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• Starting Point
• Some Background Information about Germany
• The Project
• Analyzing Methods
• Exemplary (Preliminary) Results
• Conclusion
Beginning of marriage: almost equal division of household labor in ~ half of the couples

Course of marriage → more traditional arrangements

Increasing marriage duration → declining propensity to change an existing arrangement

Intensification of this tendency by the transition to parenthood

Legislation as important for interviewed couples

- **Maternity leave:**
  - 6 weeks before and 8 weeks after birth

- **Child-raising allowance:**
  - depends on income
  - max. 307€ for 24 months or 460€ for 12 months
  - To some extent additional benefits from the states

- **Parental leave:**
  - max. 36 months
  - max. 12 months for flexible use (child 3-8 yrs old)
  - can be used by mother/father or simultaneously
  - working part-time (max. 30 hrs/week) is possible
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Entitlement and use of parental leave

Source: BMFSFJ 2004: 12.

Elterzeitanspruch: Mindestens eine Person im Haushalt ist nach §15 BBzGG anspruchsberechtigt. Inanspruchnahme der Elterzeit: Mindestens eine Person im Haushalt nimmt die Elternzeit in Anspruch.

Quelle: Repräsentativbefragung 2003, n = 725

Source: BMFSFJ 2004: 12.
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## Some background information about Germany

### Duration of parental leave after the birth of the first child

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Ost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bis 6 Monate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12 Monate</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-24 Monate</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-36 Monate</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>länger als 36 Monate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gesamt</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Datenbasis: Repräsentativbefragung 2000; n=1.089
Quelle: IAB-Projekt 3-523, 2000, Beckmann/Kurtz, 10/2001: 3

Source: BMFSFJ 2005: 349.
Some background information about Germany

Day care places per 100 children for different age groups

Source: BMFSFJ 2005: 337.
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Some background information about Germany

Day care places for 3-5 year-old children by opening hours in %
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Some background information about Germany

Labor force participation in %

Source: Eurostat 2010.
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Some background information about Germany

Labor force participation of parents by age of youngest child
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Some background information about Germany

Full-/Part-Time rate of employed mothers/fathers by age of youngest child

Source: Statistisches Bundesamt 2006: 11.
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The project

• “The Household Division of Domestic Labor as a Process. How does the division of housework change over the course of relationships?”

• 56 interviews with 14 couples

• Longitudinal design

• Event-centered
  – 1st interview shortly before the birth of the first child, prospective design
  – 2nd interview about one year afterwards → Changes due to the birth

→ Deeper insights by means of a longitudinal qualitative study
Main questions of the project

- Development of division of labor (household tasks, employment, childcare) during the transition to parenthood → explanation for changes and stability
- Understanding of decisions and interpretations of couples motivating or rationalizing traditionalization – even for well-educated couples
- Analysis of consistence between anticipated and realized division of labor after the birth
- Examination of rationales according to well-elaborated theories
Aim of this presentation

- Analyzing methods
  - Coding
  - Extracting information
  - Aggregation of data
  - Theories
- Exemplary advantage of the approaches
- Preliminary results
Analyzing methods

• Computer-aided analysis: MAXqda
  – Theoretical Coding
  – Open Coding
B: 
Es hat sich dahingehend, ja für mich, eigentlich nichts geändert.

I: 
Also auch der, der Umfang ist das alles, der Job an sich ist das gleiche. Wie sieht's mit dem Umfang aus?

B: 
Ja, also ich hatte letztes Jahr irgendwie so die Hoffnung, dass das irgendwie sonach dem Hausbau dann auch beruflich sich das Ganze mal ein bisschen straffer kann und ein bisschen mehr Zeit hab, das war ein echter Trugschluss.

I: 
Ja?

B: 
Das war ein voller (betont) Trugschluss, das ist immer noch, also ich hab, ja um Weihnachten rum, hab ich dann irgendwann von der Firma, die mir anhören müssen, lassen müssen, dass es doch schon gut war, dass sie eine problemlose Schwangerschaft gehabt hat, weil ich eh nie da war. Also ich eh nie so richtig wirklich greifbar war und das sieht sich jetzt durch. Es ist jetzt im Moment eigentlich eher noch wieder mehr geworden. Ich hab eigentlich heut Nachmittag, hätte ich mir eigentlich frei nehmen wollen, weil ich bevor wir hier das Interview machen, eigentlich (betont) noch mal schnell in die Stadt wollte, weil wir am Samstag in Urlaub fahren, und ein paar Besorgungen machen. Das hat sich heute Früh um 7.00 Uhr dann geändert, einen Anruf bekommen, 16.00 Uhr noch eine Sitzung bis 19.00 Uhr.
Analyzing methods

• Computer-aided analysis: MAXqda
  – Theoretical Coding
  – Open Coding

• Combination of different approaches:
  – Qualitative Content Analysis (Mayring)
  – Identification of types on the basis of the single cases (Kelle/Kluge)
  – Confrontation of theories with the qualitative data (Hopf)
Example for summarizing content analysis

- Theoretical Consideration: Importance of analyzing different tasks separately: household, employment, childcare and to distinguish between different chores in each field
- MAXqda: Looking at the codings concerning i.e. cooking of one couple
- For each chore and field:
  - Reduction of information
  - Summary of information
  - Interpretation
### Example: Cooking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification and execution by man/woman (said by: woman/man)</th>
<th>Rationale (said by man/woman)</th>
<th>Key for rationale</th>
<th>Conflicts (said by woman/man)</th>
<th>Questions/remarks</th>
<th>Interpretations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily decision of couple who shall cook; warm meals often in the evening; couple often goes out for food, at least weekly (woman); normally: cooking is done by the man, sometimes by the woman (man)</td>
<td>Man cooks if the woman has no time due to further education; if the man has no time, the couple eats out (woman); If the man does not have business appointments, he cooks; due to his skills and the woman’s lack of skills in cooking, he often cooks (man)</td>
<td>time (both); professional reasons (woman); routine, skills (man)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Only woman reports externalization of cooking.</td>
<td>Both describe different divisions: Man says, that he normally cooks and his wife only occasionally due to skills. In contrast, the woman reports that the couple decides daily who cooks and that the man cooks if she cannot due to professional reasons. Only she mentions externalization of cooking --&gt; Difficult to interpret who cooks in which share.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example for identification of types on the basis of single cases

- Each couple is analyzed based on the summaries generated with the method of content analysis
  → good overview and simplifications for classification

- Typus: combination of characteristics

- Different foci → different typifications
Example for identification of types on the basis of single cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Household tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only M(^1)</td>
<td>M &gt; F(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only M(^1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M &gt; F(^2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M = F(^3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M = F(^3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M &lt; F(^4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only F(^5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Only M: Man’s Proportion > 90%; 2 M>F: Man’s Proportion 60-90%; 3 M=F: Man’s Proportion 40-60%; 4 M<F: Man’s Proportion 10-40%; 5 Only F: Man’s Proportion < 10%
### Example for identification of types on the basis of single cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Only M&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>M &gt; F&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>M = F&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>M &lt; F&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Only F&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only M&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M &gt; F&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>04, 08, S02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M = F&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>01, 03, 07, 08,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12, S09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M &lt; F&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>10, 11, S02, S06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only F&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Only M: Man’s Proportion > 90%; 2 M>F: Man’s Proportion 60-90%; 3 M=F: Man’s Proportion 40-60%; 4 M<F: Man’s Proportion 10-40%; 5 Only F: Man’s Proportion < 10%
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## Example for identification of types on the basis of single cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Only M(^1)</th>
<th>M &gt; F(^2)</th>
<th>M = F(^3)</th>
<th>M &lt; F(^4)</th>
<th>Only F(^5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only M(^1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M &gt; F(^2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M = F(^3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M &lt; F(^4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only F(^5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Only M: Man’s Proportion > 90%; \(^2\) M>F: Man’s Proportion 60-90%; \(^3\) M=F: Man’s Proportion 40-60%; \(^4\) M<F: Man’s Proportion 10-40%; \(^5\) Only F: Man’s Proportion < 10%
Types:

- **Traditionalization**: Man invests more in labor market and less in housework after birth, woman acting vice-versa
  - Moderate traditionalization: only small differences
  - Strong traditionalization: almost full polarization

- **Constant equality**: both partners invest almost equal shares in labor market participation and housework after birth

- **Equalization**: moderate traditional division is transformed in almost equal proportions concerning labor market and housework
Example for identification of types on the basis of single cases

• Benefits:
  – Concentration of the material
  – Helpful for further research
  – Theoretical concepts
  – Visibility of empirical regularity
  – Combination of different typifications

• Risks, restrictions:
  – Practical and theoretical usability
  – Selection of theoretical/practical important categories
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Confrontation of theories with the qualitative data – Example: Becker

- Hypotheses according Gary S. Becker’s New Home Economics:
  - Spouse with higher education/higher income $\rightarrow$ time only/mostly in the market; spouse with greater comparative advantage in the household $\rightarrow$ time only/mostly there.
  - At most one spouse: investment in both spheres.
  - Polar division of labor.
  - Both spouses with same resources: prediction impossible.
  - Pregnancy: investment in household-related human capital.
Confrontation of theories with the qualitative data – Example: Becker

Exemplary test with Couple S02

- 1st wave: Man is working fulltime (according to contract 38 hours a week, normally more than 40 hours a week) in a dairy as shift supervisor, net income: 2000-3000€;
  Woman is working fulltime (shift work) in a children’s home as a team leader, net income: 1000-1500€

Assumptions according to Becker:

- Not efficient if both spouses spend time in market and household.
- Woman: higher education (Fachabitur vs. Mittlere Reife).
- Man: more income.
  → Only the woman should do the household tasks.
Confrontation of theories with the qualitative data – Example: Becker

De facto division of labor:
– Woman: more time in household chores.
– Explanation via attitudes, socialization, time

Assumptions for the time after the child’s birth
– Woman: more time for household tasks in 1st wave
– Pregnancy as investment in household specific human capital for the woman
– Man: more income in 1st interview
→ Man specializes on the market, woman does all housework and if it is efficient, she will be employed, too.
OR: Woman specializes on the household and man is employed and perhaps, he will do some household chores.
Confrontation of theories with the qualitative data – Example: Becker

De facto division of labor after the birth of the first child

- Man still full-time employed. Woman in parental leave.
- Woman: about 80% of household chores.
- Man: about 15-30% of childcare. Only woman: going to a baby group and baby massages.
- Explanation: financial reasons, attitudes, specialization

→ After the birth division according to Becker’s New Home Economics, rationale in part economic.
Conclusion

Methods:

– Combination of different approaches with diverse potentials
– Collection of different aspects with the methods
– Choice of method on basis of research question
Conclusion

Preliminary results:

– Most cases:
  – Some form of traditionalization
  – Arrangement after birth not far from anticipation

– Polar division often rationalized by economic arguments, but also: never questioned, gender roles

– Equal division often rationalized by egalitarian values, concept of active fatherhood/motherhood and job as combinable spheres

– Women with polar division often not happy – even if they planned polar division
Next steps:

– Typification with more/other „variables“, i. e. rationales for arrangements
– Test of norm-based theories ➔ See how good different theories explain the couples‘ situations
– Analysis of different chores, not only shares
– Analysis of satisfaction with arrangements
– Analysis of child care tasks and total amounts of work
Thank you!
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