4. Situations of childbirth and childrearing
(Thoughts about childbirth)
According to the “14th Japanese National Fertility Survey (Survey on Married Couples)” conducted by the National Institute of Population and Social Security Research (2010), the ideal number of children (average ideal number of children) for married couples has continued to decline since the 13th Survey (2005), resulting in the lowest recorded number since the survey was started (2.42). In addition, the number of planned children for married couples (average planned number of children) stands at 2.07.

**Fig. 1-1-15** Change in the average ideal and intended number of children

Note: Subjects were first-married couples of less than 50 years old. The planned number is the sum of the additionally planned number and the existing number. The total number includes that in which the duration of marriage is unknown. The years represent the years in which the survey was conducted.
The biggest reason why married couples do not have as many children as they would like is because “it costs too much money to raise and educate children” (60.4%), and this belief is higher among younger people. Another reason is that they “hate to bear children at older age” (35.1%), a belief that is higher among older people. (Fig. 1-1-16)

**Fig. 1-1-16** Reasons why married couples do not have the ideal number of children, by wife’s age

(Difficulty persists in continuing employment for women)
Concerning the situations of women’s employment before and after childbirth, the percentage of the married women, who had a first child and returned to work between 2005 and 2009, stays around 40%. (Fig.1-1-17). Out of those who were permanent employees before the childbirth, 52.9% are still working after childbirth, whereas 18.0% of part-time or irregular employees are working after the childbirth (the 14th Japanese National Fertility Survey (Survey on Married Couples) National Institute of Population and Social Security Research) (2010).

About one fourth of women, who retired before and after the pregnancy and childbirth, say that they wanted to continue working but retired because the balance of work-childrearing was difficult. This shows that childbirth makes women’s continuous work difficult. (Fig.1-1-18)
**Fig. 1-1-17** Change in employment status of wives before and after giving birth to their first child, by year of birth of first child

**Rate of employment before childbirth:** 70.7 (100)%

**Rate of continuous employment after childbirth:** 26.8 (38.0)%

Source: The "14th Japanese National Fertility Survey (Survey on Married Couples)" in 2010, by National Institute of Population and Social Security Research

**Fig. 1-1-18** Reasons for resigning before or after pregnancy/childbirth

Concrete reasons that made balancing difficult:
- Inconvenient working hours: 65.4%
- Lack of workplace atmosphere to support balance: 49.5%
- Insufficient physical strength: 45.7%
- Little hope to take child-care leave: 25.0%

It was difficult to continue work due to work location or job transfer of the husband: 4.7%

Voluntarily resigned from job to concentrate on household work and child-care: 39.0%

Wanted to continue working but had to quit as it was difficult to balance work and childcare: 26.1%

Resigned from the job for reasons other than childbirth and childcare: 7.2%

Source: "Comprehensive study on problems concerning work-family balance support," 2008, Mitsubishi UFJ Research and Consulting
(Long working hours for males of the childcare generation)
The number of men who are working for more than 60 hours per week is declining every year since 2005. However, men involved in childcare are working for more than 60 hours in 2015: 16.0% in their 30’s and 16.6% in their 40’s are working for more than 60 hours per week, higher than any other age groups. (Fig. 1-1-19)

Fig. 1-1-19 Percentage of employed males working 60 hours or longer per week, sorted by age group

Source: “Labour Force Survey,” Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications
Note: 1. The figures represent the percentage to employed persons in non-agriculture industries (except those on leave).
2. The figures of 2011 are the results of all the prefectures except Iwate, Miyagi and Fukushima prefectures.
(Men’s involvement in housework and childcare)

Men’s hours involved in housework and childcare on holidays versus having the second and subsequent child are positively correlated. (Fig.1-1-20)

**Fig. 1-1-20** State of the second and subsequent child birth in the last 12 years among couples with children by husband’s hours spent on housework/childcare in holidays

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>With childbirth</th>
<th>No childbirth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No time for housework and childrearing</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 2 hours</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 4 hours or under</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 6 hours or under</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6 hours</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note:
1. Couples living together that fall under (1) or (2), and (3) below was tabulated. However, couples without wives’ data of the survey before the childbirth was excluded from the tabulation.
   (1) Couples who answered to the 1st through the 13th survey
   (2) Couples who were never married at the time of the 1st survey but married by the 12th Survey and answered to the 13th Survey
   (3) Couples who have one child or more at the time of the survey before the childbirth
2. The housework and childrearing hours of couples “with childbirth” shows the situation at the survey before the childbirth, and those of couples with “no childbirth” shows the situation at the time of the 12th survey.
3. The data of couples with 2 or more childbirths during 12 years show about the youngest child.
4. The total includes couples whose housework and childrearing hours are unknown.
Men’s hours involved in housework and childcare are the fewest among developed countries: housework-related hours of men with a child less than 6 years old is 67 minutes per day. (Fig. 1-1-21)

**Fig. 1-1-21 Time spent on housework and child care by husbands with a child or children under 6 years old (international comparison per day)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total Housework Hours</th>
<th>Child Care Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1:07</td>
<td>0:39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>2:58</td>
<td>1:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2:46</td>
<td>1:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>2:30</td>
<td>0:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>0:59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>3:21</td>
<td>1:07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>3:12</td>
<td>1:13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Japan’s results about couples with children show husband’s total hours involved in “Housework,” “Caring or nursing,” “Childcare” and “Shopping” (weekly average).
5. Comparison with Foreign Countries

(Transition of the fertility rate in other countries)
The changes in the total fertility rate of Western countries (USA, France, Sweden, UK, Italy, and Germany) were 2.0 or higher in all countries up until the 1960s. Then, from 1970 to 1980, there was an overall downward trend. Since around 1990, however, the birth rate has differed among countries and some countries have recovered from downward trends. (Fig. 1-1-22)

**Fig. 1-1-22** Trends in the total fertility rates in major countries (USA and Europe)

![Trends in the total fertility rates in major countries](image)

Source: The data up to 1959 are based on the United Nations, “Demographic Yearbook” etc., and the data of 1960 onwards have been prepared by Cabinet Office based on OECD Family database (the 2016-March revised version) and "Vital Statistics," Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare.
(Proportion of family-related social expenditures to GDP)
It is pointed out that Japanese government budget for in-kind benefits or other measures for supporting families is smaller than that of Western countries, although simple comparison cannot be made because of difference in the national burden ratio. The proportion of Japan’s family-related social expenditures to GDP is 1.25% (in 2013), about 40% as compared with the budgets of European countries, such as France and Sweden. (Fig.1-1-23)

Fig. 1-1-23  Comparison of Ratio of GDP to Family-related Social Expenses in Each Country

Note: 1. Social expenditure for family --- Cash benefit and benefit in kind paid for supporting family.
   The budgeted benefits are as follows (Excerpted from the reference in the appendix of “Social Security Expenditure Statistics” of the National Institute of Population and Social Security Research):
   Child allowance (child benefit): benefit, expense for child fostering service etc.
   Social welfare: Payment for Special child dependent’s allowance, various expenses of childrearing allowance, child protection cost, operating cost of nursery center.
   Association-managed health insurance, Union-managed health insurance, National health insurance: various expenses of child birth and child-rearing, lump-sum money for child birth and child-rearing.
   Various Mutual insurance cooperatives: various expenses for child birth and child-rearing, childcare leave benefit, family-care leave benefit.
   Unemployment insurance: childcare leave benefit, family-care leave benefit.
   Social aid: Aid in child birth and education
   School expense subsidies
   Aid for school attendance and pre-school education: primary/secondary education promotion cost
   Pre-school education (public expense of early childhood educational cost, according to “Education Database” by OECD)