THIS DOCUMENT ANALYZES LINKS BETWEEN UNPAID CARE WORK (UCW) & WOMEN’S ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT (WEE) IN LMICS

1. WHAT IS UCW AND HOW DOES IT AFFECT WOMEN AND GIRLS?

2. HOW DOES UCW IMPACT WEE?

3. WHAT SOLUTIONS CAN ALLEVIATE WOMEN’S UCW?
HOW DID WE GET HERE?

OUR OBJECTIVES

- **Deep-dive into the evidence** on the links between unpaid care work (UCW) and women’s economic empowerment (WEE), especially in LMICs, given that the broader element analysis showed that UCW is a critical driver of WEE

- **Highlight open questions and knowledge gaps** to inform our learning agenda, given the relatively under-studied nature of UCW

OUR APPROACH

- **Our methodology for analyzing UCW included**
  - Data analysis by building a database of global time use
  - Literature review of over 100 articles and reports
  - Expert interviews with over 60 experts, including two convenings

- **We analyzed links between UCW and WEE from the perspective of an individual woman**, calling out population-wide implications where possible

- **Given the relative paucity of data, the insights presented rely on a combination of causal and correlative evidence validated by experts**
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (1 OF 2)

• Unpaid care work (UCW) is a critical part of everyday life. Ranging from domestic work such as cooking as well as care for the sick, elderly, and young, UCW drives human health and development.

• This work is disproportionately shouldered by women and girls. Over the course of their lives, women do 7 years more UCW than men. Girls, mothers, and domestic workers are particularly vulnerable to the impacts of unpaid care work. In LMICs, this work is more routine in nature and women multi-task more among different types of UCW.

• In LMICs, the heavy and unequal responsibilities of UCW fundamentally shapes the economic empowerment of women and girls beginning as early as adolescence by:
  – Reducing preparation to engage in paid work – either through decreased education or skills development. Girls who do more than 4 hours of UCW per day are 28% less likely to be in school than those who do two hours a day.
  – Limiting participation (entry, re-entry, quality of work opportunities) in the labor force, particularly for mothers. One in five economically inactive young women cite family responsibilities as a reason for their inactivity.
  – Reducing pay as a result of taking jobs of lower quality, intensity, and remuneration. Working women with children earn one-fifth less than those without children (also known as the “motherhood penalty”).
  – Handicapping progress in their chosen paid careers as well as their likelihood of achieving leadership positions and ultimately reducing their power by limiting agency and decision-making authority in the home and beyond.

• Alleviating the heavy and unequal UCW responsibilities of women and girls can transform their economic empowerment and unlock the power of other WEE elements.
  – Failure to address UCW can lead to a starkly negative cycle, whereby UCW’s effects on WEE lead to women doing more UCW, which in turn exacerbates negative effects on WEE.
  – UCW is deeply interlinked with other elements of economic empowerment such as education, access to work, and family planning.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (2 OF 2)

• The heavy and unequal burden of UCW on women and girls is driven by four root causes:
  – Social norms
  – Policy and social institutions
  – Economic environment
  – Technology / infrastructure

• Several proven and promising solutions already exist that address the root causes of women’s UCW in LMICs; other solutions require further innovation and testing. The most proven solutions include provision of care services, which one study found reduced female unemployment by roughly 40% in one study. Promising solutions include income support, labor-saving devices, and interventions to drive social norms change. There are several areas for innovation within each of these categories, such as private-sector and community-based child care services, labor-saving devices designed to meet women’s local needs, mobile platforms, and stronger integration of norms change into existing programs.

• Beyond these solutions, women’s UCW remains poorly measured and only mildly understood. Despite its pervasive impact on women’s economic empowerment and other gender outcomes, currently no large donors or champions focus on the issue of unpaid care work (e.g., only ~50 organizations around the globe work to directly alleviate UCW) and very limited data exist (e.g., only 42 countries have conducted time-use surveys since 2010, with the majority occurring in high-income countries).
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UCW INCLUDES DOMESTIC AND CARE WORK

Unpaid care work refers to:

- Domestic work for maintenance of a home (e.g., cleaning, collecting water or firewood)
- Care of other persons (e.g. children, older persons, persons with disabilities) including volunteering that is carried out in homes and communities

Unpaid care work does not include:

- Production of assets or inputs for personal use (e.g., building a house, subsistence farming)
- Production of assets or inputs for the market (e.g., unpaid family work on farms)
- Paid work (e.g., having a job or owning a revenue-generating business)

[1] Synthesized from definitions proposed by the ILO, SIDA, UN Women, and Commission for the Status of Women position papers. [2] UN High Level Panel on Women’s Economic Empowerment
Cooking and maintaining homes is necessary for basic survival

Caring for children and elders supports human development

The goal is not to eliminate UCW but to minimize its drudgery, distribute it more equitably, And that ensure women and girls have choice over how much UCW they do and why¹

¹Expert interviews; Folbre 1995; Hirway 2005
… AND HAS REMAINED NEAR CONSTANT OVER THE PAST 40 YEARS

Time spent on unpaid care work\(^1\)
Hours per day by men and women (average of seven developed countries)

Global averages mask variation; UCW has fallen considerably in certain countries

Over three decades (1970-2010), total UCW decreased by ~1.8 hours per day (falling from ~8 hours to ~6.4 hours)

Between 2001-2011, hours spent on UCW decreased by ~17 minutes per day, or two hours per week\(^2\)

GLOBALLY WOMEN DO THREE TIMES MORE UCW THAN MEN

The ratio is highest in South Asia, where men do the least amount of UCW (and not because women do significantly more)

The ratio in SSA may be under-reported relative to other regions because women multi-task more with subsistence agriculture (which is counted as paid work)

[1] Data include 75 countries total including South Asia (3), MENA (7), sub-Saharan Africa (12), East Asia and the Pacific (5), Latin America (13), CEECA (16), and the developed world (19). Regional averages are simple averages across the countries and are not population weighted. Progress of the world’s women 2015-2016, UN Women; data from national surveys across 1998 to 2012/13. Dalberg analysis.
OVER THE COURSE OF THEIR LIVES, WOMEN DO 7 ADDITIONAL YEARS\(^1\) OF UCW RELATIVE TO MEN

Time spent on various activities\(^2\)
Percentage of hours per day, average

### UNPAID WORK HOURS
- Routine housework (e.g., cleaning, cooking)
- Shopping for household
- Childcare
- Other UCW (e.g., volunteering, travel for household)

### PAID WORK HOURS
- Paid work or study

### OTHERS
- Other personal care (e.g., eating)
- Leisure (e.g., watching TV)
- Religious and spiritual activities

- Sleeping

---

\(^1\) Estimated using the average unpaid work hours per day across girls and adult women compared to boys and adult men multiplied by the average life expectancy for men and women globally. Data on girls and boys time use from UNICEF; data on adult time use from UN Women. \(^2\) Average of all men and women aged 15-64, not just participating men and women (e.g., not just mothers for care of children) for 26 OECD countries, China, India, and South Africa, for various years spanning (1998-2014). Routine housework includes cooking, cleaning, gardening, laundry, dishwashing, house repair/maintenance, ironing. Raw data for India and South Africa include collection of water and firewood in paid work. Given that these activities can occur for subsistence agriculture as well as domestic work, these activities have not been reclassified into unpaid work. The unpaid work averages presented, therefore, should be considered lower bounds. OECD
Characteristics of a “good girl”\(^1\)

**Girls and boys say:**
- Helps at home: 18 – 22 %
- Behaves well: 14 – 15%
- Studies: 9 – 12%
- All other: 55% (e.g., decently dressed, polite)

Characteristics of a “good wife”\(^1\)

**Women and men say:**
- Fulfils domestic responsibilities: 37%
- Behaves well / good attitude: 27%
- Has an economic role in the household: 22%
- Has marital relations: 15%

---

[1] All numbers refer to share of total mentions in 194 focus groups (“good wife”) and 82 focus groups (“good girl”) from 20 developing countries in every region of the world. World Bank, “On Norms and Agency” 2012.

Images from Shutterstock.
GIRLS, MOTHERS, AND DOMESTIC WORKERS ARE PARTICULARLY AFFECTED BY UCW

Share of adolescents doing UCW, Ethiopia/India\(^1\)
Percent of total, 2009

1. ODI, “Mothers and the childcare crisis,” 2016;
2. MTUS; Takes a straight average across 16 developed countries for respondents 25-44; includes only cohabitating couples
3. ILO, “Who are domestic workers”

Adolescents experience a widening UCW gap

Mothers do the most UCW

Domestic workers are often subject to unsafe, unregulated UCW

Women with children spend 2.3X more on unpaid work compared to men with children\(^2\)

Of 67 million domestic workers worldwide, 83% are women, many of whom face very low wages, excessively long hours, have no guaranteed weekly day of rest, and are vulnerable to employer abuse\(^3\)
IN LMICS, UCW IS TYPICALLY MORE ROUTINE HOUSEWORK, WHICH OFTEN INCLUDES DRUDGERY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOMEN’S UNPAID WORK TIME BY CATEGORY¹</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL UNPAID WORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing countries (India, China, South Africa)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other unpaid work</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel for domestic tasks</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care for people</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine housework</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other unpaid work</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel for domestic tasks</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care for people</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine housework</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other unpaid work</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel for domestic tasks</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care for people</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine housework</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other unpaid work</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Women often have to travel long distances and carry heavy loads in order to collect fuel and water given limited basic infrastructure (e.g., water, electricity, transportation). One study in eastern Uganda found that women saved roughly 17 hours each week when their water source was within 400m of their homes².

Women often have to care for children and elders due to lack of care services (e.g., childcare centers, elder care services), limited policies to support parents (e.g., maternity and paternity leave), and limited health infrastructure to support care for children, elderly, and the ill.

This work is also likely under-reported because women multi-task with other UCW categories. Oxfam estimates that women multi-task an average of six hours a day.³

Women spend most of their time cooking and cleaning given the lack of labor-saving technologies. Hours spent on cooking in developing countries can be as much as ~30% higher than in developed countries⁴ and washing clothes and dishes also take significantly longer as well (e.g., in Ghana, women spend ~2 hours per day on these tasks).⁵
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Link to UCW</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Strength of evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PREPARATION</td>
<td>Women and girls build fewer skills and capabilities due to UCW responsibilities</td>
<td>• Multiple studies show correlative links</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPATION</td>
<td>Women often participate in the paid labor force or take lower quality / more flexible/more informal jobs due to UCW responsibilities</td>
<td>• Multiple studies (including several RCTs) show causal links</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAY</td>
<td>Women earn less than men due to the quality, intensity, and remuneration of jobs they take due to UCW responsibilities</td>
<td>• Multiple studies show causal links</td>
<td>3-2-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRESS</td>
<td>Women are unable or not allowed to advance in their careers or lead others due to UCW responsibilities</td>
<td>• 1-2 studies show correlative link with UCW</td>
<td>3-2-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWER</td>
<td>Even if women earn income, they may still lack control in household decision-making over that income (and/or more broadly)</td>
<td>• No direct link to UCW; multiple studies show causal links through other WEE outcomes</td>
<td>3-2-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PREPARATION: UCW RESULTS IN LOWER ATTENDANCE AT SCHOOL AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

Girls with more UCW responsibilities have decreased school attendance

Women with more UCW responsibilities have decreased enrollment in training programs

School attendance rates among girls age 5-14 in 16 developing countries¹

- 83% < 2 hours / day domestic work
- 60% 4 hours / day domestic work

Less preparation can lead to poor health outcomes and lower GDP growth

Effects on education and skills have broader ripple effects on development outcomes.

It is estimated that each additional year of maternal education can reduce child mortality up to 9.5% and can increase GDP growth up to 0.2% annually³

Reasons for dropping out of vocational skills training program in Malawi²
Percentage of those surveyed (n=43)

- New household/family obligations/marriage
- Other

- Men: 4
- Women: 43

Other:

- New household/family obligations/marriage: 96
- Other: 57


²Mobarak and Cho et al., “Gender Differences in the Effects of Vocational Training: Constraints on women and dropout behavior,” 2016

# PARTICIPATION: WOMEN DO LESS PAID WORK AND TAKE LOWER QUALITY JOBS DUE TO UCW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teen girls and women do less paid work due to UCW</th>
<th>Teen girls and women enter lower quality jobs due to UCW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More economically inactive</td>
<td>Less likely to do paid work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**In Ethiopia and Ghana,** women with children under 6 do

- **20%** less paid work than those without children

Women with heavier housework loads are more likely to have **flexible** jobs according to a study of 8 LMICs

Women repeatedly cite childcare as a key reason for informal sector work, with **13-40%** of women in Bangladesh, Guatemala, and the Philippines citing this, compared to 1-15% of men

---

PAY: WOMEN SEE A PAY CUT OF UP TO 23% AFTER HAVING CHILDREN

Comparison of earnings by mothers and non-mothers in 21 developing countries

Daily wage for those in the paid labor force, USD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-mother</th>
<th>Mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily wage</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>5.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is called the motherhood pay gap and it is deeply connected to UCW

A study of 135,000 women across 21 developing countries found that among women in the paid labor force:

- Mothers earn less because they work in more flexible or vulnerable jobs (e.g., informal, part-time) due to UCW responsibilities
- Mothers earn less because they select into historically under-paid “feminine” jobs such as education or healthcare in order to balance UCW responsibilities

These findings are even starker for mothers of children under 6

**PROGRESS: WOMEN LIKELY TAKE ON FEWER LEADERSHIP ROLES DUE TO UCW**

Data are limited but early evidence points to trade-offs between UCW responsibilities and career advancement.

### Analysis of barriers to women in leadership roles in the higher education sector

1. **INDIA:** 26% of women did not take leadership roles due in part to UCW-related career interruptions.

2. **NEPAL:** Women’s UCW (childcare and eldercare) restricted their ability to play a full role in university affairs according to a qualitative research study.

3. **PAKISTAN:** Women encountered UCW-related barriers to leadership in both public and private universities in Rawalpindi and Islamabad.

4. **SRI LANKA:** Women struggled with work/life balance and high expectations of work in the home (one of six key barriers to leadership according to a review of 11 studies).

### Reasons respondent left previous job

N=2,610, India¹

- **Family-related**
  - Men: 16%
  - Women: 27%
  +11

- **Low pay**
  - Men: 45%
  - Women: 20%

---

¹ Phone survey of 2,610 training participants (1,909 women and 701 men) between age 18-25 after government-sponsored training; conducted by EsPD, Harvard University.

² British Council, “Women in higher education leadership in South Asia: expert interview.”
Girls and young women across 16 LMICs reported an increase in self-confidence and a sense of power following participation in an Intel skills training program. Women’s financial and social agency within households and communities is most strongly driven by formal and semi-formal employment, in a study of ~6600 women in Egypt, Ghana, and Bangladesh.

Women had greater agency in spending decisions as their earned income increases according to a review of 8 LMIC-focused studies.

Women were able to develop and enhance agency if they advanced in their own careers or organized through cooperatives or self-help groups.

---

WHERE AVAILABLE, DATA REINFORCE THE STRONG CORRELATION BETWEEN UCW AND THESE WEE OUTCOMES IN LMICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Statistically significant?¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PREPARATION</td>
<td>Cross-country indicators for adult women’s skill levels or girls’ time use are not available</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPATION</td>
<td>Ratio of female to male labor force participation (aged 15-64)</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAY</td>
<td>Ratio of women to men’s estimated earned income³</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRESS</td>
<td>Ratio of women to men in professional / technical jobs</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ratio of women to men in leadership positions²</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWER</td>
<td>Cross-country indicators for power are not available</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Statistical significance at a 95% confidence interval based on a sample of 43 countries. Dalberg analysis, using data from WEF, UN Women, and the World Bank. ² Refers to legislators, senior officials, managers ³ Excludes agricultural income.
UCW CONTINUALLY SHAPES THE ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT OF WOMEN AND GIRLS THROUGHOUT THEIR LIVES

Note: This slide presents the boy / man as benchmark for simplicity, notwithstanding the fact that boys and men also drop out of school and enter / re-enter vulnerable jobs.

- **Preparation**: Stays in school
- **Participation**: Enters and stays in the labor force
- **Pay**: Earns income
- **Progress**: Advances in his career and leads others
- **Power**: Is able to control and benefit from his economic gains

**Boy**
- Stays in school

**Man**
- Enters and stays in the labor force
- Earns income
- Advances in his career and leads others
- Is able to control and benefit from his economic gains

**Woman**
- 30-60% less likely to be in the workforce compared to a man[^3]
- 42% lower wages than men in LMICs[^4]
- Only 23% of leadership positions in business in emerging Asia and Africa[^5]
- Less likely than other women to take a leadership role due to UCW realities and expectations[^9]
- Even lower levels of power than other women due to low preparation, participation, pay, and ability to progress[^10]

**Mother**
- 28% less likely to be in school if she does more than 4 hours of UCW a day (compared to those doing less than 2 hours a day[^2])
- 10-25% more likely to leave the labor force after she has a child[^7]
- 23% lower wages than women without children[^8]
- No pay

**Girl**
- Roughly the same likelihood of being in primary school as a boy[^1]

[^1]: World Bank, referring to adjusted net primary enrolment rates.
[^3]: Dalberg calculation consisting of 51 LMIC countries.
[^6]: Simple average of data from 15 African countries.
[^7]: ODI, 2016 citing a range of studies in LMICs.
[^8]: Various studies.
[^9]: British Council.
[^10]: Various studies.
THERE IS ALSO RISK THAT NOT ADDRESSING UCW CREATES A NEGATIVE CYCLE FOR WOMEN’S ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT…

As women do more UCW, this reinforces norms that UCW is “women’s work”

UCW norms carry across generations (men are 1.5x more likely to do housework if their fathers did)³

Women are thus less likely to do paid work and more likely to do UCW

As gender gaps in earnings increase, women are more likely to do unpaid work relative to men (increasing the gap from 0.3 to 0.6 almost doubles the ratio of F/M UCW)²

UCW responsibilities lower WEE

88% percent of women aged 30-39 saw earnings decline when they had children (a proxy for UCW) in a study of 28 developed and developing countries¹

There is also a tension between women’s economic empowerment and that of their daughters’ due to UCW. Research shows less educated women earn 12% more if they have an adolescent girl child at home, as girls take on UCW.⁴

---

¹ Gender and Development Network, “Sharing the load.” ² Dalberg analysis based on Phase 1, using data from UN Women and WEF. Women earn 30-60% of what men earn in 28 countries, and 0-30% of what men earn in 6 countries (India, Pakistan, Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia, Oman). ³ Promundo, 2015. ⁴ Aguero, 2012.
…ESPECIALLY SINCE UCW CAN ACCELERATE OR INHIBIT OTHER WEE ELEMENTS

**UCW effect on WEE**

**Medium effect:** Girls drop out of school or perform less well in school due to UCW responsibilities according to a 16-country study by ILO.

**Strong effect:** Women cannot fully participate in formal or informal work due to UCW responsibilities, as per over a dozen studies in LMICs.

**Weak effect:** Women have less agency in household decisions due to lack of earned income and skills, limiting their control over family formation and assets such as property and bank accounts.

---

**WEE element**

**EDUCATION**

**WEE effect on UCW**

**Weak effect:** Educated women may do more or less UCW, with positive correlation in 10 countries and negative or mixed in 11.

**Medium effect:** Lack of access to work lowers opportunity costs, increases UCW, and reinforces norms, as per correlation analysis, country studies (e.g., Nigeria), and experts.

**Strong effect:** Women with more children do more UCW (almost 50% higher across 16 developed countries).

**Data not available**

---

1. ILO, 2016. 2. ODI, 2016. 3. Numerous studies. 4. Dalberg analysis based on MTUS data and national time-use surveys. Countries where lower education levels result in more unpaid work are France, Italy, Netherlands, South Africa, Spain, the UK, Ecuador, Mexico, Colombia, Peru. 5. GAD, “Sharing the load” citing a World Bank study in Nigeria, correlation analysis between gender gaps and UCW F/M ratio by Dalberg. 6. MTUS; Takes a straight average across 16 developed countries for respondents 25-44; includes only cohabitating couples.
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WOMEN’S UCW IS DRIVEN BY FOUR ROOT CAUSES AND PERPETUATED BY INADEQUATE DATA AND AWARENESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy and social institutions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Weak policies and social institutions, including insufficient access to affordable, quality care services, lead to more work for women (particularly mothers).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic environment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ The economic environment subjects women to poor working conditions and/or discourages them from formal, paid work; this is due in part through gender discriminatory hiring policies, inadequate social protections, and unequal wages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Availability of technology / infrastructure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Inadequate technology and infrastructure requires women to perform physically taxing and time-consuming unpaid work, e.g., walking long distances to collect water and/or firewood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social norms</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Social norms regard domestic and care work as women’s work, which in turn leads to women doing disproportionate amounts of UCW regardless of their circumstances. Norms also influence and shape all other root causes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data and measurement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Knowledge of extent and impact of UCW is limited by the lack of contextualized, current, and historical time-use data in LMICs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Knowledge of what works to alleviate UCW is limited because many programs do not track and evaluate UCW, time-use, or WEE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recognizing and valuing UCW</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ UCW and its impacts on women and girls’ lives are not well-recognized; few organizations or donors focus on alleviating and highlighting UCW and there are no dedicated global or regional forums for sharing learnings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These root causes can be addressed by a number of actors (e.g., private-sector, government, community) and interventions (e.g., service delivery, product development).
EFFECTIVE SOLUTIONS MUST MEET THREE CRITERIA: IMPACT, RELEVANCE, TO LMICS AND SCALABILITY

**Root causes**

Cross-cutting barriers

**Long list of solutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Root cause</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy and social institutions</td>
<td>Care: Childcare provisions/subsidy, Eldercare services, Income support (unconditional), Income support (conditional), Paid family &amp; medical leave, Early childhood education, Antidiscrimination policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic environment</td>
<td>Jobs: Flexible work arrangements, Employment skills training, Job placement programs, Equal pay audits, Transparency in compensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Digital infrastructure (network/individual level): Mobile platforms, Mobile phones, applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social norms</td>
<td>Individual norms change: Parental education programs, School-based programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population norms change: Media campaigns, Community campaigns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrated programs: Programs with norms campaigns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment criteria**

1. **Is there proven / promising impact?**
   Solutions that have proven impact on UCW (hours per week, F/M ratio) and WEE outcomes in MICs and are being implemented in LMICs

2. **Is it relevant to LMIC contexts?**
   Solutions that exist in LMICs or could feasibly be implemented in an LMIC context

3. **Is it scalable?**
   Solutions that can be implemented at a national scale or replicated at a sub-national level

**Effective solutions**

- **Proven:** Many evaluations showing quantitative positive impacts on UCW and/or WEE and backed by experts; relevant and scalable
- **Highly promising:** Evaluations showing qualitative (limited quantitative) positive impacts on UCW and/or WEE and backed by experts; relevant and scalable
- **Promising:** Interesting programs supported by anecdotal evidence and backed by experts; relevant and scalable

Innovative solutions that have potential for a large impact on UCW are marked with a lightbulb on the following slides

---

[1] Criteria sought to identify most effective solution regardless of who is best equipped to fund them (philanthropic capital, public sector, etc.); as such, other criteria such as additionality were not considered. Dalberg analysis.
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# POLICY & SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS: EFFECTIVE SOLUTIONS INCLUDE CHILDCARE SERVICES AND INCOME SUPPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Scalability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Childcare provision / subsidy    | Proven: public childcare services widely proven; private and community-level childcare are early-stage with room to innovate | • Nationwide publicly provided childcare programs  
• Small-scale privately provided childcare  
• Community-level childcare | *High*: Reduced hours spent on care work; increased female LFPR and wages by 20-50%, reduced female unemployment by ~40%<sup>1</sup> | Medium: Large variety of childcare programs (public and private) across the formal and informal economy in many MICs, with increasing numbers in LICs | *High*: Designed / implemented nationally |
| Conditional income support       | Promising: Conditional cash transfers (CCTs) established across LMICs with early evidence of positive impacts when UCW initiatives are incorporated | • Cash benefits provided to caregivers; dependent on the caregiver adhering to set conditions (e.g., school attendance, health checks) | *Mixed*: Some CCTs see UCW increase for mothers, decrease for girls<sup>2</sup> | *High*: CCTs already exist with and without UCW component in ~30 LMICs, with ~40% located in Latin America<sup>2</sup> | *High*: Designed / implemented nationally |

---

<sup>1</sup> Various studies, across LMICs.  
<sup>2</sup> World Bank, Early childhood development overview, 2016.
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TECHNOLOGY/INFRASTRUCTURE: PROMISING SOLUTIONS INCLUDE LABOR-SAVING DEVICES AND MOBILE PLATFORMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Scalability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor-saving devices</td>
<td>Highly promising:</td>
<td>Carefully designed, purpose-specific solutions associated with positive UCW impacts; room to innovate around new, demand-driven devices</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>High: Innovations exist across LMICs (e.g., Hippo Rollers throughout SSA, NextDrop in India; LifeStraw initiatives in SSA and South Asia)</td>
<td>Medium: Solutions must be tailored to need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Purpose-designed labor-saving devices (e.g., water gathering solutions such as Hippo Rollers, NextDrop); water purification systems; cookstoves</td>
<td>• Water gathering solutions: Anecdotal evidence available but limited quantitative evidence linking programs, UCW, and WEE</td>
<td>• Water purification solutions: Anecdotal evidence available but limited quantitative evidence linking programs, UCW, and WEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile platforms</td>
<td>Promising: Qualitative evidence exists but solutions must be delivered in combination with connectivity solutions in LMICs; room to innovate and incorporate a UCW focus into existing / new platforms</td>
<td>• Digital solutions like mobile banking and m-health platforms</td>
<td>Medium: ~50 min/week travel time saved with mobile cash transfers, with qualitative evidence suggesting time saved was used for productive agriculture activities; limited evidence on other mobile solutions and link to WEE</td>
<td>Medium: Growing presence in SSA (12% of adult population has a mobile account); small presence in South Asia (3%)</td>
<td>High: Designed / implemented nationally / regionally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# NORMS CHANGE: INDIVIDUAL, POPULATION-WIDE, AND INTEGRATED NORMS CHANGE PROGRAMS ARE PROMISING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Scalability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual norms change</td>
<td>Highly promising:</td>
<td>Quantitative evidence of changed perceptions around norms, emerging links to reduced UCW; widely used across LMICS</td>
<td>High: Changed attitudes around gender roles; emerging evidence of greater participation of men and boys in housework and childcare(^1); increased agreement that boys can help girls do housework (from 59% to 86%)(^2)</td>
<td>High: Exist across LMICs with different scales / focus (e.g., MenCare in 22 LMICs; Save the Children “CHOICES&quot; in 8 countries)</td>
<td>Medium: Designed nationally / regionally, must be tailored / implemented locally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promising:</td>
<td>Qualitative evidence of changed perceptions, but no links to reduced UCW; smaller nascent campaigns in LMICs</td>
<td>Medium: Some promising results (e.g., &gt; 5% increase in female LFPR; increased uptake of childcare places; increased awareness around shared caring responsibilities)(^3) but not widely replicated</td>
<td>Medium: Smaller empowerment / awareness mostly in MICs (e.g., Soul City, South Africa; Entre Nos, Brazil)</td>
<td>High: Designed / implemented nationally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population-wide norms change</td>
<td>Promising:</td>
<td>Qualitative / anecdotal evidence that integrated programs lead to improved UCW / WEE outcomes; room to innovate and integrate norms activities into existing care / training / education programs</td>
<td>Not known: Early stage; limited evidence linking programs, UCW, and WEE</td>
<td>Medium: Early-stage programs (e.g., Bolsa Familia Companion Program, Brazil; Oxfam’s We-Care in 10 LMICs)</td>
<td>Medium: Designed nationally / regionally, must be tailored / implemented locally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated norms change</td>
<td>Promising:</td>
<td>Qualitative / anecdotal evidence that integrated programs lead to improved UCW / WEE outcomes; room to innovate and integrate norms activities into existing care / training / education programs</td>
<td>Not known: Early stage; limited evidence linking programs, UCW, and WEE</td>
<td>Medium: Early-stage programs (e.g., Bolsa Familia Companion Program, Brazil; Oxfam’s We-Care in 10 LMICs)</td>
<td>Medium: Designed nationally / regionally, must be tailored / implemented locally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Evidence from Program P, a subcomponent of the MenCare campaign in Nicaragua; evidence from Save the Children’s CHOICES program in Egypt and Nepal; evidence from Program H, a subcomponent of the MenCare campaign, in Brazil and Indonesia; \(^2\) Evidence from a gender awareness mass media campaign in Malta.
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OPPORTUNITIES FOR INNOVATION EXIST WITHIN SEVERAL TYPES OF SOLUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>Potential for innovation¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Childcare provision</td>
<td>• Engaging the private sector, e.g., benefit policies that support care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Providing integrated care, e.g., across childcare and eldercare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor-saving devices</td>
<td>• Designing locally tailored solutions with a norms change component, e.g., solutions that reflect norms around women’s use of technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Leveraging technology to develop labor-saving devices, e.g., low-wattage solar-powered home appliances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile platforms</td>
<td>• Developing digital solutions to reduce information frictions (e.g., sensors that alert women when water tanks have arrived)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated norms change</td>
<td>• Building norms change components into programs to leverage links between other elements and WEE, e.g., education, family planning, and vocational training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Designing integrated norms change across paid and unpaid work, e.g., media campaigns on how working mothers and fathers balance UCW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Dalberg analysis
SOME SOLUTIONS ARE IRRELEVANT TO LMICS OR HAVE IMPACTS THAT ARE NOT YET KNOWN / MIXED

**IRRELEVANT**

Solutions not applicable to an LMIC context due to the large informal economy, e.g.,:

- *Decent work policies:* Predominantly affect the formal economy, and have no effect on the unregulated economy
- *Paid family & medical leave:* Support workers in the formal economy but have no effect on the unregulated economy

**74% of the female labor force in sub-Saharan Africa and 83% in South Asia are in the informal sector¹**

**NOT KNOWN**

Impact not known where programs are nascent and measurement and evaluation (M&E) is limited, e.g.,:

- *Domestic workers:* Limited evidence linking interventions, UCW, and WEE
- *Elder care:* Early-stage programs in MICs with very few programs in LMICs and no existing M&E
- *Community norms change:* Early-stage programs and no existing M&E

**MIXED**

Programs show contradictory results around UCW, e.g.,:

- *Vocational programs:* Programs that do not simultaneously address childcare needs have high drop out rates and low efficacy
- *Large-scale infrastructure:* Investments that fail to take a gender lens can lead to negative effects for women

In Malawi, women are more likely to drop out of vocational training due to UCW responsibilities²

---

¹ WIEGO ILO, 2009, “Give girls a chance.”
### MEXICO

**Description**

**CHILDCARE:** Programa de Estancias Infantiles is a public daycare program providing subsidized childcare services for low-income families.

**UCW impacts**

- Childcare decreased by 10 hours per week (while multitasking) and 2 hours per week (exclusive).

**Other impacts**

- Employment rate rose 18%
- Paid hours rose 7 hours per week

**INCOME SUPPORT:** Prospera\(^1\) is a national conditional cash transfer program providing cash payments on condition of school enrollment and attendance.

**Other impacts**

- Unpaid care work for girls decreased by 1 hour per week
- LFPR is 5% lower for CCT families\(^2\)
- School enrollment for adolescent girls increased by 20%

### AFRICA

**Description**

**INDIVIDUAL NORMS CHANGE:** WE-Care is an integrated Oxfam initiative providing norms-change and labor-time saving technology interventions.

**Other impacts**

- F/M ratio increased by 300% (Ethiopia); decreased by 50% (Zimbabwe)
- Paid hours increased by 8 hours per week (Ethiopia), decreased by 5 hours per week (Zimbabwe)

---

\(^{1}\) Formerly known as Oportunidades and PROGRESA. Oportunidades was a renaming of the PROGRESA program. Prospera expands the scope of Oportunidades to promote beneficiaries’ access to higher education and formal employment.

\(^{2}\) Evidence is not rigorous.

\(^{3}\) Evaluation focused on Ethiopia and Zimbabwe; Dalberg analysis
CASE STUDIES OF OTHER INNOVATIVE SOLUTIONS

**SOUTH KOREA**

**PUBLIC NORMS CHANGE:** "Superman is Back" is a reality television show that *depicts changing gender norms* around childcare

**AFRICA**

**LABOR-SAVING DEVICES:** The Hippo Roller is a water container that can be rolled, *allowing more water to be transported easily* from the source to the home

**KENYA**

**MOBILE PLATFORMS:** MPESA is a mobile banking system that *allows individuals to send money*, reducing travel required to make transactions

---

**Description**

**No rigorous studies** but demonstrated potential given popularity, observed impacts in edutainment on other issues (e.g., HIV), and proven replicability

**Impacts**

- No rigorous studies but anecdotal evidence from users point to decreased unpaid care work; one user noted taking multiple trips in one day prior to the Hippo Roller but now it is "easier, quicker, and not as back-breaking"

- No rigorous studies but qualitative evidence shows that women cite saving time and money because they no longer need to travel to make transactions (e.g., for school fees)
IN SUMMARY, THREE TYPES OF SOLUTIONS HOLD PROMISE TO ALLEVIATE UCW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution type</th>
<th>Findings from landscape</th>
<th>What can be done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CARE SERVICES</td>
<td>Proven public, private, and community-based solutions deliver childcare services at varying levels of scalability depending on context</td>
<td>Direct support to innovate, design, and test promising solutions and scale proven solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promising income transfer solutions</td>
<td>Advocacy and convening of actors to catalyze scaling of proven solutions and designing / testing of promising solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCALABLE SOCIAL NORMS CHANGE</td>
<td>Promising solutions for population-wide norms change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promising integrated multi-intervention programs with a norms change component</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFRASTRUCTURE &amp; TECHNOLOGICAL IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>Promising solutions around household-level technological solutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ALLEVIATING UCW ALSO REQUIRES TACKLING TWO CROSS-CUTTING BARRIERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional barriers to addressing UCW</th>
<th><strong>Illustrative examples</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Many LMICs lack detailed, current, and historical time-use data; existing data is often of inconsistent quality (e.g., only 85 countries run time-use surveys, 42 of which have conducted a survey later than 2010)</td>
<td>India’s latest time-use survey is from 1998 and only covers six states that do not represent the country as a whole¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many potential programmatic solutions do not track UCW or time use and those that do neglect to evaluate effects of the program on UCW or WEE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Across all LMICs, very few organizations focus on alleviating UCW; no large donors or champions focusing on this issue; and no global or regional fora to share learnings</td>
<td>Across LMICs, only ~50 organizations work to directly alleviate UCW, with very limited coordination²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

¹ India Time Use Survey, 1998
² The landscape analysis included stakeholders who directly research, fund programs, implement programs, or advocate for alleviating UCW. It excluded stakeholders who study or provide solutions which may, but are not designed to, affect UCW (e.g., funders of improved water or sanitation access). It also excluded individual researchers and national governments. Dalberg analysis; drawing on expert interviews, literature surveys, and “Addressing unpaid care for economic empowerment of women and girls,” Background paper for the UNHLP, June 2016
DATA AND MEASUREMENT: CURRENTLY, THE UNDERSTANDING OF UCW RELIES HEAVILY ON TIME-USE SURVEYS AND PROXIES

Understanding the extent and impacts of UCW

- Data on the extent of UCW that women perform mostly come from national time-use surveys (individual programs typically do not measure this in a systematic way)
- Data on the impacts of UCW mostly use proxies, e.g., having a child or living in an infrastructure-poor environment

Understanding what works to alleviate UCW

- Programs that tackle UCW do not measure WEE impacts
- Programs that tackle UCW are not rigorously evaluated, often relying on qualitative evaluations rather than impact evaluations or RCTs
### Identified gaps

- **Data availability**, i.e., lack of current data on:
  - Girls’ time use (0-15 years)
  - Multi-tasking\(^1\)
  - Time use over time
  - Contextual variables (e.g., time use of men and women in the same home, availability of labor-saving appliances)
  - Time-use preferences and opportunity costs
  - Direct measures of norms

- **Data quality**, i.e., availability of:
  - Harmonized cross-country data (currently unavailable in LMICs)
  - Nationally representative data (only available in some LMICs)

- **Data insights**: Limited number of studies that analyze UCW and WEE

### Why this matters

- Helps identify women and girls most in need
- Helps understand **women’s lived experiences and preferences** around time use
- Helps uncover **potential drivers of UCW** and understand strength of links
- Helps establish causal links from time use to WEE and other important outcomes

### What can be done

- **Develop innovative sources of data that measure context and impacts**, e.g.,
  - Design holistic small-sample time-use surveys that measure factors such as WEE impacts, context, opportunity cost, choice
  - Embed measurement of UCW impacts and costs into existing solutions or interventions

- **Fund research** into the case for investing in alleviation of UCW and links with WEE

\(^1\) Includes both secondary activities as well as supervisory responsibilities
**MEASUREMENT:** BEST PRACTICES AND TOOLS ARE NEEDED TO FURTHER TEST AND DEMONSTRATE LINKS BETWEEN UCW AND WEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified gaps</th>
<th>Why this matters</th>
<th>What can be done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Solutions **do not primarily target** UCW and typically **do not measure** UCW impacts and WEE | • Need evaluations to understand **what works and what doesn’t** across contexts (e.g., age, income level, geography), and identify the most promising solutions | • **Develop best practices and tools to measure UCW and WEE** alongside interventions  
  - Work with experts to define metrics of success (UCW and WEE) that can be used across studies and contexts  
  - Develop best-practice evaluation methods that are simple and cheap to implement |
| • Measuring time saved is often **costly, long-term, and complex** (e.g., women often shift from one unpaid activity to another) | • Need simple, cheap measurement tools to ensure evaluations are **consistently conducted and learnings are captured** | |
| • There are **no common metrics or tools to track success** around quantity or quality of time use | • Need standardized metrics and methods to **facilitate cross-study comparisons** and identify common learnings | |
| • Even when quality data are available, **certain questions remain unanswered** (e.g., cost-effectiveness of various solutions) | • Need comprehensive evaluations that provide **sufficient detail to make funding and implementation decisions** across settings | |
# Recognizing and Valuing UCW: The Field of UCW is Small (~50 Organizations) and Fragmented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th>Advocates</th>
<th>Implementers</th>
<th>Funders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Primarily rely on existing national time-use data (only 3 of 25 organizations identified collect new primary data: Oxfam, Promundo, Young Lives)</td>
<td>- Primarily advocate for a specific issue (e.g., including men and boys in childcare), type of solution (e.g., cookstoves), or efforts to improve data (e.g., Caring Economy Campaign)</td>
<td>- Primarily NGOs (14 of 16 identified), limited private-sector engagement</td>
<td>- Primarily fund research (e.g., Hewlett, UN Women, European Research Council, Washington Center for Equitable Growth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No regional or global forums for sharing learnings aside from time-use conferences, which focus on data availability and quality and tend to be academic</td>
<td>- No high-profile advocate identified that addresses this issue holistically (smaller-scale efforts include ODI for childcare globally)</td>
<td>- Primarily focus on only one of four root causes (2 of 16 identified work on more than one of the following: policy, economic environment, norms, infrastructure)</td>
<td>- Fund time poverty research directly and through use of time-use metrics in broader portfolio (e.g., Hewlett funds research on time poverty and includes time-use in infrastructure projects)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the ~50 organizations that work on UCW issues in LMICs, only 16 implement programs

---

1 The landscape analysis included stakeholders who directly research, fund programs, implement programs, or advocate for alleviating UCW. It excluded stakeholders who study or provide solutions which may, but are not designed to, affect UCW (e.g., funders of improved water or sanitation access). It also excluded individual researchers and national governments. Dalberg analysis; drawing on expert interviews, literature surveys, and *Addressing unpaid care for economic empowerment of women and girls,* Background paper for the UNHLP, June 2016
RECOGNIZING AND VALUING UCW: THE FIELD NEEDS CHAMPIONS TO ADVOCATE FOR EFFECTIVE SOLUTIONS AND ATTRACT MORE PLAYERS

**Identified gaps**

- No large donor or champion for this issue globally (e.g., Malala Yousafzai for education, Mark Zuckerberg for internet freedom)
- Only ~50 organizations working to alleviate UCW in the LMIC context\(^1\)
- No forums for sharing knowledge and learnings (e.g., the equivalent of Women Deliver for health or Global Forum for Gender Statistics for data)

**Why this matters**

- Lack of recognition of this issue likely limiting efficacy of other programs; funding is limited
- This issue is not being tackled at scale; skills and expertise likely fragmented across players
- Learnings are fragmented and often not widely shared

**What can be done**

- **Advocate** to implement effective solutions
- **Convene** existing actors and attract new ones through conferences and learning sessions
- **Fund existing efforts** to share learnings and build the networks (e.g., existing time-use conferences such as the International Association of Time Use Survey’s annual conference)

---

\(^1\) The landscape analysis included stakeholders who directly research, fund programs, implement programs, or advocate for alleviating UCW. It excluded stakeholders who study or provide solutions which may, but are not designed to, affect UCW (e.g., funders of improved water or sanitation access). It also excluded individual researchers and national governments. Dalberg analysis; drawing on expert interviews, literature surveys, and "Addressing unpaid care for economic empowerment of women and girls,” Background paper for the UNHLP, June 2016
IN ADDITION TO PROGRAMMATIC SOLUTIONS, DATA AND ADVOCACY ARE ALSO NEEDED

DATA AND ADVOCACY

to build the case for investing in UCW and attract new players to the space

Solution type

Findings from landscape

- There is a need for a clearer, more compelling case regarding the impacts and costs of investing in UCW
- There is a need to expand the number of actors in this space and strengthen coordination

What can be done

Testing and measuring impacts and costs of existing solutions to build the case for UCW investments

Advocacy and convening of actors to attract interest and funding to this space and increase coordination
Data analysis

- We created our own database with both country-level and individual-/household-level data

Country-level macro data
- Base time-use data of 75 countries from UN Women
- Cross-checked these data with OECD and Charmes UNDP data
- Included and analyzed country-level variables such as income category, SIGI, labor force participation (from UN Women, OECD, World Bank)

Individual/household-level micro data
- Base data are from 16 mostly developed countries from MTUS
- Cross-checked trends with ~20 select developing countries from summary stats of individual national time-use surveys

Literature review

Academic literature (60+ papers)
- Comprehensive search of publications published after 2000

Grey literature (40+ reports)
- Publications on unpaid care and domestic work from organizations such as ActionAid, IDS, OECD, ILO

Proprietary material (50+ items)
- Work in progress research shared by experts
- Documents shared from BMGF and Pivotal Ventures

Cabinet of advisors

Completed interviews (57 experts)

- **57**
- Private: 2
- BMGF: 3
- Media: 12
- Donors: 18
- Academic: 19
- Civil society: 19

Organization type
OVER THE YEARS, UCW HAS PROVED IMMUNE TO INDUSTRIALIZATION AND OTHER TRENDS THAT HAVE TRANSFORMED WORK

Percent of time spent on unpaid work in 16 developed countries

While data over time are not available for developing countries, anecdotal evidence suggests that similar trends hold.

ABSOLUTE UNPAID CARE WORK BY REGION

ABSOLUTE UNPAID WORK (hours per day)

- Central and Eastern Europe and Central Asia: 4.9
- East Asia and the Pacific: 3.8
- South Asia: 4.8
- Latin America and the Caribbean: 5.0
- Middle East and North Africa: 4.1
- Sub-Saharan Africa: 4.9
- Developed regions: 4.5

[1] Data include 75 countries total including South Asia (3), MENA (7), Sub Saharan Africa (12), East Asia and the Pacific (5), Latin America (13), CEECA (16) and the developed world (19).
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CERTAIN SEGMENTS OF WOMEN AND GIRLS ARE GENERALLY MORE AFFECTED BY UNPAID CARE WORK

**Girls** face the impacts of unpaid care work at a critical stage in their life, setting them on a difficult path.

**Mothers** do the most unpaid care work in both absolute and relative terms.

The amount and intensity of unpaid care work is generally greater in **LMICs**, driven by the types of tasks women do and multi-tasking.

However, the manifestation of the impacts of UCW are ultimately context-specific.
THE GENDER GAP IN UCW STARTS EARLY

The inequality in unpaid work starts early…

Unpaid work among children and adolescents¹
Hours per day

- Boys
- Girls

Global average ages 5-9: 0.4, 0.6
Global average ages 10-14: 1.3

… which sets girls on a more difficult path

Proportion of 5-14 year old girls attending school, by hours devoted to domestic work
ILO 2009, 16 developing countries²

- < 2 hours per day: 83%
- 2-4 hours per day: 79%
- > 4 hours per day: 60%

---

¹ UNICEF Harnessing the Data Revolution for Girls. ² Countries include Colombia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Azerbaijan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkey, Ukraine, Burkina Faso, Malawi, Mali, Senegal, Cambodia, Mongolia, Philippines, and Sri Lanka. ILO, 2009, “Give girls a chance”
MOTHERS DO THE MOST UCW, CREATING DIFFICULT TRADE-OFFS WITH PAID WORK

Mothers do more absolute and relative unpaid work…

- Having a child correlates with
  ~50% increase in women’s unpaid work relative to pre-child

- Women with children spend 2.3x more on unpaid work compared to men with children

… which affects their access to quality paid work

- In the United States, 39% of working mothers report taking significant time off from work due to family reasons

- Globally, mothers earn on average 20-40% less than non-mothers (also known as the “motherhood penalty”)

[1] MTUS; Takes a straight average across 16 developed countries for respondents 25-44; includes only cohabitating couples
[3] Range based on studies spanning developed and developing countries. ODI, 2016, “Mothers and the childcare crisis”
WHERE AVAILABLE, DATA REINFORCE THE STRONG CORRELATION BETWEEN UCW AND THESE WEE OUTCOMES IN LMICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Statistically significant?¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PREPARATION</td>
<td>• Cross-country indicators for adult women’s skill levels or girls’ time use are not available</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPATION</td>
<td>• Ratio of female to male labor force participation (aged 15-64)</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAY</td>
<td>• Ratio of women to men’s estimated earned income²</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRESS</td>
<td>• Ratio of women to men in professional / technical jobs</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ratio of women to men in leadership positions²</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWER</td>
<td>• Cross-country indicators for power are not available</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Statistical significance at a 95% confidence interval based on a sample of 56 countries. Dalberg analysis, using data from WEF, OECD (supplied by McKinsey), and the World Bank. ² Refers to legislators, senior officials, managers. ³ Excludes agricultural income.
ROOT CAUSES OF UCW

Root causes of UCW

Social norms dictate who does UCW and how it is valued

Policy and social institutions (which are influenced and shaped by norms) provide support in meeting UCW responsibilities

The economic environment (which is influenced and shaped by norms) shapes incentives and provide support in meeting UCW responsibilities

The availability (or lack thereof) of technology / infrastructure affects both the amount and type of UCW

Illustrative evidence

Share of men who agree that women’s most important role is to take care of the home and cook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Share of rural women reporting tradeoffs between childcare and livelihood ambitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unpaid work, by gender wage gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wage gap</th>
<th>Female to male ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>6.7x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>3.3x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Time spent collecting water and firewood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Hours per day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## POLICY/SOCIAL INSTITUTION SOLUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Scalability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Childcare provision / subsidy</td>
<td>Proven</td>
<td>• Nationwide publicly provided childcare programs (including care / education programs for under age 3)</td>
<td>High: Increases female LFPR and wages by 20-50%, reduces female unemployment by ~40%¹</td>
<td>Medium: Large variety of childcare programs (public and private) across the formal and informal economy in many MICs, relatively fewer in LICs</td>
<td>High: designed / implemented nationally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eledercare services</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>• Care programs for the elderly (public / private or community-based)</td>
<td>Not known: Early stage: limited evidence linking programs, UCW, and WEE</td>
<td>Not known: Small-scale implementation (e.g. Groots in Kenya)</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income support (unconditional)</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>• Unconditional cash transfers, pension benefits for women, or universal basic income designs</td>
<td>Not known: Impacts on UCW not known, some links to WEE outcomes; depending on design, caregiver credits can significantly increase women's pension entitlements (by up to 5-7% of gross replacement rates)²</td>
<td>Low: Programs very limited in LICs or even MICs but simulations of likely impact of caregiver credits in the United States finds that low income women benefit the most from caregiver credits³</td>
<td>High: designed / implemented nationally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income support (conditional)</td>
<td>Promising</td>
<td>• Cash benefits provided to caregivers, dependent on the caregiver adhering to a set of conditions (e.g., school attendance, health checks)</td>
<td>Mixed: Some CCTs see UCW increase for mothers, decrease for girls⁴</td>
<td>High: CCTs already exist (with and without UCW component) exist in ~30 LMICs, with ~40% in LatAm⁴</td>
<td>High: designed / implemented nationally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid family &amp; medical leave</td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>• Maternity and paternity leave policies (maternity leave is available in all but 9 countries while paternal leave is only available in about half of the countries (87/194))</td>
<td>Not known: Studies of labor market effects of maternity benefits are mostly in developed countries, with mixed results on labor force re-entry / wages⁵</td>
<td>Low: Most countries in SSA/SA have maternity benefits; but &lt;15% of women are effectively covered as they work in the informal sector⁶</td>
<td>High: designed / implemented nationally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic workers</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>• Policies to formalize domestic care work and ensure they have the same rights as other formal workers (e.g., in 2013, Brazil passed a constitutional amendment to give domestic workers formal rights)</td>
<td>Mixed: Some evidence that increased access to domestic workers results in redistribution of UCW but formalization of domestic workers in some cases has resulted in families letting go of workers and women in household taking on UCW⁷</td>
<td>High: Domestic workers already estimated to be 4-10% of labor force in developing countries including LICs.⁸ Well-designed domestic worker programs/ policies may have promise in LICs</td>
<td>High: designed / implemented nationally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antidiscrimination policies</td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>• Policies that prevent gender-based hiring and prevent harassment or discrimination in the work place</td>
<td>Low: Improves WEE outcomes and incentivizes women’s entry into the labor force, no direct impact on UCW</td>
<td>Low: Fundamental yet underrepresented, with over 100 countries still lacking non-discrimination policies in hiring</td>
<td>High: designed / implemented nationally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

## ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT SOLUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>Assess.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Scalability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flexible work arrangements</td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>• Flexible work arrangements (e.g., telework, part-time work) are increasingly available through private employers and online job platforms, especially across developed countries</td>
<td>Low: Improves WEE outcomes and incentivizes women’s entry into the labor force, but no direct impact on UCW</td>
<td>Low: Applies to the formal sector, which is less relevant in LMICs with large informal sectors</td>
<td>High: designed / implemented nationally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational programs</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>• Small-scale programs are common in both developed and developing countries, especially with regard to financial literacy and entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Mixed: Evidence linking to WEE (e.g., educational attainment, professional qualifications, female LFPR) but limited evidence linking to UCW; reports of high drop out rates due to UCW and insufficient supporting interventions (e.g., care services)</td>
<td>Medium: Small-scale programs are common in both developed and developing countries</td>
<td>Medium: designed / implemented for particular sectors and regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job placement programs</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>• Programs aimed to place women in formal employment; designed to meet the needs of women, offered through online platforms and physical programs</td>
<td>Low: Evidence linking to WEE (e.g., female LFPR) but no direct impact on UCW</td>
<td>Medium: Predominantly developed countries; emerging in LMICs</td>
<td>Medium: designed / implemented for particular sectors and regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal pay audits</td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>• Assessment of how pay rates are distributed by gender</td>
<td>Low: Improves WEE outcomes and incentivizes women’s entry into the labor force but no direct impact on UCW</td>
<td>Low: Applies to the formal sector, which is less relevant in LMICs with large informal sectors</td>
<td>High: designed / implemented nationally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency in compensation</td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>• Includes transparency in pay levels, legal channels for employee salary disputes</td>
<td>Low: Improves WEE outcomes and incentivizes women’s entry into the labor force but no direct impact on UCW</td>
<td>Low: Applies to the formal sector, which is less relevant in LMICs with large informal sectors</td>
<td>High: designed / implemented nationally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### INFRASTRUCTURE/ TECHNOLOGY SOLUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>Assess.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Scalability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water and sanitation</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>• Improved access to water through local wells or piped water systems</td>
<td><em>Medium:</em> Households decrease time fetching water by ~66% and increase girls’ schooling by 8.2%; limited evidence on LFPR; experts say that without a gender lens, large-scale infrastructure change can increase or not affect UCW</td>
<td>High: Programs to improve water infrastructure exist across LMICs</td>
<td>High: designed / implemented nationally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>• Large-scale grid electrification</td>
<td><em>High:</em> Biofuel collection decreased ~50 minutes per week; women’s employment hours increased &lt;17%; experts say that without a gender lens, large-scale infrastructure change can increase or not affect UCW</td>
<td>Medium: Exist across rural areas of middle-income countries (e.g., India, Peru, South Africa); early investments in LICs (e.g., Kenya)</td>
<td>High: designed / implemented nationally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>• Improved paths, roads, railways, or public transport systems</td>
<td><em>Medium:</em> Increased women’s employment hours by 2.8 hours per week and girls’ schooling by 14%; qualitative decrease in UCW; experts say that without a gender lens, large-scale infrastructure change can increase or not affect UCW</td>
<td>High: Large-scale public projects across LMICs</td>
<td>High: designed / implemented nationally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical infra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor-saving devices</td>
<td>Highly promising</td>
<td>• Purpose-designed labor-saving devices, e.g., water gathering solutions (Hippo Rollers, NextDrop), water purification systems, cookstoves</td>
<td><em>Mixed:</em> Water-gathering solutions: Anecdotal evidence available but limited quantitative evidence linking programs, UCW, and WEE</td>
<td><em>High:</em> Innovations exist across LMICs (e.g., Hippo Rollers across sub-Saharan Africa, NextDrop in India; LifeStraw initiatives in sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia)</td>
<td><em>Medium:</em> Solutions must be tailored to the need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital infra</td>
<td>Promising</td>
<td>• Digital solutions such as mobile banking and m-health platforms</td>
<td><em>Medium:</em> ~50 minutes per week travel time saved with mobile cash transfers; qualitative evidence suggests time saved was used for productive agriculture activities; limited evidence on other mobile solutions and link to WEE</td>
<td><em>Medium:</em> Growing presence in SSA (12% of adult population has a mobile account) versus small presence in South Asia (3%)</td>
<td><em>High:</em> designed / implemented nationally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

© Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
## SOCIAL NORMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>Assess.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Scalability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Individual norms change       | Highly promising | • Parental education (typically high contact, 6-18 months) targeting both parents; often offered with other benefits (e.g., Brazil’s Bolsa Familia)  
• Adolescent education usually uses short workshops with stories, games, and role play around gender roles | High: Changed attitudes around gender roles; emerging evidence of men’s greater participation and in housework and childcare\(^1\); increased agreement that boys can help girls do housework (from 59% to 86%) and increased participation of boys in housework\(^2\) | High: Exist across LMICs (including LICs) but have different scales / focus (e.g., MenCare operates in 22 LMICs/LICs; Save the Children “CHOICES” operates in 8 countries) | Medium: Can be designed nationally / regionally but must be tailored and implemented locally |
| Community norms change        | Not known        | • Some norms change programs are being implemented at the community level, with a focus on changing perceptions across all members of the community and including women in community decision-making | Not known: Early-stage; limited evidence linking programs, UCW, and WEE | Not known: Small-scale (e.g., Men as Partners, South Africa and Nepal, Tostan, SSA) | Medium: Can be designed nationally / regionally but must be tailored and implemented locally |
| Population-wide norms change  | Promising        | • Some private-sector consumer goods companies (e.g., Dove, P&G, Unilever) have produced commercials / ad campaigns encouraging men to use their products | Medium: Some promising results, (e.g., > 5% increase in female LFPR; uptake in childcare places; increased awareness around shared caring responsibilities\(^3\)) but not widely replicated | Medium: Localized gender empowerment and male awareness media campaigns, mostly in MICs (e.g. Soul City, South Africa; Entre Nos, Brazil) | High: Designed / implemented nationally |
| Integrated norms change       | Promising        | • A select number of nonprofit organizations (e.g., ActionAid, Oxfam’s WeCare) integrate norms change into other solutions seeking to alleviate UCW at the community level in developing countries | Not known: Early-stage; limited evidence linking programs, UCW, and WEE | Medium: Early-stage programs (e.g., Bolsa Familia Companion Program, Brazil; Oxfam’s We-Care in 10 LMICs including LICs) | Medium: Can be designed nationally / regionally but must be tailored and implemented locally |

\(^1\) Evidence from Program P, a subcomponent of the MenCare campaign in Nicaragua; evidence from Save the Children’s CHOICES program in Egypt and Nepal  
\(^2\) Evidence from Program H, a subcomponent of the MenCare campaign, in Brazil and Indonesia.  
\(^3\) Evidence from a gender awareness mass media campaign in Malta.