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1. An introduction:
The feminist challenge to the common notion of work

1. The data (TUS)

1. The results for a set of European countries

1. Explaining the persistent inequality

1. Conclusions and policy implications
1. What do we mean by WORK?

- Work is equal to employment?
- The third person criteria
- Care work and unpaid care work
- The social construction of care
- GDP and national satellite accounts
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TOTAL WORK, PAID AND UNPAID
source: UNDP, HDR 1995

Diagram showing the comparison of paid and unpaid work between men and women.
2. Time use data

- Time-use data allow us to show how care work performed outside the marketplace represents an essential and distinctive part of national economies and to highlight how this work is unevenly distributed among women and men.

- Cross-national comparisons among time-use surveys show persisting patterns and differences in observed gender inequalities in terms of total workload and care responsibilities.

- Women and men make important choices in how to allocate their time, but their choices are considerably constrained by the various restrictions and social conditions they encounter, including the institutional environment in which they live.
Figure 1: Care diamond

RAZAVI (2007)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time, am</th>
<th>What were you doing?</th>
<th>What else were you doing?</th>
<th>Where were you?</th>
<th>Were you with anybody?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00 - 7:10</td>
<td><strong>Sleeping</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>At home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:10 - 7:20</td>
<td>Had a shower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:20 - 7:30</td>
<td>Made breakfast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 - 7:40</td>
<td>Ate breakfast</td>
<td>Read newspaper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:40 - 7:50</td>
<td>Did washing up</td>
<td>Talked with my son</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:50 - 8:00</td>
<td>Got my son dressed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 - 8:10</td>
<td>Walked to school with son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:10 - 8:20</td>
<td>Dropped son off at school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:20 - 8:30</td>
<td>Walked to bus stop</td>
<td>Read newspaper</td>
<td>On the bus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 - 8:40</td>
<td>Travel by bus to work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:40 - 8:50</td>
<td></td>
<td>Read newspaper</td>
<td>On the bus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:50 - 9:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 - 9:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:10 - 9:20</td>
<td>Walked from bus stop to main job</td>
<td></td>
<td>Walking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:20 - 9:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 - 9:40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:40 - 9:50</td>
<td>Main job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:50 - 10:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1: Part of the 2000/1 UK HETUS diary form**
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3. The results
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Figure 1 Working time of women and men ages 20–74 (hours and minutes per average day) Note: W and M refer to women’s and men’s hours, respectively.

Sources: HETUS (Eurostat 2004b, 2006).
Figure 2 Structure of working time of employed women and men (hours and minutes per average day)
Note: W and M refer to women’s and men’s hours, respectively.

Sources: HETUS (Eurostat 2004b, 2006).
Figure 3 Hierarchical cluster analysis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Cluster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>F-ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid work</td>
<td>7,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>2,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid care work</td>
<td>86,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>3,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal care</td>
<td>1,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure</td>
<td>3,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleep</td>
<td>19,620</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our findings

• In all European countries women spent more hours in unpaid than paid work, the opposite behavior than their male counterparts.

• This “specialization” decreases when looking only at employed people, but not in an important way in most of the countries (different behaviors by gender).

• In all countries, women work longer hours than men –except in Sweden-.

• In fact, there are some welfare systems that are much more egalitarian in gender terms than others, and these are the ones with:
  • High percentage of social service expenditure over the total public expenditure.
  • Where social services are more important than direct transfer and different parental leave arrangements work both for men and women.

• The ones in which the main provider continues to be the family are the most gender unequal ones and the most unsustainable in demographic terms.

• Although, regimes are not constants as the socio-economic environment undergoes frequent changes that give rise to new demands by social forces, gender division of labor changes are very slowly modified showing also differences in past institutional developments.
4. Explaining the persistent inequality

- Stereotypes are strong and constantly reinforced
- Public policies are not promoting equality using a clear mainstreaming approach
- Labor market discrimination feeds family inequalities and the other way around
- The current economic system and economic policies promote inequality
Stereotypes

• Segregated education
  – Family, school, media..

• The market potentiates the stereotyping process
  – Product differentiation
  – Hypersexualization from infancy

• Labor market and families used them in order to select their employees or redistribute work load and resources
Public policies reinforce gender segregated stereotypes

- Maternity leave is favored instead of equal, non-transferable and fully paid paternity leave
- The maintenance of joint family fiscality
- Money transfer instead of public services
- Non gender-sensitive budgeting and evaluation processes
- Gender mainstreaming has always been absent from macroeconomic policy
Markets and labor market

- The more gender discrimination operates in labor markets, less bargaining power women have in their families.
- Labor policies should look at the whole picture (paid and unpaid work).
- Female unpaid care work specialization does not only make more difficult their participation in the labor market but it also frees men to participate the way they do.
  - And that way becomes norm and it is considered universal.
5. Conclusions and policy implications

- Patriarchal work specialization still survives in all countries, something that must be taken into consideration as a central issue in macroeconomic models and policies.
- The biggest gender differences on time use are not in the time spent in the labor market but in the unpaid work.
- The recent restructuring of welfare state does not need to follow the agenda of re-privatizing and redistributing care towards the family and the market because that could imply an intensification of women’s work and important inequalities regarding family income.
- The economic crisis and the austerity policies (austericide) should not end up in an intensification of female work. Sustainable structural adjustment requires an investment in social reproduction.
- TUS data shows that although there are better places than others for gender equality, there is not yet a non-discriminatory and equal model from a feminist perspective and that innovation in the way society faces care should arrive.
Lessons for Public Policies

• Need to invest an important amount of budgets in Social Services and Equal Opportunity Policies, so that they can really reduce gender inequality
  – Specially regarding male non-transferable parental leave
  – And preferring social services investment to direct transfers

• To combat discrimination and precarization in the labor market

• Key role of education to change social norms and traditional culture:
  – Formal education but mainly
  – Media and culture
    • Limits are needed especially in children’s culture and media consumption
    • Audiovisual councils

• BUT THERE IS NO SPACE FOR ALL THAT WITHIN THE NEOLIBERAL POLICIES AND INSTITUTIONS PRESENT AT THE EUROPEAN UNION
  – And which reinforce the belief that markets should regulate themselves
  – And commodify more and more parts of human lives
LESSONS FOR TUS STUDIES

• Homogeneous, comparative international studies need to be done

• Continuous over time, to capture evolution and cultural changes

• Add other socioeconomic variables & indicators to be able to obtain a full view of how socially unsustainable our economic development is in terms of gender equity
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