

In 2017, men worked 56% of all hours and earned 56% of all income. Women worked 44% of all hours and earned 44% of all income.

March 5, 2020 | 2369 upvotes | by [Oncefa2](#)

Basically, men's and women's hourly wages were the same.

This trend goes back for decades but here's a nice graph illustrating the situation in 2017:

<https://imgur.com/gallery/UCXgIhU>

Credit: [u/FelineQuinine](#)

Notice how 93% of workplace fatalities are still men. A fact that men apparently do not get compensated for.

~~The math is pretty simple, though not obvious at first:~~

$$\$1 / (\$1 + \$0.77) = 0.56$$

I think this shows pretty clearly what the largest factor in the earnings gap is.

Of course the fact that men have to work longer hours than women is itself a problem. Paying for dates and bills for your girlfriend / wife isn't exactly cheap. Not to mention that many women look for men who earn more money, thus creating an incentive for men to sacrifice their work-life balance in order to earn more.

I guarantee most men would love to work fewer hours and spend more time at home but the spending and earning patterns of their partners don't often facilitate this.

This also contributes to poorer health outcomes for men and the fact that men die 5 years earlier than women on average.

Edit: Graph is fine, title is misleading. The 77 cents per dollar thing is likely just a colloquialism at this point. The graph itself is showing total hours worked for all workers, part time and full time combined. But AFAIK there is no equivalent wage gap statistic to compare that to.

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

iaimf[M] [score hidden] 5 March, 2020 09:00 PM stickied comment

There are some questions about the accuracy of this post.

see comment below:

https://www.reddit.com/r/MensRights/comments/fduess/in_2017_men_worked_56_of_all_hours_and_earned_56/fjl2qb8?utm_source=share&utm_medium=web2x

TheVoluntaryBeggar • 283 points • 5 March, 2020 12:22 PM

That's a 27% longer workload for men.

Slade_Riprock • 143 points • 5 March, 2020 05:11 PM

Well of course it's because men hold women back from working longer hours, taking more dangerous and potentially lucrative jobs.

DamnIamHigh_Original • 40 points • 5 March, 2020 10:53 PM

Selfish men, give those poor ladies the rifles and let them storm the insurgent town... wait nobody said that

StupidisAStupidPosts • 16 points • 5 March, 2020 10:44 PM

And usually that 27% is what makes life worth living. It's your weekends / holidays.

genobeam • 8 points • 5 March, 2020 08:57 PM

It would be if the title was accurate. However among full time workers men work 43.5 hrs/week compared to women's 41.1. That's only ~6% more.

<https://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat22.htm>

Trind • 10 points • 5 March, 2020 10:15 PM

What portion of all male workers are part-time and what portion of all female workers are part-time?

Adam_2102 • 3 points • 5 March, 2020 11:17 PM

In 2018 it was something like 10 million male and 18 million female in the US, not sure what percentage of the total workforce that is. Might not have been 2018 though i cant remember the exact year the article mentioned.

genobeam • -11 points • 5 March, 2020 10:24 PM

That's irrelevant. The wage gap only compares full time workers

orcscorper • 13 points • 5 March, 2020 11:55 PM

There is no wage gap. The wage gap is a lie. There is an *earnings* gap. Men earn more because they work more hours, as this post shows. Even the definition of "full-time" varies by gender. Full-time women work 38 hours per week, while full-time men work an average of 46 hours per week. That's 82.6¢ on the dollar without accounting for men dominating the highest-paying college majors, and women choosing the lowest-paying majors.

Men earn more because hypergamy causes women to consistently select men who earn more, so they can work less. They choose to spend more time at home with their children, then blame patriarchy when they make less money.

genobeam • 7 points • 5 March, 2020 11:59 PM

It's not just hours worked that causes the gap. Men work more lucrative professions, there's an exponential benefit for overtime, men commute further, work more on-call jobs, are more willing to relocate for work, retire later.

This post is wayyy oversimplifying the gap.

Also men don't work 46 hours per week on average. it's 43.5 among full time workers and 41.1 for women not 38.

Trind • 6 points • 5 March, 2020 10:28 PM

No, that absolutely is relevant. If you compare all workers, men work way more than women. They work way more dangerous jobs. And they earn more. I would be curious to know if how much more they earn is proportional to how much more they work. I'm betting it's not.

genobeam • 7 points • 5 March, 2020 10:37 PM

In the context of the wage gap, which compare earnings of full time working men to the earnings of full time working women, any statistics about part time workers is irrelevant. The wage gap essentially already accounts for the fact that of course full time workers earn more than part time workers.

orcsorper • 3 points • 5 March, 2020 11:58 PM

There is no wage hap. The wage gap is a lie. You are a brainwashed feminist who would fit in nicely at r/MensLib.

genobeam • 3 points • 6 March, 2020 12:01 AM

"full time working women earn 77 cents for every dollar a man earns"

the above statement is true. There are reasons that explain why it exists, but it's not a lie.

"women earn 77 cents for the same job as men" < that statement is a lie.

Trind • 0 points • 5 March, 2020 10:46 PM

If the wage gap only compares the earnings of full-time workers then how can it account for anything to do with part-time workers?

That's like saying my study of the echolocation system of bats has provided me with insight about how alcohol is absorbed into the bloodstream. My study did not include alcohol being absorbed into the bloodstream, so how can it take into account something that was not a part of it?

genobeam • 6 points • 5 March, 2020 10:56 PM

If the wage gap only compares the earnings of full-time workers then how can it account for anything to do with part-time workers?

It doesn't account for anything to do with part time workers, and why should it? Part

time work is often less skilled and requires less education. It's not fair to compare part time workers to full time.

Trind • 2 points • 5 March, 2020 11:52 PM

It doesn't matter, it's more hours put in to earn an income. I'm willing to bet that men hold more additional jobs than women do, too. This should all be a part of the picture, because it will truly show just how much more men work than women, and would hopefully shut them the fuck up about an imaginary wage gap lol men work WAAAAAY more than women, of course they should earn more.

genobeam • 2 points • 6 March, 2020 12:03 AM

If you include part time workers as part of the wage gap then women earn much less than 77 cents on the dollar. Your statistics would cause the "wage gap" to grow by a lot. As someone who often tries to explain why the wage gap doesn't exist for comparable jobs, you're going the opposite direction.

orcscorper • 1 point • 6 March, 2020 12:02 AM

Part-time work is often less skilled and requires less education, but nobody is comparing part-time workers to full-time workers, are they?

The post is comparing all female workers (part-time and full-time) to all male workers (part-time and full-time). Men work more hours, and men make more money. It is completely delusional to think that this is an injustice.

genobeam • 1 point • 6 March, 2020 12:06 AM

We're using a statistic (women earn 77c for every \$1 a man earns) which ONLY includes full time workers and comparing it to a different statistic (men work 56% of total hours) which includes both full time and part time workers.

If you want to compare these two you either have to compare the hours full time working women work compared to full time working men, or you need to compare the earnings of all women to all men. Mixing and matching the two data sets is misleading.

If you include the earnings of all women vs all men, women earn much less than 77 cents on the dollar.

[deleted] • 1 point • 7 March, 2020 01:20 AM

Women who work part time earn more than men who do that on average

genobeam • 1 point • 7 March, 2020 01:52 AM

Yes but both women and men who work part time make much less than men and women who work full time, so the fact that there are twice as many part time working women than men and more full time working men will skew the numbers

rabell111 • -4 points • 5 March, 2020 10:45 PM

In your tiny mind maybe. The cutting a slicing of epidemiological data in order to find a ratio that

supports one view over another is well known as "cooking the books". It's a practice used by those with agendas not supported by the data.

genobeam • 3 points • 5 March, 2020 10:49 PM

I'm cooking the books? You're attempting to compare two different data sets. full time working women earn .77 for every \$1 a man earns. Full time working men work 6% more than full time working women. These numbers are apples to apples comparisons.

compare that to the statement you're trying to make:

full time working women earn .77 for every \$1 a man earns. Among all workers men work 12% more than women.

Do you see how the second statement is misleading? it's not the same dataset.

also whats with the personal attack?

RCO_[] • 3 points • 5 March, 2020 11:11 PM

I agree with you here. But, i want to add that

full time working women earn .77 for every \$1 a man earns.

is misleading as well. As is every statistic that neglects all other contributing factors but gender.

genobeam • 2 points • 5 March, 2020 11:15 PM

100% agree

rabell111 • 3 points • 6 March, 2020 04:01 AM

Personal attack out of order. I am tied and didn't read properly, and even then it's not appropriate. Apologies. Clearly your analysis is of high quality. You do this for a living?

The comparisons require interchangeability, or the comparisons suffer increased degrees of uncertainty, agreed. As a matter of interest, did your data set exclude agricultural employment and labor?

genobeam • 0 points • 6 March, 2020 04:06 AM

Apology accepted and thank you, very rare to get that on here.

I was using the data from CPS, yes it did exclude agricultural.

ZombieAlpacaLips • 2 points • 5 March, 2020 07:04 PM

I'm guessing that women make up the difference by working on household chores and errands. Men put in more hours earning an income, and women put in more hours maintaining a home.

originalSpacePirate5 points 5 March, 2020 08:03 PM* **[recovered]**

Your guess is wrong. I dont know a man (apart from my dad) that isnt also taking care of the majority of the household chores too. I would LOVE to come home to a clean house and warm home cooked meal after a 12 hour day. That only happens if i spend the first 2 hours at home cooking and cleaning

Jack_N_Morty • 17 points • 5 March, 2020 08:10 PM

Right, nevermind I gotta work 12 hours come home and give my wife a break from looking after our

child. Weekends I just can't take the dirtiness and start cleaning.

Blackops_21 • 1 point • 5 March, 2020 11:02 PM

My wife and I both work 40-45 hours a week. She still cooks nearly every night, does all the cleaning, and does the laundry (plus keeps the garden out front looking nice).

I help out with vacuuming when the mood hits me, sometimes spraying the bathroom with scrubbing bubbles & wiping everything down, and taking the trash out.

ZeldaVelveeta • 1 point • 6 March, 2020 12:54 AM

So....you do know a man.

accidental_me • 15 points • 5 March, 2020 07:14 PM

At least in Finland men work more even the household chores are taken into account.

Oncefa2[S] • 6 points • 5 March, 2020 08:33 PM

In terms of total time it evens out. At least according to people like PEW (technically men do an extra hour or two of paid / unpaid work per week than women).

I'd rather be "working" at home and watching the kids than working overtime though. There's definitely a difference in difficulty and in terms of how much it wears you out.

Household chores often becomes an excuse to work less. But this gets turned around and thrown in our face like we're the bad guys for stepping up and making the extra sacrifices to bring in a few extra thousands for the household.

tallwheel • 1 point • 6 March, 2020 08:05 AM

And even if you don't agree with this, at the very least there is the downtime women have for childbirth and the possible timespan around that when they can't work. This is more pronounced in societies where women still spend a lot of their adult lives pregnant with multiple children.

Thewildjudoman • 187 points • 5 March, 2020 04:14 PM

I 100% guarantee if I showed this to my sociology classmates I would be dead within 24hrs

This is really interesting though as I never had any statistical argument to go against the pay gap without getting shot down because 'they must be fake'. Thanks for this information.

am_i_wrong_or_right • 85 points • 5 March, 2020 05:54 PM

That just shows people dont want to have honest conversations. They start with a narrative they would like to beleive then only seek out information to prove their narrative and often ignore facts that disprove it.

Thewildjudoman • 42 points • 5 March, 2020 05:56 PM

I'm the only male in my class so the fact that all of the females are just like that is difficult to say the least

am_i_wrong_or_right • 26 points • 5 March, 2020 06:04 PM

Just yell sexism, male privledge and patriachy real loud and you will be laid by the end of the day.

snoopyowns • 35 points • 5 March, 2020 06:29 PM

And accused of rape by the end of the week..

QueenSlapFight • 15 points • 5 March, 2020 08:53 PM

You don't have to have sex with someone for them to accuse you of rape.

Thewildjudoman • 6 points • 5 March, 2020 09:13 PM

Merely a hello will be suffice

orescorper • 7 points • 6 March, 2020 12:11 AM

Sounds like too much work.

I would rather walk on a train platform, on camera, and walk near a batshit crazy chick. I could be accused of rape despite video evidence to the contrary, for doing nothing at all. I wouldn't even have to make eye contact, just be a male in the right place and time.

Thewildjudoman • 2 points • 5 March, 2020 08:47 PM

Wouldn't even surprise me tbh

Thewildjudoman • 4 points • 5 March, 2020 06:10 PM

Hmm umm okay that is an interesting suggestion lol

theInfiniteHammer • 3 points • 5 March, 2020 09:07 PM

That's called confirmation bias.

thetruemask • 1 point • 6 March, 2020 01:38 AM

Its classic confirmation bias. You only accept it and listen to information that confirms your existing opinions. Everything else is a lie or fake because it doesn't suit your opinion.

WhatMixedFeelings • 4 points • 6 March, 2020 01:47 AM

Sociology is such a bullshit class anyway. My professor was extreme-radical-Left and I felt threatened to even offer my opinion. That's not how college should be.

Thewildjudoman • 1 point • 6 March, 2020 07:20 AM

Yeah luckily my teacher isnt that bad and I can have my say its just my fellow class mates

Burrito_Capital • 70 points • 5 March, 2020 01:52 PM

Did you compensate for overtime? It seems that if these numbers were at a single workplace, men are actually paid less than women. If it is a second job, with no overtime, then this is wholly accurate. The salary workers do not get overtime, but more blue collar types do.

Oncefa2[S] • 28 points • 5 March, 2020 02:39 PM

The date comes from the BLS. Overtime pay would be included in the earnings gap.

Burrito_Capital • 11 points • 5 March, 2020 03:10 PM

Ok, thanks!

YaskyJr • 29 points • 5 March, 2020 04:36 PM

Crosspost this to r/dataisbeautiful

Oncefa2[S] • 21 points • 5 March, 2020 06:18 PM

Apparently Thursdays is when they allow "political content". But per the rules, I can't post this because it's considered original content and I didn't create it.

I imagine it might do well but u/FelineQuinine would have to post it.

jacoblisk • 8 points • 5 March, 2020 06:45 PM

I'd post it

Oncefa2[S] • 6 points • 5 March, 2020 05:16 PM

Do they ban stuff like this?

StrictObject • 7 points • 5 March, 2020 07:29 PM

Honestly, fuck the rules. Spread the word.

Oncefa2[S] • 10 points • 5 March, 2020 08:15 PM

Lots of times it's not the "rules". The people running these subs just hate men, and men's activists most of all. So the bans are completely arbitrary and unjustified.

I actually had a ban overturned not too long ago on what I thought was a male friendly sub. The response I got was that it was a "rogue mod" who banned me lol. So even the good subs have this problem on occasion.

StrictObject • 4 points • 5 March, 2020 08:16 PM

But if you don't try, you let them win.

accidental_me • 12 points • 5 March, 2020 07:51 PM

According to the rules of the International Labor Organization, the EU and others this is the right way to compare wages. But only on paper. Feminists won't allow anybody to follow these rules.

Litigious_Energy_ • 6 points • 5 March, 2020 07:46 PM

A disproportionate amount of men had fatal work accidents.

lastlaugh100 • 20 points • 5 March, 2020 05:06 PM

I work in medicine. A lot of the men work a second job that is low stress and they get paid for a full day even if they get done early. They do it because they like what they do and it adds another \$100k a year to their family income.

I haven't met a single woman that works a second job. I've only seen them quit to work somewhere else part time or one that pays less because the work is less intense.

NixieNik99 • 2 points • 5 March, 2020 07:28 PM

I work in medicine . Don't know any women in medicine working part time □ . It's either you pull your share or you are fired.

GitGudScrubzzz1 points 5 March, 2020 07:36 PM* [recovered]

I work in medicine . Don't know any women in medicine working part time

I can counter this with another anecdote, worthless as they are: a massive number of nurses in my area are part time or casual, and the profession is almost entirely female dominated.

NixieNik99 • -2 points • 5 March, 2020 07:40 PM

Dang seriously ? Personally I'm working over 50+ hours a week . Must be nice to afford part time pay

□

Oncefa2[S] • 6 points • 5 March, 2020 08:17 PM

Might depend on where you work. Hospitals probably require crazy hours but there are nurses and "nursing assistants" (with like a two year degree) working at doctor's offices and testing labs and places like that.

I don't work in the industry but my guess is that the part time workers they're talking about have jobs at those places.



genobeam • 48 points • 5 March, 2020 08:06 PM*

Hate to say this but this chart is a bit misleading, and the title is inaccurate. (using 2019 data below, but shouldnt be too different)

Bottom line: hours worked only explains part of the wage gap. The difference between "all income" earned between men and women isn't 56 to 44 as the title suggests.

~~The full time labor force in the USA is 56% male and that is what the number on the chart is representing. That number does NOT account for differences in average hours worked.~~ The fact that men worked 56% of total hours does not account for the fact that there are more men in the work force, and that number includes all workers, not just full time workers.

The difference in hours worked among full time workers is 43.5 hours for full time working men vs 41.1 hours for full time working women. As a ratio this is 51.4% hours worked by the average full time male employee vs the average full time female employee. Full time working men work about 6% more than full time working women (your title suggests more like 27% more)

Among ALL (non agricultural) workers men work on average 41 hours per week and women work on average 36.6 hours. This number is heavily skewed because of the large percentage of women who work part time. According to the BLS 20M women worked part time compared to 13M men. However, the "wage gap" only compares full time workers so these are not the correct hours to compare.

Simply put, you cannot explain away the wage gap with only hours worked, although it is certainly a factor. For a more detailed breakdown of some of the main factors that go into the wage gap here is a write up I did:

<http://rollfordamage.net/index.php/2018/04/10/a-guide-to-equal-pay-day/>

Sources:

labor force by gender: <https://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat08.htm>

Hours worked by gender: <https://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat22.htm>

Oncefa2[S] • 13 points • 5 March, 2020 08:23 PM

Interesting, I'll definitely look into that.

I saw a graph one time that plotted the average hourly rate of workers by gender (over time) and the lines essentially hugged each other. I don't know if it was full time only or if it was for everyone but I haven't been

able to find it since.

chamaelleon • 7 points • 5 March, 2020 11:48 PM

I read your article, and I have no idea how you actually disagree with OP, or if you even disagree. Your article seems to convey a similar overall sentiment, that there are legitimate reasons for the alleged pay gap, and that any pay gap is actually against men rather than women.

genobeam • 1 point • 6 March, 2020 06:45 AM*

I don't disagree with any of that, I'm just saying his numbers and methodology are wrong. It's important to me to get the facts exactly right, not just the overall sentiment. For instance when you say men work 27% more hours without including the difference in the number of Male workers vs female workers, you're exaggerating the gap. Full time working men only work 6% more than full time working women. Or when you compare the hours worked gap of all workers including part time to the earnings gap of only full time workers, that's also wrong and misleading.

Oncefa2[S] • 4 points • 5 March, 2020 10:16 PM*

Per the second link, for 2019, men worked 41 hours and women worked 36.6 hours on average.

In terms of percentages:

Men worked 53% of hours and women worked 47% of hours. That's for 2019 though, not 2017. But the numbers are not that far off. Also, in 2018, the gender gap was 81%. $1 / (1 + 0.81)$ is 55%. So still relatively close if you try to update everything with more recent numbers. Although like the 77% figure, I don't know if that's only for full time work.

And the 56% figure *from 2019* being the same as the reported figure in this chart from 2017 is likely just a coincidence.

If I had time I'd do some more digging. The 2017 version of the second link you gave me would be useful.

genobeam • 3 points • 5 March, 2020 10:22 PM

That's including part time workers. The wage gap excludes part time workers so it's incorrect to include them in this discussion.

Oncefa2[S] • 5 points • 6 March, 2020 01:18 AM

This source quotes both full and part time separate from each other.

<https://www.bls.gov/cps/womens-earnings-tables-2017.xlsx>

The full time wage gap is 81.1% and the part time wage gap is 106%. Meaning women who work part time outearn men who work part time.

You could add up all the part time and full time workers multiplied by the number of workers in each one and see what it comes out to. That would literally show you how many dollars were earned by each gender.

I get that a comparison for just full time workers is probably a better (or at least simpler) metric but it might be interesting to see what that would be.

[deleted] • 2 points • 6 March, 2020 05:34 AM

Why non agricultural? Seems like random limits.

Oncefa2[S] • 2 points • 6 March, 2020 01:10 PM

There are classes of workers who only do seasonal jobs and those stats are highly volatile so it's hard to compare one year to the next (like if you're trying to track economic growth). When you see "non-farm" payroll statistics that's what it means.

genobeam • 1 point • 6 March, 2020 05:35 AM

Just the data set I had to work with on the census.gov website

FelineQuinine4 points 5 March, 2020 11:27 PM [recovered]

The graphic is directly from the official BLS CFOI chart pack (w/ addition of the 77¢/\$1 part). The chart packs have been discontinued/removed as of 2020, but you can still find the underlying data in spreadsheet form.

genobeam • 2 points • 5 March, 2020 11:41 PM

The data is not wrong, the context added is misleading. The "wage gap" states that women who work full time (35hrs +) earn 77 cents for every 1 dollar a man earns. Comparing the total hours worked by men to the total hours worked by women is misleading because there are more men that work full time than women.

According to the data you linked men worked 161,535,000 hours compared to 124,442,000 for women in 2017, but this is a comparison of all workers, not just full time.

FelineQuinine1 points 6 March, 2020 12:15 AM [recovered]

You're giving Muh Wage Gap woozle too much credit. The "raw wage gap" is simply a matter of how the dollars payed out by all employers to all employees is split between genders, e.g., for every 1.77x dollars paid to employees, 0.77x of those dollars go to female employees, 1.00x of those dollars go to male employees.

And yes, a single first-pass adjustment for something as simple as how much life&labor men and women sell to employers is 100+% sufficient to account for Muh Wage Gap.

The added 77¢/\$1 part *is calculated from the BLS CFOI data*. It's entirely possible that the **expected** wage gap from the work-hours gap could have **not** precisely matched the wage gaps disingenuously flogged in other publications. It frequently doesn't, actually, women are usually paid *slightly above* (about 2%) the predicted wage gap in the years I've been tracking the gender work-hours gap.

genobeam • -1 points • 6 March, 2020 12:18 AM

You're wrong, "muh wage gap" is the average earnings by full time workers of each gender. It's the dollars paid out divided by the number of workers of each gender in the category of "full time" (>35 hrs/week).

I don't know how i'm "giving it too much credit" i'm just saying what it is.

> The added 77¢/\$1 part *is calculated from the BLS CFOI data*.

It's calculated from BLS CFOI data on FULL TIME EMPLOYEES.

FelineQuinine0 points 6 March, 2020 01:16 AM* [recovered]

[An Analysis of Reasons for the Disparity in Wages Between Men and Women](<https://www.shrm.org/hr-today/public-policy/hr-public-policy-issues/Documents/Gender Wage Gap Final Report.pdf>) prepared by CONSAD for the Department of Labor in 2009

is the original primary source that kicked off Muh Wage Gap.

Some choice quotes:

"the raw wage gap continues to be used in misleading ways to advance public policy agendas without fully explaining the reasons behind the gap"

"When *the ratio is calculated for all men and women who are paid wages or salaries* [...] the measure is often called the raw gender wage gap." (emphasis added)

"it is not possible now, and doubtless will never be possible, to determine reliably whether any portion of the observed gender wage gap is not attributable to factors that compensate women and men differently on socially acceptable bases, and hence can confidently be attributed to overt discrimination against women"

It's calculated from BLS CFOI data on FULL TIME EMPLOYEES.

"The total hours worked figures are annual average estimates of total at work multiplied by average hours for civilians, 16 years of age and older, from the CPS, 2018."

Note that "average hours for civilians" apparently *does not account* for differences in usual hours work by gender, and thus the hours worked figures may overestimate work hours for women and underestimate work hours for men. It also does not take into account rate premiums for overtime.

The 77¢/\$1 is thus the *most conservative* estimate of the expected Muh Wage Gap, it probably should be larger. Since 77¢/\$1 has already accounted for 100+% of Muh Wage Gap, further adjustments are not necessary to kill the woozle.

edit: *You may be getting confused by fatality rates being expressed in terms of "full time equivalent workers"?*

genobeam • 1 point • 6 March, 2020 03:13 AM

"When *the ratio is calculated for all men and women who are paid wages or salaries* [...] the measure is often called the raw gender wage gap." (emphasis added)

the part you [...]ed out

or for all wage and salary earners **who work full-time and year-round**

are you serious? You dont think that bit is relevant to this discussion? how dishonest is this?

FelineQuinine1 points 6 March, 2020 03:55 AM **[recovered]**

The CFOI methodology *as described* is not limited to "full-time and year-round". The replication in the other comment using 2019 data confirms the methodology.

You dont think that bit is relevant to this discussion?

Considering that's not relevant to the 77¢/\$1 and that's been the focus of this discussion, no, that's not relevant to this discussion.

Recap:

>>>> There's 8.4mg of Vitamin C in apples according to google.

>>> ACKSHUALLY, google says there's 51.1mg in oranges.

>> [...] I'm not talking about oranges.

> You don't think that's relevant? How dishonest!

genobeam • 2 points • 6 March, 2020 04:13 AM

the "CFOI methodology" that you're using is not some accepted standard and honestly i didnt understand what you were doing until just now. You're using statistics that include a different number of men and women, and driving them down to a number that really should be average per man or per women. It's extermely misleading.

The problem is the wage gap is the average for women and average for men. Women on average earn 77c for every dollar a man earns. Your numbers are aggregate (and not even true). You're saying women in aggregate earn 77c per every dollar that men in aggregate earn, but you're also not factoring in that men's hours are paid at a higher rate.

You're not understanding why your methodology is terrible. Let me give you an example.

Let's say there are 10 men and 5 women in the labor force. Let's say the men work 40 hours a week and each are paid \$100/hr. The women work 40 hrs/week and each are paid \$50/hr.

The wage gap is the average that women earn 50c for every \$1 a man earns.

Ok but lets use the lauded "CFOI methodology"

Well the men work a total of 400 hrs per week and the women work a total of 200 hrs per week. NEVERMIND THAT THERE ARE A DIFFERENT NUMBER OF MEN AND WOMEN

therefore the wage gap IS PREDICTED TO BE 50c per \$1! dont even bother thinking about the fact that this data is comparing an average to an aggregate!

The data happens to match 77 hrs worked per 100 hrs worked by women in aggregate vs men in aggregate, but that's just coincidence and is an awful predictor of earnings of an average woman vs an average man.

I dont know how to explain any better how bad your "method" is. It's just so misleading.

FelineQuinine0 points 6 March, 2020 04:39 AM **[recovered]**

I find it delightful you're so engaged, but you still seem to be missing the forest for the trees..

Try it out with StatCan data for average usual weekly hours by gender and Hourly wages, full time workers (which is already reduced to a gender ratio, but is derived from the average usual weekly pay by gender).

Spoiler: America's Hat StatCan data is 'coincidentally' also parity +/- 2%, just as with BLS data from Canada's Pants.

genobeam • 0 points • 6 March, 2020 01:41 AM

"The total hours worked figures are annual average estimates of total at work multiplied by average hours for civilians, 16 years of age and older, from the CPS, 2018."

OK here is the CPS 2017 data:

https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/income-poverty/cps-pinc/pinc-01.2017.html#par_textimage_14

	Total full time workers	Median Earnings	Mean Earnings
Male	66,515K	55,502	78,730
Female	49,244K	45,831	59,655

Women on average earn 59,655 for every 78,730 that men earn. **That means women earn 75.7 cents for every dollar a man earns.**

If you want to use the median then women earn 82.6 cents for every dollar a man earns.

You used 77 cents in your graphic. You should know where that number comes from.

FelineQuinine0 points 6 March, 2020 02:00 AM [recovered]

You used 77 cents in your graphic. You should know where that number comes from.

It comes from the hours worked.

There is no addition outside source for the 77¢/\$1.

That the raw gender wage gap *expected* from the gender hours-worked gap and raw gender wage gap from additional outside sources are often similar *is the point*.

genobeam • 2 points • 6 March, 2020 02:13 AM

Let's do it your way.

Here is the 2017 data for all hours worked.

	# of workers	Mean income	Total
male	88,069K	68,610	6,042,414,100,000
female	78,359K	48,112	3,770,008,208,000

Expressed in terms of total dollars earned for total hours worked women earned 62 cents for every male dollar

Now I've shown you that when you use mean hours worked you get ~77 the number YOU yourself chose. When you use total hours worked you get 62 cents.

FelineQuinine0 points 6 March, 2020 02:52 AM [recovered]

Ayy, now there's something to discuss.

...which CONSAD did pretty exhaustively 11 years ago.

chamaelleon • 1 point • 5 March, 2020 11:49 PM

But the different in full time workers is only 7M people, out of more than 250M people. That's barely statistically significant. Do the numbers for us, if you think it's such a big deal. How would the stats change if part-time workers were included?

genobeam • 2 points • 6 March, 2020 01:16 AM*

The labor force is 157M people not 250M. There are 130 M full time workers and 27 M part time workers. Part time workers make up over 20% of the work force and part time work is 63% female.

What do you mean that's not statistically significant?

chamaelleon • 2 points • 6 March, 2020 05:44 AM

It's still not that significant because there isn't likely to be a huge difference in the pay rate for part time workers. It's probably going to be pretty close to 50%;50% there too, and that single-digit-percentage addition to the numbers isn't going to sway the original figure by more than 1 or 2%, I guarantee it. Probably less than 1%. Try the math and see if I'm wrong.

genobeam • 2 points • 6 March, 2020 06:06 AM

First off "statistically significant" is a phrase that has a defined meaning having to do with the number of samples in a set of data, so you're wrong right off the bat because you're using this phrase incorrectly. Statistically significant has nothing to do with the percent difference between two stats.

Secondly,

	Mean income - Full time workers	Mean Income - All workers
Total	70,616	58,959

If you include part time workers, average income drops 16.5%. Is that significant enough for you?

Thirdly, why don't you do the math yourself. Don't act like you understand the math if you are not capable of doing it yourself.

chamaelleon • 0 points • 6 March, 2020 09:40 AM*

No, because that's not the number we care to look at. What we care to look at is the difference in the ratio of mens-to-women's pay for both full and part-time workers. The difference in overall income of part-time and full-time workers has exactly *zero* to do with this discussion. Nice try to distract from the fact that the difference is negligible. Or maybe you just don't understand the math we're actually considering.

I'm not the one challenging that including part-time pay would change things. You are. Therefore the burden of proof is on you. But it's quite obvious to anyone who grasps basic statistics that including part-time workers is not going to change anything significantly. It will be pretty much the same ratio after including them. Unless you have some reason to suggest that a big sexist shift happens in part-time work, which isn't happening in full-time work, that would throw the overall numbers way off.

genobeam • 1 point • 6 March, 2020 01:35 PM*

You have links to all the plots why don't you show me what you're trying to say instead of speculating

Edit: Since you can't be bothered to do it yourself:

	Full time mean	All workers mean
Men	\$78730	\$68610

Full time mean All workers mean

Women	\$59655	\$48112
Ratio	75.8c/\$1.00	70.1c/\$1.00

If you include part time workers the wage gap goes from 76 cents per dollar to 70 cents per dollar.

chamaelleon • 0 points • 8 March, 2020 11:43 PM

I see numbers, but I don't see a source.

LotBuilder • 13 points • 5 March, 2020 05:38 PM

And women account directly or indirectly for 80%+ of all spending.

ElectraUnderTheSea • 21 points • 5 March, 2020 03:29 PM

"I guarantee most men would love to work fewer hours and spend more time at home but the spending and earning patterns of their partners don't often facilitate this"

Those men chose to date those women so this one is on them, honestly. If they don't want a partner who spends frivolously and has a lower-paid job, then don't date/marry one.

Oncefa2[S] • 16 points • 5 March, 2020 05:19 PM

Not everyone wants to "go their own way". It would be nice if more women adopted "progressive attitudes" and didn't expect men to pay for everything.

Regs2 • 3 points • 5 March, 2020 08:22 PM

I live in one of the most progressive areas (PNW) in the US and women who pay there own way is the rule, not the exception. I'm 40 and can honestly say I've had women pay for me more than I've paid for them.

When I've asked about it, I've been told the idea that a man should have to pay for them is insulting because it insinuates they can't take care of themselves and need a white knight to come in and provide for them. They can take care of there own damn selves!

Dunkolunko • 32 points • 5 March, 2020 03:48 PM

Easy to say if you have an endless sea to choose from, but for the majority of men their choices are very limited.

valenin • 18 points • 5 March, 2020 06:22 PM

‘The peasants choose to eat potatoes. If they didn’t want potatoes, they should just eat something else. Incidentally, do we have any more roast pig, your majesty? I tire of all this lobster and veal.’

notacrackheadofficer • 5 points • 5 March, 2020 06:57 PM*

Once she has a ring on or gives birth to your kid, you'll not have a say in what she spends on what. Many people change drastically once they get married or have a kid. Many women's personalities disappear and another personality appears after giving birth. It's not an insult. It's a fact.

No one knows what kind of mother/partner a woman will be after child birth. Sometimes they stay somewhat the same, sometimes no.

My daughter's mother became a completely different person. She went from an anti leg shaving hippy chick on mushrooms , with peace sign necklace, to a staunch GW Bush fanatic calling for Muslim deaths. They can change big time.

My friends wife went from responsible and conservative , straight to a party monster drunken coke head who abandoned them , after giving birth. Ya never know what to you're getting.

porkopolis • 4 points • 5 March, 2020 07:34 PM

This is my experience. Thanks for putting this in writing. I've never heard anyone say it so bluntly before.

notacrackheadofficer • 3 points • 5 March, 2020 07:43 PM

Women are educated on it when they become pregnant, by health care providers and childbirth classes and books. Young men are told nothing about it. "Post partum depression" is one aspect of it every young man here should research.

Cheers friend

ZeldaVelveeta • 1 point • 6 March, 2020 12:58 AM

You really don't. My SO and I had a baby he wanted very badly and now I get to do all of the working and most of the housework. Do I judge all men based on my choice? Nope. Because anecdotes do not account for every single man or woman. Crazy!

notacrackheadofficer • 1 point • 6 March, 2020 04:48 AM

Female hormones do wild roller coaster space voyages and deep earth tunnelling and time slip shape shifting. Especially during and after pregnancy.

Men? Not so much.

This is scientific fact. Thousands of by mothers for mothers websites openly discuss it .

Gutotito • 5 points • 5 March, 2020 05:36 PM

If you know that's the case going in, sure, but people change, and sometimes you get stuck with a lemon after-the-fact. Society still looks down on men who leave a relationship because their partner refuses to pull their weight.

angry_cabbie • 1 point • 6 March, 2020 10:03 PM

I didn't choose for my partner to have a major and debilitating stroke that caused her to leave the workforce.

rickgauer • 3 points • 5 March, 2020 08:23 PM

This needs to go in data is beautiful

DevilishRogue • 3 points • 5 March, 2020 09:33 PM

Yet women are responsible for 85% of all consumer spending.

TC1827 • 2 points • 5 March, 2020 09:23 PM

Sexism against Men. Men are seen as ATMs while women get to live of male labour

ZeldaVelveeta • 1 point • 6 March, 2020 01:00 AM

SAHDs exist.

chamaelleon • 2 points • 5 March, 2020 11:42 PM

And men generally worked more dangerous jobs, which means we are the ones being underpaid for our work.

john_nash1 • 5 points • 5 March, 2020 04:00 PM

This is the first time that I've seen this. I've always thought that the earning is 0.77 for each 1 per hour. And that the wage gap is the result of different career choices and positions!

Oncefa2[S] • 11 points • 5 March, 2020 05:08 PM*

Time spent on the job is the biggest factor.

If you look at union jobs, they pay everyone exactly the same. But most union jobs are hourly, and women end up working less and therefore making less.

The earnings gap for union work is exactly the same as non-union work though.

You can blame this on child care to an extent but lots of times this is actually the mother's choice; she prefers that her husband works extra (and/or pays child support) so she can stay home and watch Jerry Springer "take care of the kids".

Before having kids women usually work fewer hours than men. Which is fine. It would just be nice if a) people were honest about this, and b) men were allowed to do the same thing without being punished for it.

See:

Lips, K. A. (2016). Don't Buy into the Gender Pay Gap Myth. Forbes. Available from: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/karinagness/2016/04/12/dont-buy-into-the-gender-pay-gap-myth/#5b65f3322596>

Phelan, J. (2018). Harvard Study: "Gender Wage Gap" Explained Entirely by Work Choices of Men and Women. FOUNDATION for ECONOMIC EDUCATION. Available at: <https://fee.org/articles/harvard-study-gender-pay-gap-explained-entirely-by-work-choices-of-men-and-women//amp>

Bolotnyy, V., & Emanuel, N. (2018). Why Do Women Earn Less Than Men? *Evidence from Bus and Train Operators*. Working paper. Available from https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/bolotnyy/files/be_gendergap.pdf

Demonspawn • 7 points • 5 March, 2020 06:02 PM

This is the first time that I've seen this. I've always thought that the earning is 0.77 for each 1 per hour.

It's never been that. That is the lie that everyone repeats, but the BLS only ever looks at total earnings per year without compensating for hours worked, education, job title, experience.... anything other than total pay.

Blutarg • 3 points • 5 March, 2020 05:25 PM

It depends. There are multiple ways to torture data to produce a "wage gap."

Mode1961 • 2 points • 5 March, 2020 07:19 PM

There was a "STUDY" (i use that term very loosely) a few years ago that said essentially that "Men who work more than 40 hours per week , do not add any extra value to the company", though they never said if women do. I have seen this repeated a few times.

Oncefa2[S] • 2 points • 5 March, 2020 08:26 PM

Employees burn out over time and there was a study that showed that 40 hours per week was essentially the limit to how productive an employee could be per each hour worked (so they still did more, they were just less efficient, meaning you're better off hiring another employee at that point).

The same study showed that an employee working 60+ hours a week actually produces less than 40 hours worth of work. Not in terms of productivity per hour but actually in terms of total productivity.

lesbefriendly • 1 point • 6 March, 2020 01:19 AM

The same study showed that an employee working 60+ hours a week actually produces less than 40 hours worth of work. Not in terms of productivity per hour but actually in terms of total productivity.

Did it take into account the type of work done?

I'd imagine a lot, if not the majority, of "60 hour weeks" are roles where you're being paid to be available, rather than to be productive. Firefighters, as an example, can have a lot of downtime with little productivity between their call-outs.

Lendari • 3 points • 5 March, 2020 08:27 PM*

bUt guiSe thEy Do tHe SamE Work!!!

Seriously. If you could pay women less to do the same work, men would be replaced with women. Its basic economics. The reality is men work longer hours, have fewer gaps in employment, negotiate more aggressively for salary and gravitate towards different competencies than women. All of those things are variables that the wage gap myth doesn't bother to control for and every one is a personal choice.

Also no one went around using their "power" to force anyone to hire a male plumber or engineer. It's not discrimination that men and women make personal choices to develop different competencies and its gor sure not discrimination to employ a workforce that is 60% male from a population of applicants that is also 60% male.

The things people say about this stuff is so shallow and non-critical I just cant believe people buy into it at all.

stevrock • 1 point • 5 March, 2020 07:49 PM

Where is the data that this case was built from?

ColonelVirus • 1 point • 5 March, 2020 07:51 PM

Sorry where does it say the earnings were 56%/44%??

The graph shows hours Vs workplace injuries?

theels6 • 1 point • 5 March, 2020 08:24 PM

Coming back to this

[deleted] • 1 point • 5 March, 2020 08:25 PM

This data has obviously been contrived by "The Grand Order of The Conspiracy To Hold Women Back Society"

[deleted] • 1 point • 5 March, 2020 08:26 PM

I'm sorry I can't believe this, it doesn't give me the chance to complain-America

Vashstampede20 • 1 point • 5 March, 2020 08:40 PM

equality doing it's job.

QueenSlapFight • 1 point • 5 March, 2020 08:51 PM

So what you're saying is men get equal pay per hour worked with women who on average have 21% less

experience. Sounds fair.

HNutz • 1 point • 6 March, 2020 01:06 AM

Makes sense to me!

supermarioplush220 • 1 point • 6 March, 2020 01:29 AM

I need to show this to everyone.

parsons525 • 1 point • 6 March, 2020 01:56 AM

Feminist logic: Men get to work more AND men get paid more. It's a double injustice.

McDorable • 1 point • 6 March, 2020 02:29 AM

Women earn more in tipping industries and imo rarely report what they earn thus evading taxes owed.. Here in Canada, 71.3% of food and bev servers are female. Anecdotally, I can tell you that NONE that I have known in my life claim the full amount of tips they receive. Ive known some who pull in 6 figures while on paper making \$16/hour. $\$100k \div \$16/hr = 6250$ hours worked in a year. The restaurant isn't even open 6000 hours in the year lol.

gloryhole87 • 1 point • 6 March, 2020 03:26 AM

We need to encourage men to work less days and encourage their wives to work more. Spending time with their kids instead of work work work

WDMC-905 • 1 point • 6 March, 2020 10:08 AM*

why do you worry about fathers when you never want to be one?

We need to encourage men to work less days and encourage their wives to work more. Spending time with their kids instead of work work work

I get it now. any inch to get woman to do more. any lie to mask your real intent.

you must really resent, hate and blame women for everything you've suffered in this life so far.

granted, likely the wrong channel to call you out on this but meh. this is just between us. the rest can push the little down arrow.

gloryhole87 • 1 point • 6 March, 2020 12:22 PM

All I'm saying is men work too many hours. This is well documented. Why shouldn't men spend as much time at home with their kids?

WDMC-905 • 1 point • 6 March, 2020 01:32 PM

my apologies then.

I'm a father. I did an audit one year to see how much time I was spending exclusively sponsoring my sons' development and was surprised to find that for an 8 month period I'd averaged over 22.5hrs a week. in this same period I average over 50hrs a week working.

my wife is as educated, ambitious and applied as myself. my wish would be that her vocation paid as well as mine does. I should also note that it's l an unfair comparison as we'd decided as a couple that she would stay home until our youngest was 5 yrs old.

I know that that choice severely curtailed her career development and had I done the same I'd be no where as far ahead of her income wise.

lastly I should also recognize that should we part ways, that career hit that she took would eventually be her burden alone.

really, I feel I'm the lucky one having the option and freedom to participate in my sons' growth now that there needs are far richer, complex and engaging than when they were infants.

that's not to say that I didn't also love that stage in their lives but I do think for me, parenting preteens is much easier for me.

Penny000000 • 1 point • 6 March, 2020 03:54 AM

I mean, I would really like to ask -

Why is it like this?

We all know that women are expected to do more housework and take care of children more than men, but how does this effect the wage gap?

I see a lot of arguments against the wage gap's existence, but I never see anyone actually asking this question.

Please don't boo me, I want to know.

arturo_tamburo • 1 point • 6 March, 2020 06:17 AM

...however, you can be sure women ~spent~ more than 44% of the income.

Svenskbtch • 1 point • 6 March, 2020 09:26 AM

Would this figure include social transfers?

[deleted] • -4 points • 5 March, 2020 05:54 PM

Women are overpaid.

Go to Home Depot and ask a woman a question. She'll find a man to answer it.

Women don't earn their keep at Home Depot and, frankly, most other places.

Regs2 • 4 points • 5 March, 2020 08:26 PM

Neither do the guys at Home depot. I've came to the conclusion that you need to be a worthless twat to work there. Anytime I ask anybody for anything there they just acted confused or clearly don't know what the fuck they are talking about. Recently, I needed a junction box for a light fixture and the dude I asked in the lighting section didn't even know what I was talking about!

Googlepost • 2 points • 5 March, 2020 10:11 PM

Those smaller hardware stores that use retired construction workers are better suited for questions but they will cost you more to shop at. I rely on YouTube more than retail workers these days.

HelloYouBeautiful • 3 points • 5 March, 2020 07:35 PM

Reverse the genders and you sound like a feminist.

ZeldaVelveeta • 3 points • 6 March, 2020 01:01 AM

No, he would still sound like an asshole.

Blutarg • 1 point • 5 March, 2020 05:25 PM

Great post! I'm saving this.

MarcusAurileus70 • 1 point • 5 March, 2020 10:02 PM

Damn that patriarchy

/s

Resplendent_Fervor • -3 points • 5 March, 2020 04:44 PM

Literally men should just women completely take the wheel on society and lets watch them crash and burn. I want to hear them beg for the return of the patriarchy.

cursed_deity • 3 points • 5 March, 2020 09:46 PM

/r/mgtow might be more suited to your needs

Resplendent_Fervor • 2 points • 5 March, 2020 09:53 PM

They banned me, im pro relationships unfortunately

Burrito_Capital • -5 points • 5 March, 2020 01:52 PM

Did you compensate for overtime? It seems that if these numbers were at a single workplace, men are actually paid less than women. If it is a second job, with no overtime, then this is wholly accurate. The salary workers do not get overtime, but more blue collar types do.

guidedhand • 0 points • 5 March, 2020 09:25 PM

I dont believe you.

Higher risk jobs generally get paid more, thats why people do them. If there are more men in those roles, then the total % earned by men should be higher than the % of hours worked.

There are many problems and causes of why men feel like they need to sacrifice life for money, and its an issue which is frustratingly hidden by these number you have pulled up.

I trust your numbers on work fatalities, but not at all on how work hours marries up to amount earned; also the link doesnt work for me

orangeLILpumpkin • -1 points • 6 March, 2020 02:40 AM

I guarantee most men would love to work fewer hours and spend more time at home

Well then do your work more efficiently and get it done in the same amount of time that woman can. Why should women be punished for working efficiently?

Sincerely,

Feminists.