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Preface

In the coming years, the need for care work is likely to increase due to demographic, socio-economic and environmental transformations. Across the world, unpaid carers, especially women, meet the large majority of care needs. For an analysis of unpaid care work, time-use data are one of the most important data sources to look at, especially considering the important gender dimension of its work. How much time do people spend on doing paid and unpaid care work? How do women and men spend their time differently on unpaid care work? Are there any differences in time use among the regions? How do socio-economic factors influence people’s choices to do paid and unpaid care work?

To address these questions, the Unpaid Care Work and Labour Market: An Analysis of Time Use Data on the Latest World Compilation of Time-use Surveys provides a comprehensive overview of the extent, characteristics and historical trends of unpaid care work based on the analysis of the most recent time-use surveys carried out at the national level across the world. By discussing the concepts and methodological approaches which underlie the analysis of time-use data, this research paper shows the differences in time spent on unpaid care work between women and men and among people with different socioeconomic characteristics: geographical location, age group, educational level, activity status, employment status, income group, marital status and presence and age of children in the household.

Through examining the trends in time spent on paid and unpaid care work over the last twenty years, this paper shows that women have unequal accesses to the labour market due to a significant extent to the disproportionate amount of time they spend on unpaid care work. Across the world, without exception, women carry out three-quarters of unpaid care work, or more than 75 per cent of the total hours provided. Women dedicate on average 3.2 times more time than men to unpaid care work. There is no country where women and men perform an equal share of unpaid care work. As a result, women are constantly time poor, which constrains their participation in the labour market. The paper highlights the importance of collecting and publishing sex-disaggregated data and calls for more robust methodologies to harmonize and improve the comparability of time-use survey data across countries.

The Unpaid Care Work and Labour Market: An Analysis of Time Use Data on the Latest World Compilation of Time-use Surveys is part of a series of papers that was commissioned as background research for the major ILO report Care work and care jobs for the future of decent work. This major report and related research build a compelling and evidence-based case for placing good quality care work as a priority in macroeconomic, social protection, labour and migration policy agendas. These publications represent an important contribution to the ILO’s women at work centenary initiative, which has been examining why progress in closing the gender gaps in the world of work has been so slow and what needs to be done for real transformation. It has also
been identifying innovative action to guide work on gender equality and non-discrimination as the ILO enters its second centenary.
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Introduction

The present exercise is a tentative compilation of data on unpaid work and more specifically on unpaid care work based on the systematic analysis of the most recent time-use surveys carried out at national level across the various regions of the world. It has not been attempted to gather micro data of all surveys – a too long-standing and lasting task ending with a too little number of countries – but rather to rely on existing official publications from the National Statistical Offices or Technical Departments, currently available on the websites of these institutions.

While our previous work for the 2015 Human Development Report (Time use across the world. Findings of a world compilation of time-use surveys, Working paper for the Human Development report 2015, New York, UNDP-HDRO, 90p. http://www.hdr.undp.org/en/content/time-use-across-world-findings-world-compilation-time-use-surveys) focussed on unpaid care work analysed globally and by sex at national and regional levels, the present report attempts to analyse unpaid care work by sex and by socio-economic characteristics: geographical location (urban-rural), age groups, marital status, education level, activity status, employment status, income group, and presence and age of children in the household. It also attempts to analyse trends over time, as many countries have repeated their time-use surveys, sometimes on more than 5 decades.

These are the main socio-economic characteristics that are the most significant for labour market analyses and that are the most widely available in the publications. There are many other characteristics that would be of interest for the analysis of unpaid care work. Yet, one of the findings of the present compilation is to highlight the fact that many countries have carried out such surveys without having the sense of the necessity of engendering time-use statistics: for example, the time-use tabulations are not systematically disaggregated by sex. Sex remains a variable like the others – one of many analytical dimensions – instead of being cross-tabulated with all other dimensions.

The short list of variables selected for this report (geographical location, age group, educational level, marital status, activity status, employment status, income group, presence and age of children), was tentatively gathered. The number of countries varies depending on the variable. Still they are far from being easily comparable, because the harmonisation process seems to have not yet started, a supplementary evidence of the underutilisation of time-use data. The present work intends to be a step toward a better sensitisation of users as well as producers towards a more complete utilisation of time-use data.

In a first section we will first recall the concepts and methodologies on which the analysis of time use is based. A second and third section will show the gender variations in paid and unpaid work in the various regions of the world and the global estimates. The fourth section will proceed to the analysis of unpaid work according to various socio-economic characteristics across regions. Finally, section five will present trends over the last twenty years.
Section 1: Concepts and methodologies

1) Concepts

The present study measures the unpaid care work as captured by time-use surveys.

The unpaid care work is based on the definition of the Non-SNA work in the System of National Accounts (SNA) in its 1993 and 2008 revisions.

Work is a generic term covering all activities said to be productive and as such falling within the "general production boundary".

The productive activities satisfy the “third-party criterion” (or “third person criterion”) that was firstly defined by Alfred Marshall in its “Economics of Industry” in 1879 where he pointed out “all other services which one person may be hired to perform for another”, then put into discussion among the economists by Margaret Reid in her “Economics of Household Production” in 1934 where she states that “if an activity is of such character that it might be delegated to a paid worker, then that activity shall be deemed productive”.

The SNA production boundary is more restrictive and includes “all production actually destined for the market, whether for sale or barter. It also includes all goods or services provided free to individual households or collectively to the community by government units or Non-Profit Institutions serving households. (…). The SNA therefore includes all production of goods for own use within its production boundary, as the decision whether goods are to be sold or retained for own use can be made even after they have been produced, but it excludes all production of services for own final consumption within households (except for the services produced by employing paid domestic staff and the own-account production of housing services by owner-occupiers).” (SNA, 2008, §§ 1.40-1.42).

Therefore the unpaid care work includes all non-SNA productive activities falling within the general production boundary. Following the Guide to Producing Statistics on Time Use: Measuring Paid and Unpaid Work (United Nations Statistical Division, 2004) and the International Classification of Activities for Time-Use Statistics (ICATUS) unpaid care work and paid work can be defined as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unpaid care work (or non-SNA work activities) consists in the three categories of the classification:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Providing unpaid domestic services for own final use within households (06);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Providing unpaid caregiving services to household members (07);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Providing community services and help to other households (08).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paid work (or SNA work activities) is defined as comprising:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2 The new ICATUS 2016 ([https://unstats.un.org/unsd/demographic-social/time-use/icatus-2016/](https://unstats.un.org/unsd/demographic-social/time-use/icatus-2016/)) now distinguishes, in accordance with the 19th ICLS: Unpaid domestic services for household and family members (3); Unpaid caregiving services for household and family members (4); Unpaid volunteer, trainee and other unpaid work (5). And for SNA work: employment and related activities (1); production of goods for own final use (2). However this new classification has not been applied yet.
Reference to the SNA plays a major role in time-use statistics because one of the objectives of such data collection is to build satellite accounts of household production that come and complement the central framework of the national accounts.

Reference to the labour force concepts is not less important as time-use surveys collect data on time spent in employment.

Since their conception, there has been a close link between the concepts of labour force and employment on one hand, and the scope of production activities as measured by the National Accounts on the other. From 1982 to 2013, the "employed" was defined by international statistics standards adopted by the International Conference of Labour Statisticians (ICLS) as comprising all persons above a specified age who during a specified brief period were either in paid employment or in self-employment. Prior to 2013 there was a one-to-one correspondence between the productive activities of the employed and the production boundary as defined by the United Nations System of National Accounts (SNA). Currently, employment is a much narrower concept capturing work for pay or profit only, as per Resolution 1 of 19th ICLS in 2013. Yet, it should be noted that the definitions adopted in the TUS this report is based on in all cases utilize the pre-19th ICLS definition of employment.

As a matter of fact, before the adoption of the new standards in 2013, measurement of employment was intended to include work for pay or profit as well as some forms of unpaid work (included in SNA work activities). However, the unpaid forms of work that were included as part of employment prior to 2013 such as own-use production of goods, where the production was intended for own use (e.g. subsistence farming), could be excluded from measurement if they were not deemed to represent an important contribution to household consumption. As a result, these activities were poorly captured or not at all measured to estimate employment in labour force surveys. This meant that workers engaged in subsistence farming were not well-identified or monitored for policy purposes. Attempts to use the results of time-use surveys for a better capture of women’s SNA activities in countries where female labour force participation rates are low have turned short.

Similarly, until 2013 there were no international statistical standards to define work in own-use provision of services or volunteer work, so that work such as unpaid care work in one's own household or volunteer care work for other households even when captured was not measured in any consistent way. And as the SNA (2008) puts it: “The location of the production boundary in the SNA is a compromise, but a deliberate one that takes account of the needs of most users. In this context it may be noted that in labour force statistics economically active persons are defined as those engaged in productive activities as defined in the SNA. If the production boundary were extended to include the production of personal and domestic services by members of households for their own
final consumption, all persons engaged in such activities would become self-employed, making unemployment virtually impossible by definition. This illustrates the need to confine the production boundary in the SNA and other related statistical systems to market activities or fairly close substitutes for market activities”.

Although water and wood fetching have long been considered as production of goods by the System of National Accounts and thus an economic activity, most labour force surveys did not count them as part of the activities to identify the employed. The 2006 Integrated Labour Force Survey of the United Republic of Tanzania was one exception 3. More common has been for countries to measure these activities separately from employment or to not measure them at all. In this report these activities - where measured - have been included in “paid work” as part of SNA productive activities.

In an attempt to reconcile these various conceptions and definitions, the 19th International Conference of Labour Statisticians (ICLS 2013) recognised “the need to revise and broaden the existing standards in order to enable better statistical measurement of participation of all persons in all forms of work and in all sectors of the economy (...) in particular (...) to estimate volume of work or labour input for national production accounts, including existing ‘satellite’ accounts, and the contribution of all forms of work to economic development, to household livelihoods and to the well-being of individuals and society”.

Resolution 1 adopted by the Conference identifies – for separate measurement- “five mutually exclusive forms of work:

(a) own-use production work comprising production of goods and services for own final use;
(b) employment work comprising work performed for others in exchange for pay or profit;
(c) unpaid trainee work comprising work performed for others without pay to acquire workplace experience or skills;
(d) volunteer work comprising non-compulsory work performed for others without pay;
(e) other work activities (not defined in this resolution)”.

Chart 1 below presents the position of these various forms of work in relation with the production boundaries of the System of National Accounts.

3 See section 5.7 of the national report of ILFS 2006, p.39: “As explained above, employment in the private sector was divided into four sub-sectors namely; agriculture, informal sector, household-related economic work and other private. Other household chores were excluded, but fetching water and collecting firewood activities were included in the category household-related economic work in line with the SNA.”
'Unpaid care work' which is referred to in this report corresponds to the own-use production work of services and to the volunteer work in households producing services (in light grey on the chart), all activities inside the general production boundary of the SNA, but outside the strict SNA production boundary.

Important note about the concept of unpaid care work used in this report

In this report unpaid care work is limited to the unpaid services that are not taken into account in the compilation of GDP. It is neither comprised of the work undertaken by contributing family workers nor of activities such as fetching water and firewood that are not considered as services but as primary activities (in the sense of extractive or picking industries) by the System of National Accounts. Although these activities are part of the problem of women’s work invisibility, there are several reasons why this report does not include them within unpaid care work. Firstly the compilation of time spent by contributing family workers would require to have the data disaggregated by employment status and furthermore by detailed employment status (whereas many countries only disaggregate their data between paid employment and self-employment). Secondly, subsistence agriculture and other production of goods for own final use can hardly be considered as being care work. And thirdly in most developing countries agricultural production is measured by crop areas and yield per acre rather than by the output of the farming economic units and therefore data on agricultural employment are only used for the distribution between market and non-market agriculture, or subsistence and market agriculture, as well as for the distribution of value added between compensation of employees and mixed income. As a wage is imputed to “contributing” family workers in national accounts, time measurement of unpaid work extended to family workers would introduce an obstacle to the comparison between total GDP and domestic production valued on the basis of time spent in unpaid care work. Despite these difficulties, it is clear that the estimation of total unpaid work including the production of goods and services for the market by unpaid ‘contributing’ family workers is an important indicator that could be calculated and compared to unpaid care work in a selected set of developing countries.

Box 1 below is an extract from the resolution of the 19th ICLS highlighting the definitions of the components of ‘unpaid care work’. Although these new definitions have been adopted, and because of the extensive and numerous works that have referred to the concept, we will continue to use in this report the notion of ‘unpaid care work’ for convenience and clarity.
### Box 1: Definitions of the components of ‘unpaid care work’ by the Resolution concerning statistics of work, employment and labour utilization adopted by the 19th ICLS in 2013

**Persons in own-use production work** are defined as all those of working age who, during a short reference period, performed any activity to produce goods or provide services for own final use, where:

(a) ”any activity” refers to work performed in the various activities under paragraph 22(b) and (c) for a cumulative total of at least one hour;

(b) production of “goods” (within the 2008 SNA production boundary) covers:

(i) producing and/or processing for storage agricultural, fishing, hunting and gathering products;

(ii) collecting and/or processing for storage mining and forestry products, including firewood and other fuels;

(iii) fetching water from natural and other sources;

(iv) manufacturing household goods (such as furniture, textiles, clothing, footwear, pottery or other durables, including boats and canoes);

(v) building, or effecting major repairs to, one’s own dwelling, farm buildings, etc.;

(c) provision of “services” (beyond the 2008 SNA production boundary but inside the General production boundary) covers:

(i) household accounting and management, purchasing and/or transporting goods;

(ii) preparing and/or serving meals, household waste disposal and recycling;

(iii) cleaning, decorating and maintaining one’s own dwelling or premises, durables and other goods, and gardening;

(iv) childcare and instruction, transporting and caring for elderly, dependent or other household members, etc.;

(d) ”for own final use” is interpreted as production where the intended destination of the output is mainly for final use by the producer in the form of capital formation, or final consumption by household members, or by family members living in other households:

(i) the intended destination of the output is established in reference to the specific goods produced or services provided, as self-declared (i.e. mainly for own final use);

(ii) in the case of agricultural, fishing, hunting or gathering goods intended mainly for own consumption, a part or surplus may nevertheless be sold or bartered.

**Persons in volunteer work** are defined as all those of working age who, during a short reference period, performed any unpaid, non-compulsory activity to produce goods or provide services for others, where:

(a) ”any activity” refers to work for at least one hour;

(b) ”unpaid” is interpreted as the absence of remuneration in cash or in kind for work done or hours worked; nevertheless, volunteer workers may receive some small form of support or stipend in cash, when below one third of local market wages (e.g. for out-of-pocket expenses or to cover living expenses incurred for the activity), or in kind (e.g. meals, transportation, symbolic gifts);

(c) ”non-compulsory” is interpreted as work carried out without civil, legal or administrative requirement, that are different from the fulfilment of social responsibilities of a communal, cultural or religious nature;

(d) production “for others” refers to work performed:

(i) through, or for organizations comprising market and non-market units (i.e. organization-based volunteering) including through or for self-help, mutual aid or community-based groups of which the volunteer is a member;

(ii) for households other than the household of the volunteer worker or of related family members (i.e. direct volunteering).
2) Methodologies

Sources

Time-use surveys are the main sources of data for the measurement of “unpaid care work”, comprised by own-use production work and volunteer work as defined above.

Data collection on time spent in paid and unpaid work is still a challenge although the experience of time-use surveys is now rather long, especially in Europe. But the harmonisation of the methods of data collection is far from being achieved. Today, the most reliable and robust data on time-use are based on diaries (that is, the complete enumeration of activities during a 24-hour lapse time) and international classifications of time-use activities rather than on methodologies based on a set of various stylised questions on a reference period of a week. Recently, many household surveys have added short sections or modules on time-use that follow synthetic methodologies (short tasks surveys, stylized diaries) that are not 24-hour diaries. The present compilation relies on time-use surveys that were either stand-alone or full-fledged diaries as modules of regular household surveys.

More specifically, this report is based on the compilation of a hundred and thirty three (133) time-use surveys carried out in 76 countries through diaries, and at national level (Table 1 hereafter). The compilation excludes the household surveys collecting time use data through a short list of stylised questions (for instance the Living Standards Measurement Study LSMS-type of surveys). The only exception to this rule is for Latin America where, in the absence of time-use surveys based on diaries, the method used was a long and detailed set of questions on a week reference period. In this respect, the comparison of the findings for Latin America with the other regions is highlighting and must be interpreted with caution in the sense that it shows the tendency of stylised questions to overestimate the time dedicated to unpaid activities, one of the reasons for that being that it mixes simultaneous activities. Cabo Verde in Africa has also used the same method. Several surveys used the technique of diaries in Latin America: Cuba in 2001 (but the results were only published by region), Argentina (for the city of Buenos Aires that was added to the compilation), Chile for Gran Santiago in 2008 (not added to this review because a national survey was carried out more recently, Brazil in 2010 and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela in 2012 (but no publications followed for these two countries, this is why they are not mentioned in this review).4

The list of surveys, publications and url links are provided in references and a summary of metadata is provided in Annex (Table A1).5

---


5 The time-use survey of Cameroon (2015) is under print (but not yet official), the survey for the United Kingdom UK (2015) has not provided results yet, but the required indicators were kindly provided from the microdata base by Dr. Jooyeoun Suh, at the Centre for Time Use Research, Oxford University and the detailed results of the time use survey for China (2008) were kindly provided by Pr. Xiao-Yuan Dong from the University of Winnipeg because the official publication of the survey was out of print.
Table 1: List of time-use surveys by year and region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North Africa (3 countries /3 surveys)</th>
<th>Arab countries (4 countries /5 surveys)</th>
<th>Sub-Saharan Africa (10 countries /13 surveys)</th>
<th>Eastern Asia (5 countries /13 surveys)</th>
<th>South-Eastern Asia and the Pacific (4 countries /3 surveys)</th>
<th>Southern Asia (3 countries /6 surveys)</th>
<th>Central and Western Asia (12 countries /15 surveys)</th>
<th>Latin America (12 countries /15 surveys)</th>
<th>Northern, Western and Southern Europe (22 countries /42 surveys)</th>
<th>Eastern Europe (6 countries/ 7 surveys)</th>
<th>Northern America (2 countries /19 surveys)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peru (2010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Portugal (1999)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serbia (2010-11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slovenia (2000-01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spain (2002-03)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sweden (2000-01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Classifications

One of the difficulties in the international comparison of time use statistics is related to the absence of use of a system of harmonized classifications of time-use activities. A trial International Classification of Activities for Time Use Statistics (ICATUS) was published in 2005 by the United Nations, as part of the Guide to Producing Statistics on Time Use: Measuring Paid and Unpaid Work. This classification has been used in time-use surveys conducted in many developing countries. The Harmonized European Time-Use Survey (HETUS) classification is used in Europe including Eastern Europe as well as in North Africa and in some transition countries. In Latin America the Classification of activities for time-use for Latin America and the Caribbean (CAUTAL)\(^6\) is used. In addition, many countries, for example, Australia, New Zealand and the United States have developed their own classifications for time-use statistics.

Many countries still use classifications that do not distinguish child care from adult care, meaning that adult care is then captured through other household chores. Depending on the classification, volunteer work and help to other households is detailed in a specific digit of the classification or split between care-work and community services, and sometimes includes other activities (such as participating in meetings or religious activities).

The last difficulty is due to the treatment of travel related to a given activity. In principle, related travel time should be added to each activity. For childcare, related travel is clearly part of the time dedicated to this activity. However in some surveys, travel is measured in a single separate indicator and cannot be imputed to any specific activity.

A recent development which promises to improve international harmonization and comparison in time use statistics is the first non-trial version of the International Classification of Activities for Time Use Statistics (ICATUS 2016)\(^7\) which was adopted by the United Nations Statistical Commission at its 48th Session in 2017. This new classification was developed under the guidance of an Expert Group on Time Use Statistics whose members had experience in the use of the trial ICATUS, HETUS, CAUTAL and various national time use activity classifications.

The purpose of ICATUS 2016 is to provide a framework that can be used to produce meaningful and comparable statistics on time use across countries and over time. Its categories are aligned with the 19th ICLS definition of work and forms of work as well as with the SNA production boundaries. A correspondence between the 2008 version of the HETUS activity coding list has been developed and is available as part of the published ICATUS 2008. With certain limitations this would make it possible to map data coded to HETUS to an aggregate level of ICATUS 2016. Over time it is to be hoped that countries will increasingly adopt ICATUS 2016 in their national time use surveys, or develop mappings to national and regional classifications so as allow statistics on time use to be compiled according to the new international standard.

In summary, the comparability of data is not strictly respected, but at this stage of the harmonisation process of such types of surveys, it is a necessary requirement to accept a certain degree of uncertainty.

\(^6\) Clasificación de Actividades de Uso del Tiempo para América Latina y el Caribe
\(^7\) [https://unstats.un.org/unsd/demographic-social/time-use/icatus-2016/](https://unstats.un.org/unsd/demographic-social/time-use/icatus-2016/)
**Indicators of time use**

There are three basic indicators for time use: time use for participants, participation rate and time use for total population (also called social time in some surveys). Except for physiological needs (sleeping, eating), not all the population is involved in the various activities: time use for participants is an approach of the reality experienced by the population, for instance a workday is approximately of 8 hours for a worker, and a care-work day is of 7 hours for a young mother, but all the population is not at work during the reference period and not all women are young mothers entirely dedicating their time to care. Participation rates indicate the proportion of population, of workers, of mothers, etc., who, during the period of reference, participate in a precise activity. And time use for total population in a given activity is the ratio of the total time recorded in the survey by the total population or also the multiplication of time use for participants by participation rates. Time use for total population is an indicator that allows reconstituting a complete 24-hour day (or 1440 minutes). The average time spent in the activity by the total covered population is the indicator used in this report: in order to compute an annual value, the simple multiplication by 365 is enough, provided that the survey methodologies take the weekly and the seasonal variations into account.

However the published reports of time-use surveys across the world are not always clear about the indicators highlighted in the tables. In some countries, especially in Latin America, the indicator on time use for participants is privileged and the indicator on time use for total population cannot always be computed. Furthermore the published results emphasise the measurement of unpaid care work and do not always provide the data for paid work (and sometimes for personal activities). Many countries present tables with the three indicators, while others prefer tables with the sum at 1440 minutes.

Another difficulty is that many published tables mix paid (SNA) work with learning activities so that where the detailed tables are not available, it has not been possible to compare time spent in unpaid care work with time spent in paid work.

Finally a general remark must be made about the availability of data in the published reports: Although time-use surveys are – or should be – centered on gender, it is surprising to note that the variable ‘sex’ is often treated as any other socio-economic variable. In other words, not all the tables are disaggregated by sex, and many of the socio-economic characteristics sought for this report are available (for instance educational level, income groups, or activity status) but not disaggregated by sex.
Section 2: Gender variations in paid work and unpaid care work by country in the various regions of the world

Across the globe and with no exception, women dedicate more time than men to unpaid care work.

Chart 2 hereafter shows the importance of time (in number of minutes per day) dedicated by women to the three forms of unpaid care work (domestic services, care services, and community services or volunteering) across the world. It can be noted that in countries where caregiving services are not distinguished, they are included in domestic services.

Globally, women’s unpaid care work ranges from a maximum of 490 minutes (8 hours and 10 minutes or 34 per cent of a 24-hour day) in Cabo Verde (2012) to a minimum of 168 minutes (2 hours and 48 minutes or 11.7 per cent of a 24-hour day) in Taiwan, China (2004) and 178 minutes (2 hours and 58 minutes or 12.4 per cent of a day) in Thailand (2014).

However we must keep in mind that the five countries at the top (4 Latin American countries and Cabo Verde, the only African country to have followed the same methodology) have not applied the diary data collection method, which explains the overestimation of time spent in these unpaid activities. This is because it includes simultaneous activities and because the total time cannot be checked against the total number of hours per day. If we don’t take these 5 countries in consideration, then time spent in unpaid care work ranges from the maximum of 345 minutes (5 hours and 45 minutes or 24 per cent of a 24-hour day) for Iraq (2007) to the minimum of 11.7 per cent in Taiwan, China. That means that depending on countries, time devoted to unpaid care work can vary from single to double. This is why a regional analysis is so important.

The average time devoted to unpaid care work for women at the global level (including 75 countries) is 277 minutes (4 hours and 37 minutes or 19.7 per cent of a 24-hour day). The median value for 75 countries is represented by Ecuador (2012) with 273 minutes (4 hours and 33 minutes or 19.0 per cent of a 24-hour day).

Looking now at men’s unpaid work (Chart 3), it ranges from a maximum of 246 minutes (4 hours and 6 minutes or 17.1 per cent of a 24-hour day) in Cabo Verde again to a minimum of 18 minutes in Cambodia (1.2 per cent). Here again the country (Cabo Verde) at the top is characterised by a difference in methodology. Without it, the maximum is at 200 minutes (3 hours and 20 minutes or 13.9 per cent of a 24-hour day) for the Republic of Moldova (2011-12), with a gap between the maximum and the minimum reaching a factor of 11. The world average is 111 minutes (1 hour and 51 minutes: 7.7 per cent of a 24-hour day) and the median value is represented by Kazakhstan (2012) with exactly the same value as the average.

---

8 The three categories of unpaid care work have been defined in section 1 above.
9 In this section average numbers are unweighted: each country has the same weight. Weighted averages will be calculated in section 3. Unweighted averages provide a general profile, avoiding giving too strong importance to the most populated countries.
Chart 2: Time spent by women in the various categories of unpaid care work. Country averages. 75 countries.
Chart 3: Time spent by men in the various categories of unpaid care work. Country averages. 75 countries.
Chart 4 summarises the existing gaps in the relative contributions of women and men to unpaid care work making visible the remaining path to reach parity (when women and men share an equal part of the unpaid care work burden at 50 per cent). Women’s share is the complement to 100 per cent for this indicator. Countries are ranked by increasing share of women’s contribution to unpaid care work. None of the countries reaches parity (at 50 per cent) as regards men’s contribution to total unpaid care work. But as expected Northern European countries come close to it, with Sweden, Norway and Denmark above 40 per cent (respectively 44.7, 43.9 and 43.4 per cent), followed by Canada, Finland and Estonia (above 39 per cent). At the other extreme we find Mali, Cambodia, Pakistan and India with fewer than 10 per cent (respectively 8.0, 8.7, 8.9 and 9.5 per cent).

The world average is 27.5 per cent (corresponding to the situation in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia 2014-15) and the median value is slightly higher, at 28.4 per cent (for China 2008). Thus in average at world level, men’s contribution to total unpaid care work hardly exceeds one fourth of the total burden.

The series of Charts that follows (Charts 5 to 33) present time (in minutes per day) spent by women and men in unpaid care work and men’s share of total unpaid care work, for the various regions and sub-regions of the world according to the ILO regional, country groupings, as well as (charts 27 to 33) for the income groupings (developed-high income, emerging-middle income and developing-low income countries). On these Charts, countries are ranked by increasing order of women’s time spent in unpaid care work or by decreasing order of women’s share of total unpaid care work. Charts show that there is no direct relationship between women and men’s allocations of time in unpaid care work: in other words, countries characterised by high levels of time allocated by women to domestic and care-work are not always simultaneously characterised by higher levels of time allocated by men to these tasks. As a matter of fact, it is the share of men (or of women) in the fulfilment of the burden of domestic work that reflects the relative status of women across the countries and better accounts for target 5.4 of the SDGs monitoring framework (proportion of time spent in unpaid domestic and care work by sex).

In this regard, the ranking of countries within each region or sub-region according to this indicator is significant.

Chart 24 for example shows that, in Northern, Southern and Western European countries, as expected, the countries that perform better (situated on the right-hand side of the Chart and highlighted in red) are the Northern European, with men contributing for more than 39 per cent of total unpaid care work whereas Southern European countries (highlighted in yellow) are clearly on the left-hand side with men’s shares below 30 per cent (Albania, Portugal, Italy, FYR of Macedonia, Greece) and Western European countries (highlighted in blue) in between.

The same observations can be made for developed (high income) countries on Charts 27 and 28 where again the Northern European countries perform the best on the right-hand side, together with Canada (above 40 per cent), while Southern European countries share the left-hand side with the Republic of Korea, Taiwan China (below 20 per cent), Japan and Oman.
Eastern Europe (Charts 25 and 26) is the only region where the longer the time dedicated by women to unpaid care work, the longer is also the time dedicated by men to these tasks. In these countries, men’s share of total unpaid care work represents one third of the total (with the minimum in Romania: 32.1 per cent and the maximum in the Republic of Moldova: 37.7 per cent).

In emerging (middle income) countries (Charts 29 and 30), Eastern European countries (Republic of Moldova, Bulgaria, Serbia, Romania) perform the better with men’s share of total unpaid care work higher than 30 per cent, together with one Latin American country (Chile), two Central Asian countries (Mongolia, Kazakhstan) and one African country (South Africa). At the other end with men’s share of total unpaid care work below 20 per cent, Asian countries (Cambodia, Pakistan, India) with a low share (less than 10 per cent), followed by Northern African countries (Morocco, Tunisia, Algeria), Arab countries (Iraq, Occupied Palestinian Territory) and also one country from Southern Europe (Albania), one Latin American country (El Salvador) and one Central Asian country (Armenia).

Finally Chart 33 summarises the situation for the three categories of countries, on the same scale. It shows that the emerging countries (36 countries) are generally situated below the developed countries (33 countries) as regards the remaining distance to parity, and the developing countries below the emerging countries (although the number of developing countries remains small in the sample (6). Disparities between countries within each group are not very different between groups.
Chart 4: Women’s and men’s share of total unpaid care work (75 countries)
Chart 5: Time spent by women and men in the various categories of unpaid care work by region: Northern Africa. 3 countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morocco 2011-12</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria 2012</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia 2005-06</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Providing community services and help to other households
- Providing unpaid caregiving services to household members
- Providing unpaid domestic services for own final use within household

Chart 6: Share of women in total unpaid care work by region: Northern Africa. 3 countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morocco 2011-12</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia 2005-06</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria 2012</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart 7: Time spent by women and men in the various categories of unpaid care work by region: Sub-Saharan Africa, 10 countries

Chart 8: Share of women in total unpaid care work by region: Sub-Saharan Africa. 10 countries
Chart 9: Time spent by women and men in the various categories of unpaid care work by region: Northern America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing community services and help to other households</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing unpaid caregiving services to household members</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing unpaid domestic services for own final use within household</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 10: Share of women in total unpaid care work by region: Northern America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Share of Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA 2015</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada 2010</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart 11: Time spent by women and men in the various categories of unpaid care work by region: Latin America and the Caribbean. 11 countries

Chart 12: Share of women in total unpaid care work by region: Latin America and the Caribbean. 11 countries
Chart 13: Time spent by women and men in the various categories of unpaid care work by region: Arab countries. 4 countries

Chart 14: Share of women in total unpaid care work by region: Arab countries
Chart 15: Time spent by women and men in the various categories of unpaid care work by region: Eastern Asia, 5 countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Providing community services and help to other households</th>
<th>Providing unpaid caregiving services to household members</th>
<th>Providing unpaid domestic services for own final use within household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan, China</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea, Republic of China</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 16: Share of women in total unpaid care work by region: Eastern Asia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Share of women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Korea, Republic of China</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan, China</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart 17: Time spent by women and men in the various categories of unpaid care work by region: South-Eastern Asia and the Pacific. 4 countries

Chart 18: Share of women in total unpaid care work by region: South-Eastern Asia and the Pacific
Chart 19: Time spent by women and men in the various categories of unpaid care work by region: Southern Asia. 3 countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Pakistan</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>Iran, Islamic Republic of, urban average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing community services and help to other households</td>
<td>W: 231</td>
<td>W: 297</td>
<td>W: 305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing unpaid caregiving services to household members</td>
<td>M: 2</td>
<td>M: 31</td>
<td>M: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing unpaid domestic services for own final use within household</td>
<td>W: 55</td>
<td></td>
<td>M: 75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 20: Share of women in total unpaid care work by region: Southern Asia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Women %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran, Islamic Republic of, urban average</td>
<td>79.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart 21: Time spent by women and men in the various categories of unpaid care work by region: Central and Western Asia. 5 countries

Chart 22: Share of women in total unpaid care work by region: Central and Western Asia
Chart 23: Time spent by women and men in the various categories of unpaid care work by region: Northern, Southern and Western Europe. 22 countries
Chart 24: Share of women in total unpaid care work by region: Northern (in red), Southern (in yellow) and Western (in blue) Europe
Chart 25: Time spent by women and men in the various categories of unpaid care work by region: Eastern Europe. 6 countries

Chart 26: Share of women in total unpaid care work by region: Eastern Europe
Chart 27: Time spent by women and men in the various categories of unpaid care work by region: Developed countries (high income). 33 countries
Chart 28: Share of women in total unpaid care work by region: Developed countries (high income). 33 countries
Chart 29: Time spent by women and men in the various categories of unpaid care work by region: Emerging countries (middle income). 36 countries
Chart 30: Share of women in total unpaid care work by region: Emerging countries (middle income). 36 countries.
Chart 31: Time spent by women and men in the various categories of unpaid care work by region: Developing countries (low income). 6 countries

Chart 32: Share of women in total unpaid care work by region: Developing countries (low income). 6 countries
Charts 33: Share of women and men in total unpaid care work-Summary by region

**Developed countries**

- **Sweden**
  - Women: 55.3%
  - Men: 44.7%
- **Korea, Rep of**
  - Women: 82.8%
  - Men: 17.2%

**Emerging countries**

- **Cambodia**
  - Women: 91.3%
  - Men: 8.7%
- **Moldova, Rep of**
  - Women: 62.3%
  - Men: 37.7%

**Developing countries**

- **Cabo Verde**
  - Women: 66.6%
  - Men: 33.4%
- **Mali**
  - Women: 92.0%
  - Men: 8.0%
Looking now at the share of unpaid care work in total work (paid and unpaid), Chart 34 shows that for women this indicator ranges from a maximum of 91.8 per cent in Iraq (2007) to a minimum of 41 per cent in Cambodia (2004). Very high levels of this indicator (above 74 per cent) characterise Arab countries such as Iraq, the Occupied Palestinian Territory, Oman, Northern African countries (Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia), Central and Western Asia (Turkey, Armenia, Azerbaijan), Southern Asia (Iran, Pakistan), and also Greece and Italy, as well as Costa Rica. Most of these countries are known for their very low female labour force participation rates: women devote almost all their working time to household duties and care. At the bottom of the Chart, on the contrary, women dedicate more than half of their working time to paid work in Asian countries such as Cambodia, Thailand and China, and also in Sub-Saharan countries such as Madagascar and Ghana. Northern European countries that we have already pointed out for their high share of men’s contribution to unpaid care work are situated just above the 50 per cent line (with 54.4 per cent for Sweden, 56 per cent for Norway and 56.6 per cent for Finland). Three Latin American countries also belong to this category: Paraguay (48.3 per cent), Chile (51.9 per cent) and El Salvador (54.3 per cent).

The world average is 65.0 per cent (represented by France) where women devote a little bit less than two thirds of their working time to household duties and care for a labour force participation rate of 51.2 per cent in 2014) and the median value is 63.3 per cent (represented by New Zealand where the female labour force participation rate reaches 63.4 per cent in 2014).

As to men (Chart 35) the share of unpaid care work in their total work time is everywhere below 50 per cent. Minimums (less than 12 per cent) are observed in India (7.9 per cent), Pakistan (8 per cent), El Salvador (11.1 per cent), Mali (11.4 per cent) and Morocco (11.7 per cent), as well as Thailand and Taiwan China. Such cases reflect very different situations: Thailand and El Salvador, for example, are countries where women dedicate less than 50 per cent of their working time to household chores and care (and respectively 62.5 and 49.3 per cent for their participation to the labour force in 2013-14), whereas in Morocco and Pakistan they dedicate more than 78 per cent of their working time to unpaid care work (and respectively 25.2 and 23.2 per cent for their participation to the labour force in 2014). More generally in countries where women find obstacles to enter the labour market because of their status and the fact that their access to public space is limited by social or religious norms, their contribution to unpaid care work is the highest (top of Chart 34 and bottom of Chart 35) and it is exactly the reverse for countries where women are naturally and socially present on the labour market (bottom of Chart 34 and top of Chart 35).

Countries where men devote the larger part of their working time to unpaid care work are the Republic of Moldova (48 per cent) and other Eastern European countries (such as Bulgaria and Romania) or Northern-Western European countries (Denmark, Estonia, Belgium, Sweden), with more than 43 per cent.

For men, the world average and the median value are the same with 29.1 per cent (represented by the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia).
Finally, Charts 36 and 37 present the number of minutes per day women and men spend in unpaid care work and paid work (excluding Uruguay, Slovenia, Cape Verde for which time spent in paid work is not provided by the surveys).

The maximum for women for Latin American countries that did not use the diaries in their surveys is observed in Chile (670 minutes or 11 hours and 10 minutes) and the minimum in Paraguay (373 minutes or 6 hours and 13 minutes) whereas the maximum for women for countries that used the diaries is observed in Lithuania (2003) where the total daily working time amounts to 539 minutes (or 8 hours and 59 minutes: 37.4 per cent of a 24-hour day), followed by Mongolia (2011). And the minimum is in Belgium (2013) where the daily working time amounts 313 minutes (or 5 hours and 13 minutes: 21.7 per cent of a 24-hour day). Other countries at the bottom are Arab countries (Qatar, the Occupied Palestinian Territory, Oman), as well as the Republic of Korea and Mali.

The world average (including Latin American countries) is 425 minutes (or 7 hours and 5 minutes: 19.2 per cent of a 24-hour day, represented by Latvia 2003) and the median value is 420 minutes (for El Salvador 2010).

As for men, again for countries that used the diaries, the maximum is observed in Mongolia with 487 minutes (or 8 hours and 7 minutes: 33.8 per cent of a 24-hour day), followed by Thailand, Latvia, Lithuania and China, and the minimum in the Occupied Palestinian Territory (with 143 minutes or 2 hours and 23 minutes: 9.9 per cent of a day), Mali (184 minutes) and Algeria (252 minutes). For countries that did not use the diaries, the maximum for men is observed in Chile (555 minutes or 9 hours and 15 minutes) and the minimum in Paraguay (373 minutes or 6 hours and 13 minutes).

The average working day for men (including Latin America) amounts to 375 minutes (or 6 hours and 15 minutes: 26.0 per cent of a day) represented by Serbia (2010-11) while the median value is 373 minutes (Paraguay 2016). Women's working time is therefore equivalent to 113 per cent of men's total working time.

Table 2 summarises the findings for world averages: Women devote 2.51 times more time to unpaid care work than men, a little bit more than half (0.57) the time men spend in paid work, and 1.13 more time than men in total work.

**Table 2: Average time spent by women and men in paid, unpaid and total work 75 countries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In minutes per day</th>
<th>Average time of unpaid work</th>
<th>Average time of paid work</th>
<th>Average time of total work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women/Men</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Unweighted averages. Three countries have not collected data on paid work in their time-use surveys: Cabo Verde, Slovenia, Uruguay*

More detailed results at world and regional levels will be presented in section 3 below where countries are weighted according to their population.
Chart 34: Women’s share of unpaid care work in total women’s work. 72 countries
Chart 35: Men's share of unpaid care work in total men's work. 72 countries
Chart 36: Time devoted by women to unpaid care work and paid work (in minutes per day), countries ranked by decreasing time devoted to total work. 72 countries.
Chart 37: Time devoted by men to unpaid care work and paid work (in minutes per day), countries ranked by decreasing time devoted to total work. 72 countries
Section 3: Gender variations in paid work and unpaid care work in the various regions of the world: global averages

In Section 2, we presented the results on paid work and unpaid care work by country regrouped by regions. Global averages presented there were simple (unweighted) averages that provide a general profile by region (each country having the same weight). In this section, the global averages and the averages by countries grouped by income levels, and by region, are calculated using weighted averages. Each of the 75 countries we have data for (there is no national data for Cuba) is weighted by its population in 2015, as provided by the most recent revision of the World Population Prospects of the United Nations Population Division. The 75 countries represent 67.8% of world total population. Consequently, the world and regional averages presented in this section are impacted by the weight of two countries: China and India that represent more than 53.6 per cent of the population of the 75 countries with data on time-use.

1) World estimates

Charts 38 show that at world level, women dedicate 3.2 times more time than men to unpaid care work: 4 hours and 32 minutes (272 minutes) per day against 1 hour and 24 minutes for men (84 minutes), or more than three-fourths (76.4 per cent) of the total amount of unpaid care work.

On the contrary, women devote a little bit more than 1/3 (36.1 per cent) of the total amount of paid work, or 0.3 time the time dedicated by men: 3 hours and 1 minute (181 minutes) against 5 hours and 21 minutes (321 minutes) for men.

As to total work obtained by adding up unpaid care work and paid work, it appears that the women's burden is heavier than men's by 5.8 percentage points (2.9 percentage point above parity): 7 hours and 33 minutes per day (453 minutes), against 6 hours and 44 minutes for men (404 minutes). But gender inequality mostly resides in the unequal distribution of roles between paid work and unpaid care work.
Charts 38: Gender distribution of paid work, unpaid care work and total work: world average, 75 countries
2) Estimates by regions defined by income groups

Looking now at the same patterns in developed, emerging and developing countries (Charts 39, 40 and 41) it is clear that there are substantial differences between regions. Chart 42 helps to visualise those differences by ranking the regions by income groups according to the decreasing burden of unpaid work, of paid work and of total work.

Charts 39: Gender distribution of paid work, unpaid care work and total work: average for 33 developed countries

Note: Regional estimates based on the following countries: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Republic of Korea, Latvia, Lithuania, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Taiwan China, United Kingdom, Uruguay, United States.
Charts 40: Gender distribution of paid work, unpaid care work and total work: average for 36 emerging countries

Note: Regional estimates based on the following countries: Albania, Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Cameroon, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ghana, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, the Former Yugoslav republic of Macedonia, Mauritius, Mexico, Republic of Moldova, Mongolia, Morocco, Pakistan, the Occupied Palestinian Territory, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Romania, Serbia, South Africa, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey.
Charts 41: Gender distribution of paid work, unpaid care work and total work: average for 6 developing countries

Note: Regional estimates based on the following countries: Benin, Cabo Verde, Ethiopia, Madagascar, Mali, the United Republic of Tanzania.
Chart 42: Regions by income group ranked by decreasing order of women's burden of unpaid care work, paid work and total work, 75 countries
Chart 43: Regions by income group ranked by increasing order of men’s burden of unpaid care work, paid work and total work, 75 countries
It is in the emerging countries that women spend the longest hours in unpaid care work (4 hours and 36 minutes) and in the developed countries that they spend the shortest (4 hours and 20 minutes). But there is a very little difference: only 16 minutes, even when in developed countries the household chores are much more capital intensive and therefore less time-demanding. It is interesting to note (Chart 43) that in these two regions, men are the least contributing to household chores (emerging countries: only 1 hour and 8 minutes) or the most (developed countries: 2 hours and 17 minutes), highlighting the variations in gender disparities in these two regions. In the developing economies (represented by only 6 African countries), women’s unpaid care work is higher than in developed countries by only 2 minutes but the gender gap is of 49 minutes, men dedicating only 88 minutes to domestic work.

The contribution of women to paid work is the highest in developing countries (3 hours and 12 minutes), followed by emerging countries (3 hours and 9 minutes) and developed countries are lagging behind with only 2 hours and 34 minutes. The difference however is that, in developed countries, women are mostly wage and salaried workers whereas in developing and emerging countries a high proportion is self-employed and (unpaid) contributing family workers in their family's farms. In emerging countries, time spent by men in paid work is as high as 5 hours and 43 minutes or 1.8 times the time spent by women against 1.6 times in developed countries.

Regarding total work, the emerging countries come first with the heaviest women’s burden (7 hours and 45 minutes), and the developed countries come last with 6 hours and 53 minutes (the difference between the two groups being 52 minutes). It is in developing countries however that the difference is the most striking between women and men: women work 77 minutes more than men, against 54 minutes in emerging countries and only 26 minutes in developed countries.

3) Estimates by regions and sub-regions

Northern Africa (Charts 44) and Arab countries (Charts 45) are the two sub-regions, which are characterised by a very low participation of women to paid work (respectively 18.8 per cent and 14.5 per cent) and a very low participation of men to unpaid care work (respectively 13.9 per cent and 16.4 per cent). On the latter aspect, only men in Southern Asia (and specifically India) do worse (with only 10 per cent), as shown on Charts 46 hereafter.

Except for these latter regions as well as for Western and Central Asia, the patterns are quite similar in the various regions with Northern America (Charts 52) performing the best at the extreme with a contribution of women to paid work reaching 41.2 per cent and a contribution of men to unpaid care work at 39 per cent.

In Sub-Saharan Africa (Charts 46), women contribute much more to paid work (40.1 per cent) and men to ¼ of unpaid work (24.9 per cent).

In Latin America (Charts 47), women's contribution to paid work hardly reaches 1/3 of the total (33.3 per cent) whereas men contribute to a little bit more than ¼ of unpaid work (25.9 per cent).
Charts 44: Paid work, unpaid care work and total work by regions and sub-regions: global averages for Northern Africa, 3 countries

Note: Regional estimates based on the following countries: Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia.
Charts 45: Paid work, unpaid care work and total work by regions and sub-regions: global averages for Arab countries, 4 countries

Note: Regional estimates based on the following countries: Iraq, Oman, Occupied Palestinian Territory, Qatar
Charts 46: Paid work, unpaid care work and total work by regions and sub-regions: global averages for Sub-Saharan Africa, 10 countries

Note: Regional estimates based on the following countries: Benin, Cameroon, Cabo Verde, Ethiopia, Ghana, Madagascar, Mali Mauritius, South Africa, United Republic of Tanzania.
Charts 47: Paid work, unpaid care work and total work by regions and sub-regions: global averages for Latin America, 11 countries

Note: Regional estimates based on the following countries: Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay.
Charts 48: Paid work, unpaid care work and total work by regions and sub-regions: global averages for Eastern Asia, 5 countries

Note: Regional estimates based on the following countries: China, Japan, Republic of Korea, Mongolia, Taiwan, China.
Charts 49: Paid work, unpaid care work and total work by regions and sub-regions: global averages for South-Eastern Asia and the Pacific, 4 countries

Note: Regional estimates based on the following countries: Australia, Cambodia, New Zealand, Thailand.
Charts 50: Paid work, unpaid care work and total work by regions and sub-regions: global averages for Southern Asia, 3 countries

Note: Regional estimates based on the following countries: India, Islamic Republic of Iran, Pakistan.
Charts 51: Paid work, unpaid care work and total work by regions and sub-regions: global averages for Central and Western Asia, 5 countries

Note: Regional estimates based on the following countries: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkey.
Charts 52: Paid work, unpaid care work and total work by regions and sub-regions: global averages for Northern America, 2 countries

Note: Regional estimates based on the following countries: Canada, United States.
Charts 53: Paid work, unpaid care work and total work by regions and sub-regions: global averages for Northern, Southern and Western Europe, 22 countries

Note: Regional estimates based on the following countries: Albania, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Serbia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom
Charts 54: Paid work, unpaid care work and total work by regions and sub-regions: global averages for Eastern Europe, 6 countries

Note: Regional estimates based on the following countries: Belarus, Bulgaria, Hungary, Republic of Moldova, Poland, Romania.
Charts 55 shows a cross regional comparison of gender gaps in unpaid, paid and total work.

As regards unpaid work, women spend more time than men in all regions, ranging from 1.57 time more in Northern America, 1.89 time more in Northern, Southern and Western Europe, to 2.85 times in Latin America and 2.86 times in sub-Saharan Africa, up to 3.25 times in Western and Central Asia, 5.09 in Arab countries, 6.18 in Northern Africa and 8.97 in Southern Asia.

In all regions, women dedicate less time than men to paid work: the ratio ranges from 17 per cent in Arab countries, 23 per cent in Northern Africa, 37 per cent in Western and Central Asia and 41 per cent in Southern Asia, up to 70 per cent in Northern America and 71 per cent in Eastern Asia.

In all regions, women are working more than men when we add up unpaid work and paid work. The women-to-men ratio for total work ranges from 1.05 in Northern America and South-Eastern Asia and the Pacific, up to 1.19 in Northern Africa, 1.2 in sub-Saharan Africa and 1.27 in the Arab countries.
Charts 55: Ratio Women to Men of unpaid care work, paid work and total work by regions, 75 countries
Charts 55 (continued): Ratio Women to Men of unpaid care work, paid work and total work by regions

Charts 56, 57 and 58 rank the regions according to women’s time spent in unpaid care work, to gender gap in unpaid care work, and to women’s time spent in total work. Latin America comes in the first place for women’s time in unpaid care work and total work (Charts 56 and 58), because of the survey methodology, as already explained. The region gains a better rank when it comes to the gender gap in unpaid care work due to the role of men in sharing unpaid care work (Chart 57).
Chart 56: Regions ranked by decreasing order of women's time in unpaid care work
Chart 57: Regions ranked by decreasing order of gender gap in unpaid care work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southern Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central and Western Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Eastern Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern, Southern and Western Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart 58: Regions ranked by decreasing order of women’s time in total work
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Legend:
- Blue: Unpaid care work
- Orange: Paid work
- Yellow: Total work
Section 4: Unpaid care work according to various socioeconomic characteristics

The gaps and variations between women and men observed in time use across regions and countries can even be amplified depending on geographical location (urban or rural areas), age group, education level, activity status, employment status, income group, marital status and presence of children in the household.

1) Paid work and unpaid care work by geographical location

Although the definition of urban and rural may vary from region to region and from country to country the main difficulty in the present comparative work has been that some surveys provide an excess of details without allowing aggregation: geographical areas may distinguish the capital city, another major city (the economic capital for instance), secondary urban areas, semi-urban areas and finally rural areas. For comparison purposes and in order to avoid very complex tables, only two areas per country were retained: rural and urban. The limited cases in which the urban areas were only represented by the capital city, and aggregation was not possible, were taken into account in the narrative.

Charts 59 to 62 below present time spent by women and men in paid work and unpaid care work by urban and rural areas. Countries were ranked by increasing order of time spent in urban areas. The results show that two different categories of countries can be distinguished: a first category where women spend less time in paid (or unpaid care) work in rural areas, compared with urban areas, and a second category where it is exactly the reverse. Therefore, we tried to isolate each category of countries.

Most of the 14 countries where time spent by women in paid work is longer in rural areas than in urban areas are characterised by a vast agricultural population and include: Mali, India, China, Madagascar, Ethiopia, Mongolia, Benin, Ghana (with rural populations ranging from 46 per cent in Ghana, up to 80 per cent in Ethiopia), and also Armenia, Albania, Tunisia, much more urbanised (with 66 per cent of urban population), looks like an exception in the group. On the other hand, the 10 countries where women spend more time in paid work in urban areas than in rural areas are Latin American countries, as well as South Africa (note that in South Africa, urban formal areas are opposed to tribal areas), Thailand, Belgium (Brussels as opposed to Wallonie), and Greece.

A striking feature is that in almost all countries women dedicate more time to unpaid care work in rural areas than in urban areas. The reason is that unpaid care work is usually less time consuming in urban areas, because these types of unpaid activities may become more capital intensive, there is better access to basic infrastructure, labour-saving devices and processed food, whereas in rural areas lot of time can be devoted to the processing of food products (pounding of grains for example and also water and wood fetching). There are however three exceptions: India, Madagascar and China, where women’s unpaid care work is more time-consuming in urban areas than in rural areas. These three countries belong to the category where women spend more time in paid work in rural areas compared with urban areas.
Interestingly, the countries where men spend more time in unpaid care work in rural areas do not coincide with the countries where women dedicate less time to these activities in these same areas. In China and Madagascar, similar to women, men also devote less time to unpaid care work in rural areas than they do in urban areas, due to their higher engagement into paid work.
Chart 59: Time spent by women in paid work in urban and rural areas (countries ranked by increasing order of time in urban areas). 31 countries

Note: The surveys of Cabo Verde, El Salvador, Peru and Uruguay provide data only for unpaid care work, not for paid work.
Chart 60: Time spent by women in unpaid care work in urban and rural areas (countries ranked by increasing order of time in urban areas). 35 countries
Chart 61: Time spent by men in paid work in urban and rural areas (countries ranked by increasing order of time in urban areas), 30 countries

Note: The surveys of Cabo Verde, El Salvador, Peru and Uruguay provide data only for unpaid care work, not for paid work
Chart 62: Time spent by men in unpaid care work in urban and rural areas (countries ranked by increasing order of time in urban areas). 34 countries
Charts 63 to 70 show the respective shares of women and men in paid work and in unpaid care work, in urban and rural areas, in absolute terms (number of minutes) and in relative terms (share of the total burden).

As regards paid work in urban areas, women contribute from a minimum of 11-14 per cent of the total amount of paid work in Pakistan, Iran, Iraq or Algeria to a maximum of 42-45 per cent in China, Macedonia, Thailand and Ghana (Chart 64). Only in eight countries out of 28), including India and Tunisia, the share of women's paid work in urban areas is below 30 per cent of the total. As regards rural paid work, women's contribution ranges from 12-15 per cent in Algeria and Iraq up to 42-45 per cent in China, Benin, Thailand, Ghana and Mali. Again, eight countries (not the same as in urban paid work), including Pakistan and Mexico, are below 30 per cent.

Chart 67 on unpaid care work in urban areas shows that women contributes from a minimum of 62 per cent of the total daily burden in Belgium to a maximum of 90-92 per cent in Mali, Pakistan and India. In rural areas (Chart 66), the distribution is approximately the same (from 62 up to 92 per cent) for the same countries.
Charts 63: Time spent by women and men in paid work in urban areas (countries ranked by increasing order of time spent by women in the area), 31 countries

Note: The surveys of Cabo Verde, El Salvador, Peru and Uruguay provide data only for unpaid care work, not for paid work
Chart 64: Time spent by women and men in unpaid care work in urban areas (countries ranked by increasing order of time spent by women in the area), 35 countries
Charts 65: Time spent by women and men in paid work in rural areas (countries ranked by increasing order of time spent by women in the area), 28 countries

Note: The surveys of Cabo Verde, El Salvador, Peru and Uruguay provide data only for unpaid care work, not for paid work
Charts 66: Time spent by women and men in unpaid care work in rural areas (countries ranked by increasing order of time spent by women in the area), 32 countries
Chart 67: Share of women and men in paid work in urban areas, 31 countries

Note: The surveys of Cabo Verde, El Salvador, Peru and Uruguay provide data only for unpaid care work, not for paid work
Chart 68: Share of women and men in paid work in rural areas, 28 countries

Note: The surveys of Cabo Verde, El Salvador, Peru and Uruguay provide data only for unpaid care work, not for paid work.
Chart 69: Share of women and men in unpaid care work in urban areas, 35 countries
Chart 70: Share of women and men in unpaid care work in rural areas, 32 countries
2) Paid and unpaid care work by age group

Defining youth, adults and the elderly by age groups is not easy. The age group of 15-24 or 15-29 is commonly used in high-income countries, whereas in Africa youth is defined (for instance, by the African Union) as comprising the whole range from 15 to 35 years. The 65+ age group most commonly defines the elderly, but in high-income countries the age group 75+ is sometimes used. The adult group is in between. Still the age groups used for tabulating the time-use surveys vary extremely so that it would be impossible to build a homogeneous table for comparative purposes unless we accept some discrepancies. The range for youth varies from 10-15, 10-17 or 10-19 (in Cameroon, South Africa and Mauritius respectively) to 18-29 (in Uruguay or in the Occupied Palestinian Territory) or 20-24 (in Greece or in the USA) or 15-24 (in China). The age groups for the elderly range from 45+ in South Africa, 50-74 in Tunisia, 55+ in Turkey, up to 65+ for a majority of countries, and 66+ in Chile. Age groups for adults vary accordingly, but due to the impossibility of aggregating sub-groups, the age group 25-44 or 35-44, or even 25-34 represents adults in a non-negligible number of countries. For one country (Albania), the age group 15-64 stands for adults (without any youth category).

Charts 71 and 72 show that, as expected, adult women and men spend more time than youth or the elderly in paid work. The United Kingdom and the United States are two exceptions regarding women: in these two countries, young women spend more time than adult women in paid work. In the case of the United States, the age groups concerned possibly explain the difference (20-24 and 25-34 cannot allow a clear differentiation between generations).

Charts 72 are more differentiated (heterogeneous?) showing that young women generally spend less time than adults in unpaid care work, except in China (due to the specificity of the age group) and in the United Republic of Tanzania where they spend more time, and in Ghana and Ethiopia where they spend almost as much time. Still among women, the elderly spend less time in unpaid care work than the adults, but their contribution remains quite high and even almost equivalent in some countries (e.g. Norway, Argentina, Greece). In three countries women in old age spend more time in unpaid care work than their adult counterparts: Japan, Belgium (two countries where the age group for the elderly is capped at 75) and Italy. Ageing populations are part of the explanation. Moreover it is a common practice in these countries (and others) that grandparents increase their contribution to childcare, especially where such public or private services are lacking or are unable to meet the demand.

As regards men's unpaid care work, the most striking feature emerging from Chart 72 is that men strongly increase their time in unpaid care work when getting older: in 21 countries among 28, men spend more time in unpaid care work than the adults or the youth. The same explanations as for women remain valid for men. The exceptions are for Latin American countries (Chile, Colombia, Argentina), Cabo Verde, and also Ethiopia and Benin.

Charts 73 to 78 summarise the patterns described above and show more clearly the general opposite trends: in all regions, the number of hours spent by women in unpaid care work declines in old age, whereas the time spent by men in these activities increases during this transition.
Charts 71: Time spent by women and men in paid work by age group (countries ranked by increasing order of adults’ time), 31 countries

Note: The surveys of Cabo Verde and Uruguay provide data only for unpaid care work, not for paid work.
Charts 72: Time spent in unpaid care work by age group (countries ranked by increasing order of adults’ time), 33 countries

[Bar charts showing time spent in unpaid care work by age group for men and women across 33 countries.]
Chart 73: Patterns of change in time spent by women and men in unpaid care work by age group: Northern Africa, 2 countries
Charts 74: Patterns of change in time spent by women and men in unpaid care work by age group: Sub-Saharan Africa, 8 countries
Charts 75: Patterns of change in time spent by women and men in unpaid care work by age group: Asia, 5 countries

Note: Indian adults stand at 104 minutes

Note: Indian adults stand at 54 minutes. No data on Iranian men by age group
Charts 76: Patterns of change in time spent by women and men in unpaid work by age group: Latin America, 5 countries
Charts 77: Patterns of change in time spent by women and men in unpaid care work by age group: Europe, 10 countries

[Graphs showing time spent in care work by age and gender for 10 countries]
Chart 78: Patterns of change in time spent by women and men in unpaid care work by age group: United States
3) Paid work and unpaid care work by educational level

Classifications by educational level are also far from being harmonised. In some countries secondary education is split into lower and higher education levels. In such cases, we have opted for the higher level. Pre-schooling is sometimes included in primary education and finally some countries distinguish between university level and other post-secondary levels. In order to make comparisons possible, the university level was retained. Another type of classification includes the following categories: “secondary incomplete”, “secondary complete + tertiary incomplete” and “tertiary complete”. Some discrepancies may be explained by the specificities of classifications used. However, and despite such heterogeneity in the categories, it is possible to identify some patterns.

In Charts 79 and 80 below, countries have been classified by region and within regions, by increasing order of time spent by tertiary level educated women and men (whether in paid work or in unpaid care work). The general pattern that emerges from the Charts is that women dedicate more and more time to paid work as their educational level increases: in 14 countries out of 18, such as Turkey, Cambodia and Costa Rica, women with tertiary level spend more time in paid work than their counterparts with secondary level and primary level. Exceptions are Benin and Cameroon where the non-educated and the primary-level educated women are spending more time in paid work than their counterparts with secondary and tertiary levels of education. The same observation is valid in India and to a lesser extent in China. The European exception is Greece, which could be explained by the specificity of the classification used, namely the following three educational levels: “up to lower secondary”, “upper secondary and post secondary” and “tertiary”. More generally the explanation for this drop in paid work when the educational level increases could be that in the countries concerned, women strongly participate to the labour force, mainly in informal employment and therefore by necessity. When this necessity is lacking, in more well off households, women may prefer to dedicate more time to household care.

The pattern for men in paid work is different: in 11 countries, men with tertiary level of education spend less time in paid work than their counterparts in secondary or primary levels. Three categories of countries emerge. In the first group, men's time spent in paid work clearly declines with the increase in the educational level: India, China, Cameroon, Benin. Similar patterns are found in Algeria and Tunisia, which also stand out since men with no education spend less time in unpaid care work than those with higher levels of education. In the second category, the pattern is exactly the reverse: men's time spent in unpaid care work increases with the level of education: South Africa, the United Republic of Tanzania, Ghana (in which non-educated men spend more time in paid work than each of the other categories), Argentina, Turkey, and Belgium. Finally, the third category includes countries in which the maximum of time spent by men in paid work is reached at secondary level and declines afterwards: Costa Rica, Serbia, Albania, Greece.

Regarding the patterns of time use for unpaid care work, Charts 80 shows that in 14 countries out of 21, women's time spent in unpaid care work declines with the increase in educational level. In some countries, such as the United Republic of Tanzania and Colombia, time spent by women in unpaid care work increases with the educational level up to the secondary level and then declines. And in other countries, for example Argentina
or India, the time dedicated to unpaid care work is nearly the same at all educational levels.

As to the time spent in unpaid care work by men, the expected or desirable increase with the educational level is observed only in 6 countries: Benin, Cabo Verde, China, Colombia, Albania, Belgium. Costa Rica, Cameroon and Tunisia can be added to the list, if the non-educated (or those with primary level for Costa Rica) are not taken into account. In Ethiopia, Argentina, Uruguay, Greece and Serbia the reverse pattern can be observed: the more educated men are, the less time they devote to unpaid care work. Finally, in Algeria, Turkey, India, behaviours do not change with the level of education: these are countries where patriarchal attitudes remain widespread and strong.
Charts 79: Time spent in paid work by educational level (countries ranked by region and increasing order of time spent by tertiary educated women), 18 countries
Charts 80: Time spent in unpaid care work by educational level (countries ranked by region and increasing order of time spent by tertiary educated women), **21 countries**

![Graph showing time spent in unpaid care work by educational level for 21 countries.](chart)
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4) Paid work and unpaid care work by activity status

The activity status distinguishes between the active and the inactive, and among the active, the employed and the unemployed. Challenges to comparisons come from the fact that in many countries several categories of inactive are distinguished, mainly including the “female housekeepers”, the “male retirees”. In other cases, the divide is between those “working” and “not working” or the “employed” and the “not employed,” the latter category including the “unemployed”. In addition, among the “employed”, the employed “full-time” and “part-time” are sometimes distinguished. As published data do not make possible the aggregation of several sub-categories, we have opted for the most representative (and aggregated) categories in this report.

On average (Charts 81), in the 24 countries with available data, employed women spend 5 hours per day in paid work. Although the unemployed and the inactive are not supposed (by definition) to work for pay or profit, as shown on Charts 55, non-employed women were respectively working for an average of 27 and 20 minutes per day: especially in Benin (89 minutes for the inactive), Ghana (69 minutes for the inactive) and Argentina (56 minutes for the unemployed).\(^\text{10}\)

Employed men spend on average approximately 6 hours and 30 minutes per day in paid work, and the unemployed and the inactive respectively 49 and 26 minutes. The difference between employed men and employed women is 1 hour and 30 minutes, highlighting the fact that women are – more often than men - involved in part-time jobs. In three countries, Japan, the Islamic Republic of Iran and Pakistan, men spend more than 7 hours and 30 minutes in paid work. In Kazakhstan and Belgium, they spend less than 5 hours.

In all countries but one (Cabo Verde), employed women dedicate less time to unpaid care work than their unemployed or inactive counterparts (Charts 82) – something that is expected given their different time availability. In the 27 countries for which data were gathered, the average time spent in unpaid care work by employed women is 4 hours per day, as compared with 5 hours and 9 minutes for the unemployed and 5 hours and 14 minutes for the inactive. In general, in Asia and the Pacific inactive women spend more time in unpaid care work than unemployed women, as well as in Northern Africa and in Europe, with exceptions for Finland, France, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and the United Kingdom. In Africa, the reverse pattern is observed as well as in Chile and Argentina: inactive women spend less time than unemployed women in unpaid care work, and most often more than the employed themselves.

As to employed men, they spend an average of 1 hour 30 minutes per day in unpaid care work, against 2 hours and 11 minutes for the unemployed and 2 hours and 5 minutes for the inactive. In all countries (again with the exception of Cabo Verde), men increase their involvement in domestic work and care when they are unemployed or inactive. Similar to women, in many countries in all regions, including Argentina, France, Pakistan and South

---

\(^{10}\) Among the reasons of such a paradox, there is the difficulty for respondents of household's surveys to understand the concept of economic activity and employment, a source of underestimation especially among women. Another reason is that the economic activity may be split into many episodes in a day or a week so that the question: “have you work for pay or profit at least one hour during the day or the week?” is not so easy to respond whereas the diary is an easier way of capture the activity without presuming whether this activity is productive or not in the sense of the SNA.
Africa, unemployed men dedicate more time to unpaid care work than their inactive counterparts. The reason is that the elderly represent a large share of the inactive.

Charts 81: Time spent in paid work by activity status (countries ranked by region and increasing order of time spent by the employed), 24 countries
Charts 82: Time spent in unpaid care work by activity status (countries ranked by region and increasing order of time spent by the employed women/men), 27 countries.
5) Paid work and unpaid care work by employment status

Data on employment status disaggregated by sex were available only in 6 countries. In three countries, Tunisia, China and Finland, wage and salaried women spend more time in paid work than their self-employed counterparts (Charts 83). The time gap is more pronounced (75 minutes) in Tunisia where women’s labour force participation rate is low and the composition of female employment is dominated by wage and salaried employment in the formal economy. In China, Finland and to a lesser extent in France, women self-employed dedicate more time to paid work than wage and salaried women.

As to men and except in Benin, those in self-employment generally spend more time in paid work than wage and salaried men, with important time differences in France, Finland and China.

Charts 84 show that in all six countries wage and salaried women spend less time in unpaid care work than the self-employed, with important time differences, ranging from 164 minutes in Turkey and 102 minutes in Tunisia to 33 minutes in Benin, but only one minute in France. It is exactly the opposite as regards the time spent by men in unpaid care work: in four countries, except Tunisia, self-employed men dedicate more time to unpaid care work than the paid employed: the broader gap is observed in France (39 minutes).

For women, as well as for men, self-employment makes it easier to conciliate paid work with household and care duties, because the place of work is often close to the place of living, if not the same; young children can play and prepare their homework in the next room, etc.
Charts 83: Time spent in paid work by employment status, 6 countries
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Charts 84: Time spent in unpaid care work by employment status, 6 countries
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6) Paid work and unpaid care work by income groups

Income groups may refer to household expenditures or to household income and therefore being classified by expenditures or income groups, or by quintiles, quartiles (such as in China) or in three income categories in South Africa.

Charts 85 show that time devoted by women to paid work is clearly increasing with the income group in South Africa and Argentina. The more women work for pay or profit, the more the household income grows up. It means that women's work is a determinant factor of the household's standard of living and also that women's work is more socially accepted in well-off households. China and Ghana show a different picture: women's paid work seems to decline with the rise in income brackets.

Men's paid work follows the same trends, upwards oriented for South Africa, for Argentina (but only for the three first quintiles), and also for Ethiopia, and downward oriented for Ghana and China, and less clearly for Tunisia.

Women's unpaid care work (Charts 86) is obviously downward oriented in all countries except in Ghana where the decline is more pronounced for intermediary income groups.

As to men's unpaid care work, Charts 86 highlight two different patterns. In countries such as Ethiopia, South Africa and Argentina, men reduce their time dedicated to unpaid care work as the household progresses through the income brackets. Whereas the contrary occurs - though not regularly - in Tunisia, Ghana, China and Uruguay, showing slow changes in cultural habits among higher-income groups.

Such findings do not imply that unpaid care work does not improve living standards, but simply mean that resorting to unpaid care work decreases as the households can access to these services through the market and dedicate more hours to paid work.
Charts 85: Time spent in paid work by income group, 6 countries

Note: No data available on paid work in Uruguay
Charts 86: Time spent in unpaid care work by income group, 7 countries
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7) Paid work and unpaid care work by marital status

Classifications of marital status are also very different by the details they provide. Married/non married or single is a divide, which is rarely presented as such in the survey reports. Generally many sub-categories are used: officially married/living together, married monogamous/married polygamous, and on the other hand divorced, separated, widowed are often distinguished. Here again where aggregation revealed not to be possible, we have chosen the most numerous categories.

Chart 87 points out that in general divorced women increase their time devoted to paid work. Whereas married women lessen their time dedicated to paid work in countries such as Algeria and Tunisia, where they leave the labour market at marriage or at first birth. The same trend is observed in the United Republic of Tanzania, Ethiopia, Turkey and Costa Rica. On the contrary, married women sharply increase their working time for pay or profit in Benin, South Africa, Cameroon and Ghana as well as in India and China, and also Belgium: a possible explanation (except for Belgium) is that in these countries women mostly perform their economic activities in the informal economy, which allows them to conciliate their care duties with an increase in paid work destined to satisfy increased needs and expenditures.

In the case of men, the increase of time spent in paid work is general for the married, while overall there is a decrease in paid work among the divorced (except in Ethiopia where the involvement remains at the same level) and the widowed, presumably due to old age and retirement.

As regards unpaid work (Charts 88), married women see a dramatic increase of their unpaid care work burden. Women’s burden doubles for married women compared with singles in Algeria and Tunisia (from 3 hours and 30 minutes per day up to 6 hours and 40 minutes and more) as well as in China (from 2 hours and 13 minutes to 4 hours and 9 minutes). Unpaid care work triples in Turkey (from 2 hours and 25 minutes up to 6 hours and 34 minutes). The increase is also quite high in Uruguay and Costa Rica (between double and triple).

Men’s burden increases when married as well but not so dramatically in Northern Africa and Turkey, and in Ethiopia, as well as in Latin America and in Belgium. But in other African countries their unpaid care work declines when married and rises up when divorced.
Charts 87: Time spent in paid work by marital status (countries ranked by region and increasing order of time spent by the married), 13 countries
Charts 88: Time spent in unpaid care work by marital status (countries ranked by region and increasing order of time spent by the married), **15 countries**
8) Paid work and unpaid care work by presence of children in the household and their age group

Maternity and care of children are major determinants of the increase of time spent in unpaid care work within the household. In order to capture changes in time-use due to childcare, survey reports use different methodologies. They adjust for age (for instance, 25+ years in Algeria or less than 45 years in Finland) or categorise households in subgroups depending on the presence or not of children under a certain age or within an age bracket. It should be noted that these types of classification are not harmonised, therefore the age groups and classifications used in our tabulations and figures are not homogeneous.

Four categories have been defined: no children in the household; presence of children under 5 years of age; presence of children aged between 5 and 11 years; presence of children aged between 11 to 17 years. However, some countries use different age brackets, including 6 and 18 years (Ethiopia and Ghana, China); or 7 and 18 years (South Africa); 7 and 17 years (Belgium, Finland, Serbia, Albania), and 3, 6 and 12 (Uruguay).

Sometimes, countries such as Ethiopia, Ghana, Uruguay include the precision: “at least one child aged less than...”.

As expected (Charts 89), women’s time dedicated to paid work declines with the presence of a young child and increases when the child gets older: from 4 hours and 18 minutes down to 1 hour and 37 minutes in the United Kingdom (2005), or from 3 hours and 30 minutes down to 2 hours and 32 minutes in Finland (2009-10) or from 4 hours and 41 minutes down to 3 hours and 56 minutes in China (2008). There are exceptions however: time spent by women in paid work increases with the presence of a young child as if the latter required the mother to work for pay or profit in South Africa and in Belgium (respectively from 1 hour and 38 minutes up to 2 hours and 26 minutes, and from 1 hour and 15 minutes up to 2 hours and 24 minutes).

Regarding men’s time in paid work, it substantially increases with the presence of children in most countries highlighting the transition from youth (or study) to work that corresponds to marriage and paternity, for instance from 1 hour and 55 minutes up to 4 hours and 25 minutes in Belgium (2013), or from 2 hours and 33 minutes up to 5 hours and 46 minutes in South Africa (2010), with the exception of Ghana where it declines (from 6 hours and 28 minutes down to 5 hours and 27 minutes).

Time dedicated to unpaid care work noticeably increases with the presence of children, and in particular of children less than 5 years old, in all reviewed countries (Charts 90). It more than doubles in Finland and it triples in the United Kingdom. The overload ranges from 1 hour and 24 minutes in Belgium up to 3 hours and 30 minutes in Finland and even 4 hours and 6 minutes in the United Kingdom. In these two countries, men also dramatically increase their unpaid care work (by one hour and 39 or 41 minutes respectively). The increase is more modest in the other countries, from 0 minute in South Africa, 3 minutes in Ghana, 6 minutes in Algeria, up to 35 minutes in Ethiopia and 36 minutes in China. Men’s unpaid care work even declines in Albania with the presence of a young child.
Charts 89: Time spent in paid work by presence and age of children in the household (countries ranked by region and increasing order of time spent by the households with no children), 11 countries

**WOMEN**

- No children
- Less than 5
- 5 to 10
- 11 to 17

**MEN**

- No children
- Less than 5
- 5 to 10
- 11 to 17
Charts 90: Time spent in unpaid care work by presence and age of children in the household (countries ranked by increasing order of time spent by the households with no children), **12 countries**
Section 5: Trends in paid work and unpaid care work by regions

Among the 75 countries having carried out a time-use survey, only 27 have repeated the survey at least once. The periodicity of time-use surveys is generally irregular. The United States is the only country that has carried out such a survey regularly on a yearly basis since 2003. Norway conducts a time-use survey every ten years since 1970. For most countries, only two points (or three points) in time are available. Assessing trends is therefore difficult.

Charts 91 below clearly indicates that for the United States, trends in unpaid care work are downward oriented for women as well as for men, with a more rapid decline for women, so that in the country where the gender gap in unpaid care work is the least extended, it is still declining. Similarly trends in paid work are also downward oriented, less rapidly for women than for men. In terms of proportion of total work, the share of unpaid care work remained remarkably stable around 59 per cent for women, against 38 per cent for men.

The trends in time spent in paid work clearly illustrate the impact of the financial crisis, showing a dramatic drop between 2008 and 2010 among men (from 271 minutes per day or 4 hours and 31 minutes down to 245 minutes or 4 hours and 5 minutes), a drop that is interestingly preceded by a similar pattern among women from 2007 to 2009 (from 188 minutes or 3 hours and 8 minutes down to 171 minutes or 2 hours and 51 minutes). In other words women were the first to be impacted and they were also the first to recover in 2010. A similar shifted drop is observed between 2012 and 2013 for women and 2014 and 2015 for men. It is also interesting to note that similar drops – though less marked and ahead of paid work – are observed for unpaid care work, especially among men, as if just before the crisis men (and women) tended to reduce their unpaid care work (due to more intensive paid work?).

In Canada (Charts 92), women and men’s unpaid care work is downward oriented (more rapidly for women, so that the gap is reducing) and dropped below the levels of the USA. Regarding paid work the trends are downward oriented, more rapidly for men compared with women. The impact of the 2008 financial crisis is again clearly visible: time spent by men in paid work is reduced by 27 minutes between 2005 and 2010 and by 60 minutes between 2005 and 2015. For women, the drop is less marked but still reduced by 6 minutes between 2005 and 2010, and by 24 minutes between 2005 and 2015. Interestingly an increase in unpaid care work is observed among women (+ 5 minutes) and especially among men (+ 14 minutes) between 2005 and 2010. Then after 2010, the downward trend in unpaid care work resumes even more strongly, especially among women.
Charts 91: Trends in unpaid care work and paid work in the USA

USA

Women Unpaid care work

Men Unpaid care work

Women Paid work

Men Paid work

Minutes per day

Charts 92: Trends in unpaid care work and paid work in Canada

**Canada**

- **Women Unpaid care work**
  - 1992: 270 minutes
  - 2015: 216 minutes

- **Men Unpaid care work**
  - 1992: 156 minutes
  - 2015: 144 minutes

**Minutes per day**

- **Women Paid work**
  - 1992: 270 minutes
  - 2015: 222 minutes

- **Men Paid work**
  - 1992: 162 minutes
  - 2015: 162 minutes
Charts 93 and 94 highlight the trends in women and men’s unpaid care work in Northern, Western and Southern Europe. In all countries, time spent by women in unpaid work has rapidly declined since the 1970s, in most countries, especially where unpaid care work was taking longer hours. In the recent period six countries have come down from 6 or 5 hours per day under the limit of 4 hours per day (240 minutes). In three other countries (Italy, Spain and Estonia), unpaid care work is still above 4 hours, but they are rapidly rejoining the other group.

Regarding men, the trends are unclear. While Norway and Sweden are characterised by an increased contribution of men to unpaid work (up to more than 3 hours per day), as well as Finland and Belgium (above two hours) but at a lower level, and also a very rapid increase in Spain (starting from a very low point), all the other countries have seen a recent decline of men’s contribution to unpaid work: the United Kingdom, Italy (after a very strong increase), Estonia, and more slowly: France.

Simultaneously, Charts 95 and 96 show that the contribution of men to paid work has been on the decline in all countries (except Belgium) of Northern, Western and Southern Europe whereas the contribution of women was rather on the increase (except in Estonia, Finland and Italy for the most recent period).

From these time-use data it is clear that women continue to bear the bulk of unpaid care work, while men’s participation to these activities has increased over time. These findings are in line with the conclusions of Oriel Sullivan (2000) and Man Yee Kan, Oriel Sullivan, Jonathan Gershuny (2011) who show that cross national trends over the last 40 years reveal a slow and incomplete convergence of women’s and men’s work patterns: beyond the trends, “gender segregation in domestic work is quite persistent over time. Women still do the bulk of routine housework and caring for family members while men have increased their contributions disproportionately to non-routine domestic work”.

Charts 97 to 104 show the trends in the few countries in the other regions. In some regions, women’s unpaid work is still on the rise, whereas in other regions it is declining. And at the same time, men’s unpaid work is declining in some regions whereas it is increasing in other regions.

However, Charts 105 to 110 summarize the global trends that emerge from our database by providing a general view for the 25 countries.

Man Yee Kan, Oriel Sullivan, Jonathan Gershuny (2011), Gender Convergence in Domestic Work: Discerning the Effects of Interactional and Institutional Barriers from Large-scale Data, in Sociology 45 (2), 234-251.
Chart 93: Trends in women’s unpaid care work in Northern, Western and Southern Europe, 10 countries

Table 3: Time spent by women in unpaid care work in Northern, Western and Southern Europe (in minutes per day)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>280</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>261</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures in italics have been interpolated in order to show up on the chart.
Chart 94: Trends in men’s unpaid care work in Northern, Western and Southern Europe, 10 countries

Table 4: Time spent by men in unpaid care work in Northern, Western and Southern Europe (in minutes per day)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>183</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures in italics have been interpolated in order to show up on the chart.
Chart 95: Trends in women’s paid work in Northern, Western and Southern Europe, 10 countries

Table 5: Time spent by women in paid work in Northern, Western and Southern Europe (in minutes per day)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
<td>172</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures in italics have been interpolated in order to show up on the chart
Chart 96: Trends in men’s paid work in Northern, Western and Southern Europe, 10 countries

Table 6: Time spent by men in paid work in Northern, Western and Southern Europe (in minutes per day)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>223</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>243</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures in italics have been interpolated in order to show up on the chart
Charts 97: Trends in unpaid care work in sub-Saharan Africa, 3 countries

**Women:***
- Tanzania, United Republic: Increasing trend
- South Africa: Increasing trend
- Benin: Decreasing trend

**Men:***
- Tanzania, United Republic: Increasing trend
- South Africa: Increasing trend
- Benin: Decreasing trend
Charts 98: Trends in paid work in sub-Saharan Africa, 3 countries

For women:
- Tanzania, United Republic
- Benin
- South Africa

For men:
- Tanzania, United Republic
- Benin
- South Africa
Chart 99: Trends in unpaid care work in Thailand, Australia and New Zealand

Chart 100: Trends in paid work in Thailand, Australia and New Zealand
Charts 101: Trends in unpaid care work and paid work in Eastern Asia, 3 countries
Chart 102: Trends in unpaid care work and paid work in Mexico

Chart 103: Trends in unpaid care work and paid work in the Occupied Palestinian Territory

Chart 104: Trends in unpaid care work and paid work in Azerbaijan and Turkey
Charts 105 to 108 have selected for the 25 countries for which several observations over
time are available, the earliest year and the latest. In all 4 charts the earliest year is green-
coloured, and the latest is yellow-coloured whether the trend is upward-oriented, blue-
coloured whether the trend is downward-oriented, and green in case of stability.

In sixteen countries (out of 25) of Northern America, Northern-Southern-Western
Europe, South-Eastern Asia and Pacific (except in New Zealand), Arab countries and
Western Asia (Chart 105), time spent by women in unpaid care work has declined (more
dramatically in Norway, France, Italy, Canada, Turkey and much less in Thailand, New
Zealand, Belgium and Spain). In nine countries (out of 25) of Africa, Eastern Asia, Western
Asia and Latin America, women’s unpaid care work has increased (especially in Japan and
Mexico).

As to men (Chart 106), progress is more mixed. During the same periods, men’s unpaid
care work has increased in twelve countries (more dramatically in Norway and Mexico,
and much less in Mexico, Japan, Belgium, United Kingdom) whereas it declined in eleven
countries (more dramatically in France and Thailand and much less in Turkey, Germany
and Estonia) and remained stable in two more countries (Canada and United States).

In eighteen countries (out of 25) (Chart 107), women’s paid work has increased (more
dramatically in Mexico, Norway, Japan and Spain), whereas it declined in six countries
(more dramatically in Benin and United Kingdom) and remained stable in one country
(Azerbaijan). In the mean time, men’s paid work (Chart 108) has increased in 7 countries
(more dramatically in the United Republic of Tanzania, Thailand and Mexico), remained
stable in two countries (Japan and Turkey) and declined in seventeen countries (more
dramatically in France, the Occupied Palestinian Territory, Norway, Finland, Canada).

Charts 109 and 110 summarize the global trends in unpaid care work and in paid work
for the period. The average year for the earliest period is 1998 and for the latest 2012. For
this set of 25 countries, weighed and unweighted averages are quite similar. The following
charts present the weighted averages.

Whereas women’s unpaid care work decreased from 276 minutes (4 hours and 36
minutes) down to 266 minutes (4 hours and 26 minutes) or 10 minutes in total over 15
years, men’s unpaid care work increased by 1 minute (from 115 minutes or 1 hour and
55 minutes, up to 128 minutes). In proportion the share of women in total unpaid work
has dropped from 70.6 per cent down to 67.5 per cent (or 3.1 percentage points) in 15
years.

During the same period, women’s paid work has decreased from 151 minutes down to
149 minutes (a drop of 2 minutes) whereas men lost 11 minutes (Charts 110). Proportionally in 2012 women contribute for 35.6 per cent of total paid work (a gain of
0.6 percentage points).

Finally women reduced by 11 minutes their contribution to total work over the 15 years,
while men increased theirs by 2 minutes. Women still contribute to 51.1 per cent of total
work in 2012 against 51.9 per cent in 1998.
Chart 105: Trends in women’s unpaid work across regions (earliest and latest years). 25 countries

Women Unpaid work

Note: Earliest year in green. Latest year in yellow (where increase) and in blue where decrease
Chart 106: Trends in men's unpaid work across regions (earliest and latest years). 25 countries

Note: Earliest year in green. Latest year in yellow (where increase), in blue where decrease, in green where stable
Chart 107: Trends in women's paid work across regions (earliest and latest years). 25 countries

Note: Earliest year in green. Latest year in yellow (where increase), in blue where decrease, in green where stable
Chart 108: Trends in men’s paid work across regions (earliest and latest years). 25 countries

Men paid work

Note: Earliest year in green. Latest year in yellow (where increase), in blue where decrease, in green where stable
Charts 109: Global trends in unpaid care work by sex, 1990s-2010s. 25 countries

- Men unpaid care work
- Women unpaid care work

1998:
- Men: 276 minutes per day
- Women: 115 minutes per day
- Men unpaid care work: 70.6%
- Women unpaid care work: 29.4%

2012:
- Men: 266 minutes per day
- Women: 128 minutes per day
- Men unpaid care work: 67.5%
- Women unpaid care work: 32.5%
Charts 110: Global trends in paid work by sex, 1990s-2010s. 25 countries

[Bar chart showing minutes per day of paid work for men and women in 1998 and 2012.]

In 1998:
- Men paid work: 281 minutes
- Women paid work: 151 minutes

In 2012:
- Men paid work: 270 minutes
- Women paid work: 149 minutes

[Another bar chart showing percentage of paid work for men and women in 1998 and 2012.]

In 1998:
- Men paid work: 65.0%
- Women paid work: 35.0%

In 2012:
- Men paid work: 64.4%
- Women paid work: 35.6%
Chart 111: Global trends in total work by sex, 1990s-2010s. 25 countries

- **1998**
  - Men total work: 396 minutes/day
  - Women total work: 51.9%

- **2012**
  - Men total work: 398 minutes/day
  - Women total work: 51.1%
Conclusion

One of the most striking conclusions of the attempted exercise is methodological: the lack of harmonisation in the most basic classifications used for categorising the population in time-use surveys. Efforts concentrate on the classification of time-use activities, which is of course a priority and on the recommended use of diaries rather than stylised questions, but this is not enough for allowing robust international comparisons.

It is too often taken for granted that the generalisation of micro-data analyses makes it unnecessary to sensitise governments and statisticians about minimum standards in basic classifications. But this generalisation makes such an issue even more acute, because individual users may generate their own classifications and make international comparisons even more difficult. However worldwide comparisons cannot be done through micro-data analyses and the present exercise show that efforts in harmonisation would need to be strengthened.

The major issue with national reports of time-use surveys (and this is also true for other types of surveys) is that the analysts in charge of these reports are not aware or have not been sensitised enough to understand that gender is not a variable like others (such as educational level, or activity status). All variables should be cross-classified by sex and gender should not be kept in a stand-alone chapter. It is amazing to note that among the number of time-use surveys collated for this work, only a few of them have produced Tables on activity and employment status disaggregated by sex, whereas this is a major dimension to understand the constraints women face on the labour market.

Notwithstanding these difficulties and obstacles, the present work is an attempt to demonstrate the magnitude of unpaid work across the various regions and sub-regions of the world and of the share incumbent on women.

Although more puzzling, the more detailed analyses by urban-rural location, age groups, educational levels, activity and employment status, income groups, marital status, and number of children clearly show the challenges that women face in their access to the labour market: their double burden is hardly alleviated by their male counterparts. In this respect, trends must be assessed that could highlight whether, over the past two decades, all the efforts towards raising awareness about the obstacle that unpaid care work represents for women’s participation to the economy and society have been successful.

This report is a tentative contribution to this aim.
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UN statistics division
### Table A1: Overview of TUS main characteristics across regions and countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Type of survey</th>
<th>Minimum age</th>
<th>Sample size (individuals)</th>
<th>Type of sample</th>
<th>Survey instrument</th>
<th>Mode of data collection</th>
<th>Classification used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern Africa</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>12+</td>
<td>22,138</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>One diary</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>HETUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>7+</td>
<td>9,200 households</td>
<td>Random selection</td>
<td>One diary</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>HETUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Stand alone, sub sample of household survey</td>
<td>15+</td>
<td>11,594</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Two diaries</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>HETUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Saharan Africa</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>1998-2015</td>
<td>2 months 1 month</td>
<td>Module of household survey</td>
<td>6-65 6+</td>
<td>12,604 4,920hh, 13,026 individuals</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>One diary</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Pre-listing (63 activities) (84 activities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>Module of household survey</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>4,988 households</td>
<td>Household head, spouse, random men/women among others aged 10-14 and 15+</td>
<td>One diary</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>ICATUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabo Verde</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Module of household survey</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Ad-hoc detailed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>One month</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>52,262</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>One diary</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>ICATUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>9,297</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>One diary</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>ICATUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>Stand alone, sub sample of household survey</td>
<td>6-65</td>
<td>7,749</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>One diary</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Pre-listing (77 activities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>6-65</td>
<td>2,249</td>
<td>Random selection</td>
<td>One diary</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Pre-listing (63 activities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>Module of household survey</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>6,480 households</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>One diary</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>ICATUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>2000-2010</td>
<td>3 rounds 4th quarter</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>14,553 30,897</td>
<td>Random selection</td>
<td>One diary</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>ICATUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania, United Republic of</td>
<td>2006-2014</td>
<td>4 quarters</td>
<td>Module of household survey</td>
<td>5+</td>
<td>10,553</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>One diary</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>ICATUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Year(s)</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Type of survey</td>
<td>Minimum age</td>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>Type of sample</td>
<td>Survey instrument</td>
<td>Mode of data collection</td>
<td>Classification used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina (Buenos Aires)</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>Module of household survey</td>
<td>15-74</td>
<td>1,408 individuals</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Diary</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>ICATUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>12+</td>
<td>10,502 households</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Weekday/week end day on one week</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>CAUTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>148,492</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Yesterday</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Ad hoc detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>One month</td>
<td>Module of household survey</td>
<td>12+</td>
<td>32,437</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Yesterday</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Ad hoc detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>12+</td>
<td>20,767 households</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Weekday/week end day</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>CAUTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>12+</td>
<td>3,305 households</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Ad hoc detailed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Module of household survey</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>5,445 hh 17,000 hh 18,996 households</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Weekday/week end day</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Ad hoc detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>2002-2012</td>
<td>1 month 2 months 4th quarter</td>
<td>Module of household survey</td>
<td>12+</td>
<td>4,272 hh</td>
<td>One able to respond for all eligible</td>
<td>Past week</td>
<td>Interview of one able to respond for all</td>
<td>CAUTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>One month</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>15+</td>
<td>6,907</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Weekday/week end day</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Ad hoc detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>One quarter</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>14+</td>
<td>4,272 hh</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Past week</td>
<td>CAUTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>One quarter</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>12+</td>
<td>4,580 hh</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Weekday/week end day</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Ad hoc detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>2007-2013</td>
<td>One quarter (May-August)</td>
<td>Module of household survey</td>
<td>14+</td>
<td>3,391 households, 7,447 individuals</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Weekday/week end day</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Ad hoc detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Type of survey</td>
<td>Minimum age</td>
<td>Sample size (individuals)</td>
<td>Type of sample</td>
<td>Survey instrument</td>
<td>Mode of data collection</td>
<td>Classification used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern America</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canada</strong></td>
<td>1992-1998 2005-2010 2015</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Module of household survey</td>
<td>15+</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>One diary</td>
<td>Computer assisted telephone interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARAB STATES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arab States</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Iraq</strong></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>Module of household survey</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>6,048 households</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>One diary</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Pre-listing (27 activities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oman</strong></td>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Stand alone, sub sample of household survey</td>
<td>15+</td>
<td>9,063</td>
<td>One diary</td>
<td>Pre-listing (23 activities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupied Palestinian Territory</strong></td>
<td>1999-2000 2012-13</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>8,038 4,605</td>
<td>Random selection</td>
<td>One diary</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>ICATUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Qatar</strong></td>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td></td>
<td>15+</td>
<td>16,754</td>
<td>One diary</td>
<td>Pre-listing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ASIA and the PACIFIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Type of survey</th>
<th>Minimum age</th>
<th>Sample size (individuals)</th>
<th>Type of sample</th>
<th>Survey instrument</th>
<th>Mode of data collection</th>
<th>Classification used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastern Asia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>One month</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>15-74</td>
<td>37,142</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Two diaries</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Mixed HETUS/ICATUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>2001, 2006</td>
<td>One month</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>19,982</td>
<td>One diary</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea, Republic of</td>
<td>1999-2014</td>
<td>One month</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>46,109, 21,000, 20,657</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Two diaries</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Ad hoc detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>2007-2011</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>12+</td>
<td>3,135 (7,136), 4,000</td>
<td>All eligible who</td>
<td>One diary</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>ICATUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Eastern Asia and the Pacific</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1992-1997</td>
<td>Four 13-day period</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>15+</td>
<td>15,000 households</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>One diary</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Pre-listing (22 activities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>Module of household survey</td>
<td>5+ (15-64)</td>
<td>9,159</td>
<td>Random selection</td>
<td>Two diaries</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>ACTUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southern Asia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>4 rounds</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>6+</td>
<td>77,593</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Three diaries</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Ad hoc list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>3 quarters</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>15+</td>
<td>77,593</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>One diary</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>ICATUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>19,380 households</td>
<td>Random selection</td>
<td>One diary</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>ICATUS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## EUROPE and CENTRAL ASIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Type of survey</th>
<th>Minimum age</th>
<th>Sample size (individuals)</th>
<th>Type of sample</th>
<th>Survey instrument</th>
<th>Mode of data collection</th>
<th>Classification used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>10,333 diaries</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Two diaries</td>
<td>HETUS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>One diary</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>HETUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1999 2005 2013</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Module of household survey</td>
<td>12+</td>
<td>8,382 6,400</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Two diaries</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Ad hoc detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Two diaries</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>1999-2000 2009-10</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>7,225</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Two diaries</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>HETUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1979 1987 1999 2009</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>3,795</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Two diaries</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Ad hoc detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1974 1986 1999 2010</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>15+ 11+ (15+)</td>
<td>15,441 17,383</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Two diaries</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Ad hoc detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>2001-02 2012</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>12,655 5,000 households, 11,000 individuals</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Three diaries</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Ad hoc detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td></td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Two diaries</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>HETUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>18+</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Two diaries</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Ad hoc detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1988-89 2002-03 2008-09 2013-14</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>3+ (15+)</td>
<td>50,968</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>One diary</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Ad hoc detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>2003 8 months</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>10+ (20-74)</td>
<td>3,804 diaries</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Two diaries</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>HETUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>10+ (20-74)</td>
<td>4,768 diaries</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Two diaries</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>HETUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia, the Former Yugoslav Republic of</td>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>2,080 households</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Two diaries</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>HETUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12+</td>
<td></td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Two diaries</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Ad hoc detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Type of survey</td>
<td>Minimum age</td>
<td>Sample size (individuals)</td>
<td>Type of sample</td>
<td>Survey instrument</td>
<td>Mode of data collection</td>
<td>Classification used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1970-1980</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>16-74</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Diaries for two consecutive days</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Ad hoc detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1990-2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16-79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9-79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>15+</td>
<td>10,013</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>One diary</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Ad hoc detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>15+</td>
<td>2,340</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Two diaries</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>HETUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>10+ (20-74)</td>
<td>2,364</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Two diaries</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>HETUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>19,295</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>One diary</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>HETUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>20-84</td>
<td>7,955</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Two diaries</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Ad hoc detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>2000-2015</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>8+</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Two diaries</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Ad hoc detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>16+</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Two diaries</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Ad hoc detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>8+</td>
<td>9,388</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Two diaries</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Ad hoc detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Module of household survey</td>
<td></td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Two diaries</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Ad hoc detailed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td></td>
<td>provided 16,553</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Two diaries</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Ad hoc detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>diary days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Two diaries</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>HETUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>5,503</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Two diaries</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>HETUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>15-74</td>
<td>5,503</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Two diaries</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>HETUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15-84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova, Republic of</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>10,642</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>HETUS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>15-64</td>
<td>18,720</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Two diaries</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>HETUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>18,720</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Two diaries</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>HETUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Type of survey</td>
<td>Minimum age</td>
<td>Sample size (individuals)</td>
<td>Type of sample</td>
<td>Survey instrument</td>
<td>Mode of data collection</td>
<td>Classification used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>One month Stand alone</td>
<td>15-80</td>
<td>1,342</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Two diaries</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>HETUS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>2008-2012</td>
<td>Year Module of the household budget survey</td>
<td>15+</td>
<td>3910 households, 9633 individuals</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Two diaries</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>HETUS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Module of a living standard survey</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>12,000 households, 33,830 individuals</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Two diaries</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>ICATUS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Year Stand alone</td>
<td>12+</td>
<td>4,929 households</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>One diary</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>2006-2014-15</td>
<td>Year Stand alone</td>
<td>15+ 10+</td>
<td>5,070 households 11,815 individuals 11,440 households</td>
<td>All eligible</td>
<td>Two diaries</td>
<td>Interview  Mixed</td>
<td>HETUS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Blanks mean that no information was found in the methodological documents or that the survey results were obtained from an international database (OECD for example). The mixed mode of data collection means that diaries are self-recorded by the interviewees and individual/household questionnaires are filled by interviewers.