QUANTIFICATION OF HOUSEWORK

QUANTIFICATION OF HOUSEWORK

CONTENTS

STUDY ON THE
QUANTIFICATION OF HOUSEWORK

I. INTRODUCTION

Of the 16.3 million women of working age in 1984, (1st quarter) about 7 million were fully unemployed, 9 million were not considered part of the labor force and the rest alone, that is, the remaining 6.7 million (41%), are said to contribute to the country's gross national product (GNP). But the 9.7 million women who are not contributing to the nation's GNP do a lot of housework which actually have economic values. As a matter of fact, these household chores are recognized as legitimate economic activities if done by paid domestic helpers. Moreover, when a household member decides to work in the household rather than in the labor market, it is because she perceives the returns from unpaid housework as equal or even higher than those derived from equivalent market activities. It is now the intent of this study to attempt the quantification of non-market household activities in money terms.

OBJECTIVE

This study seeks to measure the value of the housework done by women. Its thrust is to sift through the hundreds of studies undertaken in this area and pick one that is most feasible within the realm of the existing data system.

II. PROFILE OF FILIPINO WOMEN

The Integrated Survey of Household (ISH) is a rich potential source of information for further analysis of the value of housework by women. The ISH is conducted by the National Census and Statistics Office on a quarterly basis primarily to gather data on the labor force and related characteristics of the household population. The latest available data files as of this time were for the third quarter of 1982. In the absence of more current data, therefore, the initial findings of the report are based on the data for that particular survey round.

1

CHARACTERISTICS OF WOMEN

1) Demographic. Sixty percent of the women live in rural areas, while forty percent are found in urban areas. More than one half (56 percent) of the women are married. Another 37 percent are single and the remaining 7 percent are widowed or separated.

The median age of Filipino Women is 32.9 years. One half of the married women are below 40.4 years old, while the single women have a median age of 19.1 years.

TABLE 2.1
Age Distribution of Women, by Marital Status: 1982 (in Percent)

AGE GROUP	TOTAL	SINGLE	MARRIED	WIDOWED/ SEPARATED
15 — 19	20.5	53.7	1.5	0.6
20 — 24	13.1	25.1	6.7	1.5
25 — 34	19.5	12.5	25.7	6.2
35 — 44	17.3	3.6.	27.2	9.9
45 — 54	13.8	2.1	20.9	17.7
55 — 64	8.9	1.5	11.9	23.1
65 and over	7.0	1.5	6.2	41.0
Median (years)	32.9	19.1	40.4	60.6

The median educational attainment of women is elementary graduate. Only 8 percent have college or higher degrees. On the average, single women in urban areas have completed high school, while their rural counterparts have some high school education.

TABLE 2.2
Median Age of Women, by Highest Educational Attainment,
by Marital Status: 1982 (in years)

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	SINGLE	MARRIED	WIDOWED/ SEPARATED
ALL WOMEN	19.1	40.4	60.6
No grade completed	33.5	52.7	66.8
Some elementary	19.4	45.8	61.1
Elementary graduate	19.2	38.8	54.5
Some high school	17.6	35.9	50.9
High school graduate	18.7	34.8	49.5
Some college	20.2	32.4	48.5
College and post graduate	26.1	38.8	51.3
Not stated	19.3	33.2	65.6

2) The Filipino Women and Her Household. The average household of the Filipino woman has 6 to 7 members. This household has two women in the age group 15 years and over, one pre-school age child and one child age 7 to 15 years. One member of the household is a parental surrogate, defined for our purposes as a women who can act as a proxy for the parental responsibilities, i.e., one whose occupation is either housekeeper or domestic help. Two members of the household earn incomes which averages ₱ 3,500 per quarter in 1982 prices.

Only 7 out of every 100 women are household heads. Forty seven and six tenths percent are wives of the household heads and 31.8% are daughters. Other relatives account for 10.4 percent of the women while non-relations comprise the rest. Three out of every 10 women are the only women in these households. Twenty seven and two tenths percent of the women belong to households with no parental surrogates in their households.

3) The Filipino Woman in the Labor Market. The ISH data show that 43.6% of women are in the labor market. Of this number, almost 91% are employed. Although urban women have a

higher labor force participation rate than rural women, their unemployment rate of 10.7% is significantly higher than the 8% observed in the rural areas.

Table 2.3
Labor Force Participation and Employment Rates by Marital Status
Urban-Rural 1982

AREA MARITAL STATUS	EMPLOYMENT RATE (%)	LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATE (%)
Philippines	90.9	43.6
Single	87.1	43.3
Married	92.1	43.1
Widowed/Separated	96.0	47.3
Urban	89.3	44.4
Single	86.8	45.5
Married	90.6	43.4
Widowed/Separated	94.6	44.8
Rural	92.0	42.9
Single	87.4	41.4
Married	93.9	43.1
Widowed/Separated	96.9	49.0

Among rural women, widowed/separated women have the highest participation and employment rates while single women have the lowest participation rate and the highest unemployment rate. About half (49%) of widows/separatees in rural areas are in the labor market and only 3.1% of them are unemployed. The highest unemployment rate (about 13%) are found among the single women in both urban and rural areas.

Higher participation rates are found among women who have completed the three levels of education — elementary, secondary and collegiate. A high 85.6 percent of college graduates enter the labor market but only less than 9% are unemployed. The second highest participation rate is found among elementary school graduates where 45.8% join the labor force and end up with about 7% unemployed. The lowest participation rates are found among women who have some secondary (31.3%) or some college education (32.5%) probably because most of them are still in the pro-

4

cess of completing their education. Surprisingly, the highest unemployment rates are found among the high school graduates (15.3%) and women with some college education (17.2%). On the other hand, while only 37.1% of women who have not completed any grade have entered the labor market, they enjoy the highest employment rate of 85.2%.

TABLE 2.4
Labor Force Participation and Employment Rates of Women
by Highest Educational Attainment: 1982

Educational Attainment	Labor Force Participation Rate (Percent)	Employment Rate (Percent)
Total	43.6	90.9
No grade completed	37.1	95.2
Some elementary	44.4	93.9
Elementary graduate	45.8	92.9
Some high school	31.3	89.4
High school graduate	39.1	84.7
Some college	32.5	82.8
College and post graduate	85.6	91.5

One out of every three employed women works in the agriculture, forestry and fishing sector. Three out of every 10 are employed in services and two out of every ten are engaged in wholesale and retail trade.

TABLE 2.5
Distribution of Employed Women by Kind of Business: 1982

BUSINESS or INDUSTRY	Percent
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	33.8
Mining and quarrying	0.1
Manufacturing	14.5
Electricity, Gas and Water	0.1
Construction	0.2
Wholesale and Retail Trade	21.8
Transport, communication, storage	0.5
Services	29.0

In the urban areas, most of the working women are either sales workers (24.4%), service workers (18.9%), professionals (16.2%), or production workers (19.9%). In the rural areas, on the other hand, about a third are farmers, fisherman and forestry workers and the other third are sales workers (17.0%), service workers (12.7%) and professionals (10.2%). Only 1.1% of urban women and an even lower 0.3% of rural women work as adminstrators, executives and in other managerial positions.

Table 2.6

Percentage Distribution of Employed Females by
Major Occupation Group (Urban/Rural), 1982

OCCUPATION	TOTAL	URBAN	RURAL
Professionals	12.6	16.2	10.2
Administrators, executives, managerial workers	0.6	1.1	0.3
Clerical workers	5.9	10.1	3.2
Sales workers	20.0	24.4	17.0
Service workers	11.9	18.9	12.7
Farmers, fishermen & forestry workers	24.2	9.9	33.7
Production workers	12.5	12.9	8.6
Not stated	12.3	6.5	14.3

Around three out of every 10 employed women (29.3%) are salaried workers in private firms while one out of every eight are government employees. Self-employed women and unpaid family workers are almost equally distributed at 27.6 and 27.5 percent respectively.

The median age of employed women is 33 years. The youngest workers are service workers, who average 22.9 years. The oldest employed women are administrative, executive and managerial workers (40.1 yrs.) and farmers, fishermen and related workers (40.4 years).

Among women who are not employed, i.e., unemployed or not in the labor force, around 71.9 percent are housekeepers, 27.5 percent are students, and 0.6 percent are disabled or retired.

4) Income of Employed Filipino. In general, women in urban areas earn more than their counterparts in rural areas. Household incomes are, likewise, higher in urban areas than in rural areas. Widowed/separated women earn more than single or married women.

6

Their personal income accounts for more than 60 percent of total income of rural households and abour 43 percent of total household income in urban areas. Personal income of married women on the average, is less than half of the income of widowed/separated women; nevertheless it accounts for about a fifth of their household income. Household income of single women are generally higher than those of married and widowed/separated women; however, single women have the smallest personal income accounting for about 7-10 percent of their household income.

The data also show that regardless of marital status or labor force status, both household incomes and individual incomes are higher with increasing educational attainment. Among employed women, administrative workers have the highest personal income, followed by sales workers, professionals and service workers.

Women who manage their own family business earn almost ten times as much as those who are salaried employees in private firms. Government employees are likewise better off than their counterparts in private firms.

Table 2.7

Mean Quarterly Income of Employed Women by Class of Worker: 1982

Class of Worker	Mean Quarterly Income
Employee in private firm	₱ 540.49
Employee in government	916.51
Self-employed	858.49
Employee in own operated family enterprise	4,999.86
Working with pay in family enterprise	612.27
Unpaid family worker	28.84

As expected, women who are household heads have significantly higher individual incomes than those who are not.

III. METHODOLOGIES FOR QUANTIFYING HOUSEWORK

1. Opportunity Cost Method of Valuation

This approach requires the development of model that would impute, on the household work time, the wages the unpaid house-

7

hold worker would earn in the market if she would choose to give up the household work and take up employment. Essentially the approach entails the substitution of activity by one person and takes cognizance of the assumption that the households allocate time so as to maximize returns. That is, if a household member opts to work in the household rather than in the market, it is because the returns from unpaid housework are perceived as equal or higher than those from market work. In effect, the household views that the utility derived from the foregone market income is smaller than or equal to the utility derived from unpaid household work, and therefore the foregone market income reveals the monetary value the household places on the allocation of its member's work time to household production.

In an ideal world where a job could be had without much difficulty whenever one so desires to join the labor market, the utility of unpaid family work could be measured in terms of income actually derived from productive economic activity done by a group of women with identical individual and household characteristics and environmental forces that affect income generating capabilities of the individual.

2. Market Valuation approach

This approach requires imputing monetary values on unpaid work inputs in the household on the basis of market wages or of he market value equivalent of non-cash benefits enjoyed as a member of the household. Literatures suggest several variations in imputing monetary values on unpaid housework, among these mentioned are imputations based on:

a. wages of substitute household workers, polyvalent or specialized;

b. wages of workers performing in market enterprise whose functions are equivalent to household production activities;

c. wages of workers performing in the market sector whose tasks require qualifications similar to those required by household tasks;

d. wages based on legislated minimum wages; and

e. market value of wages in kind.

3. The Utility Function (Income) Model for the Opportunity Cost Method.

The utility function models required to measure the foregone market wages were developed using regression analysis techniques.

8

The method of discriminant analysis was later used to validate the efficiency of the model.

The process of quantifying housework done by women using the concepts of foregone market income requires the identification of the appropriate criterion variable and the set of independent predictive variables.

The efficiency of the income models was validated using the technique of discriminant analysis.

In discriminant analysis, the variables are weighted and linearly combined to form the discriminant function or functions. The function assumes the following form:

$$D_i = d_{i1}Z_i + d_{i2}Z_2 + \ldots + d_{ip}Z_p,$$

where Di is the score on the discriminant function i, the d's are weighting co-efficients, and the Z's are the standardized values of the p discriminating variables used in the analysis. The functions are formed in such a way as to maximize the separations of the groups, thus, ideally, the discriminant scores (D's) for the cases within a particular group will be fairly similar.

The relevant information from the ISH that could be used in building up the utility function models for this particular study are given below.

Area/Environmental Variables: 1) Urbanity; 2) major economic activity

Household Variables: 1) Quarterly income; 2) size; 3) Presence/absence of parental surrogate; 4) number of children; 5) number of women; 6) number of earning numbers.

Individual Variables: 1) Age; 2) Sex; 3) Marital status; 4) Relation to household head; 5) highest grade completed; 6) employment status; 7) class of worker; 8) Usual occupation; and 9) Individual income for one quarter.

Using these variables, income models were constructed using multiple regression techniques. These models have this general configuration:

Income = f (sets of area/environmental variables, sets of household variables, sets of individual variables)

Having observed significant differentials between urban and rural settings, separate individual income models were developed for urban and rural women.

4. Individual Income Model

A women's income earning potential is believed to be a function of her (1) age, (2) occupation, (3) education, (4) marital status,

and (5) type of residence (urban or rural). It was also felt that her income could be affected by some household characteristics, such as (1) household size, (2) number of employed males, (3) number of employed females, (4) number of women 15 years old or over, (5) number of parental surrogates, (6) number of children less than 7 years old and (7) number of children 7-15 years old.

For the purpose of estimating the regression coefficients for the model, dummy variables are used for the independent categorical variables included in the model.

The income model was developed using the information contained in the 1982 third quarter round of the Integrated Survey of Households the analysis which focuses on the females 15 years old and over uses 44,231 records broken down by employment status as follows:

employed	17 494
unemployed	1 752
not in the labor force	24 979
employment status unknown	6

Results were as follows: The typical Filipina considered in this study is 36 years old, most probably married, and at least an elementary school graduate. She belongs to a household with six to seven members, two of whom are women at least 15 years old of age. At most one of the two working members of the household is a female while at least one of the two minor children is of school age (7-15 years old). There is also one member who acts as a parental surrogate of these children. The total quarterly income of this household is at least ₱ 3,500.

On the average, the employed woman is 37 years old, most probably married and belongs to a household with a total income of ₱ 4,203 a quarter. All unemployed woman, on the other hand is much younger at 30, most probably still single and comes from a household with a lower quarterly income of ₱ 2,771. A typical woman who is not a member of the labor force is most likely a housewife, 26 years of age and has a total quarterly household income of ₱ 3,094.

The data sets showed that among the 17,494 employed women, only 5,231 were found to have positive incomes, the rest were either unpaid family workers or did not indicate any reply to the question on income.

5. Discriminant Function analysis

Discriminant function analysis was used to validate the efficiency of the variables to statistically distinguish among the employed, the unemployed and those not in the labor force.

Given equal probability of classification, the discriminant function correctly classified 71.5% percent of the original set of observations. Moreover, it correctly classified 85.1% percent of the employed women, 63.6% percent of women not in the labor force and only 48.6% percent of the unemployed. However, 40.5% percent of those unemployed were classified as not in the labor force. The extent of misclassification of the unemployed as not in the labor force reflects the similarity in the characteristics of these two groups.

Results showed that the probability that a woman is classified as employed is greater —

    a. as she reaches adulthood but decreases the older she gets,

    b. if she belongs to a household with a large number of employed men/women,

    c. if she has a large number of children below 7 years old, or,

    d. if she is single.

6. General Income Model

Since the study aims to develop a model that could predict or estimate the income of any employed woman with a given set of individual and household characteristics, regression analysis was undertaken utilizing information from the subset of 5,231 employed women who had positive incomes. The model took the form:

INCOME = f (urbanity, individual characteristics, household characteristics).

Among the individual characteristics included, occupation, education and marital status (single women in particular) turned out to be good predictors of income. That income is a function of age was refuted by the model.

Among the household characteristics identified, the number of parental surrogates and the number of women age 15 years and over did not yield significant income differentials. However, the number of employed men/women household size and number of children (0-6 and 7-15 years) appeared to be good predictors of income.

11

The results of the regression analysis, likewise, showed significant income differentials between employed women in urban and rural areas. The model indicates that, taking everything equal, an employed woman living in an urban area earns ₱ 726 more per quarter than her rural counterpart.

7. Urban Income Model

In order to estimate income foregone by urban women who are not competing in the labor market, an urban income model excluding occupation as an explanatory variable was generated utilizing the data set made up of 2,303 employed women residing in urban areas.

On the average, the urban woman represented in the model is 37 years old, either single or married at least an elementary graduate, engages in sales or service activity and earns a quarterly income of ₱ 2,591. She belongs to a household with a total quarterly income of ₱ 10,611 coming from the earnings of 3 households members, 2 of whom are women. Her household has 1 available parental surrogate. 3 women in the age group 15 and over, and 2 children; 1 between 7-15 years of age and the other below 7 years of age.

As in the general income model, the results of the regression run for urban income showed that age did not significantly affect income of employed women in urban areas. Income differentials arising from marital status were similarly not significant. Education, however, has consistently surfaced as a strong explanatory variable. This finding supports the hypothesis that income potential increases as the level of education of a woman rises.

The results also indicated significant correlation between income of urban women and the following household characteristics, viz., number of employed women, number of employed men, and number of school-age children. Taking all things equal, the income of women in urban areas increased by ₱ 345 for every additional employed woman in the same household. This implies that the income potential of the urban woman is enhanced by the presence of another working female member in the household. On the other hand, the number of employed males in the same household has a negative effect on the woman's income. The results showed a ₱ 405 reduction in her income for every additional working male member in the same household. This means that the pressure on urban women to join the labor market diminishes as more male members of the household are employed.

A similar negative influence on the income of urban women is exhibited by the number of school age children in the household.

12

The results showed an average drop of ₱ 257 in income for every additional child 7-15 years of age. Noteworthy, was the emergence of parental surrogate as a significant predictor of income with the exclusion of usual occupation as an explanatory variable. Logically, one would assume a rise in the income of an urban employed woman as the number of parental surrogate increases since the presence of the latter in the woman's household would tend to free her from her household role and, in the process, enhance her participation in the labor force. The negative correlation that was observed, however, indicating a ₱ 185 decrease in income for every additional parental surrogate appears to be inconsistent with the above hypothesis suggesting an area for future research.

8. Rural Income Model

A similar regression model was developed utilizing the data set covering some 2928 employed women living in rural areas and with positive incomes.

The typical employed rural woman considered on this study is 41 years of age, significantly older than her urban counterpart. She is married, has completed at least the elementary level of education, and derives her quarterly income of ₱1547 from agricultural activities or as a sales or production worker. She belongs to a household consisting of about 6 members and with a quarterly income of ₱ 4087 contributed by 2-3 earning members, one of which is a male. Aside from herself, there is another female member of the household in the age group 15 and over and at least one child of school age (7 — 15 years).

Unlike the urban model, income of rural woman is a linear function of her age. The results showed a ₱ 37 rise in income for every year increase in age. Similarly, income differentials arising from marital status turned out to be significant, in contrast to the insignificant relationship of the same variables in the urban model. Married woman in rural areas received ₱ 686 more than widows and divorces, again in contrast to the insignificant relationship indicated in the urban model.

While it was the presence of school-age children that negatively affected income of urban women, it was the presence of children less than 7 years of age which exerted a strong negative influence on income of rural women. On the average, every additional young child resulted in a ₱ 220 reduction in income.

As in the urban model, the number of employed males in households of rural women exerted a negative influence on income. The model showed a ₱ 248 reduction in the income of rural women for every additional employed male in her household.

13

As in the urban model, the results show that household size has a positive effect on the income of rural women. Taking everything equal, a unit increase in household size brought about a ₱161 increase in her income.

As in the urban model likewise, the number of parental surrogates exerted a significant negative effect on the income of rural women. A ₱ 126.41 reduction in income was actually observed for every additional parental surrogate in her household.

The other household characteristics failed to show any systematic variation in the income of working rural women.

IV. PILOT SURVEY ON WOMEN AND HOUSEHOLD WORK

The survey instrument is intended to cover family or household information, socio-demographic characteristics of all household members, and time-use information for all women 10 years old and over. The inclusion of young women in the age group 10-14 years is intended to cover all housework undertaken by all females in the household.

A pilot survey was conducted after a preliminary pretesting of the survey instrument to determine the feasibility of collecting the items of information sought, particularly on the time allocation of women for housework and other activities. The more compelling reason, however, was the need to access to the actual information on the time-use budget, no matter how limited the coverage of the survey was, in order to arrive at estimates of the market value of unpaid housework of woman. There was, likewise, need to access to the detailed individual and household characteristics of women in order to quantify the value of unpaid housework by the opportunity cost approach utilizing the appropriate urban or rural income model. The results were supplemented by personal interviews of purposive sample of households in Metropolitan Manila.

The resulting composite sample could be taken as a hypothetical community consisting of 106 households, 40 from rural areas and 66 from urban areas. This represented a total of 253 women, out of whom 95 were not in the labor force. Of the 158 women competing in the labor market, only 12 were unemployed.

Table 4.1
Women 15 year old and over, by Employment Status
By Major occupation group, Urban-Rural: 1984

Employment Status/Major Occupation Group	Philippines	Urban	Rural
TOTAL	253	174	79
Employed	146	115	31
Professional	16	14	2
Clerical	21	21	
Sales	32	21	11
Domestic	44	44	
Other Services	20	10	10
Others	13	5	8
Not Employed	12	7	5
Not in the labor force	95	52	43

Time use of women. The time allocation profile of the 209 sample women indicated that, on the average, employed women spent more time for work, recreation and other social and religious activities, and for unpaid housework than the unemployed and those not in the labor force. Among the working women, urban residents spent more time for these activities than their rural counterparts.

On the average, employed women in rural areas worked for 24.5 hours a week about half of the reported 45.2 hours of work observed for urban women. As a consequence, working rural women had more time for housework. On the average, she spent 32.9 hours a week or about half of her working hours doing unpaid household chores. On the other hand, working urban women averaged 28.6 hours per week or about a third of her working hours for unpaid housework.

Women outside the labor market spent the most number of hours a week for household activities with rural women chalking a higher average of 42.6 hours against the 39.5 hours logged by urban woman. It is interesting to note the significantly small amount of time devoted for housewcrk by unemployed rural and urban women.

Significant differentials were also noted between single and married women. In both areas, married women spent more time in unpaid housework, averaging more than twice the time spent by never-married women.

15

Table 4.2
Time Spent by women 15 years old and over on Unpaid
Housework, by Marital Status, Urban-Rural: 1984
(Time spent in hours/week)

Place of Residence	Single		Married		Others	
	Number	Time	Number	Time	Number	Time
TOTAL	73	18.2	113	45.2	21	35.4
Urban	42	16.5	69	42.7	17	34.0
Rural	31	20.5	44	49.0	4	41.0

Among urban residents, baby-sitting or attending to the needs of children and looking demanded the most time averaging 8.9 and 8.5 hours per week, respectively. Cooking and laundry work, on the other hand, took the most time among rural residents. On the average, she spent 11.2 hours a week for cooking and another 5.5 hours per week for laundry.

The relatively less number of hours devoted to housework by urban residents could largely be explained by the availability of paid domestics in urban areas.

What appears to defy rational explanations is the significantly low time allocation for housework observed for unemployed women, particularly those in the relatively more depressed rural areas, notwithstanding the fact that most of these women are single and with college education.

There are two kinds of substitute workers for which wage could be derived from surveys for the imputation of the monetary value of unpaid housework. The first is the polyvalent substitute, a live-in hired domestic help who performs almost all the household chores and the second, the specialized substitute, usually hired to do a specific task such as laundry work, gardening, etc.

The pilot survey yielded only 18 sample households which engaged the services of hired help to do specific household task, particularly laundry work.

16

The sample covered 44 polyvalent substitutes, or domestics, serving in 36 sample households in urban areas. Majority of the domestic help were either elementary graduates with some secondary education and several were high school graduates. Their work hours ranged from a low of 31 to a high of 104, averaging 68.4 hours/week.

The result shows that the higher the educational attainment of the domestic help, the better her chances of getting a higher wage rate. Whether or not educational attainment is a factor contributing to the efficiency and thus better pay of domestics was not determined, however, in the survey.

Table 4.3
Domestic Help by Educational Attainment
Number of Hours Worked, and Mean Wage Rate Per Hour

Educational Attainment	Number of Respondent	Mean no. of hours worked/week	Wage Rate in pesos	
			Per Hour	Per Month
with some elementary	5	81.2	1.57	509.94
elementary graduate with some high school	25	67.1	1.69	453.60
high school graduate with some college	14	66.3	1.81	480.00
TOTAL	44	68.4	1.71	467.86

In addition to her monthly wages which are usually paid in cash, the domestic generally resides with her employer and is usually served the regular meals. Her aggregate compensation, including the imputed value of meals received along with other similar benefits averaged about ₱ 468 a month or about ₱ 1.71 per hour.

Other Findings

Aside from providing the quantitative basis for valuation of unpaid housework of women, the pilot survey also revealed to a limited extent the factors that affect her participation in the labor market based on her attitudes and perceptions.

One of the questions asked was their reason for working, and for those not employed, their reason for not working. Majority of women in both urban and rural areas cited the need to augment family income as their reason for working. The second reason given, coming mostly from the never married respondents, was the desire

17

to finance personal needs. Worthy of note, likewise, was the substantial 16.1% of rural respondents mostly married, who claimed working is an excuse to get out of the house. About 10% of the urban respondents gave no reason for working.

Table 4.4
Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Major
Reason for Working, Urban-Rural: 1984

Reasons	Philippines		Urban		Rural	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
TOTAL	146	100	115	100	31	100
1. augment family income	89	61.0	67	58.3	22	71.0
2. finance personal needs	21	14.3	18	15.7	3	9.7
3. practice profession	8	5.5	7	6.1	1	3.2
4. meet people	2	1.4	2	1.7	-	-
5. have reason to get out of the house	7	4.8	2	1.7	5	16.1
6. other reasons	4	2.7	4	3.5	-	
7. no response	15	10.3	15	13.0	-	

A high degree of non-response (52% for urban women and 62% for rural women) characterized the inquiry into the reasons why those not working or out of the labor force were not working. It might be pointed out however, that most of those who failed to respond were students who are not within the scope of the inquiry. Among the 31 urban residents who answered the question, 16 or 51.6% percent cited the demand of housework as their major reason. Similarly, 43.3% percent or 13 out of rural residents who replied gave the same reason for not working. Other reasons given included: non-availability of jobs, health and/or old age. demands of a growing family, objection of husband, and no need to work.

While the questionnaire covered several other aspects, the limited number of responses was not sufficient to provide even at least some insights into these factors.

18

V. EMPIRICAL MEASUREMENTS OF UNPAID HOUSEWORK

1. Monetization of Unpaid Housework by the Opportunity Cost Method

The appropriate urban and rural model derived by regressing income of employed women on selected individual and household characteristics was first applied to the sample women in the pilot survey in order to obtain estimates of foregone income of the unemployed and those outside the labor force. The resulting estimates which reflected 1982 prices were subsequently valued at 1984 prices to maintain comparability with the results from the 1984 pilot survey. To revalue income estimates at current wages, these were adjusted using the overall index of compensation per worker.

Table 5.1
Estimated Monthly Mean Income Using the Opportunity Cost
Method, by Labor Force Status and Place of Residence

Employment status/ Place of Residence	Actual Income in 1984 Pesos	1982 Pesos	1984 Pesos
URBAN	1259.13		
Employed		1059.82	1402.5
Unemployed and not in the labor force		1244.60	1620.4
RURAL	594.36		
Employed		450.13	595.49
Unemployed and not in the labor force		592.33	915.90

The generally higher estimates of income foregone relative to those accruing to the mployed women in both urban and rural areas appear to confirm the assumption under the opportuntty cost approach that households allocate time so as to maximize returns, that is, household members opt to work in the household rather than in the market because he or she perceived the returns from unpaid housework as equal to a higher than those from market work. The average foregone income of non-working women in urban areas was 16% percent higher than those who were actually engaged in paying jobs. This differential was more pronounced in the rural areas where foregone income was 54% percent higher.

19

The only plausible difference in individual attributes observed that could substantially contribute to income differential was in marital status. It was observed that in both urban and rural areas, the proportion of married women who were not employed was higher than those who were employed.

Following the observed differential between income of employed urban and rural women, the estimated foregone income of non-working women in the urban areas were observed to be about twice what would have accrued to rural women.

2. Monetization of Housework Through Market Valuation

Utilizing the sample estimates of average time use of women for unpaid housework and prevailing wage rates of domestics, estimates of the monetary value of unpaid housework by the market valuation approach were derived for the sample population of women represented on the pilot study.

Table 5.2
Imputed Wage of Women Engaged in Unpaid Housework
by type of Employment status and by place of Residence

Employment Status Urban-Rural	Monthly Average Hours spent for Housework	Imputed Monthly Wage
TOTAL		
Employed	119.6	204.56
Unemployed	84.0	143.87
Not in the labor force	162.8	279.78
URBAN		
Employed	114.4	195.62
Unemployed	92.8	158.69
Not in the labor force	158.0	270.18
RURAL		
Employed	131.6	225.04
Unemployed	72.0	123.12
Not in the labor force	170.4	291.38

It might be recalled that because of the absence of domestics in rural households an average wage rate of ₱ 1.71 observed for househelps living with urban households was taken as the prevailing wage rate. Considering further that more time was spent by rural women on unpaid housework, the resulting estimates of the monetary value of unpaid housework were generally higher than those of urban residents. The imputed monetary value of unpaid for women not in the labor force amounted to ₱ 270.18 a month for urban residents and ₱ 291.38 a month for rural women.

3. Contribution of the Imputed Value of Unpaid Housework to the GNP

Having extended the boundary of production to cover unpaid housework, the only remaining question is the magnitude of its contribution to the Gross National Product (GNP) of the country.

There are two ways of measuring the impact of the monetization of unpaid housework to the economy. Considering that most of the baseline data and derived estimates of relevant parameters obtained from a hypothetical community covered in the pilot survey, it is but natural to relate the incremental value of unpaid housework to the actual measure of income that have accrued from the production activities in the sample area. A more indirect way is to assume that the sample estimates of the necessary parameters are representatives of the entire population and could, therefore, be applied to the universe of women for the entire country. The global estimate of the monetary value of unpaid housework could then be related to the global estimate of GNP.

Using the first alternative and noting that the pilot survey did not generate enough information to permit an estimation of aggregate income generated from production activities in the area, an estimate of the monetary value of unpaid housework by women covered in the survey was compared with the reported household income in the area as an indicator of the contribution of monetized housework to the economy.

The result show that for a 5-month period in 1984, the aggregate value of unpaid housework of sample women amounted to ₱ 147,512 representing 11 percent of the reported aggregate family income of ₱ 1,335,571 during the same period. It is interesting to note however, that the value of unpaid housework of rural women accounted for 23.1 percent of their aggregate family or about 3 times the contribution to total family income of urban women.

21

Using the opportunity cost approach, on the other hand, the estimated monetary value of unpaid housework in the sample community amounted to ₱ 418,636 for the quarter or about 31.3 percent of total family income for the same period. The monetized value of unpaid housework of rural women accounted for more than half of aggregate family income, about twice the 26.7 percent share of total income for urban households.

Table 5.3
Contribution of Unpaid Housework to Total Family Income
by Place of Residence: Sample Community, 1984

Place of Residence	Total Income	Market Value Approach		Opportunity Cost	
		Value (₱)	% of total	Value (₱)	% of total
ALL FAMILIES	₱1,335,572	147,512	11.2	418.636	31.3
URBAN	1,072,573	87,148	8.1	286,747	26.7
RURAL	262,799	60,655	23.1	131,889	50.2

Assuming that the sample estimates of parameters derived for unpaid women in the various labor force categories and place of residence are valid for the entire country, these could be applied to the actual population of women to obtain estimates of the monetary value of unpaid family work by both approaches.

Although estimates of the magnitude of the contribution of unpaid housework to the GNP or proxy measures of income calculated from the sample distribution and actual population of women for various individual characteristics, labor force and area categories differ for the same methodology, the observed differentials follow a smilar trend.

Table 5.4
Contribution of Unpaid Housework to
Aggregate Income by Valuation Approach and Coverage

Distribution Used	Valuation by	
	Market Approach	Opportunity Cost
Pilot survey sample	11.0	31.3
ISH sample	9.7	29.4

Estimates of the contribution of housework to aggregate income as derived from the pilot survey tended to be on the high-side in comparison to the estimates utilizing GNP as a measure of aggregate income. This study could actually come to the conclusion that estimates of unpaid housework, by imputing prevailing wage rates of domestics to time spent for these non-market activities could easily account for 10-11 percent of GNP. If the monetary value of unpaid housework, in turn, were estimated by the aggregate value of foregone income of non-working women, assuming no constraints as the absorptive capacity of the labor market, the imputed value could easily account for about 30 percent of GNP. This of course, is an assumption that could hardly be tenable even assuming that the Philippine economy could significantly improve to generate sufficient jobs to absorb new entrants to the labor force as well as the backlogs in the unemployed and underemployed. Secondly, it is well recognized that there will always be groups in the population 15 years old and over that will defer their entrance to the labor market as they go through the process of preparing themselves through formal education. Similarly, there are the aged and the physically and mentally handicapped who for obvious reasons must have to be counted out. Latest available statistics on the labor force indicated that there were about 31.9 percent of the working age population who are in the above mentioned categories.

If these groups of women were excluded from the eligible population, the aggregate value of unpaid housework by opportunity cost will amount only to P 49,527, representing only 20.7 percent of GNP. If the same correction could also be effected on the data generated from the pilot survey, it is expected that the corresponding estimate of the contribution of unpaid housework by opportunity cost will be substantially reduced to a ratio probably higher than but nevertheless close to 20.7 percent.

The primary objective of this study is to assess the available statistical information generated from the quarterly survey of households to determine whether or not the detailed labor force statistics regularly generated could provide an adequate basis for the quantification of unpaid housework, and shoul gaps exist, whether or not it is feasible to generate the required information utilizing the same survey as a vehicle for filling up the identified gaps.

That the existing labor force statistics were adequate enough for the quantification of unpaid housework by opportunity cost was demonstrated by the successful development of separate urban and rural income models utilizing the available individual and household characteristics as explanatory variables.

Constraints on data availability, however, surfaced out with respect to the market valuation of unpaid housework. Although there have been one or two successful attempts to generate time use data from limited household surveys, these have been of limited circulation to permit an adequate assessment of the results. Moreover, it was felt that there was considerable merit in integrating all the related information needed from household surveys through modular type of inquiries. Thus, a pilot survey was undertaken primarily to test the feasibility of collecting time use data through nation-wide household surveys as well as to generate, even on a limited basis, information that could permit market valuation of unpaid housework.

The use of a small sample supplemented by a purposive sample of Metro Manila households was resorted to, purely for purposes of reducing cost while increasing the representativeness of the sample. That the resulting sample would fail to generate information on the characteristics and wage rates of domestics in rural households was not foreseen. It was felt, however, that the inability of the small sample to generate the required information would hardly be a problem when the survey instrument developed would be implemented in the regular ISH rounds that cover a total sample of about 18,000 households.

Notwithstanding the deficiencies of the statistics derived from the small sample, the investigators found these adequate for the purpose of imputing the market value of unpaid housework as well as for deriving an appropriate algorithm for quantifying the opportunity cost of the non-market household activities of women. Moreover, the pilot survey demonstrated that it is feasible to take a smaller subsample of the ISH sample to generate fairly reliable estimates of time use of women at home and other relevant information not only for the quantification of unpaid housework but also to shed light on decision making processes relative to women's participation in the labor market.

Our pilot survey experience, although limited, pointed out the difficulty of obtaining data on rural domestic workers largely due to the nature of economic activities in rural areas. Most of the households are engaged in agricultural activity where under employment is prevalent and exchange labor widely practiced. Moreover, the employment of domestic helps needs not be resorted to due to the presence of relatives who could be relied upon to assist in housework. Although urban wage rates could serve as a proxy for prevailing rural wages, there is probably the need to adjust these to correct for urban-rural wage differentials.

The second limitation arises from the respondent's estimate of time allocation for the different housework identified. The ability to recall exactly the number of hours devoted for each activity may be limited considering further that several tasks can be done simultaneously. With a simple suggestion made during the pilot interview of dividing equally the total time into the various simultaneous activities, there is still doublt as to the accurrancy of the estimates.

In the case of the opportunity cost approach, the estimate of the foregone income of a non-working woman was derived by equating this to the income of an employed women with a similar set of individual and household characteristics.

What is questionable is the assumption that enough job opportunities are available for all eligible non-working women. Related to this is the pilot survey's experience with respect to unemployed women. Regression estimates obtained on the basis of their qualifications indicated fairly high foregone income. The fact that they were unemployed meant that while they were looking for work, none were available and their only alternative recourse was to do unpaid housework in comparison with the employed and those not in the labor force. This could only suggest that their imputed foregone incomes from unpaid housework were overvalued. This exception points to a serious limitation of the opportunity cost valuation. While market valuation of housework is based on the marginal cost of labor, opportunity cost appears to be merely based on qualifications, contrary to the principle of equal pay for equal work.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aganon, V. C., Agaron M. E., "A Study of Women Workers in Women Dominated Manufacturing Establishments in Metro Manila."

Becker, G., "A Theory of the Allocation of Time," *Economic Journal, 75* September 1965.

Bell, Carolyn Shaw, "Women and Work: An Economic Appraisal," from Stromberg, Ann H. and Harkess Shirly (eds.) *Women Working — Theories and Facts in Perspective,* USA: Mayfield Publishing Co., 1978.

Blau, Francine D., "The Data on Women Workers, Past, Present and Future," pp., 29-62, from Stromberg.

Blay, Eva A., The Relation Between Paid and Unpaid Work of Women, A Source of Inequality: The Case of Brazil, *Women at Work in the Labour Force and At Home,* International Institute for Labour Studies, 1976.

Boserup, Ester, *Women's Role in Economic Development,* London: George Allen and Unwin, 1970.

Boserup, B. and Laljencrantz, "Integration of Women in Development: Why, When and How," UNDP, New York: 1874.

Bowen, W. and T. Aldrich Finning, *The Economics of Labour Force,* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.

Briones, Hermina M., "Women Workers in the Philippines," *Proceedings of the Regional Workshops in Bangkok,* 19-13 July 1976," The Role of Women in Contributing to Family Income, Bangkok, Thailand, Friedrich- Ebert-Stiftung, June 1977.

Brunster, Ximena, et al, (eds.) *Women and National Development: The Complexities of Change,* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1977.

Castillo, Celia T., "The Filipino Woman as Manpower: Imaage and Empirical Reality," Los Banos, Laguna, UP and Los Banos, (mimeographed,) 1976.

Castillo, Celia, "The Filipino Woman: Wife, Mother, Worker and Citizen," *NFE/WID Exchange,* Occasional paper no. 3, UP at Los Banos, Dec. 1981.

Cortes, Irene R., "Discrimination Against Women," *Working Women, August 1983, Vol. 2, no. 8, Makati, MM: Total Resources Inc.*

Cortes, Irene R., *"Women Rights under the 1973 Constitution, Professorial chair lecturer. Monograph No. 10, Q.C.: UP Press.*

Encarnacion, J., *"Family Income, Educational Level, Labour Force Participation and Fertility,"* Philippine Economic Journal, 12: 1 and2, 1973.

Encarnacion, J., *"Fertility and Labor Force Participation: Philippines 1968,"* IEDR Discussion Paper No. 73-13 *Institute of Economic Development and Research, School of Economics, University of the Philippines, 1973.*

Esmundo, Rafael A., , *(remarks)* — Proceedings of the Seminar — Workshop on the Role of Woman Executives in Population Education, *April 15-19, 1975, Pasay City.*

Eviota, Elizabeth U., *"Sex as a Differentiating Variable: Sex Role and Social Inequality in Work and Power Relations in Philippine Society,"* — *IPC, Ateneo de Manila University,* Paper presented at the PSS National Convention, *April 30 — May 2, 1977, UP at Iloilo, Iloilo City.*

Eviota, Elizabeth U., *"Time Use and the Sex Division of Labor,"* Philippine Journal of Industrial Relations, *Vol. IV, Nos. 1-2, Institute of Industrial Relations, UP, 1982.*

Feranil, I.Z., *Women, Work Force Participation and Underutilization,* WID Special Studies No. 2.

Fidelino, Rachel E., *"The Employment of Women: Myths, or Realities and a Strategy for Change,"* Proceedings of the Seminar-Workshop on Development Planning and the Status and Roles of Women in the Philippines *(unpublished), Quezon City, 1981.*

Goldschmidt Clermont, L., Unpaid work in the Household, A Review of Economic Evaluation Method. *ILO, Geneva, 1982.*

Gonzales, Anna Miren and Hollsteiner, M.R.,. Filipino Women as Partners of Men in Progress and Development, *Quezon City, IPC, Ateneo de Manila University.*

Guerrero, Sylvia II., *1965. "An Analysis of Husband-Wife Roles Among Filipino Professionals at UP Los Banos,"* PSR 13 (4): 274-284.

Haekenberg, Beverly H., Lutes, Steven V., and Angeles Teresita, "Social Indicators of Pre-marital and Post-marital Labor Force Participation Among Women in Region XI: Southern Mindanao," (WID Special Studies No. 3) — Submitted to PIDS, the IPC, Ateneo de Manila University, 1980 — Davao Research and Planning Foundation, Inc., Davao City.

Herrin, Alejandro, "Economic Activities of Married Women in the Philippines: Conceptual and Measurement Issues," *Proceedings of the Seminar-Workshop on Development Planning and the Status and Roles of Women in the Philippines (unpublished),* Quezon City, 1981.

Illo, Jean Frances P., "Constraints to Rural Women's Participation in Philippine Development: a report from the field, 1978.

Ireson, Carol, "Girls Socialization for Work," Stromberg and Harkess (eds.), *Womne Working: Theories and Facts in Perspective,* USA: Mayfield Publishing Co., 1978.

Jayme, Brigida, 1976. Family Role and Fertility Patterns of Urban Upper-Class Filipino Wives and Mothers, MA Thesis (draft) — Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Ateneo de Manila University.

Jayme-Ho, Teresa, "Time Budgets of Married Women in Rural Households, Laguna, Institute of Economic Development and Research, Q.C.: U.P., 1976.

Juliano, Priscilla, "Woman Power of Developing Nations," *NFE/ WID Exchange Asia,* Vol. 1 No. 3, October-December 1981.

Lauby, Jennifer, "The Effect of Marriage, Childbearing and Migration on the Labor Force Participation of Women," 1979, *WID Special Studies No. 4.*

Lauby, Jennifer, "Women in the Philippines Labor Force."

Layo, Leda L., "Correlates of Female Income: Preliminary Results," *Proceedings of the Regional Workshop in Bangkok,* 19-23 July 1976, (The Role of Women in Contributing to Family Income), Bangkok, Thailand, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, June 1977.

Licuanan, Patricia B. and Anna Merin Gonzales, "Filipino Women in Development," Quezon City, IPC, Ateneo de Manila University, (typescript), 1976.

Mahar, Mary. "Women at the Top." *The NFE/WID Exchange-Asia,* UPLB Information Exchange Center for Asia, Vol. 2, No. 4., Jan.-March, 1982.

Mangahas, Mahar and Ho, Teresa Jayme, "The Economic Status of Women: An Analytical Framework," *Proceedings of the Regional Workshop 19-23 July 1976 on the Role of Women in Contributing to Family Y,* Bangkok, Thailand; Friedrich-Ebert, Stiftung, June 1977.

Mernissi, Fatima, "The Moslem World: Women Excluded From Development, Tinker, Irene and Bramsen, Michelle B., (eds.) *Women and World Development, USA* — Overseas Development Council 1976.

Mijares, Tito A., and Engracia Luisa, "Measurement Concerns on the Role of Women in Development," *Unpublished Proceedings of the Seminar Workshop on Development Planning and the Status and Role of Women in the Philippines,* Quezon City; October 1981, organized by the PSSC — in collaboration with the Law Center, University of the Philippines, Quezon City, 1981.

Mincer, Jacob, "Labor Force Participation of Married Women in Universities," National Bureau of Committee for Economic Research, *Aspects of Labor Economics*, Princeton: Princeton University Press for the NBER, 1962, 63-67.

Miralao, Virginia, "Methodological Issues in the Collection and Analysis of Women's Time-Use Data, (xeroxed material).

Miralao, Virginia, "Women and Men in Development: Findings from a Pilot Study."

Miralao, Virginia, "Gender Employment Differentials"

Miralao, Virginia, "Time Use as a Measure of Women's Role in Development, Q.C.; IPC, Ateneo de Manila University, 1981.

Montiel Cristina and Hollenstenier M.R., "The Filipino Woman: Her Role and Status in Philippine Society," IPC, Ateneo de Manila University, 1974.

Papanek, Hanna, "Women in Cities: Problems and Perspectives," from Tinker and Bramsen (eds.) *Women and World Development*, Washington, D.C., Census Development Council, 1976.

Perez, B.A., "Women Labor Force Participation and Incomes in Three South East Asian Countries," *Proceedings of the Regional Workshop in Bangkok*, 19-23 July 1976, (The Role of Women in Contributing to Family Income), Bangkok, Thailand, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, June 1977.

Porio, E., Lynch, F., and Hollensteiner M.R., "The Filipino Family, Community and Nation. The Same Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow?," Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University, Quezon City, April 1975.

Renolds, Lloyd G., *Labour Economics and Labor*, New Jersey: Princeton Hall Inc., 1974.

Rogers, Barbara, *The Domestication of Women*, NY, St. Martin's Press, 1979.

Romero, Florida Ruth, "Law and Policy," *Proceedings of the Seminar-Workshop on Development Planning and the Status and Roles of Women in the Philipoines*, (unpublished), Quezon City, 1981.

Santiago, Emmanuel S., "Women in Agriculture: A Social Accounting of Female Workshare," *WID Special Studies No. 7* — Final Report submitted to the Philippine Institute for Development Studies through the IPC, Ateneo de Manila University, January 1980, Los Banos, Laguna, Association of Colleges of Agriculture in the Philippines.

Singh, Padua M., "Role and Participation of Nepalese Women in Rural Development," NFE/WID, Vol. 2 No. 6, July-September 1982.

Stromberg, Ann H., and Harkess, Shirley (eds.), *Women Working: Theories and Facts in Perspective*, USA: Mayfield Publishing Co., 1978.

Tang Yong Moy and Uraivan Tan Kim Yong, "The Position of Women and their Contributions to Rural Productive Efforts: A Comparison of Two Cases in Thailand and Malaysia," *Proceedings of the Regional Workshop in Bangkok*, 19-23 July 1976, (The Role of Women in Contributing to Family Income) Bangkok, Thailand, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, June 1977.

Tidalgo, R. P., Wages and Wage Structure in the Philippines (1951-1959). Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1975.

Tinker, Irene and Bramsen, M. B., (eds.) *Women and World Development*, Washington D.C., Overseas Development Council, 1976.

Vanek, Joann, "Housewives as Workers" — *Women Working:* Theories and Facts in Perspective, Edited by A. Stromberg and S. Harkess — UDA: Mayfield Publishing Co., 1978.

Whyte, Robert Orr and Whyte, Pauline, *Rural Asian Women, Status and Environment*, Research Notes and Discussion Paper No. 9, Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asean Studies, 1978.

Youssef, Nabia H., *Women and Work in Developing Societies*, Berkeley., University of California, 1974.

Zamora, Estela L., "Women and the Working Environment," *Proceedings of the Regional Workshop in Bangkok*, 19-23 July 1979, (The Role of Women in Contributing to Family Income), Bangkok, Thailand, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, June 1977.

The DAP Mafazine, Makati, MM., Nov-Dec. 1975.

"Development Issue," NFE/WID Exchange, Vol. 2 No. 4, January-March 1982.

Report of the Independent Commission on International Development Issues, 1980.

"Women in Development" of the Report entitled *North-South: A Programme for Survival,"* (The Report of the Independent Commission on International Development Issues Under the Chairmanship of Willy Brandt), Pan Books Ltd., London, 1980.

APPENDICES

Appendix Table A.1

Mean and Standard Deviation of Selected Individual and Household
Characteristics of Women by Employment Status

Variables	MEAN				STANDARD DEVIATION			
	Total	Employed	Unemployed	Not in the labor Force	Total	Employed	Unemployed	Not in the labor Force
Age	35.87	36.83	29.68	35.62	16.75	14.58	12.86	18.28
Age Square	1566.80	1569.04	1046.09	1603.29	1435.99	1199.02	1014.10	1601.79
Household size	6.54	6.46	6.85	6.58	2.72	2.74	2.70	2.69
Household income (Pesos)	3519.14	4203.07	2770.98	3093.81	9891.77	12174.56	5110.83	8196.19
Number of employed males	1.34	1.34	1.36	1.34	0.94	0.99	0.95	0.90
Number of employed females	0.96	1.72	0.48	0.46	1.08	1.04	0.76	0.77
Place of Residence	0.40	0.40	0.48	0.40	0.49	0.49	0.50	0.49
Number of children less that 7 years	0.87	0.83	0.89	0.90	1.11	1.09	1.13	1.13
Number of children 7-15 years	1.38	1.37	1.35	1.39	1.33	1.32	1.33	1.33
Number of women 15 years and over	2.39	2.43	2.57	2.35	1.35	1.41	1.35	1.30
Number of parental surrogate	1.00	0.72	1.34	1.17	0.87	0.93	0.91	0.76
Marital status (widowed/divorced -reference)								
Single	0.37	0.35	0.51	0.37	0.48	0.48	0.50	0.48
Married	0.56	0.57	0.45	0.56	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50
Highest grade completed (college and over- reference)								
No grade completed	0.07	0.06	0.03	0.08	0.25	0.24	0.18	0.27
Some elementary	0.23	0.24	0.16	0.22	0.42	0.43	0.36	0.42
Elementary and some high school	0.38	0.36	0.32	0.41	0.49	0.48	0.47	0.49
High school and some college	0.24	0.18	0.35	0.27	0.43	0.38	0.48	0.44
Number of cases	44,225	17,494	1,752	24,979				

Source: Integrated Survey of Households, 3rd Quarter, 1980.

Appendix Table A.2 .-

Time Spent by Women 15 Years Old and Over
By Type of Activity, By Employment Status, Urban-Rural: 1984

Employment Status	No. of Respondent	Working[1]	Travel[1]	Recreation	Other Activities	Marketing	Laundry	Cleaning house	Cooking	Washing dishes	Gardening	Babysitter	Other Unpaid housework	Total Unpaid housework
PHILIPPINES	209	38.92	5.08	6.01	2.53	3.00	3.87	3.84	9.54	3.47	2.35	7.32	.89	34.28
Employed	102	38.92	5.08	5.95	2.08	3.00	3.33	2.89	8.26	3.26	2.05	5.87	1.23	29.89
Professional	16	39.56	6.92	11.12	4.06	2.87	1.56	2.50	10.81	1.50	2.31	10.25	1.19	32.99
Clerical	21	41.76	11.02	8.19	1.67	2.17	2.55	2.36	3.86	0.95	1.86	9.43	4.33	27.51
Sales	32	44.69	2.67	3.03	2.19	3.84	4.47	2.28	11.19	1.67	1.60	3.41	0.28	28.74
Services	20	36.95	1.82	4.15	1.20	2.82	3.15	3.15	5.45	1.75	2.50	4.40	0.10	23.32
Others	13	22.38	4.15	5.92	1.38	2.69	4.23	5.31	9.31	15.38	2.46	3.08	0.38	42.84
Unemployed	12	-	-	4.00	2.33	1.83	1.17	4.75	3.58	3.54	1.42	4.25	0.50	21.04
Not in the LF	95	-	-	6.33	3.03	3.13	4.81	4.75	11.67	3.68	2.78	9.26	0.58	40.66
URBAN	130	45.21	6.01	7.61	2.87	2.97	2.88	2.94	8.50	2.98	2.46	8.86	0.88	32.47
Employed	71	45.21	6.01	7.24	2.25	2.79	2.54	2.28	7.42	3.44	2.16	6.55	1.39	28.57
Professional	14	38.36	7.73	12.14	4.07	2.92	1.71	2.50	11.50	1.21	2.50	11.71	0.57	34.62
Clerical	21	41.76	11.02	8.19	1.67	2.17	2.55	2.36	3.86	0.95	1.86	9.43	4.33	27.51
Sales	21	52.19	0.71	3.29	2.33	3.38	3.00	1.38	10.00	1.21	1.10	1.38	-	21.45
Services	10	49.20	1.85	4.60	1.30	3.05	3.00	2.10	5.20	1.70	4.90	7.40	-	27.35
Others	5	41.60	10.80	11.40	1.20	2.00	2.00	5.40	4.60	33.00	1.40	-	-	48.40
Unemployed	7	-	-	5.14	1.86	1.14	0.29	6.86	2.43	3.79	1.43	7.29	-	23.23
Not in the LF	52	-	-	8.46	3.86	3.45	3.71	3.31	10.79	2.25	3.00	12.23	0.31	39.05
RURAL	79	24.52	2.94	3.37	1.95	3.04	5.51	5.33	11.25	4.27	2.16	4.78	0.91	37.24
Employed	31	24.52	2.94	3.00	1.68	3.48	5.13	4.29	10.16	2.84	1.80	4.32	0.87	32.89
Professional	2	48.00	1.25	4.00	4.00	2.50	0.50	2.50	6.00	3.50	1.00	-	5.50	21.50
Clerical	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sales	11	30.36	6.41	2.54	1.91	4.73	7.27	4.00	13.45	2.54	2.54	7.27	0.82	42.62
Services	10	24.70	1.80	3.70	1.10	2.60	3.30	4.20	5.70	1.80	0.10	1.40	0.20	19.30
Others	8	10.38	0.00	2.50	1.50	3.12	5.62	5.25	12.25	4.38	3.12	5.00	0.62	39.36
Unemployed	5	-	-	2.40	3.00	2.80	2.40	1.80	5.20	3.20	1.40	-	1.20	18.00
Not in the LF	4	-	-	3.74	2.02	2.74	6.14	6.49	12.74	5.42	2.51	5.67	0.91	42.62

1/ Excludes domestic helps.

Discriminant Function Coefficients, Group Centroids and Statistics Using Employment Status as Group

Standard Discriminant Function Coefficients	Function 1	Function 2
Age	2.27	—1.68
Age Square	—2.15	2.25
Household Size	—0.25	0.29
Household Income	—0.05	0.10
Number of Employed Males	0.09	—0.09
Number of Employed Females	0.99	0.30
Residence	—0.01	—0.06
Number of Children less than 7	0.11	0.01
Number of Women 15 Years and Over	—0.30	—0.09
Number of Parental Surrogate	—0.15	0.23
Marital Status Widowed and divorced- reference)		
Single	0.07	0.55
Married	—0.20	0.86

Standard Discriminat Function Coefficients	function 1	Function2
Highest Grade Completed (college and over- reference)		
No Grade Completed	—0.13	0.60
Some Elementary	—0.21	0.97
Elementary and Some High School	—0.24	1.22
High School and Some College	—0.25	1.88
Group Centroids		
Employed	0.91	0.01
Unemployed	—0.54	0.63
Not in the Labor Force	—0.60	0.04
Statistics		
Relative Percentage	97.87	2.13
Canonical Correction	0.73	0.16
Milks' Lambda	0.45	0.98
Chi Square	35140.75	1100.27
d.f.	34	16
significance	0.01	0.01

Appendix A.4
Regression Coefficients of Income On Selected
Socio-Economic and Household Characteristics
of Employed: 3rd Quarter 1982

Item	Regression Coefficient	Standard Error	F.Value
Constant	2,452.44		
Urban	726.28	99.12	53.69*
Age	19.42	27.88	0.485
Age Square	-0.10	0.25	0.148

Occupation (production workers- reference)

Item	Regression Coefficient	Standard Error	F.Value
1. Professional	-135.48	281.22	0.232
2. Administrative	5,384.97	583.04	85.30*
3. Clerical	478.36	302.15	2.51
4. Sales	390.79	139.87	7.81*
5. Service	-417.36	167.21	6.23*
6. Agriculture	-59.34	160.10	0.14

Education (college graduate and over- reference)

Item	Regression Coefficient	Standard Error	F.Value
1. No education	-2,015.86	315.92	91.13*
2. Some elementary	-2,677.91	271.82	97.15*
3. Elementary and some High school	-2,315.76	261.58	78.38*
4. High School and some college	-1,592.70	252.02	39.94

Marital Status (widowed/divorced- reference)

Item	Regression Coefficient	Standard Error	F.Value
1. Single	-1,280.90	620.10	4.27*
2. Married	490.45	561.20	0.76
Household Size	170.47	60.33	8.00*
Number of Parental Surrogate	-41.18	61.60	0.45
Number of Employed Males	-313.11	72.54	18.63*
Number of Employed Females	201.31	66.37	9.20*

Regression Coefficients of Income on
Selected Socio-Economic and Household Characteristics
of Employed Women in the Urban Areas: 3rd Quarter 1982

Item	Regression Coefficient	Standard Error	F-Value
Education (college graduate and over- reference)			
1. No education	-3,662.01	528.93	47.93*
2. Some elementary	-3,095.86	334.57	85.62*
3. Elementary and			
some High School	-2,410.10	90.43	63.86*
4. High School and			
some College	-1,436.55	314.70	20.84*
Marital Status (widowed/divorced- reference)			
1. Single	-2,102.80	1,381.98	2.32
2. Married	597.64	2,284.80	.22
Household Size	183.93	109.79	2.80*
Number of Parental Surrogate	-185.10	103.58	3.19*
Number of Employed Males	-404.58	136.68	8.76*
Number of Employed Females	344.92	121.16	8.10*
Number of Women 15 Years Old			
and Over	211.09	169.66	1.55
Number of Children 0-6 Years Old	-38.70	139.22	.08
Number of Children 7-15 Years Old	-257.37	131.80	3.81*
Interaction			
Age x Single	15.21	27.42	.31
Age x Married	3.18	24.38	.02

* Statistically significant

Appendix A.5
Mean and Standard Deviation of Selected Socio-
Economic and Household Characteristics of Rural Woman

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation
Income Pesos	1,546.46	2,109.15
Age (years)	40.81	15.55
Occupation (production- reference) (per cent)		
1. Professional	8.9	0.28
2. Administrative	0.5	0.07
3. Clerical	2.2	0.15
4. Sales	28.3	0.45
5. Service	14.8	0.36
6. Agriculture	23.3	0.42
Education (college or more- reference) (per cent)		
1. No education	9.4	0.29
2. Some elementary	31.0	0.46
3. Elementary and some High School	37.7	0.48
4. High School and some College	12.6	0.33
Marital Status (widowed/divorced reference) (per cent)		
1. Single	27.2	.44
2. Married	50.0	.50
Household Income (Pesos)	4,086.79	10,739.01
Household Size (Thousand)	5.8	2.81
Number of Parental Surrogate	0.6	0.88
Number of Earning Members	2.6	1.45
Male	1.1	0.99
Female	1.5	0.87
Number of Women 15 Years Old and Over	2.15	1.25
Number of Children	2.2	
0-6 Years Old	0.8	1.08
7-15 Years Old	1.4	1.34

Appendix A.6
Regression Coefficients of Income on
Selected Socio-Economic and Household Characteristics
of Employed Women in the Rural Areas: 3rd Quarter 1982

Item	Regression Coefficient	Standard Error	F-Value
Constant	2,285.49		
Rural			
Age	37.11	21.83	2.89*
Age Square	-.29	.20	2.07

Education (college graduate and over- reference)

Item	Regression Coefficient	Standard Error	F-Value
1. No education	-2,716.05	178.47	231.61*
2. Some Elementary	-2,419.49	140.63	295.99*
3. Elementary and			
some High school	-2,187.74	135.28	261.52*
4. High School and			
some College	-1,604.52	157.62	103.62*

Marital Status (widowed/divorced- reference)

Item	Regression Coefficient	Standard Error	F-Value
1. Single	478.09	465.10	1.06
2. Married	685.60	411.64	2.77*
Household Size	161.19	53.11	9.21*
Number of Parental Surrogate	-126.41	52.12	5.88*
Number of Employed Males	-247.86	61.59	16.19*
Number of Employed Females	-72.65	60.47	1.44
Number of Women 15 years Old			
and Over	63.67	79.27	.64
Number of Children 0-6 years old	-220.33	62.67	12.36*
Number of Children 7-15 years old	75.22	61.14	1.51

Interaction

Item	Regression Coefficient	Standard Error	F-Value
Age x Single	6.96	9.61	.52
Age x Married	-12.53	8.14	2.37

*Statistically significant.

THE INTEGRATED SURVEY OF HOUSEHOLDS
(Module on Women and Housework)

Province _____

City/Mun./Mun, District _____

City District _____

Barangay _____

Urban/Rural _____

Barangay Stratum _____

Household Serial Number _____

Household Schedule No. _____

Address _____
            (House No. and name of street/sitio)

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the data set forth hereon were obtained/reviewed by me personally and in accordance with instructions.

_____   _____
Date Accomplished   Signature of Enumerator

_____   _____
Date Reviewed   Signature of Supervisor

A. DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Line No. (Encircle respondent) (1)	Name of household member (As of date of visit) (2)	Relationship to the HH. head (Enter code) (3)	Sex M F (4)	Age as of last birthday (check Col. 6 for members 10 years old and over) (5)	(6)	Marital (civil) status 1 S 2 M 3 WD 4 D/SEP 5 Unknown (Enter code) (7)	Highest grade completed (Enter code/specify degree) (8)	Usual occupation/status during the last 12 months (Specify, e.g. Palay farmer, Elementary teacher, Jeepney driver, Student, Housekeeper, Retired, Disabled) (9)	Do not fill (10)	Did he have a job/business or unpaid work on family farm or business even for only one hour at anytime during the past quarter from — to —? 1 Yes 2 No (If No, skip to Col. 36) (11)	(If Yes in Col. 11) Did he work at all during the past quarter? 1 Yes 2 No (12)	What was his primary job or business (P) during the past quarter? What other job or business (O) did he have during the past quarter? Please include one for only a few days, unpaid work on family farm or business, raising chickens, etc. Gainful occupation (Specify, e.g. Palay farmer, Elementary teacher, Jeepney driver, Exclude Student, Housekeeper, etc.) P – Primary O – Others (13)	Do not fill (14)
		All persons						10 years old and over					
01												P	
												O	
02												P	
												O	
03												P	
												O	
04												P	
												O	
05												P	
												O	
06												P	
												O	
07												P	
												O	
08												P	
												O	
09												P	
												O	
10												P	
												O	
11												P	
												O	
12												P	
												O	

Codes for Col. 3 –
Relationship

01 – Head
02 – Wife/Spouse
03 – Son
04 – Daughter
05 – Son-in-law
06 – Daughter-in-law
07 – Grandson
08 – Granddaughter
09 – Father
10 – Mother
11 – Other relative
12 – Boarder
13 – Domestic help, etc.

Codes for Col. 8 – Highest
Grade Completed

00 – No grade completed
Elementary
11 – 1st grade
12 – 2nd grade
13 – 3rd grade
14 – 4th grade
15 – 5th grade
16 – 6th and 7th grade
High school
21 – 1st year
22 – 2nd year
23 – 3rd year
24 – 4th year

College Undergraduate

31 – 1st year
32 – 2nd year
33 – 3rd year
34 – 4th year
35 – 5th year or higher

For college graduates

Specify the Bachelor's or higher degree completed and field of study

B. ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS (10 years old and over)

1. For persons who ever worked or had jobs or business during the past quarter (Yes, in Col. 11)

Kind of business industry (Specify, e.g. Palay farm, Public school, Jeepney PUJ Textile factory)		Class of worker (Enter code)	Status in job/business (Enter code)	Number of days worked during the month of:									No. of normal working hours per day	Salaries/ Wages and Net Receipts			Is he with a job or business at the end of the QTR? 1 Yes 2 No	(For all who worked or with a job or business) Did he want more hours of work per day or more days of work, during the past qtr? 1 Yes 2 No (Skip to Col. (47)	Line No.
				January April July October		February May August November		March June September December						In Cash	In Kind	T O T A L			
	Do not fill			Full day (No.)	Less than full day No. Ave. No. of hrs. per day	Full day (No.)	Less than full day No. Ave. No. of hrs. per day	Full day (No.)	Less than full day No. Ave. No. of hrs. per day									
(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)(21)	(22)	(23)(24)	(25)	(26)(27)	(28)	(29)	(30)	(31)	(32)	(33)	(34)
																01
																02
																03
																04
																05
																06
																07
																08
																09
																10
																11
																12

Codes for Col. 17 – Class of Worker

1 – Worked for private employer
2 – Worked for government/government corporation
3 – Self-employed without any employee as defined in "4"
4 – Employer in own and family-operated farm/business (with one or more regular paid employees or one or more hired employees most of weeks in operation during the past quarter
5 – Worked with pay or, own family-operated farm or business
6 – Worked without pay on own family-operated farm or business.

Codes for Col. 18 – Status in Job/Business

1 – Permanent job/business/unpaid family work or one that had lasted or expected to last for 1 year or longer. Farm operator and fisherman and their unpaid family workers who *usually work in at least 10 calendar months of the year.*
2 – Short-term or seasonal or casual job/business/unpaid family work (expected to last less than 1 year since commencement). Farm operator and fisherman and their unpaid family workers who *usually work in less than 10 calendar months of the year.*
3 – Worked for different employers on day to day or week to week basis like odd job workers or farm laborers/stevedores not on payroll or not connected with union/market and other cargo handlers receiving pay from individual customers.

02F

32

B. ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS (10 years old and over)

2. For persons who had no jobs or business during the past quarter

(If person wanted work — 1 or 2 in Col. 36)

L i n e No.	Did he want to work anytime during the past quarter? (If Yes) Full time or part time? 1 Yes, full time 2 Yes, part time 3 No (If No, skip to Col. 47)	What occupation did he want? Specify, e.g. Palay farm, Elementary teacher, Jeepney driver)	Do not fill	Did he look for work at any time during the past quarter? 1 Yes 2 No	(If No in Col. 39) Why did he not look for work? (Enter code/ specify)	Since the age of 15 up to the end of the past quarter, did he ever work full time for at least 2 consecutive weeks, including unpaid work on family farm or business? 1 Yes 2 No (If No, skip to Col. 47)	Occupation (Specify, e.g. Palay farmer, Elementary teacher, Jeepney driver)	Do not fill
							(If Yes in Col. 41)	
(35)	(36)	(37)	(38)	(39)	(40)	(41)	(42)	(43)
01								
02								
03								
04								
05								
06								
07								
08								
09								
10								
11								
12								

Codes for Col. 40 and Col. 50 — Reason
for not looking for work

1 — Too old or retired/too young
2 — Schooling
3 — Housekeeping
4 — Believed no work available
for factory closed
5 — Temporary illness/disability
6 — Permanent illness/disability
— Others, specify

44

(No. in Col. 11) Kind of business or industry (Specify e.g. Palay farm, Public school, Jeepney PU)		Class of work- er (Enter code)	3. Activity during the past week (Ask for all persons 10 years old and over)				Line No.
	Do not fill		Did he work at all or had a job or bu- siness last week? 1 Yes 2 No	(If Yes in Col. (47) How many hours did he work last week?	(If No in Col. (47) Did he look for full- time or part- time work last week? 1 Yes 2 No	(If No in Col. (49) Why did he not look for work last week? (En- ter code)	
(44)	(45)	(46)	(47)	(48)	(49)	(50)	(51)
							01
							02
							03
							04
							05
							06
							07
							08
							09
							10
							11
							12

Codes for Col. 46 – Class of Worker

1 — Worked for private employer
2 — Worked for government/government corporation
3 — Self-employed without any paid employee
  as defined in "4"
4 — Employer in own family-operated farm/business
  (with one or more regular paid employees or
  one or more hired employees most of the week
  of the last quarter in operation.)
5 — With pay on own family-operated farm or business
6 — Without pay on own family-operated farm or
  business

45

L i n e N o.	D. FOR WOMEN MEMBERS OF HOUSEHOLD 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER						
	Do you have children 1-Yes 2-No	If yes in Col.53 how many children of ages-				On the average, how many hours a a week do you spend for -	
		Less 1 Year	1-6 Years	7-15 Years	15 years and over	Recreation, social, religious activities outside home	Other activities outside home not related to employ-ment or studies
(52	(53)	(54)	(55)	(56)	(57)	(58)	(59)
01							
02							
03							
04							
05							
06							
07							
08							
09							
10							
11							
12							

46

L i n e N o.	Do you do un- paid housework regularly 1-Yes 2-No	If yes in Col. 61 how many hours a week on the average do you spend on -							
		Market- ing	Laun- dry	Clean- ing the house	Cook- ing	Wash- ing dishes	Garden- ing and home beauti- fication	Baby sit- ting and attending to child- ren needs	Other unpaid house- hold chores
(60)	(61)	(62)	(63)	(64)	(65)	(66)	(67)	(68)	(69)
01									
02									
03									
04									
05									
06									
07									
08									
09									
10									
11									
12									

FOP. WOMEN MEMBERS OF HOUSEHOLDS 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER

47

L i n e N o.	Type of work (Primary job or business)	Status of employ- ment (Primary job or business)	Distance of place of work from residence (kms.)	Mode of travel to work (Primary job or business)	Average time per day spent in travel- ing	Average time per week spent in working	Reason for work- ing	Possible reasons to stop working
(70)	(71)	(72)	(73)	(74)	(75)	(76)	(77)	(78)
01								
02								
03								
04								
05								
06								
07								
08								
09								
10								
11								
12								

E. FOR EMPLOYED WOMEN 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER

Code for type of work (Col. 71)

1 - Supervisory
2 - Field work
3 - Office'clerical
4 - Skilled work
5 - Other specify

Code for status of employed (Col. 72)

1 - Full time (i.e. getting full time pay)
2 - Part time (getting less than full time pay)
3 - On commission basis
4 - Piece work
5 - Other (specify)

Mode of Travel to Work (Col. 74)

1 - Not applicable (place of work is in the residence)
2 - Walking
3 - Tricycle, bycycle or motorcycle
4 - Jeepney'bus
5 - Boat or other water transport
6 - Other specify

48

L i n e N o.	Reason for not working	Skills you have	Type of work desired if wanting employ- ment (See Code)	Status of employment desired if wanting employment (See Code)	If going to be employed expected minimum monthly earnings
(79)	(80)	(81)	(82)	(83)	(84)
01					
02					
03					
04					
05					
06					
07					
08					
09					
10					
11					
12					

F. FOR WOMEN 10 YEARS OLD AND OVER NOT EMPLOYED NOT STUDENTS

Code for type of work
Col. 82)

1 - Supervisory
2 - Field work
3 - Office/clerical
4 - Skilled work
5 - Other(specify)

Code for status of employment
(Col. 83)

1 - Full time (i.e. getting full time pay)
2 - Part time (getting less than full time pay)
3 - On commission basis
4 - Piece work
5 - Others (specify)

49

G. Additional Household Information.
(To be answered by household member in charge of managing the household)

1. What is your average monthly expenditure for -

    a) food   _____

    b) rent   _____

    c) household supplies   _____

    d) electricity, gas and water   _____

    e) household operation   _____
       (e.g. salaries of domestic help)

    f) others   _____

             T O T A L   _____

2. Do you have live-in domestic help?

    __ Yes (Continued to 2a and 2b)

    __ No (Proceed to 3)

  2a. What are these domestic helps?

  2b. How much is their monthly compensation?
      (fill in table below)

    (2a)   (2b)

DOMESTIC HELP				MONTHLY COMPENSATION			
Name	Type of domestic help	Wage in cash	Other cash benefits	Clothing allow- ance	Other non-cash benefit	Imputed value of consump- tion	Total Compensa- tion

3. Do you hire outside help to do household chores

    __ Yes (Continue to 3a and 3b)

    __ No (Proceed to 4.)

  3a. What type of chore done.
  3b. No. of times per month chore is done
  3c. Average amount paid for the chores

50

	3a	3b	3c		
Type of Chore	No. of Times per month chore is done	Average amount paid for chore back home		
		Cash	Kind	Total

4. What households appliances do you use in the house. (Please check)

    __ Gas stove   __ Refrigerator

    __ Electric iron   __ Other electric cooking gadgets
    __ Electric stove   (please specify)

    __ Electric washing machine   ————————————

5. Do you have piped running water in the house   _____

6. What is the estimated floor area of the house   _____