

# The modern husband/father and wife/mother— how do they spend their time?

Jens Bonke

## Introduction

One often-debated aspect of the issue of gender equality is the movement towards increasing homogeneity in how people use their time: i.e. the assumption that male behaviour and attitudes are becoming closer to those of women in terms of how they allocate their time for household chores, while women are becoming ever more labour-market oriented. Whether this constitutes modernity, however, is an open-ended question, as this concept is usually unclear and there are only a few major empirical studies.

In this article, modernity is interpreted as a phenomenon characterised by an equal allocation of time between husbands and wives as well as fathers and mothers— or more specifically, the allocation of time outside the labour market. Hence, we recognise the attachment to the labour market as a prerequisite for other time allocations, thereby excluding variations in working conditions on the labour market, which we found to be an immense issue in and of itself. Thus, we are only studying the allocation of time within the so-called 'private sphere', this being a more unrestricted area of behaviour than is the labour market. Moreover, applying the actual allocation of time spent on household chores and leisure-time activities allows for focusing solely on revealed preferences and rules out concealed preferences/attitudes.

The findings refer to the *Danish Time-use Surveys* of 1987 and 2001, and thereby to the behaviour of men and women living within a family-friendly welfare state. The hypothesis, therefore, is that if modernity is measured as approaching an equal distribution of time, the most appropriate model to study is the Scandinavian welfare state.

## The labour market—a prerequisite for modernity

During the last few decades, the amount of time men and women have spent on the labour market has become more and more equalised. In 1987, men spent an average of 4¾ hours on paid work, including commuting time, on an average day— weekdays and weekends alike— whereas women only spent 3¼ hours at the workplace. In 2001, the difference became smaller, i.e. men worked 5 hours and women nearly 4 hours per day (see Table 1).

That women spent more time on paid work is due to the fact that more women have become part of the labour market, with participation rates approaching that of men. Furthermore, women's part-time work has decreased considerably during the past few decades, from about 29% in 1989 to 17% in 2000. Combining these two effects, one finds that they have outweighed the effect of negotiated general working-time reductions for full-time workers within the same period. This is especially surprising for men, because their attachment to the labour market has always primarily been as full-time workers.

Taking into consideration the improvement in economic cyclical fluctuations over the same period and the improved educational background of the labour force— the latter usually functioning as a determinant of labour supply— the increase in the work supplied by men and women becomes more moderate. This, however, does not imply that there has been no trend towards modernity in terms of women's and men's labour-market behaviour; it only shows that the effects of structural changes take some time to catch on.

## The home as the place to practise modernity

The modern father is often recognised as an equal partner in the marriage, as he spends the same number of hours as the mother does on household chores and on childcare. The modern mother, on the other hand, also does her share of the housework and childcare while

concurrently making her own career on the labour market. The implicit assumption is that the husband also has a career, but that by participating on equal terms with his wife in domestic chores, he allows her to do the same. Moreover, making a career for themselves enables women to have a stronger say in family decision-making, including bargaining on time use, which in turn encourages an ever further development towards modernity.

By looking at the distribution of different combinations of spousal labour supply, we can get an idea of the extension of modern families (see Table 2). First of all, we find that every fourth couple is of the old-fashioned type, with a full-time working individual— the breadwinner— and a part-time individual— the homemaker. Moreover, another 13% shows an even more marked differential in intra-household time distribution, i.e. one person works more and the other one less than 37 hours a week. The most common, however, is that two out of every five couples consist of two full-time working spouses. The number of career families or modern families where neither partner works less than 37 hours a week is 21%, out of which one third is considered to be dual-career families.

Looking at the development of the average amount of time women and men spend on household chores, we still find an unequal distribution (see Table 1). While women now spend 3½ hours per week on housework, men only spend 2½ hours— a smaller differential than in 1987, when similar figures were 3 hours for women and 1¼ hours for men. The implication is that, although men have increased their contribution considerably, women have— contrary to expectations— done the same, which results in only a minor decrease in gender-related differentials in the performance of household chores. However, the applied figures should be treated with caution, as the time use in 2001 was registered in 10-minute intervals, whereas 15-minute intervals were used in 1987 (Bonke 2002).

Another way of illustrating the distribution of time spent on household chores is to perform calculations on a weekly basis. This implies that nearly half of all women spent more than 15 hours per week on such activities, whereas this holds true for only every fifth man. At the other end of the scale, we find that spending less than 5 hours per week is what every fourth man does, compared to only every twelfth woman (see Table 3).

If housework is divided into different categories of tasks, i.e. housework and fix-it chores, we find a considerable division of labour between spouses. While women spent 2 hours 11 minutes on housework, men spent only 1 hour 9 minutes; whereas the opposite distribution is found for fix-it jobs, i.e. women spent an average of 10 minutes and men 31 minutes (see Table 4).

Besides the number of hours spent on housework and fix-it jobs, there are also variations in terms of both the frequency and timing of that work. While housework has to be done on an everyday basis, most fix-it jobs are more flexible, meaning that it is easier for the person doing it to schedule it at his/her convenience. Moreover, such housework as food preparation and dishwashing need to be done at fixed times during the day, not to mention caring for small children, which is probably the most time-restricted and inflexible activity within a family. Hence, four out of five women and only three out of five men prepare food on an average day, and the time spent on this activity by the active ones is 54 and 38 minutes respectively. Furthermore, half of all women and only a third of all men do the dishes (see Table 5). These factors might explain why fewer women than men choose a career on the labour market (Bonke et al. 2005) and why the development of a more modern lifestyle is rather moderate in terms of the number of men and women fitting that description.

In caring for children as well, we find large gender differentials, given that three out of four mothers and three out of five fathers are engaged in some form or another of caring on a given day. Among these parents, active mothers spend nearly 2 hours on childcare, as opposed to 1¼ hours for fathers (see Table 5). If not all parents provide care on a randomly chosen day, the explanation is that they might not be at home that day and/or that children include 0–18-year-olds who live with their parents.

Household chores— housework and childcare— of preschoolers' parents (i.e. children < 7 years) take up 7½ hours per day, whereas the parents of school-age children (7–14 years) spend 6¼ hours doing these domestic chores. Older couples without children, where the wife is over 44, spend 6½ hours on housework, whereas young couples, where the wife is under 45, spend only 4½ (see Table 6). The smallest division of labour appears between young couples without children, whereas there is no variation in the spouses' share of housework between the other groups. However, if the division of labour is measured by a segregation index with a value of 0 if both participates on equal terms in all household activities, and 1 if all activities are only performed by one spouse, couples with small children specialise the most, followed by couples with older children. Specialisation is moderate among couples without children (see Table 6). Time pressures within families with children are certainly the reason why they specialise in housework to a greater degree.

Many studies have shown that education influences time use (cf. Bonke 1999), where the explanation is either that human capital positively affects the wage rate and thereby the number of hours spent on the labour market substituting housework, or that education brings about positive changes in cultural understanding and the search for equity. This seems to be confirmed by Table 7, where women's share of housework is found to be smallest in families where the wife has a greater educational background, and where there is less segregation— though not significantly less— than in other families. Highly educated women spend less time doing housework, mostly because of their higher income and thereby increased ability to purchase services, as well as their preference for equity within the family.

### **Equity and fairness**

The above findings question the modernity thesis, saying that both women and men are now allocating their time the same way. An interesting question is, however, whether there is a trade-off within the family, meaning that women's greater participation in housework is compensated for by a higher level of personal consumption. If spouses thus have the same bargaining power, one might expect that an uneven distribution in one dimension might be compensated for by an uneven distribution in another.

Comparing the proportion of household chores done by women with the proportion of their personal consumption, we find no divergence with only 38% of all couples: the diagonal in Table 8 indicates that fair bargaining takes place. In nearly half of the couples (46%), the woman's level of personal consumption is lower than what she would be entitled to on the basis of her contribution in term of housework; whereas for 16% of the couples, the wife is 'overcompensated' for her extensive performance at home. This indicates that there is still a long way to go before the modern family defined by equity and/or fair sharing of resources becomes reality.

### **Variations in the performance of household chores**

Not very surprisingly, housework varies during the week. Neither is it surprising that the weekend is used for activities not performed during weekdays (see Table 9). There are some gender differentials, however, in the weekly timing of this work. For men, Saturday is their compensatory day, with an increase in housework of more than 2 hours, i.e. from 2 to 2½ hours on ordinary weekdays to 3½ hours on a Saturday. For women, their contribution increases from 3¼ to 3½ hours to about 4 hours on both weekend days. The explanation probably is that on ordinary weekdays, men as well as women already spend from 8½ to 9 hours on both paid and unpaid (house)work, which is why there is no space for any increase in housework. Men's weekly variation being larger than that of women is certainly also due to the fact that male-oriented fix-it work is more flexible than is female-oriented housework, which has to be done on an everyday basis.

Among housework activities, shopping is one of the less gender-specific activities. On an average day, between 44% and 50% of both men and women go shopping, whereas only 18% shop on Sundays, mostly due to stores' restricted opening hours (see Table 10). Relatively few men go shopping during the first three days of the week or on Saturdays, whereas men go shopping as frequently as women on Thursdays. Many men also go shopping on Fridays and Sundays. Thus, men go shopping less frequently than do women, who on the other hand distribute this activity more evenly during the week.

Going shopping together does not happen very often. Only 10–12% of couples do this, Fridays and Saturdays being exceptions when every seventh and every fourth couple (18% and 25%, respectively) go shopping together.

### **Caring as a priority activity**

In the public debate, it is often argued that modern fathers and mothers do not see their children very much, because the children are either in childcare institutions or at school, or because they are sleeping. This study, however, does not confirm these statements (see Table 11). The time fathers spend on children in families with 1–6-year-olds (children under a year of age being excluded, given that maternity, paternity and parental leave provide a misleading picture) is on average 1 hour of direct care and 5 hours of indirect care, i.e. the child and the father are together in leisure-time activities or are doing housework together. For mothers, the number of hours spent on childcare is calculated at 2 hours of direct and 7 hours of indirect care.

Obviously, the amount of time spent on childcare decreases with the age of the child (see Table 11). Thus, fathers in families where the youngest child is between 7 and 15 provide an average of half an hour of direct care and 3¼ hours of indirect care, whereas mothers provide an hour of direct care and 4½ hours of indirect care. When aggregating the figures, the total is 9 hours of care by the mother and 6 by the father in families with children from 1 to 6; in families where the youngest child is of school age, the concurrent figures are 4½ and 5½ hours per day. This shows that, although the mother is more active than the father in terms of childcare, and this care decreases as the children grow, parents still spend a considerable number of hours on childcare in the family-friendly Danish welfare state.

The time parents spend on caring depends on the time they spend in the labour market, which is the usual argument for reducing the number of hours spent on the job— especially in terms of the number of hours that women spend doing paid work. There is, however, no evidence of this relationship. In terms of parents of preschool children who work a combined 74 hours a week, the time spent on direct and indirect childcare is more than that of similar parents working fewer hours on the labour market, i.e. 7½ hours a week among dual-career parents as opposed to 7 hours for parents working 38–73 hours, and 6½ hours for single-earner families (37 hours) (see Table 12). The explanation is to be found in the time spent on indirect care, as the variation in direct care is insignificant. This implies that career-oriented parents pay more attention to spending time together with their small children. On the other hand, when the children grow up and reach school age, the dual-career parents spend fewer hours with their children than do other parents.

Educational background is also expected to correlate with childcare, because a positive correlation exists between education and labour supply. In families where the mother has a lower level of education, however, we find more time dedicated to childcare than in families with more educated wives (8 hours versus 6¼ hours a week) (see Table 13). Again indirect care makes the difference. When looking at the number of parents who receive help from people outside the family, we find that families where the mother has no or a moderate level of education get the most help. Payment for this help, however, is much more widespread among families where the mother has more education (28%) than among families where the mother has no education at all (14%).

### **Togetherness in modern families**

Modernity is often being characterised by individuality and a fragmented life. The stereotype is a family where one spouse arrives and the other departs, illustrating the highest possible level of specialisation of housework and the lowest degree of spousal togetherness.

If togetherness is measured as the number of evenings where family members declare that they have a chance to spend time together because they neither have to go to work nor join any regular leisure-time activities, half of all families with children have at least five such evenings during a given week, and two out of three of these families at least four evenings off (see Table 14).

Saturdays and Sundays are included in these calculations, although they are togetherness days for most families. When excluding these days, we find that a third of all families with children (32%) has one ordinary weekday, and half of the families two ordinary days as the maximum time available for family socialising, i.e. togetherness. We do not know whether this is due to paid work obligations or regular leisure time activities or the like, nor do we know whether limitations on togetherness are seen as a problem by these families. The only thing we may conclude is that evenings are available for family socialising activities, and that the number of such evenings has remained the same in the period from 1987–2001.

Time devoted to family socialising activities is restricted, whereas this is not necessarily the case in terms of time spent on people outside the family (see Table 15). When asked about time spent this way during the past four weeks, adults up to 45 report that they spent about 12 or 13 hours; the 46–70-year-olds, 17 hours; and elderly people— the 61–74-year-olds— nearly 21 hours. For most of these people, helping neighbours/friends or colleagues is the most widespread way of spending time, although the frequency decreases with the helper's age. The next group of receivers is 'other people'; and among younger cohorts, every fourth person has helped their parents within the past four weeks. For those over 45, nearly every third person has helped their children who no longer live at home, whereas only every eighth of the 46–60-year-olds and every fifth 60–74-year-old have helped their grandchildren within the past four weeks.

Our findings show that intergenerational help is more moderate than that given to neighbours/friends/colleagues. Whether this is because relatives live further away and the grandparents themselves are still on the job, or because it is more satisfying to be together with and help other people, are open-ended questions.

### **Leisure time and modernity**

Besides social activities, there are a number of other activities in which people are involved during their time off. These are activities such as sleep, personal care, eating, and scheduled leisure-time activities, where the social dimension is more or less present.

We know from many studies (see, for example, Biddle & Hamermesh 1990) that women sleep more than men. We find these findings confirmed for ordinary weekdays, whereas we do not find any gender differentials for weekend days in terms of sleeping (see Table 16). Moreover, the average time for going to bed is the same for both women and men, i.e. about 11 p.m., for which reason it is during the hours after midnight that we find more women asleep than men. Personal care is an activity on which women spend more time than men, especially in the morning when getting ready for work. The average amount of time women spend on their 'morning toilette' is about half an hour, whereas men spend only 20 minutes. During the day, the number of hours increases from 45 minutes for men to an hour for women.

We found no gender differentials in terms of the amount of time spent on eating, except for breakfast on an ordinary day being somewhat shorter for women than for men. The aggregate amount of time spent on eating on an average weekday is about 1¼ hours for both men and women, increasing to about 2¼ hours for both on weekends, with evening dinner as the top scorer at an overall average of 50–60 minutes. We do need to mention, however, that more than

every seventh person, regardless of gender, does not spend time on breakfast during the weekdays, that more than every fourth does not eat lunch, and every eighth does not eat in the evening (see Table 17). The explanation for not having regular meals might be that men and women nowadays are too busy to remember to eat! Another explanation is that eating is not always reported as a primary activity (see Bonke 2002) because it takes place alongside other activities.

When focusing on leisure-time activities at home, watching TV and listening to music or the radio are the most widespread, with three out of every four people doing one of them on any given day. Socialising at home ranks second, with between half and two-thirds doing it, and reading finishes third with nearly half of all adults reading on an average day (see Table 18). Among the readers, handymen, TV-viewers, radio- and music-listeners, and IT-users, men spend more time on these activities than do women. Moreover, if we look at the time that the average man— active and non-active alike— spends on all leisure-time activities at home, it is somewhat more than that of the average woman, i.e. 3½ hours per week versus 3¼.

A similar picture emerges in terms of leisure-time activities outside the home, where men spend 2¼ hours and women about 2 hours per week. The activities dominated by men are participation in associations/clubs, volunteer work, exercise and sports, whereas socialising is mostly done by women in the sense that more women than men participate in it, though active men spend more time socialising than do most women. This picture illustrates that men have more leisure time than women do.

Participation in regular leisure-time activities is sometimes seen as being a sign of quality of life. The argument is that these activities allow for thinking about things other than the workplace and thereby are seen as a manifestation of a multifaceted, modern life.

The time available to a person is also an important determinant of her/his participation in regular leisure activities, shown by the fact that many older people are active in this regard, i.e. two out of three 61–74-year-olds are active as opposed to about 50–55% from other age groups. The number of hours spent at work also plays a role, because it reduces the participation rate in regular leisure activities (see Table 19). Within the different age groups, however, the picture is less explicit, as the 31–45-year-olds and 46–60-year-olds who work 37 hours a week are less active in regular pastimes than are similar people who spend either more or less time on the job. The absolute level of participation in regular leisure-time activities for women and men during their career phase— i.e. 31–45 year-olds— nonetheless illustrates that they do spend time on activities outside work. This holds true even for people who work more than 37 hours a week, out of whom every second individual participates in some sort of regular pastime.

### **Quality time**

The ultimate measure of quality time is shown through people's satisfaction with it. Quality time spent at work is one thing that, among others, is hard to measure because an economic reward is involved. This is also the case in terms of housework, where the reward is in kind. The quality of leisure time is somehow simpler to measure because it is usually assumed to be proportional to the quantity of leisure time. However, there has been an intense debate about quality time spent on childcare. The argument is that it is not the quantity but rather the quality that matters, i.e. the way parents spend time with their children is not just a matter of hours.

In the following, we refer to self-reported satisfaction with leisure time, stemming from a question in the Danish Time-use Survey. Not surprisingly, the number of hours spent on pastimes has a positive effect on a person's level of satisfaction with it (see Table 21). Thus, if the leisure time is less than 5 hours a day, only every second individual will be satisfied or very satisfied, whereas three out of five people having 5–8 hours of leisure time a day will be satisfied or very satisfied; and among people with more than 10 hours of leisure time, two out of every three will be satisfied or very satisfied. However, if we add up the somehow satisfied, satisfied and very satisfied,

we find that nine out of ten Danes (92%) are satisfied with their daily leisure time, though they spend more time working than ever before. This seems to indicate that there is a higher preference for work than for leisure time nowadays.

### **Conclusion**

The article focuses on modernity as a phenomenon characterised by equal time allocation between husbands and wives as well as between fathers and mothers— and more precisely, time allocated outside the labour market. If men and women spend the same amount of time on various activities, this emerges as an indicator of modernity in private life. Since the empirical findings refer to the Danish Time-use Surveys of 1987 and 2001, the degree of modernity is measured within a family-friendly welfare-state perspective.

Within the past few decades, we find men's and women's use of time becoming more similar. This means that women spend more time on the labour market and men spend more time doing housework. In addition, a higher level of education coupled with a preference for equity helps explain this development. Nonetheless, if we look behind these overall figures, a more mixed picture emerges.

If we measure the number of modern families solely by their attachment to the labour market, we find that every fourth couple still belongs to the old-fashioned type, i.e. a full-time working person— the breadwinner— and a part-time working person— the homemaker. Another 13% display an even more substantial differential in the intra-household distribution of time, i.e. one person works more and the other less than 37 hours a week. The most common group, however, is two full-time working spouses (two out of every five couples), followed by truly modern families where no partner works less than 37 hours a week. These families made up 21% of all families in 2001.

Moreover, we find that the time men and women spend on housework is still unequally distributed, though men have increased their contribution considerably. This is, however, also the case for women, with the implication that only a minor decrease in gender-related differentials in terms of doing housework has emerged since the end of the 1980s.

Housework specialisation also prevails with regard to women doing more housework than men, and men more fix-it jobs than women. This specialisation is also present when dividing housework into cooking, dishwashing, cleaning, etc. In terms of childcare, we find that three out of every four mothers and three out of every five fathers are engaged in childcare in one way or another on any random day, and active mothers spend more time on it than do fathers. Some rather interesting findings, however, show that career-oriented parents pay more attention to spending time with their small children than do non-career families. On the other hand, once the children reach school age, dual-career parents spend fewer hours with their children than do other parents.

Regarding leisure time, we find that men's activities are dominated by participation in associations/clubs, volunteer work, exercise and sports, whereas more women than men participate in socialising. Active men, however, spend more time on socialising than do most women. This picture illustrates that men have more leisure time than women do.

We find that, although the mother is more active than the father in terms of caring for the children, — and despite the fact that this care decreases as the children grow up— parents still spend a considerable amount of time caring for their children.

The overall conclusion is that we still have a long way to go before an equal distribution of time is the case for a majority of families, and that the term 'modernisation' is not yet the most appropriate way of characterising the Danish welfare state.

## References

- Biddle, J. & Hamermesh, D. (1990): Sleep and the allocation of time. In: *Journal of Political Economy* 98 (5). Pp. 83–921.
- Blair, S. L. & Lichter, D. T. (1991): Measuring the division of household labour. In: *Journal of Family Issues* 12 (1). Pp. 91–113.
- Bonke, J. (1999): Education, work and gender. An international comparison. In: Hufton, O. & Kravaritou, Y. (eds.): *Gender and the Use of Time*. The Hague: Kluwer. Pp. 297–2318.
- Bonke, J. (2002): Time and welfare (in Danish). Report 02:26. Copenhagen: The Danish National Institute of Social Research.
- Bonke, J., Gupta, N. & Smith, N. (2005): Timing and flexibility of housework and men and women's wages. In: Hamermesh, D. & Pfann, G. (eds.): *The economics of time use*. Elsevier: Amsterdam.

## Annex: Tables

Table 1:  
How men and women allocate their time  
(1987, 2001\*)

	1987		2001	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
	<i>Minutes: average minutes per day</i>			
<b>Primary needs</b>	9:51	10:15 <sup>1</sup>	10:31 <sup>a</sup>	10:54 <sup>1,a</sup>
<b>All work</b>	6:23	6:21	7:31	7:40
- Gross working time	4:45	3:18 <sup>1</sup>	5:02 <sup>c</sup>	3:53 <sup>1,a</sup>
- Housework	1:38	3:03 <sup>1</sup>	2:26 <sup>a</sup>	3:30 <sup>1,a</sup>
<b>Leisure time</b>	7:28	7:14 <sup>1</sup>	5:57 <sup>a</sup>	5:40 <sup>3,a</sup>
<b>All</b>	23:52	23:55	23:57	23:57
<b>N</b>	1.810	1.779	889	1.065

\* Information from the spring-samples only.

<sup>1,2,3</sup> Difference to men within the same year significant at 0.001, 0.01 and 0.05 level.

<sup>abc</sup> Difference to same sex in 1987 significant at 0.001, 0.01 and 0.05 level

Table 2:  
Spousal labour supply by couples (2001)

Both parents work part- time	Single- breadwinner family	Breadwinner- career family	Both parents work	One- career family	Dual- career family
<37 hours	37 hours	37+ hours	37 hours	37+ hours	37+ hours
<37 hours	<37 hours	<37 hours	37 hours	37 hours	37+ hours
			%		
2	25	13	40	15	6

Table 3:  
Men, women and housework  
(2001)

	Men	Women
	%	%
<b>Time spent on housework per week</b>		
< 5 minutes	24.3	7.3
5–9 minutes	30.3	16.9
10–14 minutes	25.2	29.6
15+ minutes	20.1	46.2
<b>All</b>	99.9	100
<b>N:</b>	900	834

Table 4:  
Men, women and housework  
(1987, 2001\*)

	1987		2001	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
	<i>Minutes: average minutes per day</i>			
<b>Shopping</b>	0:17	0:23 <sup>1</sup>	0:25 <sup>a</sup>	0:31 <sup>2,a</sup>
<b>Housework</b>	0:38	1:56 <sup>1</sup>	1:09 <sup>a</sup>	2:11 <sup>1,a</sup>
<b>Do-it-yourself work</b>	0:36	0:25 <sup>1</sup>	0:31	0:10 <sup>1,a</sup>
<b>Care</b>	0:08	0:18	0:20 <sup>a</sup>	0:37 <sup>1,a</sup>
<b>All activities</b>	1:38	3:03 <sup>1</sup>	2:26 <sup>a</sup>	3:30 <sup>1,a</sup>
<b>N:</b>	1,809	1,784	889	1,065

\* Information from the spring-samples only.

<sup>1,2</sup> Difference to men within the same year significant at 0.001, 0.01 and 0.05 level.

<sup>a</sup> Difference to same sex in 1987 significant at 0.001, 0.01 and 0.05 level.

Table 5:  
Men's and women's time use and participation in chores  
(2001)

	Men		Women	
	<i>Participation</i> %	<i>Time per participant</i> <i>Minutes: average</i> <i>minutes per day</i>	<i>Participation</i> %	<i>Time per participant</i> <i>Minutes: average</i> <i>minutes per day</i>
<i>Shopping</i>	48	1:14	56	1:16
<i>Housework</i> <sup>1</sup>	82	1:21	93	2:17
- Cooking <sup>1</sup>	59	0:38	79	0:54
- Dishwashing/cleaning up <sup>2</sup>	35	0:21	55	0:27
- Cleaning <sup>3</sup>	31	0:45	57	0:50
- Laundry <sup>1</sup>	12	0:32	46	0:46
<i>Fix-it work</i> <sup>1</sup>	30	1:55	15	1:19
<i>Care</i> <sup>1</sup>	25	1:15	32	1:49
<i>All activities</i> <sup>1</sup>	90	2:49	97	3:47
<b>Parents</b>				
<i>Care</i> <sup>1</sup>	60	1:17	74	1:59
- Transporting/picking up children	23	0:48	32	0:56
- Childcare <sup>1</sup>	53	1:01	70	1:33
- Family care	5	0:27	6	0:24

<sup>1,2,3</sup> Gender differentials significant at 0.001, 0.01 and 0.05 level.

Table 6:  
Time and sharing housework— segregation by life stages  
(2001)

	<b>Housework</b>	<b>Women's share</b>	<b>Segregation<sup>1</sup></b>
	<i>Minutes:average minutes per day</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>index (0–1)</i>
Couples without children, wife under 45	4:38	56.3	0.35
Couples with children under 7	7:29	59.5	0.59
Couples with youngest child 7–15	6:14	61.5	0.46
Couples without children, wife over 44	6:35	60.0	0.39

<sup>1</sup> 0 if no division of labour, 1 if complete division of labour (Blair & Lichter 1991).

Table 7:  
Housework— time-sharing and segregation by wife's education level  
(2001)

	<b>Housework</b>	<b>Women's share</b>	<b>Segregation<sup>1</sup></b>
	<i>Minutes:average minutes per day</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Index (0–1)</i>
<b>Education</b>			
- None	6:14	60.1	0.43
- Skilled	6:27	61.4	0.45
- Somewhat highly skilled	5:56	58.4	0.45
- Moderately highly skilled	6:16	59.7	0.45
- Highly skilled	6:00	52.3 <sup>2</sup>	0.47

<sup>1</sup> See footnote, Table 7.

<sup>2</sup> Difference to no education significant at 0.001 level.

Table 8:  
Division of labour for household chores and distribution of personal consumption between  
spouses  
(2001)

		<b>Woman's share of housework</b>					
		<i>&lt;20%</i>	<i>20–</i>	<i>40–</i>	<i>60–</i>	<i>&gt;80%</i>	<i>All</i>
			<i>39%</i>	<i>59%</i>	<i>79%</i>		<i>N</i>
<b>Woman's share of personal consumption</b>							
<20%	<b>(0.0)</b>	(0.3)	1.3	1.2	0.5		56
20–39%	(0.2)	<b>0.5</b>	5.7	6.0	2.8		258
40–59%	0.4	2.0	<b>28.9</b>	17.0	7.1		941
60–79%	0.3	1.0	8.8	<b>7.4</b>	4.2		367
>80%	(0.1)	(0.1)	1.8	1.3	<b>1.1</b>		74
All						100.0	
N	17	67	788	558	266		1,696

( ) <5 observations.

?<sup>2</sup> test significant at 0.001 level.

Table 9:  
Men's and women's housework by weekday (2001)

	<b>Mondays</b>	<b>Tuesdays</b>	<b>Wednesdays</b>	<b>Thursdays</b>	<b>Fridays</b>	<b>Saturdays</b>	<b>Sundays</b>
	<i>Hours:minutes</i>						
<b>Men</b>							
- Housework	2:20	2:05	2:19	2:30	2:35	3:24	2:39
- Housework and paid work (incl. commuting)	8:38	9:14	8:51	9:12	8:03	4:35	3:59
<b>Women</b>							
- Housework	3:30 <sup>1</sup>	3:28 <sup>1</sup>	3:33 <sup>1</sup>	3:19 <sup>1</sup>	4:08 <sup>1</sup>	4:00 <sup>1</sup>	3:35 <sup>1</sup>
- Housework and paid work (incl. commuting)	8:49	8:43	9:04	8:49	8:33	5:11 <sup>2</sup>	4:34 <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup> Difference to men significant at 0.001 and 0.01 levels.

Table 10:  
Single's and couple's shopping during the week (1987, 2001)

	<b>Mondays</b>	<b>Tuesdays</b>	<b>Wednesdays</b>	<b>Thursdays</b>	<b>Fridays</b>	<b>Saturdays</b>	<b>Sundays</b>
	<i>Participation rates</i>						
<b>1987</b>							
<i>Singles and couples</i>	35	35	36	41	48	43	8
<b>2001</b>							
<i>Singles and couples</i>	44	50	51	52	60	57	28
<i>Couples<sup>1</sup></i>							
- Husband alone	26	29	29	44	38	30	21
- Husband and wife together	12	12	12	10	18	25	11
- Woman alone	51	50	46	44	54	50	18

<sup>1</sup> Because men and women can go shopping both alone and together on the same day, the figures do not add up to 100.

Table 11:  
Amount of time fathers and mothers spend on childcare\*  
(couples, 2001)

	<b>Youngest child</b>							
	<b>Age 1–6-</b>				<b>Age 7–15-</b>			
	<i>Direct</i>	<i>Indirect</i>	<i>All care</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Direct</i>	<i>Indirect</i>	<i>All care</i>	<i>N</i>
	<i>Minutes:average minutes per day</i>				<i>Minutes:average minutes per day</i>			
<b>Men</b>	1:12	4:48	6:00	195	0:26	3:45	4:11	193
<b>Women</b>	2:05 <sup>3</sup>	7:03 <sup>3</sup>	9:07 <sup>3</sup>	193	0:56 <sup>3</sup>	4:36 <sup>4</sup>	5:32 <sup>3</sup>	238

\* Direct care when dedicated specifically to the child;  
indirect care when the child is present exclusive of direct care.

<sup>3,4</sup> Difference to men significant at 0.001 and 0.05 levels.

Table 12:  
Hours parents spend on childcare\* in relation to time spent at work  
(couples, 2001)

	<b>Child age 1–6-</b>				<b>Child age 7–15<sup>1</sup></b>			
	<i>Direct</i>	<i>Indirect</i>	<i>All</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Direct</i>	<i>Indirect</i>	<i>All</i>	<i>N</i>
<b>Weekly working hours in primary occupation</b>								
<37 minutes	0:42	6:44	7:26	34	0:11	3:30	3:41	20
37 minutes	0:50	5:48	6:38	48	0:27	4:02	4:29	56
38–73 minutes	0:56	6:07	7:04	112	0:20	4:21	4:42	96
74 minutes	0:43	6:44	7:27	80	0:19	3:58	4:17	104
74+ minutes	0:42	5:53	6:35	62	0:19	4:13	4:32	86
All	0:48	6:13	7:01	338	0:20	4:07	4:27	362

\* See note in Table 11.

Table 13:  
Childcare for 1–6-year-olds by parents and others\*  
(by mother's education, 2001)

	Parental childcare <sup>2</sup>				Childcare by others outside the family (exclusive of institutions)	
	Direct	Indirect	All	N	Received care	Share, who are paying for the received care %
	Minutes:min./average day					
<b>Woman's education</b>						
- None	1:22	5:28	7:10	55	64.4	14.3
- Skilled	1:13	4:48	6:12	139	58.5	21.0
- Somewhat highly skilled	1:51	6:12	8:03	40	59.3	18.8
- Moderately highly skilled	1:39	5:51	7:29	110	63.9	19.6
- Highly skilled	1:52	5:33	7:25	44	60.0	27.8

\* See note, Table 11.

<sup>2</sup> Difference between families with a non-educated and educated woman is significant at 0.05 level concerning all care.

Table 14:  
Number of evenings available for socialising among families with children  
(1987, 2001)

	Number of evenings available for socialising <sup>1</sup>								
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
2001	2.8	4.6	9.9	14.7	16.7	16.6	11.1	23.8	100.2
1987	3.1	2.3	8.3	14.4	17.0	20.1	12.5	22.3	100.0

Table 15:  
Time spent helping others (2001)

	Age					
	16–30	31–45	46–60	61–74	All	
<i>Helped others outside the family within the last 4 weeks</i>					%	
- Parents	26.6	26.8	24.8	5.6	23.7	
- Children no longer living at home	1.0	8.4	29.9	31.0	14.0	
- Grandchildren	0	1.6	12.2	21.4	6.1	
- Neighbours/friends/colleagues	40.4	35.1	25.4	21.4	32.8	
- Other people	36.8	27.6	20.3	14.0	27.4	
	<i>Hours:min. in all</i>	12:02	12:46	16:47	20:53	14:20

Table 16:  
Men's and women's primary needs  
(2001)

	<b>Weekdays</b>		<b>Weekends</b>	
	<i>Men</i> (N: 953)	<i>Women</i> (N: 1098)	<i>Men</i> (N: 903)	<i>Women</i> (N: 1057)
	<i>Minutes:min</i>			
<i>Sleep</i>	7:24	7:39 <sup>1</sup>	8:45	8:47
- Before midnight (12-23.50)	0:57	0:56	0:57	0:52
- After midnight (0-11.50)	6:27	6:43 <sup>1</sup>	7:48	7:55
<i>Personal care</i>	0:46	0:56 <sup>1</sup>	0:46	1:00 <sup>1</sup>
- Morning (0-8.50)	0:24	0:29 <sup>1</sup>	0:16	0:18 <sup>2</sup>
- During the day (9-21.50)	0:13	0:15	0:23	0:32 <sup>1</sup>
- Evening (22-23.50)	0:09	0:11 <sup>1</sup>	0:08	0:10 <sup>1</sup>
<i>Eating</i>	1:47	1:45	2:18	2:19
- Morning (0-10.50)	0:28	0:24 <sup>2</sup>	0:34	0:33
- Lunch (11-15.50)	0:29	0:31	0:43	0:44
- Evening (16-23.50)	0:50	0:50	1:02	1:02
<i>Primary needs total</i>	9:57	10:20 <sup>1</sup>	11:50	12:06 <sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup> Difference to men significant at 0.001, 0.01 and 0.05 levels.

Table 17:  
Proportion of men and women who skip a meal on an average day  
(2001)

	<b>Men</b>		<b>Women</b>	
	<i>Weekdays</i>	<i>Weekend days</i>	<i>Weekdays</i>	<i>Weekend days</i>
	%			
<b><i>Eating</i></b>				
- Breakfast (0–10.50)	17.4	19.6	15.6	14.8
- Lunch (11–15.50)	27.8	20.2	26.3	17.1
- Dinner/Supper (16–23.50)	7.8	11.5	7.8	11.8

Table 18:  
Amount of time men and women spend on leisure activities  
(2001)

	<b>Men (N: 1856)</b>		<b>Women (N: 2155)</b>	
	<i>Participation</i>	<i>Minutes:min. per participant</i>	<i>Participation</i>	<i>Minutes:min. per participant</i>
<b>At home</b>		3:34 <sup>3</sup>		3:15 <sup>3</sup>
- Reading	44.0	1:02	50.3	0:55 <sup>2</sup>
- Hobby	15.7	1:30	15.4	1:03 <sup>1</sup>
- Socialising	47.2	0:55	62.0	0:56
- TV, radio, music	79.7	2:28	77.6	2:09 <sup>1</sup>
- IT	20.3	1:23	14.4	0:53 <sup>1</sup>
- Relaxation	16.1	0:50	17.9	0:46
- Other	16.8	0:34	18.8	0:33
<b>Outside the home</b>		2:14 <sup>3</sup>		2:04 <sup>3</sup>
- Participation in associations, voluntary work, etc.	16.4	2:38	16.3	1:54 <sup>1</sup>
- Socialising	39.3	2:28	45.3	2:15
- Exercise/sports	23.2	1:55	23.2	1:21 <sup>1</sup>
- Entertainment/culture	6.1	2:37	7.4	2:16
- Hobby	7.1	2:09	6.1	2:03
- Other	14.0	1:52	15.5	1:50

<sup>1,2</sup> Difference to men significant at 0.001 and 0.01 levels.

<sup>3</sup> Overall average.

Table 19:  
Amount of time regularly spent on leisure activities  
(working people, 2001)

	<b>Age</b>					<i>N</i>
	<i>16-30</i>	<i>31-45</i>	<i>46-60</i>	<i>61-74</i>	<i>All</i>	
			%			
Time spent in primary occupation						
<37 hours	51.5	56.2	60.2	60.0	56.8	326
37 hours	53.3	51.9	52.3	84.6	52.9	998
>37 hours	41.7	53.0	57.1	46.7	51.3	310
<i>All</i>	<i>51.2</i>	<i>53.1</i>	<i>55.0</i>	<i>63.2</i>	<i>53.4</i>	<i>1,634</i>
<i>N</i>	<i>461</i>	<i>631</i>	<i>504</i>	<i>38</i>	<i>1,634</i>	

Table 20:  
Level of satisfaction with leisure time<sup>1</sup>  
(2001)

	Very satisfied	Not very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Not at all satisfied	Average level of satisfaction		
	Percent						Mean	St. error
<i>Leisure time on weekdays<sup>2</sup></i>								
<5 minutes	25.9	25.3	38.5	7.7	2.5	100 (1,619)	4.38	1.35
5–9 minutes	37.4	23.6	31.6	6.5	0.1	100 (1,580)	4.71	1.30
10–14 minutes	40.4	25.8	28.8	4.3	0.9	100 (800)	4.85	1.23
All	33.4	24.7	33.8	6.5	1.6	100	4.61	1.32
N	1,334	989	1,353	261	62	(3,999)		

<sup>1</sup> ?<sup>2</sup> test significant at 0.001 level.

<sup>2</sup> (24 – [paid work + housework + primary needs]).