

Family Structure, Usual and Preferred Working Hours, and Egalitarianism

Robert Drago
The Pennsylvania State University

Yi-Ping Tseng
The Melbourne Institute of Applied Economics and Social Research

Paper for presentation at the HILDA Conference, March 2003
University of Melbourne

March 10, 2003

Abstract

We use data from the first wave of the HILDA survey data to analyze usual and preferred working time arrangements across a variety of family types. For employed men and separately for employed women, across different family types, we uncover evidence of a time divide: many short hours individuals desire longer hours of employment, while many long hours individuals prefer shorter hours. Overall, the group working long hours and desiring shorter hours tends to be larger: across men and women in a variety of family circumstances, the average employee desires fewer hours. The major exception here concerns lone employed mothers, whom on average prefer longer hours (around 2 hours per week) than they are currently employed.

We also find that men typically work longer hours than women. Within the sample of dual-earner couples with children, men are employed for an average of approximately 20 hours more per week than women. Even if the time divide was eliminated such that individuals worked their preferred hours, the gender difference would drop only slightly such that men would be employed for around 18 hours per week more than women.

For the sample of dual-earner couples with children, just under one-fifth of the couples exhibited egalitarian working hours. These couples averaged a combined 84 hours per week of employment, and tended to favour the shared care of children, were more likely to be non-Australian born, and included a high proportion of women holding degrees and working in professional occupations.

The authors thank Mark Wooden and Janeen Baxter for comments, and the Department of Family and Community Services for supporting this research.

Family Structure, Usual and Preferred Working Hours, and Egalitarianism

Background

Patterns of family structure and of paid working time in Australia and the U.S. exhibit some similar trends but also marked divergence. On the demographic front, both societies have witnessed a long term increase in divorce and cohabitation, along with declining marriage rates and the expansion of lone parent families. For example, 18 percent of all Australian births occurred outside of the context of marriage in 1987, a figure that increased to 28 percent by 1997. In the U.S., eight percent of dependent children lived in a single-parent family as of 1950, while 28 percent of children did so in 1998.¹

In the labour market, both nations have experienced the massive entrance of women and mothers into the labour force. In the U.S., the percentage of wives employed rose from 24 percent in 1950 to 60 percent as of 1999, while the percentage of mothers who are employed more than quadrupled during the same period, such that almost two-thirds of all mothers of preschoolers are in the labour force. In Australia, the participation rate of adult women rose from 42 percent in 1968 to 59 percent by 1998, and 47 percent of all female lone parents were employed as of 1999.²

Both nations have also witnessed an increasing polarisation of working hours that is connected to rising levels of income inequality. For the U.S., Costa (2000) found that daily hours of work for men in the top half of the wage distribution increased between 1973 and 1991 by between .3 and .5 hours per day, and that women followed a similar pattern of change. At the bottom of the income distribution, daily hours declined by over one-half hour for men and for women in the lowest wage decile. Wooden (2001) reports related findings for Australia, where the percentage of employees reporting more than 45 hours per week rose from 23 in 1970 to 28.4 in 1999, while those claiming less than 30 hours rose from 10.2 percent to 24.9 percent across the same time period.

Drago (2000) presents evidence that working hours polarisation in the U.S. is related to a “time divide,” such that many employees working long hours prefer shorter hours, and many of those working part-time desire longer hours.³ The time divide finding suggests that employees have not actively sought out the polarisation in working time that exists, and instead that the changing structure of jobs and employer preferences explain the result. We document the extent of time divides in Australia below.

The time divide can be conceived as a simple difference between preferred and actual working hours resulting from non-convexities or constraints on employers. For example, assembly line technologies may dictate certain structures of working time, or consumer

¹ Australian figures cited in Russell and Bowman (2000, p. 21). U.S. figures from Council of Economic Advisors (2000, p. 166).

² U.S. figures from Moen (2000, pp. 2-3). Australian figures for women from Bardoel, Tharenou and Ristov (2000, p. 61), while the figure for lone mothers is from Russell and Bowman (2000, p. 15).

³ See also Jacobs and Gerson (1998).

expectations of around-the-clock service may limit the potential combinations of working hours for various employees. Alternatively, if the fixed costs of employment are very high, long hours of employment will be required to recoup these fixed costs, explaining the prevalence of long hours among some employees who would otherwise prefer more moderate hours.

A very different possibility is that norms around working time explain the time divide. Specifically, Williams (1999) argues that the ideal worker norm has become prevalent in the U.S. in recent decades. The ideal worker is someone who gains appropriate educational credentials and climbs a professional career ladder without interruptions for family or anything else, and with consistently long work hours. The ideal worker can be viewed as a norm rather than a preference if employees and managers come to share a belief that such behavior is reasonable and appropriate both on their part and among others. Employees who are not ideal workers will then be penalized because they do not follow the dictates of the norm.

The ideal worker norm will likely clash with other norms, particularly historical norms around working weeks of 40 (or 38) hours. Such norms that are enshrined in the U.S. Fair Labor Standards Act and many Australian awards. Recognizing these norms is crucial for our analysis because they can explain why many employees anchor their stated hours preferences around the 40 hour week.⁴

Using the notion of norms, we could view the increasing polarization of working time as reflecting the expanded prevalence of the ideal worker norm. Any time divide would then reflect more a battle of norms – the ideal worker versus what was historically considered usual – as opposed to the intersection of exogenous preferences with technology and consumer markets.

Closely related to all of these phenomena, the “neotraditional family” has emerged as a modal type in both nations. Moen (2000) defines a neotraditional family as one where both heterosexual parents participate in the labour market and in household and child care tasks, but the division of labour is highly unequal, with the man performing a disproportionate amount of paid work and the woman undertaking most unpaid work for the family. By way of contrast, the traditional family cast fathers as the sole earner for the family, and the mother as the almost exclusive source of unpaid household labour. The traditional family has declined as a proportion of households in both Australia and the U.S. We document the precise proportion for Australia below.

There are nonetheless crucial differences between the societies. Relevant to both the extent of the neotraditional family and of any potential time divide, rates of part time employment among women are far higher in Australia. Although the figures are not precisely comparable, defining part-time employment as 35 hours per week or less and considering all adult women, recent figures find 5.6 percent of women in the U.S. employed part-time in 1999, while 23 percent of Australian women fell into that category as of May 2001. Considering only women performing paid work, 27.7 percent of this

⁴ For U.S. evidence regarding such anchoring, see Drago (2000).

group worked part-time in the U.S. The comparable figure in Australia is 44 percent.⁵ Indeed, although women have risen rapidly as a proportion of full-time employees in the U.S. in recent decades, Bardoel, Tharenous and Ristov (2000) argue that virtually all of women's increased labour force participation in Australia can be accounted for by the expansion of part time jobs.

If we hone in on mothers, the differences are also striking. Australian researchers have found that over one-half of all mothers, but only 5 percent of fathers, are employed part-time.⁶ U.S. figures from the 1997 NSCW show a slightly lower percentage of fathers, 4.2, checking in as part-timers, but less than half the proportion of mothers, 23.6 percent, performing paid work part-time.

Differences in the division of household tasks mirror labour market divergence. Although equality is still distant, the U.S. has witnessed a dramatic convergence of child care time within heterosexual families, with fathers increasing time on child care. For example, Sandberg and Hofferth (2001) report that between 1981 and 1997, fathers whose wives were not employed increased time with children from 19.97 to 22.40 hours per week, while those with employed wives increase their time from 17.01 to 22.94 hours per week.

This convergence suggests the prevalence of a U.S. belief in egalitarianism. Egalitarian beliefs need to be differentiated from perceptions of fairness. Equality implies doing the same things and receiving the same rewards. Fairness, very differently, might imply providing financial supports for parents or for the poor, or having the winner of a race receive a higher prize than the loser (Grandey, 2001). In the present context, it should be kept in mind that neotraditional families might be viewed as fair by the participants, even if they are not egalitarian.

An egalitarian ethos in the U.S. would imply that men and women *should* devote equal time to paid employment and to family. Hochschild (1989) found evidence of such a belief among families that claimed to be egalitarian and were, in the course of her study, disappointed to learn that they were in fact neotraditional (with women performing the "second shift"). Similarly, Barnett (1999) presents evidence from a variety of polls and surveys confirming that a majority of both men and women in the U.S. believe they should share the care of children equally across gender lines. Nonetheless, egalitarian families *per se* remain rare in the U.S. (Deutsch 1999).

Australian evidence suggests that the division of household labour has changed only slightly here. For example, Baxter (2002) analyzes a series of specific tasks around children and housework, and finds Australian women reducing housework time significantly between 1986 and 1997, with virtually no change in the division of child care or in men's housework performance. Bittman (1995) found some evidence of Australian men increasing their share of child care, but the evidence is mild.

⁵ All part-time figures were constructed from BLS (2000, Table 1), and ABS (2001, Table 2), respectively.

⁶ See Bardoel, Tharenou and Ristov (2000).

Other evidence consistent with men's changing role in the U.S., relative to Australia, comes from the gender mix of lone parents. In the U.S., men currently comprise approximately one-quarter of all lone parents, while figures from the HILDA reported below suggest that less than one-seventh of Australian lone parents are men.⁷ The relative shift towards egalitarian outcomes in the U.S. is indeed marked.

The differences in the division of child care labour across the two societies might be traced to two causes. First, attitudes and norms may play a role, with the egalitarian dreams of second wave feminists in the U.S. leading to new preferences among women in recent decades, and stepped-up demands on male husbands and partners. Egalitarian beliefs may be more prevalent in the U.S. Second, economic incentives could contribute, since part time employment in the U.S. is poorly remunerated relative to full time employment, and superannuation and health insurance benefits are typically lost in any switch from full to part time employment (Budig and England, 2001). Part time employees in Australia have been guaranteed pay equity since the 1970s, and typically lose neither superannuation nor health insurance benefits when switching from full to part time employment. By making part time employment relatively attractive, Australia may shore up inequality in the division of household labour.

The incentive explanation for the greater prevalence of part time employment in Australia is ironic. U.S. researchers have uncovered a wage penalty for motherhood that they attribute in part to discrimination specifically targeting mothers as opposed to non-mother women (Waldfogel, 1998; Budig and England, 2001). It could be that mothers in the U.S. are driven by the penalty to seek longer hours of employment,⁸ and hence that the penalty induces greater equality in the home.

Carrington's (2002) research on lesbian and gay families may help to explain the slightly different question of why egalitarian families are so rare in both nations. Carrington found that virtually all of these families believed in the "egalitarian myth" – that lesbian and gay families escape the dynamics of gendered power relations, so are inherently more equal. Nonetheless, the vast majority of these families exhibited an unequal division of household labor. It is conceivable that household tasks and child care require such extensive training that only one partner in any couple will rationally undertake the years of training required to achieve even a modicum of expertise in these areas, but this argument has never stopped individuals from parenting with virtually no experience at all. What seems more likely is that the structure of jobs and employment push individuals towards either very long or very short hours. Unless a couple can achieve a sufficient income with both adults working part time, or if virtually all household tasks can be farmed out where both adults work long hours, something akin to a neotraditional family will typically eventuate. The same forces creating a time divide in the U.S. may militate against egalitarian families.

⁷ For the U.S. figure, see Drago (2003).

⁸ The argument is slightly more complicated. In particular, mothers in the U.S. may use long hours to escape hourly wage penalties associated with part time employment, and they may believe that working ideal worker hours will help them to evade the wage penalty for motherhood.

If these arguments are correct, then it might require an extreme belief in egalitarianism to sustain relevant practices within any given family. Alternatively, if there is sufficient variation within the labour market, it might be that some families are simply pitched, at random, into egalitarian circumstances. Somewhat differently, households where grandparents or other relatives are present and available to perform child care might facilitate full-time employment for both parents and egalitarian families as a result. We can gather some idea regarding the extent of these dynamics below.

We here attempt to shed light on these issues by exploring usual and preferred work hours in the context of diverse families, using a national sample from the initial wave of the HILDA survey. We have three purposes in doing so. The first is to get a glimpse at actual and preferred working hours across family types, utilizing various pieces of demographic information. For example, we might expect that lone adults are likely to work and to prefer longer hours than lone parents. More broadly, this descriptive exercise can help us to understand the relationship between labour market and family patterns.

The second task in our analysis is to identify the extent of any time divide for the men or the women involved in diverse families. For example, we can ascertain whether certain families such as lone parents are more susceptible to a time divide.

The third task is to identify egalitarian parents, and parents who wish to be but are not egalitarian in terms of working hours. We are partly interested in identifying the constraints that prevent some but not other parents from achieving an egalitarian division of working time. We are also interested in the simple arithmetic question of how many people are involved, or the scope of the egalitarian families at present.

The HILDA Data

The data used in this analysis come from the first wave of the Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia (HILDA) Survey. Described in more detail in Watson and Wooden (2002), the HILDA Survey is based on similar studies conducted in both Germany and the UK (the German Socio-Economic Panel and the British Household Panel Survey respectively). The HILDA Survey thus involved the selection of a large nationally representative sample of households and then seeking interviews with members of those households. Specifically, a household interview was sought with at least one adult member. Individual interviews were then sought with all household members over the age of 15 years on the 30 June preceding interview. In addition to the collection of data through personal interview, all persons completing a personal interview were given a self-completion questionnaire that they were asked to return after completion either by mail or by handing it to the interviewer at a subsequent visit to the household. Almost all of the interviews were conducted during the period between 24 August 2001 and 21 December 2001.

Households were selected into the sample by a multi-stage process. First, a random sample of 488 Census Collection Districts (CDs), based on 1996 Census boundaries, was

selected from across Australia (each of which consists of approximately 200 to 250 households). Second, within each of these CDs all dwellings were fully enumerated and a sample of 22 to 34 dwellings randomly selected.¹ Third, given dwellings can contain more than one household, rules were devised for the selection of households within dwellings. These rules stipulated that where a dwelling contained three or fewer households, all such households should be sampled. Where there were four or more households occupying one dwelling, all households had to be enumerated and a random sample of three households obtained (based on a predetermined pattern).

After adjusting for out-of-scope dwellings (e.g., unoccupied, non-residential) and households (e.g., all occupants were overseas visitors) and for multiple households within dwellings, the total number of households identified as in-scope was 11,693. Interviews were completed with all eligible members at 6872 of these households and with at least one eligible member at a further 810 households. The total household response rate was, therefore, 66 per cent.

Within the 7682 households at which interviews were conducted, there were 19,917 people. Of this group, 4790 were under 15 years of age on the preceding 30 June and hence were ineligible for an interview in Wave 1. This left 15,127 persons eligible for a personal interview, 13,969 of whom completed the Person Questionnaire.

As discussed in Wooden, Freidin and Watson (2002), these response rates compare favourably with the rates achieved in the first waves of similar major household panel surveys. They are also well in excess of the rates typically reported in other Australian surveys that have attempted to measure life satisfaction. More importantly, comparison with population benchmark data from official Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) sources suggests that the sample has characteristics that are broadly in line with what would have been expected if the sample were truly random. There is, however, at least one major disparity, with residents from Sydney under-represented, a result that Wooden et al. (2002) attribute to both greater difficulties making contact with some Sydney residents (e.g., those in living in high-rise apartments) and a greater reluctance to participate because of time commitments.

Table 1 lists the variables used in the main analyses that follow. Most of the variables are self-explanatory. Most importantly, the usual and preferred hours questions were designed precisely for the sort of analyses performed below. Usual hours includes any paid or unpaid overtime during a typical week, and covers all jobs for multiple jobholders. The preferred hours question asks about a comparable time period, and specifically asks the respondent to account for the fact that income would decline if hours declined.

Table 1: Variables and Characteristics of the Entire Sample

Characteristic	Mean	Std. Dev.
Average age in yrs.	45.10	16.96
Number of children children aged under 15, including own child, step child and foster child derived from household q12: How are the different members of household related to each other?	0.63	1.07

Australian born % from person qA1: In which country were you born	0.74	0.44
English as second language % from person qA3: Is English the first language you learned to speak as a child?	0.13	0.34
Degree and above % Highest education level achieved, derived variables, see HILDA technical paper 2.02-confidentialised	0.20	0.40
Urban % live in major cities in Australia, derived variables, see HILDA technical paper 2.02-confidentialised	0.59	0.49
Employed % derived variables, see HILDA technical paper 2.02-confidentialised	0.62	0.49
Professional % (emp) managers, administrators and professionals. ABS ASCO code 1 and 2. from questions E13: What kind of work do you do in this job (main job)? That is what is your occupation called? Please describe fully.	0.32	0.47
Average usual working hours (emp) from person qE1: Including any paid or unpaid overtime, how many hours per week do you usually work in all your jobs?	38.51	16.37
Average preferred working hours (emp) from person qE6: If you could choose the number of hours you work each week and taking into account how that would affect your income, would you prefer to work “fewer hours”, “the same” or “more hours” than you do now? and qE7: In total how many hours a week, on average, would you choose to work ___ hours? Again, taken into account how that would affect your income. This includes any work done at the workplace and at home.	36.16	14.09

Analyses

Families, Work Hours and Demographics

To examine usual and preferred work hours across diverse families, we begin with a glimpse at lone individuals and lone parents. In this and all of the other samples analyzed here, men and women are treated separately. We then turn to couples, beginning with a depiction of all couples, then honing in on couples with children, and finally looking at various dual-earner couples with children. For the latter subsample, we initially consider egalitarian couples, as defined by usual work hours for each partner that are weakly within five hours per week of the other (i.e. difference ≤ 5). Non-egalitarian couples (i.e., difference > 5) are analyzed next. We finally consider the subset of non-egalitarian couples who express a preference for an egalitarian division of work hours.

For these analyses, it is important to note that we are not discussing the division of child care labour *per se*. A couple might exhibit extremely unequal paid work hours and share child care equally, or exhibit equal paid working time and complete inequality in child care time. Nonetheless, it seems likely that the correlation between egalitarian work hours and egalitarian child care arrangements is positive.

Table 2 describes lone individuals who are men or women. Adding the percentages at the bottom of the table reveals that these individuals comprise just under 30 percent of the entire adult population. Many of the demographic characteristics are similar for lone women and lone men, including the proportions born in Australia, and those having English as a second language (ESL), and the urban/rural location of the individuals. Differences can also be seen. The average age of the women in this category is over nine years beyond that of men, consistent with women’s greater longevity. Relatedly, the lone women are over 13 percentage points less likely to be employed than their male counterpart. Education patterns are very different, with holding a degree around seven percentage more often and, for those who are employed, the women are more often employed in professional occupations.

In terms of working hours, the employed men report around five hours per week more than the employed women. Differences in average preferred hours are in fact larger, with men working close to the hours they prefer, while the average woman in this subsample would prefer to work a little over one-half hour per week less. Given the small size of the divergence between actual and preferred working time, this evidence suggests the labour market is functioning reasonably well for many if not all lone individuals.

Table 2: Characteristics of Men and Women Lone Individuals

Characteristics	Men	Women
Average age in yrs.	37.59	46.85
Number of children	0.00	0.00
Australian born %	78.32	77.73
English as second language %	11.08	12.05
Degree and above %	13.65	20.63
Urban %	63.88	65.53
Employed %	64.99	51.41
Professional % (emp)	22.53	27.95
Average usual working hours (emp)	38.98	34.01
Average preferred working hours (emp)	38.72	33.41
% of entire population	14.44	15.35

Note: “(emp)” is for employed subsample.

Turning to lone parents, these are described in Table 3. As mentioned earlier, there are relatively few lone fathers: less than one-half of one percent of the adult population. We therefore focus the discussion here on the far larger group of lone mothers. This group has an average of around one-and-three-quarters children, are far younger than the lone women group, are about average in terms of immigrant status and ESL. However, lone mothers are less educated relative to other groups of women analyzed here. They are also less likely to be employed, and less often hold professional positions where employed, relative to other women analyzed here excepting lone individuals.

The working time of lone mothers who are employed averages 27.75 hours per week, a figure very close to that for mothers in couple relationships. However, the lone mothers express an average preference for longer hours of employment: viewing themselves as over two hours below where they would like to be on average. The fact that lone mothers prefer but are not employed for longer weekly hours is striking because they are the only group analyzed here, regardless of gender, for whom this result holds. In every other case, the average of preferred hours is less than that for actual hours.

Table 3: Characteristics of Men and Women Lone Parents

Characteristic	Men	Women
Average age in yrs.	39.65	36.08
Number of children	1.48	1.77
Australian born %	75.38	77.97
English as second language %	9.23	11.63
Degree and above %	11.11	17.36
Urban %	56.92	57.92
Employed %	56.92	48.76
Professional % (emp)	30.56	28.93
Average usual working hours (emp)	43.38	27.75
Average preferred working hours (emp)	40.43	29.79
% of entire population	0.49	3.06

Note: "(emp)" is for employed subsample.

We begin our ascent to the subsample of egalitarian households by examining the characteristics of all men and women in couple households in Table 4, regardless of parental or employment status. This category reflects the characteristics of almost two-thirds of the Australian adult population. Because the category includes couples whose children are no longer dependent, and those who are retired, the group tends to skew older. The average number of children in the home is small – less than one – and the education levels of men and women are very similar at just over 20 percent of each group holding degrees. For those who are employed, the percentages in professional occupations are also very similar for men and women, at around one-third.

There are, however, large differences in employment. Almost three-quarters of men, but just over half of women in this category are employed. Work hours differences are also large, with employed women in couples averaging around two-thirds the hours of their male counterparts. Both men and women would, however, prefer shorter hours on average. The average woman expresses a preference for around 2.5 fewer hours per week, and the comparable figure for the average man is about four fewer hours per week.

Table 4: Characteristics of Men and Women in Couple Households

Characteristics	Men	Women
-----------------	-----	-------

Average age in yrs.	48.21	45.35
Number of children	0.86	0.87
Australian born %	71.00	72.84
English as second language %	13.77	14.05
Degree and above %	20.65	21.73
Urban %	56.02	56.28
Employed %	72.74	56.72
Professional % (emp)	36.43	33.03
Average usual working hours (emp)	46.19	31.50
Average preferred working hours (emp)	42.23	29.03
% of entire population	32.14	33.82

Note: “(emp)” is for employed subsample.

Within the sample of couple households lies the subsample of couples with dependent children in the home, a group that comprises just under one-third of the adult population. The characteristics of this subsample are provided in Table 5. Relative to all couples, this group has around twice as many children, is younger by the better part of a decade, is more highly educated, and is far more frequently employed. The employment result might be surprising, except that the requirement of dependent children tends to exclude the retirees counted in the larger sample.

For those who are employed, average reported hours of employment are higher for men and (by around 1.5 hours) and lower for women (by over three hours) relative to work hours for those employed across all couple families. This difference is suggestive of the prevalence of neotraditional families. Indeed, for those who are employed, women average less than 60 percent of the men’s working hours.

Considering preferred working hours, if these couples were in fact to work their preferred hours, the divergence between men’s and women’s hours would close, but not by much. An approximate 20 hour gap would close to a little over 17 hours. Men would still perform far more paid work. This stated preference for neotraditional arrangements will appear again shortly.

Table 5: Characteristics of Men and Women in Couple Households with Children

Characteristics	Men	Women
Average age in yrs.	39.89	37.32
Number of children	1.98	1.98
Australian born %	73.26	74.48
English as second language %	13.70	14.45
Degree and above %	23.86	25.24
Urban %	54.62	54.57
Employed %	89.95	61.41

Professional % (emp)	36.20	33.75
Average usual working hours (emp)	47.56	27.85
Average preferred working hours (emp)	43.67	26.23
% of entire population	13.95	14.85

Note: “(emp)” is for employed subsample.

We now consider the even smaller subsample of couples with children who exhibit egalitarian working hours. Compared to all couples with children, the women and men in this group tend to be a little older, have slightly fewer children, and are far more likely to have English as a second language. The ESL figure that rises from around 14 percent for all parent couples, to over 22 percent for egalitarian couples. Other differences include the finding that the women in egalitarian families are over 10 percent more likely to hold a degree, and are over seven percent more likely to work in a professional occupation.

Given the method used to construct this subsample, it is not surprising that work hours for the men are typically shorter, and those for the women are typically longer than is true for the average couple with children. These differences generate equality of work hours. However, the women in this group still exhibit lower preferred hours of work relative to the men – with the average difference being around five hours.

This brief description is consistent with two possibilities regarding the causes of egalitarian families. First, the high proportion of ESL adults might be connected to either difficulties for foreign-born men in obtaining high wage jobs, or perhaps there is a greater availability of extended family or community members to perform child care, facilitating an equal division of employment hours – anchored on full-time work. Second, the job demands placed on women with higher levels of education than their partners, and with professional careers, may push the family towards egalitarian hours. In neither case does an egalitarian ethos necessarily play a major role, consistent with preferences for gender differences in hours.

Table 6: Characteristics of Egalitarian Couples with Children, Dual-Earners Only

Characteristics	Men	Women
Average age in yrs.	41.46	38.83
Number of children	1.62	1.62
Australian born %	64.09	68.51
English as second language %	22.10	22.10
Degree and above %	29.61	40.56
Urban %	55.80	55.80
Employed %	100.00	100.00
Professional %	34.25	41.99
Average usual working hours	42.55	42.16
Average preferred working	40.91	36.09

hours		
% of entire population	1.37	1.37

Within the subsample of dual-earner couple parents, the complement of the egalitarian group with children is the non-egalitarian group where the men report more than five additional hours per week of employment relative to their partners. This group of neotraditional families is almost five times as large as the egalitarian subsample; just over 17 percent of dual-earner couples with children are egalitarian.

The non-egalitarian group is slightly younger. Relative to egalitarian families, the non-egalitarian subsample has slightly more children in the household (around an extra 1/3 of a child per family), is Australian born around 10 percent more frequently, and less likely to be classified as ESL. The men are slightly less educated, while the women hold a degree around 10 percent less frequently. A major switch can be seen with regard to professional employment: in the egalitarian couples, women are around seven percent more likely than the men to be professionals, while in the non-egalitarian group, men are around six percent more likely than the women to hold such positions.

Working hours differences are even more striking, with men in the non-egalitarian subsample working around 24 hours more per week than the women. Of course, this difference is partly attributable to the way the subsamples were constructed. The result, however, is not entirely due to sample restrictions. It is instead mainly due to men working more than women: the sample includes both families where the women work longer hours than the men, and those where the men work longer hours, but the women are working longer hours in less than one-tenth of these families.⁹ In light of this fact, it is not surprising that, the difference between men's and women's preferred working hours in this group is above 20 hours per week.

Table 7: Characteristics of Non-Egalitarian Couples with Children, Dual-Earners Only

Characteristics	Men	Women
Average age in yrs.	40.48	38.08
Number of children	1.99	1.99
Australian born %	78.77	78.77
English as second language %	8.22	8.90
Degree and above %	26.50	30.01
Urban %	51.48	51.48
Employed %	100.00	100.00
Professional %	40.32	34.02
Average usual working hours	49.22	24.88
Average preferred working	44.15	23.93

⁹ The precise figures are that, out of the 6.64 percent of the population who are men in dual-earner couples with children and non-egalitarian work hours, 6.12 are cases where the men work longer hours, and .52 are accounted for by families where the women work longer hours.

hours		
% of entire population	6.64	6.64

The fact that preferred hours differences by gender rise from around five for the egalitarian group to over 20 for the non-egalitarian group is consistent with preferences largely being met within the labour market. However, some non-egalitarian couples may wish to be egalitarian. To consider this group, we turn in Table 8 to the subsample of non-egalitarian couples whose preferred working hours are egalitarian.

This subsample is small: just under 10 percent of the non-egalitarian couples state a preference for egalitarian hours arrangements. The subsample may nonetheless provide information on who would take advantage of egalitarian opportunities if these were expanded. The group does not diverge much from other non-egalitarian couples in terms of age or number of children, is slightly less often Australian born and more often claims ESL, and education levels are elevated. More dramatic differences exist in terms of professional status: while men more often hold professional positions in most non-egalitarian families, women tend to do so in most of those with a stated preference for egalitarian hours.

Table 8: Characteristics of Non-Egalitarian Couples with Children Who Prefer Egalitarianism, Dual-Earners Only

Characteristics	Men	Women
Average age in yrs.	41.33	38.48
Number of children	1.71	1.71
Australian born %	81.25	66.67
English as second language %	9.38	17.71
Degree and above %	30.53	39.58
Urban %	52.08	52.08
Employed %	100.00	100.00
Professional %	43.16	50.00
Average usual working hours	45.69	35.45
Average preferred working hours	36.19	34.66
% of entire population	0.73	0.73

The Time Divide

The analysis to this point has reported averages, an approach that could tend to mask any time divide. For example, supposed half of all people were employed for 30 and the other half for 50 hours per week, but that everyone preferred working 40 hours per week. The averages would then line up perfectly at 40, even though all of the short hours individuals would prefer more, and the long hours individuals fewer hours, consistent with the presence of a time divide.

To get at potential time divides, preferred work hours are subtracted from actual hours, and these are regressed against a constant and actual work hours. If the coefficient on the constant is negative, and the coefficient on actual work hours is positive, then we can infer that low hours individuals prefer to work more, and that this difference disappears as actual hours rise. We can also calculate a “zero point,” where the regression finds a match between preferred and actual hours. For hours beyond the zero point, the relationship between actual and preferred work hours reverses: longer hours individuals prefer shorter hours. If the zero point were, say, well over 40 hours per week, then the time divide interpretation would not be appropriate: we would simply be uncovering a stated preference for greater working hours. At the polar extreme, if the zero point were around, say, 10 hours per week, then most individuals would simply prefer shorter hours than they in fact have. The adjusted R^2 for the equation provides rough information on the strength of the time divide.¹⁰

Starting in Table 9 with the regressions for men across different family types, evidence of a time divide exists for respondents in each group: sole parents, egalitarian families, non-egalitarian families, and for the group who prefer but are not in egalitarian families. The coefficients on the constant terms are uniformly negative, the hours coefficients are positive, the zero points all lie above 10 and below 40 hours, and the lowest adjusted R^2 is .300, a reasonable fit for these regressions (see Drago, 2000). These findings are consistent with a time divide afflicting men across diverse families.

Considering differences by family type, it appears that men in egalitarian families are least susceptible to a time divide. The absolute value of the coefficients on the constant and on working hours are lowest for this group, and the adjusted R^2 is also lowest for this subsample. Men in non-egalitarian families are slightly more time divided by these criterion, while lone father men are far more so, and the men who prefer but are not in egalitarian families are the most time divided. However, it should be noted that the last-mentioned finding is partly attributable to the construction of the subsample: these men work more hours than their partners, but would like to work the same hours.

More intriguing is the contrast between the findings for men in non-egalitarian families when we examined averages (Table 7) as opposed to those with the time divide analysis. The evidence just presented suggests that many of the men in non-egalitarian families would prefer something closer to egalitarian hours arrangements, a finding that was indeed masked by considering only the average figures.

Table 9: Predictions of Actual less Preferred Work Hours -- The Time Divide for Men in Diverse Families

Variable	Sole Parent	Egalitarian Family	Non-egalitarian	Prefer but not Egalitarian
----------	-------------	--------------------	-----------------	----------------------------

¹⁰ Note that the relationship could be curvilinear, such that an actual hours quadratic would provide a better fit for the data. All of the regressions reported below were attempted with such a quadratic. The results are not reported here because the adjusted R^2 figures rose in only two cases, and then only slightly: for men in egalitarian families, the figure rose from .299 to .316, and for lone mothers, the figure went up from .348 to .353.

			Family	Family
Constant (s.e)	-23.72 (5.18)	-17.53 (2.25)	-17.79 (1.17)	-29.40 (2.21)
Hours Coefficient (s.e.)	.615 (.112)	.451 (.051)	.464 (.023)	.852 (.046)
Zero point	38.59	38.90	38.35	34.53
Adjusted R ²	.447	.300	.317	.782
Sample size	37	181	873	96

Turning to results for women in Table 10, some of the time divide results are similar to those for the men. The coefficients for the constant are consistently negative, those for actual hours are all positive, the zero point is well above 10 and well below 40 hours, and the adjusted R² figures fit the time divide story as well. As was true for the men, the weakest evidence for a time divide comes from the subsample of women in egalitarian families. Although the coefficient on the constant is absolutely larger than for the non-egalitarian families, the coefficient on actual hours is absolutely smaller, and the adjusted R² figure is smaller by over ten percentage points. Again, the evidence suggests that many women in non-egalitarian, or neotraditional families, would prefer something closer to egalitarian arrangements.

This interpretation of the findings – that many men and women in non-egalitarian families prefer something closer to egalitarian hours – needs to be tempered by a comparison of the zero points across Tables 9 and 10. Excepting the subsample of non-egalitarian families who wish to be egalitarian, the zero point for men is close to 40 hours per week, while that for women varies from 22 to 32 hours. By construction of the zero point, these differences imply that women working more than 32 hours per week prefer fewer hours, but this preference is not true for men until they work upwards of and beyond 40 hours per week.

Table 10: Predictions of Actual less Preferred Work Hours -- The Time Divide for Women in Diverse Families

Variable	Sole Parent	Egalitarian Family	Non-egalitarian Family	Prefer but not Egalitarian Family
Constant	-15.36 (1.44)	-11.29 (2.32)	-9.57 (.555)	-27.55 (1.92)
Hours Coefficient	.479 (.047)	.412 (.053)	.425 (.019)	.800 (.051)
Zero point	32.05	27.42	22.52	34.45
Adjusted R ²	.348	.247	.358	.724
Sample size	196	181	869	96

A conservative interpretation of these findings is that many Australians, both men and women, and across a variety of family types, are subject to a time divide. Many individuals who are working short hours state a preference for longer hours, and many longer hours individuals prefer shorter hours. Nonetheless, even if the time divide were

eliminated, the average father would work longer hours than the average mother. As can be inferred from the earlier analysis of actual and preferred hours, the percentage of egalitarian families, out of all dual earner couples with children, would in that case rise from slightly over 17 percent, to just over 25 percent. A majority of such families would maintain a neotraditional pattern.

Miscellaneous Issues

A final exercise involves asking about arrangements for children, spending patterns, attitudes and the ideologies of several of the subgroups to explore the effects and the reasons families may be or wish to be egalitarian or not. For comparability, we only analyze dual-earner couples with children, and employed lone parents.¹¹ For men and separately for women, we are interested in finding out how behaviors, spending patterns and attitudes are linked to the reality and preferences for egalitarianism.

Starting with men in Table 11, results for a scale indicating difficulties juggling child care show men in families with unrealized preferences for egalitarian work hours arrangements having the greatest difficulties, followed by lone fathers. These difficulties appear less frequently for egalitarian families and in those that prefer and are neotraditional. Skipping down to Table 12 results, for women, note that the question on juggling was asked of only one parent per household, so the results are identical by construction in couple families. For lone mothers, however, reported difficulties are far more severe than for lone fathers, perhaps because lone mothers have less money to spend on child care.

Another indicator of child care difficulties lies in the extent of self-care, or the time children spend in “latch-key” arrangements. As was the case for the juggling question, only one parent per household was asked the question, so most results appear to be identical for men and women. For the men covered in Table 11, the highest level of self-care, reported at just over one-quarter hour per week, is in families that wish to be but are not egalitarian, while lone fathers report the lowest figure. The lone mothers (see Table 12), report figures closer to those for the other families such that, across all mothers in these families, the lowest reported levels of self care are among families who are and wish to be neotraditional.

Figures for expenditures on groceries and on non-home meals are reported next, and help to inform us regarding household production and consumption patterns. Again, only one parent per household answered these questions, so results in Tables 11 and 12 are mainly identical. Across both tables, the highest weekly grocery expenditures are by lone parents, and the lowest are for families who wish to be but are not egalitarian. It seems likely that lone parents in the sample – all of whom are employed – are trading off higher grocery expenditures for less time in food preparation. Results for non-home meals, particularly for men, are consistent with this pattern. For the dual-earner couple families, the highest non-home meal expenditures are for egalitarian families, consistent with these couples taking on combined hours of employment that are longer than for the other

¹¹ For completeness, responses to these questions for individuals in other family arrangements are reported in Appendix Tables A1 and A2.

families in the sample. Recalling results reported in Tables 6 and 7, the egalitarian families work a combined total of around 85 hours per week, while the comparable figure for the non-egalitarian subsample was 74 hours.

Table 11: Behavior and Attitudes of Men in Diverse Circumstances, Means (standard deviations)

Variable	Egalitarian Family	Prefer but not in Egalitarian Family	Prefer and in Neotraditional Family	Lone Parents
Difficulty juggling multiple childcare arrangements (HQ Q4 g)	1.31 (2.66)	2.26 (3.28)	1.31 (2.59)	1.73 (3.19)
Child looks after self (HQ Q7 03, hours)	.25 (.44)	.27 (.45)	.18 (.38)	.11 (.31)
Normal weekly expenditures on groceries (HQ R27)	\$58.13 (20.14)	\$54.73 (17.08)	\$55.75 (16.45)	\$68.40 (23.39)
Normal weekly expenditures on non-home meals (HQ R29)	\$14.40 (11.83)	\$12.99 (10.43)	\$11.39 (9.27)	\$23.42 (26.92)
Father and mother divorced or separated at any time (PQ B3a)	.20 (.40)	.22 (.42)	.15 (.36)	.30 (.46)
Marital satisfaction (SCQ B11 a)	8.40 (1.66)	8.01 (2.17)	8.51 (1.76)	...
Parental satisfaction (SCQ B11 b)	8.72 (1.31)	8.56 (1.57)	8.64 (1.55)	7.86 (2.00)
Weekly hours caring for disabled spouse/relative or elders (SCQ B16 f)	.23 (.87)	.74 (4.36)	.26 (1.68)	1.78 (7.18)
A father should be as heavily involved in the care of his children as the mother (SCQ D1 n)	5.99 (1.31)	5.66 (1.38)	5.70 (1.37)	6.19 (1.17)
Approx. # Observations	180	96	715	37

To see whether these family patterns may have historical roots, the next question asks whether the parents of the respondent were ever divorced or separated. For both men and for women, the lowest rates of parental separation are related to the neotraditional families who also prefer that status, while the highest rates are associated with lone parents. Although we do not formally test the possibility, these results are consistent with divorce leading boys and girls to hold at least a slight preference for egalitarianism later in life.

Turning to marital satisfaction, rates across both men and women are highest in families that both are and prefer to be neotraditional. This result fits the argument that norms

make it easier to be a neotraditional family. Supportive evidence for this interpretation comes from Francine Deutsch’s (1999) U.S. study of couples who exhibited egalitarian work and child care arrangements. After going to a great deal of trouble to identify parent couples who were egalitarian in deed as well as in words, Deutsch found that a majority of the mothers, but only a small fraction of fathers, felt “bad” about their parenting. It seems likely that the norm of motherhood remained inside the psyches of these egalitarian parents, driving the women to feel insufficiently committed to their children, while the men felt like they were doing plenty for their kids.

Turning to the related issue of satisfaction with performance as a parent, the highest levels of satisfaction for the men appear in egalitarian families (Table 11). For women, however, the highest levels appear in the families where the adults prefer but do not experience egalitarian hours. These results are somewhat comforting, since they are consistent with the notion that egalitarian working hours, or preferences for such hours, are correlated with time spent by men and women on parenting.

The next question asks about the time spent caring for a disabled spouse or relative. Across all couple types, and for both men and women, the highest levels are for families who wish to be but are not egalitarian. This result is interesting, since it suggests that the care of the disabled typically falls on women, and can thereby drive a family away from egalitarian arrangements.

Table 12: Attitudes and Behavior of Women in Diverse Circumstances, Means (Standard Deviations)

Variable	Egalitarian Family	Prefer but not in Egalitarian Family	Prefer and in Neotraditional Family	Lone Parents
Difficulty juggling multiple childcare arrangements (HQ Q4 g)	1.31 (2.66)	2.26 (3.28)	1.31 (2.59)	2.14 (3.37)
Child looks after self (HQ Q7 03, hours)	.25 (.44)	.27 (.45)	.18 (.38)	.24 (.43)
Normal weekly expenditures on groceries (HQ R27)	\$58.13 (20.14)	\$54.73 (17.08)	\$55.75 (16.45)	\$62.62 (22.01)
Normal weekly expenditures on non-home meals (HQ R29)	\$14.40 (11.83)	\$12.99 (10.43)	\$11.39 (9.27)	\$12.95 (10.51)
Father and mother divorced or separated at any time (PQ B3a)	.22 (.41)	.22 (.42)	.19 (.40)	.30 (.46)
Marital satisfaction (SCQ B11 a)	7.88 (2.33)	8.06 (2.28)	8.30 (1.93)	...
Parental satisfaction (SCQ B11 b)	8.65 (1.59)	8.84 (1.34)	8.81 (1.35)	8.45 (1.71)
Weekly hours caring for	.51	2.24	.49	.51

disabled spouse/relative or elders (SCQ B16 f)	(2.61)	(13.98)	(2.44)	(1.75)
A father should be as heavily involved in the care of his children as the mother (SCQ D1 n)	6.22 (1.17)	6.09 (1.19)	5.76 (1.31)	6.17 (1.18)
Approx. # Observations	181	96	718	196

The final question covered in Tables 11 and 12 concerns views of fatherhood, and specifically whether the individual believes in egalitarian child care arrangements. Excepting lone fathers, who hold a very strong belief here, the highest scores are reported for egalitarian families. This result is consistent with a positive correlation between egalitarian work hours arrangements and the equal sharing of child care. Moreover, the result suggests that egalitarian work hours may be linked to an ethos of equality inside the family.

Discussion

The results presented here are consistent with two major conclusions regarding Australian patterns of preferred and actual working time. We have documented the existence of a time divide, wherein many long hours individuals prefer shorter hours, and many short hours individuals prefer longer hours. Most striking, the time divide result held across men and women, and across these groups for diverse family types. Egalitarian families – where the working hours of employed mothers and fathers are similar – come the closest to escaping the time divide, but even for these groups the evidence is consistent with such a division.

The averages suggest that the short hours group preferring longer hours is typically smaller than the long hours group who desire shorter hours. For most family types, the average employed adult desires fewer hours of employment. The one exception here was employed lone mothers, who prefer longer hours than they currently work.

The second major conclusion is that men’s stated work hours preferences are typically longer than those for women. This result holds for lone parents, wherein women express a preference for around 30 hours per week, and men prefer above 40 hours per week. The result also holds for the average couple with children, wherein the women typically prefer 26 hours of work, and the men almost 44 hours per week. Even in the subsample of families with egalitarian work hours, the women state a preference for 36 hours, and the men for 41 hours per week.

Just under one-fifth of dual-earner couples with children exhibited egalitarian work hours – wherein men’s and women’s usual work hours are close (within five hours per week). Although the women in these couples are probably performing more child care than the men, there was some evidence of a belief in the sharing of child care among these families.

We contrasted egalitarian families with neotraditional families wherein one individual performs at least five hours of additional paid work relative to their partner. In over 90 percent of neotraditional families, the man works longer hours than the woman. In those families, again limited to dual-earner couples with children, the men averaged 49 hours per week of paid work, while the women averaged only 25 hours per week of paid work). Such families comprised over 80 percent of all Australian dual-earner couples with children.

The conditions that support egalitarian families include being foreign born and having English as a Second Language, a result that might be related to the greater availability of relatives and community members for child care, limited job opportunities for men with ESL, or perhaps a more egalitarian ethos among some immigrant groups.

More striking were educational and occupational distinctions between egalitarian and neotraditional families. In the egalitarian families, 11 percent more women than men held degrees, while in the neotraditional families, women held degrees 3.5 percent more often. These results make it appear that women are more educated than men, something that is not true *per se*. What is instead going on is that average education levels for men and women are quite similar across all couples (see Table 4), but that women with less education tend to stay out of the labour market. Regarding occupation, in the neotraditional families, men were employed as professionals over six percent more frequently than women, while for egalitarian families, women appeared as professionals over seven percent more often than the men.

Among families who preferred but had not achieved an egalitarian distribution of hours of work, we found high levels of education and of professional occupational status for both men and women. For that same group, responsibilities for a disabled relative also appeared more frequently. If responsibilities for the disabled typically fall on women, then disability within a family may inhibit the emergence of egalitarian hours.

For those who believe in the neotraditional family, the evidence here provides some support. Women typically express preferences for lower hours than men. Such families do comprise the vast majority of dual-earner couples with children. And measured marital satisfaction was highest for these couples.

Moreover, all is not sweetness and light for the egalitarian couples analyzed here. These couples averaged long hours of work – above 84 combined hours per week, compared to 74 hours in total for the dual-earner neotraditional couples. Organizations that promote the shared care of children would view the working time of our egalitarian couples as overly long.¹²

For those who believe egalitarian arrangements are desirable, the results provide some rays of hope as well. Most obviously, these families already exist in substantial numbers, accounting for just under one-fifth of all dual-earner couples with children. While far from a majority, these families are no longer unusual. Further, women's continuing

¹² See, for example, the Third Path's world-wide web site at thirdpath.org.

movement into professional careers in Australia will likely promote egalitarian families, as will expanded educational opportunities for women. Perhaps of greater importance are the opportunities that currently exist in Australia for reduced hours employment, opportunities that are far more limited in the U.S. If fathers were motivated to use such arrangements, the proportion of egalitarian families would likely rise, and without the long hours of employment associated with egalitarian families at present.

What we cannot say with the present analysis is whether egalitarian family arrangements are consistent with current Australian understandings of fairness within families. It is possible, and even probable, that most Australians view neotraditional arrangements as fair. Certainly, the norms of motherhood and of the ideal worker, as applied to women and men respectively, would promote such an understanding of fairness because women may perform more unpaid work while men undertake more paid work. Nonetheless, it seems highly unlikely that women will achieve equality in the labour market, nor will men reach their potential as fathers, without further movement towards egalitarian families.

Finally, in terms of public policy, it seems safe to conclude that expanding the menu of possible and acceptable work hours arrangements would be a boon to many Australians would like to see. Such an expansion would reduce the time divides found for virtually all family types analysed here. It would not necessarily, but could also promote egalitarian family arrangements.

Table A1: Attitudes and Behavior of Fathers in Single- and No-earner Couples

Variable	Couple, Only Man Employed	Couple, Only Woman Employed	Couple, non-employed
Difficulty juggling multiple childcare arrangements (HQ Q4 g)	.55 (1.91)	.87 (2.33)	.55 (1.95)
Child looks after self (HQ Q7 03, hours)	.15 (.38)	.25 (.50)	...
Normal weekly expenditures on groceries (HQ R27)	\$53.37 (18.22)	\$50.81 (17.11)	\$47.32 (20.60)
Normal weekly expenditures on non-home meals (HQ R29)	\$11.03 (12.97)	\$9.20 (6.67)	\$6.41 (6.65)
Father and mother divorced or separated at any time (PQ B3a)	.21 (.40)	.28 (.46)	.24 (.43)
Marital satisfaction (SCQ B11 a)	8.65 (1.64)	8.53 (2.43)	9.01 (1.47)
Parental satisfaction (SCQ B11 b)	8.82 (1.51)	8.83 (1.48)	8.81 (1.98)
Weekly hours caring for disabled spouse/relative or elders (SCQ B16 f)	.37 (2.13)	.44 (1.98)	3.12 (14.58)
A father should be as heavily involved in the care of his children as the mother (SCQ D1 n)	5.70 (1.38)	6.07 (1.47)	5.87 (1.49)
Approx. # Observations	558	46	133

Table A2: Attitudes and Behavior of Mothers in Single- and No-Earner Couples and Lone Parent Non-employed Families

Variable	Couple, Only Man Employed	Couple, Only Woman Employed	Couple, Neither Employed	Lone, Non-employed Mothers
Difficulty juggling multiple childcare arrangements (HQ Q4 g)	.55 (1.91)	.87 (2.33)	.55 (1.95)	1.08 (2.74)
Child looks after self (HQ Q7 03, hours)	.15 (.38)	.25 (.50)33 (.58)
Normal weekly expenditures on groceries	\$53.37 (18.22)	\$50.81 (17.11)	\$47.32 (20.60)	\$57.41 (22.67)

(HQ R27)				
Normal weekly expenditures on non-home meals (HQ R29)	\$11.03 (12.97)	\$9.20 (6.67)	\$6.41 (6.65)	\$8.23 (7.93)
Father and mother divorced or separated at any time (PQ B3a)	.26 (.44)	.28 (.46)	.20 (.40)	.41 (.49)
Marital satisfaction (SCQ B11 a)	8.46 (1.94)	8.19 (2.14)	8.78 (1.99)	
Parental satisfaction (SCQ B11 b)	9.14 (1.18)	8.71 (1.69)	9.37 (.96)	8.76 (1.66)
Weekly hours caring for disabled spouse/relative or elders (SCQ B16 f)	1.16 (7.67)	4.23 (16.08)	3.09 (12.16)	2.84 (13.19)
A father should be as heavily involved in the care of his children as the mother (SCQ D1 n)	5.73 (1.41)	6.13 (1.52)	5.92 (1.46)	5.92 (1.49)
Approx. # Observations	530	43	114	186

References

Australian Bureau of Statistics (2001). *Labour Force, Australia, Preliminary*, Catalogue No. 6202.0, May.

Albelda, Randy P., and Tilly, Chris. (1997). *Glass Ceilings and Bottomless Pits: Women's Work, Women's Poverty*. Boston MA: South End Press.

Bardoel, E. Anne, Phyllis Tharenou, and Douglas Ristov. (2000). "The Changing Composition of the Australian Workforce Relevant to Work-Family Issues," *International Human Resource Issues*, 1(1), 58-77.

Barnett, Rosalind C. and Gareis, Karen C. (2002). "Full-time and Reduced-Hours Work Schedules and Marital Quality: A Study of Female Physicians with Young Children," *Work and Occupations*, 29(3), 364-379.

Baxter, Janeen. (2002). "Patterns of Change and Stability in the Gender Division of Household Labour in Australia, 1986-1997," *Journal of Sociology* 38(4), 399-424.

Berns, Sandra. (2002). *Women Going Backwards: Law and Change in a Family Unfriendly Society*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.

Budig, Michelle J. and England, Paula. (2001). "The Wage Penalty for Motherhood," *American Sociological Review*, 66(2), 204-225.

Carrington, Christopher. (2002). "Domesticity and the Political Economy of Lesbian Gay Families," in N. Gerstel, D. Clawson and R. Zussman (eds.), *Families at Work: Expanding the Bounds*. Nashville TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

Chapman, Bruce, Dunlop, Yvonne, Gray, Matthew, Liu, Amy and Mitchell, Deborah (2001) "The Impact of Children on the Lifetime Earnings of Australian Women: Evidence from the 1990s," Working paper, Canberra: Australian National University.

Costa, Dora. (2000). "The Wage and the Length of the Working Day: From the 1890s to 1991," *Journal of Labor Economics* 156, 156-181.

Council of Economic Advisors. (2000). *Economic Report of the President*. Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Crittenden, Ann. (2001). *The Price of Motherhood*. New York: Metropolitan Books.

Deutsch, Francine. (1999). *Halving It All: How Equally Shared Parenting Works*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Drago, Robert. (2000). "Trends in Working Time in the U.S.: A Policy Perspective," *Labor Law Journal*, 51(Winter), 212-218.

_____, Rosanna Scutella and Amy Varner. (2002). "Fertility and Work/Family Policies: Australia and the U.S." Paper presented at "Towards Opportunity and Prosperity," Sponsored by the Melbourne Institute and The Australian, Melbourne, Australia, April.

Grandey, Alicia A. 2001. "Family Friendly Policies: Organizational Justice Perceptions of Need-Based Allocations," in R. Cropanzano, ed., *Justice in the Workplace: Applications*, Vol 2. Mahwah NJ: Erlbaum, pp. 145-174.

Heymann, Jody. (2000). *The Widening Gap: Why America's Working Families Are in Jeopardy – and What Can Be Done About It*. New York: Free Press.

Jacobs, Jerry A. and Kathleen Gerson. (1998). "Who are the Overworked Americans?" *Review of Social Economy* 56.

Maushart, Susan. (2001). *Wifework: What Marriage Really Means for Women*. Melbourne: Text Publishing.

McClure, Patrick. (2000). "Participation Support for a More Equitable Society." Final Report of the Reference Group on Welfare Reform, Department of Family and Community Services, Canberra.

Moen, Phyllis. (2000). "The Career Quandary," Reports on America 2(1), Washington, DC: Population Reference Bureau.

Russell, Graeme and Lyndy Bowman. (2000). "Work and Family: Current Thinking, Research and Practice," Background paper for the National Families Strategy. Canberra: Department of Family and Community Services.

Sandberg, John and Hofferth, Sandra. 2001. "Changes in Children's Time with Parents, 1981-1997," PSC Research Report no. 01-475, University of Michigan, May. [available on-line <http://www.psc.isr.umich.edu/pubs/papers/rr01-475.pdf>]

U.S. Census Bureau for the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2000). Current Population News Releases, USDL 00-333, Work Experience in the Population 1999. Available [on-line]: <ftp://146.142.4.23/pub/news.release/work.txt>

Waldfogel, Jane. (1998). "Understanding the 'Family Gap' in Pay for Women with Children," *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 12(1), 137-156.

References

Watson, N. and Wooden, M. (2002), 'The Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia (HILDA) Survey: Wave 1 Survey Methodology', HILDA Project Technical Paper Series No. 1/02, May 2002 (Revised September 2002), Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research, University of Melbourne.

Williams, Joan. (1999). *Unbending Gender: Why Work and Family Conflict and What to Do About It*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wooden, Mark. (2001). "The Growth in 'Unpaid' Working Time," Working paper. Melbourne: Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research.

Wooden, M., Freidin, S. and Watson, N. (2002), 'The Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia (HILDA) Survey: Wave 1', *Australian Economic Review* 35, September, 339-348.

ⁱ The number of selections made varied with the expected response and occupancy rates within each area.