PSC Discussion Papers Series

Volume 15 | Issue 13 Article 1

7-2001

Models of Earning and Caring: Evidence from Canadian Time-Use Data

Roderic Beaujot
University of Western Ontario, rbeaujot@uwo.ca

Jianye Liu
University of Western Ontario, jliu8@lakehead.ca

ISSN 1183-7284

Models of Earning and Caring: Evidence from Canadian Time-Use Data

by
Roderic Beaujot
Jianye Liu

Discussion Paper no. 01-13

July 2001

On the web in PDF format: http://www.ssc.uwo.ca/sociology/popstudies/dp/dp01-13.pdf

Paper presented at session on "Women's labour: production and reproduction" at the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population General Population Conference, Salvador, Brazil, 18-24 August 2001.

Population Studies Centre
University of Western Ontario
London CANADA N6A 5C2

Models of earning and caring:
Evidence from Canadian time-use data

Roderic Beaujot
Rbeaujot@uwo.ca

and

Jianye Liu
jliu2@uwo.ca

Population Studies Centre
Department of Sociology
University of Western Ontario
London, Ont N6A 5C2, Canada

July 13, 2001

Paper to be presented at session on "Women's labour: production and reproduction" at the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population General Population Conference, Salvador, Brazil, 18-24 August 2001.

Models of earning and caring: evidence from Canadian time-use data

Abstract:

Family models can usefully consider the production and reproduction roles of women and men. For husband-wife families, the breadwinner, one-earner, or complementary-roles model has advantages in terms of efficiency/specialization and stability, but it is a high risk model for women and children in the face of the inability or unwillingness of the breadwinner to provide for (especially former) spouse and children. The alternate model has been called two-earner, companionship, "new families" or collaborative in the sense of spouses collaborating in both the paid and unpaid work needed to provide for and care for the family. When there are children, this can be called the co-provider and co-parenting model.

Adopting the common metric of time-use to study both paid and unpaid work, the Canadian national surveys of 1986, 1992 and 1998 show that the traditional or neo-traditional models remain the most common, and the "double burden" is the second most frequent, but there is some evidence of change in the direction of more symmetric arrangements, especially for younger couples with children, when both are employed full-time. Patterns over the life course clearly indicate that women carry much more of the burden in terms of accommodating the meshing that needs to occur between productive and reproductive activities. Policies that would modernize families are discussed, including those that would reduce dependency in relationships.

The study of family models has paid much attention to the transition from a breadwinner model to dual-earner families. When the focus is on domestic work, the literature is prone to conclude that the change has been from the homemaking model to women having a double burden. That is, the change in women's labour force participation has not been accompanied by an equal change in the division of unpaid work, giving women a second shift. While these are clearly important family models, they can mask other distinctions and changes with regard to the division of paid and unpaid work. For instance, Hernandez (1993: 103) observes that the breadwinner or one-earner family comprised more than half of American families only for the period 1920-70, and never amounted to more than 57 percent of all families. He achieves these results by separating out the two-parent farm families which were previously the predominant model, and which are not unlike two-earner families. There has been a tendency to ignore the remaining differential involvement of husbands and wives in paid work, and to conclude too readily that the lack of change in men's unpaid work implies a second shift in the sense of women having more total (paid plus unpaid) work than men. Sullivan (2000) observes that concepts such as double burden, second shift or stalled revolution have contributed to the understanding of the division of domestic work and related issues of power, but these ideas correspond to a "no change" model that tends to ignore the potential for and possibilities of change.

While the relative earnings of men and women provide a means of analysing "productive" activities, the measurement of reproductive or caring activities is much less advanced.

Sometimes there are measures of the responsibility for given tasks, but these are difficult to summarize in terms of the division of unpaid work at the level of the couple. In spite of its various limitations, a time-use calendar provides a common metric with which to analyse "total productive activity," that is both paid and unpaid work, or earning and caring. It then becomes an empirical question to determine the relative predominance of various family models. In the breadwinner or neo-traditional arrangement, the man takes more responsibility for paid work and the woman for unpaid work. In the double burden, both are equally involved in paid work but the women does more of the unpaid work. By not observing the relative amount of paid work done by men and women, much research is unable to distinguish between neo-traditional and second shift arrangements (Becker and Williams, 1999). The focus on averages at the aggregate level, either for all couples, or for dual-earner couples, does not permit a consideration of cases of "new families" where the unpaid work is more equally divided, or situations where men work significantly longer hours than women.

On the basis of Canadian time-use data from 1986, 1992 and 1998, this paper first seeks to describe the division of labour and to establish the relative predominance of various models in the division of earning and caring activities. We will then consider the various circumstances, by life cycle stage, by number and age of children, and by work status, where given models are more predominant.

Models of earning and caring

Durkheim (1960 [1893]: 60) saw complementary roles as a basis for holding families together. He thought that if we "permit the sexual division of labour to recede below a certain level ... conjugal society would eventually subsist in sexual relations preeminently ephemeral." It would appear that Durkheim saw this "modern" form of solidarity, based on a division of labour, as applying to families from time immemorial. Families were units of economic activity involving typically some specialization of tasks by gender. The alternative of mechanical solidarity, or a more immediate identification with others who share a common sense of values and belonging, was not envisaged as a means of family solidarity. Nonetheless, it would appear that mechanical solidarity is similar to what others have called a companionship model, or what Giddens (1991) calls a "pure relationship." Others have spoken of a de-institutionalization of the family, which might be seen as a movement from organic to mechanical solidarity, or a change from institution to companionship (Burgess et al.,1963), from orderly replacement of generations to permanent availability (Farber, 1964), from instrumental to expressive relationships (Scanzoni and Scanzoni, 1976), from living up to external norms to a "projet de couple" (Roussel, 1987).

Instead of seeing mechanical and organic solidarity as mutually exclusive alternatives, it may be useful to make a two-fold classification (Beaujot and Ravanera, 2001). A relationship based only on mechanical solidarity may be called a companionship or pure relationship, while one based only on organic solidarity may be called instrumental or dependent. When neither exists there is no relationship, but if both are there it may be called a collaborative model. Others have used the concept of a collaborative model to refer to family strategies that involve collaborating at both earning a living and caring for each other, when there are children this would be a co-providing and co-parenting model.

The complementary roles model is clearly based on strong gender differentiation. In effect, Lerner (1986: 217) proposed that gender inequality and its structural manifestation as patriarchy can be an exchange of "submission for protection," or of "unpaid labour for maintenance." This definition of patriarchy pays particular attention to the division of earning and caring activities. Starting with the "manifestation and institutionalization of male dominance over women and children in the family," there follows an "extension of male dominance over women in the society in general (idem, p. 239). Clearly, a strong gender differentiation between paid and unpaid work brings dependency and the potential for exploitation. Nonetheless, the dependence of one person on another is a prime characteristic of family life. Finch (1989: 167) further observes that dependence is inherently unstable, and that reciprocity is preferred, but husband/wife and parent/child relations can tolerate substantial periods of one-way flow. It may be that the cultural basis for one way flows, "for rich or for poor, in sickness and in health," is being undermined in spousal relations.

Dependency is part of most relationships, and relationships based on instrumental interdependency are more stable. Thus, Nock (2001) proposes the concept of "marriages of equally dependent spouses (MEDS)." Defining these as cases where neither partner earns less than 40 percent of total family earnings, 22 % of American couples are in relationships of equal dependency. Nock proposes that the instability that we see in current relationships is partly due to the transition that is underway toward equally dependent relations. Once couples form unions based on new understandings of gender ideals, there may be more stability in unions. This may also be part of the difficulty in couples making adjustments after they had initially established a division of labour based on complementary roles. If the wife was at home full-time when there were young children, the adjustments in the husband's unpaid work may be difficult to negociate when the wife returns to the labour force. Based on a Dutch sample, Kluwer et al. (1996, 1997) have found that accommodations that are based on mutually integrative interaction, rather than withdrawal or destructive conflict, are more likely to occur if the differences that need to be re-negotiated are not large.

Complementary roles can also be an efficient way of dividing work. Becker (1981) proposes that it is inefficient to have more than one person in a unit dividing their time between market and household production, because different forms of capital are needed for these two forms of production. This is based on the assumption that the human capital needed for production and reproduction are mutually exclusive, and that efficiency is a prime consideration. While a division of labour between paid and unpaid work may be an efficient strategy, it is also a high risk strategy when marriages are not stable (Oppenheimer, 1997). That is, there is a risk for the partner who has specialized in caring, if the one who has specialized in the market is unable or unwilling to provide for, especially a former spouse and children. The interest to reduce risks, including inter-personal risks, is one of the characteristics of a post-modern society (Hall, 2001).

There is a stronger basis for the Becker model when household production is a full-time activity. Before the existence of modern energy saving household devices, when food was partly produced in gardens, heating a house required constant attention, and washing clothes was a full day's work, there was a logic of having one person look after things inside and the other outside the

household. However, when housekeeping is less than a full-time activity, the efficiency gain of having only one person both in the market and in household production is no longer so clear, especially for that person.

It may even be argued that the baby boom of the 1950s was a strategy to maintain complementary role relationships, when the work of the home required less time. Having more children in this "golden age of the family" helped to preserve a family type when the external supports for this type were crumbling. Caldwell (1999) proposes a similar explanation for the delay in the demographic transition in English-speaking countries. That is, the economic circumstances were undermining the value of children, but couples had children in order to sustain a family model of stable dependent relations that would otherwise have been under more severe stress.

There is obviously considerable pull toward unions based on complementary roles, but there is also considerable interest to establish more equal relationships in order to reduce differentiation by gender, to reduce risks, and to establish relations based on companionship rather than dependency. More egalitarian relations are probably easiest to maintain if couples have started with a strategy that seeks to reduce gender differentiation. It would appear that such a strategy is more likely in the context of persons who have undergone the second demographic transition in terms of less rigid definitions of unions (flexibility in entry and exit) and a delay in family life course transitions. Less institutionalized relations need to be maintained on other grounds than that of dependency, and this mutuality may include the sharing of domestic work. The delay in home leaving, in forming relations, and especially in first birth, permitting both women and men to invest longer in themselves before they invest in reproduction, facilitates the establishment of more equal relationships.

Literature on division of paid and unpaid work

The often quoted work of Hartmann (1984) is based on a 1967-68 sample from Syracuse, New York. While exploitation through housework is demonstrated, there are insufficient controls introduced in the analysis. For instance, across family sizes, the housework done by wives was found to increase significantly while that done by husbands was stable. However, this outcome could be the result of women doing less paid work in larger families, and thus the division of work is more specialized. Based on the 1992 Canadian time-use survey, Frederick (1995: 27-28) found that the wife's labour force status did not greatly change the unpaid work hours of husbands. The observation that men whose spouses are not employed are doing the must unpaid work is surprising until one appreciates that these are the households with more children, and thus with more unpaid work to be done.

Brines (1994) seeks to establish the relative importance of economic dependency and gender display in predicting the amount of housework that each person does. She pays particular attention to men who are not employed, and for whom their masculinity may be further undermined if they do housework. While some support is found for this form of symbolic display, the data are from unions in the American Panel Study of Income Dynamics that had commenced by the early-1980's, including men who would have had more difficulty with the gender display associated with housework. In a study based on the 1995 Canadian General Social Survey, Gazso and McMullin (2001) find that the main activity of "keeping house" is a

particularly strong predictor of time spent in housework and child care, and the predictor is positive for both women and men. It is important to separate out the various types of non-employment, from those who are temporarily unemployed and spending their time looking for work, to those who are not-employable because they have a disability of some kind, and those for whom "keeping house" is a main activity.

Based on the 1988 American National Survey of Families and Households, Harpster and Monk-Turner (1998) find that men do more housework if they are more educated and have ideological beliefs in the direction of gender equality. Age and number of children are also relevant since their sample is limited to married or cohabiting men under 35 who are also childfree.

In considering British time-use surveys from 1975, 1987 and 1997, Sullivan (2000) observes an increase in men's time in domestic work. While the overall division of housework remains unequal, there is a substantial increase in egalitarian couples, defined as those where the woman contributes less than 60 percent of the overall domestic work time. These egalitarian couples are most frequent when both are working full time. By 1997, 32% of the couples where both are working full-time have the woman doing less than half of the domestic labour, and 58% are doing less than 60% of the domestic work (idem, p. 449).

In testing hypotheses regarding alternate family models, it is clear that the life course stage is important (especially number and ages of children), but also age or cohort, and especially the extent of attachment to the labour force (McFarlane et al., 2000). For instance, in measuring gender relations at the couple level, Olah (2001) includes amount of domestic work and labour force attachment. Similarly, Moen and Yu (1999) find that life stage and hours of paid work matter to the sense of life success in two-earner couples. Thus we would expect to find more egalitarian couples among younger respondents, when there is less unpaid work to be done, and for couples without children or with fewer children. Older couples are expected to be more traditional in the division of labour, while young couples with more than two children would be the most likely to represent a double burden.

Data and measures

The data used here are from time-use diaries that were collected in the Canadian General Social Surveys of 1986, 1992 and 1998. It is clear that various data need to be analysed in the study of family models. The main advantage of time-use is that the same metric is used for paid and unpaid work. We are adopting the broadest possible definition of work, where paid work includes time spent in education, along with driving to and from work, and unpaid work includes domestic work, child care, household maintenance, and even volunteer work. In effect, the only categories of time-use that are not considered are those under the labels of personal care, leisure, and free time. The measurement of paid and unpaid work is clearly uneven; for instance coffee breaks at work are not discounted, but they are treated as personal care at home. Only the main activity is counted at any given time, which discounts multi-tasking, any measure of the intensity of time-use, or the extent to which people are responsible for given activities. The main advantage is that the measurement takes into account the whole 24 hour day, which reduces the error compared to estimates of the amount of time spent on given activities in a given day or

week. Response bias may also be reduced through having respondents indicate what they were doing at given times of the day, rather than being asked directly to estimate the amount of time spent on given activities.

Since the measurement of time-use is only for one day, it is often a-typical for a given respondent. Thus it is important that the data collection take place over all days of the year. Demographic approaches, producing averages for given population groups, have an advantage over multi-variate approaches that seek to explain the variation in what can be an a-typical day.

The data used here will mostly be for one respondent per household. However, we will also make use of some broad weekly estimates of time use for respondent and spouse. These estimates are not as inclusive as the daily time use, but they have the advantage of being available for both members of the couple. The questions concerned the total weekly time spent in paid work, domestic work, household maintenance, and child care, for the respondent and their spouse. These separate measures have collapsed into the two categories of weekly paid and unpaid work.

Various measures have been used to establish alternate family models. There are also a variety of concepts used: collaborative, egalitarian, fair, new families, peer couples, postgender marriages, and equally dependent spouses. When **qualitative approaches** are used, several criteria can be taken into consideration. For instance, 12 of the co-parenting couples identified by Coltrane (1990) were sharing equally in both the management and labour associated with parenting, and they were committed to quality childraising as a first priority. Similarly the 18 shared parenting couples that Dienhart (1998) studied had deliberately co-created alternatives to traditional parenting roles. In her study of dual-earner couples where both were working full-time, Hochschild (1989) considered especially domestic work and child care, including responsibility for this work, but she did not pay attention to the paid hours that each worked.

In locating their 15 postgender marriages with children, Risman and Johson-Sumerford (1998) first screened volunteer respondents by asking if they “shared equally in the work of earning a living and rearing their children.” From the 75 who passed this screen, the numbers were reduced on the basis of questions that required at least a 40/60 split in each of earning a living and child care, and a sense from each partner that the division of work was fair. Other things were constant across the selected couples with children. Both husband and wife were committed to professional growth and co-parenting. They had rejected gender as an ideological justification for inequality. They compared their time doing domestic work to each other, rather than to persons of the same sex in other couples. Each expressed deep friendship toward the other; their relationships were of primary importance to them. Only one of the 15 had more than two children, and the mothers were all highly paid professionals.

Gilbert (1993) uses three categories of dual-career couples. In the traditional/conventional case, he is more professionally ambitious, with a more important career, and only "helps out" with housework and child care. In the participant/modern case, there is less extensive gender-based role specialization, parenting is shared, the father is "active," while the wife does most of the other housework. In the role-sharing/egalitarian case, both are actively involved in career

pursuits as well as the housework and family life. Gilbert suggests that there are three requisites for egalitarian career families. There needs to be economic equality between the sexes, both in the society and in specific families. There needs to be compatibility of occupational and family systems, contrary to a world where careers often involve the assumption that occupants are "family-free." Finally, the partners themselves need to seek role sharing and mutuality, based on an "interdependency free of the constraints of gender."

Quantitative studies have largely adopted the 40/60 split of labour and responsibility that Schwartz (1994) used to identify peer couples. For instance, Nock (2000) defines marriages of equally dependent spouses as those where neither spouse earns less than 40 percent of total family earnings. Looking only at two-earner couples, Feree (1991) identifies the "two-housekeeper" model as the wife doing less than 60 percent and the husband more than 40% of the housework. Similarly, Sullivan (2000) defines egalitarian couples as those where the woman does less than 60% of the overall domestic work time.

Becker and Williams (1999) used hierarchal cluster analysis based on a combination of paid and unpaid work with a sample from upstate New York. The classification by paid work depended on who spent the most time, while on unpaid work respondents were asked which partner spent the most time, or was it about the same, four nine specific tasks ranging from meal preparation to driving others. Four types were identified: 50% of couples were traditional in the sense of complementary roles, 26% were non-traditional in the sense that the man did more of the household tasks, 11% were sharing because most non-paid tasks were divided equally, and 14% were second shifts because the wife had responsibility for most household tasks, though she also invested heavily in paid work. In each category, the average time spent in paid work was higher for the man, the difference being largest at 14.9 hours per week in the second shift category. It would appear that the men in this category were also doing a second shift, because it was here that their average hours at work was highest at 50.9 hours per week. The average difference in weekly hours of work was lowest in the non-traditional category at 5.1 hours, but it was also relatively low in the shared category with men working an average of 7.6 more hours per week.

Time use data also allows for the classification of couples along the dimensions of paid and unpaid work, with the added advantage that a similar metric can be used for both dimensions. In earlier work, couples were identified as doing the same amount of either paid or unpaid work if they were within four hours of each other in the weekly estimates of the respondent (Beaujot, 2000: 224-226; Beaujot, 2001). Four hours is a fairly stringent measure because it comprises only 15% of total weekly paid or unpaid work, or slightly more than a half hour per day. In the present analysis, a relative share was used. The 40/60 split that others have used is rather generous, because the person doing the larger amount can be doing as much as 50% more than the person doing the smaller amount. Instead, we have here used the range of 45% to 55% of the couple total on a given type of work as being "same," while under 45% is doing less than the spouse, and over 55% is doing more than the spouse.

<u>Paid and unpaid work by sex, age, marital and parental status</u>

The 1986, 1992 and 1998 Canadian surveys have given very similar results in terms of the

overall distribution of time in **total productive activities**, both paid and unpaid (Table 1). The average for the total population was 7.6 hours in 1986 and 8.0 in each of 1992 and 1998. The difference in this average between men and women is within 0.1 hours in each of the years. For **paid work**, men's time has declined slightly, while women's has increased. In 1986, women's average time in paid work was 60% of that of men, and this increased to 67% in 1998. For **unpaid work**, men's average time has increased slightly, while women's has been more stable. In 1986, men's time was 48% of women's time, but this increased to 62% in 1998. In 1986, women were doing two-thirds of the unpaid work, or twice as much as men, but this is no longer an appropriate generalization. Even using a broad definition of unpaid work, men remain more concentrated on the market, where they spend 65% of their productive time, while women spend 56% of their productive time in unpaid work. Women's time is more evenly divided and consequently they are more involved in balancing the two types of work.

There is an increase in terms of amounts of productive time from those who are single, to those who are married or cohabiting, then a decline for the formerly married who are not living alone, and for the formerly married living alone (Table 2). Total productive time also increases from ages 15-24 to 25-44, then declines for the remainder of the life course. This same generalization applies within the married category. These changes over the life course are more associated with paid work for men. The gender differences in total work are highest at age 15-24, because women do more unpaid work, but these gender differences in total productive time are negligible at ages 25-64. Those spending the most time working are married persons aged 25-44; in 1998 men at these ages were spending an average of 6.8 daily hours in paid work and 3.2 in unpaid work, while women were spending 4.0 hours in paid work and 5.7 in unpaid work.

The gender differences in total work are minimal for married persons, but they are more pronounced for those who are not married, largely because women do more unpaid work. However, the married have the largest differences in the distribution of this work into paid and unpaid categories. Conversely, the gender differences for each of paid and unpaid work are smallest for the single, especially those under 25, but the women still do more unpaid work than men, as they do when they are formerly married and living alone.

For both men and women, **total productive activity** rises from those who are not married without children, to those who are married without children; it is highest for those who are married parents, and slightly lower for the unmarried parents (Table 3). However, within each category of age, marital and parental status, the gender differences in total work are not large. In 1998 the largest difference is 0.7 more hours for women who are unmarried without children at ages 45-64 compared to men in the same category. In about half of comparisons, women do more total work. While the differences are small, in each year and for both age groups, as married parents men's average total work is higher than that of women. It is especially in the not-married categories that women do more total work. While marriage accentuates the inequality in the distribution of unpaid work, it appears to reduce the inequality in the distribution of total productive time.

For the most part, marriage increases the unpaid work of both women and men, and the paid work of men. Once people have children, being unmarried increases the time in paid work and

reduces the time in unpaid work. That is, compared to persons who are not married with no children, **married** men without children spend more time in both paid work and in unpaid work, while women spend more time in unpaid work. Compared to married parents, the unmarried parents spend more time in paid work and less time in unpaid work. The exception in 1998 is younger lone parent men who spend more time in unpaid work and less in paid work, compared to their married counterparts.

In comparison to the categories of persons without children, the work patterns of persons **with children** are changed in three ways. Children increase the total work of both women and men. At younger parental ages, children reduce the paid work time, and increase the unpaid work time, especially for women. At older ages of parents, children increase men's paid work time and have little influence on their unpaid work time, while they increase both the paid and unpaid work time of women. Thus children especially differentiate women and men in terms of the proportion of total productive activity that occurs in the categories of paid and unpaid work. For instance, in 1998, the younger married men with children spend 66% of their productive time in the market, compared to 35% for women.

These patterns by marital and parental status imply considerably more variability for women than for men over the life course in terms of their involvement in the separate categories of work. For instance, at age groups under 65, in 1998 men's average paid work varies from 7.2 hours per day in the case of older lone parents to 4.2 hours in the case of older unmarried men without children. In comparison, women's average paid work varies from 5.6 hours per day when they are younger married without children to 2.8 when they are older married without children. In unpaid work, men vary between 1.6 hours when they are young unmarried without children to 4.1 when they are young lone parents. For women, the variation is again larger, between 2.2 hours of unpaid work for the young unmarried without children to 6.3 for the young married parents. This variability means that women make much more of the accommodations between paid and unpaid work, following especially the shifting domestic demands over the life course.

Hours of paid and unpaid work by parental and employment status

Besides differentiating by marital and parental status, clearly the ages of children and the extent of employment of spouses makes a difference in the paid and unpaid work time. In earlier results based on age group 30-54 in 1992 and 1998, three categories of employment status were used in husband-wife families: both employed full-time, two employed but not both full-time, and one employed (Beaujot, 2000: 211; Beaujot, 2001). Total productive time, for both women and men was highest when both spouses were employed full-time. Total time was also higher when there are children under 19, especially if the children are under five years of age. Consequently, the most total work, an average of 10.6 hours per day in 1992 and 10.9 in 1998, was done by women where both are employed full-time and there are children under five years of age. The total productive time was similarly high for men in this category, amounting to 10.2 hours per day in 1992 and 10.7 in 1998.

Women do more total work than men when they are both employed full-time, and less work than men when only one is employed. Within categories of presence and age of children, the

comparisons show both men and women doing the most total work if both spouses are employed full-time, followed by cases where one spouse is employed part-time and finally cases where only one spouse is employed.

Given the importance of the model where both are employed full-time, Table 4 shows average daily hours of work for this category of couples, separately by age of respondent, and number and age of children. The total work of both men and women tends to increase with the number of children. While both are employed full-time, at younger ages men's paid work hours are almost one hour more than that of women. At older ages, the average hours were the same in 1992 but men had more paid hours in 1998. Conversely, women's unpaid work is more than an hour higher than that of men. These differences are stronger when there are children aged 0-4 present. For instance, at ages under 45 in 1998, women with children under 5 have an average of 5.3 hours of paid work compared to 6.7 hours for men, while in unpaid work the averages are 5.8 hours for women and 3.8 for men.

At the younger ages, the paid work of men is highest when they have either no children or three or more children, while that of women declines as they have more children. The most consistent results regard unpaid work, which systematically increase for both men and women with the number of children under 19. Consequently, the greatest similarity between these women and men is for those without children. For instance, taking the average of 1992 and 1998, at ages under 45 there are 6.9 and 7.6 hours of paid work for women and men respectively, and 2.8 and 2.3 hours of unpaid work for women and men. These differences are nonetheless significant, and they are larger when there are children, especially younger children present. In terms of total productive work, the averages are mostly higher for women, with the largest differences occurring at ages 45 and over in 1992, where women were doing an hour more work on average, among these persons employed full-time. However, by 1998, the difference is a half hour, with men doing more total work at ages 45 and over.

In summary, for these persons where both spouses are employed full-time, children and younger children increase the unpaid work of both men and women. They have less influence on paid work, but they reduce the paid work of women. The differences in total productive time are relatively small, especially at ages under 45, but they mostly show women working more hours. While both spouses employed full-time clearly puts stress on the time of these couples, and children have more impact on women than on men, the averages would suggest that the double burden applies to both genders, and not only to women.

Relative participation in paid and unpaid work

In order to compare the time use of men and women in given couples, it is necessary to use the weekly estimates that respondents provided for both themselves and their spouse. While these are subject to estimation error, and there is significant non-response especially for the questions regarding the spouse, these measures have the advantage of enabling comparisons within couples.

Compared to one's spouse, one could be doing more, less or the same amount of each of paid and

unpaid work. We are using a range of 45% to 55% of the total of the two spouses on a given type of work to indicate the same amount of time. It is of interest to first observe that there are couples in each of the cells of this three-by-three table (Table 5). From these nine categories, it is possible to suggest three types of work arrangements. In the traditional or **complementary roles** model, one person does more paid work and the other more unpaid work, though it is useful to also observe the sub-category of cases where it is the man who does more unpaid work and less paid work. In the **double burden**, a given person does the same amount (or even more) paid work, and more unpaid work. Here again, the double burden can be on the part of women or men. We can classify persons in a collaborative or more **egalitarian** model where both do the same amount of unpaid work. While this gives predominance to unpaid work in defining an egalitarian model, it does correspond to the literature on unpaid work, and it is possible to further specify the specific cases where spouses are doing similar hours of each of paid and unpaid work. The dominant category, amounting to 57% in 1992 and 54% in 1998, are couples where one spends more time at paid work and the other spends more time at unpaid work. Within this complementary roles model, there are 7% of the cases in 1992 and 10% in 1998 showing the man doing more unpaid work and the woman doing more paid work. The second largest category is the double burden where typically a given person is doing the same amount of paid work but more unpaid work. This corresponds to 31% of the sample in 1992 and 33% in 1998; in 25% of these cases in 1992 and 30% in 1998 it was men who had the double burden. The remaining 12% of the sample in 1992 and 13% in 1998 can be called a collaborative model or shared roles, including 4.7% in 1992 and 5.7% in 1998 where they do the same amount of both paid and unpaid work. As indicated, the comparisons between 1992 and 1998 show only slight change, but this tends to be in the direction of somewhat greater symmetry, with slight reduction in complementary roles and a greater proportion of men among persons with a double burden.

The average of men's and women's responses have been further analysed within given categories of age, work status, number and age of children (Table 6). Complementary roles are more common for older persons, especially in 1992, while shared roles are slightly more common for younger persons. The double burden is much more common when both are employed full-time, amounting to over half of these couples, and the men have the double burden in only a quarter of these cases. The shared roles alternative is also highest, at 18.5% in 1998, in couples where both are employed full-time. In husband and wife families where they are not both employed full-time, the complementary roles amount to 75 to 80% of couples. This traditional arrangement is also more common as there are more children. It is noteworthy that only 11.7 % of 1998 couples without children manage to have shared roles. The shared roles are slightly more common among younger couples who are both employed full-time and also have children. In 1998, the proportion with shared roles is 14.9% for no children, 21.9 with one child, 22.1 with two children, and 23.4% with three or more children (Table not shown). Having children under five years of age increases the likelihood of complementary roles, and the double burden is more common when children are aged 5-18, amounting to about a third of these couples. The employment status of the couple is therefore more important than life cycle stage, but both factors play a role.

Discussion

By using the same metric for productive and reproductive activities, time-use diaries enable a

common analysis of the two domains (see Gurshuny and Sullivan, 1998). For instance, while it is well known the women are more likely to be employed part-time, this is not always taken into account when analysing the extent to which men and women take responsibility for given domestic activities. While time-use varies considerably from day to day, the measurement on a given random day over the year, and the resulting averages in given population groups, makes it possible to obtain descriptive results on how paid and unpaid work are enmeshed in people's lives. We have used here broad measures of both activities, with paid work including time associated with education and driving to and from work, and unpaid work including housework, child care, maintenance and volunteer activity. In effect, we are including in total productive time all activities other than those for personal care, leisure and free time.

This total productive time is a useful measure, in part because it does not show large variation over the course of adult life, and the averages are very similar for women and men. While men spend more time in paid work, and women in unpaid work, the total of these two activities is remarkably similar around an average of 8 hours per day. Total productive time increases from young adult ages to a maximum at ages 25-44, then declines. It also increases from being single to married, and from not having children to having children.

Over the life course, marriage and children influence the total productive time, but they have an even larger consequence on the gender differential in the division of this time between paid and unpaid work. Marriage typically increases the paid work of men and the unpaid work of women, children increase the unpaid work of both men and women, but especially of women. Consequently, the largest gender differentiation in the use of time occurs for couples with young children. It would appear that this is the stage of the life course where the efficiencies associated with specialization are most relevant in family and work strategies. Another important generalization is that women have more variability over the life course, documenting that they absorb more of the responsibility for, and consequences of, the meshing of earning and caring activities in family strategies (see also Kempeneers, 1992, Goldscheider and Waite, 1991).

The employment patterns are also an important part of the time use questions, especially whether both are employed full-time, or both employed but not both full-time, or only one is employed. The greatest similarity in the total time occurs when both are employed. When both are employed full-time, the averages are high for both sexes but women are doing somewhat more total work, and when only one is employed the men are doing somewhat more total work while the averages are lower for both sexes. There remain differences in the distribution of work time, even when both are employed full-time. For instance, in 1998, for persons under 45 who are without children under 19 and both employed full-time, men spend an average of 78% of their time on the market, compared to 68% for women. When there are children under five in couples with both employed full-time, men spend 64% of their time on the market, and women 48%. In these couples, the total daily productive time is 10.5 hours for men and 11.0 hours for women, suggesting that women's double burden is only slightly higher than that of men.

The measurement of a double burden, in contrast with the traditional complementary roles, and the alternative of a more egalitarian model, requires estimates of time use from both partners. This has been taken from the weekly estimates made by respondents for themselves and their

partners. Several researchers have used a 40/60 split as indicating equality, but we have used a narrower definition where equal paid or unpaid work is between 45% and 55% of the couple total. The overall distribution shows about half of couples corresponding to the traditional division of work, where one does more paid work and the other more unpaid work. About a third of couples have a double burden, for instance they have the same amount of paid work but one has more unpaid work. About one in eight couples have a more egalitarian relationship in the sense that the unpaid work is shared about equally. The results from 1992 and 1998 show slight change in the direction of less traditional and more equality, along with a slightly higher proportion of gender-reversed traditional division of work, and of men's double burdens. The traditional model is most common when they are not both employed full-time, for older respondents, and when there are children under 5 years of age. The double burden is most common when both are employed full-time, and only a quarter of these are men's double burdens. The double burden is also more common in older couples, and when the children are aged 5-18. The egalitarian model is most common at younger ages, when both are employed full-time, and for couples with children. Contrary to expectations, the egalitarian models is not more common in couples without children, though the traditional model does systematically increase with the number of children.

As Becker and Williams (1999) and others have proposed, it is important not to analyse paid work and domestic work as discrete phenomena. Treating the two types of work together also shows that the second shift, or double burden should not be generalized to all couples where both are working. These more continuous measures also show that there is change, along with the potential for further change, contrary to the concept of a stalled revolution. While a variety of factors are related to this change, one of them surely is the greater equal opportunity structure for education and work in the **broader society**. Presser (2001) largely documents negative consequences for families from a 24-hour economy, but there are positive elements both in terms of opportunities to purchase services at various times of the day, and opportunities to work at times that accommodate the family.

It can be argued that the change **within families** is equally important to changing family models. This has already occurred for education, where the parental tendency to give equal importance to the education of their sons and daughters is facilitating equal opportunity (Warner, 1999). In reflecting on her 15 post-gender marriages, Risman (1998: 154) suggests that some dual-worker professionals are converting their educational status and career success, or cultural capital, into leverage for rejecting traditional gender. It could be that this pattern includes more than dual-worker professionals, and that there is a more concerted effort on the part of a number of couples to achieve family and work strategies that ensure more equal opportunity to husbands and wives. In the Canadian case, local-area samples from 1971 and 1994, both published in the Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, arrive at rather different conclusions. The earlier study, called "No exit for wives," documents a generalized unwillingness on the part of men to accommodate for wives working (Meissner et al., 1975), while the second sees a tendency to de-gender domestic work, and argues that women's paid work is a "trump card" against their exploitation through domestic labour (Bernier et al., 1996).

If gender is forged at all levels of social life, but especially in family and other intimate

relationships, then not only are measures of the division of work an important marker, but policy should especially push at establishing modern families where work in both domains is shared. For instance, Risman (1998: 159-160) proposes that we "strike first at the ... family roles that materialize wive's economic dependency and men's alienation from nurturing work, [and at] an economic structure that assumes that paid workers are not responsible for family work at all." While aimed at supporting women, and at supporting women in families in particular, it is noteworthy that policies such as tax deductions for dependent spouses, pension splitting, widowhood benefits, and spousal alimony encourage dependency on the part of wives. In Canada, we have what is called an "equivalent to married" tax deduction that applies to the first child of a lone-parent family. Why not have this deduction apply to all families with children, and rid ourselves of the deduction for dependent spouses. Besides changing policies in directions that assume and encourage both spouses to work, there should be changes that encourage both spouses to absorb the work-leaves or part- time work that occur when there are young children, along with a greater support from the society for child-care services (Beaujot, 2000: 351-356). In addition, changing to a default condition of joint custody could change our understanding in the direction of equal responsibility for children and involvement in children's lives as an undertaking that goes beyond the survival of given marriages. While families justifiably want to keep the state out of the bedrooms of the nation, there are ways for the society to signal that men and women should share more equally in earning and caring activities.

References:

Beaujot, Roderic. 2000. Earning and Caring in Canadian Families. Peterborough: Broadview.

Beaujot, Roderic. 2001. "Earning and Caring: Demographic Change and Policy Implications." University of Western Ontario, Population Studies Centre Discussion Paper No. 01-5.

Beaujot, Roderic and Zenaida Ravanera. 2001. An Interpretation of Family Change, with Implications for Social Cohesion. University of Western Ontario, Population Studies Centre Discussion Paper No. 01-1.

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

Becker, Penny Edgell and Sonya Williams. 1999. "Work-Family Strategies: An Integrated Approach to Couple's Division of Labor. Cornell University, Bronfenbrenner Life Course Center Working Paper No. 99-21.

Bernier, Christiane, Simon Laflamme, and Run-Min Zhou. 1996. "Le travail domestique: tendances à la désexisation et à la complexification." Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology 33,1: 1-21.

Brines, Julie. 1994. "Economic Dependency, Gender and the Division of Labor at Home." American Journal of Sociology 100,3: 652-88.

Burgess, E.W., H. Locke, and M. Thomas. 1963. The Family: From Institution to Companionship. New York: American.

Caldwell, John. 1999. "The Delayed Western Fertility Decline in English-Speaking Countries."

Population and Development Review 25 (3): 479-513.

Coltrane, Scott. 1990. “Birth Timing and the Division of Labor in Dual-Earner Families: Exploratory Findings and Suggestions for Future Research.” Journal of Family Issues11: 157-181.

Dienhart, Anna. 1998. Reshaping Fatherhood: The Social Construction of Shared Parenting. London: Sage.

Durkheim, Emile. 1960 [1893]. The Division of Labour in Society. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.

Farber, Bernard. 1964. Family Organization and Interaction. San Francisco: Chandler.

Feree, Myra Marx.1991. “The Gender Division of Labor in Two-Earner Marriages: Dimensions of Variability and Change.” Journal of Family Issues 12: 158-80.

Finch, Janet. 1989. Family Obligations and Scial Change. Cambridge: Polity Press.
Frederick, Judith. 1995. As Time Goes By. Ottawa: Statistics Canada, cat. no. 89-544.

Gazso, Amber Marie and Julie McMullin. 2001. “Time Availability, Relative Income, Gender Ideology and the Time Spent in Household Labour.” Paper presented at the meetings of the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association, Quebec, May 2001.

Gershuny, Jonathan and Oriel Sullivan. 1998. “Sociological Uses of Time-use Diary Data.” European Sociological Review 14: 69-85.

Giddens, Anthony.1991. Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Polity Press.

Gilbert, Lucia Albino. 1993. Two Careers/One Family. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications.

Goldscheider, Frances and Linda J. Waite. 1991. New Families, No Families? Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hall, David. 2001. “The Sociology of Risk and Social Demographic Change.” Paper presented at the meetings of the Canadian Population Society, Quebec, May 2001.

Harpster, Paula and Elizabeth Monk-Turner. 1998. “Why Men Do Housework: A Test of Gender Production and the Relative Resources Model.” Sociological Focus 31(1): 45-59.

Hartmann, Heidi.1984. “The Family as the Locus of Gender, Class, and Political Struggle: The Example of Housework.” In A. Juggar and P. Rothenberg, eds., Feminist Frameworks. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hernandez, Donald. 1993. America’s Children. New York: Russell Sage.

Hochschild, Arlie Russell. 1989. The Second Shift. New York: Viking.

Kempeneers, Marianne. 1992. Le Travail au féminin. Montreal: Presses de l'Université de Montréal.

Kluwer, Esther, José Heesink, and Evart Van de Vliert. 1996. “Marital Conflict about the Division of Household Labor and Paid Work.” Journal of Marriage and the Family 58,4: 958-69.

------ 1997. “The Marital Dynamics of Conflict over the Division of Labor.” Journal of Marriage and the Family 59,3: 635-53.

Lerner, Gerda. 1986. The Creation of Patriarchy. New York: Oxford.

McFarlane, Seth, Roderic Beaujot and Tony Haddad. 2000. “Time Constraints and Relative Resources as Determinants of the Sexual Division of Domestic Work.” Canadian Journal of Sociology 25(1): 61-82.

Meissner, Martin, Elizabeth Humphreys, Scott Meis, and William Scheu. 1975. “No Exit for Wives: Sexual Division of Labour and The Cumulation of Household Demands.” Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology 12,4: 424-39.

Moen, Phyllis and Yan Yu. 1999. “Having It All: Overall Work/Life Success in Two-Earner Families.” Cornell University, Bronfenbrenner Life Course Center Working Paper No. 99-03.

Nock, Steven L. 2001. “The Marriages of Equally Dependent Spouses.” Paper Presented at the meetings of the Population Association of America, Washington, March 2001.

Olah, Livia. 2001. “Gender and Family Stability: Dissolution of the First Parental Union in Sweden and Hungary.” Demographic Research 4(2): 29-77.

Oppenheimer, Valerie K.1997. “Women's Employment and the Gain to Marriage: The Specialization and Trading Model.” Annual Review of Sociology 23: 431-53.

Presser, Harriet B. 2001. “The 24-Hour Economy: A Threat to American Families? Paper Presented at the meetings of the Population Association of America, Washington, March 2001.

Risman, Barbara. 1998. Gender Vertigo: American Families in Transition. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Risman, Barbara and Danette Johson-Sumerford. 1998. “Doing it Fairly: A Study of Postgender Marriages.” Journal of Marriage and the Family 60 (1): 23-40.

Roussel, Louis. 1987. “Deux decennies de mutations demographiques (1965-1985) dans les pays industrializés.” Population 42,3: 429-48.

Scanzoni, Letha and John Scanzoni. 1976. Men Women and Change: A Sociology of Marriage and the Family. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Schwartz, P. 1994. Peer Marriage: How Love Between Equals Really Works. New York: Free Press.

Sullivan, Oriel. 2000. “The Division of Domestic Labour: Twenty Years of Change?” Sociology 34(3): 437-456.

Wanner, Richard. 1999. “Expansion and Ascription: Trends in Educational Opportunity in Canada.” Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology 36(3): 409-442.

Table 1. Time use of total population (average hours per day in population 15+), by sex, Canada, 1986, 1992, 1998

	1986		1992		1998	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
total productive activity	7.55		7.96	8.00	8.04	8.03
paid work and education	5.45	3.27	5.26	3.36	5.24	3.51
unpaid work	2.10	4.36	2.70	4.63	2.80	4.52
personal care	10.65	11.05	10.33	10.81	10.26	10.64
leisure/free time	5.81	5.33	5.71	5.19	5.69	5.33
total	24.00	24.00	24.00	24.00	24.00	24.00
N	9946		8996		10749	

Source: Time Use survey from Statistics Canada, General Social Survey, 1986, 1992, 1998.

Table 2. Average daily hours of paid and unpaid work, by sex, age, and marital status, Canada, 1986, 1992, 1998

	1986				1992				1998			
	Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		Women	
Age & marital	paid	unpaid	paid	unpaid	paid	unpaid	paid	unpaid	paid	unpaid	paid	unpaid
15-24												
Single	6.4	1.0	6.2	1.7	5.7	1.2	6.1	2.0	5.6	1.3	5.6	2.1
Married	6.1	1.8	4.0	4.2	6.8	2.6	4.4	4.1	7.0	2.4	5.1	3.9
Other not alone	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other alone	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	6.4	1.1	5.6	2.3	5.8	1.4	5.6	2.5	5.7	1.4	5.5	2.5
25-44												
Single	5.3	1.7	5.5	2.9	6.2	1.7	4.9	3.4	6.3	2.0	5.2	3.4
Married	6.7	2.4	3.3	5.5	6.6	3.1	3.8	5.8	6.8	3.2	4.0	5.7
Other not alone	6.1	1.9	4.0	4.4	5.2	3.0	3.6	5.3	5.6	3.4	4.4	5.2
Other alone	5.4	2.0	5.5	2.7	6.7	2.1	5.8	2.9	6.5	2.6	5.5	3.8
Total	6.4	2.2	3.7	5.0	6.5	2.7	3.9	5.4	6.6	2.9	4.3	5.2
45-64												
Single	4.4	2.4	3.2	4.1	4.4	2.9	3.5	4.1	3.5	2.7	4.4	3.9
Married	5.1	2.5	2.1	5.2	5.0	3.1	2.8	5.1	5.2	3.2	3.2	5.0
Other not alone	4.7	2.8	3.1	4.6	4.5	3.2	3.2	4.4	5.7	2.3	3.7	5.0
Other alone	5.4	2.1	2.8	4.3	4.9	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.8	3.0	2.9	4.0
Total	5.1	2.5	2.3	5.0	5.0	3.1	2.9	4.9	5.1	3.1	3.2	4.8
65+												
Single	2.3	1.9	1.0	4.2	1.3	3.4	0.1	4.9	0.6	3.1	0.0	4.8
Married	0.8	2.9	0.3	4.9	0.7	3.9	0.1	5.3	0.6	3.9	0.3	4.8
Other not alone	0.4	2.3	0.2	2.7	1.3	4.2	0.0	4.3	0.3	2.4	0.1	3.8
Other alone	0.5	2.2	0.1	3.7	0.3	3.8	0.2	3.8	0.1	3.3	0.1	4.0
Total	0.8	2.8	0.3	4.2	0.7	3.9	0.2	4.6	0.5	3.8	0.2	4.4
Total												
Single	5.9	1.3	5.6	2.3	5.7	1.6	5.3	2.7	5.6	1.7	5.2	2.7
Married	5.3	2.5	2.7	5.3	5.2	3.2	3.1	5.4	5.2	3.3	3.3	5.2
Other not alone	4.4	2.2	2.8	4.0	4.5	3.2	2.7	4.8	4.7	2.7	3.1	4.8
Other alone	3.9	2.1	1.1	3.8	3.5	3.1	1.3	3.8	3.6	3.0	1.2	4.0
Total	5.4	2.1	3.3	4.4	5.3	2.7	3.4	4.6	5.2	2.8	3.5	4.5
N	4877		5063		4398		4592		5281		5446	

Note: "-" = less than 10 cases.

Table 3. Average daily hours in paid work and unpaid work, by sex, age, marital and parental status, Canada, 1986, 1992, 1998

	15-44				45-64			
	unmarried no children	married no children	married parents	unmarried parents	unmarried no children	married no children	married parents	unmarried parents
1986								
Men								
total	7.3	8.2	9.3	9.4	7.1	7.1	8.4	8.5
paid	6.1	6.3	6.8	7.4	4.7	4.7	5.8	7.8
unpaid	1.2	1.9	2.5	2.0	2.4	2.4	2.6	0.7
Women								
total	8.0	8.4	8.9	8.4	7.3	7.0	8.3	8.4
paid	6.2	5.1	2.9	3.6	3.0	1.9	2.7	3.1
unpaid	1.8	3.3	6.0	4.8	4.3	5.1	5.6	5.2
1992								
Men								
total	7.4	9.4	9.7	8.1	7.6	7.6	9.0	8.5
paid	6.0	7.2	6.4	3.7	4.5	4.7	5.5	6.1
unpaid	1.4	2.2	3.4	4.4	3.0	2.9	3.5	2.4
Women								
total	8.2	8.9	9.6	8.9	7.2	7.6	8.7	8.7
paid	6.0	5.5	3.2	3.2	3.1	2.5	3.6	3.9
unpaid	2.2	3.4	6.4	5.6	4.1	5.0	5.2	4.8
1998								
Men								
total	7.5	9.2	10.2	9.2	7.0	7.8	9.7	9.2
paid	5.9	7.0	6.7	5.2	4.2	4.6	6.4	7.2
unpaid	1.6	2.3	3.5	4.1	2.8	3.2	3.3	2.0
Women								
total	7.8	9.0	9.9	9.6	7.7	7.7	9.6	9.2
paid	5.7	5.6	3.5	3.8	3.3	2.8	4.3	4.9
unpaid	2.2	3.4	6.3	5.8	4.4	4.9	5.3	4.3

Note: Sample size is 8666 in 1986, 7734 in 1992, and 9146 in 1998.

Table 4. Average daily hours of paid work and unpaid work in couples when both are working full-time, by sex, by number of children, and by age of children, Canada, 1992, 1998

	1992						1998					
	male			female			male			female		
	Total	Paid	Unpaid	Total	Paid	Unpaid	Total	Paid	Unpaid	Total	Paid	Unpaid
15-44	10.0	7.1	2.9	10.3	6.2	4.1	10.1	7.2	2.9	10.5	6.2	4.3
0 child	9.8	7.5	2.3	9.6	7.2	2.4	9.8	7.6	2.3	9.7	6.6	3.1
1 child	9.9	7.3	2.6	10.1	5.4	4.6	10.0	6.8	3.2	11.2	6.1	5.0
2 children	9.8	6.4	3.4	10.8	5.6	5.1	10.3	7.1	3.3	10.9	6.2	4.7
3+ children	11.1	7.4	3.6	11.2	6.0	5.1	10.5	7.0	3.6	11.1	5.4	5.7
age 0-4	10.4	6.9	3.5	10.9	5.3	5.6	10.5	6.7	3.8	11.0	5.3	5.8
age 5-18	9.9	6.9	2.9	10.4	5.8	4.6	10.1	7.1	3.0	11.0	6.4	4.6
45-64	9.3	6.7	2.6	10.3	6.7	3.5	10.2	7.3	2.9	9.7	5.9	3.8
0 child	9.6	7.4	2.2	10.5	7.3	3.3	9.6	7.0	2.6	9.2	5.6	3.6
1 child	9.7	6.7	3.0	8.8	4.9	3.9	10.8	8.3	2.5	10.6	6.8	3.9
2 children	7.5	3.7	3.9	12.7	8.2	4.5	11.3	8.0	3.4	10.9	6.3	4.6
3+ children	-	-	-	-	-	-	10.4	3.1	7.3	15.6	14.1	1.5
age 0-4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
age 5-18	9.0	5.9	3.2	9.7	5.6	4.1	11.0	7.7	3.3	10.8	6.6	4.1

Note: 1. "-" = less than 10 cases;
2. "no child" = no children under 19;
3. “age 5-18” excludes cases where there are children 0-4.
4. Sample size is 7504 in 1992 and 8225 in 1998.

Table 5. Predominance of models of husband-wife families in terms of the relative proportion of paid and unpaid work by sex, Canada, 1992, 1998

Compare to husband, wife does	Compare to husband, wife does 1992			1998		
	More paid	Same paid	Less paid	More paid	Same paid	Less paid
More unpaid						
Men	4.1	13.6	52.9	4.2	15.5	48.1
Women	6.5	22.2	53.4	7.3	19.0	48.9
Average	5.3	17.9	53.1	5.7	17.2	48.5
Same unpaid						
Men	2.8	5.2	7.6	1.0	6.7	7.4
Women	1.9	4.2	2.4	2.9	4.8	3.6
Average	2.4	4.7	5.0	1.9	5.7	5.5
Less unpaid						
Men	3.7	5.4	4.7	5.0	4.7	7.5
Women	4.0	2.9	2.5	5.7	4.4	3.5
Average	3.9	4.2	3.6	5.3	4.5	5.5

Note: This table excludes couples where one or both are aged 65 or over. The sample size is 3598 in 1992 and 3794 in 1998.

Table 6. Predominance of models of husband-wife families, by age group, by working status, by number of children, and by age of children, Canada, 1992 and 1998

	Total	age		Working status		Number of children				Age of children	
		15-44	45-64	Both FT	Others	0	1	2	3	0-4	5-18
1992											
Traditional	57.0	54.5	61.9	27.0	80.5	51.6	54.7	62.4	67.9	66.9	56.6
% men	6.8	6.0	8.1	5.9	7.1	11.6	5.1	3.8	2.6	3.1	4.7
Double burden	30.9	31.5	29.3	56.5	10.8	34.9	34.0	26.3	22.1	22.7	31.7
% men	25.2	25.9	24.5	23.0	34.5	30.5	19.8	23.5	15.7	22.4	19.8
Shared	12.1	14.0	8.8	16.5	8.7	13.5	11.3	11.3	10.0	10.4	11.7
% both	38.9	40.8	33.5	64.3	1.2	39.9	33.7	37.8	47.2	30.0	43.0
1998											
Traditional	53.8	53.6	54.3	28.7	75.4	47.3	58.1	56.7	64.8	66.2	54.1
% men	9.9	8.5	12.4	6.7	10.9	15.3	9.3	6.6	3.1	4.9	8.2
Double burden	33.0	31.4	35.4	52.8	15.8	41.0	27.9	28.0	23.2	19.4	31.6
% men	30.4	30.3	30.7	25.5	44.3	34.5	29.5	23.1	25.0	24.9	26.2
Shared	13.2	15.0	10.2	18.5	8.8	11.7	14.0	15.3	11.9	14.4	14.2
% both	43.4	39.7	52.3	66.4	0.6	43.9	52.3	43.6	19.0	37.1	46.7

Note: See Table 5. Using averages in cells from a given year in Table 5, and labelling the cells 1 to 9, the following definitions are used:
Traditional: 3 + 7
% men: 7/(3 + 7)
Double burden: 1 + 2 + 8 + 9
% men: (8 + 9) / (1 + 2 + 8 + 9)
Shared: 4 + 5 + 6
% both: 5 / (4 + 5 + 6)
The sample size is 3598 in 1992 and 3794 in 1998.