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Abstract

This doctoral dissertation investigates variations in parenting behavior by education, gender, social class, and countries. Time-diary data from Britain, Denmark, Flanders, and Spain are analyzed. The main findings are these: (1) cross-national variations in parenting-work balance are observed amongst fathers, but not amongst mothers, for which a more salient education gradient is observed; (2) in Spain, women’s employment is strongly correlated with paternal involvement in routine/physical activities in families with preschoolers; (3) a strong education gradient in fathering is correlated with children’s developmental stages, in line with those child-rearing practices recommended by “parenting experts”; (4) in Britain, social class and education are strongly correlated with those parenting styles associated with children’s accumulation of cultural, human, and social capital; (5) men in post-industrial occupations appear to be particularly identified with the fathering norms of intensive “educational cultivation”.

Resumen

Esta tesis doctoral investiga cómo el cuidado parental varía por educación, género, clase social y países. Se usan datos de uso del tiempo para Gran Bretaña, Dinamarca, Flandes y España. Éstos son los resultados principales: (1) existen variaciones nacionales en el equilibrio “cuidado parental-empleo” entre los padres, pero no entre las madres, quienes muestran más diferencias por educación; (2) en España, el empleo femenino se correlaciona fuertemente con la participación paterna en actividades rutinarias/físicas en familias con niños preescolares; (3) existe un gradiente educativo paternal, relacionado con las etapas evolutivas y en consonancia con las prácticas de crianza recomendadas por “expertos” en paternidad; (4) en Gran Bretaña la clase social y la educación se correlacionan fuertemente con los estilos parentales asociados con la acumulación de capitales cultural, humano y social; (5) los hombres en ocupaciones post-industriales parecen identificarse particularmente con las normas de paternidad intensiva de “cultivo educacional”.
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Chapter 1

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.1. Presentation

This dissertation focuses on parental care involvement in advanced societies. My specific analytical focus is on how parenting behavior diverges within and across countries. Scholars argue that the study of parenting is essential to understand contemporary family life and the process of child development. A review of the historical research on industrialized countries suggests that a more child-oriented parenting norm has emerged over the last decades (Alwin, 2004). Despite these demographic changes in parenting ideals, child-rearing practices have been found to diverge significantly across socio-demographic groups (Bianchi, Robinson, & Milkie, 2006; Lareau, 2003). Further, how mothers and fathers spend time in child care activities also differs across countries with distinct family-work contexts, gender regimes, and social norms (e.g., Craig & Mullan, 2011; Hook, 2006). Previous research provides important insights on how parental care operates within and across countries. Yet, as I argue in this introductory chapter, the literature on parenting presents some gaps that require further examination.

This dissertation is based on three interrelated empirical studies that focus on parenting in different industrialized countries (Chapters 2,
As the title suggests, throughout this doctoral thesis I aim to shed light on the question of how parental care involvement varies across the educational and social ladder, gender, and institutional contexts. To conduct the empirical analyses, I applied multivariate statistical techniques with time-diary data for cohabiting and married parents. The different analytical samples that I use are nationally representative and include heterosexual couples with dependent children. I analyze a total of four time use surveys that represent countries with distinct cultural, family-work, and institutional contexts, namely Denmark, Flanders, Spain, and the United Kingdom.

The doctoral thesis contains, apart from this general introduction, three empirical chapters and the general conclusions. The three empirical chapters respond to the identification of specific gaps in the literature on parenting behavior. The reader will note that these chapters can be read as different articles with specific empirical objectives. However, the implications of the different empirical analyses are, in many regards, complementary.

In Chapter 2, I examine how education and employment explain variations in maternal and paternal care time in Britain, Denmark, Flanders, and Spain. Chapter 3 examines how Spanish fathers allocate time to different child care activities across children’s developmental stages. In this chapter, I paid particular attention to the question of how fathers’ education and wives’ employment are correlated with paternal care involvement. Finally, in Chapter 4, I study how education, social class, and the sector of occupation are
interrelated with mothers’ and fathers’ time with children in activities that are expected to foster children’s accumulation of cultural, human, and social capital. Finally, in the general conclusions (Chapter 5), I summarize the implications of my empirical analyses and address three lines of investigation for future research that, in my opinion, are relevant for the literature.

This introductory chapter is organized as follows. Firstly, I present the motivation behind the doctoral dissertation. In so doing, I argue that studying parental care involvement is important to better understand key issues in contemporary family relations (i.e. parents’ lives, child development, intergenerational relations, and gender roles). Secondly, I conceptualize parenting and present a review of the main theoretical perspectives on parental care allocation considered. Thirdly, I present the structure and motivation of the three empirical chapters of the thesis. Finally, I conclude this general introduction by presenting the surveys and data, as well as the methods that I employed to conduct my empirical analyses.

1.2. General Motivation

Scholars have long argued that analyzing parental care involvement is critical to providing a complex picture of contemporary family life. The study of parenting is well-suited for an understanding of two critical dimensions within the literature on the family. One dimension is related to the inputs that children receive from mothers and fathers and the quality of parent-child interactions. A second relevant aspect deals with the degree of gender equity in the society.
Let me explain in the next paragraphs each of these two theoretically-driven motivations\(^1\).

In the literature on child development it is well-established that parental care involvement has positive effects on children’s well-being. The family is a central institution that provides the bases for children’s present and future development. And, within the family, parents (especially mothers) are typically the main providers of care. As put by Waldfogel (2006: 38), “the care that young children receive from their parents (…) lays the foundation not just for their physical growth and health but also for their cognitive and emotional growth and development.” Other adults can and do obviously contribute to children’s development, through their active participation in child care activities. For example, grandparents, teachers or educators complement parents’ efforts to care for their children, especially in light of parents’ increasing levels of time-pressure in post-industrial societies (Jacobs & Gerson, 2004; Presser, 2003). Additionally, the availability of accessible and good-quality childcare has been found to be relevant in enhancing children’s cognitive and socio-emotional skills, especially amongst children from disadvantaged backgrounds (Esping-Andersen, 2009; Krueger, 2003). Although non-parental care through formal or

\(^1\) The motivation of this dissertation is not only theoretical and empirical. This thesis also has important policy implications. First, if we better understand how parent-child interactions operate across society, we should have better instruments to implement efficient and equitable family and human capital policies. Second, if we can disentangle under what conditions gender inequalities in the household division of child care are more or less salient, we may provide valid information for understanding the institutional mechanisms that are correlated with changing gender roles at the domestic level.
informal networks represents an important dimension of child care (Folbre et al., 2005), parents tend to play the most central role in the cumulative process of child development, especially in early childhood (Heckman, 2006).

Children require more than material resources and financial support to grow up. Children also require a secure environment through which they can receive family support and active parental monitoring to enhance their skills throughout the different developmental stages (Mayer, 1997; Waldfogel, 2006). It is in this context that scholars have noted the detrimental impact that increasing rates of divorce can have on the quality and frequency of father-child interactions (Amato, 2000; Lamb, 2010; McLanahan & Sandefur, 1994).

Previous research found that highly-engaged and supportive parenting is correlated with child outcomes. Intensive parenting behaviors, for instance, have been found to positively influence children’s scholastic achievement, labor market outcomes, and socio-emotional skills (e.g., Amato & Rivera, 1999; Heckman, 2006; Mullan, Furstenberg & Marmer, 1998; Pleck, 2010; Waldfogel, 2006). Thus, studying the inputs that children receive from parents is central to understanding the cumulative process of child development. Because parenting varies across socioeconomic and demographic groups, the examination of parental care is critical to predict the unequal childhoods and outcomes among children from different socioeconomic backgrounds (Lareau, 2003). Further, warm and engaged parenting has been found to be positive for
parents themselves. We know from quantitative studies that parent-child interactions can also be positive for parents’ well-being. Longitudinal studies reveal that the quality of parent-child interactions is positively correlated with changes in parents’ satisfaction and well-being across time (Schindler, 2010; Umberson, 1989).

There is, as mentioned above, a second major reason that motivates the study of parental care time allocation: our understanding of gender relations (Craig, 2006; Gershuny, 2000). The feminist critique of mainstream sociological theories until the 1980s contributed to a growing production of research on the household division of labor and gender inequalities until our days (England, 1993a). In parallel, over the last 30 or 40 years women’s demographic and socioeconomic behaviors have changed dramatically. Female labor market participation rose substantially in industrialized countries between the 1970s and 2000. Today, women from the younger cohorts have higher levels of education than their male counterparts, whereas female economic power is much higher than it was by the 1970s and 1980s (Esping-Andersen, 2009; Goldin & Kratz, 2008; Lundberg & Pollak, 2007).

The demographic changes in women’s roles leave us with the question of whether or not men’s and women’s behaviors in the domestic arena have changed (Bianchi, 2000). Fathers have significantly increased their participation in child care in those countries for which we have historical time use data from the 1960s. However, mothers have also increased their child care time inputs.
in this period, primarily as a result of the historical transformation of parenting conceptions, with an increasing proliferation of the norms of “involved mothering” (Hofferth & Sandberg, 2001; Raley, Bianchi, & Wang, 2012; Sayer, Bianchi, & Robinson, 2004a). Although men are today, in absolute and relative terms, more involved in child care activities than they were three decades ago, women still devote about twice as much time as men in child care activities (Bianchi et al., 2006; Pleck, 2010; Yeung et al., 2001).

These mentioned gender inequities, however, are expected to vary across cultural, demographic, institutional, and socioeconomic contexts. Consequently, the study of how the gender division of labor varies across countries and socio-demographic contexts is important to get a broad picture of what factors are correlated with high levels of gender equity in the home and at the societal level (Fuwa, 2004; Geist, 2005; Hook, 2006).

Previous research has demonstrated that paid and unpaid work maintain a bidirectional relationship. Although this endogenous puzzle is difficult to solve with representative data, we have empirical evidence that women’s paid work time affects unpaid work time, and vice versa (Bianchi & Milkie, 2010). On the one hand, gender equity in employment is correlated with historical trends towards gender equity in housework and child care activities (Gershuny, Bittman, & Brice, 2005; Hook, 2006). But recent studies also suggest that gender inequalities in housework and child care are correlated with inequalities in earnings and labor market trajectories, especially in households with young children (Bryan &
Sevilla-Sanz, 2011; Kuhhirt & Ludwig, 2012). As Craig and Mullan (2010: 1345) stress, “people who withdraw from paid work to care for children may not only lose income in the short term but also suffer cumulative material disadvantage over the lifetime.” Other authors suggest that mothers’ higher propensity to multitask in domestic activities, including mothers’ major responsibility to spend time with children while doing other activities, produces gender inequities in individual life satisfaction and employment chances (Craig, 2006; Offer & Schneider, 2011). Leaving everything else equal, the greater the men’s participation in child care is, the more egalitarian the potential share of the parenthood penalty and individuals’ careers would be (Folbre, 2008; Raley et al., 2012).

Examining parental care involvement is important to understand the well-being of people from different generations. Social scientists can offer important insights through the analysis of parenting and children’s daily lives. In so doing, researchers can produce knowledge on households’ quality of life and children’s returns to education at the individual and national level. This is a question that has obvious economic, policy, and social implications for all the cohorts of a society. In short, parental care is a source of family solidarity, and it is also related to social and gender equality.
1.3. Theoretical Perspectives on Parenting

1.3.1. General Background

Parenting practices and conceptions of childhood have changed dramatically over the last three centuries (Aries, 1961). Ideals of what it means to be a “good father” or a “good mother” are shaped by a complex intersection of cultural contexts, demographic dynamics, and the socioeconomic forces that are predominant in a given historical moment (Alwin, 2004; Coltrane, 2004). Demographers stress that parents from contemporary industrialized societies are worried about the “quality”, rather than the “quantity” of children (Becker, 1991). Similarly, parenting scholars posit that a more child-oriented norm has emerged over the last decades in Western societies (Alwin, 2004). Notwithstanding these demographic shifts in parenting beliefs, parenting styles vary across social groups, including variables like social class, ethnic groups, gender, or cultural values (Arendell, 1997).

In this dissertation, parenting will be understood as a multidimensional activity. Although fathers and mothers can cluster within distinct ideal-typical parenting styles - i.e. authoritarian, permissive, and authoritative - (Baumrind, 1978), all parents are expected to interact with their children through a wide range of forms. The dramatic changes that occur in children’s lives from infancy to late childhood imply that, to some extent, parents adjust their child-rearing behaviors to their children’s physical, emotional, and intellectual needs at each developmental stage. Throughout this
dissertation, I will consider both the “quantity” (time, frequency) and the “quality” (typology) of parental care. At the quality level, I will take into account the difference between “direct” activities (the parent is primarily involved in child care) and “indirect” activities (the parent is engaged in a non-child care activity while her/his child is physically present) (see Bittman, Craig, & Folbre, 2004, for a related typology).\(^2\)

Within the group of direct child care activities, I will differentiate between “physical child care” and “interactive child care”. Physical child care activities are the ones that provide the basic material needs for children, including medical care, feeding, bathing the child, putting children to bed, or accompanying them. Interactive child care activities consist of explicit parent-child interpersonal relations, including teaching, playing, reading to the child, or speaking to the child (see Bianchi et al. 2006). As pointed out by Robinson and Godbey (1999), I assume that interactive activities are the ones that have the direct potential to enrich children’s intellectual development and are typically the most enjoyable. However, I also argue that physical activities are crucial for children’s development of cognitive and socio-emotional skills, especially in early childhood, when children are strongly dependent

\(^2\) In the group of indirect child care activities, one can find a wide diversity of parent-child interactions. For example, one parent can watch TV with a child without being engaged in any verbal interaction. But a parent can watch a particular TV program (i.e. an educational TV program for children) while being actively engaged in discussing its content with the child. This fact should be considered by researchers, either quantitative or qualitative. Of course, these distinctions are usually not possible to disentangle with survey data, but it is still important to take them into consideration when developing hypotheses and interpreting empirical results.
upon extensive physical care. Moreover, physical child care activities tend to be the most time-rigid, energy-demanding, and female-typed ones (Craig, 2006).

To study variations in parental care involvement, I opt for an approach that incorporates individuals’ opportunity-costs at the micro and macro level, but also parenting norms and values. Following Gershuny (2000: 79), to study individuals’ daily behaviors “it is perfectly sufficient (...) to construct a model in which ‘comprehensive rationality’ is one among a range of behaviours that may precede the events of the day.” Thus, I argue that individuals’ daily activities can and often do respond to a rational maximization of utility under specific opportunity-cost scenarios. Yet, at the same time, individuals’ actions are shaped by their personal trajectory and participation in activities that are influenced by social and cultural environments. The theoretical perspectives that I include in this doctoral dissertation respond to different theoretical traditions in the social sciences. Finally, my

---

3 Despite the advantages of using the typologies of routine/physical and interactive/developmental, time use scholars should consider that, in the real world, these two activities very often overlap and are not necessarily mutually exclusive.

4 Some of the theoretical debates discussed in this section are more deeply explained in the specific theoretical discussions of the three empirical chapters (Chapter 2, 3, 4).

5 The theoretical approaches that I use in my empirical analyses are in fact associated with different sociological traditions. Some hypotheses are related to a rational-choice approach to individuals’ constraints, linked, for example, to Coleman’s (1990) theoretical tradition (Chapter 2). In other cases, the reader will note that my approach is closely influenced by another tradition, as is the case of Lareau’s (2003) concept of “concerted cultivation”, which is closely related to Bourdieu’s (1984) notion of *habitus* (Chapter 4).
analytical framework is based on “middle range theories” (Merton, 1968), rather than on abstract “ground theories”.

In the next two sections, I present two broad groups of theories within the literature on parental care involvement. The first group of perspectives includes those approaches that examine parents’ decision-making under specific micro-level opportunity-cost scenarios. These approaches emphasize the importance of either time or resources. The second broad group of theoretical perspectives integrates those approaches that are not restricted to the micro-level rational-choice or related explanations, but rather focus on other key dimensions, such as gender and social norms, social group variations in child-rearing behaviors, and institutional contexts.

1.3.2. Rational-choice, Time, and Resources

From a rational-choice perspective, parents try to maximize their utility as a response to specific opportunity-cost constraints. In economics, there are two essential opposed theoretical approaches on family time allocation rooted in the rational-choice tradition. One perspective is the “neo-classical unitary model” (Becker, 1965; 1991). Becker (1991), the most emblematic representative of neo-classical New Home Economics, argues that parents should specialize in either market or home tasks, responding to the spousal comparative advantage in earnings and level of human capital. In
the unitary (or altruist) model, it is assumed that households behave as single units of decision-making seeking to maximize a utility⁶.

The second rational-choice economic approach, known as the “game-theoretical” approach, emerged as a critique of Becker’s unitary model. From a game-theoretical (or bargaining) perspective, cohabiting or married individuals have preferences that change over time and can have conflictive interest and outcomes relative to their spouses (Ermisch, 2003; Lundberg & Pollak, 1996). In this sense, it is assumed that “each person in the household has his or her own preferences, while collective decisions are Pareto efficient” (Browning & Chiappori, 1998: 1242). Unlike the unitary model, the bargaining model provides a wide range of possible outcomes regarding parental care time allocation.

Becker’s specialization theory has been widely criticized from a large group of scholars. As Folbre (2004: 10) puts, “most neoclassical economists not only take what people want as given, but argue that preferences do not systematically vary, either across populations or time”. In contrast, as I stress in this dissertation, other theoretical perspectives take for granted that parenting styles and ideologies vary significantly across the population. Yet, a fundamental problem of Becker’s specialization theory is its lack of

⁶ Becker’s definition of the household division of labor (Becker, 1991) has been strongly criticized by Feminist economists, which have criticized his gender-blind approach to the family. Feminist theory posits that women’s higher propensity to undertake housework and child care chores, place them in a weak position with respect to men, an aspect that is entirely absent in neo-classical theories about the family. Becker’s model of specialization is, according to Feminist authors, inequitable and unnecessary for our societies (England, 1993b).
consistency with most changes that have occurred since the 1970s. For instance, over the last decades, dual-earner couples have become the norm in most Western countries (Jacobs & Gerson, 2004; Lundberg & Polack, 2007). Thus, family scholars should develop theories that allow us to understand how parental care allocation operates in a world in which parents’ time-constraints have increased together with female labor market participation (Gornick & Meyers, 2003; Jacobs & Gerson, 2004). From this point of view, a bargaining model seems a more plausible approach to examining parental care decisions and behaviors than the unitary model. Moreover, the bargaining approach provides a more realistic framework to study related life-course dynamics in advanced societies, including childbearing, marriage, divorce, and labor market trajectories (Ermisch, 2003).

In the sociological tradition, two game-theoretical perspectives on parental care involvement have dominated the literature: “time-availability” and “relative resources” (Breen & Cooke, 2005; Coverman, 1985; England & Farkas, 1986; Presser, 1994; Gupta, 2007). The “relative resources” model assumes that the greater the comparative advantage of an individual in a couple, the less time this person will spend in unpaid work (Coverman, 1985). This implies that heterosexual couples negotiate their paid and unpaid
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7 The reader will note that Parsons’ role theory has not been included in the literature review. Parsons’ role theory is no longer included in mainstream empirical sociological literature on parental care allocation. Leaving aside important differences, Parsons’ approach has affinities with Becker’s defense of the traditional nuclear family, altruism/solidarity in the family, and the gender division of labor (Parsons & Bales, 1955). Parsons, like Becker, does not see any existence of conflicts, both at the family and at the societal level.
work commitments based on their relative marital power or resources -i.e. earnings, human capital- (Breen & Cooke, 2005). Some studies on parental care allocation have actually found support for the relative resources theory. Raley et al. (2012) have recently found with American data that the wife’s share of the couple’s income increases paternal engagement in physical child care. A variation of the relative resources approach focuses on women’s economic autonomy. Women’s absolute (not relative) income was found to have a strong negative effect on women’s housework time in different life transitions (Gupta, 2007; Schober, 2012). The impact of individual resources on the partner’s increase of unpaid work time was found to vary by gender, with women’s resources having much stronger effects than men’s resources (see Gupta, 2007, for a review).

Women’s autonomy and relative power are thus expected to predict variations in the household division of labor, including child care. Yet, the logic behind parents’ child care time differs from that behind housework. As Raley and colleagues put it (2012: 1424), “in contrast to other types of unpaid work, caring for children is not widely viewed as undesirable work to be avoided or outsourced.” Parents are typically motivated to participate in daily interactions with children (Hallberg & Klevmarken, 2003), which is not the case for housework. Although employed parents actually maximize their time allocated to parental care (Bianchi, 2000), parents’ abilities to spend time with children are crucially determined by their time-availability. This reality is particularly striking in the so-called 24/7 economy, with remarkable levels of time-pressure among parents.
with young children (Presser, 2003). We can find different indicators of how difficult it is for parents to balance employment and parenting in contemporary advanced societies. For example, in the U.S., 55% of fathers and 42% of mothers report having “too little time” for their youngest child (Bianchi et al., 2006: 133). Similarly, in Europe, 28% of employees feel stressed, and more than 20% of them report general fatigue (Van der Lippe, 2007: 694).

The “time-availability” perspective represents a complementary sociological explanation to the relative resources approach. From a “time-availability” approach, it is argued that parental care involvement crucially depends on individuals’ absolute and relative time scarcity (Nock & Kingston, 1987; Presser, 1994). Because time is a finite resource, one should expect that, leaving everything else constant, those parents who work more time in the labor market or have inflexible work schedules, will have significant constraints to balancing employment and parenting (Lesnard, 2008; Presser, 2003). Similarly, one should expect that individuals respond to their spouse’s time-constraints by increasing their parental care inputs. Recent studies have found general support of the idea that paid work time constraints predict parental involvement in the physical child care activities (Roeters, van der Lippe, & Kluwer, 2009).

Finally, “socioeconomic resources” can also play an important role in parenting behavior. Leaving parenting norms constant, material resources are expected to affect differences in daily child-rearing practices. One mechanism through which economically advantaged
parents could have more resources to spend time with children is through their lower propensity to be engaged in housework. Individuals - particularly women - at the top of the income distribution have been found to allocate less time to housework activities, for example via outsourcing domestic work (Gupta et al., 2010; Heisig, 2011). For this reason, some scholars argue that middle and upper class families have a comparative advantage in maximizing parent-child interactions (Bianchi et al., 2004). In this sense, leaving everything else constant, working-class parents (especially mothers) would have less energy and time left to be actively involved in their children’s educational cultivation (Lareau, 2003). Other related perspectives suggest that parents with high levels of human capital might have more power to negotiate their work schedules, making it easier for them to spend time with their children (Bianchi et al., 2004; Sayer, Gauthier, & Furstenberg, 2004b).

To my knowledge, few studies have deeply explored how economic resources (i.e. family income) affect actual parent-child interactions. However, socioeconomic resources are often expected to have an influence on parents’ abilities to invest time in children.

1.3.3. Parenting Styles, Gender, and Institutions

Preferences and behaviors towards child care are expected to be strongly shaped by ideologies and norms that are socially and culturally constructed in everyday life. This does not mean that opportunity-cost contexts are not important explanatory factors of
parental care allocation; parents with similar constraints but different preferences and norms are expected to have distinct child-rearing practices. Thus, preferences and parenting ideologies are expected to vary significantly across the population, both at the macro and micro level.

A first important group of theories underlines that gender is a fundamental variable explaining fathers’ and mothers’ child care behavior (Craig, 2006). According to Berk (1985), analysis of the division of unpaid work in heterosexual couples should never ignore the existence of normative constraints on members’ activities within and outside the household. In this context, “gender ideologies” have been found to shape individuals’ roles towards the gender division of labor (Hochschild, 1989). The “doing gender” thesis (West & Zimmerman, 1987) argues that men and women are socialized in a world with remarkable patriarchal values, which are embedded through humans’ everyday interactions. Thus, the different roles that men and women display throughout their process of socialization might explain why men and women have gender-typed notions about “good fathering” and “good mothering”. Interestingly, some studies found that men perform traditional male roles in domestic work, even when they are unemployed or socioeconomically disadvantaged in relation to their wives (Brines, 1994; Evertsson & Nermo, 2004; Hochschild, 1989). Nonetheless, recent studies with large longitudinal datasets suggest that the household division of labor does respond substantially to partners’ comparative advantage (see Sullivan, 2011, for a review).
A second group of theories emphasizes the importance of “institutions” in creating specific conditions for parental care allocation. Adopting a cross-national institutional approach, scholars have emphasized that public institutions are relevant in shaping family-work balance and gender relations (Cooke & Baxter, 2010; Esping-Andersen, 1999; Ghysels, 2004; Gornick & Meyers, 2003; Hook, 2006; Lewis, 2009; Orloff, 1996; Sayer et al., 2004b). First, macro-level variations in family-work policies are expected to have an influence on how parents combine employment and parenting in different countries. At the European level, some countries have implemented strong social policies (i.e. family-friendly policies, universal childcare systems) to create incentives for the balance of employment and parenting (i.e. Denmark, Sweden). In other national contexts, institutions have implemented residual family-friendly policies to create family-work balance (i.e. Britain, Italy, and Spain). Related studies suggest that countries with welfare and gender regimes that have promoted the dual-earner/dual-care model have achieved more gender egalitarian relations in men’s and women’s domestic work (including child care) than other countries (Geist, 2005; Hook, 2006).

Finally, scholars have emphasized that “social class” and “education” are variables associated with distinct parenting styles and ideals. Individuals at the top of the social and educational ladder have been found to feel closer to the norms of intensive parenting. Consequently, parents from more privileged backgrounds adopt the child care behaviors that are expected to enhance critical skills to succeed in key institutions for the reproduction of social
inequality, such as the school and the labor market (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977; Zick & Bryant, 1996; Lareau, 2003; Sayer et al., 2004b). As put by Lareau (2003), if only the resources of the poor and working-class families were transformed overnight so that they equaled those of the middle-class families, significant differences in child-rearing behaviors would persist. Hence, parenting and family environments associated with children’s creation of human, cultural, and social capital are expected to vary across social strata.

1.4. Motivation and Structure of the Empirical Chapters

Drawing on different theoretical approaches, previous studies have documented variations in parenting behavior across the population. Different factors have been considered in the literature, like time constraints, employment conditions, socioeconomic status, parental education, children’s sex, children’s age, parenting styles, family structures, cultural contexts, ethnic groups, gender norms, or institutional contexts, amongst others (Alwin, 2004; Bianchi et al., 2006; Coltrane, 2000; Craig & Mullan, 2011; Gershuny, 2000; Hochschild, 1989; Hoffferth, 2003; Hook & Wolfe, 2012; Kan, Sullivan, & Gershuny, 2011; Lareau, 2003; Pleck, 2010; Presser, 2003; Raley & Bianchi, 2006; Sayer et al., 2004b; Sayer & Gornick, 2011; Sullivan, 2010).

Previous research has undoubtedly contributed to our understanding of the mechanisms behind parental care involvement. Yet, in the literature on parenting and children’s lives, some empirical gaps
persist. This leaves us with puzzles or inconclusive questions that motivate the empirical analyses of this doctoral dissertation. In this section, I will present the main gaps or puzzles that motivate the three main empirical sections of this doctoral thesis.

1.4.1. Motivation and Structure of Chapter Two

Chapter 2 is motivated by the fact that previous research has not provided conclusive evidence of how education and employment intersect to explain parental care involvement. Parental education is a variable with different implications for the study of parenting. Education is considered a marker of different notions of child development and parenting styles. Highly-educated parents are indentified as those who feel closer to the norms of intensive parenting that emerged over the last decades (Alwin, 2004; Zick & Bryant, 1996; Sayer et al., 2004b). But, in addition, scholars have argued that well-educated parents might have a comparative socioeconomic advantage to allocate time to child care. Bianchi and colleagues raised this last question (2004: 191) eloquently: “if parents wish to spend time with their children regardless of their level of education and family income, then it may be easier for well-educated parents than for less-educated parents to protect time for their children from the demands of paid work, because they may have higher status, more flexible jobs, and a greater ability to purchase housekeeping services, prepared meals, and other services that reduce housework other than child care”.
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Indeed, one can expect that parents with high levels of human capital are in a better position to allocate time to child care, leaving differences in parenting norms constant. However, other factors are in play when one studies individuals’ time-pressures across groups of education. As Gershuny (2000) has stressed, over the last decades college-educated parents have become more and more likely to work full-time, reducing very significantly their leisure time in comparison to lower educated parents (see also Aguiar & Hurst, 2007; Sevilla-Sanz, Gimenez, & Gershuny, 2012). Consequently, well-educated parents have - on average - less availability of non-working time than their lower educated counterparts, even if they have a comparative advantage to negotiate their work schedules and organize domestic activities.

Although scholars have explored how education affects parental care time after controlling for employment conditions (e.g., Bianchi et al., 2006), previous research has not considered how these two variables interact in predicting child care time. It could be the case that education is essentially driven by individuals’ selection in certain employment categories. But it could also be that parents with different levels of education behave differently in relation to child care, after controlling for paid work time constraints in a multivariate statistical framework.

Some related studies have examined educational variations in child care time in countries with different family-work and cultural contexts. The study by Sayer and colleagues (2004b) on Canada, Germany, Italy, and Norway is one of the most influential studies in
this direction. Sayer et al. (2004b: 1156) argue, in line with Bianchi and colleagues, that “the less educated are more likely to be employed in occupations with rotating shifts, or inflexible hours, and may also have to work two jobs to make ends meet.” In this context, the authors persuasively argue that in generous welfare states (Norway) this educational gap in child care time would be more modest than in other countries (Canada, Italy, Germany). Consequently, they posit that low-skilled workers in countries with generous welfare states have an advantage in balancing paid and unpaid work in comparison to their counterparts in countries with residual social policies.

The theoretical rationale of Sayer and colleagues is well-articulated. However, this approach leaves two unanswered questions. First, it does not take into account the fact that individuals with a high status and level of education are more hurried than their lower educated counterparts, at least in terms of paid work time allocation (Gershuny, 2000; Sevilla-Sanz, Gimenez, & Gershuny, 2012). Second, their reasoning does not consider that countries differ in the number of hours that people with different educational levels are employed in the labor market.Ironically, in countries with strong welfare states, an average low-skilled woman might face stronger levels of time-pressure than her low-skilled counterpart where social policies are residual. This could simply reflect that the former are more likely to work full-time than the latter. For example, although Italian mothers with low levels of education receive residual support to allocate time to child care, they might have more time left to be allocated to child care than their counterparts in
Norway. This would be explained by the fact that Norwegian low-skilled mothers are more likely to be employed than Italian low-skilled mothers. In this sense, scholars interested in how education affects parental care time in different countries should consider that the correlation of education and employment varies cross-nationally. Thus, researchers should examine to what extent the effect of education on child care time responds to specific employment conditions in different countries by examining the interaction between employment and education.

Following the mentioned empirical motivation, Chapter 2 focuses on parental care involvement in Britain, Denmark, Flanders, and Spain. In the literature, these four countries have been associated with distinct welfare and gender regimes (e.g., Esping-Andersen, 1999; Esping-Andersen et al., 2010; Geist, 2005; Ghysels, 2004; Gornick & Meyers, 2003; Lewis, 2009).

In Spain and the UK, public institutions provide weak universal family support while full-time workers typically face important time-constraints to balancing work and parenting. Nonetheless, in Britain, female part-time employment has been significantly promoted. In this country more than 40% of women in the labor force are employed as part-time workers. In contrast, in Spain, the male breadwinner model remains much widespread across society, with another large group of couples where both partners have a full-time contract. Flanders, like the UK, is a country with a large group of mothers working as part-time employees, but it has stronger family-friendly policies than Britain or Spain. Denmark, as a
Scandinavian country, with a Social-democratic tradition, has developed active family policies to promote the dual-earner/dual-career model. In terms of gender policies and norms, Spain is the country with the most traditional context; Denmark has the most gender egalitarian one. Britain and Flanders, despite some policy differences, are somewhere in between Denmark and Spain regarding gender equity in the household.

In Chapter 2, I investigate under what conditions education and employment have an effect on parental care time in these four different countries. Drawing on previous time use literature on parental care involvement (Sayer et al., 2004b) and on welfare and gender regimes (Cooke & Baxter, 2010; Esping-Andersen, 1999; Lewis, 2009), in this chapter I focus on two main questions. First, I examine whether countries with different family-work scenarios provide different opportunities to invest time in children across parents with different paid work characteristics. Second, after controlling for paid work constraints, I explore how education influences parental care involvement in countries with different family-work scenarios.

1.4.2. Motivation and Structure of Chapter Three

A second key question that needs further scholarly attention is the study of how parents of different socio-demographic groups interact with children at different developmental stages. More specifically, the study of how residential fathers from different socio-demographic groups spend time with children of different ages has
received very little attention in the literature on paternal care involvement (see Marsiglio, 1991; Yeung et al., 2001). Studies on parental care time allocation typically control for children’s age, but these do not tend to look at how parental care variations by children’s age differ across the population.

A focus on fathers’ education and women’s labor characteristics when studying variations in fathering across children’s life course is especially important. These two variables allow us to understand two critical domains of family life: (i) under what conditions well-educated fathers have distinct child care behaviors that cluster with children’s specific life stages; (ii) to what extent women’s employment predicts changes in fathers’ engagement in the most time-demanding and female-typed child care activities, namely physical child care time with preschoolers.

The study of whether an education gradient in fathering occurs across children’s life stages is crucial to better understand the intergenerational transmission of social advantage. We know that parental care needs vary dramatically by children’s developmental stages (Waldfogel, 2006). Preschoolers usually receive extensive amounts of child care time, whereas parental care time allocation decreases significantly once children grow up (Ironmonger, 2004; Yeung et al., 2001). In previous literature, it has been made explicit that the types of child care that children require from their parents vary significantly across their life course (Gelman, 2008; Guralnick, 2008; Lamb, 2010; Pleck, 2010; Waldfogel, 2006). In these studies, it is stressed that preschoolers require intensive face-to-face
physical child care involvement to secure their mental and socio-emotional development while promoting a close relationship with their fathers. Once children get older, they gain autonomy, while their brain and personality develop in such a way that they require intensive engagement in psychological reasoning and social skills from parents in order to succeed in schooling. Therefore, to understand the extent to which highly-educated parents (in this case fathers) are the ones who conform to the intensive child-rearing practices that are associated with children’s cognitive and socio-emotional development, we should examine how child-rearing varies across children’s developmental stages.

Further, the study of how mothers’ employment affects fathers’ engagement in child care time in families with children of different ages is crucial to understanding gender relations. Following Budig and Folbre (2004) and Wang and Bianchi (2009), our understanding of fathering might increase if we were to study different types of paternal care involvement in families with children of different ages (especially preschoolers). It is well-established that families with young children have a particularly salient traditional division of labor, and it is in these families where child care demands are highest (Craig & Mullan, 2011). For this reason, exploring gender-typed child care activities in families with the youngest child at different life stages can complement recent studies on how women’s socioeconomic characteristics are associated with fathers’ child care involvement. These two questions remain inconclusive within the time use literature on fathering.
In Chapter 3 I examine whether paternal involvement varies across fathers with different levels of education and wives with distinct employment circumstances. I use the “2003 Spanish Time Use Survey” to investigate a sample of fathers with children at different developmental stages. Spain is an interesting case of study. This country has a traditional normative and policy context (Esping-Andersen et al., 2010; Sevilla-Sanz, Gimenez, & Fernandez, 2010). Yet, in Spain a dramatic rise in female labor market participation has recently occurred, a fact that provides an interesting framework to test whether men have responded to changes in women’s socioeconomic roles in a country with a markedly traditional family-work context.

1.4.3. Motivation and Structure of Chapter Four

Chapter 4 is motivated by the assumption that research on how parents with different levels of education and social classes spend time with children requires further attention. More specifically, very few quantitative studies have examined how children from different social and educational backgrounds spend time with parents in a range of activities that are expected to foster children’s cultural, human, and social capital.

Although previous research focused on how education is correlated with parental care time (e.g., Bianchi et al., 2006; Guryan, Hurst, & Kearney, 2008; Sayer et al., 2004b; Sullivan, 2010), very few studies have provided a wide picture of how parents and children from different socioeconomic backgrounds interact in everyday life.
The study of how socio-cultural family-orchestrated activities vary across social strata is expected to provide a complex picture of the conditions under which children from different backgrounds achieve specific interpersonal, cultural, and social skills (Farkas, 2003; Lareau, 2003).

In this sense, Lareau (2002) argues that the majority of studies on parenting and family life are narrowly focused, since most of them do not examine more than one dimension inside the home. The few studies that examined different parent-child activities found a correlation between parents’ social position and parental engagement in their children’s educational and cultural activities (Lareau, 2003; Yeung et al., 2001). These studies, however, are essentially restricted to American data; little is known about other industrialized countries. In addition, the study of leisure time with children is necessary to provide a rich picture of how children from different social backgrounds interact with their parents in their daily routines. Parents are increasingly including their children in most of their leisure activities, in order to maximize time-scarcity, family relations, and parental care (Bianchi et al., 2006). Very little is known on how specific family leisure activities with implications for children’s cultural, intellectual, or social skills vary across social strata and groups of education.

Finally, to my knowledge, scholars have not paid enough attention to the question of how occupational characteristics affect individuals’ behaviors in the home. In particular, the extent to which fathers employed in post-industrial occupations have (in
relative terms) distinct behaviors towards child care remains an open question. Scholars have argued that post-industrial occupations are associated with genuine identities, social interactions, loyalties or labor relations. Following Esping-Andersen’s (1993), one can assume that men employed in post-industrial occupations are, in relation to their counterparts in (pre)industrial occupations, more likely to be employed in a type of occupation where social relations are less hierarchical. Further, men working in post-industrial occupations, in general, have the chance to interact with more women at the workplace than those in industrial occupations. In other words, men in the post-industrial sector have more contact with the “feminine world”. Finally, men who are post-industrial employees, unlike their counterparts from the traditional/industrial sector, could establish a more open and diverse network of relationships derived from a richer variety of interpersonal relations through everyday work experiences. Thus, one might argue, for example, that the work relations of hairdressers or waiters (in terms of social relations at workplace) diverge dramatically from that of carpenters, plumbers, or construction workers. Yet, how are these sector differences correlated with fathers’ child care involvement? To my knowledge, this question has not been studied in the literature.

Thus, an interesting and understudied question to understand variations in men’s family roles is whether or not, after controlling for different covariates (i.e. education, paid work time, female employment), men employed in post-industrial occupations have genuine behaviors towards child care. Because post-industrial
occupations, unlike industrial occupations, are more mixed in terms of gender and social relations, one might expect that men in the post-industrial sector have been particularly likely to absorb contemporary norms of intensive fathering (Alwin, 2004; Coltrane, 2004) through a higher exposure to these norms through everyday life interactions. Studying this question might shed light on how father-child interactions operate in post-industrial societies.

Chapter 4, which is motivated by the abovementioned gaps, examines data from the “2000 British Time Use Survey”. In this last empirical chapter, I adopt a multidimensional approach to family life and parenting. Unlike in most previous studies, I concentrate on a wide range of activities that are expected to have implications for children’s cultural, human, and social capital. My main focus is on education, class, and occupational variations in different child care and leisure activities that involve interactions at the parent-child level, such as family-orchestrated cultural and social activities. Throughout these empirical analyses across different British families, I hope to provide a better understanding of how parenting and childhood socialization varies across the social and educational ladder in industrialized countries.

1.5. Data and Methods

The empirical analyses that I employed in this dissertation were based on the exploitation of rich representative time-diary data for four European countries, namely Britain, Denmark, Flanders, and Spain. This section starts with a brief introduction of the history and
nature of time use surveys. Secondly, I present the surveys that I analyzed for my three empirical studies (Chapters 2, 3, 4), as well as my analytical measures. I conclude this methodological section by presenting the statistical techniques that I used for my three empirical chapters (or articles).

1.5.1. Time Use Surveys: An Overview

Time is a limited resource with both an “objective” dimension (time passes for everyone) and a “subjective” one (every historical biography is unique). Through the analysis of time use data, social scientists can connect these two analytical levels through investigating how individuals with a set of specific characteristics (i.e. race, age, gender, level of income, education, ideology, religion) spend their time in a fixed space of time, be this one day (24 hours) or a larger period.

As defined by Robinson and Godbey (1997: 66), “the time-diary is a micro-behavioral technique for collecting self-reports of an individual’s daily behavior in an open-ended fashion on an activity-by-activity basis.” These data are collected once individuals report their daily activities in questionnaires that contain rich information on different time use activities along the 1,440 minutes (24 hours) of a random day. This time is fixed (everyone has 24 hours), but varies depending on either personal or group-level circumstances (the allocation of this fixed time differs across the population).
Throughout the long history of time-diary data collection, a wide variety of surveys and techniques have been applied for several periods and countries. At one extreme, some remarkable time use studies were applied at a very local scale (i.e. towns, small communities). At the other extreme, some time use surveys were designed to investigate micro and macro level variations from an international perspective (i.e. cross-national comparisons).

Most time use scholars establish the origins of the field in the post-tsarist Russia of the early 1920s. The first large time use data collection, which had economic planning purposes, was conducted in the USSR in the period 1921-23 (Gershuny, 2011). These analytical techniques were imported to the U.S. around the 1930s, when sociologist Sorokin emigrated from Russia (Gershuny, 2000). The book *Time Budgets of Human Behavior*, written by Sorokin and Berger (1939), has been considered an influential introduction among social scientists using these empirical techniques.

Yet, it was not until the the 1960s when the first harmonized and international time use research project flourished. The results of this process of data collection were published in the highly influential 1965 ‘Multinational Time Budget Study’ by Alexander Szalai and colleagues (Szalai, 1972). This pioneering study was based on roughly 2,000 respondents from each of the 12 different countries under study. In these harmonized diaries, respondents reported daily activities along the 1,440 minutes of a single day and, subsequently, activities were coded following equivalent criteria for the 12 countries that were included in the study.
Following Bianchi, Robinson, and Milkie (2006), the Szalai code system has two critical advantages in relation to previous time use surveys: 1) It provides harmonized data for different countries, which enables the employment of a rigorous cross-national comparison; 2) The Szalai code system can be easily adapted to construct various activities, depending on researchers’ empirical priorities. This method has been subsequently revised and applied in recent datasets. Today, the Multinational Time Use Study (MTUS) provides post-fieldwork-harmonized time use data for about 60 national surveys from more than 20 countries. The MTUS has the advantage of including existent harmonized time use datasets coming from different sources. Amongst other surveys, the MTUS includes early surveys from the 1960s, the different surveys from the Harmonized European Time Use Study (HETUS), or recent surveys from the American Time Use Study (ATUS).

The methodological validity of time use diaries has been largely studied. In a review of the literature on housework time with time-diary data, Shelton and John (1996) argue that time use surveys prove a general validity to examine people’s allocation of time within a large population. Some studies examined the reliability and validity of time-diaries by comparing respondents’ and spouses’ accounts of when an activity occurred (see Juster, 1985). Others have compared activities recorded in time-diaries with those occurring when respondents reported their activity at a signal of a beeper set to go off randomly (see Robinson, 1985). In general, these studies report high correlations between what respondents did and what they reported in diaries (Shelton & John, 1996).
Overall, a long history of studies with time-diary data proves the reliability of time-diary surveys to investigate individuals’ allocation of time. Therefore, time use surveys are expected to be most valid instruments to investigate parental care allocation in the framework of a large representative population.

1.5.2. Data

In this dissertation, I use four representative time use surveys. These surveys are: the “2000 British Time Use Survey”, the “2001 Danish Time Use Survey”, the “2005 Flemish Families and Care Survey”, and the “2003 Spanish Time Use Survey”. The four surveys contain rich time-diary data for both respondents of a couple, either for one or two days within a random week.

The surveys of Denmark, Spain, and the UK are included within the MTUS datasets. The structure of MTUS surveys is based on the responses of one or more members from a household who reported daily activities across the 144 activities of a random day, which are usually defined by 10 minutes of duration along a standard day. MTUS surveys usually contain information on primary and secondary activities. Primary activities are those that are defined by the respondent as the main activity (i.e. direct activities). Secondary activities are typed by the respondent as the ones that took place simultaneously to the main activity (i.e. indirect activities). For example, a respondent can eat and watch TV in a spell of time that lasts 10 minutes. In this case, the respondent would most likely
include eating as a primary activity; watching TV would be reported as the secondary activity.

The MTUS surveys contain a wide range of activities. As mentioned above, one advantage of the Szalai code system is that activities can be reconverted from more specific to more general. A good example is leisure time. Researchers can study the amount of time devoted to leisure through the inclusion of the total time, including the sum of time allocated to socializing, cultural activities, practicing sports, playing music, or watching TV. But researchers can also study specific activities within the broad category of leisure. A second important feature of the MTUS surveys is their inclusion of information on the dyadic relations that take place within households. These surveys include information on with whom of the household each activity took place, including spouses and children. This feature is critical for studying the frequency in which children and other adults are involved in specific daily activities.

One first survey that I use in my empirical analyses is the “2000 British Time Use Survey.” This is a representative survey that contains demographic and socioeconomic variables at the household and individual level. The “2000 British Time Use Survey” is based on a large sample of respondents, including a total of 19,898 respondents with valid information on diaries. This survey offers two time-diaries: one diary is reported on a random weekday (Monday-Friday) and a second diary on a random weekend (Saturday-Sunday). Diary respondents reported their daily
activities for every 10 minutes along the 1,440 daily minutes, including a wide range of activities. Every interviewed person reported primary and secondary activities, as well as information on with whom in the household each activity took place.

The “2001 Danish Time Use Survey” contains information on diary activities reported by respondents for every 10 minutes on two different days. One diary is reported for a weekday. A second survey represents a random weekend. The “2001 Danish Time Use Survey” includes, like other MTUS surveys, both primary and secondary activities. For each of the 144 spells of time, scholars can obtain information on “where” and with “whom” (including a young child from the household) the activity has taken place. The original sample for Denmark is significantly smaller than the three other samples used in this dissertation. It only includes 2,712 households in its original dataset. Yet, the survey provides information on a representative sample of Danish couples with young children.

The third survey used in this dissertation is the “2003 Spanish Time Use Survey.” This survey includes a large sample of 46,774 individuals and 20,603 households. The survey contains rich information on sociological, demographic, and economic variables for each individual older than 10 years old. As it is the case of the British and Danish surveys, the Spanish time use survey offers information on primary and secondary activities that respondents reported for every 10 minutes along the day. Likewise, it provides information on “where” and with “whom” (including children and
spouses) the activity took place. Unfortunately, this survey, unlike the other three surveys, only provides one diary per person, either for a random weekday or for a random weekend. This impedes to get a broad picture of the weekly average time that Spaniards allocated to different time use activities by 2003.

Finally, the “2005 Flemish Families and Care Survey” has some minor differences in relation to the three surveys presented above. Nonetheless, the general characteristics of this survey are well-suited to establish a rigorous cross-national comparison. In this representative survey, every resident parent of a household filled two 24-hour diaries (one on a weekday; another on a weekend), in which activities for 15 minutes were reported. By using this survey, one can know with whom of the household activities took place, as well as information on several economic and socio-demographic variables. Unfortunately, this representative time use survey of the Flemish population does not include secondary activities. This fact implies that I can only study primary activities when I compare my four cases of study.

1.5.3. Dependent Variables

In this dissertation, parenting is understood as a multidimensional activity. Consistent with my empirical objectives, several dependent variables are included in my analyses. The nature of my dependent variables is continuous. My dependent variables capture the time (total of minutes) that individuals spent in child care activities on the random day of observation.
In Chapter 2, parental care time is defined as a general category, including the total time that either the father or the mother allocated to primary child care on the day of observation. In contrast, in Chapter 3 the reader will appreciate a richer conceptualization of parental care involvement. This definition is consistent with the aforementioned distinction between routine (or physical) and interactive (or developmental) activities (Bianchi et al., 2006; Craig, 2006). “Routine” or “physical” child care is represented as a continuous variable, including examples like feeding, medical care, bathe the child, supervising, putting the child to bed, watching over the child, and accompanying children. “Interactive” activities are also included as a continuous measure, including time spent playing with the child, teaching or talking to the child, and reading to the child. Within interactive activities, I also considered a subcategory: “teaching”. This activity includes educational child care (i.e. interactive games with the child, teaching the child). As the reader will see in Chapter 3, teaching was defined as a dummy variable.

Finally, Chapter 4 presents a more open definition of parenting and parents’ time with children. Firstly, my variables capture, not only the amount of time that each parent allocated to primary and secondary child care (total child care time), but also the amount of time allocated to leisure while the child was present in the activity. Regarding leisure activities, I create a wide range of subcategories, which allow me to deepen in the study of parent-child interactions. These variables, all continuous, include social activities, cultural activities, watching TV, and having meals with the child. Secondly, the analyses differentiate the parent-child and family dimension.
The former dimension includes the total amount of time that one parent allocated to each activity with the presence of (at least) one dependent child. The latter represents the minutes that the mother devoted to each leisure activity together with the spouse and the child in any given activity.

1.5.4. Independent Variables

The main independent variables that I used for the empirical analyses of this dissertation are education, employment, and social class. Education is used as a categorical variable with three categories: primary (ISCED 1, 2), secondary (ISCED 3, 4), and tertiary (ISCED 5, 6). Employment is either used as a continuous (number of hours allocated to paid work on an average week) or as a categorical variable. For mothers, in the majority of analyses, I use three categories: (i) non-employed; (ii) employed as part-time worker; (iii) employed as full-time worker. For fathers, paid work is in general categorized as follows: (i) non-employed; (ii) employed as a standard full-time worker; (iii) overworking (working more than 45 hours on an average week). Finally, social class is categorized in four categories: (i) Unskilled working-class; (ii) Skilled working-class; (iii) Professional occupation (low and high); (iv) Managerial occupation (low and high).

I also constructed two occupational categories: (i) post-fordist or post-industrial occupations; (ii) industrial or fordist occupations. These occupational categories, like the ones created for social class, were constructed using the wide schema from the “International
Standard Classification of Occupations - ISCO 88”, which is included in the “2000 British Time Use Survey”. As the reader will see in Chapter 4, I combine these two occupational categories with the three levels of education for fathers. I end up having 6 different variables that combine father’s sector of occupation and their level of education (see Chapter 4).

1.5.5. Analytical Techniques

There is a debate in the time use literature on whether scholars should use Tobit or Ordinary Least Square (OLS) regressions to study people’s allocation of time. This discussion exists because in time use diaries it is common to find a significant amount of zeros for certain activities (i.e. minutes devoted to a play in the theatre, playing music or visiting a museum). A common solution for zero responses has been the employment of Tobit Regressions for censored data, assuming that some zero values are correct, while others are overrepresented (Greene, 1997).

Tobit models have been widely used among time use scholars in the last two decades. However, these techniques have become less popular in recent years. Time use activities range from zero minutes to 24 hours on the day of observation and, consequently, diaries do not provide negative responses (Hook, 2010). One might argue that we do not have theoretical reasons to expect that zero responses are overrepresented or incorrect and not other “unusual” responses (i.e. one individual doing more child care than he/she does in a “random” day). A logical question arises here: How can we assume
with time-diary data that non-zero responses are not overrepresented or underrepresented?

In fact, previous exploratory analyses suggest that OLS regressions are better suited for time use analysis than Tobit models (see Stewart, 2009). Moreover, OLS regressions are more robust than Tobit regressions. Thus, in the empirical analyses that are presented in the next three sections I applied OLS regressions when dealing with a linear dependent variable. Finally, logistic regressions were used with some variables that were converted into categorical.
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Chapter 2

PARENTAL CARE INVOLVEMENT IN BRITAIN, DENMARK, FLANDERS, AND SPAIN: EMPLOYMENT AND EDUCATION

ABSTRACT

How do employment and education affect parental care involvement in countries with different family-work contexts? We examined this question using time-diary data from Britain, Denmark, Flanders, and Spain (N = 4,023). For fathers, full-time employment proved to be associated with a strong negative impact on child care time in Britain and Spain, moderate in Flanders, and low in Denmark. Yet, among mothers we found a strong negative effect of employment on child care time in all four countries. Multivariate analyses showed weaker effects of education, as it was only significantly correlated with child care time among Spanish mothers and fathers, and British mothers. After predicting the effect of education by differences in paid work time, we found a substantial education gradient in maternal care time in Flanders, and particularly in Britain and Spain. The same analyses for fathers offered more mixed results.

2.1. Introduction

Parents’ involvement in child care is considered a key indicator of children’s well-being. Despite this fact is widely accepted across the society, not all parents allocate the same amount of time to child

---

8 This empirical chapter is based on a collaborative article with Joris Ghysels and Kim Vercammen.
care, an activity that varies by parents’ attitudes, gender, time-availability, or resources. Although all parents are expected to be worried by their children’s development, parenting attitudes diverge across the social and educational ladder (Lareau, 2003). Further, parenting is expected to be explained by opportunity-cost decisions that are taken under contexts of time-scarcity, depending on micro-level paid work scenarios (Presser, 1994), but also on macro-level or institutional contexts of family-work balance (e.g., Gornick & Meyers, 2003; Lewis, 2009).

In this article, we examine the quantity of parental care time among married and cohabiting parents from four countries, namely Denmark, Flanders, Spain, and the United Kingdom (UK). These four countries have been chosen for presenting key variations in their family-work contexts, welfare regime traditions, and gender relations (Esping-Andersen, 1999; Fuwa, 2004; Geist, 2005; Hook, 2006; Kan, Gershuny, & Sullivan, 2011; Lewis, 2009).

In Spain and the UK, public institutions provide weak universal family support. In these two countries full-time workers tend to face important time-constraints to balancing work and parenting. Flanders, like the UK, has a large group of mothers working as part-time employees, but this country has public institutions that tend to implement more generous family-friendly policies than it is the case of Spain and the UK (Ghysels, 2004). Denmark is, within our four cases, the country where public institutions have promoted the most effective policies to support the dual-earner/dual-carer model (Esping-Andersen, 2009). In relation to their gender regimes,
Denmark is considered the most gender egalitarian of these four countries, whereas Spain is located at the other extreme (Lewis, 2009). Britain and Belgium have been, respectively, conceptualized as liberal and conservative regimes (Esping-Andersen, 1999, Geist, 2005; O’Connor, Orloff, & Shaver, 1999), though Belgium has recently implemented some family-work policies that can promote more gender equity in the home (Jacobs & Gerson, 2004).

The aim of this paper is to investigate how education and employment affect parental care time in different countries. In the cross-sectional and cross-national literature on parenting, education and employment have been considered as two crucial explanatory variables (Bianchi, Robinson, & Milkie, 2006; Hook & Wolfe, 2011a; Gauthier, Smeeding, & Furstenberg, 2004; Sayer, Gauthier, & Furstenberg, 2004; Sayer & Gornick, 2011). Although parents can adopt different strategies to maximize their balance of child care and paid work time, employment (especially for women) has been found to have a strong negative effect on parental care time (Bianchi et al., 2006). Education is expected to have a more complex relation with child care time. Parental education is expected to be correlated with different parenting styles, with highly-educated parents being typically more identified with the norms of intensive parenting (Sayer et al., 2004). But, on the other hand, education can also be a marker of better access to powerful resources to maximize child care time (Bianchi et al., 2004). In part for this ambiguous relation between education and parenting, scholars have argued that studying different countries can help us to
better understand how education and employment are correlated with parenting behavior.

In a recent comparative study focused on nine countries, Sayer and Gornick (2011) found that the negative effect of employment on parental care time is particularly strong in English-speaking countries, with Australian, British, and American mothers (and fathers) presenting the most negative effects of employment on parental care time. In contrast, the authors found a more moderate association between employment and child care among Norwegian, Swedish, and French mothers. Finally, they did not find significant effects among Dutch parents, nor among Norwegian, Swedish, and French fathers. Although these results suggest that family-work contexts are associated with how employment intersects with child care time, the authors found some striking and interesting results for the literature. For instance, they found that non-employed French fathers and mothers allocate less time to child care than American, Canadian, Norwegian, and Slovenian mothers and fathers working long hours in the labor market. These findings imply that a combination of cultural factors, parenting ideologies, employment regulatory frameworks, and family policies could play a role in how employment is correlated with parental care time. But the results presented by Sayer and Gornick (2011) also suggest that there could be a certain cross-national variation in the parenting profiles of people selected into specific paid work categories.

In another article, Sayer, Gauthier, and Furstenberg (2004) used data from Canada, Germany, Italy, and Norway to examine whether
the effect of education on parental care time diverges across countries. The authors (2004: 1156) argue that “the less educated are more likely to be employed in occupations with rotating shifts, or inflexible hours, and may also have to work two jobs to make ends meet.” Thus, they posit that where family policies are strong, such as in the Scandinavian countries, the educational gap in parental care time should be more moderate than where family policies are residual, such as in English-speaking and Southern European countries. Indeed, amongst fathers, they found the weakest educational effects for Norway. Yet, they found a strong positive education gradient for maternal care time in Canada, Italy, and Norway, and, to a lesser extent, in Germany.

The study of Sayer and colleagues (2004), and also other cross-national published studies (see Bianchi et al., 2006; Hook & Wolfe, 2011a), do not provide a clear picture of how education is correlated with parental care time allocation. At the theoretical level, the idea that highly-educated parents can use their employment advantage to allocate more time to child care is logically convincing. Well-educated parents could have a comparative advantage to reorganize their work schedules, so as to be more likely to spend time with children; these differences might certainly vary depending on how social policies support low-skilled workers. But high-skilled parents can also be relatively more hurried, simply because they are especially likely to be employed as full-time workers (Gershuny, 2000). More important, the correlation between education and paid work time varies significantly across countries (e.g., Gershuny & Sullivan, 2003). For instance, in the 1990s the difference between
national female employment rates and the employment rates of highly-educated women was 19% in Denmark, 21% in Norway and the UK, 30% in Belgium, 69% in Spain, and 80% in Italy (see Pettit and Hook, 2009: 50). Perhaps the key question that creates skepticism with the assumption that an education gradient in parental care time is per se strongest in countries with residual family policies is that low-skilled parents (especially mothers) living in countries with generous family policies are particularly likely to be employed. By contrast, the opposite tends to be true in countries with residual or conservative policies (for our study, the examples of Denmark and Spain are very clear). This might be translated into the paradox that many low-skilled women from countries with residual family policies have, ceteris paribus, a comparative “time advantage” to spend time with children.

The complex puzzle of how education affects parental care time allocation suggests that, unless we study the interaction effects between employment and education, it is difficult to disentangle how education is correlated with parenting behavior. In our study we focus on two interrelated questions. The first objective of the paper is to study how education and employment (after controlling for other covariates) affect parental care time allocation. The second objective is to investigate the extent to which the association between education and parental care might be mediated by an interaction between education and paid work time in different countries. We analyze nationally representative time-diary for married and cohabiting fathers and mothers. Our paper includes two countries that have been incorporated in previous cross-national
research (Britain, Denmark) (Craig & Mullan, 2010; Hook & Wolfe, 2011a; Sayer & Gornick, 2011). Yet, the interest of this paper also lies on the fact that we investigate two understudied cases within this cross-national literature (Flanders, Spain).

The paper is structured as follows. First, the theoretical approaches and previous empirical analyses on parental care allocation are presented. Secondly, the four cases and the theoretical rationale of the study are explained. Thirdly, we present our data and methods. Fourth, the empirical results based on multivariate statistical analyses are discussed. The paper finishes with the discussion of the main results and implications of the study.

2.2. Theoretical Framework

2.2.1. Background

Two theoretical approaches have been central in the literature on parental care involvement within and across countries. One focuses on ‘attitudes’ and ‘norms’; a second one on ‘opportunity-cost logics’. From the second viewpoint, the relative resources approach states that the larger the comparative advantage an individual has in a couple (i.e. earnings, human capital), the less time that individual will spend in unpaid work (Becker, 1991; Breen & Cook, 2005; Coverman, 1985). In contrast, the time-availability perspective posits that child care performance depends particularly on time-scarcity (Nock & Kingston, 1988). Probably because parenting activities are highly valued among most parents (Hallberg &
Klevmarken, 2003), the time-availability approach has been found to provide a better explanation of parents’ child care time than the relative resources one (Presser, 1994). Thus, parents are expected to maximize their child care time responding to their (and their spouse’s) work schedules, through using the different sorts of strategies that they have access to.

We also know that parental care allocation varies dramatically by gender. Although the last decades have seen a process of gender convergence in unpaid work performance, this pattern cannot be compared to the dramatic rise of female employment (Bianchi, 2000; Gershuny, 2000). Thus, scholars found a remarkable persistence of traditional gender ideologies towards unpaid work (Hochschild, 1989; Treas & Drobnic, 2010). However, gendered behaviors towards parental care time allocation were found to vary across countries with different gender and welfare regimes (Fuwa, 2004; Geist, 2005; Hook, 2006), but also across social groups; highly-educated couples have been found to have a more gender egalitarian ideology and division of labor (Coltrane, 2000). In addition, education and social class are also identified with parents’ degree of proximity towards the norms of intensive child-rearing (Coleman, 1988; Lareau, 2003). In general, college-educated parents have been found to spend more time with their children than lower educated parents (e.g., Bianchi et al., 2006; Gauthier et al., 2004; Zick & Bryant, 1996). In light of how gender, education, and time-constraints affect parenting behavior, a key question for the study is whether or not, and to what extent, these differences vary cross-nationally.
Cross-national studies on how education explains parental care involvement present mixed findings and interpretations (Bianchi et al., 2006; Craig & Mullan, 2010; Hook & Wolfe, 2011a; Sayer et al., 2004). The study of Sayer et al. (2004) represents the most exhaustive published cross-national analysis on how parental education affects child care time. The preliminary expectation of the authors was that contexts with generous universal policies (Norway) should minimize the education gap in time-pressure in relation to contexts with a liberal or conservative tradition (Canada, Germany, and Italy). In their study, Norway was found to be the only country where fathers’ education had a weak effect on child care time. But, in contrast, for mothers they found an education gradient in their four cases of study, with weaker effects for Germany.

The study of Sayer and colleagues (2004), but also other related studies (e.g., Bianchi et al., 2006; Hook & Wolfe, 2011b), do not suggest that the correlation between education and parental care time allocation mirrors welfare state contexts. One reason of these mixed results could be that parenting ideologies vary across countries (see Lewis, 2009; Sayer & Gornick, 2011) and, in particular, the fact that education and parenting ideologies are correlated in significantly different ways across countries (to our knowledge, no study has demonstrated such findings). But a key problem of statistical identification to study these cross-national differences might be that scholars have simply not carefully investigated how education interacts with employment. For example, Danish low-skilled mothers are living in a country with more generous policies to reconcile parenting and employment than
their Spanish counterparts (i.e. different labor market regulation; differences in job flexibility; variations in hours of paid work among full-time workers). Yet, the former are also more likely to be employed, and this might reflect cross-national differences in time-availability across parents with similar levels of education (the same can be said on differences between Italy and Norway).

Thus, scholars should take employment characteristics into consideration to better understand possible cross-national variations in how education explains child-rearing practices. However, a different question emerges when we want to know how employment (itself) affects parenting behavior. Leaving everything else constant, working full-time in a country with low levels of family-work balance (i.e. Italy, Spain, and UK) should have a more negative impact on parental care time than working full-time in a country with family-friendly employment contexts (i.e. Denmark, the Netherlands Norway, Sweden). In part, Sayer and Gornick’s (2011) recent study on nine countries with different cultural frameworks and welfare and gender regimes (mentioned in the introduction), corroborates these expectations. But the authors’ study also suggests that paid work time and the macro-level conditions to reconcile parenting and employment are not necessarily central to understand parental care time. In other words, this means that other variables are in play, such as cultural norms or gender regimes. These mixed results, and also the puzzle of how education affects parenting behavior, motivates our study, which includes two countries (Flanders, Spain) that were typically absent in the cross-national literature on parental care time.
2.2.2. Theoretical Assumptions

Our four countries of study, Denmark, Flanders, Spain, and the UK, present important differences in their work-family contexts. In Denmark, family policies have contributed to very high figures in the ratio of dual-earner couples, with high levels of work-family balance and gender egalitarianism in the household division of labor (Craig & Mullan, 2010; Esping-Andersen, 2009). In Flanders, though to a lesser extent than in Denmark, institutions have implemented active family policies through the promotion of public childcare systems and labor market regulation (Jacobs & Gerson, 2004; Ghysels, 2004). In Flanders, female part-time employment is widely extended. In contrast, the Spanish female labor force is essentially polarized between full-time workers and housewives, while family norms remain markedly traditional and family policies residual (Lewis, 2009). Finally, in Britain family-work policies are weak and most mothers, like in Flanders, are employed in part-time jobs (Crompton, 2006).

Table 2.1 shows key figures that reflect important country differences and similarities in family-work indicators, which are useful to study country-variations in parental care time. Female employment rates vary significantly (Denmark 73%; UK 68%; Flanders 58%; Spain 50%), but not male’s. It is worth noting that in Belgium and the UK more than 40% of mothers are employed as part-time workers. These numbers are the result of a policy strategy that diverges from the dual-earner model of Denmark and from the more traditional policy context of Spain, with low levels of female
part-time jobs (Lewis, 2009). In Table 2.1, we observe that Spanish full-time employed mothers work the most hours in the labor market, followed by their British counterparts. Similarly, the mean of fathers’ paid work time is higher in Britain and Spain (9.6 hours) than in Flanders (8.8) and Denmark (8.5). These mentioned family-work differences are associated with a significant number of parents who report having flexible or family-friendly work schedules in Denmark (around 50%), in comparison to employed parents from Flanders, Spain, and particularly Britain.

In line with the existing country variations in paid work patterns and their relation with differences in family-work contexts (Esping-Andersen, 1999; Gornick & Meyers, 2003), one might expect to find cross-national variations in the effect of full-time employment on parental care time. The negative impact of being a full-time employee on parental care time should be stronger where full-time workers have long work schedules and high levels of job pressure (English-speaking countries, Southern Europe) than in countries where parents have intermediate levels of family-work balance (Continental Europe) and, very especially, where strong family-friendly policies have been implemented (Scandinavia). Thus:

Hypothesis 1: In Spain and the UK mothers and fathers employed as full-time workers will significantly reduce their time invested in parental care. In Flanders this effect will be intermediate, whereas in Denmark full-time employment will have a weak effect on parental care time.

But another key question of the present study is how (and under what conditions) education can affect parental care. As mentioned
above, some analytical approaches adopted a cross-national approach to suggest that an education gradient in child care time should be more salient in countries with residual policies. This should be in part due to cross-national variations in the employment conditions of different groups of education (see Sayer et al., 2004). On the other hand, a different (micro-level) theory suggests that, *ceteris paribus*, college-educated parents are more active in spending time with children, because they are more likely to conform to the norms of intensive parenting than their lower-educated counterparts (Coleman, 1988; Lareau, 2003; Zick & Bryant, 1996). Yet, if we put everything together, we should expect two different results. First, if we properly control for employment constraints (here measured as paid work time pressure), we should be able to reduce the expected (different) correlation between employment and education across different countries (see Tables 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, and 2.8). In this sense, one should expect that, after holding paid work time constant, educational differences are important in all countries, since an education gradient in child-rearing is expected to be more or less universal in different advanced societies. Second, if college-educated parents are more likely to have active parenting behaviors, their child care time should also be especially correlated with their paid work time.

---

9 Some might argue that such theories imply that educational differences in parental care are only observed in developmental activities. Results (not-shown) suggest that this is not the case. Moreover, in this dissertation the idea that an education gradient in child care time is (on average) stronger in interactive than it is in physical activities is questioned (see Chapter 3).
Hypothesis 2: First, highly educated parents are expected to allocate more time to child care than their lower educated counterparts who work the same number of hours in the labor market. Secondly, we expect to find a stronger negative relation between paid work and child care time among college-educated parents than among their lower educated counterparts.

2.3. Data and Method

2.3.1. Surveys and Samples

We use nationally representative data from the “2001 Danish Time Use Survey”, the “2005 Flemish Families and Care Survey”, the “2003 Spanish Time Use Survey”, and the “2000 British Time Use Survey” (N = 4,023). The surveys of Denmark, Spain, and the UK are included in the ‘Multinational Time Use Study’ database. Two adult respondents in a couple reported their daily time-use activities in diaries of 10 minutes spells and were interviewed on several household and individual variables. The survey of Flanders is comparable to the other three surveys, though it counts activities in 15 minutes spells. We only study weekdays; the four surveys have a proportional distribution of days, with close to 20% of the diaries representing one day between Monday and Friday. Response rates in the original data are 90% for Britain, 49% for Denmark, 64% for Flanders, and 86% for Spain. Previous research found no significant bias with the Danish data, despite having very low response rates (Bonke, 2005). Our samples include heterosexual couples aged above 25 and at least one child aged 0 to 15. These definitive samples exclude cases with missing values in any of our variables of interest (the missing values do not present statistical bias). This
leaves us with 908 couples in Britain, 370 in Denmark, 934 in Flanders, and 1811 in Spain.

2.3.2. Variables

Our dependent variable is continuous and captures the number of minutes allocated to primary child care activities. Unfortunately, secondary activities, done simultaneously to primary activities, are not available for Flanders (our main results for Britain, Denmark and Spain do not change when merging primary with secondary activities). As we see in Table 2.2, our independent variables include two dummy variables for college education: “mother’s college education” (yes = 1) and “father’s college education” (yes = 1). This is the best educational category that we could create, since the Danish data contains very few parents with elementary education. Regarding employment, for fathers we constructed the variables “father is not employed” (yes = 1), “father works standard full-time” (yes = 1) and “father overworks” (yes = 1). In the third dummy variable we include fathers that work more than 45 hours in a regular week. For mothers, after taking into account comparable groups, we use four employment categories based on the weekly paid work time: 1) “mother not employed”; 2) “mother works up to 30 weekly hours”; 3) “mother works up to 37 hours”; 4) “mother works more than 37 hours”. Finally, we also use a continuous variable that counts the hours of employment in a standard week: “weekly paid work hours”.
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In Table 2.2, we can also observe the distributions of the control variables: one captures whether or not the person worked after 6pm on the same day of observation: “person worked after 6pm” (yes = 1). We use the same dummy variable for the partner: “partner worked after 6pm” (yes = 1). Other control variables include: “public sector employment” (yes = 1); “paid/unpaid child care help” (yes = 1), “paid/unpaid housework help” (yes = 1); children’s age: “youngest child 0-5” (including 5), youngest child 6-11 (including 11), and “youngest child 12-15” (including 15); and the continuous variable “number of children”.

2.3.3. Analytic Strategy

We test our hypotheses using Ordinary Least Squares’ (OLS) regressions (we cannot run cross-national multilevel models with four cases). We run models with the variables “college education” and “hours of employment” and their interaction term and calculate the Linear Combination Test for the statistical (adjusted) effect of the interaction (we use the command “lincom” in Stata 11). We also predict the child care time by the hours of employment, after controlling for other covariates, and present graphs by levels of education. We have to acknowledge that parents can choose their work schedules according to their family preferences (Carriero, Ghysels, & Van Klaveren, 2009; Hamermesh, 2002), particularly under family-friendly environments. However, our aim is to examine whether child care behaviors are influenced by certain macro-level and micro-level contexts that operate in parents’ daily
tradeoffs and influence parents’ decision-making regarding parental care time allocation.

2.4. Empirical Results

Mothers allocate significantly more time to child care than fathers (Table 2.2), though the sex ratio varies across countries: 3.1 (Spain), 2.5 (UK), 2.0 (Flanders), and 1.9 (Denmark). In what follows, we present our findings for our two hypotheses.

2.4.1. Effects of Employment

In our first hypothesis we expect that the impact of full-time employment on child care time will be strong in Britain and Spain, medium in Flanders, and weak in Denmark.

Table 2.3 presents the OLS results for child care time among mothers and fathers. As expected, in Denmark employment does not have any significant effect on father’s child care time. In Flanders only the group of fathers working more than 45 hours in a standard week significantly reduced their child care time, although showing a relatively low magnitude (14 minutes) and a moderate statistical impact (p-value < 0.05). In contrast, for the UK we do find a stronger negative effect in the two employment variables, with a decrease of child care time above 18 minutes (p-value < 0.01). Spanish fathers working full-time strongly reduce their child care, with negative coefficients for the two paid work variables ranging from 47 to 53 (p-value < 0.001).
Yet, we can analyze whether the effects of father’s employment on child care time are driven by other variables. The correlation between father’s and mother’s hours of paid work is +0.22 in Denmark, +0.12 in Britain, +0.08 in Flanders, and -0.17 in Spain (see covariate matrices; from Table 2.5 to Table 2.8). From a time availability approach, Danish couples should have more paid work time incentives to share child care symmetrically than Spanish couples. However, the results of Table 2.3 do not suggest that the cross-national differences in the effects of father’s employment on parental care time are explained by the wife’s employment characteristics or other unobserved factors.

The findings for mothers reveal that full-time employment strongly reduces child care time in relation to not being employed (Table 2.3). Against our expectations, in all four countries mothers who are employed more than 37 hours significantly reduced their time spent in child care (p-value < 0.001). This effect is particularly salient in Denmark (Coefficient = -70), followed by the UK (-43), Flanders (-39), and Spain (-28) (see also from Table 2.5 to Table 2.8).

Differences in the sizes of the coefficients are explained by the characteristics of unemployed women (Table 2.3). Danish mothers who are not employed are especially likely to have a child aged 0 to 5 (Correlation = 0.30). Most of them are on maternity leave. In contrast, in Spain having a young child is not associated with mothers’ employment. These correlations are 0.16 in Flanders and 0.18 in the UK. These correlations explain the size of the coefficients: mothers with young children spend more time in child
care than other mothers (Bianchi et al., 2006). Working up to 30 hours has no effects on mothers’ child care in Flanders, weak in Spain, and strong in Britain and Denmark. The results for Spain would be explained by differences in the age of the youngest child for non-employed mothers in comparison to Britain and Denmark. But there are not reasons to expect that Flemish mothers are more likely to work part-time than their British and Danish counterparts to be able to spend time with children.

2.4.2. Effects of Education

Our second hypothesis states, first, that college-educated parents allocate more time to child care than lower educated parents who work the same number of hours in the labor market. Second, we expect a stronger negative relationship between paid work and child care time among college-educated parents than among their lower educated counterparts. Table 2.3 presents the coefficients of maternal and paternal education in a standard multivariate statistical framework. Education has a significant positive effect among Spanish mothers (Coefficient = 19), Spanish fathers (13), and British mothers (19). But in the other models education does not have any significant impact on child care.

To examine how education interacts with paid work, in Table 2.4 we show the results of the OLS regressions with the impact of paid work hours on child care time (Model 1) and the interaction term of paid work and education (Model 2). Not surprisingly, the effects of employment presented in Model 1 are consistent with the ones
observed in Table 2.3 with categorical variables. In Model 2, we observe that only in Denmark and Flanders are the marginal effects of paid work hours on child care time stronger for college-educated mothers. In those countries, the interaction terms of the variables college education and paid work time present a level of significance above 99.9% (see the Lincom test). In contrast, in Britain no educational differences for mothers are found in this regard. In Spain, lower educated mothers are more responsive to paid work time pressure (p-value < 0.01) than the college-educated (no significant effects for them). For fathers, in Britain and Flanders the low educated ones are more responsive to paid work time demands (p-value < 0.01) than their college-educated compatriots (Table 2.4). No differences are observed for Denmark, while Spanish college-educated fathers reduce their child care time by the hours of paid work (p-value < 0.001) to a higher extent than lower educated fathers (p-value < 0.01). Thus, education is not associated with how child care decreases with paid work time.

Yet we need to examine if the quantity of child care varies by level of education after paid work time is held constant. Figure 2.1 presents the effects of parental education on the predicted differences in child care time among parents working the same number of weekly hours. As expected, college-educated mothers from Flanders, and particularly those from Britain and Spain, present a significantly higher and persistent involvement in parental care. In contrast, in Denmark there is no such education gradient for mothers. Therefore, the association of education and maternal child care time observed in Britain, Spain, and to a lesser extent in
Flanders (Table 2.3), is not due to educational variations in paid work time.

In contrast, in Figure 2.1, we find mixed results for fathers. Only in Spain we find a strong education gradient (except for the group of fathers who overwork). In Denmark we observe a moderate education gradient for full-time employed fathers, where we find the majority of fathers. However, in Flanders and the UK we see a negative association between education and child care, except for parents working a significant amount of hours. The fact that British non college-educated fathers working zero or few hours allocate more time to child care than their college-educated counterparts would be explained by the higher propensity of the former (in our sample) to live in a household with a preschooler. Overall, we do not find a generalized relationship between fathers’ education and child care time after we control for paid work time pressures and other covariates.

Figure 2.1 shows two important gender differences. First, as we also observed in Table 2.3 and Table 2.4, the relationship between paid work and child care time is weaker among fathers than it is among mothers. Second, except in Denmark, the education gradient in child care time for mothers is clearly stronger across the paid work spectrum than it is for the group of fathers (for Spanish fathers, we do find a clear education gradient, though this gradient is more irregular than it is for the group of mothers).
In short, after controlling for paid work time constraints, education seems to be a good predictor of maternal care time (except in Denmark). However, education does not seem to help us to understand differences in child care behaviors, after holding constant fathers’ hours of paid work time.

2.5. Discussion

We have examined how paid work and education affect parental care time in Denmark, Flanders, Spain, and the UK. Two important contributions, we believe, have been made to the cross-national literature on parental care time (Bianchi et al., 2006; Craig & Mullan, 2010; Gauthier et al., 2004; Hook & Wolfe, 2011a; Sayer et al., 2004; Sayer & Gornick, 2011). First, we have presented new evidence on how employment and education explain parental care involvement in countries with different cultural and family-work contexts, including two understudied cases in the literature, namely Flanders and Spain. Second, we have studied how education predicts child care time in different countries, after controlling for paid work time constraints.

Scholars have argued that educational differences in child-rearing practices might be essentially explained by variations in parenting styles across the social and educational ladder (e.g., Zick, 1996; Lareau, 2003). Others suggest that these educational differences could also be related to the higher advantage of well educated parents to manage their work schedules and organize home production (Bianchi et al., 2004), particularly in countries with
weak family policies (Sayer et al., 2004). We contribute to this inconclusive question in the literature by exploring the interaction between parents’ education and paid work time, while controlling for various socioeconomic and demographic variables.

As our first hypothesis predicts, in Britain and Spain, fathers’ employment has a stronger negative impact on fathers’ child care time than in Flanders and, particularly, Denmark. Our results suggest that where the degree of labor market regulation is high (Denmark) and medium (Flanders) the balance of employment and fathering is significantly higher than where family-work policies are residual (Spain, UK). We found more cross-national divergence in the effects of paid work on father’s child care time than Sayer and Gornick (2011) found in their recent study. We have to stress that their samples included parents with at least one preschooler, when the gender division of labor is more traditional, while we have investigated couples with children aged 0 to 15. Yet, our results, in line with some previous studies (Craig & Mullan, 2010; Sullivan, Coltrane, Mcanally, & Altintas, 2009), imply that father-friendly contexts enhance fathers to become more involved in child care.

Meanwhile, mothers’ full-time employment was found to reduce maternal care time very significantly in all four countries. Unlike their British and Danish counterparts, Spanish and (especially) Flemish mothers employed less than 31 weekly hours spent significantly more time in child care than full-time employed mothers. Spanish mothers in the reference category have older children than their counterparts in Britain and Denmark. This
explains the weaker effect of having a part-time job in explaining maternal care in Spain. However, the findings for Flanders are difficult to interpret without data on child care preferences and values. Future research should further investigate this question. Overall, we found that child care time has a stronger negative correlation with paid work time amongst mothers than amongst fathers. Even in the most gender egalitarian countries, gender inequalities in child care time are clear. Danish mothers, the ones who live in the most gender egalitarian country of this study, still do about twice as much child care as their husbands.

How does education affect parents’ child care time? Our findings in this regard were more mixed than expected. Certainly, these results suggest that further investigation is needed. Except for Spanish fathers and mothers, and for British mothers, our multivariate analyses showed no statistical association between parental education and child care time. In line with previous studies (Hook & Wolfe, 2011a; Sayer et al., 2004), we found that the impact of education on parental care time varies across countries. After comparing mothers with similar paid work time pressures, the highly-educated ones spent significantly more time in child care than the lower educated, with the sole exception of Denmark. In contrast, only in Spain highly educated fathers were clearly more involved in parental care activities than their lower educated counterparts who work the same number of hours (except for the group of fathers who overwork). In Denmark, only a moderate education gradient was observed for fathers. In Flanders and to some extent in Britain low educated parents allocated more time to
child care, albeit without significant effects. Unlike it was expected, our results show that college-educated parents were particularly likely to decrease their parental care time in response to their paid work time pressures. This suggests that other mechanisms (perhaps related to economic resources) can explain how different parents react to their working conditions to spent time with children.

We have to admit at least three important caveats. One caveat is that our sample size for Denmark is small ($N = 370$), which leaves us with a small subsample for certain employment categories. Nonetheless, the high variation and strong statistical power of the paid work variables for Danish mothers and the insignificant effects of the continuous variable “paid work hours” amongst fathers suggest that our results for Denmark are not biased by our sample size. Unfortunately, this sample size problem applies to the majority of recent time-use surveys from Scandinavian countries.

A second limitation is that, for reasons of space, we have not presented results for different types of child care activities. In other analyses (not-shown), physical child care was found to decrease with paid work time to a higher extent than interactive child care. This line of research, which has only been examined in a few studies (e.g., Roeters, Van der Lippe, & Kluwer, 2009), might help us to explain important questions related to how employment affects the quality of parental care time, but also the gender division of child care. Related analyses (not-shown) reveal that educational differences were not more relevant in interactive child care, but in physical child care activities, especially amongst fathers. This line
of investigation, however, should receive further attention in a future related study.

A third limitation is our incapacity to completely teasing out why the effect of parental education on child care time differs across our four countries of study. Like in previous related studies with time-diary data, we cannot assess whether or not parents with similar levels of education in Britain, Denmark, Flanders, and Spain have different preferences and attitudes towards parenting. However, following the rationale of Sayer et al. (2004), we can explore if the observed cross-national variations in the links between education and parental care time are related to differences in social policy traditions. For fathers we do not find such correlations. Although the strongest effect of education on fathers’ child care was observed for Spain, in Denmark highly educated fathers allocated more relative time to child care than their counterparts in Flanders and the UK, two countries with weaker institutional support for low-income/low-skilled parents. But the impact of education on maternal care time is consistent with our four institutional contexts, with strong educational differences in Britain and Spain, intermediate in Flanders, and insignificant variations in Denmark.

The strong family-work policies of Denmark might contribute to reduce the comparative disadvantage of low-skilled mothers to negotiate their work schedules and to outsource domestic work. In this sense, the study of Gupta and colleagues (2010) suggest that in countries with a social-democratic heritage the gap in women’s housework allocation across the income distribution is smaller than
in countries with conservative or liberal social policy traditions. However, our additional exploration does not suggest that the educational differences in mothers’ child care time are explained by correlated differences in housework time across countries\(^\text{10}\). Future research should complement our study by looking at dimensions related to mothers’ time-poverty and child care values across countries and social groups.

Overall, our results imply that educational differences in everyday mothers’ child care exist in three of the four countries included in our study (Flanders; particularly in Britain and Spain), but not in the country with the strongest family-friendly policies (Denmark). These results leave some questions for future research. Interestingly, our empirical analyses suggest that father-friendly environments are correlated with the actual reconciliation of fathers’ employment and child care time. Father-friendly contexts are expected to promote gender equity in the division of child care and father-child daily interactions. These relevant findings contribute to our general understanding of the cross-national variations in paternal care involvement.

In our opinion, future cross-national studies on parental care involvement should further examine the interaction of sociological variables (i.e. education, class) with employment factors. Exploring

\(^{10}\) In the UK full-time employed mothers who hold a college degree allocated 36% more time to child care and 7% more time to housework than their lower educated counterparts. In Spain, college-educated mothers employed as full-time workers spent 12% less time in housework, but 49% more time in child care than the reference group
additional dimensions, such as the quality of employment (Gallie, 2003), the type of work schedules (Hook & Wolfe, 2011b; Presser, 2003), occupational and socioeconomic characteristics (Lareau, 2003), socioeconomic variations in household work performance (Heisig, 2011) and time-poverty, would offer us a more complex picture of current trends in parental care investments. Finally, using data of cross-national differences in child care preferences and family values (having access to this information in time use surveys or related representative surveys) would permit us to better understand the micro and macro level explanatory factors of mothers’ and fathers’ child care allocation.
2.6. References


Coverman, S. (1985). 'Explaining husbands' participation in
domestic labor.' The Sociological Quarterly, 26(1), 81-97.


Craig, L., & Mullan, K. (2010). 'Parenthood, gender and work-
family time in USA, Australia, Italy, France and Denmark.'

reconfiguration of work and family life in contemporary
societies. Cambridge: Cambridge Press.


to women's new roles. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fuwa, M. (2004). 'Macro-level gender inequality and the division of
household labor in 22 countries.' American Sociological
Review, 69(6), 751-767.

different?' European Sociological Review, 19(1), 61-79.

'Are parents investing less time in children? Trends in
selected industrialized countries.' Population and

differences in the domestic division of labour.' European

Gershuny, J. (2000). Changing times: work and leisure in

policy regimes.' Social Politics, 10(2), 205-228.


Review. Advanced access published online (October 18, 2011).


Roeters, A., Van der Lippe, T., & Kluwer, E.S. (2009). 'Parental work demands and the frequency of child-related routine
and interactive activities.' *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 71, 1193 - 1204.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Denmark</th>
<th>Flanders</th>
<th>Spain</th>
<th>UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>% Children in age 0-2 enrolled in child care schools in 2004</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weeks of paid Parental Leave in 2006/7 (100% rate of allowance)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weeks of Parental Leave (job protection, in FTE)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weeks of paid parent leave (in fraction of average wage)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% Female/Male employment rate around 2005</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% Maternal employment in couples with children aged 0-14 in 2008</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hours of paid work among employed parents with children in random weekday</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Usual Paid work weekly hours among employed parents with young children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% Mothers in part-time jobs and % Fathers working =&gt; 10 hours in weekdays</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% Parents with young children working in Public Sector jobs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% Parents with young children who reported having 'flexible' work schedules</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** (1) Only in the UK parents do not receive 100% of the rate of allowance (24% for mothers and 15% for fathers).

**Sources:**
(c) OECD Family Database (www.oecd.org/els/social/family/database) (d) for Denmark data for 1999; others OECD
(e) Time-Use Surveys (own calculations); Denmark 2001; Flanders 2004/05; Spain 2002/03; UK 2000
(f) OECD Family Policy Database (m) for Flanders data from the EU-LFS (last quarter of 2005)
### Table 2.2. Description of Variables. Means and SD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Denmark M</th>
<th>Denmark s.d.</th>
<th>Flanders M</th>
<th>Flanders s.d.</th>
<th>Spain M</th>
<th>Spain s.d.</th>
<th>UK M</th>
<th>UK s.d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father's Child Care Time</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Child Care Time</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father College</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother College</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father not working</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Full-time employed</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Employed 45 or more hours</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Paid Work Hours</td>
<td>36.09</td>
<td>10.64</td>
<td>42.17</td>
<td>15.09</td>
<td>37.39</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>40.59</td>
<td>14.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Public Sector Job</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother not employed</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother works &lt;= 30 hours</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother works &gt; 30 and &lt;=37</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother works &gt; 37 hours</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Paid Work Hours</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>15.42</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>15.81</td>
<td>15.47</td>
<td>17.93</td>
<td>20.29</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Public Sector Job</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Help</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housework Help</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngest Child 0-5 yrs</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngest Child 6-11 yrs</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngest Child 12-15 yrs</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children in Household</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>908</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3. OLS. Minutes of Parental Care Time by Educational and Employment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mothers</th>
<th>Fathers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Flanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father College</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother College</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Full-time</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>14.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Overworks</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>17.7**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Work&lt; 30h</td>
<td>-56.9</td>
<td>13.7+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Work&lt; 38h</td>
<td>-71.7</td>
<td>11+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Work&lt; 37h</td>
<td>-70.3</td>
<td>18+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father works late</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother works late</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector job</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>8.9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R-Sq.</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>934</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: see Table 2.2 / Controls: 'Young child', 'Number of children', 'Outside domestic help', 'Outside child care help' /
*p < .05, **p < .01, + p < .001
### Table 2.4. OLS. Minutes of Child Care in Interaction Term between Paid Work Hours and Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mothers</th>
<th>Fathers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Flanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College Educ.</strong></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>(9.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paid Work hours</strong></td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>(.3)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intercept</strong></td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>(20.0)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adj.R-Squared</strong></td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College Educ.</strong></td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>(17.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paid Work hours</strong></td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>(.5)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work x College</strong></td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>(.4)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intercept</strong></td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>(22.5)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adj.R-Squared</strong></td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
<td>370</td>
<td>934</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Control variables are ‘partner’s education’, ‘public sector job’, ‘child care help,’ ‘housework help’, ‘number of children’, and ‘age of the youngest child’. / *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001 / Sources: see Table 2.2./ (Interaction based on ‘Lincom Test’).
Figure 2.1. Predicted Minutes of Child Care Time by Education and Hours of Employment

Denmark

Flanders

Note: all the control variables are included (see Tables 2.3 and 2.4).
Sources: calculations from the original time use surveys.
Figure 2.1. Predicted Minutes of Child Care Time by Education and Hours of Employment (from previous page)

Spain

United Kingdom

Note: all the control variables are included (see Tables 2.3 and 2.4).
Sources: calculations from the original time use surveys.
### Table 2.5. Matrix Correlation of Independent Variables: Denmark

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F. College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. College</td>
<td>0,21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Work Hrs</td>
<td>0,06</td>
<td>0,08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Work Hrs</td>
<td>-0,12</td>
<td>0,05</td>
<td>0,22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Unemploy.</td>
<td>-0,07</td>
<td>-0,07</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>-0,13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Unemploy.</td>
<td>-0,06</td>
<td>-0,10</td>
<td>-0,11</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>0,18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Public</td>
<td>0,28</td>
<td>0,12</td>
<td>-0,13</td>
<td>0,03</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>-0,05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Public</td>
<td>0,09</td>
<td>0,25</td>
<td>-0,08</td>
<td>0,09</td>
<td>-0,04</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>0,18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 0-5</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>-0,02</td>
<td>-0,04</td>
<td>0,02</td>
<td>0,04</td>
<td>0,31</td>
<td>-0,08</td>
<td>-0,16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. works late</td>
<td>0,05</td>
<td>0,02</td>
<td>0,20</td>
<td>-0,04</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>-0,05</td>
<td>0,05</td>
<td>-0,02</td>
<td>-0,04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. works late</td>
<td>-0,01</td>
<td>0,11</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>0,03</td>
<td>-0,03</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>0,01</td>
<td>0,07</td>
<td>-0,04</td>
<td>0,02</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *Danish Time Use Data* (2001)
Table 2.6. Matrix Correlation of Independent Variables: Flanders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F. College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. College</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Work Hrs</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Work Hrs</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Unemploy.</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Unemploy.</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Public</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Public</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 0-5</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. works late</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. works late</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Danish Time Use Data (2001)
**Table 2.7. Matrix Correlation of Independent Variables: Spain**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Moth.</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Moth.</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Child aged 0-5</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Work Hrs</td>
<td>Work Hrs</td>
<td>no-work.</td>
<td>no-work.</td>
<td>Publ. Job</td>
<td>Publ. Job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. College</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Work Hrs</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Work Hrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Unemploy.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Unemploy.</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Public</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Public</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 0-5</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. works late</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. works late</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *Danish Time Use Data (2001)*
Table 2.8. Matrix Correlation of Independent Variables: United Kingdom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F. College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. College</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Work Hrs</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Work Hrs</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Unemploy.</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Unemploy.</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Public</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Public</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 0-5</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. works late</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. works late</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Danish Time Use Data (2001)
Chapter 3

PATERNAL INVOLVEMENT AND CHILDREN’S DEVELOPMENTAL STAGES IN SPAIN

Abstract

How does fathering vary by levels of education and women’s employment across children’s life stages? To investigate this inconclusive question in the literature, I use the “2003 Spanish Time Use Survey” (N = 2,941) for a sample of heterosexual couples with children. I differentiate between “physical care” (i.e. feeding, putting children to bed, bathe the child, watching over) and “interactive care” (i.e. playing, talking with the child, educational care). My findings suggest that well-educated fathers conform to the parenting behaviors that professionals and parenting “experts” recommend for children’s specific developmental stages.

Fathers’ education strongly influences how much fathers participate in physical child care in families with children under 6, a stage in which these activities are particularly important for children’s physical, social, and emotional development. For interactive activities, a significant education gradient emerges when the youngest child is aged 3 to 5, a period in which the acquisition of complex linguistic, conceptual, and social skills is critical for children’s later academic success. Mother’s employment has a strong positive effect on father’s relative and absolute physical child care time in families with preschoolers. This finding has important policy implication, suggesting that empowering Spanish women’s labor market participation is significantly associated with the degree of gender equity in the household division of child care.
2.1. Introduction

The study of fathering is essential to understand both family life and child development. Previous studies found that fathers’ child care engagement, accessibility, and responsibility have positive effects on child outcomes (Pleck, 2010). Fathers can influence children through a wide range of daily interactions that foster their cognitive, social, and emotional skills. Whereas some parenting activities, like teaching or playing, have been associated with children’s cognitive, linguistic, and behavioral skills, others, like feeding or supervising, have been associated with the provision of physical needs (Bianchi, Robinson, & Milkie, 2006). Yet, the various skills that children receive from parental inputs are all critical for future life chances and mutually interconnected, especially in early childhood (Heckman, 2006).

In the literature there is a debate on whether or not a “new father” has emerged in Western countries (Pleck, 2010). Raley et al. (2012) and Yeung et al. (2001) found that a more gender egalitarian father has emerged in the U.S, especially in couples where wives are economically advantaged. In addition, Hook and Wolfe (2012), using time use data from Britain, Germany, Norway, and the U.S., found that fathers’ child care time increased substantially during non-working days. Although men’s unpaid work has risen together with women’s entry in the labor market, women still spend about twice as much time as men in parental care (Gauthier, Furstenberg, & Smeeding, 2004; Gershuny, 2000). This gender gap widens in the most time-rigid, energy-demanding, and female-typed activities,
such as the feeding, bathing, supervising children in routine care, and solo child care (Craig, 2006a).

Paternal involvement has been found to vary across socio-demographic groups. Factors like having gender egalitarian values, working few hours in the labor market, and having a socioeconomically advantaged partner have been found to increase fathers’ child care time (Coltrane, 2000). Highly-educated fathers are expected to be identified with the norms of intensive parenting (Craig, 2006b) and are disproportionately involved in parenting, which fuels concerns of increasing socioeconomic polarization in advanced societies (Esping-Andersen, 2009; McLanahan, 2004). Yet, the study of the conditions under which paternal involvement varies across children’s life stages has received little attention in the literature.

In this paper, I argue that examining fathering through the lens of children’s developmental stages provides a better understanding of fathers’ child care and children’s development. Although some studies have used representative data to analyze the association between parenting and children’s age (Folbre et al., 2005; Ironmonger, 2004; Marsiglio, 1991; Yeung et al., 2001), few have investigated variations across the population (Marsiglio, 1991). These studies are restricted to American data and do not provide conclusive evidence for key variables, like father’s education and mother’s employment. Following Budig and Folbre (2004), it is important to focus on parental involvement in households with preschoolers, when childcare demands are highest. Although it is
well established that the division of child care is particularly
traditional in couples with preschoolers (Craig & Mullan, 2011),
little is known about how the allocation of child care differs by type
of families across children’s life stages\textsuperscript{11}. In addition, studying the
links between fathering and children’s age in families with different
educational, cultural, and financial resources is critical to
understand children’s accumulation of socio-emotional and
cognitive skills from infancy to late childhood (Heckman, 2006;
Lamb, 2010; Waldfogel, 2006).

I use the “2003 Spanish Time Use Survey” (STUS) to analyze how
fathers’ education and women’s employment influence paternal
care time. I examine a large representative sample of heterosexual
couples with children aged 0 to 11 (N = 2,941) and focus on three
subsamples based on the age of the youngest child. Spain is a well-
suited case for this study. Although it has residual family-work
policies and a large proportion of heterosexual couples adopting a
traditional division of labor (Esping-Andersen et al., 2010), Spain
has recently undergone dramatic changes in women’s employment,
especially among the college-educated (Gonzalez, Jurado, &
Naldini, 2000). For example, between 1980 and 1998, female
employment rates in Spain increased by 87% (Sanchez-Marcos,
2003). Further, Spanish female employees tend to have very long
and inflexible work schedules (Gutierrez-Domenech, 2010). This
permits to test under what conditions fathers’ child care is

\textsuperscript{11} The majority of recent studies that analyzed individuals’ trajectories when
entering into parenthood have focused on housework (Schober, 2012) or labor
market careers (Aisenbrey, Evertsson, & Grunow, 2009).
responsive to their wives’ job pressures. Recent studies have analyzed fathers’ child care involvement in contemporary Spain (Baizan, Domínguez, & González, 2010; Fernandez & Sevilla-Sanz, 2006; Sevilla-Sanz, Gimenez-Nadal, & Fernandez, 2010). But none of them explored paternal involvement throughout children’s life stages.

My multivariate analyses reveal a significant education gradient in physical care with children under 6 (and in interactive care for children aged 3 to 5), a stage in which child development depends crucially on intensive parental inputs (Heckman, 2006). Further, my findings show that Spanish fathers with preschoolers significantly increase their physical child care with their wives employment12.

3.2. Fathering: Theoretical Perspectives and Research

Parenting is a multidimensional activity that ranges from indirect (low-intensive) to more direct (high-engaged) forms of involvement (Bittman, Craig, & Folbre, 2004; Pleck, 2010). Scholars distinguish physical child care (i.e. feeding, supervising, putting children to bed) and interactive child care (i.e. speaking to, playing with, teaching the child) (Bianchi et al., 2006). Parental care has been traditionally defined as a “feminine” task, which explains why fathering has been associated with gender egalitarianism (Coltrane, 2004). Although fathers tend to specialize on the “fun” side of child care (Lamb, 2010) and couples with young children have a

---

12 I use spouse, wife/husband, and partner as synonyms. My sample includes married and cohabiting fathers.
particularly salient traditional division of labor (Craig & Mullan, 2011), previous research has found cross-national and socioeconomic variations in fathers’ child care allocation (Craig & Mullan, 2011; Sayer & Gornick, 2011)\textsuperscript{13}.

Five empirical findings provide us with a picture of current trends in parenting in industrialized countries. First, between the 1960s and 2000s, parents increased their average time spent with children (Gauthier et al., 2004; Sayer, Bianchi, & Robinson, 2004a). Second, in the last 30 years, the gender child care gap has been reduced, despite mothers allocating more time to child care than fathers, particularly in physical activities (Bianchi et al., 2006). Third, highly-educated parents have increased their child care time relative to their lower educated counterparts (Gauthier, et al., 2004; Sullivan, 2010), albeit educational differences vary across countries (Gracia, Ghysels, & Vercammen, 2011; Sayer, Gauthier, & Furstenberg, 2004b). Fourth, in countries with gender egalitarian norms, active family-friendly policies, and high rates of female employment, men’s participation in child care and housework is higher than in other countries (Geist, 2005; Hook, 2006). Fifth, fathers spend more time with sons than with daughters, especially in interactive activities with older children (Raley & Bianchi, 2006; Lundberg, Wulff Pabilonia, & Ward-Batts, 2007).

\textsuperscript{13} Scholars found this analytical distinction to be useful to study paternal involvement (Pleck, 2010). However, physical and interactive activities can be combined and are sometimes ambiguous (i.e. a father that feeds or watches over his toddler is very often engaged in developmental care at the same time).
Several theoretical approaches have been applied to study variations in fathers’ child care. Drawing on theories from family economics, the “relative resources” approach states that the greater is the comparative advantage of an individual in a couple the less time this person will spend in unpaid work (Breen & Cooke, 2005; Coverman, 1985; Ermisch, 2003). The wife’s relative earnings were found to increase father’s time in physical child care, a particularly time-demanding activity (Raley et al., 2012). Yet, parents are motivated to interact with children (Hallberg & Klevmarken, 2003) and may maximize child care time responding to their own time limitations. Other studies adopted a “time-availability” approach (Nock & Kingston, 1988; Presser, 1994) to demonstrate that parental care involvement depends more on individuals’ (and their spouses’) time scarcity than on the spousal comparative advantage. Women’s employment has been found to have a strong effect on men’s physical child care (Roeters, van der Lippe, & Kluwer, 2009).

Gender ideologies and norms are essential for understanding men’s and women’s behaviors towards domestic work (Craig, 2006a). According to the “doing gender” thesis, individuals are embedded through everyday interactions that define gender-typed traditional roles (West & Zimmerman, 1987). But the causal link between gender ideology and unpaid work is difficult to disentangle, simply because work and family decisions are reciprocally connected (Crompton, 2006). Some studies found that men perform traditional male roles in domestic work, even if their wives have a relatively high socioeconomic status (Brines, 1994; Evertsson & Nermo,
2004; Hochschild, 1989). However, recent studies with large longitudinal data from Britain and the US found that the household division of labor does respond to partners’ relative advantage (Gough & Killewald, 2011; Kan, 2008; Sullivan, 2011). In addition, gender egalitarian behaviors in domestic work were found to be more widespread at the top of the social and educational ladder (Coltrane, 2000). In this sense, one might expect that men’s share of the couple’s physical child care, a female-typed and time-demanding activity, would be higher among well-educated fathers.

Parental social position has also been associated with variations in parenting. In her ethnographic study, Lareau (2003) found that American middle and upper class parents adopt what she calls the parenting style of “concerted cultivation”. This is based on a strong engagement in family orchestrated activities that allow children to enhance their cultural, human, and social capital. In contrast, working-class parents were found to conform to her concept of “accomplishment of natural growth”, characterized by a less intensive approach to child-rearing. Well-educated parents are expected to feel closer to the child-oriented norms that have emerged in Western countries (Alwin, 2004). In the majority of countries that have been investigated, highly-educated fathers were found to be more involved in both developmental and routine child care activities (Bianchi et al, 2006; Hook & Wolfe, 2012; Marsiglio, 1991). Far less is known, however, about how fathers from different social backgrounds interact with their children at each life stage, from infancy to late childhood.
Parenting goes hand-in-hand with children’s development. Ironmonger (2004) estimated with Australian data that one-child households with a child under 5 allocate more than 80 weekly hours to parental care, whereas those with one child aged 10 to 14 allocate 30 weekly hours. But dramatic qualitative changes in parenting also occur across children’s life course. In families with infants and young toddlers, physical activities pervade nearly every single parent-child interaction. Interactive care with children under 3 is usually combined with physical child care, enabling the establishment of a close affective parent-child relationship that is vital for children’s development (Waldfogel, 2006). Children aged 3 to 5 increasingly acquire complex conceptual, social, and linguistic skills that are greatly enhanced from parental engagement in teaching, playing games or psychological reasoning (Gelman, 2008; Guralnick, 2008). Although in primary school (age 6-11) children achieve more autonomy from parents, parental supervision remains essential for their accumulation of cultural and social capital (Lareau, 2003). This evidence notwithstanding, previous studies on how parental care varies by children’s age (e.g., Ironmonger, 2004; Marsiglio, 1991) do not provide a conclusive picture of differences across socio-demographic groups.

3.3. Theoretical Framework

This study focuses on how paternal involvement varies by education and women’s employment across children’s life stages. First, I expect that well-educated fathers have the most gender egalitarian norms (Coltrane, 2000). Thus, highly-educated fathers
are expected to be the most actively involved in the household’s childcare responsibilities, especially in the most time-inflexible and female-typed activities.

Hypothesis 1a: *The higher is the level of education of the father, the higher the man’s share of the couple’s physical child care will be.*

Drawing on previous literature (Alwin, 2004; Coleman, 1988; Lareau, 2003; Zick & Bryant, 1996), highly-educated fathers should be the ones that have primarily internalized the norms of intensive child-rearing recommended by professionals and parenting experts. Thus, the strongest education gradient in physical activities should be observed in families with infants and young children, a period in which children’s well-being is considered as strongly dependent on parental physical supervision (Waldfogel, 2006). Following Lareau’s (2003) concept of “concerted cultivation”, well-educated fathers would be particularly active in fostering their children’s talents through their involvement in specific activities that enhance crucial skills for school success. Because children’s abilities for psychological reasoning and conceptual learning start to emerge by age 3 (Gelman, 2008; Guralnick, 2008), it would be in families with preschoolers (aged 3-5) and children in their mid-childhood (aged 6-11) where interactive (i.e. games; conversations) and educational activities (i.e. teaching) should mirror fathers’ educational differences.

Hypothesis 1b: *A significant education gradient in fathers’ physical child care will be observed among couples with a child aged 0 to 5. In interactive activities,*
this education gradient would be more salient in families where the youngest child is aged 3 or older.

From a time-availability approach (Presser, 1994), fathers’ child care time should respond to women’s levels of job pressure. Following Roeters and colleagues (2009), I expect fathers’ physical care with preschoolers to be particularly sensitive to the wife’s employment. This effect should be especially striking in the father’s share of the couple’s physical child care, since decisions at the couple level should be better captured through father’s relative participation in child care.

Hypothesis 2: Female employment has a strong effect on fathers’ physical child care allocation, an effect that should be mainly observed through the man’s share of the couple’s physical child care. This result is expected to be particularly salient in families with young children.

3.4. Methodology

3.4.1. Data

The “2003 Spanish Time Use Survey” (STUS) comes from the Spanish Institute of Statistics (INE) and is included in the Multinational Time Use Study (MTUS). Time budget data have for long been considered the best statistical sources to examine how people spend their time on a random day (Robinson, 1985). In the STUS each respondent (and his/her partner) reported a 24 hours time-diary and provided information on individual and household variables. Diary respondents reported their activities for every 10 minutes along the day, including a primary activity (the main one)
and a secondary activity (the simultaneous one). I excluded secondary activities from my analyses, since the STUS does not provide information on specific secondary child care activities. The original STUS has a relatively high rate of response (86%). Although the MTUS surveys do not provide longitudinal data, the large sample of the STUS permits us to study families with the youngest child at different life stages. After excluding cases with missing values, my sample sums 2,941 heterosexual couples with at least one child aged 0 to 11. I focus on three subsamples: 1) families with a child aged 0 to 2 (N = 942); 2) families where the youngest child is aged 3 to 5 (N = 792); 3) families where the youngest child is aged 6 to 11 (N = 1,207).

3.4.2. Variables

I focus on four dependent variables (see Table 3.1 and Table 3.4): 1) Father’s Share of Couple’s Physical Child Care: a percentage ranging from 0 (the father did 0% of the couple’s physical child care) to 100 (he did all the physical care), excluding cases in which both spouses did zero minutes of child care; 2) Father’s Minutes of Physical Care: a continuous variable; 3) Father’s Interactive Child Care: a continuous variable; 4) Teaching Children: a dummy variable including fathers who were involved in educational child care during the day of observation (see Table 3.4).

---

14 In exploratory analyses (not shown), I did not find any relevant change when primary and secondary activities were merged. Secondary activities represent 9% of fathers’ total child care.
The “independent variables” (see Table 3.1) are: Father’s Education (basic; low secondary; high secondary; tertiary), Mother’s Education (same categories), Mother’s Employment (not employed; employed less than 30 weekly hours; working between 30 and 37 hours; working full-time). “Control variables” (see Table 3.1) include: Father’s Employment (not employed; working up to 45 weekly hours; employed more than 45 hours); Son in home (at least one child of the household is a son); Outside Domestic Help (whether the household has regular unpaid domestic help); Number of Dependent Children (continuous); Weekend Diary (whether or not the diary refers to a Saturday or Sunday); Child 0-4 (couples with at least one child aged under 5).

3.4.3. Analytical Strategy

I first present descriptive evidence on educational differences in fathers’ physical and interactive child care by the age of the youngest child (Figure 3.1). Multivariate analyses include Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regressions and Logistic Regressions (for teaching care). I include models for the different subsamples based on the age of the youngest child (Tables 3.2 and 3.3). As a robustness test, I ran Seemingly Unrelated Regressions to assure that highly-educated fathers do not have significantly different employment patterns and leisure time conditions that might explain the expected educational differences in child care (see Table 3.5)

---

15 The Seemingly Unrelated Regressions for child care, paid work, and leisure (Table 3.5) show that college-educated fathers with preschoolers allocated less time to paid work than fathers with primary education, but these effects were not
3.5. Results

3.5.1. Descriptive Analyses

Figure 3.1 presents the relationship between the father’s average child care time and the age of the youngest child by level of education. One observes that paternal involvement is negatively associated with the age of the youngest child, whereas the volume of physical care is much higher than the volume of interactive care, particularly in families with preschoolers. Further, physical child care decreases with the age of the young child to a much higher extent than interactive activities.

Figure 3.1 shows important educational differences in father’s child care time. In families with a child aged 0 to 5, a very strong education gradient is observed, especially for physical activities. College-educated fathers with a child under 2 spend 74 minutes of physical child care, as compared to the 31 of those with primary education. Where the youngest child is aged 3 to 5, this gap is even larger (56 vs. 20). In families with a child under 3, fathers holding a high school diploma are nearly as engaged in physical activities as college-educated fathers. However, while college-educated men maintain high levels of involvement in physical care until children statistically significant. Yet, the college-educated, instead of allocating a significant amount of time to leisure without children, invested in primary child care, with an increase of 33 minutes in comparison to the less educated (p-value < 0.001). Similarly, highly-educated fathers also spent more time in housework than other fathers (results not shown). Consequently, I assume that, when studying educational differences in child care time with my data, I would be capturing possible variations in parenting norms and styles.
enter primary school (6 years), men with high secondary education significantly decrease their physical care when the youngest child is aged 2 to 5. In interactive activities, differences are more moderate, but fathers with high secondary and tertiary education are more engaged in these activities than their lower educated counterparts, especially when the youngest child is aged 3 to 5. Now, it is necessary to investigate to what extent these educational differences in paternal involvement persist after controlling for other variables.

3.5.2. Multivariate Statistical Analyses

In Table 3.2 one can observe the results of the OLS regressions for the father’s share of the couple’s physical child care. In line with expectations (Hypothesis 1a), fathers who hold a high school diploma and those with a college degree increased their share of physical child care by 5%, relative to those with primary education (p-value < 0.05). Education increased the male’s share of the household physical child care where the youngest child is aged 0 to 2, particularly among fathers with high secondary education. However, it is in families with the youngest child aged 3 to 5 where the strongest educational differential is observed, with college-educated fathers increasing their share of the couple’s physical care by 10% (p-value < 0.05). Yet, it is important to stress that the average contribution of Spanish residential fathers to the couple’s physical child care time is only 23% (Table 3.1). In couples with college-educated fathers, men contribute 30% to this activity
(analyses not shown)\textsuperscript{16}. This evidence notwithstanding, Spanish highly educated fathers are clearly the most gender egalitarian in the division of child care, even after controlling for mother’s and father’s employment\textsuperscript{17}.

Fathers’ education is expected to explain parenting styles and norms (\textit{Hypothesis 4}). In line with expectations, in Table 3.2 one observes that father’s education is significantly correlated with physical care in families with a child aged 0 to 5, but not where the youngest child is aged 6 to 11. In couples with a child aged 0 to 2, fathers with a university degree increased their physical child care by 22 minutes (p-value < 0.05) and those with high secondary education by 19 (p-value < 0.1) relative to those with primary education. Where the youngest child is aged 3 to 5 the education gradient was stronger, with college-educated fathers increasing their physical child care by 33 minutes (p-value < 0.001), even after controlling for socioeconomic and demographic variables. Table 3.3 allows us to interpret how education affects fathers’ interactive child care. In line with theoretical predictions, a positive impact of education on interactive activities is observed, although with smaller effects than for physical activities. After controlling for other covariates, college-educated fathers with a child aged 3 to 5 increased their interactive care by 12 minutes (p-value < 0.05) and those with high secondary education by 7 (p-value < 0.05). Logistic regressions

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{16} In line with Baizan et al. (2010), I found that the observed effect of mother’s education is essentially “spurious”, driven by a significant correlation of mother’s education with mother’s employment.

\textsuperscript{17} Unfortunately, the STUS does not have data on family norms. I assume that highly-educated fathers have the most gender egalitarian norms \textit{and} feel closer to intensive child-rearing practices than other fathers (Coltrane, 2000).
\end{footnotesize}
revealed that, in these families, the impact of being a college-educated father on interactive care is concentrated on educational activities (odds = 2.41; p-value 0.01), consistent with Lareau’s concept of “concerted cultivation”\(^\text{18}\). However, against my expectations, education did not explain changes in interactive care time where the youngest child is aged 6 to 11. It might well be that, when children are in mid-childhood, educational variations are primarily observed in paternal engagement in children’s activities (Yeung et al., 2001). Future research should investigate this critical question for our understanding of how father-child interactions vary across children’s developmental stages.

Finally, in line with theoretical expectations (Hypothesis 2), my findings show a very strong impact of mothers’ employment on father’s physical care (Table 3.2), but not on interactive care (Table 3.3)\(^\text{19}\). These effects were especially salient for the share of the couple’s physical child care and among families with a child aged 0 to 5, with significant effects of at least 10% for all measures of women’s employment (p-value < 0.001). These findings are consistent with previous studies suggesting that individuals’ physical child care is particularly responsive to spouses’ job pressure (Roeters et al., 2009). In Spain, maternal employment not

\(^{18}\) OLS regressions with the continuous variable “teaching children” show the same general results than logistic regressions. I opted for applying logistic regressions because these were more robust than OLS regressions. Only 6% of the fathers spent time in this activity.

\(^{19}\) Following previous studies (Craig, 2006; Hook & Wolfe, 2012), I also examined fathers’ solo child care (results not shown). The time that fathers allocated to child care without the spouse is also strongly correlated with the wife’s employment in families with children under 6.
only increases paternal involvement in child care. Maternal employment has a positive impact on father’s relative involvement in the most time-inflexible and female-typed child care activities.

3.6. Discussion

This article contributes to the emerging literature on fathering (Cabrera et al., 2000; Lamb, 2010; Marsiglio et al., 2000). I have analyzed how education and women’s employment affect Spanish fathers’ participation in child care. The novelty of this study is that it focuses on fathering across children’s age, a key question that has received little attention in the literature (Marsiglio, 1991). This analytical approach complements previous studies on fathers’ child care involvement (Bianchi, 2000; Bianchi et al., 2006; Gershuny, 2000; Hook & Wolfe, 2012; Raley et al., 2012; Sayer et al., 2004b; Wang & Bianchi, 2009; Yeung et al., 2001; Zick & Bryant, 1996). Spain has a mixture of coexisting realities that make this country a well-suited case of study, with high levels of traditionalism in the gender division of labor (Esping-Andersen et al., 2010) and difficulties of reconciling employment and parenting (Gutierrez-Domenech, 2010), together with a recent dramatic increase of women’s labor market participation, particularly among the college-educated (Gonzalez et al., 2000).

My multivariate statistical analyses give general support to my theoretical predictions. Firstly, after controlling for different variables, Spanish highly educated fathers were found to be significantly more involved in the share of the couple’s physical
care than their lower educated counterparts, especially in families with preschoolers. As I have argued throughout this paper, my findings can be interpreted in light of previous studies suggesting that well-educated fathers have internalized gender egalitarian norms towards the family more than less educated fathers (Coltrane, 2000).

Secondly, I found that the impact of wives’ employment on fathers’ child care varies by activity and children’s age. Consistent with previous studies (Roeters et al., 2009), in Spain, the wife’s employment is strongly correlated with father’s allocation to physical child care time. This effect is especially striking in families with young children, where childcare demands are highest. Even in a country with markedly traditional gender roles, like Spain, men respond to their wives’ employment circumstances by substantially increasing their contribution to the most time-demanding child care activities. Although previous studies found important gender inequities in how Spanish dual-earner couples divide their domestic tasks (Carrasco & Dominguez, 2012; Fernandez & Sevilla-Sanz, 2006), my analyses imply that a key mechanism to achieve a more equitable gender division of child care in Spain would be to stimulate women’s employment. This finding has important policy implications and contributes to the debate on gender inequalities in European countries.

---

20 It is well-known that women in Southern Europe undertake the lion’s share of domestic work, that they receive weak public support to balance paid and unpaid work, and that are less likely to be employed than women in other Western European countries (Esping-Andersen, 2009; Gonzalez et al., 2000).
The third key finding lies in the observed interaction between education and children’s age in explaining paternal care time. In families where the youngest child is younger than 5, an age when children well-being is strongly dependent upon extensive amounts of physical care (Lamb, 2010; Waldfogel, 2006), well-educated fathers were found to be the most involved in physical activities. For interactive child care, especially educational activities, a significant education gradient emerged in couples with a child aged 3 to 5, a stage when parental engagement in children’s linguistic and conceptual development plays a key role in later cognitive outcomes (Gelman, 2006; Guralnick, 2008). Since parental engagement in early childhood is determinant for future life chances (Heckman, 2006), my results provide new evidence in line with those scholars who argue that diverging parenting practices have potential effects on increasing social polarization in children’s destinies (Esping-Andersen, 2009; McLanahan, 2004). In line with previous demographic studies (McLanahan, 2004), Spanish fathers with high levels of education appear to be those who have primarily internalized child-oriented contemporary norms, which are reflected in distinct child-rearing behaviors that are adjusted to children’s specific needs at each developmental stage. From previous studies it is unclear whether educational differences in child-rearing lie in developmental care or in physical related activities (e.g., Bianchi et al., 2006; Craig & Mullan, 2011; Gracia et al., 2011; Hook & Wolfe, 2012). My study suggests that the mechanisms through which education is correlated with different father-child interactions vary significantly across children’s developmental stages. This
finding should contribute to our understanding of how the transmission of social advantage operates in advanced societies.

In addition, my multivariate analyses reveal that Spanish fathers with at least one son spent significantly more time in child care than those without sons, including interactive (for children aged 0 to 11) and physical activities (for children aged 3 to 5). These results are in line with previous related studies (Bonke & Esping-Andersen, 2011; Lundberg et al., 2007; Raley & Bianchi, 2006). Yet, an interesting agenda for future research would be to examine whether those gender-typed behaviors towards fathering have an impact on children’s gendered norms and attitudes.

Two important caveats in this study should be mentioned. A first caveat deals with the lack of representative longitudinal time-diary data. I cannot study changes in families with the existing cross-sectional time use surveys for Spain. However, because the age of the child has been considered a key indicator of parental care engagement (Ironmonger, 2004), constructing subsamples based on this criterion appears to be the best possible analytical strategy for my empirical purposes.

21 With Danish time-diary data, Bonke and Esping-Andersen (2011) found that the “son-effect” on fathers’ child care time is more salient among low-skilled fathers than among the high-skilled. I explored this with the STUS, but found no social group differential in this regard.

22 I ran my statistical models after dividing my sample by the presence of one or more children in each age category (results not shown). These analyses were in general consistent with my findings. But the models that I present in the paper are better suited for my empirical purposes. The age of the youngest child is what better captures parental care time, regardless of the presence of older children (in my models, I control for the number of children in the household).
The second limitation of my study is the fact that child care is both household work and a gendered nurturing activity (Craig, 2006b). Consequently, the impact of education on fathers’ physical care could capture simultaneously ideals on child development and gender ideologies. Nonetheless, by using two different dependent variables on physical child care time, I was able to minimize this analytical problem. One outcome captured the “quantity”, namely the father’s focus on children’s physical development (Pleck, 2010). A second outcome captured the “relative” contribution to physical child care at the couple level, namely the degree of female-male fairness in the couple’s division of physical child care activities. Still, related investigations should be conducted with data for other countries to increase our knowledge on how fathering operates within different contemporary societies. Future studies would improve our empirical evidence on parenting even more, should we have information on family preferences, attitudes, and longitudinal time-diary data.
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Table 3.1. Summary of Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father's Minutes of Physical Child Care</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>38.59</td>
<td>62.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Share of Couple's Physical Child Care (%) (*)</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>22.75</td>
<td>27.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Minutes of Interactive Child Care</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>19.62</td>
<td>39.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Teaching/Educational Care</td>
<td>Dummy</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables and Controls</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father Basic Education</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Low Secondary Education</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father High Secondary Education</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Tertiary Education</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Basic Education</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Low Secondary Education</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother High Secondary Education</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tertiary Education</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Unemployed/Inactive</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Working Standard Full-Time</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Working &gt; 45 Hours in Random Week</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Unemployed/Inactive</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Working Short Part-Time (&lt; 30 Hours)</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Working Long Part-Time (30-37 Hours)</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Working Full-Time (&gt; 37 hours)</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son in the Household</td>
<td>Dummy</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Dependent Children at Home</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Domestic Help</td>
<td>Dummy</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Aged 0 to 4</td>
<td>Dummy</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend Diary</td>
<td>Dummy</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 2,941

Source: "2003 Spanish Time-Use Survey" (INE)

(*) N = 2,628 (here, cases where both spouses did 0 physical care were excluded)
Figure 3.1. Education Gradient in Fathers’ Minutes of Child Care by the Age of the Youngest Child

Source: "2003 Spanish Time use Survey"
Table 3.2. OLS Regressions. Fathers' Share of the Couple's Physical Care and Minutes of Physical Care by Children's Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share of Physical Child Care Time</th>
<th>Minutes of Physical Child Care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coeff</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Secondary Educ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1,3</td>
<td>1,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Secondary Educ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>1,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>2,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Low Sec. Educ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>1,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother High Sec. Educ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,7</td>
<td>2,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Full-Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-17,9</td>
<td>2,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Overworks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-17,5</td>
<td>3,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Short Part-Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,2</td>
<td>1,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Long Part-Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,6</td>
<td>1,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Works Full-Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,5</td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Household Help</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son in Household</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>1,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1,3</td>
<td>0,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27,4</td>
<td>3,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. R-Squared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0,12</td>
<td>0,16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2003 Spanish Time-Use Survey (Spanish National Institute of Statistics) / Controls: "weekend day" and "child aged 0-4" for the child 0-11 sample.
+ p-value < 0,1  * p-value < 0,05  ** p-value < 0,01  *** p-value < 0,001.
### Table 3.3. Multivariate Regressions. Fathers' Interactive Time and Teaching Child Care Activities by Children's Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>All Interactive Child Care Time (OLS)</th>
<th>Only Teaching Child Care (Logistic Regressions) (*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child 0-11</td>
<td>Child 0-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Secondary Educ.</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Secondary Educ.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary Education</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Low Sec. Educ.</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother High Sec. Educ.</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tertiary Educ.</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Full-Time</td>
<td>-20.2</td>
<td>3.6 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Overworks</td>
<td>-26.1</td>
<td>5.0 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Short Part-Time</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Long Part-Time</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Works Full-Time</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Household Help</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son in Household</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.6 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>5.0 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. R-Squared</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2003 Spanish Time-Use Survey (Spanish National Institute of Statistics) / Controls: "weekend day" and "child aged 0-4" for the child 0-11 sample. 
+ p-value < 0.1  * p-value < 0.05  ** p-value < 0.01  *** p-value < 0.001 / (*) The Pseudo R-Squared is included in the logistic models.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Table 3.4. Definition of Dependent Variables</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities coded in the MTUS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examples of activities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Child Care Time</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 389, 939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing with child, teaching, feeding, accompanying, travel escorting a child, bathe the child, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Child Care Time</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381, 384, 939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feeding, bathe the child, supervising, putting child to bed, accompanying child, and related routine/physical activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactive Child Care Time</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382, 383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>playing, teaching, reading to the child, and other related interactive and developmental activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Child Care Time</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching, homework with child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father's share of Physical Care Time</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381, 384, 939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feeding, bathe the child, supervising, putting child in bed, accompanying child, and related routine/physical activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: "2003 Spanish Time-Use Survey" (INE; Spanish National Institute of Statistics)

(a) Multinational Time Use Study database (For information on the harmonization procedure: http://www.timeuse.org)
Table 3.5. SUR Estimation. Fathers' Daily Minutes in Specific Activities (a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Child Care</th>
<th>Paid Work</th>
<th>Leisure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coeff</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Coeff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Secondary Education</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>-11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Secondary Education</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary Education</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Low Secondary Education</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother High Secondary Education</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tertiary Education</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Employed</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son in Home</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Squared</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.744</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation Matrix of Residuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Child Care</th>
<th>Paid Work</th>
<th>Leisure</th>
<th>(without child)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Care</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Work</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure (without child)</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) SUR (Seemingly Unrelated Regressions). Families with a child aged 0-5.
(b) "Child Care Time" is the total primary child care; "Leisure Time" excludes leisure with a child.
Source: "2003 Spanish Time-Use Survey" (INE).

* p-value < 0.05, ** p-value < 0.01; *** p-value < 0.001
Chapter 4

DIVERGING PARENTING AND FAMILY TIME IN POST-INDUSTRIAL BRITAIN: EDUCATION, CLASS, AND OCCUPATIONS

ABSTRACT

I use data from the “2000 British Time Use Survey’ (N= 908) to study variations in family time and parenting across social strata, education, and occupational sectors. First, drawing on Lareau’s (2003) theoretical framework, I explore whether education and class explain variations in parenting and family activities associated with children’s acquisition of cultural, human, and social capital. Second, I examine the extent to which fathers employed in post-industrial occupations are, after controlling for academic qualifications, more involved in child care and family time than fathers working in industrial or traditional occupations. Since the post-industrial sector implies a high exposure to a diverse network of interpersonal relationships at the workplace, I argue that post-industrial occupations can be overrepresented by men conforming to contemporary norms of involved fathering.

Consistent with my theoretical hypotheses, my results can be summarized as follows: (1) Education and social class have a strong significant effect on parents’ involvement in child care and socio-cultural activities with children; (2) In families where both parents are college-educated, the time allocated to family-orchestrated cultural, social, eating-related, and leisure activities is significantly higher than in other families; 3) After controlling for different variables (i.e. education, paid-work time) fathers employed in post-industrial occupations appear to conform more to the norms of intensive fathering than their counterparts in (pre)industrial occupations.
4.1. Introduction

Contemporary sociology offers two contrasting views on how social position intersects with individuals’ lifestyles in advanced societies. Individualization theorists (Beck, 2007) and advocates of the “classless society” (Kingston, 2000) argue that family background is no longer a powerful analytical category to understand family life, including parenting practices. In contrast, others (e.g., Bourdieu, 1984; Lareau, 2003) posit that parents’ class, education, and status remain strongly associated with distinct child-rearing behaviors and family environments. Solving this puzzle is critical to better understand family life in post-industrial societies.

Despite the certain popularity of the thesis that parents’ social position is no longer a powerful category to understand family life (e.g., Beck, 2007; Kingston, 2000), a group of empirical sociologists argue that the opposite trend is taking place in advanced capitalist societies. In contrast to what modernization theories predicted, recent studies have found a strong correlation between the family of origin and children’s educational and socioeconomic outcomes (Erikson & Goldthorpe, 1992; Lareau, 2008; Morgan, 2006; Pollak et al., 2007). Parents’ resources are expected to play a role in supporting children’s educational transitions (Boudon, 1974; Morgan, 2006). But, in addition, scholars have argued that differences in daily family routines and parenting practices have a remarkable impact on the reproduction of social inequality (Bourdieu, 1984; Lareau, 2003).
In their classical study, Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) stressed that children who are socialized in middle and upper class environments internalize a proximity to the hegemonic culture that makes them to easily succeed in schooling. In contrast, working-class kids, because they lack cultural capital and usually have a distant relation towards the school, tend to achieve poorer academic results (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977). Other studies suggest that well off parents are the most involved in face-to-face developmental child care activities, like teaching, talking with children or being engaged in family-orchestrated activities with children. This parenting behaviors have been found to stimulate children’s verbal, academic, and social skills (Hsin, 2009; Roksa and Potter, 2011; Lareau, 2003).

Previous studies offer a comprehensive picture of how parental care involvement varies across the social and educational ladder (Gauthier, Furstenberg, & Smeeding, 2004; Sullivan, 2010). In the majority of these studies highly-educated parents were found to be more involved in child care than their lower educated counterparts. Yet, scholars paid little attention to study a rich diversity of family-orchestrated activities and parenting routines with cultural and social capital implications. As Lareau (2002: 747-8) points out, the majority of studies “are narrowly focused. Researchers look at the influence of parents’ education on parent involvement in schooling or at children’s time spent watching television or at time spent visiting relatives. Only a few studies examine more than one dynamic inside the home.” Bianchi and Robinson (1997) found a significant positive correlation between parents’ education and children’s time allocated to intellectual activities (Bianchi &
Robinson, 1997). Yeung and colleagues (2001) found that college-educated fathers were more engaged in their children’s academic activities than their lower educated counterparts. In her ethnographic study, Lareau (2002; 2003) observed that middle and upper class parents are the most engaged in specific leisure and cultural activities that foster children’s academic skills. Despite this empirical evidence, only a few studies have adopted a multidimensional approach to parenting and these studies have been restricted to American data.

In parallel, in the last two decades there has been an increasing attention to the question of whether post-fordist labor relations have led to changes in people’s personality traits, identities, and family life (Harvey, 1990; Sennett, 1998). In light of economic transformations, the two dominant approaches to class analysis, the neo-Marxist (Wright, 1997) and the neo-Weberian (Breen, 2005; Erikson & Goldthorpe, 1992), have conceptually incorporated the kinds of skills that are required for specific occupations. However, these two approaches have not emphasized in their analytical categories the fact that the “old” industrial and the “new” post-industrial sector have critical differences (Bell, 1973). As Esping-Andersen (1993) posits, variations across sectors should not be overlooked to understand occupational classes and social change. He argues that the transformation of the employment structure in a post-industrial world goes hand-in-hand with dramatic changes in people’s identities, social interactions, loyalties, and labor relations.

---

24 I use post-industrial and post-fordist as the same concepts.
From this approach, economic change, not only has altered labor and social relations across occupations with different skills, prestige, and salaries. Changes should also be manifested within occupations that have a similar position in the structure of opportunity. As Esping-Andersen (1993: 14) puts it, “a skilled metal worker and a skilled hairdresser would have very little in common be it in terms of autonomy, authority, labor relations, or reward system.”

In post-industrial societies, the majority of women are employed in the service sector. But most men remain employed in industrial occupations. The industrial/traditional sector, with occupations like construction workers, electricians, carpenters, plumbers or production managers, represents a male-dominated world with a traditional hierarchy. Industrial work environments tend to imply a limited network of open quotidian interactions at the workplace. In contrast, post-industrial occupations are expected to be more fluid in terms of social interactions, affording employees the opportunity to get to know people with different values, preferences, and discourses through different interpersonal relations through their daily work experiences.

An important number of employees from the post-industrial sector might have the potential conditions to fit within the work demands of occupations that, in general, require a certain ability to be engaged in interpersonal relations. This feature is expected to apply to different ranks of occupations, from low-skilled workers (i.e. waiters, hotel receptionists, routine officers) to professionals and
semi-professionals (i.e. graphic designers, lawyers, data analysts, teachers, professional therapists). Men employed in post-fordist occupations also have a closer relation to the “feminine” world, since they work in female-dominated occupations.

Now, one of the key sociological question of the present study is whether men from this post-fordist world, who are more exposed to different beliefs and social norms, are more likely to behave in tune with contemporary norms of intensive fathering and men’s involvement in family life (Alwin, 2004; Coltrane, 2000). To date, as far as I know, there are no studies with representative data that examined whether the sector of employment affects fathers’ engagement in child care and family time.

In this paper, I examine how British parents of different socioeconomic backgrounds and occupational characteristics spend time with their children in activities associated with the accumulation of cultural, human, and social capital (Bourdieu, 1986; Coleman, 1988). Following Bourdieu (1984), I assume that individuals’ acquisition of cultural and social capital is shaped by family environments that lead to different processes of childhood socialization which diverge across social strata. Drawing on Lareau’s (2003) theoretical framework, I concentrate on two different approaches to parenting: the “concerted cultivation” (associated with the middle class) and the “accomplishment of natural growth” (associated with the working-class). Additionally, I study the extent to which the economic sector in which British men are employed is associated with child care practices and daily
family routines, after comparing men with similar levels of education, but working in different occupational sectors.

I explore data from the “2000 British Time Use Survey” for a sample of heterosexual couples (married or unmarried) with at least one child aged 0 to 15 (N = 908). I apply multivariate statistical analyses and focus on a wide range of activities that are associated with children’s formation of social and cultural skills. I first analyze the amount of time that each father and mother spends with children in four specific activities: 1) parental care time; 2) cultural and intellectual activities; 3) social life activities; 4) watching TV. Secondly, I explore educational variations in five family leisure activities that are associated with children’s cultural and social development: 1) family leisure time; 2) cultural family time; 3) social life activities with family members; 4) family meals; 5) TV family time. Third, I study how men with similar levels of education in different economic sectors spend time with their children in child care, cultural activities, social related activities, and watching TV.

The structure of this article is organized as follows. First, in the background I introduce the different debates of interest in previous literature. Secondly, I present my analytical strategy, including my theoretical expectations, data, methods, and statistical techniques. Thirdly, I introduce my descriptive results and findings derived from multivariate statistical analyses. I conclude the article with a discussion of the findings and the implications of my results.
4.2. Background

A large body of literature has documented that children from the most privileged backgrounds perform better at school and are employed in better paid jobs than less advantaged children (Haveman & Wolfe, 1995). Parents from advantaged families can transfer the highest economic and cultural resources for their children’s education (Boudon, 1974; Bourdieu, 1986; DiMaggio, 1982) and are the most involved in parenting practices that stimulate children’s academic skills, such as face-to-face developmental activities (Hsin, 2009; Roksa & Potter, 2011) and family-orchestrated socio-cultural activities (Lareau, 2003). This empirical evidence is consistent with previous research suggesting that family-orchestrated routines and intensive parenting have positive outcomes on children’s socio-emotional and cognitive skills in early childhood (Guralnick, 2008; Heckman, 2006).

The question of whether children from different social and educational backgrounds are socialized in distinct environments is a key one to understand what factors explain variations in family time and childhoods. Lareau’s (2003) ethnographic study provides empirical insights for this question. She found that middle and upper class parents have an approach to parenting that fits with her concept of “concerted cultivation”. These parenting strategies consist of a strong engagement in supervised parental care activities that foster children’s cultural and social talents. In contrast, she found that poor and working-class parents conform to what she calls the norms of the “accomplishment of natural growth”. This
approach to child-rearing is characterized by low-intensive parenting practices based upon the belief that family organized activities should not conflict with children’s free time.

Several studies have investigated whether education is correlated with parental care involvement. In general, college-educated parents were found to allocate more time to child care than their lower educated counterparts (Bianchi et al., 2006; Gauthier, Furstenberg, & Smeeding, 2004; Sayer, Gauthier, & Furstenberg, 2004). Yet, much less is known about how class, status or education affect parenting practices in key dimensions for the intergenerational transmission of social and cultural capital, such as family-orchestrated leisure activities.

The combination of leisure and children’s supervision has become a key family strategy in Western societies. Leisure activities with parents can be especially enriching for children’s acquisition of skills that are important for their future human development, especially in cultural activities and daily routines involving interpersonal relations. Family time serves as a mechanism through which spouses prioritize spending time with children, especially in families with young children (Dew, 2009). Bianchi and colleagues (2006) show that a significant proportion of the overall increase in child care time between the mid 1970s and 2000 has been due to parents combining child care time with leisure activities. This trend is particularly salient among mothers, especially when they are employed, since mothers undertake the majority of leisure time with children (Craig & Mullan, 2011). Yet, the extent to which the
quantity and quality of leisure (i.e. cultural events, social activities, watching TV, family meals, sports) vary across families with different social backgrounds remains an inconclusive question in the literature.

Parents are expected to influence their children’s behaviors through their engagement in specific leisure activities. In their study with French, Italian, and German time use data, Cardoso, Fontainha, and Monfardini (2010) found that the time that parents allocate to reading is positively correlated to the time that children spend in the same activity. In contrast, the mother’s and the father’s share of time watching TV was found to be strongly associated with the share of time that children spent in front of TV. Whereas reading and studying have been associated with an increase in children’s cultural and intellectual skills, watching TV (especially “too much” TV) is associated with a more passive and less enriching leisure activity (Bianchi & Robinson, 1997).

The degree of parental supervision in children’s cultural and intellectual activities has been found to vary by parents’ education. In their study with American data from the “Panel Study of Income Dynamics”, Yeung et al. (2001) found that college-educated fathers are significantly more engaged in accompanying children in their intellectual and social activities than other fathers. Bianchi and Robinson (1997), using data from a representative sample of children from California in the U.S., found that children whose parents are highly-educated allocated significantly more time to reading and studying and less to watching TV than children of
parents with lower levels of education. Although parents’ education and class have been found to explain children’s involvement in cultural and educational activities, only a few studies have examined how family organized leisure and parental supervision varies across social strata (Lareau, 2002). Moreover, previous studies have been restricted to American data, a fact that motivates a focus on other countries.

Although the literature provides an analytical framework to study variations in parenting and family environments across social strata (e.g., Bourdieu, 1986; Lareau, 2003), much less attention has been paid to variations across sectors of occupation. More specifically, previous studies have not focused on whether men employed in the “new” post-industrial occupations have a different behavior towards the family than those employed in the “old” industrial/traditional sector. This question, however, is important to better understand what types of occupational contexts are related to certain parenting behaviors.

Following Esping-Andersen’s (1993) approach, one can assume that men employed in post-industrial occupations are, in relation to their counterparts in (pre)industrial occupations, more likely to: (i) be employed in a type of occupation where social relations are less hierarchical; (ii) interact with more women at the workplace; (iii) establish a more open and diverse network of relations derived from everyday life in working routines. From this perspective, one could argue that, after controlling for different variables (i.e. education, time-pressure, hours employed in the labor market, wife’s
employment), men employed in post-industrial occupations might have different behaviors towards the family and child care. These differences would be derived from the influence that individuals’ social relations at the workplace have on one’s personality traits, values, and social norms. In the literature, however, this question has not been investigated.

4.3. The Present Study

In this study, I use British time-diary data to examine three key questions: 1) Do parents’ education and class affect the way fathers and mothers spend time with their children in key activities for the reproduction of cultural, human, and social capital?; 2) Does parents’ education explain the propensity of married/cohabiting parents to be engaged in specific family organized activities that are expected to have different effects on children’s development?; 3) How is the coming of post-industrialism in Britain related to parenting behaviors and family time across fathers employed in different economic sectors?

4.3.1. Hypotheses

Drawing on Lareau’s (2003) theoretical framework, I assume that parents from the most advantaged backgrounds feel closer to the norms of intensive parenting. Privileged parents are expected to prioritize spending time with children in activities that foster their children’s personal talents and socio-cultural skills. At the parent-child level, privileged mothers and fathers should be more engaged
in child care, but also in leisure activities with implications for children’s development, such as cultural activities or social life with children. In contrast, I expect to observe a negative relationship between education and watching TV with children, an activity that is usually identified with a more passive approach to child-rearing and cultural consumption. At the family level, I expect to find an education gradient in the time allocated to family meals. Family meals have been defined as routines that are markers of family communication with potential effects on child development (Eisenberg et al., 2004). Highly-educated parents would prioritize their time in those family activities that are associated with the “high culture” (educational, cultural) or with the creation of social capital (organized social activities), as opposed to TV family time, which is associated with what Lareau (2003) terms the norms of the “accomplishment of natural growth”.

Hypothesis 1a: The higher the level of education, the more time parents will spend in child care, as well as cultural and social activities with children. In contrast, watching TV with the presence of a child is expected to be negatively correlated with education.

Hypothesis 1b: Parents from professional and managerial occupational classes, in line with the norms of concerted cultivation, are expected to be significantly more active in child care time and socio-cultural activities with children than parents from a more disadvantaged position. Watching TV with the presence of a child is expected to be negatively correlated with social class.

Hypothesis 1c: The higher is the level of education of parents, the more likely a family would be to be engaged in total leisure family time, family meals, cultural
activities, and social life activities. The opposite effect should be observed in relation to TV family time.

A second level of hypothesis is related to the links between post-industrialization and fathers’ behaviors in the family. Men employed in the “new” post-fordist economy, because they have more opportunities to get to know different sorts of people at their work, are expected to be more open to a wide range of discourses and practices about how men should behave in the family. Thus, men in post-fordist occupations are expected to have a closer relationship with the contemporary norms of intensive fathering (Alwin, 2004) and those ideals that support father’s involvement in the household (Coltrane, 2000) than those men employed in the industrial sector. In this sense, after controlling for the level of skills, and also for levels of job pressure, one should expect that men in post-industrial (or post-fordist) occupations are more involved in child care and socio-cultural activities with children than their counterparts employed in traditional sectors.

Hypothesis 2: After controlling for other factors, men working in post-fordist occupations are more engaged in parental care and in cultural and social activities with children than men employed in the industrial sector. The opposite effect should be observed for the time allocated to watching TV.

4.3.2. Data

The “2000 British Time Use Survey” (BTUS) is a representative survey with time-diary data that includes demographic and socioeconomic variables at the household and individual level.
Time-diaries have been for long considered the most reliable data to examine how individuals of a large population spend their time in a random day (Robinson, 1985). The BTUS offers two time-diaries: one diary is reported on a random weekday (Monday-Friday) and a second diary on a random weekend (Saturday-Sunday). Diary respondents reported their daily activities for every 10 minutes along the 1,440 minutes of the day of observation, including a wide range of activities, such as reading, watching TV and videos, attending cultural events, listening to the radio or participating in social activities. For each spell of time, every interviewed person reported, apart from the main activity, a secondary activity, which occurs simultaneously to the main activity. Respondents of time-diaries also provided information on whether or not each of their activities took place with the presence of a child and/or the presence of the spouse.

My sample of analysis includes heterosexual couples (married or unmarried) who have at least one child aged 0 to 15. All the parents of my sample have an age compressed between 25 and 60 years. The general rate of response of the BTUS is high (90.5%) and the data that I use are weighted for a representative sample. Those cases with missing values in some of the variables of interest were excluded from the original sample. It includes households in which the parent did not report one of the two diaries. I had to exclude all cases with missing values for social class variables, people who never worked, and households where at least one spouse was a student at the time of the interview. This implies that 5% of the population from my sample was excluded from the analyses.
Individuals belonging to the excluded group are more likely to be less educated than the average population. However, alternative analyses with educational variables including the missing cases in the occupational class categories present identical results (levels of significance) and degrees of explanatory power (R-squared). My definitive sample is represented by 908 households with responses for both mothers and fathers.

4.3.3. Variables

All my “dependent variables” are continuous and include the sum of primary and secondary activities. If respondents reported one activity as primary and secondary for the same spell of time (i.e. childcare, leisure), it only counts 10 minutes. The totals of my dependent variables result from a widely used formula among time use scholars to obtain the weekly averages of time allocation:

\[
\text{[Time allocated to “Y”, weekday} \times 5] + \text{[Time allocated to “Y”, weekend} \times 2] / 7
\]

At the individual level, I use four continuous variables (see Table 4.1): (1) the weekly average minutes allocated to parental care time; (2) the weekly average minutes allocated to watch TV with the presence of one child; (3) the weekly average minutes allocated by the parent to cultural and intellectual activities with the presence of one child (i.e. teaching the child, attending cultural events, visiting museums, reading; listening to music); (4) the weekly average

\[25 \text{ In some models, as I detail below, my dependent variables only include weekend diaries.}
\[26 \text{ Technically, “with the presence of one child” means “with the presence of at least on child”.
} \]
minutes that the parent allocated to social life activities with the presence of one child (i.e. receiving visitors, attending social events, different types of feasts). At the couple level, I focus on five dependent variables, considering that both spouses were together with the presence of one or more children in the activity (see Table 4.1)²⁷: (1) the weekly average minutes allocated to family leisure activities (2) the weekly average minutes allocated to family meals; (3) the weekly average minutes allocated to TV family time; (4) the weekly average minutes allocated to cultural and intellectual family time; (5) the weekly average minutes allocated to family social life activities.

The main independent variables of the present study are “education’ and “social class’ (see Table 4.2). Education was divided in three categories: primary (ISCED 1-2); secondary (ISCED 3-4); tertiary (ISCED 5-6). “Social class” was divided in four categories: (1) managerial occupations; (2) professional occupations; (3) skilled working-class; (4) unskilled working-class²⁸. The class-schema that I used is the one that better captures the general class differences

²⁷ Family time is based on the activities reported by the mother with the presence of at least one child and her spouse. Findings based on the diary reported by the father were not included for three reasons: a) for reasons of space; b) this results were consistent with the ones offered with the responses of mothers; c) in mothers’ diaries there is more statistical variation and less zeros in diary responses.

²⁸ For sample size limitations, I had to merge low/high managers for women, which brought me to merge semi-professionals and professionals in the same category. Women in semi-professional and professional occupations were found to behave in exactly the same fashion. For men, semi-professionals were slightly more involved in most almost all child care activities than professionals, even after controlling for time-constraints (i.e. non-working weekend diaries). Yet, fathers in professional and semi-professional occupations presented a similar behavior in relation to the other classes.
that are included in Lareau’s theoretical approach. In any case, for sample limitations, I could not construct an EGP class-schema (see Erikson & Goldthorpe, 1992).

In my examination of the impact of the type of economic sector on fathers’ child care involvement, I created six categories. These six categories combine the three levels of education with the two economic sectors: 1) Primary education and Fordist; 2) Primary Education and Post-fordist; 3) Secondary education and Fordist; 4) Secondary Education and Post-fordist; 5) Tertiary Education and Fordist; 6) Tertiary Education and Post-fordist. This strategy allows me to compare men with similar educational qualifications, but working in different economic sectors. My occupational categories, and also my social class categories, were constructed using the wide schema of occupations that is provided within the “International Standard Classification of Occupations - ISCO 88” (the ISCO - 88 is fully provided in the BTUS).

“Control variables” are (see Table 4.2): “number of children in the household”; “child aged 0 to 5”; “paid/unpaid domestic work help”; “paid/unpaid outside child care”; “partner’s education”: a) primary; b) secondary; c) tertiary; “father’s employment categories”: a) unemployed/inactive; b) standard full-time; c) overworking; “mother’s employment categories”: a) unemployed/inactive; b) part-time job; c) full-time job.
4.3.5. Analytical Strategy

At the descriptive level, I examined the average time that fathers and mothers with different levels of education allocated to four specific activities with children (Figures 4.1 and 4.2). I applied Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regressions. In a first step of the multivariate statistical analyses, I ran separated models for class and education (Table 4.3 and Table 4.4). Due to the high correlation between class and education, especially amongst mothers and fathers in professional occupations, I decided to run two groups of models, one for social class and another for education.

In a second analytical step, I examined the effect of parents’ education on the allocation of family time in specific activities. In order to examine the impact of education at the couple level, I used 9 categories with the combinations of the mother’s education and the father’s education (basic, secondary, and tertiary).

Finally, I ran two different levels of OLS regressions, to examine whether the economic sector affects how fathers allocate time to different activities with children (see Table 4.6). My explanatory variables combined the three educational categories for fathers and the two economic sectors of analysis (fordist vs. post-fordist). One group of regressions focused on the weekly average time allocated to each activity, whereas a second group focused on non-working

---

29 There are some differences in the time that parents of different occupational categories allocated to paid work. In general, fathers in post-industrial occupations worked less time in the labor market than those in industrial occupations, especially at the bottom of the educational ladder.
weekend. In so doing, I can see whether or not variations across occupations are driven by differences in daily job pressures.

4.4. Empirical Results

4.4.1. Education Gradient in Leisure with Children

Figure 4.1 presents a description of the average time that fathers of different levels of education allocated to specific activities with children. These activities include total leisure, cultural activities, social life, and watching TV. Significant educational differences in fathers’ cultural and social activities with children are observed. One observes that college-educated fathers allocated an average of 58 minutes to cultural activities with children. Fathers with secondary education spent 49 minutes in cultural activities with children, whereas their counterparts with primary education only 35. In relation to social life, educational differences are more modest, but still visible. Parents holding a secondary and university degree are both more involved in social activities with children (51 minutes), as compared to their counterparts with primary education (39 minutes). In contrast, a negative relationship between watching TV with the child and education is observed. In this regard, fathers who have primary education allocated 70 minutes to these activities, 66 minutes were spent by those with secondary education, and 53 minutes by the college-educated. Although educational differences in specific activities with children are observed, no relevant variations were found for the total amount of leisure spent together with children (Figure 4.1).
Figure 4.2 presents educational differences in mothers’ leisure with children. As observed for fathers, differences in the quantity of leisure with children are insignificant (about 4 hours), but not those regarding the quality of leisure. On an average day, college-educated mothers spent 90 minutes in cultural activities with their children, in relation to the 77 minutes spent by their counterparts with secondary education, and the 61 for the less educated. For social life activities with children, one observes an education gradient too: 76 minutes among college-educated mothers, 72 for those with secondary education, and 51 for the ones with primary education. As observed for fathers, college-educated mothers were the ones who spent less time watching TV with a child (50 minutes), in relation to those with secondary education (64) and primary education (63)\textsuperscript{30}.

The descriptive findings presented in Figures 4.1 and 4.2 are in line with theoretical expectations. These figures imply that highly-educated parents are more involved in cultural and social activities with children, whereas those with lower levels of education are the ones who spend more time watching TV with children.

\textbf{4.4.2. Education and Class in Parent-Child Activities}

The multivariate analyses presented in Table 4.3 show that college-educated mothers are the most involved ones in the three activities associated with the norms of “concerted cultivation” (child care,\textsuperscript{30} Descriptive differences by social class in the same activities, in general, mirror similar figures to the ones observed for the groups of education (results not shown).
cultural activities with children, and social activities with children). For all these three activities I found strong significant effects in relation to mothers with primary education (p-value < 0.001). Mothers with secondary education are significantly more involved in cultural activities (p-value < 0.05) and social activities (p-value 0.01) than those with primary education, although to a lesser extent than their counterparts holding a university degree. For watching TV with a child, differences by education were found to be insignificant. Results (not shown) reveal that differences in mothers’ time watching TV with children are mainly driven by paid work time pressures. In Table 4.4, one can observe that college-educated fathers are the most active in child care time and social life with children (p-value < 0.01), but very especially in cultural activities with children (p-value < 0.001). Fathers with secondary education are somewhere in between those with primary and tertiary education regarding their time spent in cultural activities with children (p-value < 0.05), while for social activities they behave in the same fashion than college-educated fathers (p-value < 0.01). College-educated fathers spent significantly less time watching TV with children than those with basic education (p-value < 0.05). Overall, the multivariate analyses of Table 4.3 are consistent with descriptive statistics (Figures 4.1 and 4.2).

Are there differences in how mothers and fathers of different social classes spend time with children in activities associated with the formation of social and cultural capital? In Table 4.4, the findings for social class variables are somewhat similar to the ones observed for education. Yet, key differences are appreciated when studying
class variables. In Table 4.4, one observes that mothers in professional occupations were clearly the most involved ones in cultural and social activities with children, especially in relation to their unskilled counterparts, the ones who were included in the reference category (p-value < 0.001). Hence, mothers in managerial occupations were significantly less involved in social and cultural activities than those working in professional occupations (Table 4.4). Further, OLS regressions show that mothers in professional occupations are the ones that spent less time watching TV with the presence of children (p-value < 0.01), a difference that is not observed when examining educational variations. Similar to the findings for mothers, working-class fathers allocated less time to child care, social life activities and, very especially, to cultural activities with children. In contrast, social class differences in the time watching TV with children were insignificant. Unlike for mothers, differences between professionals and managers were almost insignificant. Professionals were significantly more involved in child care (p-value < 0.01) than managers (p-value 0.05). But the opposite was true for social activities, for which only managers performed a significant involvement in social life with children (p-value < 0.05).

Overall, OLS regressions show that highly-educated mothers and fathers are the most involved in child care activities and in those social-cultural activities through which children are expected to acquire cultural capital and social skills. Social class, in general, mirrors the results observed for education, with low-skilled parents being the ones that appear to fit with Lareau’s concept of
“accomplishment of natural growth”. Yet, for mothers, not for fathers, professionals are clearly the ones who are more likely to include their children in leisure activities that are associated with the norms Lareau’s concept of “concerted cultivation”.

4.4.3. Education Gradient in Family-Orchestrated Leisure

Table 4.5 presents multivariate analyses for family time activities, including family leisure, cultural family-orchestrated activities, TV family time, family social life, and family meals. My main explanatory variables capture the combined level of education of both parents, namely the relative level of education within the couple.

Results presented in Table 4.5 are consistent with theoretical predictions. Except for the amount of family time spent watching TV, for which I did not find any significant educational difference, college-educated parents were clearly the most engaged in family time activities that are expected to foster children’s formation of cultural and social skills. Where both parents are college-educated, family time in cultural activities increased by 23 minutes in relation to families where both partners had primary education (p-value < 0.01). For social activities, this differential between college-educated parents at the top and those at the bottom was of 27 minutes (p-value < 0.01). Similarly, couples at the top of the educational ladder increased their time allocated to family meals by 11 minutes, as compared to homogamous couples with basic education (p-value < 0.01). Finally, a similar pattern is observed
when looking at the total family leisure. Indeed, couples in which both partners were college-educated spent 48 minutes more in family leisure time than those at the bottom of the educational ladder, with statistically significant effects (p-value < 0.01). Overall, homogamous college-educated parents were the ones with the strongest willingness to organize cultural and social activities that involve both parents and at least one child in the household\textsuperscript{31}.

4.4.4. Time with Children by Occupational Sectors

Table 4.6 presents the results of the multivariate analyses for the same four activities that have been presented in Table 4.3 and Table 4.4 (child care time, cultural activities with children, watching TV with children, and social life with children). In the models of Table 4.6 the focus is on whether fathers employed in different economic sectors (defined as fordist vs. post-fordist) have different behaviors towards parenting. The previous analyses for fathers (see Table 4.3) have shown an important education gradient in fathers’ child care and socio-cultural activities with children. But the question that arises is whether differences in parenting behaviors are also found \textit{within} levels of education across men employed in different economic sectors.

First, the findings presented in Table 4.6 include analyses for the weekly average time and for non-working weekends. After

\textsuperscript{31} Note that the construction of this variable (as mentioned) is based on mothers’ time-diaries. The results offered in Table 4.5 do not give reasons to argue that it is the level of the mother, rather than the combined level of education of both partners, the explanatory variable of educational differences in family leisure activities.
controlling for different covariates, fathers who are employed in the post-fordist sector with a basic level of education spent 28 minutes more in primary child care than those with the same level of education employed in the fordist sector (p-value < 0.01). Similar differences are observed for cultural activities with children. Fathers with basic education and employed in the post-industrial sector increased their cultural activities with children by 15 minutes, as compared to their counterparts in the industrial sector (p-value < 0.05). During non-working weekends, post-industrial workers with basic education were also more involved in child care than those employed in the (pre)industrial sector, but with lower statistical effects (at the 90%). Yet, for cultural activities, differences by economic sector remain visible during non-working weekends, with a difference of 41 minutes (p-value < 0.01). For social life, differences are greater on non-working weekends than on weekdays, with a positive coefficient of 42 (p-value < 0.01). Hence, at the bottom of the educational ladder, fathers with post-industrial occupations are more engaged in socio-cultural activities with children and child care than those employed in the fordist sector.

Second, among fathers with intermediate levels of education (secondary education) differences are salient in primary child care and in social activities. During an average day, fathers in post-fordist occupations allocated 30 minutes more to primary child care than those in the fordist sector (p-value < 0.01); for social life activities this difference was of 20 minutes (p-value < 0.01). During a non-working weekend, differences across fathers with secondary education remain salient, though statistical effects are weaker, both
for primary child care activities and for social life activities with children (p-value < 0.01). Yet, for non-working weekends, fathers with secondary education employed in the post-industrial sector were significantly more involved in cultural activities with their children than their counterparts working in the fordist sector.

Finally, except for watching TV with the child (where differences are insignificant across economic sectors), important statistical differences are observed across different occupational sectors. College-educated fathers employed in post-industrial occupations were more active in fathering (especially in socio-cultural activities) than fordist workers with the same level of education (see Table 4.6). Overall, the post-industrial sector appears to be associated with being more active in fathering and increasing time in cultural and social activities with children in everyday life in comparison to the “old” industrial or traditional sector.

4.5. Discussion

This article was motivated by contemporary debates in sociology on whether social class and parents’ level of education remain important predictors of individuals’ lifestyles, parenting, and family life (Crompton, 2010; Kingston, 2000; Lareau, 2003). Using the “2000 British Time Use Survey” for heterosexual couples with children aged 0 to 15, I have examined the time that parents allocated to specific cultural and social activities with their children. Not only was my analytical focus on parent-child interactions, but on the quality and quantity of family leisure, a key understudied
dimension in the quantitative literature on how family life and childhood socialization vary across social strata.

Drawing on Lareau’s (2003) theoretical framework, I first examined the concepts of “concerted cultivation” (associated with upper middle classes) and “accomplishment of natural growth” (associated with the working-classes). Some quantitative (Yeung et al., 2001) and qualitative studies (Lareau, 2003) have previously explored how parents of different levels of education and social class are involved in activities with children that have key implications for the intergenerational transmission of status. Yet, this line of research has been quite exceptional and essentially restricted to data from the U.S. The lack of quantitative studies in this direction is really surprising, given the key relevance of the topic to provide a better understanding of childhood socialization and family life in contemporary advanced societies.

Further, this paper was motivated by the debate on whether differences between post-industrial and industrial occupations predict significant variations in people’s working experiences and identities (Bell, 1973; Esping-Andersen, 1993; Kingston, 2000). Is there something genuine in post-industrial occupations that make fathers different? Because its more open labor relations, blurred sense of authority, and higher gender diversity make post-industrial occupations more fluid and diverse than industrial occupations, I have argued that men employed in post-industrial occupations would be more likely to have absorbed the contemporary standards of involved parenting (Alwin, 2004; Coltrane, 2000) than their
counterparts employed in the (pre)industrial sectors. This line of investigation with representative data of British men stimulates, in my opinion, a relevant question for the sociology of work, family sociology, and related areas in the social science.

My empirical results are in line with my general theoretical predictions. To begin with, my statistical analyses show that parental education and social class have a significant positive effect on parents’ involvement in child care and socio-cultural activities with children. In contrast, watching TV is negatively correlated with education and class, though negative correlations were only found to be significant amongst college-educated fathers and women in professional occupations. My results in this respect support the idea that parents at the top of the social and educational ladder have different preferences towards parenting and different cultural routines (Bourdieu, 1986; Lareau, 2003). British privileged children are clearly more likely than disadvantaged children to interact with parents in activities that produce a relative social advantage (Coleman, 1988), such as face-to-face parent-child interactions, engagement in cultural activities, and social life with close relatives and other individuals.

Are there educational differences in parent-child interactions at the couple level? My findings reveal that families headed by two college-educated parents were undoubtedly the most engaged in activities associated with children’s accumulation of social and cultural capital. The studied daily activities are diverse, including family leisure, family meals, orchestrated activities with cultural
aims, and social life. These results can be interpreted as a manifestation of different strategies and conceptions towards parenting across social strata (Lareau, 2003). My results with British data show, once again, that time use surveys are useful analytical tools to explore variations in family life across the population (Robinson & Godbey, 1997). In fact, my findings complement Lareau’s (2003) influential ethnographic study, which produced important insights to our understanding of the complex process of stratification. My findings shed light on important differences in family daily routines across social strata, which in turn play a key role in the intergenerational transmission of social advantage (Farkas, 2003). On the contrary, Kingston (2000: 131) argued that, in the U.S. “in terms of actual time commitments, the broad contours of domestic life for married couples are remarkably similar across the classes.” Yet, my study shows that, at least in Britain, heterosexual couples of different social backgrounds present an opposed fashion regarding critical family leisure routines for children’s development.

Finally, my study has contributed to the literature on family and work, as well as to contemporary debates on occupational classes and post-industrialization. My empirical analyses show that the economic sector in which British fathers are employed is correlated with their involvement in child care and leisure activities with children. After controlling for paid work time-constraints, and for different levels of education, fathers’ employed in post-industrial

---

32 Alternative analyses for family time shows related findings when social class is included in my models instead of the level of education (results not shown).
occupations are the most involved in child care and in socio-cultural activities with children. These results open an interesting line of research within the scholarship on parenting and the household division of labor. Yet, the exact mechanisms through which parents of different economic sectors behave towards family life require further attention. In my opinion, these analyses should be replicated through the exploration of different variables (i.e. child care, leisure, housework), using different methodological techniques (surveys, interviews, ethnographic data), and capturing a wide range of post-industrial and traditional occupations.

Overall, my analyses suggest that education, social class, and the sector of employment are associated with important differences in parenting styles. My results with British time-diary data suggest that parenting and family time vary significantly across social groups. British children from different social backgrounds are socialized in worlds that are distinct from the point of view of their parental inputs in cultural and social capital. Future research should investigate the extent to which the observed differences in parents’ daily activities with children are also observed with children’s diaries, a dimension that has received little empirical attention (e.g., Cardoso et al., 2010; Bianchi & Robinson, 1997).
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Table 4.1. Means and SD of Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fathers' Total Child Care</td>
<td>continuous</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers' Cultural Activities with Children</td>
<td>continuous</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers' Social Activities with Children</td>
<td>continuous</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers' Watching TV with a child</td>
<td>continuous</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers' Total Child Care</td>
<td>continuous</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers' Cultural Activities with Children</td>
<td>continuous</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers' Social Activities with Children</td>
<td>continuous</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers' Watching TV with a child</td>
<td>continuous</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Leisure Time</td>
<td>continuous</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Cultural Time</td>
<td>continuous</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Social Life Time</td>
<td>continuous</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family TV time</td>
<td>continuous</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family meals time</td>
<td>continuous</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 908

Source: "2000 British Time Use Survey"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father Basic Education</td>
<td>categorical</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Secondary Education</td>
<td>categorical</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father College Education</td>
<td>categorical</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers Basic Education</td>
<td>categorical</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers Secondary Education</td>
<td>categorical</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers College Education</td>
<td>categorical</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Unskilled Working Class</td>
<td>categorical</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Skilled Working Class</td>
<td>categorical</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Professional Occupation</td>
<td>categorical</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Managerial Occupation</td>
<td>categorical</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Unskilled Working Class</td>
<td>categorical</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Skilled Working Class</td>
<td>categorical</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Professional Occupation</td>
<td>categorical</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Managerial Occupation</td>
<td>categorical</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man Basic Educ. - Industrial</td>
<td>categorical</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man Basic Educ. - Post-Industrial</td>
<td>categorical</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man Medium Educ. - Industrial</td>
<td>categorical</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man Medium Educ. - Post-Industrial</td>
<td>categorical</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man High Educ. - Industrial</td>
<td>categorical</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man High Educ. - Post-Industrial</td>
<td>categorical</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Unemployed</td>
<td>categorical</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Full-time Employed</td>
<td>categorical</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Overworking</td>
<td>categorical</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Unemployed</td>
<td>categorical</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Part-time Employed</td>
<td>categorical</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Full-time Employed</td>
<td>categorical</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 0-5 years old</td>
<td>categorical</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>continuous</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Child care help</td>
<td>categorical</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Domestic Work Help</td>
<td>categorical</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 908

Source: "2000 British Time Use Survey"
Figure 4.1. Fathers’ Leisure with Children by Education

Source: "2000 British Time Use Survey"

Figure 4.2. Mothers’ Leisure with Children by Education

Source: "2000 British Time Use Survey"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Child Care</th>
<th>Cultural Activities</th>
<th>Watching TV</th>
<th>Social Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coeff</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Coeff</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Basic Education</td>
<td>ref.</td>
<td></td>
<td>ref.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Secondary Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother College Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,3</td>
<td>6,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>50,2</td>
<td>19,0</td>
<td>55,2</td>
<td>13,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. R-Squared</td>
<td>0,32</td>
<td>0,05</td>
<td>0,05</td>
<td>0,05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Basic Education</td>
<td>ref.</td>
<td></td>
<td>ref.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Secondary Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father College Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,5</td>
<td>5,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>14,9</td>
<td>6,4</td>
<td>22,5</td>
<td>5,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. R-Squared</td>
<td>0,17</td>
<td>0,03</td>
<td>0,04</td>
<td>0,03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>908</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Controls: Mother's and father's employment, Number of children, Young child, Child care help, Domestic work help.

Source: "2000 British Time Use Study"

* p-value < 0,05  ** p-value < 0,01  *** p-value < 0,001
# Table 4.4. OLS. Parents' Weekly Average Minutes of Time with Children in Specific Activities by Social Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Child Care</th>
<th>Cultural Activities</th>
<th>Watching TV</th>
<th>Social Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coeff</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Coeff</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mothers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Unskilled Occupation</td>
<td>ref.</td>
<td>ref.</td>
<td>ref.</td>
<td>ref.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Skilled Working Class</td>
<td>-14.4</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Professional Occupation</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Managerial Occupation</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>19.3 **</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>13.4 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. R-Squared</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fathers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Unskilled Occupations</td>
<td>ref.</td>
<td>ref.</td>
<td>ref.</td>
<td>ref.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Skilled Working Class</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Professional Occupation</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>7.3 **</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>6.3 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Managerial Occupation</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>7.7 *</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>6.7 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>10.4  *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. R-Squared</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>908</td>
<td></td>
<td>908</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Controls: Father's and mother's employment, Number of children, Young child, Child care support from outside the household, Domestic help. Source: "2000 British Time Use Study" / * p-value < 0.05  ** p-value < 0.01  *** p-value < 0.001
Table 4.5. OLS. Weekly Average of Family Time in Specific Activities by Parents' Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Cultural Coeff</th>
<th>Cultural SD</th>
<th>TV Coeff</th>
<th>TV SD</th>
<th>Social Coeff</th>
<th>Social SD</th>
<th>Meals Coeff</th>
<th>Meals SD</th>
<th>Total Leisure Coeff</th>
<th>Total Leisure SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>She low / He low</td>
<td>ref.</td>
<td></td>
<td>ref.</td>
<td></td>
<td>ref.</td>
<td></td>
<td>ref.</td>
<td></td>
<td>ref.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She low / He mid</td>
<td>-0.4, 7.3</td>
<td>2.3, 6.7</td>
<td>1.6, 8.7</td>
<td>-1.9, 4.1</td>
<td>5.4, 16.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She low / He high</td>
<td>12.7, 9.3</td>
<td>1.7, 8.6</td>
<td>7.8, 11.1</td>
<td>-1.4, 5.2</td>
<td>19.3, 20.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She mid / he low</td>
<td>4.8, 6.9</td>
<td>8.3, 6.4</td>
<td>13.1, 8.3</td>
<td>2.8, 3.9</td>
<td>24.3, 15.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She mid / he mid</td>
<td>18.4, 6.8, **</td>
<td>3.7, 6.3</td>
<td>22.1, 8.1</td>
<td>0.3, 3.8</td>
<td>28.5, 14.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She mid / he high</td>
<td>12.0, 7.8</td>
<td>-3.4, 7.2</td>
<td>13.8, 9.4</td>
<td>-0.5, 4.4</td>
<td>5.1, 17.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She high / he low</td>
<td>-0.5, 8.6</td>
<td>-4.9, 7.9</td>
<td>10.4, 10.2</td>
<td>0.1, 4.8</td>
<td>10.5, 18.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She high / he mid</td>
<td>15.5, 8.0</td>
<td>5.4, 7.4</td>
<td>31.1, 9.6</td>
<td>-0.2, 4.5</td>
<td>40.9, 17.6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She high / he high</td>
<td>22.8, 6.7, **</td>
<td>-5.1, 6.2</td>
<td>26.7, 8.1</td>
<td>11.3, 3.8</td>
<td>47.7, 14.8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>18.2, 8.8, *</td>
<td>49.6, 8.1, ***</td>
<td>32.2, 10.5</td>
<td>26.7, 4.9</td>
<td>126.6, 19.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. R-Squared</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>908</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p-value < 0.05  ** p-value < 0.01  *** p-value < 0.001

Source: "2000 British Time Use Survey"

Note: Controlling for socio-economic and demographic variables (employment, young child, number of children, domestic help)
Table 4.6. OLS. Fathers' Time with Children in Specific Activities by Education and Economic Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Child Care</th>
<th>Cultural Activities</th>
<th>Watching TV</th>
<th>Social Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coeff  SD</td>
<td>Coeff  SD</td>
<td>Coeff  SD</td>
<td>Coeff  SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Average Time (n = 908)</td>
<td>ref.</td>
<td>ref.</td>
<td>ref.</td>
<td>ref.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Education - Fordist Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Education - Post-Industrial Sector</td>
<td>27,8 9,0 **</td>
<td>15,5 7,8 *</td>
<td>-0,9 8,9</td>
<td>7,0 7,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education - Fordist Sector</td>
<td>13,0 7,4</td>
<td>13,0 6,4 *</td>
<td>-0,2 7,3</td>
<td>8,4 6,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education - Post-Industrial Sector</td>
<td>29,9 8,6 **</td>
<td>19,0 7,4 *</td>
<td>-6,3 8,5</td>
<td>20,5 7,0 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary Education - Fordist Sector</td>
<td>31,3 11,4 **</td>
<td>21,6 9,9 *</td>
<td>-13,7 11,4</td>
<td>17,6 9,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary Education - Post-Industrial Sector</td>
<td>20,8 7,2 **</td>
<td>25,5 6,3 ***</td>
<td>-13,0 7,2</td>
<td>12,6 5,9 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>14,4 12,0</td>
<td>17,3 10,4</td>
<td>64,1 11,9</td>
<td>34,5 9,8 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. R-Squared</td>
<td>0,17</td>
<td>0,03</td>
<td>0,04</td>
<td>0,03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-working Weekend Day (n = 639)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coeff  SD</th>
<th>Coeff  SD</th>
<th>Coeff  SD</th>
<th>Coeff  SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ref.</td>
<td>ref.</td>
<td>ref.</td>
<td>ref.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Education - Fordist Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Education - Post-Industrial Sector</td>
<td>19,4 10,7</td>
<td>41,2 20,4 *</td>
<td>-0,3 15,4</td>
<td>41,8 20,4 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education - Fordist Sector</td>
<td>5,8 8,6</td>
<td>30,3 16,4</td>
<td>7,7 12,4</td>
<td>15,7 16,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education - Post-Industrial Sector</td>
<td>20,5 9,4 *</td>
<td>42,5 18,0 *</td>
<td>-13,8 13,6</td>
<td>42,5 18,0 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary Education - Fordist Sector</td>
<td>21,5 13,0</td>
<td>59,0 24,9 *</td>
<td>-10,6 18,8</td>
<td>14,6 24,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary Education - Post-Industrial Sector</td>
<td>16,0 8,0 *</td>
<td>54,2 15,3 ***</td>
<td>-14,5 11,6</td>
<td>30,9 15,3 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>20,8 13,0</td>
<td>15,2 24,8</td>
<td>79,7 18,8</td>
<td>45,5 24,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. R-Squared</td>
<td>0,19</td>
<td>0,04</td>
<td>0,02</td>
<td>0,02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Controls: Mother's and father’s employment, Number of children, Young child, Outside child care, Domestic work help.
Source: "2000 British Time Use Study" / * p-value < 0,05  ** p-value < 0,01  *** p-value < 0,001
Chapter 5

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

5.1. General Summary

This doctoral dissertation focused on variations in parenting behavior in advanced societies. My specific focus has been on how parenting practices vary across the population. Although all parents are expected to be motivated to allocate time to child care (Hallberg & Klevmarken, 2003), parental care involvement and family daily routines are expected to diverge across the population. Indeed, not all parents have the same time-availability, a limited resource that is expected to vary within and across countries (Sayer & Gornick, 2011). But preferences, norms, and beliefs also affect parenting behaviors, including a number of key variables, such as gender (Craig, 2006), social class (Lareau, 2003) or education (Sayer, Gauthier, & Furstenberg, 2004). Therefore, in this thesis, parenting has been viewed as an activity that responds to both opportunity-cost scenarios and parenting ideologies and beliefs.

In the different empirical chapters of the doctoral dissertation, I have attempted to shed light on different explanatory mechanisms (or associations) of parental care involvement in post-industrial
societies\textsuperscript{33}. Each empirical section of the thesis (Chapters 2, 3, 4) has contributed to some extent to the general academic debate on parenting and children’s lives. As I have pointed out in Chapter 1 (“General Introduction”), for each empirical chapter I have followed a two-fold criterion: (i) the production of knowledge applied to the theoretical and empirical literature on parenting and children’s lives; (ii) the aim of filling at least one gap in the empirical literature on parenting, family life, and children.

This general conclusion is organized as follows. First, I provide a summary of the main findings and implications of the three empirical chapters (Chapter 2, 3, 4). Finally, I close this general conclusion by presenting an agenda for future research that is related to the analytical scope of this doctoral dissertation.

5.2. Summary of Chapter Two

In Chapter 2 ("Parental Care Involvement in Britain, Denmark, Flanders, and Spain: Employment and Education") I explored four European countries with different institutional, demographic, and cultural characteristics. I paid particular attention to the analysis of how parental employment and education affect child-rearing behaviors under different national scenarios. Education is considered a marker of different child-rearing conceptions (Bianchi, Milkie, & Robinson, 2006). In addition, scholars have argued that

\textsuperscript{33} I recognize that in some parts of this dissertation I use a causal language, when my results provide correlations that do not necessary express a theoretical causality. Yet, the reason of this jargon is essentially explained by the different hypotheses that have been presented along the three empirical chapters.
the effects of education on parental care involvement could be mediated by specific employment characteristics (Bianchi et al., 2004; Sayer, et al., 2004). Yet, previous studies have not examined the extent to which education affects parental care time, after taking into account how education intersects with paid work time characteristics. This analytical strategy is important to disentangling the mechanisms through which education is correlated with parental care time allocation.

The four countries included in Chapter 2 cluster with different contexts in terms of family-work balance; these cases also represent different gender regimes (Esping-Andersen, 1990, 2009; Esping-Andersen et al., 2010; Fuwa, 2004; Geist, 2005; Ghysels, 2004; Gornick & Meyers, 2003; Gutierrez-Domenech, 2010; Lewis, 2009; O’Connor, Orloff, & Shaver, 1999; Orloff, 1996).

In Spain and the UK, public institutions provide weak family universal support while full-time workers typically face important time-constraints to balancing work and parenting. Nonetheless, in Britain, female part-time employment has been significantly promoted. In this country more than 40% of women in the labor force are employed as part-time workers. In contrast, in Spain, the male breadwinner model remains significantly widespread across society, with another quite large group of couples where both partners have a full-time contract. In Spain, unlike in Britain, the ‘one-and-a-half model’ has never been included as part of any structural family policy. Flanders, like the UK, is a country with a large group of mothers working as part-time employees, but it has
stronger family-friendly policies than Britain or Spain. Denmark, as a Scandinavian country, with a Social-democratic tradition, has developed active family policies to promote the dual-earner/dual-career model. In terms of gender policies and norms, Spain is the country with the most traditional context; Denmark has the most gender egalitarian one. Britain and Flanders, despite some policy differences, are somewhere in between Denmark and Spain regarding gender equity in the household.

The main results of Chapter 2 can be summarized as follows. First of all, my multivariate statistical analyses (OLS Regressions) show that Danish fathers employed as full-time workers are significantly more likely to balance employment and parenting than their British and Spanish counterparts. Flemish fathers also appear to be significantly more likely to balance fathering and employment than their British and Spanish counterparts, though showing lower levels of work-parenting balance than their Danish counterparts. These results are line with previous scholarship suggesting that institutional contexts have an effect on fathers’ participation in domestic work and child care (Hook, 2006; Sullivan, Coltrane, McAnnally, & Altintas, 2009). In other words, the micro and macro level conditions for reconciling parenting and employment appear to predict actual paternal care time in these four European countries (Gornick & Meyers, 2003). Yet, in all four countries, mothers’ full-time work had a strong negative effect on child care time. Although the sex ratio in child care time varied across these four countries (3.1 in Spain; 2.5 in the UK; 2 in Flanders; 1.9 in Denmark), in all four countries mothers were found to undertake the lion’s share of
child care time, even in Denmark, the most gender egalitarian country of these four cases.

Regarding the interaction of education and paid work time, the effect of maternal education on mothers’ child care time remained strong in Britain and Spain, intermediate in Flanders, and insignificant in Denmark. This suggests that in those countries with educational differences in maternal care time, the observed educational variations are not explained by a selection of mothers with higher levels of education in paid work time categories which have lower levels of time-pressure. For fathers, in contrast, more mixed results were observed in relation to education: an education gradient in child-rearing was only observed for Spain. Yet, differences in paid work time were not found to alter the effects of education on paternal care time.

5.3. Summary of Chapter Three

In Chapter 3 (“Fathers’ Child Care Time and Children’s Developmental Stages in Spain”), I examined how fathers’ child care involvement diverges across children’s developmental stages. For this chapter, I conducted analyses using data from the “2003 Spanish Time Use Survey”. I focused on heterosexual couples, since part of the empirical motivation was on how fathers respond to their wives’ employment characteristics. In order to capture variations in fathering across children’s ages, I studied three different subsamples. One subsample included infants and young preschoolers (with a child aged 0 to 2); in the second subsample the
The youngest child was an older preschooler (aged 3 to 5); in the third subsample the youngest child of the household was enrolled in primary school (aged 6 to 11).

The theoretical and empirical motivation of this chapter was two-fold: (i) to examine the extent to which education affects fathering in activities with different implications for child development at different developmental stages; (ii) to examine whether men’s child care behaviors in Spain are responsive to their wives’ employment, especially in the most time-demanding and female-typed child care activities (Craig, 2006) and in families with different child care demands (with children of different ages). My multivariate statistical analyses (Linear and Logistic Regressions) were applied for three dependent variables: (i) “physical care” (i.e. feeding, bathing, putting children to bed); (ii) “interactive care” (i.e. playing, conversations with children); (iii) “teaching” (explicitly educational care activities). Whereas interactive child care activities have been identified with a more pleasant and flexible child care, physical activities are considered the most time-consuming, energy-demanding, and female-typed ones (Craig, 2006). In addition, research on early childhood development has documented how each developmental stage in children’s early life course is associated with specific children’s needs of parental support (Pleck, 2010; Waldfogel, 2006).

My empirical findings in Chapter 3 reveal that college-educated fathers are significantly involved in physical care activities with infants and toddlers when these father-child activities are crucial for
children’s subsequent developmental stages (Pleck, 2010). For interactive and teaching care, a significant education gradient emerged when children were aged 3 to 5, a period in which the acquisition of rich conceptual, verbal, and social skills is a determinant for later scholastic achievement (Gelman, 2008). Finally, in families with preschoolers, Spanish fathers significantly increased their absolute and relative contribution to physical care when their wives were employed. This finding has important implications to understand gender relations in Spain.

Finally, the findings presented in Chapter 3 show significantly different parenting practices across parents with different levels of education. In line with McLanahan’s (2004) argument my results imply that behaviors associated with the Second Demographic Transition (like changing gender roles within couples) diverge across social groups. In this sense, Spanish college-educated fathers appear to be the ones that have primarily internalized the norms of intensive parenting in age-specific activities that are associated with children’s present and future development.

5.4. Summary of Chapter Four

For Chapter 4 ("Diverging Parenting and Family Time in Post-industrial Britain: Education, Class, and Occupations"), I explored time-diary data for British couples with children. Using the “2000 British Time Use Survey”, I examined the quality of time that parents allocated to specific cultural and social activities with their children. Not only was my analytical focus on parent-child
interactions, but on the quality and quantity of family leisure time, an issue that has received little attention in the literature. Drawing on Lareau’s (2003) theoretical framework, I examined to what extent education and class are important explanatory variables of parents’ cultural and social activities with their children. In addition, I studied whether fathers employed in post-industrial sectors are more likely to conform to contemporary norms of involved fathering (Alwin, 2004) than their counterparts employed in other sectors.

The empirical analyses that I conducted for Chapter 4 focused on a wide range of activities that are associated with children’s socio-cultural development. A few studies with large quantitative data have analyzed how parents of different levels of education and social class are involved in their children’s activities (Yeung et al., 2001), yet this line of research has been rare, restricted to the American case, and characterized by omitting the couple-level dimension. A crucial question that motivated this chapter was: Is Lareau’s ethnographic study with American data consistent with the reality of British families? Furthermore, previous research has not investigated the extent to which differences between post-industrial and industrial occupations (e.g., Bell, 1973; Esping-Andersen, 1993), like distinct interpersonal relations, types of authority, hierarchies, and quotidian interpersonal relationships, are correlated with differences in men’s participation in different child care activities.
The findings presented in Chapter 4 are derived from multivariate statistical analyses (Logistic and Linear Regressions), including a rich variety of parents’ cultural and social activities with children. My statistical analyses show that parental education and social class have a significant positive effect on parents’ involvement in child care and socio-cultural activities with children. In contrast, watching TV is negatively correlated with education and class, although significant effects were only observed among college-educated fathers and amongst women in professional occupations. As regards family time, my findings show that families headed by two college-educated parents were the most active in all the enriching activities associated with Lareau’s (2003) concept of concerned cultivation. These types of activities include family leisure, family meals, culturally oriented activities, and social life activities involving both parents and children. These results can be interpreted in light of different parenting styles and strategies for child development across the educational and social ladder.

Finally, the empirical analyses presented in Chapter 4 show that fathers employed in post-industrial occupations are more involved in child care and socio-cultural activities with children than those employed in industrial occupations. These differences are consistent across fathers with the same level of education and after looking at both weekday and (non-working) weekend diaries. The observed differences in parenting across different economic sectors open an interesting line of research within the scholarship on men’s family behaviors in advanced societies. These findings notwithstanding, future research should further investigate the implications of the
mentioned results for other unpaid work activities with specific gender-typed implications, such as housework activities.

5.5. Future Lines of Research

This thesis has focused on some specific empirical questions on parental care involvement within and across countries. My empirical analyses, I believe, have contributed to the scholarship on parenting and family research in contemporary advanced societies. Notwithstanding these contributions, one can find a number of critical questions that have not been addressed here and should be considered in future research. I will mention three lines of research that, in my opinion, could complement the theoretical and empirical background of this dissertation.

A first line of scholarship for future studies deals with an extension of the cross-national literature on parental care time. In Chapter 2, I studied how education and employment are associated with parental care involvement. I concentrated, in part, on how welfare states and gender regimes affect parental care time. Yet I have not examined different types of child care (physical vs. non-physical), as it has been investigated in related studies focused on the same countries of study (Gracia, Ghysels, & Vercammen, 2011), nor have I explored in a comparative perspective whether married parents do child care

---

34 As it has mentioned in Chapter 1, the motivation (but also most of the empirical results) of this doctoral dissertation have important social and policy level implications. Nevertheless, in this chapter, I have opted for presenting my results, in order to contribute to the cumulative knowledge about parenting, which, overall, is determinant for any public policy debate.
alone, nor if parents synchronize their child care activities, as a result of their specific micro-level and macro-level circumstances.

Following recent cross-national literature on child care time (Craig & Mullan, 2010, 2011; Gauthier, Furstenberg, & Smeeding, 2004; Hook & Wolfe, 2011; Roeters, 2011; Sayer, Gauthier, & Furstenberg, 2004; Sayer & Gornick, 2011; Sullivan et al., 2009), one can argue that a more specific focus on different dimensions of child care is important to capturing how parental care operates across countries. A multidimensional approach to parenting, like the one adopted in Chapter 3, might provide a more complex understanding of child well-being, family-work strains, and gender equity in different countries.

Indeed, future research should further investigate how cultural, institutional, and socioeconomic contexts affect fathers’ child care responsibilities associated with gender egalitarianism in the household. Examples of these activities include solo child care, routine child care or father’s share of the couple’s child care time. Only a few cross-national studies (Craig & Mullan, 2011; Hook & Wolfe, 2011) have pursued this line of investigation. The aforementioned studies, however, have not adopted a multilevel approach, nor have they covered most of the countries that can be studied using representative time-diary data. This analytical strategy should shed light on how the division of child care varies across countries with different family-work contexts and levels of gender equity in the home. A particular focus on families with infants and toddlers, when the traditional division of labor is strongest and
women suffer a more pervasive economic penalty (Aisenbrey, Grunow, & Evertsson, 2009; Schober, 2012), would also be important to better understanding fathering across different countries.

A second important agenda for future research is the specific focus on children’s diaries. A rational follow-up from the empirical results of Chapters 3 and 4 is the following research question: what are the consequences of diverging parental involvement across social groups on the way children spend their time and how is it related to behavioral, academic, and intellectual outcomes? As Bianchi and Robinson (1997: 332) put it, “the interrelated notions of human capital development and social capital suggest that how children spend their time is important, and that parental (and community) resources may be critical in determining which children engage in activities that enhance intellectual growth, encourage responsibility, and generally steer children toward a productive adulthood”.

A growing body of literature has analyzed children’s daily routines and how children’s daily lives are associated with parents’ behaviors and family characteristics (Bianchi & Robinson, 1997; Cardoso, Monfardini, & Fontainha, 2010; Del Boca, Flinn, & Wiswall, 2010; Hofferth, 2010; Mullan, 2009; Yeung et al., 2001). This line of research is a necessary step to better understanding the process of child development from a sociological and demographic perspective. In order to illustrate whether childhood socialization varies in the way that has been described by Lareau (2003), and also
in line with my own analyses with British time-diary data (see Chapter 4), family and stratification scholars should further explore children’s diaries. Drawing on my own empirical analyses, a necessary research question for future research is the following: are British and Spanish children from different social backgrounds involved in different activities with distinct implications for their future cultural, human, economic, and social capital? This empirical question is relevant for the sociological debate on the conditions under which polarization in children’s destinies is occurring across different post-industrial societies (Esping-Andersen, 2009; McLanahan, 2004).

The third promising line of scholarship that is derived from this doctoral dissertation is a profound study of men’s domestic work roles across occupational categories. My analyses with British data suggest that the sociological and economic changes in post-industrial societies could be associated with differences in men’s gender roles, at least with regard to parenting behaviors. In many respects, the idea that different types of masculinities vary across occupations and social classes is not new in the literature (Coltrane, 2000; Schrock & Schwalbe, 2009). Yet, an implicit question in my dissertation deals with whether or not variations in gender-typed occupations (i.e. more or less female-dominated) are correlated with men’s behaviors towards unpaid work, a question that has received very little attention in previous literature. In this sense, a focus on how men’s gender-typed behaviors vary across occupations could include other domestic activities, such as routine and non-routine child care and housework activities which are associated with
distinct levels of gender equity (Craig, 2006; Hook, 2010). Both qualitative and quantitative research could help us to understand the extent to which individuals’ social relations at the workplace affect men’s ‘gender display’ towards specific female-typed behaviors.

Therefore, if variations across occupational sectors were to exist in different domains of men’s family roles, an important question that would emerge is: can we assume that differentials in men’s unpaid work behaviors across occupations stem from men’s previous selections within the occupational structure (i.e. interpersonal skills, personality traits, previous biography) or from distinct, daily work experiences derived from men’s interpersonal relations at the workplace? The question of how the workplace affects people’s identities and behaviors is an old sociological question. Nonetheless, in my opinion, this question has not been fully explained when exploring men’s family behaviors in post-industrial societies. This research question, which is well-suited within the time use empirical literature, motivates future quantitative and qualitative research on gender relations in post-industrial societies.
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