed as reference category.
- 4- Year 1971 as reference category.

Source: Authors' computation from MTUS data.

Table A1: Technical details on the surveys

Country ¹	Code	Year	Age	N of cases ²	Response Rate (%)	Diary	Survey Period ³	MTUS Version ⁴
Australia	AU	1974	18-69	1493	63	1-day	n/a	W5.0
Australia	AU	1987	15+	1011	56	2-day	1 month	W5.5-2
Australia	AU	1992	15+	3612	83	2-day	11 months	W5.5-1
Australia	AU	1997	15+	3528	84	2-day	4 periods	W5.5-2
Belgium	BE	1965	18-64	2077	60	1-day	2 months	W5.0
Bulgaria	BU	1988	0+	27506	n/a	1-day	12 months	W5.0
Canada	CN	1971/2	18-64	1014	72	1-day	1 month	W5.5-1
Canada	CN	1981	15+	759	46	1-day	3 months	W5.5-1
Canada	CN	1986	15+	2446	80	1-day	2 months	W5.5-1
Canada	CN	1992	15+	2430	77	1-day	12 months	W5.5-1
Canada	CN	1998	15+	2470	78	1-day	12 months	W5.5-1
Czechoslovakia	CZ	1965	18-64	2193	100	1-day	2 month	W5.0
Finland	FI	1987/8	10+	4068	74	2-day	12 months	W5.5-1
France	FR	1965	18-64	2805	90	1-day	2 months	W5.0
France	FR	1974/5	18+	6641	66	1-day	12 months	W5.0
Germany-West	WG	1965	18-64	2478	80	1-day	4 months	W5.0
Germany-East	EG	1966	18-64	2152	90	1-day	2 months	W5.0
Germany ⁵	GE	1991/2	12+	8486	Quota	2-day	4 months	W5.5-1
Hungary	HU	1965	18-64	1994	95	1-day	1 month	W5.0
Hungary	HU	1976/7	15-69	6925	96	1-day	12 months	W5.0
Italy	IT	1988/9	3+	9933	70	1-day	12 months	W5.5-1
Norway	NO	1971	16-74	2522	58	2-day	12 months	W5.5-2
Norway	NO	1981	16-74	2228	65	2-day	12 months	W5.5-2
Norway	NO	1990	16+	1926	64	2-day	12 months	W5.5-1
Poland	PO	1965	18-64	2759	95	1-day	2 months	W5.0
Sweden	SE	1991	20-64	2508	75	2-day	9 months	W5.5-1
UK	UK	1961	15+	2363	54	7-day	1 month	W5.0
UK	UK	1975	5+	549	60	7-day	4 periods	W5.5-1
UK ⁶	UK	1987	16+	549	70	7-day	1 period	W5.5-1
UK ⁷	UK	1995	16+	390	70	1-day	1 month	W5.5-1
UK	UK	2000	8+	4160	45	2-day	12 months	W5.5-2
USA	US	1965	19+	990	82	1-day	3 periods	W5.5-1
USA ⁸	US	1975	18+	877	72	1-day	3 months	W5.5-1
USA ⁹	US	1985	18+	1111	56	1-day	12 months	W5.5-1

Country ¹	Code	Year	Age	N of cases ²	Response Rate (%)	Diary	Survey Period ³	MTUS Version ⁴
USA	US	1998	18+	297	56	1-day	12 months	W5.5-2
Yugoslavia	YU	1965	18-64	2125	97	1-day	3 months	W5.0

Notes:

- 1- More countries have carried out time use surveys, however we only used here surveys which have been harmonized into a common set of variables. For reason of non-comparability, we however excluded Austria 1992, Denmark 1964, Denmark 1987, Israel 1992, the Netherlands 1975-1995, and the United States 1992. Note also that not all the surveys included here use a nationally representative sample (geographically). However, the time use literature suggests that time use averages are quite robust and vary little by geographical areas (see for example Gershuny 2000).
- 2- The sample size refers to the number of individuals. The actual number of cases is larger in surveys for which 2 or 3-day diaries were collected.
- 3- While cross-survey variations in the coverage of the twelve months of the year may raise concern about the comparability of the data, analyses suggest that parental time varies little by the month of the year with the exception of the summer months. Most of the surveys that only covered selected months usually do not include summer months.
- 4- Indicates which release of the survey was used in this paper, where W5.0: World 5.0 version; W5.5-1: World5.5 Release 1; W5.5-2: World5.5 pre-Release 2.
- 5- The German 1991/2 survey used a quota sample. No information on the corresponding non-response rate is available.
- 6- UK 1987: In the World5.0 version of the MTUS dataset, UK 1983/4 and UK 1987 were combined and called UK 1985. In World5.5, we only included the 1987 survey.
- 7- UK 1995: The response rate of the time-use module was high, 93%, but we report here the overall response rate of the Omnibus survey.
- 8- USA 1975: Includes only data from the main respondents and from the first wave of this longitudinal dataset.
- 9- USA 1985: Data were collected on individuals aged 12, but only the sample for the population 18+ has been publicly released.

Sources: Authors' tabulation from information contained in Fisher (2000) and various country-specific documents.

Table A2: Descriptive sample statistics, Canadian time use surveys 1971—1998 (married or cohabiting parents aged 20-49 with at least one child under the age of 5) (unweighted).

MEN

		1971	%	1981	%	1986	%	1992	%	1998	%
Age	20-29	83	49.7	76	38.8	223	34.8	149	27.3	109	21.1
	30-49	84	50.3	120	61.2	418	65.2	396	72.7	408	78.9
Education	Low	83	50.0	51	26.3	136	23.4	96	18.0	73	14.7
	Medium	24	14.5	61	31.4	105	18.1	132	24.8	103	20.7
	High	59	35.5	82	42.3	339	58.4	304	57.1	321	64.6
Day	Weekday	128	76.6	125	63.8	494	77.1	397	72.8	351	67.9
	Weekend	39	23.4	71	36.2	147	22.9	148	27.2	166	32.1
N of children	(mean)	2.23		1.98		1.68		1.92		1.98	
Employed	No	11	6.7	11	5.6	89	13.9	77	14.3	65	13.4
	Yes	153	93.3	185	94.4	550	86.1	462	85.7	420	86.6

Table A2 (continued)**WOMEN**

		1971	%	1981	%	1986	%	1992	%	1998	%
Age	20-29	125	62.5	102	49.8	349	49.3	277	46.2	165	31.1
	30-49	75	37.5	103	50.2	359	50.7	322	53.8	365	68.9
Education	Low	107	54.3	45	22.2	150	22.7	74	12.6	58	11.6
	Medium	42	21.3	88	43.3	165	25.0	181	30.8	76	15.2
	High	48	24.4	70	34.5	346	52.3	333	56.6	367	73.3
Day	Weekday	157	78.5	150	73.2	526	74.3	425	71.0	370	69.8
	Weekend	43	21.5	55	26.8	182	25.7	174	29.0	160	30.2
N of children	(mean)	2.1		1.91		1.68		2.01		1.98	
Employed	No	156	79.6	131	63.9	466	66.3	384	64.9	301	60.4
	Yes	40	20.4	74	36.1	237	33.7	208	35.1	197	39.6

Source: Authors' computation from MTUS data.