

**Comparative EU Statistics on Income and Living Conditions:  
Issues and Challenges**

**Helsinki, 6-8 November 2006**

**The differential access of women and men to employment and income:  
evidence from the EU-SILC**

**Terry Ward**

**Applica sprl**

## **The differential access of women and men to employment and income: evidence from the EU-SILC**

### **INTRODUCTION**

The aim here to examine the information provided in the EU-SILC on differences in the access of women and men to employment, and accordingly to income from employment, and the effect which children have in this regard. The additional concern is to consider indicators which can potentially be derived from the data collected by the survey to throw light on the participation of women in the labour market relative to men and on the ease or difficulty which they have in reconciling childcare responsibilities with the pursuit of a working career. Such indicators are of increasing relevance given the growing policy emphasis on the need to get the most out of the EU's potential work force in the coming years in the context of a prospective decline in population of working age as well as of the ongoing importance of maintaining economic competitiveness.

The focus is on women aged 25-49 – ie of an age when women typically face the challenge of balancing the pursuit of a working career and having a young family – sharing a household with a spouse or male partner. These are divided into four groups: those with a child under 3, those whose youngest child is aged 3 to 5, those whose youngest child is aged 6 to 11 and those without a child under 12 (which, of course, includes those who have no children at all). These age divisions correspond with those which are usually distinguished when considering the need for childcare, given that pre-school, or nursery school, typically starts in EU countries at the age of 3 and (compulsory) primary school at the age of 6, while children of 12 and over are considered no longer to need close supervision. The two younger age groups, therefore, correspond with the so-called Barcelona targets adopted by the EU in 2002, which set the objective for policy in Member States of providing by 2010 childcare for at least 33% of children under 3 and for at least 90% of those aged 3 to compulsory school age.

To make the analysis manageable (or, at least, more manageable), no account is taken of the number of children which women might have in each age group. Having more children is clearly likely to increase the difficulty of arranging childcare and, perhaps more importantly, the cost, though arguably in most cases, it is the ability to arrange childcare for the youngest child which determines whether women – or more generally both parents – are able to work or not and, if so, the hours they can work. Accordingly, if the data indicate that the youngest child does not receive childcare then this constrains the ability of both parents to be in paid employment irrespective of whether older children receive care or not. (It does not, it should be noted, necessarily prevent both from working in the sense they may be able to stagger their working hours in such a way that one of them is able to look after their child – or children – at any given time. The extent to which this occurs in practice is not considered here but it could be examined from the SILC data.)

The analysis begins by examining the data collected for the first time at EU level on the use of childcare and attendance of children at pre-school and primary school, which although they are part of the education system provide, at the same time, childcare which might make it possible for women – or more generally parents of both sexes – to be in paid employment.<sup>1</sup> The concern is with the extent to which households with young children of different ages make use of childcare and how this varies between those above and below the poverty line, defined in the customary way, as well as between the countries for which data are available from the 2004 wave of the EU-SILC.

Secondly, it considers the division of paid employment between women and men in couple households – or more specifically in those in which the woman concerned is aged 25 to 49 – examining not only the extent to which the respective partners are working but also the hours which each of them works if they are employed.

Thirdly, it considers the income which each of the partners contributes to that of the household as a whole, focusing, in particular on earnings from employment, whether from a paid job or from a business. This is measured, so far as possible, in gross terms in order to leave out of account the vagaries of the tax system in different countries which, depending on how the tax levied on the income of couples is calculated – and on how the individuals concerned manage their tax affairs – might be an important determinant of the net income which each of them is recorded as generating.

Apart from the interest in this issue in its own right, the rationale is that this provides a basis for assessing how far the customary assumption made, when analysing the distribution of income, that household income is divided equally between household members is justifiable. The specific interest, therefore, is in how far the practice of calculating equivalised income to allow for differences in the size of households and their composition and attributing the income so calculated equally to each household member might lead to misleading conclusions about the actual disposable income which women receive and the proportion of them falling below the poverty line.

## **THE USE OF CHILDCARE**

The EU-SILC contains a series of questions on the receipt of childcare by children, as well as on their attendance at pre-school and at compulsory school. With regard to the former, the questions distinguish between childcare at a day-care centre, from a centre-based service outside of school hours and from a professional child-minder as well as from a grandparent, another household member apart from the parents, a friend, relative or neighbour. In each case, respondents are asked to give the number of hours during a usual week for which school is attended or childcare is received by children, with '0' hours being included as an option to

---

<sup>1</sup> There is some debate in any case of how far pre-school, or nursery school, should be considered as part of the childcare rather than the education system and, indeed, how far there is any significant difference across countries between pre-schools and centres which are specifically labelled as caring for children. The two are

distinguish those who do not make use of childcare at all. While this is itself is important information for assessing the adequacy of care arrangements in respect of the support provided for parents wishing to work, especially if they wish to work full-time, it creates some problems of interpreting the answers given that no prior question is asked about whether children receive care or not.

It is, accordingly, difficult to interpret missing answers, since it is by no means clear whether respondents have simply not been able to answer the question – because, for example, they found it difficult to estimate how many hours of care their child usually received since it varies from week to week – or whether it signifies that they are not making use of childcare at all. Accordingly, there is no way of distinguishing ‘genuine’ missing answers or blanks from those who should have indicated 0 hours. Similar difficulties apply to the ‘not applicable’ responses, which in the case of attendance at pre-school, for example, are intended to mean that the child concerned is not eligible to attend because of their age but it might also mean that there is no pre-school available in the area. In the analysis below, missing values and ‘not available’ responses are both assumed to signify that children are not receiving childcare (in the sense that the denominator in the calculation of the proportions receiving care is the total of all couple households with the youngest child in the age group distinguished). This might, therefore, mean that the results understate the relative number of couples using childcare.

A further difficulty of interpretation arises over the way the answers to the survey as regards this set of questions are organised. They are, therefore, set up to provide an indication of the relative number of children receiving childcare and, accordingly, they represent a means of assessing progress towards meeting the Barcelona targets in the different Member States. Consequently, a separate set of weights is given for children (rather than households) for this purpose – or, more accurately, it is given for some of the countries since for 5 of the 14 countries covered, no weights for children are included.

The proportion of children receiving childcare, however, is not necessarily the most appropriate indicator of how far the services or facilities concerned are meeting the need for parents to work, since this in itself may give a misleading impression of the proportion of households, or parents, who are able to make use of childcare. This can be seen by taking a simple example of five children, three of whom live in the same household and receive care and two of whom live in two separate households and do not receive care. In this case, while 60% of children are recorded as receiving care, only a third of the households in fact have the possibility of having both parents in paid employment. While, therefore, defining objectives for childcare in terms of the proportion of children receiving care can be rationalised if the main – or, in the past, often the only – source of data relates to the provision of places, the availability of data from a household survey opens up the possibility of devising a more satisfactory indicator. In other words, while providers may not be able to distinguish children from the same household whom they care for, the EU-SILC is able to do so.)

---

regarded in the same way below as providing childcare, but the distinction between an education and a social support service can sometimes distort comparisons across countries.

Taking explicit account of this point and relating the receipt of childcare to households, or parents rather than children *per se* is, however, not straight-forward because in principle each child in the household needs to be considered individually to determine whether they receive care or not. Nevertheless, in practice, it should be sufficient to examine the childcare – or education – status of the youngest child in each household, since, as noted above, the ability to arrange childcare for these is likely to be the critical indicator of whether or not both parents are able to be in paid employment. Although it might be the case in some instances that it is more difficult to organise care for other children, the absence of care for these is still likely to be reflected in the youngest child not receiving care since the parents concerned are both unable to work anyway. If the youngest child is not receiving care, then from the perspective of both parents being able to work, it is likely to be immaterial whether an older child is receiving care or not, which is a further reason why the simple targets set by the Barcelona Council are not in themselves sufficient to assess how far the provision of childcare meets the potential need of parents to be able to pursue working careers. (In practice, as indicated below, the proportion of children receiving care tends to be higher, in some cases significantly so, than the proportion of couples making use of care.)

The approach adopted here, therefore, is to examine whether or not the youngest child in the couple households selected for analysis is receiving childcare. In order to simplify things, the analysis is limited to whether or not parents make use of childcare and no account is taken of the number of hours of care their youngest child receives. This is an important limitation – of the Barcelona targets as well as the analysis here – which needs to be removed if the results of the EU-SILC in this respect are to be fully exploited for monitoring the availability of childcare across the EU. (The hours of caring received are not considered here not so much because of the difficulty involved but mainly because of the additional effort required to add the hours provided by the different forms of care when more than one type is used and then to group the results for summary purposes. This additional step, though important in a general sense, is not critical to the concern here which is with a preliminary analysis of the data to examine their usefulness.)

### **Youngest child aged under 3**

The results show that there is significant variation across countries in the use made of childcare, defining this to include attendance at pre-school as well as at day-care centres, after-school centres and so on. For couples with a child under 3, therefore, the proportion making use of childcare of some kind varies from almost 70% of couple households in Denmark and 63% in Portugal to 23% in Finland and 19% in Estonia (Table 1). Apart from in the latter two countries and Austria (30%), the proportion of couple households making use of some form of childcare for children in this age group is 40% or more in all the countries from which data are available for 2004 from the EU\_SILC.

This in the majority of countries is significantly higher than indicated by measures of childcare for this age group based on estimating the number of places provided by suppliers,

which is the basis of the indicator used at EU level to monitor the pursuit of the Barcelona targets for children under 3. Estimates of this, harmonised so far as possible for differences in definitions, show a variation from around 55% in Denmark and Belgium to under 10% in Greece and Italy<sup>2</sup>. At the same time, the SILC data show a reasonably close correspondence with the provider -based estimates for Belgium, Ireland, Finland and Estonia.

In the other countries, the difference is partly explicable in terms of the inclusion of informal care in the SILC and its exclusion from the provider-based estimates, as well as by the similar inclusion of care provided by professional child-minders, which also tends to be left out of account by the latter estimates. In most countries, informal care – provided by grandparents, other relatives, friends and so on – accounts for a significant proportion of the overall childcare received (10% or more) in all only countries except the three EU Nordic Member States, where it is of minimal importance (in Norway, more use is made of informal care than in these three, accounting for around 10% of the total). In Greece, in particular, over 70% of the care received is provided informally, so that excluding this, the proportion of children receiving care is reduced much closer to the provider-based figure (to around 16% for couple households). Similarly, in Estonia, over 65% of couples making use of childcare rely on informal arrangements, while in Austria, almost 55% , do so, which again accounts for a major part of the difference between the figures presented here and those relating to official providers (couples using formal care amount to 15% of the total. The inclusion of informal care in the SILC data, as well as possibly child-minders, also explains much of the difference in France.

On the other hand, although informal care accounts for around a third of the total received in Portugal and Luxembourg and 40% in Italy, this still only explains part of the difference in the figures from the two sources and a wide gap between the two remains for all three countries (around 20-25% more couple households using childcare than indicated by the provider-based estimates).

It is not clear why this should be the case. It should be recognised, however, that estimates of childcare from the provider side are liable to give a misleading impression of the extent of care, both because they tend to count childcare places rather than the individual children cared for – and one place might accommodate more than one child at different times of the day – and because they tend to be incomplete (ie it is difficult to cover all providers, many of which may be very small). In other words, there is no reason why provider-based estimates of childcare should be more accurate than those derived from the EU-SILC. Indeed, the latter should be a more reliable source so long as the information reported, and recorded, is correct, which perhaps is only likely to become clear over successive surveys.

### **Comparison of couple-based and child-based indicators**

---

<sup>2</sup> See *A target-based assessment study of the European Employment Guidelines*, Part 2, Provision of childcare, report produced by Alphametries for DG Employment and Social Affairs and published at: [http://ec.europa.eu/employment\\_social/incentive\\_measures/studies/assessm\\_eg\\_fin\\_rep\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/incentive_measures/studies/assessm_eg_fin_rep_en.pdf)

The figures presented here for the proportion of couples with the youngest child under 3 who make use of childcare can be compared for 9 of the 14 countries with the proportion of children in this age group receiving care (as noted above, for 5 countries, weights for children are not included in the SILC microdata). This indicates that in most cases – the only exceptions are Luxembourg, Finland and Austria, in the first two of which, the figures are much the same and – the proportion of children receiving care is larger than the proportion of couples, in some cases significantly so. In Belgium and Italy, in particular, the proportion of children aged under 3 receiving care is around 9 percentage points more than the couples making use of childcare.

### **Youngest child aged 3-5**

The proportion of couples whose youngest child is aged 3 to 5 who make use of childcare varies much less between countries than for those with a child under 3, especially if Estonia, for which the data seem incomplete (no answers are recorded on attendance at school), is left to one side. In 7 of the 14 countries covered by the 2004 SILC, over 90% of couple households falling into this category make use of childcare – including pre-school under this heading – while in another 5, around 80% or more do so. This leave only Estonia, where only some 29% of couples are recorded as using childcare, and Ireland, where the figure is 52%. In the latter, however, where compulsory education starts earlier than in the other countries covered, a further 28% of couples have children in primary school. This raises the proportion who are effectively receiving care to around 80%, more similar to that in other countries (it is around the same as in Greece, Finland and Austria).

These figures are also more similar to those indicated by estimates from provider-based sources. The main exception, apart from Estonia (where the provider-based data show a proportion of children being cared for of around 80%), is Greece, for which the provider-based estimates indicate a figure some 20 percentage points lower than that derived from the SILC data (60% as opposed to 80%). Much of this difference, however, can be explained by the inclusion of informal care arrangements in the latter, which are used by around 13% of couples together with the 2-3% who use professional child-minders. Elsewhere, apart from Estonia, informal care is less important, accounting for under 10% of care received in all countries, and under 2% in all but Ireland, Luxembourg, Austria and Portugal, in all of which it represents around 8-9% of the total.

### **Youngest child aged 6-11**

Compulsory education starts at 6 in most EU countries, the exceptions among the countries covered by the SILC in 2004, apart from Ireland as mentioned above, being the three Nordic Member States and Estonia, where it begins a year later. In most countries, therefore, primary school, as well as providing education, is also a source of childcare for parents wishing to work. This, however, is only the case within school hours, so that parents wanting to have full-time employment are likely to need to have recourse to childcare arrangements outside of

school hours. The extent to which they make use of such arrangements varies markedly across countries, reflecting the differential availability of services of this kind.

The proportion of couples using formal care services out of school hours, therefore, ranges from 50% in Denmark, 35% in Sweden and around 30% or just under in Spain and Portugal to under 15% in Greece, Ireland, Luxembourg and Finland and only around 7% in France (no data are available for Estonia). In addition, some 20% of couples make use of informal care on a regular basis in Italy, as do around 16% in Belgium and 10-15% in Greece, France, Ireland, Luxembourg and Portugal, while hardly any couples do so in the three Nordic countries.

The use of informal arrangements, therefore, raises the proportion of couples with children of this age receiving out-of-school childcare to around 40% in Belgium, Italy and Portugal and to around a third in Austria, but to only around 20% in France and around 11% in Finland.

### **The relationship between childcare and income**

The inclusion of information on childcare in EU-SILC means that its use can be related to other aspects of household circumstances, in particular to disposable income as well as to the employment characteristics of household members. Relating the use of childcare to income indicates, perhaps not unexpectedly, that the proportion of couples receiving some form of childcare tends to be smaller among those with equivalised household income below the poverty line (60% of the median in the country concerned) than among those with income above this level. (A more detailed analysis of the relationship between childcare and income remains to be undertaken.) Perhaps surprisingly, however, the relative use made of informal care arrangements tends to also be lower among the former group than the latter.

In Belgium, Luxembourg and Portugal, the proportion of couples with a child under 3 making use of childcare is around 30 percentage points higher for those with income above the poverty line than for those below and in Ireland, over 40 percentage points higher, while in most of the other countries, it was around 20 percentage points higher or more. The one exception to the norm is Sweden, where a larger share of couples with poverty-level income used childcare than those above.

This general pattern also applies to couples with a child aged 3 to. In all countries apart from Denmark and Luxembourg, a larger share of couples with a child of this age and with income above the poverty line receive childcare than those with income below. In Greece and Ireland, the difference is around 30 percentage points, in Estonia and Portugal, over 25 percentage points and in Finland and Sweden, around 20 percentage points.

Much the same is true of couples with a child aged 6 to 11. In all countries apart from Austria, proportionately more couples in this category with income above the poverty line make use of childcare than those below, the difference being some 20 percentage points or more in Belgium, Greece, Ireland and Portugal, as well as in Norway.

In all countries and for children in all three age groups, the proportion of couples with income above the poverty line with informal care arrangements is larger than for those with poverty-level income, in many cases significantly so.

The factors underlying the apparent relationship between the use of childcare and household income, however, remain uncertain. In particular, it is by no means clear whether the direction of causation runs from the non-use of childcare to having income below the poverty line, in the sense that the need to look after a child prevents both of the parents from being in paid employment, or from having a low level of income to not being able to afford childcare. In practice, both are probably relevant, insofar as for those with relatively low earnings potential, there may be little to be gained from both partners working.

This raises a general point about the survey, in that the limitation of questions on childcare to the number of hours of care used means that it is not possible to conclude very much about these underlying factors. In particular, there is an absence of questions on the reasons for not using care as well as on the cost of care and its accessibility – in terms of location in addition to the price. Although questions on cost, in particular, might be difficult to frame and interpret, given, for example, problems of taking explicit account of government subsidies or tax concessions, the lack of information on this diminishes the value of the data collected by the survey. Moreover, problems of framing the questions to be included in the survey on these aspects do not extend to questions on why those not making use of childcare do not do so – whether because they choose not to or because they cannot afford to – which, in principle at least, would give an insight into affordability and accessibility issues.

#### **THE DIVISION OF EMPLOYMENT BETWEEN MEN AND WOMEN**

In practice, as data from the EU-SILC show clearly, it is women rather than men who in the great majority of households bear the main burden of caring for children and who face the challenge of reconciling this with the pursuit of a working career. Despite the relatively widespread use of childcare as described above, therefore, a significantly smaller proportion of women in couple households with children are in paid employment than men throughout the EU. In all the countries covered, with the sole exception of Sweden, around 90% of men in such households were recorded as being in work in 2004, almost all of them in full-time employment. Moreover, this proportion varies hardly at all with the age of the youngest child. In Sweden, however, only around 80% of men with a child aged under 3 were in paid employment and almost 20% were not working, whereas for those with children older than this, the proportion in work was much the same as in other countries (Table 2 which shows the employment status of women in couple households according to the employment status of men in the same households).

In addition, in the majority of the countries – though not in the four southern EU Member States, France and Luxembourg – a large proportion of men with children were in employment than those without. (It should be noted that employment here is defined in terms

of whether or not respondents consider themselves to be employed as opposed to being unemployed or inactive, instead of in terms of the ILO standard definition under which someone is regarded as employed if they work at least one hour a week.)

For women, however, having a child markedly reduces the likelihood of being in paid employment in almost all countries, especially in the early years, and equally reduces the chances of being in a full-time rather than a part-time job if they are in employment. At the same time, again in nearly all the countries, women aged 25 to 49 are less likely than men to be employed even if they do not have a child under 12. This difference is particularly pronounced in Greece and Italy, where the proportion of women in work in couple households without children was around 25 percentage points less than for men in the same households.

In both countries, having a child under 3 reduces the proportion of women in employment by around a further 20 percentage points, as it does in Spain, France, Ireland and Luxembourg, while in Sweden, it reduces it by some 25 percentage points, in Austria and Finland, by over 45 percentage points and in Estonia, by 55 percentage points. On the other hand, the reduction is under 10 percentage points in Belgium and Denmark, and under 5 percentage points in Portugal and Norway. These figures bear some relationship to the relative number of couples with children of this age receiving care, which is particularly small in Austria, Finland and Estonia.

In all three of these countries, the proportion of women in work with a child aged 3 to 5 is markedly higher (65-75%), though in both Estonia and Austria, it is still some 15 percentage points less than for women without children. (For Estonia, it is difficult to reconcile this with the relatively small share of couples making use of childcare.) The proportion of women in employment is also significantly higher in Denmark and Sweden and, to a lesser extent, in France. In the other countries, however, there is relatively little difference between the employment rate of women in a couple with a child of this age and the rate for those with a child under 3. Indeed, in Spain, Ireland, Italy and Luxembourg, the proportion of women in work with a child aged 3 to 5 is actually lower and, in the first three, only around 50% (in Luxembourg, 55%). Given the results of the analysis of childcare above, there seems to be little relationship between the proportion of women in work and the relative number of couples with children of this age receiving care (in three of the four countries – all except Ireland – over 90% of couples received childcare).

While, therefore, the use of childcare might be a necessary condition for a woman to be in paid employment, it is clearly not a sufficient condition. In other words, there are other reasons for parents to send their children to pre-school or a day-care centre than being able to work.

In both Spain and Italy, moreover – as in Greece – the employment rate of women in couple households with a child aged 6 to 11 is also much the same as that for those with a child under 6 (and, therefore, only around 50%), while in Luxembourg, it is only slightly higher. In Ireland, on the other hand, it is some 10 percentage points higher, which still means, however,

that it is well below the rate for women without children. The same is the case in Austria, but in the other countries, there is little or no difference between the proportion of women employed with child of 6 to 11 and that of women with no children.

Nevertheless, in most of these countries, a substantial share of the women with a child of this age work part-time rather than full-time, the exceptions being Portugal and Finland as well as Estonia, in the first of which only 12% of women work part-time and in the second, 15%, while in Estonia, the figure is under 10% (Table 3 which shows the average usual hours a week worked by women aged 25 to 49 in couple households who are employed by the usual hours worked by men).. In Portugal, this is reflected in a relatively large proportion of couples with a child of 6 to 11 using childcare outside of school hours, but not so in Finland, where the proportion is relatively small, and even less so in Estonia, where only 12% are recorded as making use of care.

In Belgium as well as Norway, around 55% of women in a couple household with a child aged 6 to 11 work part-time, while in Denmark and Sweden, the figure is some 40%, in all cases considerably less than the proportion of women without children employed part-time (though in Belgium, the figure for the latter is still around 30%). In Ireland and Austria, the proportion of women with children working part-time is even higher, at around two-thirds, which in the former, at least, is arguably a reflection of the relatively small number making use of childcare outside of school hours. In Austria, however, the number is relatively large.

Overall, therefore, there seems to be only a tenuous relationship between women's employment and the number of hours they work and the use made of childcare, as recorded by the EU-SILC. This does not mean, of course, that access to childcare is not essential for women to be able to pursue a working career but only that, as noted above, that there are other reasons for using care services. But it is clearly the case that in all countries women in couple households with children are much less likely to be in employment than men and, if they are employed, much more likely to work shorter hours.

A further point to note is that there is no evidence of any greater tendency for women in couple households to be in paid employment when men are not working. On the contrary, women are less likely to be employed when their partner is not working than when he is. This is especially so in households without young children – in all of the countries, the proportion of women in employment being significant lower if their partner is not employed than he is in work – but it is also the case in most countries in households where there are young children. In Belgium, for example, only 34% of women with a child aged 3 to 5 were in work in 2004 in households where their partner was not employed, whereas 73% were working in households where their partner was in full-time employment. A similar difference, though not necessarily on the same scale, is evident for couples with children in this age group in all of the countries except Luxembourg and Austria and for those with children under 3, in all countries apart from Austria again and Greece.

This suggests that there are comparatively few cases of men taking over childcare responsibilities to enable women to work and reinforces the conclusion reached above that it is women rather than men who ultimately face the challenge of reconciling the pursuit of a working career and having children.

#### **WOMEN'S EARNINGS RELATIVE TO MEN'S IN COUPLE HOUSEHOLDS**

The smaller proportion of women in couple households in employment relative to men and the shorter hours they tend to work on average when they are employed is reflected in women contributing less in terms of earnings to household income than men. This is particularly the case in couples with young children, but it is equally evident in those without children, even if in general the extent of the difference is smaller.

This can be seen if the personal income of women aged 25 to 49 living with their spouse or partner recorded by the EU-SILC is compared with that of men in the same households. The focus here is on earnings from employment in particular which in most of such households is by far the major source of income. More specifically, the analysis is based on comparing, where possible, the gross monthly earnings of women and men in the same households, together with any gross cash profits from self-employment, adjusted to a monthly basis. In practice, gross monthly earnings data are not available for many of the countries – Denmark, Estonia, France, Luxembourg, Finland and Sweden. In these cases, ‘cash or near cash employee income’ is used instead, again measured in gross terms. This tends to give a slightly higher figure (when adjusted to a monthly basis) than the gross monthly earnings series in countries where the two can be compared, but ought not to affect the comparison between men's and women's earnings significantly. (It should be noted that it might give a higher figure because it includes occasional income, such as bonuses, which is not part of normal monthly earnings.) Where gross figures are not available for the income of the self-employed – as is the case in each of the four southern Member States – net figures are used instead, which has an uncertain effect on the comparisons.

These data indicate that the average earnings from employment of women in couple households without children under 12 ranged from a high of around 75% of those of men the same households in Portugal and Finland, 73-74% in Belgium and Denmark and 70-72% in Spain, France, Ireland, Austria and Sweden to around 58% in Luxembourg, 56% in Norway and only just over 50% in Greece (Table 4). This gap in earnings is partly attributable to the greater prevalence of part-time working among women than among men, though this does not account for all of the difference.

In all the countries, therefore, a gap remains even after allowing for differences in working time. The extent of this gap, however, varies markedly between them, the excess of men's average earnings over those of women ranging from 7% in Italy and 9-10% in Spain and Portugal to around 40% in Greece and around 60% in Estonia (and around 55% in Norway). (It should be noted that these figures are approximate only insofar as they are based on dividing working time between broad groups of hours rather than on the specific hours

usually worked by the men and women concerned. They also take no account in most cases of differences in the average number of months worked during the year, though they do to some extent - implicitly – in the countries for which annual data on employee income have been used rather than gross monthly earnings.)

For couples with young children, the gap between men's earnings and those of women is in all countries, with the partial exception of Norway, wider still. This again partly reflects the relatively large number of women who work part-time instead of full-time as well as the smaller proportion of women than men in paid employment at all. But again, these two factors explain only part of the gap. Moreover, contrary to what be expected, in many of the countries, the contribution of women to household income, according to the SILC data, is not closely related to the age of their youngest child, which partly reflects the fact, noted above, that in a number of countries, the employment rate of women does not seem to vary with this.

The average gross earnings of women in couple households with a child under 3, therefore, varies from around 63% of that of their male partner in Portugal, around 60% in Norway and just under 55% in Belgium, Denmark and France, to only just over 35% in Estonia and Sweden, around a third in Luxembourg and Finland and under 30% in Austria. Some of this is explicable in terms of a significant proportion of women in such circumstances not being in work but caring for their child instead. But even allowing for this, by comparing the earnings of women and men when both are in work, there is still a considerable gap between the two. In all countries, the earnings of women are on average less than 80% of those of men, which again can only partly be attributed to a significant number of them working part-time.

Although the relative number of women in work tends to rise as children grow older, in 6 of the 14 countries, the average earnings of women as compared with those of men are lower for those whose youngest child is aged 3 to 5 than for those with a child aged under 3. Moreover, in half the remaining countries, the earnings of women relative to men are only slightly higher for those with a child over 3 than for those with a child younger than this. In most countries, therefore, the gap between men's and women's earnings for couples with a child aged 3 to 5 is wider once allowance is made for differences in their average employment rate and working time than for those with a child under 3.

Much the same is true for couples with the youngest child aged 6 to 11 as compared with those with a child aged 3 to 5. In general, the earnings of women in such households are little if any higher relative to those of men than in the case of women with a child under 6 and in some countries, they are lower.

## **CONCLUDING REMARKS**

The general conclusion, therefore, is that women in couple households contribute much less to income than men in all the countries covered by the 2004 EU-SILC data, the more so when they have young children. In most of the countries, women's earnings on average amount to around half or less of men's when they have a child under 12, and the specific age of the child

makes comparatively little difference in this respect. The conventional assumption that men and women in such households share the income they both individually receive equally between them needs to be considered against this background. While the assumption might be valid, there is clearly a greater likelihood that women in practice receive less than implied by this assumption than that they receive more.

It is equally arguable that it is relevant to take account of women's earnings relative to men's in the way that has been done above in order to obtain a more complete picture of the position of women as compared with men, just as it is relevant to take account of their labour market situation and their relative access to employment. The accessibility of childcare, in terms of both its affordability and the convenience of the location of the services provided, is also more than relevant in this regard, since for most women, the availability of childcare is essential if they have young children and wish to pursue a working career. Even though these aspects are not covered by the EU-SILC, the survey can still throw light on the extent to which households make use of childcare in different countries and how this is linked to employment and income.

While no specific indicators additional to those at present in use have been proposed above, the analysis suggests:

- first, that the form in which the present indicator on childcare is framed should be reconsidered to incorporate households' use of care explicitly;
- secondly, that there is some policy relevance in monitoring the division of employment between women and men living in the same household, especially those with young children, since this is indicative of the way that caring responsibilities are shared between them;
- thirdly, that it is equally relevant to monitor the extent to which women and men contribute to household income, especially as regards their earnings from employment, which in some degree is related to their relative rates of employment and differences in the hours they work but also reflects the continuing pay gap between men and women. This arguably provides a useful indicator to supplement comparisons of equivalised disposable income between women and men – or more specifically the indicator of their relative risk of poverty based on this.

Table 1 The proportion of couple households in which the woman is aged 25-49 making use of childcare, 2004

	% of total households in each category																					
	BE			DK			EE			GR			ES			FR			IE			
	Age of child:			Age of child:			Age of child:			Age of child:			Age of child:			Age of child:			Age of child:			
	0-2	3-5	6-11	0-2	3-5	6-11	0-2	3-5	6-11	0-2	3-5	6-11	0-2	3-5	6-11	0-2	3-5	6-11	0-2	3-5	6-11	
<b>Total couple households</b>																						
Formal	36.3	65.3	0.7	67.7	94.1	19.0	5.6	13.9	4.7	9.1	43.8	6.1	39.7	90.3	4.6	36.7	73.6	5.7	26.7	29.5	1.3	
Informal	12.6	0.2	0.1	1.1	0.6	0.1	12.8	13.6	6.5	35.8	13.4	0.5	9.8	0.6	0.0	10.6	0.7	0.0	12.1	4.6	0.7	
Formal+informal	8.9	25.0	0.8	1.1	1.1	0.5	1.1	1.1	0.5	4.8	22.6	1.8	4.3	6.3	0.0	9.9	20.5	1.8	4.5	5.5	0.0	
Compulsary school	0.0	5.3	56.2	0.0	0.0	29.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	65.6	0.0	0.0	64.8	0.0	1.2	72.6	0.0	27.8	66.6	
School+formal	0.7	19.0	51.1	0.0	0.0	51.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.9	0.0	0.0	26.9	0.0	0.1	4.8	0.0	3.3	9.2	
School+informal	1.8	15.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.9	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.4	12.8	0.0	6.2	11.9	
School+formal+informal	0.2	3.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.4	12.8	0.0	2.5	4.9	
Total childcare	57.8	93.0	38.9	68.9	94.7	70.2	19.5	28.5	11.8	49.7	79.8	32.7	53.8	97.2	34.5	57.2	95.3	27.0	43.3	51.7	28.1	
Childcare+school	57.8	98.3	95.1	68.9	94.7	99.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	49.7	79.8	98.4	53.8	97.2	99.3	57.2	96.6	99.6	43.3	79.5	94.7	
<b>Households with income above poverty line</b>																						
Formal	38.2	63.0	0.5	68.9	93.9	18.6	6.4	16.5	4.3	10.7	44.4	6.0	41.4	90.2	4.9	38.3	73.0	5.4	29.6	30.9	1.5	
Informal	13.8	0.2	0.1	1.2	0.6	0.1	16.4	14.8	6.8	36.5	14.9	0.6	10.8	0.4	0.0	11.1	0.8	0.0	13.2	4.9	0.9	
Formal+informal	9.8	27.2	0.6	1.4	1.3	0.6	1.4	1.3	0.6	5.7	24.9	1.8	5.0	6.8	0.1	10.2	21.6	2.0	5.0	6.2	0.0	
Compulsary school	0.0	5.8	54.7	0.0	0.0	28.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	62.0	0.0	0.0	62.0	0.0	1.1	71.8	0.0	27.2	64.7	
School+formal	0.8	19.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	52.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.1	0.0	0.0	29.4	0.0	0.1	5.3	0.0	3.8	10.1	
School+informal	2.0	16.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.9	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.0	0.4	13.6	0.0	7.2	13.1	
School+formal+informal	0.3	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	0.0	0.4	16.6	0.0	2.9	5.5	
Total childcare	61.7	93.3	40.8	70.1	94.5	70.7	24.3	32.6	11.7	52.8	84.2	36.5	57.1	97.5	37.7	59.6	96.0	28.0	47.8	55.9	31.1	
Childcare+school	61.7	99.2	95.5	70.1	94.5	99.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	52.8	84.2	98.5	57.1	97.5	99.8	59.6	97.1	99.8	47.8	83.1	95.7	
<b>Households with income below poverty line</b>																						
Formal	23.4	84.4	2.2	56.5	97.1	25.9	2.9	6.8	6.8	40.1	6.8	6.8	30.7	90.5	3.9	20.4	79.2	8.3	1.6	20.5	0.0	
Informal	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	31.3	4.0	4.0	4.0	1.4	0.0	6.2	0.0	0.0	3.0	2.5	0.0	
Formal+informal	3.2	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	1.5	1.5	0.7	4.2	0.0	6.7	10.4	8.3	1.4	1.4	0.0	
Compulsary school	0.0	1.3	70.0	0.0	0.0	36.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	80.6	0.0	0.0	72.8	0.0	2.3	80.1	0.0	31.7	78.7	
School+formal	0.0	1.3	13.8	0.0	0.0	37.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	19.7	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	3.8	3.8	
School+informal	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	5.2	0.0	4.4	4.4	
School+formal+informal	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	4.1	0.0	0.9	0.9	
Total childcare	31.1	90.1	20.8	56.5	97.1	63.1	2.9	6.8	11.9	31.3	52.5	17.2	35.4	96.1	25.2	33.3	89.6	18.2	4.6	24.4	9.1	
Childcare+school	31.1	91.4	90.7	56.5	97.1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	31.3	52.5	97.8	35.4	96.1	98.1	33.3	91.9	98.2	4.6	56.1	87.8	

Note: 'Formal' covers pre-school, day-care centre, centre-based services and professional child-minders; 'informal' covers all kinds of informal arrangements (with grandparents, etc)  
The poverty line is defined as 60% of the national median equivalised income

Source: EU-SILC, 2004

Table 1 The proportion of couple households in which the womam is aged 25-49 making use of childcare, 2004 (cont'd)

	% of total households in each category																					
	IT			LU			AT			PT			FI			SE			NO			
	Age of child:			Age of child:			Age of child:			Age of child:			Age of child:			Age of child:			Age of child:			
	0-2	3-5	6-11	0-2	3-5	6-11	0-2	3-5	6-11	0-2	3-5	6-11	0-2	3-5	6-11	0-2	3-5	6-11	0-2	3-5	6-11	
<b>Total couple households</b>																						
Formal	18.8	57.5		26.1	65.5	9.9	10.8	52.7	8.1	37.1	66.2	8.9	22.1	78.5	16.1	46.8	81.9	14.3	36.7	84.8	1.5	
Informal	17.5	1.3		20.1	7.0	0.5	16.6	6.0	0.1	21.4	7.2	0.9	0.9	0.4	0.1	0.9	0.2	0.3	4.6	1.7	0.1	
Formal+informal	7.8	30.5		7.5	20.5	6.3	3.2	21.5	1.7	4.4	13.4	2.9	0.3	0.3	0.2	1.0	2.0	0.2	3.8	3.9		
Compulsary school	0.0	2.8	59.0	0.0	0.0	53.0	0.0	0.0	55.4	0.0	0.1	40.7	0.0	0.0	70.7	0.0	0.0	43.3	0.0	0.0	61.3	
School+formal	1.0	13.6		12.5			22.8			0.4			10.5			34.8			30.6			
School+informal	1.1	17.9		13.0			8.0			0.4			10.5			0.8			0.8		5.1	
School+formal+informal	0.5	9.5		1.1			2.9			0.3			0.3			0.4			0.4		0.8	
Total childcare	44.1	92.0	41.0	53.8	92.9	43.3	30.6	80.2	43.6	62.9	87.2	53.7	23.0	79.3	27.5	48.8	84.1	50.8	45.0	90.5	38.2	
Childcare+school	44.1	94.8	100.0	53.8	92.9	96.3	30.6	80.2	99.0	62.9	87.3	94.5	23.0	79.3	98.2	48.8	84.1	94.1	45.0	90.5	99.4	
<b>Households with income above poverty line</b>																						
Formal	19.3	56.1		26.0	62.0	8.5	11.3	51.4	8.4	40.3	68.3	9.6	24.1	80.0	16.3	46.1	83.1	14.3	37.4	86.2	1.6	
Informal	19.7	1.4		24.0	8.0	0.7	17.3	6.2	0.2	22.9	7.4	1.1	0.9	0.4	0.1	0.5	0.2	0.3	4.0	1.1	0.1	
Formal+informal	8.9	33.5		9.3	22.6	6.3	3.7	22.9	1.9	5.2	15.7	3.5	0.4	0.4	0.1	1.1	2.1	0.1	3.8	4.2		
Compulsary school	0.0	2.4	55.4	0.0	0.0	50.7	0.0	0.0	56.1	0.0	0.1	35.1	0.0	0.0	70.2	0.0	0.0	43.3	0.0	0.0	60.2	
School+formal	0.9	13.7		13.6			21.6			0.5			10.8			35.0			31.9			
School+informal	1.3	19.8		14.7			8.2			0.5			11.4			0.9			0.9		5.0	
School+formal+informal	0.7	11.0		1.3			3.0			2.8			0.3			0.4			0.4		0.9	
Total childcare	47.9	93.8	44.6	59.2	92.7	45.1	32.3	80.5	43.2	68.4	91.9	59.8	25.0	80.8	27.9	47.7	85.5	51.1	45.2	91.5	39.5	
Childcare+school	47.9	96.1	100.0	59.2	92.7	95.8	32.3	80.5	99.3	68.4	92.0	94.9	25.0	80.8	98.1	47.7	85.5	94.4	45.2	91.5	99.7	
<b>Households with income below poverty line</b>																						
Formal	16.5	63.3		26.9	88.1	16.7	7.1	58.9	6.0	18.4	56.6	6.8	3.5	61.9	13.8	53.2	64.0	13.4	25.3	64.6		
Informal	8.2	1.2		3.9			11.3	5.2		12.3	6.3	0.4	0.5			4.7			14.0	11.5		
Formal+informal	3.5	18.8		0.1	6.3	6.4	14.4			3.1	3.1	1.1	0.9			1.9			3.7			
Compulsary school	0.0	4.5	71.2	0.0	0.0	64.3	0.0	0.0	49.8	0.0	0.0	58.9	0.0	0.0	76.1	0.0	0.0	43.3	0.0	0.0	77.6	
School+formal	1.5	13.0		7.1			32.5			17.9			7.5			32.2			9.9			
School+informal	11.5			4.6			6.3			7.7											7.5	
School+formal+informal	0.1	4.3		1.9			0.3			0.3												
Total childcare	28.3	84.9	28.8	30.9	94.5	34.8	18.4	78.5	46.6	30.7	65.9	34.3	3.5	62.5	22.1	57.9	64.0	47.5	43.0	76.1	17.4	
Childcare+school	28.3	89.4	100.0	30.9	94.5	99.1	18.4	78.5	96.5	30.7	65.9	93.2	3.5	62.5	98.3	57.9	64.0	90.7	43.0	76.1	95.0	

Table 2 Employment of men and women in couple households where the woman is aged 25-49, 2004

	% men/women in households in each category																				
	BE			DK			EE			GR			ES			FR			IE		
	Age of child:	No child	Age of child:	No child	Age of child:	No child	Age of child:	No child	Age of child:	No child	Age of child:	No child	Age of child:	No child	Age of child:	No child	Age of child:	No child	Age of child:	No child	
<b>MEN</b>	0-2	3-5	6-11	0-2	3-5	6-11	0-2	3-5	6-11	0-2	3-5	6-11	0-2	3-5	6-11	0-2	3-5	6-11	0-2	3-5	6-11
Working full-time	40.4	34.8	38.8	53.6	55.8	56.5	23.8	65.4	78.2	84.7	44.5	49.8	62.8	35.8	33.4	39.9	65.5	40.0	44.1	49.6	69.8
Working part-time	30.6	38.3	40.1	17.1	29.8	27.5	7.4	7.6	6.2	7.1	7.3	8.4	9.3	16.9	16.6	10.6	11.8	21.0	30.1	29.7	14.0
<b>Men full-time, total</b>	29.0	26.9	21.1	29.2	14.3	16.0	68.8	27.0	15.6	8.2	48.2	37.6	40.9	47.3	50.0	49.5	22.7	39.0	25.8	20.6	16.2
<b>Men part-time total</b>	1.9	6.2	2.5	2.8	2.2	1.5	4.2	0.6	2.9	2.8	2.0	2.9	0.8	2.1	1.4	1.4	2.6	3.9	3.3	2.4	3.5
Not working	27.7	18.8	49.8	36.4	73.5	57.0	0.0	0.0	85.5	47.7	51.5	73.8	62.5	55.0	49.8	44.0	47.3	37.5	60.3	33.1	40.1
Working full-time	0.0	38.4	53.0	36.1	26.5	13.9	15.8	0.0	14.5	0.0	46.7	0.0	32.1	10.5	41.9	22.2	29.9	43.4	19.6	30.0	23.3
Working part-time	51.7	24.6	12.0	27.5	0.0	29.1	84.2	100.0	0.0	52.3	1.8	26.2	5.5	34.5	8.3	33.8	22.7	19.1	20.1	36.9	36.6
<b>Men not working total</b>	1.9	6.2	2.5	2.8	2.2	1.5	4.2	0.6	2.9	2.8	2.0	2.9	0.8	2.1	1.4	1.4	2.6	3.9	3.3	2.4	3.5
Not working	16.7	15.1	2.7	0.0	9.9	10.4	0.0	9.9	1.1	2.1	0.0	0.0	6.8	5.4	13.5	15.2	12.0	11.5	22.6	23.9	11.7
Working full-time	55.7	66.0	47.5	56.5	37.2	26.3	88.9	69.1	24.9	35.4	28.7	58.2	39.6	58.5	63.2	49.8	55.6	60.7	44.9	31.6	48.4
Working part-time	6.6	8.8	6.7	8.1	4.9	5.7	7.4	8.3	10.5	22.4	2.6	3.2	6.3	5.4	7.4	9.7	8.2	8.9	9.4	8.4	11.9
<b>Men not working total</b>	39.7	33.5	39.4	52.3	56.1	56.9	21.9	61.3	78.0	78.7	45.3	54.2	50.1	36.2	32.9	39.5	62.4	38.8	43.5	48.8	65.2
Women full-time	29.1	36.3	37.9	16.3	28.8	26.3	7.2	7.8	5.9	5.8	7.9	7.9	9.3	16.1	16.7	11.2	12.3	21.0	29.0	29.3	14.0
Women part-time	29.1	36.3	37.9	16.3	28.8	26.3	7.2	7.8	5.9	5.8	7.9	7.9	9.3	16.1	16.7	11.2	12.3	21.0	29.0	29.3	14.0
<b>Women part-time total</b>	29.1	36.3	37.9	16.3	28.8	26.3	7.2	7.8	5.9	5.8	7.9	7.9	9.3	16.1	16.7	11.2	12.3	21.0	29.0	29.3	14.0
<b>Women full-time total</b>	39.7	33.5	39.4	52.3	56.1	56.9	21.9	61.3	78.0	78.7	45.3	54.2	50.1	36.2	32.9	39.5	62.4	38.8	43.5	48.8	65.2
<b>Women part-time total</b>	29.1	36.3	37.9	16.3	28.8	26.3	7.2	7.8	5.9	5.8	7.9	7.9	9.3	16.1	16.7	11.2	12.3	21.0	29.0	29.3	14.0
<b>Women total</b>	69.4	70.1	77.3	68.6	85.1	83.2	53.7	73.1	91.9	84.5	53.2	62.1	59.4	52.3	65.4	79.1	74.7	59.8	72.5	78.1	79.7
<b>Men total</b>	30.9	25.7	41.9	36.4	57.7	58.7	15.8	17.6	11.1	10.0	49.7	40.3	43.4	57.5	61.4	60.9	45.3	42.4	59.6	52.4	46.6
<b>Men part-time total</b>	1.9	6.2	2.5	2.8	2.2	1.5	4.2	0.6	2.9	2.8	2.0	2.9	0.8	2.1	1.4	1.4	2.6	3.9	3.3	2.4	3.5
<b>Men full-time total</b>	29.0	26.9	21.1	29.2	14.3	16.0	68.8	27.0	15.6	8.2	48.2	37.6	40.9	47.3	50.0	49.5	22.7	39.0	25.8	20.6	16.2
<b>Women full-time total</b>	39.7	33.5	39.4	52.3	56.1	56.9	21.9	61.3	78.0	78.7	45.3	54.2	50.1	36.2	32.9	39.5	62.4	38.8	43.5	48.8	65.2
<b>Women part-time total</b>	29.1	36.3	37.9	16.3	28.8	26.3	7.2	7.8	5.9	5.8	7.9	7.9	9.3	16.1	16.7	11.2	12.3	21.0	29.0	29.3	14.0
<b>Women total</b>	69.4	70.1	77.3	68.6	85.1	83.2	53.7	73.1	91.9	84.5	53.2	62.1	59.4	52.3	65.4	79.1	74.7	59.8	72.5	78.1	79.7

Note: Employment status is self-defined

Source: EU-SILC, 2004



Table 3 Average usual hours worked per week in couple households where the woman is aged 25-49, 2004

	% men/women employed in each category of household																												
	BE			DK			EE			GR			ES			FR			IE										
	Age of child:	No	child	Age of child:	No	child	Age of child:	No	child	Age of child:	No	child	Age of child:	No	child	Age of child:	No	child	Age of child:	No	child								
<b>MEN</b>	0-2	3-5	6-11	0-2	3-5	6-11	0-2	3-5	6-11	0-2	3-5	6-11	0-2	3-5	6-11	0-2	3-5	6-11	0-2	3-5	6-11	0-2	3-5	6-11					
<15 hours	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
part-time	0	0	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	100				
long part-time	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	28	0			
full-time	0	0	56	0	0	100	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	38	100	0	76	0	0	32	0			
<b>&lt; 15 hours Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>			
Part-time (15-29)	56	17	21	17	21	0	0	12	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	0	0	11	0	6	0	0	0	0		
part-time	17	0	13	10	36	0	0	6	0	0	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	0	58	0	6	0	0	9	0	30	0	
long part-time	26	83	66	66	0	100	100	78	69	100	49	100	73	61	78	34	86	44	48	42	41	65	41	66	69	0	55	35	
full-time	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	
<b>Part-time Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Part-time (30-34)	0	0	13	37	19	13	20	30	0	0	0	0	43	0	21	70	31	0	0	16	45	27	22	10	19	100	43	16	0
part-time	56	49	31	12	0	27	36	0	0	0	0	100	4	0	46	30	13	42	40	0	20	20	32	24	24	0	42	0	42
long part-time	44	51	37	50	81	60	44	70	100	84	100	0	54	100	33	0	56	58	42	84	35	41	46	55	58	0	57	42	0
full-time	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	
<b>Long part-time Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>
Full-time (35+)	22	33	36	19	10	16	13	8	17	13	5	4	14	17	16	13	28	25	14	10	23	24	22	12	36	41	48	19	0
part-time	20	16	15	10	22	25	26	10	0	3	0	10	16	7	11	5	7	8	7	6	13	15	15	9	11	16	13	6	0
long part-time	55	49	45	71	67	58	61	82	74	84	91	86	67	71	71	81	64	60	76	83	62	56	60	76	49	33	30	71	0
full-time	<b>96</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Full-time Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	
<b>OVERALL DIVISION OF WOMEN EMPLOYED</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>0</b>
part-time	20	15	15	10	22	24	26	9	0	3	1	11	15	6	13	5	7	9	8	6	13	15	15	9	11	16	13	7	0
long part-time	54	51	45	45	70	67	58	61	74	85	91	85	67	71	69	77	64	59	74	82	60	56	59	75	50	32	32	67	0
full-time																													

Source: EU-SILC

Table 3 Average usual hours worked per week in couple households where the woman is aged 25-49, 2004 (cont'd)

		% men/women employed in each category of household																							
		IT			LU			AT			PT			FI			SE			NO					
		Age of child: 0-2	3-5	6-11	No child	Age of child: 0-2	3-5	6-11	No child	Age of child: 0-2	3-5	6-11	No child	Age of child: 0-2	3-5	6-11	No child	Age of child: 0-2	3-5	6-11	No child				
<b>MEN</b>	<15 hours	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
	part-time	29	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
	long part-time	10	0	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	full-time	61	42	26	95	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	0	100
<b>&lt; 15 hours Total</b>	Part-time (15-29)	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	part-time	29	55	52	40	2	0	0	31	51	41	26	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	long part-time	25	0	7	6	0	0	0	3	49	59	42	29	0	12	18	6	26	0	33	14	17	34	50	13
	full-time	45	32	41	55	65	100	97	68	0	0	0	29	0	61	19	30	0	0	0	7	14	8	0	0
<b>Part-time Total</b>	Part-time (30-34)	3	4	3	2	1	2	1	1	3	2	1	4	1	1	4	3	2	1	3	2	1	3	2	3
	<15 hours	0	12	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	part-time	41	38	39	31	55	0	100	0	0	48	0	34	0	0	11	7	0	0	0	0	19	22	24	43
	long part-time	43	23	17	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	35	39	37	14	27	0	100	12	18	9	18
<b>Long part-time Total</b>	Full-time (35+)	16	27	44	63	45	0	0	95	100	52	0	66	0	65	61	52	79	67	100	0	69	60	57	39
	<15 hours	1	2	2	2	2	0	1	1	2	2	0	2	1	1	3	5	2	3	3	1	3	2	3	4
	part-time	2	3	2	1	7	8	4	5	10	11	6	1	1	1	2	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	8
	long part-time	32	34	32	18	40	46	41	14	33	50	47	15	8	8	13	8	7	5	12	12	13	8	28	29
<b>Full-time Total</b>	OVERALL DIVISION OF WOMEN EMPLOYED	11	11	8	6	10	2	6	3	8	12	13	5	2	1	11	15	8	6	29	35	26	5	15	19
	part-time	56	53	57	75	43	43	49	77	50	27	34	79	89	92	89	91	85	88	57	52	60	86	51	45
	long part-time	96	94	95	96	96	98	98	98	93	96	99	93	99	99	98	98	93	96	95	99	94	96	93	94
	full-time	2	3	2	1	7	8	4	5	11	12	6	1	1	1	2	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	5	7
<b>OVERALL DIVISION OF WOMEN EMPLOYED</b>	part-time	32	35	33	19	40	45	41	14	32	50	47	16	8	5	6	7	12	8	12	12	14	8	27	29
	long part-time	11	10	8	6	10	2	6	3	7	12	13	6	2	1	3	2	12	17	28	36	25	6	15	18
	full-time	55	51	57	74	44	44	49	77	50	26	34	78	89	92	88	90	73	72	59	52	60	86	53	46

**Table 4 Average income from employment of men and women in couple households where the woman is aged 25-49, 2004**

	BE				DK				EE				GR			
	Age of child:			No child	Age of child:			No child	Age of child:			No child	Age of child:			No child
	0-2	3-5	6-11		0-2	3-5	6-11		0-2	3-5	6-11		0-2	3-5	6-11	
<b>Average monthly earnings men/women</b>																
Men (EUR)	2,389	2,279	2,564	2,188	3,203	3,809	3,976	3,015	648	579	504	430	1,343	1,367	1,235	1,253
Women (EUR)	1,304	1,315	1,391	1,629	1,701	2,333	2,474	2,208	231	214	296	292	586	605	586	631
Women as % men	54.6	57.7	54.2	74.5	53.1	61.2	62.2	73.2	35.6	36.9	58.7	67.7	43.6	44.3	47.5	50.3
Women's working time as % men's	62.6	63.7	65.9	83.7	68.7	79.0	80.3	86.5	27.4	71.5	90.6	109.2	49.9	58.0	58.6	71.4
Adjusted earnings ratio (men relative to women, %)	14.7	10.4	21.4	12.5	29.4	29.1	29.1	18.2	-23.0	93.6	54.5	61.2	14.4	31.1	23.3	41.8
<b>Average, women and men both working</b>																
Men (EUR)	2,497	2,434	2,630	2,400	3,502	3,990	4,170	3,465	1,133	553	566	556	1,462	1,501	1,348	1,351
Women (EUR)	1,772	1,833	1,755	2,104	2,053	2,592	2,826	2,704	572	297	337	335	1,066	966	952	886
Women as % men	71.0	75.3	66.7	87.7	58.6	65.0	67.8	78.1	50.5	53.7	59.5	60.2	72.9	64.4	70.6	65.5
Women's working time as % men's	85.0	83.3	79.4	91.6	92.0	88.6	91.0	97.1	87.2	95.0	96.8	100.3	91.3	90.6	92.3	93.1
Adjusted earnings ratio (men relative to women, %)	19.7	10.6	19.0	4.5	57.0	36.3	34.3	24.4	72.5	76.8	62.6	66.7	25.2	40.7	30.8	42.0

	ES				FR				IE			
	Age of child:			No child	Age of child:			No child	Age of child:			No child
	0-2	3-5	6-11		0-2	3-5	6-11		0-2	3-5	6-11	
<b>Average monthly earnings men/women</b>												
Men (EUR)	1,402	1,375	1,331	1,162	2,001	2,112	2,237	1,991	3,141	3,400	3,257	2,625
Women (EUR)	647	501	541	810	1,083	1,077	1,267	1,394	1,440	1,210	1,335	1,830
Women as % men	46	36	41	70	54	51	57	70	46	36	41	70
Women's working time as % men's	48	44	51	77	57	68	73	83	54	40	47	82
Adjusted earnings ratio (men relative to women, %)	4	20	25	10	5	33	29	19	17	11	16	18
<b>Average, women and men both working</b>												
Men (EUR)	1,553	1,511	1,408	1,277	2,146	2,257	2,349	2,232	3,553	3,561	3,186	3,162
Women (EUR)	1,118	957	1,055	1,091	1,648	1,477	1,573	1,671	2,392	2,192	2,208	2,312
Women as % men	72	63	75	85	77	65	67	75	67	62	69	73
Women's working time as % men's	86	82	90	94	87	85	86	92	81	69	72	88
Adjusted earnings ratio (men relative to women, %)	20	29	21	10	13	29	28	23	20	12	4	20

Note: The top half of the table shows average earnings of all men and women in couple households, including those not working, by age of youngest child, the bottom half only of those in households where both partners are in work. Adjusted earnings ratio is the ratio of men's earnings to those of women (expressed as a %) adjusted for differences in working time.

Source: EU-SILC, 2004

**Table 4 Average income from employment of men and women in couple households where the woman is aged 25-49, 2004 (Continued)**

	IT				LU				AT				PT			
	Age of child:			No child	Age of child:			No child	Age of child:			No child	Age of child:			No child
0-2	3-5	6-11	0-2		3-5	6-11	0-2		3-5	6-11	0-2		3-5	6-11	0-2	
<b>Average monthly earnings men/women</b>																
Men (EUR)	1,723	1,745	1,999	1,520	3,853	4,382	4,101	3,828	2,374	2,430	2,470	1,980	967	853	803	942
Women (EUR)	773	711	749	963	1,286	1,267	1,575	2,214	676	797	842	1,402	607	587	488	711
Women as % men	44.9	40.8	37.5	63.4	33.4	28.9	38.4	57.8	28.5	32.8	34.1	70.8	62.8	68.9	60.8	75.5
Women's working time as % men's	45.6	43.7	47.5	67.6	44.4	40.8	49.8	72.9	27.3	43.7	51.3	90.4	75.9	79.1	78.0	82.5
Adjusted earnings ratio (men relative to women, %)	1.6	7.2	26.9		33.0	41.2	29.5	26.1	-4.0	33.3	50.3	27.6	20.8	14.8	28.2	9.4
<b>Average, women and men both working</b>																
Men (EUR)	1,920	1,926	2,114	1,576	4,070	4,086	3,830	4,083	2,297	2,470	2,395	2,286	1,080	941	867	1,040
Women (EUR)	1,374	1,396	1,383	1,364	2,038	2,186	2,560	2,850	1,463	1,228	1,159	1,665	789	729	652	874
Women as % men	71.6	72.5	65.4	86.6	50.1	53.5	66.8	69.8	63.7	49.7	48.4	72.8	73.0	77.6	75.2	84.1
Women's working time as % men's	83.8	81.4	83.3	91.0	74.3	71.2	77.1	88.9	75.7	64.3	70.5	94.4	95.9	97.5	95.4	97.0
Adjusted earnings ratio (men relative to women, %)	17.1	12.2	27.3	5.1	48.4	33.1	15.4	27.3	18.8	29.4	45.8	29.5	31.4	25.7	26.8	15.3

	FI				SE				NO			
	Age of child:			No child	Age of child:			No child	Age of child:			No child
0-2	3-5	6-11	0-2		3-5	6-11	0-2		3-5	6-11		
<b>Average monthly earnings men/women</b>												
Men (EUR)	2,313	2,414	2,515	2,112	2,403	2,506	2,581	2,176	1,877	2,050	1,866	2,060
Women (EUR)	782	1,425	1,672	1,581	885	1,566	1,639	1,565	1,118	1,021	1,070	1,146
Women as % men	33.8	59.0	66.5	74.9	36.8	62.5	63.5	71.9	59.5	49.8	57.3	55.6
Women's working time as % men's	35.7	79.8	93.0	93.1	56.9	81.0	82.6	88.2	68.3	65.2	68.0	86.7
Adjusted earnings ratio (men relative to women, %)	5.7	35.2	39.9	24.4	54.6	29.7	30.1	22.6	14.6	31.0	18.6	55.9
<b>Average, women and men both working</b>												
Men (EUR)	2,557	2,588	2,746	2,479	2,562	2,732	2,735	2,364	1,992	2,004	1,902	2,019
Women (EUR)	1,472	1,800	1,898	1,878	986	1,738	1,848	1,943	1,369	1,190	1,179	1,408
Women as % men	57.6	69.6	69.1	75.7	38.5	63.6	67.6	82.2	68.7	59.4	62.0	69.7
Women's working time as % men's	92.9	93.9	97.4	98.8	90.6	89.7	91.4	97.5	82.2	78.3	80.2	94.8
Adjusted earnings ratio (men relative to women, %)	61.5	34.9	40.9	30.5	135.4	41.0	35.3	18.7	19.7	31.8	29.4	36.0

Note: The top half of the table shows average earnings of all men and women in couple households, including those not working, by age of youngest child, the bottom half only of those in households where both partners are in work. Adjusted earnings ratio is the ratio of men's earnings to those of women (expressed as a %) adjusted for differences in working time.

Source: EU-SILC, 2004