

## **The impact of leave policies on child care and household work; is there a labeling effect?**

Maroesjka Versantvoort  
Department of Tax Law and Economics  
Leiden University  
PO Box 9520  
2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands  
T +31 71 527 4856  
E [M.C.Versantvoort@law.leidenuniv.nl](mailto:M.C.Versantvoort@law.leidenuniv.nl)

### **Abstract**

Using time use data from the 2000 and 2005 tbo-surveys for the Netherlands, this paper analyses the relation between time spent on paid work, time spent on child care, and time spent on household work, and focuses on the role of leave policies and policy labeling. It is found that the replacement rate between time spent on paid work and time spent on child care is quite low for both men and women. Furthermore, the results show that the time men spend on household work is quite indifferent to the time their partners spend on the labour market, which undermines the substitution idea underlying some of the leave policies. Besides that, the time men spend on child care or household work appears not sensitive to the use of leave policy. Men who use parental leave spend as many hours on child care than men who do not use this policy option or men who make use of other leave policies. The time women spend on child care appears sensitive to the use of leave policy however. The results support the idea of the labeling effect of parental leave and pregnancy leave for women. Apparently, women consider the “free time” offered by these leave policies as a benchmark for what they should spend on their children, or experience a moral obligation to spend a relatively large part of their time on child care during these leaves.

**Keywords** Leave policies - Balancing work and care - Child care - Time use - Tobit

## Introduction

In recent years, governments in many European countries have created job leaves and/ or child-rearing benefits that allow parents (almost entirely mothers) of young children to care for their own children at home and receive public funds to support them. In the Netherlands for instance, during last years life-course policies were introduced as well as the right on part-time work and the parental leave tax credit, and the maximum period of parental leave was doubled.

Though often couched in the language of choice and helping parents balance work and family, Morgan and Zippel (2003) have shown for Austria, Finland, France, Germany, and Norway (states that have developed two- and three-year paid child care leaves during last decade) that the underlying goal of care leave policies has been to value and support child care.

Empirical research shows a clear positive influence of the time parents spend with their children on the development of children (Furstenberg et al., 1987, Büchel and Duncan, 1988). This makes some scholars to conclude that the time parents spend with their children can be considered as a major form of investment that is strongly related to children's development and well-being (Gauthier et al., 2004). During last decades labour market participation of women increased substantially. Nowadays balancing work and family life has become one of the most important issues for families. With both spouses having a paid job, difficulties may arise as to who is responsible for the domestic and caring duties at home (Van der Lippe, 2007). According to Epstein (2004) an escalation of time demands has occurred in the family. The terms "time crunch", "time pressure" and "time squeeze" have frequently been used in the recent literature on family economics. It is often claimed that parents, and in particular parents with small children, is a group that suffers more from the shortage of time than most other groups (Hallberg and Klevmarken, 2003). This time pressure would suggest that parents devote less time to their children as decades ago. However, as Sayer et al. (2004), Bianchi (2000), and Bryant and Zick (1996) have shown for the Anglo-Saxon welfare states the United States, the United Kingdom and Canada, mother's time with children has tended to be quite stable over time. Also Gauthier et al. (2004) show an increase in time spent on child care during last decades for a selection of 16 industrialized countries. In line with these results Versantvoort (2010) has shown a quite low replacement rate between time spent on paid work and time spent on child care for the Netherlands, Norway, and the United States.

This paper aims to add to this literature by analyzing the relation between time spent on paid work and time spent on child care and examining the role of policies and policy-labeling in this. Previous research has shown a quite low replacement-rate between paid work and child care (Bryant and Zick, 1996, Bianchi et al., 2000, Versantvoort, 2010). That research did not address the possible influence of family policies in the relation between paid work and child care, however. This paper aims to find out to what extent policy and policy labeling affects the relation

between time spent on paid work and time spent on child care. Does for instance parental leave lead to more time for child care? Is such a change in child care time comparable to changes in child care time due to other policies or situations (a.o. educational leave, calamities, care)? What is the effect of so-called 'policy labeling'?

The paper proceeds as follows. Section I presents some theoretical considerations. Section II explains the Dutch leave system. Section III describes the sample. Section IV contains the results of estimation, and of testing the null hypothesis of equal effects of different leave policies on child care spending. Section V concludes.

## **Theoretical considerations**

### *Division of paid work and child care*

Although paid work and child care are decided upon simultaneously according to economic literature, we assume that paid work affects domestic work, including child care. Starting from this assumption three theoretical perspectives regarding the division of paid and unpaid labor have been developed that dominated the debate over the past 20 years (see for instance Shelton & John, 1993): (a) time availability, (b) resource power and (c) gender role. The time availability argument (Bianchi et al., 2000, Shelton & John, 1996) indicates that the partner with the most available time will most likely take the largest share of household tasks, among which child care. A variant of this perspective argues that partners allocate time to paid work and to home duties on the basis of their relative productivity in each sphere (see Becker, 1981). A 'rational' household does not have incentives to allocate a member's time to home duties if he or she has a comparative advantage in paid work (see Fuwa, 2004). The resource power perspective conceptualizes the division of household labor as an outcome of negotiation between husbands and wives who use whatever valued resources they can to strike the best deal on behalf of self-interest. The individual with more resources uses his or her advantage to avoid home duties (Brines, 1993). The gender role perspective focuses on socialization and gender role attitudes, suggesting that partners perform household labor according to what they have learned about appropriate behavior for men and women (Batalova & Cohen, 2002). This approach posits that men and women are socialized to conform to socially constructed gender roles, and home duties are divided accordingly (Fuwa, 2004).

According to the time availability and resource power perspectives a woman's full-time job will decrease her time spent on home duties. Less time is available for domestic duties. Furthermore, because the woman is less time at home, more domestic tasks have to be done by her partner. Women's employment makes them less economic dependent on their partners and this lead to less time spent on domestic duties by the woman and more by the man (Van der Lippe, 2010, Brines, 1993). Doing gender perspectives argue however that domestic duties are

perceived as women's duties, so that the effect of women's labor market participation on men's time spent on home duties is less than expected on the basis of the time availability or resource power perspectives.

#### *Policy labeling effect*

A policy question that arises from leave policies that afford leave or career breaks, is to what extent children benefit from these breaks in terms of time spent on them by their parents. Standard microeconomic theory allows no role for effects of the origin of reduced working time. Within that framework, the marginal propensity to spend time on child care from one hour of reduced working time due to for instance parental leave is no different than from one hour of reduced working time due to other policies or situations.

Within the context of household income spending, Kooreman has developed the concept of the labeling effect of policies. Analyzing the effects of child benefits on expenditures, he has presented empirical evidence indicating that for some groups of households the marginal propensity to consume child clothing out of exogenous child benefits is much larger than the marginal propensity to consume child clothing out of other income sources, while for adult clothing such an effect is not present. As an explanation he argues that it is conceivable that parents consider the child benefit as a benchmark for what they should spend on their children, or that they experience a moral obligation to spend a relatively large part of child benefits on child goods. In such a case child benefits change parents' preferences towards child goods: The labeling effect of a child benefit system (see Kooreman, 2000, p. 581). Besides Kooreman (2000) also Lundberg and Pollak (1993), Browning et al. (1994), and Del Boca and Flinn (1994) offer empirical evidence for differences between the spending of child benefits on the one side and other income sources on the other. Del Boca and Flinn (1994) have analyzed the effect of income composition on expenditure decisions of divorced mothers. They conclude that the parameters related to child support and alimony income differ from those for other income in Engel curves for expenditures on goods that are child-specific.

This perspective offers a starting point to analyze the possible labeling effects of leave policies also. If parents consider the "free time" offered by leave policies as a benchmark for what they should spend on their children, or experience a moral obligation to spend a relatively large part of their time on child care during leave, we could speak of the labeling effect of leave policies. In that case leave policies change parents' preferences towards child care.

#### **Dutch leave system**

<PM>

## Data and variables

The analysis is based on the Time Use Survey (tbo) of the Dutch Central Bureau of Statistics (Statistics Netherlands) and the Dutch Institute for Social Research (SCP). The data set comprises two cross-sections covering the period 2000 through 2005, and contains information on 926 different respondents. Only respondents who take care for at least one child aged between 0 and 12 are included. For these persons we may assume there is some "care demand". Some sample statistics are given in Table 1.

The dependent variables are time spent on child care, and time spent on household work. Besides the general variable 'time spent on child care', also two more specific variables are taken into account: 'child care and travelling with children' and 'child support and playing'. This last variable is assumed to represent the more 'active' child care. Table 1 shows the various activities that form the main categories 'child care and travelling with children', 'child support and playing with children', 'general child care' and 'household work'.

<<Table 1 about here>>

These variables are measured in hours per week. They are assumed to depend on time spent on paid work, age of the respondent, educational level of the respondent, management function of the respondent, presence of children younger than age 5 in the household, household size, living together with a partner, time spent on paid work by the partner, educational level partner, rural or urban area, year, and leave policy used.

The time spent on home duties is assumed to be highest when the children are young since very young children ask most parental attention. We also assume that the time spent on home duties increases with the number of household members.

A higher education presumably leads to a greater understanding of the importance of parenting and a consequent increase in the time spent in child care (see Zick and Bryant, 1996, p.271). Various empirical studies have shown that better-educated parents tend to spend more time on paid work and childcare (see Leibowitz, 1974, Hill and Stafford, 1985). Furthermore, cross-sectional observations from large-scale social surveys about the working hours of better qualified (and hence more highly paid) workers suggests that as qualification levels rise, so do hours of work (Sullivan & Gershuny, 2001). From a theoretical perspective education reflects the relative resources men and women bring to relationships. Brines (1993), Presser (1994) and South & Spitze (1994) have found that men's educational level is positively associated with their participation in housework. These results are inconsistent with the arguments of the relative resource perspective and are sometimes interpreted as indicating the relationship between education and ideology (Shelton & John, 1996, p. 305). With respect to the relation between

education and time spent on unpaid work, Shelton & John (1993), South & Spitze (1994), and Brines (1993) show that women's educational level is negatively associated with time spent on unpaid work. In line with a higher education we also assume that a higher age positively relates to child care time as older persons may be more conscious of the importance of parent-child interaction for the development of children.

Furthermore, the presence of a partner in the household as well as the working status and educational level of that partner are assumed to affect time spent on domestic tasks. The presence of a partner in the household is taken into account since partners may tend to specialize; women are assumed to spend more time and men to spend less time on child care or household work when they live with a partner. Studies that focus on comparisons of dual-earner and single-earner households find that women in dual-earner households are responsible for the majority of the household labour and that the division is often gender-typed by task although women in dual-earner households typically have less responsibility for such tasks than do women in single-earner households (see Shelton & John, 1996, p. 308). The educational level of the partner is taken into account as a proxy for the earning capacity (and relative resources) of the partner. More resources are assumed to result in less home duties (Brines, 1993).

To find out whether or not we can speak of a labeling effect of leave policies, we take into account dummy-variables for the use of seven policies that offer possibilities for leave: parental leave, pregnancy leave, educational leave or sabbatical, calamity leave, saving holiday leave, varying with shorter and longer working weeks, and care leave.

Finally, to take into account spatial differences in time use as is demonstrated by Schwanen et al. (2007), we distinguish between rural and urban areas in the analysis. Due to cultural differences in general and ideas on the combination of work and care, task division, and outsourcing of child care in particular, men living in rural areas are assumed to spend less time on child care than men living in urban areas and women living in rural areas are assumed to spend more time on child care.

<<Table 2 about here >>

## Results

We use tobit models to examine to what extent the relation between time spent on paid work and time spent on child care is affected by leave policies. Because of the relatively high number of "zero cases" in some of the dependent variables I use tobit regression. The tobit model is based on the following latent variable model for time spent on child care or household work ( $Y$ ):  $Y^* = \beta'X + U$ , where  $X$  is a  $k$ -vector of regressors, including 1's for the intercept, and the error term  $U$  is  $N(0, \sigma^2)$  distributed, conditionally on  $X$ . The latent variable  $Y^*$  is only observed if  $Y^* > 0$ . In

particular, the actual dependent variable is  $Y = \max(0, Y^*)$  (see Bierens, 2004, McDonald & Moffitt, 1980).

Table 3 shows the tobit estimates of the various home duties for women with at least one child in their household younger than 13. These estimates show that taking parental leave increases the time spent on general child care with almost 5 hours a week. Taking pregnancy leave increases the time spent on general child care with more than 5 hours a week. The other leave options appear not to influence the time women spent on general child care. Focussing on the two subcategories of child care, the influence of parental leave appears only significant for the more 'active' category of child care (support and play). The influence of pregnancy leave even turns out to be negative for this 'active' form of child care. On the contrary, pregnancy leave seems to increase the more 'passive' and 'caring' forms of child care most. This result is not really surprising as child care for young babies - related to pregnancy leave - is mostly limited to 'caring' and 'nursing'. Besides the negative influence of 'flexible working weeks' on 'direct child care and travelling', the other policy options do not influence the two subcategories of child care. Furthermore, none of the policy options appears to influence the time spent on household work.

The time spent on paid work appears to influence the time spent on child care negatively, especially the most 'passive' forms of child care. The difference between time spent on child care by full-time working mothers and non-working mothers is about 4 hours a week, and the difference between mothers who have a larger part-time job (25-35 hours per week) and non-working mothers is nearly 5 hours a week. However, compared to the difference in time spent on paid work between these working mothers and the non-working mothers, these differences seem not really large. With respect to 'active' child care, the differences in time spending between full-time working mothers and mothers who are not employed are not even significant. Women who work in a small part-time job (1-12 hours per week) appear to spend an equal amount of time to their children than women who do not work. So, these results support the ideas of 'time availability' and 'relative resources', but to a small extent. With respect to household work, the results offer more support for these theoretical ideas. The differences in time spent on household work between the various groups are larger than the differences in time spent on child care, especially between full-time working mothers and non-working mothers. Although the difference in time spent on general child care is about 4 hours a week and the difference in time spent on 'active' child care is not significant, the difference in time spent on household work is more than 8 hours a week. Apparently, mothers manage to save most of the time with their children when they work, and prefer to offer household work. Furthermore the results show - in line with the idea of relative resources - that a higher management function leads to less time spending on household work an general and 'passive' child care, although the parameters are not significant. With respect to 'active' child care, the sign of the parameter does not support the idea of 'relative resources' at all. In line with our expectations, education appears to influence the time spent on

'active' child care in particular. The difference between academic mothers and low educated mothers in time spent on 'active' child care is almost 2 hours a week. Apparently, higher educated women are more conscious of the importance of parent-child interaction for the development of children. A higher education appears to relate to less time spending on household work also.

A higher educational level of the partner leads - in line with the idea of relative resources - to more time spending on household work and 'active' child care by the respondent. The difference in time spent on household work between mothers with an academic partner and mothers with a low educated partner amounts to almost 13 hours per week. For 'active' child care these differences are small however. With respect to general and 'passive' child care, a high vocational education of the partner leads to substantial less time spending of the respondent. However, for respondents with an academic educated partner this results could not be found, which makes it hard to relate these results for instance to the idea of 'doing gender'.

Focussing on the other control variables, age appears not to increase time spent on child care, and even decreases 'passive' child care. The time spent on household work does increase with age. The presence of very young children appears to increase the time spend on child care, in line with our expectations. Remarkably, the time spent on child care does not increase with the number of household members. As most households consist of two partners, this means that the time spent on child care does not increase with the number of children. The influence of the number of children on 'active' child care is even negative, although not significant. Although somewhat unexpected, this result is in line with previous research (Versantvoort, 2010). The time spent on household work increases with the number of children. Contrary to our expectations, urbanisation rate does not influence the time spent on child care nor the time spent on household work by women with children.

<< Table 3 about here >>

Table 4 shows the tobit estimates of the various home duties for men with at least one child in their household younger than 13. The estimates show that making use of leave policies has no consequences for the time spent on child care, not for 'active' childcare nor for 'passive' child care. Furthermore, besides parental leave, making use of leave policy appears not to affect the time spent on household work for men with children. Parental leave appears to influence the time spent on household work positively for men. Men who use this policy option spend more than 3 and a half hours per week more on household work than men who do not use this policy option.

The time spent on paid work appears to influence the time spent on child care and household work negatively. Contrary to the results for women with children, these results do not seem to differ for the various types of child care nor between child care and household work. Instead, the results are quite clear: the more time is spent on paid work, the less time is spent on

child care or household work. The difference between full-time working fathers and non-working fathers amounts to almost 6 hours per week for general child care, and 5 and a half hour per week for household work. For general child care this difference is larger than for women with children (which was about 4 hours a week), for household work it is smaller (was 8 hours a week). Although mothers aim to save the time with their children, and especially the 'active child care' when they work, men seem quite indifferent to the various forms of child care or household work. Their behaviour seems more in line with the idea of time availability. Contrary to the results for women, having a higher management function is of no meaning for the time spent on home duties for men. Time spent on home duties relates to the time left, and does not seem to relate to the 'status' of the job.

Although educational level does not seem to influence the time spent on household work, it seems to influence the time spent on child care positively. As we saw for women, higher educated men seem more conscious of the importance of parent-child interaction and spend more time with their children than lower educated men. The difference in time spent on general child care between men with an academic education and men with a low education amounts to almost 4 hours per week.

In line with the idea of relative resources, a higher educational level of the partner lead to more time spending on child care, especially with respect to the more passive type, and household work. The differences between fathers with a academic educated partner and fathers with a low educated partner in time spent on general child care and household work amount to 4 hours per week for general child care, and 3 and a half hours for household work. Although a higher educational level of the partner increases the time spent on household work, a full-time working status of the partner does not seem to have any influence. Probably, the idea of 'doing gender' is more dominant in the context of household work than in the context of child care. What it shows is that the time spent on household work by men does not increase with the number of working hours by their partners. The results show that men with a partner who works in a larger part-time job even spend less time on household work than men with a partner who is not employed, although the result is not significant.

With respect to the other control variables, table 4 shows that age hardly affects time spent on child care or household work. The presence of very young children appears to increase the time spent on child care and has no effect on the time spent on household work. Contrary to the results for women, the time spent on child care increases with the number of household members (in fact the number of children), while this number has no effect on the time spent on household work. This could be an indication for substitution effects when the number of children increases; women tend to spend more time on household work and men tend to spend more time on child care, both active and passive. Contrary to our expectations, but in line with the results for

women, urbanisation rate does not influence the time spent on child care nor the time spent on household work by men with children significantly.

<< Table 4 about here >>

Do these results indicate that leave policies change parents' preferences towards child care and household work? The results in table 3 and 4 show significant parameters of especially parental leave and pregnancy leave for women, but not for men. To test the joint significance of the parameters we apply Wald-tests. Table 5 shows the results of these tests.

<<Table 5 about here >>

The null-hypothesis assumes that the parameters of the various leave policies included in the analyses are similar and equal to zero. For men, the results of the Wald-tests indicate that we have to accept this hypothesis for each of the categories of home duties. So, the time men spend on child care or household work is not influenced by the use of leave policies. For women, the results of the Wald-tests indicate that we have to accept the null-hypothesis for household work. For child care, we should reject this hypothesis however. Thus, the time women spend on household work is not influenced by the use of leave policies, while the time they spend on child care is.

## **Conclusions**

With this paper we aimed to add to the literature on the relation between time spent on paid work and time spent on child care by examining the role of policies and policy-labeling in this. Previous research has shown a quite low replacement-rate between paid work and child care (Bryant and Zick, 1996, Bianchi, 2000, Versantvoort, 2010). That research did not address the possible influence of leave policies in the relation between paid work and child care, however. This paper aimed to find out to what extent leave policy affects the relation between time spent on paid work and time spent on child care and to analyze whether we could speak of a labeling effect of leave policies.

The results in this paper confirm the results in earlier research: time spent on paid work influences time spent on child care negatively, but the replacement-rate between paid work and child care is quite low for both men and women. For men full-time employment leads to a reduction of almost 6 hours a week in time spent on general child care and for women to a reduction of about 4 hours a week.

While some of the leave policies are based on the idea of time substitution between men and women, the results show that the time men spend on household work is quite indifferent to the time their partners spend on the labour market. Men with a non-working partner spend as many hours on household work per week as men with a full-time working partner. With respect to child care the results show some substitution however; the more time a partner spends on paid work, the more time a man spends on general or passive child care. However, the differences between men with a full-time working partner and men with a non-working partner are - compared to the differences in time spend on the labour market by the partners - not really large; about 3 and a half hours a week.

The time men spend on child care or household work appears not sensitive to the use of leave policy. Men who use parental leave spend as many hours on child care than men who do not use this policy option or men who make use of other leave policies. So, leave policies do not appear to change men's preferences towards child care. The time women spend on child care appears sensitive to the use of leave policy however. For instance, women who use parental leave spend about 4 and a half hour more on general child care per week than women who do not use this policy. The use of parental leave does not have any influence on the time women spend on household work however. Furthermore, Wald-tests have shown that the influence of the various leave policies included on the time women spend on child care differ by policy option. Although the use of parental leave and pregnancy leave implicate a significant increase in time women spend on child care, the use of care leave, calamity leave, educational leave, saving holiday leave, or flexible working week, do not change the time women spend on child care. Since the respondents are confronted with a similar 'care demand' (the respondents are selected on the presence of a child in the household and the presence of young children is controlled for), these result supports the idea of the labeling effect of parental leave and pregnancy leave for women. Apparently, women consider the "free time" offered by these leave policies as a benchmark for what they should spend on their children, or experience a moral obligation to spend a relatively large part of their time on child care during their leave.

## References

- Batalova, J.A. & Ph. N. Cohen (2002), "Premarital cohabitation and housework: couples in cross-national perspective", *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, vol. 64, pp. 743-755.
- Becker, G.S. (1981), "Altruism in the Family and Selfishness in the Market Place," *Economica*, vol. 48, nr. 189, pp. 1-15.
- Bianchi, S.M. (2000), "Maternal employment and time with children: dramatic change or surprising continuity", *Demography*, vol. 37, nr. 4, pp. 401-414.
- Bianchi, S.M., M.A. Milkie, L.C. Sayer & J.P. Robinson (2000), "Is anyone doing the housework? Trends in the gender division of household labor", *Social Forces*, vol. 70, nr. 1, pp. 191-228.
- Bierens, H.J. (2004), *The tobit model*, Pennsylvania State University,  
[http://econ.la.psu.edu/~hbierens/EasyRegTours/TOBIT\\_Tourfiles/TOBIT.PDF](http://econ.la.psu.edu/~hbierens/EasyRegTours/TOBIT_Tourfiles/TOBIT.PDF)
- Brines, J. (1993), "Economic dependency, gender, and the division of labor at home", *The American journal of sociology*, vol. 100, nr. 3, pp. 652-688.
- Browning, M., Bourguignon, F., Chiappori, P-A. & V. Lechene (1994), "Incomes and Outcomes: A Structural Model of Intrahousehold Allocation", *Journal of Political Economy*, vol. 102, nr. 6, pp. 1067-1096.
- Bryant, W.K. & C. Zick (1996), "Are we investing less in the next generation? Historical trends in time spent caring for children", *Journal of Family and Economics Issues*, vol. 17, pp. 365-392.
- Büchel, F. & G.J. Duncan (1988), "Do parents' social activities promote children's school attainments? Evidence from the German socioeconomic panel", *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, vol. 60, nr. 1, pp. 95-108.
- Del Boca, D. & J.Ch. Finn (1994), "Expenditure Decisions of Divorced Mothers and Income Composition." *Journal of Human Resources*, vol. 29, nr. 3, pp. 742- 61.
- Epstein, C.F. (2004), "Border Crossing; the Constraints of Time Norms in Transgressions of Gender and Professional Roles", in: C.F. Epstein & A.L. Kallenberg (eds.), *Fighting for time*, pp. 317-340, New York: Russel Sage.
- Fuwa, M. (2004), "Macro-level gender inequality and the division of household labor in 22 countries", *American Sociological Review*, vol. 69, pp. 751-767.
- Furstenberg, F., S.Ph. Morgan & P.D. Allison (1987), "Paternal participation and children's well-being after marital dissolution", *American Sociological Review*, vol. 52, pp. 695-701.
- Gauthier, A.H., T.M. Smeeding & F.F. Furstenberg, jr. (2004), "Are parents investing less time in children? Trends in selected industrialized countries", *Population and development review*, vol. 30, nr. 4, pp. 647-671.
- Hallberg, D. & A. Klevmarken (2002), "Time for children: a study of parent's time allocation", *Journal of Population Economics*, vol. 16, pp. 205-226.

- Hill, R.C. & F.P. Stafford (1985), "Parental care of children: time diary estimates of quantity, predictability and variety", in: Juster, F.T. & F.P. Stafford (eds.), *Time, Goods, and Well-Being*, pp. 415-437, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan: Michigan.
- Kooreman, P. (2000), "The labeling effect of a child benefit system", *American economic review*, vol. 90, nr. 3, pp. 571-583.
- Leibowitz, A. (1974), "Home investments in children", *NBER Chapters in: Economics of the Family, Marriage, Children, and Human Capital*, pp. 432-456, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.
- Lundberg, S. and R.A. Pollak (1993), "Separate Spheres Bargaining and the Marriage Market." *Journal of Political Economy*, vol. 101, nr. 6, pp. 998-1010.
- Morgan, K.J. & K. Zippel (2003), "Paid to care; the origins and effects of care leave policies in Western Europe", *Social Politics*, vol. 10, nr. 1, pp. 49-85.
- McDonals, J.F. & R.A. Moffitt (1980), "The uses of tobit analysis", *The review of economics and statistics*, vol. 62, nr. 2, pp. 318-321.
- Presser, H.B. (1994), "Employment schedules among dual-earner spouses and the division of household labor by gender", *American Sociological Review*, vol. 59, pp. 348-364.
- Sayer, L.C., S.M. Bianchi & J.P. Robinson (2004), "Are parents investing less in children? Trends in mothers' and fathers' time with children.", *American journal of sociology*, vol. 110, pp. 1-43.
- Schwanen, T., D. Ettema & H. Timmermans (2007), "If you pick up the children, I'll do the groceries: spatial differences in between-partner interactions in out-of-home household tasks", *Environment and Planning, A*, vol. 39, nr. 11, pp. 2754-2773.
- Shelton, B.A. (1992), *Women, men, and time: gender differences in paid work, housework, and leisure*, Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Shelton, B.A. & D. John (1993), "Does marital status make a difference?", *Journal of Family Issues*, vol. 14, pp. 401-420.
- Shelton, B.A. & D. John (1996), "The division of household labor", *Annual Review of Sociology*, vol. 22, pp. 299-322.
- South, S.J. & G. Spitze (1994), "Housework in marital and non-marital households", *American Sociological Review*, vol. 59, pp. 327-347.
- Sullivan, O. & J. Gershuny (2001), "Cross-national changes in time-use; some sociological (hi)stories re-examined", *British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 52, nr. 2, pp. 331-347.
- Van der Lippe, T. (2007), "Dutch workers and time pressure: household and workplace characteristics", *Work, Employment and Society*, vol. 21, pp. 693-711.
- Van der Lippe, T. (2010), 'Women's employment and housework', in: Treas, J. and S. Drobnic (eds.), *Dividing the domestic; men, women and household work in cross-national perspective*, pp.41-58.

- Versantvoort, M.C. (2010) 'How work affects care - A comparative analysis for the Netherlands, Norway, and the United States', in: Taskforce Part-Time Plus (ed.), *24orMore – increasing female labour participation*, Den Haag: Taskforce Part-Time Plus, pp <PM>.
- Zick, C. & W.K. Bryant (1996), "A new look at parent's time spent in child care: primary and secondary time use", *Social Science Research*, vol. 25, pp. 260-280.

Table 1: Composition variables domestic duties by tbo-code and activity

Child care: direct care and travel	Child care: support and play	Household work	Child care: general
200 caring for babies	210 caring for other children	100 cooking	200 caring for babies
260 providing medical care for children	220 helping with housework	110 setting and cleaning the table	210 caring for other children
270 taking care, nursing children	230 reading and talking with children	120 doing the dishes	220 helping with housework
291 – 297 travelling with children as driver or passenger, by car, motor, moped, bicycle, train, bus, etc.	240 playing games with children	121-125 cleaning	230 reading and talking with children
	250 walking with children, doing games outside	130-132, 160 doing odd jobs, repairing car and bicycle 141-142 washing clothes etc.	240 playing games with children 250 walking with children, doing games outside
		150 repairing clothes	260 providing medical care for children
		151 gardening	270 taking care, nursing children
		171-172 caring for pets and plants	291 – 297 travelling with children as driver or passenger, by car, motor, moped, bicycle, train, bus, etc.
		180 organising and planning home duties	
		191-197 travelling as driver or passenger	

Source: Tbo 2000 and tbo 2005 (CBS, SCP)

Table 2: Descriptive statistics dependent variables and covariates, tbo 2000 and tbo 2005, respondents who have at least one child under age 13 in the household included

Variable	Men (N=366)				Women (N=560)			
	Mean	St.dev.	Min	Max	Mean	St.dev.	Min	Max
Age	39.35	6.38	20.00	63.00	36.62	6.34	20.00	63.00
Year (1=2000)	0.40				0.52			
Young children (1= age 0-4) <sup>a</sup>	0.49				0.48			
NHousehold members	4.08	0.97	2.00	10.00	3.93	0.93	2.00	9.00
Living with a partner	0.97				0.88			
Urbanisation rate <sup>b</sup>	2.88	1.42	1.00	5.00	3.07	1.37	1.00	5.00
Full-time (>35h/wk) <sup>c</sup>	0.83				0.06			
Large part-time (25-35h/wk) <sup>c</sup>	0.09				0.12			
Med. part-time (13-24h/wk) <sup>c</sup>	0.02				0.37			
Small part-time (1-12h/wk) <sup>c</sup>	0.01				0.11			
Educ = medium <sup>d</sup>	0.38				0.44			
Educ = high vocational <sup>d</sup>	0.34				0.46			
Educ = high scientific <sup>d</sup>	0.13				0.07			
Management job (Ninferiors)	6.94	27.93	0.00	300.00	1.25	6.68	0.00	130.00
Educ partner = medium <sup>e</sup>	0.23				0.01			
Educ partner = high vocational <sup>e</sup>	0.20				0.01			
Educ partner = high scientific <sup>e</sup>	0.04				0.04			
Educ partner = unknown <sup>e</sup>	0.45				0.97			
Partner full-time job (>35h/wk) <sup>f</sup>	0.04				0.03			
Partner large part-time (25-35h/wk) <sup>f</sup>	0.08				0.01			
Partner medium part-time (13-24h/wk) <sup>f</sup>	0.36				0.00			
Partner small part-time (1-12h/wk) <sup>f</sup>	0.12				0.00			
Partner job unknown <sup>f</sup>	0.24				0.45			
Leave – parental <sup>g</sup>	0.04				0.05			
Leave – pregnancy <sup>g</sup>	0.01				0.10			
Leave – education/ sabbatical <sup>g</sup>	0.03				0.01			
Leave – calamity <sup>g</sup>	0.05				0.03			
Leave – saving holiday leave <sup>g</sup>	0.11				0.07			
Leave – short/long work.weeks <sup>g</sup>	0.07				0.10			
Leave – care <sup>g</sup>	0.03				0.02			
Time spent on child care – general <sup>h</sup>	7.11	6.39	0.00	45.50	15.67	9.22	0.00	52.00
Time spent on child care – play and support <sup>h</sup>	2.97	2.89	0.00	14.50	4.66	3.59	0.00	21.25
Time spent on child care – care and travel <sup>h</sup>	3.79	4.54	0.00	35.50	10.16	8.06	0.00	43.25
Time spent on household work <sup>h</sup>	5.89	4.85	0.00	28.50	18.48	7.75	0.00	47.75

<sup>a</sup> Indicates the presence of young children (age 0-4) in the household; <sup>b</sup> Ranges from 1=rural to 5=highly urbanized.

<sup>c</sup> Indicates time spent on paid work last week; reference category is no time on paid work; <sup>d</sup> Reference category is education respondent is low; <sup>e</sup> Reference category is education partner is low. Because of the large number of unknown values, especially for women, this variable is excluded in the analyses for women; <sup>f</sup> Indicates time spent on paid work by partner last week; reference category is no time on paid work; <sup>g</sup> Reference category is not using leave policy; <sup>h</sup> Measured in hours per week.

Source: Author's computation, based on tbo 2000 and tbo 2005 (CBS, SCP)

Table 3: Tobit estimations for time spent on child care and household work, *women* with at least one child under age 13 in the household included, 2000-2005

Independent variable	Child care: general		Child care: direct care and travel		Child care: support and play		Household work	
	b	t	b	t	b	t	b	t
Age	-0.11	-1.69	-0.16	-5.36	0.01	1.05	0.16	2.88
Year (1=2000)	-1.11	-1.69	-0.98	-1.67	-0.27	-0.88	2.13	0.41
Young children (1= age 0-4)	8.27	11.08	5.84	8.85	2.75	8.35	-0.74	-1.07
NHousehold members	0.27	0.83	0.23	0.95	-0.20	-1.71	1.36	4.21
Living with a partner	0.32	0.33	0.67	0.79	0.63	1.50	1.67	1.86
Urbanisation rate	-0.25	-1.12	-0.24	-1.26	-0.03	-0.32	0.25	1.24
Full-time (>35h/wk)	-4.16	-2.81	-2.70	-1.97	-0.79	-1.11	-8.21	-6.27
Large part-time (25-35h/wk)	-4.84	-4.27	-2.87	-2.75	-1.38	-2.55	-7.27	-7.28
Med. part-time (13-24h/wk)	-2.04	-2.57	-1.23	-1.71	-0.62	-1.68	-5.05	-7.21
Small part-time (1-12h/wk)	0.27	0.25	-0.12	-0.12	0.62	1.19	-2.45	-2.57
Educ = medium	-0.32	-0.36	-0.77	-0.99	0.69	1.74	-1.42	-1.83
Educ = high vocational	1.07	1.09	0.70	0.81	1.30	2.82	-2.79	-3.25
Educ = high scientific	2.29	1.48	1.87	1.32	1.45	1.98	-4.57	-3.37
Management job (Ninferiors)	-0.07	-1.44	-0.08	-1.74	0.01	0.53	-0.07	-1.86
Educ partner = medium	-6.12	-1.53	2.57	0.82	0.50	0.49	5.12	0.96
Educ partner = high vocational	-13.03	-3.50	-5.69	-1.92	1.29	2.83	3.98	0.77
Educ partner = high scientific	-0.92	-0.15	3.87	0.74	1.45	1.98	12.78	1.93
Educ partner = unknown	-7.28	-2.91	-0.97	-0.73	0.00	0.00	8.51	1.85
Leave – parental	4.55	2.71	2.63	1.70	2.01	2.49	1.29	0.88
Leave – pregnancy	5.37	3.97	7.04	5.66	-1.56	-2.44	1.12	0.94
Leave – education/ sabbatical	0.32	0.09	-2.19	-0.75	0.41	0.27	-1.03	-0.36
Leave – calamity	-2.73	-1.13	-1.42	-0.65	-0.91	-0.57	-1.71	-0.81
Leave – saving holiday leave	0.54	0.41	0.79	0.65	-0.42	-0.68	-0.88	-0.78
Leave – short/long work.weeks	-2.32	-1.88	-2.53	-2.21	-0.32	-0.55	-1.01	-0.94
Leave – care	-3.00	-1.01	-3.52	-1.32	-0.84	-0.67	1.70	0.66
constant	23.75	8.71	14.46	10.30	2.83	4.80	2.14	0.41
N-cases	560		560		560		560	
Standard error of u	7.32	33.07	6.81	32.20	3.54	31.41	6.39	33.27
Number of zeros	9		32		47		1	
Log likelihood	-1,890.15		-1,793.42		-1,424.78		-1,832.92	
AIC	6.84		6.50		5.18		6.63	

Source: Author's computation, based on tbo 2000 and tbo 2005 (CBS, SCP)

Table 4: Tobit estimations for time spent on child care and household work, *men* with at least one child under age 13 in the household included, 2000-2005

Independent variable	Child care: general		Child care: direct care and travel		Child care: support and play		Household work	
	b	t	b	t	b	t	b	t
Age	0.01	0.49	-0.02	-1.98	0.01	1.00	0.00	0.04
Year (1=2000)	-4.02	-3.56	-4.73	-5.87	0.04	0.08	-2.27	-2.18
Young children (1= age 0-4)	6.31	10.06	4.40	8.88	2.50	7.62	-0.35	-0.69
NHousehold members	1.07	5.01	0.54	4.13	0.52	5.45	0.05	0.28
Living with a partner	2.19	2.11	1.96	3.23	0.52	1.25	2.41	2.18
Urbanisation rate	-0.34	-1.84	-0.23	-1.70	-0.07	-0.77	0.11	0.67
Full-time (>35h/wk)	-5.92	-6.39	-3.32	-5.56	-2.33	-5.58	-5.48	-6.04
Large part-time (25-35h/wk)	-4.68	-3.36	-2.12	-2.05	-1.85	-2.63	-3.71	-2.94
Med. part-time (13-24h/wk)	-3.82	-1.77	-1.38	-0.81	-1.19	-1.02	-2.42	-1.27
Small part-time (1-12h/wk)	5.04	1.91	5.72	2.75	0.56	0.39	3.04	1.35
Educ = medium	0.85	1.07	1.10	1.84	0.27	0.67	0.98	1.41
Educ = high vocational	2.57	3.01	2.51	3.78	1.08	2.45	0.77	1.03
Educ = high scientific	3.83	3.38	2.67	2.99	2.09	3.49	0.86	0.89
Management job (Ninferiors)	-0.01	-0.60	-0.01	-0.10	-0.00	-0.45	-0.00	-0.55
Educ partner = medium <sup>a</sup>	-0.19	-0.18	0.51	0.68	0.00	0.00	-0.20	-0.22
Educ partner = high vocational <sup>a</sup>	1.33	1.16	1.93	2.23	0.29	0.51	1.07	1.11
Educ partner = high scientific	4.01	2.06	3.76	2.43	1.73	1.66	3.30	1.99
Educ partner = unknown	3.76	3.51	5.50	7.15	-0.39	-0.84	2.16	2.12
Partner full-time job (>35h/wk)	3.68	2.31	3.19	2.50	1.09	1.25	0.70	0.51
Partner large part-time (25-35h/wk)	0.60	0.44	0.65	0.60	-0.05	-0.07	-2.12	-1.77
Partner medium part-time (13-24h/wk)	-0.04	-0.05	0.13	0.21	0.26	0.61	-0.76	-0.96
Partner small part-time (1-12h/wk)	-0.63	-0.59	-0.82	-0.99	0.59	1.06	-1.72	-1.81
Partner job unknown	-1.56	-1.51	-1.15	-1.56	-0.27	-0.53	-1.93	-2.04
Leave – parental	0.56	0.34	1.67	1.24	-1.24	-1.33	3.59	2.56
Leave – pregnancy	-2.85	-0.64	-1.52	-0.42	-0.26	-0.11	3.85	1.03
Leave – education/ sabbatical	-0.40	-0.21	0.30	0.20	-0.73	-0.71	0.91	0.56
Leave – calamity	-0.89	-0.63	-0.92	-0.80	-0.27	-0.36	-0.83	-0.71
Leave – saving holiday leave	0.04	0.04	0.12	0.14	0.13	0.24	-0.06	-0.07
Leave – short/long work.weeks	0.28	0.21	-0.57	-0.53	0.49	0.67	0.06	0.28
Leave – care	1.02	0.58	-0.10	-0.07	1.26	1.30	0.47	0.32
Constant	1.14	1.04	-1.27	-2.00	-0.18	-0.42	7.77	6.29
N-cases	366		366		366		366	
Standard error of u	5.47	25.63	4.42	23.49	3.01	23.49	6.67	43.31
Number of zeros	36		81		72		18	
Log likelihood	-1,059.25		-8,850.03		-7,996.03		-1,043.98	
AIC	5.96		5.01		4.54		5.87	

Source: Author's computation, based on tbo 2000 and tbo 2005 (CBS, SCP)

Table 5: Wald-tests on parameter restrictions

H0: Parameters leave policies are similar and equal to zero	Child care: general		Child care: direct care and travel		Child care: support and play		Household work	
	Wald test	p	Wald test	p	Wald test	p	Wald test	p
Women	31.14	0.00	44.64	0.00	13.16	0.04	3.80	0.80
10% (critical value 12.02)		Reject		Reject		Reject		Accept
5% (critical value 14.07)		Reject		Reject		Reject		Accept
Men	1.35	0.98	2.92	0.89	3.90	0.79	11.11	0.13
10% (critical value 12.02)		Accept		Accept		Accept		Accept
5% (critical value 14.07)		Accept		Accept		Accept		Accept

