

VARIATIONS IN CHILD REARING PRACTICES: GENDER, RACE AND PARENTAL RESOURCES

WORK IN PROGRESS
PLEASE DO NOT CITE

The effects of parental background on variety of children's outcomes are well established in the literature but the mechanisms by which parental (dis)advantages are transmitted to children's life chances are still debated. A recent study advanced one possible mechanism: inequalities in the transmission of parental cultural capital takes place through different "child rearing strategies" (Lareau 2003). Using the 2003-2008 American Time Use Survey, we test this theory and investigate the absolute and relative differences in childcare patterns of parents. The preliminary findings provide support for the theory; that is, for example, compared to less well-off parents, parents with higher educational and financial resources are more likely to read or talk to their children; while they are less likely to watch TV when the child is in parental care. However, the findings also demonstrate significant racial/ethnic differences in child rearing practices, even after controlling for parental resources.

INTRODUCTION

The effect of parental background on a variety of children's outcomes, particularly on educational attainment, is well established in the literature (Wagmiller 2008, McLoyd 1998, Duncan and Brooks-Gunn 1997), however the process by which parental advantages are transmitted to children's enhanced life chances remains unresolved. In her ethnographic study of working class and middle class parents, Lareau puts forward discrepancies in child rearing practices as one of the underlying mechanisms behind persistent class differentials in educational attainment. Following the theoretical underpinnings of Bourdieu, Lareau argues that unlike working class parents, middle class parents embrace a set of child rearing practices that is compatible with the dominant child rearing culture of the major social institutions in the US, which therefore leads to the transmission of differential advantages to working class and middle class children.

Previous research has established a large amount of evidence establishing on the correlation between *parental involvement*, particularly in "developmental" activities and children's school achievement (McNeal 1999). Some parenting practices, are claimed to affect the likelihood of children behaving in the ways that lead to school success as well as promoting children's 'cognitive ability' and 'thinking skills' (Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler 1995). Accordingly, research in child development psychology has demonstrated that not only the total amount of time but also the type of activities parents engage in are important determinants of a child's well being (Pleck 1996, Shaw and Bell 1993). To the extent that some childcare practices are more vital in enhancing children's success in school variations in specific parenting behaviours could be informative in understanding the differential transmission of parental advantages to children. The objective of the study is to empirically document the differences in the time use patterns of parents with varying degree of resources, and to test whether the hypothesized relationships of Lareau about the proposed variations hold.

ESTABLISHING THE LINK BETWEEN PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT AND CHILDREN'S ATTAINMENTS

There is a rich literature on "parental involvement/inputs" and "child outcomes", mostly conveying a positive relation between the two. However the findings are not entirely consistent and rather scattered for several reasons. Most importantly, definitions and operationalization of "parental

involvement” and “child outcomes” vary widely.¹ By parental involvement, researchers variously mean: time spent with children (Leibowitz 1977), frequency of specific activities with children (Zick, Bryant and Oesterbacka 2001, Amato and Rivera 1999, Thomson, Hanson and McLanahan 1994), children’s perception of parental behavioural and emotional involvement (Wenk et al. 1994), involvement with school activities (Epstein 1990), parental aspiration for educational attainments (Sewell and Shah 1968), frequency of contact (Amato and Gilberth 1999, Furstenberg, Morgan and Allison 1987), parental rules and control (Thomson, Hanson and McLanahan 1994), or a combination of some of the above (King and Sobolewski 2008, Astone and McLanahan 1991, McNeal 1999). Similarly, child outcomes as a response variable very broadly defined and operationalized as cognitive or linguistic skills (Leibowitz 1977, Rosenzweig and Wolpin 1993), educational attainments (Coleman 1987), behavioural outcomes (Aizer 2008, Baumrind 1991, Richardson et al. 1989) or psychological well being (Baumrind 1978). Moreover, many studies failed to account for significant intervening variables between “parental inputs” and “child outcomes” such as race, gender or socio-economic situation (McNeal 1999) or ethnic context and sub-cultural variations of norms and acceptable behaviours (Bluestone and Tamis-Lemonda 1999). Adding to the difficulty of studying parental investments and child outcomes, Burton, Phillips and Curtis (2002) suggest that contrary to that commonly assumed in the literature, parental behaviour is not exogenous to child behaviour and so should not be analysed in a simple unidirectional sense as it has been done in much empirical research.

Despite the diversity of definitions, methods and data, a great deal of research consistently provides support for the positive effect of “parental involvement”-very broadly defined- on a variety of cognitive, behavioural and social-emotional child outcomes: sensitive parenting predicts children’s cognitive and linguistic achievements (Lamb and Tamis-Lemonda 2007), higher levels of paternal involvement is associated with fewer behavioural problems (Amato and Rivera 1999), self care at early ages is a significant risk factor for substance use (Aizer 2004, Richardson et al. 1989), and school-related parenting practices are positively related to many school achievement indicators (Sui-Chu and Willims 1996, Astone and McLanahan 1991). The conclusions regarding the importance of parental involvement are not limited to sociological research. Psychological studies underlined the significance of parental style in children’s psychological well being (Deater-Deckard et al. 1998, Baumrind 1978), while economic studies approached the issue from a “human capital” perspective and highlighted the increased salience of parents’ responsibility to augment their children’s human capital (Leibowitz 2003, Rosenzweig and Wolpin 1993, Becker and Nigel 1986, Leibowitz 1974). In brief, the literature provides an accumulated empirical evidence for the association between parental involvement and child outcomes.

EXPLAINING VARIATIONS IN PARENTING PRACTICES

The main argument of Lareau is that ‘social class creates distinctive parenting styles (2002). Middle class parents embrace a culture of *concerted cultivation* while working class parents facilitate the accomplishment of *natural growth*. *Concerted cultivation* refers to the set of child rearing practices through which middle class parents deliberately try to augment their children’s ‘*cultural capital*’. In other words, middle class parents actively engage in activities that improve their children’s cognitive and social skills which can lead to further success in various social settings, in particular in school and labour market. The practice of *natural growth* on the other hand does not entail an active promotion in children’s *cultural capital* or very close monitoring of everyday school experiences; instead it grants more autonomy to children in everyday life and keeps them free from constant parental scrutiny, if not guidance.

The components of the logic of *concerted cultivation* among middle class parents can be stated as follows: Middle class parents invest considerable amounts of money and time in organized leisure

¹ The age range of children in the reviewed literature is 0 to 18.

activities for their children. Every organized activity involves planning, preparing, coordinating transportation, waiting for children and paying for necessary equipments as well as the participation fee. Despite the substantial time and money costs associated with these activities, middle class parents are “committed to involving their children in a steady schedule of organized activities attuned to children’s particular interests” (2003: 170). Second, middle class parents use verbal negotiations extensively in daily interactions with children; and “reasoning” is a part of regular parental guidance. Instead of just telling children what to do, parents engage in discussions with children and explain the rationale behind their act. As a result, in the course of daily family life middle class parents and children often engage in long conversations. Third, “intensive parental involvement is a key component of *concerted cultivation*” (2003: 82). Middle class parents not only constantly monitor their children’s educational activities but also pursue assertive advocating on behalf of them in any settings, particularly in school. They use their informal networks to gain more information about school related activities; that is, they talk to friends, experts, and teachers; do not hesitate to intervene in the classroom, question or criticise the teacher; and even demand individualized treatment for their children if need be. Despite the fact that “assertive parental involvement” does not yield benefit in every single situation, it helps to create school-home interconnectedness as well as a critical teacher-parent linkage, which parents exploit at the advantage of their children in many settings such as parent-teacher conferences (Lareau 1989). Moreover, middle class parents teach their children to be “involved” by instructing them how to interact with other adults such as teachers or doctors. Lastly, *concerted cultivation* complies with current professional standards which emphasize the “importance of parents being ‘active’, ‘involved’, ‘assertive’, ‘informed’, and ‘educated’ ‘advocates’ of their children (Lareau and Weininger 2003: 589).

These set of middle class practices are quite different from the working class logic of child rearing, which Lareau calls *natural growth*. For a start, mainly due to financial constrains, working class children’ participation to organized activities is far more limited. Fees, cost of equipment as well as the difficulties in transportation make it very hard for working class and poor parents to afford such activities. As a result, children have more “unstructured” free time and are more autonomous. They spend their leisure time mostly playing outside, hanging around with friends and extended family. Second, unlike middle class parents, working class parents tend to use short directives in their interactions with children, and expect respectful compliance rather than questioning/challenging their parental authority. Long discussions, reasoning and bargaining are not part of the daily family life. Additionally, lack of negotiation and an expectation of obedience from children draw boundaries between adults and children. Parent and children do not happen to be equal partners in a discussion. Third, although working class parents care about their children’s education to a great extent, they are more reserved and sceptical in their dealings with school authorities. This partially stems lack of informal networks to access information, and so unfamiliarity with the practices in school. This results with absence of strong school-home interconnectedness and deprives the working class parents from “social capital” to be activated for the benefit of their children if necessary. Although both child rearing strategies have their strength and weakness/ advantages and disadvantages middle class children are expected to be more advantaged since *concerted cultivation* is in line with the dominant cultural repertoire of child rearing in the US context.² Hence the skills transmitted to children via *concerted cultivation* are more appreciated and valuable in major US institutions, particularly in school and labour market.

² What is found positive in the US setting today (e.g. individualism, independence, standing for himself) can be interpreted as negative in other social settings or at other times. The emphasis is on “the US context” at “present”. See Hays (1996) for a short review of the historical conceptualization of “good parenting” and how the opinions on “the right way of childrearing” have historically evolved. See Wrigley (1989) on how expert opinions on how to raise a child have also changed over time. Wrigley’s historical study shows that the widely held opinion of children’ being in need for ‘intellectual stimulation’ is in fact a fairly recent advice without a historical precedence.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. *Do parental resources have an effect childcare patterns of parents?*

The main objective of this study is to test the behavioural implications of Lareau's theory about different child rearing practices and show the extent of the inequalities in time spent with children. The basic premise is as follows: *If parents with different resources do have different logics of child rearing practices there must be behavioural implications of such differences in their daily activity patterns.* In fact, similar to Bourdieu who is interested in daily practices, Lareau's theory also concerns behaviours not attitudes or preferences. Lareau indeed explicitly states that her work is on *behaviours not attitudes*, and that she observes much fewer differences in attitudes (2003: 5, footnote 5). Irrespective of underlying motivation, this research is on how parents *behave*, and so concentrates on observable implications, specifically time use patterns.³

2. *Does race/ethnic background significant factor in explaining parental behaviour above and beyond parental resources?*

Lareau claims that race does not play a decisive role in forming parental care practices. This claim is rather unexpected, not only because, in the US context race has been a key explanatory variable in many other sociological studies on transmission of family advantages or disadvantages to children (Cheng and Powell 2007, Kao and Thompson 2003, Roscigno and Ainsworth-Darnell 1999, Entwistle and Alexander 1992), but also Lareau's previous work underlined the importance of race as a significant factor beyond and above class in line with other studies⁴ (Downey and Pribesh 2004, Tyson 2003, Roscigno and Ainsworth-Darnell 1999). To the extent that school embodies the cultural practices of the dominant group in the US, race (as well as religion or ethnic background) acts as another significant "stratifier". We therefore investigate the role of race/ethnicity as well as parental resources in understanding parenting behaviours in this study.

3. *Do parental resources or race/ethnicity operate differently for mothers and fathers?*

Childcare activities are predominantly gendered in the sense that childcare is widely considered as women's responsibility and fathers' involvement remains limited despite the recent trends of increased contribution (See Monna and Gauthier 2008 for a review). In this study we explore parenting practices of fathers and mothers separately and show whether the available resources or race/ethnicity have different effect on fathers and mothers.

DATA, MEASUREMENT AND METHODS

Data

The data comes from 2003-2008 American Time Use Survey (ATUS) which collects information on amount of time the respondents spend in various activities, where and with whom each activity occurred and whether a child was in care of the respondent during the activity. ATUS uses time diary methodology, in which the respondents report the activities they involved in, the day before the interview. Because the respondents are asked to remember the "sequence of activities" in their own narrative rather than an aggregate estimate of the total time in specific activities in a given time

³ Lareau also explicitly states that her work is on *behaviours not attitudes*, and in fact she observes much fewer differences in attitudes (2003: 5, footnote 5). This is also in line with our argument that the way parents enact their visions of good parenting is very much constraint as well as enabled with the resources at their disposal.

⁴ See for example Lareau and Horvat 1992 (38-49) where the authors stat "Although social class seems to influence how black and white parents negotiate their relationships with schools, for blacks race plays an important role independent of social class, in framing the terms of their relationship" .

period, it is less prone to social bias or misreporting, hence provides the most reliable estimates of time use patterns (Harvey 1993).

Response variables

ATUS contains information on two distinct types of childcare: primary and secondary childcare. Primary childcare refers to the activities where the diarist was actively involved in providing childcare for their children, that is: childcare was her/his “primary activity”. Secondary childcare refers to the activities where the diarist was primarily involved in a non-childcare activity while child was in parental care.⁵ In line with these two types of childcare we first investigate five different types of primary childcare activities, namely: general care, playing with child, reading/talking to a child, school-related activities and out-of-home care. Secondary childcare also decomposed into six sub-categories according to the primary activity accompanied secondary childcare: personal care, unpaid domestic work, TV watching, in-home free time and leisure (other than TV), out-of-home free time and leisure, and travel (other than travel for childcare with children).

Explanatory and control variables

In line with the research focus of this paper we have four main explanatory variables: gender, educational attainment, race/ethnic background of a parent and household income. *Educational attainment* has five categories: (i) 0-11th grade; (ii) high school degree; (iii) some college education; (iv) college degree; and (v) post college degree. *Race/ ethnic background* was grouped under five categories: (i) Hispanic; (ii) non-Hispanic Asian; (iii) non-Hispanic Black; (iv) non-Hispanic White and (v) non-Hispanic other. We look into the role of *gender* in childcare both by doing a comparative analysis of time use patterns of fathers and mothers separately and investigating the role of presence of same sex child at home. Presence of same sex child is a binary variable and coded as one if a mother has at least one daughter, or if a father has at least one son. *Household income* is a four category (quartile) variable. Cut off points were chosen according to the distribution of household income of all households in the population with at least one child aged under 18.

A significant amount of missing household income values (14%) exhibited serious problem for the analysis since the preliminary analysis showed that households who did not report income are not a random sub-sample. Hence the missingness was not completely at random and fully utilize the information contained in the sample we decided to apply multiple imputation, as this is the most appropriate technique with many advantages, among which are providing unbiased estimates and valid confidence intervals (Rubin 1987, Schaffer 1997 and Allison 2001).⁶

The control variables in the model are theory driven and in line with the previous research on time spent with children (e.g. Sayer, Bianchi and Robinson 2004; Zick and Bryant 1996; Sayer, Gauthier and Furstenberg 2004). Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics for the explanatory and control variables in the study.

Methods

⁵ The standard way of collecting secondary activities is putting a parallel column for secondary activities in the diary or asking whether the respondent was involved in secondary activity, immediately after she reported her primary activity (See for instance, Harmonised European Time Use Survey Guidelines 2008). ATUS does not follow this way. Instead, *after completion of the diary*, respondents are asked whether at least one of their own household children under 13 was in their care during the activity. Therefore this question actually addresses “in care” time which is indeed a broader category than childcare provided as “secondary activity” as known in the literature. As a result, average time spent in “secondary in the USA is much longer than in other countries. In this study the term “secondary childcare” used interchangeably with “child-is-in-care”.

⁶ In terms of the number of imputation, we followed Rubin’s approach (1987) and created 10 imputed datasets. For each imputed dataset, an analysis (regression) was performed and estimates (along with estimates of uncertainty) were collected. This yielded 10 sets of parameter estimates. To obtain a single, final set of parameter estimates, ‘Rubin’s Rules’ were employed, thus combining uncertainty arising from estimation and from imputation.

Statistical analysis of diary data is far from being straightforward due to the highly skewed and zero inflated nature of the response variable, which violates usual normality assumptions and leads to non-constant variance of errors. Particularly while analysing specific activities we deal with very high percentages of non-reporting (see for example Table 2a and Table 2b). Additionally, whether the diarists reported any minutes in the activity at all or not, is as important as the average minutes spent in the activity. In order to address these issues we conducted two sets of analysis: logistic and gamma regressions which are special cases of a more general class of models: the Generalized Linear Model (GLM) family. The GLM equation can be written as: $E[Y_i|X_i, \theta] = g^{-1}(X_i^T \theta)$ Where Y is the dependent variable, X is a vector of independent variables, and θ is a set of parameters. The function g is often called the ‘link function’ as it relates how linear predictors are related to the conditional mean of the dependent variable.

GLM estimation assumes the conditional mean of the dependent variable is some function of a linear combination of independent variables. The function in question can be quite general, allowing estimation when the dependent variable is binary, continuous, non-negative, etc. If the response variable is a binary variable (the diarist reported the activity or not), a linear combination of control and explanatory variables is connected to the dependent variable via a logit link function; that is, $\ln(\mu_i/(1 - \mu_i))$, where μ_i is the expectation of the response for observation i . When minutes in activity is assumed to follow a Gamma distribution (as is done in gamma regression), the log link function, $\ln \mu_i$, is used. Gamma distributions are a continuous, two-parameter family, (*shape* and *scale*) which roughly correspond to the central tendency and the spread of the distribution respectively.

RESULTS

Descriptive analysis

Table 2a and Table 2b show the descriptive statistics of time spent in primary and secondary childcare activities for mothers and fathers. In all tables, the first column within each activity category column shows the average minutes all parents spend in a given childcare activity. It is followed by the percentage of parents who reported at least 1 minute in the activity (hereafter *participant* parents), and the average minutes spent in the activity only by the participant parents. The results are both from weekday and weekend diaries and weights are applied to correct for diary completion day and sampling problems.

[TABLE 2. AND TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE]

As shown on the last columns of Table 2 and 3, there is an evident variation in total time spent in primary childcare. For example, parents with college degree or more provide at least half an hour more childcare per day compared to those with less than high school degree. Additionally, White parents report more time in primary childcare than Hispanic or Black parents. Married/cohabiting parents and those with higher financial resources also spend longer time in the activity compared to single and less well off parents respectively. The decomposition of primary childcare into sub-categories however shows that the variation in time spent in specific childcare activities is not constant across activity types. Parents do not vary much in their participation to school related activities and provision of out-of-home care, while total time spent in playing with children or general care activities vary relatively more, particularly by educational attainment, race/ethnicity and civic status.

Overall, the findings show some variation in the percentage of participant parents, particularly fathers, while the minutes reported in the activity by participant parents do not vary much. In other words, the variation in time spent by all parents mostly come from the participation rate of parents in the activity, rather than the number ‘minutes’ spent in each activity by participants. This partially stems from the fact that the activity types are very narrowly defined. There are practical and physical limits in the average time one could spend in, say ‘playing with a child’ on a given day.

Educated parents are more likely to report any type of childcare but particularly general care, playing with children and reading/talking to children compared to less educated. Approximately one third of mothers with at least a college degree reads/talks to their children on a given diary day while this figure drops to 18 percent for mothers with high school degree.⁷ The corresponding values are 4 percent for fathers with less than high school degree and 15 percent for those with college degree. There is a small variation in the percentage of mothers and father who report school related activities. The percentage of mothers who involve in school related activities goes up slightly as the household income increase.

There are also noticeable differences among parents from different race/ethnicity. Only one in every ten non-Hispanic Black mother spends some time playing with their children while almost one third (27 percent) of White mothers do so. White mothers also spend longer time playing with their children than Hispanic mothers. The percentage of White or Asian mother who read/talked their children on a given diary day is almost the double of the proportion of Hispanic or Black mothers. Racial/ethnic differences are equally pronounced for fathers. 14 percent of White fathers report reading/talking to their children while the figure drops to 4 percent for Hispanic fathers. The percentage of Hispanic fathers who provide general care for a child is almost as half as White fathers. Only one in every ten Black fathers spend some time playing with their children on a given diary day. There is, however, no substantial difference among parents with different race/ ethnicity in their involvement in school related activities.

Overall, the variations in childcare patterns of fathers are more pronounced compared to those of mothers. The percentage of fathers who report general care, playing with children or reading/talking to children increases substantially as the household income and educational attainment of father increases. The descriptive analysis clearly portrays mothers as the primary care giver regardless of their socio-economic or civic status. Fathers are most similar to mothers when it comes to “playing with child”, particularly if they have a son. Gendered nature of childcare patterns as well as the significance race/ethnicity in parenting behaviour is noticeable.

[TABLE 3.A AND TABLE 3.B ABOUT HERE]

There is not much variation in terms of the total time spent in providing secondary childcare by parents. This is not surprising since “secondary care” here refers to time during which child is in parental care. Approximately 95 percent of mothers and 85 percent of fathers reports some time during which child was in their care. The biggest exception is single fathers, of whom 35 percent reported no time in secondary childcare. This probably stems from the fact that children are far more likely to stay in the custody of their mothers in case of a divorce, which then makes non-resident fathers less available for children.

There is a considerable variation in average time spent in watching television while child is in parental care with respect to educational attainment and household income. On average mothers with less than high school degree spent twice more time watching television compared to mothers with college degree. In the same way, fathers with college degree spend approximately half an hour less time in front of the television while child is in care compared to fathers with high school degree or less. This difference stems from lower educated parents’ tendency to report time in watching television as well as participant parents’ longer hours in front of the television. Similarly, as the level of household income increases average minutes spent watching television during secondary childcare decreases while leisurely time outside home increases.

Mothers’ time spent in unpaid work while child is in care also varies considerably according to education level and race/ethnicity. White mothers provide less secondary care for their children while doing housework compared to Black mothers, yet the figures are particularly high for Hispanic

⁷ It must be noted that “talking to children” here refers to talking as a *primary activity*. The percentage of parents who engage in a conversation with their children on a given day during another activity must be higher.

mothers. On average, Hispanic mothers spend half an hour more in housework while child is in their care compared to White mothers on a given day; and they spend 72 minutes more compared to Black mothers. Single mothers also spend 40 minutes less in the activity compared to married mothers.

The percentage of fathers who report secondary childcare during any activity is generally lower than mothers but the biggest gap is observed in unpaid work while child is in parental care. 88 percent of all mothers spend some time in unpaid work while child is in their care while only half of the fathers do so. An interesting finding is that while the percentage of fathers who reported some time in unpaid work during secondary childcare rises as the income or education level increases, the average time spent in the activity by the participant fathers *decreases* as the educational attainment and household income *increases*.

Time spent in primary childcare activities

Table 4a and 4b show the results of logistic regressions estimating mothers' and fathers' probability of providing specific childcare activities on a given day and Table 5a and 5b show the gamma regression estimating minutes spent in the activities.

For both mothers and fathers educational attainment is strongly and significantly correlated with the probability of reading/talking to a child (as a primary activity) on a given diary day. Compared to mothers with some college education the odds of reading/talking to a child on a given day is 37 percent lower for those with less than high school degree and 28 percent higher for those with post-college degree. The effect of educational attainment on probability of reading/talking is more substantial in the case of fathers. The odds of reading/talking to a child for a father with the lowest educational attainment is almost 50 percent less compared to fathers with some college education. Having a post college degree on the other hand increases the odds reporting the activity by 60 percent. Having a college education also increases mothers' probability of playing with their child on a given day but it does not have an affect on provision of general care, with respect to those who have at least some college education. Unlike in the case of mothers, educational attainment has a statistically significant and consistent positive affect on fathers' probability of providing general care for their children. In fact, with the single exception of involvement in school related activities, having a post college degree significantly increases the probability of providing any type of primary childcare as well as minutes spent in the activities (Table 5a and 5b). This is consistent with the previous study of Coltrane (1996), claiming that more educated fathers have stronger shifts in new fatherhood ideals that involve higher time commitment to children, compared to less educated males.

Despite the established research on the strong correlation between parental socio-economic status and the children's school success (Wagmiller et al 2006, McLoyd 1998, Haveman and Wolfe 1991), our findings indicate that parents with higher socio-economic status are *not* necessarily more likely to be involved in their children's school related activities. Mothers with less than high school degree are somewhat less likely to spend time in their children's school related activities, yet there are no significant differences among mothers with high school degree or more. The gamma regression results, where we estimate the actual minutes spend in the activity, also do not show consistent and significant effect of income or education on parents' minutes spent in school related activities. We further investigated this response variable by excluding diaries completed during the summer months and limiting the sample to parents with at least one child aged between five and twelve. The overall conclusion remained the same: household income and educational attainment are not significant *and* consistent estimators of time spent in school related activities.

The analysis reveals significant effect of race/ethnicity on parental childcare patterns. The most noticeable is the lower probability of Hispanic, and particularly Black parents to play with their children compared to White parents. The odds of playing with a child on a given diary day is 65 percent and 50 percent lower for Black mothers and fathers respectively. Being Black is also negatively associated with minutes spent in playing with children. Black or Hispanic mothers are also less likely to provide general care or to read/talk to their children as a primary activity on a given diary day. However there is no significant different in the probability of providing school related

childcare between Hispanic and White mothers, while Black mothers are more likely to report the activity. Black or Hispanic fathers are not significantly different from White fathers in their probability of involving in school related activities on a given day, whilst the odds reporting the activity is 68 percent more for Asian fathers. It is noteworthy that the coefficient of being Asian in estimating probability of spending time in school related activities as well as out-of-home childcare are significantly different for mothers and fathers.⁸ Asian fathers are *more* likely to report those two activities on a given diary in comparison to their White counterparts while Asian mothers are less likely to do so. This could be indicative of cultural differences in parenting practices; that is, a combination of an emphasis on academic achievement and patriarchal family structure in Asian families (Julian, McKenry, and McKelvey 1994).

The analysis also reveals that, being a US citizen –which is used as a proxy of integration to the US society (e.g. competency in linguistic skills, period spent in the country). US citizens, particularly fathers, are more likely to spend some time in general care or reading/talking to their children. On the other hand, the estimates from logistic and gamma regression shows that, overall being a US citizens *decreases* involvement in school related activities, especially for fathers.

Previous research highlighted several advantages of being born to older parents: Older parents are more likely to be psychologically mature and financially secure, they are more likely to have stable relationship with their partners, and less likely to have unwanted/unplanned pregnancy (See Martin 2004 for a review). This led some researchers to use parental age as a proxy of “parenting quality” (McLanahan 2004). Our results from both logistic and gamma regressions are in line with this approach and suggest that, older parents indeed spend more time in all of the childcare activities particularly playing with children, reading/talking to children and spending time in school related activities.

The findings are also indicative of gendered patterns in parental childcare. For a start, presence of same sex child increases the probability of and minutes spent in providing general care for both mothers and fathers. Fathers also play more with their child if they have at least one son. Table 5 further demonstrates gendered patterns of childcare activities. The table shows for each explanatory variable the relative allocation of childcare time. For example 47 percent of all primary childcare activities of college educated parents are spent in general care, while the corresponding proportions are 7 percent and 24 percent for school related activities and out-of-home care. As shown, fathers allocate larger portion of their childcare time to playing with their children compared to mothers. More specifically ‘playing with children’ constitutes 12 percent of all the primary care activities of mothers, the proportion raises to 22 percent for fathers. The greatest gap is between Asian parents, where almost one third of the all primary care activities of fathers are allocated to playing with children. Such gendered patterns are in line with the previous research which showed that fathers tend to spend more time in ‘fun’ activities while mothers spend more time in physical care (see Monna and Gauthier 2008 for a review).

Table 5 also reveals that as the educational attainment of parents increase the proportion of time allocated to reading/talking to children also increases. In the case of mothers this increase is compensated by a decline in general care. We can then conclude the effect of education on time spent in reading/playing with children can be decomposed into two parts: First, the total amount of time spent in each types of childcare activity is greater for educated than non educated parents. As a result they spend more number of minutes in reading/talking to children. Second, higher educated parents also allocate more time to reading/talking as a *percentage of total time in primary childcare*.

Time spent in activities during which child was in parental care (secondary childcare)

⁸ We pooled the fathers and mothers in a single dataset together and run the same model by interacting all the variables by “sex”. The interaction terms then give us whether the coefficients of variables for mothers and fathers were statistically significantly different.

A great amount of childcare is performed in the form a secondary childcare where parents are primarily involved in another activity while child is under their supervision. Previous research found that secondary childcare comprise almost one third of all parental childcare time (Zick and Bryant 1996). Tables 6a and 6b show the logistic regressions estimating the probability of reporting different primary activities while child is parental care while Tables 7a and 7b show the gamma estimates.

Primarily, the findings demonstrate a strong negative relation between educational attainment and watching TV while child is in parental care. In particular having a post-college degree largely decreases parents' time spent in front of TV during secondary childcare. Gamma estimates also show that mothers and fathers coming from the household at the highest income quartile spend less time watching TV during parental care compared to those coming from the households at the lowest income quartile. The negative relation between parental socio-economic status and secondary childcare reverses if the primary activity is leisurely time spent outside the house. Overall, children born to households at the highest income quartile less likely to accompany their parents while watching TV, whereas they are more likely to be in parental care while parents are having leisure time outside the home.

Racial/ethnic differences are pronounced in this set of findings as well. Asian parents are less likely to provide secondary childcare during leisurely time outside compared to White parents. Asian mothers also spend less time travelling while child is in their care, however this is not the case with Asian fathers. They are not significantly different from White fathers in their probability of providing secondary childcare during travel, and they spend more time in the activity. Together with the findings on the primary childcare activities, the results suggest that Asian fathers are more likely contribute to childcare if the related activity takes place 'outside the house'. Black parents also spend less time in leisurely time outside and more time in watching TV while child is in their care compared to Whites.

The results also reveal an evident relation between citizenship status and secondary childcare activities. Citizenship is positively associated with fathers' probability of reporting secondary childcare during all types of activities. However mothers who are US citizens spend less time in secondary childcare during unpaid work compared to non-citizens. The coefficient of being US citizenship predicting time spent in secondary childcare during unpaid work is significantly ($p < 0.001$) different for fathers.

The negative association between educational attainment and probability of watching television while child is in parental care is evident. However, we also know that on average uneducated parents spend more time watching TV compared to educated parents (not shown here). For example, mothers with less than high school degree allocate one and a half hour more time in watching TV compared to mothers with post college degree and an hour more compared to those with college degree. Similarly, fathers with less than high school degree allocate three times more time to TV watching compared to those with post college degree. That means the tendency for less educated parents to watch television while their children is in their care might stem from the fact that total amount of time they spend in front of the television is longer. Alternatively, or additionally, it might be due to the fact that they are more likely to 'keep children in their care' while watching TV. Table 8 presents the relative time spent in a specific activity during secondary childcare in proportion to total secondary care activity on a given diary day, and Table 9 presents relative time spent in an activity during secondary care in proportion to total minutes spent in that activity on a given day. According to Table 9, for example, for college educated mothers, only 15 percent of all their secondary childcare activities take place during watching TV while 9 percent of their secondary childcare time spent during leisurely time outside. The corresponding figures are 27 percent and 5 percent for mothers with lowest educational attainment. Similarly, as the household income increases the relative time spent in watching TV during secondary care decreases while leisure time outside increases. The pattern is the same with fathers. Percentage of time spent in secondary childcare during watching TV in proportion of all secondary activities drops from 38 percent for the fathers with the lowest educational attainment to 17 percent for those with the highest educational attainment.

As shown on Table 9 highly educated mothers are also less likely to keep children in their care while watching TV (or watching TV while child is in their care). For example, high school graduates provide secondary childcare during 70 percent of all the time in front of TV while this figure is 10 percent less for college graduates. We see a similar pattern with respect to parents coming from households with different levels of income.

While mothers with less than high school degree have their children in their care during 70 percent of their leisurely activity outside the home, the figure drops to around 57 percent for mothers with at least college degree. Previous analysis showed positive association between parental education and leisure outside while a child is in parental care. On average, mothers with less than high school degree spend forty minutes leisurely time outside the house, while this figure rises up to 71 to 81 minutes for mothers with college or post college degree respectively (not shown here). We can therefore conclude that the reason while college and post college educated parents spend longer time in leisure out home while child is in their care is not necessarily because they are more likely to take children with them during leisure activities but they spend more leisurely time compared to less educated mothers.

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Better educated and financially better of parents put more emphasis on language use and more likely to provide intensive parenting compared to less advantaged parents. Overall, in line with Lareau's argument, affluent and educated parents spend more time in 'primary childcare' activities. Moreover they are also more likely to report interactive/ stimulating childcare activities such as reading/talking to a child or playing with child that would augment children's *cultural capital* compared to parents with limited resources.

Better educated parents are more TV-conscious. This is in line with theoretical expectations. "Middle-class" parents in Lareau's qualitative work either ban or strictly limit watching television for their children, while television is reported to be 'always available' for children from "working class" or "poor" families. The culture of *concerted cultivation* "vehemently opposes" watching television, whilst children raised by parents who embrace "*natural growth*" watches "unrestrictive amounts of television" (Lareau 2003: 242)⁹ There are two important reasons behind this variation, each relates to the availability of a specific parental resource: First, parents with higher income are able to schedule/ provide alternative leisurely activities for their children, and so decrease the amount of time available for children to watch television. For example, one of the affluent parents scheduled a piano lesson and a choir practice on Saturday morning for her son to specifically prevent him from watching television (2003:112). Second, parents with higher *cultural capital* are more aware of the negative effects of television on children. Scientific research has demonstrated the potential harms of excessive television watching, particularly if the content is non-educational and the age of child is young (see Christakis 2009 for a review). The dominant/popular expert opinion on childrearing practices is also very critical towards television exposure. Since parents with higher educational attainment have a better access to such information and comply with the dominant professional standards in child rearing practices, they are expected to limit their children's television watching more compared to culturally impoverished parents. Accordingly, parents who oppose their children's excessive exposure to television should be less likely to watch television themselves while child is in parental care. Moreover, previous research shows that parents interact with their children less if they are watching television while their children are in their care (Mendelsohn et al. 2008, Tanimura, Okuma and Kyoshima 2007). As parents who embrace the logic of *concerted cultivation* are more likely to involve intensive interaction with their children, they are expected to spend less time watching television while child is in parental care.

Parents with higher financial and educational resources are not more likely to be involved in school related activities: One possible explanation is that 'time spent in school activities' are demand driven. In other words, children coming from the less advantaged households are in need of more parental

⁹ For more on variations in parental attitudes on TV see Chapter 6 and Chapter 7 in Lareau (2003).

help to be successful in school. However, then remains the question of why children coming from less advantaged households are having higher difficulty in school related activities? We can speculate that other parental activities such as reading/talking to children or private tutorials, courses, trainings etc. act as a 'substitute' for parental time spent in school related activities.

Race/ethnicity is a very significant factor in explaining childcare patterns. Unlike in the study of Lareau, we find that ethnicity/race is a key variable in understanding parenting behaviour. This might be due to combination of several factors such as neighbourhood context, some unexplained economic circumstances that are not captured in the model as well as cultural differences in parenting. For example, Black parents, being more likely to live apart from biological children, have irregular working hours, suffer from job insecurity and financial strain, tend to spend less time with and show less warmth to their children (Monna and Gauthier 2008; Golden 2008; Hofferth 2003; Bulcroft, Cyr and Bulcroft 1996).

There is a limit how much we can empirically document the transmission of *cultural capital* from parents to children with the available time use data. For a start, infrequent activities are not captured well enough with single day diaries. The activities such as visiting museum or going to theatre with children would also be very good indicators of transmission of *cultural capital* but they are not very well captured in a single day diary. Second, the data does not allow us to measure the 'specific contents' of activities which would be very informative. For instance, it tells us whether parent reading or talking to a child, but it does not tell what she is telling, or what parents do watch on TV. Third, 'objectified' forms of *cultural capital* such as number of books, newspapers etc. are not available. Fourth, some strong propositions of Lareau, such as importance of informal social networks of parents have to be left untested due to data limitations

WORK IN PROGRESS
PLEASE DO NOT CITE

REFERENCES

- Aizer, A. 2004. "Home Alone: Supervision after School and Child Behaviour." *Journal of Public Economics* 88(9-10):1835-1848.
- Allison, P.D. 2001. *Missing Data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Amato, P.R. and F. Rivera. 1999. "Paternal Involvement and Children's Behaviour Problems." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 61(2):375-384.
- Amato, P.R. and J.G. Gilbreth. 1999. "Non-resident Fathers and Children's Well-Being: A Meta-Analysis." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 61(3):557-573.
- Astone, N.M. and S. McLanahan. 1991. "Family Structure, Parental Practices and High School Completion." *American Sociological Review* 56:309-320.
- Baumrind, D. 1991. "The Influence of Parenting Style on Adolescent Competence and Substance Use." *Journal of Early Adolescence* 11(1):56-95.
- . 1978. "Parental Disciplinary Patterns and Social Competence in Children." *Youth and Society* 9:238-276.
- Becker, G.S. and T. Nigel. 1986. "Human Capital and the Rise and Fall of Families." *Journal of Labor Economics* 4(3):1-39.
- Bluestone, C. and C.S. Tamis-LeMonda. 1999. "Correlates of Parenting Styles in Predominantly Working- and Middle-Class African American Mothers." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 61:881-893.
- Bulcroft, R.A., D.C. Carmody, and K.A. Bulcroft. 1996. "Patterns of Parental Independence Giving to Adolescents: Variations by Race, Age and Gender of Child." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 58:866-883.
- Burton, P., S. Phipps, and L. Curtis. 2002. "All in the Family: A Simultaneous Model of Parenting Style and Child Conduct." *American Economic Review* 92(2):368-372.
- Christakis, D.A. 2009. "The Effects of Infant Media Usage: What Do We Know and What Should We Learn?" *Acta Paediatrica* 98(1):8-16.
- Cheng, S. and B. Powell. 2007. "Under and Beyond Constraints: Resource Allocation to Young Children From Biracial Families." *American Journal of Sociology* 112:1044-1094.
- Deater-Deckard, K., K.A. Dodge, J.E. Bates, and G.S. Pettit. 1998. "Multiple Risk Factors in the Development of Externalizing Behaviour Problems: Group and Individual Differences." *Development and Psychopathology* 10(3):469-493.
- Downey, D.B. and S. Pribesh. 2004. "When Race Matters: Teachers' Evaluations of Students' Classroom Behaviour." *Sociology of Education* 77:267-282.

- Duncan, G.J. and J. Brooks-Gunn, eds. 1997. *Consequences of Growing Up Poor*. New York: Russel Sage Foundation.
- Entwisle, D.R. and K.L. Alexander. 1992. "Summer Setback: Race, Poverty, School Composition, and Mathematics Achievement in the First Two Years of School." *American Sociological Review* 57:72-84.
- Epstein, J.L. 1990. "School and Family Connections: Theory, Research, and Implications for Integrating Sociologies of Education and Family." *Marriage and Family Review* 15:99-126.
- EUROSTAT. 2008. "Harmonised European Time Use Surveys 2008 Guidelines."
- Furstenberg, F.F., Jr., S.P. Morgan, and P.D. Allison. 1987. "Paternal Participation and Children's Well-being after Marital Dissolution." *American Sociological Review* 52(5):695-701.
- Garci-Coll, C., Lamberty, G., Jenkins, R., McAdoo, H.P., Crnic, K., Wasik, B.H., et al. 1996. An Integrative Model for the Study of Developmental Competencies in Minority Children. *Child Development* 67: 1891-1914.
- Haveman, R. and B. Wolfe. 1995. "The Determinants of Children's Attainments: A Review of Methods and Findings." *Journal of Economic Literature* 33(4):1829-1878.
- Hays, S. 1996. *The Cultural Contradictions of Motherhood*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Hofferth, S.L. 2003. "Race/Ethnicity Differences in Father Involvement in Two-Parent Families: Culture, Context or Economy." *Journal of Family Issues* 24:185-216.
- Hoover-Dempsey, K.V. and H.M. Sandler. 1995. "Parental Involvement in Children's Education: Why Does It Make a Difference?" *Teachers College Record* 97(2):310-331.
- Kao, G. and J.S. Thompson. 2003. "Racial and Ethnic Stratification in Educational Achievement and Attainment." *Annual Review of Sociology* 29:417-442.
- King, V. and J.M. Sobolewski. 2006. "Non-resident Fathers' Contributions to Adolescent Well-Being." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 68(3):537-557.
- Lamb, M.E. and C.S. Lemonda-Tamis. 2007. "The Role of the Father: An Introduction." Pp. 1-31 in *The Role of the Father in Child Development*. Fourth ed., edited by M.E. Lamb. New Jersey: Wiley.
- Lareau, A. 2003. *Unequal Childhoods: Class, Race, and Family Life*. London: University of California Press.
- . 2002. "Invisible Inequality: Social Class and Childrearing in Black Families and White Families." *American Sociological Review* 67:747-776.

- . 1989. *Home Advantage: Social Class and Parental Intervention in Elementary Education*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Lareau, A. and E.B. Weininger. 2003. "Cultural Capital in Educational Research: A Critical Assessment." *Theory and Society* 32(5/6):567-606.
- Lareau, A. and M.E. Horvat. 1999. "Moments of Social Inclusion and Exclusion: Race, Class and Cultural Capital in Family-School Relationships." *Sociology of Education* 72:37-53.
- Leibowitz, A. 1977. "Parental Inputs and Children's Achievement." *The Journal of Human Resources* 12(2):242-251.
- Leibowitz, A.A. 2003. "In-Home Training and the Production of Children's Human Capital." *Review of Economics of the Household* 1:305-371.
- Martin, S.P. "Women's Education and Family Timing: Outcomes and Trends Associated with Age at Marriage and First Birth." Pp. 79-118 in *Social Inequality*, edited by K.N. Neckerman.
- McLanahan, S. 2004. "Diverging Destinies: How Children Are Faring under the Second Demographic Transition." *Demography* 41(4):607-627.
- McLoyd, V.C. 1998. "Socioeconomic Disadvantage and Child Development." *American Psychologist* 53(2):185-204.
- McNeal, R.B. 1999. "Parental Involvement as Social Capital: Differential Effectiveness on Science Achievement, Truancy, and." *Social Forces* 78(1):117-144.
- Mendelsohn A.L., Berkule S.B., Tomopoulos S., Tamis-LeMonda C.S., Huberman H.S. and Alvir J, *et al.* 2008 "Infant television and video exposure associated with limited parent-child verbal interactions in low socioeconomic status households". *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med*; 162: 411–7.
- Monna, B. and A.H. Gauthier. 2008. "A Review of the Literature on the Social and Economic Determinants of Parental Time." *Journal of Economic Issues* 29:634-653.
- Pleck, J.H. and B. Masciadrelli. 2004. "Paternal involvement: Levels, Sources, and Consequences." Pp. 227-271 in *The Role of the Father in Child Development*. 4th ed., edited by M.E. Lamb. New York: Wiley.
- Richardson, J.L., K. Dwyer, K. McGuigan, W.B. Hansen, C. Dent, A.C. Johnson, S.Y. Sussman, B. Brannon, and B. Flay. 1989. "Substance Use Among Eighth-Grade Students Who Take Care of Themselves After School." *Pediatrics* 84(3):556-566.
- Roscigno, V.J. and J.W. Ainsworth-Darnell. 1999. "Race, Cultural Capital, and Educational Resources: Persistent Inequalities and Achievement Returns." *Sociology of Education* 72:158-178.

- Rosenzweig, M.R. and K.I. Wolpin. 1994. "Are There Increasing Returns to the Intergenerational Production of Human Capital?" *The Journal of Human Resources* 29(2):670-693.
- . 1993. "Intergenerational Support and the Life-Cycle Incomes of Young Men and Their Parents: Human Capital Investments, Co residence, and Intergenerational Financial Transfers." *Journal of Labor Economics* 11(1, Part 1: Essays in Honor of Jacob Mincer):pp. 84-112.
- Rubin, D.B. 1996. "Multiple Imputation After 18+ Years." *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 91(434):473-489.
- . 1987. *Multiple Imputation for Nonresponse in Surveys*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Sayer, L.C., S.M. Bianchi, and J.P. Robinson. 2004. "Are Parents Investing Less in Children? Trends in Mothers' and Fathers' Time with Children." *The American Journal of Sociology* 110(1):1-43.
- Sayer, L.C., A.H. Gauthier, and F.F. Furstenberg Jr. 2004. "Educational Differences in Parents' Time With Children: Cross-National Variations." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 66:1152-1169.
- Schafer, J.L. 1997. *Analysis of Incomplete Multivariate Data*. New York: Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- Sui-Chu, E.H. and J.D. Willms. 1996. "Effects of Parental Involvement on Eighth-Grade Achievement." *Sociology of Education* 69(2):126-141.
- Tanimura M, K Okuma, and Kyoshima K. 2007. "Television viewing, reduced parental utterance, and delayed speech development in infants and young children". *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* 161: 618–619.
- Thomson, E., T.L. Hanson, and S. McLanahan. 1994. "Family Structure and Child Well-Being: Economic Resources vs. Parental Behaviours." *Social Forces* 73(1):221-242.
- Tyson, K. 2003. "Notes from the Back of the Room: Problems and Paradoxes in the Schooling of Young Black Students." *Sociology of Education* 76:326-343.
- Wagmiller, R., M.C. Lennon, and L. Kuang. 2008. "Changes in Parental Health and Children's Economic Well-Being." *Journal of Health and Social Behaviour* 49(1):37-55.
- Wenk, D., C.L. Hardesty, C.S. Morgan, and S.L. Blair. 1994. "The Influence of Parental Involvement on the Well-Being of Sons and Daughters." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 56:229-243.
- Wrigley, J. 1989. "Do Young Children Need Intellectual Stimulation? Experts' Advice to Parents 1900-1985." *History of Education* 29:41-75.

Zick, C.D. and K.W. Bryant. 1996. "A New Look at Parents' Time Spent in Child Care: Primary and Secondary Time Use." *Social Science Research* 25(3):260-280.

Zick, C.D., W.K. Bryant, and E. Österbacka. 2001. "Mothers' Employment, Parental Involvement, and the Implications for Intermediate Child Outcomes." *Social Science Research*, 30(1):25-49.

TABLES

Table 1 Summary statistics for variables predicting time spent with children

	Mothers	Fathers
Education		
0-11 the grade	10.3	10.2
High school graduate	25.5	25.4
Some college	19.4	16.7
College graduate	34.4	33.2
Post college	10.5	14.5
Household income quartile		
Lowest quartile	24.6	13.8
Second lowest quartile	27.7	26.6
Second highest quartile	19.2	23.3
Highest quartile	28.6	36.2
Race/ ethnicity		
Hispanic	16.2	14.7
Non-Hispanic Asian	3.6	4.0
Non-Hispanic Black	10.8	6.5
Non-Hispanic White	67.6	73.0
Non-Hispanic Other	1.8	1.8
Employment status of diarist		
Employed full-time	45.6	88.7
Employed part-time	21.6	3.9
Not employed	32.8	7.4
Employment status of spouse		
Employed full-time	62.3	37.8
Employed part-time	5.5	20.3
Not employed	5.4	32.8
Spouse not present	26.8	9.1
Other demographics		
Lives in an urban area	82.5	82.4
US citizen	88.8	88.8
Non-parent adult is present in the household	10.5	9.87
Age of diarist	34.79 (7.91)	37.66 (8.14)
Geographic region		
North East	18.1	18.0
Midwest	25.5	26.6
South	34.6	32.2
West	21.8	23.3

Table 1 Summary statistics for variables predicting time spent with children

	Mothers	Fathers
Child characteristics		
Age of youngest child	4.99 (3.78)	4.86 (3.72)
Number of children aged younger than 5	0.66 (0.76)	0.68 (0.75)
Number of children aged between 5 and 12	1.07 (0.88)	1.07 (0.89)
Number of children aged between 13 and 18	0.24 (0.51)	0.25 (0.53)
Same sex child present at home	64.4	66.3
Non-residential child present	1.0	4.2
Diary completion day		
Weekday	71.4	70
Saturday	14.0	14.4
Sunday	14.6	14.6
Survey year		
2003	23.7	23.4
2004	15.1	15.8
2005	16.4	15.6
2006	16.3	15.2
2007	14.3	14.7
2008	14.2	15.2

Note: Percentages are shown for categorical variables. Means and standard deviations (in parantheses) are shown for quantitative variables. Weighted to correct for diary completion day.

TABLE 2a. Minutes in primary childcare activities and percentage of mothers who reported the activity

	<u>General care</u>			<u>Play with child</u>			<u>School related activities</u>			<u>Read/ Talk to child</u>			<u>Out-of-home care</u>			<u>Total primary care</u>		
	All	%	>0	All	%	>0	All	%	>0	All	>0	%	All	>0	%	All	>0	%
0- 11th grade	55	65%	86	17	18%	96	9	15%	61	5	12%	39	22	41%	54	108	77%	140
High school graduate	57	69%	82	22	20%	110	9	17%	55	7	18%	39	21	44%	48	116	82%	143
Some college	57	74%	78	21	21%	102	10	17%	58	7	23%	33	25	48%	51	121	84%	143
College graduate	62	77%	81	27	27%	98	11	18%	59	10	29%	36	29	53%	56	139	88%	158
Post college	70	78%	89	31	31%	100	11	19%	59	11	32%	35	30	53%	56	153	89%	171
Lowest income quartile	59	71%	82	20	19%	104	10	16%	63	6	17%	38	23	45%	50	117	83%	142
2nd lowest quartile	59	71%	83	23	22%	104	10	16%	59	9	22%	39	23	45%	50	122	83%	148
2nd highest quartile	59	75%	79	27	26%	105	10	17%	58	9	26%	34	28	50%	55	132	85%	154
Highest income quartile	63	76%	83	27	28%	96	11	20%	53	10	30%	34	29	53%	56	140	88%	160
Hispanic	54	67%	82	17	19%	91	9	16%	56	6	15%	38	24	44%	54	110	79%	139
Non-Hispanic Asian	70	69%	101	30	30%	99	12	16%	71	11	27%	40	21	43%	49	144	84%	170
Non-Hispanic Black	51	63%	81	11	11%	96	10	17%	55	5	14%	37	21	46%	45	97	78%	124
Non-Hispanic Other	66	71%	92	20	20%	102	10	15%	70	9	23%	37	27	48%	56	131	84%	157
Non-Hispanic White	62	77%	81	28	27%	104	10	18%	58	10	27%	35	27	50%	54	136	87%	157
Married/cohabiting	64	76%	85	27	26%	102	10	18%	57	9	25%	36	26	47%	56	136	86%	158
Single mother	49	67%	73	16	17%	98	10	16%	59	7	20%	37	23	51%	46	105	81%	130
Sp is not employed	55	69%	81	21	22%	94	9	16%	59	7	20%	33	20	38%	53	112	80%	140
Sp is part-time emp	65	77%	85	23	23%	99	9	16%	58	9	26%	36	24	45%	54	131	87%	151
Sp is full-time emp	65	76%	85	28	27%	103	10	18%	57	9	26%	36	27	48%	56	139	87%	160
Same sex child present	66	76%	87	24	24%	101	11	18%	59	9	25%	36	27	49%	54	136	86%	158
No same sex child present	50	70%	73	24	23%	103	8	15%	54	8	22%	35	23	47%	50	113	82%	138
All mothers	60	73%	82	24	24%	101	10	17%	58	9	24%	36	26	49%	53	128	85%	151

Note: Results are weighted to correct for diary completion day.

TABLE 2b: Weighted means of minutes in primary childcare activities and percentage of fathers who reported the activity

	General care			Play with child			School related activities			Read/ Talk to child			Out-of-home care			Total primary care		
	All	%	>0	All	%	>0	All	%	>0	All	%	>0	All	%	>0	All	%	>0
0- 11th grade	17	22%	77	14	14%	101	4	7%	60	2	4%	62	7	20%	33	44	43%	102
High school graduate	23	36%	63	18	17%	108	4	7%	61	3	8%	31	10	24%	41	58	55%	105
Some college	23	44%	52	19	20%	93	5	8%	64	3	11%	31	12	27%	46	62	63%	100
College graduate	30	51%	59	23	24%	97	4	8%	53	5	15%	32	12	27%	46	75	68%	109
Post college	31	55%	56	24	26%	92	5	10%	52	6	19%	31	15	32%	46	80	73%	110
Lowest income quartile	22	31%	70	16	17%	99	4	8%	59	4	8%	46	8	22%	37	54	50%	109
2nd lowest quartile	22	39%	58	19	20%	98	4	6%	61	3	9%	30	10	25%	40	58	58%	101
2nd highest quartile	28	46%	60	21	21%	102	4	8%	59	4	13%	32	11	26%	44	69	64%	108
Highest income quartile	29	51%	56	22	23%	95	5	9%	54	5	15%	31	14	29%	48	74	69%	108
Hispanic	18	25%	70.3	13	15%	85	4	7%	61	2	5%	36	9	23%	37	45	48%	94
Non-Hispanic Asian	25	40%	62.5	24	28%	85	7	12%	61	4	11%	34	12	30%	40	72	64%	112
Non-Hispanic Black	21	33%	61.7	10	11%	93	5	9%	57	4	10%	42	13	27%	50	53	51%	105
Non-Hispanic Other	30	52%	57.5	24	20%	117	6	8%	84	5	14%	35	15	26%	56	80	67%	120
Non-Hispanic White	28	48%	57.7	22	22%	100	4	8%	56	4	14%	32	12	26%	44	71	66%	108
Married/cohabiting	27	45%	59	21	22%	98	4	8%	58	4	12%	31	11	25%	45	67	63%	107
Single mother	19	32%	58	11	12%	97	4	8%	49	5	10%	48	13	35%	37	52	49%	105
Sp is not emp	23	42%	56	22	23%	94	4	6%	61	4	12%	32	8	18%	48	61	59%	104
Sp is part-time emp	29	49%	59	22	23%	95	4	8%	52	4	14%	30	10	24%	43	70	67%	105
Sp is full-time emp	28	45%	62	21	20%	104	5	9%	59	4	11%	32	14	33%	44	72	65%	110
Same sex child present	28	46%	62	23	22%	101	5	8%	58	4	12%	31	12	27%	46	71	65%	111
Same sex child is not present	21	38%	54	16	18%	91	4	7%	56	4	11%	35	10	25%	39	54	57%	95
All fathers	26	44%	59	20	21%	98	4	8%	57	4	12%	33	11	26%	44	66	62%	106

Note: Results are weighted to correct for diary completion day.

TABLE 3a. Time spent in primary activities while child is in mother's care

	<u>Personal care</u>			<u>Unpaid work</u>			<u>Watching TV</u>			<u>Leisure at home</u>			<u>Out-of-home leisure</u>			<u>Travel</u>			<u>Total</u>		
	All	%	>0	All	%	>0	All	%	>0	All	%	>0	All	%	>0	All	%	>0	All	%	>0
0- 11th grade	63	86%	74	160	85%	189	125	69%	182	51	42%	121	29	25%	119	27	50%	54	468	95%	493
High school graduate	61	87%	70	135	85%	159	98	64%	154	58	51%	114	36	31%	115	28	55%	52	435	96%	454
Some college	60	85%	70	127	84%	151	77	58%	133	56	53%	105	40	36%	112	29	55%	53	412	95%	434
College graduate	65	88%	73	125	86%	145	59	53%	112	53	55%	96	44	41%	108	29	58%	51	400	96%	416
Post college	62	88%	71	112	85%	132	45	44%	103	51	55%	92	47	44%	108	29	55%	53	374	97%	387
Lowest quartile	60	85%	71	131	82%	158	105	63%	166	56	47%	120	30	26%	114	28	53%	52	426	95%	449
2nd lowest quartile	62	86%	72	136	85%	160	84	60%	140	55	52%	107	38	34%	113	28	55%	51	426	95%	447
2nd highest quartile	64	88%	73	130	87%	149	70	56%	123	55	55%	100	44	41%	109	31	58%	53	417	96%	434
Highest quartile	64	89%	72	125	87%	144	54	50%	108	51	56%	92	47	43%	109	29	56%	52	395	96%	410
Hispanic	67	90%	75	160	87%	183	105	66%	160	51	44%	114	33	28%	118	30	55%	54	461	96%	482
Non-Hispanic Asian	77	91%	85	139	88%	158	68	51%	134	50	50%	100	38	32%	116	25	45%	56	416	97%	428
Non-Hispanic Black	55	80%	69	96	76%	126	98	58%	170	53	43%	122	25	21%	118	25	48%	51	369	93%	395
Non-Hispanic Other	67	82%	82	137	85%	161	78	56%	140	51	51%	101	47	36%	130	39	60%	64	432	95%	455
Non-Hispanic White	62	87%	70	128	86%	149	69	55%	124	56	56%	100	44	40%	108	29	57%	51	412	96%	429
Married/cohabiting	65	89%	73	141	88%	160	75	57%	130	56	56%	101	45	40%	112	30	57%	53	435	97%	449
Single mother	54	81%	67	100	77%	130	86	57%	152	50	44%	113	27	25%	106	25	51%	48	362	92%	393
Sp is not emp	61	85%	72	124	81%	152	83	58%	145	55	50%	112	34	29%	117	27	50%	54	409	94%	434
Sp is part-time emp	60	87%	69	149	86%	174	88	60%	146	60	55%	111	41	39%	106	31	57%	54	456	96%	477
Sp is full-time emp	66	90%	74	142	89%	160	73	57%	128	56	56%	99	46	41%	112	31	57%	53	436	97%	448
Same sex child present	63	88%	72	136	86%	158	77	57%	136	55	53%	104	42	37%	113	30	57%	52	425	96%	443
No same sex child pres.	61	86%	70	120	84%	144	79	58%	137	53	52%	103	36	34%	106	27	52%	52	398	95%	419
All mothers	62	87%	72	130	88%	153	78	57%	136	54	52%	104	40	36%	111	29	55%	52	416	96%	434

Note: Results are weighted to correct for diary completion day.

TABLE 3b. Time spent in primary activities while child is in father's care

	<u>Personal care</u>			<u>Unpaid work</u>			<u>Watching TV</u>			<u>Leisure at home</u>			<u>Out-of-home leisure</u>			<u>Travel</u>			<u>Total</u>		
	All	%	>0	All	%	>0	All	%	>0	All	%	>0	All	%	>0	All	%	>0	All	%	>0
0- 11th grade	35	61%	58	48	40%	120	99	53%	186	34	30%	115	27	19%	142	14	29%	48	263	71%	371
High school graduate	40	68%	58	51	48%	105	93	56%	166	41	35%	120	33	27%	124	17	34%	50	286	82%	347
Some college	42	73%	58	58	53%	109	82	53%	155	44	41%	106	39	31%	127	21	37%	58	301	85%	355
College graduate	48	76%	64	57	55%	103	65	49%	133	42	42%	100	42	34%	125	22	38%	59	296	86%	344
Post college	49	77%	64	50	55%	91	47	42%	114	41	45%	91	47	36%	131	24	39%	62	288	88%	328
Lowest quartile	39	63%	62	50	44%	113	96	52%	185	41	34%	122	25	21%	121	17	34%	51	283	76%	373
2nd lowest quartile	41	69%	59	52	49%	107	84	53%	160	43	37%	116	34	29%	119	18	35%	51	286	82%	350
2nd highest quartile	45	75%	60	57	53%	106	76	53%	144	41	42%	99	41	31%	133	23	38%	59	302	86%	350
Highest quartile	47	75%	62	54	55%	98	62	48%	130	39	41%	96	45	35%	129	22	36%	60	287	86%	332
Hispanic	38	62%	62	50	42%	119	87	54%	163	38	30%	125	27	22%	123	19	34%	57	268	73%	368
Non-Hispanic Asian	51	73%	70	50	45%	111	69	54%	128	48	46%	105	30	24%	125	27	34%	79	291	83%	351
Non-Hispanic Black	38	63%	60	46	47%	96	108	55%	198	37	35%	107	30	22%	140	16	30%	53	288	79%	366
Non-Hispanic Other	40	74%	55	62	55%	113	79	48%	165	47	41%	114	39	34%	115	22	42%	52	305	87%	351
Non-Hispanic White	45	75%	60	55	54%	102	71	50%	143	42	41%	102	42	33%	127	21	37%	55	294	86%	341
Married/cohabiting	45	74%	61	54	52%	105	78	52%	150	43	41%	105	40	31%	127	21	37%	57	296	86%	346
Single mother	29	53%	54	45	45%	100	61	42%	147	27	25%	105	28	21%	132	14	33%	44	220	64%	341
Sp is not emp	45	70%	64	49	45%	108	76	50%	154	44	39%	113	36	29%	125	21	34%	60	285	82%	347
Sp is part-time emp	46	76%	60	54	53%	101	71	50%	144	43	43%	101	41	34%	123	20	37%	55	294	88%	336
Sp is full-time emp	45	75%	60	60	58%	104	83	55%	149	41	41%	101	41	32%	129	22	38%	57	308	87%	352
Same sex child present	45	73%	61	55	52%	105	75	51%	147	41	40%	105	40	31%	128	20	37%	55	291	84%	347
No same sex child pres.	42	71%	60	52	50%	102	78	51%	155	40	39%	106	36	29%	124	20	35%	59	285	83%	345
All fathers	44	72%	61	53	51%	104	76	51%	150	41	39%	105	38	30%	127	20	36%	56	290	84%	346

Note: Results are weighted to correct for diary completion day.

Table 4a. Logistic regression estimating mothers' primary childcare activities

	<u>General care</u>		<u>Play with child</u>		<u>School related activities</u>		<u>Read/Talk to child</u>		<u>Out-of-home care</u>	
	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE
Intercept	1.27	0.39	-2.22	0.42	-5.18	0.5	-5.24	0.41	-2.39	0.32
0 - 11th grade	-0.52	0.09	-0.08	0.10	-0.26	0.10	-0.46	0.10	-0.07	0.07
High school graduate	-0.26	0.06	0.02	0.07	-0.03	0.07	-0.22	0.06	-0.11	0.05
College graduate	0.07	0.06	0.22	0.07	-0.05	0.07	0.16	0.06	0.10	0.05
Post college	0.10	0.09	0.30	0.09	0.02	0.09	0.25	0.08	0.09	0.07
2nd lowest quartile	-0.05	0.06	0.21	0.07	0.02	0.08	0.18	0.07	0.01	0.06
2nd highest quartile	0.00	0.08	0.31	0.08	0.04	0.09	0.16	0.08	0.17	0.07
Highest quartile	0.07	0.08	0.42	0.09	0.12	0.10	0.21	0.08	0.21	0.07
Hispanic	-0.46	0.07	-0.46	0.08	-0.04	0.08	-0.29	0.07	-0.04	0.06
Asian	-0.56	0.12	-0.15	0.12	-0.16	0.13	0.00	0.11	-0.29	0.10
Black	-0.58	0.07	-1.02	0.09	0.18	0.08	-0.53	0.08	-0.18	0.06
Other	-0.28	0.16	-0.41	0.17	-0.09	0.19	0.05	0.15	0.10	0.13
Presence of same sex child	0.08	0.04	-0.04	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.07	0.04	0.01	0.04
Employed part-time	0.24	0.05	0.37	0.06	0.46	0.06	0.38	0.05	0.10	0.05
Not employed	0.56	0.05	0.75	0.05	0.66	0.06	0.59	0.05	-0.12	0.04
Spouse not present	0.33	0.10	0.13	0.11	0.13	0.11	0.20	0.10	0.78	0.09
Spouse is part-time employed	0.42	0.13	-0.10	0.13	-0.06	0.14	0.21	0.12	0.31	0.11
Spouse is full-time employed	0.32	0.09	-0.03	0.10	0.10	0.11	0.06	0.09	0.40	0.08
Lives in an urban area	0.07	0.06	0.12	0.06	0.09	0.06	0.13	0.06	0.15	0.05
US citizen	0.25	0.08	0.00	0.08	-0.21	0.09	0.35	0.08	0.17	0.07
Non-parent adult present	-0.23	0.06	0.03	0.08	-0.11	0.08	-0.13	0.07	-0.27	0.06
Age of youngest child	-0.27	0.01	-0.29	0.01	0.06	0.01	-0.04	0.01	-0.03	0.01
Number of children <5	0.08	0.06	-0.12	0.05	0.07	0.06	0.13	0.04	0.04	0.04
Number of children <5-12	0.07	0.03	-0.39	0.03	0.58	0.03	0.11	0.03	0.23	0.02
Number of children 13-18	-0.16	0.04	-0.37	0.06	-0.15	0.05	-0.13	0.04	-0.18	0.04
Non-residential child	-0.98	0.19	-0.12	0.27	-0.66	0.27	-0.53	0.25	-1.11	0.19
Age	0.06	0.02	0.11	0.02	0.13	0.03	0.16	0.02	0.08	0.02
Age squared	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Saturday	-1.19	0.06	-0.15	0.06	-2.26	0.13	-0.67	0.06	-1.31	0.05
Sunday	-0.61	0.06	-0.14	0.06	-1.36	0.09	-0.41	0.06	-1.65	0.06
Midwest	-0.19	0.07	0.05	0.07	-0.20	0.07	-0.05	0.06	-0.01	0.05
South	-0.31	0.06	-0.16	0.06	-0.11	0.07	-0.08	0.06	0.18	0.05
West	-0.36	0.07	-0.18	0.07	-0.19	0.07	-0.09	0.06	0.11	0.06
2004	0.03	0.07	0.18	0.07	-0.01	0.08	-0.10	0.07	0.04	0.06
2005	0.02	0.07	0.16	0.07	0.12	0.07	0.11	0.06	0.12	0.06
2006	-0.06	0.07	0.20	0.07	0.05	0.07	0.02	0.06	0.01	0.06
2007	-0.04	0.07	0.18	0.07	0.04	0.08	-0.03	0.07	0.00	0.06
2008	0.12	0.07	0.19	0.07	0.15	0.08	-0.05	0.07	0.20	0.06

Table 4b. Logistic regression estimating fathers' primary childcare activities

	<u>General care</u>		<u>Play with child</u>		<u>School related activities</u>		<u>Read/Talk to child</u>		<u>Out-of-home care</u>	
	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE
Intercept	-2.16	0.41	-3.66	0.51	-5.09	0.85	-5.47	0.67	-2.45	0.44
0 - 11th grade	-0.64	0.10	-0.28	0.12	-0.25	0.17	-0.75	0.19	-0.26	0.10
High school graduate	-0.28	0.07	-0.18	0.08	-0.10	0.12	-0.27	0.10	-0.12	0.07
College graduate	0.14	0.06	0.04	0.08	-0.05	0.12	0.22	0.09	0.02	0.07
Post college	0.33	0.08	0.19	0.09	0.07	0.14	0.48	0.11	0.31	0.08
2nd lowest quartile	0.14	0.09	0.24	0.10	-0.25	0.14	-0.08	0.13	-0.01	0.09
2nd highest quartile	0.21	0.10	0.13	0.11	-0.03	0.16	0.03	0.14	-0.01	0.10
Highest quartile	0.31	0.10	0.20	0.11	0.02	0.16	0.06	0.14	0.06	0.10
Hispanic	-0.56	0.08	-0.38	0.10	0.08	0.14	-0.60	0.14	0.17	0.08
Asian	-0.47	0.11	0.04	0.13	0.52	0.17	-0.35	0.17	0.18	0.12
Black	-0.43	0.09	-0.67	0.13	0.18	0.15	-0.13	0.14	-0.04	0.10
Other	0.16	0.16	-0.14	0.19	0.10	0.29	0.18	0.21	0.01	0.17
Same sex child	0.16	0.05	0.31	0.06	0.02	0.09	-0.01	0.07	0.02	0.05
Employed part-time	0.33	0.11	0.26	0.13	0.41	0.18	0.31	0.16	0.36	0.11
Not employed	0.66	0.09	0.56	0.10	1.05	0.12	0.64	0.11	0.34	0.09
Spouse not present	0.47	0.09	-0.21	0.13	0.54	0.16	0.25	0.13	1.31	0.09
Sp. is part-time emp	0.37	0.06	0.13	0.07	0.27	0.11	0.13	0.08	0.40	0.07
Sp. is full-time emp	0.33	0.05	-0.08	0.06	0.32	0.10	-0.04	0.08	0.91	0.06
Lives in an urban area	0.30	0.06	0.08	0.07	0.17	0.11	0.09	0.09	0.07	0.06
US citizen	0.55	0.09	-0.12	0.10	-0.22	0.15	0.33	0.15	0.09	0.09
Adult present	-0.20	0.08	-0.11	0.10	-0.52	0.15	-0.21	0.13	-0.35	0.08
Age of youngest child	-0.18	0.01	-0.16	0.01	0.04	0.02	-0.01	0.02	-0.03	0.01
Number of child <5	0.22	0.05	0.06	0.06	-0.16	0.10	0.33	0.07	0.00	0.06
Number of child <5-12	0.22	0.03	-0.27	0.04	0.62	0.05	0.17	0.04	0.23	0.03
Number of child 13-18	-0.29	0.05	-0.42	0.07	-0.17	0.08	-0.20	0.07	-0.14	0.05
Non-residential child	-0.90	0.13	-0.12	0.16	-1.34	0.30	-0.52	0.20	-0.72	0.13
Age	0.06	0.02	0.15	0.03	0.09	0.04	0.14	0.03	0.02	0.02
Age squared	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Saturday	-0.35	0.06	0.12	0.07	-2.18	0.22	-0.46	0.10	-0.54	0.07
Sunday	0.11	0.06	0.25	0.07	-0.99	0.14	-0.10	0.09	-0.90	0.08
Midwest	-0.21	0.07	0.11	0.08	-0.37	0.11	-0.01	0.09	-0.03	0.07
South	-0.17	0.06	-0.03	0.08	-0.32	0.11	-0.26	0.09	0.00	0.07
West	-0.21	0.07	-0.11	0.08	-0.20	0.11	-0.09	0.09	-0.03	0.07
2004	0.11	0.07	-0.03	0.08	-0.02	0.13	-0.07	0.10	0.00	0.07
2005	0.19	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.09	0.12	-0.09	0.10	-0.09	0.07
2006	0.14	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.21	0.12	0.03	0.10	-0.04	0.07
2007	0.20	0.07	0.20	0.08	0.07	0.13	0.01	0.10	-0.14	0.08
2008	0.37	0.07	0.09	0.08	0.04	0.13	0.12	0.10	0.06	0.07

Reference categories: Education: Some college; Household income: Lowest income quartile; Race/ethnicity: Non-Hispanic White; Employment status: Not-employed; Employment status of spouse: Not employed; Year: 2003; Diary day: Weekday

Note: Weights are applied to correct for diary completion day.

Table 5a. Gamma regression estimating mothers' primary childcare activities

	<u>General</u>		<u>Play</u>		<u>School related</u>		<u>Read/Talk</u>		<u>Out-of- home</u>	
	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE
Intercept	3.78	0.20	3.27	0.49	-0.47	0.47	-1.44	0.36	1.34	0.30
0 - 11th grade	-0.11	0.05	0.03	0.11	-0.17	0.11	-0.23	0.08	-0.10	0.07
High school graduate	0.00	0.03	0.22	0.08	-0.01	0.08	-0.05	0.06	-0.12	0.05
College graduate	0.02	0.03	0.15	0.08	0.04	0.08	0.19	0.06	0.12	0.05
Post college	0.06	0.05	0.26	0.11	0.15	0.11	0.20	0.08	0.14	0.07
2nd lowest quartile	-0.01	0.04	0.21	0.09	-0.06	0.09	0.20	0.06	0.01	0.05
2nd highest quartile	-0.02	0.04	0.20	0.10	-0.03	0.10	0.08	0.08	0.11	0.06
Highest quartile	0.05	0.05	0.34	0.11	-0.10	0.11	0.02	0.08	0.13	0.07
Hispanic	-0.15	0.04	-0.23	0.09	-0.07	0.09	-0.21	0.07	0.01	0.06
Asian	-0.01	0.06	-0.10	0.15	0.12	0.15	0.10	0.11	-0.25	0.09
Black	-0.15	0.04	-0.75	0.10	0.11	0.09	-0.30	0.07	-0.19	0.06
Other	-0.03	0.08	-0.02	0.20	0.11	0.19	-0.06	0.15	0.14	0.12
Presence of same sex child	0.12	0.02	0.00	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.04	0.04	-0.01	0.04
Employed part-time	0.24	0.03	0.33	0.07	0.22	0.07	0.36	0.05	0.09	0.04
Not employed	0.45	0.03	0.71	0.07	0.55	0.06	0.48	0.05	0.01	0.04
Spouse not present	0.15	0.05	-0.02	0.13	0.09	0.12	0.21	0.10	0.38	0.08
Spouse is part-time employed	0.18	0.07	-0.28	0.16	-0.13	0.16	0.20	0.12	0.14	0.10
Spouse is full-time employed	0.08	0.05	-0.25	0.12	0.00	0.12	0.07	0.09	0.19	0.07
Lives in an urban area	0.10	0.03	0.02	0.07	0.18	0.07	0.17	0.05	0.14	0.04
US citizen	0.14	0.04	-0.08	0.11	-0.20	0.10	0.10	0.08	0.07	0.06
Non-parent adult present	-0.06	0.04	-0.17	0.09	-0.14	0.08	-0.09	0.07	-0.11	0.05
Age of youngest child	-0.17	0.01	-0.21	0.01	0.09	0.01	-0.02	0.01	-0.01	0.01
Number of children <5	0.10	0.03	-0.04	0.06	0.19	0.06	0.10	0.05	0.16	0.04
Number of children <5-12	0.09	0.02	-0.25	0.04	0.59	0.04	0.13	0.03	0.28	0.02
Number of children 13-18	-0.01	0.02	-0.14	0.06	-0.07	0.06	-0.03	0.04	0.02	0.04
Non-residential child	-0.41	0.11	0.13	0.27	-0.10	0.26	-0.01	0.20	-0.67	0.16
Age	0.02	0.01	0.04	0.02	0.07	0.02	0.14	0.02	0.06	0.02
Age squared	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Saturday	-0.36	0.03	0.22	0.08	-1.26	0.07	-0.38	0.06	-0.39	0.05
Sunday	-0.18	0.03	0.16	0.08	-0.75	0.07	-0.23	0.06	-0.91	0.05
Midwest	-0.11	0.03	-0.06	0.08	-0.14	0.08	0.03	0.06	-0.10	0.05
South	-0.11	0.03	-0.09	0.08	-0.09	0.08	-0.03	0.06	0.02	0.05
West	-0.19	0.04	-0.19	0.09	-0.07	0.08	-0.07	0.06	-0.02	0.05
2004	-0.01	0.04	0.13	0.09	0.03	0.08	-0.12	0.06	-0.03	0.05
2005	-0.07	0.04	0.12	0.09	0.07	0.08	-0.01	0.06	0.00	0.05
2006	-0.12	0.04	0.04	0.09	0.05	0.08	-0.02	0.06	-0.01	0.05
2007	-0.05	0.04	0.16	0.09	0.05	0.09	-0.03	0.07	-0.06	0.05
2008	-0.02	0.04	0.15	0.09	0.14	0.09	-0.17	0.07	0.04	0.05

Table 5b. Gamma regression estimating fathers' in primary childcare

	<u>General care</u>		<u>Play</u>		<u>School related activities</u>		<u>Read/Talk</u>		<u>Out-of-home</u>	
	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE
Intercept	2.16	0.42	-0.08	0.06	0.33	0.66	-0.39	0.57	0.07	0.06
0 - 11th grade	-0.17	0.10	-0.03	0.01	-0.35	0.16	-0.09	0.13	-0.04	0.01
High school graduate	-0.07	0.07	-0.02	0.01	-0.23	0.11	-0.16	0.10	-0.02	0.01
College graduate	0.11	0.07	0.01	0.01	-0.17	0.11	0.26	0.09	0.00	0.01
Post college	0.25	0.09	0.03	0.01	-0.24	0.14	0.40	0.12	0.05	0.01
2nd lowest quartile	0.03	0.10	0.03	0.01	-0.12	0.14	-0.13	0.13	0.00	0.01
2nd highest quartile	0.02	0.10	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.15	-0.02	0.14	-0.01	0.01
Highest quartile	0.02	0.10	0.03	0.01	-0.02	0.16	0.01	0.14	0.01	0.01
Hispanic	-0.25	0.08	-0.04	0.01	0.02	0.13	-0.34	0.11	0.03	0.01
Asian	-0.08	0.12	0.01	0.02	0.31	0.19	-0.11	0.17	0.02	0.02
Black	-0.45	0.09	-0.06	0.01	0.10	0.15	0.11	0.13	-0.01	0.01
Other	0.03	0.17	-0.02	0.02	0.18	0.26	0.27	0.23	0.00	0.02
Presence of same sex child	0.17	0.05	0.04	0.01	-0.08	0.08	-0.08	0.07	0.00	0.01
Employed part-time	0.28	0.12	0.03	0.02	0.19	0.18	0.53	0.16	0.05	0.02
Not employed	0.78	0.09	0.07	0.01	0.73	0.14	0.50	0.12	0.05	0.01
Spouse not present	0.41	0.09	-0.02	0.01	0.11	0.15	0.52	0.13	0.18	0.01
Spouse is part-time emp	0.30	0.06	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.10	0.09	0.09	0.05	0.01
Spouse is full-time employed	0.36	0.06	-0.01	0.01	0.08	0.09	0.00	0.08	0.12	0.01
Lives in an urban area	0.19	0.06	0.01	0.01	0.13	0.10	0.05	0.09	0.01	0.01
US citizen	0.35	0.09	-0.01	0.01	-0.58	0.14	0.16	0.12	0.01	0.01
Non-parent adult present	-0.16	0.08	-0.01	0.01	-0.31	0.12	-0.32	0.11	-0.05	0.01
Age of youngest child	-0.18	0.01	-0.02	0.00	0.05	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00
Number of children <5	0.11	0.05	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.08	0.21	0.07	0.00	0.01
Number of children <5-12	0.20	0.03	-0.04	0.00	0.64	0.05	0.15	0.04	0.03	0.00
Number of children 13-18	-0.14	0.05	-0.03	0.01	-0.05	0.07	-0.15	0.06	-0.02	0.01
Non-residential child	-0.48	0.12	-0.01	0.02	-0.88	0.19	-0.27	0.16	0.00	0.00
Age	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.05	0.03	0.07	0.03	-0.09	0.02
Age squared	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Saturday	-0.02	0.06	0.01	0.01	-0.85	0.10	-0.08	0.09	-0.07	0.01
Sunday	0.21	0.06	0.03	0.01	-0.45	0.10	0.05	0.09	-0.11	0.01
Midwest	-0.20	0.07	0.01	0.01	-0.16	0.11	0.10	0.09	-0.01	0.01
South	-0.17	0.07	-0.01	0.01	-0.11	0.10	0.01	0.09	0.00	0.01
West	-0.24	0.07	-0.01	0.01	-0.08	0.11	-0.01	0.10	0.00	0.01
2004	0.04	0.07	0.00	0.01	-0.03	0.11	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.01
2005	0.11	0.07	0.01	0.01	0.10	0.11	0.01	0.10	-0.01	0.01
2006	-0.02	0.07	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.11	-0.12	0.10	-0.01	0.01
2007	0.10	0.07	0.02	0.01	-0.07	0.12	-0.16	0.10	-0.02	0.01
2008	0.24	0.07	0.01	0.01	-0.14	0.11	0.01	0.10	0.01	0.01

Table 6a. Logistic regression estimating mothers' secondary childcare

	<u>Personal care</u>		<u>Unpaid work</u>		<u>TV</u>		<u>Leisure at home</u>		<u>Leisure outside</u>		<u>Travel</u>	
	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE
Intercept	-0.24	0.42	-0.69	0.42	0.39	0.31	0.08	0.31	-1.94	0.33	0.20	0.31
0 - 11th grade	-0.13	0.10	-0.09	0.10	0.25	0.07	-0.35	0.07	-0.34	0.08	-0.25	0.07
High school graduate	0.19	0.07	0.05	0.07	0.21	0.05	-0.06	0.05	-0.14	0.05	0.03	0.05
College graduate	0.09	0.07	-0.03	0.07	-0.12	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.09	0.05	0.16	0.05
Post college	0.06	0.10	-0.22	0.10	-0.40	0.07	0.03	0.07	0.22	0.07	0.09	0.07
2nd lowest quartile	0.00	0.07	0.06	0.07	-0.03	0.05	0.10	0.05	0.16	0.06	0.14	0.05
2nd highest quartile	0.08	0.10	0.09	0.09	-0.06	0.07	0.13	0.06	0.32	0.07	0.22	0.07
Highest quartile	0.13	0.10	-0.07	0.09	-0.20	0.07	0.10	0.07	0.29	0.07	0.15	0.07
Hispanic	0.28	0.09	0.09	0.08	0.20	0.06	-0.24	0.06	-0.23	0.06	0.08	0.06
Asian	0.21	0.16	0.04	0.14	-0.07	0.10	-0.16	0.10	-0.38	0.10	-0.42	0.10
Black	-0.23	0.08	-0.24	0.07	0.01	0.06	-0.19	0.06	-0.52	0.07	-0.21	0.06
Other	-0.30	0.16	0.06	0.18	-0.12	0.13	-0.14	0.12	-0.02	0.13	0.14	0.13
Same sex child is present	0.00	0.05	0.04	0.05	-0.07	0.04	-0.01	0.04	0.09	0.04	0.17	0.04
Employed part-time	0.28	0.06	0.33	0.06	0.03	0.04	0.36	0.04	0.37	0.05	0.28	0.04
Not employed	0.58	0.06	0.79	0.06	0.45	0.04	0.74	0.04	0.59	0.04	0.43	0.04
Spouse not present	-0.07	0.11	-0.05	0.10	-0.12	0.08	-0.12	0.08	-0.01	0.09	0.18	0.08
Spouse is part-time employed	0.11	0.14	0.25	0.14	0.10	0.10	0.11	0.10	0.33	0.11	0.23	0.10
Spouse is full-time employed	0.34	0.11	0.56	0.10	0.07	0.08	0.14	0.08	0.34	0.08	0.20	0.08

Table 6a (cont.) Logistic regression estimating mothers' secondary childcare

	<u>Personal care</u>		<u>Unpaid work</u>		<u>TV</u>		<u>Leisure at home</u>		<u>Leisure outside</u>		<u>Travel</u>	
	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE
Lives in an urban area	0.02	0.07	0.09	0.06	0.04	0.05	-0.08	0.05	-0.11	0.05	-0.06	0.05
US citizen	-0.03	0.11	0.01	0.10	0.04	0.07	0.26	0.07	0.23	0.07	0.16	0.07
Non-parent adult present	-0.12	0.08	-0.30	0.07	0.01	0.06	-0.24	0.06	-0.21	0.06	-0.32	0.06
Age of youngest child	-0.07	0.01	-0.06	0.01	0.02	0.01	-0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.01	-0.04	0.01
Number of children <5	0.04	0.06	0.23	0.06	0.01	0.04	0.03	0.04	-0.07	0.04	-0.08	0.04
Number of children <5-12	0.05	0.04	0.15	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.02
Number of children 13-18	-0.12	0.05	-0.06	0.05	-0.03	0.04	-0.04	0.04	-0.07	0.04	-0.14	0.04
Non-residential child	-1.12	0.18	-1.17	0.18	-0.46	0.17	-0.49	0.17	-0.52	0.21	-0.52	0.17
Age	0.09	0.02	0.08	0.02	-0.02	0.02	-0.04	0.02	0.00	0.02	-0.04	0.02
Age squared	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Saturday	0.02	0.07	0.02	0.07	0.21	0.05	0.27	0.05	0.73	0.05	0.70	0.05
Sunday	0.35	0.08	0.17	0.07	0.30	0.05	0.36	0.05	0.96	0.05	0.80	0.05
Midwest	-0.10	0.08	0.06	0.07	0.13	0.05	-0.06	0.05	0.16	0.05	0.11	0.05
South	-0.08	0.07	-0.09	0.07	0.06	0.05	-0.16	0.05	0.21	0.05	0.25	0.05
West	-0.02	0.08	0.09	0.08	0.04	0.05	-0.03	0.05	0.25	0.06	0.22	0.05
2004	0.14	0.08	-0.04	0.08	0.00	0.05	0.11	0.05	-0.08	0.06	0.00	0.06
2005	0.25	0.08	0.04	0.08	0.06	0.05	0.09	0.05	-0.11	0.06	-0.06	0.05
2006	0.20	0.08	-0.02	0.07	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.06	-0.08	0.05
2007	0.20	0.08	-0.01	0.08	0.15	0.06	-0.09	0.06	0.04	0.06	-0.07	0.06
2008	0.13	0.08	0.02	0.08	0.17	0.06	0.03	0.06	-0.01	0.06	-0.13	0.06

Table 6b. Logistic regression estimating fathers' time spent in secondary childcare

	<u>Personal care</u>		<u>Unpaid work</u>		<u>TV</u>		<u>Leisure at home</u>		<u>Leisure outside</u>		<u>Travel</u>	
	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE
Intercept	-0.25	0.41	-1.25	0.38	-0.54	0.38	-0.43	0.38	-2.01	0.43	-0.45	0.40
0 - 11th grade	-0.24	0.09	-0.25	0.09	0.03	0.09	-0.37	0.09	-0.38	0.11	-0.32	0.10
High school graduate	-0.14	0.07	-0.13	0.06	0.15	0.06	-0.27	0.06	-0.13	0.07	-0.10	0.07
College graduate	0.07	0.07	0.04	0.06	-0.17	0.06	-0.01	0.06	0.12	0.07	0.08	0.06
Post college	0.16	0.09	0.12	0.08	-0.44	0.08	0.16	0.08	0.26	0.08	0.24	0.08
2nd lowest quartile	0.04	0.08	0.06	0.09	0.01	0.08	0.05	0.08	0.26	0.09	-0.04	0.08
2nd highest quartile	0.15	0.09	0.13	0.09	0.06	0.08	0.07	0.09	0.23	0.10	0.03	0.09
Highest quartile	0.02	0.09	0.06	0.10	-0.05	0.09	-0.09	0.09	0.23	0.10	-0.16	0.09
Hispanic	-0.24	0.08	-0.20	0.07	0.19	0.07	-0.29	0.08	-0.21	0.08	0.04	0.08
Asian	-0.04	0.12	-0.33	0.11	0.45	0.11	0.18	0.11	-0.43	0.13	-0.13	0.12
Black	-0.28	0.09	-0.21	0.09	0.16	0.09	-0.21	0.09	-0.49	0.10	-0.34	0.09
Other	-0.06	0.17	0.00	0.15	-0.18	0.15	-0.08	0.15	0.06	0.16	0.12	0.16
Same sex child is present	0.05	0.05	-0.01	0.04	0.02	0.04	0.06	0.04	0.04	0.05	0.06	0.05
Employed part-time	0.05	0.11	0.26	0.10	0.25	0.10	0.23	0.10	0.00	0.12	0.06	0.11
Not employed	0.41	0.09	0.66	0.08	0.58	0.08	0.50	0.08	0.15	0.09	0.28	0.08
Spouse not present	-0.44	0.09	0.36	0.09	-0.39	0.08	-0.52	0.09	-0.26	0.10	0.20	0.09
Spouse is part-time emp	0.24	0.06	0.28	0.06	0.00	0.06	0.11	0.06	0.09	0.06	0.14	0.06
Spouse is full-time emp	0.24	0.06	0.56	0.05	0.18	0.05	0.08	0.05	0.09	0.06	0.24	0.05

Table 6b (cont.) Logistic regression estimating fathers' time spent in secondary childcare

	<u>Personal care</u>		<u>Unpaid work</u>		<u>TV</u>		<u>Leisure at home</u>		<u>Leisure outside</u>		<u>Travel</u>	
	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE
Lives in an urban area	-0.08	0.06	0.18	0.06	-0.05	0.05	0.12	0.06	-0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06
US citizen	0.32	0.08	0.32	0.08	0.26	0.08	0.20	0.08	0.28	0.09	0.24	0.09
Non-parent adult present	0.04	0.07	-0.30	0.07	-0.10	0.07	0.05	0.07	-0.14	0.08	-0.18	0.08
Age of youngest child	-0.01	0.01	-0.02	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.03	0.01	-0.02	0.01
Number of children <5	0.13	0.05	0.13	0.05	-0.01	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.06	0.05	-0.01	0.05
Number of children <5-12	0.09	0.03	0.16	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.17	0.03	0.10	0.03
Number of children 13-18	-0.09	0.05	-0.09	0.04	-0.06	0.04	-0.05	0.04	-0.05	0.05	-0.12	0.05
Non-residential child	-1.06	0.11	-0.73	0.11	-0.69	0.11	-0.57	0.13	-0.51	0.14	-0.62	0.13
Age	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.02	-0.01	0.02	-0.03	0.02	-0.01	0.02	-0.04	0.02
Age squared	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Saturday	0.20	0.06	0.67	0.06	0.36	0.06	0.43	0.06	1.00	0.06	1.17	0.06
Sunday	0.53	0.07	0.90	0.06	0.68	0.06	0.71	0.06	1.31	0.06	1.40	0.06
Midwest	-0.08	0.07	-0.08	0.06	0.10	0.06	-0.09	0.06	0.09	0.07	0.16	0.07
South	-0.07	0.07	-0.15	0.06	0.10	0.06	-0.02	0.06	0.09	0.07	0.07	0.06
West	-0.10	0.07	0.01	0.06	0.02	0.06	0.01	0.06	0.23	0.07	0.26	0.07
2004	0.18	0.07	-0.01	0.06	0.19	0.06	0.03	0.07	0.02	0.07	-0.20	0.07
2005	0.24	0.07	0.14	0.07	0.17	0.06	0.15	0.07	-0.02	0.07	-0.14	0.07
2006	0.19	0.07	0.11	0.07	0.19	0.06	0.17	0.07	0.05	0.07	-0.19	0.07
2007	0.12	0.07	0.13	0.07	0.19	0.07	0.00	0.07	0.18	0.07	-0.08	0.07
2008	0.36	0.07	0.18	0.07	0.32	0.07	0.00	0.07	0.04	0.07	-0.17	0.07

Reference categories: Education: Some college; Household income: Lowest income quartile; Race/ethnicity: Non-Hispanic White; Employment status: Not-employed; Employment status of spouse: Not employed; Year: 2003; Diary day: Weekday

Note: Weights are applied to correct for diary completion day

Table 7a. Gamma regression estimating mothers' secondary childcare

	<u>Personal care</u>		<u>Unpaid work</u>		<u>TV</u>		<u>Leisure at home</u>		<u>Leisure outside</u>		<u>Travel</u>	
	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE
Intercept	3.59	0.13	4.05	0.15	4.89	0.20	4.21	0.24	2.33	0.33	3.13	0.26
0 - 11th grade	-0.01	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.25	0.05	-0.16	0.06	-0.24	0.08	-0.13	0.06
High school graduate	0.02	0.02	0.05	0.03	0.19	0.03	0.04	0.04	-0.06	0.06	-0.01	0.04
College graduate	0.04	0.02	-0.06	0.02	-0.15	0.03	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.05	0.04	0.04
Post college	-0.01	0.03	-0.18	0.03	-0.33	0.04	0.02	0.05	0.15	0.08	0.02	0.06
2nd lowest quartile	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.03	-0.04	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.10	0.06	0.04	0.05
2nd highest quartile	0.04	0.03	0.02	0.03	-0.09	0.04	0.01	0.05	0.16	0.07	0.10	0.06
Highest quartile	0.04	0.03	-0.02	0.03	-0.18	0.04	-0.06	0.05	0.14	0.07	0.00	0.06
Hispanic	0.09	0.02	0.10	0.03	0.18	0.04	-0.07	0.05	-0.12	0.06	0.04	0.05
Asian	0.19	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.11	0.06	-0.04	0.08	-0.04	0.10	-0.15	0.08
Black	0.00	0.03	-0.12	0.03	0.22	0.04	0.04	0.05	-0.33	0.06	-0.05	0.05
Other	0.12	0.05	0.07	0.06	-0.04	0.08	-0.16	0.10	0.28	0.14	0.31	0.11
Same sex child is present	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	-0.03	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.13	0.04	0.09	0.03
Employed part-time	0.15	0.02	0.25	0.02	0.06	0.03	0.25	0.03	0.32	0.05	0.18	0.04
Not employed	0.21	0.02	0.51	0.02	0.36	0.03	0.58	0.03	0.51	0.04	0.32	0.04
Spouse not present	-0.06	0.03	-0.10	0.04	-0.07	0.05	-0.13	0.06	-0.09	0.09	-0.01	0.07
Spouse is part-time employed	-0.05	0.04	0.12	0.05	0.06	0.07	-0.01	0.08	0.16	0.11	0.11	0.09
Spouse is full-time employed	0.03	0.03	0.12	0.04	-0.01	0.05	-0.04	0.06	0.24	0.08	0.07	0.07

Table 7a (cont.) Gamma regression estimating mothers' secondary childcare

	<u>Personal care</u>		<u>Unpaid work</u>		<u>TV</u>		<u>Leisure at home</u>		<u>Leisure outside</u>		<u>Travel</u>	
	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE
Lives in an urban area	-0.02	0.02	-0.03	0.02	-0.02	0.03	-0.09	0.04	-0.05	0.05	0.00	0.04
US citizen	0.01	0.03	-0.13	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.12	0.05	0.27	0.07	0.09	0.06
Non-parent adult present	-0.03	0.02	-0.01	0.03	0.01	0.04	-0.12	0.04	-0.08	0.06	-0.19	0.05
Age of youngest child	-0.02	0.00	-0.03	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.03	0.01
Number of children <5	0.02	0.02	0.13	0.02	-0.03	0.03	-0.02	0.03	0.01	0.04	-0.07	0.03
Number of children <5-12	0.01	0.01	0.11	0.01	0.02	0.02	-0.02	0.02	0.08	0.03	-0.02	0.02
Number of children 13-18	-0.04	0.02	0.04	0.02	-0.01	0.02	-0.04	0.03	-0.02	0.04	-0.08	0.03
Non-residential child	-0.19	0.07	-0.32	0.08	-0.23	0.11	-0.15	0.13	-0.30	0.18	-0.30	0.15
Age	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.04	0.01	-0.03	0.01	-0.01	0.02	-0.01	0.01
Age squared	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Saturday	0.24	0.02	0.53	0.02	0.35	0.03	0.57	0.04	0.99	0.05	0.69	0.04
Sunday	0.36	0.02	0.40	0.02	0.38	0.03	0.55	0.04	1.21	0.05	0.67	0.04
Midwest	-0.03	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.06	0.03	-0.04	0.04	0.19	0.06	0.03	0.04
South	-0.01	0.02	-0.06	0.02	0.01	0.03	-0.10	0.04	0.16	0.05	0.15	0.04
West	0.04	0.02	-0.01	0.03	0.01	0.03	-0.05	0.04	0.23	0.06	0.18	0.05
2004	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.03	-0.04	0.04	-0.02	0.04	-0.12	0.06	-0.01	0.05
2005	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.03	-0.05	0.03	-0.05	0.04	-0.14	0.06	-0.03	0.05
2006	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.03	-0.04	0.03	-0.02	0.04	-0.01	0.06	-0.03	0.05
2007	0.01	0.02	-0.04	0.03	0.01	0.04	-0.08	0.04	0.00	0.06	-0.08	0.05
2008	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.08	0.04	0.06	0.04	-0.02	0.06	-0.12	0.05

Reference categories: Education: Some college; Household income: Lowest income quartile; Race/ethnicity: Non-Hispanic White; Employment status: Not-employed; Employment status of spouse: Not employed; Year: 2003; Diary day: Weekday

Note: Weights are applied to correct for diary completion day.

Table 7b. Gamma regression estimating fathers' secondary childcare

	<u>Personal care</u>		<u>Unpaid work</u>		<u>TV</u>		<u>Leisure at home</u>		<u>Leisure outside</u>		<u>Travel</u>	
	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE
Intercept	3.34	0.20	3.12	0.33	4.42	0.26	4.70	0.38	2.48	0.45	2.74	0.47
0 - 11th grade	-0.13	0.05	-0.10	0.08	0.16	0.06	-0.35	0.09	-0.08	0.10	-0.43	0.11
High school graduate	-0.02	0.03	-0.12	0.06	0.11	0.04	-0.08	0.06	-0.10	0.08	-0.19	0.08
College graduate	0.09	0.03	-0.05	0.05	-0.19	0.04	-0.05	0.06	0.14	0.07	0.05	0.08
Post college	0.11	0.04	-0.13	0.07	-0.45	0.05	-0.03	0.08	0.29	0.09	0.16	0.10
2nd lowest quartile	0.01	0.04	0.04	0.07	-0.06	0.05	0.13	0.08	0.20	0.10	-0.02	0.09
2nd highest quartile	0.05	0.05	0.09	0.08	-0.08	0.06	0.01	0.08	0.31	0.10	0.13	0.10
Highest quartile	-0.01	0.05	-0.05	0.08	-0.20	0.06	-0.08	0.09	0.22	0.10	-0.11	0.10
Hispanic	-0.02	0.04	-0.04	0.06	0.07	0.05	-0.06	0.07	-0.20	0.09	0.12	0.09
Asian	0.12	0.06	-0.01	0.09	0.17	0.08	0.19	0.11	-0.36	0.13	0.31	0.13
Black	-0.12	0.04	-0.24	0.07	0.23	0.06	-0.13	0.08	-0.43	0.10	-0.23	0.11
Other	-0.13	0.08	0.12	0.13	-0.07	0.11	0.00	0.15	-0.07	0.18	-0.04	0.19
Same sex child is present	0.00	0.02	-0.02	0.04	-0.05	0.03	0.01	0.04	0.06	0.05	0.02	0.05
Employed part-time	0.08	0.05	0.20	0.09	0.15	0.07	0.35	0.10	0.00	0.12	-0.08	0.13
Not employed	0.23	0.04	0.66	0.07	0.51	0.06	0.64	0.08	0.29	0.10	0.23	0.10
Spouse not present	-0.23	0.04	0.12	0.07	-0.36	0.06	-0.50	0.08	-0.11	0.10	0.01	0.11
Spouse is part-time employed	0.03	0.03	0.10	0.05	-0.02	0.04	-0.03	0.06	0.00	0.07	0.01	0.07
Spouse is full-time employed	0.05	0.03	0.27	0.04	0.09	0.04	-0.08	0.05	0.12	0.06	0.13	0.06

Table 7b (cont.) Gamma regression estimating fathers' secondary childcare

	<u>Personal care</u>		<u>Unpaid work</u>		<u>TV</u>		<u>Leisure at home</u>		<u>Leisure outside</u>		<u>Travel</u>	
	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE	Est	SE
Lives in an urban area	-0.07	0.03	-0.04	0.05	-0.04	0.04	0.00	0.06	-0.06	0.07	0.04	0.07
US citizen	0.09	0.04	0.16	0.07	0.13	0.06	0.13	0.08	0.22	0.09	0.27	0.10
Non-parent adult present	-0.01	0.04	-0.11	0.06	0.01	0.05	0.04	0.07	0.10	0.08	-0.03	0.09
Age of youngest child	-0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.03	0.01	-0.02	0.01
Number of children <5	0.10	0.03	0.15	0.04	-0.07	0.03	-0.05	0.05	0.01	0.06	-0.04	0.06
Number of children <5-12	0.06	0.01	0.13	0.02	-0.01	0.02	-0.05	0.03	0.19	0.03	-0.01	0.03
Number of children 13-18	-0.03	0.02	-0.05	0.04	0.01	0.03	0.00	0.04	0.01	0.05	-0.18	0.05
Non-residential child	-0.62	0.06	-0.47	0.09	-0.31	0.08	-0.59	0.11	-0.33	0.13	-0.56	0.13
Age	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.02	-0.02	0.01	-0.06	0.02	-0.01	0.02	-0.01	0.02
Age squared	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Saturday	0.38	0.03	0.96	0.05	0.58	0.04	0.73	0.06	1.28	0.07	1.08	0.07
Sunday	0.58	0.03	1.00	0.05	0.74	0.04	0.86	0.06	1.35	0.07	1.15	0.07
Midwest	-0.08	0.03	0.01	0.05	0.07	0.04	-0.01	0.06	0.17	0.07	0.16	0.08
South	-0.05	0.03	-0.08	0.05	0.05	0.04	-0.02	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.13	0.07
West	-0.03	0.03	0.10	0.06	-0.03	0.04	0.05	0.06	0.16	0.08	0.23	0.08
2004	0.06	0.03	-0.09	0.06	0.10	0.05	0.05	0.06	-0.07	0.08	-0.29	0.08
2005	0.07	0.03	0.03	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.06	-0.11	0.08	-0.10	0.08
2006	0.07	0.03	-0.04	0.06	0.10	0.05	0.07	0.06	-0.08	0.08	-0.23	0.08
2007	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.06	0.12	0.05	-0.01	0.07	0.10	0.08	-0.13	0.08
2008	0.11	0.03	-0.04	0.06	0.17	0.05	-0.11	0.07	-0.04	0.08	-0.19	0.08

Table 8. Relative time spent in a specific primary care activity on a given diary day

	Mothers					Fathers				
	General	Play	School rel.	Read/Talk	Out-of-home	General	Play	School rel.	Read/Talk	Out-of-home
0- 11th grade	54%	11%	7%	5%	23%	35%	24%	10%	6%	26%
High school graduate	51%	12%	8%	7%	22%	42%	22%	7%	6%	23%
Some college	50%	11%	7%	8%	23%	43%	21%	7%	7%	23%
College graduate	47%	13%	7%	9%	24%	45%	22%	6%	8%	19%
Post college	47%	15%	7%	9%	22%	43%	21%	7%	9%	20%
Lowest income quartile	53%	11%	7%	6%	22%	39%	23%	8%	7%	22%
2nd lowest quartile	50%	12%	7%	8%	23%	42%	23%	6%	6%	22%
2nd highest quartile	48%	13%	7%	8%	23%	44%	22%	6%	8%	20%
Highest income quartile	47%	13%	8%	9%	23%	44%	21%	7%	8%	20%
Hispanic	52%	11%	7%	6%	24%	35%	23%	9%	5%	28%
Non-Hispanic Asian	47%	15%	8%	11%	19%	36%	27%	11%	6%	21%
Non-Hispanic Black	51%	7%	9%	6%	27%	40%	13%	8%	9%	29%
Non-Hispanic Other	52%	12%	6%	7%	24%	45%	21%	6%	11%	17%
Non-Hispanic White	49%	13%	7%	8%	22%	44%	22%	6%	8%	20%
Married/cohabiting	50%	13%	7%	8%	21%	43%	23%	7%	7%	20%
Single mother	47%	10%	8%	8%	27%	36%	13%	7%	9%	35%
Sp is not employed	53%	13%	8%	7%	19%	45%	27%	6%	8%	15%
Sp is part-time employed	54%	12%	7%	8%	19%	45%	22%	7%	8%	18%
Sp is full-time employed	49%	13%	7%	8%	22%	41%	19%	7%	7%	26%
Same sex child present	51%	12%	7%	8%	22%	43%	22%	7%	7%	20%
Same sex child is not present	47%	13%	8%	8%	24%	42%	20%	7%	8%	23%
All parents	49%	12%	7%	8%	23%	43%	22%	7%	8%	21%

*Results are weighted to correct for diary completion day.

Table 9. Relative time spent in a specific care in proportion to all sec care activity on a given diary day

	Mothers						Fathers					
	Personal care	Unpaid work	Watching TV	Leisure at home	Leisure out	Travel	Personal care	Unpaid work	Watching TV	Leisure at home	Leisure out	Travel
0- 11th grade	17%	33%	27%	10%	5%	6%	20%	16%	38%	12%	8%	5%
High school graduate	18%	30%	22%	13%	7%	6%	21%	16%	32%	13%	9%	5%
Some college	19%	30%	19%	13%	8%	6%	20%	18%	27%	14%	11%	6%
College graduate	20%	31%	15%	13%	9%	7%	24%	17%	22%	13%	12%	6%
Post college	22%	30%	12%	13%	11%	7%	26%	17%	17%	15%	13%	6%
Lowest quartile	18%	30%	24%	13%	6%	6%	20%	16%	33%	14%	7%	6%
2nd lowest quartile	19%	31%	20%	13%	7%	6%	21%	17%	29%	14%	10%	5%
2nd highest quartile	19%	31%	17%	13%	9%	7%	22%	17%	26%	14%	11%	6%
Highest quartile	21%	31%	14%	12%	10%	6%	25%	17%	22%	13%	12%	5%
Hispanic	18%	34%	23%	10%	6%	6%	20%	16%	35%	12%	8%	6%
Non-Hispanic Asian	24%	33%	16%	11%	7%	5%	26%	15%	26%	16%	7%	6%
Non-Hispanic Black	20%	26%	24%	13%	5%	6%	19%	16%	35%	13%	8%	5%
Non-Hispanic Other	18%	31%	18%	13%	9%	8%	19%	21%	23%	14%	12%	7%
Non-Hispanic White	19%	31%	17%	13%	9%	7%	23%	17%	24%	14%	12%	5%
Married/cohabiting	19%	32%	17%	12%	9%	6%	23%	17%	26%	14%	11%	5%
Single mother	20%	27%	23%	13%	6%	7%	19%	20%	28%	12%	10%	6%
Sp is not emp	20%	29%	20%	13%	7%	6%	24%	15%	26%	15%	10%	5%
Sp is part-time emp	17%	32%	19%	12%	8%	6%	24%	16%	24%	14%	11%	5%
Sp is full-time emp	19%	32%	17%	12%	9%	6%	22%	18%	27%	13%	11%	5%
Same sex child present	19%	31%	18%	12%	8%	7%	23%	17%	26%	13%	11%	6%
Same sex child is not present	20%	29%	20%	13%	8%	6%	22%	16%	27%	14%	10%	6%
All parents	19%	31%	19%	12%	8%	6%	23%	17%	26%	14%	11%	6%

*Results are weighted to correct for diary completion day.

TABLE 11. Relative time spent in an activity with child was in care in proportion to total minutes spent in that activity

	Mothers						Fathers					
	Personal care	Unpaid work	Watching TV	Leisure at home	Leisure out	Travel	Personal care	Unpaid work	Watching TV	Leisure at home	Leisure out	Travel
0- 11th grade	9%	74%	76%	62%	70%	47%	5%	47%	58%	40%	44%	21%
High school graduate	10%	72%	70%	61%	63%	45%	7%	51%	62%	42%	48%	22%
Some college	10%	70%	65%	58%	61%	43%	7%	54%	58%	49%	49%	24%
College graduate	11%	70%	61%	60%	58%	42%	8%	54%	54%	49%	46%	25%
Post college	10%	68%	57%	57%	56%	40%	8%	54%	50%	48%	45%	26%
Lowest quartile	9%	71%	71%	60%	64%	45%	6%	50%	56%	42%	45%	25%
2nd lowest quartile	10%	71%	67%	60%	61%	45%	7%	51%	59%	44%	47%	23%
2nd highest quartile	10%	72%	65%	61%	62%	45%	8%	54%	59%	48%	48%	25%
Highest quartile	11%	69%	60%	58%	56%	40%	8%	53%	54%	48%	46%	23%
Hispanic	10%	74%	76%	65%	69%	48%	6%	51%	59%	42%	46%	23%
Non-Hispanic Asian	12%	74%	67%	61%	62%	42%	8%	53%	60%	51%	46%	25%
Non-Hispanic Black	9%	67%	65%	53%	52%	35%	6%	45%	56%	36%	39%	20%
Non-Hispanic Other	10%	73%	65%	59%	71%	50%	7%	57%	62%	47%	48%	26%
Non-Hispanic White	10%	70%	63%	59%	59%	43%	8%	53%	56%	48%	47%	24%
Married/cohabiting	11%	72%	66%	63%	62%	46%	8%	54%	58%	48%	48%	24%
Single mother	9%	66%	65%	51%	53%	37%	5%	41%	44%	30%	36%	20%
Sp is not emp	10%	69%	67%	62%	59%	40%	7%	50%	57%	47%	47%	24%
Sp is part-time emp	10%	71%	70%	65%	63%	46%	8%	54%	55%	48%	47%	24%
Sp is full-time emp	11%	73%	65%	62%	62%	46%	8%	56%	60%	49%	49%	25%
Same sex child present	10%	72%	66%	61%	62%	46%	7%	54%	57%	47%	48%	25%
Same sex child is not present	10%	68%	65%	57%	56%	39%	7%	50%	57%	47%	48%	25%
All parents	10%	71%	66%	60%	60%	43%	7%	53%	57%	46%	47%	24%