



Ratniece, L. & L. P. Nielsen (2016)

The Cohorts of Convergence? Danish Women and the Changing Paradigm of Women's Labor Market Participation

in G. Ritschard & M. Studer (eds), Proceedings of the International Conference on Sequence Analysis and Related Methods, Lausanne, June 8-10, 2016, pp 645-692.





Unil UNIL | Université de Lausanne Institut des sciences sociales

The Cohorts of Convergence?

Danish Women and the Changing Paradigm of Women's Labour Market Participation

Luize Ratniece^a and Lisbeth Palmhoej Nielsen^{b.}

^aUniversitat Pompeu Fabra, ^bSFI - The Danish National Centre for Social Research

Abstract: Cohorts born during the 1940s have been the ones identified as breaking the middle-class ideal of separation of gendered work spheres and the following cohorts have been gradually converging towards their male peers. This article explores labour market trajectories of the cohorts of women who spearheaded the switch towards an uninterrupted presence in the Danish labour market. The extent and conditions of gender convergence in the Danish labour market for the 1941-1980 cohorts is assessed via sequence and regression analysis on Danish register data. The novelty of this article lies in a longitudinal approach that includes the intensity of the labour market attachment as a key aspect of analysis. The results indicate that the gender convergence when it comes to work regime is still incomplete. The divide between public and private sector work is an essential aspect that genders the labour force during the time span examined.

Key words: Gender revolution, gender gap, female labour market participation, Denmark.

Acknowledgements: We thank SFI for data access and methodological support, and Gøsta Esping-Andersen, Clara Cortina Trilla, Elisabeth Kraus and Alessandro Di Nallo for valuable inputs. This research has been possible thanks to the ERC Advanced grant *Stratified Family Dynamics: Polarizing Trends in Couple Behaviour and Parenting* (PI: Gøsta Esping-Andersen).

1 Introduction

The interest in the gendered patterns of labour market attachment and success has been stirring the social science research for decades. The explanations for women's attachment to the labour market are more complex than those used for a masculinized workforce (Goldin 1990; Blau et al 1998). We now have the opportunity to map out the breathtaking advancement that women have made (Blau et al 1998; Goldin 2006; Coontz 2011) which is a continuous puzzle about the absence of full gender convergence in labour market and income trajectories (Gerson 2009, 2011; England 2010, 2011; Goldin 2014). An overview of the current literature reveals complex interactions that link personal preferences and structural constraints.

This paper explores the gender differences in labour market trajectories that are still present even in one of the pioneer countries of gender revolution. Denmark has undoubtedly been at the forefront of the gender revolution, encompassing profound changes both at the labour market and at the reproductive work (Esping-Andersen 2009 [2013], Esping-Andersen et al 2013), which makes it a case of great interest for anybody wishing to explore the process of women becoming intensely attached to the labour market and men starting to pick up their fair share of house and care work. According to the most of the common indicators of formal gender equality (such as the Gender Equality Index (UNDP 2015) or labour market participation rates (OECD Statistics 2016)), the Danish society seems very close to a complete gender convergence.

Yet despite the high participation rates and an early attitudinal shift towards gender egalitarianism (Jensen and Rathlev 2010), the Danish labour market is highly segregated by gender (Esping-Andersen 1993, Leth-Sorensen and Rohwer 2001, Statistics Denmark 2015). Women typically congregate in the public sector as care workers. Hence, we explore the extent of convergence of the labour market trajectories and closure of the gender gap in Danish labour market across a set of key cohorts. Examining the years during which care work passed from the private to the public sphere via increased gender egalitarianism and the advances of the Welfare State (Hernes 1987, Jensen and Rathlev 2010), we expect to map the gender revolution in the Danish labour market by comparing older Danish cohorts to younger cohorts.

There are three aspects of the methodical design of this analysis that contributes to the existing literature on how women construct their careers. The first one is choosing to compare women with their male peers. While throughout the years the labour market trajectories of men have served as the benchmark for women's achievements (Moen & Roehling 2005), in only a few cases men are explicitly assumed to be the counterfactuals of women. More often women have been compared among themselves, emphasizing the differences between the married and unmarried, and women with and without children. The strategy of comparing women to their male peers has been applied for the highly educated (for example, Goldin 2014), but not that often across all social classes. Taking into account

that during the time period of interest also male labour market trajectories have changed towards less labour market attachment (mostly due to education expansion and earlier retirement (Leth-Sorensen and Rohwer 2001, Jensen and Rathlev 2010), this approach permits to avoid comparison with an ideal-typical male trajectory and do it with actual data instead.

The second contribution is that the use of longitudinal data. Such design ensures the capacity to analyze the working lives as a dynamic phenomenon, capturing the key moments of labour market trajectories with greater precision than any cross-sectional data ever could. The female labour market revolution is a relatively recent phenomenon, even in the countries, such as Denmark, that were among first to shift from women holding jobs to women having careers, also known as the quiet revolution (Goldin 2006). Due to the short time spell, longitudinal research on full labour market trajectories is becoming possible just now as the cohorts who pioneered the massive incorporation in the formal labour market reach the retirement age (see, for example, García-Manglano 2014).

The third contribution stems from the comparison of key cohorts, hence following the gradual change of milieu in the population and convergence in labour market outcomes for men and women. This is only possible, because we have access to the best available dataset containing very detailed, longitudinal data on labour market experiences of Danes on an individual level. The Danish registry data cover the period from 1986 till 2011. A large representative sample is drawn from these population data and sequence analysis followed by regression analysis is applied to assess the extent and conditions of gender convergence in labour market trajectories of Danish women throughout the years observed.

The rest of this paper is structured in the following way. Section two offers an overview of the state of art regarding longitudinal analysis of women's labour market participation with a special focus of their relevance for Denmark. In section three we describe the data and the analytical methods we use. Section four contains all the empirical results, while section five discusses them. Conclusions and ideas for future development of this research question can be found in section six.

2 Background and relevance

In the West it has been taken as a given that women have some labour market experience, at least throughout the second half of 20th century (Goldin 1990, Blau et al 1998, Cooke 2011, Coontz 2011). Women are expected to enter the labour market before even considering the possibilities of opting out of it. The great majority of people with no labour market experience are among the youth who are yet to enter in the labour market.

The framing of paid work done by women has evolved. Participation rates have been rising up till the 1990s (Goldin 2006, 2014), especially for married women and women with young children (Cooke 2011). Also the significance of women's paid work has changed. The idea of jobs that would sustain one until marriage, or help family budget in case of occasional need (Warren & Warren Tyagi 2004) has been replaced with that of careers,

bringing about more purposeful investment in human capital and establishment of a professional identity (Goldin 2006). And, while this change has been more obvious for highly educated women, Rubin (1994) observe a very similar discourse among the working class women who do paid work primarily because of the economic need. Therefore, the notion of having a career is used in its widest meaning. It implies an ongoing attachment to the labour market and the very idea that doing paid work is most likely not a transitory phase in a woman's life (Goldin 2006).

This shift from jobs to career has been named *the quiet revolution* by Claudia Goldin (2006). For her the quietness of this change stems from the fact that it was not primarily driven by a discourse of labour market participation as an emancipatory practice in the battle for gender equality. Instead, it was a response to changes in patterns in union formation and fertility (such as reliable contraceptives and high divorce rates) and labour market characteristics (such as growth in administrative, service or institutionalized care jobs, and improvements in working hours and conditions). The trend towards convergence in women's labour market trajectories that Goldin observes in the US starting from the 1970s is a change due to exogenous reasons. "As opposed to the noisy revolution [Civil Rights movement, anti-war protests, women's liberation], the quiet revolution was accomplished by many who were unaware that they were part of a grand transformation. They were the unwitting foot soldiers of an upheaval that would alter women's employment, education, and family" (Goldin 2006: 32-33). Therefore asking if one has ever worked for pay is not that relevant anymore.

After observing this shift from framing the female employment as jobs to that of careers (Goldin 2006), the question is about the what extent that attachment women have to the labour market are now equaling that of men. The research interest now lies in the characteristics of women's careers. It is the entry and exit points, interruptions, length of the trajectories, intensity of dedication, professional growth during the years of attachment to the labour market that are the variables of interest. In some contexts the change towards the notion of career has effectively been labeled as the masculinization of women's life course (Esping-Andersen 2009 [2013]).

It has been recognized that this revolution has its own steps that depend on the labour market context: participation that goes from (1) working at certain life stages to working throughout life, especially the reproductive years, (2) part time to full time work, (3) work in feminized sectors to dissipation of the notion of feminized/masculinized sectors. Each country that has undergone the transition towards a more gender equal labour force has had its own unique mixture of these aspects.

Depending on the socio-cultural context and historical contingencies, the patterns of participation vary a lot across countries. While most women in Scandinavia are attached to the labour market throughout their lives), the women in the US are obliged to decide between full attachment or exit from the labour market (Pfau-Effinger 2004, Goldin 2006, Esping-Andersen 2009 [2013], Cooke 2011). At the same time women in the UK

experience a bimodal distribution of attitudes towards labour market participation and attachment to it (Hakim 1996). In Germany women tend to opt for part-time work instead of full time attachment once they form a family, and in the Netherlands women seem to be moving away from housewifery followed by part-time pattern towards their own quiet revolution where the new ideal might be dual earner couples where both partners work part-time (Pfau-Effinger 2004).

Even among the vanguard countries of female employment a complete convergence with men is closer in some countries than in others. The female labour force participation in Finland was 0.96 of that of male participation rate in 2013. Norway, Iceland, Sweden and Denmark all had ratios above 0.9. It was 0.85 in the US, and 0.78 was the average for all the OECD countries (OECD 2016). These numbers signifies the fast pace of female convergence since the quiet revolution that changed the way how women relate to the labour market (Goldin 2006). For example, the ratio of the Civilian labour force participation rates in the US labour force for those over 16 was 0.39 in 1950, 0.54 in 1970, 0.75 in 1990 and 0.82 in 2010 (US Department of Labour 2015). At the same time an inquiry about the failure to achieve a complete convergence is also possible (Williams 1999; Stone 2007; Gerson 2009, 2010; Cha 2010, 2013; Goldin 2014; Pedulla & Thébaud 2015). The pay gap – the other star indicator of women's progress in paid work – is experiencing exactly the same dynamics. The gap has been closing consistently if looking at the nation-wide averages while maintaining pockets of yawning gaps in certain professions (Goldin 2014).

Recognizing that the change in women's labour market attachment was the first step in the revolution, we focus on that. Figure 1 shows the labour market participation rates of women and men in different age groups from 1940 to 2010's. The graph clearly shows that women in all age groups have increased their labour market participation from below 40 per cent to more than 80 per cent. Yet part-time work is still rather prominent for Danish women, despite the fact that hour-wise these are typically "long part-time hours" (Blossfeld and Drobnič 2001b). It is not the almost half of all working women that it was in the 1970s (Bonke 1997) - and still is in Germany and Austria, and to a greater extent in Netherlands and Switzerland (Eurostat 2016) – but it ought to have an impact on the overall labour market outcomes for Danish women. While the impact should not be as severe as for typical British, Dutch or German women (Hakim 1996, Esping-Andersen 2009 [2013]), it is still a prominent gendered difference in the Danish labour market.

The time of the great advancement in women's labour market attachment is meshed with several other phenomena: the overheating of the Danish economy in the early 70's (Esping-Andersen 1990 [1991]: 170-173, Koch-Nielsen 1998) and the preference to incentivize the labour market participation of women instead of inviting foreign guest-workers (Esping-Andersen 1990 [1991]: 173, Lewis 1992, Koch-Nielsen 1998, Jensen and Rathlev 2010), as well as the rise of the consumer culture and subsequent demand for 1.5 or 2 salaries per household (Koch-Nielsen 1998, Warren and Warren Tyagi 2004).



Figure 1: Changes in the rates of active population in Denmark between 1940 and 2014 between ages 15 and 64 by gender. Source for data until 1983: Bonke (1997). The values for women in 1950 are imputed due to missing data and the age groups used there are wider than in the OECD data. Source for data starting from 1983: OECD Statistics (2016).

At the same time, the understanding of what constitutes a standard work week has changed. Since the early 1990s, normal weekly hours of 37 and overtime premiums have been established through collective bargaining (OECD 1998, Lee 2004), a change that started with the Metal Working Industry Agreement and later spread to other sectors. While this change has made shorter hours the mode of the duration of a full-time work-week (Bishop 2004, Lee 2004), in early 2000s almost a third of the men and 10 per cent of the women employed reported having a work-week over 40 hours (Bishop 2004).

The care work was crowded out by the welfare state and is now taken care of mainly by women employed by the public administration (Jensen and Rathlev 2010) in a very formalized way (Jensen et al 2010, Jensen and Rathlev 2010, Pfau-Effinger et al 2010), hence there was no obvious need for changing the care work patterns inside the families (Blossfeld and Drobnič 2001b). The ideal-typical model of the Danish family is having two breadwinners and the state serves as the major care-provider (Esping-Andersen 1999, Jensen et al 2010, Jensen and Rathlev 2010, Pfau-Effinger et al 2010). An example of this ideal is reflected in the parental-leave policies. In comparison with Norway and Sweden that have had generous maternity-leave arrangements since the early 1960s, Denmark has

opted for using public childcare instead. The relatively short maternity leave coupled with a high coverage by public day-care institutions "helps to preserve women's close contact with the labour market and their human capital investments during maternity" (Jensen and Rathlev 2010: 46).

Aligned to this is also the tax system. There is no fiscal incentive for the breadwinnerhomemaker model from the highly individualized Danish taxing system (Blossfeld and Drobnič 2001b, Leth-Sorensen and Rohwer 2001), as having two incomes does not undermine the benefits and tax returns, and high income earners pay a larger share of their income than low income earners. The expansion of the Danish welfare state has created a virtuous loop of public employment for women, boosting the participation rates. In the late 1990s, 30 per cent of all employees worked in the public sector, and almost 45 per cent of all employed women (Leth-Sorensen and Rohwer 2001, Statistics Denmark 2015).

While Danish women have partly overcome the part-time hurdle and the country is characterized by an early attitudinal shift towards gender egalitarianism (Jensen and Rathlev 2010), Denmark at the same time has a highly gender segregated labour market, both sectorial and occupational (Esping-Andersen 1993). Even more, at least back in the 1990s some would confirm that,

Although [Denmark and Sweden] have proactively tried to integrate married women with children in the labour force via full-time work, reduced full-time work, and part-time work, 'the wife's role as a supplementary worker has hardly changed' (Bernhardt 1993). It is generally acknowledged that Scandinavian women are less dependent on their husbands or partners in financial terms than women in many other Western European countries, but they, by and large, still suppress their own long-term job opportunities, earning profiles, and other job-related interests when they raise young children. (Blossfeld and Drobnič 2001a: 7)

The more recent work suggests that Denmark has undergone a full gender revolution in intra-couple behaviour since then (Esping-Andersen [2009] 2013, Esping-Andersen et al 2013), converging in the amount of housework done. Yet the tensions between careers and family life described are at recent if not present and have been a reality for many of the women who are still active in the labour market.

We set up three hypotheses that we test empirically:

Hypothesis 1: The labour market trajectories are not gender-neutral, but a gradual convergence is observable across the birth cohorts. It is expected that the regression analysis will confirm the hypothesis that the extent to which gender is a strong predictor of a labor market attachment-based cluster membership is fading out with subsequent birth cohorts (Han and Moen 2001).

Hypothesis 2: Women with higher education credentials are more likely to have trajectories closer to those typical of men. It has been established that one of the most important predictors of labour market attachment is larger investment in education (Han and Moen 2001, Goldin 2014). In previous Swedish research the authors found that higher education for women reduce risks of labour market exits, increase the likelihood of reentries and speeds up the return (Henz and Sundstrom 2001). For Denmark it has been found that less education is linked to higher risk of experiencing unemployment and exiting form the labour market (Leth-Sorensen and Rohwer 2001). Despite the educational expansion that has taken place across the cohorts of our interest, we expect that there will be differentiation by education level in all birth cohorts.

Hypothesis 3: For women the presence of young children in the family has a much stronger impact on work trajectories than for men and are more likely to be towards less intense labor market attachment (Blossfeld and Drobnič 2001a). A major hindrance to career success for women is children, both for those that exit the labour market and those that return (Stone 2007, Cooke 2014). Previous results suggest that – while the institutional framework mediates the intensity of the effect – even in the most family-friendly national contexts there are significant effects (Aisenbrey et al 2009). In Sweden, having small children increases the likelihood of part-time work and labour market exits of women (Henz and Sundstrom 2001). Also for Denmark, having children have been found to decrease the likelihood of uninterrupted presence in the labour market for women (Leth-Sorensen and Rohwer 2001). For older cohorts in the US, Han and Moen (2001) found that strong labour market attachment for women even precluded stable unions and vice versa, while it did not impact the labour market trajectories of men (2001).

In light of the move towards more gender-egalitarian patterns of sharing the care work at home (Esping-Andersen et al 2013), we expect to observe a gradual change across the cohorts. We expect that the labour market trajectories of younger Danish women will be less negatively affected by parenthood, while men's will begin to experience a negative impact similar to that of women. Among older cohorts we foresee a bimodal tendency. Only women with significant human capital, or in urgent need of resources, will adopt a fully attached working life whereas men's labour market trajectories are not expected to be sorted by union or fertility events.

3 Data and Methods

The optimal data for an analysis that is able to assess a full labour market trajectory are those covering the whole life course and at the same time containing a wealth of additional information. Cross-sectional data would offer only a glimpse at an individual's connection to the labour market instead, as proposed, to examine the complete development of women's careers. Previous research has found women's labour market trajectories to be dynamic to an extent that preferences stated early in life, or even behavior at some point, hold little prediction value over the later life course (Gerson 1985; Hakim 2002; García-Manglano 2014).

The Danish register data maintained by Statistics Denmark permits to carry out a longitudinal research design. The unique datasets follows the entire population since the mid-1980s and contain individual, yearly, greatly detailed information on, among other variables, labour market participation (For a more detailed description see, for example,

Leth-Sorensen and Rohwer 2001). In comparison to the second-best data which would be longitudinal panels, register data offer more precision due to the fact that the data are not self-reported, why we avoid attrition problems. Because the data are not retrospective, we also avoid recall bias. The drawback from the register data is that there is no information on attitudes or interpretations of the behaviors, such as the reasons behind retreat from the labour market or choice of work sector. Furthermore, the fact that the work with these sensitive data has to occur on the Statistics Denmark servers, the computational capacity required for the chosen methodology obliges us to select a smaller random sample to work with instead of the entire population of birth cohorts of interest. The final sample is still a large sample though, of 10.000 observations per subsample.

Aiming at analyzing only the complete labour market trajectories of women born in 1940s and after, there are very few cohorts available for such research design. The literature agrees that the quiet revolution in the US started with women born during the 1940s (Gerson 1985; Goldin 2006; Coontz 2011; García-Manglano 2014), which was also true for Denmark (Koch-Nielsen 1998, Blossfeld and Drobnič 2001b, Henz and Sundstrom. 2001, Pfau-Effinger 2005). Therefore, it is reasonable to take these cohorts as the baseline for the evolution of the women's labour market trajectories in the last decades of the 20th century, and then follow the subsequent cohorts.

Due to data limitations, we are unable to work with full labour market trajectories, as the 1940's birth cohorts entered in the labour market in the late 1950s and early 1960s when the registers were not yet set up. Additionally, some of the younger cohorts that are currently still in the labour market are only half-way through, hence their full labour market trajectories are not available either. The register data available allows us to observe 26 consecutive years between 1986 and 2011. In order to work with sequences meaningful to our research question the final sample is restricted to individuals who immigrated in Denmark no later than 1998 and individuals who died *after* 1999, assuring that they have been "present" for at least half of the observed years. Individuals with missing data on labour market attachment (most probably due to having spent time abroad) have been excluded. Individuals are included in analysis from the moment that the individuals are 17 years old, due to the fact that late teens are the years when divergence among labour market trajectories start.

Due to data limitations, until 1994 it's impossible to distinguish the type of paid work that the person observed is engaged in. Only from then on we are able to distinguish between employment in public or private sector, part-time work and full-time work. Despite the fact that until then the only labour market dynamic observable is being in paid work versus different reasons for being out of it, we opt to include these years in our analysis. For the oldest cohort – the most affected by this limitation – it is still analytically interesting to look at the dichotomy between paid work and absence from the labour market, even if there are no other details available. Recognizing that we work with a complex dataset where the variables of interest reflect both cohort and period effects, we work with four separate segments of the sample. We end up with four subsamples of the birth cohorts grouped as follows: (1) those born in 1941-1950, (2) 1951-1960, (3) 1961-1970, and (4) 1971-1980. For the sake of simplicity from now on we will be referring to these groups as "birth cohorts".

For each of the cohorts there is a common chunk of 17 (fifteen for the youngest cohort) years observed for all subsamples, and we choose to expand it including all the available data (see table 1). While accepting that the results will be based on fewer cohorts on the tails of the sequences, this approach allows us to make the most of the available observed years and achieve an almost full vision of the adult lives of the three older birth cohorts.

| | Total age range observed | The common age range | Number of common observed years for all observations | Number of observed years for each observation |
|-----------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|--|---|
| 1941-1950 | 36-70 | 45-61 | 17 | 26 |
| 1951-1960 | 26-60 | 35-51 | 17 | 26 |
| 1961-1970 | 17-50 | 25-41 | 17 | 25 |
| 1971-1980 | 17-40 | 17-31 | 15 | 15 |

Table 1: The age ranges observed for each of the birth cohorts.

As the literature has shown (Gerson 1985; Hakim 1996, 2002; Stone 2007; García-Manglano 2014), there is a lot of change during the life course and a lot of heterogeneity among women. To carry out this research design, the method of choice has to be one that maintains the complexity of trajectories in a longitudinal analysis (Widmer & Ritschard 2009; Barban 2011). As much of the sociological thinking explains phenomena as sequences and interactions, it makes sense to work with a method that addresses that directly (Abbott 1995). It also has to be a method that is able to capture the patterns behind the sequences (Abbott 1995). Sequence analysis permits all of this (Abbott 1995; Abbott & Tsy 2000; Billari 2001; Aassve et al 2007; Widmer & Ritschard 2009; Barban 2011; Barban & Billari). Sequence analysis is especially relevant for analyzing life courses, as it captures the complex lives of people as heterogeneous sequences in different states (Billari 2001). Aassve, Billari & Piccarreta (2007) have carried out a similar design to ours for the trajectories of women in the UK, finding the method fruitful and the results relatively easy to interpret.

Sequence analysis serves as a purely descriptive technique, permitting the construction of whole sequence of diverse events without any assumption about them (Abbott & Tsay 2000). We use it to create two longitudinal trajectories (R Development Core Team 2011, Gabadinho et al 2009, 2011), one of labour market related activity and the other of household composition. The Labour market sequence includes the relationship with the labour market, the intensity of that attachment if the individual is working and, for the specific case we are analyzing, if the paid work is carried out in the private or public sector.

There are 12 possible sequence states: (1) working full-time in the public sector, (2) working full-time in the private sector, (3) working part-time in the public sector, (4) working part-time in the private sector, (5) working but with further details unknown (this is the state for everybody working until 1994 due to data limitations, see above for explanation), (6) being on a leave (sick, maternity, sabbatical, etc), (7) being unemployed, (8) being in school, (9) being out of the labor market (retired or otherwise not active), (10) dead, (11) not yet in Denmark (for those who immigrate during the observed period), and (12) missing due to data limitations regarding the years observed.

The Household sequence captures partnership status and number of children under 18 in the household. The register data permits to include all couples that are sharing a dwelling, be they married or cohabiting. The importance of cohabiting in Scandinavia (Bracher and Santow 1998, Henz and Sundstrom 2001, Leth-Sorensen and Rohwer 2001) makes sharing a dwelling more appropriate than using civil status. The only care aspect included is the number of children. Taking into account the fact that Danish families have a relatively small care burden due to the high levels of formalized care by the welfare state (Jensen and Rathlev 2010), the number of children raised in the household is the most straightforward and common stratifier of amount of care demanded from a person. There are 11 sequence states of household composition: (1) living with parents, (2) single, (3) living with a partner, (4) single with a child, (5) in a union with a child, (6) single with two children, (7) in a union with two children, (8) single with three or more children, (9) in a union with three or more children, (10) unknown (implies exit from the sample mostly due to death), (11) missing due to data limitations regarding the years observed.

First we provide a description of the typical activity in the labour market and household composition trajectories at the observed ages for each of the birth cohorts. We cluster each of our subsamples according to the most common trajectories (Studer 2013). Across the four cohorts, the optimal number of clusters for the Labour market sequence is three, though there are slight differences due to the different age spans we are observing for each cohort. For the same reason the number of clusters for Household sequence varies for each cohort. Once the clusters are created, we explore the correlation between the two sets of clusters for each cohort descriptively and apply regression analysis to examine the variables that predict cluster membership.

In the following we first provide a description of the typical work and family trajectories at the observed ages for each of the birth cohorts, and the way those two trajectories correlate. Second, we assess to what extent the Labour market cluster membership is predicted by gender and Household cluster membership.

The key results of the regression analysis (See tables 6-9 in the Annex) is the predicted margins of the likelihood of the Household cluster membership depending on the effects of the three-way interaction among gender, education level, and Household cluster membership. These are presented in the graphical form in the Results section below (Figures 18-29).

4 Results

4.1 The 1941-1950 Birth Cohorts and Labour Market

The years between 1986 and 2011 for the 1941-1950 birth cohorts, observed between ages 36 and 70, are dominated by paid market work and gradual move into retirement. The patterns observed in the figure 2 confirm the gendered division between private and public sectors. It is an index plot summarizing all 10,000 sequences for this cohort. Five blue hues represent different types of paid work while a range of other colors represent the rest of states. It can be observed that the trajectories of men (left side of figure 2) are dominated by private sector jobs while those of women (right side of figure 2), especially of the older cohorts (upper part of the figure), are dominated by work in the public sector. Part time work is not randomly distributed either. It is more prevalent among women. We do not distinguish between different types of exits from the labour market, but we can observe that trajectories of women become dominated by being out of the labour market sooner than those of men.

The most typical trajectories confirm the gendered differences in exit from the labour market and in the likelihood of working in either the private or public sector. These are the 20 most common trajectories, covering 14% of all male trajectories and 10% of all female. There is a total 6608 unique sequences in this birth cohort. The elevated number is partly due to the unequal length of the observed sequences, partly due to the heterogeneity of the population. Yet it is clear that for a Danish man born in the 1940s the typical trajectory has been to work continuously and mostly (while not exclusively) in the private sector, followed by retirement from the labour market in their sixties or later. The most typical women's trajectories range between continuous paid work and permanent absence from the labour market. Work in the public sector dominates the trajectories of women participating in the labour market. Retirement among those is experienced earlier than among their male counterparts working in the private sector, and is common already in their fifties.

The mean years spent in each state is another way of observing the same divisions in the labour market. The great heterogeneity among the observations is confirmed by the fact that in no state, any of the genders spend more than ten years on average. Paid work in all its different modalities dominates the trajectories, followed by having exited from the labour market. Men spend more years in paid work (in all work categories together) than women, while women are the ones spending more years out of the labour market. Also evident is the gendered differences between public and private sectors and part-time and full-time work. While all categories are present in the sample, it is clear that the auxiliary categories of being on a leave, unemployed, in education, already dead and not yet in Denmark, only unemployment has a significant appearance among average years spent in different states.

As specified above, deaths and arrivals to Denmark have been censored, while being in education and on leave are not states relevant to this birth cohort.

Division in clusters reveal divisions created along the lines of trajectories dominated by private or public sector work for clusters 1 and 2, and between continuous labour market attachment (clusters 1 and 2) and a less typical cluster that gathers trajectories marked by absence from the labour market and early retirement, unemployment and part-time work. 38 per cent of the sample is sorted in the first cluster, 32 in the second one, and 30 per cent in the third. Taking into account that this is the birth cohort that we observe entering into retirement, the elevated "population" of the third, marginal, cluster is not surprising.



| 🔲 WOFPub 🗖 WOPPriv | UNE UNE | 🗖 DEA |
|---|---------|-----------|
| 🗖 WOFPriv 🗖 WOna | 🗖 SCH | 🗖 NOT |
| WOFPub WOPPriv WOFPriv WOna WOPPub LEA | 🗆 ООТ | 🗆 missing |

Fig. 2: Labour market sequence full-sequence index plots for the 1941-1950 birth cohorts.



Fig.3: State distribution plots by Labour market cluster for the 1941-1950 birth cohort.

4.2 The 1941-1950 Birth Cohorts and Household Composition

Though the heterogeneity of the trajectories is high (7460 unique sequences, the twenty most common cover 9 per cent of male trajectories and 8 per cent of female), when it comes to the household composition at these ages, we mainly observe the process of "emptying the nest" (see figure 4). Most households start with having children under 18 living with them and then move towards living with their partner or alone.

According to the mean years at each state, men and women follow similar dynamics of mostly spending these years with their partners. One of the visible gendered differences is that women on average spend more time being unpartnered but with a child, confirmation that single mothers are more common than single fathers. Yet men on average spend more time with a partnered household maintaining two or more minors.

Clustering divides the sample in two (see figure 5). Cluster 1 is dominated by singlehood and cluster 2 – by being in a partnership. The great majority of the population (78 per cent) is sorted into the cluster of being in a partnership.



| □ WPar □ 00 □ 10 | □ 01 □ 11 □ 02 | ■ 12 ■ 03+ ■ 13+ | □ Unk □ missing |
|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------|
|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------|

Fig. 4: Household sequence full-sequence index plots for the 1941-1950 birth cohort.



Fig.5: State distribution plots by Household cluster for the 1941-1950 birth cohort.

4.3 The 1941-1950 Birth Cohorts' Labour Market Activity and Households

The two cluster memberships are not homogeneous across each other (See Table 2). The majority of the sample is people whose trajectories are dominated by being in a union during the time span observed, 78 per cent of men and 77 per cent of women are sorted in the Union cluster. The Labour market cluster membership is not gender neutral, though. Most men (52 per cent) belong to the cluster characterized by full-time private sector employment, and the rest is evenly divided between full-time public sector work and absent-intermittent trajectories. The proportion of private sector cluster members is even bigger among the men from the Union cluster (56 per cent). Yet among the members of the household cluster characterized by singlehood, the most numerous group is that of Absence-intermittence – grouping together labour market absentees and retirees – members (44 per cent).

Women of this birth cohort are mostly members of Public sector and Absenceintermittence cluster (39 and 37 per cent respectively), while only a quarter belong to the Private sector cluster, the most common among men. The distribution of Labour market cluster membership among women from the Union cluster mirrors that of the total sample. But women with trajectories dominated by singlehood follow a similar pattern than the men from that cluster. Those single tend to be also the ones belonging to the Absenceintermittence cluster (44 per cent), followed by the full time cluster characteristics to one's gender (38 per cent of women in the Public sector and 37 per cent of men in the Private sector). This initially counterintuitive finding is in line with previous findings of Leth-Sorensen and Rohwer (2001) linking lack of success at the labour market for men with decreased likelihood of having experienced fatherhood.

 Table 2: A contingency table between Labour market and Household clusters for the 1941-1950 birth cohort.

| | | | | Household clusters | | | | | |
|--------|-----------|--------------------------|------------|--------------------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|
| | | | | C1 | C2 | | C1 | C2 | |
| | | | | Single | Union | Total | Single | Union | Total |
| | | | | Men | Men | Men | Women | Women | Women |
| | | | | (22) | (78) | (100) | (23) | (77) | (100) |
| | t | s | C1 Private | 37 | 56 | 52 | 18 | 26 | 25 |
| Labour | market | clusters | C2 Public | 19 | 26 | 24 | 38 | 39 | 39 |
| Ľ | La clu | C3 Absence-Intermittence | 44 | 18 | 24 | 44 | 34 | 37 | |
| - | | | | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Items may not sum exact 100 due to rounding.

4.4 The 1951-1960 Birth Cohorts and Labour Market

The age range observed of those born between years 1951-1960 is 26-50. While their trajectories are peppered with part-timing, schooling, leaves, unemployment and exits, for both men and women they are dominated by full-time work (figure 6).

An inspection of the most common trajectories confirms the predominance of uninterrupted work. Covering 28 per cent of men and 21 per cent of women in the sample (from a total of 6687 unique sequences), it also reiterates the gendered division between public and private employment. While the division is not exclusive, of course, it's much more common for women to work in the public sector than it is for men. The mean years spent in each state illustrate the dominance of paid work. The gendered differences are largely the same as in the oldest birth cohort. Women do more public sector work and more part time work. They are also spending more time out of the labour market and on leaves.

The clustering of this birth cohort follows the same logic as with those born between 1941-1950, yet the proportions of cluster membership are different (figure 7). Cluster one – dominated by private sector employment – include 47 per cent of the sample. Cluster two - dominated by the public sector employment – covers 39 per cent. The Absence-intermittence cluster becomes a residual cluster (14 per cent) of trajectories vaguely attached to the labour market and marked part-time work, leaves, unemployment and absence from the labour market.



Fig. 6: Labour market sequence full-sequence index plots for the 1951-1960 birth cohort.



Fig.7: State distribution plots by Labour market cluster for the 1951-1960 birth cohort.

4.5 The 1951-1960 Birth Cohorts and Household Composition

Between their late twenties and early fifties those born between 1951 and 1960 have lived through a great variety of family arrangements (figure 8).. There are 8726 unique sequences, and the 20 most common cover only 7 per cent of sequences for men and 4 per cent for women. While most of the sequences are dominated by living with a partner, there are periods of singlehood both at the beginning and the end of the trajectories.

The mean number of years spent in each state reveals the diversity of states. None average above seven years yet it is distributed among having had a differing number of children inside a partnership. The observable gendered differences are that men have been somewhat more likely to live with their parents while among women there is greater prevalence of single parenthood.

The clustering of the family trajectories is done based on the same logic as that of the oldest birth cohort. Cluster 1 separates the trajectories dominated by singlehood (20 per cent of the sample), and cluster 2 to 4 sort people according to the number of children in the household during most of the time span observed (figure 9). Cluster 2 gathers the childless and those with one child (26 per cent). Cluster 3 gathers those who have mostly had two children (37 per cent), and Cluster 4 is for partnerships that have been living with three or more minors under their roof (16 per cent).



| WPar 01 00 11 10 02 | ■ 12 ■ 03+ ■ 13+ | □ Unk □ missing |
|---|------------------------|--------------------|
|---|------------------------|--------------------|

Fig. 8: Household sequence full-sequence index plots for the 1951-1960 birth cohort.



Fig.9: State distribution plots by Household cluster for the 1951-1960 birth cohort.

4.6 The 1951-1960 Birth Cohorts' Labour Market Activity and Households

When it comes to the burden of care work, most of the people during this period have had a household with two or more minors (See Table 3). 36 per cent of men belong to the cluster 3, characterized by households that have had two children, and additional 16 per cent belong to the cluster 4, implying having raised 3 or more children. For women the respective percentages are 38 and 17. Yet Household clusters seem to be loosely connected with the Labour market cluster membership. Across all Household clusters, the most common Labour market cluster for men is the one dominated by full-time employment in the private sector (ranging from 47 to 66 per cent) and the most common Labour market cluster for women is the one dominated by full-time public sector work (40 to 57 per cent of all women in the sample). It is true, though, that public-sector cluster membership is more common among women with the most care burden, and so it is also among men. 30 per cent of the Household cluster 4 members form part of the Public-sector Labour market cluster.

 Table 3: A contingency table between Labour market and Household clusters for the 1951-1960 birth cohort.

| | Household clusters | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------|------|---------|---------|---------|-------|--|
| | | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | | |
| | | | Union 1 | Union 2 | Union 3 | Total | |
| | | Men | Men | Men | Men | Men | |
| | | (25) | (23) | (36) | (16) | (100) | |
| | C1 Private | 47 | 67 | 66 | 63 | 61 | |
| Labour market clusters | C2 Public | 22 | 26 | 30 | 30 | 27 | |
| La mi clu | C3 Absence-Intermittence | 30 | 7 | 4 | 7 | 12 | |
| | | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | |

| | | | | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | |
|--------|----------|----------------------|------------|--------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| | | | | Single | Union 1 | Union 2 | Union 3 | Total |
| | | | | Women | Women | Women | Women | Women |
| | | | | (16) | (30) | (38) | (17) | (100) |
| | | | C1 Private | 24 | 35 | 37 | 26 | 33 |
| Labour | market | clusters | C2 Public | 40 | 50 | 55 | 57 | 51 |
| La | La mí | C3 Retired, marginal | 36 | 15 | 7 | 18 | 16 | |
| | | | | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Items may not sum exact 100 due to rounding.

4.7 The 1961-1970 Birth Cohorts and Labour Market

The Labour market sequences for those born between 1961 and 1970 (observed between 17 and 50 years) reveal entrance in the labour market and strong attachment to it (figure 10). Yet there is a lot of variance (8089 unique sequences, the twenty most common covering 19 per cent of men and 9 per cent of women).

Analysis of the most common sequences show that for both men and women the most common has been to work full time in the private sector. Public sector work has been, however, more common among women than men also during the observed years of this birth cohort. The so far marginal categories of education, unemployment of leaves appear for the first time in the most common trajectories. Yet leaves – most probably maternity – appears only for women and unemployment only for men.

Nevertheless, the mean amount of years spent in each state show that men and women have spent on average the same years in unemployment while women have had more time on leaves. The gendered differences by sector show that women on average have spent only slightly more years in private sector than in the public while men have spent significantly more in the private sector.

The clustering logic for the Labour market sequences is the same as with the previous birth cohorts (See figure 11). Cluster 1 includes trajectories dominated by private sector work and covers 57 per cent of the sample. Cluster 2 is driven by trajectories dominated by public sector work (32 per cent). And Cluster 3 – of trajectories marked by part-time work, unemployment and absence – is of 11 per cent of the sample.



| WOFPub | WOPPriv | UNE | DEA |
|---------|------------------------|-----|---------|
| WOFPriv | WOna | SCH | NOT |
| WOPPub | WOPPriv WOna LEA | OUT | missing |

Fig. 10: Labour market sequence full-sequence index plots for the 1961-1970 birth cohort.



Fig. 11: State distribution plots by Labour market cluster for the 1961-1970 birth cohort.

4.8 The 1961-1970 Birth Cohorts and Household Composition

The 1961-1970 birth cohorts are observed during the process of emancipation and family formation (ages 17-50) (figure 12). Most start out from the household of their parents, and, following a spell of singlehood, form unions, have children, and see even their own children leaving the nest. The sequences observed are very heterogeneous. There are 9553 unique sequences, and the twenty most common sequences cover only 3 per cent for men and 2 per cent of the women in sample.

The diversity of household arrangements for this birth cohort is clear when analyzing the number of mean years spent in each state. On average, men have spent most of the time being single, followed by being in a partnership and raising a child. The state that the average woman has spent most years is being in a partnership and raising a child. Most significant gendered differences are observed when it comes to emancipation and single parenthood. On average, men have spent more time living with their parents while women have spent more time being a single parent.

The clustering of the family trajectories follows the logic of the family trajectories of the birth cohorts described above (Figure 13). Cluster 1 encompasses trajectories dominated by singlehood and, differently from the previous ones, late emancipation from the parental home (30 per cent of the sample). Cluster 2 gathers trajectories dominated by having one or

two children in a partnered household (47 per cent). Cluster 3 covers households that have had three or more children (23 per cent).



| 1 0 | 02 | ■ 13+ | |
|------------|----|-------|--|
| | | | |

Fig. 12: Household sequence full-sequence index plots for the 1961-1970 birth cohort.



Fig. 13: State distribution plots by Household cluster for the 1961-1970 birth cohort.

4.9 The 1961-1970 Birth Cohorts' Labour Market Activity and Households

In this birth cohort the care burden of women does differentiate the Labour market cluster membership (See Table 4). Among all women the most common (46 per cent) is Labour market Public sector cluster membership, followed by the Private sector cluster membership (42 per cent). When analyzed by the care burden, only those with the least care burden (Single Household cluster) are more likely to find themselves in the Private sector Labour market cluster (44 per cent), followed by the Public sector cluster membership (36 per cent). This dynamic is also observed on the other end of the care burden spectrum. Most women (52 per cent) that have raised three or more children form part of the Public sector Labour market cluster.

Among men Private sector Labour market cluster membership is the case for most of the sample, going up to 80 per cent for up to two children households. Absence-intermittence Labour market cluster membership is negligible for men with care burden.

 Table 4: A contingency table between Labour market and Household clusters for the 1961-1970 birth cohort.

| | | | Household clusters | | | | | | |
|--------|-----------|----------|--------------------------|---------|---------|-------|-------|--|--|
| | | | | C1 | C2 | C3 | | | |
| | | | Single | Union 1 | Union 2 | Total | | | |
| | | | | Men | Men | Men | Men | | |
| | | | | (39) | (41) | (20) | (100) | | |
| | | s | C1 Private | 62 | 80 | 77 | 72 | | |
| Labour | market | clusters | C2 Public | 19 | 17 | 17 | 18 | | |
| Ľ | La clu | clı | C3 Absence-Intermittence | 20 | 2 | 7 | 10 | | |
| | | | | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | | |

| | | C1 | C2 | C3 | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| | | Single | Union 1 | Union 2 | Total |
| | | Women | Women | Women | Women |
| | | (21) | (54) | (25) | (100) |
| r r s | C1 Private | 44 | 46 | 32 | 42 |
| Labour market clusters | C2 Public | 36 | 47 | 52 | 46 |
| ch n Ľ | C3 Absence-Intermittence | 21 | 8 | 15 | 13 |
| | | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Items may not sum exact 100 due to rounding.

4.10 The 1971-1980 Birth Cohorts and Labour Market

The youngest cohort (1971-1980) – observed between the ages of 17 and 40 – are seen during their formative years and entrance in the labour market. As seen in figure 14, their

trajectories start by either work or being in education and then develop into attachment to the labour market.

The twenty most common sequences (out of 9083 unique sequences) cover 9 per cent of men and 3 per cent of women. The most typical ones for both men and women is continuous work in the private sector. Nevertheless, due to the fact that for most of this birth cohort data on full or part time work is available from the very beginning of the trajectory, we can appreciate the importance of part-time work in the private sector as a strategy to enter in the labour market. Also education appears in the most typical sequences and – only for women – full time work in public sector.

Only in this birth cohort the mean number of years spent working full-time in the private sector during the observed period is higher than work in the public sector for both men and women. Yet the difference between the two genders is striking, because for women, as observed above, work in the public sector is still much more common.

Also for the youngest birth cohort the Labour market cluster solution is one of three clusters (See Figure 15). Private sector cluster (57 per cent of the sample) gathers trajectories dominated by full- and part-time work in the private sector. Public sector cluster (37 per cent of the sample) covers trajectories of full-time public sector works, part-time work in both sectors and somewhat more education. The Absence-intermittence cluster (11 per cent) is dominated by absence from the labour market and unemployment while none of the paid work modalities is salient.



Fig. 14: Labour market sequence full-sequence index plots for the 1971-1980 birth cohort.



Fig. 15: State distribution plots by Labour market cluster for the 1971-1980 birth cohort.

4.11 The 1971-1980 Birth Cohorts and Household Composition

When it comes to household composition sequences, the 1971-1980 birth cohorts so far have emancipated from the parental households and, mostly after spells of singlehood, have formed unions and had children (figure 16). This transition has not been uniform, though. There are 9328 distinct sequences and the twenty most common cover 3 per cent of male trajectories and 2 per cent of female trajectories.

This diversity is reflected by the mean years spent in each state. Only being single for men surpass an average of five years. For men, the following largest on average spells have been spent at the parental home and in union without children. For women, the three states with largest on average spells are the same but in the following order: being single, in union with no children, and in the parental home.

As with the other birth cohorts, the clustering of household sequences separates singles and those in union (figure 17). Here the Singlehood cluster is dominated by trajectories with long spells of singlehood after emancipation and late, if any, union formation. It covers 36 per cent of the sample. The Early unions cluster gathers individuals whose emancipation from the parental home was very soon followed by union formation and childbearing (64 per cent of the sample).



| □ WPar □ 00 □ 10 | 01 | 1 2 | 🗆 Unk |
|------------------------|------|------------|-------|
| 00 | 🗖 11 | 🗖 03+ | |
| 1 0 | 02 | 🗖 13+ | |

Fig. 16: Household sequence full-sequence index plots for the 1971-1980 birth cohort.



Fig. 17: State distribution plots by Household cluster for the 1971-1980 birth cohort.

4.12 The 1971-1980 Birth Cohorts' Labour Market Activities and Households

Among the youngest birth cohorts there are no big differences in Labour market cluster membership patterns between those entering in unions early (Household cluster 2) or delaying them (Household cluster 1) (Table 5). Most men belong to the Private sector Labour market cluster, although more so those that have established early unions than those who have enjoyed a longer spell of singlehood (79 and 64 per cent respectively). Women are divided between the Private sector and Public sector Labour market clusters, with slightly more being members of the Labour market cluster dominated by work in the public sector than in the private (43 vs. 39 per cent of the Singles and 46 vs. 43 per cent of the Early unions). As with the other birth cohorts, the Absence-intermittence cluster membership is correlated with being in the Household cluster dominated by singlehood.

 Table 5: A contingency table between Labour market and Household clusters for the 1971-1980 birth cohort.

| | | | | Household clusters | | | | | |
|--------|--------|----------|--------------------------|--------------------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|
| | | | | C1 | C2 | | C1 | C2 | |
| | | | | Single | Union | Total | Single | Union | Total |
| | | | | Men | Men | Men | Women | Women | Women |
| | | | | (46) | (54) | (100) | (26) | (74) | (100) |
| Labour | | clusters | C1 Private | 64 | 79 | 73 | 39 | 43 | 42 |
| | market | | C2 Public | 19 | 17 | 18 | 43 | 46 | 45 |
| | m | | C3 Absence-Intermittence | 17 | 3 | 9 | 18 | 11 | 13 |
| | | | | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Items may not sum exact 100 due to rounding.

4.13 Regression Outcomes for the 1941-1950 Birth Cohorts

Among those in the Single Household cluster, men of all levels of education are more likely than women to be in the Private sector Labour market cluster (figure 18). Among those in the Union Household cluster, men with only secondary education or less are the ones most likely to find themselves in the Private sector Labour market cluster, followed by men with post-secondary education and then men with tertiary education. Women with postsecondary and tertiary education who are in union are the ones least likely to be in the Private sector Labour market cluster. This likelihood is not significantly different between





Fig. 18: Predictive margins of the Household cluster, gender and education level interaction for the Private sector Labour market cluster, birth cohort 1941-1950.

The "profile" that is the most likely to find themselves in the Public sector Labour market cluster almost mirrors that of the Private sector Labour market cluster. Those most likely to be in the Public sector cluster are women with post-secondary and tertiary education, both single and in union (figure 19). The difference is that they are followed by men with post-secondary and tertiary education. Those least likely to be in this Labour market cluster are men and women with least education, both single and in unions.

Altogether those in the Single Household cluster are more likely to form part of the Retired-Absence Labour market cluster (figure 20). Among the singles, it's men and women with the least education that are the ones most likely to find themselves in this Labour market cluster. In the Union Household cluster, it's only the least educated women who are the ones clearly most likely to be in the Retirement-Absence cluster. There are no significant differences among the rest of gender/education groups.



Fig. 19: Predictive margins of the Household cluster, gender and education level interaction for the Public sector Labour market cluster, birth cohort 1941-1950.



Fig. 20: Predictive margins of the Household cluster, gender and education level interaction for the Absence-Intermittence Labour market cluster, birth cohort 1941-1950

4.14 Regression Outcomes for the 1951-1960 Birth Cohorts

The characteristics that make one likely to be in the Private sector Labour market cluster are similar to that of the previous birth cohort (figure 21). There is some variance, though, in the correlation between the unions and care burden experienced during the observed years. The differences are insignificantly small among the Single Household cluster members. However, in the Union clusters men with least education are the ones most likely to find themselves in the Private sector Labour market cluster. Women with little education have similar likelihood than men with post-secondary and tertiary education. Irrespective of the care burden, women with more education are the ones least likely to form part of the Private sector Labour market cluster.



Fig. 21: Predictive margins of the Household cluster, gender and education level interaction for the Private sector Labour market cluster, birth cohort 1951-1960.

Women with post-secondary and tertiary education are the ones most likely to find themselves in the Public sector Labour market cluster, especially so the ones with postsecondary education (figure 22). And here increase in care burden at home raises the likelihood of membership in this cluster. This dynamic is also true for women with less education, but the probabilities are significantly lower, lower than those of post-secondary and tertiary educated men. The gender/education group least likely to be part of the Public sector Labour market cluster is men with secondary education or less. However, for men there is no clear pattern linking care burden and Labour market cluster.

The pattern for the likely Retirement-Absence Labour market cluster membership in these cohorts is very similar – if only clearer – to that of the previous one (figure 23). Women with little education across the different household structures are the ones most

likely to find themselves in this cluster. However, it is especially the single ones – as are single little-educated men and the rest of the gender/education groups, but to a much smaller extent – that are the ones most likely to be in the Retirement-Absence Labour market cluster.



Fig. 22: Predictive margins of the Household cluster, gender and education level interaction for the Public sector Labour market cluster, birth cohort 1951-1960.



Fig. 23: Predictive margins of the Household cluster, gender and education level interaction for the Absence-Intermittence Labour market cluster, birth cohort 1951-1960.

4.15 Regression Outcomes for the 1961-1970 Birth Cohorts

The predicted probabilities for the Private sector Labour market cluster membership in the 1961-1970 birth cohorts reveal differential patterns by care burden at the household (figure 24). While ordering of the Single Household cluster members according to gender and education is rather unclear due to overlapping confidence intervals, there is a clear dispersion of probabilities for those in unions. Increased care burden clearly diminishes the likelihood that a woman with post-secondary credentials finds herself in the Private sector Labour market cluster. For other women the pattern is not that clear, while for men it's the reverse. Men of all educational levels, and especially the less educated, are more likely to be in this cluster when they have a partner and children.

As observed in the other cohorts, increased care burden for women increase the likelihood of them being in the Public sector Labour market cluster (figure 25). These increased probabilities are the most clear for women with post-secondary education or less while women with post-secondary education or more are the ones most likely to find themselves in this cluster across the Household clusters. Men with Secondary education or less are the ones least likely to be in this cluster. Among men there is little correlation between Household care burden and Labour market clusters.

As with the previous cohorts, the least educated women are the ones most likely to find themselves in the Retirement-Absence Labour market cluster (figure 26). In case of singles, it's also the case for the least educated men.



Fig. 24: Predictive margins of the Household cluster, gender and education level interaction for the Private sector Labour market cluster, birth cohort 1961-1970.



Fig. 25: Predictive margins of the Household cluster, gender and education level interaction for the Public Sector Labour market cluster, birth cohort 1961-1970.



Fig. 26: Predictive margins of the Household cluster, gender and education level interaction for the Absence-Intermittence Labour market cluster, birth cohort 1961-1970.

4.16 Regression Outcomes for the 1971-1980 Birth Cohorts

For the youngest cohort, there are few differences between the two Household clusters when it comes to likelihood of Labour market cluster membership. For the Private sector Labour market cluster, early entrance in union disperses the likelihood of membership in this Labour market cluster (figure 27). Partnered low educated men are more likely to be in the Private sector cluster than their single counterparts. And partnered women with post-secondary or tertiary education – especially the ones with post-secondary credentials - are clearly less likely to be in this cluster than less educated women or men of any educational level.

These women are much more likely to be in the Public sector Labour market cluster, the ones with post-secondary education more than tertiary educated, especially among the ones in unions (figure 28). For women of least education, being in union from early on increases the likelihood of being in this cluster, but it still below that of higher educated men. As for all other cohorts, the least educated men are the ones least likely to form part of this cluster.

Replicating the pattern described above, the least educated women are the ones most likely to find themselves in the Retirement-Absence Labour market cluster (figure 29). In case of singles, it's also the case for the least educated men. For the rest of the gender/education groups, the likelihood of being in this cluster is negligible.



Fig. 27: Predictive margins of the Household cluster, gender and education level interaction for the Private sector Labour market cluster, birth cohort 1971-1980.


Fig. 28: Predictive margins of the Household cluster, gender and education level interaction for the Public sector Labour market cluster, birth cohort 1971-1980.



Fig. 29: Predictive margins of the Household cluster, gender and education level interaction for the Absence-Intermittence Labour market cluster, birth cohort 1971-1980.

5 Discussion

According to our Hypothesis 1, we expected to find evidence of both gendered labour market participation patterns and gradual dissipation of those in the most recent birth cohorts. We do find gender to be of great importance in predicting the likelihood of being in one Labour market cluster or other. However, nothing in the analysis we have done suggests disappearance of the gendered patterns captured in this paper. For all four birth cohorts women are much more likely to be in the Labour market clusters dominated by public sector work and absence/loose attachment/early retirement from the labour market. We observe that gender interacts with other variables, namely, the level of education achieved and the composition of the household. Hypothesis 1 is partly confirmed: there are important gender differences, but no sign of closing the gendered sectorial divide.

Our Hypothesis 2 predicted that higher education would increase the likelihood of more men-typical trajectories for women. In the operationalized terms of our research it would mean higher likelihood of being in the Private sector Labour market cluster. While it is true that the post-secondary educated women are the ones least likely to form part of the Private sector Labour market cluster, under none of the conditions that we have specified tertiary educated women are more likely to form part of that Labour market cluster than women with secondary education or less. Hence Hypothesis 2 is rejected while admitting that there is a non-linear pattern of linking Private sector paid work with women's education, namely that the trajectories of women with post-secondary education are the most different ones from male trajectories.

Hypothesis 3 was formulated to capture the impact of the care burden of the family life. We expected to find that having been in a partnership and having raised more children during the observed years would decrease the likelihood of women to have a male-typical career, i.e. form part of the Private sector Labour market cluster. However, across the four birth cohorts we find no evidence that the least care burden – singlehood – increases the likelihood of being in the Private sector Labour market cluster or that having raised more children increases the likelihood of Absence-intermittence Labour market cluster membership. It is true, though, that Public sector Labour market cluster seem to be the refuge for women with higher care burden, especially among the birth cohorts of 1951-1960 and 1961-1970.

Only among the women with least education (and in the three older cohorts only) we actually observe that partnership and children tend to increase the likelihood of being in the Private sector Labour market cluster.

Only in one instance we find such dynamic for men. Among those born in 1951-1960, increased care burden does raise the likelihood of Public sector Labour market cluster membership for men with post-secondary education. For the rest of cohort/education groups of men a pattern of increased likelihood of Private sector Labour market cluster membership is observed. Hence Hypothesis 3 is partly confirmed: women's Labour market

cluster membership is more impacted by the household care burden than men's yet there is no sign of a generational change of this pattern across the cohorts observed.

6 Conclusions and future research ideas

These findings allow us to conclude that the four cohorts we are observing have gone through similar dynamics during this time window. Women with post-secondary or higher education credentials tend to reconciliate their care burden with paid work via public sector employment while for men unions and children have been a correlate for more private sector work. Both men and women with secondary education or less rely heavily on the private sector work that offers more opportunities for people for scarce educational credentials.

Despite the methodological limitations for overarching conclusions, the analysis carried out confirms the partiality of the apparent gender egalitarianism of the Danish labour market. While the strong labour-market attachment of Danish women is very clear, so is the fact that at least so far they have tended to build their careers in the more sheltered public sector. We find that more education - especially the post-secondary education that is not yet tertiary - make it more likely for them to find a position in this more familyfriendly part of the economy. The most important finding is that across the years we observe all four cohorts follow the same pattern of clustering around the same three modes of relating with the labor market. Curiously enough, only one of the two key stratifiers of the work regime introduced in the analysis (the part-time/full-time division and public sector/private sector division) drives the clustering. While the distribution of part-time work is clearly gendered, it is not a salient part of the trajectories except for the youngest cohort where it is common to use part-time to reconciliate work with studies. The preliminary conclusion with the data available is that, while a significant part of women are working part-time at any given moment in time, it serves as a transitory phase and women do not tend to stay in it. Our analysis so far permits us to conclude that gender convergence in the Danish labor market is at the point where both men and women work full-time for most of their lives and the major stratifier by gender is the sector of the economy. At least so far this difference does not show clear signs of disappearing with the most recent cohorts.

These data offer a rich material for further exploration and analysis. At the moment we are considering several options. One would be more detailed analysis of the characteristics of the gender-outliers, i.e. women that pursue a private-sector career, men that opt for public-sector work, and the extent to which the two profiles are similar.

Onother path could be a reduced research design option that would allow to disentangle cohort and period effects would be to analyze only (a) trajectories between ages 25-34 comparing cohorts 1961-1977, (b) trajectories between ages 35-44 comparing cohorts 1951-1967, and (c) trajectories between ages 45-54 comparing cohorts 1941-1957.

Nevertheless, that would imply working with significantly reduced sequences, passing from the minimum sequence length of 15 years and maximum of 26 to a uniform trajectory length of 10 years. This design would also allow to use the transversal entropy (Billari 2001, Widmer and Ritschard 2009) as an alternative dependent variable able to measure the dissolving of the male breadwinner pattern into a range of diverse arrangements of reconciling paid work and family.

An alternative clustering of Household trajectories, forming them around theoretically reasoned ideal-typical paths (Elzinga and Liefbroer 2007) could enrich our understanding of household composition. Such approach would permit a clearer interpretation of the Household cluster membership and probably a more intuitive division too.

A way to add precision to the Labour market sequence could be a multichannel sequence analysis design that would add income to the Labour market-intensity sequence (Gauthier et al 2010). There is little doubt that income potential is a powerful stratifier of labour market trajectories (Henz and Sundstrom 2001), hence there are probably additional layer of complexity – except for the partial effect that we are capturing via education credentials – which we are not currently taking into account.

Another design change could be one that analyzes together the parallel trajectories of couples. An analysis of the intertwined trajectories of the unions would allow a more precise assessment of the complex interdependencies of the three careers of each couple (Han and Moen 2001), their "linked lives" (Elder): the two individual ones and the common (Hertz 1986, Reichart et al 2007, Gerson 2011). This is a feat that few data sets allow (Han and Moen 2001) to do but the Danish Register data offer an opportunity to fully track all the partners that a person has shared a household in Denmark with (Leth-Sorensen and Rohwer 2001).

7 References

- Aassve, Arnstein, Francesco C. Billari, and Raffaella Piccarreta. 2007. "Strings of Adulthood: A Sequence Analysis of Young British Women's Work- Family Trajectories." *European Journal of Population*, 23 (3-4): 369–88.
- Abbott, Andrew. 1995. "Sequence Analysis: New Methods for Old Ideas." *Annual Review* of Sociology, 21: 93–113.
- Abbott, Andrew, and Angela Tsay. 2000. "Sequence Analysis and Optimal Matching Methods in Sociology: Review and Prospect." Sociological Methods & Research, 29 (1): 3–33.
- Aisenbrey, Silke and Anette E. Fasang. 2014. "Work-Family Trajectories in Germany and the United States." Paper presented at the 2014 Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America.
- Barban, Nicola. 2011. "Family Trajectories and Health: A Life Course Perspective." Milan: Dondena working papers, 39.
- Barban, Nicola and Francesco C. Billari. 2012. "Classifying Life Course Trajectories: A Comparison of Latent Class and Sequence Analysis." *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 61 (5): 765–84.
- Bernhardt, Eva M. 1993. "Fertility and Employment." *European Sociological Review*, 9(1): 25-42.
- Billari, Francesco C. 2001. "Sequence Analysis in Demographic Research." *Canadian Studies in Population*, 28 (2): 439-458.
- Bishop, Kate. 2004. "Working Time Patterns in the UK, France, Denmark and Sweden." *Labor Market Trends*, March 2004, 113-122. London: Office for National Statistics.
- Blau, Francine D, Marianne A Ferber and Anne. E. Winkler. 1998. The Economics of Women, Men, and Work. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Blossfeld, Hans-Peter, and Sonja Drobnič. 2001a. "A Cross National Comparative Approach to Couples' Careers." In Blossfeld, Hans-Peter, and Sonja Drobnič, (eds.). 2001. Careers of Couples in Contemporary Society: From Male Breadwinner to Dual-Earner Families. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Blossfeld, Hans-Peter, and Sonja Drobnič. 2001b. "Theoretical Perspectives on Couples' Careers." In Blossfeld, Hans-Peter, and Sonja Drobnič, (eds.). 2001. Careers of Couples in Contemporary Society: From Male Breadwinner to Dual-Earner Families. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bonke, Jens (ed.). 1997. Levevilkår i Danmark: Statistik Oversigt 1997. Copenhagen: Danmarks Statistik and Socialforksningsinstituttet.
- Bracher, Michael, and Gigi Santow. 1998. "Economic Independence and Union Formation in Sweden." *Population Studies*, 52(3): 275-294.

- Cha, Youngjoo. 2010. "Reinforcing Separate Spheres: The Effect of Spousal Overwork on the Employment of Men and Women in Dual-Earner Households." *American Sociological Review*, 75(2): 303–329.
- Cha, Youngjoo. 2013. "Overwork and the Persistence of Gender Segregation in Occupations." *Gender & Society*, 27(2): 158–184.
- Cooke, Lynn Prince. 2014. "Gendered Parenthood Penalties and Premiums across the Earnings Distribution in Australia, the United Kingdom, and the United States." *European Sociological Review*, 30 (3): 360–372.
- Coontz, Stephanie. 2011. A Strange Stirring: The Feminine Mystique and American Women at the Dawn of the 1960's. New York: Basic Books.
- Elder, Glen H. 1994 "Time, human agency, and social change: Perspectives on the life course." *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 1994: 4-15.
- Elzinga, Cees H., and Aart C. Liefbroer. 2007. "De-Standardization of Family-Life Trajectories of Young Adults: A Cross-National Comparison Using Sequence Analysis." European Journal of Population 23 (3-4): 225–50.
- England, Paula. 2010. "The Gender Revolution: Uneven and Stalled." *Gender & Society*, 24, Vol. 2: 149–166.
- England, Paula. 2011. "Reassessing the uneven gender revolution and its slowdown." Gender & Society, 25, Vol. 1: 113–123.
- Esping-Andersen, Gøsta. 1990 [1991]. *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Esping-Andersen, Gøsta. 1993. Changing Classes: Stratification and Mobility in Post-Industrial Societies. London: Sage.
- Esping-Andersen, Gøsta. 1999. Social Foundations of Postindustrial Economies. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Esping-Andersen, Gøsta. 2009 [2013]. The Incomplete Revolution: Adapting to Women's New Roles. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Esping-Andersen, Gøsta, Diederik Boertien, Jens Bonke, and Pablo Gracia. 2013. "Couple Specialization in Multiple Equilibria." *European Sociological Review* 29 (6): 1280–94.
- Eurostat. 2016. Labour Force Survey: Persons Employed Part-time. Retrieved on April 18, 2016 from http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/lfs/data/main-tables.
- Gabadinho, Alexis, Gilbert Ritschard, Matthias Studer and Nicholas S. Muller. 2009. "Mining Sequence Data in R with the TraMineR Package: A User's Guide." Technical report, Department of Econometrics and Laboratory of Demography, University of Geneva, Geneva.
- Gabadinho, Alexis, Gilbert Ritschard, Nicolas S. Muller, and Matthias Studer. 2011. "Analyzing and Visualizing State Sequences in R with TraMineR." Journal of Statistical Software 40 (4): 1–37.

- García-Manglano, Javier. 2014. "The Life-Course Employment Profiles of Early Baby-Boom Women: A Group-Based Trajectory Analysis." Paper presented at the Population Association of America 2014 Annual Meeting in Boston, MA (May 1-3).
- Gauthier, Jacques-Antoine, Eric D. Widmer, Philipp Bucher and Cédric Notredame. 2010.
 "Multichannel sequence analysis applied to social science data." *Sociological Methodology*, 40(1): 1–38.
- Gerson, Kathleen. 1985. Hard Choices: How Women decide about Work, Career, and Motherhood. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Gerson, Kathleen. 2009. "Falling Back on Plan B: The Children of the Gender Revolution Face Uncharted Territory." In B. J. Risman (Ed.), *Families as They Really Are* (pp. 379–392). New York: Norton.
- Gerson, Kathleen. 2011. The Unfinished Revolution: How a New Generation Is Reshaping Family, Work, and Gender in America. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Goldin, Claudia. 1990. Understanding the Gender Gap: An Economic History of American Women. New York / Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goldin, Claudia. 2006. "The Quiet Revolution that Transformed Women's Employment, Education, and Family." *American Economic Review*, 96(2): 1–21.
- Goldin, Claudia. 2014. "A Grand Gender Convergence: Its Last Chapter." American Economic Review, 104(4): 1091–1119.
- Hakim, Catherine. 1996. Key Issues in Women's Work: Female heterogeneity and the polarization of women's employment. London: The Athlone Press.
- Hakim, Catherine. 2002. "Lifestyle Preferences as Determinants of Women's Differentiated Labor Market Careers". Work and Occupations, Vol. 29, No. 4: 428-459.
- Han, Shin-Kap, and Phyllis Moen. 2001. "Coupled Careers: Pathways Through Work and Marriage in the United States." In Blossfeld, Hans-Peter, and Sonja Drobnič, (eds.).
 2001. Careers of Couples in Contemporary Society: From Male Breadwinner to Dual-Earner Families. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Henz, Ursula, and Marianne Sundstrom. 2001. "Earnings as a Force of Attraction and Specialization in Sweden." In Blossfeld, Hans-Peter, and Sonja Drobnič, (eds.). 2001. Careers of Couples in Contemporary Society: From Male Breadwinner to Dual-Earner Families. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hernes, Helga Maria. 1987. Welfare State and Woman Power: Essays in State Feminism. Oslo: Norwegian University Press.
- Hertz, Rosanna. 1986. More Equal than Others: Women and Men in Dual-Career Marriages. Berkeley / Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Jensen, Per H., Birgit Pfau-Effinger, and Lluís Flaquer. 2010. "The Development of Informal Work-Welfare Arrangements of European Societies." In Pfau-Effinger, Birgit, Lluis Flaquer and Per H. Jensen (eds.) Formal and Informal Work: The Hidden Work Regime in Europe. New York / London: Routledge.

- Jensen, Per H. and Jakob Rathlev. 2010. "Formal and Informal Work in the Danish Social Democratic Welfare State." In Pfau-Effinger, Birgit, Lluis Flaquer and Per H. Jensen (eds.) Formal and Informal Work: The Hidden Work Regime in Europe. New York / London: Routledge.
- Koch-Nielsen, Inger. 1998. "The Roots of Equal Opportunity in the Family." In Ludvigsen, Peter and Lone Palm Larsen (eds.) *The People's Century*. Copenhagen: Arbejdermuseet and ABA.
- Lee, Sangheon. 2004. "Working-hour Gaps: Trends and Issues." 29-59. In Messenger, Jon C. (ed.). 2004. Working Time and Workers' Preferences in Industrialized Countries: Finding the Balance. New York / London: Routledge.
- Leth-Sorensen, Soren, and Gotz Rohwer. 2001. "Work Careers of Married Women in Denmark." In Blossfeld, Hans-Peter, and Sonja Drobnič, (eds.). 2001. Careers of Couples in Contemporary Society: From Male Breadwinner to Dual-Earner Families. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lewis, Jane. 1992. "Gender and the Development of Welfare Regimes." Journal of European Social Policy, 2 (3): 159–73.
- Moen, Phyllis and Patricia Roehling. 2005. *The Career Mystique: Cracks in the American Dream*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- OECD. 1998. OECD Employment Outlook 1998. Paris / Danver, MA: OECD.
- OECD Statistics. 2016. *Labour Force Statistics: Labour Force Participation Rate*. Retrieved on April 14, 2016 from http://stats.oecd.org.
- Pedulla, David S. and Sarah Thébaud. 2015. "Can We Finish the Revolution? Gender, Work-Family Ideals, and Institutional Constraint." *American Sociological Review*, 80, No 1, 116–139.
- Pfau-Effinger, Brigit. 2004. Development of Culture, Welfare States and Women's Employment in Europe. Hants, England: Ashgate Publishing.
- Pfau-Effinger, Birgit. 2005. "Development paths of care arrangements in the framework of family values and welfare values." In Pfau-Effinger, Birgit and Birgit Geissler (eds.) *Care and Social Integration in European Societies*. Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Pfau-Effinger, Birgit, Per H. Jensen, and Lluís Flaquer. 2010. "Formal and Informal Work in European Societies: A Comparative PersepctiveNo Title." In Pfau-Effinger, Birgit, Lluis Flaquer and Per H. Jensen (eds.) Formal and Informal Work: The Hidden Work Regime in Europe. New York / London: Routledge.
- R Development Core Team (2011). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. ISBN 3-900051-07-0.
- Reichart, Elisabeth, Noelle Chesley, and Phyllis Moen. 2007. "The End of the Career Mystique?" Zeitschrift für Familienforschung, 19 Jahrh, Heft 3/2007: 337-370.
- Rubin, Lillian. 1994. Families on the fault line. New York: Harper Collins.

- Statistics Denmark. 2015. Statistical Yearbook 2015. Copenhagen: Statistics Denmark. Retrieved on May 24, 2016 from www.dst.dk/yearbook.
- Stone, Pamela. 2007. *Opting Out? Why Women Really Quit Careers and Head Home*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Studer, Matthias. 2013. "WeightedCluster Library Manual: A practical guide to creating typologies of trajectories in the social sciences with R". LIVES Working Papers, 24.
- UNDP. 2015. Gender Inequality Index (GII). Retrieved on May 24, 2016 from http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/gender-inequality-index-gii
- US Department of Labor 2016. "Labor Force Statistics from the Current Population Survey: Access to historical data series by subject." Retrieved on April 22, 2016 from http://www.bls.gov/cps/cps/dbtabs.html.
- Warren, Elizabeth, and Amelia Warren Tyagi. 2004. *The Two-Income Trap: Why Middle-Class Parents are Going Broke*. New York: Basic Books.
- Widmer, Eric. D., and Gilbert Ritschard. 2009. "The de-Standardization of the Life Course: Are Men and Women Equal?" *Advances in Life Course Research*, 14 (1-2): 28– 39.
- Williams, Joan C. 1999. Unbending Gender: Why Family and Work Conflict and What to Do about It. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

8 Annex

| | Specification without interaction Specification with interaction | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| | Public sector Labour market cluster | Absence- Intermittence Labour market cluster | Public sector Labour market cluster | Absence- Intermittence Labour market cluster |
| Gender: Woman | 1.344*** | 1.325*** | 0.910*** | 0.544 |
| (Ref: Man) | (0.05) | (0.06) | (0.27) | (0.43) |
| Year of birth | -0.0575*** | -0.317*** | -0.0587*** | -0.324*** |
| | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) |
| Immigration background: 1st or 2nd gen. | 0.382** | 1.332*** | 0.384** | 1.366*** |
| (Ref: None) | (0.15) | (0.13) | (0.15) | (0.13) |
| Household cluster: Single | 0.356*** | 1.089*** | 0.214 | 1.557*** |
| (Ref: Union) | (0.07) | (0.07) | (0.11) | (0.09) |
| Education: Post-secondary | 1.216*** | -0.397*** | 1.022*** | -0.546*** |
| (Ref: Secondary or less) | (0.07) | (0.09) | (0.10) | (0.15) |
| Education: Tertiary | 1.477*** | -0.251 | 1.511*** | 0.0428 |
| (Ref: Secondary or less) | (0.11) | (0.15) | (0.14) | (0.21) |
| Single#Woman#Post-secondary | | | 0.815* | 0.447 |
| | | | (0.37) | (0.53) |
| Single#Woman#Tertiary | | | 0.125 | -0.402 |
| | | | (0.47) | (0.60) |
| Constant | 110.8*** | 615.9*** | 113.0*** | 629.4*** |
| | (18.90) | (20.34) | (18.99) | (20.55) |
| Number of observations | | 10000 | | 10000 |
| pseudo R2 | | 0.144 | | 0.149 |

Table 6: Multinomial regression output for 1941-1950 birth cohorts(DV reference category: Private sector Labour market cluster).

Standard errors indicated in parentheses. * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001

. . Table 7: Multinomial regression output for 1951-1960 birth cohorts

(DV reference category: Private sector Labour market cluster).

| | Specification without interaction | | Specification | n with interaction |
|---------------|---|---|--|---|
| | Public sector Labour market cluster | Absence- Intermittence Labour market cluster | Public sector Labour market cluster | Absence- Intermittence Labour market cluster |
| Gender: Woman | 1.289*** | 1.259*** | 0.961* | -14.14 |
| (Ref: Man) | (0.05) | (0.07) | (0.39) | (1004.7) |

| Year of birth | -0.0727*** | -0.0673*** | -0.0735*** | -0.0707*** |
|--|-----------------|------------|---------------------|------------|
| | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) |
| Termientien beskennigt 1st en 2nd een | 0 151 | 1.573*** | 0 151 | 1.575*** |
| Immigration background: 1st or 2nd gen. (Ref: None) | 0.151 (0.11) | (0.11) | 0.151 (0.12) | (0.11) |
| | (0.11) | (0.11) | (0.12) | (0.11) |
| Education: Post-secondary | 1.449*** | -0.639*** | 1.423*** | -0.123 |
| (Ref: Secondary or less) | (0.06) | (0.12) | (0.13) | (0.39) |
| | 1 20(*** | 0.021*** | 1 270*** | 0.016 |
| Education: Tertiary | 1.306*** | -0.831*** | 1.379*** | -0.216 |
| (Ref: Secondary or less) | (0.09) | (0.20) | (0.18) | (0.53) |
| Household cluster: Single | 0.140* | 2.111*** | 0.234* | 2.380*** |
| (Ref: Union 2) | (0.07) | (0.09) | (0.11) | (0.15) |
| Household cluster: Union 1 | -0.0771 | 0.429*** | -0.108 | 0.419* |
| | | | | |
| (Ref: Union 2) | (0.06) | (0.10) | (0.11) | (0.18) |
| Household cluster: Union 3+ | 0.193** | 0.728*** | 0.0951 | 0.647*** |
| (Ref: Union 2) | (0.07) | (0.11) | (0.12) | (0.20) |
| Sin ala #Warnan #Daat aanan dami | | | 0.152 | 14.39 |
| Single#Woman#Post-secondary | | | | |
| | | | (0.46) | (1004.7) |
| Single#Woman#Tertiary | | | -0.361 | 14.21 |
| | | | (0.48) | (1004.7) |
| Union 1#Woman#Post-secondary | | | 0.244 | 15.12 |
| Union 1# woman#Post-secondary | | | (0.43) | (1004.7) |
| | | | (0.43) | (1004.7) |
| Union 1#Woman#Tertiary | | | -0.0252 | 15.35 |
| | | | (0.46) | (1004.7) |
| Union 3+#Woman#Post-secondary | | | 0.626 | 14.73 |
| Union 3+# Woman#1 Ost-secondary | | | (0.43) | (1004.7) |
| | | | (0.43) | (1004.7) |
| Union 3+#Woman#Tertiary | | | Omitted | Omitted |
| | | | (.) | (.) |
| Constant | 141.0*** | 128.9*** | 142.5*** | 135.4*** |
| Constant | (16.62) | (22.87) | (16.72) | (23.01) |
| Number of observations | | 10000 | / | 10000 |
| pseudo R-sq | | | | |
| 11 | | | rd errors indicated | |

Standard errors indicated in parentheses. * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001

| Public sector Labour market cluster Intermittence Labour market cluster Public sector cluster Intermittence Labour market cluster Gender: Woman (Ref: Man) 1.482*** 1.182*** 1.137*** 13.96 (sc 2.1) Year of birth (Ref: Man) 0.0589*** 0.0444*** -0.0584*** -0.0434*** 1.001 0.011 0.011 0.011 0.011 0.011 Immigration background: 1st or 2nd gen. (Ref: None) 0.427*** 1.872*** 0.478*** 1.925*** Education: Post-secondary (Ref: Secondary or less) 0.060 0.011 0.011 0.013 Education: Tertiary (Ref: Secondary or less) 0.069 0.0145 1.308*** -1.308*** -1.378 (ref: Secondary or less) Household cluster: Single (Ref: Union 1) 0.069 0.019 0.17 0.0212 -14.48 (0.34) 0.0212 -14.48 (ref: Union 1) 0.0212 -14.48 (ref: Union 1) 0.060 0.019 0.011 0.017 Household cluster: Union 1 0.066 0.019 0.011 0.017 0.218*** 1.4st3h3#1.gend#1.educate -4.48 -0.702 -0.886 (rd; 2) <th></th> <th>Specification</th> <th>without interaction</th> <th>Specification</th> <th>with interaction</th> | | Specification | without interaction | Specification | with interaction |
|--|--|---------------|---------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Labour market cluster Cluster Cluster <thcluster< th=""> Cluster Clu</thcluster<> | | | Absence- | * | Absence- |
| Image: cluster cluster cluster cluster cluster Gender: Woman 1.482*** 1.182*** 1.137*** 1.33.96 (Ref: Man) (0.05) (0.07) (0.28) (502.1) Year of birth -0.0589*** -0.0444*** -0.0584*** -0.0434*** 10001 (0.01) (0.01) (0.01) (0.01) (0.01) Immigration background: 1st or 2nd gen. 0.427*** 1.872*** 0.478*** 1.925*** (Ref: None) (0.11) (0.11) (0.11) (0.11) (0.11) Education: Post-secondary 1.289*** -1.195*** 1.018*** -0.703 (Ref: Secondary or less) (0.06) (0.14) (0.14) (0.53) Education: Tertiary 1.06*** -1.296*** 1.308*** 2.518*** (Ref: Secondary or less) (0.08) (0.19) (0.17) (0.21) Household cluster: Single 0.145* 1.857*** 0.389*** 2.518*** (Ref: Union 1) (0.06) (0.09) (0.11) | | | | | Intermittence |
| $ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | | | | | |
| $ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | C t We see | | | | |
| Year of birth -0.0589^{***} -0.0444^{***} -0.0584^{***} -0.044^{***} Immigration background: 1st or 2nd gen. (0.427^{***}) 1.872^{***} 0.478^{***} 1.925^{***} Immigration background: 1st or 2nd gen. (0.427^{***}) 1.872^{***} 0.478^{***} 1.925^{***} Immigration background: 1st or 2nd gen. (0.427^{***}) 1.872^{***} 0.478^{***} 1.925^{***} Immigration background: 1st or 2nd gen. (0.427^{***}) 1.872^{***} 0.478^{***} 1.925^{***} Identities in the interval of the interva | | | | | |
| Immigration background: 1st or 2nd gen. (Ref: None) 0.427*** 1.872*** 0.478*** 1.925*** Immigration background: 1st or 2nd gen. (Ref: None) 0.111 (0.11) (0.11) (0.11) Education: Post-secondary (Ref: Secondary or less) 1.289*** -1.195*** 1.018*** -0.703 Kef: Secondary or less) (0.06) (0.14) (0.14) (0.53) Education: Tertiary (Ref: Secondary or less) 1.006*** -1.296*** 1.308*** -13.78 Mousehold cluster: Single (Ref: Union 1) 0.145* 1.857*** 0.389*** 2.518*** Household cluster: Union 2 (Ref: Union 1) 0.267*** 0.807*** -0.146 0.835*** I.dst3h3#1.gend#1.educate (Ref: Union 1) 0.060 (0.10) (0.15) (0.21) I.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate -0.702* -0.886 (0.29) (0.64) 3.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate -0.702* -0.886 (0.31) (502.1) 3.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate -0.702* -0.886 (0.21) (0.31) (502.1) 3.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate -0.702* -0.886 | (Ref: Man) | (0.05) | (0.07) | (0.28) | (502.1) |
| Immigration background: 1st or 2nd gen. (Ref: None) 0.427^{***} 1.872^{***} 0.478^{***} 1.925^{****} Immigration background: 1st or 2nd gen. (Ref: None) 1.289^{***} -1.195^{***} 1.018^{***} -0.703 Immigration background: 1st or 2nd gen. (Ref: Secondary or less) 1.289^{***} -1.195^{***} 1.018^{***} -0.703 Immigration background: Tertiary (Ref: Secondary or less) 1.006^{***} -1.296^{***} 1.308^{***} -13.78 Immigration background: Tertiary (Ref: Union 1) 1.006^{***} -1.296^{***} 1.308^{***} -13.78 Immigration background: Tertiary (Ref: Union 1) 0.066^{***} 0.145^{*} 1.857^{***} 0.389^{***} 2.518^{***} Household cluster: Union 2 (Ref: Union 1) 0.267^{***} 0.807^{***} -0.146 0.835^{****} I.dst3h3#1.gend#1.educate (Ref: Union 1) 0.060 (0.10) (0.15) (0.21) I.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate -0.702^{*} -0.886 (0.29) (0.64) 3.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate -0.702^{*} -0.886 (0.31) (502.1) 3.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate -0.702^{*} -0.886 (0.31) | Year of birth | -0.0589*** | -0.0444*** | -0.0584*** | -0.0434*** |
| (Ref: None) (0.11) (0.11) (0.11) (0.11) (0.11) Education: Post-secondary (Ref: Secondary or less) 1.289^{***} -1.195^{***} 1.018^{***} -0.703 Education: Tertiary (Ref: Secondary or less) (0.06) (0.14) (0.14) (0.53) Education: Tertiary (Ref: Secondary or less) 1.006^{***} -1.296^{***} 1.308^{***} -13.78 (Ref: Secondary or less) (0.08) (0.19) (0.17) (502.1) Household cluster: Single (Ref: Union 1) 0.145^{*} 1.857^{***} 0.389^{***} 2.518^{***} Household cluster: Union 2 0.267^{***} 0.807^{***} -0.146 0.835^{***} (Ref: Union 1) (0.06) (0.09) (0.11) (0.21) 1.dst3h3#1.gend#1.educate -0.702^{*} -0.886 (0.29) (0.64) 3.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate -0.702^{*} -0.886 (0.31) (502.1) 3.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate $(13.8^{***}$ 84.14^{***} 112.8^{***} 81.76^{***} (.) (.) (.) (.) (.) (.) (.) | | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) |
| (Ref: None) (0.11) (0.11) (0.11) (0.11) (0.11) Education: Post-secondary (Ref: Secondary or less) 1.289^{***} -1.195^{***} 1.018^{***} -0.703 Education: Tertiary (Ref: Secondary or less) (0.06) (0.14) (0.14) (0.53) Education: Tertiary (Ref: Secondary or less) 1.006^{***} -1.296^{***} 1.308^{***} -13.78 (Ref: Secondary or less) (0.08) (0.19) (0.17) (502.1) Household cluster: Single (Ref: Union 1) 0.145^{*} 1.857^{***} 0.389^{***} 2.518^{***} Household cluster: Union 2 0.267^{***} 0.807^{***} -0.146 0.835^{***} (Ref: Union 1) (0.06) (0.09) (0.11) (0.21) 1.dst3h3#1.gend#1.educate -0.702^{*} -0.886 (0.29) (0.64) 3.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate -0.702^{*} -0.886 (0.31) (502.1) 3.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate $(13.8^{***}$ 84.14^{***} 112.8^{***} 81.76^{***} (.) (.) (.) (.) (.) (.) (.) | Immigration background: 1st or 2nd gen | 0.427*** | 1.872*** | 0.478*** | 1.925*** |
| Education: Post-secondary (Ref: Secondary or less) 1.289^{***} -1.195^{***} 1.018^{***} -0.703 (Ref: Secondary or less) (0.06) (0.14) (0.14) (0.53) Education: Tertiary (Ref: Secondary or less) 1.006^{***} -1.296^{***} 1.308^{***} -13.78 (Ref: Secondary or less) (0.08) (0.19) (0.17) (502.1) Household cluster: Single (Ref: Union 1) 0.145^{*} 1.857^{***} 0.389^{***} 2.518^{***} Household cluster: Union 2 0.267^{***} 0.807^{***} -0.146 0.835^{***} (Ref: Union 1) (0.06) (0.10) (0.15) (0.21) 1.dst3h3#1.gend#1.educate -0.702^{*} -0.886 (0.29) (0.64) 1.dst3h3#1.gend#1.educate -0.702^{*} -0.886 (0.29) (0.64) 3.dst3h3#1.gend#1.educate 1.444^{***} -12.27 (0.31) (502.1) 3.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate $(1.38^{***}$ 84.14^{***} 112.8^{***} 81.76^{***} (Constant 113.8^{***} 84.14^{***} 112.8^{***} 81.76^{***} | | | | (0.11) | (0.11) |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | | . , | | | · · · · |
| Education: Tertiary (Ref: Secondary or less) 1.006^{***} -1.296^{***} 1.308^{***} -13.78 Household cluster: Single (Ref: Union 1) 0.08) 0.19) 0.17) (502.1) Household cluster: Union 2 (Ref: Union 1) 0.145^* 1.857^{***} 0.389^{***} 2.518^{***} Household cluster: Union 2 (Ref: Union 1) 0.267^{***} 0.807^{***} -0.146 0.835^{***} 1.dst3h3#1.gend#1.educate 0.267^{***} 0.807^{***} -0.146 0.835^{***} 1.dst3h3#1.gend#1.educate 0.0212 -14.48 (0.34) (502.1) 1.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate -0.702^* -0.886 (0.29) (0.64) 3.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate 1.444^{***} -12.27 (0.31) (502.1) 3.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate 0.0116^* 0.0116^* 0.0116^* (0.31) (502.1) 0.310 (502.1) 0.310 (502.1) 3.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate 0.0116^* 0.0116^* 0.0116^* 0.0116^* (0.1016^*) (0.1016^*) (0.1016^*) (0.1016^*) (0.1016^*) (0.1016^*) (0.1016^*) <td>Education: Post-secondary</td> <td>1.289***</td> <td>-1.195***</td> <td>1.018***</td> <td>-0.703</td> | Education: Post-secondary | 1.289*** | -1.195*** | 1.018*** | -0.703 |
| (Ref: Secondary or less) (0.08) (0.19) (0.17) (502.1) Household cluster: Single 0.145^* 1.857^{***} 0.389^{***} 2.518^{***} (Ref: Union 1) (0.06) (0.09) (0.11) (0.17) Household cluster: Union 2 0.267^{***} 0.807^{***} -0.146 0.835^{***} (Ref: Union 1) (0.06) (0.10) (0.15) (0.21) 1.dst3h3#1.gend#1.educate 0.0212 -14.48 (0.34) (502.1) 1.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate -0.702^* -0.886 (0.29) (0.64) (0.21) (0.64) 3.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate 1.444^{***} -12.27 (0.31) (502.1) (0.31) (502.1) 3.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate 0.0110^{***} $(0.29)^{**}$ $(0.29)^{*}$ (0.31) $(502.1)^{**}$ $(0.31)^{**}$ $(0.31)^{*}$ $(0.21)^{*}$ (0.31) $(502.1)^{*}$ $(0.31)^{*}$ $(0.21)^{*}$ $(0.31)^{*}$ $(0.21)^{*}$ (0.31) $(502.1)^{*}$ $(0.31)^{*}$ $(0.31)^{*}$ | (Ref: Secondary or less) | (0.06) | (0.14) | (0.14) | (0.53) |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | Education: Tertiary | 1.006*** | -1.296*** | 1.308*** | -13.78 |
| (Ref: Union 1) (0.06) (0.09) (0.11) (0.17) Household cluster: Union 2 0.267*** 0.807*** -0.146 0.835*** (Ref: Union 1) (0.06) (0.10) (0.15) (0.21) 1.dst3h3#1.gend#1.educate 0.0212 -14.48 (0.34) (502.1) 1.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate -0.702* -0.886 (0.29) (0.64) 3.dst3h3#1.gend#1.educate 11.444*** -12.27 (0.31) (502.1) 3.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate 0mitted 0.31) (502.1) 3.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate 0mitted 0.31) (502.1) Constant 113.8*** 84.14*** 112.8*** 81.76*** | | | (0.19) | (0.17) | (502.1) |
| (Ref: Union 1) (0.06) (0.09) (0.11) (0.17) Household cluster: Union 2 0.267*** 0.807*** -0.146 0.835*** (Ref: Union 1) (0.06) (0.10) (0.15) (0.21) 1.dst3h3#1.gend#1.educate 0.0212 -14.48 (0.34) (502.1) 1.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate -0.702* -0.886 (0.29) (0.64) 3.dst3h3#1.gend#1.educate 11.444*** -12.27 (0.31) (502.1) 3.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate 0mitted 0.31) (502.1) 3.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate 0mitted 0.31) (502.1) Constant 113.8*** 84.14*** 112.8*** 81.76*** | Have hald alvetan Simal | 0.145* | 1 957*** | 0.290*** | 2 5 1 9 * * * |
| Household cluster: Union 2 (Ref: Union 1) 0.267*** 0.807*** -0.146 0.835*** (Ref: Union 1) (0.06) (0.10) (0.15) (0.21) 1.dst3h3#1.gend#1.educate 0.0212 -14.48 (0.34) (502.1) 1.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate -0.702* -0.886 (0.29) (0.64) 3.dst3h3#1.gend#1.educate 1.444*** -12.27 (0.31) (502.1) 3.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate 0mitted 0.011 Constant 113.8*** 84.14*** 112.8*** 81.76*** (17.35) (24.47) (17.47) (24.53) | e | | | | |
| (Ref: Union 1) (0.06) (0.10) (0.15) (0.21) 1.dst3h3#1.gend#1.educate 0.0212 -14.48 (0.34) (502.1) 1.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate -0.702* -0.886 (0.29) (0.64) 3.dst3h3#1.gend#1.educate 11.444*** -12.27 (0.31) (502.1) 3.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate 0.011 (0.31) (502.1) 3.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate 0.011 0.011 (0.31) Constant 113.8*** 84.14*** 112.8*** 81.76*** (17.35) (24.47) (17.47) (24.53) | (Kei: Union I) | (0.06) | (0.09) | (0.11) | (0.17) |
| 1.dst3h3#1.gend#1.educate 0.0212 -14.48 (0.34) (502.1) 1.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate -0.702* -0.886 (0.29) (0.64) 3.dst3h3#1.gend#1.educate 1.444*** -12.27 (0.31) (502.1) 3.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate 0.011 (0.31) Constant 113.8*** 84.14*** 112.8*** (17.35) (24.47) (17.47) (24.53) | Household cluster: Union 2 | 0.267*** | 0.807*** | -0.146 | 0.835*** |
| 1.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate (0.34) (502.1) 1.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate -0.702* -0.886 3.dst3h3#1.gend#1.educate 1.444*** -12.27 3.dst3h3#1.gend#1.educate 1.444*** -12.27 3.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate Omitted (0.31) Constant 113.8*** 84.14*** 112.8*** (17.35) (24.47) (17.47) (24.53) | (Ref: Union 1) | (0.06) | (0.10) | (0.15) | (0.21) |
| 1.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate (0.34) (502.1) 1.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate -0.702* -0.886 3.dst3h3#1.gend#1.educate 1.444*** -12.27 3.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate 0.31) (502.1) 3.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate Omitted Omitted Constant 113.8*** 84.14*** 112.8*** (17.35) (24.47) (17.47) (24.53) | 1.dst3h3#1.gend#1.educate | | | 0.0212 | -14.48 |
| (0.29) (0.64) 3.dst3h3#1.gend#1.educate 1.444*** -12.27 (0.31) (502.1) 3.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate Omitted Constant 113.8*** 84.14*** (17.35) (24.47) (17.47) | - | | | (0.34) | (502.1) |
| (0.29) (0.64) 3.dst3h3#1.gend#1.educate 1.444*** -12.27 (0.31) (502.1) 3.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate Omitted Constant 113.8*** 84.14*** (17.35) (24.47) (17.47) | $1 det^{2}h^{2}t^{1} and^{2}h^{2}$ | | | 0 702* | 0 886 |
| 3.dst3h3#1.gend#1.educate 1.444*** -12.27 3.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate (0.31) (502.1) 3.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate Omitted (.) Constant 113.8*** 84.14*** 112.8*** 81.76*** (17.35) (24.47) (17.47) (24.53) | 1.ust5115#1.gend#2.educate | | | | |
| 3.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate (0.31) (502.1) 0mitted 0mitted (.) (.) Constant 113.8*** 84.14*** 112.8*** 81.76*** (17.35) (24.47) (17.47) (24.53) | | | | (0.29) | (0.64) |
| 3.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate Omitted Omitted Constant 113.8*** 84.14*** 112.8*** 81.76*** (17.35) (24.47) (17.47) (24.53) | 3.dst3h3#1.gend#1.educate | | | 1.444*** | -12.27 |
| Constant 113.8*** 84.14*** 112.8*** 81.76*** (17.35) (24.47) (17.47) (24.53) | | | | (0.31) | (502.1) |
| Constant 113.8*** 84.14*** 112.8*** 81.76*** (17.35) (24.47) (17.47) (24.53) | 3.dst3h3#1.gend#2.educate | | | Omitted | Omitted |
| (17.35) (24.47) (17.47) (24.53) | c | | | | (.) |
| (17.35) (24.47) (17.47) (24.53) | Constant | 113 8*** | 8/1 1/1*** | 110 8*** | 81 76*** |
| | Constant | | | | |
| | N | | | (17.47) | 10000 |
| pseudo R-sq 0.153 0.161 | | | | | 0.161 |

| Table 8: Multinomial regression output for 1961-1970 birth cohorts | |
|---|--|
| (DV reference category: Private sector Labour market cluster). | |

Standard errors indicated in parentheses. * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001

| | | Specification without interaction | | Specification with interactio | |
|------------------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| | | Public sector Labour market | Absence- Intermittence Labour market | Public sector Labour market | Absence- Intermittence Labour market |
| | | cluster | cluster | cluster | cluster |
| Gend | er: Woman | 1.414*** | 1.275*** | 0.691*** | 1.088* |
| | (Ref: Man) | (0.0526) | (0.0751) | (0.143) | (0.543) |
| Y | ear of birth | 0.0246** | -0.00229 | 0.0244** | -0.00241 |
| | | (0.00884) | (0.0122) | (0.00885) | (0.0122) |
| ration background: 1st | or 2nd gen. | 0.312** | 1.694*** | 0.328** | 1.706*** |
| (| Ref: None) | (0.117) | (0.105) | (0.119) | (0.108) |
| Education: Post | -secondary | 1.736*** | -1.537*** | 1.986*** | -0.862* |
| (Ref: Second | ary or less) | (0.0576) | (0.150) | (0.130) | (0.430) |
| Educatio | on: Tertiary | 1.567*** | -1.322*** | 2.288*** | -0.558 |
| (Ref: Second | ary or less) | (0.0682) | (0.159) | (0.140) | (0.469) |
| Household clu | ster: Single | 0.102 | 1.356*** | 0.543*** | 1.991*** |
| (F | Ref: Union) | (0.0555) | (0.0760) | (0.129) | (0.136) |
| Single#Woman#Post | -secondary | | | 0.215 | -1.046 |
| | | | | (0.241) | (0.751) |
| Single#Woman#Post | -secondary | | | -0.501* | -1.810*** |
| | | | | (0.204) | (0.479) |
| | Constant | -50.90** | 1.707 | -50.74** | 1.462 |
| | | (17.46) | (24.13) | (17.49) | (24.19) |
| | Ν | | 10000 | | 10000 |
| p | seudo R-sq | | 0.183 | | 0.190 |

| Table 9: Multinomial regression output for 1971-1980 birth cohorts | |
|--|--|
| (DV reference category: Private sector Labour market cluster). | |

Standard errors indicated in parentheses. * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001