Time Use, Health, and Subjective Well-Being in China: A Gendered Life Course Approach

Zheng Mu[1]

Kriti Vikram[2]

[1] Department of Sociology and Centre for Family and Population Research, National University of Singapore. Email: socmuz@nus.edu.sg.

[2] Department of Sociology and Centre for Family and Population Research, National University of Singapore. Email: socvk@nus.edu.sgs.

Time Use, Health, and Subjective Well-Being in China: A Gendered Life Course Approach

Abstract

Using the nationally representative 2010 Chinese Family Panel Studies (CFPS), this is the first study comprehensively investigating links between time use and individuals' well-being in China. Specifically, we examined how weekly hours on work, housework, caregiving, sleep, and leisure influence physical health, mental health, and subjective well-being, and how the link differs by gender and across life course stages. Results show that longer working hours lead to better self-rated health, lower depression, better self-rated social ability and stronger confidence for both men and women. However, it only makes men happier. But the coefficient for women is insignificant. Additionally, longer caregiving hours lead to negative well-being outcomes for men, while relating to better health and higher level of happiness for women. Drawing on the gendered life course approach, we find that the gender differences in links between time use and well-being outcomes enlarge during life course transitions of marriage and parenthood.

Time Use, Health, and Subjective Well-Being in China: A Gendered Life Course Approach

1. Introduction

People's life choices have been shaped by life course norms (Elder 1998, 1999). Individuals are expected to make decisions based on normative sequences of roles and events, often marked by age-sensitive transitions such as entering the first marriage, becoming a parent, and adjusting parenting behaviors according to ages of their children (Elder, Johnson and Crosnoe 2003). There are major differences between men and women on their expected trajectories to pursue the normative transitions (Flood and Moen 2015). For example, the model of within-household specialization posits that couples pursue a joint strategy in which they divide labor to maximize household-level well-being (Becker 1981, 1985). The division of labor, typically with the husband specializing in the labor market and the wife specializing in home production, is based on the comparative advantages of the spouses in each realm. Thus, based on the gendered socialization of life course norms, men are encouraged to develop skills for the labor market and women to become capable housewives (Becker 1981, 1985), and the labor market seems to support this specialization, given that employed women have historically earned less than employed men (Bianchi 1994; Blau 2012; Corcoran and Courant 1987; Oppenheimer 1997; Smock, Manning, and Gupta 1999). Therefore, it is important to examine how individuals' life choices are interactively influenced by gender and life course stages. As proposed by Flood and Moen (2015), this can be called a gendered life course approach.

Previous studies on the intersection between gender and life course trajectories mostly focused on their joint influences of gender and life course norms on significant life events and outcomes of achievement, such as educational attainment, employment, and family relations (Gough and Noonan 2013; Mu and Xie 2016; Sayer and Gornick, 2012). However, how gender and life course norms jointly shape individuals' daily lives through structuring their time use arrangements have been understudied (Bird and Fremon 1991; Flood and Moen 2015).

Time use is linked to both socioeconomic background and quality of life (Chen and Lu 2009, Kruger and Mueller 2012, Møller 1992). How individuals arrange their time is jointly shaped by their gender, socioeconomic status, family backgrounds and life course norms (Anxo

et al. 2011, Cutler and Hendricks 1990, Møller 1992). Studies also show one's time use patterns are closely related to their overall subjective wellbeing and quality of life (Chang, Dong and MacPhail 2011, Chen and Lu 2009, Gross, Juvonen and Gable 2002, Krueger and Mueller 2012). For example, at younger ages, individuals work for survival and career establishment, and they also spend time on mate selection and personal development, such as taking training courses and passing exams to get professionally certified. After becoming parents, they need to re-arrange their schedules for the newly-emerging childcare responsibilities. Additionally, quality of life hinges on individuals' preferences and tastes, which are mainly revealed and developed through individuals' interests and hobbies during leisure time (Mu and Yeung 2018). Thus, one's leisure activities are shaped by their socioeconomic experiences, and in turn, contribute to their overall wellbeing (Møller 1992).

Despite the theoretical importance of time use patterns as both a potential explanatory variable and an outcome variable, time use has been mostly studied as an outcome variable through descriptive studies (Burgard 2011; Burgard and Ailshire 2013; Mattingly and Bianchi 2003; Pepin, Sayer, and Casper 2018). That is, most relevant studies focused on how various time use outcomes differed across gender and along different stages of life course. Very few studies have examined time use as an explanatory variable using the gendered life course approach (Bird and Fremon 1991; Flood and Moen 2015). To our best knowledge, studies taking time use as an explanatory variable often focused on the link between time use and health in Western countries (for example, both Bird and Fremon 1991 and Flood and Moen 2015 examined how gender and life course responsibilities jointly shaped the influence of time use on physical health). However, none of them looked at mental health and subjective well-being, or in the Asian context.

China constitutes an interesting research setting to examine the link between time use and well-being using the gendered life course approach. On the one hand, China has been characterized by its long tradition of patriarchy (Meisner 1999). On the other hand, Chinese society has been undergoing dramatic social changes (Hauser and Xie 2005). The most salient are women's improved social status in education and employment (Hannum 2005; Treiman 2013; Wu and Zhang 2010). During the decades following the 1949 Revolution, Communist ideology regarding gender equality was zealously promoted, highlighting women's parity with men (Meisner 1999) and popularizing the slogan "women hold up half the sky" (Mauer-Fazio,

Rawski, and Zhang 1999). In the spheres of politics and work life, the Chinese constitution guarantees women equal rights with those of men in all respects and specifically endorses the policy of "same-work, same-pay" (Mauer-Fazio et al. 1999; Zuo and Bian 2001). However, changes in the private sphere and home life have not been as remarkable (Mu and Xie 2014). Even though household gender inequality and within-household gender-role specialization have been gradually declining, women's roles as homemakers are still entrenched (Qian 2017). Thus, to what extent and in what forms norms of gender roles and life course responsibilities have jointly shaped the influences of daily life on Chinese people's well-being is uncertain and worth a comprehensive empirical examination.

Using the nationally representative 2010 Chinese Family Panel Studies (CFPS), this is the first study to systematically investigate the link between time use and individuals' well-being. Specifically, we examined how weekly hours on work, housework, caregiving, sleep, and leisure influence physical health, mental health, and subjective well-being. Drawing on the gendered life course approach, we further examine how the link differs on the intersections between gender and life course stages.

2. Theoretical Issues

Employment from the Gendered Life Course Perspective

When discussing how gender and life course norms have jointly influenced individuals, one outcome that has been paid particular attention to is employment. Overall, researchers have established gender differences in the work-life balance. Even though gender egalitarianism has been widely promoted, women still find it harder to juggle between work and family due to their upgraded socioeconomic profiles and the entrenched gender role norms (England 2010; Gough and Noonan 2013). However, as time passes by, more men are seen to stay home and help with the housework that was traditionally done by women (Craig and Mullan 2010). The interaction between gender and life course norms have been extensively studies by focusing the division of labor outcomes in different forms of families. For example, in families with children, mothers have traditionally done unpaid housework, while men earned the family income, and it is rare for fathers to take the primary responsibilities for child care (Craig and Mullan 2010). However,

men have increased their domestic participation over the years although not at the same rate as women entering the workforce.

Women have actively strategized their competing roles at work and in the family. For example, if we compare both employed and not employed mothers, mothers who received higher education were more willing to focus on interactive activities to foster their children's human development. However, they also tend to shift child care and housework to the weekends, while concentrating on paid work during weekdays (Criag 2007).

Self-employment was a crucial factor in determining the time use patterns of the parents. Mothers who were self-employed spent significantly less time in paid work and more time on child care than other working mothers, indicating that self-employment allows them to maximize their time spent with their children (Craig and Powell 2012). For men, self-employment had a very limited relationship with the amount of time spent with their children.

Moreover, studies have shown the link between working hours and health outcomes. For example, long working hours of parents result in reduced time spent with their children, and the time squeeze has detrimental effects on parent's health and increased stress levels (Sayer and Gornick 2012). Specifically, fathers' long working hours often relates to mothers' shorter working hours, based on the assumption that women's devotion to the family at the cost of their careers may work best for well-being of the family and the children (Bianchi 2011).

Time Use from the Gendered Life Course Perspective

When it comes to time use patterns, there are major gender differences, due to both norms of gender ideology and life course responsibilities. For example, although women often have more sleep than men, they also report more sleep interruptions than men do because women are more likely to be the one who take the night shift (Burgard 2011; Burgard and Ailshire 2012). This is especially true if they are mothers of young children.

Aside from gender differences, time use patterns have been further complicated by various life course responsibilities. For example, mothers reported more time on housework than never-married mothers (Pepin, Sayer and Casper 2018). Never married mothers, on the other hand, have more time for leisure and sleep than married mothers. Moreover, never married mothers spent greater share of the leisure activities alone, whereas for married mothers, their leisure activities incorporated spending time with their family and bringing their children for

enrichment courses. Craig (2007) found that mothers get less sleep than fathers, but overall, parents get less sleep than non-parents.

The gendered life course perspective also applies to leisure time. For example, parents may consider activities done in the presence of children as having leisure and child care at the same time (Berkman and Glass 2000; Kahneman and Krueger 2006). According to Passias, Sayer and Pepin (2017), never-married mothers report less leisure time than married mothers due to the changing definition of leisure activities.

When comparing leisure time of married and single individuals, Lee and Bhargava (2004) found that leisure time is negatively related with being married and working full-time, as increased demand for housework is likely to decrease the time allocated for leisure enjoyment. Presence of children further reduces leisure time. Contents of leisure time also differ across demographic groups (Lee and Bhargava 2004). While married individuals engage in more active sports activities and more team-oriented activities like golf, tennis, camping, boating, and sailing, single individuals engage in more individual-based activities such as listening to radio, playing musical instruments, and going to bars and lounges.

In addition, Sayer (2005) found that the distribution among various time use outcome are also subject to gender differences. For example, men have only increased their unpaid work slightly whereas women have increased their paid work substantially, meaning that women are doing a "second shift" of unpaid work resulting in less time on activities other than employment, housework and caregiving (Hochschild and Machung 2012).

Health from the Gendered Life Course Perspective

Inadequate leisure time is associated with negative health outcomes, such as higher levels of stress, obesity, cardiovascular disease, risk of increased social isolation and lower satisfaction with intimate relationships, for both genders (Craig and Mullan 2013; Grøntved and Hu 2011; Stern and Munn 2010). However, how various time use outcomes influence individuals' well-being aside from health has not been fully explored, which will be the strength of this paper.

3. Research Setting

In Western countries, although the cultural norms of mothers being the caregivers and fathers as the primary breadwinners remained entrenched, compared to Asian countries, fathers get increasingly involved in housework and childcare (Killewald 2013). Overall, research on Western countries indicates more egalitarian division of labor within the household, reflected also by rising full time employment of mothers, public child care and paid maternity leave (Fuwa, 2004; Hook, 2010; Knudsen & Waerness, 2008).

In comparison, in Asian countries, it is harder for women to juggle both work and family (Knight and Brinton 2017). On the one hand, women's roles in the public spheres have been upgraded, and they are expected to achieve success in education and employment (Cha and Eun, 2014). On the other hand, domestic work is still seen as women's primary responsibilities and they may lose out on their bargaining power because of the gender norms (Zuo and Bian 2001). As proposed by Knight and Brinton (2017), the gender role norms shared in many Asian countries can be termed as "pro-work conservative," indicating the competing roles of women as both capable workers and devoted mothers. The lack of enough socialized domestic services and gender discrimination in the labor market further added to the difficulty for women to strike the work-family balance (Cha and Eun, 2014).

China constitutes an interesting research setting. With a long tradition of patrichy, Chinese society has been undergoing dramatic social changes, the most salient among which are women's improved social status (Hannum 2005; Treiman 2013; Wu and Zhang 2010). During the decades following the 1949 Revolution, Communist ideology regarding gender equality was zealously promoted, highlighting women's parity with men (Meisner 1999) and popularizing the slogan "women hold up half the sky" (Mauer-Fazio, Rawski, and Zhang 1999). In the spheres of politics and work life, the Chinese constitution guarantees women equal rights with those of men in all respects and specifically endorses the policy of "same-work, same-pay" (Mauer-Fazio et al. 1999; Zuo and Bian 2001). However, changes in the private sphere and home life have not been as remarkable (Mu and Xie 2014). Even though household gender inequality and within-household specialization have been gradually declining, women's roles as homemakers are still entrenched (Qian 2017). Thus, how and how much have norms of gender roles and life course responsibilities shaped the link between Chinese people's time use and well-being is uncertain and worth a systematic empirical examination.

4. Data and Methods

We utilize data from the nationally representative 2010 Chinese Family Panel Studies (CFPS), which was conducted using multistage probability proportional-to-size sampling with implicit stratification. CFPS 2010 includes information on a battery of stylized questions on time use, mental health, subjective well-being and physical health, as well as respondents' various demographic and socioeconomic characteristics. The richness of the above information enables us to comprehensively understand how the relationship between time use and well-being outcomes have been jointly shaped by gender and life course norms.

Measures

We use three types of dependent variables, namely, health, mental health, and subjective well-being. Specifically,

Health: We use self-rated physical health to measure this variable, which is based on the survey question: ''In general, would you say your own health is…" Responses ranged from 1 to 5, indicating very good to very poor health. We recoded this variable with higher values to indicate better health. This measure of self-reported physical health has been used extensively in U.S. and international research and has been consistently recognized to be a valid measure of physical health (Farmer and Ferraro 1997; Johnson and Wolinsky 1993).

Mental health: We took the sum of responses to a group of six questions on mental health to measure level of depression. Specifically, the six questions are about the self-rated levels of mental health indicating how much the respondent felt upset, nervous, uneasy, hopeless, difficult to cope with daily lives, and found life was meaningless. Responses ranged from 1 to 5, indicating very high to very low levels of depression. We recoded this variable with higher values to indicate higher levels of depression.

Subjective well-being: We have three measures on individuals' subjective well-being. The first is the self-rated level of happiness. The second is the self-rated level of social ability. The third variable is the sum of responses to two questions regarding the respondent's self-rated confidence in his/her career and in the future overall. Responses to all the relevant questions ranged from 1 to 5, with larger numbers indicating more positive subjective status.

Main independent variables: We include five time use outcomes, respectively about respondents' weekly hours spent on work, housework, taking care of family members, sleep, and

leisure activities. All four measures are continuous variables, indicating hours spent per week on the specific type of activities. In CFPS, average daily hours on different activities were reported by the respondent based on stylized questions, for one average weekday and one average weekend day, not based on time diaries. We compute weekly hours by multiplying the weekday time by five, multiplying the weekend time by two, and then taking the sum. Specifically, work includes both primary and part-time jobs. Leisure activities include reading, media consumption, watching TV or other visual products and listening to radio or music, using internet for entertainment, exercising, engaging in hobbies and other leisure activities, social activities, volunteer and charity activities, and religion activities.

Life course transitions: We used three sets of variables to indicate various life course transitions of marriage and parenthood. Specifically, for entry into the first marriage, we use the binary variable (never married vs. ever married) in the interactions between life course transitions and time use items, and the five-category variable (never married, currently married, cohabiting, divorced, and widowed) in the main analysis. For entry into parenthood, we use the binary variable (no child vs. having children) in the interactions between life course transitions and time use items, and the three-category variable (no child, one child, and two or more children) in the main analysis. For moving along different stages of parenthood, we use the three-category variable measuring age of the youngest child (0-5, 6-18, and 19 and above) to indicate changing parenting responsibilities according to ages of children.

Other independent variables: we also control for age, education, family income, and whether the respondent holding urban residential registration (*hukou*) to account for potential demographic and socioeconomic influences. Note that we use total family income minus the respondent's income to single out the influences of income from other family members given the potential collinearity between individual education and income.

Analysis Strategies

We have three sets of analyses. All analyses are gender-specific given the gendered nature of daily life experiences. In the future, we will further explore the gender differences by both conducting gender-specific analysis and including relevant variables in one model to directly estimate gender differences.

Specifically, in the first set of analyses, we examined how various demographic and socioeconomic characteristics differentially shaped men's and women's time use patterns.

In the second set of analyses, we take various time use items as the explanatory variable for five well-being outcomes on health, mental health, and subjective well-being, controlling for other demographic and socioeconomic variables.

In the third set of analyses, we explore the link between time use and well-being through the gendered life course perspectives, by including three sets of interactions between time use and life course transitions, namely, entering the first marriage, entering parenthood, and moving along different stages of parenthood.

5. Preliminary Results

Table 1 shows descriptive statistics for variables included in the analysis, respectively for men and women. As shown, men work more and have longer hours of leisure time than women. Women, on the other hand, spend longer hours doing housework and taking care of family members. Women also have more sleep.

[Table 1 about here]

Regarding well-being outcomes, women tend to report worse health, higher levels of depression, and lower confidence than men. But women have reported higher levels of happiness and social ability than men do.

Gender Differences in Time Use Patterns

Table 2 shows gender-specific estimates of how various demographic and socioeconomic characteristics influenced time use patterns. The results are highly gendered.

[Table 2 about here]

As shown, transitioning to marriage increases men's working hours, but not women's. Although marriage increases both men's and women's weekly hours taking care of family

members, the coefficient on women is both bigger in absolute values and more significant. On the other hand, transitioning to parenthood increases men's working hours, but the coefficient on women is negative. Moreover, becoming a parent increase both men's and women's time spent taking care of family members, but the effect on women is both bigger in size and more significant. Moreover, parenthood leads to longer hours doing housework for women, but not for men.

Gendered Relationships between Time Use and Well-Being

In Table 3, we show results taking various time use items as the explanatory variable to predict five different well-being outcomes, controlling for other relevant variables.

[Table 3 about here]

Results show that longer working hours lead to better health, lower depression, better self-rated social ability and stronger confidence for both men and women. However, it only makes men happier with the coefficient on women insignificant. Additionally, longer hours taking care of family members lead to negative well-being outcomes for men, while relating to better health and higher levels of happiness for women.

The Gendered Life Course: Transitioning to First Marriage

Results in Tables 4, 5, and 6 aim to pin down the link between time use and well-being through the gendered life course approach. Specifically, in Tables 4, 5, and 6, we respectively include interactions between time use and three life course transitions, namely, entering the first marriage, entering parenthood, and moving along different stages of parenthood. These models aim to indicate how the influences of time use on individuals' well-being are moderated by their gendered and changing life course responsibilities. Overall, we find that gender differences in the links between time use and well-being outcomes enlarge during life course transitions of marriage and parenthood.

[Table 4 about here]

For example, in Table 4, the interaction between work hours and never married is positive for health and negative for depression, but only significant for women. These patterns indicate that after getting married, the positive influences of work on women's well-being are weakened, possibly due to the difficulty for them to balance work and family responsibilities. To put things in perspective, these coefficients are not significant for men.

The Gendered Life Course: Transitioning to Parenthood

In Table 5, we further examine how the time-use – well-being links are shaped by entering parenthood. Overall, men seem to be negatively influenced by their newly-gained fatherhood responsibilities.

[Table 5 about here]

For example, in Table 5, the interaction between hours taking care of family members and having no child is positive for health and negative for depression, but only significant for men. These patterns possibly indicate that after becoming a parent, the already negative influence of caregiving on men's well-being is further strengthened, again echoing the gendered life course norms during major life transitions.

The Gendered Life Course: Moving along Stages of Parenthood

In Table 6, we show results examining how the time-use – well-being links are shaped by moving along different stages of parenthood, namely, from being parents of young children aged 0 to 5, to parents of school-aged children aged between 6 to 18, and then to parents of adult children. Overall, patterns show that the intensity of childcare necessity may lead individuals to partly deviate from the gendered life course expectations.

[Table 6 about here]

For example, as shown, longer hours taking care of family members leads to higher levels of depression for men. However, the interaction between caregiving hours and having young children aged 0 to 5 is negative for men, indicating the urgency of childcare may overshadow the

pressures for them to adhere to their primary roles of family providers, and thus alleviate the negative influence of caregiving on their mental health.

6. Discussion and Future Directions

Previous studies on the intersection between gender and life course trajectories mostly focused on their joint influences on significant life events and outcomes of achievement, such as educational attainment, employment, and family relations. However, how gender and life course norms jointly shape individuals' daily lives through structuring their time use arrangements have been understudied.

Moreover, research examining time use from the gendered life course perspectives mostly studied time use as an outcome variable in a descriptive fashion. Even for studies taking time use as explanatory variables, the researchers often focused on the link between time use and health outcomes in Western countries, with attention to mental health and subjective well-being, and the Asian context lacking.

Using the nationally representative 2010 Chinese Family Panel Studies (CFPS), this is the first study to systematically investigate links between time use and individuals' well-being. Specifically, we examined how weekly hours on work, housework, taking care of family members, sleep, and leisure influence individuals' physical health, mental health, and subjective well-being, and how the links differ on the intersections between gender and life course stages. Results show that longer working hours lead to better health, lower depression, better self-rated social ability and stronger confidence for both men and women. However, longer working hours only lead to men's higher level of happiness with the coefficient on women insignificant. Additionally, longer hours taking care of family members lead to negative well-being outcomes for men, while relating to better health and higher levels of happiness for women. Drawing on the gendered life course approach, we find that the gender differences in the links between time use and well-being outcomes enlarge during life course transitions of marriage and parenthood.

For further development of this project, we will further explore the gender differences by both conducting gender-specific analysis and including the variables in one model to systematically test various gender interactions. Moreover, to account for the inter-correlations between various time use items and well-being outcomes, we will use seemingly uncorrelated

regression to test about the link between time use and well-being, aside from regular OLS regressions. We will also further divide the analysis by weekdays and weekends to pin down the variations of expected responsibilities on weekdays and weekends. Among married individuals, we will further investigate characteristics of the marriages, such as marriage duration and marital quality, and the spouses' information, such as spousal education and age, to uncover further nuances underlying the link between time use and well-being.

References

Anxo, D., Mencarini, L., Pailhé, A., Solaz, A., Tanturri, M.L. and Flood, L., 2011. “Gender differences in time use over the life course in France, Italy, Sweden, and the US.” Feminist Economics 17(3): 159-195.

Becker, Gary S. 1981. A Treatise on the Family. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

———. 1985. “Human Capital, Effort, and the Sexual Division of Labor.” Journal of Labor Economics 3: S33-58.

Berkman, L. F.,& Glass, T. (2000). Social integration, social networks, social support, and health. In L. F. Berkman & I. Kawachi (Eds.), Social epidemiology (pp. 137–173). New York: Oxford University Press.122412472048

Bianchi, Suzanne M. 1994. “Changing Economic Roles of Men and Women.” Pp. 107-154 in State of the Union: Social Trends, edited by R. Farley. New York: Russell Sage.

Bianchi, S. M. (2011). Family change and time allocation in American families. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 638(1), 21-44. doi:10.1177/0002716211413731

Bird, C. E., & Fremont, A. M. (1991). Gender, time use, and health. Journal of Health and social Behavior, 114-129.

Blau, Francine D. 2012. Gender, Inequality, and Wages, edited by A. Gielen and K. F. Zimmermann. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Burgard, S. A. (2011). The needs of others: Gender and sleep interruptions for caregivers. Social Forces, 89(4), 1189-1215. doi:10.1093/sf/89.4.1189

Burgard, S. A., & Ailshire, J. A. (2013). Gender and time for sleep among U.S. adults. American Sociological Review, 78(1), 51-69. doi:10.1177/0003

Chang, Hongqin, Xiao-yuan Dong and Fiona MacPhail. 2011. "Labor Migration and Time Use Patterns of the Left-Behind Children and Elderly in Rural China." World Development 39(12):2199-210.

Chen, Su Yen and Luo Lu. 2009. "After-School Time Use in Taiwan: Effects on Educational Achievement and Well-Being." Adolescence 44(176):891.

Corcoran, Mary E. and Paul N. Courant. 1987. “Sex-Role Socialization and Occupational Segregation: An Exploratory Investigation.” Journal of Post Keynesian Economics 9: 330-346.

Craig, L. (2007b). How employed mothers in Australia find time for both market work and childcare. Journal of Family and Economic Issues, 28(1), 69–87.

Craig, L., & Mullan, K. (2010). Parenthood, Gender and Work-Family Time in the United States, Australia, Italy, France, and Denmark. Journal of Marriage and Family, 72(5), 1344-1361. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.libproxy1.nus.edu.sg/stable/40865614

Craig, L., & Powell, A. (2012). Dual-earner parents' work-family time: The effects of atypical work patterns and non-parental childcare. Journal of Population Research, 29(3), 229-247. doi:10.1007/s12546-012-9086-5

Cutler, S.J. and Hendricks, J., 1990. "Leisure and time use across the life course." Handbook of Aging and the Social Sciences 3: 169-185.

Elder Jr, G. H. (1998). The life course as developmental theory. Child development, 69(1), 1-12.

Elder Jr, G. H. (1999). The life course and aging: Some reflections. Distinguished Scholar Lecture, 10.

Elder, G. H., Johnson, M. K., & Crosnoe, R. (2003). The emergence and development of life

course theory. In Handbook of the life course (pp. 3-19). Springer, Boston, MA.
England, P. (2010). The gender revolution: Uneven and stalled. Gender & society, 24(2), 149-166.
Farmer, M. M., & Ferraro, K. F. (1997). Distress and perceived health: mechanisms of health decline. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 298-311.
Flood, S. M., & Moen, P. (2015). Healthy time use in the encore years: do work, resources, relations, and gender matter?. Journal of health and social behavior, 56(1), 74-97.
Fuwa, M. (2004). Macro-level gender inequality and the division of household labor in 22 countries. American Sociological Review, 69(6), 751–767. doi:10.1177/000312240406900601
Gross, Elisheva F, Jaana Juvonen and Shelly L Gable. 2002. "Internet Use and Well-Being in Adolescence." Journal of Social Issues 58(1):75-90.
Hannum, E., 2005. Market transition, educational disparities, and family strategies in rural China: new evidence on gender stratification and development. Demography 42, 275-299.
Hauser, S., Xie, Y., 2005. Temporal and regional variation in earnings inequality: urban China in transition between 1988 and 1995. Social Science Research 34, 44-79.
Hochschild, A., & Machung, A. (2012). The second shift: Working families and the revolution at home. Penguin.
Hook, J. L. (2010). Gender inequality in the welfare state: Sex segregation in housework, 1965–2003. American Journal of Sociology, 115(5), 1480–1523. doi:10.1086/651384
Johnson, R. J., & Wolinsky, F. D. (1993). The structure of health status among older adults: disease, disability, functional limitation, and perceived health. Journal of health and social behavior, 105-121.
Killewald, A. (2013). A reconsideration of the fatherhood premium: Marriage, coresidence, biology, and fathers' wages. American Sociological Review, 78(1), 96-116.
Knight, C. R., & Brinton, M. C. (2017). One egalitarianism or several? Two decades of gender-role attitude change in Europe. American Journal of Sociology, 122(5), 1485-1532.
Krueger, Alan B and Andreas I Mueller. 2012. "Time Use, Emotional Well-Being, and Unemployment: Evidence from Longitudinal Data." The American Economic Review 102(3):594-99.
Lee, Y. G., & Bhargava, V. (2004). Leisure time Do married and single individuals spend it differently Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal, 32(3), 254-274. doi10.11771077727X03261631
Mattingly, M. J., & Blanchi, S. M. (2003). Gender differences in the quantity and quality of free time: The US experience. Social forces, 81(3), 999-1030.
Maurer-Fazio, Margaret, Thomas G. Rawski, and Wei Zhang. 1999. "Inequality in the Rewards for Holding up Half the Sky: Gender Wage Gaps in China's Urban Labour Market, 1988-1994." The China Journal 41: 55-88.
Meisner, M., 1999. Mao's China and After: A History of the People's Republic. New York, NY: Free Press.
Møller, Valerie. 1992. "Spare Time Use and Perceived Well-Being among Black South African Youth." Social Indicators Research 26(4):309-51.
Mu, Zheng and Yu Xie. 2014. "Marital Age Homogamy in China: A Reversal of Trend in the Reform Era?" Social Science Research 44: 141-157.
Mu, Zheng and Yu Xie. 2016. "'Motherhood Penalty' and 'Fatherhood Premium'? Fertility Effects on Parents in China." Demographic Research 35: 1373-1410.

Mu, Zheng and Jean Wei-Jun Yeung. 2018. “For Money or for a Life: A Mixed-Method Study on Migration and Time Use in China.” Social Indicators Research 139: 347-379.
Oppenheimer, Valerie K. 1997. “Women's Employment and the Gain to Marriage: The Specialization and Trading Model.” Annual Review of Sociology 23: 431-53.
Passias, E. J., Sayer, L., & Pepin, J. R. (2017). Who experiences leisure deficits? mothers' marital status and leisure time. Journal of Marriage and Family, 79(4), 1001-1022. doi:10.1111/jomf.12365
Pepin, J. R., Sayer, L. C., & Casper, L. M. (2018). Marital status and mothers’ time use: Childcare, housework, leisure, and sleep. Demography, 55(1), 107-133. doi:10.1007/s13524-018-0647-x
Qian, Yue. (2017). “Gender Asymmetry in Educational and Income Assortative Marriage.” Journal of Marriage and Family, 79(2), 318-336.
Sayer, L. C. (2005). Gender, time and inequality: Trends in women's and men's paid work, unpaid work and free time. Social Forces, 84(1), 285-303. doi:10.1353/sof.2005.0126
Sayer, L. C., & Gornick, J. C. (2012). Cross-national variation in the influence of employment hours on child care time. European Sociological Review, 28(4), 442;421;-442. doi:10.1093/esr/jcr008
Smock, Pamela J., Wendy D. Manning, and Sanjiv Gupta. 1999. “The Effect of Marriage and Divorce on Women’s Economic Well-Being.” American Sociological Review 64:794-812.
Treiman, D. J. (2013). Trends in educational attainment in China. Chinese Sociological Review, 45(3), 3-25.
Wu, X., Zhang, Z., 2010. Changes in educational inequality in China, 1990-2005: evidence from the population census data. Research in Sociology of Education 17, 123-152.
Zuo, J., & Bian, Y. (2001). Gendered resources, division of housework, and perceived fairness. A case in urban china. Journal of Marriage and Family, 63(4), 1122-1133. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2001.01122.x

Tables

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

Variables	Men (*N*=7,705)		Women (*N*=8,599)	
Time use	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Weekly hours working	44.656	23.543	30.897	25.549
Weekly hours doing housework	6.778	8.838	15.924	10.477
Weekly hours taking care of family members	4.270	7.283	10.345	14.594
Weekly hours of sleep	56.301	9.559	57.707	9.618
Weekly hours of leisure	26.350	16.330	23.280	15.689
Well-being outcomes				
Health	4.401	0.858	4.223	0.962
Depression	8.814	3.669	9.337	4.051
Happiness	3.778	1.044	3.842	1.008
Social ability	4.062	0.839	4.071	0.850
Confidence	7.618	1.959	7.410	1.924
Demographic and Socioeconomic Characteristics				
Age	38.844	7.034	38.788	7.045
Education				
junior high school or below	0.730	0.444	0.788	0.409
senior high school	0.160	0.367	0.126	0.332
associate college or above	0.110	0.313	0.086	0.281
Family income (excluding that of the respondent)	22321.7	46295.5	30379.8	51950.7
Holding urban hukou	0.296	0.457	0.275	0.447
Marital status				
never married	0.078	0.268	0.022	0.145
currently married	0.891	0.312	0.947	0.223
cohabiting	0.004	0.059	0.003	0.054
divorced	0.022	0.148	0.013	0.115
widowed	0.005	0.073	0.015	0.120
Number of children				
no child	0.124	0.329	0.054	0.226
one child	0.429	0.495	0.432	0.495
two or more children	0.448	0.497	0.513	0.500

Source: Chinese Family Panel Studies 2010.

Table 2. Gender Differences in Time Use Patterns

	Weekly hours working		Weekly hours doing housework		Weekly hours taking care of family members		Weekly hours of sleep		Weekly hours of leisure	
Independent Variables	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Age	-0.112***	0.217***	0.113***	0.216***	-0.214***	-0.766***	-0.051***	-0.108***	-0.021	0.100***
	(0.044)	(0.044)	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.013)	(0.023)	(0.018)	(0.016)	(0.029)	(0.026)
Education (ref.=senior high)										
junior high school or below	-0.046	-0.859	0.569*	1.341***	-0.311	-0.517	1.072***	1.015***	-3.611***	-3.628***
	(0.811)	(0.948)	(0.304)	(0.376)	(0.247)	(0.503)	(0.329)	(0.353)	(0.531)	(0.557)
associate college or above	-0.095	7.582***	-0.386	-2.754***	-0.302	-2.075***	-0.33	-0.360	3.092***	-0.680
	(1.124)	(1.292)	(0.421)	(0.512)	(0.343)	(0.686)	(0.456)	(0.481)	(0.736)	(0.758)
Logarithm of family income	-0.186***	-0.343***	0.063**	0.109***	0.011	0.0498	0.047*	0.053	0.112**	0.261***
(excluding that of the respondent)	(0.068)	(0.106)	(0.025)	(0.042)	(0.021)	(0.056)	(0.028)	(0.040)	(0.044)	(0.062)
Holding urban hukou (ref.=rural)	-2.765***	-2.766***	-1.345***	-0.792**	0.502**	2.153***	-1.414***	-2.222***	5.778***	3.052***
	(0.748)	(0.801)	(0.281)	(0.317)	(0.228)	(0.424)	(0.304)	(0.298)	(0.490)	(0.470)
Marital status (ref.=currently married)										
never married	-4.285***	-2.645	0.520	-1.364	-0.856*	-3.570***	0.572	-0.313	2.813***	6.841***
	(1.573)	(2.433)	(0.589)	(0.964)	(0.479)	(1.290)	(0.638)	(0.905)	(1.031)	(1.428)
cohabiting	0.998	-11.260**	-0.250	0.544	-2.000	-2.262	3.461*	0.772	1.571	11.130***
	(4.765)	(5.324)	(1.783)	(2.156)	(1.452)	(2.822)	(1.934)	(1.981)	(3.123)	(3.126)
divorced	-1.98	-1.005	3.093***	-1.264	0.487	-1.576	-1.167	-1.275	1.160	5.947***
	(1.881)	(2.457)	(0.706)	(0.973)	(0.575)	(1.302)	(0.763)	(0.914)	(1.233)	(1.442)
widowed	-10.85***	2.286	3.444**	-1.383	0.585	-0.136	0.905	-1.633*	-0.296	-0.113
	(3.730)	(2.414)	(1.396)	(0.956)	(1.137)	(1.279)	(1.514)	(0.898)	(2.445)	(1.417)
Number of children (ref.=no children)										
one child	3.489***	-3.432**	-0.726	2.240***	2.860***	11.670***	-0.749	-1.917***	-2.301***	-5.426***
	(1.338)	(1.617)	(0.501)	(0.641)	(0.408)	(0.857)	(0.543)	(0.602)	(0.877)	(0.950)
two or more child	3.158**	-3.566**	0.221	3.838***	3.427***	15.050***	0.046	-2.005***	-5.107***	-9.582***
	(1.400)	(1.679)	(0.524)	(0.665)	(0.427)	(0.890)	(0.568)	(0.625)	(0.917)	(0.986)
Constant	48.82***	29.88***	2.035***	3.107***	9.896***	26.86***	57.90***	63.21***	29.89***	26.05***
	(2.102)	(2.464)	(0.787)	(0.977)	(0.641)	(1.308)	(0.854)	(0.918)	(1.378)	(1.446)
Observations	7,318	8,163	7,304	8,140	7,306	8,136	7,307	8,148	7,318	8,163
R-squared	0.012	0.01	0.029	0.082	0.043	0.133	0.018	0.027	0.116	0.093

Note: Standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Source: Chinese Family Panel Studies 2010.

Table 3. Gender Differences in the Relationship between Time Use Patterns and Well-Being Outcomes

Independent Variables	Health		Depression		Happiness		Social Ability		Confidence	
Time use	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Weekly hours working	0.00422***	0.00399***	-0.0115***	-0.00537**	0.00208***	0.000746	0.00229***	0.000906*	0.00636***	0.00313***
	(0.00056)	(0.00059)	(0.00240)	(0.00254)	(0.00066)	(0.00062)	(0.00055)	(0.00054)	(0.00126)	(0.00121)
Weekly hours doing housework	0.00524***	0.000992	0.00561	-0.00256	-0.00449***	-0.00283**	0.00268**	-0.00148	0.00294	-0.00174
	(0.00123)	(0.00116)	(0.00534)	(0.00496)	(0.00147)	(0.00122)	(0.00121)	(0.00105)	(0.00281)	(0.00238)
Weekly hours taking care of family	0.00003	0.00398***	0.0153**	-0.00191	0.00217	0.00173*	-0.00164	0.000355	-0.00234	0.00192
members	(0.00145)	(0.00090)	(0.00629)	(0.00387)	(0.00173)	(0.00095)	(0.00143)	(0.00082)	(0.00330)	(0.00185)
Weekly hours of sleep	-0.00008	-0.000837	-0.00737	-0.0133***	0.00298**	0.00163	0.000298	-0.00117	0.00144	0.00077
	(0.00110)	(0.00117)	(0.00476)	(0.00501)	(0.00131)	(0.00122)	(0.00108)	(0.00105)	(0.00250)	(0.00239)
Weekly hours of leisure	0.00414***	0.00380***	-0.0196***	-0.0178***	0.00536***	0.00600***	0.00312***	0.00463***	0.00616***	0.00367**
	(0.00076)	(0.00084)	(0.00330)	(0.00358)	(0.00091)	(0.00088)	(0.00075)	(0.00075)	(0.00174)	(0.00171)
Demographic and Socioeconomic Characteristics										
Age	-0.0201***	-0.0251***	-0.00131	0.0257***	-0.0102***	-0.00542***	-0.00379**	0.00195	-0.0494***	-0.0311***
	(0.00161)	(0.00174)	(0.00695)	(0.00744)	(0.00192)	(0.00182)	(0.00158)	(0.00156)	(0.00365)	(0.00355)
Years of schooling	0.0189***	0.0225***	-0.0714***	-0.110***	0.0213***	0.0213***	0.0197***	0.0260***	0.0372***	0.0367***
	(0.00291)	(0.00284)	(0.01260)	(0.01220)	(0.00348)	(0.00298)	(0.00287)	(0.00256)	(0.00663)	(0.00583)
Logarithm of family income	-0.00157	0.00877**	-0.00913	-0.0968***	0.00478*	0.0259***	-0.00502**	-0.00173	0.00328	0.0199**
(excluding that of the respondent)	(0.00243)	(0.00389)	(0.01050)	(0.01670)	(0.00290)	(0.00407)	(0.00239)	(0.00351)	(0.00553)	(0.00794)
Holding urban hukou (ref.=rural)	-0.0728***	0.0125	0.238**	-0.0942	0.0514	0.0355	-0.016	-0.0454*	-0.324***	-0.267***
	(0.02650)	(0.02870)	(0.11500)	(0.12300)	(0.03170)	(0.03000)	(0.02610)	(0.02580)	(0.06030)	(0.05860)
Marital status (ref.=currently married)										
never married	-0.142**	-0.0563	0.923***	0.650*	-0.642***	-0.357***	-0.101*	-0.0232	-0.667***	-0.311*
	(0.05660)	(0.08890)	(0.24500)	(0.38100)	(0.06760)	(0.09310)	(0.05570)	(0.08010)	(0.12900)	(0.18200)
cohabiting	-0.117	-0.232	0.878	0.649	-0.184	-0.212	-0.0304	-0.264	-0.426	-0.348
	(0.17100)	(0.19900)	(0.75300)	(0.85100)	(0.20400)	(0.20900)	(0.16800)	(0.17900)	(0.38900)	(0.40700)
divorced	0.0141	-0.0971	1.038***	0.896**	-0.812***	-0.780***	-0.167**	-0.0711	-0.716***	-0.604***
	(0.06780)	(0.08990)	(0.29200)	(0.38400)	(0.08120)	(0.09420)	(0.06670)	(0.08100)	(0.15400)	(0.18400)
widowed	-0.355***	-0.274***	2.247***	2.418***	-0.841***	-1.049***	-0.319**	-0.150*	-0.883***	-0.935***
	(0.13400)	(0.08830)	(0.57800)	(0.37900)	(0.16000)	(0.09240)	(0.13200)	(0.07980)	(0.30500)	(0.18000)
Number of children (ref.=no children)										
one child	0.0187	0.0102	0.0374	-0.366	0.0204	0.0537	0.0929*	0.143***	0.171	0.156
	(0.04820)	(0.05970)	(0.20900)	(0.25600)	(0.05770)	(0.06250)	(0.04750)	(0.05380)	(0.11000)	(0.12200)
two or more child	0.0457	0.0409	0.157	-0.222	-0.119**	-0.0495	0.0597	0.101*	0.311***	0.233*
	(0.05050)	(0.06270)	(0.21900)	(0.26900)	(0.06040)	(0.06570)	(0.04970)	(0.05650)	(0.11500)	(0.12800)
Constant	4.706***	4.709***	10.63***	11.71***	3.676***	3.452***	3.821***	3.680***	8.604***	7.863***
	(0.11800)	(0.13400)	(0.51200)	(0.57600)	(0.14100)	(0.14100)	(0.11700)	(0.12100)	(0.26900)	(0.27500)
Observations	7,295	8,127	7,259	8,077	7,290	8,113	7,291	8,108	7,286	8,089
R-squared	0.046	0.070	0.025	0.043	0.073	0.071	0.021	0.033	0.050	0.031

Note: Standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Source: Chinese Family Panel Studies 2010.

Table 4. Relationship between Time Use Patterns and Well-Being Outcomes, with **Interactions between Marital Status and Time Use**

Independent Variables	Health		Depression		Happiness		Social Ability		Confidence	
Time use	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Weekly hours working	0.00422***	0.00387***	-0.0111***	-0.00448*	0.00209***	0.00057	0.00204***	0.000827	0.00539***	0.00288**
	(0.00058)	(0.00060)	(0.00251)	(0.00257)	(0.00070)	(0.00063)	(0.00057)	(0.00054)	(0.00132)	(0.00123)
Weekly hours doing housework	0.00567***	0.000924	0.00714	-0.000984	-0.00473***	-0.00280**	0.00299**	-0.00152	0.00274	-0.00154
	(0.00127)	(0.00116)	(0.00551)	(0.00499)	(0.00153)	(0.00124)	(0.00125)	(0.00105)	(0.00290)	(0.00239)
Weekly hours taking care of family	-0.000141	0.00400***	0.0195***	-0.00155	0.000971	0.00149	-0.00207	0.000466	-0.004	0.00236
members	(0.00149)	(0.00089)	(0.00645)	(0.00383)	(0.00179)	(0.00095)	(0.00146)	(0.00081)	(0.00339)	(0.00183)
Weekly hours of sleep	0.00112	-0.000828	-0.00709	-0.0139***	0.00320**	0.00198	0.000369	-0.00138	0.00297	0.00123
	(0.00114)	(0.00118)	(0.00497)	(0.00507)	(0.00138)	(0.00125)	(0.00113)	(0.00106)	(0.00261)	(0.00242)
Weekly hours of leisure	0.00433***	0.00357***	-0.0194***	-0.0169***	0.00620***	0.00584***	0.00275***	0.00437***	0.00516***	0.00266
	(0.00079)	(0.00084)	(0.00344)	(0.00362)	(0.00096)	(0.00089)	(0.00078)	(0.00076)	(0.00181)	(0.00173)
Demographic and Socioeconomic Characteristics										
Age	-0.0195***	-0.0250***	0.00266	0.0300***	-0.0130***	-0.00862***	-0.00365**	0.00187	-0.0459***	-0.0304***
	(0.00152)	(0.00164)	(0.00661)	(0.00706)	(0.00184)	(0.00174)	(0.00150)	(0.00148)	(0.00347)	(0.00337)
Years of schooling	0.0183***	0.0217***	-0.0751***	-0.112***	0.0241***	0.0231***	0.0197***	0.0266***	0.0357***	0.0342***
	(0.00291)	(0.00278)	(0.01260)	(0.01200)	(0.00351)	(0.00295)	(0.00287)	(0.00251)	(0.00663)	(0.00571)
Logarithm of family income	-0.00154	0.0106***	-0.0119	-0.114***	0.00636**	0.0346***	-0.00483**	-0.000678	0.00471	0.0275***
(excluding that of the respondent)	(0.00243)	(0.00384)	(0.01050)	(0.01650)	(0.00292)	(0.00407)	(0.00239)	(0.00347)	(0.00553)	(0.00786)
Holding urban hukou (ref.=rural)	-0.0813***	0.00238	0.202*	-0.126	0.0889***	0.0498*	-0.00958	-0.0373	-0.379***	-0.304***
	(0.02540)	(0.02760)	(0.11000)	(0.11800)	(0.03060)	(0.02920)	(0.02500)	(0.02490)	(0.05790)	(0.05650)
Gendered Life Course Approach: Transitiong into First Marriage										
Never married	0.750**	-1.061	1.705	5.540*	-0.206	-0.97	-0.364	-1.429**	-0.687	-2.246
(ref.=ever married)	(0.31900)	(0.72400)	(1.38500)	(3.10200)	(0.38500)	(0.76800)	(0.31500)	(0.65200)	(0.72800)	(1.48100)
Interactions										
Never married X										
(ref.=ever married)										
Weekly hours working	0.000712	0.00871*	-0.00675	-0.0452**	0.000872	0.00825*	0.00388**	0.00477	0.0127***	0.0185**
	(0.00198)	(0.00445)	(0.00863)	(0.01920)	(0.00239)	(0.00471)	(0.00195)	(0.00400)	(0.00451)	(0.00909)
	-0.00847*	0.00949	-0.00185	-0.138***	-0.0125**	0.00232	-0.0115**	0.0102	-0.0149	0.0184
Weekly hours doing housework	(0.00501)	(0.01010)	(0.02180)	(0.04320)	(0.00604)	(0.01070)	(0.00493)	(0.00907)	(0.01140)	(0.02060)
Weekly hours taking care of family	0.00681	0.0305*	-0.0798***	-0.0218	0.0202***	0.00837	0.0130**	-0.00939	0.0485***	0.0485
members	(0.00638)	(0.01760)	(0.02780)	(0.07540)	(0.00770)	(0.01870)	(0.00629)	(0.01590)	(0.01460)	(0.03600)
Weekly hours of sleep	-0.0145***	0.00627	-0.00439	-0.0162	-0.00282	0.00324	-0.00082	0.0121*	-0.0149	0.00234
	(0.00398)	(0.00805)	(0.01730)	(0.03450)	(0.00480)	(0.00853)	(0.00392)	(0.00725)	(0.00907)	(0.01650)
Weekly hours of leisure	-0.00229	0.00531	-0.00481	-0.0284	-0.00711**	0.00272	0.00419*	0.00990**	0.00588	0.0221*
	(0.00245)	(0.00556)	(0.01070)	(0.02390)	(0.00296)	(0.00589)	(0.00242)	(0.00501)	(0.00559)	(0.01140)
Constant	4.644***	4.724***	10.61***	11.45***	3.638***	3.441***	3.896***	3.798***	8.683***	7.958***
	(0.11700)	(0.12800)	(0.50800)	(0.54900)	(0.14100)	(0.13600)	(0.11600)	(0.11600)	(0.26700)	(0.26300)
Observations	7,295	8,127	7,259	8,077	7,290	8,113	7,291	8,108	7,286	8,089
R-squared	0.047	0.069	0.023	0.039	0.058	0.047	0.022	0.031	0.048	0.027

Note: Standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Source: Chinese Family Panel Studies 2010.

Table 5. Relationship between Time Use Patterns and Well-Being Outcomes, with **Interactions between # of Children and Time Use**

Independent Variables	Health		Depression		Happiness		Social Ability		Confidence	
Time use	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Weekly hours working	0.00416***	0.00398***	-0.0114***	-0.00429	0.00192***	0.000541	0.00185***	0.000781	0.00495***	0.00251**
	(0.00059)	(0.00061)	(0.00257)	(0.00261)	(0.00072)	(0.00065)	(0.00059)	(0.00055)	(0.00135)	(0.00125)
Weekly hours doing housework	0.00552***	0.000745	0.00702	-0.000426	-0.00506***	-0.00291**	0.00306**	-0.00174	0.00333	-0.00214
	(0.00130)	(0.00118)	(0.00562)	(0.00505)	(0.00157)	(0.00125)	(0.00128)	(0.00107)	(0.00296)	(0.00242)
Weekly hours taking care of family	-0.000678	0.00399***	0.0188***	-0.00121	0.000947	0.0015	-0.00227	0.000261	-0.00464	0.00198
members	(0.00152)	(0.00091)	(0.00659)	(0.00390)	(0.00184)	(0.00097)	(0.00150)	(0.00082)	(0.00346)	(0.00186)
Weekly hours of sleep	0.000565	-0.000846	-0.00946*	-0.0159***	0.00289**	0.00218*	0.000557	-0.00121	0.00271	0.00109
	(0.00117)	(0.00119)	(0.00509)	(0.00513)	(0.00142)	(0.00127)	(0.00116)	(0.00108)	(0.00268)	(0.00244)
Weekly hours of leisure	0.00452***	0.00399***	-0.0211***	-0.0182***	0.00621***	0.00592***	0.00262***	0.00453***	0.00480**	0.00236
	(0.00082)	(0.00086)	(0.00354)	(0.00368)	(0.00099)	(0.00091)	(0.00081)	(0.00077)	(0.00187)	(0.00176)
Demographic and Socioeconomic Characteristics										
Age	-0.0200***	-0.0254***	0.00241	0.0317***	-0.0129***	-0.00858***	-0.00431***	0.00116	-0.0477***	-0.0312***
	(0.00157)	(0.00169)	(0.00682)	(0.00724)	(0.00190)	(0.00179)	(0.00155)	(0.00152)	(0.00359)	(0.00346)
Years of schooling	0.0190***	0.0219***	-0.0764***	-0.112***	0.0253***	0.0230***	0.0200***	0.0269***	0.0373***	0.0345***
	(0.00290)	(0.00279)	(0.01260)	(0.01200)	(0.00352)	(0.00296)	(0.00286)	(0.00251)	(0.00663)	(0.00572)
Logarithm of family income	-0.00142	0.0108***	-0.0124	-0.112***	0.00685**	0.0351***	-0.00475**	-0.00102	0.00511	0.0271***
(excluding that of the respondent)	(0.00243)	(0.00384)	(0.01050)	(0.01650)	(0.00294)	(0.00407)	(0.00239)	(0.00346)	(0.00553)	(0.00785)
Holding urban hukou (ref.=rural)	-0.0800***	0.00227	0.200*	-0.123	0.0916***	0.0489*	-0.00702	-0.0332	-0.372***	-0.302***
	(0.02550)	(0.02760)	(0.11000)	(0.11900)	(0.03080)	(0.02930)	(0.02510)	(0.02490)	(0.05810)	(0.05650)
Gendered Life Course Approach: Transitiong into Parenthood										
No child (ref.= having children)	0.224	-0.132	-0.547	-1.443	-0.338	-0.197	-0.301	-0.347	-0.911	-1.626*
	(0.26600)	(0.47000)	(1.15200)	(2.01700)	(0.32100)	(0.49900)	(0.26100)	(0.42400)	(0.60500)	(0.97000)
Interactions										
No child X										
(ref.= having children)										
Weekly hours working	0.000859	0.000642	-0.00252	-0.0137	0.00258	0.0037	0.00374**	0.00153	0.0115***	0.0128**
	(0.00164)	(0.00271)	(0.00716)	(0.01170)	(0.00199)	(0.00288)	(0.00162)	(0.00245)	(0.00375)	(0.00558)
Weekly hours doing housework	-0.0034	0.00979	0.000208	-0.0564**	-0.00504	0.00467	-0.00769*	0.00527	-0.0145	0.0224*
	(0.00407)	(0.00610)	(0.01770)	(0.02620)	(0.00493)	(0.00647)	(0.00401)	(0.00550)	(0.00928)	(0.01250)
Weekly hours taking care of family	0.00984*	0.00909	-0.0473**	0.0308	0.0162**	-0.00488	0.00762	-0.0116	0.0328***	-0.00823
members	(0.00522)	(0.00867)	(0.02280)	(0.03710)	(0.00632)	(0.00920)	(0.00514)	(0.00781)	(0.01190)	(0.01770)
Weekly hours of sleep	-0.00499	0.00156	0.0166	0.0431*	0.000405	-0.00189	-0.00142	0.00148	-0.00627	0.00367
	(0.00328)	(0.00556)	(0.01420)	(0.02390)	(0.00397)	(0.00590)	(0.00322)	(0.00501)	(0.00747)	(0.01140)
Weekly hours of leisure	-0.00302	-0.0043	0.0108	0.0114	-0.00559**	-0.000482	0.00356*	0.00137	0.00536	0.0151**
	(0.00205)	(0.00352)	(0.00891)	(0.01510)	(0.00248)	(0.00374)	(0.00202)	(0.00317)	(0.00467)	(0.00725)
Constant	4.690***	4.726***	10.83***	11.48***	3.647***	3.426***	3.924***	3.825***	8.790***	8.036***
	(0.12000)	(0.13000)	(0.52000)	(0.55600)	(0.14500)	(0.13800)	(0.11800)	(0.11700)	(0.27400)	(0.26600)
Observations	7,295	8,128	7,259	8,078	7,290	8,114	7,291	8,109	7,286	8,090
R-squared	0.045	0.07	0.021	0.039	0.049	0.046	0.022	0.032	0.046	0.027

Note: Standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Source: Chinese Family Panel Studies 2010.

Table 6. Relationship between Time Use Patterns and Well-Being Outcomes, with **Interactions between Age of Youngest Child and Time Use**

Independent Variables	Health		Depression		Happiness		Social Ability		Confidence	
Time use	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Weekly hours working	0.00787***	0.00570***	-0.0137**	-0.00778*	0.000122	-0.00102	0.000794	-7.23E-05	0.00193	0.000746
	(0.00123)	(0.00107)	(0.00534)	(0.00459)	(0.00148)	(0.00113)	(0.00121)	(0.00097)	(0.00281)	(0.00218)
Weekly hours doing housework	0.0108***	0.00275	-0.00202	-0.00613	-0.00442	-0.00408*	0.00311	-0.00145	2.98E-05	7.65E-05
	(0.00242)	(0.00208)	(0.01050)	(0.00889)	(0.00290)	(0.00219)	(0.00238)	(0.00186)	(0.00551)	(0.00422)
Weekly hours taking care of	0.00173	0.00511***	0.0410***	-0.00366	0.00431	0.000737	-0.000328	0.000209	-0.000765	-0.00211
family members	(0.00328)	(0.00193)	(0.01420)	(0.00826)	(0.00393)	(0.00204)	(0.00322)	(0.00173)	(0.00746)	(0.00394)
Weekly hours of sleep	-0.000987	-0.000744	-0.00151	-0.00424	0.00447	0.00146	-0.00197	0.000367	-0.00429	-0.00245
	(0.00241)	(0.00206)	(0.01050)	(0.00882)	(0.00289)	(0.00217)	(0.00237)	(0.00185)	(0.00549)	(0.00418)
Weekly hours of leisure	0.00518***	0.00531***	-0.0231***	-0.0343***	0.00537***	0.00523***	0.00219	0.00407***	-0.00175	0.00105
	(0.00162)	(0.00147)	(0.00704)	(0.00629)	(0.00195)	(0.00155)	(0.00159)	(0.00132)	(0.00369)	(0.00299)
Demographic and Socioeconomic Characteristics										
Age	-0.0170***	-0.0240***	-0.00239	0.0291***	-0.0216***	-0.0148***	0.00688***	-0.00493**	-0.0486***	-0.0311***
	(0.00242)	(0.00253)	(0.01050)	(0.01080)	(0.00290)	(0.00267)	(0.00238)	(0.00227)	(0.00551)	(0.00515)
Years of schooling	0.0193***	0.0217***	-0.0844***	-0.116***	0.0228***	0.0237***	0.0212***	0.0267***	0.0268***	0.0329***
	(0.00318)	(0.00290)	(0.01380)	(0.01240)	(0.00382)	(0.00306)	(0.00313)	(0.00260)	(0.00725)	(0.00590)
Logarithm of family income	-0.00069	0.0129***	-0.00612	-0.107***	0.00316	0.0354***	-0.00444*	-0.000483	-0.000869	0.0240***
(excluding that of the respondent)	(0.00261)	(0.00405)	(0.01130)	(0.01730)	(0.00313)	(0.00428)	(0.00257)	(0.00364)	(0.00595)	(0.00821)
Holding urban hukou (ref.=rural)	-0.0825***	0.0142	0.233**	-0.169	0.0850***	0.0411	-0.0148	-0.0288	-0.380***	-0.306***
	(0.02730)	(0.02890)	(0.11800)	(0.12300)	(0.03270)	(0.03040)	(0.02680)	(0.02580)	(0.06200)	(0.05850)
Gendered Life Course Approach: Changing Stages of Parenthood										
Age of youngest child (ref.=19+)										
youngest child ages 0-5	0.349	0.00816	-0.227	1.5	0.156	-0.31	-0.419	-0.0184	-0.413	-0.573
	(0.27600)	(0.29100)	(1.19700)	(1.24300)	(0.33100)	(0.30700)	(0.27100)	(0.26100)	(0.62900)	(0.59100)
youngest child ages 6-18	0.13	0.321	0.51	-0.474	-0.372	-0.327	-0.247	-0.00464	-1.388***	-0.427
	(0.23200)	(0.21900)	(1.00600)	(0.93800)	(0.27900)	(0.23200)	(0.22900)	(0.19700)	(0.52900)	(0.44600)
Interactions										
Age of youngest child (ref.=19+)										
youngest child ages 0-5 X										
Weekly hours working	-0.00564***	-0.00410**	0.0178**	0.00547	-0.00114	0.000732	0.00105	-0.000207	-0.00103	-0.00116
	(0.00175)	(0.00186)	(0.00759)	(0.00793)	(0.00210)	(0.00196)	(0.00172)	(0.00166)	(0.00399)	(0.00377)
Weekly hours doing housework	-0.00902**	-0.000412	0.0434***	-0.000828	-0.00676	0.00151	-0.000351	0.000243	-0.00393	-0.00669
	(0.00372)	(0.00340)	(0.01620)	(0.01450)	(0.00446)	(0.00359)	(0.00365)	(0.00305)	(0.00847)	(0.00690)
Weekly hours taking care of	-0.00373	-0.00418	-0.0411**	0.0035	-0.00368	-0.000172	-0.000945	-0.00066	-0.00949	0.00311
family members	(0.00407)	(0.00254)	(0.01760)	(0.01090)	(0.00488)	(0.00269)	(0.00400)	(0.00228)	(0.00926)	(0.00517)
Weekly hours of sleep	0.00132	0.0052	-0.0178	-0.0412***	-0.00503	0.00134	0.00485	-0.0022	0.00262	0.00877
	(0.00342)	(0.00335)	(0.01480)	(0.01430)	(0.00409)	(0.00354)	(0.00335)	(0.00300)	(0.00777)	(0.00680)
Weekly hours of leisure	-0.00219	-0.00352	0.0109	0.0263**	-0.00203	0.00101	0.000514	-5.66E-05	0.00903*	0.00505
	(0.00230)	(0.00244)	(0.00996)	(0.01040)	(0.00276)	(0.00258)	(0.00226)	(0.00219)	(0.00523)	(0.00496)
youngest child ages 6-18 X										
Weekly hours working	-0.00443***	-0.002	-0.00269	0.00475	0.00393**	0.00282*	0.00146	0.00167	0.00646*	0.00391
	(0.00147)	(0.00137)	(0.00638)	(0.00588)	(0.00176)	(0.00145)	(0.00145)	(0.00123)	(0.00335)	(0.00279)
Weekly hours doing housework	-0.00677**	-0.00423	-0.00137	0.00975	0.000953	0.00183	-0.000273	-0.000713	0.00634	-0.0023
	(0.00303)	(0.00268)	(0.01310)	(0.01150)	(0.00364)	(0.00284)	(0.00298)	(0.00242)	(0.00690)	(0.00548)
Weekly hours taking care of	-0.0018	0.000132	-0.0028	0.0156	-0.00128	0.00463	-0.00238	0.0031	0.0036	0.0116**
family members	(0.00423)	(0.00271)	(0.01840)	(0.01160)	(0.00507)	(0.00287)	(0.00416)	(0.00243)	(0.00962)	(0.00552)
Weekly hours of sleep	0.00266	-0.00289	-0.00688	-0.00615	-0.000539	0.000821	0.00277	-0.00256	0.0122*	0.00376
	(0.00290)	(0.00272)	(0.01260)	(0.01160)	(0.00348)	(0.00287)	(0.00285)	(0.00243)	(0.00659)	(0.00552)
Weekly hours of leisure	-0.000155	-0.00137	-4.09E-05	0.0230***	0.00255	0.000583	0.000383	0.000553	0.00992**	0.000684
	(0.00195)	(0.00190)	(0.00846)	(0.00811)	(0.00234)	(0.00200)	(0.00192)	(0.00170)	(0.00443)	(0.00386)
Constant	4.400***	4.517***	10.78***	11.47***	4.194***	3.887***	4.244***	4.074***	9.763***	8.376***
	(0.22900)	(0.20800)	(0.99000)	(0.89100)	(0.27400)	(0.22000)	(0.22500)	(0.18700)	(0.52000)	(0.42400)
Observations	6,403	7,685	6,378	7,638	6,400	7,671	6,399	7,666	6,394	7,648
R-squared	0.041	0.068	0.026	0.042	0.044	0.048	0.016	0.034	0.033	0.025

Note: Standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Source: Chinese Family Panel Studies 2010.