The impact of fatherhood on men's earnings in Canada

Fabiola Aravena

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Master of Arts in Sociology

School of Sociological and Anthropological Studies

Faculty of Social Sciences

University of Ottawa

Table of contents

List of Tables

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I wish to thank my supervisor, Dr. Phyllis Rippey, who always found the time to read through the many drafts of this research and provided insightful feedback. Without her encouragement and constant help this thesis would not have been possible. My work and my sociological perspective have benefited immeasurably from her knowledge and expertise.

I would also like to thank Dr. André Tremblay and Dr. Vincent Mirza for their constructive comments and suggestions that have greatly improved this study.

Special thanks to Jonea, Aissa, Catherine, Joyce, and Shawn for all their support at the different stages of this research. Your company and continuous encouragement have been invaluable.

I am grateful to my family for being so confident in me, and always pushing me to try to be a better version of myself.

Lastly, I would like to thank Rubén not only for supporting every project I undertake, but also for taking time out from his own research to help me develop my ideas and proofread different sections of my own. Your kindness and love have kept my spirits up through this project.

Abstract

Whereas the effect of motherhood on women's earnings has been well documented, little research has been done in Canada exploring the impact of fatherhood on men's earnings. Although international research has shown that, unlike women, men who have a child increase their earnings, a growing body of research suggests that this benefit may be mediated by whether or not the father takes a parental leave. Using the 2011 General Social Survey (GSS) on family issues and employing ordinary least squares regression I investigate whether fathers receive an earnings bonus compared to childless men and whether fathers who take paternity/ parental leave earn less than fathers who do not. Our findings show that after controlling for personal and work related characteristics fathers earn significantly more than childless men and fathers who took paternity/parental leave earn significantly less than fathers who did not. Potential explanations for these earnings gaps are discussed.

Introduction

The beginning of the twenty-first century marked a pivotal point in the study of fatherhood among sociologists. With the increased participation of women in the labour force, researchers have expressed a growing interest in fathers' roles in the childrearing process. While previous notions of fatherhood depict fathers as breadwinners whose family role was to provide economic support for their children, new notions portray them as playing an active role in childcare and family life (Coltrane, 1996; Pleck, 1993). Research based on this new image of fatherhood has focused on the nature of becoming a father (Cohen, 1993), the effects of fatherhood on children's development (Allen, Daly, & Ball, 2012; Lamb, 2004; Marsiglio, Amato, Day, & Lamb, 2000) and the implications of fathers' paid work on family life (Nepomnyaschy & Waldfogel, 2007; Seward, Yeatts, Zotarelli, & Fletcher, 2006; Tanaka & Waldfogel, 2007). However, little research has been done on the impacts of fatherhood on men's development, specifically, how fatherhood affects men in their working lives. This research aims to address this gap in the literature by exploring the impact of fatherhood on men's earnings in Canada.

Past research has shown that, unlike women, men who have a child increase their earnings abilities (Boeckmann & Budig, 2013; Glauber, 2008; Hodges & Budig, 2010; Lundberg & Rose, 2002). However, a growing body of research suggests that this benefit may be mediated by whether or not the father takes a parental leave. Research has revealed that men who are characterized as taking a parental leave are less likely to be recommended for rewards and more likely to decrease their long-term earnings than their male counterparts who have not taken a leave of absence (Allen & Russell, 1999 ; Rege & Solli, 2013). Thus, taking

any kind of leave of absence for parental reasons may have a negative impact on fathers' future career outcomes. Considering that most of this research has been carried out in the United States, there is a need to advance current knowledge regarding the impact of fatherhood on men's earnings in Canada, where there are far more generous parental leave policies and, at least in Quebec, more affordable childcare options. Using the 2011 General Social Survey (GSS) on family issues (Statistics Canada, 2012) this study explores the following questions: (1) Do fathers receive an earnings bonus compared to childless men? (2) Do fathers who take paternity/parental leave earn less than fathers who do not? (3) If so, for either question, what are the mechanisms explaining these potential differences? (e.g., human capital, marital status, participation in housework, workplace characteristics).

The premise of the current research is that work and family are not two separate spheres in men's lives. On the contrary, both spheres are intrinsically linked and changes in family life will have repercussions on paid work (Ranson, 2009; Wall & Arnold, 2007). In this sense, by focusing on the impact of fatherhood on men's earnings, this study is seeking to acknowledge the involvement of fathers in family life.

Although the impact of fatherhood on men's earnings has been documented mostly in the United States (Glauber, 2008; Hodges & Budig, 2010) and some European countries such as the United Kingdom (Cooke, 2014), little research has been done in Canada. Exploring the roles of fathers and how they may impact men's working roles can provide some insights into how Canadian families and workplaces are dealing with the process of raising children in a society where the number of dual earner households has grown considerably (Marshall, 2006). Similar to other industrialized countries, in Canada the participation of mothers in the labour force has increased as well as the participation of men in childcare (Marshall, 2006). However,

little support has been given to the development of policies that promote childcare services and fathers' involvement in childcare; with the exception of the province of Quebec, Canada has no universal child care provision or paid paternity leave that is exclusive for fathers[1] (Doucet, 2009 ; O' Brien, 2009). An examination of the impact of fatherhood on men's earnings in this particular context should provide insight into how these two simultaneous processes, austere family policies and changes in the distribution of paid and unpaid work between men and women, shape fathers' behaviours in the workplace. Further, an examination of the relationship between family and work roles for men challenges the notion that family life is an exclusively female domain. If fatherhood has an impact on men's earnings it must be recognized that men are deeply affected by family life.

Finally, the few fatherhood studies done in Canada that examined the nature of fatherhood and the relationship between paid work and family roles have been conducted using qualitative methodology, focussing on particular groups of fathers (stay at home fathers, young fathers, divorced fathers, and so on) (Doucet, 2009; Daly, Ashbourne, & Brown, 2013; Pratt, Lawford, & Allen, 2012; Whitehead & Bala, 2012). Limited research has been carried out using quantitative methods that allow researchers to find general trends in fathers' behaviour. This research aims to fill this gap by exploring the population of fathers in Canada.

The first chapter explores the literature regarding the relationship between fatherhood and paid work. The chapter will focus first on changes in family and working life in Canada, the working experience of Canadian men, the main theoretical arguments of contemporary fatherhood, followed by the main findings from past research exploring the impact of

[1] Although there is a parental leave that employee fathers and mothers can share, mothers tend to be the main beneficiaries of parental leave. Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report (2015) shows that over the period from 2013-2014 women made 86.7 percent of biological parental claims.

fatherhood on men's earnings, and a detailed explanation of the regulations regarding parental leave and the impact of parental leave on fathers' earnings. The second chapter will focus on theory; specifically using a gender approach to understanding workplaces, fatherhood and family policies the relationship between fatherhood and paid work is examined. The chapter ends with the presentation of the research hypotheses tested in this study. Chapter three describes the methodology used in this research. Using t-tests for differences between means and proportions followed by multiple regression models, we assess 17 hypotheses to provide answers to our primary research questions. Chapter four will contain the main results organized according to the two main hypotheses. The fifth chapter explores discussions relating the findings to previous literature. The discussion will analyze the main findings and the mechanisms explaining the earnings differences between the groups. The last chapter contains the conclusion, summarizing the major findings of the study, its limitations as well as recommendations for future research.

Review of the literature

In this chapter, I review the research which examines the relationship between fatherhood and paid work. The first section provides a detailed account of significant changes in family and paid work in Canada during the last sixty years. In the second section, I explore the working experience of Canadian men and identify some of the differences between childless men and fathers. The next section explains the two analytical models of contemporary fatherhood used in most research in this field. Finally, focusing on the research questions, I describe the findings from previous studies on the impact of fatherhood on men's earnings, the characteristics of the parental leave policy in Canada, and what past research has found when examining the impact of parental leave on fathers' earnings.

Changes in family and working life in Canadian society

Since the mid-twentieth century, the Canadian family and workforce have experienced significant changes. The demographic and economic changes observed in the past decades have deeply altered the family and working life of individuals in Canada (LaPierre-Adamcyk, Marcil-Gratton, & Le Bourdais, 2006 ; Rapoport & Le Bourdais, 2006). In order to understand the relationship between fatherhood and paid work it is important to consider the significant changes experienced by Canadian society during the last sixty years.

As a result of processes of industrialization and urbanization in the 1960s, the cost of living in Canada rose steeply, especially in urban areas. This increase in the cost of living not only had an important impact on the way people earned a living, but also on the distribution of the unpaid childcare and housework in the home. Because one income was no longer sufficient to support a family, married women and mothers, who had previously been expected

to dedicate themselves to housework and childcare, entered the labour force "which made having more than two children even more costly in terms of lost income, time and childcare costs" (Baker, 2009, p. 63).

Since 1959, the Canadian birth rates have been dropping. The average fertility rate per woman in Canada in 1957 was an average of 3.9 children. This declined to 2.2 in 1971, remained stable at about 1.6 to 1.7 from 1980 to 1996 and then decreased to 1.5 births per woman in 2003 (Beaujot, 2000). According to Baker (2009) in 2003, 20 percent of the Canadian population did not produce any children, either by choice of lifestyle or problems of infertility.

The fact that couples started to limit the size of their families is not only due to the cost involved in having children, but also due to changes in the understanding of the role that children play in family and society. In the 19th century, children from low income families were not viewed differently from any other adult member of the family; they were expected to work in order to help to support their family like any other member of the family. However, with the development of policies to abolish child labour and promote mandatory education, in the 20th century, children were recognized as persons in need of special emotional protection and cognitive development. The understanding of childhood evolved from a view of children as economic assets toward one in which children were considered parents' economic responsibility. These notions have evolved to the point where children today are considered to be citizens with rights who depend on their parents' economical support and are to be socially valued. Moreover, the relationship between parents and children is based on the values of love, companionship and enjoyment (Wall, 2009).

In terms of employment, the economic growth in the post-war decades brought an increase in available jobs and a rapid development of the information and service sectors. This development not only made women integrate into the workforce in greater numbers, but also created the need for more qualified workers. As the composition and organization of the work force changed, the growth in wages slowed down significantly. The average wages showed only a 2.0 percent increase during the 1980s and a 2.6 percent decline over the period from 1990-96 (Beaujot, 2000). Although a larger proportion of the population is currently employed, workers have experienced limited wage gains in a context of higher unemployment, and an increase in non-standard work, such as part-time work, multiple jobs, and self-employment (Beaujot, 2000).

Another process that has evolved over the last six decades is the change in the perception of women's roles in society. While political rights were gained at the beginning of the twentieth century, it was only later that women's access to education and paid work became more prominent giving women more opportunities to play public roles. Since the 1960s women's access to post-secondary education and paid work has increased (Beaujot, 2000). Over the past sixty years women have outnumbered men in fields such as education, applied arts and health studies and today, 58 percent of all undergraduate degrees are earned by women (Wente, 2010). In terms of employment, the rate of women's participation in the labour force has increased since 1961. The rate of women's participation was 29.1 percent in 1961, 39.9 percent in 1971, 51.8 percent in 1981, and was 62.7 percent by 2007 (Ranson, 2009). Further, according to Statistics Canada (2015), relative to men, women accounted for nearly 48 percent of the workforce in 2014.

While these changes may appear to reflect more gender equality within society, where men and women share the burden of paid and unpaid work equally, women today are still at a disadvantage compared to men, primarily in terms of the amount of income and the types of occupations in paid work. Canadian women are paid less than men in almost every industry, at every educational level, working full time or part time (McInturff & Macdonald, 2015). According to Statistics Canada (2015), in 2011 the female-to-male earnings ratio among those working full-time, full-year was 0.77. Also, Canadian women continue working in the same occupations that have been dominated by women for decades (i.e., nursing and other health-related jobs, teaching, and clerical, administrative, sales and service work) (Statistics Canada, 2010). Similarly, labour force survey estimates elaborated by Statistics Canada show that the gender pay gap increases in occupations that are male dominated. For July 2015 the average hourly wage rate for males working in management occupation was 5.07 dollars higher than their female counterparts. This gap was even larger in "Primary industry" and "Trades and related occupations"; where the gap was 6.57 and 7.17 respectively (Statistics Canada). In addition, in 2009, 70 percent of part time workers were women. An important number of those women work part time due to childcare responsibilities. About 35 percent of women aged 25 to 44 working part time declared that they had made this choice in order to care for their children (Stastna, 2012). Furthermore, previous research on motherhood and earnings indicates that the experience of working mothers may be widening the gap. In a study using Canadian data, Budig, Misra, and Boeckmann (2012) show that mothers decreased their earnings by an estimated eight percent, even when age, employment level (part-time or full-time) and education were held constant.

Nevertheless, researchers have noted that today's couples are dividing economic and domestic responsibilities more equally than before. Marshall (2006) argued that gender roles are converging; men are allocating more time to unpaid work whereas women are spending more time on paid work. In terms of unpaid work, men in Canada are spending more time on housework and childcare than before, but they are still doing less than their women counterparts. According to time-use surveys results, in 1986 men in the 25-54 years age range spent on average 2.1 hours per day in unpaid work and in 2005 this number went up to 2.6 hours. For women of the same age group, the average went from 4.8 in 1986 to 4.3 hours of unpaid work in 2005 (Marshall, 2006). Also, labour force survey results looking at the evolution of hours per week used in paid work by men and women since 1987, show that men are allocating less time to paid work whereas women are doing a little more. While in 1987 men worked on average 40.4 and women 32.2 hours per week, in 2013 men reduced their time at work to 38.7 and women to 32.3 hours (Statistics Canada). Similarly, in a study examining participation in and time spent on paid and unpaid work of individuals aged 20 to 29 from three different generations[2] Marshall (2011) found that over generations, participation in paid work and housework has also converged for men and women. The gender gap in terms of daily paid work and housework participation rates still exists, but it has been narrowing over time. Whereas in 1986, 48 percent of the baby boomer men and 78 percent of the women reported doing some housework; by 2010, 65 percent of the Generation Y men and 76 percent of the women reported doing housework. The gap went from a 30 percentage point difference in 1986 to an 11 percentage point difference in 2010. In terms of daily participation rate in paid

[2] The first or baby boom generation included those born between 1947 and 1966, the Generation X comprised those born between 1967 and 1979, and the last generation or Generation Y included those born between 1980 and 1995.

work, there was a 12 percentage point difference between men and women in the first generation in 1986, which declined to an 8 percentage point difference for the last generation in 2010 (Marshall, 2011).

Today the Canadian context is characterized by dual-earner families with fewer children, where parents tend to work in full or part time jobs while developing different strategies to take care of their children. Although the federal government has implemented family friendly policies, such as parental leave, that are intended to allow workers to create a better balance between family life and work demands, their general approach to family policy is argued to be falling short. With the exception of the province of Quebec, Canada has no universal child care provision or paid paternity leave that is exclusive for fathers (Doucet, 2009; O' Brien, 2009). Moreover, McInturff and Macdonald (2015) assert that although more than 50 percent of the 1.9 million children under the age of five in Canada live in dual-earner families, the regulated childcare spaces available only cover half of those children. Additionally, since only three provinces have set maximum fees for childcare, getting access to this service can be very expensive (McInturff & Macdonald, 2015). In a study examining the median unsubsidized child care fees in Canada's biggest 22 cities for children, researchers found that regardless of the age of the child Torontonians pay the most per month for child care; ranging from $998 for preschoolers to $1,676 for infants. In contrast, the lowest fees were found in all Quebec cities; due to this province's child care policy, infant, toddler, and preschooler care costs only $152 per month or $7 a day (Macdonald & Friendly, 2014).

Finally, another example of family policies that do not adapt to parents' needs is the Employment Insurance Maternity and Parental Benefits (EI). Although the federal

government offers a parental leave (Quebec excepted[3]) that mothers and fathers can share, the EI parental leave benefits do not pay out a worker's full salary; most leave takers receive only 55 percent of their average insurable weekly earnings. Living with half of a salary may represent an economic burden for a family, especially for those with low incomes. Additionally, in a context where men earn more than women, this kind of policy encourages those who earn more (i.e. men) to stay in paid work while those who earn less (i.e. women) to make use of EI Maternity and Parental Benefits.

Men and paid work in Canada

For many years, men held the majority of jobs in the formal paid labour force. According to Beaujot (2000), in 1951, 84.1 percent of all men older than 15 were in the labour force, compared to only 24.2 percent of women. Although the scenario has changed mostly due to women's greater participation in the formal paid labour force, men still spend most of their time at work. The results of the General Social Survey examining Canadians' use of their time in 2010 shows that on average, men over 15 spent 8 hours and 36 minutes per day on paid work and related activities, 53 minutes longer than their women counterparts (Statistics Canada, 2011). Although compared to previous survey results the average daily time spent on paid work for men has decreased; specifically, according to the time-use survey results, in 2010 men spent 14 minutes less per day on paid work and related activities than in 1998. Similarly, Marshall's findings from her study across generations show that baby boomers and Generation X men had a daily participation rate in paid work of 57 percent which dropped to 51 for Generation Y in 2010- a difference of 6 percent (Marshall, 2011).

[3] Quebec has its own EI parental leave that is more generous than the one implemented for the federal government. In the section "Parental leave policy in Canada" I will explain in more detail the differences between the two programs.

The amount of time men allocate to paid work hinges on their occupation. Labour force survey estimates from 2013 show that although men dedicate an average 39 hours per week to work, this number increases for men in male dominated occupations. Men working in trades, transport and related occupations spend an average of 41 hours per week at work, while men in management occupations dedicate 43 hours. Similarly, men working in primary industries allocate 47 hours per week of their time to work, which is eight hours more than the average of all occupations analyzed together (Statistics Canada).

Previous research has suggested that parenthood and living arrangements have a gendered impact on paid work. In her research on paid and unpaid work over three generations Marshall (2011) found that whereas married men with children tend to work more than married men without children or single men, the opposite was true for women. Moreover, according to another study conducted by Marshall (2006), when grouping men aged 25 to 54 according to their living arrangements, married men with children had the highest daily rate of participation in paid labour; in 2005 the rate was 70 percent. The group with the second-highest rate was married men without children whose participation rate was roughly 65 percent. Finally, for men living alone, the participation rate was almost 60 percent. Similar patterns emerged in the analysis of the time spent in paid work per day. In 2005, married men with children spent on average almost 7 hours per day at work. Married men without children spent roughly 6 hours per day at work and finally men living alone spent roughly 5.5 hours per day (Marshall, 2006). Although these averages may also reflect those who work as seasonal or part-time employees, the results of Marshall illuminate some important work distinctions between men with children and childless men.

There are also relevant differences between fathers and men without children in terms of earnings and individual incomes. In Canada, regardless of their age and employment status fathers tend to be better off economically than childless men. According to Ravanera and Hoffman (2012), fathers, those living with children under the age of 25, have higher median salaries compared to childless men; the median wage and salaries for fathers was $ 42,000 whereas for men without children was $14,000. Also, Ravanera and Hoffman's findings indicated that in 2006 men living with children under the age of 25 had higher median income than childless men. Specifically, 50 percent of fathers had an individual income lower than $ 46,000 whereas for childless men 50 percent had an income lower than$ 23,000.

Contemporary fatherhood

Numerous studies have suggested that there has been a remarkable shift in the culture of fatherhood since the early 1980s (Pleck, 1993; Ranson, 2001; Wall & Arnold, 2007). The idea that fathers are taking a more active role in childcare is becoming increasingly prominent in research on fatherhood and in media debates (Kaufman, 2013). However, empirical research has shown that fathers' behaviour may not be consistent with these cultural expectations. According to research conducted by Parker and Wang (2013), even though American fathers today are doing more housework and allocating more time to childcare than their women counterparts in 1965, mothers still bear the bulk of childrearing; specifically, they spend almost twice the time on childcare and housework as fathers do. Similarly, in Canada the results of the time-use survey 2010 show that among parents with children under 13 years old women spent more than twice as much time on their care as men did. Whereas women spent two hours and 43 minutes men spent only one hour and 23 minutes (Statistics Canada, 2011).

A possible explanation for this divergence between the conduct and the culture of fatherhood is that changes in the conduct of fatherhood may not occur in the same way or at the same pace as changes in the culture of fatherhood. LaRossa (2012) has argued that it is important to acknowledge the distinction between the two domains; whereas the culture of fatherhood is the shared norms, values, and beliefs surrounding men's parenting, the conduct is what they factually do, their paternal behaviour. The assumption that changes occur simultaneously in both domains is based more on explaining women's behaviour than men's actions; one may think that given the large number of working mothers, fathers would be more involved in the household labour, including childcare; however, this does not appear to be the case. Daly (1993) suggests that the relatively slow change in fathers' conduct is due to the lack of exposure to appropriate paternal models when they were children. Furthermore, Bianchi, Robinson and Milkie (2006) argue that even when fathers increase their participation in childcare they use most of this time on interactive types of activities (e.g., playing with them, talking, or reading to them), while mothers are the ones taking on the custodial childcare activities such as feeding and dressing them. Thus, a substantial part of the theoretical research on fatherhood argues that the role of fathers has only been transformed in terms of changes in the expectations and meanings that people attach to being a father.

Nevertheless, other researchers have found evidence to support the argument of the changing role of fathers in terms of conduct. They have pointed out that we are witnessing a shift in the image of fathers of the 1950s to the 1970s who played a more distant, breadwinning role, to fathers of the 1980s until the present who are viewed as being more nurturing and committed to spending time with their children (Wall & Arnold, 2007). According to Sullivan's (2000) research men have increased their participation in domestic work and

involvement in childcare activities. Studies have also shown that fathers' involvement and responsibility have increased over the past decades; based on time-use analysis Marshall (2006) showed that the proportion of Canadian men taking care of children increased from 23 percent in 1986 to 27 percent in 2005, while women's decreased from 44 percent in 1986 to 39 percent in the same period. Additionally, after changes in the law that made it easier for fathers to apply for parental leave benefits, the number of fathers using parental leave in order to take care of their newborn children has shown a promising increase in recent years. According to an analysis of Employment Insurance data, in 2002 the average number of fathers making use of parental benefits was 7,900, which represents a fivefold increase over the 1,600 in 2000 (Pérusse, 2003). Similarly, McKay, Marshall and Doucet (2012) found that while in 2000 only about three percent of eligible fathers claimed parental leave, in 2008 this percentage increased drastically to 33 percent (12 percent of fathers outside Quebec and 82 percent from Quebec). Lastly, the number of fathers staying at home taking care of their children has also increased. While in 1976 only four percent of stay-at-home parents in Canada were men, in 2008 this percentage had gone up six points (Ravanera & Hoffman, 2012). In the absence of conclusive evidence regarding conduct, both models of fathering, the breadwinner and the nurturing, remain valid as two competing models that can be used, in Weberian terms, as "ideal types" to explain the nature of contemporary fatherhood.

The impact of fatherhood on men's earnings

In contemporary society, work and family roles play an important part in most individuals' lives (Carlson & Kacmar, 2000). Gender scholars have long argued that they are connected; the organization of work affects family roles and at the same time family life influences work (Glauber, 2008). Research has shown that the transition to fatherhood strongly

affects men's lives, not only in terms of identity and well-being, but also in terms of employment (Knoester & Eggebeen, 2006; Townsend, 2002). Research findings have revealed that becoming a father substantially changes men's occupational behaviour and work expectations (Cohen, 1993; Eggebeen & Knoester, 2001). As a consequence, fathers respond to work demands in a different way than childless men (Kaufman & Uhlenberg, 2000). Notably, however, due to limitations in data found in most quantitative analyses and the fact that the bulk of research on this topic has been conducted in the United States some critique these findings for failing to adequately account for cultural differences influencing men's decisions or the structural constraints men face in making decisions about how to organize their work and family lives in Canada.

In her research on balancing work and family life in the 21st century, Kaufman (2013) explains that there are at least two types of working fathers that coexist. On the one hand, a "new" father expresses his parental concerns by trying to modify his work life in order to spend more time with his children. On the other hand, a "traditional" father expresses his concerns by trying to provide economic support in order to cover his children's needs. The first model suggests that "nurturing fathers", who are more involved in raising children, are more likely to cut back their work hours than childless men. On the contrary, the second model proposes that fathers who prioritize the role of providers are more likely to work longer hours than childless men.

Studies supporting the new model of fatherhood have suggested that once men become parents they may wish to reduce their obligations at work. The Fathers, Family and Work report produced by the Equality and Human Rights Commission in the UK (EHRC) found that 62 percent of fathers thought that fathers should spend more time caring for their children

(2009). Moreover, 54 percent of fathers with children under the age of one believed that they were not devoting enough time to their children. However, when flexible work was actually available, only 30 percent were making use of it. (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2009). Therefore, these findings only demonstrate a change in fathers' desire to play a bigger part in bringing up their children as opposed to an important change in their working behaviour. As the conclusions of the same report stress, "fathers' attitudes towards parenting do not appear to match the reality of their work and care arrangements" (p. 14). In practice, fathers work mainly full time, and many work long hours. Although fathers' ideals seem to have changed, their working practices have not changed at the same pace.

While some researchers argue strongly that fathers do not define their family role based on their ability to provide economic support for their children, proponents of the breadwinner model have shown that men increase their working hours following the transition to parenthood in order to meet their family's economic needs. In an American study about fathers' commitments to their careers, Eggebeen and Knoester (2001) showed that men with children in the household worked longer hours (measured by usual weekly hours) than men without children in the household, which is consistent with Marshall's (2006) findings showing that Canadian married men with children spent on average almost 7 hours per day at work while men living alone spent roughly 5.5. Drawing on longitudinal data, Lundberg and Rose (2002) found that men work about 82 additional hours per year after the birth of the first child and 26 hours more after the second child. Additionally, researchers have pointed out that being the breadwinner is still an important component of men's fathering identity (Townsend, 2002). Based on the results of her qualitative study on middle class professional fathers in Canada, Ranson (2001) concluded that "fatherhood responsibilities continue to be organized

around the demands of the workplace" (p. 3) which is also consistent with the breadwinner model of fatherhood.

Previous research on the impact of fatherhood on men's earnings has shown that men's earnings also tend to change once men become fathers. While the number of hours that fathers work can be explained by men's fathering identity (being a provider or a nurturing father) among other reasons, changes in fathers' earnings can also be explained by how workplaces perceive their employees who are fathers. The bulk of the research on fathers' earnings has shown that unlike women, men who have become fathers increase their earning abilities. In an American study, Lundberg and Rose (2002) found that fatherhood significantly increases the hourly wage rates. Using fixed-effects estimation the authors discovered that on average, "each additional child is associated with an increase in wages of approximately 4.2 percent" (p. 256). Similarly, in her study about gender and race on fathers' labour market outcomes in the U.S., Glauber (2008), also using fixed-effects models, showed that the association between fatherhood and wages for white and Latino married men is greater than the association between fatherhood and wages for black married men, but overall all men's wages increase "first when they marry and then again when they have children within marriage" (p.24). For married black, Latino, and white men, one child is associated with about a dollar increase in their mean hourly wage.

Past research has proposed that there are three possible explanations of the fatherhood bonus. First, some researchers have argued that earnings differences between fathers and childless men can be explained by a selection effect (Hodges & Budig, 2010; Knoester & Eggebeen, 2006). Studies suggest that what explains the fatherhood bonus may not be fatherhood status, but fathers' individual characteristics. Thus, men who tend to earn more are

more likely to be fathers. Previous research suggested that fathers' education, work experience and marital status along with other personal characteristics may be able to explain the earnings gap between fathers and childless men (Boeckmann & Budig, 2013). Second, as proposed by Becker (1993), members of heterosexual households divide paid and unpaid work in order to maximize their assets by comparing costs and benefits. The family member who has access to better resources would be expected to spend more time in paid work whereas the other person would be expected to focus on household labour (Shelton, 2000). Thus, once they become parents, women's home time tends to be more valuable than men's and the existence of an earnings gap between men and women makes women focus on taking care of children at home while men concentrate on the labour market. According to the household specialization argument, the fatherhood premium is attributed to the increase in the number of fathers' working hours.

However, past research on the impact of fatherhood on paid hours has shown mixed results. While some studies have shown that parenthood for men does not have an important impact on their work performance, other researchers have concluded that fatherhood status actually predicts men's performance at work. In her research about the relationship between fatherhood and work hours in the UK, Dermot (2005) concluded that fatherhood status does not determine the number of hours that fathers spend at work. Moreover, when other variables are taken into account, the relationship between fatherhood and paid hours becomes insignificant. In contrast, based on Kaufman & Uhlenberg's (2000) findings from their research on the influence of parenthood on the work effort of American married men, being a father is linked tothe amount of timemen spend in paid work. Kaufman and Uhlenberg explained that after controlling for education, age, occupation and other work-related

variables, fathers were not only found to be employed more often than childless men as previous research had suggested, but they were also more likely to work longer hours than their childless counterparts.

Along this line of reasoning, men who are fathers would be less likely to participate in housework because they are focused on paid work. Prior research on the impact of housework on earnings has shown that performing housework has a negative impact on earnings (Noonan, 2001). Moreover, this negative impact is greater on people performing female-type housework tasks rather than male-type or shared-type tasks. In her research on the impact of domestic work on men's and women's wages, Noonan (2001) argues that 'female-type' tasks (e.g., preparing daily meals, cleaning the house, doing dishes, doing laundry, and organizing the household's social life) are more time consuming because, unlike male-type or shared tasks (e.g., doing outdoor work, grocery shopping, gardening) they need to be performed more often and at specific times. Thus, participation in housework and the type of housework performed may also help to explain earnings differences between fathers and their childless counterparts.

Studies of the impact of fatherhood on earnings have also used family structure as another way to approach the specialization argument. In order to identify whether the division of paid and unpaid work was traditional, researchers have used the partner/spouse status employment as a measure of the family structure. Thus, in families where a men's partner or spouse works part time or does not work at all, the division of the paid work and housework is specialized or traditional. Using data from the Luxembourg Income Study, Boeckmann and Budig (2013) examined how the division of labour in two-parent heterosexual households is associated with an increase in fathers' earnings in fourteen countries, one of those being Canada. Their findings showed that the fatherhood premium tends to be connected to the

division of labour at home; in most countries men with caregiver partners are more likely to receive the fatherhood premium. Specifically, their analysis showed that in Canada, being a father is linked to a wage bonus of 15.7 percent and, even after controlling for age, education, marital status, and labour supply characteristics, the fatherhood premium persists. However, when the presence of a female care providing partner is added to the model, the gap between fathers and childless men disapears. Morever when including an interaction between the presence of a female caregiver and fatherhood status, the results showed that "it is predominantly men with female caregivers who garner a premium for fatherhood" (p. 16).

The final third explanation that some authors propose is that widely held gender beliefs of men as ideal workers and women as primary caretakers structure the relationships between employers and employees which reproduce gender inequalities (Glauber, 2008). As Hodges and Budig (2010) mention in their article, being a father "may be interpreted by employers as a signal for valued, unobservable individual traits, such as loyalty or dependability" (p. 718). Correll, Benard and Paik (2007) conducted an audit study of actual employers and a laboratory experiment to evaluate the hypothesis that discrimination based on parental status plays an important role in working practices. In both, the audit study and the laboratory experiment, researchers held constant the workplace performance and other important characteristics and potential workers only differed in their parental status so differences in evaluation could not be attributed to skill differences or productivity. In the audit study, they analyzed positive responses from potential employers to fictitious applicants based on the number of callbacks they received. In the laboratory experiment, they assessed participants' evaluation rates to potential job applicants in terms of perceived competence, workplace commitment, likelihood of being hired and promoted, and recommended salary. The results of the audit indicate that

being a parent reduced the likelihood that a woman, but not a man, would receive a callback from employers. Similarly, the results of the experiment show that fathers were advantaged over childless men in numerous ways—specifically, they were seen as more committed to paid work and more deserving of promotions, and being offered higher starting salaries. The authors explain their findings by arguing that, due to hegemonic constructions of masculinity and fatherhood that portray fathers as providers, employers tend to see them as better workers (Correll, Benard, & Paik, 2007).

Drawing on longitudinal data collected in USA from 1979 to 2006, Hodges & Budig (2010) found that the fatherhood bonus persists after controlling for different variables such as human capital, labour supply, family structure, and wives' employment status. Moreover, the authors showed that "the fatherhood bonus is significantly larger for men with other markers of workplace hegemonic masculinity" (p. 717). Thus, men who were white, married, living in households with a traditional gender division of work, had graduated from college, and were professional/managerial employees obtained the largest fatherhood bonus.

On the other hand, recent studies about the impact of fatherhood on men's earnings have argued that fathers may also experience an earning penalty. Coltrane, Miller, DeHaan & Stewart (2013) pointed out that fathers who are unemployed or cut back their work hours for family reasons "could experience a "flexibility stigma" depressing earnings and limiting future career opportunities" (p. 279). This research found that men who did not work for family reasons received a wage penalty of 26.4 percent. Nurturing or "new" fathers, who do not conform to normative pressures to specialize in breadwinning and have decided to reduce or restructure their commitment to work for family reasons are more likely to experience a wage penalty than fathers who conform to the breadwinner model.

Most of the research examined in this section have used individual data focusing on the individual factors that influence men's decision making at work without paying attention to structural factors that could affect men's actions. By using this individualistic approach these studies fail to acknowledge that individual choices are always embedded in specific cultural and political contexts and as a consequence personal decisions do not rely solely on individual preferences or desires. Further, because the majority of the studies reviewed in this section were not carried out in Canada and did not take into account cultural and political characteristics influencing men's decisions, the following section explores the differences between provinces in terms of family policy by looking at the characteristics of the parental leave policy in Canada. Additionally, in order to acknowledge the importance of cultural differences, the next chapter will examine the importance of gender as a social force that shapes personal identities and social structures.

Parental leave policy in Canada

Canada, like other industrialized countries,[4] has implemented family friendly policies in order to help workers to mediate between family and work obligations (Haas & Hwang, 2009). Even though the initial aim of these practices was to facilitate women's entry into the labour market, today they have extended their scope to include policies that encourage employed fathers to take a more active role in childcare (Hojgaard, 1997). Thus, parental and paternity leave policies allow fathers to take time off work in order to promote fathers' involvement with their children from an early stage (Tanaka & Waldfogel, 2007).

[4] Findland, Germany, Iceland, Norway, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Belgium, Denmark, France, Greece, Hungary, Netherlands, United Kingdom.

Unlike most European countries, Canada as a federal state has distinct mandates for policy at the federal and provincial levels. Whereas issues that deal with the economy or relations outside the country are the jurisdiction of the federal government, issues related to human welfare such as healthcare and education are to be dealt with at the provincial level. As such, parental leave policies differ by province, despite efforts by the federal government to provide some family leave benefits through national taxation policies. Although initially there was a universal parental leave, since 2006 the province of Quebec has its own leave benefit program that has important differences compared to the one used in the rest of the country. Even though both plans are only available to parents with insurable employment, their approach towards who is covered by the program, how eligibility is established, the income replacement rate and for how long workers can make use of the leave make these two programs very different (Phipps, 2006).

Parental leave in most Canadian provinces is regulated under Employment Insurance (E.I) which is administrated by the federal government. Paid parental leave started in 1971 with the introduction of maternity benefits to EI. Back then, mothers with 20 or more insurable weeks were the only beneficiaries of this policy and were entitled to 15 weeks of benefits following a two-week waiting period. The benefits received during the leave were paid at a rate of 66 percent of the mother's previous insurable earnings without exceeding the amount of $150.00 per week. During the last fifteen years, due to pressure from unions and women's organizations, several changes have been introduced to this policy (Doucet, McKay, & Tremblay, 2009). First, in the 1980s adoptive and legally recognized parents including fathers became eligible beneficiaries. Second, in 1990 and 2001 the length of the leave was prolonged. Third, since 2001 the two-week waiting period was no longer required and the necessary

number of annual employment hours was reduced. Finally, in 2010 self-employed women became eligible for maternity leave benefits. In order to receive them mothers must have registered at least for one year in EI, paid contributions to the program, earned no less than $2,000 from self-employment in the reference period of the previous 52 weeks, and have reduced the number of hours devoted to their business by more than 40 percent due to childbirth. Although all these changes have improved the benefits and the eligibility of the beneficiaries, during these years the rate of remuneration has also declined, while in 1971 parents were paid at a rate of 67 percent of their previous insurable earnings, currently they are paid at a rate of 55 percent. (Doucet, Lero, Mc Kay, & Tremblay, 2015; Office of the Auditor General of Canada, 2003; Phipps, 2006).

Currently, parental benefits provided for the birth of a child include paid parental leave of up to 50 weeks. Under EI all biological and adoptive parents are entitled to 35 weeks of leave which can be shared in the manner deemed to be in the best interest of the family, plus biological mothers are entitled to 15 weeks that are not transferable. In order to apply, employees must have worked at least 600 hours in the preceding year. Eligible parents who claim benefits are paid at a rate of 55 percent of the worker's previous insurable earnings up to an earnings ceiling of $49,500.00. In other words, parents can receive a benefit payment of a maximum of $524.00 per week (Service Canada , 2015). Low-income families[5] can qualify for a family supplement up to a maximum of 80 percent of average insurable earnings (Doucet, Lero, McKay, & Tremblay, 2015).

Quebec

[5] It applies for families with a net income of $25,921 or less per year.

The Quebec Parental Insurance Plan (QPIP) was implemented in 2006 after many years of debate among various social actors such as trade unions, women's groups and some progressive family groups. As a result of the debate, coalitions and consultative bodies on family issues were built up in order to develop a new family policy for the province. Thus, in 2005 the federal and provincial governments reached a financial agreement that allowed Quebec to withdraw from EI and develop its own policy regarding parental leave (Doucet, McKay, & Tremblay, 2009).

Quebec parental policy is more flexible and better paid than the one implemented for the rest of Canada. Unlike EI, under QPIP self-employed workers can opt for a parental paid leave and working parents are only required to have had a minimum level of earnings ($2000) in the year prior to the birth in order to be beneficiaries of this program. Parents in Quebec have two different options of paid leave: the Basic Plan and the Special Plan. The main difference is that while the first one offers a more extensive leave period at a lower remuneration rate, the second gives parents a shorter period of leave, but the remuneration replacement rate is higher. Thus, under the Special Plan parents can opt for 25 weeks of leave with an income replacement rate of 75 percent and under the Basic Plan parents can benefit from 32 weeks of parental leave with the first seven weeks paid at a rate of 70 percent and the remaining 25 weeks left at 55 percent of average earnings (Gouvernement du Quebec, 2015). Both plans have an earning ceiling of $70,000. Low-income families can also qualify for a family supplement which on average is $35.38 per family (Doucet, Lero, McKay, & Tremblay, 2015).

QPIP introduced important changes that affect various kinds of parents differently. Under this program, mothers can opt for maternity leave of 15 or 18 weeks (paid at a rate of

75 percent and 70 percent respectively) and adoptive parents are ineligible for maternity or paternity benefits. Adoptive parents under this program can choose between a special plan of 28 weeks with an income replacement of 75 percent of average earnings or a basic plan of 37 weeks, with 12 weeks at 70 percent and 25 weeks at 55 percent of average earnings.

Additionally, under QPIP there are benefits offered exclusively to fathers. The Quebec paternity leave comprises a non-transferable leave for fathers of three or five weeks paid at a rate of 75 percent and 70 percent respectively (Gouvernement du Quebec, 2015). This kind of leave has been classified in other countries as a 'father's quota' or 'daddy days' (O' Brien, 2009) which means that if the leave is not used by the father it cannot be transferred to the mother or any other caregiver (Gouvernement du Quebec, 2015).

Canadian employees whether or not they live in Quebec might have access to other parental benefits depending on their workplace policies. Some employers offer a supplemental benefit plan that covers some or all the differences between federal EI parental leave/QPIP benefits and the worker's salary. The coverage (mothers, fathers and adoptive parents), replacement rate, and duration of payment vary between companies (Doucet, Lero, McKay, & Tremblay, 2015; Marshall, 2010).

The 2001 extension of leave and the change in the qualifications required for paid leave beneficiaries under EI in Canada and the implementation of paternity leave by the Quebec Government have resulted in an important increase in the number of fathers taking leave. Based on an analysis of EI data, Pérusse (2003) showed that in 2002 the average number of fathers making use of parental benefits each month reached 7,900, which represents a fivefold increase over the 1,600 in 2000. Moreover, according to Mckay, Marshall and Doucet (2012)

while in 2000 around three percent of fathers made use of parental leave, in 2008 this percentage increased importantly to 33 percent and most of the beneficiaries were fathers living in Quebec (82 percent of Quebecois fathers and 12 percent of fathers from outside Quebec). Similarly, in a study examining leave patterns using data from the 2010 Survey of Young Canadians, Findlay and Kohen (2012) show that fathers living in Quebec are more likely to take parental or paternity leave than fathers living in other provinces of the country. Specifically, whereas 76 percent of the children living in Quebec had a father who took a leave, only 26 percent of the children living elsewhere in Canada had the same experience.

There are several factors that can affect fathers' decision to make use of parental programs. In a study about parental leaves in 30 European countries, Platenga and Remery (2005) identify five main factors that determine fathers' use of parental leave: level of payment, organizational and social culture, program flexibility, labour market sector and educational attainment. The return rate of leave takers plays an important role on the take-up rates. The payment level not only affects the likelihood of taking a leave, but also influences which parent will take it. For example, if the rate of leave replacement is low, the parent with the lower income is more likely to make use of the parental leave. Another important element to take into account is the influence of organizational and social culture. Gender expectations at work and home can determine whether a father decides to take a leave and whether an organization supports the decision to take care of family demands. In terms of program flexibility, under what conditions and when a leave can be taken can influence fathers' use of parental leave; having different leave modalities or plans can allow parents to continue working on a part time basis when work conditions make it extremely hard to be absent on a full time basis while still taking care of their children. Additionally, the sector in which the

worker is employed can determine whether to take parental leave. Previous research has shown that public workplaces tend to accommodate absent workers better because they can easily replace leave takers. Problems with career advancement can discourage working fathers from taking a leave. Finally, the last reason identified by the authors was that a father's high level of education can have a positive impact on take-up rates.

A Canadian study analysing some of the factors affecting the proportion of fathers claiming parental leave benefits shows that among the fathers who did not apply for benefits 40 percent did not because it was the preferred arrangement of the mother or the family, 22 percent declared that it was impossible to take time off from work, 17 percent reported it was due to financial constraints and the remaining 21 percent of the participants includes those who did not know, were not interested in the program or stated another reason (Marshall, 2008)**.**

The impact of paternity leave on fathers' earnings

Previous research has suggested that workers who take advantage of family friendly policies may also be subject to penalties. Irrespective of their performance at work, employees with family responsibilities may experience hiring discrimination, not be considered for a promotion, or be terminated because their employers penalize workers who do not meet the "ideal worker" standards (Acker, 1990). Thus, employees who make use of these policies may be perceived as less serious about their careers and as a consequence, they are at risk of experiencing flexibility stigma (Rudman & Mescher, 2013). The results of a study about discrimination against leave takers in Australia show that 27 percent of surveyed fathers mentioned to having experienced some kind of discrimination at their workplace when requesting or taking parental leave or when they returned to work. Among the fathers who

were discriminated against, half declared receiving negative comments and attitudes from colleagues or employers and 47 percent mentioned that the act of discrimination was related to pay, work conditions or labour duties (Australian Human Rights Commission 2014, 2014). Likewise, Judiesch and Lyness (1999), using data from a financial services organization, concluded that male and female managers who made use of leaves of absence received fewer rewards; they were promoted less and received fewer raises than their counterparts who had not taken any leave.

Additionally, male employees who challenge the gender norms at the workplace by making use of these kinds of policies (that are seen as designed for women) may also suffer femininity stigma. Canadian research has argued that although public policy plays an important role on fathers' take-up of parental leave, social and ideological norms in workplaces also shape whether a father makes use of this benefit. Drawing on qualitative data, McKay, Marshall, and Doucet (2012) found that while mothers did not encounter problems when taking a leave, most employers did not expect or encourage fathers to take leave. Fathers in the study were concerned that "taking leave "sent the wrong message" that they were not commited to their jobs" (p.219). As Rudman and Mescher (2013) explained in their research, men who request parental leave "are apt to be similarly feminized as low on agency and high on weakness, which could lead to men being viewed as more punishable than women when they request a family leave" (p. 324). According to Vandello, Bosson, Cohen, Burnaford, and Weaver (2008) being a man is defined by men's behaviour rather than by biological markers, thus manhood must be actively achieved and continuously defended by men's actions. Therefore, leave takers risk penalties in the workplace when they make use of their rights to meet family obligations because they are not perceived as "real men".

In their study, Allen and Russell (1999) found that American men who were characterized as taking a parental leave were less likely to be recommended for rewards and were perceived as less comitted to their jobs than their male counterparts who had not taken a leave of absence. Additionally, in their research on the impact of paternity leave on fathers'long-term earnings, Rege and Solli (2013), using a difference-in-differences model, concluded that fathers in Norway who took paternity leave for four weeks, during the child's first year, decreased their future earnings by 1.4 percent. Thus, taking any kind of leave of absence for parental reasons may have a negative impact on fathers' future career outcomes.

In summary, previous research has suggested that there are two models to explain the impact of fatherhood on men's earnings. According to the first "new" or nurturing model, fathers express their parental concerns by decreasing their participation in paid work in order to spend more time with their children. In the second, "breadwinner" model, fathers express their concerns by increasing their participation in paid work in order to provide economic support for their children. Based on the above discussion, in the breadwinner model fathers would tend to earn more than childless men, but in line with the nurturing model those who have taken a leave would earn less than non-leave takers. Additionally, quantitative studies investigating the earnings gap have shown that in addition to age, race and other social demographics, human capital characteristics, number of hours at work, workplace conditions, and marital status have an effect on earnings. However, when all these variables are taken into account and the earnings gap persists, another kind of explanation that takes into account how men, fathers and leave takers are perceived at the workplace needs to be considered. The following chapter, drawing on gender theories, offers a plausible explanation for the

persistence of an earnings gap between fathers and childless men and between leave takers and non-leave takers.

Theory

In order to explain how fatherhood and paid work are related a better understanding of the social mechanisms behind that relationship must first be explored. In looking at this relationship this research uses the concepts of gender as a social force that shapes personal identities and social structures as the main theoretical framework. In this research, gender is approached as a multilevel structure in the sense that it serves to explain mutually reinforcing processes at the individual level, the interactional level, and the macro-structural/ institutional level (Ridgeway & Smith - Lovin, 1999; Risman, 2004). From this perspective, three other concepts are explored: workplaces, fatherhood, and family policies.

Social scientists and feminist scholars have long argued the importance of gender as an analytical category to understand social relations mostly because individuals use gender as a primary frame to organize their everyday social relations. People use gender not only to make sense of others and themselves, but also to organize and coordinate their actions in social settings such as workplaces (Ridgeway, 2011). Gender shapes the relationships between men and women, men and men, as well as the way men construct their own identity. Thus, men and women will act and relate to others according to what gender social norms have taught them to do.

Gender is a social construction that varies across time and place. The social meanings that people attach to being a woman or being a man vary according to the specific context where they take place. The way men and women experience gender shapes the way they conceive it, which has an influence on how individuals structure their future actions. Thus, as interactionists have argued, gender, as with socially constructed phenomena, is enacted

through social relations (Ridgeway, 2011). Gender is created within the group rather than being something that resides within an individual.

Among the interactionist approaches that have been used to analyze gender, there is a particularly important one that will be used to explain the relationship between fatherhood and paid work: Status characteristics theory.

Status characteristics theory

This theory forms part of the expectation states theory and argues that categorization plays a meaningful role in the status people assign to others, which has an important impact on the social expectations that individuals construct about others. Through categorization individuals use cues of cultural assumptions about appearance and behaviour to represent differences, and in doing so they attach greater value, worthiness or expected competence to one category of the distinction than another. Common examples of these processes are race, social class and gender categorization (Berger, Fisek, Norman, & Zelditch, 1977).

The primary focus of the status characteristics theory is on explaining, first, how actors use status information from their social environment to generate expectations, and second, how these expectations have an impact on actors' behaviour toward one another. Therefore the theory is especially well suited to explaining the distribution of power and prestige among actors who share a specific goal (Wagner & Berger, 2002). The developer of the theory, Joseph Berger contended that "differences in the evaluations the actors make of specific task performances are sufficient to generate such expectation states. In turn, these expectations determine the future course of interaction —in particular, the distribution of power- and prestige-related behaviours among the actors" (p. 42).

According to Berger and Webster (2006) there are four assumptions at the core of this theory. First, status information is able to shape performance expectations when the characteristic becomes salient for actors in the situation, in other words, when it is relevant to the task. For example, the chances of being used in biracial or mixed gender groups are higher than in settings where all actors share the same characteristic. Similarly, if the tasks are culturally classified as feminine or masculine, the gender status characteristic probably will become salient. Second, salient status characteristics will shape individuals' expectations for themselves and others even if it is not logically relevant to the task. Status advantages tend to be generalized from one situation to the next. As a result, an actor who is advantaged in a particular situation usually behaves and is treated as if he/she has greater performance capacities to deal with in a variety of tasks, even those that are not related to the status characteristic in question.

The third assumption claims that because individuals are different in many ways, multiple status characteristics are generally salient in any given situation. Individuals form their performance expectations of themselves compared to others based on a combination of the negative and positive status and competence implications of all salient status characteristics, each weighted by its relevance to the context. Finally, according to this theory an actor's task-related evaluations and behaviours, compared to another, will be a direct result of the aggregated expectation (combination of positive and negative status) (Berger & Webster, 2006; Ridgeway & Correll, 2004).

As can be noticed, status characteristics theory focuses on goal-oriented interactions so it is especially well suited to explaining settings like the workplace. When individuals get together to complete a task, they construct an expectation, based on their status beliefs, of their

personal performance and their peers' performance in completing that shared task. Although performance expectations tend to be unconscious, they still have an impact on how individuals engage in the interaction, how others react to them, and how individuals relate to each other. Due to this, status characteristics have significant effects on creating subtle barriers to advancement in the workplace for workers who are in the lower status categories of these characteristics (Ridgeway, 1997). Thus, status characteristics theory helps explain not only how workers construct expectations and interact with each other, but also how status differentiation generates inequality in the workplace.

Sociologist Ridgeway and her colleagues have developed a theoretical extension of status characteristics theory called status construction theory. Her theory seeks to explain how status beliefs about social differences develop and become widely shared in a given society (Ridgeway, 2006). Specifically, most of her research has focused on how gender can be understood as a status marker and how gender inequality persists in societies regardless of continuous socioeconomic and political changes.

Gender as a status marker

The argument that Ridgeway makes in most of her work is that gender has been constructed as a status characteristic in American society. She argues that there is a widespread and deeply held belief that women are different and inferior in terms of status compared to men. This hegemonic status belief about gender shapes social interactions regulated by performance expectations, thus putting women at a disadvantage relative to men, and leading to the assumption that they are less competent than their male counterparts. Ridgeway explains that as these gender beliefs continue to be reinforced through social interactions, gender inequality will persist (Ridgeway, 2009, 2011).

Ridgeway contends that, as individuals constantly use gender as a primary frame for organizing social interactions, they activate gender status beliefs in most domestic and public settings. In the process of defining self in relation to others, individuals evoke hegemonic cultural beliefs about gender. These beliefs are shared stereotypes about how "most people" see the typical man or woman and have an important effect on how people coordinate their public behaviour (Ridgeway, 2009).

Unlike categories such as race and social class, gender permeates nearly all social interactions. While in segregated societies people from a higher social class may never interact with individuals from a lower class, they all come across at least one man or woman on a daily basis. Interactions between men and women can take place at home, in public spaces, and in workplaces, leading individuals to use sex categorization practically unconsciously in almost every social setting, which activates individuals' gender beliefs, thus biasing the actions and evaluations of self and others in gender consistent directions. Ridgeway (2011) argue that if initially one category has received power or resource advantages it will reflect on social interactions and as a consequence it will shape individuals' status beliefs. Thus, if men have historically received a power advantage, social processes where individuals share a task are likely to transform this advantage into gender status beliefs.

Gendered organizations theory

Turning gender to a more structural level of analysis, the gendered organization theory claims that gender is embedded in the core structure of social organizations. Its main developer Joan Acker, has argued that organizations are not structured by gender neutral practices. This theory claims that gender is a basic component of the functioning of a given organization because rules that coordinate behaviour within organizations take into account stereotypical

assumptions about women and men. As a result, organizations, through practices, form gendered individuals and shape gendered interactions (Acker, 1990).

The theory asserts that gender permeates the macrostructure of an organization, affecting as a result, its processes, its practices, and the individuals who compose it. Thus, a gendered organization is one in which "advantage and disadvantage, exploitation and control, action and emotion, meaning and identity, are patterned through and in terms of a distinction between male and female, masculine and feminine" (Acker, 1990, p. 146). According to Acker, organizations produce gender through five interconnected processes. First, organizations create divisions among the participants based on gender; they are reflected through divisions of physical locations, power or allowed behaviours and means for maintaining these divisions. Second, gendered organizations create images and symbols to support and reinforce these divisions. Third, gendered organizations produce types of interactions between women and men, women and women, and men and men that reinforce these divisions and inequality. Fourth, gendered organizations also impact individuals' identities affecting, for example, the choice of appropriate work, language use, and clothing that their participants make. Finally, gendered practices within organizations contribute, through organizational logic, to creating and reinforcing social structures within the organization (Acker, 1990).

Gendered organization theory has been used most often to explain dynamics at the workplace. This theory challenges the organizational logic of workplaces that sees jobs and hierarchies as abstract gender neutral categories of differentiation. A job or a position within a given organization is seen as completely separate from the person who may hold it. According to Acker (1990) this abstract worker, in order to be suitable for the position, must

be a disembodied worker who exists only for the work and cannot have other obligations outside the boundaries of the job. Acker (1990) contends that the closest this disembodied worker comes to an actual worker is a stereotypical version of a male worker whose life is assumed to center on paid employment, while someone else – usually a woman – takes care of his personal needs and his children. Thus, she concludes that this abstract idea of jobs already assumes a gendered division of labour at home where women's and men's roles are clearly defined.

The meanings of fatherhood

Ridgeway (2011) has argued that in a system of gender inequality men and women are viewed and treated differently in public and private settings. Men tend to be seen as more agentic and instrumental while women are described as more communal (Eagly, Wood, & Diekman, 2000). These widespread gender beliefs are not only responsible for constructing stereotypes about womanhood and manhood, but also for creating stereotypes about other roles that individuals perform in society, one of those being a parent.

Under these widely held beliefs mothers and fathers are expected to behave differently. Whereas motherhood is understood as a "child centred, expert-guided, emotionally absorbing, labour-intensive, and financially expensive" experience (Doucet, 2006), fathers are seen as instrumental providers. Fatherhood then signals conformity not only to hegemonic masculine expectations, but also to the ideal worker standards. Fathers are seen as individuals whose identity revolves around work and, as a result, workplaces perceive them as more committed workers. Thus, stereotypical notions of women and men make fathers, unlike mothers, perfect candidates for workplaces.

This understanding of fatherhood, based on stereotypical gender notions, not only shapes how fathers are perceived by others at the workplace, but also how they see themselves. In his research exploring the meanings that middle class men attach to being a father, Townsend (2002) argues that being married, having children, holding a steady job, and owning a home are part of a package that men use to measure their own and others' success. Although many men may opt out of this path, the package deal serves as the predominant cultural script that describes the life that most people, including the men themselves, think a man should have.

According to his research, being a father has four facets that are interconnected: emotional closeness, protection, endowment, and provision. Among these four characteristics that fathers consider important to being a good father, being a provider is deemed to be the basic pillar because it serves as a means to achieve the other three. Fathers want to have a close relationship with their children; to protect their children from threats and fears; and to endow their children with opportunities that can give them a better life. Having a job or being able to provide is seen as an expression of paternal love because it can allow fathers to give their children a safe place to live, set up the conditions for mothers to stay home and take care of them, and provide a good education. Townsend maintains that employment and fatherhood tend to be mutually reinforcing; having children motivates fathers to dedicate themselves to employment, and at the same time supporting a family is central to successful fatherhood (Townsend, 2002).

Family policies

There is a wide range of perspectives in the literature on family policies. Some of them focus on the children's development; others center their analysis on work-family conflict while

others develop a critique of the welfare state. In this research I use Brighouse and Wright's (2008) approach that pays particular attention to the impact of family policies on gender inequality.

Brighouse and Wright (2008) propose that family policies can be classified in three types of parental policies: Equality-impeding leaves, Equality-enabling leaves, and Equality-promoting leaves. The first type of policies are those oriented to support dual-earner families as a unit, but without paying attention to the impact that they can make on producing an unequal division of labour within the family. These kinds of policies provide, for example, leaves that are to be used exclusively by mothers or unpaid leaves to be used by any member of the family. On the other hand, the Equality-enabling leaves offer a more generous paid parental leave to families, also considering them as a unit. These policies, as they are more generous, encourage men to engage in childcare and families to employ more egalitarian strategies in terms of the division of unpaid work within the family, but they do not put pressure on families to adopt these strategies.

Lastly, the third kind of policies, equality-promoting leaves seek to create incentives "that put some pressures on families to move toward a more egalitarian gender distribution of caregiving activities within the family" (Brighouse & Wright, 2008, p. 361). There are moderate and radical versions of this kind of policy. An example of moderate policies would be individualized parental leaves where each parent is assigned a certain length of leave, which cannot be transferred to another member of the family. A more radical approach would be to assign the amount of time a mother takes on leave depending on the amount of time a father takes.

Using a gender approach I examined how gender is enacted with in organizations such as workplaces (Acker, 1990), the meanings that men attach to being a fathers (Townsend, 2002) and how certain social policies seek to achieve gender equality (Brighouse & Wright, 2008). I argue that due to ideal worker norms and stereotypical notions of fatherhood, fathers tend to be seen as individuals whose identities revolve around work. Based on what has been presented in the review of the literature and in this chapter, this study adds to the Canadian literature on gender, work, and family, by assessing whether Canadian men receive a fatherhood bonus and if leave takers experience an earnings penalty.

Hypotheses

Based on the above discussion and according to the breadwinner model of fatherhood, I predict that fathers in Canada earn more than childless men. Further, in accordance with the perspective of the new/involved father, fathers who do not conform to normative pressures to specialize in breadwinning and decide to take paternity/ parental leave experience a penalty compared to fathers who do not make use of it. As evidenced in the literature review, previous research has tested different explanatory models in order to assess the earnings differences between fathers and childless men and between leave and non-leave takers. In this research, I will explore four of those explanations (Marital status, human capital, participation in paid work, workplace characteristics) through the development of a first set of hypotheses and seven (Marital status, human capital, participation in paid work, workplace characteristics, participation in housework, and family structure) through the development of a second set of hypotheses.

Since I am not able to measure workplaces practices with the survey data used in these analyses, based on the theory of gendered organization and the breadwinner model of

fatherhood, I consider workplace discrimination in favor of fathers and/ or against leave takers as a potential explanation for a persistent earnings gap between fathers and childless men and between leave takers and non-leave takers.

Hypothesis 1: Fathers receive an earnings bonus compared to childless men.

This is because

[H1a] More highly educated people and men who have taken few interruptions from work earn more and fathers have more education and have taken fewer interruptions than childless men.

[H1b] People who work for more hours earn more and fathers are more likely to work more than childless men.

[H1c] Married people earn more and fathers are more likely to be married than childless men.

[H1d] People who work in trades, transport and related occupations (a male dominated occupation) as regular employees and are covered by a union contract earn more and fathers are more likely to work under those conditions than childless men.

Hypothesis 2: Fathers who take paternity/parental leave earn less than fathers who do not.

This is because

[H2a] More highly educated people earn more and fathers who take paternity/parental leave have less education than fathers who do not

[H2b] People who work for more hours earn more and fathers who take paternity/parental leave work fewer hours than fathers who do not.

[H2c] People who are not married earn less and fathers who take paternity/parental leave are less likely to be married than fathers who do not.

[H2d] People who carry out female household tasks will receive less of a bonus than those who do not carry out housework and fathers who take paternity/parental leave are more likely to perform female household tasks.

[H2e] People who carry out household tasks will receive less of a bonus than those who do not carry out housework and fathers who take paternity/parental leave are more likely to perform household tasks.

[H2f] People who lived in a household with a traditional division of labor, male breadwinner/partner caregiver, earn more and fathers who take paternity/parental leave are less likely to have this family structure than fathers who do not.

[H2g] People who work in white collar occupations as regular employees and are covered by a union contract earn more and fathers who take paternity/parental leave are less likely to work under those conditions than fathers who do not a leave.

Methods

Data

For this analysis, I used the cross-sectional General Social Survey (GSS), conducted in 2011 that collected information on Canadian families. The survey gathered information on family background, marriage, parenthood, division of household labour, paternity/parental leave and work activity in order to measure changes in society related to well-being and living conditions. These data were particularly useful for this research because they provided detailed information on paid work, unpaid work, parenthood and parental leave. The data are based on a representative sample of the Canadian population[6] with women and men aged 15 and over who lived in Canada as the unit of analysis. In terms of sampling procedures, "households were selected for the survey by Random Digit Dialing. The telephone numbers in the sample were selected using the Elimination of Non-working Banks technique" (Statistics Canada, 2012). In order to carry out a more accurate analysis the confidential microdata file was used in the Carleton, Ottawa, Outaouais Research Data Centre (COOL-RDC). This version was especially valuable to this study, as it allowed access to the main dependent variable (earnings) measured at the interval ratio level as well as detailed information regarding the relationship between fathers and children that enabled to construct different measures of fatherhood.

For the purposes of this research, two different samples were analyzed. In the first analysis the sample was restricted to males who were 18 and over and worked at a paid job or business and the second analysis used a sample of males who were 18 and over, worked at a

[6] With the exception of Residents of the Yukon, Northwest Territories, and Nunavut and Full-time residents of institutions.

paid job or business, were living with a female[7] partner or spouse and have had or adopted a child in the last five years. I dropped cases because of missing data on the dependent variable in both samples which consisted of 1167 and 146 cases respectively. In the remaining unweighted samples, 5 percent of the cases of the first sample did not include information in at least one of the independent variables. In the second sample three percent of the cases had missing values on the independent variables. After eliminating these cases, the final samples for the two analyses consisted of 4,570 and 744 men respectively.

Measures

Dependent variable

In order to assess earnings differences between fathers and childless men (H1) and fathers who took paternity leave and those who did not (H2) the dependent variable in the analysis was the respondent's earnings. This variable was measured by the annual personal income of the respondent[8]. To address the fact that income data is usually right skewed, individual responses were transformed into their natural logarithm. Using the natural logarithm of earnings, one interprets the regression coefficients as the percentage change in earnings associated with a one-unit increase in the independent variables.

Independent variables

The main independent variable in the first analysis was fatherhood, which building on previous research (Glauber 2008; Kaufman and Uhlenberg 2000), was measured in three

[7] No respondents in the sample declared to be living with a male partner or spouse.
[8] 85 percent and 84 percent of the selected participants in each sample declared that their main source of income was "Employment including wages, salaries, commissions and tips or "Self-employment such as unincorporated business, professional practice or Farm"

different ways[9]: being a father of a child under 19, number of children the respondent had, and age of the youngest child. I used these three measures of fatherhood to acknowledge that as the experience of being a father is diverse its effects on men's working lives/earnings may also vary depending on how fatherhood is measured. The first measure recognizes that the experience of having children under 19 could have a stronger impact on men' lives because underage children are still dependants of their parents; they tend to live in the parent's household and are reliant primarily on their parents' incomes. The respondent was considered to be a father if he has fathered, step fathered or adopted at least one child under the age of 19. Fathers were coded as 1 and childless men as 0. The second measure of fatherhood acknowledges that having more children could have a bigger effect on men's lives. To address the left skew of the variable number of children, a set of dummy variables indicating whether the respondent has one child, two children, or three or more children were used. Lastly, measuring the age of the youngest child takes into account that having younger children may have a greater impact on men's lives. This variable was measured as a set of dummy variables indicating whether the age of the youngest child was under 5 years old (preschoolers), between 5 and 12 years old (elementary school-age) or between 13 and 18 years old (high school-age). The reference category in these three measures of fatherhood was childless men. Thus, by having these three measures of fatherhood we can obtain a more nuanced understanding of the relationship between fatherhood and earnings for men in Canada.

For the second analysis, only fathers who have had or adopted a child in the last five years were included in the sample and the main independent variable was whether the

[9] In order to take into account that having children may have a different long-term effect on men's lives, in a complementary analysis fatherhood was also measured as having a child regardless of the child's age.

respondent was a leave taker. Respondents were considered to be leave takers if they have taken paternity/parental leave before or after the birth/adoption of their (youngest) child with 'did not take a leave' as the reference category. Leave takers were coded as 1 and fathers who did not take a leave as 0.

In the first analysis I measured marital status using married as the reference category comparing those single (never married), living in common law, and divorced (including those who were separated and widowed) while in the second analysis I measured it with married as 1 and cohabitating as the reference category, as all respondents were married or cohabiting.

Human capital was measured in terms of educational attainment, with a set of dummy variables indicating Doctorate, masters or degree in Medicine, Dentistry, Veterinary or Optometry; Diploma or certificate from community college, CEGEP, nursing, trade, technical, vocational school or business college; Some university, community college, CEGEP, nursing, trade, technical, vocational school or business college; High school diploma, Some secondary, high school, elementary school or no schooling, with Bachelor undergraduate degree or teacher's college as the reference category.

I also included the number of work interruptions the respondent has had as a result of being away from work for more than 3 months because of a lack of work, sickness, paternity/parental leave, retirement, or other reason. Participation in paid work was measured as the average number of hours per week that the respondents spent in paid work.

Measures of workplace characteristics included terms of employment at current job, union membership, and occupation. Terms of employment was measured as a set of dummy variables indicating seasonal, term, casual or on-call employee; self-employed, with regular

employee (no contractual or anticipated termination date) as the reference category. I included a dichotomous variable measuring whether the respondent was a union member or covered by a union contract or collective agreement in his current job. Covered was coded as 1 and self-employed or not covered was coded as 0. Lastly, in the first analysis Occupation was measured as a set of dummy variables indicating Management occupations; Business, finance and administrative occupations; Natural and applied sciences and related occupations; Health occupations; Occupations in social science, education, government service and religion; Occupations in art, culture, recreation and sport; Sales and services occupations; Occupations unique to primary industry; Occupations unique to processing, manufacturing and utilities, with Trades, transport and equipment operators and related occupations as the reference category. In the second analysis, due to sample size restrictions[10], Occupation was measured as a series of indicator variables, coded as Blue collar, Sales and services occupations with White collar occupations as the reference category.

Participation in housework was disaggregated into two variables that measured the degree of participation of the respondent in traditionally female tasks and the total degree of participation in all tasks (shared and feminine tasks)[11]. Based on Noonan's research (2001), tasks that have been traditionally done by women are: preparing daily meals, cleaning the house, doing dishes, doing laundry, and organizing the household's social life. While tasks that have been traditionally shared equally between men and women are: doing grocery shopping, household finances including payment of bills, daily household purchases, and occasional

[10] While the first sample is comprised of 4,570 cases, the second is comprised of only 744.
[11] Traditionally male tasks were not included in the analysis because the GSS only have one measure of this kind of tasks (doing outside work, like repairs) which did not apply for an important number of participants, probably because not all of them live in a house.

more expensive purchases. The survey asked respondents who in their couple mainly takes care of each of the mentioned housework tasks. Their responses were recoded 2 if a man declared he was primarily taking care of that task, 1 if a man declared that the task was shared equally, and zero otherwise ('Mostly your spouse/partner', 'Neither'). The answers to these nine questions were summed in order to create two independent variables of housework; one equaling the total participation in housework of each participant and other equaling the participation in traditionally women tasks. Low values indicate a low degree of participation whereas high values indicate a high degree of participation. Finally, I generated a dummy variable using spouse/partner's employment status as a measure of the family structure of the couple, where respondents living with a spouse/partner who was working more than 30 hours per week were coded as dual-earner couples and breadwinner/partner caregiver as the reference category.

Control variables

To control for other possible covariates of the independent and dependent variables, four socio-demographic control variables were included in the multivariate analysis: being a member of a visible minority, age of the respondent, urbanicity/rurality, and province of residence of the respondent. I measured being a member of a visible minority with dummy variables for 'visible minority' with 'not a visible minority[12]' as the reference category. The variable age of the respondent was measured in years, to address the skewness of the distribution individual age responses were transformed into their natural logarithm. I included a dichotomous variable measuring whether the respondent was living in an urban area with

[12] According to the survey report "Not a visible minority includes Aboriginal, single origin White and multiple origin White/Latin American and White/Arab-West Asian, as per Census definition".

rural as the reference category. Finally, whereas in the first analysis province of residence was measured as a set of dummy variables indicating Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia with Quebec as the reference category, in the second analysis Quebec was compared against all the other provinces because this province is regulated by a different parental leave policy than the rest of Canada, the reference category was living outside Quebec.

Methods

A series of t-tests for differences between means and proportions followed by multiple regression models were used to assess the impact of fatherhood on men's earnings. Mean differences tests were carried out in order to identify differences between fathers and childless men and fathers who took paternity/parental leave and fathers who did not. Ordinary least squares (OLS) multiple regression analysis allows researchers not only to assess the relationship between two variables, but also to estimate the relative importance of independent variables in affecting a dependent variable (Jackson, 1999).

In the first analysis seven models were tested in multiple regression analyses comparing fathers and childless men (H1) using the three different measures mentioned above. In the first model, the independent variable of interest is fatherhood. In the second model I included the socio-demographic control variables. In order to explore the research hypotheses each variable or set of variables representing an explanation was independently added to the socio-demographic variables. Thus, the third model added human capital measures, including highest educational grade completed and number of work interruptions, while the fourth model added men's participation in paid work, and the fifth model added marital status. The sixth model added to the control variables the workplace characteristics, including occupation,

terms of employment and union membership. Finally, model seven included all the variables previously discussed.

In the analyses comparing fathers who took paternity/parental leave and fathers who did not (H2), ten models were tested in multiple regressions. In the first model, the independent variable of interest is whether the respondent took paternity/parental leave. In the second model I included the socio-demographic control variables. The third model added highest educational grade completed by the respondent, while the fourth model added men's participation in paid work instead. In addition to the socio-demographic variables the fifth model added marital status while model six and seven added participation in female housework tasks and total participation in housework respectively. Model eight added family structure instead. The ninth model added to the control variables the workplace characteristics, including occupation, terms of employment and whether the respondent was covered by a union. Finally, model ten included all the variables previously discussed in this section. The following equations show in detail all seventeen models.

Hypothesis 1: Fathers receive an earnings bonus compared to childless men:

Model 1:

$$\hat{y}_1 = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{Fatherhood} + \epsilon_1$$

Model 2:

$$\hat{y}_2 = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{Fatherhood} + \beta_2 X_{age} + \beta_3 X_{area} + \beta_4 X_{minority} + \beta_5 X_{province} + \epsilon_2$$

Model 3:

$$\hat{y}_3 = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{Fatherhood} + \beta_2 X_{age} + \beta_3 X_{area} + \beta_4 X_{minority} + \beta_5 X_{province} + \beta_6 X_{human\ capital} + \epsilon_3$$

Model 4:

$$\hat{y}_4 = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{Fatherhood} + \beta_2 X_{age} + \beta_3 X_{area} + \beta_4 X_{minority} + \beta_5 X_{province} + \beta_6 X_{paid\ work} + \epsilon_4$$

Model 5:

$$\hat{y}_5 = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{Fatherhood} + \beta_2 X_{age} + \beta_3 X_{area} + \beta_4 X_{minority} + \beta_5 X_{province} + \beta_6 X_{marital\ status} + \epsilon_5$$

Model 6:

$$\hat{y}_6 = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{Fatherhood} + \beta_2 X_{age} + \beta_3 X_{area} + \beta_4 X_{minority} + \beta_5 X_{province} + \beta_6 X_{workplace\ \ characteristics} + \epsilon_6$$

Model 7:

$$\hat{y}_7 = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{Fatherhood} + \beta_2 X_{age} + \beta_3 X_{area} + \beta_4 X_{minority} + \beta_5 X_{province} + \beta_6 X_{human\ capital} + \beta_7 X_{paid\ work} + \beta_8 X_{marital\ status} + \beta_9 X_{workplace\ characteristics} + \epsilon_7$$

Hypothesis 2: Fathers who take paternity/parental leave earn less than fathers who do not:

Model 1:

$$\hat{y}_1 = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{Leave\ takers} + \epsilon_1$$

Model 2:

$$\hat{y}_2 = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{Leave\ takers} + \beta_2 X_{age} + \beta_3 X_{area} + \beta_4 X_{minority} + \beta_5 X_{province} + \epsilon_2$$

Model 3:

$$\hat{y}_3 = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{Leave\ takers} + \beta_2 X_{age} + \beta_3 X_{area} + \beta_4 X_{minority} + \beta_5 X_{province} + \epsilon_2 + \beta_6 X_{education} + \epsilon_3$$

Model 4:

$$\hat{y}_4 = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{Leave\ takers} + \beta_2 X_{age} + \beta_3 X_{area} + \beta_4 X_{minority} + \beta_5 X_{province} + \beta_6 X_{paid\ work} + \epsilon_4$$

Model 5:

$$\hat{y}_5 = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{Leave\ takers} + \beta_2 X_{age} + \beta_3 X_{area} + \beta_4 X_{minority} + \beta_5 X_{province} + \beta_6 X_{marital\ status} + \epsilon_5$$

Model 6:

$$\hat{y}_6 = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{Leave\ takers} + \beta_2 X_{age} + \beta_3 X_{area} + \beta_4 X_{minority} + \beta_5 X_{province} + \beta_6 X_{female\ housework} + \epsilon_6$$

Model 7:

$$\hat{y}_7 = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{Leave\ takers} + \beta_2 X_{age} + \beta_3 X_{area} + \beta_4 X_{minority} + \beta_5 X_{province} + \beta_6 X_{housework} + \epsilon_7$$

Model 8:

$$\hat{y}_8 = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{Leave\ takers} + \beta_2 X_{age} + \beta_3 X_{area} + \beta_4 X_{minority} + \beta_5 X_{province} + \beta_6 X_{family\ structure} + \epsilon_8$$

Model 9:

$$\hat{y}_9 = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{Leave\ takers} + \beta_2 X_{age} + \beta_3 X_{area} + \beta_4 X_{minority} + \beta_5 X_{province} + \beta_6 X_{workplace\ \ characteristics} + \epsilon_9$$

Model 10:

$$\hat{y}_{10} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{Leave\ takers} + \beta_2 X_{age} + \beta_3 X_{area} + \beta_4 X_{minority} + \beta_5 X_{province} + \beta_6 X_{education} + \beta_7 X_{paid\ work} + \beta_8 X_{marital\ status} + \beta_9 X_{housework} + \beta_{10} X_{family\ structure} + \beta_{11} X_{workplace\ characteristics} + \epsilon_{10}$$

Finally, it is worth mentioning that all the analyses were conducted using person level weights from the GSS 2011, cycle 25 in order to make sure the sample was representative of the population. Bootstrapping techniques were then used adjust the standard errors that would be underestimated due to the increased weighted sample size. This allows for more conservative hypothesis tests and reduces the likelihood of committing a Type I error.

Results

Comparing fathers and childless men: Descriptive Statistics

For descriptive purposes, results from the mean and proportion difference tests, for all the variables included in the first analysis (H1), are presented in Table 1. When defining fatherhood as having at least one child under the age of 19, important differences become clear between fathers and childless men. First, it is important to mention that the sample is evenly distributed between the two groups, since men with adult children are considered "childless"; 43 percent of the sample are childless men while 57 percent are fathers. Focusing on earnings, as predicted by hypothesis 1, we see that fathers earn significantly more than those who have not fathered, step fathered or adopted at least one child under 19 years old. On average, fathers report making $80,560.16 whereas men without children make $64,895.64 per year.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Fathers (n=1,956) and Childless Men (n=2,614)

	Fathers			Childless Men	
	Mean		SD	Mean	SD
Income	80560.16	***	89418.52	64895.64	102709.10
Income (logged)	11.06141	***	0.65	10.78	0.73
Socio-Demographics					
Age	41.02	***	8.13	43.44	14.94
Age (logged)	3.69		0.20	3.70	0.38
Urban	0.81		0.39	0.80	0.40
Minority	0.18		0.38	0.15	0.36
Newfoundland and Labrador	0.01		0.12	0.01	0.12
Prince Edward Island	0.00		0.06	0.00	0.06
Nova Scotia	0.02	*	0.15	0.03	0.17
New Brunswick	0.02		0.14	0.02	0.15
Quebec	0.21		0.41	0.22	0.41
Ontario	0.39		0.49	0.39	0.49
Manitoba	0.04		0.20	0.04	0.19
Saskatchewan	0.03		0.18	0.03	0.17
Alberta	0.13		0.33	0.12	0.33
British Columbia	0.13		0.34	0.13	0.34

Human Capital					
Doctorate, masters or degree in Medicine, Dentistry, Veterinary or Optometry	0.11	**	0.32	0.08	0.27
Bachelor undergraduate degree or teacher's college	0.21	*	0.41	0.18	0.39
Diploma or certificate from community college, CEGEP, nursing, trade, technical, vocational school or business college	0.35		0.48	0.31	0.46
Some university, community college, CEGEP, nursing, trade, technical, vocational school or business college	0.12		0.33	0.14	0.35
High school diploma	0.12	***	0.33	0.17	0.37
Some secondary, high school, elementary school or no schooling	0.08	**	0.27	0.11	0.32
Work Interruptions	0.46		0.81	0.49	0.83
Work Hours	45.02	***	11.46	42.99	12.15
Marital Status					
Married	0.73	***	0.44	0.47	0.50
Single	0.03	***	0.17	0.33	0.47
Living in common law	0.18	**	0.39	0.14	0.35
Divorced, separated and widowed	0.05		0.22	0.06	0.23
Workplace characteristics					
Management occupations	0.14	***	0.35	0.10	0.31
Business, finance and administrative occupations	0.09	*	0.29	0.12	0.32
Natural and applied sciences and related occupations	0.12		0.33	0.12	0.32
Health occupations	0.02		0.15	0.03	0.17
Occupations in social science, education, government service and religion	0.07		0.26	0.06	0.24
Occupations in art, culture, recreation and sport	0.02		0.15	0.02	0.14
Sales and services occupations	0.14	***	0.34	0.19	0.39
Trades, transport and equipment operators and related occupations	0.27		0.44	0.26	0.44
Occupations unique to primary industry	0.04		0.20	0.04	0.19
Occupations unique to processing, manufacturing and utilities	0.07		0.26	0.06	0.24
Union membership	0.25		0.44	0.25	0.43
Regular employee	0.77		0.42	0.74	0.44
Seasonal, term, casual or on-call employee	0.05	***	0.21	0.09	0.29
Self-employed	0.18		0.39	0.16	0.37

Note: These data are weighted.

** p≤0.05; ** p≤0.01; *** p≤0.001*

Regarding the socio-demographic variables, fathers are significantly younger than childless men. The average age of fathers is 41 years old while the average age of men without children under 19 is 43 years old. Only a small proportion of the working men declared to be part of a visible minority. Specifically, 18 percent of fathers and 15 percent of childless men are members of a visible minority group. In terms of the province and area where the participants inhabit, consistent with national analyses of population, most working men live in urban areas and within the provinces of Ontario and Quebec regardless of whether they have children. There are no significant differences between fathers and childless men regarding the province they live with the only exception of the province of Nova Scotia where the number of fathers is statistically significantly smaller than the number of childless men, two and three percent respectively.

When looking at the human capital variables, there are important differences between the groups. Fathers are significantly more likely than childless men to have attained a doctorate or master's degree or a degree in medicine, dentistry, veterinary or optometry; 11 and eight percent respectively. Similarly, fathers are more likely to have obtained a bachelor diploma than childless men. On the other hand, childless men are more likely to be in the categories that include "Some secondary, high school diploma or no schooling" and "High school diploma" than fathers. Only in the categories of diploma or certificate from community college or some university or community college are there no important differences between both groups. About a third of working men have obtained a college or university diploma. In relation to work interruptions, all working men tend to have the same average number of interruptions, which is about 0.47. We found partial support for hypothesis 1a that fathers have more education and haven taken fewer interruptions from work. Although fathers are more

highly educated people, they have taken the same number of interruptions from work than childless men.

Turning next to personal characteristics such as work hours and marital status, in line with our expectations, fathers work significantly more hours than childless men. On average, fathers work 45 hours whereas childless men work 43 hours per week. Also, compared to childless men, fathers are significantly more likely to live with a partner or spouse. Among fathers, 73 percent are married and 18 percent live in a common law relationship. Regarding childless men, although almost half are married, they are much more likely than fathers to be single, 33 percent versus three percent. Both groups are equally likely to be divorced, separated and widowed. Thus, the results support Hypotheses 1b and 1c that fathers work for more hours and are more likely to be married than childless men.

Finally, looking at the workplace characteristics, although most men work as regular employees in trades and transport and equipment operators and related occupations, there are differences between fathers and childless men in terms of occupation and type of employment. Fathers are more likely than childless men to work in management. Specifically, 14 percent of fathers work in this occupation while only 10 percent of men without children under 19 work in this field. At the same time, childless men are more likely than fathers to work in business and sales and services occupations. Table 1 shows that 19 percent of childless men work in sales compared to only 14 percent of fathers in the same area. In relation to union membership, both groups are equally covered by a union; 25 percent of fathers and childless men are covered by a union contract. Lastly, in terms of the type of employment, working men regardless of their status of fatherhood tend to be regular employees. Specifically, 77 percent of fathers and 74 percent of childless men work as regular employees. However, men without

children are significantly more likely than fathers to work as a seasonal, term, casual or on call employee; five percent of fathers and nine percent of childless men work as seasonal or term employees. In this sample, both groups are equally likely to be self-employed. Regarding hypothesis 1d, no evidence was found to support the statement that fathers are more likely to work in trades and related occupations, be regular employees or covered by a union contract than childless men.

To take into account that having children may have a different long-term effect on men's lives a complementary analysis was conducted measuring being a father as ever having experienced fatherhood regardless of the age of the children. The results (see Table 8 in Appendix B) showed that the characteristics of both groups, fathers and childless men, followed a similar trend to the first analysis. Fathers were more likely to earn more, be better educated, work more hours and be married than childless men. Although in this analysis fathers were significantly more likely to be older, have work interruptions, and be self-employed than their childless counterparts, the earnings gap between the groups widened. Fathers reported earning an average of $80,560.16 per year whereas men without children earned $53,564.71. Because the earnings gap between the groups in both analysis exhibited a similar pattern and the results of the first analysis showed a smaller gap, I took a more conservative approach focusing the analyses of this research on the first measure of fatherhood.

When examining the differences among fathers depending on the number of children that they have, we see increasing numbers of children has a positive impact on earnings. Among fathers, those who have three or more children earn the most. Table 2 shows that the average annual earnings of men who have fathered a child under 19 years old is $72,795.39;

for those who have fathered two children it is $83,568.21 and for those with three or more children it is $90,230.24. Fathers of one child earn significantly less than those with two or three and more children. It is important to take into account that the group of fathers with three or more children is the smallest group in the sample, comprising only 345 fathers, whereas the groups of one-child fathers and two-child are more alike with 748 and 863 cases respectively.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for One Child (n=748), Two children (n=863) and Three Children (n=345)*

	One Child		Two Children		Three or more Children	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Income [a,b]	72795.39	61526.06	83568.21	92240.49	90278.65	126380.30
Income (logged) [a,b]	10.99	0.63	11.11	0.63	11.10	0.71
Socio-Demographics						
Age [a,b,c]	41.87	9.77	40.81	6.94	39.68	6.58
Age (logged) [b,c]	3.71	0.24	3.69	0.17	3.67	0.17
Urban [b,c]	0.84	0.37	0.83	0.38	0.73	0.45
Minority	0.16	0.37	0.20	0.40	0.16	0.37
Newfoundland and Labrador [b]	0.02	0.13	0.01	0.12	0.01	0.09
Prince Edward Island	0.00	0.06	0.00	0.06	0.00	0.06
Nova Scotia	0.02	0.13	0.03	0.16	0.02	0.14
New Brunswick [b]	0.02	0.15	0.02	0.14	0.01	0.11
Quebec	0.23	0.42	0.20	0.40	0.19	0.39
Ontario	0.38	0.49	0.40	0.49	0.40	0.49
Manitoba	0.04	0.19	0.04	0.19	0.05	0.22
Saskatchewan [b,c]	0.03	0.17	0.03	0.18	0.05	0.22
Alberta	0.12	0.33	0.12	0.33	0.15	0.36
British Columbia	0.13	0.34	0.14	0.35	0.11	0.32
Human Capital						
Doctorate, masters or degree in Medicine, Dentistry, Veterinary or Optometry	0.13	0.34	0.11	0.31	0.09	0.29
Bachelor undergraduate degree or teacher's college	0.20	0.40	0.23	0.42	0.21	0.41
Diploma or certificate from community college, CEGEP, nursing, trade, technical, vocational school or business college	0.33	0.47	0.37	0.48	0.32	0.47

Some university, community college, CEGEP, nursing, trade, technical, vocational school or business college	0.13	0.34	0.11	0.32	0.13	0.34
High school diploma	0.12	0.32	0.11	0.32	0.15	0.36
Some secondary, high school, elementary school or no schooling	0.09	0.28	0.07	0.26	0.09	0.28
Work Interruptions	0.45	0.74	0.46	0.84	0.48	0.88
Work Hours [b]	44.09	10.74	45.18	11.52	46.71	12.62
Marital Status						
Married [a,b]	0.66	0.48	0.79	0.41	0.76	0.43
Single [a,b]	0.05	0.22	0.02	0.13	0.02	0.14
Living in common law [a]	0.23	0.42	0.15	0.36	0.17	0.38
Divorced, separated and widowed	0.06	0.24	0.04	0.20	0.05	0.22
Workplace characteristics						
Management occupations	0.13	0.34	0.16	0.37	0.13	0.34
Business, finance and administrative occupations	0.09	0.29	0.10	0.30	0.08	0.27
Natural and applied sciences and related occupations	0.11	0.31	0.14	0.34	0.12	0.33
Health occupations	0.02	0.13	0.02	0.15	0.02	0.16
Occupations in social science, education, government service and religion	0.08	0.28	0.06	0.23	0.08	0.27
Occupations in art, culture, recreation and sport	0.02	0.13	0.03	0.16	0.01	0.12
Sales and services occupations	0.13	0.34	0.15	0.36	0.11	0.32
Trades, transport and equipment operators and related occupations	0.29	0.45	0.24	0.43	0.30	0.46
Occupations unique to primary industry [c]	0.04	0.20	0.03	0.18	0.06	0.24
Occupations unique to processing, manufacturing and utilities	0.08	0.27	0.07	0.25	0.08	0.27
Union membership	0.25	0.43	0.27	0.45	0.22	0.41
Regular employee	0.78	0.41	0.78	0.41	0.73	0.45
Seasonal, term, casual or on-call employee [a]	0.06	0.24	0.03	0.18	0.05	0.21
Self-employed [b]	0.16	0.36	0.19	0.39	0.22	0.42

Note: These data are weighted.
**The characteristics of childless men are shown in Table 1.*
a Statistically significant difference One child- and Two Children, $p \leq .05$.
b Statistically significant difference One Child and Three Children, $p \leq .05$.
c Statistically significant difference between Two Children and Three Children, $p \leq .05$.

Regarding the socio demographic variables, fathers of one child tend to be significantly older than those with two or three or more children. Specifically, fathers of one child are on average 42 years old; fathers of two children are 41 years old and fathers of three or more children are 40 years old on average. The differences among the groups are statistically significant. Fathers of two children are more likely than the other two groups of fathers to be members of a visible minority: 20 percent of two- child fathers versus 16 percent of one-child fathers and three-child fathers. When paying attention to the provinces of residence of these men, in most of the provinces there are no differences among the three groups. Only in Newfoundland and Labrador, New Brunswick, and Saskatchewan significant differences among the groups were found. Men who have fathered a child are more likely to live in Newfoundland and Labrador and New Brunswick than men who have fathered three children or more.

In relation to human capital factors, no differences could be distinguished among the three groups. We can say that fathers are a homogeneous group regarding education. Most of fathers regardless of the number of children tend to have a diploma or certificate from community college, CEGEP or nursing school, with percentages around 35 as is shown in Table 1. Additionally, no significant differences were found regarding the number of work interruptions.

With regard to the number of work hours that fathers perform, Table 2 shows a similar pattern to earnings. Fathers with only one child tend to work less than those with two or three or more children. Specifically, men who have fathered one child work on average 44 hours, fathers of two children work on average 45 and fathers of three or more children tend to work

around 47 hours. However, the differences are statistically significant only when comparing the group of fathers with two children with those with three or more.

In the analysis of the marital status of these three groups of fathers there are important differences. Although as it was mentioned fathers are more likely to be married or living in a common law relationship, one-child fathers are significantly less likely than two-child and three- child fathers to be married. Similarly, fathers of one child are significantly more likely to be living in common law than fathers of two children. Additionally, even though only three percent of fathers are single, fathers of one child are significantly more likely than fathers of two or three to be single.

Regarding workplace characteristics the three groups of fathers are homogeneous in terms of occupation. As was mentioned earlier, most of them work in trades and transport and related occupations. Only one occupation shows important differences among the groups; fathers of two children are significantly less likely than fathers of three or more children to be working in occupations unique to primary industry. When looking at union membership, no important differences arise among the groups. Finally, although the proportion of fathers working as seasonal, term or casual employee was only five percent, fathers of one child are significantly more likely than those who have fathered two children to work as a seasonal, term, or casual employee. Also, fathers of three or more children are significantly more likely to be self-employed than those who have one child.

Looking at Table 3 we see that, when classifying fathers according to the age of their youngest child, interesting findings arise. Although there is no pattern as in the previous analysis, men whose youngest child is under five years old earn less than those whose youngest

child is between 13 and 18 years old. Specifically, men whose youngest child is under five years old earn on average $79,867.14; fathers whose youngest child is between 5 and 12 years old earn $75,132.78 and those whose youngest child is between 13 and 18 years old earn $88,854.63. Significant differences were only found when comparing the earnings of men whose youngest child is between 5 and 12 and those whose youngest child is between 13 and 18 years old.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for Fathers whose Youngest Child is 0-4 years old (n=728), 5-12 years old (n=770) and 13-18 years old (n=458) *

	0-4 years old		5-12 years old		13-18 years old	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Income [c]	79867.14	96795.37	75132.78	52494.50	88854.63	113972.50
Income (logged)	11.05	0.63	11.04	0.61	11.11	0.72
Socio-Demographics						
Age [a,b,c]	35.03	6.01	41.59	6.25	48.90	5.62
Age (logged) [a,b,c]	3.54	0.17	3.72	0.15	3.88	0.11
Urban	0.82	0.38	0.81	0.39	0.80	0.40
Minority	0.17	0.38	0.19	0.39	0.17	0.38
Newfoundland and Labrador	0.01	0.11	0.01	0.12	0.02	0.13
Prince Edward Island [a]	0.00	0.04	0.01	0.08	0.00	0.06
Nova Scotia [a]	0.02	0.12	0.03	0.17	0.02	0.14
New Brunswick	0.02	0.13	0.02	0.13	0.02	0.15
Quebec	0.22	0.41	0.20	0.40	0.23	0.42
Ontario	0.40	0.49	0.40	0.49	0.37	0.48
Manitoba [a]	0.03	0.18	0.05	0.21	0.05	0.21
Saskatchewan	0.04	0.19	0.03	0.18	0.03	0.18
Alberta	0.13	0.34	0.13	0.33	0.12	0.33
British Columbia	0.14	0.35	0.12	0.33	0.14	0.35
Human Capital						
Doctorate, masters or degree in Medicine, Dentistry, Veterinary or Optometry	0.12	0.33	0.10	0.30	0.12	0.33
Bachelor undergraduate degree or teacher's college	0.23	0.42	0.21	0.41	0.20	0.40
Diploma or certificate from community college, CEGEP, nursing, trade, technical,	0.35	0.48	0.34	0.47	0.35	0.48

vocational school or business college						
Some university, community college, CEGEP, nursing, trade, technical, vocational school or business college	0.13	0.34	0.12	0.33	0.11	0.31
High school diploma [a,b]	0.09	0.29	0.15	0.35	0.14	0.34
Some secondary, high school, elementary school or no schooling	0.08	0.26	0.08	0.28	0.08	0.28
Work Interruptions	0.43	0.76	0.45	0.82	0.53	0.86
Work Hours	45.06	10.54	45.31	12.12	44.58	11.79
Marital Status						
Married	0.73	0.44	0.74	0.44	0.73	0.44
Single [c]	0.03	0.17	0.04	0.20	0.02	0.14
Living in common law [a,b]	0.23	0.42	0.15	0.36	0.16	0.36
Divorced, separated and widowed[a,b]	0.01	0.10	0.06	0.25	0.09	0.29
Workplace characteristics						
Management occupations	0.13	0.34	0.14	0.35	0.16	0.37
Business, finance and administrative occupations	0.08	0.27	0.11	0.31	0.10	0.29
Natural and applied sciences and related occupations [b,c]	0.13	0.34	0.15	0.35	0.08	0.27
Health occupations	0.02	0.16	0.02	0.15	0.02	0.13
Occupations in social science, education, government service and religion	0.08	0.27	0.06	0.23	0.07	0.26
Occupations in art, culture, recreation and sport	0.02	0.16	0.02	0.14	0.02	0.14
Sales and services occupations	0.12	0.32	0.15	0.36	0.15	0.36
Trades, transport and equipment operators and related occupations[a]	0.30	0.46	0.24	0.43	0.28	0.45
Occupations unique to primary industry	0.04	0.19	0.04	0.20	0.04	0.20
Occupations unique to processing, manufacturing and utilities	0.07	0.26	0.07	0.25	0.09	0.28
Union membership	0.27	0.44	0.24	0.43	0.26	0.44
Regular employee	0.79	0.41	0.76	0.43	0.77	0.42
Seasonal, term, casual or on-call employee	0.05	0.23	0.04	0.20	0.04	0.19
Self-employed	0.16	0.36	0.20	0.40	0.20	0.40

Note: These data are weighted.
***The characteristics of childless men are shown in Table 1.*
a Statistically significant difference Youngest 0-4 and Youngest 5-12, $p \leq .05$.
b Statistically significant difference Youngest 0-4 and Youngest 13-18, $p \leq .05$.
c Statistically significant difference between Youngest 5-12 and Youngest 13-18, $p \leq .05$.

The analyses of the age and province of residence show statistically significant differences among all three groups. As can be expected, fathers of older children are more likely to be older. The average age of those whose youngest child is under five years old is 35; for those whose youngest child is between 5 and 12 it is 42; and for those whose youngest child is between 13 and 18 years old it is 49 years old. Regarding the provinces where these fathers live, there are three provinces (Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, Manitoba) that show differences between fathers whose youngest child is under five years old and those whose youngest child is between 5 and 12 years old. No differences were found among the groups regarding being part of a visible minority group or whether they live in an urban area.

Looking at human capital variables, the highest degree of education attained tends to be similar among the groups with the exception of having a high school diploma. Fathers whose youngest child is under five years old are significantly less likely than fathers whose youngest child is between 5 and 18 to have a high school diploma as their highest level of education. Also, when analyzing work interruptions no differences among the groups arise.

Turning next to the average number of hours of work in a week, there are no significant differences among the three groups. The average of 45 hours per week remains as the average for the three groups of fathers. On the other hand, although most fathers are married, important differences were found regarding the marital status of the participants in the study. Fathers whose youngest child is between 5 and 12 are significantly more likely than fathers whose youngest child is between 13 and 18 to be single. Additionally, fathers whose youngest child is under five years old were found to be significantly more likely than fathers whose youngest child is between 5 and 18 years old to be living in a common law relationship. Similarly,

fathers whose youngest child is under five were found to be significantly less likely to be divorced, separated and widowed than fathers whose youngest child is between 5 and 18 years old.

Regarding workplace characteristics, only in one occupation do fathers seem to be different depending on the age of their youngest child. There are important differences among fathers working in natural and applied sciences and related occupations. Those with a youngest child under five years old are more likely than those whose child is between 13 and 18 to work in this industry. Similarly, between fathers whose youngest child is between 5 and 12 years old and those whose youngest child is between 13 and 18 years old the latter are less likely to work in natural and applied sciences than the former. Also, fathers with a youngest child under five years old are more likely than fathers whose youngest child is between 5 and 12 years old to be working in trades and transport industry. Finally, no differences were found among the groups regarding union membership and type of employment.

Comparing fathers and childless men: OLS Regression Results

Table 4 presents the results of the OLS regression analysis to assess the first set of research hypotheses regarding earnings differences between fathers and childless men. Looking at the first model, we see that, as predicted by hypothesis 1, fathers earn 32 percent more than childless men, which is statistically significant at the $p<0.001$ level. This model accounts for four percent of the variation in men's earnings. When we move to Model 2 where control variables were included we can see that the socio-demographic variables of age, member of a visible minority, province and area of residence make the earnings gap between fathers and childless men larger. Controlling for the socio-demographic variables, fatherhood is still affecting men's earnings ($b=0.289$, $p \leq 0.001$). Fathers earn 34 percent more than

childless men. Table 4 shows that the relationship between earnings and age is significant also at the $p<0.001$ level. As can be expected, older people tend to earn more. Similarly, living in an urban area also has a positive impact on earnings, which is statistically significant at the $p<0.001$ level. On the other hand, being part of a visible minority has a significantly negative effect on earnings. Compared with those who are not part of a visible minority, working men who identify themselves as a visible minority earn 29 percent less than white and aboriginal men. The province of residence also has an effect on earnings. Specifically, working men living in Ontario, Alberta, and British Columbia earn significantly more than those living in Quebec. For example, male workers in Alberta earn 43 percent more than their counterparts in Quebec. Similarly, Ontario workers earn 18 percent more than men working in Quebec. This model accounts for 18 percent of the variation in the dependent variable.

Table 4

OLS Regression Results Predicting Men's LN Earnings by have Child(ren) under 19 years old(N=4,570)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7
Fatherhood	0.278***	0.289***	0.244***	0.262***	0.165***	0.247***	0.112***
	(0.026)	(0.023)	(0.021)	(0.022)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.021)
Socio-Demographics							
Age (logged)		0.727***	0.691***	0.704***	0.476***	0.646***	0.471***
		(0.041)	(0.039)	(0.039)	(0.043)	(0.039)	(0.039)
Urban [a]		0.065**	0.003	0.109***	0.078***	0.010	0.022
		(0.024)	(0.023)	(0.025)	(0.024)	(0.022)	(0.022)
Minority [b]		-0.256***	-0.354***	-0.229***	-0.268***	-0.274***	-0.322***
		(0.040)	(0.039)	(0.039)	(0.038)	(0.037)	(0.035)
Newfoundland and Labrador[c]		0.041	0.033	-0.019	-0.002	0.018	-0.058
		(0.058)	(0.054)	(0.058)	(0.057)	(0.056)	(0.052)
Prince Edward Island [c]		-0.082	-0.067	-0.125*	-0.106	-0.047	-0.091
		(0.060)	(0.059)	(0.059)	(0.061)	(0.055)	(0.054)
Nova Scotia [c]		-0.024	-0.026	-0.067	-0.043	-0.017	-0.067
		(0.051)	(0.047)	(0.051)	(0.051)	(0.045)	(0.043)
New Brunswick [c]		-0.015	-0.021	-0.031	-0.048	-0.008	-0.046
		(0.054)	(0.053)	(0.052)	(0.054)	(0.051)	(0.050)
Ontario [c]		0.165***	0.157***	0.133***	0.140***	0.160***	0.116***
		(0.031)	(0.029)	(0.030)	(0.031)	(0.028)	(0.027)
Manitoba [c]		0.030	0.059	0.006	0.012	0.046	0.031
		(0.046)	(0.042)	(0.045)	(0.046)	(0.042)	(0.039)
Saskatchewan [c]		0.098	0.152**	0.040	0.057	0.114*	0.081
		(0.058)	(0.054)	(0.058)	(0.059)	(0.055)	(0.053)
Alberta [c]		0.356***	0.376***	0.293***	0.325***	0.379***	0.326***
		(0.038)	(0.036)	(0.038)	(0.038)	(0.036)	(0.034)

British Columbia [c]	0.143***	0.153***	0.118**	0.111**	0.157***	0.129***
	(0.041)	(0.038)	(0.040)	(0.040)	(0.039)	(0.035)
Human Capital						
Doctorate, masters or degree in Medicine, Dentistry, Veterinary or Optometry [d]		0.158***				0.113**
		(0.047)				(0.043)
Diploma or certificate from community college, CEGEP, nursing, trade, technical, vocational school or business college [d]		-0.228***				-0.223***
		(0.031)				(0.032)
Some university, community college, CEGEP, nursing, trade, technical, vocational school or business college [d]		-0.384***				-0.289***
		(0.039)				(0.037)
High school diploma [d]		-0.508***				-0.410***
		(0.040)				(0.041)
Some secondary, high school, elementary school or no schooling [d]		-0.564***				-0.470***
		(0.043)				(0.040)
Work Interruptions		-0.085***				-0.077***
		(0.013)				(0.012)
Work Hours			0.012***			0.012***
			(0.001)			(0.001)
Marital Status						
Single [e]				-0.424***		-0.293***
				(0.036)		(0.032)
Living in common law [e]				-0.137***		-0.081**

	(0.033)		(0.028)
Divorced, separated and widowed [e]	-0.229***		-0.124***
	(0.042)		(0.037)
Workplace characteristics			
Management occupations [f]		0.410***	0.241***
		(0.040)	(0.038)
Business, finance and administrative occupations [f]		0.118**	0.045
		(0.042)	(0.038)
Natural and applied sciences and related occupations [f]		0.355***	0.172***
		(0.032)	(0.032)
Health occupations [f]		0.507***	0.308***
		(0.089)	(0.086)
Occupations in social science, education, government service and religion [f]		0.243***	-0.025
		(0.042)	(0.047)
Occupations in art, culture, recreation and sport [f]		0.076	-0.014
		(0.089)	(0.081)
Sales and services occupations [f]		-0.129***	-0.130***
		(0.035)	(0.031)
Occupations unique to primary industry [f]		0.011	-0.093
		(0.059)	(0.056)
Occupations unique to processing, manufacturing and utilities [f]		-0.041	0.000
		(0.038)	(0.036)

Union membership [g]						0.113***	0.136***
						(0.023)	(0.022)
Seasonal, term, casual or on-call employee [h]						-0.431***	-0.384***
						(0.048)	(0.046)
Self employed [h]						-0.028	-0.081*
						(0.036)	(0.034)
Constant	10.784***	7.947***	8.446***	7.486***	9.061***	8.202***	8.820***
	(0.018)	(0.160)	(0.152)	(0.162)	(0.171)	(0.149)	(0.164)
R-Squared	0.038	0.178	0.281	0.219	0.212	0.278	0.391

Note: These data are weighted.

Unstandardized coefficients, standard errors in parentheses

** p≤0.05; ** p≤0.01; *** p≤0.001*

[a] *Omitted category is Rural*

[b] *Omitted category is not a visible minority*

[c] *Omitted category is living in Quebec*

[d] *Omitted category is Bachelor undergraduate degree or teacher´s college*

[e] *Omitted category is married*

[f] *Omitted category is Trades, transport and equipment operators and related occupations*

[g] *Omitted category is not covered*

[h] *Omitted category is regular employee*

In model 3, we find that by introducing the first explanation (Human Capital Resources) controlling for the socio-demographics variables, the gap between fathers and childless men shrinks, but it is still significant at the $p<0.001$ level. Men who have fathered a child under the age of 19 earn 28 percent more than childless men. All the variables and categories that were found to be significant in the second model remain significant (living in urban areas excluded), although some of them at the $p<0.01$. Additionally, compared to living in Quebec, living in Saskatchewan has a significant and positive effect on men's earnings. By analyzing the variable highest degree of education we see that compared to having an undergraduate bachelor's, having a doctorate has a statistically positive impact on earnings. Conversely, all those with less than a bachelor's degree earn less than those with a bachelor's degree. Regarding work interruptions, this variable has a negative impact on earnings and the relationship between the variables was also found to be statistically significant. For every additional interruption at work, men's earnings decrease by 8.9 percent, which is significant at the $p<0.001$ level. In line with hypothesis 1a while having attained a higher degree of education affects earnings positively, the opposite is true for number of work interruptions. Together, this set of independent variables explains 28 percent of the variation in men's earnings.

Model 4 included work hours and the socio-demographic variables. When adding this set of variables as predictors of men's earnings the coefficient indicates that the gap between fathers and childless men is two percent smaller from model 1. The former still earn 30 percent more than the latter, controlling for socio-demographic variables and work hours. As predicted by hypothesis 1b, although in a moderate way, work hours affects earnings positively. For every additional hour of work men increase their earnings by 1.2 percent at the $p<0.001$ level.

All the socio-demographic variables that were found to be significant in model 2 remain significant. Additionally, in model 4 those who live in the province of Prince Edward Island make 13 percent less than their counterparts living in Quebec. 22 percent of the variation in men's earnings is explained by model 4.

Looking at model 5, by adding the marital status of the participants to the socio-demographics as a potential explanation for the earnings gap between childless men and fathers, we see that the impact of fatherhood on earnings in this model is shrunk significantly. When controlling for marital status and the socio-demographics variables fathers make 18 percent more than childless men at the $p<0.01$ level. As predicted by hypothesis 1c,compared to married men all working men living in another kind of relationship, including those living in common law, earn significantly less than their married counterparts at the $p<0.001$ level. Men living in a common law relationship earn 13 percent less than married men while men who are divorced, separated or widowed earn 21 percent less than married men, but those who seem to be most affected are single men who earn 35 percent less than married men. All the variables found to be significant in model 2 are still significant in this model. This set of variables accounts for 21 percent of the variation in men's earnings.

Turning to model 6, when adding workplace characteristics to the socio-demographics, we see that the earnings gap between the groups gets smaller. In this model when socio-demographic variables and workplace characteristics are taken into account, fathers earn 28 percent more than childless men ($p \leq 0.001$). Additionally, compared to trades and transportation, men working in management, business, natural and applied sciences, health, social science, education, government service and religion occupations earn significantly more whereas men working in sales and services earn significantly less. Those earning the most are

men working in health occupations. Specifically, they earn 66 percent more than those working in trades and transport occupations. At the other end, men working in sales and services earn 14 percent less than those in trades and transport industry. As predicted by hypothesis 1d, union membership was found to have a significantly positive effect on men's earnings. Specifically, those who are members of a union make 12 percent more than those who were not union members. Finally, also in line with hypothesis 1d, I found that working men holding a seasonal, term, casual or on-call job earn 54 percent less than those having a regular job, at the $p<0.001$ level. All socio-demographics used in model 2, but living in urban areas remain significant in this model. 28 percent of the variation in men's earnings is explained by workplace characteristics and the socio-demographic variables.

Finally, model 7 includes all the variables used in previous models. When socio demographic variables, human capital, work hours, marital status and workplace characteristics are included, the gap in earnings between fathers and childless men gets smaller, but a gap remains wherein fathers make 12 percent more than childless men. All the socio-demographics that in model 2 were found to be significant are still significant in this model (living in urban areas excluded). With the exception of two occupations (social sciences and business occupations) all the categories of the variables used in previous models continue to be significant, although in some cases at a lower level of significance. Additionally, when all the variables were taken into account self-employment was found to be significant, which means that compared to regular employees, self-employed men earn eight percent less. Together, all the independent variables used in this model explain 39 percent of the variation in men's earnings.

Table 5 summarizes the results of the OLS regression analysis to assess the research hypotheses using the three measures of fatherhood. When examining the impact of the number of children, it is possible to see that the difference in earnings between fathers and childless men gets larger when men have fathered two or more children. However, the bonus for fathers with one child is smaller. Men who have fathered one child earn 23 percent more than their childless counterparts; fathers with two children earn 39 percent more than childless men; and fathers with three or more children earn 37 percent more than childless men. In the second model where the socio-demographic variables are included, consistent with the previous analysis, the earnings gap between the three groups and their childless counterparts increases significantly. Specifically, fathers with one child earn 23 percent more than childless men; fathers with two children earn 41 percent more than childless men; and fathers with three or more children earn 40 percent more.

Table 5

Coefficients Expressed as Percentage Effects for Fatherhood on LN Men's Earnings by have Child(ren) under 19, Number of Children, and Age of Youngest Child (N=4,570)							
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7
Have child(ren) under 19	32.01***	33.46***	27.62***	29.95***	17.98***	28.05***	11.90***
	(2.61)	(2.33)	(2.16)	(2.25)	(2.35)	(2.30)	(2.15)
R-Squared	0.04	0.18	0.28	0.22	0.21	0.28	0.39
Number of children							
1Child	22.51***	22.57***	16.96***	20.63***	10.73***	19.34***	6.16*
	(3.26)	(3.00)	(2.84)	(2.91)	(3.00)	(2.79)	(2.68)
2 Children	38.75***	40.89***	34.30***	36.79***	23.31***	33.53***	15.62***
	(3.27)	(2.98)	(2.74)	(2.94)	(3.01)	(2.97)	(2.76)
3 Children or more	37.28***	40.61***	36.17***	34.87***	23.18***	34.93***	17.20***
	(4.90)	(4.66)	(4.25)	(4.50)	(4.64)	(4.47)	(4.14)
R-Squared	0.04	0.18	0.29	0.22	0.21	0.28	0.39
Age of youngest child							
Child under 4	30.09***	47.40***	37.46***	42.85***	25.35***	39.19***	16.33***
	(3.35)	(3.28)	(3.06)	(3.12)	(3.30)	(3.23)	(2.91)
Child between 5 -12	29.78***	29.38***	25.85***	25.66***	16.03***	23.98***	10.77***
	(3.23)	(2.98)	(2.70)	(2.94)	(2.94)	(2.85)	(2.60)
Child between 13-18	37.93***	20.85***	17.24***	18.97***	13.04**	19.05***	8.87*
	(4.15)	(3.97)	(3.78)	(3.92)	(3.96)	(3.82)	(3.68)
R-Squared	0.04	0.18	0.28	0.22	0.21	0.28	0.39

Note: These data are weighted.

Unstandardized coefficients, standard errors in parentheses

Omitted category for all the analyses is childless men

The socio-demographic variables and the explanatory variables of each model are included in the analyses

** p≤0.05; ** p≤0.01; *** p≤0.001*

Looking at all models we see that the gap between non-fathers and fathers is reduced regardless of how many children the father has, however, the gap is smallest between non-fathers and fathers with one child. Lastly, when all variables were taken into account, the earnings gap between childless men and the three groups of fathers shrinks considerably, but it does not disappear. Fathers with one child earn six percent more than childless men ($p \leq 0.001$); fathers with two children earn 16 percent more than their childless men counterparts; and working men with three children or more earn 17 percent more than childless men. Consistent with the results from model 1, fathers of three or more children earn the most, even after incorporating all control variables.

Table 5 also presents the results of the OLS regression analysis to assess the research hypotheses when fatherhood is defined by the age of a man's youngest child. Looking at the first model, we see that fathers whose youngest child is under five years old earn 30 percent more than childless men; fathers whose youngest child is between 5 and 12 years old earn 30 percent more than their childless counterparts; and those men whose youngest child is between 13 and 18 years old earn 38 percent more than childless men. All relationships were found to be significant at the $p<0.001$ level. When we move to model 2 where control variables were included we see that the socio-demographics have a different influence on the three groups of fathers. While the earnings gap between two groups of fathers and childless men shrank, for those whose youngest child is under five years old the earnings gap widened, indicating that men receive a more substantial earnings bonus when their children are the youngest. When controlling for age, being member of a visible minority and province and area of residence, fathers whose youngest child is under five earn 47 percent more than childless men.

Similar to previous analyses, the gap between childless men and the three groups of fathers shrinks considerably in each model, but it does not disappear. In the last model where all the variables were taken into account, fathers whose youngest child is under five earn 16 percent more than childless men; fathers whose youngest child is between 5 and 12 earn 11 percent more than their childless men counterparts; and for those whose youngest child is between 13 and 18 years old the earnings gap represents only a nine percent difference. Unlike the previous analysis, the group of fathers who earn the most in the first model is not the same in the last model.

Overall, regardless of how fatherhood was measured when all the explanatory variables are taken into account a part of the gap remains unexplained. Even the results of the analysis measuring fatherhood as having a child regardless of the child's age (see Table 9 in Appendix B), where the earnings differences between fathers and childless men were larger, show that when all control variables are taken into account a part of the gap remains.

Comparing leave takers and non-leave takers: Descriptive Statistics

In order to assess the second set of research hypotheses regarding differences between fathers who have taken parental or paternity leave within the last five years and those who have had or adopted a child in the same period, but did not make use of this policy, mean and proportion differences tests were carried out. The results of these tests for all the variables included in the second analysis are shown in Table 6. 24 percent of the working men who live with a partner or spouse and have had or adopted a child in the last five years took a parental or paternity leave, while the remaining 76 percent did not make use of this benefit. Focusing first on earnings and in line with hypothesis 2 we see that fathers who took paternal or paternity

leave earn significantly less than those who did not take it. On average, non-leave takers earn $87,445.74 whereas leave takers earn $67,174.22 per year.

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics for Leave taker (n=181) and Non-Leave Taker Fathers (n=563)

	Leave Taker Fathers			Non-Leave Taker Fathers	
	Mean		SD	Mean	SD
Income	67174.22	**	45451.62	87445.74	109027.40
Income (logged)	10.97	**	0.52	11.12	0.64
Socio-Demographics					
Age	34.42	**	5.48	35.97	5.94
Age (logged)	3.53	**	0.16	3.57	0.16
Urban	0.85		0.36	0.81	0.39
Minority	0.11	**	0.31	0.21	0.41
Quebec	0.62	***	0.49	0.07	0.25
Human Capital					
Doctorate, masters or degree in Medicine, Dentistry, Veterinary or Optometry	0.10		0.30	0.13	0.33
Bachelor undergraduate degree or teacher's college	0.29		0.45	0.22	0.41
Diploma or certificate from community college, CEGEP, nursing, trade, technical, vocational school or business college	0.37		0.48	0.34	0.48
Some university, community college, CEGEP, nursing, trade, technical, vocational school or business college	0.11		0.31	0.14	0.35
High school diploma	0.09		0.28	0.09	0.28
Some secondary, high school, elementary school or no schooling	0.05		0.21	0.08	0.27
Work Hours	42.10	***	9.24	45.81	10.04
Marital Status					
Married	0.56	***	0.50	0.86	0.34
Division of Housework					
Traditional Women tasks	3.24	**	1.54	2.82	1.81
General Tasks	7.03		2.38	6.78	2.60
Dual-earner couple	0.62		0.49	0.55	0.50
Workplace characteristics					
White collar	0.49		0.50	0.49	0.50
Blue collar	0.36		0.48	0.40	0.49
Services	0.15		0.36	0.11	0.32
Union membership	0.39	***	0.49	0.21	0.41

Regular employee	0.87	**	0.33	0.76	0.43
Seasonal, term, casual or on-call employee	0.05		0.23	0.04	0.20
Self employed	0.07	***	0.26	0.20	0.40

Note: These data are weighted.

** p≤0.05; ** p≤0.01; *** p≤0.001*

Regarding socio-demographics, leave takers are significantly younger and less likely to be part of a visible minority than those who did not take a leave. Specifically, the average age of leave takers is 34 years old while the average age of non-leave takers is 36 years old. Also, 21 percent of those who did not take a leave reported to be members of a visible minority, while this proportion was significantly smaller for leave takers. In terms of the province and area where the participants inhabit, most men in the sample live in urban areas regardless of whether they took a leave, but consistent with previous research (Findlay & Kohen, 2012; McKay, Marshall, & Doucet, 2012) leave takers are significantly more likely to be living in the province of Quebec.

Turning to educational measures, there are no important differences between leave and non-leave takers. Most fathers have obtained a diploma or certificate from a post-secondary educational institution and only five percent of leave takers and eight percent of non-leave takers did not finish high school or elementary school. As a result, we do not find support for hypothesis 2a that fathers who take paternity/parental leave are more likely to have less education than fathers who do not. Looking at the average number of hours that these men work per week, we see in line with our predictions that there are important differences between the groups. While leave takers work, on average, 42 hours per week, non-leave takers work around 46 hours per week. Thus, we found evidence to support that fathers who took a leave work fewer hours than fathers who do not (H2b).

Regarding marital status, participation in housework and spouse employment status, as was predicted by hypothesis 2c and 2d, leave takers are significantly more likely to live in a common law relationship rather than being married; engage in more traditionally-feminine housework tasks; but, inconsistent with our predictions, they are equally likely to be in a relationship with a spouse who work more than 30 hours per week and perform general housework tasks than fathers who did not take a paternity or parental leave. Thus, there is no evidence to support the statement that leave takers are more likely to perform household tasks (H2e) and live in a dual-earner household (H2f).

Finally, when looking at workplace characteristics we see that there are no important differences between leave and non-leave takers regarding occupations. Most men in the sample tend to work in white collar occupations. However, Table 6 shows important differences when focusing on union membership and terms of employment. Leave takers are significantly more likely than non-leave takers to be covered by a union contract and although most men in both groups work as regular employees, fathers who took paternity or parental leave are significantly more likely than fathers who did not take a leave to be working as regular employees. Conversely, leave takers are less likely than non-leave takers to be self-employed. Specifically, seven percent of leave takers is self-employed and 20 percent of non-leave takers is self-employed. Thus, we did not find support for hypothesis 2g stating that fathers who took a leave are less likely to be regular employees and to be covered by a union contract.

Comparing leave takers and non-leave takers: OLS Regression Results

Table 7 presents the results of the OLS regression analysis to assess the second set of research hypotheses regarding earnings differences between fathers who take paternity leave

and those fathers who did not. Looking at the first model, as predicted by hypothesis 1, we see that leave takers earn 15 percent less than non-leave takers, which is statistically significant at the $p<0.01$ level. This model accounts for only one percent of the variation in fathers' earnings. When we move to model 2, where age, visible minority status, province and area or residence were included, we see that the association between taking a leave and fathers' earnings becomes non-significant. Instead, age, visible minority status, and living in Quebec are all found to be statistically significant. As fathers get older their earnings increase. Additionally, in this model being part of a visible minority has a significantly negative effect on earnings. Compared with those who do not belong to a visible minority, working fathers who identify themselves as a visible minority earn 27 percent less. Living in Quebec also has a negative impact on fathers' earnings. Those living in Quebec earn 16 percent less than those living in any other province of Canada. When the socio-demographics are taken into account the earnings gap between fathers who took parental or paternity leave and those who did not gets smaller and becomes non-significant, which means that the earnings gap is explained by age, province of residence, and being part of a visible minority. Together, all these variables explain nine percent of the variation in fathers' earnings.

Table 7

OLS Regression Results Predicting Fathers' LN Earnings by Leave Taker status (N=744)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Leave Takers	-0.157**	-0.075	-0.133*	-0.042	-0.074
	(0.054)	(0.070)	(0.067)	(0.070)	(0.070)
Socio-Demographics					
Age		0.772***	0.515***	0.747***	0.739***
		(0.149)	(0.144)	(0.146)	(0.147)
Urban [a]		0.068	-0.008	0.092	0.073
		(0.054)	(0.051)	(0.053)	(0.054)
Minority [b]		-0.311***	-0.352***	-0.292***	-0.323***
		(0.073)	(0.073)	(0.073)	(0.074)
Quebec [c]		-0.149*	-0.113	-0.133	-0.104
		(0.071)	(0.066)	(0.071)	(0.080)
Human Capital					
Doctorate, masters or degree in Medicine, Dentistry, Veterinary or Optometry [d]			0.049		
			(0.094)		
Diploma or certificate from community college, CEGEP, nursing, trade, technical, vocational school or business college [d]			-0.265***		
			(0.061)		
Some university, community college, CEGEP, nursing, trade, technical, vocational school or business college [d]			-0.430***		
			(0.090)		
High school diploma [d]			-0.488***		
			(0.078)		
Some secondary, high school, elementary school or no schooling [d]			-0.602***		
			(0.110)		

Work Hours				0.011***	
				(0.003)	
Marital Status					
Married [e]					0.093
					(0.059)
Constant	11.125***	8.387***	9.612***	7.935***	8.422***
	(0.030)	(0.521)	(0.508)	(0.517)	(0.517)
R-Squared	0.013	0.085	0.190	0.117	0.088

Note: These data are weighted.

Unstandardized coefficients, standard errors in parentheses

** p≤0.05; ** p≤0.01; *** p≤0.001*

[a] *Omitted category is Rural*

[b] *Omitted category is not a visible minority*

[c] *Omitted category is living outside Quebec*

[d] *Omitted category is Bachelor undergraduate degree or teacher´s college*

[e] *Omitted category is cohabitating*

Table 7 (continued)

	Model 6	Model 7	Model 8	Model 9	Model 10
Leave Takers	-0.064	-0.073	-0.072	-0.111	-0.126*
	(0.070)	(0.070)	(0.071)	(0.070)	(0.065)
Socio-Demographics					
Age	0.752***	0.748***	0.776***	0.596***	0.420**
	(0.146)	(0.147)	(0.148)	(0.146)	(0.137)
Urban[a]	0.090	0.085	0.070	0.026	0.011
	(0.055)	(0.056)	(0.054)	(0.053)	(0.051)
Minority [b]	-0.281***	-0.284***	-0.315***	-0.297***	-0.299***
	(0.077)	(0.077)	(0.073)	(0.074)	(0.072)
Quebec [c]	-0.129	-0.140*	-0.144*	-0.102	-0.048
	(0.072)	(0.072)	(0.071)	(0.070)	(0.076)
Division of Housework					
Traditional Women tasks	-0.049**				
	(0.017)				
General Tasks		-0.023*			-0.024*
		(0.011)			(0.010)
Dual earner couple [d]			-0.077		-0.101*
			(0.050)		(0.045)
Workplace characteristics					
Blue collar Occupations [e]				-0.253***	-0.094
				(0.048)	(0.054)
Services Occupations [e]				-0.249**	-0.123
				(0.084)	(0.075)
Union membership [f]				0.013	0.017
				(0.044)	(0.042)
Seasonal, term, casual or on-call employee [g]				-0.237**	-0.242**

				(0.091)	(0.085)
Self employed [g]				-0.041	-0.108
				(0.086)	(0.079)
Constant	8.574***	8.614***	8.417***	9.187***	9.652***
	(0.511)	(0.523)	(0.518)	(0.512)	(0.502)
R-Squared	0.103	0.094	0.089	0.130	0.261

Note: These data are weighted.

Unstandardized coefficients, standard errors in parentheses

** p≤0.05; ** p≤0.01; *** p≤0.001*

[a] *Omitted category is Rural*

[b] *Omitted category is not a visible minority*

[c] *Omitted category is living outside Quebec*

[d] *Omitted category is Breadwinner/partner caregiver couple*

[e] *Omitted category is White collar occupations*

[f] *Omitted category is not covered*

[g] *Omitted category is regular employee*

Turning to model 3, we see a suppressor effect--when controlling for education and socio-demographic variables, the relation between taking a leave and fathers' earnings returns to being significant at the $p<0.05$ level. Fathers who have taken a leave make 14 percent less than those who have not taken it. In this model, age and being part of a visible minority remain significant at the same level of significance. Additionally, consistent with expectations, having attained any diploma or degree lower than a Bachelor diploma has a significantly negative impact on fathers' earnings. The reason this is significant despite controlling for factors that initially made the father earnings gap not significant is likely because leave takers have more education and thus controlling for education removes the educational earning advantage of leave takers. 19 percent of the variation in fathers' earnings is explained by this model.

Looking at model 4, where work hours and the socio-demographics variables are included we see that the earnings gap between leave takers and non-leave takers becomes non-significant. Instead, age, visible minority status, and work hours are all found to be statistically significant. In line with our predictions, work hours affects fathers' earnings positively, but in a moderate way. For every additional hour of work fathers increase their earnings by 1.1 percent at the $p<0.001$ level. This model accounts for 12 percent of the variation in fathers' earnings.

In model 5, by adding the marital status of the participants as a potential explanation of the earnings gap between leave takers and non-leave takers we see that the gap remains non-significant. Although, compared to married fathers, those living in a common law relationship earn less, this relationship is not statistically significant. Unlike age or being part of a minority, marital status does not help explain the difference in earnings between the two groups, the regression coefficient in this model is practically the same as the coefficient in

model 2. As a consequence, we do not find support for hypothesis 2c stating that men who are not married earn less. Nine percent of the variation in fathers' earnings is explained by the independent variables used in this model.

In model 6, by adding housework tasks traditionally done by women as a potential explanation of the different earnings received by leave and non-leave takers, we see that the gap remains non-significant and very similar to model 2. Although, as predicted, participating in housework tasks that are considered to be women tasks does have a negative influence on fathers' earnings at the $p<0.01$ level, it does not shrink the earnings gap between the groups. This model accounts for 10 percent of the variation in fathers' earnings. Similarly, in model 7, the variable general housework tasks does not contribute to explain the earnings gap between fathers who took a parental leave and those who did not. Even though, consistent with expectations, its impact is negative at the $p<0.05$ level, the relationship between taking a leave and fathers' earnings remains statistically non-significant. Together, all the variables used in this model explain nine percent of the variation in fathers' earnings.

Turning to model 8, we see that the relationship between whether a father took a leave and fathers' earnings remains non-significant. Having a partner who works for more than 30 hours per week does not influence fathers' earnings. The regression coefficient in this model is practically the same as the coefficient in model 2. Again, age, being member of a visible minority and living in Quebec are more helpful to explain fathers' earnings. This model also accounts for nine percent of the variation in fathers' earnings.

Looking at model 9, where workplace characteristics were added to the socio-demographic variables, we see that, the earnings gap between leave and non-leave takers

becomes larger, but remains non-significant. Additionally, compared to white collar occupations, fathers working in blue collar and services occupations earn significantly less. Specifically, fathers in blue collar occupations earn 29 percent less than those working in white collar occupations. Fathers in services occupations earn 28 percent less than those working in white collar occupations. Similarly, in terms of employment, fathers who work as seasonal, term, casual or on-call employees earn significantly less than those working as regular employees. However, being covered by a union contract does not have a significant effect on fathers' earnings. Thus, we found partial support for the hypothesis that fathers who work in white collar occupations as regular employees and are covered by an union contract earn more than fathers who do not work under these conditions. Together, all the variables used in this model explain 13 percent of the variation in fathers' earnings.

Lastly, although model 10 includes all the variables used in previous models[13], a 13 percent earnings difference between the groups remains unexplained and significant. Leave takers make 13 percent less than non-leave takers. With the exception of living in Quebec, working in blue collar and services occupations, all other variables that in previous models were found to be significant are still significant in this model. Additionally, when all the variables were taken into account having a working partner was found to be significant, which means that, compared to those living in a household with a traditional division of labour (male breadwinner/partner caregiver), working fathers who live in a dual-earner household earn 11 percent less. Overall, we see that this model accounts for 26 percent of the variation in fathers' earnings.

[13] Human capital measures, work hours and marital status are not shown in the table.

Discussion

By using a sample of working men and a sample of fathers, this study tested different hypotheses to investigate whether men's working lives are affected by fatherhood. Specifically, I explored the questions (1) Do fathers receive an earnings bonus compared to childless men? (2) Do fathers who take paternity/parental leave earn less than fathers who do not? And (3) if so, for either question, what are the mechanisms explaining these potential differences? Through the analysis of the results and its connections to previous studies, several observations emerge.

First, the results clearly suggest that fathers receive an earnings bonus compared to childless men. Of the four hypotheses tested in the first analysis, half received total support while two received partial support from the data. Specifically, fathers were significantly more likely to be better educated, work more hours, and be married than childless men. Further, our findings show that education, work hours, marital status, and work interruptions are significant predictors of men's earnings. Whereas work interruptions have a negative impact on earnings, education, work hours and marital status affect earnings positively. Additionally, the study found that: union membership, regular employment, and specialized occupations such as management and health care, have a positive effect on earnings; this also explains a part of the earnings gaps between the two groups.

These findings are consistent with previous research (Eggebeen & Knoester, 2001; Kaufman & Uhlenberg, 2000) finding that fatherhood profoundly shapes the working lives of men. The results of the current study suggest that men who become fathers tend to increase their involvement in the labour market, as fathers work significantly more than childless men.

Thus, consistent with breadwinner ideals, Canadian fathers' more active participation in paid work could be seen as their way to parent their children via economic support.

Second, consistent with past research, our results indicate that the fatherhood premium is tied to marriage (Glauber, 2008; Hodges & Budig, 2010). Fathers in this study were significantly more likely than childless men to be married; specifically, 73 percent of fathers were married compared with only 47 percent of childless men. Further, among the main models trying to explain the earnings gap independently marital status had the strongest impact on shrinking the earnings gap. When the socio-demographic variables and marital status were held constant, fathers earned only 18 percent more than childless men.

Third, regarding the different measures of fatherhood used in this research, our findings indicate that the number of children has a positive impact on earnings. Similar to the results reported by Glauber (2008), this study shows that those who have three or more children earn the most, which persists even when controlling for all the variables used in the analysis. Likewise, we found that after controlling for all the independent predictors those with younger children received a larger bonus compared to those whose child was between 5-18 years old. This shows that, as other Canadian researchers have claimed (Doucet, 2009; Daly, Ashbourne, & Brown, 2013; Pratt, Lawford, & Allen, 2012; Whitehead & Bala, 2012) the experience of fatherhood is not entirely homogeneous among men. Although all fathers received a bonus compared to childless men, the bonus was importantly shaped by the number of children, the age of the youngest child a father has, and the other variables used in the analysis. Due to the important cost involved in raising children, fathers may feel more pressure to increase their participation in paid work when they have a larger number of children under their care or when their children are young and require greater care.

In relation to the second research question, the results of this study show that after controlling for all the independent predictors used in the second analysis, fathers who took paternity leave earn significantly less than fathers who did not make use of this family policy. Of the seven hypotheses used in the second analysis, we only found evidence to support two. Although leave takers were significantly more likely to live in Quebec, work fewer hours, perform traditionally women tasks, be covered by a union contract, and be regular employees. The results of this study indicate that when all the variables were taken into account only age, being part of a visible minority, having less than a bachelor's degree, work hours, participation in housework, partner's employment status, and work as seasonal, term, casual or on-call employee help explain the earnings gap between leave takers and non-leave takers. While age and work hours have a positive effect on fathers' earnings, all the other variables have a negative impact on fathers' earnings.

By analyzing the characteristics of the second sample we see that some of the characteristics of leave takers are consistent with the "nurturing father" ideal. Although the group was small, those who made use of this family policy were significantly more likely to participate in feminine housework tasks and work fewer hours than those who did not take a leave. In line with the argument that nurturing fathers tend to modify their work lives and get involved in all sort of housework tasks and not only those related to childcare, we could argue that fathers who took a leave are more willing to challenge breadwinner ideals and implement changes at work and at home in order to be more involved in raising their children.

One unexpected result in this study pertains to the relationship between taking a leave and living in the province of Quebec. As explained in the literature review Quebec, in addition to having a paternity leave program that can be exclusively used by fathers, has a more

generous and flexible parental policy than the federal program used by parents living outside Quebec. According to Brighouse and Wright's (2008) approach the federal program offers paid parental leave to families, that can be classified as Equality-enabling leaves, these policies do not put pressure on families to adopt more egalitarian strategies. On the other hand, the Quebec program, which can be classified as a moderate equality-promoting leaves, creates incentives for men to take leave, putting some pressures on families to adopt a more egalitarian gender distribution of caregiving activities. In view of the above, we thought that Quebecois fathers will be more likely, than fathers living in other provinces, to take paternity/parental leave and that living in this province will have an important influence in explaining the earnings gap between leave takers and non-leave takers. However, the findings show that although fathers living in Quebec were significantly more likely to take a leave, after controlling for all the variables used in the analysis living in Quebec was found to have a non-significant effect on fathers' earnings.

By trying to answer the question about the mechanisms explaining the earnings differences between the groups, we see that although most of the variables used in the research hypotheses help to explain why fathers are earning more than childless men, when all the explanatory variables are included together they only explain a part of the gap. Specifically, the earnings difference between the groups goes from 32 percent in the first model to 12 percent in the last model. In other words, even though the earnings gap is partially explained by socio-demographics characteristics, human capital characteristics, work hours, marital status, and workplace characteristics a significant proportion of the fatherhood bonus remains unexplained.

Similarly, a significant part of the earnings gap between fathers who took a parental leave and those who did not take it persists even after controlling for socio-demographic variables, education, work hours, marital status, participation in housework, workplace characteristics, and partner's employment status. The earnings difference between leave takers and non-leave takers goes from 15 percent in the first model to 12 percent in the last model. In contrast to the previous analysis, when all variables were held constant only seven out twelve help explain a portion of the gap.

A possible explanation for the remaining unexplained gap found in both analysis is that fathers and leave takers are held accountable to different expectations at work. As previous research has suggested (Glauber, 2008; Hodges & Budig, 2010), widely held gender beliefs of men as ideal workers and women as primary caretakers structure the relationships between employers and employees. Since, as the results of this research show, fathers work for more hours than their childless counterparts they may be perceived as more committed to their jobs or as Hodges and Budig (2010) pointed out they may be portrayed as more loyal and dependable workers. If this is the case, they may be given more opportunities at work or be held to lower performance standards. Similarly, those fathers who decide to take a leave to fulfill family obligations, may be seen as less serious about their jobs, particularly considering that they work fewer hours per week than their non-leave taking counterparts. Further, as Coltrane and colleagues (2013) have argued, these workers by taking on a caregiver role, may challenge not only the ideal worker standards, but also gender norms and, as a consequence, they may be penalized or discriminated against, having fewer opportunities to show how productive they can be.

Conclusions

Despite the growing body of research investigating the characteristics and gender attitudes of fathers who stay at home and/or decide to take parental leave, Canadian studies focused on identifying trends among different groups of fathers has been understudied. The current study builds on past research by providing an analytical account of differences in fathers' labour market outcomes among fathers whose youngest child is between 0 and 18, fathers with one child, two, three children, leave takers, non-leave takers, finding a significant wage gap between fathers and non-fathers and parental leave takers and non-leave takers.

The current study found that after controlling for personal and work related characteristics fathers earn significantly more than childless men and fathers who took paternity/parental leave earn significantly less than fathers who did not. Although human capital characteristics, work related and socio-demographic characteristics partially explain the earnings gap between the groups, a significant part remains unexplained. I have argued that the remaining earnings gap likely arises because, due to ideal work standards and breadwinner expectations, employers may be discriminating in favor of fathers, but against leave takers in a way that affects wages. Whereas being a father may serve as signal of being committed to paid work, taking a leave may be perceived as being more family-oriented than a career or work oriented employee

The findings presented in the current study challenge the idea that most men may be orienting their family life based on the nurturing father ideal. Although it was shown that more men are having an active participation in housework, taking on parental and paternity leave, and staying at home taking full care of children demands, most fathers are expected to act or

behave as breadwinners. The results of these analyses show that fathers work significantly more than their childless counterparts and that fewer than 30 percent took parental leave, paying a penalty in lost wages for doing so.

The current findings shed light on a significant barrier to gender equality. While previous research has shown that there is a motherhood penalty (Budig, Misra, & Boeckmann, 2012) the results of this research show that fathers, who seem to conform to breadwinner ideals, receive an earnings bonus. As a result, the experience of working mothers and working fathers may be widening the earnings gap between men and women. Although the results of this study show that fathers do not benefit from this bonus in the same way, it is likely that the fatherhood bonus as well as the motherhood penalty are both contributing to an overall gender gap in pay.

The results of this research have important implications for family policies. Our analysis of the earnings differences between leave takers and non-leave takers shows that there may be hidden economic costs to taking leaves. Although previous research has shown that mothers experience discrimination when making use of family policies or benefits, the results of this research show that discrimination against those who take family-oriented decisions may be a gender neutral practice. Consequently, it is important that policy makers address how workplaces could discriminate against parents in order to elaborate policies that do not disadvantage them in the labour force.

There are both strengths and limitations of the data we used for these analyses. Among the benefits of using the 2011 General Social Survey on family issues are the large and recent national representative sample, and its detailed information on paternity/parental leave, paid

work, workplaces and family characteristics, especially the specific questions regarding information of each child the interviewee has had were particularly useful. However, we were limited by the lack of direct information on gender and parenthood attitudes as well as information on the use of parental benefits at the workplace. Future research is warranted using more direct measures of men's and fathers' perceptions and preferences about their roles at work and at home. Further, given the cross-sectional nature of the data, we were not able to carry out an analysis that allows us to track work or family changes over time. For this reason, we were unable to test for a selection effect; our analyses were not able to examine whether men who earn more are more likely to decide to become fathers or whether fathers who earn less are more likely to take parental/paternity leave. An important avenue for future research would be to examine longitudinal data that collect information on fatherhood and men's experiences at work. This kind of data can allow researchers to identify important events in individual men's life courses, for example, what happens after a men becomes father, when he has a second child, or after he returns to work from a leave.

Additionally although the first analysis comparing fathers with childless men was carried out using a large sample of more than 4000 cases, the second analysis used a smaller sample of 744 cases. As a result, findings from the second analysis should be considered as somewhat limited in their representativeness, due to the small number of fathers who had a child in the last 5 years, but especially due to the small proportion of fathers who took a paternity or parental leave. Federal agencies or research institutes should collect longitudinal data that gathers information about men's parental leave use, workplace characteristics, parenting and work behaviours. These kind of data can contribute to the development of a new

body of research about men that would allow for the creation of policies and programs adapted to fathers' needs.

Overall, the current research contributes to the field of gender studies as well as to our knowledge of the sociology of work and family by drawing attention to the understudied relationship between fatherhood and paid work. It does this by empirically documenting the impact fatherhood has on men's earnings and the impact parental/paternity leave has on fathers' earnings. Further, by using the two competing models of fatherhood, breadwinner and nurturing father, I was able to identify two trends in the relationship between fatherhood and earnings: fatherhood impacts earnings both positively and negatively. Whereas fathers who seem to conform to the breadwinner ideals benefit from their fatherhood status, fathers who seem to guide their behaviour based on the nurturing father ideal are negatively impacted by their fatherhood status.

Bibliography

Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: a theory of gendered organizations. *Gender & Society*, 139-158.

Allen, S., Daly, K., & Ball, J. (2012). Fathers Make a Difference in Their Children's Lives: A Review of the Research Evidence. In J. Ball, & K. Daly, *Father Involvement In Canada* (pp. 50-88). Vancouver: UBC Press.

Allen, T. D., & Russell, J. (1999). Parental Leave of Absence: Some Not So Family-Friendly Implications. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 166-191.

Australian Human Rights Commission 2014. (2014). *Supporting Working Parents: Pregnancy and Return to Work National Review – Report.* Australian Human Rights Commission.

Baker, M. (2009). Canadians Families in the Past: The Decline of the Patriarchal Family. In M. Baker, *Families. Changing Trends in Canada* (pp. 49-67). Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson.

Beaujot, R. (2000). *Earning & caring in Canadian families.* Peterborough, Ont: Broadview Press.

Becker, G. (1993). *A treatise on the family.* Cambridge, Massachusetts : Harvard University Press.

Berger, J., & Webster, M. (2006). Expectations, Status, and Behavior. In P. Burke, *Contemporary social psychological theories* (pp. 268-300). Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.

Berger, J., Fisek, H., Norman, R., & Zelditch, M. J. (1977). *Status Characteristics and Social Interaction.* New York: Elsevier.

Bianchi, S. M., Robinson, J. P., & Milkie, M. A. (2006). *Changing rhythms of American family life.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Boeckmann, I., & Budig, M. (2013). Fatherhood, Intra-Household Employment Dynamics, and Men's Earnings in a Cross-National Perspective. *LIS Working Paper Series*, 1-46.

Brighouse, H., & Wright, E. O. (2008). Strong Gender Egalitarianism. *Politics and Society*, 360-372.

Budig, M. J., Misra, J., & Boeckmann, I. (2012). The Motherhood Penalty in Cross-National Perspective: The Importance of Work–Family Policies and Cultural Attitudes. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society*, 163-193.

Carlson, D. S., & Kacmar, K. (2000). Work–Family Conflict in the Organization: Do Life Role Values make a Difference? *Journal of Management*, 1031-1054.

Cohen, T. F. (1993). What Do Fathers Provide? Reconsidering the Economic and Nurturant Dimensions of Men as Parents. In J. Hood, *Men, Work, and Family* (pp. 1-22). Newbury Park, California: Sage Publication.

Coltrane, S. (1996). *Family man: fatherhood, housework, and gender equity*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Coltrane, S., Miller, E., DeHaan, T., & Stewart, L. (2013). Fathers and the Flexibility Stigma. *Journal of Social Issues* , 279-302.

Cooke, L. P. (2014). Eugenics of Inequality: UK and US Fatherhood Premia across the Earnings Distribution, 1974-2010. *LIS Working Paper Series*, 1-55.

Correll, S., Benard, S., & Paik, I. (2007). Getting a job: Is there a motherhood penalty? *American Journal of Sociology*, 1297-1338.

Daly, K. (1993). Reshaping Fatherhood: Finding the Models. *Journal of Family Issues*, 510-530.

Daly, K. J., Ashbourne, L., & Brown, J. L. (2013). A Reorientation of Worldview: Children's Influence on Fathers. *Journal of Family Issues*, 1401-1424 .

Dermott, E. (2005). Time and labour: Fathers' perceptions of employment and childcare. *The Sociological Review*, 89-103.

Doucet, A. (2006). *Do men mother? fathering, care, and domestic responsibility.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Doucet, A. (2009). Dad and Baby in the First Year: Gendered Responsabilities and Embodiment. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* , 78-98.

Doucet, A. (2009). Gender Equality and Gender Differences: Parenting, Habitus, and Embodiment. *Canadian Sociological Association*, 103-121.

Doucet, A., Lero, D., McKay, L., & Tremblay, D.-G. (2015). Canada country note. In P. Moss, *International Review of Leave Policies and Research 2015.* From http://www.leavenetwork.org/lp_and_r_reports/.

Doucet, A., McKay, L., & Tremblay, D.-G. (2009). Canada and Quebec: two policies, one country. In S. B. Kamerman, & P. Moss, *The politcs of parental leave policies.*

Children, parenting, gender and the labour market (pp. 33-50). Bristol, U.K. ; Portland, OR: Policy Press.

Eagly, A. H., Wood, W., & Diekman, A. B. (2000). Social role theory of sex differences and similarities: A current appraisal. In T. Eckes, & H. M. Trautner, *The developmental social psychology of gender* (pp. 123-174). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Eggebeen, D. J., & Knoester, C. (2001). Does fatherhood matter for men? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 381-393.

Employment and Social Development Canada. (2015). *Employment Insurance 2013/14 EI Monitoring and Assessment Report.* Canada Employment Insurance Commission. Retrieved from http://www.esdc.gc.ca/en/reports/ei/monitoring2014/index.page

Equality and Human Rights Commission. (2009). *Working Better:Fathers, family and work - contemporary perspectives.* Equality and Human Rights Comission.

Findlay, L. C., & Kohen, D. E. (2012). *Leave practices of parents after the birth or adoption of young children.* Canadian Social Trends.

Glauber, R. (2008). Race and gender in families and at work: The fatherhood wage premium. *Gender and Society,*, 8-30.

Gouvernement du Quebec. (2015). *Travail, Emploi, et solidarite sociale Quebec.* Retrieved April 1, 2015, from Benefits Table: http://www.rqap.gouv.qc.ca/includes/tableaux/tab_synthese_prestations_en.html

Haas, L., & Hwang, C. P. (2009). Is Fatherhood Becoming More Visible at Work? *Fathering, Fall, 2009*, 303-321.

Hodges, M., & Budig, M. (2010). WHO GETS THE DADDY BONUS? Organizational Hegemonic Masculinity and the Impact of fatherhood on earnings. *Gender & Society*, 717-745.

Hojgaard, L. (1997). Working Fathers - Caught in the Web of the Symbolic Order of Gender. *Acta Sociologica*, 245-261.

Jackson, W. (1999). *Methods Doing Social Research.* Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice Hall Allyn and Bacon Canada.

Judiesch, M. K., & Lyness, K. S. (1999). Left Behind? The Impact of Leaves of Absence on Managers' Career Success. *Academy of Management Journal*, 641-651.

Kaufman, G. (2013). *Superdads : How Fathers Balance Work and Family in the 21st Century.* New York: New York University Press.

Kaufman, G., & Uhlenberg, P. (2000). The Influence of Parenthood on the Work Effort of Married Men and Women. *Social Forces*, 931-949.

Knoester, C., & Eggebeen, D. (2006). The effects of the transition to parenthood and subsequent children on men's well-being and social participation. *Journal of Family Issues*, 1532-1560.

Lamb, M. E. (2004). *The Role of the Father in Child Development.* Hoboken, N.J: Wiley.

LaPierre-Adamcyk, E., Marcil-Gratton, N., & Le Bourdais, C. (2006). A Balacing Act: Parents' Work Arrangements and Family time. In K. McQuillan, & Z. R. Ravanera, *Canada's Changing Families Implications for Individuals and Society* (pp. 49-75). Toronto Ont: University of Toronto Press.

LaRossa, R. (2012). The historical study of fatherhood: theoretical and methodological considerations. In M. Oechsle, U. Müller, & S. Hess, *Fatherhood in late modernity : cultural images, social practices, structural frames* (pp. 37-58). Opladen: Verlag Barbara Budrich.

Lundberg, S., & Rose, E. (2002). The effects of sons and daughters on men's labor supply and wages. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 251-268.

Macdonald, D., & Friendly, M. (2014). *The Parent Trap. Child Care Fees in Canada's Big Cities.* Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.

Marshall, K. (2003, March). Benefiting from extended parental leave. *Perspectives on Labour and Income, 4*, 5-11.

Marshall, K. (2006). Converging Gender Roles. *Perspectives on Labour and Income*, 1-23.

Marshall, K. (2008). Fathers' use of paid parental leave. *Perspectives on Labour and Income*, 5-14.

Marshall, K. (2010). Employer top-ups. *Perspectives on Labour and Income*, 5-12.

Marshall, K. (2011). Paid and unpaid work over three generations. *Perspectives on Labour and Income*, 1-16.

Marsiglio, W., Amato, P., Day, R. D., & Lamb, M. E. (2000). Scholarship on Fatherhood in the 1990s and Beyond. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 1173-1191.

McInturff, K., & Macdonald, D. (2015). *Time to Grow Up. Family Policies for the Way We Live Now.* Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.

McKay, L., Marshall, K., & Doucet, A. (2012). Fathers and Parental Leave in Canada:Policies and practices. In J. Ball, & K. Daly, *Father Involvement In Canada. Diversity, Renewal, and Transformation* (pp. 207-223). Vancouver: UBC Press.

Nepomnyaschy, L., & Waldfogel, J. (2007). Paternity Leave and Fathers' Involvement with their Young Children . *Community, Work and Family*, 427-453.

Noonan, M. C. (2001). The Impact of Domestic Work on Men's and Women's Wages. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 1134-1145.

O' Brien, M. (2009). Fathers, Parental Leave Policies, and Infant Quality of Life :International Perspectives and Policy Impact. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 190-213.

Office of the Auditor General of Canada. (2003). *Report of the Auditor General of Canada.* Ottawa: Minister of Public Works and Goverment Services Canada. From http://www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/internet/docs/20031107ce.pdf

Parker, K., & Wang, W. (2013, April 16). *Modern Parenthood Roles of Moms and Dads Converge as They Balance Work and Family* . Washington : Pew Research Center. Retrieved from Pew ResearchSocial & Demographic Trends Project: http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2013/03/14/modern-parenthood-roles-of-moms-and-dads-converge-as-they-balance-work-and-family/

Pérusse, D. (2003). New maternity and parental benefits. 1-4.

Phipps, S. (2006). *Working for Working Parents: The Evolution of Maternity and Parental Benefits in Canada.* IRPP Choices.

Plantenga, J., & Remery, C. (2005). *Reconciliation of Work and Private Life: A Review of Thirty European Countries.* Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Pleck, J. H. (1993). Are family supportive employer policies relevant to men? In J. Hood, *Men, Work, and Family* (pp. 217-237). Newbury Park, California: Sage Publication.

Pratt, M. W., Lawford, H. L., & Allen, J. W. (2012). Young Fatherhood, Generativity, and Men's Development: Travelling a Two-Way Street to Maturity. In J. Ball, & K. Daly, *Father Involvement in Canada* (pp. 107-125). Vancouver: UBC Press.

Ranson, G. (2001). Men at work Change__or No Change__in the Era of the "New Father". *Men and masculinities*, 3-26.

Ranson, G. (2009). Paid and Unpaid Work: How Do Families Divide Their Labour? In M. Baker, *Families. Changing Trends in Canada* (pp. 108-129). Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson.

Rapoport, B., & Le Bourdais, C. (2006). Parental Time, Work Schedules, and Changing Gender Roles. In K. McQuillan, & Z. R. Ravanera, *Canada's Changing Families Implications for Individuals and Society* (pp. 76-104). Toronto Ont: University of Toronto Press.

Ravanera, Z. R., & Hoffman, J. (2012). Canadian Fathers: Demographic and Socio-Economic Profiles from Census and National Surveys. In J. Ball, & K. Daly, *Father Involvement In Canada* (pp. 26-49). Vancouver: UBC Press.

Rege, M., & Solli, I. F. (2013). The Impact of Paternity Leave on Fathers' Future Earnings. *Demography*, 2255-2277.

Ridgeway, C. (1997). Interaction and the Conservation of Gender Inequality: Considering Employment. *American Sociological Review*, 218-235.

Ridgeway, C. (2006). Status Construction Theory. In P. Burke, *Contemporary social psychological theories* (pp. 301-323). Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.

Ridgeway, C. (2009). Framed Before We Know It. *Gender & Society*, 145-160.

Ridgeway, C. (2011). *Framed by gender how gender inequality persists in the modern world.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Ridgeway, C. L., & Correll, S. J. (2004). Motherhood as a Status Characteristic. *Journal of Social Issues*, 683-700.

Ridgeway, C. L., & Correll, S. J. (2004). Unpacking the gender system: a theoretical perspective on gender beliefs and social relations. *Gender & Society*, 510-531.

Ridgeway, C. L., & Smith - Lovin, L. (1999). The gender system and interaction. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 191-216.

Risman, B. J. (2004). Gender as a Social Structure: Theory Wrestling with Activism. *Gender and Society*, 429-450.

Rudman, L., & Mescher, K. (2013). Penalizing men who request a family leave: Is flexibility stigma a femininity stigma? *Journal of Social Issues*, 322-340.

Service Canada . (2015, November 18). *Service Canada* . Retrieved from Service Canada: http://www.servicecanada.gc.ca/eng/ei/types/maternity_parental.shtml#much

Seward, R. R., Yeatts, D. E., Zotarelli, L. K., & Fletcher, R. G. (2006). Fathers Taking Parental Leave and Their Involvement with Children . *Community, Work and Family* , 1-9.

Shelton, B. A. (2000). Understanding the Distribution of Housework between Husbands and Wives. In L. Waite, *The Ties that Bind. Perspectives on Marriage and Cohabitation* (pp. 343-355). New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Stastna, K. (2012, May 10). Canada's working moms still earning less, doing more than dads. *CBC News*.

Statistics Canada . (n.d.). *Table 202-0101 Distribution of earnings, by sex, 2011 constant dollars annual.* CANSIN (database).

Statistics Canada. (2010). *Women in Canada a gender-based statistical report.* Ottawa: Statistics Canada.

Statistics Canada. (2011). *General Social Survey-2010 Overview of the Time Use of Canadians.* Ottawa: Statistics Canada.

Statistics Canada. (2012, July 17). *General Social Survey - Family (GSS)*. Retrieved October 4, 2014, from Statistics Canada: http://www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p2SV.pl?Function=getSurvey&SDDS=4501

Statistics Canada. (n.d.). *Table 282-0008 Labour force survey estimates (LFS), by North American Industry Classification System (NAICS), sex and age group annual (persons x 1,000).* CANSIM (database).

Statistics Canada. (n.d.). *Table 282-0026 Labour force survey estimates (LFS), by actual hours worked, class of worker, National Occupational Classification for Statistics (NOC-S) and sex, annual(8,9).* CANSIM (database).

Statistics Canada. (n.d.). *Table 282-0069 Labour force survey estimates (LFS), wages of employees by type of work, National Occupational Classification for Statistics (NOC-S), sex and age group.* CANSIM (database).

Sullivan, O. (2000). The Division of Domestic Labour Twenty Years of Change. *Sociology*, 437-456.

Tanaka, S., & Waldfogel, J. (2007). Effects of parental leave and work hours on fathers' involvement with their babies. *Community, Work and Family*, 409-426.

The Canadian Press. (2009, September 5). Women outnumber men in Canadian workforce. *The Canadian Press*.

Townsend, N. (2002). *Package Deal: Marriage, Work And Fatherhood In Men'S Lives*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Vandello, J. A., Bosson, J. K., Cohen, D., Burnaford, R. M., & Weaver, J. R. (2008). Precarious Manhood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1325-1339.

Wagner, D. G., & Berger, J. (2002). Expectation States Theory: An evolving Research Program. In J. Berger, & M. Zelditch, *New directions in contemporary sociological theory* (pp. 41-76). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Wall, G. (2009). Childhood and Child-Rearing. In M. Baker, *Families. Changing Trends in Canada* (pp. 91-107). Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson.

Wall, G., & Arnold, S. (2007). How involved is involved fathering? An exploration of the contemporary culture of fatherhood. *Gender & Society*, 508-527.

Wente, M. (2010, June 12). The New Heavyweight Champions. *The Globe and Mail*.

White, N. R. (1994). About Fathers: Masculinity and the Social Construction of Fatherhood. *Journal of Sociology*, 119-131.

Whitehead, D. L., & Bala, N. (2012). The Short End of the Stick? Fatherhood in the Wake of Separation and Divorce. In J. Ball, & K. Daly, *Father Involvement in Canada* (pp. 149-170). Vancouver: UBC Press.

Yeung, W., Sandberg, J., Davis-Kean, P., & Hofferth, S. (2001). Children's time with fathers in intact families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 136-154 .

Appendix A: Sensitivity analyses

Outliers

In order to address the presence of outliers in the analyses, affecting the results, I computed a Mahalanobis and a Cook's statistic from the full regression model on both men's and fathers' earnings analyses. These statistics showed that although there was a significant presence of outliers in both samples, the standardised residuals did not influence the final results of the models. For this reason the outliers were not removed from the samples when conducting the analyses.

Multicollinearity

To assess whether two or more independent variables were correlated in the regression model, I computed a Tolerance statistic from the full regression model on men's and fathers' earnings analyses. All the tolerance values were higher than the standard cut-off of Tolerance > .10. Additionally, none of the condition indices higher than 30 had two or more variables with a variance proportion of 0.50 or higher. Therefore, I concluded that the results in both analyses were no affected by multicollinearity.

Appendix B

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics for Fathers (ever having children) (N=3233) and Childless Men (N=1337)

	Fathers			Childless men	
	Mean		SD	Mean	SD
Income	80565.68	***	102884.00	53564.71	79946.16
Income (logged)	11.05	***	.65	10.61	.73
Socio-Demographics					
Age	46.06	***	10.58	34.12	11.95
Age (logged)	3.80	***	.24	3.47	.33
Urban	.80		.40	.82	.38
Minority	.16		.37	.17	.37
Newfoundland and Labrador	.01		.12	.01	.12
Prince Edward Island	.00		.07	.00	.06
Nova Scotia	.02		.15	.03	.17
New Brunswick	.02		.14	.02	.14
Quebec	.22		.41	.21	.41
Ontario	.39		.49	.40	.49
Manitoba	.04		.20	.04	.19
Saskatchewan	.04	*	.18	.02	.16
Alberta	.12		.33	.13	.34
British Columbia	.13		.34	.13	.33
Human Capital					
Doctorate, masters or degree in Medicine, Dentistry, Veterinary or Optometry	.11	**	.31	.07	.26
Bachelor undergraduate degree or teacher's college	.19		.40	.20	.40
Diploma or certificate from community college, CEGEP, nursing, trade, technical, vocational school or business college	.34		.47	.31	.46
Some university, community college, CEGEP, nursing, trade, technical, vocational school or business college	.13		.34	.15	.36
High school diploma	.13	***	.34	.18	.39
Some secondary, high school, elementary school or no schooling	.10		.30	.08	.28
Work Interruptions	.51	***	.86	.40	.73
Work Hours	44.75	***	12.16	42.14	11.01
Marital Status					
Married	.75	***	.43	.25	.44
Single	.03	***	.16	.55	.50
Living in common law	.16		.36	.17	.38

Divorced, separated and widowed	.07	***	.25	.02	.15
Workplace characteristics					
Management occupations	.15	***	.35	.07	.26
Business, finance and administrative occupations	.09	***	.29	.14	.35
Natural and applied sciences and related occupations	.12		.32	.13	.33
Health occupations	.02		.15	.03	.18
Occupations in social science, education, government service and religion	.07		.25	.06	.23
Occupations in art, culture, recreation and sport	.02		.14	.03	.16
Sales and services occupations	.15	**	.36	.20	.40
Trades, transport and equipment operators and related occupations	.27		.44	.26	.44
Occupations unique to primary industry	.04		.20	.03	.18
Occupations unique to processing, manufacturing and utilities	.08	*	.26	.05	.22
Union membership	.25		.43	.25	.43
Regular employee	.74	***	.44	.80	.40
Seasonal, term, casual or on-call employee	.06	***	.23	.11	.31
Self employed	.21	***	.40	.09	.29

Note: These data are weighted.

** p≤0.05; ** p≤0.01; *** p≤0.001*

Table 9

OLS Regression Results Predicting Men's LN Earnings by ever have Child(ren) (N=4,570)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7
Fatherhood	0.441***	0.273***	0.268***	0.241***	0.072**	0.251***	0.092***
	(0.029)	(0.028)	(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.026)	(0.025)
Socio-Demographics							
Age (logged)		0.518***	0.484***	0.519***	0.379***	0.452***	0.390***
		(0.044)	(0.042)	(0.042)	(0.044)	(0.041)	(0.040)
Urban [a]		0.077**	0.010	0.121***	0.084***	0.018	0.025
		(0.025)	(0.024)	(0.025)	(0.024)	(0.023)	(0.022)
Minority [b]		-0.246***	-0.351***	-0.219***	-0.262***	-0.267***	-0.319***
		(0.040)	(0.039)	(0.039)	(0.038)	(0.037)	(0.035)
Newfoundland and Labrador[c]		0.043	0.033	-0.018	-0.003	0.019	-0.057
		(0.058)	(0.053)	(0.058)	(0.057)	(0.055)	(0.052)
Prince Edward Island [c]		-0.078	-0.064	-0.122*	-0.103	-0.043	-0.088
		(0.060)	(0.058)	(0.059)	(0.061)	(0.056)	(0.054)
Nova Scotia [c]		-0.024	-0.024	-0.069	-0.048	-0.016	-0.067
		(0.051)	(0.047)	(0.051)	(0.051)	(0.044)	(0.043)
New Brunswick [c]		-0.020	-0.026	-0.036	-0.053	-0.012	-0.047
		(0.055)	(0.054)	(0.053)	(0.054)	(0.052)	(0.050)
Ontario [c]		0.170***	0.160***	0.137***	0.141***	0.165***	0.118***
		(0.031)	(0.029)	(0.030)	(0.031)	(0.028)	(0.027)
Manitoba [c]		0.033	0.062	0.009	0.016	0.049	0.034
		(0.047)	(0.042)	(0.045)	(0.046)	(0.042)	(0.039)
Saskatchewan [c]		0.098	0.153**	0.040	0.058	0.113*	0.082
		(0.059)	(0.054)	(0.058)	(0.060)	(0.056)	(0.053)
Alberta [c]		0.357***	0.377***	0.292***	0.325***	0.379***	0.327***

	(0.039)	(0.036)	(0.038)	(0.039)	(0.036)	(0.034)
British Columbia [c]	0.148***	0.157***	0.121**	0.111**	0.161***	0.131***
	(0.041)	(0.039)	(0.040)	(0.040)	(0.039)	(0.035)
Human Capital						
Doctorate, masters or degree in Medicine, Dentistry, Veterinary or Optometry [d]		0.162***				0.115**
		(0.047)				(0.043)
Diploma or certificate from community college, CEGEP, nursing, trade, technical, vocational school or business college [d]		-0.244***				-0.229***
		(0.031)				(0.032)
Some university, community college, CEGEP, nursing, trade, technical, vocational school or business college [d]		-0.402***				-0.296***
		(0.039)				(0.037)
High school diploma [d]		-0.534***				-0.420***
		(0.040)				(0.041)
Some secondary, high school, elementary school or no schooling [d]		-0.602***				-0.486***
		(0.042)				(0.040)
Work Interruptions		-0.086***				-0.077***
		(0.013)				(0.012)
Work Hours			0.013***			0.012***
			(0.001)			(0.001)
Marital Status						
Single [e]				-0.490***		-0.308***

	(0.037)		(0.034)
Living in common law [e]	-0.144***		-0.078**
	(0.033)		(0.029)
Divorced, separated and widowed [e]	-0.240***		-0.128***
	(0.043)		(0.038)
Workplace characteristics			
Management occupations [f]		0.420***	0.241***
		(0.040)	(0.037)
Business, finance and administrative occupations [f]		0.126**	0.044
		(0.043)	(0.038)
Natural and applied sciences and related occupations [f]		0.370***	0.172***
		(0.032)	(0.032)
Health occupations [f]		0.511***	0.301***
		(0.090)	(0.086)
Occupations in social science, education, government service and religion [f]		0.263***	-0.025
		(0.042)	(0.047)
Occupations in art, culture, recreation and sport [f]		0.110	-0.006
		(0.089)	(0.081)
Sales and services occupations [f]		-0.134***	-0.134***
		(0.035)	(0.031)
Occupations unique to primary industry [f]		0.023	-0.090
		(0.060)	(0.056)

Occupations unique to processing, manufacturing and utilities [f]						-0.040	0.001
						(0.038)	(0.036)
Union membership [g]						0.115***	0.138***
						(0.024)	(0.022)
Seasonal, term, casual or on-call employee [h]						-0.450***	-0.392***
						(0.048)	(0.046)
Self employed [h]						-0.030	-0.082*
						(0.036)	(0.034)
Constant	10.609***	8.651***	9.146***	8.100***	9.457***	8.849***	9.109***
	(0.026)	(0.162)	(0.155)	(0.167)	(0.164)	(0.147)	(0.159)
R-Squared	0.084	0.161	0.275	0.204	0.202	0.269	0.388

Note: These data are weighted.

Unstandardized coefficients, standard errors in parentheses

** p≤0.05; ** p≤0.01; *** p≤0.001*

[a] *Omitted category is Rural*

[b] *Omitted category is not a visible minority*

[c] *Omitted category is living in Quebec*

[d] *Omitted category is Bachelor undergraduate degree or teacher's college*

[e] *Omitted category is married*

[f] *Omitted category is Trades, transport and equipment operators and related occupations*

[g] *Omitted category is not covered*

[h] *Omitted category is regular employee*

Table 10

OLS Regression Results Predicting Men's LN Earnings by Number of Children (N=4,570)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7
Number of Children							
1 Child	0.203***	0.203***	0.157***	0.188***	0.102***	0.177***	0.060*
	(0.032)	(0.030)	(0.028)	(0.029)	(0.030)	(0.028)	(0.026)
2 Children	0.328***	0.343***	0.295***	0.313***	0.210***	0.289***	0.145***
	(0.032)	(0.029)	(0.027)	(0.029)	(0.030)	(0.029)	(0.027)
3 Children or more	0.317***	0.341***	0.309***	0.299***	0.208***	0.300***	0.159***
	(0.048)	(0.046)	(0.042)	(0.044)	(0.045)	(0.044)	(0.041)
Socio-Demographics							
Age (logged)		0.730***	0.694***	0.706***	0.484***	0.651***	0.479***
		(0.041)	(0.039)	(0.039)	(0.043)	(0.039)	(0.039)
Urban		0.069**	0.007	0.112***	0.081***	0.014	0.024
		(0.025)	(0.024)	(0.025)	(0.024)	(0.023)	(0.022)
Minority		-0.259***	-0.357***	-0.231***	-0.270***	-0.276***	-0.324***
		(0.039)	(0.038)	(0.038)	(0.038)	(0.037)	(0.035)
Newfoundland and Labrador		0.045	0.037	-0.015	0.004	0.021	-0.053
		(0.058)	(0.054)	(0.058)	(0.057)	(0.055)	(0.052)
Prince Edward Island		-0.084	-0.068	-0.126*	-0.106	-0.049	-0.090
		(0.059)	(0.058)	(0.059)	(0.060)	(0.055)	(0.054)
Nova Scotia		-0.029	-0.031	-0.072	-0.046	-0.022	-0.068
		(0.051)	(0.047)	(0.051)	(0.051)	(0.045)	(0.043)
New Brunswick		-0.013	-0.018	-0.029	-0.044	-0.006	-0.042
		(0.053)	(0.052)	(0.051)	(0.054)	(0.050)	(0.049)
Ontario		0.162***	0.154***	0.131***	0.140***	0.158***	0.116***
		(0.031)	(0.029)	(0.030)	(0.031)	(0.028)	(0.027)
Manitoba		0.026	0.055	0.004	0.011	0.043	0.030
		(0.046)	(0.042)	(0.045)	(0.046)	(0.042)	(0.039)

Saskatchewan	0.091	0.144**	0.035	0.054	0.107*	0.078
	(0.058)	(0.054)	(0.057)	(0.059)	(0.055)	(0.052)
Alberta	0.353***	0.373***	0.292***	0.325***	0.376***	0.326***
	(0.039)	(0.036)	(0.038)	(0.038)	(0.036)	(0.034)
British Columbia	0.141***	0.151***	0.116**	0.111**	0.155***	0.130***
	(0.040)	(0.038)	(0.039)	(0.040)	(0.039)	(0.035)
Human Capital						
Doctorate, masters or degree in Medicine, Dentistry, Veterinary or Optometry		0.164***				0.117**
		(0.046)				(0.043)
Diploma or certificate from community college, CEGEP, nursing, trade, technical, vocational school or business college		-0.227***				-0.223***
		(0.031)				(0.032)
Some university, community college, CEGEP, nursing, trade, technical, vocational school or business college		-0.381***				-0.289***
		(0.039)				(0.037)
High school diploma		-0.508***				-0.411***
		(0.040)				(0.041)
Some secondary, high school, elementary school or no schooling		-0.561***				-0.470***
		(0.043)				(0.040)
Work Interruptions		-0.086***				-0.078***
		(0.013)				(0.012)
Work Hours			0.012***			0.012***
			(0.001)			(0.001)

Marital Status			
Single	-0.414***		-0.285***
	(0.036)		(0.032)
Living in common law	-0.128***		-0.073**
	(0.033)		(0.028)
Divorced, separated and widowed	-0.223***		-0.120***
	(0.042)		(0.037)
Workplace characteristics			
Management occupations		0.406***	0.238***
		(0.040)	(0.037)
Business, finance and administrative occupations		0.116**	0.043
		(0.042)	(0.037)
Natural and applied sciences and related occupations		0.350***	0.168***
		(0.031)	(0.032)
Health occupations		0.504***	0.302***
		(0.089)	(0.086)
Occupations in social science, education, government service and religion		0.245***	-0.025
		(0.042)	(0.047)
Occupations in art, culture, recreation and sport		0.071	-0.018
		(0.089)	(0.081)
Sales and services occupations		-0.132***	-0.132***
		(0.035)	(0.031)
Occupations unique to primary industry		0.010	-0.093
		(0.059)	(0.056)

Occupations unique to processing, manufacturing and utilities						-0.042	0.000
						(0.038)	(0.036)
Union membership						0.109***	0.134***
						(0.023)	(0.021)
Seasonal, term, casual or on-call employee						-0.427***	-0.382***
						(0.048)	(0.046)
Self employed						-0.033	-0.084*
						(0.036)	(0.035)
Constant	10.784***	7.935***	8.432***	7.482***	9.023***	8.188***	8.791***
	(0.018)	(0.161)	(0.153)	(0.163)	(0.171)	(0.150)	(0.165)
R-Squared	0.042	0.182	0.285	0.223	0.214	0.281	0.392

Note: These data are weighted.

Unstandardized coefficients, standard errors in parentheses

** p≤0.05; ** p≤0.01; *** p≤0.001*

[a] *Omitted category is Rural*

[b] *Omitted category is not a visible minority*

[c] *Omitted category is living in Quebec*

[d] *Omitted category is Bachelor undergraduate degree or teacher's college*

[e] *Omitted category is married*

[f] *Omitted category is Trades, transport and equipment operators and related occupations*

[g] *Omitted category is not covered*

[h] *Omitted category is regular employee*

Table 11

OLS Regression Results Predicting Men's LN Earnings by Age of Youngest Child (N=4,570)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7
Age of youngest child							
Child under 4	0.263***	0.388***	0.318***	0.357***	0.226***	0.331***	0.151***
	(0.033)	(0.032)	(0.030)	(0.031)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.029)
Child between 5 -12	0.261***	0.258***	0.230***	0.228***	0.149***	0.215***	0.102***
	(0.032)	(0.029)	(0.027)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.028)	(0.026)
Child between 13-18	0.322***	0.189***	0.159***	0.174***	0.123**	0.174***	0.085*
	(0.041)	(0.039)	(0.037)	(0.038)	(0.039)	(0.037)	(0.036)
Socio-Demographics							
Age (logged)		0.780***	0.734***	0.753***	0.515***	0.691***	0.497***
		(0.043)	(0.041)	(0.041)	(0.046)	(0.041)	(0.041)
Urban		0.063**	0.002	0.108***	0.077***	0.009	0.021
		(0.024)	(0.023)	(0.025)	(0.024)	(0.022)	(0.022)
Minority		-0.253***	-0.350***	-0.226***	-0.266***	-0.271***	-0.321***
		(0.039)	(0.038)	(0.039)	(0.038)	(0.037)	(0.035)
Newfoundland and Labrador		0.043	0.034	-0.016	0.001	0.020	-0.057
		(0.058)	(0.054)	(0.058)	(0.057)	(0.056)	(0.052)
Prince Edward Island		-0.075	-0.063	-0.117*	-0.102	-0.040	-0.088
		(0.059)	(0.058)	(0.058)	(0.060)	(0.055)	(0.054)
Nova Scotia		-0.020	-0.023	-0.062	-0.041	-0.014	-0.065
		(0.051)	(0.047)	(0.051)	(0.051)	(0.044)	(0.043)
New Brunswick		-0.012	-0.019	-0.028	-0.047	-0.006	-0.045
		(0.055)	(0.053)	(0.053)	(0.055)	(0.052)	(0.050)
Ontario		0.162***	0.154***	0.131***	0.139***	0.159***	0.115***
		(0.031)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.031)	(0.028)	(0.027)
Manitoba		0.036	0.063	0.013	0.015	0.052	0.033
		(0.046)	(0.042)	(0.045)	(0.046)	(0.042)	(0.039)

Saskatchewan	0.094	0.148**	0.038	0.056	0.111	0.080
	(0.058)	(0.054)	(0.058)	(0.059)	(0.055)	(0.053)
Alberta	0.357***	0.375***	0.294***	0.326***	0.380***	0.326***
	(0.038)	(0.036)	(0.038)	(0.038)	(0.036)	(0.034)
British Columbia	0.141***	0.151***	0.116**	0.110**	0.155***	0.129***
	(0.040)	(0.038)	(0.039)	(0.040)	(0.038)	(0.035)
Human Capital						
Doctorate, masters or degree in Medicine, Dentistry, Veterinary or Optometry		0.156***				0.113**
		(0.047)				(0.043)
Diploma or certificate from community college, CEGEP, nursing, trade, technical, vocational school or business college		-0.224***				-0.221***
		(0.031)				(0.032)
Some university, community college, CEGEP, nursing, trade, technical, vocational school or business college		-0.382***				-0.289***
		(0.039)				(0.037)
High school diploma		-0.498***				-0.406***
		(0.040)				(0.041)
Some secondary, high school, elementary school or no schooling		-0.561***				-0.470***
		(0.043)				(0.040)
Work Interruptions		-0.086***				-0.078***
		(0.013)				(0.012)
Work Hours			0.012***			0.012***
			(0.001)			(0.001)

Marital Status			
Single	-0.405***		-0.281***
	(0.036)		(0.032)
Living in common law	-0.135***		-0.080**
	(0.033)		(0.028)
Divorced, separated and widowed	-0.220***		-0.119**
	(0.043)		(0.038)
Workplace characteristics			
Management occupations		0.408***	0.241***
		(0.040)	(0.037)
Business, finance and administrative occupations		0.120**	0.046
		(0.042)	(0.038)
Natural and applied sciences and related occupations		0.350***	0.171***
		(0.031)	(0.032)
Health occupations		0.506***	0.308***
		(0.089)	(0.086)
Occupations in social science, education, government service and religion		0.238***	-0.026
		(0.042)	(0.047)
Occupations in art, culture, recreation and sport		0.073	-0.014
		(0.089)	(0.082)
Sales and services occupations		-0.126***	-0.128***
		(0.035)	(0.031)
Occupations unique to primary industry		0.010	-0.093

						(0.059)	(0.056)
Occupations unique to processing, manufacturing and utilities						-0.040	0.001
						(0.038)	(0.036)
Union membership						0.110***	0.135***
						(0.023)	(0.022)
Seasonal, term, casual or on-call employee						-0.430***	-0.385***
						(0.048)	(0.046)
Self employed						-0.032	-0.082*
						(0.036)	(0.034)
Constant	10.784***	7.752***	8.283***	7.309***	8.912***	8.041***	8.721***
	(0.018)	(0.168)	(0.161)	(0.168)	(0.180)	(0.157)	(0.171)
R-Squared	0.039	0.183	0.284	0.224	0.213	0.282	0.391

Note: These data are weighted.

Unstandardized coefficients, standard errors in parentheses

** p≤0.05; ** p≤0.01; *** p≤0.001*

[a] *Omitted category is Rural*

[b] *Omitted category is not a visible minority*

[c] *Omitted category is living in Quebec*

[d] *Omitted category is Bachelor undergraduate degree or teacher´s college*

[e] *Omitted category is married*

[f] *Omitted category is Trades, transport and equipment operators and related occupations*

[g] *Omitted category is not covered*

[h] *Omitted category is regular employee*