



Max-Planck-Institut für demografische Forschung  
Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research  
Doberaner Strasse 114 · D-18057 Rostock · GERMANY  
Tel +49 (0) 3 81 20 81 - 0; Fax +49 (0) 3 81 20 81 - 202;  
<http://www.demogr.mpg.de>

---

MPIDR WORKING PAPER WP 2002-004  
JANUARY 2002

**The influence of the distribution  
of household and childrearing tasks  
between men and women  
on childbearing intentions in Austria**

Isabella Buber ([Isabella.buber@oeaw.ac.at](mailto:Isabella.buber@oeaw.ac.at))

---

This working paper has been approved for release by: Jan M. Hoem ([hoem@demogr.mpg.de](mailto:hoem@demogr.mpg.de))  
Head of the Laboratory of Contemporary European Fertility and Family Dynamics.

© Copyright is held by the authors.

Working papers of the Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research receive only limited review.  
Views or opinions expressed in working papers are attributable to the authors and do not necessarily  
reflect those of the Institute.

**The influence of the distribution of household and childrearing  
tasks between men and women on childbearing intentions in  
Austria**

Isabella Buber

Vienna, January 21, 2002  
Institute for Demography  
Austrian Academy of Sciences  
Isabella.buber@oeaw.ac.at

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>Abstract.....</b>   | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>1 Introduction.....</b>   | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>2 Data and method .....</b>   | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>3 Theoretical aspects of the division of household labor .....</b>                        | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>4 Perceived fairness of the division of household work .....</b>                          | <b>10</b> |
| <b>5 Time use and the division of household work in Austria .....</b>                        | <b>12</b> |
| <b>6 Government policy and public discourse.....</b>   | <b>15</b> |
| <b>7 Our hypotheses.....</b>   | <b>16</b> |
| <b>8 Results .....</b>   | <b>18</b> |
| <b>9 Discussion.....</b>   | <b>21</b> |
| <b>Acknowledgements.....</b>   | <b>23</b> |
| <b>References .....</b>  | <b>25</b> |
| <b>Tables and figures .....</b>  | <b>34</b> |
| <b>A Appendix.....</b>   | <b>38</b> |
| <b>A. 1 Coding of the desire for a further child, household chores and childcare tasks..</b> | <b>38</b> |
| <b>A. 2 Control variables.....</b>   | <b>40</b> |
| <b>A. 3 Temporal aspects of the desire for a second child.....</b>                           | <b>42</b> |
| <b>A. 4 Aspects of stepfamily fertility.....</b>   | <b>43</b> |

|             |  |           |
|-------------|--|-----------|
| <b>A. 5</b> | <b>The effect of the division of household tasks .....</b> | <b>44</b> |
| <b>A. 6</b> | <b>Tables .....</b>  | <b>46</b> |
| <b>A. 7</b> | <b>aML-program.....</b>                                    | <b>50</b> |

## **Abstract**

The purpose of this paper is to look at the extent to which the division of household work and childrearing and the perception of how fair these tasks are divided influence plans of further childbearing. We concentrate on women with one child and want to look at the question whether a woman whose partner shares the domestic responsibilities with her wishes to have a second child more often than a woman with a partner who does not help out. The data used in this study are drawn from the Austrian Fertility and Family Survey 1995/96, which includes biographies of partnerships and childbearing, detailed information on the division of household chores and childcare duties between the two sexes, and the desire for a (another) child. We model the desire for a second child using a probit model. The major findings of the paper are that sharing childcare duties among couples is a driving force behind plans of further childbearing, whereas the division of feminine household tasks between men and women has no explanatory power. Our results also illustrate that the satisfaction of a woman with her contribution to childrearing is a predictor of an increased desire for a second child.

## 1 Introduction

Over the last decades, Europe has been witnessing declining birth rates, which means, that fewer children are born to a woman. The currently low levels of fertility are to a large extent caused by the tendency of couples to stop childbearing after the birth of the second child (Coleman 1996, Hoem and Hoem 1989, Hoem et al. 1999). Fewer and fewer couples have more than two children now, and in future an increasing number of couples may decide to have only one offspring. After all, the prevailing "normative parental imperative" (Rindfuss et al. 1988, p. 16), i.e. that each (healthy) adult member of a society should become a parent, is already fulfilled by having one child only, and the decision to stop childbearing after the first child might increase in importance in future. The purpose of this study is therefore to look at childbearing plans of women with one child<sup>1</sup>.

This paper makes a contribution to research on childbearing intentions among women, focusing on a gender perspective. In general, a gender perspective defines gender as a lifelong process of situational behavior that both reflects and reproduces a structure of differentiation between "female" and "male". To be more precise, the distinction is made between "feminine" and "masculine"(Fenstermaker et al. 1991, p. 291).

A central issue in gender theory is work (paid and unpaid work, waged work and household work), and scholars have repeatedly pointed out that despite an increase in female labor force participation during the last decades, household labor apportionment has remained relatively stable and lopsided (Baruch and Barnett 1986, Presser 1994).

Inequalities in paid and unpaid work have stimulated sociological and economic research, and scholars are puzzled by the relatively slow change in domestic activities in a rapidly changing social context (Bianchi and Spain 1996, Arrighi and Maume 2000). Besides studies on the distribution of paid work and housework, some researchers have focused on the consequences of the distribution of tasks between women and men. There is evidence that gender inequality in the family affects marital stability and the well-being of women (Blair 1993, Glass and

Fujimoto 1994), but it might also influence other areas of family life that have been neglected so far.

Up to now, relatively little is known about the mechanism of the potential interplay between the division of household work among partners on the one hand and further childbearing plans on the other. Within the framework of gender theory, the purpose of this paper is to look at the question to which extent the division of household work and childcaring tasks in the household and the perceived fairness of that division influences the desire for further children.

The main result of the paper is that men who perform a greater proportion of childcare duties than other men facilitate the decision of their woman for a second child i.e. the sharing childcare duties among couples is a driving force behind further childbearing plans. By contrast, the division of feminine household tasks has no explanatory power. Our analysis also illustrates that the satisfaction of women with their man's contribution to childrearing is a predictor for an increased desire for a second child. We will therefore show that the inclusion of gender theory and gender (in)equality in the analysis of fertility desires helps to better understand the complex process of fertility decisions.

We consider the analysis in this paper a part of a redirection of fertility research towards studies of the interaction between the individual and society. This paper does not concentrate on the desired number of children or on completed fertility, but is a parity-specific analysis of childbearing intentions. Taking a gender perspective, it sheds new light on the process of fertility and childbearing decisions and complements the current literature on fertility desires.

The paper is structured as follows: Chapter 2 gives a description of the data and the method used. We continue with the theoretical aspects of the division of household chores (Chapter 3) and with women's perception of how fair this division is (Chapter 4). The reader will also learn about the amount of time partners spend on performing household duties in Austria according to a micro-census. A short descriptive analysis of the division between male and female of domestic chores and childcare tasks in our sample is provided in Chapter 5. The next chapter is devoted to Austrian family policy and aspects of gender equity, and Chapter 7

---

<sup>1</sup> We concentrate on women of parity one. Lutz (1992, p. 136) stresses that a parity-specific approach reveals additional aspects of fertility determinants which are necessary for understanding current and future fertility

presents the main hypotheses of this paper. The findings of our study and a discussion of these are provided in Chapter 8.

## **2 Data and method**

The empirical analysis of this study is based on data extracted from the Austrian Fertility and Family Survey (FFS), which was conducted between December 1995 and May 1996 (Doblhammer et al. 1997). This survey forms part of the European Family and Fertility Survey programme, which is coordinated by the Population Activities Unit (PAU) of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UN/ECE). The survey gives a rich set of data on retrospective histories of partnerships, childbearing, education, and occupational activities. It also includes detailed information on the division between the sexes of household work and childrearing tasks, and on the desire to have a second child or more.

In the survey, persons who are living together with a partner were asked in what way they organize their household work. Respondents with at least one child were interviewed about the degree to which childcare tasks in their household are distributed between the two sexes. The technique used for measuring the division of household labor and childcare duties is based on the relative distribution method where respondents indicate whether or not they have responsibility for particular tasks (e.g. cooking, cleaning, feeding the child). Furthermore, respondents were asked how fair they perceived the division of household work and childrearing duties in their household to be and to compare their contribution to household work and childrearing to that of other men and women.<sup>2</sup>

For the purpose of the present study, we selected Austrian<sup>3</sup> women with one child, who were living with a partner at the time of the interview. We took steps to make the sample as homogeneous as possible and excluded respondents with incomplete records on partnerships or childbearing histories, respondents who had adopted a child and/or whose first child had died. The selection of respondents is summarized in Table 1. We confined ourselves to a sample of 364 Austrian women born between 1941 and 1976, who had one child, were

---

patterns.

<sup>2</sup> For further details see our Appendix chapter A.1.

<sup>3</sup> Cultural differences can influence childbearing behavior. For this reason and in order to reduce the potential for heterogeneity of the comparison group, foreign nationals have been excluded in our selection.



sharing household duties with a partner at the time of the interview, were able to conceive and were not pregnant at the time of the interview.<sup>4</sup>

The analysis is based on a probit model<sup>5</sup>. It can be described as a nonlinear regression model with a binary dependent variable  $Y$ . The variable  $Y$  is assumed to depend on  $k$  observable variables  $X_1, \dots, X_k$  and on a disturbance term  $u$ , written as  $Y = \sum \beta_k X_k + u$ . The question of interest is the probability that  $Y$  equals 1, mathematically  $P(Y = 1) = P(Y = 1 | X_1, \dots, X_k)$ , or simply  $P(Y = 1 | X)$ . The standard probit model assumes a normal distributed random term  $u$ , i.e.  $u \sim N(0,1)$ , and therefore the probit model is given by

$$P(Y = 1 | X) = \Phi\left(\sum \beta_k X_k\right) = \int_{-\infty}^{\sum \beta_k X_k} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{z^2}{2}\right) dz.$$

(For further details on probit models see Aldrich and Nelson, 1986). The remaining unknowns are the parameters  $\{\beta_k\}$ , and we apply the software aML (Lillard and Panis 2000) for their estimation.<sup>6</sup>

In our study the dependent variable  $Y$  takes the value 1 if a woman wants to have a second child, and it takes the value 0 if she does not. The observable variables  $X_1, \dots, X_k$  represent the distribution of household tasks and childcare duties and further control variables described later. The parameters  $\{\beta_k\}$  represent the effects of the variables included in our model.

### 3 Theoretical aspects of the division of household labor

Housework mostly refers to unpaid work performed in order to maintain a family and/or a home.<sup>7</sup> Research on the division of household labor has generated a considerable number of published studies in this field and mainly focuses on (1) the measurement of housework, (2)

---

<sup>4</sup> We do not only concentrate on women who (still) live together with the father of their first child but also include women whose current partner is not the father of their first child. We are therefore able to look at the effect which the presence of a new partner may have on family plans.

<sup>5</sup> "Probit" is an abbreviation of the term "probability unit". This term is attributed to C. R. Bliss (Aldrich and Nelson 1986).

<sup>6</sup> The vector of regression parameters is typically estimated by a Maximum Likelihood Estimation.

<sup>7</sup> In a comparison of different kinds of work, Bird and Ross (1993) states "Housework as a primary activity is more routine than paid work, provides less work fulfillment, less recognition for the quality of the work, and is unpaid. Housework is the least fulfillment of any type of work examined, and it provides the least recognition for

historical developments, (3) explanations for the division of household labor, and (4) consequences of the division of household labor (Shelton and John 1996)<sup>8</sup>.

Explanations for the division of household labor mainly focus on three approaches: (1) feminist theory, (2) the theory of relative resources and power, and (3) the theory of time availability or time constraints.<sup>9</sup> The empirical research on this subject is dominated by studies that include a combination of these theories (e.g. Ross 1987, Kamo 1988, Blair and Lichter 1991, Goldscheider and Waite 1991, Presser 1994).

Let us give a short description of the central ideas of these three approaches. The main political philosophies in feminist theories and in conceptions of women's liberation are liberal feminism, traditional Marxism, radical feminism and socialist feminism (Jaggar 1983, p. 10ff). From a theoretical point of view, feminists argue that patriarchy determines the division of labor, with men benefiting from controlling women's labor (Folbre and Hartmann 1989). Others see capitalism rather than patriarchy as being directly related to the division of household labor and, more in general, to the position of women in the family (Jaggar 1983). The major part of feminist studies on this topic, however, relates to gender theory and the construction of gender.

In the 1980s the concept of gender became a dominant feature in feminist thinking. Gender theory focuses upon the extent to which (1) specific behavior and roles are given gendered meanings, (2) labor is divided to express gender difference symbolically, and (3) diverse social structures incorporate gender values and convey gender advantages (Ferree 1990, p. 868). Moreover, gender theory highlights the process of the social construction of maleness and femaleness<sup>10</sup> as oppositional categories with an unequal social value (Ferree 1990, p. 868)<sup>11</sup>.

---

work well done." Despite the description of housework as a thankless job, they find that "houseworkers are thanked more than paid workers, on average" (Bird and Ross 1993, p. 921).

<sup>8</sup> Shelton and John (1996) give a very good overview of the literature on the division of household labor.

<sup>9</sup> For feminist theory see Jaggar 1983, Hiller and Philliber 1986, Thompson and Walker 1989, Ferree 1991, Sanchez 1994, Greenstein 1996b, Arrighi and Maume 2000, Goldscheider and Waite 1991. For the theory of relative resources and power see Hiller 1984, Ross 1987, Bianchi and Spain 1996, Presser 1994. For the theory of time availability or time constraints see Douthitt 1989, Presser 1994, Almeida et al. 1993, McFarlane et al. 2000.

<sup>10</sup> Fenstermaker et al. (1991, p. 293) stress the importance of the distinctions made among sex, sex category, and gender. Sex is determined through biological criteria. Assignment to sex category is initially made on the basis of biological criteria, but everyday categorization is established and maintained by socially necessary displays of

The “social construction of gender“ approach assumes that early socialization and intergenerational influences are important for the gendered division of housework (Cunningham 2001a). Housework is perceived to be more than the invisible and unpaid labor that makes waged work possible; it is seen as constituting a set of culturally and historically specific tasks that convey social meanings of masculinity and femininity (Berk 1985). This implies that housework produces household goods and services and also gender itself (Hartmann 1981, Fenstermaker et al. 1991, Cunningham 2001b). From the perspective of gender theory, the symbolic as well as the structural association of housework with "women's work" is no longer taken for granted, but is treated as a social fact that needs explanation (Ferree 1990).

According to the “relative resources” explanation, the individual with the most resources (education, earnings, occupational prestige, age) uses those resources to negotiate his/her way out of housework. Husbands and wives with more relative resources (higher income, education) should, other things being equal, spend less time on domestic activities.<sup>12</sup>

The “time constraint” approach suggests that men and women participate in household and childcare duties to the extent that there are demands on them to do so and to the extent that they have time available. Employment and/or hours worked and the presence or number of children in the household are the most commonly used indicators for time constraints<sup>13</sup>.

According to the time-constraint theory, persons in the labor market - and in particular those who work more hours than the norm - have less time at their hands for household tasks, especially when both spouses are employed.

---

identification as a member of one category or the other. Gender is an accomplishment of "the activity of managing situated conduct in light of normative conceptions, attitudes and activities appropriate for one's sex category" (West and Zimmerman 1987, p. 127, cited by Fenstermaker et al. 1991, p. 293f).

<sup>11</sup> The proposition that gender is continuously being constructed and used to further a variety of individual and group goals is central to what West and Zimmermann (1987) called "doing gender" (Ferree 1990, p. 869). Berk (1985) considers the production of gender relations as such a major element of what families create in doing housework that she entitles her book on the division of household "The Gender Factory".

<sup>12</sup> The resources argument is also consistent with neoclassical economists' assumption that families seek rationally to maximize the potential earnings of the unit.

<sup>13</sup> Presser (1994) analyzed the effect of employment schedules among dual-earner spouses on the division of household labor. She presented a new specification of the concept of available time, namely the amount of overlap in spouses' employment schedules and revealed interesting new insights into the division of housework. Her work is motivated by the fact that in a substantial proportion of American dual-earner couples at least one spouse works a non-day-time shift (i.e. an evening- and/or night-shift work). In Austria, shift-work is of less importance.

Shelton and John (1996), in their review on studies about the division of labor, found support for the validity of all three approaches: feminist theory, relative resources, and time availability. Nevertheless, the findings were not always what they expected and they concluded that gender remains the most important determinant of time allocated to housework.

Studies on the impact of the division of household labor mainly concentrate on its consequences for (1) marital satisfaction or marital conflicts (McHale and Crouter 1992, Blair 1993, Perry-Jenkins and Folk 1994, Greenstein 1996b, Kluwer et al. 1996, Dillaway and Broman 2001), and (2) health and psychological well-being (Glass and Fujimoto 1994, Baruch and Barnett 1986). Numerous studies stress that women's perceptions of the fairness of the division of domestic responsibilities within the family seem to have an important (direct or indirect) influence on marital stability and the risk of family dissolution (Oláh 2001b, Greenstein 1995, Greenstein 1996a, Sanchez and Gager 2000).

#### **4 Perceived fairness of the division of household work**

Turning our attention therefore to the perceived fairness of the division of work and/or housework between men and women, we start with the general observation that women and men no longer divide the task of breadwinning strictly according to gender<sup>14</sup>. Nevertheless, although women increasingly contribute to the family income, the division of unpaid housework among partners has remained more or less unchanged throughout this development. The fact that most women do the most of housework in their families, even when holding full-time employment, has led to the introduction of the term of a wife's "second shift" of unpaid work (Hochschild with Machung 1989).

Despite clear evidence that gender inequalities exist in the division of household labor between the two sexes, most men and women regard this division as fair (Berk 1985, Blair 1993, Blair and Johnson 1992, DeMaris and Longmore 1996). This phenomenon stimulated

---

<sup>14</sup> Ferree (1990) states that the male provider notion is a myth which appears as a convention of modern industrial society.

various studies on the perceived fairness<sup>15</sup> of the division of household tasks, with theoretical explanations being based on (1) ideology (gender role), (2) power, and (3) equity (DeMaris and Longmore 1996, Blair and Johnson 1992, Sanchez 1994).

In an attempt to explain the perceived fairness of the division of household and childcare tasks among spouses, the feminist approach suggests that the inequitable division of household labor between the two sexes is accepted as long as societal norms define most household tasks as "feminine" activities. Other key determinants of the perceived fairness in household labor are women's alternatives to remaining in the relationship - briefly, women's power issues. (However, these alternatives are limited, in particular as far as the maintenance of an adequate living standard is concerned.) Research pertaining to equity assumes that "to the extent that partners perceive husbands as compensating for a low input in household labor with greater input in other important domains of the relationship, such as paid work or childcare, individuals will feel that women's greater contributions to housework are justified" (DeMaris and Longmore 1996, p. 1044). Research has found mixed results for the impact of ideology, some support for the power hypothesis but only little support for the equity theory (DeMaris and Longmore 1996).

Within the framework of entitlement psychology, Major (1987) offered three factors that contribute to a sense of fairness, namely (1) outcome values, (2) comparison referents, and (3) justifications. According to Major (1987) people feel that they are treated unfairly "if they lack some outcome they desire, have a high standard of comparison, and believe there is no acceptable justification for being deprived of their desired outcomes" (Thompson 1991, p. 183). In order to understand women's sense of fairness about family work, Thompson (1991) used this concept to develop a "distributive justice theory", which is regarded currently as the most comprehensive approach (Mikula 1998). According to him, researchers need to consider (1) value outcomes other than time and tasks, (2) between- and within-gender comparison referents, and (3) gender-specific justifications for the small contribution men make to the family (Thompson 1991, p. 181). Blair and Johnson (1992) have provided strong support for Thomson's (1991) argument that the symbolic aspect of housework is of central importance to many women by showing that the appreciation husbands have for their wife's household labor

---

<sup>15</sup> Other studies concentrate on satisfaction with household tasks (e.g. Benin and Agostinelli 1988, Pittman et al. 1999).

is a major predictor of perceptions of fairness. Nevertheless, the reasons why many women do not regard the division of household labor as unjust are multiple and it is useful to integrate complementary assumptions of different theories into a single model of perceived (in)justice (Freudenthaler and Mikula 1998).

Research on conditions and consequences of perceptions of unfairness and injustice has accumulated a good amount of knowledge, but nevertheless it has limitations. In a review of studies on the perceived fairness of the division of housework, Mikula (1998) comments critically on the current research on this subject and makes some very useful suggestions for future research.

## **5 Time use and the division of household work in Austria**

We now give a brief description of time use in Austria and of the information we have available in our sample on the division of mainly feminine<sup>16</sup> household chores and childcare tasks. "Time use" refers to the hours and minutes a person spends on paid work, education, household work, childcare, leisure, sleep, and private matters. In Austria, two official surveys on the time use of the population have been carried out up to now (1981 and 1992).<sup>17</sup> These data show how men and women divide their time across a variety of tasks. We use the data collected in 1992 and concentrate on their time-use patterns of married or cohabiting couples with at least one child under 15 years.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> There are differences in the nature of family tasks (i.e. household work and childcare tasks) that women and men typically accomplish (Thomson and Walker 1989). Household labor remains highly segregated by sex, which leads to the distinction between "feminine" or "female" household work such as cooking, laundry, or housecleaning, traditionally thought of as "women's work", and "masculine" or "male" tasks such as garden work or car maintenance (Baruch and Barnett 1986, Greenstein 1996b). More generally, women tend to perform repetitive and routine tasks whereas men tend to complete infrequent and non-routine tasks (Thomson and Walker 1989).

<sup>17</sup> Besides the two official surveys carried out by The Austrian Central Statistical Office, the study, "Living with Children: Wish and Reality", analyzed conditions of family life of married women in Austria and included several questions dealing with the division of labor in the family. This panel study was carried out twice (1978 and 1981/82). Furthermore selected women were interviewed a third time. The analysis consistently revealed a very traditional pattern in the division of labor (Findl et al. 1985).

<sup>18</sup> The survey conducted in 1992 includes 25,233 diaries of Austrians aged 10 years and more (Gross 1995). Respondents had to record how many hours and minutes a day they spent on paid work, education, household work, childcare, leisure, sleep, and private matters. These different domains were split up furthermore in a very detailed list of activities. Since the microcensus includes a representative sample of all Austrians, a description of household work among couples - especially time made available for childcare - would be distorted if one computed averages on the basis of data that included children, singles, the elderly, and childless couples. We therefore concentrate on couples with at least one child. Data for single mothers or fathers are not available. Furthermore the number of couples where the husband was unemployed was very small and therefore these

Women do the lion's share of family work; they spend from six up to nearly nine hours per day on household work; husbands put in two hours on average (Table 2)<sup>19</sup>. On weekdays, this segregation is even more distinct (Monday to Friday: women: 6 to 9½ hours, men: 1½ to 1¾ hours; see Table 2).<sup>20</sup> As expected, although employed women spend less time on household work than those who are not employed, they still have to bear the main burden of household work. Women who are in full-time employment spend 5¾ hours a day on household work, women who work part-time 6¼ hours, and non-employed women 8¾ hours.

The number of hours a woman spends in full- or part-time employment has almost no effect on her man's participation in household work. This finding supports cross-national studies which reveal that there are no significant effects of the nature of women's labor market employment on the involvement of men in domestic labor (Berk 1985, Kalleberg and Rosenfeld 1990, Almeida et al. 1993, Brines 1994). Austrian men whose wife is employed full-time participate only slightly more in household work than those whose wife is employed part-time or not employed at all (about 15 minutes more per day). The hours mentioned refer to time spent on "traditional" household chores such as cooking, washing and cleaning, but also on other activities, such as handicraft, childcare, and care of the needy (mostly elderly).

Adding up the overall time spent in employment and household work we find that on the average the total working hours of employed wives is about one hour more a day than that of their men (fulltime employed women: 10½ hours, part-time employed women: 10 hours; men: 9 hours). Only men whose wife is not employed at all work about the same amount of hours per day as their wives do (9¼ hours).

Turning to our data extracted from the Austrian FFS, we see that the distribution of feminine household chores is consistent with the findings of previous research in the sense that women do the major part of household labor. Most of the household chores in our sample are

---

couples were not included in the analysis of time-allocation of couples by Statistics Austria (Wiedenhofer 1995, p. 601).

<sup>19</sup> Couples (even relatively egalitarian ones) become more traditional in their sex-role attitudes and in the division of household labor when the first child is born (Goldscheider and Waite 1991, Coltrane 1996, Vaskovics et al. 1996).

<sup>20</sup> In the last decade men's share of household tasks has increased slightly. In 1992, men spent approximately an additional half an hour on household tasks compared to 1981 (Gross 1995). This finding applies to all men, i.e. also single and childless men.

performed primarily by the woman, though some chores are carried out by both partners. Table 3 shows that on the five mainly female domestic tasks which were included in the Austrian FFS women report that they do not receive a lot of help from their partner.

Childcare tasks are shared to a greater extent by both partners: eight out of ten women report that they share with their partner at least one of the four childcare tasks looked at in our sample, compared to six out of ten women when asked about household chores.

Although women carry the main burden of family work, only few feel that this is unfair. Nine out of ten women in our data set consider the distribution of household tasks and childcare duties as fair.<sup>21</sup> When women compare their own contribution to housework and childcare to that of other women approximately three out of four women feel that they do more or less the same amount. As Table 3 shows, 11.8 per cent of all women in our sample that think that they do more household tasks than other women, and a higher percentage (16.2) feels being more involved in childcare duties. Whereas the majority of women feel doing more or less the same amount of family work than other women, the comparison of their partner's contribution to that of other men reveals a stronger polarization towards "doing more". A much higher proportion feels that the partner accomplishes more household work (43.4 per cent) and childcare tasks (36.8 per cent) than other men. 17 per cent feel that their partner accomplishes less household work than other men, and only 8.5 per cent think that their partner is involved less in childcare duties compared to other men. This leads us to the conclusion that women in our sample give their partners rather good "marks".

Freudenthaler (1998) analyzed the perceived (in)justice of the division of household work among 132 employed Austrian women. Although women accomplished about 75 per cent of all household work, only 28 per cent perceived this division as unjust. A comparison of the actual distribution with the "desired" distribution revealed that there is a discrepancy for nine out of ten women. Therefore, the mere perception of a discrepancy in the actual and the desired distribution of housework is not synonymous with the experience of injustice.

---

<sup>21</sup> In our data set, one third of all women consider the distribution of household tasks as "very just", and an equal proportion as "quite just" and nearly one quarter as "more or less just". When asked about the distribution of childcare tasks, women are even more satisfied since nearly four out of ten consider the distribution of childcare tasks within their household as "very just" (Table 3).



## 6 Government policy and public discourse

Contemporary government policy and public discourse are "likely to influence gender relations at both the family and the societal level either by promoting or by slowing down changes in traditional gender roles" (Oláh 2001b, p. 31). For Austria, we would like to mention in this context the introduction of parental leave in 1991, the campaign "halbe-halbe" and the women's referendum, both held in 1997, and use these as examples to illustrate that contemporary government policy and public discourse encouraged the active participation of men in parenting and household work.

In Austria, mothers have been eligible for maternity leave (with a flat-rate benefit) since 1961 and fathers became eligible in 1991. The extension of maternal leave to parental leave can be seen as a step towards greater gender equity and a closer involvement of fathers in childrearing. Nevertheless, only a few Austrian fathers have used the opportunity to take parental leave. When it was introduced, only 0.6 per cent among parents on parental leave were fathers, and in 1998 the percentage was still negligibly low, with a share of 1.6 per cent (Tazi-Preve et al. 1999).<sup>22</sup>

Very often economic reasons are given for the low percentage of Austrian fathers who take parental leave. The fact that parental leave payments are relatively low does not encourage fathers to engage in active parenting. The earnings of men are generally higher than that of women and thus men's leave-taking mostly reduces the family income to a larger extent than that of women. Further reasons are the possible social stigmatization attached to fathers taking parental leave and little sympathy for these fathers among employers.

In 1997, the former Federal Ministry for Women's Affairs organized a campaign called "halbe-halbe" with the intention to start a public debate on the distribution of labor market employment, income, household work, and parenting between men and women. "Halbe-halbe" can be translated simply by "half-half", meaning that women and men should share

---

<sup>22</sup> We would like to mention the high proportion of Swedish fathers who go on parental leave – at least for a short period. Sweden is known for its long tradition of parental leave, introduced already in 1974. In the early 1990s, nearly 30 per cent of Swedish parents who took parental leave were fathers (Oláh 1998). Nevertheless, Oláh (1998) states that fathers used only about 10 to 15 per cent of all leave days, which means that their participation in active parenting must still be much below that of mothers.

work and household duties equally.<sup>23</sup> Characteristically, the ensuing public debate on a more equal distribution of housework and caring duties quickly died out.

The Austrian "Frauen-Volksbegehren" (petition for a referendum on women's affairs) in 1997 generated further public debate. The main demand was to embed equal rights for women and men in the Austrian Federal Constitution and to gradually remove discrimination of women.<sup>24</sup> The petition included the demand for eleven legal provisions, including a minimum wage, social protection for those who work only a few hours a week and concrete provisions to improve the compatibility of paid work and childrearing both for men and women (e.g. legal entitlement of part-time work for parents of pre-school children and the right to return to full-time work thereafter) (Frauen-Volksbegehren 1997). In total, 11.2 per cent of the Austrian population signed this petition, but none of the demands have been incorporated in the law up to now (Bericht des Gleichbehandlungsausschusses 1998).

Such public discourse surely influences women's perception of what a fair sharing of family work should be. Public discourse is an essential though small step towards a more gender-equal distribution of work and family duties.<sup>25</sup>

## 7 Our hypotheses

Aspects of gender theory and gender attitudes are increasingly incorporated in the social sciences and demography and have also been included in a few studies on fertility. In an analysis of the childbearing desires of couples in the United States, Thomson (1997) included gender attitudes measured by each spouse's response to five statements about gender roles. She concentrated on general gender attitudes and found a significant effect of wives' gender attitudes on childbearing desire (Thomson 1997). For Sweden and Hungary, Oláh (2001a)

---

<sup>23</sup> This project was subject to a great deal of criticism. Its opponents argued that the state should not be involved in private affairs (Rosenberger 2000, p. 427).

<sup>24</sup> The full text of the petition for a referendum can be seen on the Internet at <http://www.parlament.gv.at/>.

<sup>25</sup> A seminar dealing directly with the topic "half-half" was held in Vienna in March 2000 with the aim of discussing the actual gender roles in the Austrian society (Kammer für Arbeiter und Angestellte für Wien 2001). The seminar "Promoting Equality: A Common Issue for Men and Women" held in 1997 should also be mentioned, in particular because it focused on an international context. The main objective of the seminar was to initiate a European debate on equality issues and to raise awareness about the fact that equality must be achieved by women and men working together. The development of men's roles towards more partnership and co-operation with women was a central issue. In the opening address Imibert stressed that "it is time for men to

recently found higher second-birth intensities for couples who share family responsibilities than for couples with traditional gender role behavior.<sup>26</sup> Ruokolainen and Notkola (2001) analyzed third-birth intentions in Finland and speculated that gender equality ideologies indirectly affect the decisions that parents make regarding the size of their family.<sup>27</sup>

In this paper we hypothesize that the extent of gender equality in a relationship influences fertility in Austria. We have two main hypotheses that we want to test, namely that (1) the division of (unpaid) domestic work and (2) a woman's comparison of the division of domestic responsibilities with that in other households both influence her further childbearing plans. Moreover, we make the hypothesis that a woman's evaluation of her husband's contribution is more relevant than his actual contribution.

Feminist scholars have pointed out that the uneven balance of power between women and men in the family influences the reproductive decision-making and behavior of individuals (Hartmann 1981). Consequently, women who have to do the lion's share in household work and childrearing – with only very little or no help from their partner – might less often wish to have a further child. Conversely, the presence of a partner who is involved to a comparably high extent in domestic work and childcare might more easily make a woman want to have a further child. In other words, we hypothesize that when a partner makes a valuable contribution to household and childcaring tasks, a woman with one child wants to have a second child more often than those whose partner helps only a little or not at all.

Besides the quantitative aspect of household-task sharing there is also a qualitative one which takes into account women's comparison of their own contribution to housework with that of other women, as well as a comparison of their partner's contribution with that of other men. It might be possible that these features also influence the woman's childbearing plans.

---

redefine with women the share of tasks and responsibilities at every level of existence, especially at home" (Council of Europe 1998, p. 11).

<sup>26</sup> In Sweden, second-birth intensities turned out to be higher when the father took parental leave for the first child. "Father's leave use is a signal that the couple is more likely to share also other tasks of home-life responsibilities. This leads them to have a higher second-birth intensity than a corresponding couple where family responsibilities largely belong to the mother only" (Oláh 2001a, p. 15). For Hungary, the second-birth intensity turned out to be highest for couples who share domestic tasks more equally. Women having no help at all from their partners have a lower second-birth risk than the other groups.

<sup>27</sup> Ruokolainen and Notkola (2001) found that familial and attitudinal factors, such as quality of partnership, the gender of existing children, and family values, were associated with the intention of women to continue

Therefore, we assume in our second hypothesis that women's positive evaluation of the division of household work is associated with an increased wish for a further child.

Finally, we hypothesize that the comparison of the contribution men make towards family duties is more relevant for women's childbearing plans than men's actual amount or percentage of time spent on housework. It is not clear whether it is the husband's amount of time spent or his degree of involvement in household work that affects the wife's childbearing plans, or whether it is the wife's satisfaction with the division of household work and childcare tasks that is the operational factor.

We adhere to the idea that the behavior of men should play a greater role in the analysis of (women's) fertility and childbearing plans than it has done so far. An analysis of childbearing plans should include not only the circumstances of women but also of men, and it should also include information on the relationship between the partners. Already in the 1970s Ryder (1973) emphasized the important role men's behavior should play in analyses of fertility. He even stated: "It would seem that we regard men as so insignificant in the reproductive scheme of things that all we need to know about them is a hearsay testimony" (Ryder 1973, p. 497). Fortunately, men are increasingly included in the analysis of fertility.

Our analysis also includes factors that are not of main interest to us but that have been found to greatly influence childbearing in previous studies. We use them as control factors to avoid confounding. Following Oláh (2001a), we control for individual characteristics, maturity at parenthood, union-specific characteristics, the characteristics of the partner, the age of the first child, and family orientation, as described in our Appendix.

## **8 Results**

Among the women in our sample (parity 1 and living with a partner at the time of the interview), 33 per cent wanted to have another child within the next two years, 60 per cent would like a second child but had not made up their mind yet (Table A1). Therefore, only one third had a rather "concrete" wish for a second child, whereas nearly twice as many wanted to

---

childbearing after two children. Since gender equality affects the quality of a partnership their result might be seen as an indirect indicator for a link between gender equality and fertility plans.

have a second child at an undecided point in time; this indicates the likelihood of rather low birth intentions in the near future. We have estimated two models with different time horizons, namely the desire for a second child (1) within the next two years, and (2) at a yet undecided point in time.

Table 4 gives the estimated effects of childcare factors. The odds ratio of intention of each category versus the reference category is computed from the estimated value of the coefficient  $\beta_i$  (see Chapter 2) by the transformation  $e^{\beta_i}$ . The reference group is the level indicated with an effect of 1. An estimate larger than 1.00 means a greater likelihood of intending to have a second child.

Our data do not support our first hypothesis. The contribution of men across five feminine household chores has no significant explanatory power for the further childbearing intentions of women (Table A2). Please see the Appendix for the results on household tasks, the evaluation of household chores and the effect of the control variables.

The analysis presented in Table 4 confirms the second hypothesis outlined earlier in the paper. We find significant effects of men's active role in childcaring. Mothers with one child whose partner is responsible for at least one out of four specific childcare tasks have a much higher desire for a second child than those whose partner is responsible for none of these tasks. Besides the significance, the magnitude of the effect is very marked (6.4 and 6.03).

Furthermore, sharing childcare tasks makes a significant contribution to explaining childbearing desire. The more tasks both partners share, the higher is the woman's desire for a second child. Sharing two childcare tasks with the partner increases the probability of further childbearing intentions by a factor of 2, sharing three tasks increases it by a factor of 3. (The reference group are women who share one childcare task with their partner.) The startling high coefficient (10.91 and 46.06) for women who share with their partner all four childcare tasks considered might be explained by the relatively small size of this group (8 per cent, see Table 3).

Our findings corroborate Oláh's (2001a) recent study on Sweden and Hungary in which she shows that there are higher second-birth intensities among couples who share family

responsibilities. The fertility costs of women are reduced in relationships in which men participate in housework and childrearing, most likely since the compatibility of employment and parenthood is easier for these women as their partners share the responsibility of care-taking for the child (Oláh 2001a). The indicator for gender relations used for Sweden is the engagement of men in active parenting, measured by the question whether or not he took parental leave for the first child. For Hungary, she combines information on the division of household work and child care work into one variable. In this paper, we enlarged her analytical framework by distinguishing between household labor and childrearing, and by including a comparison with other households. This allows for a more sensitive analysis.

We find only scant support for a relationship between the comparison women make between their own contribution to childrearing and that of other women and further childbearing intentions. Interestingly, women who believe that they are much more involved in childcare than other women more often wish to have a second child than those who feel that they do about the same amount of childcare duties as other women. The corresponding factors are 4.35 (second child within the next two years) and 2.14 (second child at a yet undecided time). At first sight, these women seem to get little help from their husbands, and this might decrease their childbearing intentions. But the high involvement in childcare might also indicate that there is a strong relationship between mother and child, a strong family orientation, and therefore a high desire for a second child. Women who feel that they have a much lower involvement in childcare tasks than other women have a reduced desire for a second child. Following our previous conclusions, these women may be less involved in childcare partly because they are less family oriented and therefore may have lower intentions for a second child.

Our findings on women's evaluation of their partner's contribution to childcare tasks as compared with that of other men are rather insignificant overall. Every second woman in our sample feels that her partner is performing more or less the same amount or share of childcare duties as other men. These women constitute our reference group. Every third woman believes that her partner makes a greater contribution to household duties than other men. These women have higher second-birth intentions, although this is not statistically significant. Regarding childbearing plans, the small group of women whose partner - according to their own judgement - is much more involved in childcare than other men, do not differ from the

reference group. Only the small group of women who give their partner rather bad marks surprisingly have an increased desire for a second child. We explain this (insignificant) phenomenon with a corresponding higher involvement of women in childrearing and rather traditional family attitudes.

Several studies on the division of household labor and consequences for marital satisfaction found that perceived fairness is a better predictor of a lack of marital conflict than the actual extent of inequality in the division of labor (Blair 1993, Perry-Jenkins and Folk 1994). For the purpose of this paper, we were initially tempted to assume that women's assessment of the division of childcare duties might be more important than the actual division of the specific tasks. This conclusion does not hold up in the light of our results, as we clearly see that the additional explanatory power of the comparison women make between their own and their partner's contribution is rather small.

The time span for which a second child is planned is rather unimportant for our results. In general, the effects of our explanatory on the desire for a second child within the next two years and for a second child at a yet undecided point in time are similar and more pronounced in the model on the desire for a second child at an undecided point in time.

## **9 Discussion**

In an attempt to enhance our understanding of childbearing plans we have included gender aspects in our analytical framework. As a measure of gender equality in a relationship we used the information on housework division, the share of childcare tasks, and the comparison women make when it comes to the division of family work at the time of the interview. Our results show that the division of childcare duties is a driving force behind the childbearing plans of women, whereas the distribution of feminine household tasks among the partners has no explanatory power (Table A2).

In an analysis on the consequences of fathers' participation in family work, Baruch and Barnett (1986) showed that the participation of fathers in feminine home chores had only a limited influence on their role-strain (e.g. time and energy constraints, role conflicts) and well-being whereas their participation in childcare was a significant predictor of fathers

feeling more involved and competent as parents and wives evaluating husbands more highly as fathers. Although they concentrated on role-strain and well-being, their results support our findings since they found significant effects of the father's participation in childcare, but only limited effects for household tasks.

Our findings confirm the importance of distinguishing between household chores (especially traditionally feminine chores) and child care tasks (Baruch and Barnett 1986). The majority of studies on this subject focus on household labor and neglected childcare (e.g. Holzer and Münz 1996). Childrearing and housework are two qualitatively different dimensions which should not be confounded and the omission of childcare is particularly problematic because it seems to be more than just an additional element of family work. Childcare is perceived and valued differently from household labor, it is differently distributed between the sexes, and also leads to less conflicts between the sexes than household duties (Thompson and Walker 1989, Blair and Lichter 1991).

The hypothesis that the active contribution of men in childrearing increases the desire of women to have a further child is confirmed by our analysis. Egalitarian partners who make relatively large contributions to everyday childcare tasks facilitate the decision of women to have a second child. Certainly, the participation of men in childcare duties alleviates women's burden of childrearing. The daily childcare duties looked at in our analysis, which include feeding, dressing, caring, and time spent with the child, strengthen the bond between child and parent (father) and increase parental competence. Moreover, fathers who are responsible for several of these tasks might be more family oriented and therefore influence their wife's desire for a second child. Nevertheless, the participation of fathers in family work implicates also that there are negative outcomes such as greater conflict with the child, dissatisfaction with the time the wife spends with the child(ren), or interference of family responsibilities with the employment situation (of men) (Baruch and Barnett 1986).

Men today are willing to do more housework and to spend more time on childcare and education tasks than before. "Looking at modern fatherhood (...) we can detect a change in men's attitude towards childcare, a change in their experiences of fatherhood and (...) a change in psychological perspective on the importance of the father's role" (Segal 1990, 33f.). The



current analysis underlines the importance of family policies that encourage men to assume greater responsibilities for family work and childcare.

The analysis presented here has demonstrated the usefulness of including gender aspects in an analytical framework. Naturally, the desire for children is a more complex process than the one represented by our explanatory model. Further aspects not included in our analysis are, among others, experiences with the first child, time available for reaching one's own goals, limited leisure time, or financial constraints. All of these surely also influence the decision of women to continue childbearing after the first child (Urdze 1981, Gisser et al. 1995, Vaskovics et al. 1996, Kytir et al. 2000). Especially women with little help from their partner have little leisure time, and a second child would limit further the time they would have for themselves and for their leisure.

Fertility intentions are predictions about the future, and so they may contain considerable uncertainty. In general, there is a discrepancy between the desired and the actual number of children, due to changes in the living conditions or to other personal circumstances. A comparative analysis has shown that in general the number of children born to a woman is lower than the number of children previously desired (Hanika 1999). Several studies have confirmed, however, that fertility intentions and the certainty of those intentions provide fairly accurate forecasts of subsequent fertility (Thomson and Hoem 1989, Hanika 1999, Schoen et al. 1999).

Moreover, recent literature has shown that fertility intentions do not mediate the effects of other variables but contribute additional predictive power and bring substantial new information (Schoen et al. 1999). "The substantive importance of intentions emphasizes the salience of individual motivations and argues for a redirection of fertility research towards studies of interactions between the individual and the society" (Schoen et al. 1999, p. 790).

## **Acknowledgements**

This analysis has benefited greatly from discussions with my Ph.D. supervisor Jan M. Hoem. Although overloaded with work, he always had time for questions and some friendly words. During my stay at the Max Planck Institute his door was always open and he encouraged me

tremendously. I also thank the Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research for providing access to its excellent library and computer facilities where part of the work was carried out. Support for this research was provided when I was a guest of the Institute in September 2001. Editorial support from Susann Backer is also gratefully acknowledged.

## References

- Aldrich, J. H. and F. D. Nelson (1986) Linear probability, logit, and probit models. Sage University Paper Series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, 07-045. Beverly Hills and London: Sage Publications.
- Almeida, D. M., J. L. Maggs and N. L. Galambos (1993) Wives' employment hours and spousal participation in family work. *Journal of Family Psychology* 7, 233-244.
- Arrighi, B. A. and D. J. Maume Jr. (2000) Workplace subordination and men's avoidance of housework. *Journal of Family Issues* 21(4), 464-487.
- Axinn, W. G., M. E. Clarkberg and A. Thornton (1994) Family influences on family size preferences. *Demography* 31(1), 65-79.
- Baruch, G. K. and R. C. Barnett (1986) Consequences of fathers' participation in family work: Parents' role-strain and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 51, 983-992.
- Benin, M. H. and J. Agostinelli (1988) Husbands' and wives' satisfaction with the division of labor. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 50, 349-361.
- Bericht des Gleichbehandlungsausschusses (1998) 1113 der Beilagen zu den Stenographischen Protokollen des Nationalrates XX. Gesetzgebungsperiode. Parlamentarische Materialien. Vienna.
- Berk, S. F. (1985) The gender factory. New York: Plenum.
- Bianchi, S. M. and D. Spain (1996) Women, work, and family in America. *Population Bulletin* 51(3), 1-48.
- Bird, C. E. and C. E. Ross (1993) Houseworkers and paid workers: Qualities of the work and effects on personal control. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 55, 913-925.

- Blair, S. L. (1993) Employment, family, and perceptions of marital quality among husbands and wives. *Journal of Family Issues* 14(2), 189-212.
- Blair, S. L. and M. P. Johnson (1992) Wives' perceptions of the fairness of the division of household labor: The intersection of housework and ideology. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 54, 570-581.
- Blair, S. L. and D. T. Lichter (1991) Measuring the division of household labor. Gender segregation of housework among American couples. *Journal of Family Issues* 12(1), 91-113.
- Brines, J. (1994) Economic dependency, gender, and the division of labor at home. *American Journal of Sociology* 100(3), 652-688.
- Buber, I. and A. Prskawetz (2000b) Fertility in second unions in Austria: Findings from the Austrian FFS. *Demographic Research [Online]*, available at <http://www.demographic-research.org/Volumes/Vol3/2>.
- Chesher, A. and T. Lancaster (1983) The estimation of models of labour market behaviour. *Review of Economic Studies* 50, 609-624.
- Coleman, D. (1996) New patterns and trends in European fertility: International and sub-national comparisons. In: D. Coleman (ed.) *Europe's Population in the 1990s*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1-61.
- Coltrane, S. (1996) *Family man. Fatherhood, housework, and gender equity*. New York: University Press.
- Council of Europe (ed.) (1998) *Promoting equality: A common issue for men and women. Proceedings. International seminar, Strasbourg (France), 17-19 June 1997*.
- Cunningham, M. (2001a) Parental influences on the gendered division of housework. *American Sociological Review* 66, 184-203.
- Cunningham, M. (2001b) The influence of parental attitudes and behaviors on children's attitudes towards gender and household labor in early adulthood. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 63, 111-222.

DeMaris, A. and M. A. Longmore (1996) Ideology, power, and equity: Testing competing explanations for the perception of fairness in household labor. *Social Forces* 74(3), 1043-1071.

Dillaway, H. and C. Broman (2001) Race, class, and gender differences in marital satisfaction and divisions of household labor among dual-earner couples. A case for intersectional analysis. *Journal of Family Issues* 22(3), 309-327.

Doblhammer, G., W. Lutz and C. Pfeiffer (1997) Tabellenband und Zusammenfassung erster Ergebnisse: Familien und Fertilitätssurvey (FFS) 1996. Österreichisches Institut für Familienforschung. Materialsammlung Heft 2. Vienna: Austrian Institute for Family Studies.

Fenstermaker, S., C. West and D. H. Zimmerman (1991) Gender inequality: New conceptual terrain. In: R. L. Blumberg (ed.) *Gender, Family, and Economy. The Triple Overlap*. Newbury Park: Sage, 289-307.

Ferree, M. M. (1990) Beyond separate spheres: Feminism and family research. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 52, 866-884.

Ferree, M. M. (1991) The gender division of labor in two-earner marriages. Dimensions of variability and change. *Journal of Family Issues* 12(2), 158-180.

Findl, I., A. Laburda and R. Münz (1985) Frauenalltag und familiäre Arbeitsteilung. In: R. Münz (ed.) *Leben mit Kindern. Wunsch und Wirklichkeit*. Wien: Deuticke. 129-158.

Folbre, N. and H. I. Hartmann (1989) The persistence of patriarchal capitalism. *Rethinking Marxism* 2(4), 90-96.

Frauen-Volksbegehren (1997) 716 der Beilagen zu den Stenographischen Protokollen des Nationalrates XX. Gesetzgebungsperiode. Parlamentarische Materialien. Vienna.

Freudenthaler, H. H. (1998) Gerechtigkeitspsychologische Aspekte der Arbeitsaufteilung in Doppelverdienerhaushalten: Zum (Un)Gerechtigkeitsempfinden von Frauen. Unpublished Dissertation. Graz: Karl-Franzens-University.

- Freudenthaler, H. H. and G Mikula (1998) From unfulfilled wants to the experience of injustice: Women's sense of injustice regarding the lopsided division of household labor. *Social Justice Research* 11(3), 289-312.
- Gisser, R., W. Holzer, R. Münz and E. Nebenführ (1995) Familie und Familienpolitik in Österreich. Wissen, Einstellungen, offene Wünsche, internationaler Vergleich. Bundesministerium für Jugend und Familie. Graz: Styria.
- Glass, J. and T. Fujimoto (1994) Housework, paid work, and depression among husbands and wives. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 35, 179-191.
- Goldscheider, F. K. and L. J. Waite (1991) New families, no families? The transformation of the American home. University of California Press: Berkeley.
- Greenstein, T. N. (1995) Gender ideology, marital disruption, and the employment of married women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 57, 31-42.
- Greenstein, T. N. (1996a) Gender ideology and perceptions of the fairness of the division of household labor: Effects on marital quality. *Social Forces* 74(3), 1029-1042.
- Greenstein, T. N. (1996b) Husband's participation in domestic labor: Interactive effects of wives' and husbands' gender ideologies. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 58, 585-595.
- Griffith, J. D., H. P. Koo and C. M. Suchindran (1985) Childbearing and family in remarriage. *Demography* 22(1), 73-88.
- Gross, I. (1995) Erhebungen über die Zeitverwendung 1981 und 1992. *Statistische Nachrichten* 2/1995, 116-121.
- Hanika, A. (1999) Realisierte Kinderzahl und zusätzlicher Kinderwunsch. *Statistische Nachrichten* 5/1999, 311-318.
- Hartmann, H. I. (1981) The family as the locus of gender, class, and political struggle: The example of housework. *Signs* 6(3), 366-394.

Heckman, J. J., V. J. Hotz and J. R. Walker (1985) New evidence on the timing and spacing of births. *The American Economic Review* 75, 179-184.

Hiller, D. V. (1984) Power dependence and division of family work. *Sex Roles* 10, 1003-1019.

Hiller, D. V. and W. W. Philliber (1986) The division of labor in contemporary marriage: Exceptions, perceptions, and performance. *Social Problems* 33(3), 191-201.

Hochschild, A. with A. Machung (1989) *The second shift*. New York: Viking.

Hoem B. and J. M. Hoem (1989) The impact of women's employment on second and third births in Sweden. *Population Studies* 43, 47-67.

Hoem, J. M., A. Prskawetz and G. Neyer (1999) Third births in Austria: The effect of public policies, educational attainment, and labor-force attachment, Working Paper 1999-02, Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research, Rostock.

Holzer, W. and R. Münz (1995) Kinderwunsch in Österreich. *Zeitschrift für Bevölkerungswissenschaft* 21(1), 69-102.

Jaggar, A. M. (1983) *Feminist politics and human nature*. Lanham: Rowman&Littlefield.

Kalleberg, A. L. and R. A. Rosenfeld (1990) Work in the family and in the labor market: A cross-national reciprocal analysis. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 52, 331-346.

Kammer für Arbeiter und Angestellte für Wien (ed.) (2001) HALBE/HALBE für ALLE - eine win/win-Situation für Männer und Frauen? Tagungsband 2000. Vienna.

Kamo, Y. (1988) Determinants of the household division of labor. Resources, power, and ideology. *Journal of Family Issues* 9(2), 177-200.

Kluwer, E. S., J. A. M. Heesink and E. Van De Vliert (1996) Marital conflict about the division of household labor and paid work. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 58, 958-969.

Kytir, J., I. Buber, D. Bichlbauer and U. Forster: *Bevölkerung und Familie in Oberösterreich*. Forschungsbericht 19 des Instituts für Demographie der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna 2000.

Lillard, L. A. (1993) Simultaneous equations for hazards. Marriage duration and fertility timing. *Journal of Econometrics* 56, 189-217.

Lillard, L. A. and C. W. A. Panis (2000) aML multilevel multprocess statistical software, release 1.0. Los Angeles, California: EconWare.

Lutz, W. (1992) *Distributional aspects of human fertility. A global comparative study*. London: Academic Press.

Major, B. (1987) Gender, justice, and the psychology of entitlement. In: P. Shaver and C. Hendrick (eds.) *Sex and Gender*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. 124-148.

Major, B. (1993) Gender, entitlement, and the distribution of family labor. *Journal of Social Issues* 49, 141-159.

McFarlane, S., R. Beaujot and T. Haddad (2000) Time constraints and relative resources as determinants of sexual division of domestic work. *Canadian Journal of Sociology/Cahiers Canadiens de Sociologie* 25(1), 61-82.

McHale, S. and A. C. Crouter (1992) You can't always get what you want: Incongruence between sex-role attitudes and family work roles and its applications for marriage. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 54, 537-547.

Mikula, G. (1998) Division of household labor and perceived justice: A growing field of research. *Social Justice Research* 11(3), 215-241.

Mikula, G. and H. H. Freudenthaler (1999) Aufteilung von Familienarbeit als Gegenstand von Ungerechtigkeitswahrnehmungen und sozialen Konflikten: zur Bedeutung sozialer Vergleiche. In: W. Lutz (ed.) *Kompodium der Familienforschung in Österreich 1999*. Schriftenreihe des Österreichischen Instituts für Familienforschung Nr. 7. Vienna. 37-60.



Oláh, L. S. (2001a) Gendering fertility: Second births in Sweden and Hungary. In: L.S. Oláh (2001): Gendering family dynamics: The case of Sweden and Hungary. Stockholm University Demography Unit – Dissertation Series. I, 1-50.

Oláh, L. S. (2001b) Gender and family stability: Dissolution of the first parental union in Sweden and Hungary. *Demographic Research [Online]*, available at <http://www.demographic-research.org/Volumes/Vol4/2>.

Perry-Jenkins, M. and K. Folk (1994) Class, couples, and conflict: Effects of the division of labor on assessments of marriage in dual-earner families. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 56, 165-180.

Pittman, J. F., W. Teng, J. L. Kerpelman and C. A. Solheim (1999) Satisfaction with performance of housework. The roles of time spent, quality assessment, and stress. *Journal of Family Issues* 20(6), 746-770.

Presser, H. B. (1994) Employment schedules among dual-earner spouses and the division of household labor by gender. *American Sociological Review* 59, 348-364.

Presser, H. B. (1997) Demography, feminism, and the science-policy nexus. *Population and Development Review* 23(2), 295-331.

Rindfuss, R. R., S. P. Morgan and G. Swicegood (1988) First births in America. Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Röhler, H., A. Steinbach and J. Huinink (2000) Hausarbeit in Partnerschaften. Zur Erklärung geschlechtstypischer Arbeitsteilung in nichtehelichen und ehelichen Lebensgemeinschaften. *Zeitschrift für Familienforschung* 12(2), 21-53.

Rosenberger, S. K. (2000) Frauenerwerbsarbeit - politische Kontextualisierungen im Wandel der Arbeitsgesellschaft. *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft* 2000(4), 417-431.

Ross, C. E. (1987) The division of labor at home. *Social Forces* 65(3), 816-833.

- Ruokolainen, A. and I.-L. Notkola (forthcoming) Familial, situational, and attitudinal determinants of third-birth intentions and their uncertainty. In: Statistics Finland (eds.) Yearbook of Population Finland, Vol 38. Helsinki: Tilastokeskus, 181-208.
- Ryder, N. B. (1973) A critique of the National Fertility Study. *Demography* 10(4), 495-506.
- Sanchez, L. (1994) Gender, labor allocations, and the psychology of entitlement within the home. *Social Forces* 73(2), 533-553.
- Sanchez, L. and C. T. Gager (2000) Hard living, perceived entitlement to a great marriage, and marital dissolution. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 62, 708-722.
- Segal, L. (1990) Slow motion. Changing masculinities, changing men. London: Virago.
- Schoen, R., N. M. Astone, Y. J. Kim, C. Nathanson and J. M. Fields (1999) Do fertility intentions affect fertility behavior? *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 61, 790-799.
- Shelton, B. A. and D. John (1996) The division of household labor. *Annual Review of Sociology* 22, 299-322.
- Tazi-Preve, I. M., J. Kytir, G. Lebhart and R. Münz (1999) Bevölkerung in Österreich. Demographische Trends, politische Rahmenbedingungen, entwicklungspolitische Aspekte. Schriften des Instituts für Demographie der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften Band 12. Vienna.
- Thomson, E. (1997) Couple childbearing desires, intentions, and births. *Demography* 34(3), 343-354.
- Thomson, E. and J. M. Hoem (1998) Couple childbearing plans and births in Sweden. *Demography* 35(3), 315-322.
- Thomson, E., J. M. Hoem, A. Vikat, A. Prskawetz, I. Buber, L. Toulemon, U. Henz, A. L. Goldecker, and V. Kantorova (forthcoming) Childbearing in stepfamilies: How parity matters. In: Miroslav Makula and Gigs Beets (eds.) Proceedings of the Fertility and Family Surveys Flagship Conference, Vol. II. Geneva: UN-CBBS.

- Thompson, L. (1991) Family work. Women's sense of fairness. *Journal of Family Issues* 12(2), 181-196.
- Thompson, L. and A. J. Walker (1989) Gender in families: Women and men in marriage, work, and parenthood. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 51, 845-871.
- Toulemon, L. and M. Mazuy (2001) Les naissances sont retardées mais la fécondité est stable. *Population* 56(4), 611-644.
- Urdze, A., M. S. Rerrich (1981) Frauenalltag und Kinderwunsch. Motive von Müttern für oder gegen ein zweites Kind. Frankfurt/Main: Campus.
- Vaskovics, L. A., B. Hofmann and H. Rost (1996) Ergebnisse der soziologischen Teilstudie. In: Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend (ed.) Optionen der Lebengestaltung junger Ehen und Kinderwunsch. Verbundstuide - Endbericht. Schriftenreihe Band 128.1. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Vikat, A., E. Thomson and J. M. Hoem (1999) Stepfamily fertility in contemporary Sweden: The impact of childbearing before the current union. *Population Studies* 53, 211-225.
- West, C. and D. H. Zimmerman (1987) Doing gender. *Gender & Society* 1(2), 125-151.
- Wiedenhofer, B. (1995) Zeitverwendung: Arbeitsteilung von Ehepartnern mit Kindern unter 15 Jahren. *Statistische Nachrichten* 8/1995, 601-608.
- Wineberg, H. (1990) Childbearing after remarriage. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 52, 31-38.

## Tables and figures

Table 1: Number of respondents excluded from the analysis

|   |       |
|---|-------|
| Total number of respondents   | 6,120 |
| Of these for women  | 4,581 |
| Records excluded because of:  |       |
| Foreign nationality   | 188   |
| Childlessness or more than one child  | 2,820 |
| No current union  | 758   |
| Pregnant with second child or unable to conceive                            | 79    |
| Woman is 40 years or older or her first child is above 15 years             | 323   |
| Missing information on children   | 7     |
| Missing information on start or completion of a union                       | 3     |
| Missing information on educational period                                   | 8     |
| Missing information on distribution of household tasks and childcare duties | 6     |
| Desire for further children unknown   | 25    |
| Sum of exclusions   | 5,756 |
| Total number of cases   | 364   |

Source: Austrian FFS, own calculations.

Table 2: Time allocation of couples, by women's employment status. Austrian couples with one or more children under the age of 15 years

| Woman's employment status:   | Employed |       | Full-time employed |       | Part-time employed |       | Not employed |       |
|------------------------------|----------|-------|--------------------|-------|--------------------|-------|--------------|-------|
|                              | Man      | Woman | Man                | Woman | Man                | Woman | Man          | Woman |
| Monday to Sunday             |          |       |                    |       |                    |       |              |       |
| Employment                   | 6.49     | 4.16  | 6.44               | 4.42  | 6.58               | 3.26  | 7.10         | 0.27  |
| Household                    | 2.07     | 5.54  | 2.12               | 5.41  | 1.57               | 6.18  | 1.56         | 8.43  |
| Leisure                      | 4.24     | 3.10  | 4.21               | 3.00  | 4.30               | 3.29  | 4.16         | 3.54  |
| Sleeping and private affairs | 10.34    | 10.35 | 10.36              | 10.31 | 10.32              | 10.44 | 10.31        | 10.52 |
| Education                    | 0.06     | 0.05  | 0.07               | 0.06  | 0.04               | 0.03  | 0.07         | 0.04  |
| Employment and household     | 8.56     | 10.10 | 8.56               | 10.23 | 8.15               | 9.44  | 9.06         | 9.10  |
| Monday to Friday             |          |       |                    |       |                    |       |              |       |
| Employment                   | 8.45     | 5.19  | 8.45               | 5.51  | 8.47               | 4.23  | 9.04         | 0.29  |
| Household                    | 1.35     | 5.58  | 1.40               | 5.43  | 1.28               | 6.26  | 1.27         | 9.26  |
| Leisure                      | 3.31     | 2.30  | 3.29               | 2.20  | 3.34               | 2.47  | 3.23         | 3.22  |
| Sleeping and private affairs | 10.01    | 10.06 | 9.58               | 9.57  | 10.06              | 10.23 | 10.02        | 10.38 |
| Education                    | 0.07     | 0.06  | 0.08               | 0.09  | 0.05               | 0.03  | 0.06         | 0.03  |
| Employment and household     | 10.10    | 11.07 | 10.25              | 11.34 | 10.15              | 10.49 | 10.31        | 9.55  |

Source: Austrian Microcensus 1992, Wiedenhofer (1995).

Remark 1: All men in the sample of couples were employed. The number of couples where the husband was unemployed was very small and therefore these couples were not included in the analysis of time-allocation of couples by Statistics Austria (Wiedenhofer 1995, p. 601).

Remark: Numbers are given as "hours. minutes".

Table 3: Distribution of household chores and childcare tasks and women's satisfaction with the distribution of tasks in the data set. Austrian women aged 20 to 54 years with one child, currently living in a union. Percentages.

| Number of household tasks performed primarily by             | Woman     | Man     | Both | Others |
|--|-----------|---------|------|--------|
| None   | 4.1       | 88.7    | 42.0 | 92.0   |
| One  | 8.0       | 6.3     | 21.4 | 4.7    |
| Two  | 17.9      | 3.0     | 17.3 | 3.3    |
| Three  | 13.7      | 1.4     | 12.1 |        |
| Four   | 20.6      | 0.5     | 4.4  |        |
| Five   | 35.7      | 0.0     | 2.7  |        |
| Total  | 100       | 100     | 100  | 100    |
| Number of childcare tasks performed primarily by             | Woman     | Man     | Both | Others |
| None   | 12.1      | 92.0    | 20.6 | 97.3   |
| One  | 19.0      | 7.1     | 37.1 | 2.7    |
| Two  | 23.4      | 0.8     | 20.6 | 0.0    |
| Three  | 30.2      | 0.0     | 13.7 |        |
| Four   | 15.4      | 0.0     | 8.0  |        |
| Total  | 100       |         |      |        |
| Satisfaction with the distribution of household tasks        |           |         |      |        |
| Very just  | 33.0      |         |      |        |
| Quite just   | 32.7      |         |      |        |
| More or less just  | 22.8      |         |      |        |
| Quite unjust   | 8.2       |         |      |        |
| Very unjust  | 2.7       |         |      |        |
| No answer  | 0.5       |         |      |        |
| Total  | 100       |         |      |        |
| Satisfaction with the distribution of childcare tasks        |           |         |      |        |
| Very just  | 38.2      |         |      |        |
| Quite just   | 32.1      |         |      |        |
| More or less just  | 23.6      |         |      |        |
| Quite unjust   | 4.1       |         |      |        |
| Very unjust  | 1.1       |         |      |        |
| No answer  | 0.8       |         |      |        |
| Total  | 100       |         |      |        |
| Comparison of own (partner's) household tasks with other ... | ... women | ... men |      |        |
| Much more  | 2.5       | 9.1     |      |        |
| Rather more  | 9.3       | 34.3    |      |        |
| More or less the same  | 72.3      | 38.7    |      |        |
| Rather less  | 13.7      | 14.8    |      |        |
| Much less  | 1.6       | 2.2     |      |        |
| No answer  | 0.5       | 0.8     |      |        |
| Total  | 100       | 100     |      |        |
| Comparison of own (partner's) childcare tasks with other ... | ... women | ... men |      |        |
| Much more  | 2.5       | 6.3     |      |        |
| Rather more  | 13.7      | 30.5    |      |        |
| More or less the same  | 75.8      | 53.3    |      |        |
| Rather less  | 7.1       | 6.9     |      |        |
| Much less  | 0.0       | 1.6     |      |        |
| No answer  | 0.8       | 1.4     |      |        |
| Total  | 100       | 100     |      |        |

Source: Austrian FFS, own calculations.

Table 4: Standardized coefficients for the effect of childcare tasks on the desire for a second child, four childcare tasks included. Austrian women with one child, living with a partner at the time of interview.

| Desire for a second child  | Within the<br>next 2<br>years | At an<br>undecided<br>point in<br>time |
|--|-------------------------------|--|
| <b>Number of cc-tasks performed primarily by the woman</b>                             |                               |  |
| None   | 0.16 **                       | 0.33                                   |
| One  | 0.27 **                       | 0.25 **                                |
| Two  | 0.54                          | 0.55                                   |
| Three  | 1                             | 1                                      |
| Four   | 1.27                          | 3.42                                   |
| <b>Number of cc-tasks performed primarily by the man</b>                               |                               |  |
| None   | 1                             | 1                                      |
| One or more  | 6.40 ***                      | 6.03 ***                               |
| <b>Number of cc-tasks performed primarily by both</b>                                  |                               |  |
| None   | 0.65                          | 0.39                                   |
| One  | 1                             | 1                                      |
| Two  | 2.41 **                       | 2.12 *                                 |
| Three  | 3.16 *                        | 3.71 **                                |
| Four   | 10.91 **                      | 46.06 **                               |
| <b>Woman's comparison of her own contribution to the cc-tasks with other women</b>     |                               |  |
| Much more  | 4.35 **                       | 2.14                                   |
| Rather more  | 1.12                          | 1.02                                   |
| More or less the same  | 1                             | 1                                      |
| Rather less  | 0.71                          | 0.19 **                                |
| Rather less  |                               |  |
| <b>Woman's comparison of her partner's contribution to the cc-tasks with other men</b> |                               |  |
| Much more  | 0.94                          | 1.06                                   |
| Rather more  | 1.30                          | 1.22                                   |
| More or less the same  | 1                             | 1                                      |
| Rather or much less  | 1.37                          | 2.26 *                                 |
| ln-L   | -161.27                       | -140.86                                |

Remark 1: Significance: "\*\*" = 10%, "\*" = 5%, "\*\*\*" = 1%.

Remark 2: The effects are given as the antilog.

Remark 3: "cc" stands for "childcare".

Remark 4: For the "entire" model see Table A2 in our Appendix.

Source: Austrian FFS, own calculations.

## **A Appendix**

### **A. 1 Coding of the desire for a further child, household chores and childcare tasks**

In the Austrian FFS respondents were asked about their future childbearing plans and were required to answer if they would like to have a(nother) child within the next two years. The respondents who did not want to have a(nother) child within the next two years were asked if they would like to have a(nother) child at a yet undecided point in time in the future and if they were medically still able to bear children. Finally, the respondents were asked how many further children they desired to have. This allows us to select those respondents who are still able to bear children and to distinguish between persons who want to have at least one (further) child (1) either in the near future or (2) perhaps later or (3) or no (further) child at all.

Female and male respondents living together were asked about who in general is cooking, vacuuming and tidying up, shopping grocery, washing the dishes, doing the laundry and ironing, caring for needy and/or elderly family members, managing financial matters, doing household repairs, and running errands.

Women and men with at least one child were required to answer who in general is preparing food for the child(ren), feeding the child(ren), dressing the child(ren), nursing the child(ren) when ill, playing with and having other activities that involve the child(ren), and helping with school assignments.

They were required to choose between the following possible answers: (1) the respondent herself/himself, (2) the partner, (3) both partners more or less equally, (4) other persons in the household, (5) other persons. It was possible to choose several answers.

In order to study the effects of gendered behavior, we included five household tasks in our analysis, namely (1) cooking, (2) vacuuming and tidying up, (3) grocery shopping, (4) washing the dishes, and (5) doing the laundry and ironing. These items represent the feminine tasks at home and are everyday activities. We added up the number of household tasks performed mainly by the woman, her partner, both, or others.



For childrearing, we included four duties, namely (1) preparing the child's food, feeding a small child, (2) dressing the child, (3) nursing the child when ill, and (4) playing with the child and having other activities that involve the child. Again, we summed up the number of chores carried out primarily by the woman, her partner, both, or others.

In order to find out about the perceived fairness of household work distribution and childrearing, respondents were asked several questions (all of them separately for household work and childcare tasks), using a two-step procedure. In the first step, respondents were asked the extent to which they evaluate the distribution of household work and childcare, using a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from "very just" to "very unjust". In the second step, respondents were required to do a referential within-gender comparison<sup>28</sup>. Women were asked (1) if they thought that they are doing more household work (or childcare tasks) than other women, and (2) if they thought their husband is doing more household chores (or childcare tasks) than other men. Men were asked to make a comparison between their contribution and that of other men and to compare their wife's contribution to that of other women. For the evaluation, interviewees had to use a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from "much more" to "much less".

In our analysis, we initially included measurements for the perceived fairness of housework distribution between the two sexes and for a comparison with other households. However, in the end we included a comparison component only, because it comprises two dimensions (a woman-women comparison and a partner-men comparison) and therefore allowed for a more accurate analysis. Nevertheless, the evaluation of fairness in the distribution of household labor and the within-gender comparisons are held to be correlated. Furthermore, the variable on the perception of fairness did not attribute significantly in our model. Our procedure supports the findings of Mikula and Freudenthaler (1999). They revealed that comparisons women make between their partner's contribution to household tasks with that of other men are the best predictors of justice judgements and social conflicts. Comparison women make between their own contributions and those of their partners and those of other women additionally contribute to these predictions.

## A. 2 Control variables

Many studies of family formation emphasize the importance of family characteristics and of influences in early life on family formation behavior later in life. Accordingly, we controlled for the effect of (1) the *respondent's number of siblings*, (2) the *degree of religiousness*, and (3) the *rural or urban environment the respondents lived in during their childhood and adolescence*. Moreover, we controlled for union-specific characteristics and other variables present at the time of the interview such as (4) the *combined marital status* (marital status at the birth of the first child and at the time of the interview), (5) the *woman's age at the time of the interview*, (6) the *woman's number of working hours* (at the time of the interview), (7) the *partner's number of pre-union children*, (8) the *age of the first child at the time of the interview*, and (9) *family attitude towards the combination of motherhood and employment*<sup>29</sup> The distribution of these characteristics over different levels is given in Table A1.<sup>30</sup>

Table A2 shows the effects of our control variables. Except for *woman's age at the time of the interview*, we found no persistent significant effect in our two models (desire for a second child within the next two years or at an undecided point in time). Nevertheless, the effects mostly confirm our expectations and are briefly described here.

Women who grew up without a *sibling* less often wish to have a second child. This supports “one of the longest-standing and best-documented findings in the study of fertility” (Axinn et

---

<sup>28</sup> The FFS made no comments whether the comparison should be made with other peers or with other generations, for example their parents' generation. Nevertheless, we think that what matters is the subjective evaluation of doing more or less work than others.

<sup>29</sup> In their analysis on the childbearing plans of couples living in Sweden, Thomson and Hoem (1998) included three indicators of gender arrangements or ideology, one of them being a measure of family ideology. In the Austrian FFS each respondent was asked to give the preferred combination of parenthood and employment (normative expectations). Respondents had to choose the best and second best solution among the following alternatives:

- (1) The woman cedes her employment as soon she has one child.
- (2) The woman reduces her working hours as soon as she has one child.
- (3) The woman interrupts her employment until all children have reached school-age.
- (4) The woman interrupts her employment for two years (full period of maternity leave).
- (5) The woman interrupts her employment for a maximum of one year.
- (6) Woman and man share the two years of maternity leave (each one year).
- (7) The man interrupts his employment for two years and the woman continues to work.

We used this information in order to generate the respondent's family-orientation and distinguish between very traditional (1), traditional (2 and 3) and rather modern (4) and very modern (5, 6 and 7) family ideologies.

<sup>30</sup> In previous analyses not shown here we also included alternative measures for age, union status, employment and situation of the current partner, namely: the *woman's relative age at the birth of the first child*, *union order*, the *employment status* (e.g. white-collar worker, blue-collar worker), and the *number of the partner's pre-union children living in the household at formation of the union*. These covariates were not included in the final model because they had less explanatory power.

al. 1994, p. 66), namely the positive association between the number of children born to parents and the number of children their children have. For self-reported *religiosity* we observe that a high degree of religiosity increases the desire for a second child in the near future whereas non-religiosity decreases it. Not surprisingly, the *rural environment in which the respondents lived in during their childhood and adolescence* has an increasing effect on further family plans.

The effect of the *combined marital status* (the status at the birth of the first child and at the time of interview) reveals an increased desire for a second child among women who were cohabiting with their partner at the birth of their first child and who married at a later stage in their life. Marriage after the birth of the first child might be an indicator for a high family orientation and a "sign" that the couple wants a second child. Research revealed that marriage significantly increases the intensity for a child (Lillard 1993). In general, the desire for a second child is higher in marriage than in cohabitation. For a further interpretation of the covariate *combined marital status* we refer to the Chapter on aspects of stepfamily fertility.

Women make consistent decisions about childbearing under biological and social constraints that make certain ages more desirable than others for childbearing. Our results on the *woman's age at the time of the interview* illustrate - as has previous research - a decreasing desire for a child with increasing age. In particular women with one child who are 30 years old or more have significantly lower childbearing intentions than mothers in their twenties. Women who intend to have more than one child in general give birth to their second child rather soon after the birth of the first child (Toulemon and Mazuy<sup>31</sup> 2001). The older a woman, the larger the likelihood that she already had a second child and also the smaller the likelihood that she intends to have a second child. Therefore, with increasing age women in our sample represent more and more a selected group which might bias our estimated effects.

Our findings on mother's *enrollment in paid work* indicate that full-time employment decreases the desire for a second child within the next two years, but increases the wish for a second child at an undecided point in time. Mothers in full-time employment are the most

---

<sup>31</sup> Toulemon and Mazuy (2001) found that in France the second child arrives quite soon after the first child. In general, the second child arrives four years after the first child. They also observed a decreasing time span between the first and second child since 1993, which means that French women who intend to have a second child space their first and their second child rather closely.

employment-oriented of all women and might not wish to have a child in the very near future, but at a later stage in their life. Therefore, full-time employment of mothers should not be treated as coterminous with no further childbearing plans.

The *family attitudes* of women, measured by the normative expectations on the combination of parenthood and employment, have no significant effect on the desire for a second child. The higher coefficients for more traditional women might be interpreted as an expected result. Besides the age of the woman at the time of the interview, the *age of her first child at the time of the interview* is a significant predictor for further childbearing intentions. Not surprisingly, our findings illustrate that there is a decreasing desire for a second child with increasing age of the first child. We refer again to the selection process to which our sample might be submitted. The older the first child, the more women who intend to get a second child have realized their childbearing intentions. Therefore, the older the first child, the more selective women in our sample might be.

We do not have data on all possible covariates that might affect childbearing desires. Consequently, we can expect unobserved as well as observed characteristics to influence further childbearing plans. Heckmann et al. (1985) demonstrated the importance of controlling for unobserved features in the analysis of life-cycle birth processes. They find that controlling for unobserved heterogeneity in a robust nonparametric fashion vitally affects the sign and statistical significance of the estimated effects of early life-cycle events on subsequent fertility outcomes. As expected, we did not get converging results when including unobserved heterogeneity in our analysis. Numerous runs with different starting values did not reach convergence.

### **A. 3 Temporal aspects of the desire for a second child**

In general, the effects of our control variables on the desire for a second child within the next two years and for a second child at a yet undecided point in time are similar, with two notable exceptions. The effect of the *woman's age at the time of the interview* as well as the *age of her first child at the time of the interview* are more pronounced and show a higher level of significance in the analysis of the desire for a second child at a yet undecided point in time. This can easily be explained by the fact that in particular women in their thirties are more likely to plan to have another child within the next two years rather than much later on in life.

Furthermore, women with a baby or a toddler might not wish to have a second child in the very near future but wish to have a sibling for their first child at a later point in time: Table A2 shows non-significant coefficients of the magnitude 1.58 and 1.77 for the desire to have a second child within the next two years, but (highly) significant coefficients of the magnitude 3 and 3.7 when asked if they want to have a second child at a later stage in life.

Moreover, the effect of the number of siblings and of religiousness turns out to be significant when asked for the desire for a second child at a yet undecided time. The same holds true for full-time employed women.

#### **A. 4 Aspects of stepfamily fertility**

It is an interesting digression to look at findings related to stepfamilies. Research on stepfamily fertility<sup>32</sup> revealed in part an influence of the partners' number of children on the fertility behavior of women (Buber and Prskawetz 2000). Our analysis includes two covariates that might be related to stepfamilies, namely the *combined marital status* and the *partner's number of pre-union children*.

Studies on stepfamilies assume that there are differences in the childbearing behavior of women who experienced a union disruption in their fertility period (i.e. roughly before the age of 40 years) when compared to those who were living in a more or less stable union (Griffith et al. 1985, Wineberg 1990).

Our covariate *combined marital status* includes a group of women who were living with their partner at the time of the interview but did not do so at the birth of the first child. These women have a lower desire for a second child within the next two years; however, they have a rather high desire for a second child at a later point in time. Although the corresponding coefficients are not statistically significant, the effects are interesting because the partner may be different from the first child's father. Our results indicates that the presence of a new partner reduces the wish to have a second child relatively soon but increases the wish for a second child at a later stage in life. The (slightly) deeper desire for a second child and

---

<sup>32</sup> For an overview of the prevailing hypothesis in stepfamily fertility see Vikat et al. 1999.

therefore for a (first) child by the current partner supports the findings of recent research (Vikat et al. 1999, Buber and Prskawetz 2000, Thomson et al., forthcoming).

Further insights into stepfamily fertility behavior might be gained by the covariate *partner's number of pre-union children*. Table A2 reveals that the existence of one or two *pre-union children of the partner* has a slightly increasing, but no significant effect on the desire of women to have a second child. This result is not of further relevance because of insignificance and the small magnitude (1.13 and 1.15), but again it supports the wish for a shared child among couples with pre-union children.

#### **A. 5 The effect of the division of household tasks**

We find evidence that the contribution men make to household work increases the desire of women for a second child. Women whose partner is responsible for at least one of our five feminine tasks wish to have a second child to a higher extent than those who cannot rely on the help of their partner. The same holds true for couples where both partners share all these chores equally. Our effects of the division of household chores on childbearing intentions are only significant to a certain extent and therefore have only a low predictive value.

On the one hand, the insignificant effect of the five feminine household tasks included in the model might be due to the fact that the non-sharing of feminine household tasks has no impact on further childbearing plans in Austria where the division of labor among parents is still very gendered. On the other hand, the result may also be due to the limited tasks we included in the analysis. We do not want to be too pessimistic and believe that the choice of the five household chores is representative for feminine housework. Moreover, we find support for our results and interpretation from previous research which also revealed that there are only limited effects for household tasks (Baruch and Barnett 1986).

The within-gender comparison of women's contribution to household labor has no significant effect on the further childbearing desire of women. Women who feel that they perform *rather less* household tasks than other women wish to have a second child to a slightly greater extent than those who do more household chores (the corresponding coefficients are 1.17 and 1.19, see Table A2); those who believe that they are doing *much less* work wish to have a second child to an even greater degree (the estimated effects are 1.64 and 1.66). The reference group

is the majority of women who believe that they are doing more or less the same amount or share of household work than other women. Although the effects point into the expected direction, they are not statistically significant.

Surprisingly, our analysis reveals that there is a significantly higher desire for a second child in the near future among women who think that they are doing much more in the house compared to other women (the estimated coefficient 4.47 is significant at a 10 per cent level) and also a slightly higher desire for a second child at a yet undecided point in time (the estimated coefficient is 4.47). This effect does not confirm general expectations and can be interpreted as an indicator for still very traditional attitudes among Austrian women. It may be the result of differential gender socialization, which raises girls to understand that they will be the housekeeper (Goldscheider and Waite 1991).

Turning to the comparison women make between their partner's contribution to and that of other men, we again obtain results of little significance which at the first sight are contradictory. First of all, a positive evaluation of the partner's contribution has a slightly decreasing effect on further childbearing plans (the corresponding coefficients are 1.18 and 1.20). However, women whose partner does much more in the house than other men have an exceptionally low desire for a second child (0.53 and 0.40). This might be attributed to the fact that this rather small group of women is overloaded with housework which might in turn be an explanation for their partner's high involvement in household work and also for the decreased desire for a second child. As expected, women whose partner is doing much less in the house have an explicitly low desire for a second child.

We find a significant higher desire for a second child for the group of women who believe that their partner performs rather less household tasks than other men. This surprising result contradicts our expectations and might be interpreted in the light of still traditional attitudes.

Summing up, the analysis of a couple's contribution to household work as well as the comparison of the distribution is of limited significant power.

## A. 6 Tables

Table A1: Distribution of the control variables included in the analysis

| Covariates   | Absolute | In % |
|--|----------|------|
| <b>Wish to have a child within the next 2 years</b>                      |          |      |
| Yes  | 121      | 33.2 |
| No   | 243      | 66.8 |
| <b>Wish to have a child at an undecided point in time</b>                |          |      |
| Yes  | 218      | 59.9 |
| No   | 130      | 35.7 |
| Unknown  | 16       | 4.6  |
| <b>Siblings</b>  |          |      |
| 0  | 34       | 9.3  |
| 1  | 84       | 23.1 |
| 2  | 98       | 26.9 |
| 3  | 63       | 17.3 |
| 4+   | 83       | 22.8 |
| Unknown  | 2        | 0.5  |
| <b>Rural – urban environment</b>   |          |      |
| Under 10,000 inhabitants   | 249      | 68.4 |
| 10,000 - 1 Mio. inhabitants  | 84       | 23.1 |
| Vienna   | 27       | 7.4  |
| Unknown  | 4        | 1.1  |
| <b>Religiousness</b>   |          |      |
| Very religious   | 39       | 10.7 |
| Quite religious  | 187      | 51.4 |
| Quite non-religious  | 92       | 25.3 |
| Non-religious  | 45       | 12.4 |
| No answer  | 1        | 0.3  |
| <b>Woman's age at time of interview</b>                                  |          |      |
| 20-24 years  | 74       | 20.3 |
| 25-29 years  | 147      | 40.4 |
| 30-34 years  | 96       | 26.4 |
| 35-39 years  | 47       | 12.9 |
| <b>Number of hours of employment</b>                                     |          |      |
| Less than 13 hours   | 4        | 1.1  |
| 13-24 hours  | 53       | 14.6 |
| 25-34 hours  | 26       | 7.1  |
| 35-44 hours  | 44       | 12.1 |
| More than 44 hours   | 5        | 1.4  |
| Not employed at time of interview  | 230      | 63.2 |
| No answer  | 2        | 0.5  |
| <b>Combined marital status</b>   |          |      |
| No union at birth of first child, cohabiting at time of interview        | 22       | 6.0  |
| No union at birth of first child, married at time of interview           | 17       | 4.7  |
| Cohabiting at birth of first child, cohabiting at time of interview      | 79       | 21.7 |
| Cohabiting at birth of first child, married at time of interview         | 48       | 13.2 |
| Married at birth of first child (and still married at time of interview) | 198      | 54.4 |



Table A1 continued

| Covariates  | Absolute | In % |
|---|----------|------|
| <b>Age of first child at time of interview</b>  |          |      |
| Under 1 year  | 67       | 18.4 |
| 1 year  | 60       | 16.5 |
| 2 years   | 55       | 15.1 |
| 3-4 years   | 54       | 14.8 |
| 5-9 years   | 86       | 23.6 |
| 10-14 years   | 42       | 11.5 |
| <b>Partner's number of pre-union children</b>   |          |      |
| No child  | 330      | 90.7 |
| 1 or 2 children   | 33       | 9.1  |
| Unknown   | 1        | 0.3  |
| <b>Family attitudes (original questions)</b>  |          |      |
| The woman cedes employment as soon as she has one child.                                | 38       | 10.4 |
| The woman reduces her working hours as soon as she has one child.                       | 70       | 19.2 |
| The woman interrupts her employment until all children have reached school-age.         | 79       | 21.7 |
| The woman interrupts her employment for 2 years (total maternity leave period).         | 128      | 35.2 |
| The woman interrupts her employment for a maximum of one year.                          | 17       | 4.7  |
| Woman and men share parental leave equally (each one year).                             | 20       | 5.5  |
| The man interrupts his employment for two years and the woman continues her employment. | 5        | 1.4  |
| No answer   | 7        | 1.9  |
| <b>Family attitudes (included in the analysis)</b>                                      |          |      |
| Very traditional  | 38       | 10.4 |
| Rather traditional  | 149      | 40.9 |
| Rather modern   | 128      | 35.2 |
| Very modern   | 42       | 11.5 |
| No answer   | 7        | 1.9  |

Source: Austrian FFS, own calculations.

Table A2: Relative rates of control variables for the desire to have a second child, Austrian women with one child who were living with a partner at the time of the interview

| Desire for a second child  | Within the next 2 years | At an undecided point in time |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Constant   | 0.56                    | 1.01                          |
| <b>Siblings</b>  |                         |                               |
| No sibling   | 0.66                    | 0.29 **                       |
| One sibling and more   | 1                       | 1                             |
| <b>Religiousness</b>   |                         |                               |
| Very religious   | 1.21                    | 0.86                          |
| Rather religious   | 1                       | 1                             |
| (Rather) non-religious   | 0.79                    | 0.67 *                        |
| <b>Rural-urban environment</b>   |                         |                               |
| Under 10,000 inhabitants   | 1                       | 1                             |
| 10,000 inhabitants and more  | 0.82                    | 0.82                          |
| <b>Combined marital status</b>   |                         |                               |
| No union at birth of first child, cohabiting at time of interview        | 0.75                    | 1.55                          |
| No union at birth of first child, married at time of interview           | 0.90                    | 1.79                          |
| Cohabiting at birth of first child, cohabiting at time of interview      | 0.77                    | 1.36                          |
| Cohabiting at birth of first child, married at time of interview         | 1.37                    | 1.71                          |
| Married at birth of first child (and still married at time of interview) | 1                       | 1                             |
| <b>Woman's age at time of interview</b>                                  |                         |                               |
| 20-24 years  | 1.33                    | 1.51                          |
| 25-29 years  | 1                       | 1                             |
| 30-34 years  | 0.74                    | 0.54 **                       |
| 35-39 years  | 0.38 **                 | 0.31 ***                      |
| <b>Number of hours of employment</b>                                     |                         |                               |
| Less than 25 hours   | 1.37                    | 1.11                          |
| 25-34 hours  | 1.05                    | 2.08                          |
| 35 hours and more  | 0.84                    | 2.34 **                       |
| Not employed at time of interview  | 1                       | 1                             |
| <b>Partner's number of pre-union children</b>                            |                         |                               |
| None   | 1                       | 1                             |
| One or two   | 1.13                    | 1.15                          |
| <b>Age of first child at time of interview</b>                           |                         |                               |
| Under 1 year   | 1.58                    | 3.04 **                       |
| 1 year   | 1.77                    | 3.68 ***                      |
| 2 years  | 1.04                    | 1.38                          |
| 3-5 years  | 1.17                    | 1.25                          |
| 6-9 years  | 1                       | 1                             |
| 10-14 years  | 0.86                    | 0.56                          |
| <b>Family attitudes</b>  |                         |                               |
| Very traditional   | 0.70                    | 1.54                          |
| Rather traditional   | 1.28                    | 1.12                          |
| Rather modern  | 1                       | 1                             |
| Very modern  | 1.09                    | 0.88                          |

Table A2 continued

| Desire for a second child   | Within the<br>next 2<br>years | At an<br>undecided<br>point in<br>time |
|---|-------------------------------|--|
| <b>Number of hh-tasks performed primarily by the woman</b>              |                               |  |
| One   | 0.45                          | 0.10 *                                 |
| Two   | 0.63                          | 0.35                                   |
| Three   | 0.69                          | 0.63                                   |
| Four  | 0.72                          | 0.43                                   |
| Five  | 1                             | 1                                      |
| <b>Number of hh-tasks performed primarily by the man</b>                |                               |  |
| None  | 1                             | 1                                      |
| One or more   | 1.22                          | 2.52 *                                 |
| <b>Number of hh-tasks performed primarily by both</b>                   |                               |  |
| None  | 1                             | 1                                      |
| One   | 0.96                          | 2.09                                   |
| Two   | 1.31                          | 1.81                                   |
| Three   | 0.66                          | 2.79                                   |
| Four  | 3.95                          | 9.33                                   |
| <b>Woman's evaluation of her own contribution to the hh-tasks</b>       |                               |  |
| Much more   | 4.47 *                        | 1.16                                   |
| Rather more   | 0.82                          | 1.01                                   |
| More or less the same   | 1                             | 1                                      |
| Rather less   | 1.17                          | 1.19                                   |
| Much less   | 1.64                          | 1.66                                   |
| <b>Woman's evaluation of her partner's contribution to the hh-tasks</b> |                               |  |
| Much more   | 0.53                          | 0.40                                   |
| Rather more   | 1.18                          | 1.20                                   |
| More or less the same   | 1                             | 1                                      |
| Rather less   | 1.81 **                       | 1.11                                   |
| Much less   | 0.55                          | 0.40                                   |
| ln-L  | -161.27                       | -140.86                                |

Remark 1: Significance: "\*" = 10%, "\*\*\*" = 5%, "\*\*\*\*" = 1%.

Remark 2: The effects are given as the antilog.

Remark 3: "hh" stands for "household".

Remark 4: The results stem from a model where household tasks as well as childcare duties were included in the analysis. The effects for the division on childcare duties are shown in Table 4. The  $-2 \log$  likelihood refers to the "entire" model.

Source: Austrian FFS, own calculations.

## A.7 aML-program

This following program gives the aML-code for the model which analysis the desire for a second child within the next two years.

```
/* Specify the data set as converted by raw2aml */
dsn = hh5.dat;

/* Specify regressors */
define regressor set BetaX;
  var = 1 (siblings==1)
    (reli==1) (reli>=3)
    (rural>=2)
    (mar_stat==1) (mar_stat==2) (mar_stat==3) (mar_stat==4)
    (curr_age==1) (curr_age==3) (curr_age==4)
    (emp_h>=1 and emp_h<=2) (emp_h==3) (emp_h>=4)&(emp_h<=5)
    (p_ch==2)
    (age_1_ch==1) (age_1_ch==2) (age_1_ch==3) (age_1_ch==4) (age_1_ch==6)
    (family==1) (family>=2 and family<=3) (family>=5 and family<=7)

    (she_hh==2) (she_hh==3) (she_hh==4) (she_hh==5)
    (he_hh>=2)
    (both_hh==2) (both_hh==3) (both_hh==4) (both_hh==5)
    (sat_she==1) (sat_she==2) (sat_she==4) (sat_she==5)
    (sat_he==1) (sat_he==2) (sat_he==4) (sat_he==5)

    (she_cc==1) (she_cc==2) (she_cc==3) (she_cc==5)
    (he_cc>=2)
    (both_cc==1) (both_cc==3) (both_cc==4) (both_cc==5)
    (sat_c_s==1) (sat_c_s==2) (sat_c_s==4)
    (sat_c_h==1) (sat_c_h==2) (sat_c_h>=4)
;

/* Specify the model: outcome and right-hand-side */
probit model; keep if siblings<6 & reli<5 & rural<4 & emp_h!=6 & p_ch<3 &
  family<8 & both_hh<6 & she_hh>1 & sat_she<6 & sat_he<6
  & sat_c_s<6 & sat_c_h<6;
  outcome = wish1;
  model = regset BetaX;

starting values;

Constant      T   -0.3142
sib1          T   -0.1266
reli1         T    0.2638
reli3+        T   -0.2136
rural23       T   -0.1224
marstat1      T   -0.4158
marstat2      T   -0.0238
marstat3      T   -0.1073
marstat4      T    0.3579
curr_ag1      T    0.1296
curr_ag3      T   -0.4277
curr_ag4      T   -0.9207
e_h12         T    0.1723
e_h3          T   -0.0286
e_h45         T   -0.3259
```

|        |   |         |
|--------|---|---------|
| p_ch1+ | T | -0.0725 |
| a_ch_1 | T | 0.1420  |
| a_ch_2 | T | 0.3257  |
| a_ch_3 | T | 0.0947  |
| a_ch_4 | T | 0.0508  |
| a_ch_6 | T | -0.3796 |
| fam1   | T | -0.2239 |
| fam23  | T | 0.0907  |
| fam567 | T | -0.1283 |

|        |   |   |
|--------|---|---|
| she_2  | T | 0 |
| she_3  | T | 0 |
| she_4  | T | 0 |
| she_5  | T | 0 |
| he_2+  | T | 0 |
| both_2 | T | 0 |
| both_3 | T | 0 |
| both_4 | T | 0 |
| both_5 | T | 0 |

|         |   |   |
|---------|---|---|
| sat_s_1 | T | 0 |
| sat_s_2 | T | 0 |
| sat_s_4 | T | 0 |
| sat_s_5 | T | 0 |
| sat_h_1 | T | 0 |
| sat_h_2 | T | 0 |
| sat_h_4 | T | 0 |
| sat_h_5 | T | 0 |

|         |   |   |
|---------|---|---|
| she_c1  | T | 0 |
| she_c2  | T | 0 |
| she_c3  | T | 0 |
| she_c5  | T | 0 |
| he_c2+  | T | 0 |
| both_c1 | T | 0 |
| both_c3 | T | 0 |
| both_c4 | T | 0 |
| both_c5 | T | 0 |

|         |   |   |
|---------|---|---|
| s_c_s_1 | T | 0 |
| s_c_s_2 | T | 0 |
| s_c_s_4 | T | 0 |
| s_c_h_1 | T | 0 |
| s_c_h_2 | T | 0 |
| s_c_h_4 | T | 0 |

;