

## PSC Discussion Papers Series

---

Volume 17 | Issue 7

Article 1

---

5-2003

# Relative Participation of Men and Women in Paid and Unpaid Work: An Analysis of Variations by Individual, Family and Community Characteristics

Roderic Beaujot

*University of Western Ontario*, [rbeaujot@uwo.ca](mailto:rbeaujot@uwo.ca)

Zenaida R. Ravanera

*University of Western Ontario*, [ravanera@uwo.ca](mailto:ravanera@uwo.ca)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/pscpapers>

---

### Recommended Citation

Beaujot, Roderic and Ravanera, Zenaida R. (2003) "Relative Participation of Men and Women in Paid and Unpaid Work: An Analysis of Variations by Individual, Family and Community Characteristics," *PSC Discussion Papers Series*: Vol. 17 : Iss. 7 , Article 1.

Available at: <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/pscpapers/vol17/iss7/1>

**Relative Participation of Men and Women  
in Paid and Unpaid Work:  
An Analysis of Variations by Individual,  
Family and Community Characteristics**

by  
Roderic Beaujot  
Zenaida R. Ravanera

Discussion Paper no. 03-07

May 2003

rbeujot@uwo.ca  
ravanera@uwo.ca

On the web in PDF format: <http://www.ssc.uwo.ca/sociology/popstudies/dp/dp03-07.pdf>

Paper to be presented at session on Sociological Dimensions of Time-use, meetings of the  
Canadian Association of Sociology and Anthropology, Halifax, June 2003.

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

## **Relative Participation of Men and Women in Paid and Unpaid Work: An Analysis of Variations by Individual, Family and Community Characteristics**

### Abstract

*On the basis of the 1998 General Social Survey on Time Use, the relative participation in paid and unpaid work of partners in a household is classified into three types: **complementary** wherein one partner, usually the wife, does more unpaid work while the other partner does more paid work; **double burden** wherein one partner does more unpaid work while doing more or the same amount of paid work; and **shared roles** wherein both partners do about the same amount unpaid work. Couples who are cohabiting, and couples where both partners are working full-time, have a higher likelihood of both shared roles and double burdens, compared to complementary roles. Shared roles are less common at older ages, with lower levels of education, and for those with higher religiosity. Double-burdens are more common when there are no children, also less common in rural areas, but more common in communities where there is a low proportion of immigrants.*

Family models can usefully consider the relative participation of men and women in paid and unpaid work. These models have given 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 double burden. 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.

When both are employed, 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 double burden in the sense of women having more total (paid plus unpaid) work than men. While it is well known that 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. 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 paid work, 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 their various limitations, time-use data provide a common metric with which to analyse “total productive activity,” that is both paid and unpaid work. It then becomes an empirical question to determine the relative predominance of various family models. In the complementary-roles, 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 double burden 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 the more symmetrical, shared-roles or egalitarian “new families” where the unpaid work is more equally divided, or situations where it is the men who have a double burden.

An earlier paper used the data from the 1986, 1992 and 1998 General Social Surveys to describe how paid and unpaid work are distributed in people’s lives, and how this distribution is affected by marital, parental, and employment status (Beaujot and Liu, 2001). On the basis of time-use data from the 1998 General Social Survey, the present paper treats these family models as the dependent variable, seeking to determine the family, economic, cultural and community variables that help to predict whether a given couple would be classified as traditional, double-burden or shared-roles in its division of paid and unpaid work.

### Models of relative participation in paid and unpaid work

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 inter-dependent. When neither exists there is no relationship, but if both are present it may be called a collaborative model. This collaborative or shared-roles model can also 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.” Clearly, a strong gender differentiation between paid and unpaid work brings dependency and the potential for exploitation. 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.

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 family 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.

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 who is both in the market and in household production is no longer so clear, especially for that person.

There is obviously considerable pull toward unions based on complementary roles both as a way of dividing the work and a means of manifesting gender (Brines, 1994), 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. The adoption of a family model depends on several factors including each individual characteristics and values, the couple’s family stage, and the characteristics of the community where the family resides.

## Variations by individual, family, and community characteristics

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 with its greater flexibility in unions 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. Thus, couples in *common-law* union may be less likely than the married to be in complementary model. And, those with more liberal value orientation are also expected to be in more shared roles.

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. 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.

A person's *age* and *children* are also relevant determinants of family models. On the basis of time diary data from 1965, 1975, and 1998, Sayer (2002) finds that the relation between time use and gender has changed since the 1960s. Men have increased their time in core nonmarket tasks (cooking, cleaning, and daily child care), marriage increases housework for both women and men, and both married mothers and married fathers of young children are putting in a second shift of work. She concludes that nonmarket work may be shifting from representing gender subordination to representing family caring. On the basis of Canadian data from 1981 to 1998, Gauthier (2002) also finds that child care as a main activity is the category of time use that has increased the most for young persons who are parents. Thus we would expect to find more shared-roles couples among younger respondents, 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.

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). When both are employed full-time we would expect more double-burdens, but also more shared roles.

In addition to individual characteristics and family life course stage, we expect that the socio-economic and socio-cultural conditions in communities where couples reside would also influence the sharing of paid and unpaid work. Thus, communities characterized by more

traditional value orientations, and low opportunities for women's participation in the labour force would be less conducive to adoption of the shared model. Complementary roles are also more likely in places that require performance of more unpaid work, that is, where commodification of household tasks and caring activities is less widespread.

### Identifying alternate models

Various measures have been used to establish alternate family models. 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. Risman and Johson-Sumerford (1998), in locating their 15 postgender marriages with children, 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.

**Quantitative studies** have largely adopted the 40/60 split of labour and responsibility that Schwartz (1994) used to identify peer couples. For instance, Nock (2001) 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.

Our aim is to find a way of dividing each of paid and unpaid work so that, compared to one's spouse, one could be doing more, the same, or less. The 40/60 split that others have used, typically for only one dimension, appears to be rather generous, because the person doing the larger amount can be doing as much as 50% more than the person doing the smaller amount. While any cut-off will be arbitrary, and 50/50 would be an impossible standard, it can be argued that the 40/60 split is too generous as an indication of symmetry. Instead, we have here used the range of 45% to 55% of the couple total on a given type of work as being "the same," while under 45% is doing less than the spouse, and over 55% is doing more than the spouse. The 45/55 split is our basis for subsequently categorizing couples into the relative participation models of *complementary*, *shared*, or *double-burden* (see below).

### Data, measures and methods

The data used here are from the 1998 General Social Surveys on time-use. This is a representative sample of the Canadian population, with 10,750 respondents. The present analysis

is based on the 4950 weighted cases of married or cohabiting respondents, where both respondent and spouse were under 65 years of age. Mostly, this survey obtained the detailed time-use calendar from the respondent for the day under observation. However, some questions asked the respondent to estimate weekly total time use in given categories of activities, for both themselves and their spouse/partner. These estimates are not as inclusive as the daily time use, and they present the problem of using the respondent to estimate the behaviour of their spouse, but they have the advantage of being available for both members of the couple. The specific questions asked about total weekly time spent in paid work, domestic work, household maintenance, and child care, for the respondent and their spouse. These separate measures have been collapsed into the two categories of weekly paid and unpaid work. While these estimates 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. 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-categories of cases depending on whether it is the woman or the man doing 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 **shared-roles** model where both do the same amount of unpaid work. While this gives predominance to unpaid work in defining a shared-roles 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.

To analyse the variations in relative participation models, we start with a cross tabulation of the relative participation models with the independent variables. This provides the 'gross' differentials in the models by categories of each independent variables (results shown in Table 2). To obtain the 'net effects' of the variables, we then used a multinomial logistic regression which compares the shared and double-burden with the complementary model. The coefficients (or, more specifically, the exponentials of the coefficients) provide the likelihood (relative to the reference category) of those belonging to a category of an independent variable to fall into a certain model (shared and double burden or missing) rather than into a complementary model<sup>1</sup>. For example, for the marital status variable, a positive coefficient of the 'common-law' category (column 1 of Table 3) indicates that, in comparison to the *complementary* model, those in common-law are more likely than the married to be in the *shared* model.

The community-level variables included in the analysis were data for enumeration areas

---

<sup>1</sup> Another multivariate analysis that we tried was binary logistic regression which compares one model with all others. We found that the multinomial logistic regression provided a clearer picture of the effects of the variables than the binary logistic regressions.



derived from the 1996 Census, which were merged with the 1998 General Social Survey on Time Use. Among the available variables, we chose those that indicate the community's socio-economic (Percent with Post-secondary education, size and location, Region) and socio-cultural characteristics (Percent 60 years and older, Percent Immigrants, and Percent Separated or Divorced).

### Determinants of relative participation in paid and unpaid work

#### —Table 1 about here—

Table 1 shows separate entries for male and female respondents, but the text will focus on the totals across all respondents. The dominant category, amounting to 53.9% of respondents, is the complementary roles arrangement where one person does more paid work and the other does more unpaid work. While the numbers were too small to analyse separately, it is of interest that 48.5% are complementary-traditional, where the husband spends more time at paid work and the wife at unpaid work, while the complementary-gender-reversed comprise 5.4% of the sample. The second largest category is the double burden, representing 33.0% of the sample, including 22.9% which are women's double burdens, and 10.0% that are men's double burdens. The remaining 13.1% of the sample can be called a collaborative model or shared roles, including 5.7% where they do the same amount of both paid and unpaid work.

The variables listed in Table 2 are now entered into logistic regression, where the shared-roles and double-burden are compared to the complementary-roles alternative. Since 24.4% of the sample could not be classified because of missing data, there is less bias to the results if we include the missing data category as a fourth alternative. Though included in the multinomial logistic regression, the results for the missing category are not discussed and hence are not shown in Table 3 (but see footnote 3 in Table 3).

#### —Table 2 and 3 about here—

Male respondents are more likely to give responses to time-use that imply shared-roles. The life course considerations are also significant predictors of the division of paid and unpaid work. As expected, shared-roles are more common for younger respondents. Contrary to expectations, the double-burden is more common when there are no children in the household. The double-burden is also less common, with the complementary roles more common, when there are children either under five or aged 5-12. Finally, the cohabiting are more likely to be either shared-roles or double-burdens, compared to complementary roles.

The only variable that is strictly economic is the labour force status of the couple. As might be expected, when both are working full-time, there is lower likelihood of complementary roles, and thus a higher likelihood of shared roles and of double burdens.

The remaining factors will mostly be interpreted as measuring cultural questions that would influence the orientations toward these alternate arrangements for the division of paid and

unpaid work. If education is used as an indicator of liberal orientation, we find as expected that the persons with less than college or university graduation are less likely to have shared roles, especially if they have high school certification and no other education. It is also noteworthy that education did not influence the propensity toward double-burdens. There was also a lower likelihood of shared arrangements when respondents lived in communities that had lower levels of education. Double-burdens were least likely when the aggregate education level was intermediate.

Shared arrangements were least common for the most religious, while the double burden was less likely for persons with intermediate religiosity, thus those with no religion were least likely to be traditional in their division of labour. Immigration status was not significant at the individual level, but respondents from areas that had few immigrants were more likely to have double-burden arrangements, and areas with high proportion immigrants were least likely to be traditional in their division of labour. Persons with French mother tongue had a higher likelihood of shared arrangements. In the aggregate level measures, shared arrangements were least likely in rural areas and the Prairie region, and most likely when there was a high proportion separated or divorced in the community. Double burdens were least likely in rural areas, and most likely when there was a high proportion separated.

## Discussion

By using the same metric for productive and reproductive activities, time-use enable a common analysis of the two domains. Considering the time use estimates made by the respondents for both themselves and their spouse, 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 shared-roles arrangement in the sense that the unpaid work is shared about equally.

It is important not to analyse paid work and domestic work as discrete phenomena. Treating the two types of work together shows that traditional divisions of responsibility remain prevalent, even in a society of two-income families. The second shift, or double burden should not be generalized to all couples where both are working, but it remains an important category, with about 30% being men's double burdens.

Couples who are cohabiting, and couples where both partners are working full-time, have a higher likelihood of both shared roles and double burdens, compared to complementary roles. Shared roles are less common at older ages, with lower levels of education, for those with higher religiosity, and for those living in rural areas, and in the Prairie region, while they are more common in areas that have high proportion separated or divorced. Double-burdens are more common when there are no children, for cohabiting couples, and when both spouses are working full-time; this arrangement is also less common in rural areas, but more common when there is a low proportion immigrants in the community, or a high proportion separated or divorced.

For each of the factors under consideration, the complementary roles arrangement is the largest category in each of the categories of these factors (Table 2) except for the labour force status that has double burden as the largest for couples both working full time. Besides being particularly predominant for older persons, this traditional arrangement is also common when there are children aged 0-12, a stage of the life course where the efficiencies associated with specialization may carry more relevance to family and work strategies. Complementary roles are also more common for couples where they are not both working full-time, for married persons, the more religious, as well as persons in the Prairie region, rural areas, and in communities with low percent of post-secondary education.

There were two unexpected results: the double burden is more common in cohabiting couples and in couples without children. While cohabiting couples are also more likely to have shared roles, and less likely to have complementary-role arrangements, it would appear that this more flexible marital arrangement does not guard against one partner having a double burden. We had expected that persons without children would be more able to have shared roles and to avoid the double burden, since there is less unpaid work to be done. Further investigation is needed to determine if there is a difference between those whose children have left home, and those who have never had children, but at face value it may be that the causality is in the other direction; that is, the double burden may be part of the reason why some couples do not have children.

Given the measures that are available, it is difficult to determine the extent to which these arrangements for the division of work are a function of constraints experienced by respondents, or are to be seen in terms of preferences. Results regarding the double burden can more easily be interpreted as constraints, especially when we see that it is more common when both are working full-time, while it is less likely in rural areas. Shared roles may more often correspond to deliberate attempts to achieve a more egalitarian division of unpaid work, as appears to occur more frequently for younger respondents, those who are cohabiting, where both are working full-time, persons who are post-secondary graduates, and of French first language, while it occurs least often for those who are more religious, for those living in the Prairie region, and in regions with least education.

Studies of the division of labour have frequently pointed to cultural factors as being responsible for the traditional division of labour. For instance, Brines (1994) speaks of a “gender display perspective” that would prompt men to avoid housework as a means of establishing their masculinity. This may especially apply to men who lack other avenues for recognition, because they are experiencing difficulties in the labour market. However, Coltrane (1995) observes a cultural orientation toward shared roles, and the mutuality associated with a common undertaking. This greater belief in sharing, and in establishing relationships based on shared roles rather than dependency, may especially occur as there is reduction of gender inequality in the broader society, and in couples who have more equal incomes. Similarly, shared roles may be easier to establish when there are fewer and later births, in cohabiting couples and in second marriages. In their study of post-gender marriages Risman and Johson-Sumerford (1998) come down to a qualitative sample of only 15 couples for whom it was important to deliberately reject

gender as an ideological justification for inequality. Similarly, in his study of dual-career couples, Gilbert (1993) 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.”

That is, one of the factors at stake is surely the greater equal opportunity structure for education and work in the **broader society**. But 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-professional couples are converting their educational status and career success, or cultural capital, into leverage for rejecting traditional gender. It could be that this pattern goes beyond the dual-professional category, 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 wife’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 a policy push to de-link gender and caring, by encouraging 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. In addition, adopting the 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 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.

Beaujot, R. and J. Liu. 2001. Models of Earning and Caring: Evidence from Canadian Time-Use Data. University of Western Ontario, Population Studies Centre Discussion Paper 01-20.

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 déséxisation 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.

Coltrane, Scott. 1990. "Birth Timing and the Division of Labor in Dual-Earner Families: Exploratory Findings and Suggestions for Future Research." Journal of Family Issues 11: 157-181.

Coltrane, Scott. 1995. "The Future of Fatherhood." Pp. 255-274 in William Marsiglio, editor, Fatherhood. Thousand Oaks, Cal.: Sage.

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.

Gauthier, Anne. 2002. "Historical trends in the time Use Patterns of Canadian Youth." Paper presented at the meetings of the Canadian Population Society, Toronto, May 2002.

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.

- 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.
- Hernandez, Donald. 1993. America's Children. New York: Russell Sage.
- Lerner, Gerda. 1986. The Creation of Patriarchy. New York: Oxford.
- 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.
- Nock, Steven L. 2001. "The Marriages of Equally Dependent Spouses." Paper Presented at the meetings of the Population Association of America, Washington, March 2001.
- Oppenheimer, Valerie K. 1997. "Women's Employment and the Gain to Marriage: The Specialization and Trading Model." Annual Review of Sociology 23: 431-53.
- 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 industrialisés." Population 42,3: 429-48.
- Sayer, Liana. 2002. "Nonmarket Time and Inequality: Trends and Gender Differences in Men's and Women's Housework, Child Care and Shopping." Paper presented at the meetings of the Population Association of America, Atlanta, May 2002.
- 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, Oriol. 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. Predominance of models of husband-wife families in terms of the relative proportion of paid and unpaid work by sex, Canada, 1998**

Compared to husband, wife does	Compared to husband, wife does		
	More paid	Same paid	Less paid
<b>More unpaid</b>			
Men	4.2	15.5	48.1
Women	7.3	19.0	48.9
Total	5.7	17.2	48.5
<b>Same unpaid</b>			
Men	1.0	6.7	7.4
Women	2.9	4.8	3.6
Total	1.9	5.7	5.5
<b>Less unpaid</b>			
Men	5.0	4.7	7.5
Women	5.7	4.4	3.5
Total	5.3	4.5	5.5

Notes:

1. The cells show the distribution of couples into nine categories (3 X 3), according to men's responses, women's responses, and total responses.
2. This table excludes couples where one or both are aged 65 or over.
3. The sample size is 3794 (men: 1870, women: 1924). This table excludes persons with missing values on weekly estimates of time use for respondent or spouse.
4. The sex of respondent is shown. This respondent provided an estimate of weekly time used for both themselves and their spouse (see text).
5. Both married and cohabiting couples are included.

Source: 1998 General Social Survey on Time Use

**Table 2: Sample distribution and distribution by relative participation models  
Canada, 1998**

Relative Participation Models	N	Percentage	Percentage Based on Non-Missing Only		
			Complementary	Shared	Double Burden
Complementary	2017	40.8	53.9		
Shared	489	9.9	13.1		
Double Burden	1235	25.0	33.0		
Missing	1206	24.4			
Total	4946	100.0	100.0		

  

Individual & Family Variables	N	Percentage	Relative Participation Models		
			Complementary	Shared	Double Burden
<b>Sex</b>					
Male	2498	50.5	53.1	15.1	31.8
Female	2448	49.5	54.6	11.3	34.1
<b>Age Groups</b>					
15-34	1365	27.6	53.4	14.9	31.7
35-54	2902	58.7	53.5	13.5	33.0
55-64	679	13.7	57.6	5.9	36.5
<b>Marital Status</b>					
Living common-law	797	16.1	48.7	14.5	36.7
Married	4149	83.9	55.0	12.9	32.2
<b>Ages of Children in Household</b>					
No children	2191	44.3	47.3	11.7	41.0
With children under 5	1035	20.9	66.1	14.4	19.5
5 -12 years old only	615	12.4	57.3	13.9	28.8
All others	1105	22.3	52.2	14.3	33.5
<b>Labour Force Status of Couples</b>					
Both full time	1587	32.1	28.5	19.1	52.4
All others	3359	67.9	68.9	9.7	21.5
<b>Respondent Education</b>					
High School or Lower	872	17.6	56.9	10.2	32.8
High School Grad	878	17.7	54.4	10.5	35.1
Some College/University	806	16.3	54.4	13.7	31.9
Diploma, Certificate	2391	48.3	52.6	14.8	32.5
<b>Frequency of Religious Attendance</b>					
At least once a week	957	19.4	59.5	8.3	32.3
Sometimes	2129	43.0	54.3	13.7	32.0
Never	1071	21.7	52.1	14.1	33.7
No religion	789	15.9	48.4	16.1	35.5
<b>Migration Status</b>					
Born in Canada	3935	79.6	53.9	13.3	32.8
Immigrated before 1970	323	6.5	48.1	13.0	39.0
Immigrated in 1970-1998	688	13.9	56.6	11.6	31.8
<b>First Language</b>					
English	3406	68.9	53.7	12.7	33.5
French	1013	20.5	52.4	15.0	32.6
Other	527	10.7	59.1	10.9	30.0



**Table 2 (cont'd): Sample distribution and distribution by relative participation models  
Canada, 1998**

Community Variables	N	Percentage	Relative Participation Models		
			Comple- mentary	Shared	Double Burden
<b>Percent 60yrs and older</b>					
0-9%	1585	32.1	53.8	12.9	33.3
10-19%	2153	43.5	53.0	14.1	32.9
20% and higher	1208	24.4	55.4	11.9	32.7
<b>Percent with Post Secondary Education</b>					
0-40%	976	19.7	57.5	10.1	32.4
41-60%	2174	44.0	56.0	13.9	30.1
60% and higher	1797	36.3	49.5	13.8	36.6
<b>Percent Immigrants</b>					
0-5%	1569	31.7	54.6	12.7	32.7
6-14%	1273	25.7	55.4	12.8	31.8
15% and higher	2105	42.6	52.3	13.8	33.9
<b>Size and Location</b>					
Rural	1184	23.9	59.7	11.5	28.8
Urban less than 100000	1150	23.3	52.4	13.4	34.2
Urban 100000+	2612	52.8	52.0	13.8	34.3
<b>Percent Separated or Divorced</b>					
0-3%	1324	26.8	55.2	13.2	31.6
4-8%	2801	56.6	54.6	12.4	33.0
9% and higher	821	16.6	49.3	15.5	35.2
<b>Region of residence</b>					
Atlantic	433	8.8	56.8	10.1	33.1
Quebec	1279	25.9	54.5	13.8	31.7
Ontario	1805	36.5	50.0	13.6	36.4
Prairie	818	16.5	57.4	11.0	31.6
British Columbia	611	12.3	56.6	15.3	28.1

Note: In this table, the distribution by relative participation models excludes cases with missing data on the relative division of paid and unpaid work.

Source: 1998 General Social Survey on Time Use

**Table 3: Coefficients of multinomial logistic regression of models of relative participation in paid and unpaid work, Canada, 1998**

Individual-level Variables	Shared		Double-Burden	
	B Coeff	Exp(B)	B Coeff	Exp(B)
<b>Sex</b>				
Male	0.34 ***	1.40	-0.07	0.94
Female ®	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
<b>Age Groups</b>				
15-34	0.77 ***	2.15	-0.22	0.80
35-54	0.62 ***	1.86	-0.22	0.80
55-64 ®	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
<b>Marital Status</b>				
Common Law	0.85 ***	2.33	1.33 ***	3.78
Married ®	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
<b>Ages of Children in Household</b>				
No Children	0.04	1.04	0.36 ***	1.44
With Children Under 5	-0.24	0.78	-0.65 ***	0.52
5-12 Years Only	-0.13	0.88	-0.29 **	0.75
All Others	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
<b>Labour Force Status of Couples</b>				
Both Full Time	1.81 ***	6.13	2.29 ***	9.87
Others	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
<b>Respondent's Education</b>				
Some High School or Lower	-0.19	0.82	0.14	1.15
High School Graduate	-0.40 ***	0.67	-0.01	0.99
Some College / University	-0.10	0.91	0.03	1.03
College / University Graduate ®	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
<b>Frequency of Religious Attendance</b>				
At least once a week	-0.53 ***	0.59	-0.13	0.88
Sometimes	-0.21	0.81	-0.29 **	0.75
Never	-0.21	0.81	-0.28 **	0.76
No Religion	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
<b>Born in or out of Canada</b>				
Born in Canada	0.13	1.13	-0.04	0.97
Immigrated before 1970	0.28	1.33	0.07	1.07
Immigrated in 1970-1998 ®	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
<b>First Language</b>				
English	0.13	1.14	0.13	1.14
French	0.60 **	1.83	0.26	1.30
Other ®	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00

**Table 3 (cont'd): Coefficients of multinomial logistic regression of models of relative part in paid and unpaid work, Canada, 1998**

	Shared		Double-Burden	
	B Coeff	Exp(B)	B Coeff	Exp(B)
<b>Community Variables</b>				
Percent 60 yrs and older				
0-9%	0.01	1.01	0.15	1.16
10-19%	0.20	1.22	0.16	1.17
20 and higher	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
Percent with Post Secondary Education				
0-40%	-0.38 **	0.69	-0.20	0.82
41-60%	-0.10	0.90	-0.36 ***	0.70
60% or higher	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
Percent Immigrant				
0-5%	0.20	1.23	0.32 **	1.37
6-14%	0.05	1.05	0.05	1.05
15% or higher ®	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
Size and Location				
Rural	-0.21	0.81	-0.31 ***	0.73
Urban < 100000	-0.09	0.91	-0.07	0.93
100000 or more	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
Percent Separated or Divorced				
0-3%	-0.26	0.77	-0.24 *	0.79
4-8%	-0.29 **	0.75	-0.15	0.86
9% or higher ®	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
Region				
Atlantic	-0.40	0.67	0.10	1.10
Quebec	-0.39	0.68	0.02	1.02
Ontario	-0.09	0.91	0.26	1.29
Prairies	-0.45 **	0.63	-0.11	0.89
British Columbia ®	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
Intercept	-2.49 ***		-1.23 ***	
Number of Weighted Cases	489		1235	
Nagelkerke R Squared	29.4%			

**Notes:**

1. The complementary model is used as the reference category. Results for those with missing values on the relative participation, though included in the analysis, are not shown as they are not discussed in the text.
2. Levels of Significance: \*\*\* 1%, \*\* 5%, \* 10%
3. Our analysis shows that the following are more likely to have missing data on relative participation in paid and unpaid work: men, older respondents, those without children, with lower education, have no religion, or recent immigrants. Those in Quebec and British Columbia are less likely to have missing data on relative participation.
4. The total weighted sample size is 4946

Source: 1998 General Social Survey on Time Use