





AUTUMN 1999 Vol. 11, No. 3

- SENIORS VOLUNTEERING
- RETURN TO WORK AFTER CHILDBIRTH
- BABY BOOM WOMEN
- MISSING WORK
- SELF-EMPLOYMENT
- UNIONIZATION





Statistics Statistique Canada Canada

Canadä

At Your Service...

Data in many forms

Statistics Canada disseminates data in a variety of forms. In addition to publications, both standard and special tabulations are offered. Data are available on the Internet, compact disc, diskette, computer printouts, microfiche and microfilm, and magnetic tape. Maps and other geographic reference materials are available for some types of data. Direct online access to aggregated information is possible through CANSIM, Statistics Canada's machine-readable database and retrieval system.

Statistics Canada's Regional Reference Centres in Canada's major cities

Halifax	(902) 426-5331	Regina	(306) 780-5405
Montréal	(514) 283-5725	Edmonton	(780) 495-3027
Ottawa	(613) 951-8116	Calgary	(403) 292-6717
Toronto	(416) 973-6586	Vancouver	(604) 666-3691
Winnipeg	(204) 983-4020		

You can also visit our World Wide Web site: http://www.statcan.ca

Toll-free access is provided for all users who reside outside the local dialing area of any of the Regional Reference Centres.

National enquiries line	1 800 263-1136	
National telecommunications device		
for the hearing impaired	L 800 363-7629	
Order-only line (Canada and United States)	1 800 267-6677	
Fax order-only line (Canada and United States)	1 877 287-4369	

Ordering/Subscription information

This and other Statistics Canada publications may be purchased from local authorized agents and other community bookstores, the Statistics Canada Regional Reference Centres, or from:

Statistics Canada Operations and Integration Division Circulation Management 120 Parkdale Avenue Ottawa, Ontario KIA 0T6

Telephone: 1 (613) 951-7277 or 1 800 700-1033 Faesimile: 1 (613) 951-1584 or 1 800 889-9734 E-mail: order@statcan.ca

Standards of service to the public

Statistics Canada is committed to serving its clients in a prompt, reliable and courteous manner and in the official language of their choice. To this end, the agency has developed standards of service which its employees observe in serving its clients. To obtain a copy of these service standards, please contact your nearest Statistics Canada Regional Reference Centre.

Autumn 1999 Vol. 11 No. 3

Departments

- 3 Forum
- 5 Highlights
- 66 What's new?
- 71 Key labour and income facts Families and family income
- 79 In the works

Perspectives on Labour and Income (Catalogue no. 75-001-XPE; aussi disponible en français: L'emploi et le revenu en perspective, nº 75-001-XPF au catalogue) is published four times a year under the authority of the Minister responsible for Statistics Canada. ©Minister of Industry 1999. SUBSCRIPTION RATES: \$58 a year in Canada, US\$58 for all countries outside Canada. Single issue \$18 in Canada, US\$18 for all countries outside Canada. ISSN: 0840-8750. All prices exclude sales tax.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any other means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from Licence Services, Marketing Division, Statistics Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1A 0T6.

Indexed in the Canadian Index, Canadian Periodical Index, P.A.I.S. International and Sociological Abstracts, and available online in Canadian Business and Current Affairs and Employee Benefits Infosource. Also indexed in French in L'Index de l'Actualité and Point de Repère.

Statistics Canada

Articles

0 N

9 Seniors who volunteer

LABOUR

Frank Jones

As governments have cut back on social and other services, an aging population's need for a strong support structure has grown. Seniors, in fact, have created both a growing market for such services and a potential source of volunteer labour to meet these needs. How involved are seniors in volunteering? What services are they providing? This study examines the volunteer activity of seniors aged 55 and over in 1997.

AND

INCOM

(NPHL)

18 Employment after childbirth

Katherine Marshall

Women are an integral part of the labour market. Understanding their work patterns can help employers manage birth-related work interruptions and, in the end, retain experienced employees. This article looks at the work patterns of women who gave birth between 1993 and 1994. It examines the timing of their return to paid work following a birth, and considers the personal and job characteristics of those who returned within two years and those who did not.

26 Baby boom women – then and now

Louise Earl

Have baby boom women had an easier path through the labour market than women a generation older or younger? This article studies the "success" of baby boom women by looking at their situation in 1977 and 1997 and comparing it with that of the preceding and succeeding generations, using four major indicators: labour force participation; full-time employment; unemployment; and full-year full-time earnings.

Reçu / Re	c'd
JUL 2 3 200	02

Bibliotheque, DRHC Library, HRDC

PERSPECTIVES

Editor-in-Chief Ian Macredie (613) 951-9456 macrian@statcan.ca

Managing Editor Henry Pold (613) 951-4608 poldhen@statcan.ca

Marketing Co-ordinator Fiona Long (613) 951-4628 longfio@statcan.ca

Editors Catherine Hardwick Bruce Rogers

Data Services Pierre Bérard Joanne Bourdeau Laura Fraser Mary M^cAuley

Production and Composition Heather Berrea Diane Joanisse Annamma John Ann Trépanier

Printing Dissemination Division

30 Missing work in 1998 – industry differences Ernest B. Akyeampong

In January 1999, the Labour Force Survey adopted the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) for its industry coding. This article examines 1998 work absence rates according to NAICS. It provides a brief overview of the absence levels for 1997 and 1998, and a detailed examination of industry differences in the latter year.

37 Self-employment in Canada and the United States

Marilyn E. Manser and Garnett Picot

Considerable attention has been paid in recent years to selfemployment in Canada, especially to workers' reasons for choosing this option. Have they been "pushed" by lack of full-time paid jobs or "pulled" by the positive benefits of self-employment? This article looks at the characteristics of the self-employed and the growth of self-employment in Canada and the United States. (Adapted from an article in *Canadian Economic Observer* published in March 1999.)

45 Unionization - an update

Ernest B. Akyeampong

This update of *Perspectives'* socio-demographic and economic profile of union members provides unionization rates according to the new North American Industry Classification System and the 1991 Standard Occupational Classification. The update, which extends to the provincial level, also includes data on earnings, wage settlements, inflation, and strikes and lockouts.

Symbols

The following standard symbols are used in Statistics Canada publications:

- figures not available
- ... figures not appropriate or not applicable
- nil or zero
- -- amount too small to be expressed
- p preliminary figures
 r revised figures
- x confidential to meet secrecy requirements of the Statistics Act

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences – Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48–1984.

Forum

From the Managing Editor

In the mail...

"Seasonality in employment" (Spring 1999)

■ The article stresses fairly strongly the "costs" of seasonal variations, but fails to mention the social benefits from having seasonal jobs; for example, the possibilities these provide for young people to gain work experience during the years when they are mainly engaged in education or training, workers who find it difficult to get permanent jobs close to home, or (semi-) "retired" persons. It may therefore be that the social costs of the decline in seasonal variations are larger than the possible gains to employers. It would have been interesting to have had a more explicit assignment of the reasons for the decline in seasonal variations to demand or supply factors.

None of the "highly seasonal industries (HSI)" specified in Table 1 are "service-producing." It would be interesting to know whether the HSI group would have included service sectors, and which those would have been, if the specification of industry groups had been significantly more detailed. Will, for example, "hotels and restaurants" then qualify as HSI?

Eivind Hoffmann Bureau of Statistics International Labour Office

■ You are correct to point out that there can be positive aspects to seasonal variation in employment. In particular, the gain in seasonal employment in the summer months may indeed be beneficial for students and/or young people looking for work experience. And this is especially true given that the youth unemployment rate in Canada has been consistently above 15% throughout the 1990s. However, it has been argued (not in this paper) that regional seasonal work can be a drain on the economy and productivity, because of its historical link to the Employment Insurance program (EI, but formerly known as UI). 'UI continues to subsidize seasonal work, and blunts the incentives for workers in high-unemployment regions to move to where the jobs exist or to acquire the training they need" (Globe and Mail, November 14, 1998).

And yes, if we had done seasonal variation calculations for all 2-digit or 3-digit industry codes there most likely would have been more "highly seasonal industries." Since your letter, we did seasonal variation calculations for "accommodation and food services." Interestingly, they were not significantly greater than the overall average. For example, in 1997 the seasonal variation for all industries was 2.8 whereas for accommodation and food services it was 3.1. But at the 3-digit level, within accommodation and food services, some categories would almost certainly be highly seasonal, such as "recreation and vacation camps." However, low employment levels at the 3-digit industry level may prevent a reliable analysis of seasonal variation.

Perspectives

We welcome your views on articles and other items that have appeared in *Perspectives*. Additional insights on the data are also welcome, but to be considered for publication, communications should be factual and analytical. We encourage readers to inform us about their current research projects, new publications, data sources, and upcoming events relating to labour and income.

Statistics Canada reserves the right to select and edit items for publication. Correspondence, in either official language, should be addressed to: Bruce Rogers, "What's new?" *Perspectives on Labour and Income*, 9th floor, Jean Talon Building, Statistics Canada, Ottawa K1A 0T6. Telephone (613) 951-2883; fax (613) 951-4179; e-mail: rogebru@statcan.ca.



Work Absence Rates, 1987 to 1998

Indispensable for industrial relations professionals, productivity analysts, and researchers exploring work and family issues.

Work Absence Rates, 1987 to 1998 documents trends in absences from work for personal reasons: illness or disability, and personal or family responsibilities.

1998 Results

- In 1998, over half a million or around 5.7% of full-time employees lost some work time each week for personal reasons (excluding maternity leave).
- Con average, each full-time employee lost 7.8 days over the year 6.6 for illness or disability and 1.2 for personal or family responsibilities.
- In total, it is estimated that, among full-time workers, 72 million workdays were lost in 1998.

This publication provides a series of tables on work absence rates for men and women working full time, by age, education, and presence of children; by detailed industry and occupation groups; by public versus private sector; by union coverage, workplace size, job tenure and job permanency; by province, region and census metropolitan area; and by job benefits (paid vacation or sick leave entitlements, and flexitime work option).

To Order

Work Absence Rates, 1987-1998 (Cat. no. 71-535-MPB) costs \$50 in Canada (plus GST and applicable PST) and US\$50 outside of Canada.

To order, **CALL** toll-free at 1 800 267-6677, **FAX** 1 800 889-9734 or **MAIL** your order to Statistics Canada, Dissemination Division, Circulation Management, 120 Parkdale Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1A 0T6. Or contact your nearest Statistics Canada Regional Reference Centre listed in this publication. You may also order via **EMAIL: order@statcan.ca** or via our **WEB SITE:** *www.statcan.ca*.

Highlights

In this issue

Seniors who volunteer

... p. 9

- Over 25% of seniors (aged 55 and older) donated their time to a volunteer organization in 1997, giving 15 hours per month, compared with the overall average of 12 hours.
- In 1997, seniors' most important reason for volunteering was to support a cause in which they personally believed (98%). Second was to use skills and experience (73%), and third – cited by some two-thirds of seniors – was to work for an organization whose mandate or cause had affected them personally.
- Frequently offered "formal" volunteer services (that is, activities performed for an organization) were organizing or supervising events, sitting as board members, and canvassing, campaigning and fundraising. These occupied 39% to 43% of senior formal volunteers in 1997. Providing care or support was one of the few services that increased as seniors aged; more demanding tasks, such as organizing or supervising events, and canvassing, campaigning and fundraising, declined.
- Of the 74% of seniors who did not give their time to an organization in 1997, some 53% cited health reasons as the most important reason for not volunteering. This reason, and the view that enough time had already been contributed, increased in frequency with age.
- Seniors were much more likely to volunteer on their own ("informal volunteering") than through an organization. Over 64% volunteered informally in 1997.

Employment after childbirth

... p. 18

- On average, women returned to paid work around six months after giving birth. Of the 367,000 employed women who gave birth in 1993 or 1994, about 76,000 or 21% were back to work in less than two months. Some 12% returned after five months, while another 19% did so after six and 11% after seven. Given the flexibility of the start time of maternity leave, and a maximum 25-week combined paid maternity and parental leave under Employment Insurance, it is not surprising that many women returned around the sixth month.
- The potential for major loss of income spurred early return to work. Women who did not receive maternity benefits and those who were selfemployed returned more quickly than those who received benefits or who were paid workers. Some 34% of early returnees (those who returned in less than two months) were self-employed, compared with just 2% of those who returned later. Also, 60% of those who returned by the end of the first month received no Employment Insurance benefits, compared with just 9% of those who returned later.
- Those who returned to work early were more likely to be unionized (33% versus 16%) and to have longer tenure at their previous job (49 months versus 26).
- Of those who had *not* returned to work, 30% were lone parents (compared with 4% of women who had returned). Also, these mothers were more likely to have fewer children under the age of six at home.

Highlights

Baby boom women – then and now ... p. 26

In 1977, almost 6 of every 10 baby boom women aged 25 to 29 were in the labour force (59%). In contrast, only 53% of women aged 45 to 49 were in the labour force that year. Furthermore, a far higher proportion of employed baby boom women worked full time: 83%, compared with 74% of 45-to-49 year-olds.

- Twenty years later, 77% of baby boom women (by then aged 45 to 49) participated in the labour force, compared with 78% of Generation X women aged 25 to 29. Some 77% of employed baby boomers worked full time, as did 78% of Generation X women (though the latter had greater problems finding employment).
- Baby boom women working full time in 1977 earned \$1.04 for every dollar earned by women aged 45 to 49, even though they worked fewer hours: 1,967 hours annually, compared with 2,059. In 1997, Generation X women aged 25 to 29 earned just 83 cents for every dollar earned by baby boom women aged 45 to 49.
- Over 15% of baby boom women in the 1977 labour force held university degrees, compared with only 6% of women aged 45 to 49. The converse held true for the proportion with less than high school: only 6% compared with 24%. In 1997, some 5% of baby boom women had less than high school, while 19% were universityeducated; comparable figures for Generation X women were 1% and 27%.

Missing work in 1998 – industry differences ... p. 30

- In 1998, an estimated 5.7% (525,000) of all fulltime employees were absent from work for all or part of any given week for personal reasons ("own illness or disability" and "personal or family responsibilities") – up from 5.5% a year earlier.
- As a result of these absences, approximately 3.1% of usual weekly work time was lost (inactivity rate)

in 1998, also up slightly from 3.0%. This translates into an increase of nearly half a day per full-time employee – from 7.4 days to 7.8 (6.6 for illness or disability and 1.2 for personal or family responsibilities). Stated differently, employees missed approximately 72 million workdays because of personal reasons in 1998, up from 66 million in 1997.

- Significant variations in time lost among the major industries can be explained largely by days lost due to illness or disability. Workdays missed on account of personal or family responsibilities clustered around 1.1 days.
- Full-time employees who lost the most time (12.8 days) were in health care and social assistance, a highly unionized industry believed to be relatively stressful and having a large proportion of female workers. They were followed by those in transportation and warehousing, a relatively hazardous and heavily unionized industry (9.4); public administration, also heavily unionized and with a high concentration of female employees (9.4); and manufacturing (8.5).
- Workers who lost comparatively little time were in the professional, scientific and technical industries (4.6 days); accommodation and food services (5.7); and agriculture (5.8).

Self-employment in Canada and the United States ... p. 37

- Overall, the growth of total self-employment was substantial in both Canada and the United States from 1979 to 1997 (77% and 37%). Between 1989 and 1997, the increase in Canada's self-employment rate (share of total employment) was striking – from 14% to 18% – after having remained stable during the 1980s. The American rate changed little, registering around 10% over the entire period.
- Between 1989 and 1997, self-employment accounted for about 80% of the net employment gain in Canada, but only about 1% in the United States. Unincorporated self-employment by itself contributed about half of net new jobs in Canada, but virtually none in the United States.

- In Canada, about 60% of net new self-employment jobs created during the 1980s involved entrepreneurs who themselves engaged other employees. The remainder were created by ownaccount workers (that is, entrepreneurs with no employees). During the 1989-97 period, however, fully 90% were own-account entrepreneurs.
- The industrial concentration of self-employed jobs was similar in the two countries. Self-employment was high in agriculture and construction, and virtually absent from mining and manufacturing. Finance, insurance and real estate, and both retail and wholesale trade fell in the middle.
- Men were more likely to be self-employed than women. The proportions of male and female workers who were self-employed in the late 1990s were 13% and 8% in the United States, and 21% and 14% in Canada. In service occupations, however, women were considerably more likely than men to be self-employed.
- Over the 1989-97 period, about 40% of all net new self-employment jobs in Canada were in the generally higher-paying service industries (business services, for example); the remaining new service sector jobs were largely in the lower-paying personal services, and accommodation and food services. In contrast, the United States saw little change in service jobs for the self-employed (38% of all self-employment in 1996).

Unionization – an update ... p. 45

At 11.9 million, average paid employment during the first half of 1999 was 292,000 higher than that a year earlier. Union membership, however, remained virtually unchanged at 3.6 million. This resulted in a decline in the union rate (density) from 30.7% to 30.1%. The drop affected both men and women: men's rate fell from 31.6% to 30.9%, and women's, from 29.8% to 29.3%. Quebec, Ontario, British Columbia, Newfoundland and New Brunswick all recorded declines in union density; Alberta, Manitoba, Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia, however, saw rises, while Saskatchewan was unchanged. Approximately 3.6 million employees (30.6%) belonged to a union in 1998. An additional 297,000 (2.5%) were covered by a collective agreement. Employees in the public sector were more than three times as likely as their private sector counterparts to belong to a union (71.3% versus 19.1%). Almost one in three full-time employees belonged to a union, compared with one in five part-time workers. Close to one in three employees in a permanent position was a union member, compared with roughly one in four in a nonpermanent job.

- Unionized workers earned more than nonunionized workers. This held true whether they worked full time (\$19.06 versus \$15.57) or part time (\$16.80 versus \$9.81).
- Contract settlements surpassed the inflation rate in 1998 (1.6% versus 1.0%). As of April this year, the results were similar (1.7% versus 1.0%).
- During the first quarter of 1999, working time lost due to strikes and lockouts rose slightly – from 0.08% in 1998 to 0.09%.

What's new? ... p. 66

Upcoming release

Just released

Earnings Supplement Project Self-Sufficiency Project Geographical Patterns of Socio-economic Well-being of First Nations Communities 1998 Adult Education and Training Survey Work Absence Rates, 1987-1998 Innovation Analysis Bulletin Income after Tax, Distributions by Size in Canada, 1997 Spending Patterns in Canada, 1997 Family Incomes, Census Families, 1997 Earnings of Men and Women, 1997 Survey of Financial Security: Update

Perspectives

Health Reports



Kapid change means that you must make an extra effort to keep up to date with the many <u>factors</u> <u>influencing our health and the Canadian health</u> <u>care system</u>. Why not follow the lead of professionals like you? With a subscription to **Health Reports**, you can <u>rely on precise health</u> <u>information</u> and use it to assess change, prepare for specific demands and plan for the future.

Current topics make each issue unique

Published four times a year, this 80-page, bilingual publication lets you monitor Canadians' health and vital statistics. It presents <u>high-quality, relevant and</u> <u>comprehensive research articles</u> on the health status of the population, and on the health care system.

As a user of Statistics Canada products, you will appreciate the timeliness and accuracy of the data in *Health Reports*. Amply illustrated with tables

and easy-to-read graphs, the topical research articles contain <u>original analysis</u> on a host of health problems, such as work stress, childhood asthma, smoking, the risk behaviour of young adults, home care, and many other subjects. *Health Reports* will be a valuable addition to your reference collection.

Equip yourself with the latest analysis of health in Canada. Use *Health Reports* (Cat. No. 82-003-XPB) to <u>make informed</u> <u>decisions</u>. A one-year subscription costs \$116 in Canada (plus taxes) and US\$116 outside Canada. And for those who prefer to receive their information electronically, you can now subscribe to the downloadable version of *Health Reports* (cat. no. 82-003-XIE) on our Web site for only \$87 (plus applicable taxes). URL: www.statcan.ca/cgi-bin/downpub/feepub.cgi

SUBSCRIBE TODAY!

CALL toll-free 1 800 267-6677 FAX toll-free 1 877 287-4369 MAIL to Statistics Canada, Dissemination Division, Circulation Management, 120 Parkdale Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 076, Canada. E-MAIL: order@statcan.ca CONTACT your nearest Statistics Canada Regional Reference Centre listed in this publication. VISIT the Statistics Canada Web site at <u>www.statcan.ca</u>

... a reputable reference isol analysing the latest health information

Seniors who volunteer

Frank Jones

A s governments have cut back on social and other services, an aging population's need for a strong support structure has grown. Seniors, in fact, have created both a growing market for such services and a potential source of volunteer labour to meet these needs. Many enjoy good health and increasing leisure time.

How involved are seniors in volunteering? What services are they providing? Have the patterns changed since 1987? This study examines the volunteer activity of seniors aged 55 to 64 (young), 65 to 74 (mid-years), and 75 or over (older) in 1997 (see *Data sources and definitions*). Many young seniors are probably making the transition from paid work to retirement and are those most likely to consider new volunteer commitments. Those in their mid-years are relatively free of major life changes. And older seniors are most likely to have health problems and to need volunteer services themselves.

Though informal volunteering is also considered here, the emphasis of this analysis is on formal volunteering (through an organization).

Seniors' volunteering in context

The article first compares seniors' "formal" volunteer participation rates and hours with those of younger groups. In both 1987 and 1997, rates were highest for those aged 35 to 44 (Chart A), then tended to fall with each succeeding age group. The rates for seniors aged 55 to 64 and 65 to 74 in 1987 were the same as the average for the whole population (27%), while that for the oldest group was much lower (13%). In both years this group registered the lowest rate.

Average hours volunteered increased with age (Chart B). This is not surprising, given the free time available to many older people. For every age group except the oldest, the time commitment was greater in

Frank Jones is with the Labour and Household Surveys Analysis Division. He can be reached at (613) 951-1931 or jonefra@statcan.ca.

Data sources and definitions

The National Survey of Volunteer Activity was a supplement to the October 1987 Labour Force Survey. (A follow-up phase was completed in January 1988.) The National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating was a supplement to the November 1997 Labour Force Survey.

Formal volunteers willingly performed a service without pay, through a group or organization, at least once during the reference year, November to October (Hall et al., 1998). Informal volunteers helped on their own during the reference year, either directly to anyone not living in the same household, or indirectly by service to the community or environment – but not through a group or organization (Duchesne, 1989). Both surveys covered persons 15 years and over, except residents of the Yukon and Northwest Territories, persons living on Indian reserves, inmates of institutions, and full-time members of the Armed Forces.

The data on leisure time were obtained from the General Social Survey of 1992. That survey covered persons 15 years and over, except residents of the Yukon and Northwest Territories and full-time residents of institutions.

Note: Because of a definitional change, caution should be exercised when interpreting changes between 1987 and 1997 (see Appendix).

1987 than in 1997, though the gap tended to narrow with age. Older seniors volunteered 17 hours per month in both years. The average for all volunteers was 16 hours per month in 1987 and 12 in 1997.

Formal volunteers

Some seniors are much more likely to volunteer their services to organizations. In both years, the most likely to do so were those with relatively high education, good health and high household income, as well as those who saw themselves as being "very religious" (Table 1). Seniors in the Prairie provinces, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia were more likely to volunteer

Statistics Canada - Catalogue no. 75-001-XPE



than seniors in other provinces. Surprisingly, employed seniors were more likely to volunteer than those not employed, especially in 1997. Their sex and marital status made little difference to their participation rates.

Although seniors' volunteer rate falls with age, their hourly commitment increases, suggesting that those who volunteer more time are less likely to drop out than those who give relatively few hours (see *How much time do seniors give?*). In 1997, the rate was 30% for young seniors and 18% for older seniors. Declining health and the desire to retire not only from paid work but also from volunteer work may explain part of the drop. The declines were especially steep for residents of Nova Scotia, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, and the very religious seniors. The difference between the rates for young and mid-years seniors was generally less than that between mid-years and older seniors.

Employed seniors, however, were the exception. Their volunteer rates were higher among mid-years than young seniors. This may be because some employed seniors tend to take on volunteer work when they move to part-time work or to fewer hours – an example of role substitution (Chambré, 1984).

A related explanation is that the self-employed, who generally retire later than employees, have more control over their time, which may enable them to take on



volunteer work. In 1997, the volunteer rates for seniors with self-employment income were much higher than those for seniors who did not report such income: 40% versus 28% for young seniors and 33% versus 26% for mid-years seniors. Working mid-years seniors were almost all self-employed.

People's tendency to volunteer at different stages of life, though best studied with longitudinal data, can be considered indirectly. To illustrate, most of the young seniors in 1987 (born between 1932 and 1941) became mid-years seniors in 1997.¹ The volunteer rate for this "cohort" declined 2 percentage points over the 10-year period. The rate for women fell 7 points, while men's actually rose 4 points. In contrast, the rate for the older seniors of 1997 was 9 percentage points lower than that for mid-years seniors in 1987. The rate for women fell 13 points, and that for men, 4 points.

Seniors' overall volunteer rate increased little over the decade. Some substantial differences, however, were evident within subpopulations. The rate increased over 8 points, for example, in New Brunswick and Saskatchewan, while it fell by over 6 points in Prince Edward Island and Alberta. The rate also rose over 5 points for men and the employed, while it fell 4 or more points for those with household income of \$60,000 or more, and for those with some postsecondary education. The increase for older seniors exceeded that of young and mid-years seniors by over 5 points.

	1987				19	97		
-	55 +	55-64	65-74	75 +	55 +	55-64	65-74	75 +
				9	6			
Both sexes	24.6	27.3	27.4	12.9	25.7	29.7	25.6	18.2
Men	20.7	22.6	23.2	9.8	26.1	28.5	26.8	19.0
Women	27.9	31.7	30.6	15.1	25.4	30.9	24.5	17.7
Province								
Newfoundland	18.7	23.4	19.6		22.7	28.3	26.2	
Prince Edward Island	27.9	47.8			20.1			
Nova Scotia	25.9	30.5	27.3		30.4	44.2	26.1	14.0
New Brunswick	23.5	29.2	26.5		31.7	34.5	37.2	
Quebec	17.3	21.3	17.8		16.8	18.9	18.5	9.1
Ontario	25.6	26.6	29.9	15.6	28.2	31.9	28.0	21.6
Manitoba	31.2	37.1	31.6	18.7	30.7	38.7	30.8	18.3
Saskatchewan	28.6	33.8	30.2	16.2	39.0	51.6	35.6	25.6
Alberta	36.9	40.7	39.1	20.9	30.6	38.2	25.7	22.6
British Columbia	26.1	27.4	31.3	14.2	25.7	27.9	25.7	21.7
Area of residence								
Urban	28.6	35.2	27.9	13.5	24.6	28.3	24.9	17.1
Bural	23.7	25.6	27.2	12.8	30.9	36.1	28.9	23.6
Monital status								
Marriad or common law	26.6	20 6	000	10.1	00.0	21.0	07.0	00.4
Constant of Common-law	20.0	17.0	20.0	12.1	20.2	04.5	27.9	20.4
Midawad	19.0	17.2	04.4	14.5	10.4	24.0	21.1	15 7
Single	10.9	20.0	24.4	14.0	24.2	24.0	17.0	00.0
Single	15.0	66.0	21.J		24.2	01.7	17.6	22.0
Employment status				10.0				
Not employed	24.0	28.6	26.9	12.9	23.7	27.9	24.9	17.3
Employed	26.2	25.9	31.0		32.6	31.8	34.1	
Household income								
Less than \$15,000	19.0	20.0	21.8	14.3	16.7	20.5	16.2	13.5
\$15,000 to \$29,999	26.5	27.2	30.7	15.0	24.1	27.6	26.2	17.4
\$30,000 to \$59,999	32.5	31.0	41.7	-	30.8	32.7	31.8	22.8
\$60,000 or more	41.7	42.3	43.8		33.4	33.9	30.1	
Education								
Less than high school	12.7	14.8	14.5	6.9	17.3	19.6	18.3	12.7
High school graduation	28.2	28.2	32.8	16.7	28.4	31.4	28.1	22.8
Some postsecondary	36.5	38.2	38.4		32.8	36.0	32.4	24.4
Degree or diploma	42.3	47.6	44.2	24.7	43.9	46.5	41.3	41.2
Perceived health status								
Fair or noor	14 5	18.0	16.6	7.0	16.7	22 5	16.7	10.1
Good or excellent	34.5	33.3	39.0	27.3	29.9	32 4	30.1	22.4
	04.0	00.0	00.0	21.0	20.0	VE	00.1	20.4
Perceived religiosity	00.0	00.0	07.0	10.0	0.1.1	07.7	00 T	
rainy/not very religious	23.9	25.3	27.0	13.6	24.1	27.7	23.7	17.3
Very religious	34.6	43.8	35.7	15.4	36.3	43.7	38.6	22.7

Volunteering on one's own

Seniors are much more likely to volunteer on their own than through an organization. Over 64% did so in 1997, an increase of one percentage point from 1987. The increase was especially high for young seniors (from 66% to 74%). Men and women were equally likely to have volunteered informally in 1997, after a

4-point rise for men. The rate for young senior women exceeded that of their male counterparts in 1997, while the reverse was true for mid-years and older seniors.

Volunteer organizations may look on informal volunteering in two somewhat contradictory ways. Some may see it as competition for seniors' time. Others may view it as fertile ground for recruitment: if these Table 2: Rates of formal and informal volunteering for seniors aged 55 and over

		Ag	ge	
	55 +	55-64	65-74	75 +
		9	6	
Formal 1987				
Informal volunteer	33.6	35.6	34.7	23.3
Not informal volunteer Ratio: volunteer/non-	9.6	11.0	12.8	
volunteer	3.5	3.3	2.7	
1997				
Informal volunteer	34.2	35.9	33.8	30.4
Not informal volunteer	10.2	12.7	11.1	6.9
Ratio: volunteer/non-				
volunteer	3.3	2.8	3.0	4.4
Informal 1987				
Formal volunteer	85.5	86.5	84.2	85.2
Not formal volunteer Ratio: volunteer/non-	55.3	58.7	59.5	41.6
volunteer	1.5	1.5	1.4	2.0
1997				
Formal volunteer	85.8	88.7	84.3	80.4
Not formal volunteer Ratio: volunteer/non-	57.1	67.1	56.7	41.0
volunteer	1.5	1.3	1.5	2.0

seniors are predisposed to volunteer, they may be more likely to respond positively if approached.

The latter view is supported by the evidence. Overall, seniors who volunteered on their own in the preceding year were over three times more likely to volunteer formally than those who did not volunteer informally (a formal volunteer rate of 34% versus 10% in 1997) (Table 2). Young and mid-years seniors who gave their time informally were three times more likely to volunteer formally in 1997, and older seniors were over four times more likely to do so.

Likewise, people who volunteered for organizations were more likely to volunteer informally. The informal rate was much higher for seniors volunteering in organizations (86% in 1997) than for others (57%). Though the rate declined with age for both groups, it did so more markedly for those who were not involved with an organization.

What motivates seniors to volunteer in organizations?

Knowing what motivates seniors to volunteer is the key to their successful recruitment. In 1997, the single most important reason, cited by all age groups, was to support a cause in which they personally believed (98%) (Table 3).

The second reason was to use skills and experience (73%), a motivation that declined only slightly with age. Third, some two-thirds of seniors (both young and older) said they volunteered for an organization whose mandate or cause had affected them personally.

Fulfilling religious obligations and beliefs and exploring personal strengths were also important to senior volunteers, reported by 44% and 42%,

How much time do seniors give?

Though formal volunteer hours are not examined in detail, almost half of all senior volunteers averaged less than six hours per month in 1997. The percentage of those contributing 30 or more hours per month was higher for older seniors than for young and mid-years seniors. A higher percentage of men than women contributed 30 or more hours.

Volunteer hours per month, 1997

		A	ge	
	55 +	55-64	65-74	75 +
			%	
Both sexes				
Less than 2	23.2	23.3	23.6	22.0
2 to 5.9	23.7	23.0	24.2	25.1
6 to 14.9	22.6	24.4	21.1	20.1
15 to 29.9	16.9	17.9	16.2	15.5
30 or more	13.5	11.4	14.8	17.2
Women				
Less than 2	24.2	25.5	23.2	22.3
2 to 5.9	21.9	21.5	19.9	27.4
6 to 14.9	21.7	22.0	22.9	18.1
15 to 29.9	20.0	21.1	19.8	17.2
30 or more	12.3	9.9	14.2	15.0
Men				
Less than 2	22.2	20.9	24.1	21.7
2 to 5.9	25.8	24.6	29.0	22.0
6 to 14.9	23.6	27.1	19.1	22.8
15 to 29.9	13.4	14.2	12.2	
30 or more	15.0	13.1	15.5	20.3

Source: National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating respectively. Fulfilling religious obligations was more important for older seniors (54%, compared with 40% for young seniors). In contrast, exploring personal strengths was more important to young seniors (46% versus 35% of older seniors).

Volunteering because friends did so was less important, but still cited by 28% of senior volunteers in 1997. As was the case for fulfilling religious obligations, this reason was given more often by older seniors (33%) than by young seniors (25%).

Because most were either retired or approaching retirement, only 6% volunteered to improve job opportunities. This reason was reported most by young senior volunteers, though only by 9%.

Why not volunteer more time in an organization?

Why do formal volunteers not give more of their time? Given 10 possible reasons, 7% of senior volunteers in 1997 noted none, 22% listed only one, while the rest noted multiple reasons.

Just over half said they lacked the time to devote more hours to volunteer work (Table 3). Of these, 51% said they had already made their contribution, 34% said they were unwilling to make a yearround commitment, and 25% cited health reasons. Lack of time was a greater problem for young senior volunteers (61%) than for older volunteers (38%). Seniors volunteering informally were more likely to mention lack of time (53%) than those not volunteering informally (44%). Of those who did not men-

Table 3: Reasons for volunteering; reasons for not volunteering more time

		A	ge	
	55 +	55-64	65-74	75 +
	1.1.1	9	6	
Reason for volunteering				
Cause in which one believes	97.9	97.8	98.2	97.5
Use skills and experience	72.9	75.0	71.4	69.4
Personally affected by cause	68.1	69.6	66.6	66.8
Religious obligations or beliefs	44.5	39.8	46.8	54.0
Explore own strengths	41.8	46.1	38.9	34.7
Friends volunteered	28.3	25.1	30.4	33.3
Improve job opportunities	5.7	8.6		
Reason for not volunteering more time				
No extra time	51.7	60.7	45.2	38.3
Already made contribution	48.7	45.6	51.1	53.1
Unwilling to make year-round				
commitment	33.4	34.4	35.2	25.8
Health problems	33.0	20.6	38.6	59.0
Gives money instead	25.4	22.9	26.2	31.7
Not asked	16.1	16.0	16.7	15.2
No interest	12.4	11.7	15.9	6.8
Financial cost	12.4	15.0	10.5	8.7
Concerns about liability	4.7	6.0	3.3	
Did not know how to become involved	3.8	3.9	4.0	

tion lack of time, 46% said they had already done their share of volunteering, 42% cited health reasons, 33% said they were unwilling to make a year-round commitment, and 17% said they had not been asked.

Overall, almost half of senior volunteers said they were unwilling to contribute more time because they believed they had already made their contribution. This reason was more important than the lack of time for both the mid-years and older volunteers. Being an informal volunteer was not a factor in this response.

Health problems were cited by a third of senior volunteers. No other reason was so strongly related to age. For older seniors it was the most important reason in 1997, given by 59%. In contrast, only 21% of young seniors saw health as a problem.

One-quarter or more of senior volunteers said they preferred to give money than more time. This reason also increased in importance with age.

Only 16% of senior volunteers said they had not been asked to donate more time. This suggests that some would have been willing if asked. Of this 16%, one-half said they were too busy, 20% had no interest, and 48% believed they had already done their share. Among those who apparently had been asked to volunteer more time (84%), commonly mentioned reasons for not doing so were not having the time (52%), already having made a contribution (49%), health problems (34%), and an unwillingness to make a year-round commitment (30%). Few seniors said financial costs or legal risk prevented them from volunteering more time.

Why some are not involved

The 74% of seniors who were not formal volunteers in 1997 gave a variety of reasons, usually more than one, for not giving time to an organization (Table 4). Less than a third cited lack of interest. Health reasons were the most important reason, cited by 53%.

		A	ge	
_	55 +	55-64	65-74	75 +
		9	6	
Health problems Unwilling to make year-round	53.1	34.2	57.6	77.5
commitment Already made	45.3	50.6	45.5	36.2
contribution	43.1	36.5	42.8	54.3
No extra time	40.5	55.1	37.0	21.7
Gives money instead	39.6	37.6	41.2	40.5
No interest	32.3	33.2	36.0	25.5
Not asked	23.7	28.5	24.2	15.1
Financial cost Did not know how to	16.3	16.9	17.7	13.5
become involved	9.2	12.6	5.7	8.7
liability	54	74	47	

Two of the most common reasons for not volunteering increased in frequency with age: health reasons, and the view that enough time had already been contributed. Other common reasons decreased with age: the unwillingness to make a year-round commitment, the lack of extra time, and the absence of a direct request, for example.

Health concerns were cited by over 50% of seniors overall, as well as by mid-years and older seniors. Only one-third of young seniors gave this as a reason for not volunteering.

The view that they had already made their contribution was given by 36% of young seniors, and 54% of older seniors.

Some people were unwilling to make a year-round commitment. Though 45% gave this as a reason for not volunteering, young seniors were more likely to cite this than older seniors (51% versus 36%). This reason may not be a strong barrier, however, as many volunteer assignments presumably do not require a year-round commitment. Lack of extra time was mentioned by 41% of senior respondents. It was the most common reason given by young seniors (55%). In contrast, only 22% of older seniors, whose leisure time was greater, mentioned it (see *Free time*).

Some people said they had not been asked to volunteer, though this reason was relatively unimportant. It was least common for older seniors – 15%, compared with 24% of mid-years seniors and 28% of young seniors. Of all those who had not been asked, 46% said they had no time. Over half (56%) said they gave money instead. Health reasons were cited by 44% of those who had not been asked to volunteer. Cost and legal concerns were relatively unimportant for those who had not been asked – 25% and 14%, respectively.

Among the non-volunteers who *had* been approached, most cited health problems (56%), previous involvement (42%), lack of time (38%), an unwillingness to make a year-round contribution (38%), a preference for making financial donations (35%), and lack of interest (31%).

Free time

Seniors in their fifties gain considerable free time once they retire from paid work. Although most of the added free time goes into leisure pursuits (time spent at entertainment functions, at sports and hobbies, or with media such as television), some is channelled into unpaid work (domestic or household chores, child care and volunteering).





14 / Autumn 1999 PERSPECTIVES

One reason for not volunteering was unrelated to age: the giving of money rather than time. About 40% of seniors offered this as a reason for not volunteering.

Seniors take charge

Perhaps because seniors have more experience in such matters, they are heavily involved in organizing or supervising events, sitting as board members, and canvassing, campaigning and fundraising. These demanding tasks occupied 43% to 49% of seniors who volunteered formally in 1987, and 39% to 43% in 1997 (Table 5). They were the most popular forms of service for seniors overall, and for young and mid-years seniors. For older seniors, providing care or support occupied third position (33%).

Popular forms of care-giving among senior volunteers in 1997 were providing care or support (29%) and collecting, serving and delivering food (27%). Related services were driving (16%) and participating in self-help or mutual aid groups (8%). Providing care or support was one of the few forms of volunteering that increased with seniors' age.

Between 1987 and 1997, these preferences changed little, aside from noticeable declines in organizing or supervising events, sitting as board members and providing care or support, and a rise in "other" forms of volunteering. The declines were 7 percentage points in all three cases. Other forms of volunteering increased by 12 points (13 for young seniors and 10 for mid-years seniors). Part of this increase may reflect a change in the survey question regarding other forms of volunteering (see Appendix).

Though seniors provided many types of formal volunteer service, most focused on just one or two organizations. In 1997, some 61% worked in only one organization, another 22% in two, 10% in three, 4% in four, and the remaining 3% in five or more. Age of the senior made little difference to these findings

Reaching out informally

As noted earlier, in addition to volunteering in formal organizations, a majority of both formal volunteers and other seniors volunteered their time informally in a variety of ways (Table 6). Topping the list in both 1987 and 1997 was one of growing importance in an aging society: visiting the sick or the elderly. The percentage of informal volunteers providing this service in 1997 was 56%, some 11 percentage points lower than 10 years earlier. This activity declined by over 10 percentage points for every age group of seniors.

Shopping and driving for others and baby-sitting were also popular, involving almost half of informal senior volunteers in 1997.

Table 5: Formal volunteer services provided by seniors

	Age			
	55 +	55-64	65-74	75 +
1007			%	
Organizing or supervising event	49 4	54.6	45.6	36.5
Sitting as a board member	49 1	52.2	47.0	40.4
Canvassing campaigning fundraising	42.6	46.4	38.5	37 0
Providing care or support	36.1	35.1	38.6	32.0
Consulting office administrative work	27 7	31 4	24.0	19 0
Collecting, enving, delivering food	27.8	28.1	29.3	24.0
Other forms of volunteering	11 8	10.2	14.0	24.0
Influence public opinion, Jobby, educate	22.7	28.2	19.2	15.5
Driving	19.2	17.0	20.2	10.0
Maintenance/repair	14.9	17.3	10.5	15.
Teaching/coaching	10.2	12.0	0.0	
Protecting the environment or wildlife	7.0	12.0	9.2	-
Participating in a solf belo group	6.6	77	5.0	
First-aid firefighting search and rescue	23	2.6	0.0	
the and the second and tescue	2.0	2.0		
Organizing or supervising event	429	50.4	36.4	34 2
Sitting as a board member	42.0	45 1	38.5	20 0
Canvassing campaigning fundraising	20.2	44.6	36.0	30.4
Providing care or support	29.3	28.0	29.7	32.7
Consulting office administrative work	27 8	31 3	24.6	23.0
Collecting, serving, delivering food	26.6	26.7	27.7	20.0
Other forms of volunteering	24.2	23.1	24.5	26.8
Influence public opinion lobby educate	23.9	28.9	187	20.3
Driving	16.1	18.0	13.9	15.1
Maintenance/repair	13.8	15.6	13.5	8 6
Teaching/coaching	13.0	16.9	8.6	10.9
Protecting the environment or wildlife	8.2	10.0	6.7	6.1
Participating in a self-help group	77	10.1	5.2	0.1
First-aid firefighting search and rescue	24	3.6	0.2	

Volunteering and Participating

		Ag		
	55 +	55-64	65-74	75 +
		9	0	
1987				
Visiting the sick or elderly	67.1	65.9	67.1	70.9
Shopping, driving others	39.1	41.4	39.2	30.6
Baby-sitting	39.2	45.5	38.2	19.0
Writing letters, etc.	24.6	28.7	22.1	16.1
Housework	17.9	21.7	15.9	9.5
Yard or maintenance work	21.9	27.5	19.4	8.2
Operating a business or farm	6.9	8.1	5.5	5.8
Teaching or coaching	4.0	5.1	3.3	
Helping in other ways	5.8	5.6	6.0	6.0
1997				
Visiting the sick or elderly	56.1	54.0	57.0	60.5
Shopping, driving others	49.1	54.8	45.0	41.1
Baby-sitting	48.6	52.3	51.3	31.7
Writing letters, etc.	30.1	36.6	26.0	19.8
Housework	29.4	35.9	24.8	20.2
Yard or maintenance work	28.4	35.4	26.7	11.1
Operating a business or farm	9.9	11.7	9.3	5.8
Teaching or coaching	7.1	8.5	6.7	
Helping in other ways	11.0	12.4	9.4	10.1

Table 6: Informal volunteer services provided by seniors

Seniors' involvement in both kinds of service decreased with age. Both were more popular in 1997 than 1987, by over 9 percentage points, for all seniors.

Letter writing and related services, housework, and yard and maintenance work involved 28% to 30% of informal volunteers in 1997. All increased over the 10-year period, especially housework (up 11 percentage points). These activities, however, tended to fall off with age, especially yard and maintenance work; in 1997, for example, 35% of young senior volunteers were involved, compared with only 11% of older informal volunteers.

Summary

Canadian seniors are far from a homogeneous group when it comes to volunteering: this activity declines with age and is much more prevalent among some groups than others. Reasons for volunteering or not volunteering, as well as the time offered, also differ markedly for the three age groups studied. The types of volunteer service provided also vary significantly by age group.

Some 26% of seniors aged 55 or over offered their services to voluntary organizations in 1997. Those in the Prairie provinces, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, or in rural areas of all provinces were much more likely to do so. Seniors with higher household incomes, with jobs, or with higher education were also more likely to volunteer, as were those enjoying good health or considering themselves to be very religious.

The most frequent reason for formal volunteering was belief in a cause, although the desire to use skills and experience was also often cited, especially by young seniors. Formal volunteers were most likely to be involved in activities that made good use of their experience: organizing or supervising events, sitting on boards, and canvassing, campaigning or fundraising.

The main deterrent to giving more time was lack of extra time, for young seniors in particular. Non-volunteers, especially those who were older or mid-years seniors, were most likely to mention health reasons for not volunteering. Young seniors stressed not having time to spare.

Seniors' rates of informal volunteering were much higher than those of formal volunteering, although people who volunteered formally were much more likely to offer informal services as well. Likewise, those volunteering informally were more likely to join organizations. This was the case for all age groups studied. Informal volunteers were most likely to provide two services important in an aging society: visiting the sick and the elderly (especially popular with mid-years and older seniors) and helping others with shopping (cited most often by young seniors).

Perspectives

Mote

1 Some of these people would have died or emigrated, and immigrants would have replaced a few others.

References

Chambré, S.M. "Is volunteering a substitute for role loss in old age? An empirical test of activity theory." *The Gerontologist* 24, no. 3 (1984): 192-198.

Duchesne, D. Giving Freely, Volunteers in Canada. Catalogue no. 71-535-MPE, no. 4. Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 1989.

Hall, M., T. Knighton, P. Reed, P. Bussière, D. McRae and P. Bowen. Caring Canadians, Involved Canadians: Highlights from the 1997 National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating. Catalogue no. 71-542-XPE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 1998.

Appendix - "Other volunteering"

The 12 percentage-point increase from 1987 to 1997 in "other" forms of volunteering is much greater than the changes in specific services (Table 5). Part of the reason may be traced to the wording of the two questionnaires. In 1987, the question read: "In the past year did you do any unpaid activity not already mentioned? (If yes specify)." In 1997, the question read: "In the past 12 months did you volunteer any time in a way you have not mentioned yet? Please include help given to schools, religious organizations, community associations, etc." The examples given in the 1997 survey may have helped respondents remember other kinds of volunteering, and hence answer in the affirmative. It is impossible to estimate how much of the increase in "other volunteering" is attributable to the change of wording.

Table A: Organizations benefiting from "other activity only" volunteer work

		1997	
	Weighted count	Sample count	Hrs./mo. (weighted)
Organization			
Culture and recreation	823,522	1,250	11.5
Religious	602,724	909	10.4
Social services	478,494	707	8.1
Health	244,574	352	7.8
Education and research	163,231	221	7.1
Development housing	117,672	198	6.3
Law, advocacy, political	84,379	109	8.5
Environmental	56,879	92	7.0
Philanthropic/voluntarism	35,613	56	5.2
Association/union	27,180	42	7.1
International	29,045	32	9.4
Other	20,998	27	

Source: National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating It is possible, however, to examine the types of volunteer organizations in which the "other activity only" was done. Most of these volunteers were in the culture and recreation, religious, and social services organizations (Table A). Their average time commitments were between 5 and 12 hours a month. In all age groups this category was at least 10 percentage-points higher in 1997 (Table B).

Adjusted 1997 volunteer rates, assuming that the 1987 ratio of other-to-total volunteers applies, are shown in Chart A (main text). For all age groups the adjusted rate is lower than the unadjusted. The difference is 3 percentage points for mid-years seniors, 4 points for young seniors, 5 to 6 points for nonseniors, and 5.1 percentage points overall.

Table B: "Other activity only" volunteers by age

-			
	1987	1997	Difference
All ages	8.9	23.6	14.7
15-24	8.3	22.8	14.5
25-34	7.9	24.8	16.9
35-44	7.5	23.4	15.9
45-54	9.2	23.0	13.8
55-64	10.2	23.1	12.9
65-74	14.2	24.5	10.2
75 +		26.8	

Sources: National Survey of Volunteer Activity; National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating

Employment after childbirth

Katherine Marshall

women have become an integral part of the labour market: their labour force participation is more constant today, even throughout the childbearing years. This trend has both economic and social implications. Understanding women's work patterns can help employers manage birth-related work interruptions and, in the end, retain experienced employees.

The timing of the return to work after childbirth is also of concern to women themselves. Labour force attachment is linked positively to earnings and career opportunities (Phipps, Burton and Lethbridge, 1998). On the other hand, parental involvement, particularly through infancy, is essential to healthy child development (Belsky, 1990). These conflicting factors helped spur the development of Canada's maternity/parental leave benefit programs - programs that recognize the dual responsibilities of employed parents. Nevertheless, parents continue to struggle with these issues.

American research has found a number of factors relating to a mother's return to paid work, which fall into two broad categories: human capital and family status (Desai and Waite, 1991;

Katherine Marshall is with the Labour and Household Surveys Analysis Division. She can be reached at (613) 951-6890 or marskat@statcan.ca. Wenk and Garrett, 1992; Joesch, 1994). This article includes aspects from both these theoretical frameworks.

The human capital approach suggests that women assess the economic value of their time at work and at home, and then choose one or the other based on cost-effectiveness. The cost of not returning to paid work is largely the lost after-tax income from employment.¹ The cost of not staying home includes child-care expenses and other household services. It is argued that women who have more invested in their human capital (education, training and work experience) are those most likely to have greater earnings and job status, and to return to work sooner. For that reason, variables such as age (proxy for experience), education, income, hours of work (job quality), job tenure, unionization (job quality), class of worker and occupation might be expected to influence the return to work.

The family status approach suggests that women make employment decisions based on family considerations. Findings have been less consistent in this area, partly because the influence of marital status and presence of children has changed over time. For example, marital status is now positively correlated with women's employment status. Today, a married woman's decision to return to work after childbirth may depend on how involved her husband is at home and/or whether he is employed (and how much he earns). The more dependent the family is on the mother's earnings, the sooner she may return to work. The number and ages of dependent children at home may also influence the mother's decision, but the many possible combinations make interpretation difficult. For example, more than one child at home increases the financial needs of the family, but also means more daycare costs. These costs can vary depending on the children's ages. Family status variables included for analysis are marital status, employment status of spouse, mother's proportional contribution to family income and the number of preschool-aged children at home.

Both approaches hypothesize likely influences on a woman's return to work, but neither can account for individual preference. Some women may choose to stay at home even if it means relinquishing a well-paid job outside the home. Others may be willing to take on a low-paying position rather than remain out of the workforce any longer. The decision to return to work is complex, based not just on financial or family considerations but also on attitudes and emotions, which can be contradictory. Statistics Canada's General Social Survey found that although two-thirds of Canadian women agreed that an employed

Data source and definitions

The Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics (SLID) is a longitudinal household survey that began in January 1993. Every three years some 15,000 respondents aged 16 to 69 enter the survey and remain for six years, completing two detailed questionnaires each year on labour market activity and income. Data used in this article are for people who entered the survey in 1993 and who responded for all four years, 1993 to 1996.

The **study population** comprises all births between April 1993 and December 1994 for which the mothers worked sometime during the last three months of pregnancy. If a woman gave birth a second time in the time period (12% did so), that birth was also included if she had worked during the last three months of pregnancy. The analysis is based on women who were in the survey for at least two years after giving birth.

Women were considered to have been **employed during pregnancy** if they reported at least one hour of work at a job or business in any of the three months prior to childbirth.

Return to work is the first month following the month of childbirth in which at least one hour of work at a job or

mother's relationship with her children was probably as secure as a stay-at-home mother's, half also agreed that a preschool-aged child would probably suffer if both parents were employed (Ghalam, 1997).

In addition to the human capital and family status variables, this study considers maternity leave benefits as a factor in women's rate of return to work. American studies have not been able to look at this, as no comparable program is available in the United States (see *International comparison of maternity leave*). The lack of such a benefit may be one reason American women return to work relatively quickly (43% within three months of birth) (Desai and Waite, 1991).

This article looks at the work patterns of employed women who gave birth in 1993 or 1994. It examines the timing of their return to paid work following a birth, and considers the characteristics of those who returned and those who did not. A number of job, personal and family characteristics are analyzed (see *Data source and definitions*).

Some first-time statistics

The longitudinal Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics (SLID) offers a unique source of information on the work patterns of women before and after business was reported. (SLID offers monthly rather than weekly information on employment.) For example, if a woman reported a birth in March 1994, every month starting from (and including) April 1994 was examined for evidence of work hours. "Return to work by the end of the first month after childbirth" can technically include women who returned one week later (for example, those who gave birth in the last week of March and returned to work the first week of April) and those who went back seven weeks later (for example, those who gave birth the first week of March and returned the last week of April).

The receipt of Employment Insurance (EI) or maternity benefits variable examines the possible relationship between receiving maternity leave and returning to paid work. It relates only to the first six months after birth. Fully 80% of the women in the study population reported receiving EI benefits within the first six months. Although some may have been unemployed and looking for work, most were probably on maternity leave. Therefore, EI benefits and maternity leave benefits are used interchangeably throughout the article.

childbirth. The survey offers the following first-time findings for women who gave birth and returned to work within two years.²

- 16% of paid workers and 80% of the self-employed were back to work by the end of the first month after childbirth.
- The average time off work was 6.4 months.
- 83% returned to the same employer.
- 80% reported receiving Employment Insurance (EI) benefits after childbirth. A full 100% of the women who took six months off work reported receiving benefits, compared with only 40% of those who were back to work by the end of the first month after childbirth.
- Only 13% of paid workers did not receive EI, in contrast to 85% of the self-employed.³
- 89% returned to their previous work status (full-time or part-time), whereas 9% went from full-time to part-time and 2%, from part-time to full-time.
- The average work week was 33 hours before the birth and 32 after the return to work – reflecting a shift from full-time to part-time work for a minority of women, and a reduction of one-quarter of an hour for full-time workers.



Vast majority back within two years

Of the 367,000 employed women who gave birth in 1993 or 1994, some 76,000 or 21% were back to work by the end of the first month after childbirth (Chart A) -15% of paid workers (50,000) and 76% of the self-employed (26,000). (See Absence from Work Survey for a further comparison of paid workers.) In other words, almost one in five mothers took verv little time off. Some 19% of women returned after six months, while another 12% did so after five, and 11% after seven. Given the flexibility of the start time of maternity leave, and a maximum 25-week combined paid maternity and parental leave, it is not surprising that a large proportion of women returned to work around the sixth month after childbirth (see EI benefits). The percentage of mothers who had returned to work increased strongly until the eighth month, after which it levelled off considerably (Chart B). Within a year's time, 86% of mothers had returned to work, and by two years a full 93% were back to paid work.

Self-employment and no maternity leave linked to quick return

This study examined the differences between mothers who returned to work almost immediately after childbirth, that is, by the end of the first month after the birth, and those who did so between 2 and 24 months after. Women who returned to work by the end of the first month had worked less time at their last job (42 months versus 52) (Table 1). A smaller percentage worked in a unionized job (15%, compared with 38%) and a greater percentage worked part time (43%, compared with 24%). Large differences existed by class of worker and maternity leave benefits. Some 34% of early returnees were self-employed, compared with just 2% of those who returned later. Also, 60% of those back by the end of the first month had received no Employment Insurance benefits,



		of giving birth	1		
	Retu	rned to work withi	n 2 years	Ctatistically	
	Total	Within one month	After 2 or more months	significant difference	returning within one month ^b
Total	100%	21%	79%		
Human capital and job characteristics					
Average age	30	30	30	no	
Education: high school or less	36%	41%	35%	no	
Median income	\$25,700	\$25,600	\$25,700	no	
Usual weekly hours	33	30	34	no	
Median tenure (months)	49	42	52	ves*	1.2 ns
Unionized	33%	15%	38%	yes ***	0.6 ns
Self-employed Professional, managerial	9%	34%	2%	yes ***	7.7 *
or technical occupation ^c	43%	44%	43%	no	
Part-time work	28%	43%	24%	ves*	1.7 ns
No maternity benefits	20%	60%	9%	yes ***	5.7 ***
Family or personal characteristics					
Children <6 at home	1.6	1.7	1.6	no	
Spouse present	96%	93%	97%	no	
Employed spouse present	93%	85%	94%	no	
Income as % of family income	45%	45%	44%	no	

Table 1: Characteristics^a of employed women who returned to work within two years

Source: Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics, 1993-1996

Statistically significant at the .05 level; ** at the .01 level; *** at the .001 level.

ns Not significant.

Refers to the time of birth or of last job held before birth; for births in 1993 or 1994.

Ь The odds ratios are generated from logistic regression (see Logistic regression). The ratios indicate whether the variables included in the model increase or decrease the odds of returning to work within one month after childbirth (that is, by the end of the month following the month of childbirth), controlling for the other variables in the model. Only variables that were statistically significant in the cross-tabulations were included in the model.

Based on the Pineo-Porter-McRoberts socioeconomic classification of 4-digit occupations into homogeneous groups.

Absence from Work Survey

Statistics Canada's Absence from Work Survey (AWS) can provide some data on maternity leave absences and compensation. An annual supplement to the Labour Force Survey, it asks paid workers about financial compensation for any illness-, accident- or pregnancy-related work absence that lasted two weeks or longer during the past year. The AWS found that 10% of paid workers were back to work two to seven weeks after giving birth in the 1993-94 period, compared with 15% for SLID. However, the AWS excludes those who took no time off work or took a leave of less than two weeks. Both surveys show an average absence of roughly five and a half months, and a maternity leave claim rate of around 85%.

Paid workers 1993-1994	AWS	SLID
Quick return to work*	10%	15%
Average time off work**	5.5 months	5.4 months
Received EI after birth	85%	87%
El only El plus employer or	71%	
other compensation	14%	

eeks after birth

EI benefits

Major amendments to the Unemployment Insurance Act in 1971 brought in a wide range of benefits, including paid maternity leave for women. This leave entitles eligible women to a basic benefit of 55% of average insured earnings up to a maximum \$413 per week for a maximum of 15 weeks around the birth of a child. Maternity benefits usually start with the week of birth, but can be collected up to 8 weeks before the anticipated date. Payments start after a 2-week waiting period. Eligibility rules changed with the *Employment Insurance Act* of January 1997, increasing the minimum number of work hours in the past 52 weeks from 300 to 700.

Since 1990, eligible parents have also been entitled to 10 weeks' parental leave with the birth or adoption of a child. This leave can be taken by one parent or can be shared (if both parents are eligible) any time up to 52 weeks after the child arrives home; however, most of those who apply for the leave are mothers.

compared with just 9% of those who returned later.

Early and later returnees did not differ significantly in age, occupation, income (both personal and as a percentage of family income), marital status, education, usual hours of work, or number of children under six at home.⁴

A number of these factors may be interrelated. For example, women who returned to work by the end of the first month after childbirth were more likely than others to work part time. These jobs may not have included such benefits as coverage from Employment Insurance.⁵

In order to test which factors influence an early return to work when others are controlled for, this study used logistic regression (see Logistic regression). When this technique was applied, only two variables were found to be statistically significant predictors: class of worker and the receipt of maternity benefits. The odds of the mother's returning to work by the end of the first month were almost six times higher when she did not receive maternity leave benefits. Also, the odds of returning early were almost eight times higher for the self-employed than for employees.

In contrast to American findings, this study found no relationship between income and return to work. EI appears to negate the influence of income, even though it replaces only 55% of previous earnings, with a ceiling.6 So the net direct "cost" of not returning to work is at least 45% of previous earnings, which can be substantial, depending on previous earnings. However, maternity leave is a program that eligible women of all earning levels must decide to take or to forfeit. Compensation of 55% may be sufficient to encourage some women to remain at home regardless of previous earnings.

Logistic regression

This technique was used for predicting a quick return to paid work after childbirth (by the end of the first month after birth). The dichotomous dependent variable in this case was quick return (quick return = 1 and non-quick return = 0). This technique isolates each variable in the model and reveals its relationship with the probability of a quick return, while holding all other explanatory variables constant. One calculation from this analysis is the odds ratio, which indicates whether certain variables increase or decrease the chances (odds) of a quick return.

It is not surprising to find selfemployment linked to an early return to work. Self-employed women tend to experience a double financial loss if they take a leave after childbirth. First, most do not receive maternity leave benefits, and second, depending on the business, some may have to hire a replacement during their absence, which could be costly as well as difficult.

Those who don't return have less to lose

This study also looked at women who had not returned to paid work after two years. Although this group may have been in the majority in the 1950s, they represented only 7% of all women who gave birth in the early 1990s.

Consistent with the human capital argument, women who did not resume paid work within two years after childbirth had "invested" less in their career than those who had returned to work. For example, although some differences were not statistically significant,⁷ non-returnees were more likely to have been working part time (38% versus 28%), less likely to have been in a unionized job (16% versus 33%), and less likely to have left a professional job

Table	2:	Chara	acte	ristics	^a of	womer	n who	had	and	had	not
	ret	turned	t to	work	two	years	after	giving	g bir	th	

	Total who gave birth	Returned within 2 years	Had not yet returned	Statistically significant difference
Total	100%	93%	7%	
Human capital and job characteristics				
Average age	30	30	28	no
Education: high school or less Median income Usual weekly hours Median tenure (months) Unionized Self-employed Professional, managerial or technical occupation ^b Part-time work No maternity benefits	36% \$25,600 33 46 32% 9% 42% 28% 20%	36% \$25,600 33 49 33% 9% 43% 28% 20%	36% \$16,700 31 26 16% 8% 30% 38% 25%	no no no yes no no no
Family or personal characteristics				
Children <6 at home Spouse present Employed spouse present Income as % of family income	1.6 95% 93% 44%	1.6 96% 93% 45%	1.3 70% 87% 38%	yes yes no yes

Source: Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics, 1993-1996

Refers to the time of birth or of last job held before birth; for births in 1993 or 1994.

Based on the Pineo-Porter-McRoberts socioeconomic classification of 4-digit occupations into homogeneous groups.

(30% versus 43%) (Table 2). Furthermore, those who had not returned had, on average, spent less time at their last job than those who had returned (26 versus 49 months), and recorded lower median earnings (\$16,700 versus \$25,600). With day-care costs subtracted from modest earnings, these women would have had little financial incentive to return to work. Also, compared with those who had returned, they were younger, had fewer children under age six at home, and were more likely to be unmarried. Some 30% of non-returnees were on their own

(living without a partner), compared with just 4% of the women who returned to work. Managing child-care and household responsibilities without a partner may have made it too difficult for some to perform paid work as well.

Summary

This study found that between 1993 and 1996, about 60% of women returned to paid work within six months of giving birth. After one year, almost 9 in 10 women had returned to work. Those who had returned had more "human capital and career investment" than those who had not, and were more likely to be living with a partner. For example, compared with women who had left the labour force for an extended period (two years or more), those who had returned had higher income, higher job status, and longer tenure at their last job; they were also more likely to be in a unionized job.

The potential for major loss of income spurred early return to work. Women who did not receive maternity benefits and women who were self-employed returned more quickly than those who received benefits or who were paid workers.

This study shows that most women combine employment and parenthood within months of giving birth, confirming the strong labour force attachment of women today. Because the dynamics of women's work patterns affect both families and employers, an understanding of these work patterns is crucial for the development of up-to-date workplace and family policies.



Acknowledgement

The author wishes to thank Philip Giles, Income Statistics Division, for assistance with data retrieval, and Georgia Roberts, Social Survey Methods Division, for methodological advice.

International comparison of maternity leave

As do most other industrialized countries, Canada offers paid maternity and parental leave programs with the birth or adoption of a child. Canada is more generous with these programs than the United States and the United Kingdom, as the former offers no paid leave programs and the latter provides no parental leave program. Even so, Canada offers relatively low earnings replacement (55%) and a shorter maximum total leave time (25 weeks) than most other jurisdictions considered. Furthermore, unlike Finland, Germany and Sweden, it offers parental paid leave only to those who have recent labour market experience.

Government-sponsored maternity, paternity and parental paid leave programs for selected jurisdictions

	Canada	Belgium	United Kingdom	Finland	France	Germany	Sweden	United States
	1 Salar							
Maternity leave								
Eligibility	Previous employment with contributions	Previous employment with contributions	Previous employment with contributions	Universal	Previous employment with contributions	Previous employment with contributions	Falls under Parental leave unless sick	na
Duration	15 weeks	14 weeks	18 weeks	18 weeks	16-26 weeks*	14 weeks	Up to 15 wks sick leave	na
Compensation	55% of previous earnings	75%-80% of previous earnings	90% of previous earnings for 6 weeks, then flat rate	80% of previous earnings or flat rate	84% of previous earnings	100% of previous earnings	80%-90% of previous earnings	na
Paternity leave								
Eligibility	na	na	na	Universal	na	na	Universal	na
Duration	na	na	na	1-2 weeks	na	na	10 days	na
Compensation	na	na	na	80% of previous earnings or flat rate	na	na	90% of previous earnings or flat rate	na
Parental leave								
Eligibility	Either parent, previous employment with contributions	Both parents, previous employment	na	Either parent, universal	Either parent, previous employment	Both parents, universal	Either parent, universal	na
Duration	10 weeks	6-12 months	na	6 months	24 months	24 months	15 months	na
Compensation	55% of previous earnings	18% of average industrial earnings	na	80% of previous earnings or flat rate	46% of base wage for 9 months**	About 15% of median industrial earnings	90% of previous earnings or flat rate	na

Source: Human Resources Development Canada, 1995

16 weeks for those with fewer than three children and 26 weeks for those with three or more.

** Means-tested thereafter.

na Not applicable.

Notes

1 Other costs of not returning to paid employment include the depreciation in job-related skills and/or lost opportunities for building further skills, both of which may affect future earnings. Neither of these costs can be assessed with SLID data.

2 Refers to women who worked prior to pregnancy and were in the survey for at least two years after giving birth (for more information see *Data source and definitions*).

3 A minority (15%) of the self-employed reported receiving EI. Most of this small group would probably have been incorporated business owners who made EI insurance contributions.

4 The lack of statistical significance could be partly attributable to the small sample sizes.

5 The Employment Insurance eligibility rules for part-time workers changed in January 1997. Before this date part-time workers were eligible to claim El if they had worked at least 15 hours per week in the past 20 weeks. Since then, while their number of weekly hours is no longer stipulated, parttimers must have worked at least 700 hours in the past 52 weeks in order to be eligible for EI.

6 Findings from the Absence from Work Survey show that 71% of women in paid work received EI as their only form of compensation, while 14% received both EI and compensation from their employer or elsewhere.

7 The small sample size for non-returnees reduces the ability to produce statistically significant results. A larger sample size might increase the number of variables with estimates that show statistical significance. It would also be useful to apply logistic regression as a way to determine the key factors for leaving the labour force for at least two years, but the sample size of the women in question is too small for this type of analysis.

References

Belsky, J. "Parental and nonparental child care and children's socioemotional development: A decade in review." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 52, no. 4 (November 1990): 885-903.

Desai, S. and L.J. Waite. "Women's employment during pregnancy and after the first birth: Occupational characteristics and work commitment." *American Sociological Review* 56, no. 4 (August, 1991): 551-566.

Ghalam, N.Z. "Attitudes toward women, work and family." *Canadian Social Trends* (Statistics Canada, Catalogue no. 11-008-XPE) no. 46 (Autumn 1997): 13-17.

Joesch, J.M. "Children and the timing of women's paid work after childbirth: A further specification of the relationship." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 56, no. 2 (May 1994): 429-440.

Phipps, S.A. "Maternity and parental leaves and allowances: An international comparison." Insurance Programs Directorate, Human Resources Development Canada, Ottawa, 1995. Final draft.

Phipps, S., P. Burton and L. Lethbridge. In and Out of the Labour Market: Long-term Income Consequences of Interruptions in Paid Work. Halifax: Department of Economics, Dalhousie University, 1998.

Wenk, D. and P. Garrett. "Having a baby: Some predictions of maternal employment around childbirth." *Gender & Society* 6, no. 1 (March 1992): 49-65.

Baby boom women – then and now

Louise Earl

ave baby boom women had an easier path through Lthe labour market than women a generation older or younger? This article studies the labour market "success" of baby boom women by looking at their situation in 1977 and 1997 and comparing it with that of the preceding and succeeding generations. Four indicators are used in this study: labour force participation; full-time employment; unemployment; and full-year full-time earnings. (All earnings are in 1997 dollars; see Data sources and definitions.)

The women studied were born between 1948 and 1952, during the first wave of the postwar baby boom.1 Aged 25 to 29 in 1977, these women are compared with women aged 45 to 49 in that year that is, women born between 1928 and 1932, who went through their early childhood at the beginning of the Depression. The older group would have been 25 to 29 during the 1950s, when the idea of a conventional single-earner family held sway in North America.² Those who had been part of the paid workforce would not have been encouraged to continue their careers after childbirth.

Louise Earl is with the Science, Innovation and Electronic Information Division. She can be reached at (613) 951-2880 or earllou@statcan.ca. Women born between 1968 and 1972,³ often labelled "Generation Xers," are also thought to have entered the labour market on a rockier road than the path travelled by baby boomers (Betcherman and Morissette, 1994; Osberg, Erksoy and Phipps, 1998). These women formed the 25-to-29 age group in 1997.

Labour market changes

Between 1977 and 1997, the Canadian economy changed considerably. The period experienced two recessions, the second of which was followed by a recovery with slightly higher unemployment rates. Self-employment and servicesector employment, both of which tend to offer lower average earnings, increased over the two decades as well.

Many studies have shown that the labour market of today has not been easy on youths. High unemployment has led to a lowering of entry-level wages (Betcherman and Morissette, 1994; Osberg, Erksoy and Phipps, 1998) and a higher proportion of young adults working part time. The 1980s and 1990s also recorded increases in the proportion of dual-income families, highlighting women's increased attachment to the labour force and the need for more than one income to support a family.⁴

Labour market success of baby boom women in 1977

University-educated baby boomers poured into a welcoming labour market during a time of economic expansion. In 1977, almost 6 of every 10 baby boom women were in the labour force (Table 1).5 In contrast, only 53% of women aged 45 to 49 were in the labour force that year. Furthermore, a far higher proportion of employed 25-to-29 year-old women worked full time - 83%, compared with 74% of 45-to-49 year-olds - suggesting that baby boomers may have been less likely to have family-related responsibilities.6

Unemployment rates show that baby boom women, although faring well, were not as successful as middle-aged women in 1977. Their unemployment stood at 9.0% - more than 2 percentage points higher than for women aged 45 to 49. (New entrants to the labour market do, however, tend to have higher unemployment rates.) But education played a key role. Women aged 25 to 29 with university degrees had a significantly lower unemployment rate, 5.3% in 1977, and their 45-to-49 year-old counterparts registered just 3.7%.

In 1977, baby boom women working full year full time earned \$28,100 (1997\$), just slightly more than the \$27,000 earned by women

Data sources and definitions

Earnings data are from the Survey of Consumer Finances, and labour force characteristics, from the Labour Force Survey.

Earnings consist of annual wages and salaries and/or net income from self-employment, for full-year full-time work. The full-year full-time measure minimizes differences in the amount of paid work done over the course of a year. A more accurate measurement would be hourly wages, but these were not available for 1977 and are not calculated for the self-employed.

Full-year full-time work is mostly 30 hours or more per week for 49 to 52 weeks in the year.

The **participation rate** for a particular group is the labour force expressed as a percentage of the population for that group.

aged 45 to 49, even though they worked fewer hours: 1,967 hours annually, compared with 2,059. This suggests that young women's skills may have been in greater demand.⁷ Indeed, a larger proportion had more formal education than the preceding generation

Unemployed persons are those who, during the reference week,

- were without work, had actively looked for work in the past four weeks and were available for work;
- had not actively looked for work in the past four weeks but had been on layoff and were available for work;
- had not actively looked for work in the past four weeks but had a new job to start in four weeks or less and were available for work.

The unemployment rate for a particular group (for instance, women aged 25 to 29) is the number unemployed expressed as a percentage of the labour force for that group.

of women. Over 15% of baby boomers in the 1977 labour force held university degrees, compared with only 6% of women aged 45 to 49. The converse held true for the proportion with less than high school: only 6%, compared with 24%.

			1977		1997			
	Baby boom women, 25-29	Baby boom men, 25-29	Women, 45-49	Men, 45-49	"Genera- tion X" women, 25-29	"Genera- tion X" men, 25-29	Baby boom women, 45-49	Baby boom men, 45-49
					%			
Labour force characteristics								
Participation rate	59.0	94.3	52.7	93.6	77.9	90.5	76.8	90.6
Less than Grade 9	6.0	8.6	23.6	32.7	1.1	2.0	5.2	5.6
University degree	15.5	17.5	6.0	9.5	27.1	20.3	19.0	23.1
Unemployment rate	9.0	7.0	6.6	4.4	8.7	10.5	6.5	6.6
With less than Grade 9	17.3	13.0	8.9	7.1	20.9	32.2	10.6	14.2
With university degree	5.3	3.6	3.7	1.6	5.8	6.3	3.5	4.3
Employed labour force								
Employed full time	83.4	97.3	74.0	98.5	78.1	92.5	77.4	96.1
Average annual earnings				1	997\$			
Full-year full-time paid workers and self-employed	28,100	38,900	27,000	47.200	27,700	34,800	33.200	46.700

Baby boom women with degrees earned an average \$37,100 in 1977, compared with \$26,300 for those with less than university. However, compared with graduates in the older group, they earned 85 cents for every dollar (Table 2), perhaps reflecting their lack of work experience.

Based on the intergenerational earnings gap measure – comparisons of labour force participation rates and full-time employment – baby boom women were more successful than women a generation older in 1977. The only measure of labour market success in which they did not do as well as women aged 45 to 49 was in finding employment. However, this is not unexpected, since breaking into the labour market presents unique difficulties.

Baby boom women in 1997

In 1997, baby boomers were aged 45 to 49. For the most part their childbearing years had passed, but family-related responsibilities continued. This "sandwich generation" may have had to look after older relatives while continuing to raise children. Despite these non-labour market duties, these women had increased their labour force participation since 1977, from 59% to 77%. Their unemployment

	1977	1997
Overall		
Women 25-29 to women 45-49	1.04	.83
Women 25-29 to men 25-29	.72	.80
Women 45-49 to men 45-49	.57	.71
Men 25-29 to men 45-49	.82	.74
With university degree		
Women 25-29 to women 45-49	.85	.66
Women 25-29 to men 25-29	.86	.82
Women 45-49 to men 45-49	.59	.79
Men 25-29 to men 45-49	.58	.64
With less than university education		
Women 25-29 to women 45-49	1.04	.86
Women 25-29 to men 25-29	.69	.76
Women 45-49 to men 45-49	.58	.69
Men 25-29 to men 45-49	.87	.79

rate had declined over the two decades to 6.5% – matching the rate for women aged 45 to 49 in 1977.

A lower proportion of employed baby boom women worked full time in 1997: 77%, compared with 83% in 1977. However, those who did work full year full time averaged more hours: 2,033, compared with 1,967. And a greater proportion had university degrees by 1997 (19% versus 15%).

Based on average job tenure, women aged 45 to 49 in 1997 had more work experience than similarly aged women in 1977: almost 12 years, compared with just over 8, which may explain in part their higher annual earnings (\$33,200 versus \$27,000).

Baby boomers and "Generation X"

In 1997, some 78% of Generation X women (aged 25 to 29) and almost the same proportion of baby boom women (aged 45 to 49) participated in the labour force (77%). This shows an intergenerational levelling of women's labour force attachment in the late 1990s.

Full-time employment was not as plentiful as it had been in 1977. Even so, similar proportions of baby boom (77%) and Generation X women (78%) worked full time in 1997. (Many women choose to work part time, citing personal preference or family responsibilities as the reason.) As expected, baby boom women had a lower unemployment rate than the younger group, reflecting the latter's relatively brief work experience.

Educational attainment may have some bearing on the similarities between these two generations. Only a negligible proportion of the younger group had less than high school, while 27% were university-educated. This compares with 5% and 19% of baby boom women.

Baby boom women out-earn "Gen Xers"

In 1997, Generation X women earned 83 cents for every dollar earned by baby boom women. The latter worked longer paid hours: an average 2,033 hours in 1997, about a week more than Generation X's 2,001. But the gap was 60 hours narrower than it had been between the groups compared in 1977.

The work experience of Generation X women (46 months) was similar to that of baby boom women in their early careers (50 months) (Table 3).

Table 3: Job tenure and annual average hours of work for full-year full-time paid workers and self-employed

	1977	1997
Women 25-29 Job tenure (months) Annual hours	50 1,967	46 2,001
Women 45-49 Job tenure (months) Annual hours	98 2,059	142 2,033
Men 25-29 Job tenure (months) Annual hours	49 2,180	46 2,197
Men 45-49 Job tenure (months) Annual hours	168 2,285	160 2,253

Source: Survey of Consumer Finances

Annual average hours are calculated by multiplying the average number of actual weekly hours by the number of weeks worked for each full-year full-time paid worker and self-employed person.

Both groups had similar participation and full-time employment rates in 1997. However, the younger women had greater problems finding employment. This could reflect young people's difficulties in entering the labour market of the 1990s (Betcherman and Morissette, 1994).

Conclusion

Compared with women 20 years older and 20 years younger, baby boom women have done well in the labour market over the years. These women aged 25 to 29 in 1977 began their careers by out-earning women 20 years older. Twenty years later they out-earned female Generation Xers aged 25 to 29. Though their full-time employment rate has declined as they have aged, baby boom women have increased their participation in the labour force over two decades and experienced a reduction in their agespecific unemployment rate. Taken together, these indicators point to the continued relative success of this group.

Perspectives

Notes

1 See Galarneau (1994b) for a definition of first-wave baby boom women.

2 This belief was so entrenched in the economy that it was not until 1968 that 50% of a wife's "salaried income" could be considered as income in a couple's application for a mortgage (CMHC, 1988).

3 In Galarneau (1994a), women born between 1966 and 1975 are identified as part of the "post-baby boom."

4 See Statistics Canada (1994) for further information.

5 To provide context and balance, labour market information on men is available in the tables. For a discussion of the wage difference between the sexes, see Gunderson (1998).

6 Baby boom women delayed pregnancy and marriage (Galarneau, 1994a).

7 Baby boom women were concentrated in clerical occupations; however, members of the first wave were moving into professional occupations, including health and education (Galarneau, 1994a).

References

Betcherman, G., and R. Morissette. Recent Youth Labour Market Experiences in Canada. Catalogue no. 11F0019E, no. 63. Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 1994.

Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. Corporate Profile. Ottawa: Public Affairs Centre, CMHC, 1988.

Galarneau, D. Female Baby Boomers: A Generation at Work. Focus on Canada. Catalogue no. 96-315-XPE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada and Prentice Hall Canada, 1994a.

---. "Baby boom women." *Perspectives on Labour and Income* (Statistics Canada, Catalogue no. 75-001-XPE) 6, no. 4 (Winter 1994b): 23-29.

Gunderson, M. Women and the Canadian Labour Market: Transition towards the Future. Census monograph. Catalogue no. 96-321-MPE, no. 2. Ottawa and Toronto: Statistics Canada and ITP Nelson, 1998.

Osberg, L., S. Erksoy and S. Phipps. "How to value the poorer prospects of youth in the early 1990s." *Review of Income and Wealth* 44, no. 1 (March 1998): 43-62.

Statistics Canada. *Characteristics of Dual-Earner Families*. Catalogue no. 13-215-XPB. Ottawa, 1994.

Missing work in 1998 – industry differences

Ernest B. Akyeampong

ith the advent of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), Canada, the United States and Mexico agreed upon a new industrial classification system, namely, the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS). Its major objectives are to facilitate comparisons between NAFTA members, to accommodate industries that have emerged in the past two decades, and to acknowledge the growing importance of the service sector.

This article examines work absence rates according to NAICS (see *Comparing SIC 1980 and NAICS*),¹ focusing on 1998.² It provides a brief overview of absence levels for 1997 and 1998, and a detailed examination of industry differences in the latter year.

Work absences rose in 1998

The proportion of full-time employees missing work for personal reasons ("own illness or disability" and "personal or family responsibilities") during each week rose between 1997 and 1998, as did average days lost per employee over the course of the year (see Data source, definitions and measurements). In 1998, an estimated 5.7% (525,000) of all full-time employees were absent from work for all or part of any given week for personal reasons, up from 5.5% a year earlier (Table 1). As a result of these absences, approximately 3.1% of usual weekly work time was lost (inactivity rate) in 1998, also up slightly from 3.0%. This translates into an increase of nearly half a day per full-time employee - from 7.4 to 7.8. Stated differently, employees missed approximately 72 million workdays because of personal reasons in 1998, up from 66 million in 1997.

All of the increase in incidence (0.2 percentage points) over the period was due to illness or disability,

Ernest B. Akyeampong is with the Labour and Household Surveys Analysis Division. He can be reached at (613) 951-4624 or akyeern@statcan.ca.

Data source, definitions and measurements

The data in this article are annual averages from the Labour Force Survey (LFS). They refer to full-time employees holding only one job. Part-time, self-employed and unpaid family workers are excluded because they generally have more opportunity to arrange their work schedules around personal or family responsibilities. Multiple jobholders, too, are excluded because it is not possible, using LFS data, to allocate time lost, or the reason for it, to specific jobs. Women on maternity leave are also excluded. Employed persons on long-term illness or disability leave (exceeding one year) are included.³

Personal reasons for absence are split into two categories: "own illness or disability" and "personal or family responsibilities" (caring for own children, caring for elder relative, and other personal or family responsibilities). Absences for these two reasons represented about 26% of all time lost by full-time paid workers each week in 1998. Vacations, which accounted for about 46% of total time away from work, are not counted in this study, nor are statutory holidays, which represented 13%. Maternity leave represented 7% and other reasons, 9%.

The incidence of absence is the percentage of full-time paid workers reporting some absence in the reference week. In calculating incidence, the length of work absence – whether an hour, a day, or a full week – is irrelevant.

The inactivity rate shows hours lost as a proportion of the usual weekly hours of full-time paid workers. It takes into account both the incidence and length of absence in the reference week.

Days lost per worker are calculated by multiplying the inactivity rate by the estimated number of working days in the year (250).

as was the 0.4 rise in days lost per employee (its largest annual jump for this reason since 1980). In 1998, the work absence rate among full-time employees due to illness or disability stood at 4.3%, and average days missed for that reason at 6.6. In contrast, for both 1997 and 1998 the rate and work time missed per employee on account of personal or family responsibilities were 1.4% and 1.2 days, respectively.

Men's rates up: women's unchanged

Virtually all the increase in overall incidence of absence and workdays lost in 1998 can be traced to a rise in men's absence due to illness or disability. Even so, men continued to report work absences less often than women, and missed less time when they did so, whether for illness or disability, or for personal or family responsibilities. For example, male full-time employees lost on average 6.9 workdays (5.9 for illness or disability and 1.0 for personal or family responsibilities). This compares with an average 9.2 days missed by their female counterparts that year (7.7 and 1.5, respectively) (Table 1).

Time lost varies by industry

The nature and demands of a job, the composition of the workforce, and the percentage of employees belonging to a union or covered by collective agreement all contribute to variations in work absence rates by industry.

Generally, the more physically demanding and/or hazardous the job, the higher the illness or disability absence rate (Haggar-Guénette, 1988 and Haggar-Guénette and Proulx, 1992). And, as can be inferred from the earlier findings, the higher the proportion of women in an industry, the greater the likelihood of absence for both illness or disability and personal or family responsibilities. Finally, workdays lost on account of illness or disability by unionized employees (almost all of whom are entitled to paid sick leave) are almost twice those of non-unionized employees (Akyeampong, 1998).

With these generalizations in mind, how did the major industries compare in 1998?⁴

At the highest level of aggregation, the incidence of work absence was identical in both goods- and service-producing industries in 1998. Approximately 5.7% of fulltime employees in both sectors reported some absence every week for personal reasons (Table 2). However, because illness or disability among goods sector workers (especially in manufacturing) resulted in more lost work time, average days missed for that reason exceeded those in the service sector (6.9 versus 6.5). And as both sectors lost 1.2 days per worker on account of personal or family responsibilities, total workdays missed for both reasons by fulltime employees in the goods sector (8.1 days) exceeded the 7.7 days for workers in the service sector.

	Incidence *				Inactivit rate **	У	Days lost per worker in a year ⁺			
	Total	Illness or disability	Personal or family responsi- bilities	Total	Illness or disability	Personal or family responsi- bilities	Total	Illness or disability	Persona or family responsi- bilities	
		%			%			days		
Both sexes										
1997	5.5	4.1	1.4	3.0	2.5	0.5	7.4	6.2	1.2	
1998	5.7	4.3	1.4	3.1	2.6	0.5	7.8	6.6	1.2	
Men										
1997	4.6	3.4	1.2	2.5	2.1	0.4	6.3	5.3	0.9	
1998	4.9	3.7	1.2	2.8	2.3	0.4	6.9	5.9	1.0	
Women										
1997	6.7	5.1	1.7	3.7	3.0	0.6	9.1	7.6	1.5	
1998	6.7	5.1	1.6	3.7	3.1	0.6	9.2	7.7	1.5	

Absent workers divided by total.

** Hours absent divided by hours usually worked.

Inactivity rate multiplied by working days in year (250).

Comparing SIC 1980 and NAICS

The new classification system (NAICS) differs from the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC 1980) in a number of important respects. It groups industries in terms of common inputs and processes, rather than outputs, the basis for the earlier classification. It also accommodates industries that have emerged since the 1970s. Finally, service industries, which account for about three-quarters of employment and a large share of national output, play a more prominent role in the new classification.

A detailed account of NAICS can be found at the Statistics Canada Internet address:

www.statcan.ca/english/Subjects/Standard/index.htm.

The new classification system has six levels of detail, but the LFS uses only four. This provides roughly the same level of detail as the SIC 1980.

Both classification schemes are hierarchical in structure, composed of sectors, subsectors, industry groups and industries. At the highest level of aggregation, NAICS has 20 sectors, compared with 18 divisions in the SIC 1980. This level is still too detailed to provide reliable seasonally adjusted estimates for all provinces. The LFS groups some of the sectors (divisions), leaving 16 categories for monthly, seasonally adjusted publication. While some NAICS and SIC group titles are the same, the detailed industries represented are different.

Construction, for example, is a division of the SIC 1980 and a sector in NAICS. In the SIC 1980, it includes the inspection of buildings and landscaping activities but excludes street and highway repairs. In NAICS, it excludes building and landscaping inspection but includes street and highway repairs. Consequently, direct comparisons cannot be made. (For comparison tables, see Akyeampong, 1999.)

Seasonally	adjusted industry detail from
the	Labour Force Survey

SIC 1980	NAICS			
Goods-producing	Goods-producing			
Agriculture	Agriculture			
Other primary Logging and forestry	Forestry, fishing, mining, oil			
Fishing and trapping	Utilities			
Mining, quarrying and	Construction			
oil wells	Manufacturing			
Utilities	a			
Construction				
Manufacturing				
Service-producing	Service-producing			
Transportation, storage	Transportation and			
and communication	warehousing			
Trade	Trade			
Wholesale	Finance, insurance, real estat			
Retail	and leasing			
Finance, insurance and real estate	Information, culture and recreation			
Community, business and	Educational services			
personal services	Health care and social			
Education	assistance			
Health and social services Business and personal	Professional, scientific and technical			
services	Management, and administra			
Accommodation, food	tive and support services			
and beverage	Accommodation and food			
Public administration	Other services			
	Public administration			

At the major industry (2-digit) level some variations were noteworthy. For both personal reasons combined, full-time employees who lost the most time (12.8 days) were in health care and social assistance, a highly unionized industry believed to be relatively stressful and having a large proportion of female workers. They were followed by those in transportation and warehousing, a relatively hazardous and heavily unionized industry (9.4); public administration, also heavily unionized and with a high concentration of female employees (9.4); and manufacturing (8.5). Workers who lost comparatively little time were in the professional, scientific and technical industries (4.6 days); accommodation and food services (5.7); and agriculture (5.8).

Most of these variations can be traced to illness or disability. In 1998, health care and social assistance employees missed 11.3 workdays for this reason, while those in transportation and warehousing lost 8.1, public administration, 8.0, and manufacturing, 7.3. In contrast, workers lost little time in the professional, scientific and technical industries (3.4 days); agriculture (4.7); and accommodation and food services (4.8).

Workdays missed on account of personal or family responsibilities ranged from 0.9 to 1.6 among

		Incidenc	ce *		Inactivi rate**	ity 154	w	Days lost p orker in a y	er ear ¹
	Total	Illness or disability	Personal or family responsi- bilities	Total	Illness or disability	Personal or family responsi- bilities	Total	Illness or disability	Personal or family responsi- bilities
		%			%			days	
All industries	5.7	4.3	1.4	3.1	2.6	0.5	7.8	6.6	1.2
Goods-producing	5.7	4.2	1.5	3.2	2.8	0.5	8.1	6.9	1.2
Agriculture Forestry, fishing,	4.5	3.0		2.3	1.9		5.8	4.7	
mining oil and gas	4.8	3.7	1.1	2.8	2.4	0.4	7.1	6.0	1.1
Itilities	5.5	4.0	1.5	2.7	2.3	0.4	6.8	5.8	1.0
Construction	5.2	3.0	1 4	31	2.6	0.5	7.6	6.5	1 1
Manufacturing	5.0	0.5 A E	1.4	3.4	2.0	0.5	8.5	7.9	1.1
Durable	6.1	4.0	1.5	0.4	2.3	0.5	0.5	7.3	1.2
Durable	0.1	4.5	1.5	3.4	2.9	0.5	0.0	7.0	1.2
Non-durable	6.0	4.4	1.6	3.4	2.9	0.5	8.6	7.3	1.3
Service-producing	5.7	4.3	1.3	3.1	2.6	0.5	7.7	6.5	1.2
Trade	4.9	3.7	1.3	2.6	2.1	0.4	6.4	5.4	1.1
Whoiesale	5.0	3.7	1.3	2.5	2.1	0.4	6.2	5.2	1.0
Retail	4.9	3.7	1.2	2.6	2.2	0.4	6.5	5.4	1.1
Transportation and	- 7		1.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.4	0.4	1 0
Finance, insurance, real estate and	5.7	4.4	1.3	3.8	3.2	0.5	9.4	8.1	1.3
leasing Finance and	5.2	3.8	1.4	2.5	2.1	0.4	6.3	5.2	1.1
insurance Real estate rental	5.2	3.9	1.3	2.6	2.2	0.4	6.6	5.5	1.1
and leasing	4.9	3.5	1.4	2.2	1.8	0.4	5.4	4.5	0.9
fic and technical Management, and administrative and	4.8	3.2	1.6	1.8	1.4	0.5	4.6	3.4	1.2
support services	5.4	4.0	1.4	2.9	2.4	0.5	7.4	6.0	1.4
Educational services	5.5	4.3	1.2	3.0	2.5	0.6	7.6	6.2	1.4
assistance	8.2	6.7	1.4	5.1	4.5	0.6	12.8	11.3	1.6
and recreation	5.0	3.6	1.3	2.4	2.0	0.4	6.1	5.1	1.0
food convince	A 0	0.0	0.0	2.2	1.0	0.4	E 7	4.0	0.0
lood services	4.3	3.3	0.9	2.3	1.9	0.4	5.7	4.0	4.4
Juner services	5.1	3.7	1.5	2.1	2.2	0.5	0.8	5.4	1.4
Public administration	6.9	5.3	1.5	3.8	3.2	0.5	9.4	8.0	1.4
Federal	8.0	6.0	2.0	4.1	3.4	0.6	10.2	8.5	1.6
Provincial Local, including	7.0	5.7	1.3	4.0	3.5	0.5	10.1	8.9	1.2
other	5.7	4.3	1.3	3.3	2.7	0.5	8.2	6.9	1.3

Table 2: Absence for personal reasons by industry, full-time paid workers, 1998

Source: Labour Force Survey * Absent workers divided by total.

** Hours absent divided by hours usually worked.
 † Inactivity rate multiplied by working days in year (250).



major industries, with many clustered around 1.1 days. Higherthan-average missed days were recorded in health care and social assistance (1.6); as well as in management, and administrative and support services; educational services; and public administration (1.4 days each). Lower-than-average time was lost by those in accommodation and food services (0.9 days); information, culture and recreation; and utilities (1.0 days each).

Among selected industries at the 3-digit level, full-time employees in durable and non-durable manufacturing both lost around 8.5 days in 1998 (Table 2). Workers in retail trade missed slightly more time than those in wholesale trade (6.5 days versus 6.2). Similarly, those in finance and insurance (6.6 days) lost more work time to personal reasons than their counterparts in real estate, rental and leasing (5.4). In public administration, full-time employees in the federal and provincial governments lost just slightly over 10 days each in 1998, significantly higher than the 8.2 days missed by those in local and other government.

Summary

Workdays missed by full-time employees for personal reasons rose from 7.4 in 1997 to 7.8 in 1998. All of the increase was due to a rise in time lost to illness or disability; workdays missed for personal or family responsibilities remained unchanged at 1.2 days. Although men accounted for all of the increase over the year, women continued to report absences more often than men during a given work week, and to miss more work time during the year, at ratios of approximately 3 to 2. Among the major industries, those losing considerably more time than others to personal reasons per full-time employee were health care and social assistance; public administration; and transportation and warehousing. Those with relatively few lost workdays were professional, scientific and technical industries; accommodation and food services; and agriculture.

Notes

1 Previous studies in this journal (Akyeampong, 1992, 1995, 1996 and 1998) and elsewhere (Akyeampong, 1988, and Akyeampong and Usalcas, 1998) have examined absence rate differences among workers based on the former Standard Industrial Classification 1980.

2 Although the LFS has produced historical NAICS data back to 1987, this article considers 1998 for two reasons. First, the redesign of the LFS in
Reasons for work absences in the LFS

The pre-1997 version of the LFS grouped the reasons for being away from work all or part of the week as follows:

- illness or disability
- personal or family responsibilities
- weather (part-week absence)
- labour dispute
- vacation
- holiday (part-week absence)
- working short time (part-week absence)
- laid off during week
- new job started during week
- seasonal business (full-week absence)
- other

Studies using pre-1997 data referred to the first two reasons as absences from work for personal reasons.

Reasons for time lost to illness or disability included medical or dental appointments and other temporary health-related absences. Absence for personal or family responsibilities included taking care of children, attending funerals, appearing in court, serving on a jury, and taking care of a sick family member. Longer absences, such as maternity leave, were also included.

1997 allowed the removal of maternity leave – clearly not an "absenteeism" factor – from work absence rates (see *Reasons for work absences in the LFS*). In other words, there was a break in the time series starting in 1997, making comparisons with data from earlier years less meaningful. Second, detailed time series covering the period 1987 to 1998 (with pre- and post-1997 LFS redesign information) by industry (NAICS) and occupation (the new SOC 1991) – as well as other socio-demographic variables such as sex, age, education, province, workplace size, public and private sectors – are available in a companion publication (Akyeampong, 1999).

3 Some human resource practitioners exclude persons on long-term illness or disability leave (exceeding one year) from their attendance management statistics. Such persons are, however, included in Statistics Canada's work absence estimates if they count themselves as employed (that is, they continue to receive partial or full pay from their employer). In 1998, the number of employed persons on such longterm illness or disability leave averaged only 16,000 in a typical week. Their exclusion would have reduced the weekly work The redesigned LFS, whose 1998 estimates are used in this study, sets out the following reasons for being away from work:

- own illness or disability
- caring for own children
- caring for elder relative (60 years or older)
- maternity leave (women only)
- other personal or family responsibilities
- vacation
- labour dispute (strike or lockout)
- temporary layoff due to business conditions
- holiday (legal or religious)
- weather
- job started or ended during week
- working short time (because of material shortages, plant maintenance or repair, for instance)
- other

Illness or disability remain unchanged, and personal or family responsibilities now consist of caring for own children, caring for elder relative, and other personal or family responsibilities.

absence incidence for illness or disability from 4.3% to 4.1%, the inactivity rate from 2.6% to 2.5%, and days lost per worker from 6.6 to 6.2.

4 The following analysis looks mainly at differences in average time lost per worker. Differences in incidences and inactivity rates are shown, however, in the chart and in Table 2.

References

Akycampong, E.B. Work Absence Rates, 1987 to 1998. Catalogue no. 71-535-MPB, no. 10. Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 1999.

---. "Work absence: New data, new insights." Perspectives on Labour and Income 10, no. 1 (Spring 1998): 16-22.

---. "Work absence rates, 1995." *Perspectives on Labour and Income* (Statistics Canada, Catalogue no. 75-001-XPE) 8, no. 3 (Autumn 1996): supplement.

Missing work in 1998 - industry differences

---. "Missing work." Perspectives on Labour and Income (Statistics Canada, Catalogue no. 75-001-XPE) 7, no. 1 (Spring 1995): 12-16.

---. "Absences from work revisited." *Perspectives on Labour and Income* (Statistics Canada, Catalogue no. 75-001-XPE) 4, no. 1 (Spring 1992): 44-53.

---. "Time loss from work for personal reasons." *The Labour Force* (Statistics Canada, Catalogue no. 71-001-XPB) 44, no. 5 (May 1988): 87-121.

Akyeampong, E.B. and J. Usalcas. *Work Absence Rates, 1980 to 1997.* Statistics Canada, Catalogue no. 71-535-MPB, no. 9, Ottawa, 1998.

Haggar-Guénette, C. "Work injuries in Canada, 1982 to 1986." The Labour Force (Statistics Canada, Catalogue no. 71-001-XPB) 44, no. 3 (March 1988): 85-120.

Haggar-Guénette, C. and J. Proulx. "Back injuries at work, 1982-1990." *Perspectives on Labour and Income* (Statistics Canada, Catalogue no. 75-001-XPE) 4, no. 3 (Autumn 1992): 31-37.

Statistics Canada. Work Absence Rates, 1977 to 1994. Catalogue no. 71-535-MPB, no. 7. Ottawa, 1995.

Back Issues: Did you miss something?

Don't worry! Back issues of Perspectives on Labour and Income are available. Feature articles in these issues include:

Summer 1999 Earnings mobility · Retiring later · Retirement savings · Hours of work · Literacy and work

Spring 1999 Income deciles · Seasonality · Obtaining a job · Student loans · Protective services

Winter 1998 Gambling update · Income inequality · Retirement income · Job stability · Unionization rates · Index: 1989-1998

Autumn 1998 Shift work · Trends in participation · Job search · Retirement · Home businesses

For more information contact Statistics Canada, Operations and Integration Division, Circulation Management, 120 Parkdale Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0T6. Or, call toll free 1 800 267-6677.

Perspectives on Labour and Income

The quarterly for labour market and income information

Self-employment in Canada and the United States

Marilyn E. Manser and Garnett Picot

Self-employment has accounted for the majority of net employment growth in Canada in the 1990s, but for almost none in the United States (Manser and Picot, 1997). This marks a change from the 1980s, when it played a similar role in both countries.

Not surprisingly, considerable attention has been paid in recent years to self-employment in Canada, especially to workers' reasons for choosing this option. Have they been "pushed" by lack of full-time paid jobs or "pulled" by the positive benefits of selfemployment? ¹ Survey data in both countries shed some light on the extent to which many workers may prefer self-employment. Statistics Canada's 1995 Survey of Work Arrangements asked workers why they were self-employed, and most provided positive reasons, as did respondents to the U.S. Current Population Survey.

Employment patterns of different countries may vary for a number of reasons. First, labour supply conditions depend in part on demographic trends (for example, the age and income of a population). Second, institutional arrangements and taxation legislation can influence labour market outcomes. For example, differences in personal or payroll taxes may encourage self-employment (or discourage paid employment) in one country, but not in another. The level of "contracting-out" by firms may also be influenced by taxation or labour laws, thus changing self-employment patterns. Finally, differences in fiscal and monetary policy may influence labour demand and employment. Hence, even if all advanced indus-

Adapted from an article in Canadian Economic Observer (Statistics Canada, Catalogue no. 11-010-XPB) 12, no. 3 (March 1999). Marilyn Manser is with the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, D.C. She can be reached at (202) 606-7398. Garnett Picot is with the Business and Labour Market Analysis Division. He can be reached at (613) 951-8214 or picogar@statcan.ca. trialized countries faced similar shifts in labour demand due to globalization and technological change, employment patterns could vary.

Few studies have compared self-employment in the United States and Canada. Of those, one found that among full-timers in non-agricultural work, the selfemployed were older, and more likely to be male and well-educated and to work long hours (Reardon, 1997). In Canada, they were considerably more likely to be in the accommodation and food services industry and less likely to be in finance, insurance and real estate or in miscellaneous services. The study concluded that "[t]he difference in self-employment rates for men appear[ed] to be driven in part by worker characteristics and in part by the selection mechanism at work," and that Canada's far higher immigration rate was an important demographic factor. Differences in personal tax rates in Canada and the United States have also played a role in the divergence of men's self-employment trends during the 1990s (Schuetze, 1998).

This article looks at the characteristics of the selfemployed and at the growth of self-employment in Canada and the United States. Although the countries use different official definitions of self-employment, certain comparable information is available (see *Data sources and definitions*).

An overview of self-employment

The growth of total self-employment was substantial in both Canada and the United States from 1979 to 1997, although much higher in Canada (77% versus 37%, unadjusted for CPS redesign; 25% adjusted) (Chart A). The increase in Canada's self-employment rate (the share of self-employment in total employment) between 1989 and 1997 was striking – from 14% to 18% – after having remained stable during the 1980s. The American rate changed little, registering around 10% over the entire period (Chart B). Self-employment in Canada and the United States





Data sources and definitions

Analysts of U.S. growth often combine the 1980 recession and the more severe 1982 recession. While Canada did experience a mini-recession in 1980, employment peaked in 1981, the year often used as a cyclical peak for annual data. This study treats 1979 to 1989 as one business cycle of recession and expansion for both countries, and 1989 to 1997 as another.

Employment growth was stronger in the United States between 1989 and 1997, up 10% compared with 7% in Canada. But the dramatic difference was in the contribution of self-employment. The extent of this contribution depends on the definition used. In Canada, incorporated working owners (with or without employees) as well as the unincorporated are considered **self-employed**. In the United States, only the unincorporated are considered selfemployed; the incorporated self-employed are treated as paid employees. Both definitions are useful.

It is possible to construct both total self-employment (both incorporated and unincorporated) and unincorporated self-employment from the Canadian Labour Force Survey (LFS) for the entire period. For the United States, data are from two sources: the regular monthly Current Population Survey (CPS) and the March supplement to the CPS. Only since 1989 has an official series on incorporated self-employment been produced using the monthly CPS data. In order to examine total self-employment (incorporated plus unincorporated) for the United States back to 1979, this study uses information from the CPS March income supplement (1997 data were not yet available at the time of writing).

While Canadian data and the monthly CPS data refer to the class of worker status in the primary job held during the interview week, the March supplement refers to that of the longest job held over the preceding calendar year. In theory, the number of self-employed from the March data could be either higher or lower than the monthly average data for the corresponding year; in practice, they provide similar pictures.

The monthly CPS estimate of self-employment jobs depends on whether or not an adjustment is made to account for the effects of a January 1994 major revision.² Using the unadjusted data increases the estimated growth of self-employment in the 1990s (relative to the adjusted data), since prior to the revision the CPS was undercounting employment, particularly self-employment. Hence, use of the unadjusted data decreases the differences between the United States and Canada. Data on the estimated distribution of jobs by various characteristics probably remain similar. (Data from the March supplement are probably affected to a similar extent but no information is available to construct adjustment factors for them.)

Note: Canadian data exclude 15 year-olds to conform to the American survey.

In Canada especially, the self-employed have been incorporating to a greater extent than before. Their proportion rose from 24% to 33% between 1979 and 1989, and remained stable over the 1990s (Chart C). By contrast, in the United States it grew from 22% to 25% between 1979 and 1989 (March CPS) and from 26% to 29% between 1989 and 1997 (monthly averages unadjusted; from 27% to 29% adjusted).

Between 1989 and 1997, self-employment accounted for about 80% of net employment gain in Canada, but only about 1% in the United States (adjusted monthly data versus 11% unadjusted) (Table 1).³ Unincorporated self-employment by itself (the U.S. definition) contributed about half of net new jobs in Canada over the latest cycle, but virtually none

Table	1:	Contribution of self-employment	to
		total job growth	

Grov	wth	% of total
Total employment	Self- employment	Growth accounted for by self- employment
	'000	%
n		
2,315 904	392 682	16.9 75.4
tes		
19,638	2,624	13.4
9,597	1,180	12.3
12,216	1,402	11.5
10,662	79	0.7
tion		
2,315	199	8.6
904	439	48.6
tes		
19,638	1,585	8.1
18,518	1,624	8.8
12,216	505	4.1
	Total employment n 2,315 904 tes 19,638 9,597 12,216 10,662 tion 2,315 904 tes 19,638 18,518 12,216	Total employment Self- employment '000 '000 n '000 2,315 392 904 682 tes 19,638 2,624 9,597 1,180 12,216 1,402 10,662 79 10,662 79 tion 2,315 199 904 439 tes 19,638 1,585 1,624 12,216 505 505 505



in the United States (-2% adjusted; 4% unadjusted). The dramatic growth in Canada was unique to the 1990s.

Another striking difference between the decades in Canada is the role played by the self-employed with and without employees. About 60% of net new selfemployment jobs created during the 1980s involved entrepreneurs who themselves engaged other employees. The rest were created by own-account workers (that is, entrepreneurs with no employees). During the 1989-97 period, however, fully 90% fit the latter description. This difference would have affected the growth in paid employment. So, the 1990s in Canada produced not only many more self-employed jobs relative to the United States, but also jobs that were different in many ways from those of the 1980s.⁴

Self-employment found everywhere

In the late 1990s, Canadians' relatively greater tendency toward self-employment was widespread. It was observed in all industries and occupations (except management, which was higher in the United States) regardless of workers' education or age.

The industrial concentration of self-employed jobs was similar in the two countries. Self-employment was high in agriculture and construction, and virtually absent from mining and manufacturing. Finance, insurance and real estate, and retail and wholesale trade fell in the middle (Tables 2 and 3).

	Т	able 2:	Self-empl	oyment ra	tes* for	Canada		1	
		1979			1989		12.2	1997	
	Both sexes	Men	Women	Both sexes	Men	Women	Both sexes	Men	Women
					%				4 2
Age 16 to 19 20 to 24 25 to 34 35 to 44 45 to 54 55 to 64	13.0 7.3 4.8 10.8 15.7 18.1 19.5	15.2 6.0 5.9 12.4 18.2 20.6 21.9	9.5 8.8 3.5 8.1 11.5 13.5 14.6	13.7 5.0 4.1 10.4 15.8 19.4 23.3	16.9 4.3 4.9 12.5 19.7 23.3 27.1	9.6 5.8 3.2 7.6 10.9 14.0 16.4	17.7 8.8 5.5 12.7 18.8 21.9 29.9	21.1 7.8 6.2 14.8 22.0 26.5 34 1	13.7 9.9 4.7 10.2 15.1 16.3 23.0
65 and over	38.8	43.0	26.6	45.4	54.3	27.6	60.2	65.0	49.4
Industry Agriculture Mining Manufacturing Construction	74.6 2.6 2.5 25.7	75.4 2.7 2.9 26.7	72.2 1.5 1.5 15.1	68.8 4.0 4.1 29.2	73.5 4.0 4.6 30.7	58.8 3.5 3.0 16.9	71.7 7.8 5.2 37.3	75.3 7.5 5.3 37.9	64.2 9.2 4.8 32.1
Pransportation and public utilities Wholesale trade Retail trade Finance, insurance	6.2 11.5 17.5	7.1 13.8 22.1	2.7 4.8 12.7	7.6 14.9 16.0	9.0 17.5 20.8	3.5 8.1 11.3	12.4 18.6 18.7	14.6 20.7 23.4	6.3 13.5 13.9
and real estate Services	6.1 13.0	11.9 16.7	2.2 10.5	8.9 14.3	17.6 19.7	3.3 11.0	15.8 19.4	27.3 25.7	8.4 15.5
Occupation Managerial Professional and	6.1	7.1	3.2	14.1	18.4	7.1	13.6	17.7	8.4
technical Clerical Sales Service Primary **	8.5 2.3 24.0 15.4 58.8	12.5 1.3 27.9 10.8 56.1	4.3 2.5 18.0 19.4 71.2	10.4 2.6 24.5 14.7 56.2	15.1 2.6 30.5 10.4 54.5	6.5 2.6 17.5 18.0 63.1	15.9 4.5 30.6 19.6 59.9	22.5 3.6 37.0 14.2 57.7	10.6 4.8 23.4 23.6 67.7
Processing, machining and fabricating Operators and labourers	5.4 13.4	6.0 13.9	2.9 6.6	6.9 15.4	7.1 16.1	6.2 8.4	9.6 21.2	9.5 21.9	10.0 14.5
Education Less than Grade 9 Some or completed high	20.6	22.2	16.8	21.5	24.3	15.7	25.6	29.1	19.4
school Some postsecondary or	11.9	13.6	9.4	13.3	15.9	9.9	17.2	19.7	14.1
diploma/certificate University degree	10.4 12.1	13.1 14.5	7.0 7.1	11.4 15.0	14.6 18.9	7.9 9.3	16.5 19.7	19.6 24.6	12.9 13.7
Full-/part-time status Full-time workers Part-time workers [†]	12.4 17.0	15.0 18.6	7.3 16.4	13.4 15.2	16.7 19.3	8.2 13.5	17.2 20.1	20.7 24.4	11.8 18.3

Source: Labour Force Survey ^{*} The ratio of all self-employed (incorporated or not) to total employment, both of which are available on request. ^{**} Comprises farming; fishing and trapping; forestry; and mining. [†] Persons who usually work less than 30 hours per week.

	Table 3	3: Self-e	employme	nt rates* f	or the	United Sta	ites		
		1979			1989			1996	
	Both sexes	Men	Women	Both sexes	Men	Women	Both sexes	Men	Women
					%				
Age	9.8	13.2	5.5	10.3	13.3	6.9	10.5	13.0	7.6
16 to 19	1.2	1.8	0.6	1.2	1.7	0.7	1.3	1.9	0.8
20 to 24	3.3	4.6	1.8	2.9	3.8	1.8	3.1	3.8	2.3
25 to 34	8.2	10.7	5.0	7.7	9.5	5.7	7.2	8.2	6.0
35 to 44	13.1	17.3	7.8	12.4	15.9	8.4	11.6	14.5	8.4
45 to 54	14.1	18.6	8.0	15.0	19.1	10.2	14.4	17.9	10.5
55 to 64	15.5	20.1	8.7	17.8	22.7	11.6	18.0	22.4	12.8
65 and over	25.1	31.4	15.0	25.9	34.0	14.7	29.1	37.0	18.2
Industry									
Agriculture	44.2	50.9	21.5	42.0	45.7	29.3	42.5	42.2	43.8
Mining	3.7	4.0	1.6	6.8	8.1	0.3	4.4	5.3	0.3
Manufacturing	2.5	3.1	1.1	3.0	3.4	2.3	3.7	3.7	3.7
Construction	20.9	21.9	8.8	21.0	21.6	15.1	22.7	22.9	21.3
Transportation and									
public utilities	5.1	6.1	2.3	5.1	6.2	2.4	6.9	7.7	4.8
Wholesale trade	12.0	15.0	4.6	12.6	14.8	7.4	13.0	14.4	9.9
Retail trade	11.4	15.1	8.2	9.9	12.6	7.7	9.0	10.6	7.5
Finance, insurance									
and real estate	9.8	18.1	4.2	10.4	17.6	5.2	11.3	18.0	6.4
Services	10.5	17.3	6.4	11.8	17.6	8.3	11.2	16.4	8.2
Occupation									
Managerial	2.6	29.7	19.4	17.3	22.5	9.9	17.8	22.9	11.7
Professional and									
technical	9.4	13.3	4.8	14.0	20.8	7.6	13.2	18.7	8.9
Clerical	1.7	1.9	1.7	2.7	1.7	2.9	3.3	1.9	3.7
Sales	15.5	19.5	11.3	16.7	23.2	10.8	15.9	21.7	10.7
Service	5.9	3.8	7.1	7.5	3.7	10.0	6.8	3.6	8.9
Primary **	49.0	56.4	22.1	39.1	40.6	32.0	38.7	37.2	45.3
Processing, machining									
and fabricating	11.0	11.2	7.7	13.1	13.5	8.7	14.0	14.3	10.6
Operators and labourers	3.8	4.4	2.2	3.4	3.7	2.5	3.7	4.1	2.5
Education									
Less than Grade 9	9.2	11.9	5.0	8.9	10.8	6.1	8.4	10.1	5.7
Some or completed high									
school	9.2	12.8	5.6	9.8	12.5	6.9	9.9	12.2	7.4
Some postsecondary or									
diploma/certificate	8.4	11.0	5.1	9.4	12.5	6.1	9.6	11.8	7.4
University degree	13.6	18.0	5.6	13.4	17.2	8.3	13.4	17.1	9.0
Full-/part-time status									
Full-time workers	9.8	13.1	4.5	10.1	13.0	5.9	9.8	12.5	6.0
Part-time workerst	9.9	14.3	7.9	11.3	15.6	9.2	13.2	16.4	11.6

Source: March U.S. Current Population Survey * The ratio of all self-employed (incorporated or not) to total employment, both of which are available on request. ** Comprises farming; fishing and trapping; forestry; and mining. * Persons who usually work less than 35 hours per week.

Because of differences in the occupational categories for the two countries, comparisons are difficult, although self-employment appeared to be more concentrated in the managerial category in the United States. Next to primary occupations, management had the highest rate in that country, compared with its next to last position in Canada. Otherwise, the occupational concentration was similar in both countries.

Men were more likely to be self-employed than women. The proportions of male and female workers self-employed in the late 1990s were 13% and 8% in the United States, versus 21% and 14% in Canada.⁵ Men's rate was higher in most industries and occupations, and also in the majority of age and education groups. The main exception was service occupations, in which women were considerably more likely than men to be self-employed. The gap between men and women has narrowed recently, at least in Canada.

With the exception of the very young (age 16 to 19) in Canada, the tendency to be self-employed increased significantly with age in both countries. The self-employment rate was more than twice as great among 55-to-64 year-olds as among 25-to-34 year-olds. However, the self-employed were concentrated among 35-to-44 year-olds, the largest group of workers.

Canada outpaces United States

The most striking difference between Canada and the United States during the 1990s has been the rate of self-employment job creation. Because the growth was small or nil in the latter country, depending on how it is measured, this article focuses on sizeable shifts in the distribution of self-employment. Prior to the CPS redesign, the U.S. data understated employment of women; thus, shifts for men and women are considered separately. Effects of the redesign on other characteristics are expected to be smaller.

Self-employment created a greater proportion of new jobs in Canada than in the United States during the 1990s, but not during the 1980s.

The percentage of self-employment jobs that were full-time declined over the 1990s in both countries, for both men and women. (Part-time jobs, though, were undercounted in the U.S. monthly CPS prior to the redesign.) Over the 1980s, the United States experienced a small decline in full-time self-employment, whereas Canada saw no change.

In Canada, 42% of self-employment jobs were in services in 1997, up from 34% in 1989. Over the period, about 40% of all net new self-employment jobs were in the generally higher-paying service industries - including business services (28%), such as computer services and management consulting, and education and health (12%). The remaining new service sector jobs (20% of all new self-employment jobs) were largely in the lower-paying personal services, and accommodation and food services. In contrast, the United States saw little change in service jobs for the self-employed (38% of all self-employment in 1996). Moreover, the distribution of such jobs changed in only minor ways. The percentage in retail trade (which includes eating and drinking places in the United States), for instance, fell slightly for both men and women, but was offset by small increases elsewhere. In contrast to the 1990s, the share of self-employment in services increased in both countries during the 1980s from 31% to 37% in the United States and from 28% to 34% in Canada.

The non-farm goods sector played a relatively modest role in the United States in the 1990s. The share of self-employment jobs in this sector increased marginally over the decade, compared with a 3-point increase in Canada. During the 1980s, also, goods production played a fairly strong role in Canada's self-employment figures.

Even accounting for different classification systems, recent trends in the two countries' occupational characteristics are notably different. During the 1990s in the United States,⁶ the proportion of self-employed workers in management rose, while that of such workers in sales fell slightly. In Canada, the percentage of self-employed workers in professional/technical occupations rose from 13% to 17%. The percentage of those who were managers declined from 13% to 11%. Although their share of jobs was little changed, service occupations accounted for 17% of the new self-employment jobs in Canada.

The share of self-employment (and indeed all) jobs held by more highly educated workers rose during the 1990s in both countries. This is largely because the number of people with lower levels of education was declining, while that of the more highly educated was expanding rapidly. In Canada, the self-employment rate, perhaps a better indicator of differences among groups, rose across all educational levels. In contrast, it decreased slightly for high school leavers and was essentially unchanged for other groups in the United States. During the 1980s, the self-employment rate rose for all educational groups in Canada, but did so only for those with a high school diploma or some postsecondary schooling in the United States.

In both countries, all age groups reflected the overall trend of selfemployment during the 1990s. Self-employment rose in Canada (especially among those over age 55), but changed relatively little in the United States between 1989 and 1996 for most age groups. During the 1980s, only the middle and older age groups increased their self-employment rate in both countries.

In Canada, earnings of ownaccount self-employed workers remained about 70% of paid workers' throughout the 1990s. Earnings of employers fell relative to those of paid workers.⁷

Discussion

Although the economies of Canada and the United States are closely linked, during the 1990s their labour markets have diverged in a number of ways. The unemployment gap has increased (with lower unemployment in the United States), and income inequality and poverty have become greater issues in the United States than in Canada. In the former, most new jobs have been full-time paid jobs, whereas in Canada most employment growth has been in self-employment and in part-time paid jobs.

Even allowing for differences in the official definition of selfemployment, and for changes to

the U.S. Current Population Survey in 1994, self-employment rates have been higher in Canada for some time, a difference that has grown during the 1990s. Selfemployment is also more likely to have been full-time in Canada, including new jobs, many in the relatively high-paying business, health and education services. And, while self-employment growth is more likely to have been in management/administration in the United States, it has registered among professional/technical or sales and service jobs in Canada.

Why has job creation been concentrated in self-employment in Canada, and in paid jobs in the United States? Differences in economic conditions could be one possible explanation. While cyclical variation exists in unemployment and in the paid employment-topopulation ratio, relatively little variation characterizes the selfemployment rate (Lin, Picot and Yates, 1999). Hence, only a weak (and negative) association exists between changes in economic conditions and the self-employment rate in Canada. Analysis based on taxation data provides similar results, as does that of entry to and exit from self-employment. So, while both the "push" and "pull" theories are at work, results suggest that during recessions the "push" does not increase significantly. By extension, the slower economic growth in Canada during the 1990s might also be an unlikely explanation of the much more rapid growth in self-employment. It may be, however, that prolonged periods of slow growth (rather than recession) do encourage greater self-employment.

Several other factors may affect the two countries' self-employment levels. These include technological change resulting in reduced operating costs and increased production opportunities for small business, especially home-based business; increased contracting-out by employers; U.S. workers' preference for paid work rather than self-employment jobs (in order to take advantage of health benefits); differences in immigration rates and incentives for immigrants to enter self-employment; differences in interest rates affecting the financing of small business; changes in personal income and payroll taxes; and increasing entrepreneurial spirit. Without further analysis it is difficult to see why at least the first two of these factors would play a more prominent role in Canada than in the United States, given the similarities in the economies and demographics.

Notes

1 For a discussion of the determinants and consequences of selfemployment, see Blanchflower and Oswald (1998).

2 A data appendix, which is available upon request, provides detailed information on the variable definitions, data sources, and adjustment methodologies. See Polivka and Miller (1998) for information on the methodology used to adjust the monthly CPS estimates for the revision.

3 While Canadian growth in selfemployment continued to be strong in 1998, that of paid employment was even greater, leaving self-employment's share of the total between 1989 and 1998 at 58%.

4 For reasons of data availability, 1996 data are used for the United States, and 1997 data, for Canada. Differences are significant at the 90% level unless otherwise indicated. Approximate standard errors for the U.S. data in Table 3 (calculated using generalized variance function techniques) are available upon request. Estimated standard errors for Canadian data in Table 2 are also available.

5 One study examined trends in total self-employment using CPS March supplement data for 1974 to 1990 (Devine, 1994). It found a greater increase for women than men in the non-agricultural sector. (Over the 1979-89 period, the proportion of self-employed rose somewhat more in the non-agricultural sector than it did for all industries – from 9.8% to 10.3%, compared with 8.6% to 9.4%.) The study also compared the characteristics of self-employed women with those of women in the wage and salary sector, as well as with those of self-employed men.

6 Changes in the CPS classifications prevent an assessment of occupational shifts during the 1980s.

7 Data corresponding to Tables 2 and 3 for just unincorporated self-employment are available upon request. U.S. data are based on CPS monthly averages.

References

Blanchflower, D.G. and A.J. Oswald. "What makes an entrepreneur?" *Journal of Labor Economics* 16, no. 1 (January 1998): 26-60.

Devine, T. J. "Characteristics of self-employed women in the United States." *Monthly Labor Review* 117, no. 3 (March 1994): 20-34.

Lin, Z., G. Picot and J. Yates. The Entry and Exit Dynamics of Self-employment in Canada. Catalogue no. 11F0019MPE, no. 134. Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 1999.

Manser, M. E. and G. Picot. "Job creation in Canada and the United States: What do we know and where are the data gaps?" Paper presented at the Voorburg Meetings on Service Sector Statistics, Copenhagen, September 1997.

Polivka, A.E., and S.M. Miller. "The CPS after the redesign: Refocusing the economic lens." In *Labor Statistics Measurement Issues*, edited by J. Haltiwanger, M.E. Manser and R. Topel, 249-289. Studies in Income and Wealth, 60. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.

Reardon, E. "Self-employment in Canada and the United States." Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, 1997. Unpublished.

Schuetze, H. J. "Taxes, economic conditions and the recent trends in male self-employment: A Canada-U.S. comparison." Department of Economics, M^cMaster University, Hamilton. Paper presented at the Canadian Economics Association meeting at the University of Ottawa, 1998.

Are you moving?

Please forward your name, old address, new address, telephone number and client reference number to: Statistics Canada, Operations and Integration Division, Circulation Management, 120 Parkdale Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0T6; or call (613) 951-7277 or 1 800 700-1033 toll free, or fax (613) 951-1584.

Please allow four weeks notice to ensure uninterrupted delivery.

Unionization – an update

Ernest B. Akyeampong

Since 1997, the Labour Force Survey (LFS) has been the major source of data on unionization. The first detailed socio-demographic and economic profile of union members from the LFS was released in *Perspectives* on the eve of Labour Day 1997 and updated in 1998 (Akyeampong, 1997 and 1998).

This year's update extends the profile to the provincial level. It also provides unionization rates according to the new North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) and the 1991 Standard Occupational Classification (SOC 1991). (For details on the objectives of NAICS and SOC 1991, including comparisons with the SIC 1980 and SOC 1980, see Statistics Canada, 1999.) Data on earnings, wage settlements, inflation, and strikes and lockouts are also provided.

Some highlights follow:

Table 1: Union rates in 1998 and 1999

At 11.9 million, average paid employment (employees) during the first half of 1999 was 292,000 higher than that a year earlier. Union membership, however, was virtually unchanged at 3.6 million. This resulted in a fall in the union rate (density) from 30.7% to 30.1%.

This decline affected both men and women: men's rate fell from 31.6% to 30.9%, and women's, from 29.8% to 29.3%.

Almost all of the decline occurred in the private sector, where it fell from 19.1% to 18.2%. Public sector density remained virtually unchanged at around 71%.

Quebec, Ontario, British Columbia, Newfoundland and New Brunswick all recorded declines in union

Ernest B. Akyeampong is with the Labour and Household Surveys Analysis Division. He can be reached at (613) 9514624 or akyeern@statcan.ca.



density; Alberta, Manitoba, Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia saw rises. Density remained unchanged in Saskatchewan (Chart A).

The rate among full-time employees fell from 32.7% to 32.0%, but remained almost unchanged for part-time workers, at around 21.8%.

Workers in both permanent and non-permanent jobs recorded declines in density, as did workers in various firm sizes.

Union rates fell in half of the 16 major industry groups, rising in other primary industries; utilities; construction; trade; finance, insurance, real estate and leasing; educational services; information, culture and recreation; and public administration (Chart B).

Among the 10 major occupational groups, union density rose in 3 (social and public service; culture and recreation; and sales and service). The rest experienced declines (Chart C).

Unionization - an update



part-time workers. Also, almost one in three employees in a permanent position was a union member, compared with roughly one in four in a non-permanent job.

High union rates were found among employees aged 45 to 54 (43.0%), as well as those with university degrees (35.4%), workers in Newfoundland (38.6%), those in educational services (68.9%), utilities (65.0%) and public administration (64.3%), and workers in health care positions (64.4%).

Low union rates were recorded by youths (15 to 24 years) (11.1%), workers in Alberta (22.3%), employees in agriculture (3.8%) and professional, scientific and technical industries (4.5%), and persons in management positions (10.3%).

The number of employees who were not union members but were covered by collective agreements remained stable, at around 295,000.

Tables 2A and 2B: 1998 annual averages

Approximately 3.6 million (30.6%) employees belonged to a union in 1998. An additional 297,000 (2.5%) were covered by a collective agreement.

Employees in the public sector, that is, those working for government, crown corporations, or government-funded schools or hospitals, were more than three times as likely as their private sector counterparts to belong to a union (71.3% versus 19.1%).

Almost one in three full-time employees belonged to a union, compared with about one in five



Differences between the sexes

Men's union rate (31.6%) in 1998 slightly exceeded that of women (29.4%).

The union rate among male part-time workers (16.1%) was only half that of their full-time counterparts (33.3%). Among female employees, however, the gap was narrower (24.1% versus 31.4%).

Women's unionization rate in the public sector (72.5%) exceeded that of men (69.7%), reflecting their presence in public administration and in teaching and health positions. However, in the private sector, only 14.0% were unionized, compared with 23.3% of men. The lower rate reflected women's predominance in sales and several service occupations.

A higher-than-average union rate was recorded among men with less than Grade 9 education (35.7%), mirroring the rates for male-dominated occupations such as transport and equipment operating, machining, assembling and general labour.

For women, the highest rate was registered by those with a university degree (42.5%), reflecting unionization in occupations such as health care and teaching.

Men in permanent positions had a higher rate (33.0%) than women in similar positions (30.2%); the reverse was true among employees in non-permanent positions (20.8% versus 24.4%).

Table 3: Average earnings and hours

Though not all differences can be attributed to union status (Akyeampong, 1997), Labour Force Survey data for 1998 show the following:

Average hourly earnings of unionized workers were higher than those of non-unionized workers. This held true whether they worked full time (\$19.06 versus \$15.57) or part time (\$16.80 versus \$9.81).

Unionized part-time employees not only worked more hours each week than non-unionized parttimers (19.5 hours versus 16.6), they also earned almost twice as much (noted above). As a result, their average weekly earnings were more than double those of the latter (\$334.24 versus \$165.37).

On average, full-time unionized women earned 90% of their male counterparts' hourly wages. In contrast, unionized women who worked part time earned 8% more than their male counterparts.

Table 4: Wage settlements, inflation and labour disputes

After lagging for four years, contract settlements in 1998 (1.6%) surpassed the inflation rate (1.0%). As of April this year, wage settlements were around 1.7%, and inflation stood at 1.0%.

The gap between public and private sector wage gains seemed to widen once again, after narrowing for a couple of years. Major wage gains in the public sector during the first four months of 1999 averaged 1.5%, compared with 2.3% in the private sector.

Annual statistics on strikes, lockouts and person-days lost are affected by several factors, including collective bargaining timetables, size of the unions involved, and the state of the economy. Collective bargaining timetables and union size determine the potential for industrial disputes, as well as the number of person-days lost in the event of a strike. The state of the economy influences the likelihood of an industrial dispute, given that one is technically possible.

With these factors in mind, the data show that labour unrest lost some steam in 1998: 0.08% of working time was lost through strikes and lockouts, compared with around 0.11% to 0.12% in 1996 and 1997. During the first quarter of 1999, the percentage of working time lost through strikes and lockouts (0.09%) increased slightly.

Perspectives

References

Akyeampong, E.B. "The rise of unionization among women." *Perspectives on Labour and Income* (Statistics Canada, Catalogue no. 75-001-XPE) 10, no. 4 (Winter 1998): 30-43.

---. "A statistical portrait of the trade union movement." *Perspectives on Labour and Income* (Statistics Canada, Catalogue no. 75-001-XPE) 9, no. 4 (Winter 1997): 45-54.

Statistics Canada. Labour Force Update. Catalogue no. 71-005-XPB. 4, no. 2 (Spring 1999).

		1998*			1999*	
	Tatal	Union	density	Total	Union	density
	employees	Members	Coverage**	employees	Members	Coverage**
	'000	%	%	'000	%	%
Both sexes Men Women	11,613 6,053 5,560	30.7 31.6 29.8	33.3 34.4 32.0	11,905 6,167 5,738	30.1 30.9 29.3	32.6 33.5 31.6
Sector [†] Public Private	2,604 9,009	71.1 19.1	75.3 21.1	2,696 9,209	70.9 18.2	75.1 20.2
Age 15 to 24 25 to 54 25 to 44 45 to 54 55 and over	1,835 8,869 6,479 2,390 908	11.5 34.2 30.9 43.2 35.5	13.3 36.9 33.6 45.9 37.8	1,964 8,992 6,499 2,493 948	12.0 33.6 30.4 41.8 34.8	13.8 36.2 33.0 44.6 37.1
Education Less than Grade 9 Some high school High school graduation Some postsecondary Postsecondary certificate or diploma University degree	441 1,541 2,390 1,148 3,914 2,179	32.5 25.2 27.9 23.3 34.1 35.3	34.5 27.1 29.9 25.3 37.0 38.7	410 1,575 2,491 1,135 4,044 2,250	28.2 23.9 27.7 22.5 33.7 35.0	29.6 25.6 29.7 24.8 36.4 38.4
Province Atlantic Newfoundland Prince Edward Island Nova Scotia New Brunswick Quebec Ontario Prairies Manitoba Saskatchewan Alberta British Columbia	802 156 47 335 265 2,740 4,644 1,984 446 347 1,190 1,443	31.1 40.0 27.9 29.4 28.6 36.0 27.9 27.0 34.8 33.8 22.0 34.8	32.8 41.5 29.8 31.2 30.3 40.5 29.6 29.8 36.8 36.4 25.3 36.4	842 173 47 341 280 2,791 4,762 2,022 453 354 1,216 1,488	30.7 38.0 28.4 30.0 27.4 35.9 26.5 27.7 35.5 33.8 23.0 33.9	32.1 39.7 31.3 31.0 29.0 40.3 28.2 30.5 37.5 36.3 26.2 35.4
Work status Full-time Part-time	9,473 2,140	32.7 21.9	35.5 23.6	9,727 2,177	32.0 21.8	34.7 23.2
Industry Goods-producing Agriculture Other primary Utilities Construction Manufacturing Service-producing Trade Transportation and warehousing Finance, insurance, real estate and leasing	2,938 119 243 116 447 2,013 8,675 1,789 572 703	31.2 4.6 25.7 63.5 29.1 32.0 30.6 12.5 45.0 7.5	33.8 5.3 28.1 69.3 30.8 34.8 33.1 14.2 47.5 9.5	2,991 115 211 122 456 2,087 8,914 1,889 599 752	31.1 2.5 26.4 68.3 30.2 31.2 29.8 12.6 42.3 8.3	33.7 2.7 28.2 72.6 32.1 34.0 32.2 14.2 44.8 10.3
Professional, scientific and technica Management, and administrative and support Education Health care and social assistance Information, culture and recreation Accommodation and food Other Public administration	1 521 357 922 1,226 517 804 473 791	4.5 13.1 68.9 53.4 27.8 8.0 9.7 64.1	6.4 14.6 73.2 56.2 30.2 8.6 11.5 69.4	566 933 1,253 528 807 455 766	4.0 9.9 69.1 53.2 28.0 6.4 8.1 64.3	5.8 11.5 73.8 55.9 30.2 7.1 10.1 69.7

Table 1: Union membership and coverage by selected characteristics, 1998 and 1999

		1998*			1999*		
	Total	Union	density	Total	Union	density	
	employees	Members	Coverage**	employees	Members	Coverage**	
	'000'	%	%	'000	%	%	
Occupation							
Management	1,064	10.6	13.8	982	8.8	12.1	
Business, finance and administrative	2,243	26.4	28.8	2,349	24.2	26.8	
Professional	293	16.9	18.9	310	15.6	17.6	
Administrative	752	22.2	24.7	741	21.0	24.1	
Clerical	1,198	31.3	33.8	1,298	28.1	30.6	
Natural and applied sciences	690	26.8	29.9	767	25.1	27.8	
Health	628	64.1	67.0	671	63.9	66.6	
Professional	74	40.0	48.9	76	37.8	43.4	
Nursing	222	78.2	79.8	197	80.1	82.4	
Technical	168	62.5	65.4	208	67.4	69.1	
Support staff	163	57.4	59.6	189	53.8	56.5	
Social and public service	887	61.8	65 1	800	62.5	65.8	
Legal, social and religious workers	328	38.0	40.5	349	30.1	41.6	
Teachers and professors	558	75.8	79.6	550	77.2	91.1	
Secondary and elementary	397	87.0	89.5	400	88.1	01.1	
Other	161	48.4	55.5	400	100.1	51.1	
Culture and recreation	245	23.2	00.0	100	40.2	04.4	
Sales and service	2 074	10.0	20.7	200	20.8	29.8	
Wholesale	2,374	6.1	21.7	3,043	20.0	21.8	
Rotail	7/1	12.0	10.7	298	5.4	7.1	
Food and bevorage	141	12.9	0.7	830	12.9	14.0	
Protostivo sorvisos	400	9.0	9.7	400	9.2	9.9	
Child care and home support	202	51.9	58.9	191	52.9	61.1	
Travel and appearmedation	208	31.6	33.9	221	34.0	36.7	
Tavel and accommodation	1,037	25.2	27.0	1,054	25.3	27.0	
Trades, transport and equipment	4 5 7 7	00.0	10.0				
operators	1,577	39.8	42.3	1,615	38.2	40.6	
Contractors and supervisors	85	30.3	33.5	76	28.3	34.2	
Construction trades	173	41.1	43.1	189	40.4	41.5	
Other trades	634	43.1	45.9	656	41.7	44.1	
Transportation equipment operators	429	40.5	42.9	448	35.9	38.4	
Helpers and labourers	256	32.4	34.7	245	34.8	36.7	
Occupations unique to primary industry	/ 228	15.4	16.9	222	15.2	16.4	
Occupations unique to production	1,077	39.1	42.0	1,101	38.2	40.8	
Machine operators and assemblers	836	38.4	41.4	876	38.2	41.1	
Labourers	241	41.5	44.3	225	37.9	39.7	
Workplace size							
Under 20 employees	4,031	12.4	14.0	4,129	12.2	13.8	
20 to 99 employees	3,737	31.0	33.6	3,849	30.5	33.3	
100 to 500 employees	2,401	45.2	48.6	2,506	44.1	47.3	
Over 500 employees	1,444	57.0	60.5	1,420	56.6	59.4	
Job tenure							
1 to 12 months	2,706	13.4	15.7	2.763	14.5	16.6	
Over 1 year to 5 years	3.424	20.2	22.6	3 651	19.5	21.8	
Over 5 years to 9 years	1.758	34.6	36.9	1.618	32.6	35.1	
Over 9 years to 14 years	1.442	43.1	45.5	1 572	42.0	44 B	
Over 14 years	2,284	56.3	59.6	2,300	55.9	58.9	
Job status							
Permanent	10.340	31.6	34-1	10.560	31.0	33 4	
Non-permanent	1,273	23.5	26.3	1.345	23.4	26.1	
Courses Labour Force Survey				.,			

Table 1: Union membership and coverage by selected characteristics, 1998 and 1999 (concluded)

Source: Labour Force Survey

 * January-to-June average.
 ** Union members and persons who are not union members, but who are covered by collective agreements (for example, some religious group members). [†] Public sector: employees in government departments or agencies, crown corporations or publicly funded schools, hospitals or other

institutions; private sector: all other wage and salary earners.

Table 2A: Union membership and coverage of employees

				Bot	h sexes				Men	
			Union	member	Union o	overage*	Not a		Union	member
No		Total	Total	Density	Total	Density	member**	Total	Total	Density
		'000	'0 0 0'	%	'0 0 0'	%	'000	'000	'000	%
1	Total	11,801	3,609	30.6	3,906	33.1	7,895	6,169	1,952	31.6
	Sector †									
2	Public	2,598	1,853	71.3	1,961	75.5	637	1,111	775	69.7
3	Private	9,203	1,756	19.1	1,946	21.1	1,257	5,057	1,177	23.3
	Age	1 050	016	44.4	252	12.0	1 606	1 002	110	11.0
4	15 to 24 25 to 54	8 921	3 058	34.3	3 297	37.0	5 624	4.632	1.632	35.2
6	25 to 44	6.506	2.019	31.0	2.192	33.7	4,314	3,394	1,072	31.6
7	45 to 54	2,415	1,038	43.0	1,105	45.8	1,310	1,238	559	45.2
8	55 and over	930	336	36.1	356	38.3	574	534	201	37.6
	Education									
9	Less than Grade 9	445	139	31.3	148	33.3	297	277	99	35.7
10	Some high school	1,573	402	25.6	431	27.4	1,143	1 248	200	29.2
12	Some postsecondary	2,402	267	22.9	290	25.0	873	576	154	26.7
13	Postsecondary certificate or diploma	3.975	1.351	34.0	1,463	36.8	2,513	2,014	709	35.2
14	University degree	2,193	777	35.4	851	38.8	1,341	1,142	330	28.9
	Province									
15	Atlantic	832	251	30.2	266	32.0	566	430	132	30.8
16	Newfoundland	165	64	38.6	66	40.2	99	86	35	40.3
17	Prince Edward Island	242	13	27.2	14	29.3	227	177	53	23.5
19	New Brunswick	277	76	27.4	81	29.2	196	143	39	27.4
20	Quebec	2,792	993	35.6	1,117	40.0	1,675	1,488	553	37.1
21	Ontario	4,701	1,309	27.8	1,382	29.4	3,319	2,454	739	30.1
22	Prairies	2,007	543	27.1	603	30.1	1,404	1,045	264	25.2
23	Manitoba	452	155	34.4	164	36.3	288	233	79	33.6
24	Alberta	1 203	269	22.3	310	25.8	893	632	130	20.6
26	British Columbia	1,468	513	34.9	538	36.6	931	752	263	35.0
	Work status									
27	Full-time	9,679	3,147	32.5	3,409	35.2	6,271	5,558	1,853	33.3
28	Part-time	2,122	462	21.8	498	23.5	1,624	610	98	16.1
	Industry									-
29	Goods-producing	3,011	949	31.5	1,027	34.1	1,984	2,275	802	35.3
30	Agriculture Other primary	244	с аа	26.9	71	20.3	173	205	62	30.0
32	Utilities	117	76	65.0	83	70.7	34	90	62	68.4
33	Construction	496	148	29.9	158	31.8	338	435	145	33.4
34	Manufacturing	2,027	654	32.3	709	35.0	1,318	1,464	531	36.3
35	Service-producing	8,790	2,661	30.3	2,879	32.8	5,911	3,893	1,149	29.5
36	Trade	1,840	230	12.5	262	14.2	1,578	923	133	14.4
37	Finance, insurance, real estate and leasing	715	56	7.9	71	10.0	644	259	16	6,4
39	Professional, scientific and technical	546	25	4.5	34	6.3	511	269	17	6.1
40	Management, and administrative	359	46	12.8	53	14.6	307	192	33	17.2
41	Education	899	619	68.9	659	73.2	241	333	222	66.7
42	Health care and social assistance	1,245	662	53.2	695	55.9	549	213	117	55.1
43	Information, culture and recreation	533	148	27.8	161	30.2	372	270	75	28.0
44	Accommodation and food	812	63	7.7	69	8.5	743	323	27	8.4
45	Uther Public administration	480	47	9.7	55	11.4	425	252	285	10.5
+0	i uvile auministration	100	507	04.0	000	03.1	200	-0-	£.00	00.0

by selected characteristics, Canada, 1998

Union coverage* Not a: member* Union Total Union member Union member Union coverage* Not a: member* '000 % '000 000 000 % '000 % 000 2.125 34.4 4.044 5.633 1.659 29.4 1.782 31.6 3.851 1 8.30 74.7 2.81 1.467 1.078 72.5 1.131 76.1 356 2 1.445 2.56 3.762 4.145 579 14.0 651 15.7 3.495 3 1.441 4.61 63.7 3.42 1.88 835 4 1.769 3.82 2.863 4.269 1.326 1.38 835 4 1.769 3.82 2.863 1.177 479 40.6 606 40.0 2.67 125 9 2.85 31.2 628 661 136 2.06 146 22.1 515 0 42.8 <th></th> <th>Men</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Wo</th> <th>men</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>		Men				Wo	men			
Total Density member* Total Density Total Density Total Density member* No. '000 % '000 '000 % '000 '000 % '000 <td< th=""><th>Union cov</th><th>erage*</th><th>Not a</th><th></th><th>Union m</th><th>ember</th><th>Union c</th><th>overage*</th><th>Not a</th><th></th></td<>	Union cov	erage*	Not a		Union m	ember	Union c	overage*	Not a	
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Total	Density	member**	Total	Total	Density	Total	Density	member**	No.
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	000'	%	'000	'000'	'000	%	'000	%	'000	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	2,125	34.4	4,044	5,633	1,658	29.4	1,782	31.6	3,851	1
1.330 2.3.0 3.7.02 4.1.40 37.5 14.0 33.1 13.7 3.4.89 3 141 14.1 14.1 861 947 97 10.3 112 11.8 835.6 2.762 5 1.771 34.5 2.2.863 4.289 91.426 33.2 1.528 35.6 2.762 5 214 40.1 32.0 396 135 34.1 142 35.9 25.4 8 105 37.9 172 168 40 24.0 143 25.7 125.9 9 285 31.2 628 661 136 20.6 146 142 141 142 35.3 1.2.04 123 21.0 44.4 12 770 38.2 1.2.44 1.962 642 32.7 633 55.3 1.2.277 15 36 42.1 50 80 29 30 31.4 46 16 6 25.7 17 25 8 30.6 8 32.7 17	830	74.7	281	1,487	1,078	72.5	1,131	76.1	356	2
$ \begin{array}{c} 144 \\ 1,769 \\ 34,2 \\ 2,863 \\ 4,289 \\ 1,42 \\ 34,5 \\ 2,224 \\ 3,112 \\ 2,24 \\ 40,1 \\ 320 \\ 396 \\ 135 \\ 34,1 \\ 142 \\ 359 \\ 224 \\ 40,1 \\ 320 \\ 396 \\ 135 \\ 34,1 \\ 142 \\ 359 \\ 224 \\ 40,1 \\ 320 \\ 396 \\ 135 \\ 34,1 \\ 142 \\ 359 \\ 224 \\ 859 \\ 224 \\ 859 \\ 224 \\ 859 \\ 224 \\ 859 \\ 224 \\ 859 \\ 224 \\ 859 \\ 224 \\ 859 \\ 224 \\ 859 \\ 224 \\ 859 \\ 122 \\ 1$	1,290	25.0	3,702	4,140	219	14.0	160	10.7	3,495	3
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	141	14.1	861	947	97	10.3	112	11.8	835	4
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1,769	38.2	2,863	4,289	1,426	33.2	1,528	35.6	2,762	5
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1,171	34.5	2,224	3,112	947	30.4	1,021	32.8	2,091	6
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	599	48.4	639	1,177	479	40.6	506	43.0	671	7
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	214	40.1	320	396	135	34.1	142	35.9	254	8
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	105	37.0	172	168	40	24.0	42	25.7	105	0
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	285	31.2	628	661	136	20.6	43	20.7	515	10
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	423	33.9	825	1 204	279	23.2	300	24.0	904	11
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	167	29.0	409	588	113	19.2	123	21.0	464	12
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	770	38.2	1 2 4 4	1 962	642	32.7	693	35.3	1 269	13
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	375	32.9	767	1,051	447	42.5	476	45.3	575	14
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		20.0	000	40.0		22.0				
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	141	32.8	289	403	119	29.6	125	31.2	277	15
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	30	42.1	50	80	29	36.9	30	38.1	49	16
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	56	23.7	101	105	Ö	30.6	8	32.7	1/	17
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	30	31.0	101	100	40	27.0	48	29.3	116	18
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	42 609	42.2	860	1 204	30	27.3	39	29.0	95	19
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	791	21.9	1 673	2.249	560	33.0	490	37.3	1 6 4 7	20
2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 3.00 $3.1.7$ 0.07 2.20 84 33.9 118 173 64 37.0 68 39.4 105 24 154 24.3 478 571 139 24.3 157 27.4 4144 22 277 36.8 475 7716 249 34.8 261 36.4 455 26 2.016 36.3 3.542 4.121 1.294 31.4 1.393 33.8 2.728 27 109 17.8 501 1.512 364 24.1 389 25.7 1.123 28 863 37.9 1.413 736 146 19.9 165 22.4 571 29 3 4.2 78 46 2 4.9 3 6.0 43 30 66 22.3 139 39 4 10.8 5 13.1 34 31 67 73.8 24 27 14 53.4 16 60.3 11 32 154 35.4 281 663 122 21.8 137 24.3 426 34 $1,262$ 32.4 $2,631$ $4,897$ $1,511$ 30.9 $1,617$ 33.0 $3,280$ 35 153 16.5 771 917 97 10.6 110 12.0 807 36 22 8.3 236 277 8 3	208	28.6	7.47	062	270	20.0	205	20.7	1,047	20
33.9 118 173 64 37.0 68 39.4 105 23 154 24.3 478 571 139 24.3 157 27.4 414 25 277 36.8 475 716 249 34.8 261 36.4 455 26 2.016 36.3 3.542 4.121 1.294 31.4 1.393 33.8 2.728 27 109 17.8 501 1.512 364 24.1 389 25.7 1.123 28 863 37.9 1.413 736 146 19.9 165 22.4 571 29 3 4.2 78 46 2 4.9 3 6.0 43 30 66 32.3 139 39 4 10.8 5 13.1 34 31 67 73.8 24 27 14 53.4 16 60.3 11 32 154 35.4 281 62 3 5.4 4 66 57 33 572 39.1 892 563 122 21.8 137 24.3 426 34 $1,262$ 32.4 263 149 62 41.4 65 43.7 84 37 22 8.3 246 277 8 3.0 12 4.3 265 39 36 19.6 155 167 13 7.7 15 8.9	84	35.0	150	210	77	35.2	80	36.9	129	22
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	61	33.9	118	173	64	37.0	68	30.0	105	23
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	154	24.3	478	571	139	24.3	157	27 A	414	29
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	277	36.8	475	716	249	34.8	261	36.4	455	26
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	2.016	36.3	3 540	A 101	1 204	21 4	1 202	22.0	0 700	07
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	109	17.8	501	1,512	364	24.1	389	25.7	1,123	28
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$										
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	863	37.9	1,413	736	146	19.9	165	22.4	571	29
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	3	4.2	78	46	2	4.9	3	6.0	43	30
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	66	32.3	139	39	4	10.8	5	13.1	34	31
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	6/	73.8	24	27	14	53.4	16	60.3	11	32
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	154	35.4	281	62	3	5.4	4	6.6	57	33
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1 262	39.1	0.692	303	1 5 1 1	21.8	137	24.3	426	34
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1,202	32.4	2,031	4,097	1,511	30.9	1,617	33.0	3,280	35
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	100	40.0	220	917	97	10.0	110	12.0	807	30
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	200	8.3	237	456	40	8.7	50	43.7	406	37
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	22	83	246	277	8	3.0	10	4.2	265	20
240 72.1 93 566 397 70.1 418 73.9 148 41 126 59.1 87 1,032 544 52.8 570 55.2 462 42 84 31.1 186 263 72 27.6 77 29.3 186 43 30 9.4 292 489 36 7.3 39 7.9 450 44 32 12.6 221 228 20 8.8 23 10.2 204 45 311 715 124 354 222 62.7 239 67.5 115 46	38	19.6	155	167	13	7.7	15	8.9	152	40
126 59.1 87 1,032 544 52.8 570 55.2 462 42 84 31.1 186 263 72 27.6 77 29.3 186 43 30 9.4 292 489 36 7.3 39 7.9 450 44 32 12.6 221 228 20 8.8 23 10.2 204 45 311 715 124 354 222 627 239 675 115 46	240	72 1	93	566	307	70.1	41R	73.0	149	41
84 31.1 186 263 72 27.6 77 29.3 186 43 30 9.4 292 489 36 7.3 39 7.9 450 44 32 12.6 221 228 20 8.8 23 10.2 204 45 311 715 124 354 222 627 239 675 115 46	126	59.1	87	1.032	544	52.8	570	55.2	462	42
30 9.4 292 489 36 7.3 39 7.9 450 44 32 12.6 221 228 20 8.8 23 10.2 204 45 311 715 124 354 222 627 239 675 115 46	84	31 1	186	263	72	27.6	77	20.2	186	42
32 12.6 221 228 20 8.8 23 10.2 204 45 311 715 124 354 222 627 239 675 115 46	30	9.4	292	489	36	7.3	39	7.9	450	44
311 715 124 354 222 627 230 675 115 46	32	12.6	221	228	20	8.8	23	10.2	204	45
	311	71.5	124	354	222	62.7	239	67.5	115	46

Table 2A:	Union	membership	and	coverage	of	employees
-----------	-------	------------	-----	----------	----	-----------

				Botl	n sexes				Men	
			Union	member	Union c	overage*	Not a		Union	member
No		Totai	Total	Density	Total	Density	member**	Total	Total	Density
		'000	'000	%	'000	%	'000	,000	'000	%
	Occupation									
1	Management	1.054	108	10.3	142	13.4	913	629	61	9.7
2	Business, finance and administrative	2.241	577	25.7	632	28.2	1.609	618	180	29.2
3	Professional	294	52	17.5	59	20.0	236	133	26	19.4
4	Administrative	754	159	21.1	179	23.7	575	122	23	19.2
5	Clerical	1.192	367	30.7	394	33.1	798	363	131	36.1
6	Natural and applied sciences	705	184	26.1	205	29.0	501	570	153	26.9
7	Health	641	413	64.4	430	67.2	210	92	55	59.7
8	Professional	76	29	39.0	36	47.0	40	24	7	27.3
9	Nursing	234	185	79.1	189	80.9	45	15	12	77.5
10	Technical	169	107	63.3	111	65.6	58	29	19	65.0
11	Support staff	163	91	56.2	95	58.3	68	24	18	74.7
12	Social and public service	872	540	61.9	569	65.3	303	327	186	57.0
13	Legal social and religious workers	330	125	38.0	135	40.9	195	123	37	30.0
14	Teachers and professors	543	414	76.4	434	80.0	108	203	149	73.5
15	Secondary and elementary	390	340	87.2	349	89.7	40	120	106	88.9
16	Other	153	75	48.8	85	55.5	68	84	43	51.4
17	Culture and recreation	253	64	25.3	72	28.4	182	112	28	24.8
18	Sales and service	3 031	606	20.0	662	21.9	2 369	1 302	306	23.5
10	Wholessie	346	24	20.0	33	21.5	2,303	216	14	6.6
20	Retail	760	07	127	104	13.6	665	220	27	123
21	Food and hoverage	161	37	0.7	104	10.0	405	165	10	11.0
22	Protective services	202	100	5.1	102	61.1	403	165	02	55.0
22	Child care and hama support	211	64	20.5	60	22.9	140	100	52	20.4
20	Travel and accommodation	1 052	267	25.4	207	32.0	766	624	140	20 /
25	Trades, transport and equipment	1,652	648	39.2	690	41.7	963	1,542	618	40.1
26	Contractors and supervisors	87	28	32.1	.31	35.5	56	81	26	32.3
27	Construction trades	190	77	40.8	81	42.7	109	185	77	41.5
28	Other trades	647	273	42.2	291	45.0	356	612	263	42.9
29	Transportation equipment operators	448	178	39.6	188	42.0	260	413	167	40.3
30	Helpers and labourers	280	92	32.8	98	35.1	182	251	86	34.3
31	Occupations unique to primary industry	251	37	14.9	42	16.7	209	203	34	16.8
32	Occupations unique to production	1 099	433	39.4	462	42 1	636	774	330	42.6
33	Machine operators and assemblers	840	328	39.1	351	41.8	489	602	254	42.1
34	Labourers	259	105	40.4	111	43.0	147	172	76	44.4
	Workplace size						_			
35	Under 20 employees	4,088	495	12.1	565	13.8	3,523	1,979	271	13.7
36	20 to 99 employees	3,791	1,164	30.7	1,264	33.4	2,526	2,018	590	29.2
37	100 to 500 employees	2,467	1,115	45.2	1,194	48.4	1,273	1,366	627	45.9
38	Over 500 employees	1,455	835	57.3	883	60.7	572	805	464	57.6
30	Job tenure	2 837	380	13.4	447	15.8	2 390	1 467	209	14.3
40	Over 1 year to 5 years	2,007	608	20.2	790	22.5	2,000	1,900	271	20.6
40	Over 5 years to 9 years	1 710	670	20.2	616	26.0	2,000	929	27/	20.0
12	Over 9 years to 14 years	1 /96	650	42.7	697	46.2	800	721	219	44.1
43	Over 14 years	2.304	1,303	56.6	1,377	59.8	927	1,352	780	57.7
	Job status									
44	Permanent	10,406	3,294	31.6	3,551	34.1	6,855	5,486	1,809	33.0
45	Non-permanent	1,395	316	22.6	355	25.4	1,040	683	142	20.8

Source: Labour Force Survey
* Union members and persons who are not union members, but who are covered by collective agreements (for example, some religious group members).

	Men				Woi	men			
Union cove	erage*	Not a		Union n	nember	Union co	overage*	Not a	
Total	Density	member**	Total	Total	Density	Total	Density	union member**	No.
 '000	%	'000	'000	'000	%	'000	%	'000	
84	13.3	545	426	47	11.1	58	13.6	368	1
195	31.5	424	1,623	397	24.4	437	27.0	1,186	2
28	21.1	105	161	26	16.0	31	19.1	130	3
27	21.9	95	633	135	21.4	152	24.1	480	4
140	38.5	223	829	236	28.4	254	30.7	575	5
170	29.9	400	136	31	22.8	35	25.5	101	6
00	35.2	33	549	358	05.2	371	67.6	178	(
12	82.5	3	219	173	70.2	177	52.5	25	8
20	68.9	9	140	88	62.9	91	64.9	49	10
19	77.9	5	138	73	53.0	76	54.9	62	11
200	61.3	126	546	353	64.7	369	67.6	177	12
41	33.4	82	206	88	42.8	94	45.5	113	13
159	78.3	44	340	265	78.1	275	81.1	64	14
109	91.5	10	270	233	86.4	240	88.9	30	15
33	59.4 29.1	79	142	32	45.7	35	50.8	34	15
338	25.9	964	1 729	300	17.4	325	18.8	1 404	18
20	9.2	196	130	10	7.7	13	9.9	117	19
29	13.2	191	550	70	12.8	75	13.7	474	20
20	11.9	145	286	25	8.7	27	9.3	260	21
104	63.2	61	37	17	46.4	19	51.8	18	22
160	41.5	8	198	59	29.9	64	32.2	134	23
657	42.6	885	110	29	22.4	33	24.0 29.6	402 78	24 25
29	35.7	52	6	2	29.6	2	33.8	4	26
270	43.5	104	5	10	7			4	27
176	42.6	237	35	11	20.7	12	33.0	23	28
92	36.7	159	30	6	20.1	6	21.1	23	30
38	18.7	165	48	3	6.7	4	8.0	44	31
351	45.4	423	325	103	31.6	111	34.2	214	32
270	44.8	332	238	74	31.3	81	34.2	157	33
81	47.4	90	87	28	32.6	30	34.3	57	34
309	15.6	1,669	2,109	223	10.6	255	12.1	1,854	35
648	32.1	1,370	1,772	575	32.4	616	34.8	1,156	36
6/6	49.5	690	1,101	489	44.4	519	47.1	582	37
491	61.0	314	050	371	57.1	392	60.3	258	38
248	16.9	1 219	1 370	171	12.5	100	14.5	1 171	20
421	23.4	1,379	1.664	327	19.7	360	21.6	1.305	40
295	35.6	534	882	304	34.5	321	36.4	561	41
337	46.7	385	765	332	43.5	350	45.8	415	42
825	61.0	527	951	523	55.0	552	58.0	400	43
1,963	35.8	3,523	4,921	1,484	30.2	1,588	32.3	3,332	44
162	23.7	521	712	174	24.4	193	27.2	519	45

by selected characteristics, Canada, 1998 (concluded)

Workers who are neither union members nor covered by collective agreements. Public sector: employees in government departments or agencies, crown corporations or publicly funded schools, hospitals or other institutions; private sector: all other wage and salary earners.

Table 2B: Union membership and coverage of employees

			1.	At	lantic				Quebec	•
			Union	member	Union o	coverage*	Not a		Union	member
No		Total	Total	Density	Total	Density	member**	Total	Total	Density
		'000	'000	%	'000	%	000	000	,000	%
1	Total	832	251	30.2	266	32.0	566	2,792	993	35.6
	Sector †									
2	Public	232	162	69.5	169	12.7	64	646	493	76.4
3	Private	600	90	15.0	97	16.2	503	2,146	500	23.3
	Sex									
4	Men	430	132	30.8	141	32.8	289	1,488	553	37.1
5	Women	403	119	29.6	125	31.2	277	1,304	441	33.8
	Age									
6	15 to 24	135	9	6.7	11	8.1	124	435	63	14.6
7	25 to 54	642	223	34.8	235	36.6	407	2,145	854	39.8
8	25 to 44	463	144	31.1	152	32.7	311	1,530	559	36.5
9	45 to 54	179	10	44.3	20	40.0	90	212	290	40.0
10	55 and over	00	19	34.9	20	30.5	00	212	10	30, i
	Education						2.5	100		
11	Less than Grade 9	36	10	27.0	10	28.3	26	180	100	32.8
12	Some high school	110	20	22.0	27	23.2	125	163	158	31.2
17	Some postsecondary	71	13	17.9	14	19.4	57	227	61	26.8
15	Postsecondary certificate or diploma	310	111	35.8	116	37.6	193	1.048	395	37.7
16	University degree	138	59	42.4	62	44.9	76	526	211	40.2
	West status									
17	Full time	602	230	33.2	2/3	35.1	449	2 308	861	37.3
18	Part-time	140	230	15.3	23	16.5	117	484	132	27.3
	In ductory									
10	Goode producing	100	58	30.5	61	32.0	129	755	269	35.6
20	Agriculture	12	1	4.7	1	4.7	11	25	2	6.6
21	Other primary	30	9	31.6	10	34.0	20	39	12	31.6
22	Utilities	8	5	62.0	5	64.1	3	30	19	65.7
23	Construction	42	11	27.0	12	27.8	30	86	37	43.3
24	Manufacturing	99	32	32.2	34	33.9	65	575	198	34.5
25	Service-producing	643	194	30.1	205	32.0	437	2,037	724	35.6
26	Irade	141	10	5.3	9	6.2	132	420	50	10.8
27	Finance incuration and warehousing	40	10	39.0	2	42.1	23	155	22	42.0
28	and leasing	39	2	4.3	2	0.9	57	100	20	10.0
29	Professional scientific and technical	26	1	3.9	1	5.1	24	126	5	4.0
30	Management, and administrative	22	1	5.9	1	6.8	20	76	16	21.0
	and support									
31	Education	69	48	69.9	51	73.3	19	218	164	75.1
32	Health care and social assistance	110	62	55.8	64	57.9	46	283	177	62.6
33	Information, culture and recreation	33	9	26.7	10	29.2	23	127	42	33.4
34	Accommodation and food	58	3	5.1	3	5.4	20	184	21	11.4
36	Public administration	70	42	60.0	45	63.9	25	209	145	69.5

by selected characteristics, 1998

Quebec			Ontario							
Union co	verage*	Not a		Union m	ember	Union co	overage*	Not a		
Total	Density	member**	Total	Total	Density	Total	Density	member**	No.	
'000	%	000	'000'	'000'	%	'000	%	'000		
1,117	40.0	1,675	4,701	1,309	27.8	1,382	29.4	3,319	1	
524	81.2	121	922	613	66.5	647	70.2	275	2	
593	27.6	1,553	3,779	695	18.4	735	19.4	3,044	3	
628	42.2	860	2,454	739	30.1	781	31.8	1,673	4	
490	37.5	815	2,248	569	25.3	601	26.7	1,647	5	
81	18.6	354	746	72	9.7	81	10.8	665	6	
954	44.5	1,191	3,566	1,100	30.9 27.6	1,159	32.5	2,407	7	
322	52.4	293	946	376	39.8	392	41.4	554	9	
82	38.9	129	390	136	34.9	142	36.6	247	10	
65	36.2	115	156	54	34.2	55	35.1	102	11	
122	35.0 37.7	227 288	646 1,024	168 273	26.1 26.7	1/4 287	27.0 28.0	471 737	12	
69	30.6	157	476	97	20.4	103	21.7	373	14	
242	46.1	283	934	278	29.8	296	31.7	638	16	
972	42 1	1.336	3.867	1.162	30.1	1.226	31.7	2.641	17	
145	29.9	339	835	146	17.5	156	18.7	678	18	
307	40.6	448	1,281	420	32.8	438	34.2	843	19	
2	9.2	23	42	14	40.7		41.9	40 20	20	
21	72.1	8	48	34	69.8	35	73.3	13	22	
42	48.1	45	186	60	32.3	62	33.2	124	23	
810	39.6	1.227	3,420	888	26.0	944	27.6	2,477	25	
84	20.0	336	711	84	11.8	89	12.5	623	26	
56 33	45.3	68 122	212 334	87	41.1 3.4	90 13	42.7 3.9	121 321	27 28	
10	7.6	116	241	11	4.5	13	5.3	228	29	
19	24.8	57	166	20	12.2	21	13.0	144	30	
174	79.7	44	330	225	68.1	233	70.7	97	31	
191	67.4	92	458	194	42.3	203	44.4	254	32	
47	37.3	161	289	21	7.3	23	7.8	267	34	
18	15.6	98	182	18	9.8	19	10.5	163	35	
156	74.5	53	291	174	59.8	193	66.3	98	36	

Table 2B: Union membership and coverage of employees

		Atlantic						Quebec		
			Union	member	Union c	overage*	Not a		Union	member
No		Total	Total	Density	Total	Density	member**	Total	Total	Density
		'000	'000	%	'000	%	'000	'000	000	%
	Occupation									
1	Management	67	8	12.2	10	14.7	57	217	23	10.4
2	Business, finance and administrative	144	40	28.1	44	30.3	100	547	171	31.3
3	Professional	14	3	18.3	3	20.9	11	74	20	27.5
4	Administrative	51	14	26.5	15	29.3	36	203	51	25.1
5	Clerical	78	24	31.0	26	32.8	53	270	100	36.9
6	Natural and applied sciences	42	14	34.3	16	36.8	27	183	53	28.9
7	Health	55	38	69.5	40	71.4	16	165	115	69.4
8	Professional	5	2	40.0	2	45.5	3	24	11	45.4
9	Nursing	23	19	84.3	20	85.5	3	61	52	85.7
10	Technical	16	12	75.0	12	77.0	4	40	27	67.4
11	Support staff	11	5	46.0	5	47.6	6	40	25	60.9
12	Social and public service	63	40	62.6	41	65.1	22	222	156	70.2
13	Legal, social and religious workers	23	8	35.2	9	38.1	14	78	39	50.7
14	Teachers and professors	40	32	78.0	33	80.3	8	144	116	80.8
15	Secondary and elementary	29	26	88.3	26	90.2	3	99	88	88.1
16	Other	11	6	51.3	6	54.5	5	44	29	64.5
17	Culture and recreation	14	4	27.7	4	30.2	10	72	18	25.3
18	Sales and service	231	35	15.2	38	16.3	193	679	159	23.5
19	Wholesale	18	1	3.9	1	5.3	17	78	7	8.8
20	Retail	63	3	4.4	3	5.3	60	172	28	16.1
21	Food and beverage	33	3	9.6	3	10.0	30	114	13	11.1
22	Protective services	15	6	38.8	6	43.0	8	48	34	71.4
23	Child care and home support	20	4	18.4	4	19.4	16	34	12	35.1
24	Travel and accommodation	82	19	23.2	20	24.3	62	234	66	28.3
25	Trades, transport and equipment operators	128	47	37.1	49	38.6	78	358	164	45.8
26	Contractors and supervisors	6	2	29.0	2	32.3	4	15	6	39.3
27	Construction trades	16	6	35.9	6	36.6	10	35	21	59.3
28	Other trades	45	19	43.3	20	44.3	25	149	73	49.1
29	Transportation equipment operators	38	14	36.1	15	38.5	23	110	44	39.7
30	Helpers and labourers	22	7	29.5	7	30.6	16	49	20	41.8
31	Occupations unique to primary industry	30	4	14.0	5	15.3	26	47	8	17.2
32	Occupations unique to production	58	20	34.2	21	35.8	37	302	127	42.0
33	Machine operators and assemblers	40	13	33.4	14	35.3	26	228	94	41.1
34	Labourers	18	6	35.8	7	36.8	11	74	33	45.0
	Workplace size									
35	Under 20 employees	355	46	13.0	51	14.2	305	920	115	12.5
36	20 to 99 employees	268	93	34.6	98	36.5	170	867	306	35.4
37	100 to 500 employees	146	72	49.5	76	52.0	70	616	323	52.4
38	Over 500 employees	64	40	63.6	42	66.3	21	390	249	63.8
00	Job tenure	0.04	20	10.0	25	15.1	106	630	105	16.5
39	Over 1 year to 5 years	231	30	10.2	00	10.0	160	750	186	24 6
40	Over I year to 5 years	100	39	21.0	42	19.9	70	200	144	36.9
41	Over 9 years to 14 years	106	30	42.0	00	33.3 AE 9	16	356	160	A7 A
42	Over 14 years	176	102	43.0	105	59.8	71	647	389	60.1
	Job status									
44	Permanent	670	219	32.7	230	34.3	440	2,409	881	36.5
45	Non-permanent	162	32	20.0	36	22.3	126	382	113	29.5

Source: Labour Force Survey
* Union members and persons who are not union members, but who are covered by collective agreements (for example, some religious group members).

	Quebec				Ont	ario			
 Union cov	erage*	Not a		Union m	ember	Union co	overage*	Not a	
 Total	Density	member**	- Total	Total	Density	Total	Density	member**	No.
 '000	%	'000	'000	*000	%	'000	%	'000	
39	17.9	178	448	40	9.0	47	10.5	401	1
23	35.1 30.8 29.2	355 51 144	125	183	11.4	197 16 54	21.6 12.7 18.6	715 109 237	3
110 63	40.8 34.4	160 120	496 286	119 63	24.1 22.2	127 68	25.6 24.0	369 217	5 6
123 14	74.6	42 10	224 24 79	117 6	52.5 26.0	122	54.4 32.4	102 16	78
29 26	71.9 65.3	11 14	63 58	34 27	53.4 47.0	35 28	55.0 48.4	28 30	10 11
165 44	74.3 56.6	57 34	333 129	200 43	60.0 33.5	207 45	62.0 34.8	127 84	12 13
121 90 31	83.9 90.2 69.8	23 10 13	204 150 54	157 134 22	76.8 89.6 41.5	162 137 25	79.3 91.3 46.0	42 13 29	14 15 16
21 179	28.9 26.4	51 499	102 1,158	22 217	21.8 18.7	24 235	24.0 20.3	77 923	17 18
11 31 14	13.9 18.3 12.2	67 140 100	144 298 144	5 35 14	3.7 11.6 9.9	7 35 15	4.8 11.9 10.1	137 262 129	19 20 21
36 13 74 183	74.9 39.2 31.7 51.1	12 21 160 175	84 78 411 641	42 18 103 246	50.4 22.8 25.0 38.4	51 19 108 255	60.7 24.6 26.2 39.7	33 59 303 386	22 23 24 25
7 23	44.3 64.0	9 13	36 68	11 30	30.2 44.4	12 30	33.3 44.8	24 37	26 27
48 23	55.3 43.8 47.9 20.6	62 25 37	159 117 65	61 38	40.8 38.5 32.2 13.5	63 39	42.2 39.9 33.1 14.4	96 78 56	29 30
142 106 37	47.1 46.3 49.6	160 123 37	533 420 114	210 166 44	39.4 39.6 38.4	218 172 46	40.8 41.0 40.1	316 247 68	32 33 34
148 347 357 266	16.1 40.0 57.9	772 520 259	1,451 1,490 1,068 692	154 393 409 352	10.6 26.4 38.3 50.8	168 412 431 371	11.6 27.7 40.3	1,283 1,078 637 321	35 36 37
200	00.2	124	092	552	50.0	371	53.0	JZI	30
133 220 161 183 420	20.8 29.1 41.3 51.4 64.8	507 538 229 173 228	1,049 1,408 726 638 881	119 241 224 257 467	11.3 17.1 30.9 40.4 53.0	134 262 233 267 485	12.8 18.6 32.2 41.8 55.1	915 1,145 492 371 396	39 40 41 42 43
989 128	41.0 33.5	1,421 254	4,242 460	1,2 <mark>38</mark> 70	29.2 15.3	1,302 80	30.7 17.3	2,939 380	44 45

by selected characteristics, 1998 (continued)

** Workers who are neither union members nor covered by collective agreements.

[†] Public sector: employees in government departments or agencies, crown corporations or publicly funded schools, hospitals or other institutions; private sector: all other wage and salary earners.

Table 2B: Union membership and coverage of employees

		Prairies					
			Union m	ember	Union co	verage *	Not a
No		Total	Total	Density	Total	Density	member **
_		'000	'000	%	000	%	000
1	Total	2,007	543	27.1	603	30.1	1,404
23	Sector † Public Private	472 1,535	328 215	69.4 14.0	353 251	74.7 16.3	119 1,285
4 5	Sex Men Women	1,045 962	264 279	25.2 29.0	298 305	28.6 31.7	747 657
	Age					100	
6 7 8	15 to 24 25 to 54 25 to 44	397 1,460 1,087	39 455 312	9.9 31.2 28.7	46 504 347 157	11.5 34.5 32.0 42.1	351 955 740 216
9 10	45 to 54 55 and over	151	49	32.5	54	35.5	97
11 12	Education Less than Grade 9 Some high school	48 296	9 55	19.8 18.5	10 60	21.0 20.3	38 236
13 14 15 16	High school graduation Some postsecondary Postsecondary certificate or diploma University degree	462 214 658 329	47 207 123	22.2 21.8 31.4 37.3	52 228 138	23.0 24.3 34.6 42.0	162 431 191
	Work status						
17 18	Full-time Part-time	1,637 371	460 83	28.1 22.4	514 90	31.4 24.2	1,123 281
19	Industry Goods-producing	467	92	19.7	106	22.7	361
20 21 22	Agriculture Other primary Utilities	33 101 19	16 10	15.9 55.1	18 13 22	17.5 69.0 20.6	83 6 87
23 24 25 26	Construction Manufacturing Service-producing Trade	205 1,541 328	45 451 35	22.1 29.3 10.6	52 498 41	25.2 32.3 12.3	153 1,043 288
27 28	Transportation and warehousing Finance, insurance, real estate and leasing	113 103	50 9	44.1 8.3	52 11	46.3 11.0	61 91
29 30	Professional, scientific and technical Management, and administrative and support	83 57	4	4.3 10.2	7	12.4	78 50
31 32 33	Education Health care and social assistance Information, culture and recreation	169 228 96	105 125 29	61.9 54.9 30.6	117 131 32	69.5 57.8 33.3	51 96 64
34 35 36	Accommodation and food Other Public administration	88 127	4 7 79	2.8 7.5 62.4	5 8 86	9.4 68.3	80 40

British Columbia Union member Union coverage* Not a union Total Total Density Total member** No. Density '000 % '000 % '000 '000' 1,468 34.9 36.6 79.1 82.1 1,142 22.3 23.6 35.0 36.8 34.8 36.4 13.4 14.9 1,109 38.4 40.1 34.9 36.5 47.7 49.8 45.4 46.9 30.6 31.8 27.0 28.3 30.8 32.3 28.1 29.5 42.1 40.4 40.0 42.4 1,176 36.9 38.6 27.1 28.7 34.4 36.2 -----..... 35.1 37.5 61.8 64.4 177 27.4 28.1 37.9 40.0 1,150 35.1 36.7 15.6 16.8 62.3 64.0 13.4 14.1 6.4 7.4 7.1 9.5 68.8 73.8 63.0 64.1 34.4 36.1 7 10.7 10.3 11.6 11.6 72.7 76.4

by selected characteristics, 1998 (continued)

Table 2B: Union membership and coverage of employees

			Union m	ember	Union co	verage *	Not a
No		Total	Total	Density	Total	Density	member **
		'000	'000	%	000	%	'000
	Occupation	100	22	40.0	00	45.0	100
1	Management	189	23	12.0	29	15.2	160
2	Business, finance and administrative	362	93	25.7	105	29.0	257
3	Administrative	40	00	10.1	10	21.2	06
4	Administrative	123	23	18.8	27	21.7	104
5	Cierical Network and applied agianase	193	03	32.4	20	30.0	01
0	Natural and applied sciences	111	20	23.7	30	27.3	01
6	Realin	114	01	10.0	04	13.2	31
8	Professional	13	0	43.7	25	00.0	é
9	Tashriad	41	30	04.9	01	70.6	0
10	Lechnical	29	20	70.4	21	72.0	0
11	Support stan	20	20	03.0	21	60.0	60
12	Social and public service	151	82	54.5	91	22.0	20
13	Legal, social and religious workers	07	17	29.7	19	32.9	01
14	Secondary and professors	93	CO EA	09.0	50	97.0	21
15	Secondary and elementary	00	04	01.9	66	67.0	12
10	Other Outburg and regrestion	27	11	39.9	14	20.6	13
17	Culture and recreation	500	9	20.2	104	30.0	424
18	Sales and service	539	90	17.3	104	19.4	404
19	Wholesale Datail	100	C IC	0.2	10	10.4	114
20	Hetall	130	15	11.8	10	12.4	01
21	Produ and beverage	00	15	0.0	17	52.0	15
22	Protective services	32	10	47.1	17	00.9	10
23	Travel and nome support	40	13	30.1	14	33.2	143
24	Trades transport and equipment	214	40	21.0	100	23.0	214
25	operators	314	91	29.1	100	51.9	214
26	Contractors and supervisors	17	4	25.9	5	31.0	11
27	Construction trades	41	10	24.0	11	27.5	30
28	Other trades	116	36	31.3	40	34.3	76
29	Transportation equipment operators	86	30	34.6	32	37.4	54
30	Helpers and labourers	55	11	20.3	12	22.1	43
31	Occupations unique to primary industry	71	8	11.4	10	13.7	61
32	Occupations unique to production	121	36	30.0	40	32.9	81
33	Machine operators and assemblers	93	28	29.8	31	33.2	62
34	Labourers	28	9	30.6	9	32.1	19
	Workplace size						
35	Under 20 employees	774	86	11.1	100	12.9	674
36	20 to 99 employees	656	188	28.6	213	32.4	443
37	100 to 500 employees	381	163	42.8	177	46.4	204
38	Over 500 employees	196	106	54.3	114	58.3	82
	Job tenure						
39	1 to 12 months	566	70	12.3	82	14.6	484
40	Over 1 year to 5 years	612	113	18.5	131	21.4	481
41	Over 5 years to 9 years	255	78	30.6	85	33.4	170
42	Over 9 years to 14 years	222	93	41.8	101	45.6	121
43	Over 14 years	351	189	53.8	203	57.9	148
	Job status						4.004
44	Permanent	1,773	488	27.5	542	30.6	1,231
45	Non-permanent	234	55	23.5	61	26.2	173

Source: Labour Force Survey
* Union members and persons who are not union members, but who are covered by collective agreements (for example, some religious group members).

		British C	Columbia			
	Union me	mber	Union cov	verage*	Not a	
Total	Total	Density	Total	Density	member*	No.
 '000	'000	%	'000	%	000'	
135 276 35 86 155 83 82 9 31 22 21 104 42 61 45 16 30 425 46 106 74 24 36 140 212	14 89 7 22 60 27 62 4 29 14 14 14 62 17 45 38 7 10 102 6 17 9 12 18 39 99	10.7 32.3 20.1 25.0 39.0 32.4 74.8 49.3 92.9 66.6 66.7 60.1 41.1 73.3 84.1 43.5 35.1 23.9 13.4 16.0 12.1 51.3 50.1 28.3 46.6	17 94 7 24 63 27 62 5 29 15 14 66 18 48 39 9 11 106 7 18 9 13 18 9 13 18 41 102	$12.9 \\ 34.1 \\ 21.4 \\ 27.5 \\ 40.5 \\ 33.0 \\ 75.7 \\ 53.4 \\ 93.2 \\ 67.6 \\ 67.3 \\ 63.8 \\ 43.5 \\ 77.8 \\ 86.4 \\ 54.1 \\ 38.2 \\ 25.0 \\ 15.1 \\ 17.0 \\ 12.3 \\ 55.3 \\ 51.6 \\ 29.2 \\ 48.3 \\ 12.1 \\ 12.1 \\ 12.1 \\ 12.1 \\ 12.1 \\ 12.2 \\ $	117 182 27 62 92 55 20 4 2 7 7 38 24 14 6 8 319 39 88 65 11 17 99 110	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 4 15 16 17 18 19 20 1 2 2 3 24 25
13 30 76 56 37 38 84 60 24	5 11 37 29 16 8 40 27 12	37.8 36.2 49.1 52.7 43.4 21.3 47.1 45.5 51.0	5 11 39 30 17 9 42 29 13	38.5 36.9 51.1 54.1 46.6 22.4 49.5 47.9 53.5	8 19 37 26 20 29 43 31 11	26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34
588 510 257 114	93 184 149 87	15.8 36.2 57.9 76.5	98 195 155 90	16.7 38.2 60.2 79.0	490 315 102 24	35 36 37 38
351 475 231 164 248	56 118 97 85 156	15.9 24.9 42.1 52.0 63.0	63 125 100 87 163	17.9 26.3 43.3 53.3 65.7	288 350 131 76 85	39 40 41 42 43
1,312 156	468 45	35.6 29.0	488 50	37.2 31.8	824 106	44 45

by selected characteristics, 1998 (concluded)

Public sector: employees in government departments or agencies, crown corporations or publicly funded schools, hospitals or other institutions; private sector: all other wage and salary earners.

	Canada				Atlantic					
	Total	Union member	Union coverage *	Not a union member **	Total	Union member	Union coverage *	Not a union member **		
								110		
Both sexes										
Average hourly										
earnings (\$)	15.81	18.77	18.69	14.39	13.06	16.86	16.79	11.30		
Full-time employees Part-time employees	16.78	19.06	19.00	9.81	9.16	17.00	15.08	7.99		
Average weekly	582.85	687.04	685.45	532.08	492 77	638 51	636 57	425 14		
Full-time employees	666.02	738.81	737 68	627.06	559.90	669.49	668.68	501.01		
Part-time employees	203.48	334.24	327.82	165.37	161.95	307.52	300.36	134.54		
Average usual weekly										
hours, main job	35.7	36.4	36.4	35.3	36.6	37.9	37.9	36.1		
Full-time employees	39.8	38.8	38.9	40.2	40.6	39.5	39.6	41.1		
Part-time employees	17.2	19.5	19.4	16.6	17.2	19.9	19.7	16.7		
Men										
Average hourly										
earnings (\$)	17.36	19.68	19.62	16.17	14.38	17.67	17.62	12.80		
Full-time employees	18.12	19.88	19.84	17.15	15.00	17.79	17.76	13.52		
Part-time employees	10.39	15.78	15.49	9.28	8.37	13.95	13.61	7.69		
Average weekly					_					
earnings (\$)	683.09	764.44	763.40	640.89	581.94	707.39	706.28	521.38		
Full-time employees	738.99	788.93	788.69	/10./1	628.26	/21.8/	722.04	577.87		
Part-time employees	173.92	302.02	294.00	147.09	137.10	259.70	201.24	122.10		
Average usual weekly										
hours, main job	38.6	38.8	38.8	38.5	39.9	40.3	40.3	39.7		
Pull-time employees	41.0	39.0	39.9	41.7	42.4	41.0	41.1	45.1		
Fait-une employees	10.2	10.0	10.0	10.1	10.0	10.0	10.0			
Women										
Average hourly										
earnings (\$)	14.11	17.71	17.58	12.51	11.65	15.95	15.86	9.75		
Full-time employees	14.96	17.89	17.78	13.52	12.37	16.00	15.93	10.42		
Part-time employees	11.80	17.08	16.85	10.05	9.48	10.00	10.40	0.12		
Average weekiy	470.07	PAP AT	600 40	447.00	207.50	664.00	660 A6	224 77		
earnings (\$)	4/3.0/	595.91 667.00	592.49	417.02 519.45	J97.30	00.100	508.35 600 70	401 50		
Part-time employees	215.41	342.93	337.03	173.27	172.00	318.94	312.88	139.99		
Average usuai weekiv										
hours, main job	32.6	33.5	33.6	32.1	33.2	35.2	35.1	32.3		
Full-time employees	38.0	37.4	37.4	38.3	38.3	37.7	37.8	38.6		
Part-time employees	17.6	19.7	19.6	16.9	17.7	20.2	20.1	17.2		

Table 3: Average earnings and usual hours by union and job status, 1998

Source: Labour Force Survey

Union members and persons who are not union members, but who are covered by collective agreements (for example, some religious group members). ** Workers who are neither union members nor covered by collective agreements.

			Quebec			0	ntario	
	Total	Union member	Union coverage *	Not a union member **	Total	Union member	Union coverage *	Not a union member **
Both sexes								
Average hourly			40.00	10.00	40.50		10.11	45.00
earnings (\$)	15.51	18.20	18.06	13.82	16.50	19.44	19.41	15.30
Full-time employees	16.25	18.23	18.15	14.86	17.64	19.87	19.86	16.61
Part-time employees	12.03	17.95	17.48	9.70	11.25	15.99	15.87	10.18
Average weekly	550.00	0.40.00		504.05	040 70	700 00	707.00	500.00
earnings (\$)	558.82	646.82	644.99	501.35	613.73	728.63	727.68	566.28
Full-time employees	628.95	687.92	686.58	587.00	703.78	781.58	781.60	007.00
Part-time employees	224.42	378.54	365.90	163.97	196.50	308.01	304.50	171.63
Average usual weekly	05.0	05.0	05.7		05.0	07.4	07.4	25.0
hours, main job	35.2	35.6	35.7	34.8	35.9	37.1	37.1	35.3
Part-time employees	38.8	20.4	20.2	39.4 16.7	16.9	39.4	39.4	40.2
Men								
Average hourly								
earnings (\$)	16.82	18.73	18.67	15.47	18.11	20.33	20.33	17.07
Full-time employees	17.41	18.80	18.77	16.34	19.00	20.62	20.64	18.17
Part-time employees	11.36	17.55	16.97	9.59	10.11	14.16	14.08	9.42
Average weekly								
earnings (\$)	644.81	707.82	707.99	598.70	714.88	799.86	800.23	675.04
Full-time employees	693.31	728.66	729.52	664.69	776.03	825.31	826.86	750.17
Part-time employees	196.70	358.37	342.93	150.40	165.70	255.77	254.57	150.29
Average usual weekly								
hours, main job	37.8	37.9	38.0	37.6	38.5	39.1	39.1	38.3
Full-time employees	40.1	39.0	39.1	40.8	41.1	40.1	40.2	41.5
Part-time employees	16.5	19.6	19.4	15.6	16.0	17.9	17.8	15.6
women								
Average hourly								
earnings (\$)	14.02	17.53	17,28	12.07	14.75	18.28	18.20	13.49
Full-time employees	14.62	17.37	17.17	12.97	15.83	18.72	18.65	14.67
Part-time employees	12.31	18.08	17.65	9.75	11.72	16.52	16.41	10.53
Average weekly								
earnings (\$)	460.74	570.33	564.21	398.57	503.30	636.11	633.44	455.79
Full-time employees	539.46	625.40	619.54	487.59	607.62	713.85	711.58	565.14
Part-time employees	236.32	384.76	373.20	170.52	209.37	323.24	319.71	181.16
Average usual weekly								
hours, main job	32.2	32.7	32.8	31.8	32.9	34.5	34.5	32.3
Full-time employees	37.1	36.3	36.3	37.5	38.5	38.2	38.2	38.5
Part-time employees	18.3	20.7	20.5	17.2	17.3	19.4	19.3	16.8

Table 3: Average earnings and usual hours by union and job status, 1998 (continued)

Source: Labour Force Survey

Union members and persons who are not union members, but who are covered by collective agreements (for example, some religious group members). "Workers who are neither union members nor covered by collective agreements.

			Prairies	100		British	n Columbia	
	Total	Union member	Union coverage *	Not a union member **	Total	Union member	Union coverage *	Not a union member **
Both sexes								
Average hourly								
earnings (\$)	14.71	17.51	17.49	13.52	17.21	20.47	20.44	15.34
Full-time employees	15.69	17.94	17.93	14.67	18.23	20.82	20.83	16.59
Part-time employees	10.40	15.12	14.98	8.94	13.10	18.54	18.32	11.00
Average weekly								
earnings (\$)	552.52	642.25	644.84	512.84	622.21	730.05	730.76	559.49
Full-time employees	635.71	704.23	705.86	603.61	719.21	798.74	801.53	667.50
Part-time employees	185.27	298.79	294.92	150.32	231.77	353.33	348.07	184.90
Average usual weekly								
hours, main job	36.2	36.2	36.4	36.1	35.0	35.3	35.4	34.8
Full-time employees	40.5	39.2	39.4	41.0	39.4	38.4	38.5	40.0
Part-time employees	17.3	19.5	19.4	16.6	17.2	18.6	18.5	16.6
Men								
Average hourly	16 47	10 07	10.05	15 50	19.00	21.64	21.62	17.20
Full-time employees	17.22	19.15	19 13	16.41	19 74	21.89	21.02	18.39
Part-time employees	9.00	13.17	13.21	8.27	12.09	18.05	17.70	10.47
Average weekly								
earnings (\$)	667.03	747.77	748.57	634.44	735.19	829.23	830.11	679.85
Full-time employees	719.56	773.47	774.22	696.21	800.32	863.01	865.35	759.42
Part-time employees	147.23	238.09	239.18	131.11	207.37	346.19	337.46	169.85
Average usual weekly								
hours, main job	39.7	39.4	39.6	39.7	38.0	38.1	38.2	37.9
Full-time employees	42.0	40.5	40.6	42.6	40.6	39.5	39.6	41.3
Part-time employees	16.1	17.9	17.9	15.8	16.5	18.4	18.3	16.0
Mamaa								
women								
Average hourly								
earnings (\$)	12.80	16.23	16.16	11.25	15.42	19.22	19.18	13.27
Full-time employees	13.57	16.48	16.44	12.13	16.22	19.40	19.41	14.21
Part-time employees	10.88	15.47	15.31	9.21	13.50	18.68	18.50	11.23
Average weekly								
earnings (\$)	428.19	542.61	543.40	374.69	503.44	625.34	625.07	433.83
Full-time employees	519.97	621.01	621.36	469.06	611.90	714.39	716.94	546.04
Part-time employees	198.55	309.72	305.51	158.17	241.39	355.32	351.08	191.60
Average usual weekly								
hours, main job	32.5	33.2	33.4	32.0	31.9	32.4	32.4	31.6
Full-time employees	38.4	37.8	37.8	38.6	37.8	36.9	37.0	38.4
Part-time employees	17.7	19.8	19.7	16.9	17.4	18.7	18.6	16.9

Table 3: Average earnings and usual hours by union and job status, 1998 (concluded)

Source: Labour Force Survey

Union members and persons who are not union members, but who are covered by collective agreements (for example, some religious group members). ** Workers who are neither union members nor covered by collective agreements.

Year	Major wage	e settlements	s and infiatio	on rates *	Strikes and lockouts, workers involved,					
	Average annua	I percentage ir	ncrease in bas	se wage rates	and per	son-days an	d working tim	e lost **		
	Public sector 1	Private sector t	Both sectors	Annual change in Consumer Price Index	Strikes & lockouts	Workers involved	Person-days not worked	Percentage of estimated working time		
			%			'000	'000	%		
1980	10.9	11.7	11.1	10.2	1.028	439	9.130	0.37		
1981	13.1	12.6	13.0	12.4	1.049	341	8.850	0.35		
1982	10.4	9.5	10.2	10.9	679	464	5,702	0.23		
1983	4.6	5.5	4.8	5.7	645	329	4,441	0.18		
1984	3.9	3.2	3.6	4.4	716	187	3,883	0.15		
1985	3.8	3.3	3.7	3.9	829	162	3,126	0.12		
1986	3.6	3.0	3.4	4.2	748	484	7,151	0.27		
1987	4.1	3.8	4.0	4.4	668	582	3,810	0.14		
1988	4.0	5.0	4.4	4.0	548	207	4,901	0.17		
1989	5.2	5.2	5.2	5.0	627	445	3,701	0.13		
1990	5.6	5.7	5.6	4.8	579	270	5,079	0.17		
1991	3.4	4.4	3.6	5.6	463	253	2,516	0.09		
1992	2.0	2.6	2.1	1.5	404	150	2,110	0.07		
1993	0.6	0.8	0.6	1.8	381	102	1,517	0.05		
1994	-	1.3	0.3	0.2	374	81	1,607	0.06		
1995	0.6	1.4	0.9	2.1	328	149	1,583	0.05		
1996	0.5	1.8	0.9	1.6	330	282	3,352	0.11		
1997	1.2	1.8	1.5	1.6	284	258	3,610	0.12		
1998	1.6	1.8	1.6	1.0	378	233	2,466	0.08		
1999	1.5	2.3	1.7	1.0	127	63	709	0.09		

Table 4: Wage settlements and labour disputes

Sources: Statistics Canada, Prices Division; Human Resources Development Canada, Workplace Information Directorate Note: Major wage settlements refer to agreements involving 500 or more employees.

1999 data refer to January to April only.

** 1999 data refer to January to March only.

[†] Public sector employees are those working for government departments or agencies, crown corporations or publicly funded schools, hospitals or other institutions. Private sector employees are all other wage and salary earners.

Data sources

Information on union membership, density and coverage by various sociodemographic characteristics, including earnings, are from the redesigned Labour Force Survey (LFS), which came into effect January 1997. Further details on LFS-based union statistics can be obtained from Marc Lévesque, Labour Statistics Division, Statistics Canada at (613) 951-2793. Data on strikes, lockouts and workdays lost, and those on major wage settlements were supplied by Human Resources Development Canada. Further information on these statistics may be obtained from Angèle Charbonneau, Workplace Information Directorate, HRDC at 1 800 567-6866.

What's new?

Recent reports and studies

UPCOMING RELEASE

Latest on the labour force

The official unemployment rate is not the only summary measure of labour market slack. Additional information from the Labour Force Survey can help explain the degree to which the labour market is not matching its potential.

For example, a considerable number of people are "underemployed." They work part time but would prefer to work full-time hours. Like the unemployed, they are underused, albeit only partly.

Others, on the margins of the labour force, expressed a desire to work but were not looking for a job and therefore were not counted among the officially unemployed. Of particular interest are those who did not look for work for economic reasons: discouraged searchers; and people waiting for reply, recall or a job to start in five weeks or more.

This issue of *Labour Force Update* profiles the unemployed and also provides a more detailed look at labour market slack. A new set of summary indicators called "supplementary measures of unemployment" is introduced.

The Summer 1999 issue of the Labour Force Update (Catalogue no. 71-005-XPB, \$29), titled "Unemployment and other measures of labour underutilization" will be available soon. For additional information, contact Jeannine Usalcas at (613) 951-4720; fax (613) 951-2869; usaljea@statcan.ca.

JUST RELEASED

Earnings Supplement Project and the Self-Sufficiency Project

Statistics Canada has made available preliminary data from two studies: the Earnings Supplement Project and the Self-Sufficiency Project Applicant Baseline and the first two follow-up surveys. Funded by Human Resources Development Canada, these studies are research demonstration projects managed by the Social Research and Demonstration Corporation and conducted jointly with Statistics Canada.

The Earnings Supplement Project evaluated the effect of an earnings supplement on the re-employment of workers who had received Employment Insurance (EI) benefits. Eligible participants who gave up EI for full-time work within a specific period of time and had to take a new job that paid less than their previous one could receive a supplement that made up 75% of the earnings loss for up to two years. The project, conducted in selected cities in Canada, measured the effect of these earnings supplements on employment rates, earnings, Employment Insurance receipts, and other outcomes.

The Self-Sufficiency Project was designed to determine the effectiveness of an earnings supplement for single parents formerly on the Income Assistance Program who had found full-time jobs. The earnings supplement was offered for a limited three-year period to each eligible individual. The project, conducted in New Brunswick and British Columbia, evaluated the effect of the earnings supplement on the employment rates, earnings, family income, income assistance receipt and other outcomes. For further information on the findings from these two projects, contact the Social Research Demonstration Corporation at (613) 237-4311, or Marc Lachance at (613) 951-2902 or Richard Veevers at (613) 951-4617, Special Surveys Division, Statistics Canada.

First Nations communities

In collaboration with the Rural Secretariat, Agriculture and Agri-food Canada, Statistics Canada released the eighth in a series of analysis bulletins profiling trends in rural Canada.

Geographical Patterns of Socio-economic Well-being of First Nations Communities shows that First Nations communities in the Prairie provinces and Canadian Shield locations typically have the poorest education, housing, employment and income. Southern British Columbia and B.C. coastal communities, along with southern Ontario communities, have relatively good conditions.

Between 1986 and 1996, this geographic pattern changed little. These communities appear to be poorly integrated with the surrounding non-Aboriginal society and economy – at least in ways that are mutually beneficial.

Geographical Patterns of Socio-economic Wellbeing of First Nations Communities (Catalogue no. 21-006-XIE, free) is available on the Internet (www.statcan.ca). For more information contact Robin P. Armstrong at (613) 951-4995 or 1 800 465-1991; fax: (613) 951-0387; armsrob@ statcan.ca, Housing, Family and Social Statistics Division.

Adult education and training

In 1997, more than 6 million people, or 28% of Canadian adults, participated in adult education and training activities. As previously shown, age and level of educational attainment continue to be important factors in the decision to participate in such activities. The percentages of adults participating range from 5% for those over 64 years to 39% for those aged 17 to 34.

The influence of education on participation rates is also evident. Rates range from 11% among those with less than a high school diploma to 48% among those with a university degree. Canadians invest in education mainly to remain competitive in the labour market. Three out of four adults participating in an education or training activity (21% of the adult population) reported doing so for job-related purposes; one in ten, for personal interest or leisure reasons.

Among the labour force population, 29% of the employed and 20% of the unemployed participated in job-related adult education and training activities. Only 6% of those not in the labour force did the same. Among the employed, 32% of paid workers participated, compared with 18% of self-employed workers. Almost onequarter of the employed population enrolled in job-related education or training activities sponsored by their employer.

A microdata file from the 1998 Adult Education and Training Survey is now available. A joint Statistics Canada and Human Resources Development Canada analytical report will be released this autumn.

For more information about the survey results and related products and services, or to enquire about concepts, methods or data quality, contact Client Services at (613) 951-7355 or 1 888 297-7355; fax: (613) 951-3012; ssd@statcan.ca, Special Surveys Division, or Robert Couillard at (613) 951-1519; fax: (613) 951-9040; couirob@statcan.ca, Centre for Education Statistics.

Work absences

Work Absence Rates, 1987-1998 provides up-todate benchmark data on work absences for personal reasons – illness or disability and personal or family responsibilities. Based on data from the Labour Force Survey and using the Standard Occupational Classification system and North American Industry Classification System (NAICS), it provides absence rates for 1998 by sex, education, age, presence of children, industry, occupation, firm size, job tenure, job permanency, unionization, province and census metropolitan area. Time series from 1987 to 1998 are also provided. (See article entitled "Missing work in 1998 – industry differences" in this issue.) Work Absence Rates, 1987 to 1998 (Catalogue no. 71-535-MPB, no. 10, \$50) is now available. For further information, contact Ernest B. Akyeampong, Labour and Household Surveys Analysis Division at (613) 951-4624; fax (613) 951-4179; akyeern@statcan.ca.

New bulletin on innovation

The Science, Innovation and Electronic Information Division has launched a new publication. *Innovation Analysis Bulletin*, designed to be easily readable by non-experts, summarizes and highlights new results in the analysis of science, technology and the information society.

The table of contents will vary from issue to issue. The specific topics to be covered include government science and technology activities; industrial research and development; intellectual property commercialization; advanced technologies and innovation; biotechnology and technology use connectedness; telecommunications and broadcasting; and electronic commerce.

Innovation Analysis Bulletin (Catalogue no. 88-003-XIE, free) is now available on the Internet (www.statcan.ca). For more information contact the Science, Innovation and Electronic Information Division at (613) 951-2587.

WHAT'S NEW IN INCOME STATISTICS?

Family income after tax

After adjusting for inflation, estimated after-tax family income remained essentially unchanged in 1997 for the third consecutive year. Apart from a modest increase in 1994, the average declined throughout the early 1990s.

Average after-tax family income in 1997 (from the annual Survey of Consumer Finances) was estimated at \$45,605, about 6% less than in 1989, the peak year for income. Transfer payments averaged \$6,474, some 10% lower than their peak in 1993, while average income tax was \$11,541, down slightly from its high in 1996. Since most income before government transfers comes from earnings (90%), changes in pretransfer income are driven largely by wage settlements and labour market conditions. The Labour Force Survey indicated that employment grew by 1.9% in 1997, while average hours worked per week increased 0.5% to 37.9. Average weekly earnings in 1997 were essentially unchanged as well, with Statistics Canada's Survey of Employment, Payrolls and Hours reporting a gain of just 0.5%. At the same time, however, government transfer payments declined slightly, as the trend to lower transfers continued in 1997.

Government transfer payments and income taxes work in concert to narrow the after-tax income gap between those at the top and those at the bottom of the income scale. Average 1997 income for families in the lowest quintile was \$16,876 after taxes and transfers, more than triple their \$5,367 gross income before transfers. Families in the top quintile, on the other hand, saw their average income reduced to \$85,516 after taxes from a pre-tax, pre-transfer average of \$112,129.

Average transfers were \$6,474 in 1997, down 4% from 1996, as benefits from social assistance and Employment Insurance declined again. For the first time since 1980, average transfers fell for families in all quintiles, including the lowest. Transfers peaked in 1993, responding to somewhat unfavourable labour market conditions. The average has been declining steadily since then.

Average family income tax in 1997 was stable, at an estimated \$11,541, following the high seen in 1996. The absence of real movement reflects the fact that total family income was essentially unchanged in 1997. Income taxes had been trending upwards (an average \$336 per year between 1993 and 1996), owing mainly to increased earnings, as employment recovered from the losses of the last recession. Income tax brackets that were not adjusted for inflation also contributed to higher taxes.

Statistics are presented for families of two or more persons, unattached individuals, all families, and individuals with income in the full report, *Income after Tax, Distributions by Size in Canada,* 1997 (Catalogue no. 13-210-XPB, \$31).

Spending patterns

Spending Patterns in Canada, 1997 has recently been released. The report presents the results of the 1997 Survey of Household Spending (SHS), conducted in January through March 1998. Information about the spending habits, dwelling characteristics and household equipment of households during 1997 was obtained by asking people in the 10 provinces and 2 territories to recall their expenditures for the previous calendar year.

The report's seven sections focus on such themes as regional spending patterns, spending patterns of households in different income groups, household spending for selected household types, and rural and urban differences in household spending. Following are highlights:

- Households spent, on average, an estimated \$49,900 on everything from child care to travel to communications in 1997, virtually unchanged from 1996.
- Personal income taxes continue to make up the largest share of household spending. In 1997, households spent an average 21 cents of every dollar on personal income taxes, 20 cents on shelter, 12 cents on transportation and 11 cents on food.
- The remaining 36 cents was spent on such items as recreation, personal insurance and pension contributions, household operations, clothing, gifts and contributions to charity.
- Personal income taxes averaged \$10,600, essentially unchanged from 1996 (\$10,700). Households spent \$9,800 on shelter costs in 1997, \$5,700 on food and \$6,200 on transportation, also virtually unchanged from 1996.
- The one-fifth (quintile) of households with the lowest incomes spent \$16,700, compared with \$97,900 for the highest quintile. After adjusting for differences in household size, the average expenditure per person was \$10,200 in the lowest.
- Consistent with household income patterns, Ontario households had the highest average spending in 1997 among the provinces, about \$55,300. This compares with \$38,400 for

Newfoundland, whose households had the lowest overall spending. Yukon and the Northwest Territories had average household expenditures of \$58,600 and \$63,200, respectively.

SHS collects information broadly comparable to the former Family Expenditure Survey (FAMEX), but with several noteworthy differences. SHS is annual, whereas FAMEX was conducted every four years. The SHS sample is 50% larger, but the number of detailed expenditure categories is smaller, to reduce respondent burden. As well, housing information formerly collected in the Household Facilities and Equipment Survey is now part of SHS and can be analyzed in the context of household expenditure patterns.

Spending Patterns in Canada, 1997 (Catalogue no. 62-202-XPB-XIB) is now available. Tables presenting detailed expenditure data are also available and custom tabulations can be obtained.

Family incomes (census families)

A new publication from the Survey of Consumer Finances (SCF) presents data on average family income and on the distribution of families by income group and various characteristics for 1997. Historical data from 1980 to 1997 by family type (for example, two-parent or lone-parent families) are presented as well.

This report, Family Incomes, Census Families, 1997 (Catalogue no. 13-208-XIB), uses a narrower concept of the family (the census family) than the "economic family" referred to in the survey's main report, Income Distributions by Size in Canada, 1997 (Catalogue no. 13-207-XPB), released April 14, 1999. Census families consist of married couples and parents with never-married children, whereas economic families include everyone related by blood, marriage or adoption and sharing a common dwelling unit.

Historical data on average census family income by family type are available free on the Internet (www.statcan.ca) under "Canadian statistics," then "The people – Families, households and housing" followed by "Income."

Survey of Consumer Finances looks at earnings

According to the Survey of Consumer Finances, average annual earnings from employment remained essentially unchanged in 1997 for both men and women who worked 30 or more hours per week for the full year, after adjusting for inflation.

Average annual earnings for men working full time have fluctuated within a narrow range during the last two decades, with the 1997 average of \$42,600 virtually identical to the inflation-adjusted average of 1980. Unlike men, women have experienced a general upward trend: their 1997 average of \$30,900 was 13% higher than in 1980.

Women working full time throughout 1997 earned, on average, 73 cents for each dollar earned by their male counterparts, basically unchanged from 1996. In 1967, women earned 58 cents for each dollar earned by men.

Earnings of Men and Women, 1997 (Catalogue no. 13-217-XPB) presents the latest data on average and median annual earnings of women and men by work activity ("full-year full-time" and "other") and on the distribution of earners by earnings groups and various characteristics. Historical data on averages, estimated numbers and female-to-male earnings ratios by work activity and selected characteristics for the period from 1980 to 1997 are also presented.

Survey of Financial Security

Although income and expenditure data provide an indication of current consumption and ability to purchase goods and services, they provide little information on the long-term ability of families to sustain themselves. The results of this survey will provide information on the net worth (wealth) of Canadian families, that is, the value of their assets less their debts.

Survey of Financial Security: Update explains the objectives of the survey and indicates how the survey has changed since 1984, when it was last conducted. It also describes the types of questions asked and information provided, as well as giving other background about the survey. It describes the work to date and the next steps for this important subject. An accompanying table outlines the content of the questionnaire.

For more information about these surveys and related products and services, contact Client Services, Income Statistics Division at (613) 951-7355 or 1 888 297-7355; fax: (613) 951-3012; income@statcan.ca.

Perspectives

Did you miss...

Unionization in Canada: A Retrospective, a supplement to our last issue of Perspectives, summarizes labour union membership statistics up to 1995, the latest year for which CALURA (Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act) data are available. It reviews some of the major economic and labour market trends of the past three decades, and briefly examines how these changes may have affected union membership (numbers and rates).

Unionization in Canada: A Retrospective (Catalogue no. 75-001-SPE, \$20) is available through the Statistics Canada website (www.statcan.ca), our Order Desk (1 800 267-6677 or order@statcan.ca), or our regional reference centres.
Key labour and income facts

Selected charts and analysis

This section presents charts and analysis featuring one or more of the following sources. For general inquiries, contact Fiona Long at (613) 951-4628; longfio@statcan.ca or Joanne Bourdeau at (613) 951-4722; bourjoa@statcan.ca.

Administrative data

Small area and administrative data Frequency: Annual Contact: Customer Services (613) 951-9720

Business surveys Annual Survey of Manufactures Frequency: Annual Contact: Richard Vincent (613) 951-4070

Business Conditions Survey of Manufacturing Industries Frequency: Quarterly Contact: Claude Robillard (613) 951-3507

Census

Census labour force characteristics Frequency: Quinquennial Contact: Michel Côté (613) 951-6896

Census income statistics Frequency: Quinquennial Contact: Abdul Rashid (613) 951-6897

Employment and income surveys

Labour Force Survey Frequency: Monthly Contact: Nathalie Caron (613) 951-4168

Survey of Employment, Payrolls and Hours Frequency: Monthly Contact: Sylvie Picard (613) 951-4090 Help-wanted Index Frequency: Monthly Contact: Sylvie Picard (613) 951-4090

Employment Insurance Statistics Program Frequency: Monthly Contact: Sylvie Picard (613) 951-4090

Major wage settlements Bureau of Labour Information (Human Resources Development Canada) Frequency: Quarterly Contact: (819) 997-3117

Labour income Frequency: Quarterly Contact: Anna MacDonald (613) 951-3784

Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics Frequency: Annual Contact: Client Services (613) 951-7355 or 1 888 297-7355

Survey of Consumer Finances Frequency: Annual Contact: Client Services (613) 951-7355 or 1 888 297-7355

Survey of Household Spending (replaces Household Facilities and Equipment Survey and Family Expenditure Survey) Frequency: Annual Contact: Client Services (613) 951-7355 or 1 888 297-7355

General Social Survey

Education, work and retirement Frequency: Occasional Contact: Client Services (613) 951-5979

Social and community support Frequency: Occasional Contact: Client Services (613) 951-5979

Time use Frequency: Occasional Contact: Client Services (613) 951-5979

Pension surveys

Pension Plans in Canada Survey Frequency: Annual Contact: Thomas Dufour (613) 951-2088

Quarterly Survey of Trusteed Pension Funds Frequency: Quarterly Contact: Bob Anderson (613) 951-4034

Special surveys

Survey of Work Arrangements Frequency: Occasional Contact: Ernest B. Akyeampong (613) 951-4624

Adult Education and Training Survey Frequency: Occasional Contact: Steve Arrowsmith (613) 951-0566

Graduate Surveys (Postsecondary) Frequency: Occasional Contact: Bill Magnus (613) 951-4577



In 1996, some 84% of all persons lived as a partner in a couple, a lone parent or a child in a census family, down from 88% in 1976.

However, today's families are more diverse. In 1996, 45% of all families were married couples with children, down from 55% in 1981. During the same period, the proportion of common-law couples (with or without children) and single parents increased. In particular, children are experiencing more diversity in their families as a result of separation, divorce and remarriage. The National Longitudinal Survey of Children showed that in 1994-95, 9% of children up to age 11 lived with a step-parent and 6% lived with stepbrothers or stepsisters.





Between 1981 and 1996, the number of two-parent families with one earner shrank by more than a third. At the same time, the number of families with two full-time earners increased nearly 60%.

Another rapidly growing family group is loneparent families. Those with earnings were up 50% over the period and those *without* earnings more than doubled.

In 1981, the ratio of lone-parent to two-parent, single-earner families was 3 to 10; by 1996, this had climbed to 7 to 10.

Two-parent families with one earner tended to be larger than other families, with an average family size of 4.2. The average size of families with both parents working full time was 3.9. Among lone-parent families, those without earnings were somewhat larger than those with earnings (2.8, compared with 2.6).

Definitions:

Market income: wages and salaries, self-employment income, investment income, interest, et cetera

Government transfers: Child Tax Benefit, Employment Insurance, workers' compensation, social assistance, et cetera Income tax: federal and provincial

Disposable (or 'after-tax') income: Market income + government transfers – income tax

Key labour and income facts



The market income of families with two full-time earners was close to 80% more than that of families in which only one parent worked. Transfers and taxes both tend to make the distribution of income across families more equal. Transfers generally work at the lower end, raising the floor of the income distribution.



Not surprisingly, the pattern of average transfers by family type is the reverse of market income.

Two-parent families with one earner received an average of \$5,700 in government transfers in 1996, compared with \$1,500 for families with both parents working full time.



Income taxes also reduced inequality by lowering the ceiling of the income distribution. In 1996, the average family with both parents working full time paid \$18,400 in income tax, about *twice* the amount for two-parent families with one earner.

The trends are different for the two groups as well. From 1981 to 1996, income taxes of the average dualearner family increased 40%, whereas they grew only 21% for the two-parent family with just one earner.



After taxes and transfers, the average two-parent family with one earner had about 64% of the income of a family with two full-time earners. Average disposable income ranged from \$13,800 for lone parents without earnings to \$60,300 for families with two full-time earners.

Families with two full-time earners received relatively low transfers and paid relatively high taxes. In 1996, their disposable income was 78% of their market income. Single-earner couples, however, ended up with 91% of their market income.



For lone-parent families with earnings, government transfers and income tax were almost equal. In the case of such families without earnings, however, government transfers made up almost 90% of their disposable income.

From 1981 to 1996, real incomes were flat. Differences in disposable income from one family type to the next changed very little.





Low income rates are based on average family spending on food, shelter and clothing. Families with low income tend to spend more than 64% of their after-tax income on these basics, leaving a relatively small margin to cover transportation, health, education and all other expenditures.

Having two full-time incomes clearly reduced the risk of low income in 1996: the after-tax low income rate for these families was 2%. In contrast, two-parent families with one earner had a low income rate of 17%. However, over a quarter of all lone parents with a job headed up a family with low income. By far the highest low income rate – 80% – was recorded for lone-parent families without earnings.





The low income rate is well known, but it classifies families only as *above or below* a defined cutoff point. It is also important to know how much it would take to raise a family's income enough to put it above the line. This is referred to as the *average low income gap*.

The largest gaps – between \$6,600 and \$6,800 – were recorded for two-parent, single-earner families and for lone parents without earnings. For families with two parents working full time who nonetheless had low income, the average amount needed to "escape" this category was \$5,000.

For many two-parent families, the second salary was needed to avoid falling into a low income level. In 1996, the low income rate for these families was 2%. Without the second income it would have been 17%.

Different elements affect family earnings, however. Child care needs, for instance, vary from family to family.



Charts and text were adapted from a presentation given by Doug Norris, Director, Housing, Family and Social Statistics Division, and Maryanne Webber, Director, Income Statistics Division, to the Parliamentary Sub-committeee on Tax Equity for Canadian Families with Dependent Children of the Standing Committee on Finance. For further information, contact Fiona Long at (613) 951-4628 or longfio@statcan.ca.

chide from Coast to C

HE RANADIAN REFERENCE THAT ANSWERS YOUR **OUESTIONS ABOUT** CANADA, AND EVEN THOSE YOU NEVER THOUGHT TO ASK, IS NOW AVAILABLE AS A CAPTIVATING BOOK, AS A USER-FRIENDLY CD-ROM AND AS A PRACTICAL COMBINATION PACKAGE. CONVENIENT AT WORK, SCHOOL AND HOME. CANADA YEAR BOOK 1999 BOTH DISPLAYS AND ANALYZES THE COMPLEXITIES OF LIVING AND WORKING IN CANADA TODAY.

Time and time again, you will turn to *Canada Year Book 1999* for penetrating articles, accurate statistics, clear tables, informative graphs and exquisite photographs spotlighting key trends and changes in our social, political and economic lives.

Choose Canada Year Book 1999 or Canada Year Book 1999 on CD-ROM as your reference companion. You can order the book (cat. no. 11-402-XPE99001) for \$54.95, the CD-ROM (cat. no. 11-402-XCB99001) for \$74.95, OR the Book/CD-ROM Combination Package (cat. no. 10-3005XKE99001) available at the special price of \$123.41. (Prices exclude shipping and handling as well as applicable taxes.)

To order, call toll-free 1 800 267-6677, fax toll-free 1 877 287-4369 or write to Statistics Canada, Dissemination Division, Circulation Management, 120 Parkdale Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0T6, Canada. You may also e-mail your order to: order@statcan.ca or contact your nearest Statistics Canada Regional Reference Centre listed in this publication.

Visit our Web site: www.statcan.ca and try out a FREE DEMO of CYB99 on CD-ROM or download the FREE CYB99 Teacher's Kitl

In the works

Some of the topics in upcoming issues

Male-female earnings comparison

For many years, the Survey of Consumer Finances has provided data on men's and women's earnings. Since 1997, the Labour Force Survey has been collecting similar data. A look at how the two sources compare.

South of the border – class of '95

Only a small percentage of 1995 graduates had moved to the United States by the summer of 1997. This article profiles these emigrants.

On the road again – work patterns of truck drivers

A profile of the largest occupational group for men in 1996.

The employer pension plan: Can workers prepare for retirement without it?

Membership in employer-sponsored pension plans has been declining. This study examines the retirement savings of former plan participants.

Involuntary part-time workers

A discussion of the conceptual, measurement and profile differences of pre- and post-1997 Labour Force Survey data on involuntary part-timers.

Working together: self-employed couples

An examination of the characteristics of couples who co-own a business, with a look at the types of business run.

Public versus private wage differentials

Two studies examine earnings differentials between public and private sector employees, as well as the factors contributing to the differences (for example, human capital and occupational distribution). One study is based on cross-sectional data, the other on longitudinal.

Vouths and volunteering

The proportion of youths doing volunteer work jumped from 18% to 33% over 10 years. This paper compares young volunteers of 1987 and 1997 to determine who the new young volunteers are, where they are volunteering and what they are doing.

PERSPECTIVES ON LABOUR AND INCOME

The quarterly for labour market and income information

	EK	SPI				V H'		
•	ON LA	BOUR	ΑN	D	IN	ICOME		
T	HE CON	IPREH	IENS	IVE	J	OURN	AL	
	o fr	n labou om Stat	r and istics	inco Can	mad	e la		
(Catalon	ue no. 75-001-XP	E).	- WAY / BI YE			by ex	Save	
ubscribe to	Perspectives	S on Labour	and Inco	ome to IL can.ca	day HETHO Cha	Sub Sy subset Only \$9 by subset Only Sa by subset Only (ph OD OF PAYMENT arge to my:	Scription ave 20% cribing for 2 yea 2.80 (plus taxed ave 30% ribing for 3 year y \$121.80 us taxes) Check only one crCard	your h! hst) t VISA
ubscribe to	Perspectives	S on Labour FAX 1 600 889-9734 (613) 951-1584 Please do not send confirm	and Inco	nme to IL can.ca x orders.	day netho Car	Subsections of the section of the se	Scription ave 20% cribing for 2 year 2.80 (plus taxes) ave 30% ribing for 3 year ys121.80 us taxes) us taxes)	your ni wai () VISA
Abscribe to	A Perspectives Perspectives Phone 1 Boo 267-6677 Charge to Whas or Master U.S. and in the Otawa aree, call (613) 951-7277.	S ON Labour FAX 1 800 889-9734 (613) 951-1584 Please do not send confirm	and Inco Be-MA order@stat	ome to IL can.ca x orders.	day TETHO Car Aut	Suit Sy subset Only \$9 by subset Only \$9 by subset Only \$9 by subset Only \$9 by subset Only \$9 by subset Only \$9 by subset Only \$9 Do DoF PAYMENT Arge to my: Maste horized Signature divider (Placeo acid)	Scription ave 20% cribing for 2 year 2.80 (plus taxes) ave 30% ribing for 3 year ys121.80 us taxes) us taxes)	your n! visi visa
Abscribe to	Perspectives Perspectives	S on Labour FAX 1 600 889-9734 (613) 951-1584 Please do not send confirm	and Inco	nme to L can.ca x orders.	Car Aut Car Pay	Subsection of the second secon	Scription Save 20% cribing for 2 you 2.80 (plus taxes) ave 30% ribing for 3 year y\$121.80 us taxes) Check conic one erCard	your n! () VISA Expiry Da
Address	A Perspectives Perspectives Phone phone Boo 267-6677 Charge to VISA or MasterCard, Outside Canada and the U.S., and In the Ottawa aree, call (613) 951-7277.	S on Labour FAX 1 800 889-9734 (613) 951-1584 Please do not send confirm Department City	and Inco	Meto IL can.ca x orders:	Car Aut Car Pay	Suit by subset Only 59 Subsect Only 59 Subsect Only Subsect	SCription ave 20% cribing for 2 year 280 (plus taxes) ave 30% ribing for 3 year y \$121.80 us taxes) Check only one erCard	your n! () visa VISA Expiry Da
Address Postal Code	Perspectives	S on Labour FAX 1 600 889-9734 (613) 951-1584 Please do not send confirm Department City (Fax	and Inco	IL can.ca	Car Car Car Qar Pay Pur Aut	Suit by subsect Only set by subsect Only by subsect Only (ph only)	Scription ave 20% cribing for 2 year 2.80 (plus taxes) ave 30% ibing for 3 year y \$121.80 us taxes) // Check only one erCard	your n! visa VISA Expiry Da
Address Postal Code Catalogue No.	A Perspectives Perspectives Phone Phone Title Phone Title	S on Labour FAX 1 600 889-9734 (613) 951-1584 Please do not send confirm Department City (Fax	and Inco E-MA order@stat nation for phone or fa Provir) Subscription	Dime to IL can.ca x orders.	day Car Aut Car Pay Pur Aut	Sult by subsec Only se by subsec Only se by subsec Only se by subsec Only for the subsection only for the subsection for the subsection for the subsection for the subsection for the subsection for the subsection for the subsection for the subsection for the subsection for the subsection for the subsection for the subsection for the subsection for the subsection for the subsection for for for for for for for for for for	Cuantity	YOUIT n! visa VISA Expiry Dat
Address Postal Code Cataloge No. 75-001-XPE	A Perspectives Perspectives Market Constant of the U.S., and in the Ottawa aree, call (613) 951-7277. Phone Title Perspectives on Labour	S on Labour of FAX 1 800 889-9734 (613) 951-1584 Please do not send confirm Department City (Fax r and Income	and Inco and Inco E-MA order@stat nation for phone or fa Provin) Subscription 1 year 2 years	NIL Can.ca x orders: hce Canada \$ 58.00 92.80	Car Aut Car Pay Aut	Sult by subsect Only \$9 by subsect Only \$9 by subsect Only (pt OD OF PAYMENT arge to my: Mastect d Number horized Signature dholder (Please print) ment Enclosed \$ chase Order Number horized Signature Outside Canada U\$\$ 58.00 92.80	Cription ave 20% cribing for 2 year 2.80 (plus taxes) ave 30% ribing for 3 year y \$121.80 us taxes) check only one erCard	your n! vat v) vISA Expiry Da
Address Postal Code Catalogue No. 75-001-XPE	Perspectives	S on Labour FAX 1 600 889-9734 (613) 951-1584 Please do not send confirm Department City (Fax r and Income	and inco and inco E-MA order@stat nation for phone or far Provin) Subscription 1 year 2 years 3 years	Dime too	day TETHO Car Aut Car Pay Pur Aut	Sult by subsect Only \$29, by subsect Only by subsect Only by subsect Only (ph arge to my:	Cription ave 20% cribing for 2 year 2.80 (plus taxed ave 30% ibing for 3 year y \$121.80 us taxes) ////////////////////////////////////	YOUIT n! vat) VISA Expiry Dat
Address Postal Code Catalogue No. 75-001-XPE	A Perspectives	S on Labour of FAX 1 600 889-9734 (613) 951-1584 Please do not send confirm Department City (Fax r and Income	and Inco and Inco E-MA order@stat nation for phone or fa Provin) Subscription 1 year 2 years 3 years	Canada S 58.00 92.80 121.80	day Car Aut Pay Aut	Sult by subsect Only \$9 by subse	Cribing for 2 year 2.80 (plus taxes) ave 30% ibing for 3 year ys121.80 us taxes) Check only one arCard	your h! visa visa Expiry Dat

SERVICES INDICATORS

For and About Businesses Serving the Business of Canada...

At last, current data and expert analysis on this VITAL sector in one publication!

he services sector now dominates the industrial economies of the world.

Telecommunications, banking, advertising, computers, real estate, engineering and insurance represent an eclectic range of services on which all other economic sectors rely.

Despite their critical economic role, however, it has been hard to find out what's happening in these industries. Extensive and time-consuming efforts have, at best, provided a collection of diverse bits and pieces of information ... an incomplete basis for informed understanding and effective action.

Now, instead of this fragmented picture, Services

Indicators brings you a cohesive whole. An innovative quarterly from Statistics Canada, this publication breaks new ground, providing <u>timely</u> updates on performance and developments in:

- Communications
- Finance, Insurance and Real Estate
- **Business Services**

Services Indicators brings together analytical tables, charts, graphs and commentary in a stimulating and inviting format. From a wide range of key financial indicators including profits, equity, revenues, assets and



liabilities, to trends and analysis of employment, salaries and output – PLUS a probing feature article in every issue, *Services Indicators* gives you the complete picture for the first time!

Finally, anyone with a vested interest in the services economy can go to *Services Indicators* for current information on these industries ... both <u>at-a-glance</u> and <u>in</u> <u>more detail than has ever been</u> <u>available before</u> – all in one unique publication.

If your business is serving business in Canada, or if you are involved in

financing, supplying, assessing or actually using these services, *Services Indicators* is a turning point - an opportunity to forge into the future armed with the most current insights and knowledge.

Services Indicators (catalogue no. 63-016-XPB) is \$116 (plus GST/HST and applicable PST) in Canada, US\$116 in the United States and US\$116 in other countries.

To order, write to Statistics Canada, Operations and Integration Division, Circulation Management, 120 Parkdale Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0T6, or contact the nearest Statistics Canada Regional Reference Centre listed in this publication.

If more convenient, fax your order to **1-800-889-9734** or (613) 951-1584 or call **1-800-267-6677** toll-free in Canada and the United States [(613) 951-7277 elsewhere] and charge to your VISA or MasterCard. Via Internet: order@statcan.ca. Visit our Web Site at www.statcan.ca.





To keep up with ...

- the education levels and the training of the labour force in Canada
- the distribution of income and trends in wages in the country
- updates on research under way in the labour and income field
- the availability of new income and labour market data
- ... you need

PERSPECTIVES ON LABOUR AND INCOME (Catalogue no. 75-001-XPE) from Statistics Canada.

A yearly subscription to **Perspectives on Labour and Income** (four issues) costs just \$58.

Mail your order to Statistics Canada, Operations and Integration Division, Circulation Management, 120 Parkdale Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0T6. Or FAX **1 (613) 951-1584** or **1 800 889-9734**, or call toll free **1 800 267-6677** and use your VISA or MasterCard. E-mail: order@statcan.ca