

Can she really have it all?: Gendered differences in how work influences well-being

by
Mackenzie Cumberland

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Bachelor of Arts, Honours
In the Department of Economics
University of Victoria
April 2019

Supervised by Dr. Merwan Engineer

For

Dr. Elisabeth Gugl, Honours Co-Advisor

Dr. Martin Farnham, Honours Co-Advisor

Abstract

This paper updates “Taking its toll: The influence of paid and unpaid work on women’s well-being” (MacDonald *et al.*, 2005) using data from the 29th cycle of the General Social Survey, collected between April 7, 2015 and April 6, 2016. Important shifts that have occurred in the Canadian labour market since MacDonald *et al.* (2005), including, the dramatic increase in the number of hours Canadians supply to the labour market, make an update of this research timely. In addition to the increased discussion of stress and work-life balance in the media. Using an ordered logit regression, differences based on sex in the relationship between additional hours of paid or unpaid work and self-reported stress or dissatisfaction with work-life balance are tested. The study finds that paid work hours are related to self-reported stress and dissatisfaction with work-life balance for both women and men. However, unpaid work hours in aggregate are only related to self-reported stress, but not dissatisfaction with work-life balance, for women, and dissatisfaction with work-life balance, but not self-reported stress, for men. Additionally, there are differences in how women experience stress and dissatisfaction with work-life balance based on whether they work full- or part-time.

I. Introduction

In this paper, I estimate how paid and unpaid work hours relate to stress and dissatisfaction with work-life balance (DWLB) for Canadians. Over the past twenty years, there have been important shifts in Canada's labour force that may have influenced the ways Canadians experience stress and DWLB. Most importantly, Canadian families have dramatically increased the number of paid working hours they supply to the labour force. The rise of the "dual-earner family", in which the family is supported by two earners as opposed to one sole earner, is the driving force behind the increase in paid working hours supplied by individual Canadian families (Marshall, 2009). Although my analysis only considers changes that have occurred in Canada in the last twenty years, the significance of the transformation that has occurred is demonstrated by the almost doubling of Canadian families with two earners between 1976 and 2015, from 1.0 million to 1.9 million (Statistics Canada, 2018).

Using data from 2006, Marshall (2009) finds women are 14% more likely to experience time-related stress than men. MacDonald *et al.* (2005) also directly observe that women are more likely to report stress than men. In this paper, using data from 2016, I am able to observe changes in the differences between men and women's self-reported stress.

Studies, such as this one, in stress and work-life balance, are especially relevant to society today, as stress and DWLB are increasing rapidly. Discussion of these topics has become ubiquitous in the media. Headlines in newspapers note stress as one of the main reasons educated, white-collar professionals in Canada leave their jobs (e.g., Global News, 2018). Additionally, stress seemingly has a large impact on younger generations. Millennials have been referred to as the "burnout generation" (Peterson, 2019), while Generation Z has been referred to as "stressed, depressed, and exam-obsessed" ("Generation Z", 2019). All of this suggests that the impact of stress on society is increasing and that this is a trend that will continue.

CAN SHE REALLY HAVE IT ALL?

With this in mind, developed countries have brought work-life balance to the forefront of policy discussions. Globalization and technological change, an aging population, and falling fertility rates all indicate a need to discuss work-life balance (Gregory and Milner, 2009) because they contribute to the change in the number of hours Canadians spend engaged in paid and unpaid work. For example, technological advancement has contributed to the growth of the so-called “gig-economy,” which is associated with longer working hours and more job insecurity (Torres, 2018). Additionally, an aging population increases the need for unpaid eldercare while falling fertility rates decrease the need for unpaid childcare. These factors can have a significant influence on individual well-being and Canada’s productivity. In this discussion, policy-makers and citizens should be informed by a better understanding of the relationship between different types of work, stress, and work-life balance.

In this paper, I contribute to this conversation by estimating the relationship between work (paid and unpaid) and stress and by estimating the relationship between work (paid and unpaid) and dissatisfaction with work-life balance. While related, the concept of stress and the concept of DWLB are distinct, and each affects well-being differently. An illustrative example of this is a supermom whose success in balancing her responsibilities comes “at a high cost in terms of stress” (MacDonald *et al.*, 2005). Meanwhile, one could also imagine a single person who feels lower stress but dissatisfied with her failure to start a family.

My research builds upon the important work of MacDonald *et al.* (2005), “Taking Its Toll: The Influence of Paid and Unpaid Work on Women’s Well-Being.” The authors of this study use the 12th cycle of the General Social Survey (GSS) to find that paid work hours contributes to stress for both women and men, while unpaid work hours only contributes to stress for women. In this paper, I use the 29th cycle of the GSS, collected between April 7, 2015 and April 6, 2016, to update the research of MacDonald *et al.* (2005). Using an ordered logit regression with self-

CAN SHE REALLY HAVE IT ALL?

reported stress as my explained variable and paid and unpaid work hours as my explanatory variables, I ascertain the relationship between an additional hour of work and self-reported stress. Next, I test how paid and unpaid work hours are associated with DWLB for Canadian men and women. I also disaggregate unpaid work hours into childcare, eldercare, and housework hours to estimate how different types of unpaid work hours are related to stress and DWLB. I further examine how the results for Canadian women differ depending on whether women are engaged in full- or part-time employment. My use of an ordered logit on a five-stage Likert scale improves upon the research of MacDonald *et al.* (2005) who use a probit on a dichotomous variable, because the use of a variable with only two possible results may cause respondents at the margin to choose an extreme answer where they otherwise would not.

Like MacDonald *et al.* (2005), I find that paid work hours are associated with greater stress for both men and women, while aggregate unpaid work hours are only associated with greater stress for women. When unpaid work hours are categorized to include childcare hours, eldercare hours, and housework hours, I find childcare hours and housework hours are associated with greater stress for women. This is the same result that MacDonald *et al.* (2005) find. Unlike MacDonald *et al.* (2005), I find eldercare hours are associated with greater stress for men. Additionally, unlike MacDonald *et al.* (2005), I find a statistically significant relationship between hours of unpaid work and DWLB for men. However, I do not find any relationship between unpaid work and DWLB for women. Finally, I find that the relationship between hours of paid and unpaid work and stress or DWLB varies based on whether women are engaged in full- or part-time employment. Overall, I find the relationship between additional work hours and stress or DWLB to be either not statistically significant or small in magnitude when compared to other factors. Therefore, I conclude the relationship between additional work hours and stress or dissatisfaction with work-life balance is not practically significant.

II. Literature Review

Traditionally, economic models have only considered the trade-offs between income and leisure for households (Floro, 1995, MacDonald *et al.*, 2005). These models often define work to be paid work completed in the labour market and define leisure to be any time not devoted to labour market work. However, this approach fails to consider the various unpaid tasks that need to be completed for the well-being of the household and the ways in which these unpaid tasks can lengthen the working day or lead individuals to multitask. Both lengthening the working day and increased multitasking can have negative implications for well-being (Floro, 1995). One way these two factors can negatively affect well-being is by increasing stress. Because of the importance of the many competing time demands on individuals (e.g. from the productive, reproductive, and community managing roles individuals play in society), understanding time-related stress – whether related to paid or unpaid work – is imperative for any informed conversation about household well-being.

The fact that time-related stress is likely to have a particular impact on women, is demonstrated by the tendency of women to multi-task and lengthen their work day more than men (Floro, 1995). To ascertain the effect of multi-tasking and longer workdays on households, Floro (1995) brings these factors into the household utility function. She finds that while households can benefit from women completing more work, as it allows for greater consumption, it can also have adverse effects for the individual and the family. For the individual, completing more work, through multi-tasking and increasing the number of hours worked, can lead to fatigue and monotony culminating in dissatisfaction. For the family, greater work intensity can decrease the quality of the individual's work (Floro, 1995). An example of this would be the overwhelmed mother who, attempting to cook while giving her children the attention they require, feeds the family frozen dinners every evening. While this mother has

CAN SHE REALLY HAVE IT ALL?

accomplished two tasks by making dinner and caring for her child simultaneously, the number of frozen meals the family consumes may have adverse effects on the family's health.

Time-related stress is often inevitable as individuals have 24 hours in which to complete a multitude of tasks every day, and so optimizing individuals are always on the budget constraint for time. Because the family and the workplace are both "greedy" institutions that compete to eat up all of an individual's time (Tausig and Fenwick, 2001), time-related stress can be exacerbated for individuals with families who have a greater number of responsibilities with which to occupy their time. Phipps *et al.* (2001) consider how the distribution of free time between men and women in families relates to the well-being of the family. Using an ordered probit regression with subjective reports of "time for self" as the explained variable, they find that, in dual-earner families, men are more often satisfied with the time they have for themselves than women are. They suggest this result is influenced by women having lower quality leisure time than men, leading women to be less satisfied with the leisure time they do have. There are two reasons why women might have lower quality leisure time than men. First, it may be that traditionally female jobs in the household are more rigid than traditionally male jobs in the household. For instance, dinner must be put on the table every evening or family members will go hungry, while mowing the lawn occurs less frequently and is easily left to a later date. Second, women may have lower quality leisure time than men if their leisure time usually occurs in brief intervals (for instance, six ten-minute stints of leisure time as opposed to one 60-minute chunk) (Phipps *et al.*, 2001).

Phipps *et al.*'s (2001) findings suggest that, at the time of writing, there may have been distributional problems in the way leisure time and work were allocated within families. This is confirmed through additional empirical evidence from the 2000's. Sayer (2005) finds that between 1965 and 1999 total hours of paid and unpaid work increased for women while total hours of paid and unpaid work remained stable for men. However, Sayer (2005) also finds

CAN SHE REALLY HAVE IT ALL?

evidence that the gap in working hours between men and women may have been closing, as they find that men were increasing the number of hours they spent on unpaid work. If men have continued to increase the number of hours they allocate to unpaid work since Sayer published in 2005, then two forces have competed against each other in determining the distribution of work in the household for the last 15 years: women increasing their paid work hours and men increasing their hours of unpaid work.

Rainer (2008) models the conditions for bargaining between partners on how they allocate time between unpaid and labour-market work in the context of a multi-stage game in an attempt to explain why women allocate more time to unpaid work for the household than men. In the first stage, each partner individually determines their investment in their individual earning power. Examples of the partners' investments could include time spent in school or nights spent working late to further their career. In the second stage, the two partners bargain to determine their allocation of time to paid and unpaid labour. Next, men are presented with the decision of whether to renege on the original allocation of unpaid work negotiated with their wives. Rainer (2008) finds that when there is gender discrimination against women in the form of reduced opportunities in the labour market, men will be more likely to deviate from the agreement made at the second stage of the game. This result occurs because men gain from the deviation and women have little ability to punish men for their deviation. Therefore, anti-female bias will be introduced into the household with women completing a larger share of the unpaid work than men. However, when there is equality between the sexes, men do not have the same incentive to renege on their agreements and a more equitable distribution of unpaid work will be reached (Rainer, 2008).

Rainer's model is limited in that it assumes no substitutions for at-home labour can be purchased in the private market. This assumption means that individuals do not have the ability

CAN SHE REALLY HAVE IT ALL?

to purchase durable appliances, restaurant meals, and the labour of childminders and housecleaners. This is a strong assumption and not representative of the world we live in today. However, Phipps and Burton (1998) find that, within the household, expenditures on substitutes for the household production of childcare increase with females' incomes but not males' incomes. Phipps and Burton's (1998) finding indicates that even with the ability to purchase substitutes for household labour in the private market, men retain bargaining power in who is responsible for ensuring unpaid work for the household is completed.

III. Hypotheses

The models of Floro (1995) and Rainer (2008) inform my hypotheses. First, I hypothesize that an increase in paid work hours undertaken by the individual will increase self-reported measures of stress and DWLB for both men and women. My first hypothesis is based on Floro (1995)'s model, which says that an increase in the length in an individual's working hours will lead to greater stress when one is already working the maximum number of hours they are capable of comfortably working.

Second, I hypothesize that an increase in hours of any type of unpaid work undertaken by individual women will increase their DWLB. Because full equality between the sexes has not been attained, according to Rainer's (2008) model, men have incentives to renege on agreements they have made with their wives over the allocation of time between paid and unpaid work. Because men renege on their agreements, we can expect anti-female bias in terms of who is responsible for the bulk of the work in the household, so women become responsible for tasks they otherwise would not be. The increase in unpaid work hours that comes with completing tasks designated for both partners in the household, in addition to dissatisfaction with the tasks

CAN SHE REALLY HAVE IT ALL?

her husband is completing in the household, could have a positive relationship with a woman's DWLB.

Third, I hypothesize that an increase in unpaid work hours undertaken by the individual will have a larger positive relationship with DWLB for part-time working women than for full-time working women. My last hypothesis is partially based on the fact that part-time working women are less likely than full-time working women to have invested a great deal in their career (Higgins *et al.*, 2000), leaving them with less power over the allocation of unpaid work hours when they go to bargain with their husbands. Therefore, part-time working women are more likely to have husbands who renege on their promises, leaving the women responsible for the bulk of the unpaid labour in the family (Rainer, 2008), although this may not be what they desire. However, I hypothesize full-time working women will experience greater stress with an increase in their working hours (both paid and unpaid) than part-time working women because they already work longer hours than part-time working women.

My work contributes to this literature by increasing what we know about life satisfaction and stress for women and men in society today. Most studies on gendered differences in stress and work-life balance occurred fifteen years ago and, since then, changes have occurred in Canada's labour force. This informs our understanding of how Canadian women and men are coping with recent changes in the family and the labour force, and the influences these changes have on stress levels.

IV. Data

My analysis uses Cycle 29 of the GSS, collected by Statistics Canada between April 7, 2015 and April 6, 2016, which emphasizes time use. The time use focus of this iteration of the GSS provides insight on how Canadian men and women use their time during an average week.

CAN SHE REALLY HAVE IT ALL?

Data for Cycle 29 was collected through three methods. The first data collection method employed was interviews conducted by trained Statistics Canada employees. The second data collection method employed was an electronic questionnaire. Finally, in some cases, a combination of the two methods was used. Overall, 17,390 responses were obtained and the total response rate for the survey was 38.2 %. When sample weights are applied, the total survey is representative of Canadians 15 years and older from all provinces (the territories are excluded).

To mirror the analysis conducted by MacDonald *et al.* (2005), I only include working Canadians in my sample because they contribute the most to both their families and the labour force. However, while MacDonald *et al.* (2005) includes Canadians that fit the traditional definition of prime age used in labour economics, defined as those between the ages of 25 and 54, in their sample, I extend this definition to include those between the ages of 55 and 65. I do this because the traditional definition of prime age is not representative of Canada's labour force. This was also true between 1999 and 2005, when MacDonald *et al.* (2005) conducted their analysis. According to Statistics Canada, many Canadians have chosen to remain in the labour force until they reach their mid-60s (Statistics Canada, 2015; Statistics Canada, 2019). The inclusion of respondents between the ages of 55 and 65 in my analysis decreases the number of childcare hours and may lead to a different distribution of unpaid work hours in the family, as people in this age group do not often have young children. In fact, the average number of childcare hours in my sample is much smaller than the average number of childcare hours in MacDonald *et al.*'s (2005) sample. While I am sure the inclusion of an older cohort is partially responsible, Canadians between the ages of 25 and 55 also have less children, on average, in my sample than in MacDonald *et al.*'s (2005) sample. Other than childcare hours, the inclusion of Canadians between the ages of 55 and 65 does not largely alter the average hours spent on any other type of work. A second way I transform my data, which was also done by MacDonald *et*

CAN SHE REALLY HAVE IT ALL?

al. (2005), is that I exclude responses for which total working hours are greater than 168 (7 days in a week * 24 hours) because that would mean the respondent completed responsibilities that filled a greater number of hours than they have available in a week.

Regarding stress, the data I use to analyze the relationship between self-reported stress and work hours comes from the following question: “Thinking about the amount of stress in your life, would you say that most days are...?” Possible responses to this question are “Not at all stressful” (coded as a one), “Not very stressful” (coded as a two), “A bit stressful” (coded as a three), “Quite a bit stressful” (coded as a four), and “Very stressful” (coded as a five). Thus, a five-stage Likert scale is used to measure the stress levels of Canadians. Regarding DWLB, I use data from the question: “How satisfied are you with the current balance between your job and home life? Are you...?” Possible responses to this question are “Very satisfied” (coded as a one), “Satisfied” (coded as a two), “Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied” (coded as a three), “Dissatisfied” (coded as a four), “Very dissatisfied” (coded as a five). Therefore, a five-stage Likert scale is also used to measure level of DWLB of Canadians.

Table 1 contains summary statistics for my sample. My total sample size is 3,607 women and 3,638 men. When compared to MacDonald *et al.*'s (2005) analysis of the data from 1999, it is clear that working hours for both men and women have increased. For women, paid working hours have increased by 11.13 hours per week during this period. Meanwhile, for men, paid working hours have increased by 3.62 hours per week. The large increase in paid working hours for women may reflect the continued entry of women – especially those with young children – into full time employment. Additionally, the increase in paid work hours may reflect that Canadians, both men and women, are supplying a greater number of hours into the labour force (Jackson and Rao, 2016). It is important to note there may be some differences between how I

CAN SHE REALLY HAVE IT ALL?

constructed these variables and the method used by MacDonald *et al.* (2005). Therefore, our analyses are not perfectly comparable.

According to my data, unpaid working hours have decreased for women and men since 1999, and they have decreased by more for women than they have for men. This indicates the gap between male and female working hours is closing and that the distribution of unpaid work hours in Canadian households is becoming more equitable. This trend extends to both hours of housework and hours of childcare, which is not included in measures of housework hours. The finding that the distribution of unpaid work hours in Canadian households is becoming more equitable contrasts with previous work that says men have increased the amount of time they spend on childcare and have only retained a small role in other household chores (*eg.* Higgins *et al.*, 2000; Sayer, 2005). Therefore, it is inconsistent with the suggestion that men only contribute a small number of hours to household chores.

V. Empirical Strategy

For this study, I adopt the methodology used by MacDonald *et al.* (2005) to estimate how paid and unpaid work hours relate to self-reported stress and DWLB. The equation I use to estimate this relationship is

$$\text{logit}(p) = \log\left(\frac{p}{1-p}\right) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{paid}_i + \beta_2 \text{unpaid}_i + \beta_3 \text{caringlabour}_i + \beta_4 \text{sandwich}_i + X_i \delta + \varepsilon_i \quad (1)$$

where i indexes the individual; p is the probability of the explained variable, either stress or DWLB on a 5-point Likert scale, taking a given value (either 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5); *paid* denotes hours of paid labour; *unpaid* denotes hours of unpaid labour; *caringlabour* is a dummy variable denoting an individual has an elder in the household who might require caring labour;

CAN SHE REALLY HAVE IT ALL?

sandwich is a dummy variable for the presence of both an elder and a child in the household; X is a vector of control variables; and ε is an iid error term. In this specification, I hypothesize that paid work hours will have a positive relationship with stress (and a positive relationship with DWLB) for both men and women: $p^w > p_0^w$, $p^w > p_0^w$, where the subscript w denotes women and the subscript m denotes men and $p_0^w = p_0^m = 0$.

I control for income status in my model because I expect being low-income to have a positive relationship with stress. I construct my low-income dummy variable differently than MacDonald *et al.* (2005), using the Market-Basket Measure as opposed to the Low-income Cut-off. The Market-Basket Measure uses the cost of a basic basket of goods, with different cut-offs being used for different provinces, family sizes, and whether the respondent resides in a rural or urban area (Statistics Canada, 2019). Based on these characteristics, when a respondent's annual household income is lower than the cost of that basket of goods for one year, the dummy variable takes the value of one. Otherwise, the dummy variable takes the value of zero. I use the Market-Basket Measure as opposed to the Low-income Cut-off because, unlike the Low-income Cut-off, the Market-Basket Measure accounts for differences in price levels across provinces. For example, the cost of a basic basket of goods in British Columbia is more expensive than the cost of the same basic basket of goods in Quebec. However, note that the GSS asks respondents to report their income within a range of \$20,000. For example, respondents report whether their annual income is between \$1 and \$19,999. This makes my measure of low-income status very imprecise. To check the robustness of my results with the definition of this variable, I also estimate the relationship using the raw data on income instead of the low-income dummy variable. However, this has little impact on my results.

In addition to income and educational attainment, I control for whether the individual is single, whether they have disability status, and whether they were born in Canada. I control for

CAN SHE REALLY HAVE IT ALL?

whether they were born in Canada because being an immigrant might be a cause of stress. Unfortunately, the GSS does not directly survey for immigrant status. Therefore, I use whether or not an individual was born in Canada as an imperfect proxy (MacDonald *et al.*, 2005). I also control for educational attainment of the respondent because previous research indicates that attaining a higher educational status is associated with higher levels of stress for individuals (Phipps *et al.*, 2001). Finally, I control for the presence of children between the ages of zero and four, five and 12, 13 and 18, and 19 and 24, because the age of the one's child may affect their stress levels or DWLB. I estimate an ordered logit where the dependent variable is a Likert-scale measure of stress or dissatisfaction with work-life balance. An ordered logit is appropriate because my dependent variable is always ordinal (ie. respondents are rating their stress and DWLB on a scale of 1-5).

Next, I use MacDonald *et al.*'s (2005) methodology to differentiate between types of unpaid work hours and find the relationship between these types of work and stress. For this, I use the equation

$$\text{logit}(p) = \left(\frac{p}{1-p} \right) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{paid}_i + \beta_2 \text{childcare}_i + \beta_3 \text{eldercare}_i + \beta_4 \text{housework}_i + X\Delta_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (2)$$

where p is the probability of the explained variable, either stress or DWLB, taking on a given value (either 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5); *childcare* is the number of childcare hours in an average week; *eldercare* is the number of eldercare hours in an average week; and *housework* is the number of hours spent on household chores in an average week. I do not include controls for number of children, age groups of children in the household, being part of the sandwich generation, or having a parent in the household who might require caring labour because these controls are closely correlated with the variables of interest. However, this does open my model up to omitted variable bias. I first estimate an ordered logit based on Equation (2) on the full

CAN SHE REALLY HAVE IT ALL?

sample of women and the full sample of men. My hypothesis for this specification, when DWLB is the explained variable, is: for childcare, eldercare, and housework, $p^w > p_0$. Next, I differentiate between part-time working women, who work less than 35 hours per week, and full-time working women, who work more than 35 hours per week, and compare the results. My hypothesis for this specification when self-reported stress is the explained variable is: $p^{FT} > p^{PT}$, where the superscript *PT* denotes part-time and the superscript *FT* denotes full-time. My hypothesis for this specification when DWLB is the explained variable is: $p^{FT} < p^{PT}$.

My results may be biased if respondents failed to accurately log the number of hours they spend on work. This could easily occur in today's society where it is normal for individuals to check in to work from home and multitask between different activities. This factor could bias my results either upwards or downwards depending on whether respondents over- or underestimated the amount of time they spend on work. This is a classical measurement error where people randomly misreport their hours worked.

Misreporting by respondents may result from the fact that human memories are fallible. In general, this is a concern for self-report surveys, such as the one my research is based on, because it may make them unrepresentative of reality. Despite the fact self-reporting errors may introduce bias, they are still useful because no other sources of information provide us as intimate a portrayal of the distribution of well-being in the family (Phipps *et al.*, 2001). In addition, self-report surveys have been demonstrated to be at least as accurate as so-called objective measures of stress (MacDonald *et al.*, 2005).

VI. Results

The influence of paid and unpaid work hours on self-reported stress and DWLB

Table 2 contains the estimates of the coefficients for the ordered logit based on Equation (1). Like MacDonald *et al.* (2005), I find that paid work hours are associated with greater stress and DWLB for both men and women. This result confirms my first hypothesis, namely that paid work hours will be associated with greater stress for both women and men. My results also mirror MacDonald *et al.*'s (2005) in that I find unpaid work hours are only associated with greater stress for women, not for men¹. However, my results deviate from MacDonald *et al.*'s (2005) results, as I find a statistically significant relationship between unpaid work hours and DWLB for men. Although unpaid work hours are associated with greater stress for women, unpaid work hours are not associated with greater DWLB for women. For men, unpaid work hours are negatively related to DWLB, while no relationship is present between unpaid work hours and stress.

Table 2 also demonstrates that children are associated with greater stress for mothers and fathers at different points during their childhood. Relative to not having any children in the household, the presence of a child between the ages of five and 12 is associated with greater stress for women, conditional on hours of unpaid work. However, the presence of a child between the ages of five and 12 in the household is not associated with any change in stress for men, conditional on hours of unpaid work. Similarly, relative to not having any children in the household, having a child between the ages of 13 and 18 is associated with greater stress for men, conditional on hours of unpaid work hours. Yet, the presence of a child between the ages of

¹ These findings are based on a sample of men and women between the ages of 25 and 65, not the standard definition of "prime age" used by MacDonald *et al.* (2005), which may influence the number of hours they allocate to paid and unpaid work.

CAN SHE REALLY HAVE IT ALL?

13 and 18 in the household is not associated with any change in stress for women, conditional on hours of unpaid labour.

The presence of children in the household either between the ages of zero and four, or the ages of 19 and 24, have no statistically significant relationship to stress for either women or men, conditional on unpaid hours worked. Because of this fact, I am unable to conclude that the presence of a child between the ages of zero and 4 or 19 and 24 is associated with any change in stress for either men or women, conditional on unpaid hours worked. However, for women, conditional on hours worked, the presence of children in the household between the ages of 19 and 24 is associated with increased DWLB. There are many reasons why this might be the case. One reason for this may be that women with children in this age group are trying to transition back to full-time work and having difficulties doing so. Another potential reason for this could be that women who have transitioned to full-time work are dissatisfied with the extent to which their partner is contributing to the unpaid work necessary for the household to function.

In addition to the presence of children in certain age groups being associated with greater stress and DWLB, my analysis shows a statistically significant relationship between other control variables and stress or DWLB. First, as expected, having a disability is positively related to both stress and DWLB for men and women. Second, educational attainment is associated with both greater stress and greater DWLB for men and women. This result means that as one attains a higher educational status, they are more likely to be stressed or DWLB. Finally, there is a negative relationship between being born outside Canada and stress for both men and women.

Table 3 contains the mean marginal effects of paid and unpaid work hours on self-reported stress and DWLB. These marginal effects give the average change in probability that respondents will rate their stress at a given point on the Likert scale associated with a one-hour

CAN SHE REALLY HAVE IT ALL?

increase in paid or unpaid work. For my analysis, I focus on the average changes in probability that a respondent rates their stress or DWLB at either a four or a five.

The results in Table 3 demonstrates that, for women, an additional hour of paid work is associated with an increase in the probability of rating stress at a four or a five by 0.0048 and 0.0008 respectively. For men, an additional hour of paid work is associated with an increase in the probability of rating stress at a four or a five by 0.0041 and 0.0004 respectively². These marginal effects for women and men are statistically significant at the one percent level.

When DWLB is considered, the relationship between paid work hours and DWLB for women and men is very similar. For women, an additional hour of paid work is associated with an increase in the probability of rating DWLB at a four or a five by 0.0027 and 0.0006 respectively. For men, an additional hour of paid work is associated with an increase in the probability of rating DWLB at a four or a five by 0.0029 and 0.0005 respectively³. These marginal effects for women and men are statistically significant at the one percent level.

The relationship between unpaid work hours and stress is statistically significant for women, while the relationship between unpaid work hours and DWLB is statistically significant for men. For women, an additional hour of unpaid work is associated with an increase in the probability of rating stress at a four or a five by 0.0006 and 0.0001 respectively. For men, an additional hour of unpaid work is associated with a decrease in the probability of rating DWLB at a four or a five by 0.0003 and 0.0001 respectively⁴. Thus, for men additional unpaid work hours decrease their DWLB. However, these coefficients are small which indicates that, although I find statistical significance, the result is of little practical significance.

² See footnote 1.

³ See footnote 1.

⁴ See footnote 1.

CAN SHE REALLY HAVE IT ALL?

The influence of different types of unpaid work on self-reported stress and DWLB

Table 4 contains the estimates of coefficients for the ordered logit based on Equation (2), which differentiates between different types of unpaid work. For women, hours spent in childcare and housework are associated with higher self-reported stress. For men, only hours spent in eldercare are associated with higher self-reported stress. The results fail to confirm my second hypothesis that all types of unpaid work hours will be associated with higher stress and DWLB for women, but not for men, because eldercare is associated with stress and DWLB for men and not for women. When DWLB is the explained variable, only hours of childcare are associated with higher DWLB for women. Meanwhile, hours of eldercare are associated with higher DWLB for men. The fact that childcare hours have a statistically significant relationship with stress and DWLB for women but not men is not surprising, when considered in tandem with the result from Equation (1) that children are associated with higher stress for women when they are younger and caring for them is more labour and time-intensive. Meanwhile, children are associated with stress for men when they are older and caring for them is less labour and time-intensive⁵.

The mean marginal effects of hours spent in childcare, eldercare, and housework are shown in Table 5. For women, an additional hour of childcare is associated with an increase in the probability a respondent rates their stress at a four or a five by 0.0006 and 0.0001 respectively. This result is statistically significant at the one percent level. An additional hour of housework is associated with an increase in the probability a respondent rates their stress at a four or a five by 0.002 and 0.0002 respectively⁶. These results are statistically significant at the five percent level.

⁵ See footnote 1.

⁶ See footnote 1.

CAN SHE REALLY HAVE IT ALL?

For men, childcare and housework do not have a relationship with stress that is different than zero. However, for men, an additional hour of eldercare is associated with an increase in the probability a respondent rates their stress at a four or a five by 0.008 and 0.001 respectively⁷. These results are statistically significant at the one percent level. Most men who report eldercare hours are either married or in common-law relationships. Therefore, it is plausible that the eldercare they are participating in is caring for their in-laws. This fact might start to explain why eldercare is related to increased stress for men. However, the likelihood that men engage in eldercare for their in-laws does not explain the asymmetry in the how eldercare is associated with greater stress for men but not for women, as women likely also engage in eldercare for their in-laws.

When DWLB is the explained variable, for women, the only type of work that is associated with increased DWLB is childcare. Meanwhile, eldercare is associated with greater DWLB for men. For women, an additional hour of childcare is associated with a 0.0003 increase in the probability of rating DWLB at a four, which is statistically significant at the one percent level, and a 0.0001 increase in the probability of rating DWLB at a five, which is significant at the five percent level. For men, an additional hour of eldercare is associated with an increase in the probability of rating DWLB at a four or a five by 0.0014 and 0.0004 respectively⁸. These results are statistically significant at the ten percent level. Again, it is important to note that the size of these coefficients is rather small so, while my estimated marginal effects are statistically significant, they are of little practical significance.

⁷ See footnote 1.

⁸ See footnote 1.

CAN SHE REALLY HAVE IT ALL?

Difference between part-time and full-time working women

Because there are differences in the relationships part-time working women and full-time working women have with the workforce and their family, I run Equation (2) two more times. First, I run Equation (2) for women who work less than 35 hours per week (part-time working women). Second, I run Equation (2) for women who work 35 or more hours per week (full-time working women). The results are reported in Table 6.

For part-time working women, only housework is related to higher stress and none of the variables of interest are related to higher DWLB. A one-hour increase in housework is associated with a 0.0016 increase in the probability a respondent rates their stress at a four, which is statistically significant at the five percent level, but carries no significant impact on the probability a respondent rates their stress at a five⁹.

The results are more interesting for full-time working women. For full-time working women, an increase in paid work, childcare, or eldercare hours are all associated with an increase in the probability that a respondent reports higher stress. Meanwhile an increase in paid work or childcare hours are both associated with an increase in the probability that a respondent reports DWLB. A one-hour increase in paid work is associated with an increase in the probability a respondent rates their stress at a four or a five by 0.0068 and 0.0012 respectively. These results are statistically significant at the one percent level. That same hour increase in paid work is associated with an increase in the probability a respondent rates their DWLB at a four or a five by 0.004 and 0.0009 respectively¹⁰. These results are statistically significant at the one percent level.

⁹ See footnote 1.

¹⁰ See footnote 1.

CAN SHE REALLY HAVE IT ALL?

Childcare is also associated with higher stress and DWLB for full-time working women. A one-hour increase in childcare hours is associated with an increase in the probability a respondent rates their stress at a four and a five by 0.0009 and 0.0002 respectively. These results are statistically significant at the one percent level. That same one-hour increase in childcare hours is associated with an increase in the probability a respondent rates their DWLB at a four and a five by 0.0004 and 0.0001 respectively¹¹. These results are statistically significant at the five percent level.

Finally, for full-time working women, eldercare is only associated with an increase in the probability a respondent rates their stress highly. A one-hour increase in eldercare is associated with an increase in the probability a respondent rates their stress at a four or a five by 0.0038 and 0.0007 respectively¹². These results are statistically significant at the five percent level.

My third hypothesis is partially supported by the data. I do find hours of work to be related to increased stress for full-time working women, when they are not related to increased stress for part-time working women. However, I do not find that part-time working women are more DWLB than full-time working women. In fact, full-time working women experience more DWLB than part-time working women, so I fail to confirm that part-time women experience more DWLB than full-time working women.

VII. Conclusion

My research has demonstrated the impacts on well-being associated with an increase in the number of paid or unpaid work hours. Specifically, I have considered the influence additional hours of paid or unpaid work hours may have on stress and DWLB, paying attention to differences in how additional work impacts women and men. Like MacDonald *et al.* (2005), I

¹¹ See footnote 1.

¹² See footnote 1.

CAN SHE REALLY HAVE IT ALL?

find that paid work hours are associated with greater stress for both women and men, while unpaid work hours are only associated with greater stress for men. However, unlike MacDonald *et al.* (2005), I find that additional unpaid work hours have a statistically significant relationship with DWLB for men, but not for women. This result indicates that men are more satisfied when they participate in the unpaid labour required to keep the family functioning. The fact that men feel more satisfied when they engage in unpaid work hours for the family, in combination with improved opportunities for women in the labour force, which improve women's bargaining power at home, may explain why the distribution of unpaid labour in the household has become much more equitable. Women in MacDonald *et al.*'s (2005) sample, who were between the ages of 15 and 55, worked an additional 25.8 hours of unpaid labour when compared to men. Whereas, in my sample, women, who were between the ages of 15 and 65, worked a mere 8 additional hours than men.

In addition, I find that childcare and housework both have a statistically significant relationship with stress for women, while only eldercare only has a statistically significant relationship with stress for men. Childcare has a significant relationship with DWLB for women, while eldercare has a statistically significant relationship with DWLB for men. These results indicate that caring labour is associated with a greater influence on DWLB than other types of work. Finally, I find there are differences in what factors are associated with greater stress and DWLB for part-time and full-time working women. For full-time working women, additional hours of both paid work and caring labour are associated with greater stress and DWLB than for part-time working women. However, my results demonstrate that the influence on stress or DWLB associated with additional hours of paid or unpaid work is quite small.

It is also important to note what my study has not achieved, I have not proven causality between paid and unpaid work hours and either stress or DWLB. My results cannot be

CAN SHE REALLY HAVE IT ALL?

interpreted as causal because it is easy to imagine a situation where a woman, knowing she feels stressed or dissatisfied with the way she allocates her time, determines how many hours to spend on household chores or paid work for her employer. Therefore, I am not able to determine the direction of causation in my model. MacDonald *et al.*'s (2005) analysis suffers due to this same shortcoming. This provides an opportunity for future research.

Another limitation of my research is that because of the cross-sectional nature of my data, I have also failed to pay adequate attention to differences in how paid and unpaid work hours might influence the stress or DWLB of individuals at different stages of the lifecycle. It is easy to imagine that as priorities change throughout the life cycle, so too will the stressors and causes of DWLB that individuals face, making this an interesting avenue for future research if researchers are able to find the appropriate data.

References

- Floro, M.S. (1995). Women's well-being, poverty, and work intensity. *Feminist Economics*, 1(3), 1-25. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/714042246>
- Gregory, A., & Milner, S. (2009). Editorial: Work Life Balance: A Matter of Choice? *Gender, Work and Organization*, 16(1), 1-13. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-0432.2008.00429.x
- Generation Z is stressed, depressed, and exam-obsessed. (2019, Feb 27). *The Economist*, retrieved from <https://www.economist.com/graphic-detail/2019/02/27/generation-z-is-stressed-depressed-and-exam-obsessed>.
- This is the state of stress in 2018. (2018, April 16). *Global News*, retrieved from <https://globalnews.ca/news/4138006/stress-causes-today/>.
- Higgins, C., Duxbury, L., & Johnson, K. (2000). Part-time work for women: Does it really help balance work and family? *Human Resources Management*, 39(1), 17-32. DOI:10.1002/(SICI)1099-050X(200021)39:1<17::AID-HRM3>3.0.CO;2-Y
- Jackson, A., & Rao, G. (2016). Chapter 7: The Unhealthy Canadian Workplace. In D. Raphael (ed.), *Social Determinants of Health: Canadian Perspectives* (pp. 150 – 166). Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press Inc.
- MacDonald, M., Phipps, S. & Lethbridge, L. (2005). Taking Its Toll: The Influence of Paid and Unpaid Work on Women's Well-Being. *Feminist Economics*, 11(1), 63-94. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1354570042000332597>
- Marshall, K. (2009). The Family Work Week. *Perspectives*, (75-0010X), 5-13. DOI: 10.1.1.488.2696
- Peterson, A. (2019, January 5). How Millennials Became the Burnout Generation. *Buzzfeed News*, retrieved from

CAN SHE REALLY HAVE IT ALL?

<https://www.buzzfeednews.com/article/annehelenpetersen/millennials-burnout-generation-debt-work>.

Phipps, S., Burton, P. (1998). What's mine is yours? The influence of male and female incomes on patterns of household expenditure. *Economica*, 65(260), 599-613. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2555190>.

Phipps, S., Burton, P., & Osberg, L. (2001). Time as a Source of Inequality Within Marriage: Are Husbands More Satisfied with Time for Themselves than Wives? *Feminist Economics*, 7(2), 1-21. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1354700110068261>

Sayer, L. (2005). Gender, time and inequality: Trends in women's and men's paid work, unpaid work, and free time. *Social Forces* 84(1), 285-303. DOI: <https://doi-org.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/10.1353/sof.2005.0126>

Statistics Canada. 2015. Age at retirement, by sex. Retrieved from <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/71-222-x/2008001/sectionm/m-age-eng.htm>.

Statistics Canada. 2016. The rise of the dual-earner family with children. Retrieved from <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/11-630-x/11-630-x2016005-eng.htm>.

Statistics Canada. 2019. Retirement by age class of worker, annual. Retrieved from <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/t1/tb11/en/tv.action?pid=1410006001>.

Statistics Canada. 2019. Market Basket Measure (MBM). Retrieved from <https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/ref/dict/pop165-eng.cfm>.

Statistics Canada. 2017. Census in Brief: Working Seniors in Canada. Retrieved from <https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/as-sa/98-200-x/2016027/98-200-x2016027-eng.cfm>.

Tausig, M., & Fenwick, R. (2001). Unbinding Time: Alternate Work Schedules and Work-Life Balance. *Journal of Family and Economics*, 22(2), 101-119.

CAN SHE REALLY HAVE IT ALL?

Torres, N. (2018). Are there good jobs in the gig economy? *Harvard Business Review*, 96(4),
retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2018/07/are-there-good-jobs-in-the-gig-economy>.

CAN SHE REALLY HAVE IT ALL?

Table 1. Summary Statistics

	2016 GSS		1999 GSS	
	Females	Males	Females	Males
Average stress	2.9	2.7	-	-
% who feel stressed	10.5%	18.06%	-	-
Average satisfaction with work-life balance	2.1	2.1	-	-
% satisfied with work-life balance	25.6%	23.3%	-	-
Paid work hours/week	38.2	44.9	26.8	42.3
Unpaid work hours/week	27.2	19.2	48.2	22.4
Total work hours (paid + unpaid)	65.4	64.1	75.4	65
Housework/week	12.0	8.5	17.5	9.1
Childcare/week	14.2	10.1	28.6	12.1
Eldercare/week	1.0	0.1	1.9	1.3
Age	46	40	39.1	39
Low Income	3.4%	3.0%	14.0%	9.8%
Single	38.7%	30.6%	25.5%	26.6%
Has a child 0 – 4 in the household	4.9%	7.2%	-	-
Has a child 5 – 12 in the household	10.0%	9.8%	-	-
Has a child 13 – 18 in the household	8.6%	6.8%	-	-
Has a child 19 – 24 in the household	4.6%	3.5%	-	-
Has less than a high school degree	4.0%	7.8%	15.3%	17.9%
Has a high school degree	16.2%	17.9%	36.6%	38.8%
Has a certificate/diploma	43.0%	40.6%	26.6%	23.1%
Has a Bachelors degree	24.4%	21.5%	21.5%	25.2%
Has above a Bachelors degree	12.4%	12.2%	-	-
Main activity is school	0.6%	0.4%	-	-
Unemployed and looking for work	0.5%	0.4%	-	-
Born outside Canada	18.9%	20.3%	20.6%	21.4%
Has a disability	32.7%	24.6%	13.9%	9.5%
Observations	3616	3638	2,299	2,182

Note: Summary statistics from the 1999 GSS that are not included are those where the question changed between 1999 and 2016.

Table 2. Coefficients on the influence of paid and unpaid work hours on self-reported stress and DWLB

	Self-reported stress		Dissatisfaction with work-life balance	
	Women	Men	Women	Men
Paid work hours	0.035*** (0.004)	0.031*** (0.004)	0.037*** (0.005)	0.030*** (0.004)
Unpaid work hours	0.005** (0.002)	0.003 (0.002)	0.003 (0.002)	-0.004* (0.002)
Dummy = 1 if single	0.168* (0.098)	-0.065 (0.104)	0.361*** (0.010)	0.160 (0.114)
Dummy = 1 if low income	0.001 (0.241)	-0.168 (0.300)	0.075 (0.268)	-0.124 (0.262)
Dummy = 1 if children 0 – 4 present	0.074 (0.177)	0.052 (0.182)	0.350* (0.211)	0.231 (0.179)
Dummy = 1 if children 5 – 12 present	0.249* (0.147)	0.055 (0.149)	0.160 (0.168)	0.093 (0.148)
Dummy = 1 if children 13 – 18 present	0.151 (0.171)	0.312* (0.164)	-0.098 (0.153)	0.105 (0.164)
Dummy = 1 if children 19 – 24 present	-0.111 (0.202)	0.061 (0.205)	0.287* (0.169)	-0.047 (0.253)
Number of children in the household	0.002 (0.065)	0.079 (0.061)	-0.044 (0.052)	0.043 (0.055)
Dummy = 1 if both childcare and eldercare	0.248 (0.208)	0.320* (0.192)	0.249 (0.183)	0.177 (0.164)
Dummy = 1 if > 35 with a parent in the household	-0.463 (0.299)	-0.192 (0.296)	0.086 (0.255)	0.248 (0.249)
Dummy = 1 if respondent has a disability	1.112*** (0.092)	0.808*** (0.096)	0.807*** (0.090)	0.932*** (0.092)
Educational Attainment	0.162*** (0.026)	0.123*** (0.023)	0.090*** (0.025)	0.051** (0.023)
Dummy = 1 if born outside Canada	-0.309*** (0.117)	-0.277*** (0.105)	0.008 (0.099)	-0.034 (0.097)
Age	-0.490 (0.615)	-0.749 (0.614)	-0.109 (0.607)	-1.29** (0.583)
Age ^ (1/2)	1.882 (2.230)	2.454 (2.249)	0.019 (2.215)	4.171** (2.113)
Province	-0.007 (0.003)	0.001 (0.003)	-0.0001 (0.003)	0.005 (0.003)
Observations	3616	3638	3616	3638

*** denotes statistically significant at 1% significance level, ** denotes statistically significant at 5% significance level, * denotes statistically significant at 10% significance level

Table 3. Changes in probability a respondent rates their stress/DWLB at a certain level with an additional hour of paid or unpaid work

		Self-reported stress		Dissatisfaction with work-life balance	
		Women	Men	Women	Men
Paid Work Hours	1: Not at all stressed/DWLB	-0.00228*** (0.00032)	-0.00268*** (0.00035)	-0.00656*** (0.00085)	-0.00525*** (0.00070)
	2: Not very stressed/DWLB	-0.00419*** (0.00048)	-0.00379*** (0.00046)	-0.00003 (0.00024)	-0.00008 (0.00020)
	3: A bit stressed/Neither satisfied nor DWLB	0.00086*** (0.00022)	0.00193*** (0.00028)	0.00330*** (0.00044)	0.00291*** (0.00037)
	4: Quite a bit stressed/DWLB	0.00484*** (0.00058)	0.00410*** (0.00053)	0.00271*** (0.00037)	0.00291*** (0.00037)
	5: Very stressed/DWLB	0.00078*** (0.00016)	0.00044*** (0.00009)	0.00059*** (0.00013)	0.00047*** (0.00010)
Unpaid Work Hours	1: Not at all stressed/DWLB	-0.00029** (0.00012)	-0.00022 (0.00019)	-0.00051 (0.0032)	0.00078* (0.00043)
	2: Not very stressed/DWLB	-0.00054** (0.00023)	-0.00031 (0.00027)	-3.06e-06 (0.00002)	-0.00001 (0.00003)
	3: A bit stressed/Neither satisfied nor DWLB	0.00011* (0.00006)	0.00016 (0.00014)	0.00026 (0.00016)	-0.00043* (0.00024)
	4: Quite a bit stressed/DWLB	0.00062** (0.0002)	0.00034 (0.00029)	0.00021 (0.00013)	-0.00027* (0.00015)
	5: Very stressed/DWLB	0.00010** (0.00004)	0.00004 (0.00003)	0.00005 (0.00003)	-0.00007* (0.00004)

*** denotes statistically significant at 1% significance level, ** denotes statistically significant at 5% significance level, * denotes statistically significant at 10% significance level

This table provides the mean marginal effects of an additional hour of paid work and an additional hour of unpaid work on the probability a respondent rates their stress or DWLB at a 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5.

Table 4. Coefficients on the influence of childcare, eldercare, and housework hours on self-reported stress and DWLB

	Self-reported stress		Dissatisfaction with work-life balance	
	Women	Men	Women	Men
Paid	0.0348*** (0.0042)	0.0310*** (0.0038)	0.0378*** (0.0049)	0.0298*** (0.0040)
Childcare	0.0043*** (0.0016)	0.0033 (0.0022)	0.0046*** (0.0017)	-0.0023 (0.0024)
Eldercare	0.0192 (0.0133)	0.0617*** (0.0162)	0.0126 (0.0116)	0.0226* (0.0126)
Housework	0.0100** (0.0043)	0.0017 (0.0044)	0.0013 (0.0038)	-0.0064 (0.0064)
Low income	0.0171 (0.2403)	-0.1549 (0.3018)	0.0709 (0.2709)	-0.1307 (0.2493)
Single	0.1212 (0.0888)	-0.2022** (0.0990)	0.3592*** (0.0943)	0.1083 (0.1065)
Educational attainment	0.1695*** (0.0269)	0.1304*** (0.0217)	0.0921*** (0.0252)	0.0520** (0.0229)
Disability status	1.1120*** (0.0908)	0.8168*** (0.0964)	0.8081*** (0.0904)	0.9273*** (0.0912)
Immigrant	-0.3245*** (0.1178)	-0.2849*** (0.1054)	0.1200 (0.0973)	-0.0187 (0.0954)
Age	-0.7638 (0.5659)	-1.0794* (0.5870)	0.1705 (0.5703)	-1.5534*** (0.5335)
Age ^ (1/2)	2.7523 (2.0473)	3.6745* (2.1435)	-1.0019 (2.0798)	5.0986*** (1.9317)
Province	-0.0078** (0.0030)	-0.0003 (0.0033)	-0.0001 (0.0029)	0.0041 (0.0031)
Observations	3, 616	3, 638	3, 616	3, 638

*** denotes statistically significant at a 1% significance level, ** denotes statistically significant at a 5% significance level, * denotes statistically significant at a 10% significance level.

Table 5. Changes in probability a respondent rates their stress/DWLB at a certain level with an additional hour of childcare, eldercare, or housework

		Self-reported stress		Dissatisfaction with work-life balance	
		Women	Men	Women	Men
Paid Work Hours	1: Not at all stressed/DWLB	-0.00225*** (0.00031)	-0.00269*** (0.00035)	-0.00669*** (0.0009)	-0.00527*** (0.00070)
	2: Not very stressed/DWLB	-0.00415*** (0.00048)	-0.00381*** (0.00046)	-0.00004 (0.0024)	0.00009 (0.00020)
	3: A bit stressed/Neither satisfied nor DWLB	0.00086*** (0.00022)	0.00196*** (0.00028)	0.00337*** (0.00044)	0.00292*** (0.00037)
	4: Quite a bit stressed/DWLB	0.00477*** (0.00057)	0.00410*** (0.00052)	0.00275*** (0.00037)	0.00179*** (0.00028)
	5: Very stressed/DWLB	0.00077*** (0.00015)	0.00044*** (0.00009)	0.00060*** (0.00013)	0.00048*** (0.00010)
Childcare Hours	1: Not at all stressed/DWLB	-0.00028*** (0.00011)	-0.00029 (0.00019)	-0.00081*** (0.00030)	-0.00040 (0.00043)
	2: Not very stressed/DWLB	-0.00052*** (0.00019)	-0.00041 (0.00028)	-4.45e-06 (0.00003)	-6.60e06 (0.00002)
	3: A bit stressed/Neither satisfied nor DWLB	0.00011** (0.00005)	0.00021 (0.00014)	0.00041*** (0.00015)	-0.00022 (0.00024)
	4: Quite a bit stressed/DWLB	0.00059*** (0.00022)	0.00044 (0.00030)	0.00034*** (0.00012)	-0.00014 (0.00015)
	5: Very stressed/DWLB	0.00010*** (0.00036)	0.00005 (0.00003)	0.00007** (0.00003)	-0.00037 (0.00004)
Eldercare Hours	1: Not at all stressed/DWLB	-0.00124 (0.00086)	-0.00536*** (0.00143)	-0.00022 (0.00205)	-0.00400* (0.00223)
	2: Not very stressed/DWLB	-0.00228 (0.00158)	-0.00758*** (0.00201)	-0.00001 (0.00008)	0.00007 (0.00015)
	3: A bit stressed/Neither satisfied nor DWLB	0.00048 (0.00034)	0.00390*** (0.00106)	0.00113 (0.00103)	0.00222* (0.00124)
	4: Quite a bit stressed/DWLB	0.00262 (0.00182)	0.00816*** (0.00220)	0.00092 (0.00084)	0.00136* (0.00077)
	5: Very stressed/DWLB	0.00042 (0.00030)	0.00088*** (0.00026)	0.00020 (0.00018)	0.00036* (0.00021)
Housework Hours	1: Not at all stressed/DWLB	-0.00064** (0.00029)	-0.00015 (0.00038)	-0.00022 (0.00066)	0.00114 (0.00114)
	2: Not very stressed/DWLB	-0.00119** (0.00052)	-0.00021 (0.00054)	-1.23e-06 (8.86e-06)	-0.00002 (0.00005)
	3: A bit stressed/Neither satisfied nor DWL	0.00024* (0.00013)	0.00011 (0.00028)	0.00011 (0.00033)	-0.00063 (0.00063)

CAN SHE REALLY HAVE IT ALL?

4: Quite a bit stressed/DWLB	0.00136** (0.00059)	0.00023 (0.00058)	0.00009 (0.00027)	-0.00039 (0.00039)
5: Very stressed/DWLB	0.00022** (0.00010)	0.000025 (0.00006)	0.00002 (0.00006)	-0.00010 (0.00011)

*** denotes statistically significant at a 1% significance level, ** denotes statistically significant at a 5% significance level, * denotes statistically significant at a 10% significance level.

This table provides the mean marginal effects of an additional hour of childcare, an additional hour of eldercare, and an additional hour of housework on the probability a respondent rates their stress or DWLB at a 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5.

Table 7. Differences in the changes in probability that part-time and full-time working women rates their stress/DWLB at a certain level with an additional hour of childcare, eldercare, or housework

		Self-reported stress		Dissatisfaction with work-life balance	
		Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time
Paid	1: Not at all stressed/DWLB	-0.00065 (0.00109)	-0.00270*** (0.00047)	0.00233 (0.00241)	-0.00830*** (0.00107)
	2: Not very stressed/DWLB	-0.00081 (0.00134)	-0.00575*** (0.00083)	-0.00097 (0.00098)	-0.00138** (0.00039)
	3: A bit stressed/Neither satisfied nor DWLB	0.00070 (0.00116)	0.00042 (0.00033)	-0.00068 (0.00070)	0.00481*** (0.00057)
	4: Quite a bit stressed/DWLB	0.000716 (0.00118)	0.00680*** (0.00095)	-0.00059 (0.00067)	0.00395*** (0.00057)
	5: Very stressed/DWLB	0.00005 (0.00009)	0.00124*** (0.00027)	-0.00008 (0.00010)	0.00092*** (0.00021)
Childcare	1: Not at all stressed/DWLB	0.00027 (0.00040)	-0.00034*** (0.00011)	-0.00058 (0.00092)	-0.00078** (0.00032)
	2: Not very stressed/DWLB	0.00034 (0.00049)	-0.00072*** (0.00021)	0.00024 (0.00039)	-0.00013** (0.00006)
	3: A bit stressed/Neither satisfied nor DWLB	-0.00029 (0.00043)	0.00005 (0.00004)	0.00017 (0.00023)	0.00045** (0.00018)
	4: Quite a bit stressed/DWLB	-0.00030 (0.00043)	0.00085*** (0.00025)	0.00015 (0.00023)	0.00037** (0.00015)
	5: Very stressed/DWLB	-0.00002 (0.00003)	0.00015*** (0.00005)	0.00002 (0.00004)	0.00009** (0.00004)
Eldercare	1: Not at all stressed/DWLB	-0.00056 (0.00378)	-0.00151** (0.00069)	0.00007 (0.00790)	-0.00354 (0.00218)
	2: Not very stressed/DWLB	-0.00068 (0.00471)	-0.00321** (0.00145)	-0.00003 (0.00330)	-0.00059 (0.00038)
	3: A bit stressed/Neither satisfied nor DWLB	0.00059 (0.00403)	0.00023 (0.00021)	-0.00002 (0.00229)	0.00205 (0.00125)
	4: Quite a bit stressed/DWLB	0.00060 (0.00417)	0.00380** (0.00172)	-0.00002 (0.00202)	0.00169 (0.00105)
	5: Very stressed/DWLB	0.00004 (0.00030)	0.00069** (0.00033)	-2.76e-06 (0.00030)	0.00039 (0.00024)
Housework	1: Not at all stressed/DWLB	-0.00148* (0.00079)	-0.00047 (0.00030)	-0.00081 (0.00171)	-0.00015 (0.00072)
	2: Not very stressed/DWLB	-0.00183** (0.00091)	-0.00100 (0.00062)	0.00034 (0.00071)	-0.00003 (0.00012)
	3: A bit stressed/Neither	0.00158* (0.00082)	0.00007 (0.00008)	0.00023 (0.00050)	0.00009 (0.00042)

CAN SHE REALLY HAVE IT ALL?

satisfied nor DWLB				
4: Quite a bit stressed/DWLB	0.00162** (0.00082)	0.00118 (0.00073)	0.00021 (0.00044)	0.00007 (0.00034)
5: Very stressed/DWLB	0.00012 (0.00009)	0.00021 (0.00014)	0.00003 (0.00007)	0.00002 (0.00008)

*** denotes statistically significant at a 1% significance level, ** denotes statistically significant at a 5% significance level, * denotes statistically significant at a 10% significance level.

This table provides the mean marginal effects of an additional hour of childcare, an additional hour of eldercare, and an additional hour of housework on the probability a full-time working woman or a part-time working woman rates their stress or DWLB at a 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5.