Hedera | Health and demographic research | Ghent University

LUND UNIVERSITY

EDUCATIONAL HETEROGAMY AND THE DIVISION OF PAID LABOUR IN THE FAMILY: A COMPARISON OF PRESENT-DAY BELGIUM AND SWEDEN

Mieke Eeckhaut[1],
Maria Stanfors[2],
Bart Van de Putte[1]

European Population Conference, Stockholm
June 14, 2012

[1] Department of Sociology, Ghent University, Belgium
[2] Center for Economic Demography, Lund University, Sweden
Correspondence: Mieke Eeckhaut, Korte Meer 5, 9000 Ghent (Belgium) – Mieke.Eeckhaut@UGent.be

STRATIFICATION RESEARCH

Family as unit of analysis

↓ Growing participation of women

Individual as unit of analysis

↓ Growing interest in the partner

Individual & partner

↓

'Real' couple perspective → **Couple effects?!**

LUND UNIVERSITY

Hedera | Health and demographic research | Ghent University

RELATIVE FEMALE LABOUR MARKET PARTICIPATION

1. What is the role of the educational composition of the couple for relative female labour market participation?
   - Specialization hypothesis (cf. specialization theory, bargaining theory)
   - Gender Identity hypothesis (cf. gender identity theory)

2. What is the role of the presence of (young) children for relative female labour market participation?
   - Direct Child Effect hypothesis
   - Indirect Child Effect hypothesis

Hedera | Health and demographic research Ghent University

BELGIUM VS. SWEDEN

Belgium	**Sweden**
Conservative welfare state	Social democratic welfare state
→ Male breadwinner model	→ Dual-earner family

Educational composition?
- Specialization hypothesis BE < SE
- Gender Identity hypothesis BE > SE

The presence of (young) children?
- Direct Child Effect hypothesis BE < SE
- Indirect Child Effect hypothesis BE < SE

Hedera | Health and demographic research Ghent University

DATA

- EU-SILC 2004-2008
- Pooled cross-sectional data
- 2,592 Belgian and 3,348 Swedish couples:
  - Never-married (cohabiting) or married
  - Both partners born in BE/SE
  - Between 25-65 years old
  - Two adult household
  - Not: disabled, student, unpaid work
- Variables:

	%/means	
	BE	SE
Control variables		
Age of man	44.3	45.5
Age of man squared	2072.6	2197.6
Age of woman	42.3	43.4
Age of woman squared	1896.9	2006.5
Degree of urbanization		
Densely populated	46.8	17.9
Intermediate	48.5	13.8
Thinly populated	4.6	68.3

	%/means	
	BE	SE
Independent variables		
Man's education		
Primary	7.0	5.6
Lower secondary	14.7	9.3
(Upper) secondary	36.5	47.7
Post-secondary, non-tertiary	3.4	8.3
Tertiary	38.4	29.1
Woman's education		
Primary	8.5	2.6
Lower secondary	12.9	5.7
(Upper) secondary	32.7	47.0
Post-secondary, non-tertiary	2.4	4. 8
Tertiary	43.4	40.0
Educational heterogamy	-0.1	-0.3
Presence of (young) children		
No dependent children	42.3	43.8
Youngest child 6-18 years	32.1	29.8
Youngest child <6 years	25.2	26.3
Dependent variables		
Woman's share of couple working hours		
0%	18.3	> 8.6
1-40%	24.4	16.0
41-59%	37.5	< 63.8
≥60%	6.9	8.0

DIAGONAL REFERENCE MODELS

$$Y_{ijk} = p * \mu_{ii} + (1\text{-}p) * \mu_{jj} + \sum\beta_l * H_{ijl} + \sum\beta_c * X_{ijc} + \sum\beta_h * H_{ijh} + \varepsilon_{ijk}$$

Control variables — Presence of (young) children — Educational heterogamy

$0 \le p \le 1$
i = 1,…,T ;
j = 1,…,T ;
k = 1,…,n_{ij}

	Education woman				
Education man	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
1	μ_{11}				
2		μ_{22}			
3			μ_{33}		
4				μ_{44}	
5					μ_{55}

→ **Multinomial logistic DRMs**

RESULTS –
MULTINOMIAL LOGISTIC DIAGONAL REFERENCE MODELS

1. Baseline Model + Control Variables

2. + Presence of (Young) Children
   + Educational Heterogamy

$$Y_{ijk} = p * \mu_{ii} + (1-p) * \mu_{jj} + \Sigma \beta_l * X_{ijl} + \Sigma \beta_c * X_{ijc} + \Sigma \beta_h * H_{ijh} + \varepsilon_{ijk}$$

LUND UNIVERSITY

Hedera | Health and demographic research, Ghent University

RESULTS 1 – BASELINE MODEL + CV

	Belgium				Sweden			
	Salience Parameter *p*							
	0.033				> 0.216			
	Odds for the Homogamous with Educational Level i (Probability Between Brackets)							
	0%	1-40%	41-59%	>59%	0%	1-40%	41-59%	>59%
μ_{11}	1.269	0.454 *	1	0.742	2.661 *	0.550	1	0.130 *
	(36.6%)	(13.1%)	(28.9%)	(21.4%)	(61.3%)	(12.7%)	(23.0%)	(3.0%)
μ_{22}	0.576	0.212 *	1	0.221 *	0.557	0.223 *	1	0.138 *
	(28.7%)	(10.6%)	(49.8%)	(11.0%)	(29.0%)	(11.6%)	(52.2%)	(7.2%)
μ_{33}	0.309 *	[illegible] *	1	0.198 *	0.515 *	[illegible] *	1	0.097 *
	(17.8%)	(13.[illegible]%)	(57.7%)	(11.4%)	(28.7%)	(10.[illegible]%)	(55.7%)	(5.4%)
μ_{44}	0.701	0.272 *	1	0.737	0.460	0.122 *	1	0.066 *
	(25.9%)	(10.0%)	(36.9%)	(27.2%)	(27.9%)	(7.4%)	(60.7%)	(4.0%)
μ_{55}	0.142 *	0.213 *	1	0.162 *	0.273 *	0.118 *	1	0.097 *
	(9.3%)	(14.1%)	(65.9%)	(10.7%)	(18.4%)	(7.9%)	(67.2%)	(6.5%)
$b_{\text{age woman}}$	0.896 *	1.032	1	0.981	0.790 *	0.999	1	0.936
$b_{\text{age woman squared}}$	1.004 *	0.999	1	0.999	1.006 *	1.000	1	1.000
$b_{\text{age man}}$	1.057	1.076	1	0.866 *	1.057	1.021	1	0.895
$b_{\text{age man squared}}$	1.000	0.999	1	1.007 *	0.998	0.999	1	1.005 *
$b_{\text{intermediate populated}}$	1.219	1.144	1	1.001	0.859	1.142	1	1.325
$b_{\text{thinly populated}}$	1.315	1.645 *	1	0.729	0.926	1.469 *	1	1.396
N	**2,254**				**3,224**			

*$p < .05$.

RESULTS 2 – BASELINE MODEL + CV + PRESENCE OF (YOUNG) CHILDREN + EDUCATIONAL HETEROGAMY

	Odds for the Presence of (Young) Children and Educational Heterogamy							
	Belgium				Sweden			
	0%	1-40%	41-59%	>59%	0%	1-40%	41-59%	>59%
$b_{\text{youngest child 6-18y}}$	2.481 *	1.740 *	1	1.064	2.143 *	1.653 *	1	1.566 *
$b_{\text{youngest child <6y}}$	3.858 *	2.540 *	1	1.660	9.929 * !!	1.868 *	1	2.179 *
$b_{\text{educ. heterogamy}}$	1.014	0.993	1	0.888	1.392 *	1.184	1	1.000
N	2,254				3,224			

*$p < .05$.

Educational Heterogamy
BE: No significant effects
SE: Specialization hypothesis, BUT limited to 0% vs. 41-59%

Presence of (Young) Children
BE: (Young) children = higher odds of working 0% and 1-40%
SE: (Young) children = higher odds of working 0%, 1-40%, **and >59%**

Interaction
BE: No interaction effect
SE: Woman without dependent children **>>** Woman with children <6y

CONCLUSION

BE

Female labour market participation
<<
Education woman
>
Presence of (young) children
<
Educational heterogamy
<

SE

- More egalitarianism and family-friendliness in **SE**
- Stronger effect of age and education in **BE**
- Small effect of educational heterogamy **overall (!)**

LUND UNIVERSITY

Hedera | Health and demographic research Ghent University

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION!

Correspondence: Mieke Eeckhaut, Korte Meer 5, 9000 Ghent (Belgium) – Mieke.Eeckhaut@UGent.be

LUND UNIVERSITY

Hedera | Health and demographic research Ghent University