The employment dynamics of women with not-employed partners

Dr Jennifer Baxter
Australian Institute of Family Studies

Paper to be presented at HILDA Conference, 29-30 September

Abstract

Labour force data shows that the employment rate of women who have not-employed partners is lower than partnered women with employed partners. Research to date has not been able to explain this fully.

This paper uses HILDA data to explore the characteristics of families according to the employment status of the husband, and relates that to the employment patterns of the wives. To help to understand why the employment rates might be lower in families with not-employed husbands, the paper analyses the not-employed women's labour force data to examine whether they prefer to work, why they are not working, and their employment history. The analysis finds that the likelihood of the wife working depends to some extent on why the husband is not working, but also finds that many women with not-employed husbands have low levels of education, lack recent work experience and have health barriers to their own employment.

Of particular value is the ability to look at the dynamics of employment in families with a not-employed husband: to see how much change there is in the employment of both partners between the waves of the survey. The data show that in some of these families – particularly those where the husband is not working because of an illness or disability – there is very little transition into employment, while there is more change in families with an unemployed husband.

The views in this paper of those of the author and not necessarily those of the Australian Institute of Family Studies.

The employment dynamics of women with not-employed partners

1 Introduction

A woman whose husband is not employed is less likely to be employed herself than is a woman with an employed husband[1]. Studies of the determinants of female employment find this to be true even after controlling other characteristics (for example, Cai and Kalb 2004). This relationship between the husband's and wife's employment status has received relatively little attention in Australian research. It is, however, worthy of some attention, given that this relationship means there are more jobless households. The importance of understanding why this occurs can only increase as the number of jobless husbands increases.

In June 2005, there were 163,800 couple families in Australia with a not-employed (either unemployed or not in the labour force) husband aged between 15 and 59, representing 8 per cent of all couple families. The wife was employed in 39 per cent of these families. This compares to the employment rate of wives in families with an employed husband in the same age range, of 74 per cent (figures derived from ABS 2005).

The reasons for the lower employment rate of women with not-employed husbands are not well understood, but research has suggested a number of possible reasons. One reason is the effect of assortative mating – husbands and wives are likely to have similar characteristics, so factors affecting the employment probability of the husband (such as a low level of education) are also likely to apply to the wife. Regional variation may also contribute to lower employment rates of wives if the couple lives in an area of reduced employment opportunities, thereby reducing the employment opportunities of both partners. Another possible reason is the disincentive effect of means-testing of unemployment benefits, that can result in high effective marginal tax rates (EMTRS) and reduce the financial incentive to work. Lastly, there may be attitudinal effects resulting from an alignment of views with the male-breadwinner model. In families that prefer that the wife not be the sole breadwinner, working

---

[1] Throughout this paper 'husband' and 'wife' are used to refer to men and women in legal marriages as well as other cohabiting relationships.

wives may withdraw from work if their husband leaves employment, or may choose not to seek work if they were previously not in employment.

By exploring the demographic and labour force data in the Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia (HILDA) survey[2], this paper considers whether assortative mating can help to explain the low employment rate of wives of not-employed men, and whether there are other employment barriers more commonly found in these families. This is done through an analysis of the Wave 1 HILDA data. The analysis is then further extended by employing the longitudinal nature of the HILDA data to examine the labour dynamics of husbands and wives. This helps to determine whether joblessness in these families is a temporary or more permanent state, at least over the period covered by the first three waves of the HILDA data. Temporary periods of joblessness are likely to be less of a problem for families than are longer periods. They are also less likely to be of concern to policy makers if the jobless are not reliant on government support at all or only for a short period of time, compared to the situation of those for whom income support is their primary source of income over a longer period of time.

The structure of this paper is as follows. Section 2 presents the Australian and international literature relating to the employment of wives of not-employed men. Following this, the HILDA data used in this analysis are discussed in Section 3. The analyses are then presented in two sections – Section 4 focuses on characteristics at Wave 1, and Section 5 focuses on the longitudinal data. A final section concludes this paper.

2 Literature Review

Few Australian studies have examined the relationship between wife's and husband's employment. The exceptions are Donnelly and McClelland (1989) and a very comprehensive study by King, Bradbury and McHugh (1995)[3] who both looked at the labour force status of wives with an unemployed husband. A third study by King and McHugh (1995) analysed the labour force status of the wives of Disability Support

---

[3] A subset of this report was published by Bradbury (1995).

Pensioners. These studies were based on surveys that were specifically designed to analyse the employment decisions of wives in these families, using small samples of income support recipients[4].

Donnelly and McClelland (1989) found that it was women's roles in the home, being primarily responsible for child care and managing the household, that deterred their involvement in the labour market, even in families where the husband was not employed. Women's role in caring for children also came up as a deterrent to labour force participation in King *et al.* (1995).

All the Australian studies showed that wives of not-employed men had relatively low levels of education and work experience. Health problems also existed for some of these women. By design, all the wives in King and McHugh's (1995) study had husbands on a Disability Support Pension. These wives sometimes had caring responsibilities and their own health problems. In all studies, the authors attributed the low levels of employment amongst these women at least in part to these women's characteristics, particularly in relation to education levels, health and work experience. For example, King, Bradbury and McHugh (1995) concluded that the characteristics of women with not-employed men were important in explaining the lower employment of these women. However, they found that observed differences in variables such as education, age and region only explained a very small part of the employment gap, and concluded that most of the effect was due to unobserved characteristics.

King *et al.*'s analysis (1995) did not find strong evidence that the husband's loss of work directly caused the lower employment of their wives. This might occur, for example, if the means-testing of government support acted as a disincentive for wives to work. These authors found that the husband's loss of work did not have a strong direct effect on their wife's employment. They did note, however, that the effect of the income test was likely to make a difference to families, who weigh up the 'price effect' of the loss of income support with the 'income effect' of additional earned income when considering whether one of the couple should take up employment. With high effective marginal tax rates, the 'income effect' is often negated by the

---

[4] The report on wives of unemployed men by Donnelly and McClelland (1989) also included analyses of Australian Bureau of Statistics survey data. This was also the case for the study by King, Bradbury and McHugh (1995), which also included analyses of administrative data on unemployment benefit recipients.

'price effect' for low-income families. Donnelly and McClelland (1989) concluded that the income test of the unemployment payment did have an effect on wives' employment decisions, as it created a disincentive for them to work.

These analyses are somewhat dated now, especially considering that the eligibility requirements for income support have changed significantly since 1995. In particular, wives of income support recipients must now meet eligibility criteria of their own in order to receive an income support payment, rather than being eligible for the married rate of payment simply by being married to an income support recipient. As well, for couple families with an unemployed husband the wife's income is taken into account when assessing the value of the husband's income support payment (and for families with children, family payments). As a result, except in families where the wife can earn a high income from work, there can be high EMTRs associated with the wife taking on employment (Beer 1998; Toohey and Beer 2003).

This phenomenon of much lower employment rates for wives of not-employed husbands is found in a number of other countries. International studies give varaying reasons as to why is is the case, although the effect of means-testing of benefits has been a particular focus in the international literature. Using longitudinal data and controlling for various characteristics such as age and education, McGinnity (2002) found that in Britain, not-employed wives with unemployed husbands were less likely to take up employment than were not-employed wives with employed husbands. They attributed this to the means-testing of benefits. Dex *et al* (1995) reached the same conclusion in a cross-country analysis of the low employment rates of wives with unemployed husbands. On the other hand, based on British longitudinal data, Doris (1999) concluded that means-testing of benefits was not a significant factor in explaining the labour market transitions of wives of not-employed men.

Dex *et al.* (1995) found that different characteristics of wives of employed and not-employed men, and the differing employment conditions that they faced, do not fully explain the difference in employment rates. Similarly, in a Dutch study, Ultee *et al.* (1988) concluded that within-couple similarity of education, age and regional unemployment explains only part of the relationship between husband and wife employment status. They surmised that "consequences are present that might be termed couple effects: effects that arise from interaction between partners after marriage" (Ultee *et al.* 1988, p.120). These "couple effects" might arise because

decisions about employment – about finances and about allocation of time – are most likely made at the couple, or family level, rather than the individual level.

To summarise, the reasons for the lower employment of wives of not-employed men have not been fully explained in Australia or in other countries. There is likely to be some effect of means-testing of government assistance, and further, the assortative mating by education, and other characteristics, is likely to explain some of the difference. It is less clear what the other effects are – those termed "couple effects" by Ultee *et al.* (1988). It is hoped that by exploring the data on reasons for non-employment, and looking in a little more detail at the reasons for the husbands non-employment, that these effects can be explored in these data.

In terms of employment dynamics, some information about past employment experience was reported in King, Bradbury and McHugh (1995) and King and McHugh (1995), but these analyses were quite limited. A number of the international studies such as McGinnity (2002) and Doris (1999) use multivariate techniques to analyse employment transitions of wives, controlling for the employment status of the husband. It is possible that these data can be analysed using these techniques in the future.

3 Data

This paper uses confidentialised unit record data from the HILDA survey. A description of the HILDA survey can be found in Watson (2005).

All three waves of HILDA were used in this analysis, restricted to couple[5] households, with or without children, in which the male was aged 15 to 59 (regardless of the age of his wife) in order to focus the analysis on people of working-age. Data were only used where both the husband and wife responded to the survey and provided a valid response to the employment question. Unweighted data have been used throughout.

Refer to Table A- 1 for final sample counts from each wave. The sample numbers are relatively small in families with an unemployed husband (122 families) or not in the labour force husband (278 families), which limits the analysis that can be done.

---

[5] Men and women in these couples are referred to as 'husbands' and 'wives' even for those not in a legal marriage.

The analysis of employment dynamics required merging the data from HILDA Waves 1, 2 and 3, and for this analysis the sample was smaller again. This was due to the combined effects of attrition, and of keeping the sample restricted to couples in which the male was aged less than 60 and provided employment information in the survey (Table A- 2). The total sample size available for all three waves was 2 299 couples, of which 67 had an unemployed husband and 167 a not in the labour force husband at Wave 1.

An additional problem in using these data from the three waves to analyse not-employed men is their relatively high attrition, as seen in Table A- 3. This may mean that those in all three waves of HILDA are not representative of all those who started out with a not-employed husband at Wave 1. However, the employment rate of wives by husband's employment status is very similar across waves (Table A- 4), which suggests that attrition has not adversely affected the sample representativeness with regard to this employment data.

In addition to using the employment status as at each of the waves, the analysis included an examination of the calendar year data. This was done in an aggregate sense only – using these data to measure whether or not husbands and wives had worked at any time in the preceding year, and what percentage of the year had been spent in work.

Throughout this paper, to analyse the employment status of wives of not-employed men, the husbands are classified according to their employment status, with not in the labour force (NILF) men divided into two categories according to their main activity while not in the labour force. In analyses of labour force data, it is more usual to further classify people according to their marginal attachment to the labour force[6], but it was felt for this analysis it was more informative to classify the men according to their main activity. Table A- 5 shows the main activities for the NILF men. The classification used in this paper combines into one group those who are permanently unable to work and those who are not working because they are ill or disabled, labelled NILF-ill/disabled. The remaining NILF men are combined into NILF-other. This second group is a more heterogeneous category, including those who have

---

[6] This is a measure of how attached people are to the labour force, differentiating those who want to work from those who do not or are permanently unable to work, and for those who want to work, differentiating people according to whether they are looking for work, available for work and the reasons for not looking for work.

retired, students, those caring for someone else or undertaking home/duties or child care. A more useful classification would remove some of this heterogeneity by dividing this category further, but the sample numbers were too small in many of the individual categories to be useful. As it turned out, this simple two-group classification was sufficient to identify some overall patterns.

4 Wives' employment by employment status of the husband

The percentage of wives who are employed is much higher in families where the husband is also employed, compared to wives who have a not-employed husband. Not-employed women in families with an employed husband tended to be NILF much more so than unemployed (Table 1).

Table 1 Employment status of wife by employment status of husband, Wave 1

Husband's employment Status	Wife's employment status			
	Employed	Unemployed	NILF	Total
	Row percentage (%)			Sample
Employed	**72.4**	**2.2**	**25.3**	**2 860**
Not employed	**33.8**	**8.3**	**58.0**	**400**
Unemployed	36.0	14.0	50.0	122
NILF - illness/ disability	26.7	3.7	69.6	164
NILF force - other reason	41.6	8.9	49.6	114
Total	**67.7**	**3.0**	**29.4**	**3 260**

Source: HILDA Wave 1

In families where the husband is unemployed, the proportion of wives being also unemployed is higher than in other family types, indicating some of these not-employed wives would prefer to be working. Those with a NILF-other husband also have some attachment to the labour force – the unemployment rate is lower than for those with unemployed husbands, but the employment rate is higher. On the other hand, those women with a NILF-ill/disabled husband are less likely to be employed and less likely to be unemployed than the other families with not-employed husbands.

4.1 The characteristics of families by employment status of husbands

Differences in labour force status of wives by the employment status of the husband may be associated with differences in characteristics across families, such that in families with a not-employed husband, both husband and wife have characteristics that lower the probability of employment. This is the argument that assortative mating

is one of the reasons for the lower employment of wives with not-employed husbands. Some of the differences are evident in Table 2. Table 3 further explores this by combining husband and wife information, looking at health status and education levels simultaneously.

Husbands and wives are older, on average, in families where the husband is not in the labour force. They are oldest, on average, when the husband is NILF-ill/disability (46 years for wives and 49 years for husbands). Age may be a barrier for the older women with NILF husbands, either because they have actually retired from work, or they believe they are too old to (re-)enter employment. The average age of husbands and wives in families with an employed or unemployed husband – the unemployed are just slightly younger, on average.

The presence of children, particularly young children, is commonly associated with lower female employment rates. Young children are most likely to be in families with an employed or unemployed husband, which is to some extent related to these families being younger. In contrast, families with a NILF husband are more likely to have no dependant children. Consequently, the lower employment rate of women with NILF husbands could not be explained by their having a child distribution that deterred employment more-so than in employed husband families.

A small percentage of women have significant English language barriers, and are disproportionately represented in families where the husband is unemployed or NILF-ill/disability. Husbands also are more likely to not speak English well if they are not employed.

More widespread amongst women with not-employed husbands is the low level of education. This is particularly so for those with NILF-ill/disability husbands– almost 60 per cent of these women did not complete secondary education. Husbands also had low levels of education when they were not employed, but they were more likely to have completed secondary education than their wives, on average. Table 3 shows the extent to which both husband and wife have low education – this is more likely to be so in households with a NILF-ill/disability husband. Where the husband and wife are employed, it is much more common for both husband and wife to have completed secondary education.

Baxter, Jennifer

Table 2 Characteristics of families by husband's employment status, Wave 1

	Employed	Un-employed	NILF - illness/ disability	NILF force - other reason	Total
	Years				
Age					
Wife's average age	38.7	37.5	45.7	42.2	39.1
Husband's average age	40.9	39.8	49.3	45.0	41.4
	Column per cent (%)				
Age of youngest child[a]					
Has no dependent children	36.6	41.0	54.3	61.4	38.5
Youngest child aged 0 to 4	27.8	32.0	15.9	16.7	27.0
… aged 5 to 9	15.8	16.4	7.9	10.5	15.3
… aged 10 to 24	19.8	10.6	21.9	11.4	19.32
English language proficiency					
Husband does not speak English well	1.1	4.1	6.7	4.4	1.6
Wife does not speak English well	1.5	6.6	7.3	2.6	2.0
Education					
Husband has incomplete secondary education	21.1	35.3	53.7	28.1	23.5
Wife has incomplete secondary education	28.2	44.3	59.2	42.1	30.8
Long-term health problems					
Husband has long-term health condition	14.9	36.1	87.8	35.1	20.0
…which limits amount or type of work you can do	7.6	27.1	87.2	29.8	13.1
Wife has long-term health condition	12.7	22.1	32.9	14.0	14.1
…which limits amount or type of work you can do	8.3	17.2	29.3	11.4	9.8
Caring responsibilities					
Wife Spends time caring for ill/disabled spouse or relative	11.4	15.1	32.1	13.5	12.6
Government support					
Husband receives government support	4.2	62.3	82.3	37.7	11.4
Wife receives government support	13.0	57.4	72.6	30.7	18.3
Sample	**2,860**	**122**	**164**	**114**	**3260**

Source: HILDA Wave 1

(a) aged under 15, or dependant students aged 15 to 24

Table 3 Couple education and health status by husband's employment status, Wave 1

	Husband's Employment Status				
	Employed	**Un-employed**	**NILF - illness/ disability**	**NILF force - other reason**	**Total**
	Column per cent (%)				
Education					
Both have incomplete secondary education	9.8	16.4	32.3	15.8	11.4
Wife has incomplete secondary education, husband has secondary or higher	18.4	27.9	26.8	26.3	19.4
Husband has incomplete secondary education, wife has secondary or higher	10.6	18.0	20.7	12.3	11.4
Both have complete secondary education or higher	58.2	31.1	18.3	44.7	54.7
Long-term health problem					
Both have long term health problems	3.1	13.9	29.3	8.8	5.0
Husband only has a long term health problem	11.3	21.3	56.7	26.3	14.5
Wife only has a long term health problem	9.6	8.2	3.7	5.3	9.1
Neither have long-term health problems	72.9	50.0	8.5	58.8	68.3
Sample	**2,860**	**122**	**164**	**114**	**3260**

Source: HILDA Wave 1

Health concerns are also likely to be more of a barrier in families with a not-employed husband than those with an employed husband, according to the different proportions reporting to have a long-term health condition. Almost one-third of women with a NILF- ill/disabled husband have a long-term health condition. The majority of these women report that it affects the amount or the type of work they can do. Health problems are also prevalent for both the husbands and wives in households with an unemployed husband. In households where the husband is NILF-other, health problems are fairly common amongst the husbands, but less-so amongst their wives. The likelihood of both husband and wife having health problems is shown in Table 3. Not surprisingly, this is most common in families with a NILF-ill/disabled husband.

In some cases, the husband will be out of work to care for an ill/disabled wife – the non-employment of the husband is a factor of the wife's characteristics – however,

the data on main activity of NILF husbands (Table A- 5) showed that only 3 per cent of the NILF husbands were in this category. They were all included in the NILF-other group by definition.

Health issues also affect women if their husband requires care because of an illness, injury or disability. This would be most prevalent in the NILF-ill/disability group, and indeed Table 2 shows that almost one-third of wives of these men spend some time in the week caring for an ill or disabled spouse or family member.

Table 4 Employment rate of wives by selected characteristics and husband's employment status, Wave 1

	Husband's Employment Status				
	Employed	**Un-employed**	**NILF - illness/ disability**	**NILF force - other reason**	**Total**
	Wives' employment rate (%)				
Wife's age group					
15-29	67.8	31.0	33.3	34.8	64.2
30-39	69.4	21.2	35.9	50.0	66.4
40-49	79.2	52.9	27.1	62.5	75.1
50+	72.2	38.9	20.6	28.6	61.3
Age of youngest child[a]					
No dependent child	81.8	50.0	26.7	41.4	74.3
0 to 4	51.7	7.9	19.2	22.2	48.2
5 to 9	77.1	52.9	46.2	33.3	74.3
10 to 24	81.1	46.2	25.0	76.9	76.9
Wife has incomplete secondary education					
Yes	62.4	29.6	19.6	45.8	55.7
No	76.5	41.7	37.5	38.5	73.2
Wife has long-term health condition which limits amount or type of work she can do					
Yes	57.1	14.3	10.4	7.7	45.3
No	73.9	40.9	33.6	46.0	70.2
Total	**72.4**	**36.0**	**26.7**	**41.6**	**67.7**
Sample	**2,860**	**122**	**164**	**114**	**3260**

Source: HILDA Wave 1
(a) aged under 15, or dependant students aged 15 to 24

The relationship between wives' characteristics and employment is shown in Table 4. As expected, being older, having young children, having incomplete secondary education and having a long-term health condition are all associated with being less likely to be employed. However, it appears that characteristics alone do not explain

the lower employment of wives of not-employed husbands. Just considering the effect of each variable on its own, there is still a difference in the employment rates by husband's employment status within each of the categories shown in this table.

What these data do not show is the extent to which women in families with not-employed husbands are disadvantaged as measured on more than one characteristic. To investigate this, the number of 'employment barriers' was counted for each woman. Employment barriers are defined as: having incomplete secondary education, having an illness or disability that affects work, spending some time caring for an ill or disabled spouse or other family member, having children aged less than five, not speaking English well. The maximum number of barriers counted is five, although no one reported this many, and only six people had four barriers (Table 5).

Table 5 Number of employment barriers by husband employment status

Number of barriers[a] experienced by wife	Husband's employment status				
	Employed	Un-employed	NILF illness/ disability	NILF - other	Total
	Column Percentage (%)				
None	35.9	23.0	12.2	31.6	34.1
1	45.4	33.6	37.2	41.2	44.4
2	16.3	35.3	36.6	21.9	18.2
3 or 4	2.4	8.2	14.0	5.3	3.3
Sample	**2 860**	**122**	**164**	**114**	**3 260**

Source: HILDA Wave 1
(a) Employment barriers are defined as: having incomplete secondary education, having an illness or disability that affects work, spending some time caring for an ill or disabled spouse or other family member, having children aged less than five, not speaking English well.

Women had more employment barriers in families where the husband is NILF-ill/disability – the vast majority of women had at least one barrier to employment in these families, with half having two or more barriers. The next highest number of barriers is seen for women with an unemployed husband – just over three-quarters of these families have at least one barrier. The other family types also have some barriers, although have higher percentages having no barriers, and less having three or more barriers.

The relationship between these barriers and female employment is very strong – regardless of the employment status of the husband, wives with no or fewer barriers are more likely to be employed (Table 6). These barriers also appear as reasons for not looking for work or for having left the last job, in the analysis discussed in the

next section. As was evident when looking at the characteristics individually, there is still a higher rate of employment amongst wives with employed men, after controlling for the number of employment barriers. Again, this suggests that differences in measured characteristics only explain a portion of the difference in employment rates.

Table 6 Wives' employment by number of employment barriers and husband's employment status

Number of barriers[a] experienced by wife	Husband's employment status				
	Employed	Un-employed	NILF illness/ disability	NILF - other	Total
	Wives' employment rate (%)				
None	88.9	70.8	66.7	58.3	87.1
1	69.5	39.5	28.3	42.6	66.1
2	51.0	21.4	18.3	25.0	44.4
3 or 4	36.2	0.0	13.0	0.0	25.9
Total	**72.4**	**36.0**	**26.7**	**41.6**	**67.7**

Source: HILDA Wave 1
(a) Employment barriers are defined as: having incomplete secondary education, having an illness or disability that affects work, spending some time caring for an ill or disabled spouse or other family member, having children aged less than five, not speaking English well.

This analysis has shown that woman with not-employed husbands face considerable, and often multiple, barriers to employment. However, these barriers are not so prevalent in families where the husband is NILF-other. It is those families in which the husband is unemployed or NILF-ill/disabled that the more significant barriers exist. It appears that the 'assortative mating' argument could apply and may contribute to the lower employment rate of wives in some families. However, there could be other effects that cause there to be a reduced rate of employment amongst wives with a not-employed husband. The following sections aim to find out more about this using more detailed labour force information on the not-employed wives.

4.2 Not-employed wives – employment preferences and barriers

A small proportion of not employed wives are unemployed, that is, they are actively looking for work and available to start work. This number is too small to differentiate reasons for unemployment by husband's employment status, but the overall figures show that commonly reported difficulties in finding work by these unemployed women are because of their age, their lack of education or experience, language barriers, or because there are no jobs available at all or in their line of work.

Unemployed women with not-employed husbands are more likely to have had a long absence from employment, with about one-third not having worked in the last 5 years (or ever), compared with 18 per cent of those with employed husbands. Regardless of husband's employment status, many unemployed women last worked in a casual job – 53 per cent of those who had worked in the previous 5 years.

Why unemployed women are more likely to be married to unemployed men is not clear from these data, beyond those reasons relating to their characteristics. Nevertheless, it does not seem surprising that in jobless families, if there are no impediments to employment (such as health or caring issues) by either husband or wife, then both could be expected to be looking for work.

Of the NILF wives, 38 per cent wanted to work, plus 8 per cent said they might like to work (Table 7). Those wives with NILF-ill/disabled husbands were the least likely to be classified as wanting to work, largely because of the very high percentage – 23 per cent – classified as permanently unable to work.

Table 7 Not in the labour force wives, whether would like a job, Wave 1

	Husband's employment status				
			NILF		
		Un-	**illness/**	**NILF**	
Whether would like a job	**Employed**	**employed**	**disability**	**- other**	**Total**
	Column per cent (%)				
Yes[a]	39.1	43.9	26.8	35.7	37.7
Maybe/ it depends	8.5	8.8	8.0	1.8	8.1
No	46.9	38.6	41.1	57.1	46.3
Not asked - permanently unable to work	3.6	8.8	23.2	5.4	6.4
Sample	**703**	**57**	**112**	**56**	**928**

Source: HILDA Wave 1
(a) includes those who were looking for work, but not defined as unemployed.

The remaining analysis in this section examines these data more closely. When cross-classified by other data items the sample sizes become particularly small, which may mean these results will not generalise to the population. They should therefore be treated as indicative only.

Of those who do not want to work, many of the wives of employed and unemployed men have children at home, and cite home duties/child care as their main activity, suggesting that their reason for not wanting to work is to be there for their children (Table 8). Some of these wives of employed or unemployed men cite home

duties/child care as their main activity but do not have children at home. Wives who do not want to work, who have NILF husbands (either illness/disability or other) are even more likely to be in this category. Overall, most (70 per cent) of these women have not worked in the previous five years, and are older (60 per cent are aged over 50). It is likely that these wives would find it difficult to make the transition to employment, especially considering their lack of desire for employment.

Table 8 Main activity of not in the labour force wives who would not like a job, Wave 1

| Main activity when not in the labour force | Husband's employment status | | | | |
	Employed	Un-employed	NILF illness/ disability	NILF - other	Total
	Column per cent (%)				
Retired/voluntarily inactive	4.6	0.0	8.7	34.4	7.0
Home duties/childcare, with child<15	67.3	68.2	39.1	15.6	60.5
Home duties/childcare, no child<15	19.1	22.7	32.6	31.3	21.6
Own illness/disability/injury or looking after ill or disabled person	1.5	9.1	19.6	6.2	4.2
Study, travel, voluntary work or other	7.6	0.0	0.0	12.5	6.7
Sample	**330**	**22**	**46**	**32**	**430**

Source: HILDA Wave 1

One-third of wives who do not want to work whose husbands are NILF-other are classified as retired/voluntarily inactive. These women are unlikely to take up work in the near future, but the 12 per cent who were studying, travelling, etc, could be more likely to re-enter employment on cessation of this activity. Another group whose absence from employment is likely to be permanent is that of the wives of NILF-ill/disabled men who do not want to work, and who have health problems, or who are caring for someone with health problems.

Baxter, Jennifer

Table 9 Not in the labour force wives who want to work, reasons for not looking for work, Wave 1

Wife's reasons for not looking for work[a]	Employed	Un-employed	NILF illness/ disability	NILF - other	Total
			Column per cent (%)		
Family reasons	*70.1*	*78.6*	*70.3*	*50.0*	*69.7*
Prefers to look after children, other child care reason or pregnancy/ maternity leave	67.5	71.4	43.2	45.0	64.4
Ill health of someone other than self/other family reason	6.4	7.1	29.7	5.0	8.6
Discouraged jobseekers	*13.2*	*17.9*	*27.0*	*15.0*	*14.9*
No jobs available	5.8	3.6	18.9	5.0	6.8
Difficulties with language/ethnic background	0.6	10.7	2.7	0.0	1.5
Lacks necessary training or qualifications or experience	7.7	3.6	10.8	10.0	7.8
Too young/too old	2.9	3.6	5.4	0.0	3.0
Personal reasons	*32.5*	*17.9*	*32.4*	*50.0*	*32.3*
Own illness, injury or disability	6.1	10.7	13.5	10.0	7.3
Welfare payment/pension may be affected	1.3	0.0	8.1	0.0	1.8
Studying/returning to studies	9.0	3.6	10.8	25.0	9.6
Does not need to work	10.3	3.6	5.4	15.0	9.6
Moved house/holidays	7.4	3.6	2.7	15.0	7.1
Have a job to go to	3.2	3.6	0.0	5.0	3.0
Other reasons	11.3	10.7	0.0	10.0	10.1
Sample	**335**	**30**	**39**	**21**	**425**

Source: HILDA Wave 1
(a) Multiple responses were allowed – this table shows any reasons reported. The sub-headings show the percentage reporting any of the items under this heading.

Wives that were not in the labour force but wanted to work were asked why they were not working (Table 9). Of those with employed or unemployed husbands, more than two-thirds cite their caring for children (or related reasons) as a reason for not looking for work. These families were the mostly likely to have young children (Table 2) so it is to be expected that child-related reasons were more commonly cited by these women. There was also a range of other reasons given, with differences emerging between the employed husband and unemployed husband families, particularly with respect to the reason 'does not need to work'. This category was more often cited in families with an employed husband. Also, reasons such as the ill health of a family

member or barriers due to language and ethic background which were more often cited in families with an unemployed husband, consistent with information on English language and health status of husbands in Table 2.

Turning now to families with a NILF husband, the reasons NILF wives were not looking for work were found to be different. Recall that Table 2 showed these families were more likely to have no dependant children and the husbands and wives were likely to be older. The NILF-other category includes wives of those men who have retired from work, but also includes wives of students and those whose husbands are caring for children. The diversity in reasons not looking for work reflects this.

Not surprisingly then, many of those whose husbands were NILF-ill/disabled cited ill health of someone else as a reason for not looking for work. Many also cited their own illness or disability, reflecting that many women in this group have a long-term health condition (see Table 2). Table 9 shows that these women were also more likely to be classified as discouraged jobseekers; in particular a number said their reasons for not looking for work included their belief that there were no jobs available. The low levels of education, and for many, lack of recent work experience, are likely to contribute to this negative view of the labour market. Further, many women (and their husbands) in this category receive income support – more-so than the other groups of families (see Table 2) – and it is in these families that women are more likely to say a reason for not working is that their welfare payments would be affected (8 per cent), although this is clearly only a consideration for a minority of families. Remember, though, that this shows only the reasons for those who want to work. Some other women may have decided that they do not want to work because of the effect on welfare payments.

Overall, this information provides support for the effect of characteristics on the employment decisions of wives with not-employed husbands. Wives who want to work often attribute their not working to health problems, caring responsibilities, low levels of education or work experience, or English language difficulties. For some, their lack of work is expressed in terms of a failure in the labour market – that jobs are not available. Many wives, however, do not want to work, especially wives of NILF-ill/disability men. For those who do not want to work, some have the same barriers as those who do want to work. For some, it seems not wanting to work is related to undertaking the 'home duties' role within the household.

4.3 Not-employed wives – last job

Another way of discerning why women with not employed husbands are less likely to be employed is to look at information on their last job. This information is available for all women who are not employed (Table 10). This is only relevant for those women who have in fact worked before, and one of the differences across husband's employment status is the higher proportion having never worked amongst women with not-employed husbands, particularly those with unemployed husbands. Amongst those wives that have worked, those with NILF-ill/disabled husbands have a high proportion not having worked in the last five years. This lack of work experience, or recent work experience, is likely to be a key factor in women's ability to find work amongst those that do want to work. Being out of the labour force for a long period is also likely to be related to many of these women not wanting to work.

There were, however, a number of not-employed wives who had worked within the last year. Many not-employed wives with employed husbands last worked within the last year. These women are likely to find it easier to resume work than the wives of NILF-illness/disability husbands who have, on average, been out of work for much longer. On this variable, the wives of NILF-other men are quite similar to the wives of employed men. Many have had recent employment, and therefore might be expected to more readily move back into employment in the near future.

One of the main reasons women nominated for having left their last job was to have their children (this category also includes those who left work to care for someone other than children). This was the predominant reason amongst women with employed husbands. It was less often cited by women with not-employed husbands, because of the higher percentages having never worked, and the higher percentages reporting retirement, or sickness, etc, as described above.

Large differences emerged in the percentage of wives reporting retirement/did not want to work any more (most likely in the NILF-other husband employment status), own sickness, disability or illness (most likely in both NILF husband categories, especially NILF-illness/disability). Across all husband employment status groups, 20 per cent of not-employed women had left their last job for job-related reasons (the job was temporary or seasonal, got laid off, etc, to get a better job, business closed down).

Table 10 Not-employed wives, last job details, Wave 1

		Husband's employment status			
	Employed	**Unempl oyed**	**NILF illness/ disabilit y**	**NILF - other**	**Total**
Time since last job		*Column per cent (%)*			
Less than 1year	22.1	16.4	7.6	19.7	19.9
1 to 5 years	35.7	6.8	13.6	33.3	30.9
6 or more years	33.1	38.4	60.2	28.8	36.3
Never worked	4.4	19.2	9.3	9.1	6.4
Wife's main reason for ending last job					
Pregnancy/to have /look after children, house, someone else	52.3	35.6	37.3	19.7	47.3
Job-related[a]	20.2	19.3	19.5	22.8	20.3
Retired/did not want to work any longer	3.3	1.4	2.5	16.7	3.9
Own sickness, disability, injury	6.1	9.6	22.0	15.2	8.8
Other reasons	13.5	15.1	9.3	16.7	13.3
Never worked	4.4	19.2	9.3	9.1	6.4
Sample	**765**	**73**	**118**	**66**	**1,022**

Source: HILDA Wave 1
(a) includes job was temporary or seasonal; got laid off/no work available, retrenched, etc; not satisfied with job/to get a better job; self-employed business closed.

4.4 Summary

One of the key findings of this first section is that not-employed men are not a homogeneous group. Therefore, in looking at this group, it is useful to supplement the labour force status classification with more information on reasons for not being employed. Using the classifications applied here, the average proportion employed amongst wives of these men is low for all wives of not-employed men compared to wives of employed men.

The wives of the NILF-ill/disabled men appear to have the greatest barriers to employment. Not only do many of these wives have characteristics that are negatively associated with female employment, many have been out of employment for many years, and many do not want to work. Even amongst those who do want to work, many are limited by their own health problems or their caring responsibilities, or they do not have the confidence that they would be able to find work.

Wives of unemployed men also had characteristics associated with poor employment prospects, but a higher proportion of these wives were actively looking for work,

Baxter, Jennifer

rather than being not in the labour force. As such, it might be expected that these women will be more likely to be employed in the future. A considerable number of wives with unemployed husbands were not looking for work, and did not want to work, which is in part related to preferences to care for young children. Even amongst those that wanted to work, many were not looking because they were caring for children.

The wives of NILF-other men also have characteristics associated with poor employment prospects, but this is a very heterogeneous group of husbands, and includes those who are on holidays, studying, doing home duties and those who are retired from work. Except for the retired men, it could be expected that the absence from employment is only short-term, and therefore the employment behaviour of these wives (except for wives of retired men) might also not reflect long-term behaviour.

The above sections demonstrate that there are a number of factors affecting the low employment of wives of not-employed men. Clearly, characteristics are a factor, and the reasons for not working, reasons for leaving last job, and main activities to a large extent support the idea that these employment barriers have been significant in decisions about employment. However, there are still other factors that contribute to the difference. Characteristics not considered include regional effects – that if unemployed men are more likely to work in areas with lower employment opportunities, then this will likely affect their wives also. It is likely there are other unobserved factors, including a measure of employment preferences or taste for employment, that contribute to this difference. As described by Ultee (1988), the unobserved characteristics could be thought of as 'couple effects', which come about because husband and wife jointly consider their employment options, taking into account employment opportunities, financial issues, and tastes for employment, leisure or other activities.

These data did not identify any large direct effect of the husband not working on the wife's employment, except for those women who left work to care for an ill or disabled partner. This was an important factor for wives with NILF-ill/disabled husbands, but not so important for others.

5 Employment dynamics

In this second section, focusing on employment dynamics, by matching records across waves of HILDA it is possible to examine whether women with not-employed husbands are more or less likely to be moving in and out of employment than are other wives. Given the characteristics and reasons for not working of those wives with not-employed husbands from Wave 1, we expect that those whose husbands are NILF-ill/disabled would be the most likely to remain out of the labour force – many of these wives do not want to work, and have not worked for many years, and many have barriers to employment, such as health or caring responsibilities.

As noted in the data section, by matching across survey waves there is some sample loss due to attrition and due to the application of scoping rules. This means a greater loss of families that originally had not-employed husbands, as the attrition was greater in these families. Because of this attrition the results may be biased if those who were non-respondents were selective of those either continuing to be not employed, or those who took up employment between waves. Another issue was that the sample numbers were quite small, especially in those groups of primary interest – those with not employed husbands. This restricted the analysis that could be done, and for now, the cross-tabulation of the data as shown in the following tables is all that has been attempted.

A difficulty in analysing wives' employment transitions, for the group of those with not-employed husbands, is that these not-employed husbands can also move into and perhaps back out of work over time. To keep this analysis simple, the employment transitions are considered only according to the husband's employment status at Wave 1 (Table 11)[7].

Most of the husbands employed at Wave 1 remain employed in subsequent waves. The wives in these families also have a stable employment rate–around 72 per cent employed.

---

[7] A more complex analysis would look at within-household dynamics, to show to what extent husband and wife changed employment status. Unfortunately, the cell sizes become too small when such an analysis is attempted using these data.

Baxter, Jennifer

Table 11 Percentage of husbands and wives employed at Waves 1, 2 and 3, by husband's employment status at Wave 1

Husband's employment status at W1	Husbands			Wives		
	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 3	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 3
	Percentage employed (%)					
Employed	**100.0**	**96.7**	**96.0**	**72.4**	**72.8**	**71.8**
Not employed total		**28.7**	**40.0**	**33.8**	**39.1**	**44.2**
Unemployed		54.1	63.4	36.0	42.9	45.1
NILF-illness/disability		8.5	18.3	26.7	25.9	31.9
NILF-other		75.5	81.5	41.6	64.8	69.8
Total	**87.7**	**89.3**	**90.4**	**67.7**	**69.1**	**69.0**

Source: HILDA Waves 1, 2, 3.

Of husbands who were not employed at Wave 1, 29 per cent were employed in Wave 2 and 40 per cent in Wave 3. Clearly many of these men were not permanently out of work. In particular, the NILF-other men had a very high rate of entrance to work (82 per cent were employed by Wave 3). This would be related to the more temporary nature of many of the activities covered by the category – those studying, undertaking home duties, or absent from employment because of travel or leisure could be expected to be considered only temporarily absent from employment. Unemployed men also had a relatively high rate of return to work (63 per cent were employed at Wave 3), which is most likely due to their active job search. On the other hand, NILF-ill/disabled men were more likely to remain not working from Waves 1 to Wave 3 – 18 per cent of this group were working at Wave 3.

As has already been discussed, the wives of the not-employed men were less likely to be employed at Wave 1 than were those with employed husbands (34 per cent for all not-employed husbands). In subsequent waves this rate increased a little, as some of the women moved into work. Most of the increase occurred amongst the wives whose husbands were NILF-other at Wave 1. That is, both the NILF-other husbands and their wives had relatively dynamic employment patterns.

The wives of those men who had been unemployed at Wave 1 increased their rate of employment somewhat between Wave 1 and Wave 3, but the increase was not commensurate with the increase in employment of their husbands. Even as their husbands moved back to work, many of the women remained out of work. This is not surprising – while some of the wives of the Wave 1 unemployed husbands were themselves unemployed, more were NILF, and these NILF wives would not have had

as high a rate of movement into employment. Further, some couples may decide it is not necessary for the wife to find work once the husband has gained employment.

The wives with NILF-ill/disabled husbands at Wave 1 were the least likely to enter employment in later waves, just as their husbands were the least likely to enter employment. In Wave 1, 27 per cent of these wives were employed, and this increased just a small amount to 32 per cent in Wave 3.

In addition to employment status at each Wave, HILDA includes a set of calendar data which gives the employment status of each respondent for every one-third month over the twelve months prior to the survey. Using this calendar data, Table 12 shows the percentage of husbands and the percentage of wives who had a job at any time during the year preceding the survey. The percentage having worked at some time is higher than the percentage employed at the time of the survey, reflecting the dynamic nature of employment.

Table 12 Percentage of husbands and wives who had a job at some time in the twelve months prior to Waves 1, 2 and 3, by husband's employment status at Wave 1

Husband's employment status at W1	Husbands			Wives		
	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 3	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 3
	Percentage had a job at some time (%)					
Employed	**100.0**	**99.5**	**99.0**	**78.5**	**82.9**	**83.7**
Not employed total	**38.3**	**53.5**	**65.8**	**41.8**	**60.3**	**70.2**
Unemployed	66.4	81.1	85.2	43.9	65.3	72.1
NILF-illness/disability	17.1	35.4	53.0	32.9	49.4	63.0
NILF-other	89.9	87.9	89.8	92.2	84.6	83.6
Total	**92.0**	**93.9**	**94.9**	**74.0**	**80.1**	**82.0**

Source: HILDA Waves 1, 2, 3.

The unemployed men have not necessarily been unemployed for very long. Of the unemployed men at Wave 1, 66 per cent had worked in the preceding year. A similar picture arises for NILF-other men. Of those men in this category at Wave 1, 90 per cent had worked at some time in the preceding year. Of the NILF-ill/disability men, less than 20 per cent had worked at some time, confirming that this is a much less dynamic group with respect to employment activity.

Looking at the Wave 2 and Wave 3 data for these men substantiates these findings – those who were unemployed or NILF-other at Wave 1 were more likely to have

worked at some time in subsequent years than were men who were NILF-ill/disabled at Wave 1.

Turning to the wives, first looking at Wave 1: for wives of employed, unemployed and NILF-ill/disabled men, the percentage having worked at some time in the year is not a great deal higher than the percentage employed at Wave 1. For the wives of NILF-other men, the employment dynamics are much higher – 92 per cent of these wives had worked at some time in the year compared to only 42 per cent working at the time of the survey. For many of these women, it appears that the absence from employment at the time of the survey was just temporary.

In Waves 2 and 3, wives of men who had been unemployed or NILF-ill/disabled at Wave 1, were increasingly likely to have worked at some time during the year. At Wave 3, there was considerably less difference across all the groups than there had been in Wave 1 on this measure. Those with NILF-ill/disabled husbands remained the least likely to be employed.

Table 13 Mean percentage of time husbands and wives had a job in the twelve months prior to Waves 1, 2 and 3, by husband's employment status at Wave 1

Husband's employment status at W1	Husbands			Wives		
	Wave 1	**Wave 2**	**Wave 3**	**Wave 1**	**Wave 2**	**Wave 3**
	Mean percentage of the previous year employed (%)					
Employed	**97.1**	**97.5**	**96.9**	**69.6**	**71.3**	**71.3**
Not employed total	**26.4**	**22.9**	**32.7**	**34.7**	**37.0**	**41.5**
Unemployed	45.9	45.8	55.0	34.5	41.3	44.0
NILF-illness/disability	11.5	7.4	10.9	27.5	25.4	30.7
NILF-other	26.9	71.9	81.4	45.4	62.2	67.6
Total	**88.4**	**89.4**	**90.4**	**65.3**	**67.5**	**68.3**

Source: HILDA Waves 1, 2, 3.

However, this measure ignores what is seen in Table 13, that the percentage of the year spent in employment varies considerably across the groups. The mean percentage of the year spent in a job was very low for NILF-ill/disabled husbands, and this was true in Wave 1 and in subsequent waves. For NILF-other husbands, while the percentage of the year spent in a job was low at Wave 1, the return of many of these men to employment in Waves 2 and 3 (as shown in previous tables) was reflected in the increased percentage of time in work in these waves. While Table 12 shows that many of the unemployed men worked at some time in subsequent years, Table 13 shows that they still spent much less of subsequent years in employment,

Baxter, Jennifer

compared to those men who were employed at Wave 1 (or were NILF-other at Wave 1). Even though they found work, it appears that it was not typically permanent work.

All wives spent, on average, less than a whole year in employment. The wives of not-employed men spent the least time out of the year in employment, but the patterns tended to mirror those of the employment data showed in Table 11.

5.1 Summary

These longitudinal data confirm that there are differences across families with not-employed husbands. Some are very unlikely to change their employment behaviour – if looking at either the husband or the wife, while others have a great deal more movement into employment.

Women with NILF-ill/disabled husbands very unlikely to move into work. The Wave 1 data showed these women often had their own barriers to employment (for example, often being older, having low education, health problems, lacking recent or any work experience) as well as possibly having caring responsibilities for their husband. These women, even those that do want to work, are likely to have difficulties in finding work, and this is reflected in the low rate of transition into employment.

There is more movement into employment by husbands and, to a less extent, wives when the husband was initially unemployed or NILF-other. Unemployed men, presumably, are moving into work because of their job search activities, while some of the NILF-other men may be moving into work because of the end to the activity they were doing while not in the labour force. The women in these families still have significant barriers to employment, when their characteristics are compared to those women with working husbands. The identified barriers of education, health problems and English language barriers no doubt contribute to some extent to the lower employment of women in these families.

6 Concluding Comments

This paper had two goals – to seek to understand more fully why the employment rate of wives of not-employed men was low relative to those with employed husbands, and to explore the employment dynamics of these women to determine whether the low employment rates appeared to be a temporary or permanent state.

On the first goal, the HILDA Wave 1 data were useful for describing the families according to the employment status of the husband, and to look at the employment-related information for their wives. Clearly, while education, English language proficiency, presence of dependant children, health and caring responsibilities and other observed characteristics, are related somewhat to the relatively low employment participation of wives of not-employed men, they do not explain everything. Many women in these families do not want to work, and for these women, as well as those who have had long absences from employment, it will be difficult to enable their transition into work. This is especially so considering that many women with not-employed husbands face considerable, and often multiple, barriers to employment. The analysis showed that characteristics of the women, preferences for work, and reasons for not working differed according to whether the husband was employed, unemployed, not in the labour force and ill/disabled or not in the labour force for other reasons.

The employment dynamics analysis showed that there were particular types of households in which there was very little movement into employment. Those couples where the husband was not in the labour force, and was permanently unable to work, or ill or disabled, had far less movement into work by either the husband or the wife. However, for wives of other men who were not in the labour force, there was more movement into work. This group seems to be less of a concern as far as policy goes, as many of these men are not in the labour force for temporary reasons, and return to employment within a relatively short time. The wives of unemployed men also show some movement into employment, although they remain less likely to be employed than wives of employed men.

More comprehensive analyses of these data would be useful, to use multivariate techniques to examine the transitions data. Making use of the data from the calendar in each wave of HILDA is probably the best way of approaching this.

References

ABS (2005), *Labour Force, Australia: Labour Force Status and Other Characteristics of Families - Electronic Delivery, Table FA4*, Catalogue No. 6224.0.55.001.

Beer, G. (1998), "Is it worth working? The financial impact of increased hours of work by married mothers with young children". *Australian Bulletin of Labour*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 94-111.

Bradbury, B. (1995), "Added, subtracted or just different: Why do the wives of unemployed men have such low employment rates?" *Australian Bulletin of Labour*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 48-70.

Cai, L. and G. Kalb (2004), *Health status and labour force participation: evidence from the HILDA data*, Working Paper No. 4/04, Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research, Parkville, Vic.

Dex, S., S. Gustafsson, N. Smith and T. Callan (1995), "Cross-national comparisons of the labour force participation of women married to unemployed men". *Oxford Economic Papers*, vol. 47, no. 4, pp. 611-635.

Donnelly, C. and J. McClelland (1989), *"My family is depending on me" a study of the barriers to employment faced by unemployed couples with children*, Background/discussion paper Social Security Review No. 29, ACT Social Security Review, Woden, ACT.

Doris, A. (1999), *Means Testing Disincentives and the Labour Supply of the Wives of Unemployed Men: Results from a Fixed Effects Model*, Working Paper Maynooth University, Dublin.

King, A., B. Bradbury and M. McHugh (1995), *Why do the Wives of Unemployed Men Have such low Employment Rates*, SPRC Reports and Proceedings No. 125, Social Policy Research Centre, University of New South Wales, Sydney.

King, A. and M. McHugh (1995), *The Wives of Disability Support Pensioners and Paid Work*, SPRC Reports and Proceedings No. 126, Social Policy Research Centre.

McGinnity, F. (2002), "The labour-force participation of the wives of unemployed men. Comparing Britain and West Germany using longitudinal data." *European Sociological Review*, vol. 18, pp. 473-488.

Toohey, M. and G. Beer (2003), "Is it worth working now? Financial incentives for working mothers under Australia's new tax system", Paper presented at the 2003 Australian Social Policy Conference, Canberra, ACT, July 2003.

Ultee, W., J. Dessens and W. Jansen (1988), "Why does unemployment come in couples? An analysis of (un)employment and (non)employment homogamy tables for Canada, the Netherlands and the United States in the 1980s". *European Sociological Review*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 111-122.

Watson, N. (2005), *HILDA User Manual - Release 3.0* Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research, University of Melbourne.

Table A- 1 Husband employment status, sample numbers and distribution

| | | Husband employment status | | | |
		Employed	Unemployed	Not in the Labour Force (NILF)	Total[a]
Sample count	Wave 1	2 860	122	278	3 260
	Wave 2	2 653	83	242	2 978
	Wave 3	2 591	78	215	2 884
Distribution	Wave 1	87.7%	3.7%	8.5%	100%
	Wave 2	89.1%	2.8%	8.1%	100%
	Wave 3	89.8%	2.7%	7.5%	100%

Source: HILDA Waves 1, 2 and 3
(a) couple households, male aged 15-59 and responding to employment question.

Table A- 2 Sample loss due to in-scope rules

Employment status Wave 1	Total in 3 Waves	Not partnered in Wave 2 &/or Wave 3	Age>=60 in Wave 2 &/or Wave 3	Employment question missing on Wave 2 &/or Wave 3	Total in final sample
Employed	2 370	136	78	91	2 065
(% of sample in 3 waves)		*5.7*	*3.3*	*3.8*	*87.1*
Unemployed	79	7	5	0	67
(% of sample in 3 waves)		*8.9*	*6.3*	*0.0*	*84.8*
Not in the labour force	208	9	28	4	167
(% of sample in 3 waves)		*4.3*	*13.5*	*1.9*	*80.3*
Total	**2 657**	**152**	**111**	**95**	**2 299**
(% of sample in 3 waves)		*5.7*	*4.2*	*3.6*	*86.5*

Source: HILDA Waves 1, 2 and 3

Table A- 3 Sample attrition by husband employment status

Husband labour force status at Wave 1	in Waves 1,2,3	in Waves 1,2 not 3	in Wave 1 only	in Waves 1,
		Per cent of Wave 1 sample		
Employed	82.9	6.8	8.0	
Unemployed	64.8	14.8	17.2	
Not in labour force	74.8	10.4	13.3	
Total	**81.5**	**7.4**	**8.8**	
			Sample count	
	2,657	**240**	**288**	

Source: HILDA Waves 1, 2 and 3

Table A- 4 Husband employment status, sample numbers and distribution

Baxter, Jennifer

| | Husband employment status | | | |
	Employed	Unemployed	Not in the Labour Force	Total
	Percentage of wives employed (%)			
Wave 1	72.4	36.0	32.8	67.7
Wave 2	73.0	41.8	34.7	69.2
Wave 3	73.2	39.0	35.1	69.4

Source: HILDA Waves 1, 2 and 3.

Table A- 5 Not in the labour force husbands, main activity, Wave 1

Main activity of husband	Distribution (%)	Percentage receiving government support	Percentage with wives who are employed
Permanently unable to work	35.6	84.9	24.0
Other illness, disability	20.5	77.2	35.1
Retired, voluntarily inactive	15.5	25.6	25.6
Study	8.6	66.7	50.0
Home duties, child care	6.8	21.1	73.7
Looking after ill or disabled person	2.9	87.5	0.0
Travel, leisure	1.8	20.0	0.0
Unpaid voluntary job or other activity	4.7	46.2	61.5
Looking for work[a]	3.6	84.9	22.2
Total	**100.0**	**64.0**	**32.8**
Total Sample	**278**		

Source: HILDA Wave 1

(a) but is not classified as unemployed because does not satisfy the conditions of actively looking for work and available to start work.

Baxter, Jennifer