



## Housekeeping Claims: Time Use Statistics from Statistics Canada's 2005 *General Social Survey* (GSS) cycle 19

On the Brown Economic website ([www.browneconomic.com](http://www.browneconomic.com) > **Housekeeping**), we host a calculator called the Housekeeping Damages Calculator™ (HDC). This calculator allows users to fill out a "Diary" of how the plaintiff spends his/her time during the week - on paid work, sleep, personal care, eating meals, leisure, and housework. The HDC then calculates the plaintiff's past loss with pre-judgment interest and present value of future loss (if any) of housekeeping capacity, using an appropriate hourly replacement rate that varies per province, and making adjustments for economic contingencies for the "health" of the plaintiff and the "mortality" risk of the plaintiff.

Below, we review the results of Statistics Canada's most recent time use survey conducted in 2005, which updates the 1998 data. These statistics allow the user to benchmark the time allocated to housework by the plaintiff in his/her "Diary" based on "role groups" (a person's demographic characteristics, such as gender, age, income level, employment status, living arrangements, and presence or absence of children). Note that the data below is a combination of published data from Statistics Canada and a custom tabulation purchased by Brown Economic to be able to tailor the statistics more closely to the plaintiff's demographic characteristics.

Every year since 1985, Statistics Canada has conducted the *General Social Survey* ("GSS") by interviewing Canadians aged 15 and over living in the 10 provinces on a wide range of social issues. Using a 24-hour diary, the GSS has collected detailed information on time use in four different years using varying sample sizes: 1986 (16400), 1992 (9800), 1998 (10700) and 2005 (19600).<sup>1</sup> The 1986 survey provided time diary estimates, and the 1992 survey provided diary<sup>2</sup> and stylized<sup>3</sup> time use estimates. A major objective of the 1992 survey was to improve the quality and reliability of measures of unpaid work; this was accomplished by expanding the coding of diary activities into 167 categories, eliminating the seasonality of estimates,<sup>4</sup> and combining two methods of data collection (i.e., the diary and stylized approaches).

Statistics Canada divides domestic work into "core housework" (done daily and take the most time), "non-core housework", "shopping and services", and "primary child care":

**Core housework:** meal preparation, meal clean-up, indoor cleaning, and laundry.

**Non-core housework:** outdoor cleaning, mending or sewing, interior and exterior maintenance and repair, gardening, pet and plant care, household paperwork, unpacking groceries.

**Shopping and services:**<sup>5</sup> everyday shopping (groceries, take-out food, renting videos), shopping for durable household goods, personal care services, government and financial services, adult medical and dental care, other professional services (lawyer, veterinarian), repair services (cleaning, auto, appliance), queuing for purchase, other shopping, and travel for goods and services.

Cara Brown, M.A.,  
Principal  
Maureen Mallmes, B.Sc.,  
SEMC  
Dan Clavelle, M.Ec.  
Laura Dick, B.A.  
Sarah Tomlinson, B.A.  
Heather Ganshorn, MLIS  
J.C.H. Emery, Ph.D.  
Frank Strain, Ph.D.  
Stephen Clark, Ph.D.  
Emmanuel Yiridoe, Ph.

<sup>1</sup> Katherine Marshall, "Converging gender roles" *Perspectives in Labour and Income*, published by Statistics Canada catalogue #75-001-XPE Autumn 2006, vol. 18, pp. 7-19. The initial 2005 sample was 33470 with a response rate of 58.6%, yielding a sample size of 19613 (source: Statistics Canada, *The 2005 General Social Survey - Cycle 19 Time Use Public Use Microdata File Documentation and User's Guide* November 2006 product no. 12M0019-GPE, pp. 10-11).

<sup>2</sup> The 'diary' approach asks respondents to record all of their activities during a specific time period (i.e., for a 24-hour-day). Simultaneous activities are also reported, as is where the activity is done and who the respondent is with. This approach is considered to be the least difficult for respondents because the respondents describe activities in their own words.

<sup>3</sup> The 'stylized' approach involves asking respondents to estimate how much time they spent on various activities over a specified period of time. For example, respondents are asked: "Last week, how many hours did you spend looking after children who live in your household?" The reference period is usually for a week. A variant of this approach is to ask if the activity were done during some time period, and if so how frequently was it done (i.e., how many times per week).

**Primary child care:** activities directly involving children, such as feeding, helping, teaching, reading to, talking or playing with, medical care, and any related travel such as taking children to school or driving them to sports or other activities.<sup>6</sup>

**TABLE A: Comparison of paid work, housework & childcare, 1986 to 2005, Men & women, Canada<sup>7</sup>**

| Gender / ages / year     | Paid work (hours per day) | Housework (core & non-core) – hours per day | Child care (hours per day) |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| <b>WOMEN, ages 25-54</b> |                           |   |                            |
| 1986                     | 6.7                       | 3.1   | 2.1                        |
| 1992                     | 6.9                       | 3.1   | 2.2                        |
| 1998                     | 7.1                       | 2.8   | 2.3                        |
| 2005                     | 7.5                       | 2.8   | 2.5                        |
| <b>MEN, ages 25-54</b>   |                           |   |                            |
| 1986                     | 7.7                       | 1.9   | 1.5                        |
| 1992                     | 8.1                       | 2.0   | 1.6                        |
| 1998                     | 8.1                       | 1.8   | 1.8                        |
| 2005                     | 8.5                       | 2.1   | 1.8                        |

Source: Katherine Marshall, "Converging gender roles" *Perspectives in Labour and Income*, published by Statistics Canada catalogue #75-001-XPE Autumn 2006, vol. 18, no. 3, Table 1, p. 10.

Table A shows a progressively increasing *paid* workweek for women in the past two decades, but a slight decrease (10%) in housework, offset by a slight increase in childcare. Similarly, men's *paid* workweek has increased (exactly the same as women's workweek - 0.8 hours per day) although men work 1 more hour per day than women (8.5 versus 7.5). Men have steadily (albeit very slightly) have increased the time they spend on childcare, but have fluctuated in terms of time spent on housework (men spend approximately 2 hours per day, compared to women's 3 hours per day).

**TABLE B: Participation rate (%) in activities, men & women, 1986 to 2005, Canada**

| Gender / ages / year | Participation rate – paid work | Participation rate – housework | Participation rate - childcare |
|----------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>WOMEN, 25-54</b>  |                                |                                |                                |
| 1986                 | 41%                            | 90%                            | 44%                            |
| 1992                 | 43%                            | 93%                            | 44%                            |
| 1998                 | 46%                            | 94%                            | 43%                            |
| 2005                 | 49%                            | 89%                            | 39%                            |
| <b>MEN, 25-54</b>    |                                |                                |                                |
| 1986                 | 64%                            | 54%                            | 23%                            |
| 1992                 | 63%                            | 67%                            | 28%                            |
| 1998                 | 63%                            | 77%                            | 30%                            |
| 2005                 | 62%                            | 69%                            | 27%                            |

Source: Katherine Marshall, "Converging gender roles" *Perspectives in Labour and Income*, published by Statistics Canada catalogue #75-001-XPE Autumn 2006, vol. 18, no. 3, Table 1, p. 10.

Interestingly, more women participate in housework activities than women do in paid work - *almost twice as many women*. In contrast, two-thirds of men participate in both paid and unpaid work. Men's labour force participation rate has not changed in two decades, whereas women's labour force participation rate has increased 8 percentage points. More men are doing housework and childcare in 2005 than two decades ago, although slight decreases in both occurred between 1998 and 2005.

Married people with children do more housework than married couples without children; men and women living alone do the least amount of housework when contrasted to their counterparts. When genders are compared, however, women do more housework than men no matter their marital status or childrearing status: *women living alone* do the minimum of almost 2 hours per day of housework, whereas men - of any status - do only about 1 hour per day - even when they have children at home.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>4</sup> The survey accomplished this by conducting its poll monthly throughout the year.

<sup>5</sup> Includes activity codes 301 to 390.

<sup>6</sup> Includes activity codes 200, 210, 220, 230, 240, 250, 260, 281, 291.

<sup>7</sup> Hours per day for people who participate in the activity. Hours are higher than for the total population, which includes people who do not participate in the activity.

Time spent on childcare, unsurprisingly, is the single largest activity of domestic work. Tables C and D below compare time spent on domestic work, and then just on primary childcare, *by household income level*, for men and women, for the year 2005. These data are by “role group” in terms of the parents’ employment status and the age of the children (under or over 5 years old).<sup>9</sup>

**TABLE C: Average hours per week on domestic work, men & women (15 years and over), by household income level, 2005, Canada<sup>10</sup>**

| ROLE GROUP  | INCOME LEVEL             |                 |                 |                  |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|
|   | Across all income levels | \$20000-\$39999 | \$40000-\$59999 | \$60000 and over |
| <i>WOMEN: time spent on domestic work</i>                   |                          |                 |                 |                  |
| Female employed, partner employed, children < 5             | 14.64                    | 18.43E          | 13.57E          | 13.44            |
| Female employed, partner employed, children 5+ years old    | 18.18                    | 20.38E          | 17.83           | 18.36            |
| <i>MEN: time spent on domestic work</i>                     |                          |                 |                 |                  |
| Male employed, partner employed, children < 5               | 9.77                     |                 | 9.34E           | 10.80            |
| Male employed, partner employed, children 5+ years old      | 11.20                    | 12.27E          | 14.39E          | 11.20            |
| Male employed, partner keeping house, children < 5          | 7.56                     | 5.31E           | 9.95E           | 7.45             |
| Male employed, partner keeping house, children 5+ years old | 8.36                     |                 | F               | 8.63E            |

**TABLE D: Average hours per week on childcare, men & women (15 years and over), 2005, Canada, Household income (across all income levels) and > \$60,000<sup>11</sup>**

| Role group  | Household income level      |                            |
|---|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| <i>WOMEN: time spent on childcare</i>                         | All household income levels | Household income > \$60000 |
| Female employed, partner employed, children < 5               | 15.56                       | 16.38                      |
| Female employed, partner employed, children 5+ years old      | 5.33                        | 5.24                       |
| Female employed, partner keeping house, children < 5          | 13.44 E                     | N/A                        |
| Female employed, partner keeping house, children 5+ years old | F                           | N/A                        |
| Female keeping house, partner employed, children < 5          | 29.11                       | 29.50                      |
| Female keeping house, partner employed, children 5+ years old | 12.07                       | 14.09                      |
| Female lone parent, keeping house, children < 5               | 24.19E                      | 21.48E <sup>12</sup>       |
| Female lone parent, keeping house, children 5+ years old      | 10.81                       | 10.44E <sup>13</sup>       |
| <i>MEN: time spent on childcare</i>                           |                             |                            |
| Male employed, partner employed, children < 5                 | 11.65                       | 12.85                      |
| Male employed, partner employed, children 5+ years old        | 3.44                        | 3.94                       |
| Male employed, partner keeping house, children < 5            | 8.62                        | 8.60                       |
| Male employed, partner keeping house, children 5+ years old   | 3.22                        | 4.03                       |

E: use with caution

F: too small to be published

Females keeping house spend twice as much time on childcare activities as do females who are employed (29.11 versus 15.56 for children < 5; 12.07 versus 5.33 for children 5+). Interestingly, female lone parents “keeping house” spend less time on childcare than do females with partners (24.19 and 10.81 versus 29.11 and 12.07, respectively). When children are under 5 years old, men spend more time with them when their partner is employed than when their partner is keeping house (11.65 versus 8.62). Interestingly, income levels (\$60,000 or higher) do not seem to impact the childrearing estimates as one might have thought: these parents are spending as much, or more time, with children than households averaged across all income levels.

<sup>8</sup> Source: Katherine Marshall, “Converging gender roles” *Perspectives in Labour and Income*, published by Statistics Canada catalogue #75-001-XPE Autumn 2006, vol. 18, no. 3, Chart D, p. 12.

<sup>9</sup> There are twice as many estimates for females as for males, because there are not big enough sample sizes of males keeping house and male lone parents to compile time use data. These categories are available only for females.

<sup>10</sup> Special tabulation prepared for Brown Economic Consulting by Statistics Canada’s Labour and Household Surveys Analysis Division from the 2005 GSS cycle 19.

<sup>11</sup> Special tabulation prepared for Brown Economic Consulting by Statistics Canada’s Labour and Household Surveys Analysis Division from the 2005 GSS cycle 19.

<sup>12</sup> For households with income less than \$20,000.

<sup>13</sup> For households with income less than \$20,000.

## UPDATING NON-PECUNIARY AWARDS FOR INFLATION (SEPT. 2006, CANADA)

| Year of Accident/<br>Year of Settlement or Trial | "Inflationary"<br>Factors* | Non-Pecuniary Damages - Sample Awards |          |                 |           |                  |
|--|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------------|-----------|------------------|
|  |                            | \$10,000                              | \$25,000 | \$50,000        | \$75,000  | \$100,000        |
| September 2005-September 2006                    | 1.007                      | \$10,068                              | \$25,171 | \$50,342        | \$75,513  | \$100,684        |
| Avg. 2004-Sept. 2006                             | 1.023                      | \$10,233                              | \$25,582 | \$51,164        | \$76,746  | \$102,327        |
| Avg. 2003-September 2006                         | 1.043                      | \$10,425                              | \$26,063 | \$52,126        | \$78,189  | \$104,252        |
| Avg. 2002-September 2006                         | 1.071                      | \$10,712                              | \$26,779 | \$53,558        | \$80,337  | \$107,116        |
| Avg. 2001-September 2006                         | 1.095                      | \$10,954                              | \$27,384 | \$54,768        | \$82,152  | \$109,536        |
| Avg. 2000-September 2006                         | 1.123                      | \$11,233                              | \$28,084 | \$56,167        | \$84,251  | \$112,335        |
| Avg. 1999-September 2006                         | 1.154                      | \$11,538                              | \$28,846 | \$57,692        | \$86,538  | \$115,385        |
| Avg. 1998-September 2006                         | 1.174                      | \$11,740                              | \$29,351 | \$58,702        | \$88,052  | \$117,403        |
| Avg. 1997-September 2006                         | 1.185                      | \$11,849                              | \$29,624 | \$59,247        | \$88,871  | \$118,494        |
| Avg. 1996-September 2006                         | 1.204                      | \$12,040                              | \$30,099 | \$60,198        | \$90,297  | \$120,397        |
| Avg. 1995-September 2006                         | 1.224                      | \$12,236                              | \$30,590 | \$61,180        | \$91,771  | \$122,361        |
| Avg. 1994-September 2006                         | 1.250                      | \$12,500                              | \$31,250 | \$62,500        | \$93,750  | \$125,000        |
| Avg. 1993-September 2006                         | 1.252                      | \$12,525                              | \$31,311 | \$62,623        | \$93,934  | \$125,246        |
| Avg. 1992-September 2006                         | 1.275                      | \$12,750                              | \$31,875 | \$63,750        | \$95,625  | \$127,500        |
| Avg. 1991-September 2006                         | 1.294                      | \$12,944                              | \$32,360 | \$64,721        | \$97,081  | \$129,442        |
| Avg. 1990-September 2006                         | 1.367                      | \$13,666                              | \$34,164 | \$68,328        | \$102,492 | \$136,656        |
| Avg. 1989-September 2006                         | 1.433                      | \$14,326                              | \$35,815 | \$71,629        | \$107,444 | \$143,258        |
| Avg. 1988-September 2006                         | 1.504                      | \$15,035                              | \$37,588 | \$75,177        | \$112,765 | \$150,354        |
| Avg. 1987-September 2006                         | <b>1.564</b>               | \$15,644                              | \$39,110 | <b>\$78,221</b> | \$117,331 | \$156,442        |
| Avg. 1986-September 2006                         | 1.633                      | \$16,325                              | \$40,813 | \$81,626        | \$122,439 | \$163,252        |
| Avg. 1985-September 2006                         | 1.700                      | \$17,000                              | \$42,500 | \$85,000        | \$127,500 | \$170,000        |
| Avg. 1984-September 2006                         | 1.768                      | \$17,684                              | \$44,209 | \$88,419        | \$132,628 | \$176,838        |
| Avg. 1983-September 2006                         | 1.845                      | \$18,452                              | \$46,129 | \$92,258        | \$138,386 | \$184,515        |
| Avg. 1982-September 2006                         | 1.953                      | \$19,525                              | \$48,813 | \$97,626        | \$146,440 | \$195,253        |
| Avg. 1981-September 2006                         | 2.165                      | \$21,647                              | \$54,117 | \$108,234       | \$162,351 | \$216,469        |
| Avg. 1980-September 2006                         | 2.430                      | \$24,305                              | \$60,762 | \$121,523       | \$182,285 | \$243,047        |
| Avg. 1979-September 2006                         | 2.678                      | \$26,775                              | \$66,938 | \$133,875       | \$200,813 | \$267,750        |
| Jan. 1978-September 2006                         | <b>3.053</b>               | \$30,529                              | \$76,321 | \$152,643       | \$228,964 | <b>\$305,285</b> |

\$78,221= \$50,000 x 1.564 represents the dollar equivalent in September 2006 of \$50,000 based on inflation increases since 1987. Similarly, \$305,285 (= \$100,000 x 3.053) represents the dollar equivalent in September 2006 of \$100,000 in 1978 based on inflationary increases since 1978.

\* Source: Statistics Canada, Consumer Price Index, monthly CPI release

| Consumer Price Index                                   |       | Unemployment Rate           |       |
|--|-------|-----------------------------|-------|
| From Sept. 2005 to Sept. 2006*<br>(rates of inflation) |       | For the month of Sept. 2006 |       |
| Canada:  | 0.7%  | Canada:                     | 6.4%  |
| Vancouver:   | 1.4%  | Vancouver:                  | 4.1%  |
| Toronto:   | 0.3%  | Toronto:                    | 6.6%  |
| Edmonton:  | 2.3%  | Edmonton:                   | 4.3%  |
| Calgary:   | 5.1%  | Calgary:                    | 3.6%  |
| Halifax:   | 0.4%  | Halifax:                    | 5.6%  |
| St. John's, NF:  | 0.0%  | St. John's, NF:             | 7.8%  |
| Saint John, NB:  | -0.2% | Saint John, NB:             | 6.5%  |
| Charlottetown:   | 0.2%  | Charlottetown:              | 10.8% |

\* Based on 12-month rolling average. Source: Statistics Canada

Check out BEC's  
Damages Calculators at  
[www.browneconomic.com](http://www.browneconomic.com)