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Motivation

● Can a focus on reasons to stay in the parental home - particularly the degree of well-being and domestic comfort - add to our understanding of leaving home processes in Europe?

● The gilded cage hypothesis: with increasing material comfort, housing quality, or available financial support in the parental home young people’s risk to leave decreases

● Research has mainly focused on economic advantages for co-resident young adults (e.g. Blossfeld et al. 2005, Le Blanc and Wolff 2006) but not on time benefits (cf. Mencarini et al. 2017 for FR and IT)
Objectives

- To analyze the time benefits and domestic comfort of young adults living with their parents compared to other living arrangements (living single, co-residing with peers or living with a partner)
- To test if there are gendered, intergenerational time transfers of young adults in the parental home similar to France and Italy in Estonia, too
- To test if intergenerational time transfers of young adults in the parental home differ among Estonians and Non-Estonians, too
Data: Estonian Time Use Study

- Cross-sectional time-use data for 2009-2010
- Time diaries: record all activities in 10-min intervals during 24 h period on 2 separate days (weekday or weekend)
- Background information on individuals and households
- Time-use data were collected by the national statistical institutes; the full national data file is available thanks to Kadri Täht (“My time, your time, our time. Household time allocation: Choice or inevitability?” PUT1182, 2016-2019)
Sample

1. Single young adults aged 18–35 who are living with their two (step-) parents
   (N = 772 person-days)

2. Young adults aged 18–35 either living with parents, living alone, in a childless
   couple, in a couple with child(ren), or other
   (N = 2,481 person-days)

3. Parental couples aged 40–65 with or without (adult) children in the hh
   (N = 1,352 person-days)
Measures

- **Variable of interest:** daily domestic time in minutes (cleaning, cooking, dish washing, food shopping, childcare and adult care, looking after pets, gardening and maintenance)
- **Estonians - Non-Estonians:** self-identified ethnicity
- **Individual level:** age, age2, educational level, employment status, and interview day
- **Household level:** # of children, # of young adults, sibling sex composition (only brothers vs only sisters), mother’s employment status, mother’s level of education, # of rooms, hh has a garden, urban/rural, equivalized hh income deciles
Results
Domestic participation of young adults living with parents by sex & ethnicity: %

- **Share of participants**:
  - Men - EE: 81.2
  - Men - Non-EE: 61.4
  - Women - EE: 90.1
  - Women - Non-EE: 86.1

- **Share of domestic time (all)**:
  - Men - EE: 15.1
  - Men - Non-EE: 16.6
  - Women - EE: 19.2
  - Women - Non-EE: 25.6

- **Share of domestic time (participants)**:
  - Men - EE: 18.5
  - Men - Non-EE: 26.9
  - Women - EE: 21.3
  - Women - Non-EE: 29.6
Domestic participation of young adults living with parents by sex & ethnicity: min

![Bar chart showing domestic participation by sex and ethnicity.](image-url)
### Participation in domestic activities in min/day (sequential Tobit regressions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M1</th>
<th>M2</th>
<th>M3</th>
<th>M4</th>
<th>M5</th>
<th>M6</th>
<th>M7</th>
<th>M8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-EE (ref. EE)</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>-74.24</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>-73.97</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>-76.38</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>-81.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AME</td>
<td>-29.43</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>-29.39</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>-30.31</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>-32.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>se</td>
<td>15.92</td>
<td>15.90</td>
<td>15.81</td>
<td>15.67</td>
<td>15.82</td>
<td>16.01</td>
<td>16.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AME</td>
<td>-5.87</td>
<td>-5.91</td>
<td>-7.12</td>
<td>-6.62</td>
<td>-7.97</td>
<td>-6.54</td>
<td>-8.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ETUS (2009-2010). Own calculations.

Notes: * p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001

- M1: ethnicity
- M2: + interview day
- M3: + age
- M4: + education
- M5: + employment status
- M6: + sibling size and composition
- M7: + mother’s characteristics
- M8: + hh and dwelling characteristics
Participation in domestic activities in minutes per day, by family situation. (Marginal effects from a Tobit model)
Participation in domestic activities in minutes per day, by family situation. (Marginal effects from a Tobit model)
Individual-level regression coefficients of daily minutes in domestic activities for men and women in couple families (OLS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family composition (ref. no child, no young adult in hh)</th>
<th>Couple</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Couple</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 child</td>
<td>-5.98</td>
<td>40.18</td>
<td>-20.81</td>
<td>25.41</td>
<td>11.53</td>
<td>27.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 young adults</td>
<td>19.78</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>35.15</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>26.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 children</td>
<td>38.12</td>
<td>53.57</td>
<td>-11.40</td>
<td>36.05</td>
<td>40.26</td>
<td>33.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = 1 child + 1 young adult</td>
<td>-107.75</td>
<td>38.61 **</td>
<td>-63.60</td>
<td>29.94 *</td>
<td>-46.18</td>
<td>24.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;=3 young adults</td>
<td>12.43</td>
<td>55.30</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>32.33</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>47.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;=3 children</td>
<td>42.81</td>
<td>90.86</td>
<td>22.57</td>
<td>57.27</td>
<td>21.54</td>
<td>67.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;=3 at least 1 child 1 young adult</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td>38.17</td>
<td>-17.85</td>
<td>25.69</td>
<td>16.03</td>
<td>25.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>347.01</td>
<td>127.94 **</td>
<td>108.67</td>
<td>101.62</td>
<td>192.62</td>
<td>77.00 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N person-days</td>
<td>1836</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R squared</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ETUS (2009-2010). Own calculations.
Notes: Controlled for age, age squared, employment status, education, number of rooms, has a garden, urban, equivalized hh income decile, Saturday, Sunday.
* p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001
Next steps + Conclusions

- Re-checking findings and robustness analysis:
  - Multivariable OLS vs. Tobit regressions

- Time-use surveys are a valuable source for analysing in detail how unpaid work is shared among co-residing generations and between genders and ethnic groups (Non-Estonians and Estonians)

- The cross-sectional nature of the data does not allow dynamic analyses to verify the workload change for young people who leave the parental home; but, nevertheless, they provide interesting static comparisons between young men and women in different living arrangements
Thank you!
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Participation in domestic activities in minutes per day, by family situation. (Marginal effects from a Tobit model)