**Abstract (submitted to ESPAnet)**

**Gendered cohort trajectories for informal caregiving in Europe between 2004 and 2015.**

Evolving gender norms and increasing labour participation of women in the labour market have often been portrayed as factors endangering informal caregiving in the face of population ageing. Relatively less attention has been paid to the possibility that some evolving gender norms will lead to a higher share of men providing informal care, resulting in a more equalitarian division of unpaid care. This paper aims to take a dynamic time view on gender patterns in informal caregiving for older people across Europe to answer the following research questions: is caregiving becoming more gender equal across cohorts in Europe? Are sex/gender cohort trajectories of informal caregiving differentiated across care regimes?

As possible changes across time in informal caregiving by women and men may be traced back to cohort effects (e.g. changes in upbringing or employment trajectories), conventional analysis of time trends may conflate age, cohort and period effects. To this end we apply multilevel growth curve models to a panel sample of individuals aged 50 and older, grouped into 5 year cohorts and followed across 5 waves of the Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE), stratified by sex/gender and adjusted for education, living arrangements and self-rated health.

Our results show that at the European level, sex/gender inequalities in caregiving increased among younger cohorts at ages where care tends to be inter-generational (below 70 years old), while subsequently decreased among older cohorts at ages typically characterized by spousal care (above 70 years old). This was mainly the result of an increase in the probability of women providing care compared to previous cohorts at the same age, while men in younger cohorts were only marginally less likely to provide care. Examining care trajectories by care regime revealed diverging trends in the likelihood of providing care by sex/gender. Women and men were collectively more likely to provide care among younger cohorts in both Continental and Nordic Europe, resulting in relatively stable sex/gender inequalities. Conversely, the contrary was seen in Southern Europe with younger cohorts (both women and men) being less likely to provide care. In light of these emerging changes and regional nuances, we discuss potential reasons behind these patterns and consider the policy implications of these results for gender inequalities.

Table 1: Pooled sample: adjusted and unadjusted models (coefficients)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Model 1 Unadjusted | Model 2 Adjusted | Model 3 (Care outside the hh only) Unadjusted | Model 4 (Care outside the hh) Adjusted |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | -0.343\*\*\* | -0.171\* | -0.319\*\* | -0.225\* |
| Cohort | 0.241\*\*\* | 0.179\*\*\* | 0.428\*\*\* | 0.383\*\*\* |
| Wave | -0.018 | 0.016 | -0.262\*\*\* | -0.242\*\*\* |
| Education (ref: primary) |  |  |  |  |
| Secondary | - | 0.470\*\*\* | - | 0.755\*\*\* |
| Tertiary | - | 0.765\*\*\* | - | 1.101\*\*\* |
| Self-rated health (ref: Excellent) |  |  |  |  |
| Very good | - | -0.154\* | - | -0.126\* |
| Good | - | -0.232\*\*\* | - | -0.241\*\*\* |
| Fair | - | -0.336\*\*\* | - | -0.474\*\*\* |
| Poor | - | -0.564\*\*\* | - | -1.104\*\*\* |
| Partner in hh | - | -0.220\*\*\* | - | 0.185\*\*\* |
| Employed | - | -0.074 | - | -0.095 |
| Chronic Condition | - | 0.069\*\*\* | - | 0.068\*\*\* |
| Wave x Cohort | 0.025\*\*\* | 0.017\*\* | 0.049\*\*\* | 0.038\*\*\* |
| Gender x Wave  | -0.011 | -0.005 | -0.006 | -0.005 |
| Gender x Cohort | 0.167\*\*\* | 0.135\*\*\* | 0.139\*\*\* | 0.125\*\*\* |
| Wave x Wave  | -0.025\*\*\* | -0.026\*\*\* | -0.011 | -0.008 |
| Cohort x Cohort | -0.026\*\*\* | -0.017\* | -0.050\*\*\* | -0.047\*\*\* |
| N | 71,953 | 71,166 | 71,235 | 70,451 |

\*\*\* P<0.001, \*\* p<0.01, \*p<0.05

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Figure 1a: Unadjusted model, pooled sample:** | **Figure 1b: Adjusted model (education, partner in hh, SRH, empl, chronic conditions), poled sample:**  |
|  |  |

Table 2: Cohort-specific analysis

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1900-29 | 1930-34 | 1935-39 | 1940-44 | 1945-49 | 1950-54 |
|  | Coef | P-value | Coef | P-value | Coef | P-value | Coef | P-value | Coef | P-value | Coef | P-value |
| **Pooled sample** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gender | 0.117 | 0.554 | 0.311 | 0.07 | -0.021 | 0.881 | **0.311** | **0.015** | **0.388** | **0.004** | **0.375** | **0.006** |
| wave | **0.326** | **0.014** | 0.1 | 0.41 | 0.059 | 0.562 | 0.103 | 0.267 | -0.025 | 0.787 | -0.004 | 0.964 |
| Gender\* wave | -0.061 | 0.29 | -0.058 | 0.197 | 0.056 | 0.154 | -0.033 | 0.343 | -0.008 | 0.827 | 0.019 | 0.578 |
| N | 8507 |  | 8635 |  | 11228 |  | 13167 |  | 15216 |  | 14413 |  |
| n | 3070 |  | 2967 |  | 3777 |  | 4361 |  | 5102 |  | 4861 |  |
| **Continental** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gender | 0.046 | 0.861 | -0.039 | 0.871 | -0.241 | 0.195 | 0.146 | 0.381 | 0.021 | 0.246 | **0.39** | **0.028** |
| wave | 0.199 | 0.253 | -0.11 | 0.513 | -0.101 | 0.465 | -0.108 | 0.382 | -0.242 | 0.057 | -0.169 | 0.157 |
| Gender\* wave | -0.104 | 0.174 | -0.008 | 0.904 | 0.039 | 0.486 | -0.022 | 0.648 | -0.001 | 0.984 | -0.031 | 0.494 |
| N | 4278 |  | 4104 |  | 5510 |  | 6294 |  | 7498 |  | 7452 |  |
| n | 1551 |  | 1417 |  | 1896 |  | 2134 |  | 2576 |  | 2549 |  |
| **Southern** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gender | 0.32 | 0.36 | **0.724** | **0.011** | 0.259 | 0.262 | **0.53** | **0.022** | **0.557** | **0.018** | 0.363 | 0.156 |
| wave | **0.593** | **0.012** | 0.35 | 0.087 | **0.336** | **0.049** | **0.388** | **0.015** | 0.182 | 0.268 | 0.268 | 0.148 |
| Gender\* wave | -0.027 | 0.781 | -0.136 | 0.061 | 0.075 | 0.229 | -0.039 | 0.516 | 0.006 | 0.925 | 0.112 | 0.098 |
| N | 2399 |  | 2885 |  | 3556 |  | 3992 |  | 4385 |  | 4021 |  |
| n | 866 |  | 1003 |  | 1189 |  | 1319 |  | 1497 |  | 1411 |  |
| **Northern** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gender | -0.009 | 0.978 | -0.536 | 0.06 | -0.095 | 0.678 | 0.169 | 0.423 | 0.235 | 0.263 | -0.026 | 0.902 |
| wave | -0.014 | 0.946 | -0.031 | 0.874 | -0.057 | 0.719 | -0.109 | 0.458 | -0.039 | 0.777 | -0.264 | 0.066 |
| Gender\* wave | -0.074 | 0.488 | 0.119 | 0.125 | 0.009 | 0.884 | -0.078 | 0.144 | -0.102 | 0.052 | 0.018 | 0.723 |
| N | 1830 |  | 1646 |  | 2162 |  | 2881 |  | 3333 |  | 2940 |  |
| n | 653 |  | 547 |  | 692 |  | 908 |  | 1029 |  | 901 |  |

Adjusting for education, partner in hh, SRH, empl, chronic conditions and squared wave.

**Figure 2a: Cohort-specific effects for Continental (adjusted model)**



“Pooled model (see above) for comparison:













**Figure 2b: Cohort-specific effects for Southern (adjusted model)**



“Pooled model (see above) for comparison:













**Figure 2c: Cohort-specific effects for Nordic (adjusted model)**



“Pooled model (see above) for comparison:











