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# Paid Work 

By Vincent Ferrao

## Introduction

In 2009, $58.3 \%$ of women, representing 8.1 million women, were employed. This is more than double the number of women employed in 1976. Additionally, women's labour market experiences today differ vastly from 1976. Using the Labour Force Survey, this chapter of Women in Canada will examine the labour market experiences of women over time and compare them to that of men's. More specifically, it will examine employment and unemployment trends, part-time, education, women with children in the labour market, selfemployment, occupations, unionization, multiple job-holding and temporary work trends.

## Women in the labour market

The percentage of women who are employed has generally followed an upward trend over the past three decades, but has declined during economic downturns.

After the recession of the early 1990s, the percentage of employed women rose steadily, reaching $59.3 \%$ in 2008. In 2009, however, as the most recent labour market downturn took hold, it fell by a full percentage point in 2009 to $58.3 \%$, representing $8,076,000$ employed women (Table 1). However, for women the downturn's effects on employment were less severe than for men. In 2009, the share of men who were employed dropped much more steeply, 2.9 percentage points to $65.2 \%$, than that of women. This repeats a similar pattern seen in the previous two recessions (those of the early 1980s and early 1990s), when the percentage of women who were employed fell much less steeply than that of men (Chart 1).

Table 1
Employment trends of women and men aged 15 and over, 1976 to 2009

| Year | Women aged 15 and over |  | Men aged 15 and over |  | Women as a percentage of total employment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | thousands | percentage | thousands | perc |  |
| 1976 | 3,618.2 | 41.9 | 6,129.3 | 72.7 | 37.1 |
| 1981 | 4,556.6 | 47.7 | 6,748.4 | 72.8 | 40.3 |
| 1986 | 5,138.2 | 50.3 | 6,870.3 | 69.6 | 42.8 |
| 1991 | 5,790.5 | 52.8 | 7,066.9 | 66.9 | 45.0 |
| 1996 | 6,099.0 | 52.1 | 7,322.4 | 65.0 | 45.4 |
| 2001 | 6,910.3 | 55.6 | 8,035.8 | 66.8 | 46.2 |
| 2002 | 7,126.0 | 56.6 | 8,184.4 | 67.1 | 46.5 |
| 2003 | 7,324.2 | 57.4 | 8,348.1 | 67.6 | 46.7 |
| 2004 | 7,466.4 | 57.8 | 8,480.6 | 67.8 | 46.8 |
| 2005 | 7,575.0 | 57.8 | 8,594.7 | 67.7 | 46.8 |
| 2006 | 7,757.2 | 58.3 | 8,727.1 | 67.7 | 47.1 |
| 2007 | 7,977.5 | 59.1 | 8,888.9 | 68.0 | 47.3 |
| 2008 | 8,104.5 | 59.3 | 9,021.3 | 68.1 | 47.3 |
| 2009 | 8,076.2 | 58.3 | 8,772.7 | 65.2 | 47.9 |

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

## Chart 1 <br> Employment rates of women and men, 1976 to 2009



Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

## Employment by province

Women and men in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta were most likely to be employed in 2009; their employment rates were higher than those of women and men in all other provinces (Table 2).

Table 2
Percentage of the population aged 15 years and over who are employed, by province, 1976 to 2009

| Provinces | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1976 |  | 1986 |  | 1991 |  | 1996 |  | 2001 |  | 2006 |  | 2009 |  |
|  | percentage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Newfoundland and Labrador | 27.7 | 57.5 | 35.8 | 52.5 | 40.8 | 51.3 | 38.5 | 46.1 | 44.6 | 51.0 | 48.3 | 52.7 | 47.8 | 52.5 |
| Prince Edward Island | 38.0 | 66.3 | 46.1 | 63.2 | 49.1 | 59.8 | 51.3 | 61.8 | 55.0 | 63.2 | 58.9 | 63.5 | 57.9 | 62.2 |
| Nova Scotia | 36.0 | 65.8 | 43.0 | 61.4 | 47.1 | 61.6 | 46.4 | 58.0 | 51.6 | 60.6 | 55.0 | 61.1 | 56.4 | 61.0 |
| New Brunswick | 34.0 | 62.2 | 41.2 | 58.1 | 44.8 | 58.1 | 46.7 | 57.0 | 51.1 | 59.2 | 55.1 | 61.3 | 56.1 | 62.0 |
| Quebec | 37.4 | 70.5 | 45.7 | 66.8 | 48.1 | 64.1 | 47.7 | 61.7 | 51.7 | 64.4 | 55.6 | 65.0 | 56.7 | 62.9 |
| Ontario | 45.8 | 75.3 | 54.4 | 73.9 | 55.6 | 68.7 | 53.6 | 66.1 | 57.6 | 68.6 | 59.0 | 68.1 | 58.2 | 64.4 |
| Manitoba | 44.5 | 73.8 | 52.8 | 70.8 | 54.6 | 68.1 | 54.7 | 68.7 | 58.1 | 70.9 | 60.7 | 71.2 | 60.3 | 71.4 |
| Saskatchewan | 41.1 | 75.1 | 52.1 | 71.4 | 54.6 | 69.6 | 54.2 | 68.1 | 55.7 | 68.2 | 60.6 | 71.3 | 61.8 | 71.8 |
| Alberta | 49.2 | 80.0 | 57.1 | 73.6 | 59.5 | 73.8 | 60.7 | 73.9 | 62.8 | 75.1 | 64.6 | 76.9 | 64.1 | 74.5 |
| British Columbia | 41.9 | 71.3 | 47.9 | 66.3 | 53.5 | 67.3 | 53.6 | 66.5 | 54.6 | 63.6 | 58.0 | 67.2 | 57.5 | 64.5 |
| Canada | 41.9 | 72.7 | 50.3 | 69.6 | 52.8 | 66.9 | 52.1 | 65.0 | 55.6 | 66.8 | 58.3 | 67.7 | 58.3 | 65.2 |

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

In 2009, Alberta had the highest percentage of employed women in the country, at $64.1 \%$, a trend that began in the mid-1970s.

The percentage of women working in Saskatchewan in 2009 was $61.8 \%$; in Manitoba, the rate was $60.3 \%$.
The lowest employment rates for women and men were in Newfoundland and Labrador, where $47.8 \%$ of women and $52.5 \%$ of men were working at a job or business in 2009.

Women in all provinces continued to have lower employment rates than men in 2009. However, the gap narrowed in most provinces: women were generally less affected by the labour market downturn.

## Education level linked to employment rate

Even during economic downturns, the likelihood of being employed increases the higher the level of educational attainment. In 2009, $74.7 \%$ of women with a university degree, $59.1 \%$ of those with some postsecondary training and $56.2 \%$ of high school graduates were employed. In contrast, $35.0 \%$ of women who had attended, but had not completed, high school and just $13.7 \%$ of those who had not gone beyond grade 8 were employed that year (Table 3).

## Table 3

Percentage of the population who are employed by highest level of educational attainment, 2009

| Level of education | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 15 to 24 |  | 25 to 44 |  | 45 and over |  | 15 and over |  |
|  | percentage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 to 8 years | 19.4 | 26.0 | 40.8 | 59.1 | 10.8 | 22.7 | 13.7 | 27.1 |
| Some high school | 40.5 | 37.6 | 52.0 | 71.0 | 26.4 | 44.8 | 35.0 | 47.0 |
| High school graduate | 65.1 | 64.9 | 69.6 | 81.3 | 47.7 | 59.3 | 56.2 | 67.7 |
| Some post-secondary | 58.7 | 55.5 | 68.7 | 79.1 | 52.0 | 56.7 | 59.1 | 62.9 |
| Post-secondary certificate or diploma | 77.2 | 73.0 | 82.1 | 86.8 | 57.3 | 62.6 | 69.2 | 73.5 |
| University degree | 73.6 | 73.7 | 82.8 | 88.3 | 64.4 | 67.4 | 74.7 | 77.3 |
| Total of all education levels | 57.1 | 53.6 | 77.1 | 83.8 | 46.3 | 56.1 | 58.3 | 65.2 |

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

Regardless of educational attainment, women are still less likely than men to be employed, although the gaps are narrowest among women with higher levels of education. Among those with a university degree, for example, $74.7 \%$ of women, versus $77.3 \%$ of men, were employed in 2009. Similarly, among those with a nonuniversity postsecondary certificate or diploma, $69.2 \%$ of women, compared with $73.5 \%$ of men, were employed. In contrast, women with less than a grade 9 education were only half as likely to be employed that year as their male counterparts- $13.7 \%$ versus $27.1 \%$. These differences can be partly explained by the variation in the education and work experiences of different age groups. At the same time, these patterns generally hold among all age groups over the age of 25 .

These patterns do not hold, however, in the 15-to-24 age group, where young women with higher levels of education perform better than young men with the same levels of education. For example, $77.2 \%$ of women under 25 with a non-university postsecondary certificate or diploma were employed in 2009, compared with $73.0 \%$ of men.

## Young women saw steep employment losses during recent downturn

Women in nearly all age groups were affected by the recent downturn in the labour market. Women aged 15 to 24 were particularly hard hit: their employment rate fell from $60.3 \%$ in 2008 to $57.1 \%$ in 2009 . Even with this decline, they fared better than young men, whose employment rate dropped from $58.9 \%$ to $53.6 \%$ over the same period (Table 4).

Table 4
Percentage of women and men employed by age, 1976 to 2009

| Year | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 15 to 24 |  | 25 to 44 |  | 45 to 54 |  | 55 to 64 |  |
|  | percentage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1976 | 51.4 | 59.9 | 50.0 | 90.9 | 45.6 | 88.9 | 30.3 | 72.9 |
| 1981 | 57.2 | 63.5 | 60.3 | 90.1 | 51.8 | 88.4 | 31.1 | 70.4 |
| 1986 | 58.1 | 60.6 | 66.4 | 86.3 | 55.9 | 85.7 | 30.3 | 62.3 |
| 1991 | 57.6 | 57.1 | 70.5 | 83.6 | 64.3 | 84.1 | 32.4 | 56.9 |
| 1996 | 52.0 | 53.3 | 70.9 | 83.0 | 66.3 | 82.4 | 33.5 | 53.7 |
| 2001 | 56.2 | 56.5 | 75.3 | 85.9 | 72.3 | 84.0 | 39.4 | 57.3 |
| 2002 | 57.6 | 57.4 | 75.9 | 85.7 | 74.2 | 84.3 | 41.4 | 59.0 |
| 2003 | 58.6 | 57.9 | 76.2 | 86.1 | 75.4 | 84.5 | 45.3 | 60.9 |
| 2004 | 58.4 | 57.7 | 77.0 | 86.3 | 76.0 | 85.3 | 46.0 | 62.0 |
| 2005 | 58.9 | 56.7 | 77.0 | 86.7 | 75.6 | 85.0 | 46.8 | 63.1 |
| 2006 | 59.5 | 57.9 | 77.2 | 86.8 | 76.8 | 85.1 | 48.7 | 62.8 |
| 2007 | 59.8 | 59.1 | 78.4 | 86.9 | 77.9 | 85.1 | 50.7 | 63.6 |
| 2008 | 60.3 | 58.9 | 78.0 | 87.2 | 78.2 | 85.3 | 51.9 | 63.3 |
| 2009 | 57.1 | 53.6 | 77.1 | 83.8 | 77.3 | 82.9 | 53.1 | 62.3 |

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

The employment rate for women aged 25 to 44 dipped to $77.1 \%$; for women 45 to 54 it fell to $77.3 \%$, a decline of 0.9 percentage points for both. However, for women aged 55 to 64 , the employment rate rose from $51.9 \%$ in 2008 to $53.1 \%$ in 2009. Among men, the employment rate fell much more steeply for those between 25 and 54 years of age, and declined moderately for those aged 55 to 64 .

Women, despite considerable strides over the past three decades, are still less likely to be employed than men. The exception is young women aged 15 to 24 who, in recent years, have consistently posted higher employment rates than young men.

## More employed mothers

The employment rate of women with children has generally been increasing over the past three decades. In 2009, $72.9 \%$ of women with children under 16 living at home were part of the employed workforce. Although the percentage has declined compared with 2008 and 2007, it is still up from $39.1 \%$ in 1976 (Table 5).

Table 5
Employment rate of women with children by age of youngest child, 1976 to 2009

| Year | Youngest child less 3 | Youngest child aged 3 to 5 | Youngest child less than 6 | Youngest child aged 6 to 15 | Youngest child less than 16 | Women under 55 with no children at home |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | percentage |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1976 | 27.6 | 36.8 | 31.4 | 46.4 | 39.1 | 60.9 |
| 1981 | 39.3 | 46.7 | 42.1 | 56.2 | 49.3 | 66.0 |
| 1986 | 49.4 | 54.5 | 51.4 | 61.9 | 56.7 | 69.3 |
| 1991 | 54.4 | 60.1 | 56.5 | 69.0 | 62.8 | 72.6 |
| 1996 | 57.8 | 60.5 | 58.9 | 69.8 | 64.5 | 72.4 |
| 2001 | 61.3 | 67.0 | 63.7 | 75.3 | 70.1 | 76.8 |
| 2002 | 61.9 | 68.1 | 64.5 | 77.0 | 71.4 | 77.9 |
| 2003 | 62.7 | 68.5 | 65.1 | 76.7 | 71.6 | 79.0 |
| 2004 | 64.5 | 69.4 | 66.6 | 77.0 | 72.4 | 79.3 |
| 2005 | 64.7 | 70.6 | 67.2 | 77.4 | 72.8 | 78.7 |
| 2006 | 64.3 | 69.4 | 66.4 | 78.2 | 72.9 | 79.9 |
| 2007 | 65.1 | 72.6 | 68.1 | 79.4 | 74.3 | 80.9 |
| 2008 | 64.6 | 70.3 | 66.8 | 80.0 | 73.8 | 81.2 |
| 2009 | 64.4 | 69.7 | 66.5 | 78.5 | 72.9 | 80.4 |

[^0]The growth in the employment rate among women with children has been particularly sharp over the past three decades, women with children are still less likely to be employed than women without children. In 2009, 80.4\% of women under age 55 without children were employed.

## Chart 2

Percentage of employed mothers, by age of youngest child, 2009


Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

The strong growth in labour force participation among women with young children is reflected in their employment rates. By 2009, $64.4 \%$ of women with children less than age 3 were employed, more than double the figure in 1976, when only $27.6 \%$ of these women were employed. Similarly, $69.7 \%$ of women whose youngest child was from 3 to 5 years of age were working in 2009, up from $36.8 \%$ in 1976 (Chart 2).

Although the proportion of women who were employed and had pre-school-aged children has grown, they are still less likely to be employed than women with school-aged children. In 2009, 66.5\% of women with children under age 6 were employed, compared with $78.5 \%$ of those whose youngest child was aged 6 to 15 .

## Mothers in two-parent families more likely to be employed than lone-parent mothers

Female lone parents are less likely to be employed than mothers in two-parent families. In 2009, 68.9\% of female lone parents with children less than age 16 living at home were employed, compared with $73.8 \%$ of their counterparts in two-parent families. This represents a major shift from the late 1970s, when female lone parents were more likely to be employed than mothers with partners (Table 6).

Table 6
Employment rate of women with children by family status and presence of youngest child, 1976 to 2009

| Year | Female lone parents |  |  |  | Women with partners |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Youngest child less 3 | Youngest child aged 3 to 5 | Youngest child aged 6 to 15 | Youngest child less than 16 | Youngest child less 3 | Youngest child aged 3 to 5 | Youngest child aged 6 to 15 | Youngest child less than 16 |
|  | percentage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1976 | 27.6 | 45.1 | 54.0 | 48.3 | 27.6 | 36.0 | 45.5 | 38.3 |
| 1981 | 32.5 | 51.8 | 61.5 | 54.5 | 39.7 | 46.0 | 55.4 | 48.7 |
| 1986 | 29.8 | 47.2 | 60.1 | 51.7 | 51.1 | 55.6 | 62.2 | 57.4 |
| 1991 | 30.9 | 47.5 | 62.3 | 52.1 | 57.0 | 62.3 | 70.3 | 64.5 |
| 1996 | 32.9 | 46.2 | 62.6 | 53.1 | 61.0 | 63.3 | 71.5 | 66.6 |
| 2001 | 45.5 | 61.0 | 73.7 | 66.5 | 63.2 | 68.3 | 75.7 | 70.9 |
| 2002 | 46.2 | 60.2 | 74.4 | 67.1 | 63.7 | 69.7 | 77.7 | 72.3 |
| 2003 | 46.5 | 61.1 | 75.2 | 68.3 | 64.5 | 69.9 | 77.1 | 72.3 |
| 2004 | 46.1 | 63.3 | 74.9 | 68.3 | 66.5 | 70.6 | 77.5 | 73.2 |
| 2005 | 47.2 | 64.6 | 75.8 | 69.2 | 66.8 | 71.8 | 77.9 | 73.6 |
| 2006 | 46.3 | 66.2 | 76.6 | 69.9 | 66.5 | 70.1 | 78.6 | 73.6 |
| 2007 | 49.8 | 68.1 | 76.9 | 70.8 | 67.0 | 73.5 | 80.0 | 75.0 |
| 2008 | 49.1 | 65.6 | 77.9 | 70.6 | 66.3 | 71.2 | 80.5 | 74.5 |
| 2009 | 45.9 | 66.0 | 75.7 | 68.9 | 66.5 | 70.5 | 79.2 | 73.8 |

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

## Chart 3 <br> Percentage of employed women with children, by family status, 1976 to 2009



Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

In the intervening years, the employment rate of mothers in two-parent families grew steadily, surpassing that of female lone parents in the mid-1980s. However, in recent years, the proportion of employed lone mothers has increased substantially, jumping 20 percentage points from 1995 to 2008 (Chart 3). Over the same period, the proportion of employed mothers in two-parent families increased by 8 percentage points. The labour market downturn in 2009 affected female lone parents: the employment rate of such women with a youngest child under 16 slipped from $70.6 \%$ in 2008 to $68.9 \%$ in 2009 . The rate also declined for women in two-parent families with children under 16, from $74.5 \%$ in 2008 to $73.8 \%$ in 2009.

The presence of young children also has a greater impact on the employment of lone mothers than on their counterparts with partners. In 2009, $45.9 \%$ of lone mothers with children under age 3 were employed, compared with $66.5 \%$ of mothers in two-parent families with children under age 3. Among those whose youngest child was aged 3 to $5,66.0 \%$ of female lone parents, compared with $70.5 \%$ of mothers in two-parent families, were part of the paid workforce in 2009. The employment-related consequences of the downturn in the labour market were more severe for female lone parents with the youngest child aged less than 3 than for women in two-parent families with children in the same age group. The employment rate of women in two-parent families with children less than 3 years of age was nearly unchanged in 2009, at $66.5 \%$, compared with 2008 . In contrast, the employment rate for lone-parent mothers dropped from $49.1 \%$ in 2008 to $45.9 \%$ in 2009.

## Women are more likely to work part time than men

While about $73 \%$ of employed women worked full time in 2009 , women were, nevertheless, more likely than men to work part time. In 2009, 2.2 million women worked part time. The share of women working fewer than 30 hours per week at their main job has risen slightly from $23.6 \%$ in 1976 to $26.9 \%$ in 2009. This contrasts with men, whose part-time rate in 2009 at $11.9 \%$, was less than half that of women. The men's rate, however, has nevertheless more than doubled for men since 1976, when $5.9 \%$ of men worked part time.

Of all part-time workers in 2009, nearly 7 out of 10 were women. This proportion has changed little over the past three decades (Table 7).

Table 7
Part-time employment of women and men, 1976 to 2009

| Year | Women <br> employed <br> part-time | Women <br> employed <br> part-time | Men <br> employed <br> part-time | Women as a <br> percentage of <br> total part-time |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 254.2 |  | percentage |  |
| 1976 | $1,187.4$ | 23.6 | 5.9 | 70.1 |
| 1981 | $1,419.0$ | 26.1 | 7.2 | 70.9 |
| 1986 | $1,616.8$ | 27.6 | 8.9 | 69.9 |
| 1991 | $1,769.1$ | 27.9 | 10.1 | 69.3 |
| 1996 | $1,863.2$ | 29.0 | 10.8 | 69.1 |
| 2001 | $1,974.6$ | 27.0 | 10.5 | 68.9 |
| 2002 | $2,041.9$ | 27.7 | 11.0 | 68.8 |
| 2003 | $2,027.6$ | 27.9 | 11.1 | 68.8 |
| 2004 | $2,032.8$ | 27.2 | 10.9 | 68.8 |
| 2005 | $2,028.5$ | 26.8 | 10.8 | 68.6 |
| 2006 | $2,084.3$ | 26.1 | 10.8 | 68.2 |
| 2007 | $2,135.9$ | 26.1 | 11.0 | 68.0 |
| 2008 | $2,174.2$ | 26.4 | 11.2 | 67.8 |
| 2009 | 26.9 | 11.9 | 67.5 |  |

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

Over one-half of young women aged 15 to 24 worked part time in 2009 , compared with $38.7 \%$ of men. This phenomenon became evident in the early 1990s and has changed little since then. In 1976, one-quarter of young women worked part time, and by 1993, the proportion had climbed to $50.2 \%$. By 2009, the percentage of young women working part time reached $54.8 \%$. This compares with about $20 \%$ of women who worked part time in 2009 in the core age group ( 25 to 54 years) and $28.3 \%$ of women aged 55 to 64 .

Across all age groups, women are more likely than men to work part time. This is especially true of men and women over 25 . In 2009, $19.5 \%$ of women aged 25 to 44 and $20.0 \%$ of women aged 45 to 54 worked part time; the rates for men in the same age groups were $5.8 \%$ and $5.1 \%$, respectively (Table 8 ).

Table 8
Percentage of employed women and men working part-time by age, 1976 to 2009

| Year | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 15 to $\mathbf{2 4}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 5}$ to $\mathbf{4 4}$ |  | $\mathbf{4 5}$ to $\mathbf{5 4}$ | $\mathbf{5 5}$ to $\mathbf{6 4}$ |  |  |
|  | 24.8 | 17.9 | 21.8 | 1.5 | 24.0 | 1.4 | 24.7 | 3.7 |
| 1981 | 29.0 | 21.3 | 23.1 | 2.1 | 27.3 | 2.1 | 27.6 | 4.3 |
| 1986 | 37.4 | 28.2 | 22.7 | 3.1 | 26.7 | 2.8 | 30.3 | 6.7 |
| 1991 | 45.1 | 36.5 | 22.3 | 3.9 | 24.0 | 3.4 | 32.0 | 8.6 |
| 1996 | 53.0 | 38.6 | 23.1 | 5.1 | 23.1 | 4.3 | 32.3 | 9.9 |
| 2001 | 50.4 | 36.8 | 21.1 | 4.7 | 21.3 | 4.4 | 29.1 | 9.9 |
| 2002 | 52.4 | 37.6 | 21.2 | 4.9 | 21.5 | 4.5 | 31.3 | 10.8 |
| 2003 | 52.8 | 37.7 | 21.2 | 4.9 | 21.3 | 4.7 | 31.0 | 10.7 |
| 2004 | 52.2 | 37.4 | 20.5 | 4.7 | 20.6 | 4.3 | 29.6 | 10.7 |
| 2005 | 52.4 | 36.8 | 20.0 | 4.9 | 20.1 | 4.5 | 29.3 | 10.3 |
| 2006 | 51.5 | 36.6 | 19.3 | 4.7 | 19.5 | 4.5 | 28.3 | 10.6 |
| 2007 | 52.5 | 36.9 | 19.1 | 4.8 | 19.0 | 4.4 | 28.5 | 10.6 |
| 2008 | 52.6 | 37.2 | 18.9 | 5.2 | 19.6 | 4.4 | 28.2 | 10.4 |
| 2009 | 54.8 | 38.7 | 19.5 | 5.8 | 20.0 | 5.1 | 28.3 | 11.9 |

Note: Part-time is expressed as a percentage of totals employed.
Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

Most women who work part time do so either because they do not want full-time employment or because parttime work is more appropriate for their personal situation. In 2009, $27.7 \%$ of women employed part time reported they did not want full-time work-by personal preference-and $25.0 \%$ reported they were going to school (Table 9).

Table 9
Reasons for part-time employment by age, 2009

| Reasons | Women |  |  |  | Men |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 15 to 24 | 25 to 44 | 45 and over | Total | 15 to 24 | 25 to 44 | 45 and over | Total |
|  | percentage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Own illness | 0.5 | 2.9 | 6.5 | 3.5 | 0.6 | 5.6 | 6.5 | 3.7 |
| Caring for own children | 1.4 | 34.2 | 5.5 | 13.4 | F | 3.2 | 1.1 | 1.1 |
| Other personal/family responsibilities | 0.7 | 4.3 | 5.9 | 3.8 | 0.5 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 1.2 |
| Going to school | 71.9 | 7.6 | 0.9 | 25.0 | 73.3 | 19.5 | 0.7 | 37.0 |
| Personal preference | 5.9 | 17.7 | 54.7 | 27.7 | 4.6 | 16.8 | 56.9 | 25.0 |
| Other voluntary | 0.4 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 1.9 | 1.3 | 1.1 |
| Others | 19.2 | 32.4 | 26.0 | 25.9 | 20.5 | 51.2 | 31.7 | 30.9 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
|  |  |  |  | thou | ands |  |  |  |
| Total employed part-time | 673.9 | 694.6 | 805.6 | 2174.2 | 464.7 | 226.2 | 355.5 | 1046.4 |
|  | percentage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage employed part-time | 54.8 | 19.5 | 24.6 | 26.9 | 38.7 | 5.8 | 9.6 | 11.9 |

Note: Others includes business conditions and unable to find work.
Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

Some women, however, work part time because of childcare or other responsibilities. In 2009, nearly one in five female part-time workers said they worked part time because of personal or family responsibilities. That year, $13.4 \%$ said they did not work full time because they were caring for children, and $3.8 \%$ reported other family or personal responsibilities as the reason they worked part time. In sharp contrast, only $2.3 \%$ of male part-time workers cited these as reasons they did not work full time.

At the same time, a substantial number of women work part time because they cannot find full-time employment. In 2009, $25.9 \%$ of female part-time employees indicated reported wanting full-time employment, but only finding part-time work. Women were less likely than men to work part time involuntarily. In 2009, 30.9\% of male parttime workers wanted full-time employment.

The reasons women work part time also varied considerably by age. Almost $35 \%$ of women aged 25 to 44 , for example, stated that they worked part time to care for their children, compared with $5.5 \%$ of women aged 45 and older. In contrast, women aged 15 to 24 were most likely to work part time because they were going to school, while those aged 45 and over were most likely to not want full-time employment.

## Increasing numbers of women are self-employed

A growing number of women are self-employed. In 2009, nearly 1 million women, $11.9 \%$ of all those with jobs, were self-employed, up from $8.6 \%$ in 1976. Self-employment has grown about as fast among women as it has among men in the past two decades, though women are still less likely than men to be self-employed: $11.9 \%$ versus $19.9 \%$ in 2009. Women accounted for $35.5 \%$ of all self-employed workers in 2009 , up from $30.7 \%$ in 1991 and $26.3 \%$ in 1976 (Table 10).

Table 10
Self-employment trends among women and men, 1976 to 2009

|  |  |  |  |  | Women as a <br> percentage <br> of total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year | Self-employed <br> women | Self-employed <br> men | Self-employed <br> women | Self-employed <br> men | self-employment |
|  | thousands |  |  | percentage |  |
| 1976 | 311.6 | 873.4 | 8.6 | 14.2 | 26.3 |
| 1981 | 404.6 | $1,020.6$ | 8.9 | 15.1 | 28.4 |
| 1986 | 492.0 | $1,164.0$ | 9.6 | 16.9 | 29.7 |
| 1991 | 582.6 | $1,313.2$ | 10.1 | 18.6 | 30.7 |
| 1996 | 744.8 | $1,426.8$ | 12.2 | 19.5 | 34.3 |
| 2001 | 773.4 | $1,503.3$ | 11.2 | 18.7 | 34.0 |
| 2002 | 814.7 | $1,499.7$ | 11.4 | 18.3 | 35.2 |
| 2003 | 830.7 | $1,571.1$ | 11.3 | 18.8 | 34.6 |
| 2004 | 838.9 | $1,614.5$ | 11.2 | 19.0 | 34.2 |
| 2005 | 866.0 | $1,645.6$ | 11.4 | 19.1 | 34.5 |
| 2006 | 876.6 | $1,621.4$ | 11.3 | 18.6 | 35.1 |
| 2007 | 911.9 | $1,703.2$ | 11.4 | 19.2 | 34.9 |
| 2008 | 909.9 | $1,719.7$ | 11.2 | 19.1 | 34.6 |
| 2009 | 959.4 | $1,742.3$ | 11.9 | 19.9 | 35.5 |

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

In an economic downturn, the number of self-employed tends to rise, and the number of employees declines. Some employees who lose their jobs and are unable to find others generate their own work and become selfemployed. In 2009, a year of downturn for the labour market, the number of self-employed women rose $5.4 \%$ from the year before, while the number of employees fell $1.1 \%$-virtually all in the private sector. Over the same period, the number of self-employed men rose $1.3 \%$, a slower rate than that of women. The number of male employees dropped $3.7 \%$, also virtually all in the private sector.

## Young women and men are more likely to have temporary employment

Temporary employment is defined as working at a job that has a predetermined end date. In 2009, 12.9\% of employed women had temporary employment, compared with $12.1 \%$ of men (Chart 4). This was down from the peak in 2005, when almost $14 \%$ of women and $12.5 \%$ of men who were employed worked in temporary jobs.

The proportion of those working in temporary jobs varies widely. In 2009, young women aged 15 to 24 were three times more likely to have temporary employment than women aged 45 and over- $28.0 \%$ compared with $8.5 \%$. This relationship held for men as well: younger men were substantially more likely to have temporary jobs than older men.

## Chart 4

Percentage of employed women and men with temporary work, by age group, 2009


Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

## Multiple job-holding increases for women

Women make up a growing share of employees holding more than one job. By 2009 , about $56 \%$ of multiple job holders were women. This is because the percentage of women holding more than one job continues to grow, while men's share remains relatively constant. In 1987, $4.0 \%$ of employed women held multiple jobs; by 2009, $6.2 \%$ of employed women did so. The corresponding share of men working at more than one job over this period rose from $4.2 \%$ to $4.4 \%$ (Table 11).

Table 11
Multiple job holders as a percentage of total employed women and men, by age group, 1987 to 2009

| Year | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women as a percentage of all multiple job holders |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 15 to 24 |  | 25 to 44 |  | 45 and over |  | Total |  |  |
|  | percentage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1987 | 4.5 | 4.7 | 4.1 | 4.3 | 3.0 | 3.6 | 4.0 | 4.2 | 41.8 |
| 1991 | 5.6 | 4.9 | 5.1 | 4.8 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.6 | 46.9 |
| 1996 | 8.4 | 5.3 | 5.7 | 4.8 | 4.5 | 3.9 | 5.8 | 4.6 | 51.1 |
| 2001 | 7.8 | 4.9 | 5.3 | 4.2 | 4.6 | 3.5 | 5.5 | 4.1 | 53.6 |
| 2002 | 7.8 | 5.2 | 5.7 | 4.7 | 5.1 | 3.8 | 5.8 | 4.4 | 53.4 |
| 2003 | 8.3 | 5.3 | 5.6 | 4.5 | 5.0 | 3.7 | 5.8 | 4.3 | 54.4 |
| 2004 | 8.4 | 5.4 | 5.8 | 4.6 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 5.9 | 4.3 | 54.8 |
| 2005 | 8.9 | 5.7 | 6.0 | 4.7 | 5.1 | 3.8 | 6.1 | 4.5 | 54.7 |
| 2006 | 8.2 | 5.1 | 5.8 | 4.8 | 5.2 | 4.1 | 6.0 | 4.5 | 53.9 |
| 2007 | 8.2 | 4.9 | 6.0 | 4.8 | 5.6 | 4.0 | 6.2 | 4.5 | 55.3 |
| 2008 | 7.7 | 4.7 | 6.1 | 4.7 | 5.4 | 4.0 | 6.1 | 4.4 | 55.3 |
| 2009 | 8.0 | 5.1 | 6.3 | 4.7 | 5.4 | 4.0 | 6.2 | 4.4 | 56.2 |

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

Young women had the highest incidence of multiple job holding. In 2009, 8.0\% of employed women aged 15 to 24 were multiple job holders. This compares with $6.3 \%$ of women aged 25 to 44 and $5.4 \%$ of women aged 45 and older. At every age group, employed women were more likely than men to have more than one job.

## Unionization rates higher for women than men

The percentage of women who are in unionized jobs has risen dramatically. In 1976, $22.3 \%$ of women were in unionized jobs; by 2009, this had increased to 32.6\% (Chart 5). Men's unionization has decreased, from 39\% in 1976 to $30.3 \%$ in 2009. As a result, unionization rates were slightly higher among women than men in 2009.

## Chart 5

Percentage of female and male workers unionized, 1976 to 2009


Sources: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey and Corporations and labour unions returns act (CALURA).

Unionization density varies both by sex and by age: it increases with age for both sexes (Chart 6). For example, while $15.4 \%$ of employed women aged 15 to 24 held unionized jobs, more than $35 \%$ of women in the older age groups were in unionized jobs. Interestingly, in the 15-to-24 age group, unionization was higher for men than women. However, in older age groups, women's unionization density exceeded men's.

## Chart 6

Union density by age group and sex, 2009


Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

## Despite progress, women still concentrated in traditional female occupations

The majority of employed women continue to work in occupations in which they have been traditionally concentrated. In 2009, 67\% of all employed women were working in teaching, nursing and related health occupations, clerical or other administrative positions, or sales and service occupations. This compared with $31 \%$ of employed men (Table 12).

Table 12
Distribution of employment by occupations, 1987, 1999 and 2009

| Occupations | 1987 |  |  | 1999 |  |  | 2009 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | Women as a percentage of total occupations | Women | Men | Women as a percentage of total occupations | Women | Men |  |
|  | percentage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Managerial |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Senior management | 0.3 | 0.8 | 21.0 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 28.2 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 31.6 |
| Other management | 5.7 | 9.7 | 30.7 | 6.9 | 10.6 | 35.5 | 6.7 | 10.4 | 37.4 |
| Total management | 6.0 | 10.5 | 30.1 | 7.2 | 11.3 | 35.1 | 7.0 | 11.0 | 37.0 |
| Professional |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Business and finance | 1.9 | 2.3 | 38.3 | 3.1 | 2.7 | 49.3 | 3.6 | 3.2 | 51.2 |
| Natural sciences/engineering/mathematics | 2.3 | 7.0 | 19.5 | 3.0 | 9.6 | 20.7 | 3.3 | 10.6 | 22.3 |
| Social sciences/religion | 4.3 | 2.0 | 61.4 | 5.8 | 2.4 | 67.7 | 7.7 | 2.7 | 72.5 |
| Teaching | 3.8 | 2.6 | 52.3 | 5.2 | 2.7 | 61.9 | 5.8 | 2.7 | 65.9 |
| Doctors/dentists/other health | 0.9 | 0.9 | 43.1 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 47.3 | 1.5 | 1.1 | 55.2 |
| Nursing/therapy/other health related | 8.3 | 0.9 | 87.1 | 8.1 | 1.1 | 86.3 | 9.1 | 1.2 | 87.1 |
| Artistic/literary/recreational | 2.7 | 2.1 | 48.4 | 3.4 | 2.4 | 54.1 | 3.7 | 2.9 | 54.4 |
| Total professional | 24.1 | 18.0 | 50.4 | 29.7 | 21.9 | 53.4 | 34.7 | 24.4 | 56.7 |
| Clerical and administrative | 29.7 | 7.9 | 73.9 | 24.6 | 6.8 | 75.4 | 23.2 | 6.9 | 75.5 |
| Sales and services | 30.0 | 18.4 | 55.2 | 29.4 | 18.6 | 57.3 | 28.9 | 20.1 | 56.9 |
| Primary | 2.3 | 7.2 | 19.7 | 1.9 | 5.9 | 21.6 | 1.3 | 4.9 | 19.5 |
| Trades, transport and construction | 2.1 | 28.9 | 5.2 | 2.0 | 26.1 | 6.0 | 2.0 | 26.3 | 6.4 |
| Processing, manufacturing and utilities | 5.8 | 9.1 | 32.4 | 5.2 | 9.3 | 32.2 | 2.9 | 6.3 | 30.1 |
| Total occupations ${ }^{1}$ | 100.0 | 100.0 | 43.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 45.9 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 47.9 |
| Total Employed (thousands) | 7,025.3 | 5,307.7 | $\ldots$ | 7,797.2 | 6,609.6 | $\ldots$ | 8,772.7 | 8,076.2 |  |

[^1]Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

The proportion of women employed in traditionally female-dominated occupations, however, has declined slowly over the past two decades. In 2009, $67.0 \%$ of employed women were working in one of these areas, down from $71.8 \%$ in 1987.

Most of this decline since the late 1980s has been accounted for by falling percentages employed in clerical and related administrative jobs. In 2009, $23.2 \%$ of employed women had these types of jobs, compared with $29.7 \%$ in 1987 (Chart 7). In contrast, the share of women in teaching positions rose slightly, from $3.8 \%$ to $5.8 \%$, over this period; the share of women working in nursing and related occupations increased from $8.3 \%$ to $9.1 \%$, and the share of women in sales and service jobs slipped from $30.0 \%$ to $28.9 \%$.

Women's share of total employment in these traditional occupational groups is still significant: in 2009, 87.1\% of nurses and health-related therapists, $75.5 \%$ of clerks and other administrators, $65.9 \%$ of teachers and $56.9 \%$ of sales and service personnel were women.

## Chart 7

Women employed as a percentage of all occupations, 1987 and 2009


Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

Women have, however, increased their representation in several professional fields in recent years. For example, women comprised $51.2 \%$ of business and financial professionals in 2009 , up from $38.3 \%$ in 1987. The share of women employed has gone up in diagnostic and treating positions in medicine and related health professions. In fact, women made up more than one-half (55.2\%) of doctors, dentists and other health occupations in 2009, up from $43.1 \%$ in 1987. Similarly, $72.5 \%$ of professionals employed in social sciences or religion in 2009 were women, compared with $61.4 \%$ in 1987.

Women have also increased their share of total employment in managerial positions. In 2009, they comprised $37.0 \%$ of those employed in managerial positions, up from $30.1 \%$ in 1987. Among managers, however, women tend to be better represented among lower-level managers than among those at more senior levels. In 2009, women made up $31.6 \%$ of senior managers (up from $21.0 \%$ in 1987 ), but $37.4 \%$ of managers at other levels in 2009.

Women are also still a minority among professionals in the natural sciences, engineering and mathematics. In 2009, just 22.3\% of professionals in these occupations were women, up marginally from $19.5 \%$ in 1987.

Relatively few women are employed in most goods-producing occupations, as was traditionally the case. In 2009, $30.1 \%$ of workers in manufacturing were women, as were $19.5 \%$ of those in primary industries and just $6.4 \%$ of those in transportation, trades, and construction work. The representation of women in manufacturing has edged down; in transportation, trades and construction-related occupations, however, women's representation has increased slightly since the late 1980s. In primary industries, the percentage of women employed was about the same in 2009 as it was in 1987.

## Even in an economic slowdown, unemployment rate lower for women than men

The economic slowdown affected the labour market for both men and women. In 2009, the worst year of the labour market downturn, the number of unemployed women rose to 608,000 , compared with 487,000 in 2008 and 476,000 in 2007 . The female unemployment rate jumped to $7.0 \%$ in 2009 , the highest since 2003 (Chart 8).

Despite the increase in unemployment, women were affected less than men during the 2009 downturn in the labour market. The industries hardest hit by employment losses in 2009 were those in the goods-producing sector, mainly manufacturing, construction and natural resources. Employment in these industries is maledominated. Women, in contrast, are employed more than men in service industries where employment continued to grow, such as health care and social assistance, educational services and finance, insurance, real estate and leasing. This helped cushion the impact that the downturn had on women. While the level and rate of unemployment rose for women in 2009, the increase was less steep than that for men, for whom the unemployment rate reached 9.4\%, the highest rate since 1996.

## Chart 8

Unemployment rate for women and men, 1976 to 2009


Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

Even though the unemployment rate rose for women during the labour market downturn, it remained lower than for men, as it has consistently been since the beginning of the 1990s. This contrasts with much of the period from 1976 to 1989, when women posted higher unemployment rates than men.

Among women, those aged 15 to 24 saw the largest increase in their unemployment rate, from $10.0 \%$ in 2007 and 2008 to $12.4 \%$ in 2009 . This was more than twice the unemployment rate of women in the older cohortsthose aged 25 to 44 and 45 to 64 (Table 13).

Table 13
Unemployment rates of women and men, by age, 1976 to 2006

| Year | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 15 to 24 |  | 25 to 44 |  | 45 to 64 |  | 15 and over |  |
|  | percentage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1976 | 11.6 | 13.0 | 7.4 | 4.7 | 5.0 | 3.8 | 8.2 | 6.4 |
| 1981 | 11.7 | 13.7 | 7.5 | 5.5 | 5.2 | 4.4 | 8.3 | 7.2 |
| 1986 | 13.2 | 16.0 | 9.2 | 8.5 | 7.4 | 6.5 | 9.8 | 9.5 |
| 1991 | 12.9 | 18.5 | 9.3 | 10.2 | 8.0 | 7.5 | 9.7 | 10.8 |
| 1996 | 13.8 | 16.9 | 8.9 | 9.4 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 9.3 | 9.9 |
| 2001 | 11.1 | 14.5 | 6.3 | 6.7 | 5.4 | 5.6 | 6.9 | 7.5 |
| 2002 | 11.7 | 15.3 | 6.7 | 7.2 | 5.5 | 6.1 | 7.1 | 8.1 |
| 2003 | 11.8 | 15.3 | 6.8 | 6.9 | 5.5 | 6.2 | 7.2 | 7.9 |
| 2004 | 11.7 | 14.9 | 6.4 | 6.6 | 5.2 | 5.5 | 6.9 | 7.5 |
| 2005 | 10.6 | 14.2 | 6.0 | 6.1 | 5.2 | 5.3 | 6.5 | 7.0 |
| 2006 | 10.4 | 12.8 | 5.6 | 5.7 | 4.7 | 5.0 | 6.1 | 6.5 |
| 2007 | 10.0 | 12.3 | 5.0 | 5.7 | 4.4 | 4.9 | 5.6 | 6.4 |
| 2008 | 10.0 | 13.1 | 5.0 | 5.6 | 4.6 | 5.3 | 5.7 | 6.6 |
| 2009 | 12.4 | 18.0 | 6.4 | 8.4 | 5.6 | 7.6 | 7.0 | 9.4 |

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

Although young women (those 15 to 24) have the highest unemployment rate among women, they have a lower unemployment rate than young men. During the recent labour market downturn, the unemployment rate for young women rose from $10.0 \%$ in 2008 to $12.4 \%$ in 2009; the rate for young men rose more sharply from $13.1 \%$ to $18.0 \%$ over the same period. Although the unemployment rate rose for both men and women aged 25 to 44 and 45 to 64 , women's rates were a full two percentage points lower than men's.

Women in the Atlantic provinces and Quebec generally have higher unemployment rates than women in other provinces. However, the 2009 downturn pushed unemployment rates higher for women in all provinces. Young women (aged 15 to 24 ) in Ontario posted the second-highest unemployment rate ( $14.4 \%$ ) in 2009, behind young women in Newfoundland and Labrador (16.0\%). For women in other age groups, unemployment rates were also highest in Newfoundland and Labrador-11.2\% for 25 to 44 -year-olds and $13.1 \%$ for 45 to 64 -year-olds.

In 2009, $12.6 \%$ of all women in the labour force in Newfoundland and Labrador were unemployed, the highest in Canada. The unemployment rate for women was $10.1 \%$ in Prince Edward Island, $7.4 \%$ in Nova Scotia and $7.5 \%$ in New Brunswick in 2009. At $6.9 \%$, the unemployment rate of women in Quebec was below that for women in Ontario, $7.7 \%$. In 2009, unemployment rates for women in the western provinces were the lowest in the country: in Manitoba, it was 5.0\%; Saskatchewan, $4.2 \%$; Alberta, $5.8 \%$; and British Columbia, $6.5 \%$. In all provinces in 2009, unemployment rates were lower for women than for men (Table 14).

Table 14
Unemployment rates of women and men, by age and province, 2009

| Province | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 15 to 24 |  | 25 to 44 |  | 45 to 64 |  | 15 and over |  |
|  | percentage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Canada | 12.4 | 18.0 | 6.4 | 8.4 | 5.6 | 7.6 | 7.0 | 9.4 |
| Newfoundland and Labrador | 16.0 | 28.3 | 11.2 | 15.5 | 13.1 | 17.5 | 12.6 | 18.0 |
| Prince Edward Island | 13.2 | 21.7 | 8.3 | 12.7 | 10.3 | 12.3 | 10.1 | 13.8 |
| Nova Scotia | 13.0 | 21.9 | 6.5 | 10.2 | 6.1 | 8.1 | 7.4 | 11.0 |
| New Brunswick | 13.0 | 16.7 | 6.2 | 9.0 | 6.8 | 9.4 | 7.5 | 10.2 |
| Quebec | 12.3 | 18.1 | 5.7 | 9.1 | 6.1 | 7.9 | 6.9 | 9.9 |
| Ontario | 14.4 | 20.7 | 7.2 | 9.2 | 5.6 | 8.1 | 7.7 | 10.3 |
| Manitoba | 9.1 | 11.2 | 4.4 | 4.6 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 5.0 | 5.3 |
| Saskatchewan | 8.7 | 10.4 | 3.7 | 5.0 | 2.8 | 3.6 | 4.2 | 5.3 |
| Alberta | 10.4 | 13.9 | 5.5 | 6.1 | 4.1 | 5.7 | 5.8 | 7.2 |
| British Columbia | 9.6 | 17.0 | 6.3 | 7.2 | 5.6 | 7.3 | 6.5 | 8.6 |

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

## Reasons for unemployment vary

Unemployment occurs for several reasons. For example, in 2009, $45.6 \%$ of unemployed women lost their job or were laid off. At the same time, $23.7 \%$ of unemployed women were labour force re-entrants who had not worked in the past year, and another $9.7 \%$ were job market entrants-they had never been employed. Another $5.6 \%$ of unemployed women had left their last job to go to school, $2.6 \%$ had left because of personal or family responsibilities, and another $2.1 \%$ had left because of personal illness (Table 15).

Table 15
Unemployed women and men, by reason for leaving last job, 2009

| Reason | Women |  | Men |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | thousands | percentage | thousands | percentage |
| Own illness/disability | 12.7 | 2.1 | 15.5 | 1.7 |
| Personal/family reasons | 15.7 | 2.6 | 7.9 | 0.9 |
| Going to school | 34.0 | 5.6 | 40.7 | 4.5 |
| Lost job/laid off | 276.9 | 45.6 | 530.5 | 58.2 |
| Retired | 2.3 | 0.4 | 5.2 | 0.6 |
| Other reasons | 63.3 | 10.4 | 81.2 | 8.9 |
| Had not worked in last year | 144.2 | 23.7 | 170.7 | 18.7 |
| Never worked | 58.7 | 9.7 | 60.1 | 6.6 |
| Total unemployed | $\mathbf{6 0 7 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 1 2 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

Although much of the labour market downturn occurred in 2009, among the unemployed, women were less likely than men to have lost their last job or been laid off- $45.6 \%$ of unemployed women compared with $58.2 \%$ of unemployed men.

Unemployed women were more likely than men to have been either job market entrants or labour force reentrants who had not worked in the previous year. In 2009, $9.7 \%$ of unemployed women were job market entrants, and $23.7 \%$ had not worked in the previous year. This contrasts with $6.6 \%$ of men who were job market entrants and $18.7 \%$ who were unemployed and had not worked in the previous year.

Unemployed women were also more likely than unemployed men to have left their last job because of personal or family responsibilities.

## Immigrants and the labour market

In 2009, $51.0 \%$ of the total foreign-born female population was employed, compared with $60.6 \%$ of women born in Canada.

Women who were very recent immigrants-those who had been in the country 5 years or less-had the lowest employment rate, $49.1 \%$. Women who had been in the country from 5 to 10 years, and those who had been in Canada more than 10 years-called 'established immigrants'-fared better, with employment rates of $56.3 \%$ and $50.3 \%$, respectively.

Compared with immigrant men, immigrant women in 2009 posted lower employment rates, irrespective of the length of time spent in the country. Women born in Canada also had a lower employment rate, 60.6\%, than men born in Canada (66.4\%).

The labour market downturn had a greater impact on unemployment rates for immigrant women than for Canadian-born women. In 2009, the female immigrant unemployment rate reached $9.6 \%$, up from $7.4 \%$ in 2008: the rate for women born in Canada was $6.3 \%$ in 2009, up from $5.2 \%$ in 2008.

Women who were very recent immigrants posted the highest unemployment rate, $15.9 \%$ in 2009 , followed by recent immigrants, $12.6 \%$, and established immigrants, $7.5 \%$. The unemployment rate for the total female immigrant population was $9.6 \%$ in 2009, lower than that for male immigrants (10.5\%). However, among very recent immigrants, the female unemployment rate (15.9\%) was higher than the male unemployment rate (14.3\%) (Table 16).

Table 16
Employment, employment rate and unemployment rate for women and men, by immigration status, 2006 to 2009

| Immigration status and year |  | Women aged 15 and over |  |  | Men aged 15 and over |  |  | Womenas apercentageof totalemployment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Employment | Employment rate | Unemployment rate | Employment | Employment rate | Unemployment rate |  |
|  |  | thousands | percentage |  | thousands | percentage |  |  |
| Total | 2006 | 7,757.2 | 58.3 | 6.1 | 8,727.1 | 67.7 | 6.5 | 47.1 |
|  | 2007 | 7,977.5 | 59.1 | 5.6 | 8,888.9 | 68.0 | 6.4 | 47.3 |
|  | 2008 | 8,104.5 | 59.3 | 5.7 | 9,021.3 | 68.1 | 6.6 | 47.3 |
|  | 2009 | 8,076.2 | 58.3 | 7.0 | 8,772.7 | 65.2 | 9.4 | 47.9 |
| Total Landed immigrants | 2006 | 1,523.4 | 51.2 | 7.5 | 1,795.5 | 64.4 | 6.4 | 45.9 |
|  | 2007 | 1,593.2 | 51.9 | 7.4 | 1,842.9 | 64.5 | 6.7 | 46.4 |
|  | 2008 | 1,606.6 | 51.5 | 7.4 | 1,870.0 | 64.4 | 6.7 | 46.2 |
|  | 2009 | 1,617.6 | 51.0 | 9.6 | 1,801.4 | 61.4 | 10.5 | 47.3 |
| Very recent immigrants, 5 years or less | 2006 | 201.4 | 48.2 | 14.2 | 256.1 | 67.6 | 10.9 | 44.0 |
|  | 2007 | 203.4 | 48.0 | 13.3 | 266.0 | 67.7 | 10.7 | 43.3 |
|  | 2008 | 220.7 | 49.4 | 14.1 | 286.2 | 70.8 | 9.9 | 43.5 |
|  | 2009 | 213.4 | 49.1 | 15.9 | 259.0 | 65.7 | 14.3 | 45.2 |
| Recent immigrants, 5 to 10 years | 2006 | 239.2 | 57.3 | 10.3 | 289.8 | 73.8 | 7.4 | 45.2 |
|  | 2007 | 256.7 | 59.5 | 8.5 | 288.6 | 73.8 | 8.0 | 47.1 |
|  | 2008 | 246.8 | 56.3 | 9.5 | 303.0 | 73.2 | 8.2 | 44.9 |
|  | 2009 | 253.2 | 56.3 | 12.6 | 296.9 | 68.5 | 13.4 | 46.0 |
| Established immigrants, 10 plus years | 2006 | 1,082.8 | 50.6 | 5.5 | 1,249.6 | 62.0 | 5.2 | 46.4 |
|  | 2007 | 1,133.1 | 51.2 | 6.0 | 1,288.3 | 62.1 | 5.5 | 46.8 |
|  | 2008 | 1,139.1 | 51.0 | 5.6 | 1,280.7 | 61.4 | 5.7 | 47.1 |
|  | 2009 | 1,151.0 | 50.3 | 7.5 | 1,245.6 | 59.2 | 8.9 | 48.0 |
| Non-landed immigrants | 2006 | 109.6 | 48.0 | 8.6 | 143.4 | 62.6 | 6.4 | 43.3 |
|  | 2007 | 112.0 | 49.8 | 7.2 | 134.1 | 61.7 | 7.8 | 45.5 |
|  | 2008 | 116.4 | 50.7 | 7.5 | 142.2 | 63.7 | 7.3 | 45.0 |
|  | 2009 | 124.5 | 53.7 | 7.8 | 148.9 | 63.4 | 8.8 | 45.5 |
| Born in Canada | 2006 | 6,124.1 | 60.6 | 5.6 | 6,788.2 | 68.8 | 6.5 | 47.4 |
|  | 2007 | 6,272.3 | 61.5 | 5.1 | 6,911.9 | 69.2 | 6.2 | 47.6 |
|  | 2008 | 6,381.5 | 61.8 | 5.2 | 7,009.1 | 69.2 | 6.5 | 47.7 |
|  | 2009 | 6,334.1 | 60.6 | 6.3 | 6,822.3 | 66.4 | 9.1 | 48.1 |

[^2]
## The Aboriginal population and the labour market

In 2009, $53.7 \%$ of the female Aboriginal population ${ }^{1}$ was employed, compared with $60.6 \%$ of their male counterparts. In 2009, the Aboriginal women's rate fell 1.1 percentage points from $54.8 \%$ the year before. Aboriginal men saw a steeper decline, from $66.1 \%$ to $60.6 \%$ over the same period.

The employment rate for Aboriginal women, $53.7 \%$, was less than that of non-Aboriginal women, $58.4 \%$, in 2009. Among Aboriginal women, the employment rate for the Métis was $58.2 \%$, the same as in 2007, but down from $59.2 \%$ in 2008 . Conversely, women who were North American Indian saw their employment rate decline from $50.9 \%$ in 2007 to $49.7 \%$ in 2009.

The decline in employment in 2009 lifted the female Aboriginal unemployment rate to $12.7 \%$ from $10.0 \%$ in 2007 and $10.4 \%$ in 2008. Despite this increase, the unemployment rate for Aboriginal women was below that of Aboriginal men, 15.1\%, in 2009.

The female Aboriginal unemployment rate in 2009, 12.7\%, was nearly twice that of non-Aboriginal women, $6.9 \%$ (Table 17).

Table 17
Employment, employment rate and unemployment rate by Aboriginal identity, 2007 to 2009

| Aboriginal Identity and year |  | Women aged 15 and over |  |  | Men aged 15 and over |  |  | Women as a percentage of total employment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Employment | Employment rate | Unemployment rate | Employment | Employment rate | Unemployment rate |  |
|  |  | perce |  | thousands |  | percentage |  |  |
| Total | 2007 |  | 7,979.7 | 59.2 | 5.6 | 8,891.4 | 68.1 | 6.4 | 47.3 |
|  | 2008 | 8,108.3 | 59.3 | 5.7 | 9,024.1 | 68.1 | 6.5 | 47.3 |
|  | 2009 | 8,082.0 | 58.3 | 7.0 | 8,776.4 | 65.3 | 9.4 | 47.9 |
| Non-Aboriginal | 2007 | 7,831.3 | 59.3 | 5.5 | 8,731.4 | 68.1 | 6.3 | 47.3 |
|  | 2008 | 7,956.5 | 59.4 | 5.6 | 8,855.5 | 68.1 | 6.5 | 47.3 |
|  | 2009 | 7,931.0 | 58.4 | 6.9 | 8,618.8 | 65.4 | 9.3 | 47.9 |
| Aboriginal | 2007 | 148.5 | 54.4 | 10.0 | 160.0 | 63.9 | 11.1 | 48.1 |
|  | 2008 | 151.8 | 54.8 | 10.4 | 168.6 | 66.1 | 10.3 | 47.4 |
|  | 2009 | 151.0 | 53.7 | 12.7 | 157.6 | 60.6 | 15.1 | 48.9 |
| North American Indian | 2007 | 74.2 | 50.9 | 12.1 | 74.7 | 60.8 | 12.5 | 49.8 |
|  | 2008 | 75.1 | 51.0 | 12.7 | 77.3 | 61.6 | 13.0 | 49.3 |
|  | 2009 | 74.0 | 49.7 | 15.0 | 71.5 | 55.9 | 18.0 | 50.9 |
| Métis | 2007 | 70.8 | 58.2 | 8.0 | 81.8 | 67.0 | 9.6 | 46.4 |
|  | 2008 | 73.5 | 59.2 | 7.9 | 87.7 | 70.5 | 7.9 | 45.6 |
|  | 2009 | 74.1 | 58.2 | 10.3 | 83.7 | 65.5 | 12.3 | 47.0 |

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

Within the Aboriginal identity population, North American Indians had the highest unemployment rates. For example, in 2009 North American Indian women had an unemployment rate of $15.0 \%$, and their male counterparts had an unemployment rate of $18.0 \%$ that same year-about twice that of their non-Aboriginal counterparts. Among Métis, the unemployment rates were slightly lower, $10.3 \%$ for women and $12.3 \%$ for men.

1. Data for the Aboriginal population excludes those living on reserves or in the Territories.

## Employment Insurance eligibility up for women and men in 2009

Of the unemployed individuals who had contributed to the Employment Insurance (El) program and had a valid job separation in 2009, 558,000 , or $65.1 \%$, were men. In $2009,87.3 \%$ of male El contributors were eligible for regular benefits, up from $84.6 \%$ in 2008 . Of the 299,000 unemployed women who were contributors with a valid job separation, $84.3 \%$ were eligible for El benefits in 2009 , up from $77.8 \%$ a year earlier (data not shown).

Compared with men, a higher share of women had quit their job for a reason that disqualified them from collecting regular benefits, and a slightly higher share of women than men had not accumulated enough insurable hours.

Nearly one-third of unemployed women (32.5\%) did not contribute to EI, compared with $28.0 \%$ of their male counterparts. The proportion of women was slightly higher than that of men, mainly because women were less likely to have had paid employment in the previous 12 months.

In 2009, $76.2 \%$ of all recent mothers (with a child aged 12 months or less) had insurable employment; among these insured mothers, $88.0 \%$ were receiving maternity or parental benefits. Both rates were essentially unchanged from 2008 ( $77.0 \%$ and $88.1 \%$, respectively). Conversely, the share of recent fathers taking parental leave in 2009 was $30.1 \%$, up slightly from $28.2 \%$ in 2008.

## Employment Insurance recipients

The number of women receiving Employment Insurance (El) income benefits increased in 2009 to a monthly average of about 483,000 recipients, up from about 392,000 per month in 2008 . The number of men receiving income benefits was higher than for women in 2009, with about 574,000 men per month receiving El income benefits.

The type of income benefits received differs by sex. For example, about 734,000 people received regular income benefits each month in 2009. About $36 \%$ of those receiving these regular income benefits were women, as were $31.5 \%$ of those receiving training benefits and $29.7 \%$ of those receiving work-sharing benefits. Conversely, women made up the lion's share of those receiving parental benefits. For example, about 114,000 individuals received parental income benefits each month in 2009 -of these, $92.5 \%(105,000)$ were women. Women's share of sickness benefits was also higher than men's. In 2009, about 62,000 people received El sickness benefits each month, and about $57.5 \%$ of those receiving them were women (Table box).

Table box
Employment Insurance program, income beneficiaries by type of income benefit for women and men, 1997 to 2009

| Income benefit type | 1997 | 2001 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | average number of monthly claimants |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total income benefits ${ }^{1}$ | 775,866 | 735,672 | 761,747 | 733,770 | 750,343 | 1,056,316 |
| Women | 374,418 | 357,557 | 404,292 | 385,264 | 392,229 | 482,610 |
| Men | 401,448 | 378,113 | 357,453 | 348,508 | 358,114 | 573,706 |
| Regular benefits | 605,112 | 521,363 | 494,043 | 479,469 | 486,326 | 733,984 |
| Women | 255,198 | 201,862 | 197,727 | 191,812 | 192,624 | 263,668 |
| Men | 349,912 | 319,501 | 296,316 | 287,658 | 293,703 | 470,319 |
| Training benefits | 34,052 | 25,691 | 22,446 | 22,308 | 22,991 | 33,233 |
| Women | 13,435 | 8,971 | 7,302 | 6,717 | 6,538 | 10,470 |
| Men | 20,618 | 16,720 | 15,146 | 15,589 | 16,452 | 22,764 |
| Job creation benefits | 2,647 | 1,090 | 582 | 549 | 439 | 512 |
| Women | 1,224 | 498 | 321 | 313 | 251 | 278 |
| Men | 1,426 | 592 | 261 | 233 | 192 | 232 |
| Self-employment benefits | 4,762 | 2,562 | 2,004 | 1,815 | 1,635 | 2,185 |
| Women | 1,768 | 927 | 774 | 698 | 628 | 750 |
| Men | 2,997 | 1,635 | 1,231 | 1,118 | 1,010 | 1,435 |
| Sickness benefits | 35,275 | 48,606 | 59,228 | 59,583 | 60,984 | 62,174 |
| Women | 21,342 | 28,598 | 35,185 | 35,448 | 35,983 | 35,778 |
| Men | 13,932 | 20,005 | 24,042 | 24,136 | 25,001 | 26,398 |
| Maternity benefits | 49,341 | 55,090 | 46,912 | 47,064 | 48,145 | 48,788 |
| Women | 49,340 | 55,090 | 46,911 | 47,064 | 48,144 | 48,788 |
| Fishing benefits | 11,826 | 12,462 | 12,808 | 12,562 | 12,595 | 12,118 |
| Women | 1,452 | 2,072 | 2,419 | 2,447 | 2,482 | 2,318 |
| Men | 10,375 | 10,391 | 10,390 | 10,114 | 10,112 | 9,801 |
| Work sharing benefits | 1,685 | 7,806 | 1,791 | 2,556 | 4,755 | 48,343 |
| Women | 670 | 3,057 | 549 | 825 | 1,456 | 14,349 |
| Men | 1,016 | 4,753 | 1,243 | 1,732 | 3,302 | 33,996 |
| Adoption benefits | 341 | 834 | 1,209 | 1,138 | 1,092 | 1,085 |
| Women | 312 | 738 | 1,048 | 995 | 938 | 922 |
| Men | 28 | 96 | 162 | 142 | 152 | 164 |
| Parental benefits | 30,829 | 60,174 | 120,718 | 106,707 | 111,354 | 113,868 |
| Women | 29,681 | 55,751 | 112,056 | 98,932 | 103,167 | 105,272 |
| Men | 1,147 | 4,426 | 8,663 | 7,778 | 8,186 | 8,594 |

1. The number of beneficiaries receiving total income benefits excludes employment insurance claimants receiving employment and support measures benefits.
Note: Compassionate care benefits were created as of January 2004, however data are too small to report.
Source: Statistics Canada, CANSIM table 276-0001.

[^0]:    Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

[^1]:    1. Includes occupations that are not classified.
[^2]:    Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

