## **Technical appendix**

Table A1. *Country codes (year in sample)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Code** | **Country** | **Code** | **Country** |
| AT | Austria (2004–2019) | IS | Iceland (2004–2013, 2017–2018) |
| BE | Belgium (2004–2019) | IT | Italy (2004–2019) |
| BG | Bulgaria (2007–2019) | LT | Lithuania (2005–2019) |
| CH | Switzerland (2007–2019) | LU | Luxembourg (2004–2019) |
| CY | Cyprus (2005–2019) | LV | Latvia (2005–2019) |
| CZ | Czech Republic (2005–2019) | NL | Netherlands (2005–2019) |
| DE | Germany (2005–2014) | NO | Norway (2004–2019) |
| DK | Denmark (2004–2019) | PL | Poland (2005–2019) |
| EE | Estonia (2004–2019) | PT | Portugal (2004–2019) |
| ES | Spain (2004–2019) | RO | Romania (2007–2019) |
| FI | Finland (2004–2019) | RS | Serbia (2013–2019) |
| FR | France (2004–2019) | SE | Sweden (2004–2019) |
| GR | Greece (2004–2019) | SI | Slovenia (2005–2013) |
| HR | Croatia (2010–2019) | SK | Slovakia (2005–2017, 2019) |
| HU | Hungary (2005–2019) | UK | United Kingdom (2005–2018) |
| IE | Ireland (2004–2019) | US | United States (2004–2017) |

Table A2. *Share of homemakers and share of women among homemakers (italics) by country*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Share homemakers |  |  | Share women among homemakers |
| Country | 2004 | 2019 |  | 2004 | 2019 |
| AT | .101 | .055 |  | .977 | .977 |
| BE | .081 | .048 |  | .973 | .924 |
| BG | .021 *b* | .038 |  | .993 *b* | 1,000 |
| CH | .133 *b* | .059 |  | .984 *b* | .968 |
| CY | .125 *a* | .076 |  | .999 *a* | .998 |
| CZ | .043 *a* |  |  | .987 *a* | .980 |
| DE | .117 *a* | .053 *e* |  | .980 *a* | .962 *e* |
| DK | .014 | .011 |  | .928 | .838 |
| EE | .061 | .045 |  | .865 | .857 |
| ES | .135 | .072 |  | .995 | .990 |
| FI | .044 | .028 |  | .876 | .944 |
| FR | .055 | .031 |  | .991 | .970 |
| GR | .162 | .113 |  | .997 | 1,000 |
| HR | .052 *c* | .048 |  | .980 *c* | .995 |
| HU | .007 *a* | .016 |  | .987 *a* | .928 |
| IE | .170 | .096 |  | .981 | .954 |
| IS | .034 | .047 *g* |  | .940 | .707 *g* |
| IT | .163 | .129 |  | .938 | .977 |
| LT | .025 *a* | .032 |  | .949 *a* | .882 |
| LU | .166 | .085 |  | .981 | .896 |
| LV | .047 *a* | .050 |  | .957 *a* | .785 |
| NL | .138 *a* | .041 |  | .971 *a* | .926 |
| NO | .037 | .009 |  | .959 | 1,000 |
| PL | .031 *a* | .030 |  | .977 *a* | .957 |
| PT | .085 | .046 |  | .995 | .979 |
| RO | .108 *b* | .116 |  | .996 *b* | .993 |
| RS | .065 *d* | .037 |  | .987 *d* | .981 |
| SE | .041 | .005 |  | .827 | .970 |
| SI | .026 *a* | .016 *d* |  | 1,000 *a* | 1,000 *d* |
| SK | .007 | .010 |  | .984 | .923 |
| UK | .077 *a* | .052 *g* |  | .955 *a* | .895 *g* |
| US | .079 | .071 *f* |  | .951 | .923 *f* |

Note: *a* 2005; *b* 2007; *c* 2010; *d* 2013; *e* 2014; *f* 2017; *g* 2018

Table A3. *Correlation matrix of all variables used in regressions*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Duncan index: |  |  | Public spending on: |
|  | paid work | paid work + homemakers | Female LFP | Female LFP2 | Health and education | Care for elderly | Care for children |
| Duncan index, paid work  | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Duncan index, paid work + homemakers | .787 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female LFP | .316 | -.073 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |
| Female LFP2 | .297 | -.082 |  | 1.000 |  |  |  |
| Public spending on: |  |  |  |  |
| Health and education | -.125 | -.311 | .235 | .234 | 1.000 |  |  |
| Care for elderly  | -.146  | -.415 | .509 | .527 | .439 | 1.000 |  |
| Care for children | -.070 | -.373 | .481 | .501 | .594 | .766  | 1.000 |

Note: Female LFP= Female labour force participation.

Figure A1. *Association between labour market segregation and participation (2004–2019): Segregation across two-digit occupations*



Note: The figure is a binned scatterplot of the relationship between labour market segregation measured across occupations and participation in our sample. The participation rate is binned into 20 equal-sized bins, and the scatterplots visualise the residual mean labour market segregation within these bins, net of year effects. We have included the best quadratic fit lines. To ensure that the patterns do not arise from our definition of occupations as occupation within industry, Figure A1 displays the relationship between female labour force participation rate and segregation measured across two-digit occupations. The level of segregation is lower when measured across occupations than across occupations within industry. Notably, the inverted U-shaped pattern of segregation in paid work is retained across occupations.

Figure A2. *Association between labour market segregation and participation across countries: Median values by country*



Note: The figure shows the median values by country in labour market segregation as measured across occupations in paid work (left panel), across occupations including domestic work (right panel) and female labour force participation in our sample. The lines show the best quadratic fit. Figure A2 provide two key observations. First, looking across countries, the quadradic fit in the left panel clearly shows an inverted U-shaped relationship between segregation in paid work and labour force participation. Second, segregation declines in work when domestic tasks are included over the full range of participation.

Figure A3. *Association between labour market segregation and participation (2004–2019): Patterns for countries with low, medium and high female labour force participation*



Note: The figure is a binned scatterplot of the relationship between labour market segregation measured across jobs and participation in our sample. The participation rate is binned into equal-sized bins, and the scatterplots visualise the residual mean labour market segregation within these bins, net of year effects. We have included the best quadratic fit lines. The scatterplots are drawn separately for countries with low (less than 70 percent), medium (70–75 percent) and high (more than 75 percent) female labour force participation (flfp). Because participation changes over time within all the countries, a large overlap occurs between the groups. The figure shows that low-participation countries contribute to the part of the curve with rising segregation, whereas the high-participation countries contribute to the part with declining segregation, with the middle group in between.

Figure A4. *Association between labour market segregation and participation: Data from austerity period (2009–2014)*



Note: The figure is a binned scatterplot of the relationship between labour market segregation and participation in our sample for the period from 2009 to 2014. The participation rate is binned into 20 equal-sized bins, and the scatterplots visualise the residual mean labour market segregation within these bins, net of year effects. The best quadratic fit line is included and matches the coefficients of a multivariate regression. The figure shows a similar pattern to that for the full data period (2004–2019) in Figure 2 in the article, but with a somewhat attenuated curvature during the austerity period.

Figure A5. *Association between labour market segregation and participation: Data from outside austerity period (2004–2008 and 2015–2019)*

**

Note: The figure is a binned scatterplot of the relationship between labour market segregation and participation in our sample for the period from 2004-2008 and 2015-2019. The participation rate is binned into 20 equal-sized bins, and the scatterplots visualise the residual mean labour market segregation within these bins, net of year effects. The best quadratic fit line is included and matches the coefficients of a multivariate regression. The figure shows a similar pattern to that shown for the full data period (2004–2019) in Figure 2 in the article.