

## **Half-way to Gender Equality in Work? -- Evidence from time use data**

Paper prepared for the EMPLOY-FAMNET Berlin Workshop, May 11-12, 2009

**Jonathan Gershuny and Man Yee Kan**  
**University of Oxford**

*Draft only – please do not quote without authors' permission*

Please direct correspondence to:

Man Yee Kan  
Department of Sociology  
Manor Road Building  
Oxford, OX1 3UQ  
UK  
[man-yee.kan@sociology.ox.ac.uk](mailto:man-yee.kan@sociology.ox.ac.uk)

## **Half-way to Gender Equality in Work? -- Evidence from time use data**

**Jonathan Gershuny and Man Yee Kan**  
**University of Oxford**

Our daily activity patterns are closely related to the organization of the economic systems in our societies. Over the past four decades, there have been significant changes in the economic structure and the labour market in OECD countries: most notably, the growth of the service sector and the rise in women's labour force participation. Such changes have brought some convergence in working time patterns among different countries. For example, time use research has shown that paid work time in the UK, the US and most industrial countries has decreased for both male and female workers (Gershuny, 2000; Robinson & Godbey, 1997). As for unpaid domestic work, there has been a slight fall for women, especially for those in employment, and a moderate but continual increase in men's participation. However, women on average are still responsible for the major share of it (Gershuny, 2000; Gershuny & Sullivan, 2003; Sullivan, 2000).

The studies mentioned above suggest that the gender gap in paid work time and unpaid work time is closing slowly. Nevertheless, recent research has indicated that there is continuing gender segregation in domestic work. Kan and Gershuny (2009a, 2009b) analyze longitudinal British data (from the British Household Panel Survey) to investigate the changes in the domestic division of labour over the life course. They find that women undertake the bulk of both core housework (e.g. cleaning, washing and cooking) and non-core domestic work (e.g. childcare, shopping and gardening). In contrast, men spend little time on core housework and concentrate their domestic work time mainly on non-routine types of chores.

Is the gender divide in work time allocation really closing? This study aims to chart changes in men's and women's paid and unpaid work time over the last four decades, using large scale, nationally representative time diary data from twelve OECD countries. We are particularly interested in finding out whether there are significant differences in the trends in work time among countries of different styles of public policies. More specifically, we examine the extent to which gender equality in work time is achieved in different countries.

Current literature has classified public policy regimes in developed countries into a small number of types according to the level of social equity and state intervention in welfare provision (see e.g., Esping-Andersen, 1990, 1999; Gauthier, 1996; Goodin et al., 1999; Lewis, 1993; O'Connor et al., 1999; Sainsbury, 1999). We focus on the three most common regime categories based on past literature: (1) the liberal regimes, (2) the social democratic regimes, and (3) the social capitalist (or the conservative/corporatist) regimes. In liberal regimes—which are often anglophone—the state generally provides a low level of welfare support, but specific measures (e.g. means testing) are taken to direct benefits to those who are the most in need. Social policies carry a general assumption that the market mechanism is more efficient than state intervention in promoting social

advancement. The total social expenditure is as a result relatively low, and welfare provision (variously, in such countries, pensions, unemployment benefits, medical care) depends on privatized insurance schemes. Consequently, the society is usually highly stratified by individuals' socio-demographic characteristics, such as occupational class and gender. The UK, the US, and Canada are typical examples of this type of regimes.

Second, in social democratic regimes, the state takes a strong role in providing services and benefits for the majority of the population. Social and public policies are devised based on the consideration of citizen's right and have an objective to raise employment rate of both men and women. Public services for child- and elder-care are widely accessible so that many women are enabled to join the labour force. The level of social equality is high in these countries, with a high proportion of workers in well-paid professional occupations. The Scandinavian countries such as Norway and Sweden are commonly considered to be representatives of this regime type.

Third, continental Catholic European countries such as France and Germany are generally considered to be examples of the social capitalist (conservative/corporatist) regimes. The state provides social services mainly through social insurance programmes, which are organized to maintain a relatively wider social differentials between occupational groups, and men's role as breadwinners and women's as carers in the family. The state performs a subsidiary role to provide social services but traditional family responsibilities are assumed in public policies.

This brief characterization of the broad types of policy regime is in line with the typologies set out by Esping-Andersen (1990). Some critics later argued that issues of gender and the family are not adequately addressed in this theoretical framework (e.g. Gauthier, 1996; Lewis, 1993; O'Connor et al., 1999; Sainsbury, 1999). Nevertheless, the classifications they propose, which take account of gender-related policies and outcomes, still to a considerable extent overlap with Esping-Andersen's original typology. For example, Gauthier (1996) compares state policies regarding childcare, maternity leave and cash benefits and concludes that the US and Great Britain are representatives of the non-interventionist (liberal) model, and Sweden and Denmark are seen as the most egalitarian typology.

Certainly there are variations in welfare policies within each type of these regimes. Therefore we expect to find cross-national variations in gender and work time allocation among countries from each of the regime types. Nevertheless, we are particularly interested in whether gender equality in terms of work time allocation is better achieved in the social-democratic regimes, since many of them identify equality explicitly as an element of social advancement when devising their policies. Furthermore, with theoretically the minimal level of interventions into the market, we expect to find longer work hours but more similarities in the work time trends in the case of the liberal regimes. On the other hand, the social-capitalist or conservative regimes, given their emphasis on the traditional functions of the family, may display a distinct gendered pattern of work time trends. Nevertheless, the shared trends in economic development across the different

regime types will certainly have influenced patterns of time use, and we therefore expect that we will find also convergences in time use trends among them.

In what follows, we first describe trends in the paid and unpaid work time of men and women from twelve countries of the three types of public policy regimes over the past four decades. We then focus on unpaid work time and examine whether there is gender segregation in unpaid work. We will consider, on the basis of our findings, *whether*, and if so *when*, gender equality in the division of work time is likely to be achieved.

## DATA AND MEASURES

The data come from the Multinational Time Use Study (MTUS), a harmonized database of a collection of time-use diary surveys from a number of countries<sup>1</sup>. The original data were based on large nationally representative samples and were collected from the 1960s to the 2000s. The database currently contains more than 50 surveys from over 20 countries recording more than 500,000 diary days. There are considerable variations in the collection of these data (e.g., in the extent to which simultaneous activities and information about where and with whom the activity took place were recorded, though these aspects are covered to some degree by almost all of the component studies). In MTUS, these surveys are harmonized to a common format, with an identical set of activities and socio-demographic variables. Since a major aim of this paper is to analyze trends in work time, we have selected twelve countries where data of at least two different periods are available. The countries selected are Canada, the UK, the US, and Australia (which represent liberal welfare regimes), the Netherlands, Italy, France and Germany (which are examples of social capitalist regimes), and Denmark, Finland, Sweden, and Norway (which represent social democratic regimes). The selected countries include 437,374 diary cases<sup>2</sup> from 44 surveys. Table 1 presents the sample sizes and the periods when the surveys were conducted.

[Table 1 about here]

In the analyses, we follow Walker and Woods (1976) and Hawrylyshn (1977) to define “work” as including all those activities that someone might commission a “third party” to carry out for pay without losing the main sorts of direct utility derived from that activity<sup>3</sup>. We employ a broad definition of work including activities associated with paid work (including job-search activities), as well as time spent in education and training for

---

<sup>1</sup> The database is prepared by Centre for Time Use Research at the University of Oxford. More information is available at <http://www.timeuse.org/mtus>.

<sup>2</sup> In the analysis presented here, based on a slightly earlier release of the MTUS, the Netherlands cases alone consist of aggregated 7-day diaries. In the most recent release, all the diary cases, including those from the Netherlands, are based on single days. The dataset also includes anonymized identifiers allowing researchers to control for individual effects in those survey samples that contain more than one diary day per respondent.

<sup>3</sup> We recognise that this criterion leads to a somewhat problematical distinction between unpaid work and leisure and other non-work time.

work among people of working age (between 20 and 59), when calculating the paid work time.

## FINDINGS

### *I. Trends in Paid Work Time*

[Table 2 and Figure 1 about here]

Table 2 and Figure 1 present changes in men's paid work time over the years in the 12 countries. We can see that paid work time was at its maximum in the 1960s when the mean values were over 400 minutes per day in the UK, the US, France, Germany and Denmark (the only countries where data are available). From 1970s until late the 1980s or the early 1990s, in most of the liberal regimes (e.g., the UK, the US and Australia), men's paid work time had dropped gradually for about 50 minutes a day. Canada is an exception: the mean paid work time (365 minutes a day) was relatively lower compared to other countries in the 1970s and had experienced only a minor drop thereafter. We have fewer years of observations in other types of regimes. In general, all other countries, such as Denmark, Germany, Norway and Finland, had a moderate decrease in paid work time until the early 1990s. Nonetheless, in the Netherlands, the paid work time remained rather stable at around 300 minutes per day in the period.

The differences in paid work time trends among the regimes are found mainly in the period between the early 1990s and the early 2000s. In social democratic countries, paid work time continued to fall to around 310 minutes per day in the early 2000s. The paid work time in these countries had also been the shortest since the late 1990s. In the liberal regimes and the Netherlands, paid work time had stopped falling and had increased slightly between the early 1990s and the early 2000s.

[Table 3 and Figure 2 about here]

Table 3 and Figure 2 show the paid work time trends for women in the 12 countries. Women's time on paid work was shorter than men's and is particularly affected by their employment rate and part-time work rate. Overall, in the countries where data before the early 1970s are available, the average paid work time of women in all the countries had increased steadily and significantly until the early 2000s. The upward trend is observed in all the three typologies of regimes. In liberal regimes, for example, women's paid work time in Canada had increased steadily from 161 minutes per day in the early 1970s to 238 minutes in the late 1990s. In the UK, the figure had risen from 138 minutes in the 1960s to 202 minutes in the early 2000s. France, the Netherlands (social capitalist regimes) and Norway (a social democratic regime) had also shown a similar trend. One major factor for the growth in women's paid work time is the development of post-industrial economies, which has taken in women's labour.

Nevertheless, unlike the men's case, women's paid work time did not seem to vary according to regime types in the late 1990s or the early 2000s. Though in all

countries women's participation in paid work has increased, women on average work shorter hours for pay than men, and in a number of these countries, many more women than men are legally classified as part-time workers. Women's part-time work rates are related a very complex array of policies regarding welfare and tax systems and therefore do not vary distinctively according to the current categories of policy regimes (e.g., women's part time work rate in the early 2000s was relatively high in the UK, the Netherlands and Norway).

In Sweden (between 1990 and 2000) and Finland (between 1979 and 1996), women's paid work time had shown a modest decrease, in contrast with the general rising trend in other countries in the period. It is worth noting that, however, the paid work time was already relatively longer in the beginning period of these two countries and it remained relatively long compared with other countries despite the initial fall.

To summarize, we find more variations in men's paid work time trends than women's among the policy regime typologies. Generally speaking, men's paid work time decreased gradually since the 1960s. But in liberal and social capitalist regimes, the trend had been reversed since the late 1990s. In contrast, women's paid work had increased steadily since the 1960s and the 1970s in most of the countries regardless of the policy regime types.

## *II. Trends in Unpaid Work Time*

[Table 4 and Figure 3 about here]

The trends in unpaid work time to a certain extent mirror those in paid work time. As can be seen in Table 4 and Figure 3, men's unpaid work time generally had displayed an overall upward trend over the past four decades. In liberal policy regimes such as the UK and the US, the figures increased from 90 and 105 minutes per day respectively in the 1960s, to 148 and 173 minutes per day respectively in the early 2000s. Similar levels of rise are observed in the four social capitalist countries, although in Germany and the Netherlands, men's unpaid work time stopped to increase in the most recent periods. In addition, the figures in Italy were significantly lower than those in other countries in the two observed periods. The social democratic regimes had a similar increase in men's unpaid work time, with Sweden being an exception, where the figure had dropped from 171 to 142 minutes per day between 1990 and 2000. However, men's unpaid work time was already the longest in Sweden in the early 1990s.

[Table 5 and Figure 4 about here]

Women's unpaid work time was significantly longer than men's in all of the periods and countries observed. In contrast with men's unpaid work time trends, women's had displayed a gradual decline over the past four decades. In the 1960s, it was over 360 minutes in the UK and the US and even reached 425 minutes in France. In the early 1970s, the figures in the three countries already had dropped significantly to 304,

320 and 368 minutes already, which indicates that rapid industrialization had taken much women's time on paid work (Table 3 and Figure 2) and therefore their time on unpaid work was reduced. For all the 12 countries, women's unpaid work time dropped steadily from the early 1970s to the early 1990s: in the early 1990s, the figure was 238 minutes per day in the US and was around 300 minutes for the rest of the cases. The figures fell significantly to around 280 minutes between the 1990s and the early 2000s in most of the countries. Before the 1990s, women's unpaid work time did not appear to vary significantly according to policy regime types. Since the early 1990s, Scandinavian countries had the shortest average women's unpaid work time: the figures were 255, 276 and 205 minutes per day respectively for Finland in 1996 and for Norway and Sweden in the early 2000s. In the UK and the US, women's unpaid work time ceased to decrease significantly from the 1990s. Furthermore, women's unpaid work time was the longest in Italy in the late 1980s and the early 2000s.

To sum up, there are no significant differences in women's and men's unpaid work time trends among the countries of the three classifications of policy regimes.

### *III. Trends in the Gender Division of Labour*

[Figure 5 about here]

What are the implications of the aforementioned findings for gender equality in the division of labour? Figure 5 demonstrates the changes in the proportion of unpaid work undertaken by women (defined as women's unpaid work time divided by the sum of women's and men's unpaid work time in each year) over the decades. Despite variations in the paid work and unpaid work time trends among the countries from different policy regimes, we see overall a substantial fall of about 20% in women's proportion of unpaid work over the past four decades. The proportion was about 80% in UK, the US, France Germany and Denmark in the 1960s. It declined to around 75% in the early 1970s; the figures were about the same in countries where the earliest observations were available from this period onwards (Australia, Canada, the Netherlands, and Norway). From the late 1980s onwards, the figures were below 70% in all the countries. The only exception was Italy, where the figure was 84% and then fell to 78% in the early 2000s. Also since the 1980s, the figures for countries of the social democratic regimes were significant lower than other countries (being 64% in Denmark and 60% in Norway in the early 1990s and 58% in Finland in the late 1990s). In countries of the liberal regimes and the social democratic regimes, the figures continued to fall from the 1990s, so that in the early 2000s, they were respectively just over 60% in the UK and the US, and 59% for both Norway and Sweden. Consequently, in the early 2000s, countries of the social capitalist (corporatist) policy regimes showed the highest proportion of women's unpaid labour (the figures were at or over 65% in the Netherlands, Germany and Italy). These findings are consistent with the emphasis of the traditional family roles underlying the policy designs and implementation in these countries.

[Figure 6 about here]

Let us now consider unpaid and paid work together. Figure 6 presents the proportion of women's total work time (defined as women's total work time divided by the sum of men's and women's total work time) over the previous four decades. As we can see, the figures for all the countries had fluctuated only slightly at the 50% in all the years of observation. In other words, men and women on average had more or less the same amount of total work time. If both paid work and unpaid work were considered to be of the same values and were assumed to require the same amount of efforts, men and women were quite equal in terms of the distribution of work time.

It is well-known that, however, domestic work and paid work have *dissimilar consequences* in modern societies. Participation in labour market work is one of the key means and the most direct routes to the accumulation of human capital, which is critically—and for reasons mentioned briefly below we suspect in historical terms *increasingly*—important in the determination of life chances. Paid work provides, not just income, but also access to social networks, insurance and pension schemes, and monetary credit—all of which may improve the worker's bargaining power in the family. The findings show that there has been a gender convergence in paid work time and unpaid work time in the countries from all the three types of welfare regimes. Nevertheless, a significant gender gap in unpaid work time and paid work time remained in the early 2000s.

#### *IV. Gender Segregation in Unpaid Work*

[Tables 6, 7 and 8 about here]

[Tables 9, 10, and 11 about here]

In Tables 6 – 11, we divide men's and women's unpaid work time into three categories: core domestic work (including daily routine types of housework such as cleaning, doing the laundry and cooking), caring for family members (including care for children and adults) and other unpaid work (including non-routine types of household work such as shopping, gardening and household repairs). Comparing the distribution of unpaid work time among the three categories, we can see clear patterns of gender segregation: although women spend much more time on unpaid work than men, they concentrate their time mainly on core domestic work, while men spend the largest proportion of their time on non-core domestic work. For example, in the UK in 2000-01, women spent 59% of their unpaid work time on core housework, and men spent 53% on non-core domestic work.

The decline in the proportion of unpaid work undertaken by women over the years is mainly due to a reduction in women's core domestic work time. From Table 9, we can see that women's average time on core domestic work was very high (was between 210 and 270 minutes per day in the countries where data were recorded). This is due mainly to their much shorter hours on paid work (Table 3) compared with men's long hours of participation (Table 2). The figures dropped rapidly to be between 120 and 180 minutes in the late 1980s, except in Italy where the time was significantly longer (275

minutes per day). In the same period, men's core domestic work time increased gradually from around 20 minutes to about 40 minutes in most of the countries where records were available. From the late 1980s to the early 2000s, women's core domestic work continued to fall and men's increased slightly, both at a slower rate than the earlier periods.

The time on caring for family members has shown a somewhat different pattern of changes. Women's time was about 2.5 times of that of men. Referring to Tables 7 and 10, we might again take the UK in 2000-01 as an example. Women's average time on caring for others was 42 minutes a day, compared with men's 17 minutes. But in contrast with core domestic work, women's time spent on care fluctuated and increased to some extent over the past four decades. Men spent relatively little time on care (about 20 minutes a day in the early 2000s), despite some increases since the 1960s.

Tables 8 and 11 provide no clear picture of a gender divide in the case of non-core domestic work. By the early 2000s, men undertook slightly more non core domestic work than women in UK and Norway (at 78 and 86 minutes per day respectively) and there was no significance gender difference in the US (both stood at about 110 minutes per day); but women spent longer time on non core unpaid work than men in the corporatist policy regimes including the Netherlands, Italy and Germany. In the UK, women's time on non core unpaid work had dropped slightly since the 1970s, but the figures fluctuated slightly or remained relatively stable in other countries. Men's time on non-core domestic work had not changed very significantly over the years.

To summarize, men and women tend to undertake different types of unpaid work. Women were responsible for the bulk of core domestic work and caring for others, and men tended to spend their unpaid work time on non core domestic work. There is evidence to show that the gender gap in core domestic work is closing gradually. This finding is clearly consistent with previous results from smaller groups of countries and shorter time-spans (e.g., Robinson & Godbey (1997) and Sullivan (2000)). Nonetheless, this is achieved mainly through a reduction in women's work time rather than an increase in men's.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

We have charted changes in the division of work time between men and women over the past four decades, using nationally representative and high quality time diary data from twelve OECD countries. Our results suggest that there are more similarities than variations in work time trends among countries of different types of public policy regimes. While the general trends of men's paid work time are falling, they have rebounded both in liberal regimes and in social capitalist regimes such as the UK, the US and the Netherlands since the 1990s. Irrespective of policy regime category, women's time on paid work has been on the rise and their time on unpaid work has been declining. Since the 1990s, however, the social democratic regimes have exhibited shorter women's unpaid work time than other countries. Thus the main differences in work time trends are found between social democratic and the other two types of policy regimes.

Nevertheless, when focussing on the proportion of unpaid work undertaken by women instead of the total work done by men and women respectively, there are more variations among the three types of welfare regimes. The main divide in the trends lies between the social capitalist regimes and the other two types. While women's proportion of unpaid work has been declining in all the countries, countries of the social capitalist regimes (e.g. Italy and Germany), where traditional family functions and the male breadwinner family models are often maintained through policy implementation, have shown a significantly higher level in the early 2000s. In addition, countries of the social democratic regimes (e.g. Denmark, Sweden and Norway), where social equality is considered to be a major goal of social and public policies, have shown a relatively faster declining trend since the 1990s. These findings reveal that public and welfare policies make an impact on the gender equality in work time by influencing the pace in achieving the gender division of labour.

Despite these variations, we still see a slow but continuing trend of gender convergence in work time and the domestic division of labour regardless of policy regime types. Will this trend continue? *If* we were to project the curves in Figure 5 to continue for a further 20 years, it appears that, sometime in the later 2020s, the proportion of unpaid work undertaken by women would decline to about a half of the total, and gender equality in the division of labour will be achieved.

The convergence of patterns of work time change may suggest a “lagged adaptation” in the division of labour between men and women (Gershuny, Godwin & Jones, 1994). According to this view, market forces drive men and women to devote more time to labour market work, while ideas of fairness in the distribution of overall work burdens encourage a less unequal division of domestic labour between them. Hence gender ideologies in regard to the domestic division of labour established in childhood (in historical eras when women were less committed to paid work) are challenged by observations and experiences of gender roles during adulthood. This may lead in turn to partial adaptations in the ideologies and behaviours, so that the gender gap in the domestic division of labour is to some degree closed. The outcome is a compromise between the more strongly-gendered inherited work ideology, and the markedly less-strongly gendered requirements of household equity.

This speculation is consistent with the findings that more gender inequalities are found in core domestic work and caring for others, which are traditionally more associated with femininity than non core domestic work. The clashes in realities and ideologies may lead parents to transmit more gender egalitarian ideologies to their children, so that the gender gap in the division of labour will be further closed in the next generation. If this optimistic view holds, the 2000s is about at the mid-point of gender equality in work.

Nevertheless, the findings reveal that gender segregation in domestic work may pose a barrier to gender equality. In all the regime types, even in the social democratic ones, women still undertake the bulk of routine domestic work and care. The influence of

traditional gender ideologies is still strong. Furthermore, the decline in women's proportion of unpaid work time over the decades is due largely to a reduction in women's time on core domestic work, rather than a significant increase in men's unpaid work time. These changes are likely to have been brought about by the co-incident increase in the demand for women's participation in the labour market, and the diffusion of modern domestic technologies that increase the efficiency in housework (Gershuny, 1983, 2004), rather than by a rapid transformation in gender ideologies. In short, despite equality in educational access and in legal requirements for equality of treatment in the workplace, women still take a primary role in domestic work.

There is evidence that the continuing effects of gendered domestic work ideologies may operate dynamically through the life-course (Kan & Gershuny, 2009a). It may be rational for members of couples to specialize in paid and unpaid work in direct proportion to their paid-work earnings power. Once an even slightly traditionally gendered work distribution (i.e., men doing more paid work women more unpaid) has emerged, perhaps subsequent to the birth of a first child, the woman accumulates human capital at a slower rate than does the man, further increasing the pressure for gendered specialization. Moreover, research has suggested that couples where the female partner has a significant higher level of earning may resort to a traditional form of domestic division of labour (e.g. Brines, 1994; Bittman et al., 2003; however, Kan and Gershuny, 2009b, using longitudinal evidence of human capital and unpaid work dynamics, cast some doubt on this proposition).

The development of dispersed work-time schedules characteristic of post-industrial economies may also not be totally favourable to the process of gender equality in work. For example, the growth of the service sector has made atypical work schedules (shift work, long hours, part time and fragmented hours) more common. Kan and Lesnard (2009), analysing week-long diaries in UK and France, report that women are still far more likely than men to work on a part-time basis, and men are prone to having long work hours over the week. The gendered pattern of work schedules has reinforced the traditional form of domestic division of labour, particularly for core domestic work, which has to be undertaken on a routine basis and does not match well with men's long workweek schedules. To conclude, the gender segregation in work schedules and in domestic work demonstrates that there are still hurdles to gender equality in work.

We find that, despite the historical changes identified here, traditional gender ideologies, and hence traditional work practices, still prevail to some degree. This persistent phenomenon interacts with another, largely independently caused, recent social trend experienced throughout the developed world: the growth in the rate of partnership breakdown to produce an increasingly gendered inequality of life-chances. In previous eras, where marriages mostly persisted until the death of one partner, differences between men's and women's paid and unpaid work balances, which as we have seen do not imply overall differences in total work time, but which may have affected aspects of power within the household, at least gave rise to similar long term consequences for men and women in terms of their own households' overall access to monetary resources. Now, by contrast, where the household dynamic leading to gender specialization is coupled with a

high rate of marital breakup, then there must be an associated gendered difference in life-course prospects for financial well-being. The disproportionately paid-work-specialized husband leaves the marriage taking with him his relatively enhanced human capital. The wife is, as we know, most-likely to be left, not just with the baby, but also with her human capital—and hence her future economic prospects—relatively diminished by her previous disproportionately heavy responsibility for unpaid work.

## REFERENCES

- Bittman, Michael, Paula England, Nancy Folbre, Liana Sayer, and George Matheson. 2003. "When Does Gender Trump Money? Bargaining and Time in Household Work." *American Journal of Sociology* 109:186-214.
- Brines, Julie. 1994. "Economic Dependency, Gender and the Division of Domestic Labour at Home." *American Journal of Sociology* 100:652-688.
- Esping-Andersen, Gösta. 1990. *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- . 1999. *Social Foundations of Post-Industrial Economies*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Gauthier, Anne Helene. 1996. *The State and the Family: A Comparative Analysis of Family Policies in Industrialized Countries*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gershuny, Jonathan. 1983. *Social Innovation and the Division of Labour*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- . 2000. *Changing times: work and leisure in postindustrial society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2004. "Domestic Equipment Does Not Increase Domestic Work: a response to Bittman, Rice and Wajcman." *British Journal of Sociology* 55:425-431.
- Gershuny, Jonathan, Michael Godwin, and Sally Jones. 1994. "The Domestic Labour Revolution: a Process of Lagged Adaptation." in *The Social and Political Economy of the Household*, edited by M. Anderson, F. Bechhofer, and J. Gershuny. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gershuny, Jonathan and Oriel Sullivan. 2003. "Time Use, Gender, and Public Policy Regimes." *Social Politics* 10:205-228.
- Goodin, Robert E., Bruce Headey, Ruud Muffels, and H. Driven. 1999. *The Real Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hawrylyshn, Oli. 1977. "Towards a definition of non-market activities." *Review of Income and Wealth* 23:79-96.
- Kan, Man Yee and Jonathan Gershuny. 2009a. "Gender and Time Use Over the Life-course." in *Changing Relationships*, edited by M. Brynin and E. John. New York: Routledge.
- . 2009b. "Gender Segregation and Bargaining in Domestic Labour: Evidence from longitudinal time use data." in *Gender Inequalities in the 21st Century*, edited by R. Crompton and J. Scott. Edward Elgar.

- Kan, Man Yee and Laurent Lesnard. 2009. "Measuring Social Rhythms by Optimal Matching: Working Week Schedules in France 1998-99 and UK 2000-01." Paper presented in *Sociology Seminar at Nuffield College, University of Oxford*. Oxford.
- Lewis, Jane. 1993. *Women and Social Policies in Europe: Work, family and the state*. Aldershot, UK: Edward Elgar.
- O'Connor, Julia S., Ann Schola Orloff, and Sheila Shaver. 1999. *States, Markets, Families*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Robinson, John P. and Geoffrey Godbey. 1997. *Time for life: The surprising ways Americans use their time*. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania States University Press.
- Sainsbury, Diane. 1999. *Gender and Welfare State Regimes*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Sullivan, O. 2000. "The division of domestic labour: Twenty years of change?" *Sociology* 34:437-456.
- Walker, Kathryn E. and Margaret E. Woods. 1976. *Time Use: A Measure of Household Production of Family Goods and Services*. Washington, D.C.: Center for the Family of the American Home Economics Association.

Table 1

Survey periods and sample sizes of time use surveys (the exact years of studies are placed in parentheses)

	1961-69	1970-76	1976-84	1985-89	1990-94	1995-99	2000-04
		2138 (1971-72)	2659 (1981)	9618 (1986)	8936 (1992)	10726 (1998)	
Canada							
Denmark	4017 (1964)			3220 (1987)			
France	2893 (1966)	4634 (1975)				15318 (1998-99)	
Netherlands		1292 (1975)	2727 (1980)	3263 (1985)	3158 (1990)	3227 (1995)	1639 (2000)
Norway		6516 (1971-72)	6068 (1980-81)		6129 (1990-91)		
UK	9292 (1961)	20293 (1974)		9088 (1987)		1905 (1995)	20980 (2000-01)
US	1987 (1965-66)	6682 (1975-76)		4935 (1985)	8702 (1992-94)	1151 (1998-99)	18751 (2003)
Finland			11899 (1979)	15184 (1987-88)		10040 (1996)	
Italy				37769 (1989)			51206 (1996)
Australia		1491 (1974)		3181 (1987)	13494 (1992)	14017 (1997)	
Sweden					7065 (1990-91)		7727 (2000-01)
Germany	3687 (1965)				25778 (1991-92)		32892 (2000-01)

Data Source: Multinational Time Use Study, <http://www.timeuse.org/mtus>.

Table 2. Trends in Men's Paid Work Time (Minutes per Day)

	1961-69	1970-75	1976-84	1985-89	1990-94	1995-99	2000-04
Canada		365	332	351	354	363	
UK	434	396		327		313	333
USA	441	398		364	350	337	359
Australia		405		381	350	358	
France	436	377				324	
Netherlands		305	293	292	317	328	344
Italy				337			358
Germany	420				353		311
Denmark	407			358			
Norway		368	332		326		315
Finland			333	316		297	
Sweden					362		311

Data Source: Multinational Time Use Study.

Table 3. Trends in Women's Paid Work Time (Minutes per Day)

	1961-69	1970-75	1976-84	1985-89	1990-94	1995-99	2000-04
Canada		161	195	199	221	238	
UK	138	155		153		179	202
USA	176	180		218	255	275	247
Australia		150		189	170	186	
France	167	184				203	
Netherlands		69	79	92	115	131	157
Italy				138			172
Germany	172				186		169
Denmark	114			232			
Norway		131	167		198		195
Finland			242	231		213	
Sweden					249		226

Data Source: Multinational Time Use Study.

Table 4. Trends in Men's Unpaid Work Time (Minutes per Day)

	1961-69	1970-75	1976-84	1985-89	1990-94	1995-99	2000-04
Canada		127	146	128	144	156	
UK	90	91		133		137	148
USA	105	132		147	140	190	173
Australia		105		125	150	147	
France	114	114				157	
Netherlands		118	127	136	125	136	133
Italy				69			97
Germany	102				155		155
Denmark	64			131			
Norway		125	138		155		173
Finland			126	145		150	
Sweden					171		142

Data Source: Multinational Time Use Study.

Table 5. Trends in Women's Unpaid Work Time (Minutes per Day)

	1961-69	1970-75	1976-84	1985-89	1990-94	1995-99	2000-04
Canada		341	291	276	276	272	
UK	369	304		320		274	280
USA	361	320		277	238	283	272
Australia		362		309	318	308	
France	425	368				302	
Netherlands		356	363	349	308	288	278
Italy				375			341
Germany	392				323		292
Denmark	320			234			
Norway		367	305		279		276
Finland			259	251		255	
Sweden					289		205

Data Source: Multinational Time Use Study.

Table 6. Trends in Men's Core Domestic Work Time (Minutes per Day)

	1961-69	1970-75	1976-84	1985-89	1990-94	1995-99	2000-04
Canada		28	43	32	38	48	
UK	20	20		43		43	53
USA	21	29		56	42	82	37
Australia		19		37	41	43	
France	25	37				45	
Netherlands		28	33	43	38	44	46
Italy				16			27
Germany	17				34		44
Denmark	18			37			
Norway		35	44		37		65
Finland			34	37		41	
Sweden					57		37

Data Source: Multinational Time Use Study.

Table 7. Trends in Men's Time on Care (Minutes per Day)

	1961-69	1970-75	1976-84	1985-89	1990-94	1995-99	2000-04
Canada		16	15	15	18	22	
UK	3	6		14		23	17
USA	12	11		11	7	26	23
Australia		10		16	18	19	
France	13	13				8	
Netherlands		13	16	14	13	14	17
Italy				11			15
Germany	11				19		20
Denmark				9			
Norway		13	20		23		22
Finland			11	12		15	
Sweden					21		18

Data Source: Multinational Time Use Study.

Table 8. Trends in Men's Time on Non-core Domestic Work (Minutes per Day)

	1961-69	1970-75	1976-84	1985-89	1990-94	1995-99	2000-04
Canada		84	88	81	87	86	
UK	66	64		75		71	78
USA	73	92		80	91	82	112
Australia		76		72	91	86	
France	75	65				104	
Netherlands		76	78	80	74	79	69
Italy				42			56
Germany	74				102		92
Denmark	46			85			
Norway		77	74		94		86
Finland			81	96		94	
Sweden					93		87

Data Source: Multinational Time Use Study.

Table 9. Trends in Women's Core Domestic Work Time (Minutes per Day)

	1961-69	1970-75	1976-84	1985-89	1990-94	1995-99	2000-04
Canada		195	141	143	145	134	
UK	251	197		182		145	146
USA	211	163		149	103	127	99
Australia		211		168	155	147	
France	242	219				169	
Netherlands		191	189	176	153	139	130
Italy				275			221
Germany	243				137		145
Denmark	272			125			
Norway		268	186		134		140
Finland			157	139		117	
Sweden					144		76

Data Source: Multinational Time Use Study.

Table 10. Trends in Women's Time on Care (Minutes per Day)

	1961-69	1970-75	1976-84	1985-89	1990-94	1995-99	2000-04
Canada		53	48	45	47	47	
UK	26	26		43		56	42
USA	48	40		37	24	54	52
Australia		45		58	61	54	
France	67	51				32	
Netherlands		39	38	39	39	38	42
Italy				33			37
Germany	46				48		46
Denmark				20			
Norway		47	52		52		55
Finland			34	35		39	
Sweden					52		34

Data Source: Multinational Time Use Study.

Table 11. Trends in Women's Time on Non-core Domestic Work (Minutes per Day)

	1961-69	1970-75	1976-84	1985-89	1990-94	1995-99	2000-04
Canada		105	64	94	95	100	
UK	42	86		78		76	61
USA	110	107		110	78	118	110
Australia		99		75	97	78	
France	116	98				101	
Netherlands		57	61	60	147	66	106
Italy				67			83
Germany	44				107		100
Denmark	48			90			
Norway		34	64		42		56
Finland			71	48		54	
Sweden					94		94

Data Source: Multinational Time Use Study.

Figure 1. Trends in Men's Paid Work Time




Figure 2. Trends in Women's Paid Work Time




Figure 3. Trends in Men's Unpaid Work Time




Figure 4. Trends in Women's Unpaid Work Time




Figure 6. Trends in Women's Proportion of Unpaid Work




Figure 6. Trends in Women's Proportion of All Work

