

Melbourne Institute of
Applied Economic and Social Research

Working Paper Series

Do Weekend Workers Like Their Jobs?

Harshita Bhatia
Inga Laß
Mark Wooden

Working Paper 16/26

Do Weekend Workers Like Their Jobs?

Harshita Bhatia^a, Inga Laß^a, Mark Wooden^{a*}

^a Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research, the University of Melbourne.

*Corresponding author, m.wooden@unimelb.edu.au

Acknowledgements: This paper uses confidentialised unit record file data from Release 24 of the Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia (HILDA) Survey. The HILDA Survey Project was initiated and funded by the Australian Government Department of Social Services (DSS) and is managed by the Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research. The HILDA Survey data are available free of charge (but under a license provided by the Australian Government) to researchers through the National Centre for Longitudinal Data Dataverse at the Australian Data Archive (<https://dataverse.ada.edu.au/dataverse/nclld>).

Ethics statement: All protocols and materials used to obtain informed consent from HILDA Survey participants have been approved by both the human research ethics committee of The University of Melbourne [Project ID 13551] and the Commonwealth Government of Australia (through its Department of Social Security).

Conflict of interest: The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

**Melbourne Institute Working Paper No. 16/26
October 2026**

**Melbourne Institute of
Applied Economic and Social Research
The University of Melbourne
Victoria 3010 Australia
T +61 3 8344 2100
E melb-inst@unimelb.edu.au
W melbourneinstitute.unimelb.edu.au**

Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research working papers are produced for discussion and comment purposes and have not been peer-reviewed. This paper represents the opinions of the author(s) and is not intended to represent the views of Melbourne Institute. Whilst reasonable efforts have been made to ensure accuracy, the author is responsible for any remaining errors and omissions.

Do Weekend Workers Like Their Jobs?

Abstract

Weekend work is a pervasive feature of labor markets that comes with both potential benefits (e.g., higher pay, flexible schedules) and drawbacks (e.g., less social time). Nevertheless, robust evidence on weekend workers' job satisfaction is lacking. Longitudinal data from 21 waves of the annual Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia (HILDA) Survey (n=211,077; i=26,273) are used to estimate the association between weekend work and several dimensions of job satisfaction. Estimates from fixed effects models reveal that weekend work is associated with significantly lower levels of satisfaction with working hours and flexibility, but this does not translate into lower levels of overall job satisfaction. Additional analyses were conducted to test whether results varied with employment status, occupation and parental status. In general, the main finding applied to all groups examined. There were, however, marked differences across sub-groups in satisfaction with other job domains. Overall, the results suggest that, for most workers, the benefits of working weekends offset its disadvantages.

Keywords: job satisfaction; weekend work; work-life balance; compensating differentials; penalty rates; working time; HILDA Survey

Word count (excluding Abstract and Keywords): 9487

1. Introduction

The latter half of the 20th century saw the gradual emergence in Western nations of the notion of a standard work week involving 35 to 40 hours worked on Monday through Friday over some permitted spread of hours (e.g., 7 am to 7 pm). Many workers, however, have working arrangements that differ from this pattern. Most obviously, a sizeable fraction of the workforce is employed for fewer hours per week than this full-time standard. Another departure from this standard is the large fraction of workers reporting working at least some hours on the weekend. Data from the American Time Use Survey, for the example, reveal that in 2025 just over 30% of employed persons in the US worked on an average weekend day (US Bureau of Labor Statistics 2026). In Australia the fraction is even higher, with data collected by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) indicating that 36% of all employed persons surveyed in August 2025 reported working at least some hours on the weekend in any of their jobs (ABS 2025, Table 1).

Despite this relatively high prevalence of weekend work, and in contrast to the large body of research into how the greater availability of part-time jobs has affected workers and their families (e.g., Higgins et al. 2000; Hudson and Kalleberg 2019; Tilly 1996), weekend work has attracted relatively little attention from researchers. Furthermore, much of the research that has been undertaken has been concerned with potential consequences for health and well-being (e.g., Jamal 2004; Lambert et al. 2026; Lee et al. 2015; Niedhammer et al. 2015; Sato et al. 2020; Weston et al. 2024), and usually within a broader analysis of non-standard work schedules. Studies specifically examining relationships between weekend work and how weekend workers evaluate their jobs appear to be scarce.

In this study we seek to address this research gap. Using data from the Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia (HILDA) Survey covering the period 2004 to 2024, we test whether regular weekend work is associated with higher or lower levels of job satisfaction. Key features of the analysis include: (i) use of data that are longitudinal, providing up to 21 observations on the same individual, and thus enabling time invariant characteristics of workers

to be held constant; (ii) a sample that is both large and at any point in time, with the exception of recent immigrants, broadly representative of the population of employed persons in Australia; (iii) estimation of fixed-effects regression models of the association between weekend work and not only overall job satisfaction, but also satisfaction with five different work domains; and (iv) testing whether the estimated coefficients on weekend work differ with gender, employment status, occupation and parental status. Using a sub-sample covering persons observed since 2017, we also test whether estimated effects vary with the number of hours usually worked on the weekend.

2. Theoretical Background and Previous Research

The key premise underlying this research is that the utility workers derive from paid employment depends not only on the number of hours worked, but also on the timing of those hours (Winston 1982). In particular, and as articulated by Bryce (2021, p. 543), the value attached to leisure time may differ depending on whether it is taken on the weekend or on other days of the week. Despite the pervasiveness of weekend work, Saturdays and Sundays are still the days of the week that most people (at least in Western societies) reserve for leisure. Weekend workers will thus often be at work when others are free, meaning those workers will be unable to share as much leisure time with family and friends as comparable persons who work Monday to Friday. They will also be more likely to miss out on attending many social events given these are often scheduled on weekends.

Empirical studies, albeit few in number, provide support for these arguments. Research also using HILDA Survey data, for example, has reported evidence that, compared with other workers, weekend workers spend less time socialising with friends and relatives, are less likely to attend major social or community events or religious services, and are less likely to be a member of a sporting, hobby or community-based club or organization (Crawley 2021). Very differently, a range of studies employing data from different countries (Australia, France and the

UK) have found that weekend workers not only have less family time on the days worked, but that this lost time is only to a limited degree, if at all, recuperated during non-workdays (e.g., Boulin and Lesnard 2016; Craig and Brown 2014, 2015; Hook 2012). Weekend work is thus associated with what Wirtz et al. (2011) have referred to as “social desynchronization”, which we argue is a negative job trait. Correspondingly, other research suggests that weekend work is associated with more negative assessments of work-life balance (e.g., Fagan and Burchell 2002; Pichler 2009; Tausig and Fenwick 2001; Wirtz et al. 2011).

The theory of compensating differentials (see Lavetti 2023) suggests this disutility of the timing of weekend work should be offset by employers varying other job characteristics, such as wages or schedule flexibility. The same sort of prediction is derived from social exchange theory developed and favoured by sociologists (Homans 1958). Martin et al. (2011), for example, used this theory to explain the willingness of a sample of unionized workers at a retail trade chain in the US to work on Sundays. In their case study, workers had more favourable attitudes about work on Sundays when provided with wage premiums and greater control over their work schedules.

These predictions of compensating job characteristics may not, however, be forthcoming in sectors and firms where there is an excess supply of labor. In these situations, there will be sufficient numbers of workers willing to work on weekends to meet demand, and hence offsetting compensation is not needed. We thus still expect at least some weekend workers – those unable to find sufficient work on weekdays (i.e., on Mondays through Fridays) to meet income needs – to be less satisfied with their jobs than otherwise comparable workers. That said, this will be affected by government regulation. In particular, employers in some countries may be legally required to pay substantial wage premia for work during unsociable hours.

Overall, we expect weekend workers will, on average, be more likely to report dissatisfaction with the time at which they are required to work. Whether this results in lower overall job satisfaction, however, will depend on the extent to which there are other compensating

characteristics associated with weekend work. Indeed, the limited research that has been conducted to date suggests that weekend work is typically not associated with lower overall job satisfaction. Wanger (2017) used cross-sectional data from Germany collected in 2012 and found weekend work was, as hypothesized here, associated with significantly lower levels of satisfaction with working time, but not with any significant differences in overall job satisfaction. Similarly, Bryce (2021), who used longitudinal data from the UK, but only spanning a relatively short period (2012 to 2014), found weekend workers to be less satisfied with their leisure time and to be more likely to report feeling less happy, but no less likely to report being satisfied with their job. Indeed, the estimated coefficient on job satisfaction was positive, though not large enough to be significantly different from zero.

We also expect the association between weekend work and job satisfaction to differ with several worker and job characteristics. One relevant characteristic is parental status. Some parents of young children in dual-earner families, for example, may prefer to work weekends, to the extent that they utilize weekend work as part of a tag-team parenting strategy to avoid or reduce the costs of child care (Täht and Mills 2012). Nevertheless, most children spend weekdays in childcare or in school, so that the weekend is usually the core time for parents to spend time with their children. In line with this, prior research has shown that weekend work exacerbates time-based (and strain-based) work-family conflict within families with children (e.g., Laß and Wooden 2022; Steiber 2009; Taiji and Mills 2020). Given these greater conflicts between work and family demands, we expect job satisfaction to be lower for weekend workers with parental responsibilities than those without.

As women typically have the primary responsibility for caregiving and unpaid work, this line of reasoning would also suggest a more detrimental effect of weekend work for women than for men. That said, Laß and Wooden (2022) reported a positive association between weekend work and work-to family conflict that was significantly larger for fathers, and Bryce (2021) found no

gender difference in the effect of weekend work on overall job satisfaction or satisfaction with leisure time.

There are also good reasons to expect differences by occupational groups. As mentioned previously, compensating differentials theory suggests that weekend work should have less detrimental effects on job satisfaction where the disutility of working during unsocial times is offset by other job benefits, such as pay premia. The existence of such premia, however, likely differs across occupations, with higher prevalence in low-skilled white- and blue-collar jobs where workers typically have less control over working schedules. In contrast, workers in more highly skilled occupations (such as managers and professionals) tend to have more control over their work schedule and thus may be more likely to have chosen to work on the weekends. That said, for these groups, weekend work may often be a response to heavy workloads, and feeling pressured to work on the weekend may result in a negative impact on job satisfaction.

We also suspect the associations between weekend work and job satisfaction to vary between employees and the self-employed, although the direction of the difference is again unclear. On the one hand, it has been argued that the self-employed might have more discretion over whether or not to work on the weekend (Bryce 2021). On the other hand, many employees will receive wage premia when working weekends. While Bryce (2021) excluded the self-employed from some of his analyses, to the best of our knowledge, no study has directly compared effects for employees and the self-employed.

Finally, we expect differences by the number of hours worked on the weekend. More hours worked on the weekend will magnify both the detrimental aspects (such as loss of social time) and the benefits (such as pay premia), suggesting that effects should be most pronounced for those who work a substantial amount of time on the weekend.

3. The Australian Context

Above we argued that many employers might be expected to have to pay higher wages for weekend work in order to attract the number of workers required to meet demand. In many industries in Australia this is a legal requirement. The majority of employees in Australia are covered by “industry awards”, which are legally enforceable documents that set out minimum pay rates and employment conditions for specific industries or occupations and are updated and enforced by a statutory authority (currently the Fair Work Commission). Importantly, many of these awards, and certainly those where rostered weekend work is pervasive, specify wage premia (or what is referred to as penalty rates) for work on Saturdays and Sundays. Rates for work on Saturday generally vary between 125% and 150% of normal hourly rates of pay, but with 125% being the most common. Work on Sundays attracts higher premia, ranging between 150% and 200%. For much of the period covered by this study, a rate of 200% was most common. This changed in 2017 when a decision by the Fair Work Commission saw the start of a phased-in reduction to 150% in awards covering the retail trade, pharmacy, hospitality, fast food, and restaurant and licensed clubs sectors.¹ In short, it can be expected that many weekend workers in Australia will report relatively high levels of satisfaction with pay.

Another notable feature of Australia’s awards system is that most awards explicitly provide for the employment of workers on a casual basis. As defined by the Australian Government on its Fair Work Ombudsman site (<https://www.fairwork.gov.au/starting-employment/types-of-employees/casual-employees>) a “person is a casual employee if, when they start employment the employment relationship has no firm advance commitment to ongoing work”. However, unlike casual and zero-hours contract arrangements in other countries (such as the UK), casual employees in Australia are required to be paid an hourly wage premium, and this premium is on top of any other penalty rates such as those that apply to work on weekends. Prior to 2010 this rate varied across awards but with 20% (i.e., 120% of the hourly rate of pay applicable to non-casual employees in the same job) being the norm. Legislative change introduced in 2010 saw

this rate standardized and gradually raised to 25%, taking full effect in July 2014 (Laß and Wooden 2019, p. 458). The effect of this regulatory regime has been to both legitimise the use of casual employment and to encourage its acceptance by employees. As a result, the incidence of casual employment in Australia is relatively high, averaging around one in every five workers since the mid-1990s (Laß and Wooden 2020, Figure 3). As shown in Table 1, the incidence of casual employment is particularly high among persons working on the weekend. It will thus be important to disentangle the effect of casual employment status on job satisfaction (and satisfaction with other work domains) from that of weekend work. This is especially so given casual employment typically comes with inherently high levels of job insecurity and income uncertainty.

4. Materials and Methods

4.1 Data and Sample

As noted earlier, the data used for this analysis come from the HILDA Survey, a household panel study that commenced in 2001 with a large national probability sample of Australian households, and which has been following the members of those households that agreed to participate in wave 1 (7682 households containing 19,914 individuals) on an annual basis ever since. More specifically, we use data from Release 24, which provides data from the first 24 survey waves (and covering the years 2001 to 2024). Documented in extensive detail in a user manual, which is updated and re-issued with each annual data release (e.g., Summerfield et al. 2025), a key feature of the HILDA Survey is that the sample is automatically replenished by the addition of children born to the original sample members, who will eventually be interviewed once they reach 15 years of age. Additionally, other persons residing with an original sample member or their children are also added to the sample, though usually only on a temporary basis.² These following rules, together with sample refreshments in wave 11 and more recently

in waves 24 and 25 (targeted on recent immigrants), have worked to offset sample loss due to deaths and attrition.

While designed as a broad study of life in Australia, the HILDA Survey has a particular focus on work, and one aspect that is monitored on an annual basis is weekend work. More specifically, since wave 4 the interview instrument has included questions that enable the identification of the precise days of the week on which respondents usually work. This was then augmented in wave 17 by the inclusion of questions on the number of hours usually worked on Saturdays and Sundays.

For this analysis we initially selected the subsample of persons observed in paid employment at the time of interview over the period covered by survey waves 4 to 24 (roughly 2004 to 2024). This provided a maximum sample size of 211,077 observations from 26,273 unique individuals. In extensions to our primary analysis where the focal variable is the number of hours worked on weekends, the sample is further restricted to waves 17 to 24, which provided a maximum of 86,460 observations from 17,810 individuals. Sample sizes used in the regressions are smaller than these maxima due to missing observations on explanatory variables (which results in the loss of 4,751 observations) as well as a tiny number of missing values on the six dimensions of job satisfaction (a maximum of 270 observations omitted).

4.2 Method

Like Bryce (2021), we estimated two-way linear fixed effects models of the form:

$$JS_{it} = \alpha_i + \lambda_t + \beta WE_{it} + \delta X_{it} + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (1)$$

where JS_{it} denotes the job satisfaction level of individual i at time t , α_i is an individual fixed effect (and thus controls for all unobserved individual characteristics that are time invariant), λ_t is a time fixed effect (represented here by survey wave dummies), WE_{it} is the variable of primary interest (weekend work), X_{it} is a set of time-varying control variables, and ε_{it} is a random error term. As is standard practice in labor market research, all models are estimated separately for

men and women. Since observations within individuals are not independent, the estimated standard errors are cluster-robust; that is, they allow errors to be correlated within individuals.

A potential criticism of this estimation approach is that it assumes the outcome variable is continuous, which is not true of the outcome variables examined here. Instead, the outcomes in this analysis are represented by ordered variables with discrete values (see below). We therefore also used the blow-up and cluster estimator developed by Baetschmann et al. (2020), which enables the estimation of an ordered logit model (which is specifically intended for the estimation of regression models with an ordinal dependent variable) that incorporates individual fixed effects. However, and in line with previous research involving similar ordered variables (e.g., Ferrer-i-Carbonell and Frijters 2004; Frey and Stutzer 2000), assuming ordinality or cardinality of satisfaction scores appears to make little qualitative difference. Thus, like Bryce (2021), we have opted to report the results from the linear model given its coefficient estimates are much easier to interpret. (Key results from the estimation of fixed effects ordered logit models are, however, reported in Supplementary Appendix Table S7.)

4.3 Variables

The outcome variables come from responses to five questions about satisfaction with various aspects of the main job (pay, job security, the work itself, hours of work, and the flexibility available to balance work and non-work commitments) and one question about overall satisfaction with the job. In each case respondents were requested to pick a number between 0 and 10 where 0 means they are “totally dissatisfied” and 10 means they are “totally satisfied”.

In our primary analyses, weekend work is represented by a simple dummy variable indicating whether, in their main job, the respondent usually undertakes any work on the weekend. It is derived from questions about the days of the week usually worked and, for those reporting that the days worked vary from week to week or month to month, whether they usually work on weekends. As shown in Table 1, almost 32% of observations report usually working weekends.

This is lower than the incidence reported by the ABS in its various supplements to the Labour Force Survey, which over the period covered by our data has varied from a high of 36.3% in 2019 to a low of 33.1% in 2023.³ The lower rates reported in the HILDA Survey are to be expected given its questions on weekend work relate only to the main job, whereas the ABS measures the incidence of weekend work in all jobs.

In extensions to this analysis, but involving the shorter time window of 2017 to 2024, we replaced the dummy variable with a categorical variable measuring the number of hours usually worked on weekends. We opted for a categorical variable to allow for non-linearity in the relationship between this variable and the different outcome variables.

Selection of control variables was guided by previous studies of job satisfaction that have used HILDA Survey data, but especially Laß et al. (2025). A list of these variables, together with their means disaggregated by whether working weekends or not, is reported in Table 1. As can be seen, persons reporting usually working weekends often have characteristics that are very different to employed persons that do not work weekends. They are more likely to be very young, single, childless, and have completed less education. More importantly, they are also concentrated in different types of jobs. Weekend workers are much more likely to be working in sales or community and personal service jobs, and are greatly over-represented in the retail trade and accommodation and food services industries. Given job satisfaction likely varies systematically with the type of work, these marked differences underscore the importance of controlling for occupation and industry.

Of even greater significance may be the relatively greater concentration of weekend workers in casual jobs and in self-employment, and their lesser concentration in jobs involving regular daytime shifts. The correlation between work schedule type and weekend work is especially noteworthy given the preponderance of international evidence suggesting that shift work has negative effects on worker wellbeing (Harris et al. 2024; Torquati et al. 2019; Zhao et al. 2019).

Failure to control for these other non-standard types of work schedules might therefore cause any negative association between weekend work and job satisfaction to be overstated.

5. Results

5.1 Main Analyses

Table 2 reports findings from a series of two-way fixed-effects regression models of the satisfaction with different job domains on the binary weekend work measure and other worker and job characteristics, separately by gender. Each numeric row presents summary output from a separate regression model. Given the long list of controls, only the estimated coefficients (and standard errors) on weekend work are presented, along with selected summary statistics.

Complete results are reported in a Supplementary Appendix (Tables S1 to S6).

The first feature of Table 2 that deserves attention is that the only outcomes that attract negatively signed coefficients are satisfaction with hours of work and satisfaction with the flexibility to balance work and non-work commitments. With respect to satisfaction with hours of work, both of the estimated coefficients are, as expected, negatively signed and statistically significant. Less clear is whether the magnitudes of association are large or not. Coefficients of -0.178 (for men) and -0.134 (for women) seem small when compared with the standard deviation of the outcome (1.98). On the other hand, these magnitudes are reasonably large when compared with the estimated coefficients on most of the control variables (see Table S4). For example, one of the largest associations is found for type of work schedule, with employees who regularly work evening and night shifts estimated to report levels of satisfaction with their working hours that are about 0.4 of point lower, in the case of men, and 0.3 of a point lower, in the case of women, than comparable employees who work during standard daytime hours.

The coefficients on weekend work in the models of satisfaction with flexibility are similar in magnitude to those found for satisfaction with hours, which is indicative of the relatively high correlation between these two outcome variables ($r=0.50$). Given the number of hours usually

worked is controlled for, these results provide strong support for the argument that weekends are typically less desirable days of the week on which to work and that part of the explanation for this lies in greater difficulty combining paid work with other roles and responsibilities. Furthermore, the results provide no support for the opposing argument that weekend workers are typically provided with greater schedule flexibility to compensate for the unsocial timing of weekend work hours.

The coefficients on satisfaction with the other job domains – pay, job security, and work itself – are all positively signed, though mostly small in magnitude. There are also some noticeable gender differences. Men who work weekends, but not women, appear to be more satisfied with their pay than their non-weekend working counterparts. In contrast, the reverse is true of job security. Furthermore, a formal test, where we re-ran the models based on a joint gender sample and included interaction terms for all predictor variables and being female, showed that these gender differences in the associations between weekend work and pay satisfaction ($p=0.016$) and job security satisfaction ($p=0.006$) are both statistically significant.

Turning to overall job satisfaction, we find positively signed but very small coefficients that are only significant in the case of women. We are thus drawn to the conclusion that the higher levels of dissatisfaction with hours of work and the associated lack of flexibility are more than compensated by other aspects of weekend jobs that are viewed more favourably.

With respect to the results for the control variables (Tables S1 to S6), the signs on most coefficients are in line with what would be expected given previous research. Overall job satisfaction scores, for example, are found to be lower among workers with long-term health conditions, high education levels, and long job tenure, shift workers, and trade union members, exhibit an inverse u-shaped relationship with the number of weekly hours worked, and are higher among public sector employees, persons working in small firms, and those able to work from home.

We also used a Mundlak specification test to check whether the fixed effects estimator was preferred to the random effects alternative. In all cases the estimated chi-squared statistic was large and highly significant, meaning we can confidently reject the null hypothesis that regressors are uncorrelated with the individual-specific effects, as is assumed by a random effects model.

5.2 Heterogeneity

We next examined whether these weekend work effects vary with employee characteristics other than gender. First, we distinguished between employees and the self-employed to account for potential differences in control over working time and the likelihood of receiving penalty rates between these groups.⁴ Estimated coefficients on the weekend work variable are presented in Table 3. The presumption that greater control will translate into less dissatisfaction with weekend work hours is clearly rejected by the evidence presented here. Indeed, the self-employed who work on weekends report greater levels of dissatisfaction with their hours than employees do. Furthermore, this is not offset by greater levels of satisfaction with pay or job security. Among employees, weekend work is associated with higher levels of satisfaction on both of these dimensions. In contrast, the reverse is true for the self-employed (with these negative associations being especially pronounced among women). The higher levels of satisfaction with pay among employees who work weekends almost certainly reflect the presence of weekend penalty rates in awards.

The second worker characteristic we considered was occupation, and more specifically the occupation of employees. In Table 4 we report coefficients on the weekend work variable after dividing the sub-sample of employees into four groups based on which major group within the Australian and New Zealand Standard Classification of Occupations their job was assigned. Again, it might be expected that workers with more control over the hours they work – in this case, those working in managerial and professional occupations – would express less

dissatisfaction with work on weekends, and again the evidence leads us to reject this hypothesis. As shown in Table 4, workers in these more highly skilled white-collar occupations report, on average, relatively high levels of dissatisfaction with their hours, and, similar to the self-employed, this is not compensated for by higher satisfaction with pay. Indeed, this is the only group where weekend work is not associated with higher levels of pay satisfaction, no doubt because weekend work for these workers is generally not associated with any immediate impact on take-home pay. Rather for managers and professionals, weekend work is often a response to heavy workloads, and even though we have controlled for total hours worked, feeling pressured to work on the weekend results in a negative impact on satisfaction with both hours and flexibility. Despite this, weekend work is still not associated with markedly lower levels of overall job satisfaction, suggesting there is something else about weekend work that we do not observe that managers and professionals value.

With respect to the other occupations, overall job satisfaction is higher among weekend workers employed in sales or community and personal services or blue-collar occupations. The estimated coefficients, however, are modest in size and only statistically significant (at the 95% confidence level) among sales or service workers who are female. Much more sizeable are the higher levels of pay satisfaction among weekend workers in these occupations (as well as female employees working in clerical and administrative jobs). This is almost certainly a function of the presence of wage premia for weekend work that apply to many workers in these occupations. Note further that the gender differential in pay satisfaction noted earlier is largely absent from these results. In contrast, the earlier finding of a gender difference in satisfaction with job security among weekend workers remains: Satisfaction with job security is relatively high for many weekend workers in these occupations, and this weekend satisfaction premium is again larger among women than men.

The third and final worker characteristic we examined was parental status, with the expectation being that weekend work will typically be more problematic for workers with

parenting responsibilities and hence higher levels of dissatisfaction with weekend work among parents. Results from the estimation of separate models for employed persons whose youngest child is under the age of 5 (and thus mostly of pre-school age), other parents with at least one child under the age of 15 (mostly school-age children), and all other workers, however, provided only limited support for this hypothesis (see Table 5). For all groups, weekend work is associated with higher levels of dissatisfaction with hours of work but not higher levels of dissatisfaction with other job domains. The coefficients for dissatisfaction with hours are larger among parents but the differences with non-parents are not statistically significant. Furthermore, there is no evidence that weekend work is associated with lower levels of overall job satisfaction among parents.

5.3 Do Associations Vary With the Number of Weekend Hours Worked?

The analyses above have used a simple binary variable identifying whether any of a worker's usual weekly work hours occur on a weekend. As noted earlier, however, from wave 17 the HILDA Survey began asking survey participants who worked on weekends how many hours were usually worked on Saturdays and on Sundays. We are thus able to re-estimate our models after replacing the weekend dummy with variables representing the number of hours worked on weekends. First, we checked whether results obtained for the period covered by waves 17 to 24 are similar to those obtained for the longer period (waves 4 to 24). The regressions reported in Table 2 were thus re-estimated using data covering the shorter period, with key results reported on in Table 6. Signs on, and significance of, coefficients on the weekend work dummy are mostly little changed. Exceptions are satisfaction with the work itself for women and satisfaction with job security for men, with the coefficients smaller in magnitude and no longer statistically significant. Overall, the impact of weekend work on job satisfaction seems slightly more negative in the latter period, but the size of differences with the estimates over the full period are mostly so small as to be ignorable.

Turning now to the estimated associations with the number of weekend hours worked, these are also reported in Table 6 and suggest three main conclusions. First, the finding of a lack of difference between weekend workers and other workers in overall job satisfaction remains unaffected when weekend work is represented by variables measuring the number of hours worked on the weekend. Second, satisfaction with pay among weekend workers rises with the number of hours worked on the weekend, but this positive differential only becomes pronounced for those working more than 15 weekend hours per week. Third, among women, the magnitude of the negative association between weekend work and satisfaction with work hours declines with the number of hours worked on the weekend, and in fact turns positive (but not significant) when working more than 20 hours per week. Among men there is no such pattern, though, like women, when working many hours on the weekend the negative association disappears.

6. Discussion and Conclusion

Utilising longitudinal data from a nationally representative sample of Australian workers, this paper investigated the association between weekend work and job satisfaction. It went beyond previous research by applying fixed-effects regression to panel data spanning a long period (thereby accounting for time-constant unobserved heterogeneity), considering various dimensions of job satisfaction, and investigating whether effects are moderated by the number of hours worked on the weekend as well as gender, parental status, employment status, and occupational group.

The evidence presented reveals that weekend work affects Australian workers' job satisfaction and its different dimensions in varying directions. On the negative side, workers who regularly undertake paid work on the weekend typically report lower levels of satisfaction than other workers with the hours they work and the flexibility to balance work and non-work commitments. Whether the magnitude of the estimated difference is large or not is open to

debate, but we argue that coefficients in the range of -0.15 to -0.20 are reasonably large when compared with the estimated coefficients on other covariates. Importantly, given the number of hours usually worked per week has been controlled for, this lower level of working time satisfaction is not the result of weekend work being associated with an extension of the work week. Rather, it suggests that weekend work hours are intrinsically less desirable than work on Monday through Friday, and thus providing support for the argument that weekend working time is a negative job trait.

At the same time, however, and consistent with previous research undertaken in both Germany (Wanger 2017) and the UK (Bryce 2021), there is no evidence that weekend work is associated with lower levels of overall job satisfaction. Indeed, for some groups, and notably persons working in sales or services, weekend work is associated with higher levels of job satisfaction. The most obvious explanation for this is the higher rates of hourly pay that apply to weekend work in many occupations, which is also reflected in the greater pay satisfaction we found among employees in these occupational groups. Another contributing factor, at least for female employees, is a higher level of satisfaction with job security (bearing in mind that a worker's contractual employment status has been controlled for). We argue that rather than being the result of deliberate actions of employers, this outcome may reflect the greater and more persistent difficulty some employers have in finding suitable workers willing to work on weekends. As a result, the fear of job loss among weekend workers, other things held constant, is relatively low. These results are in line with predictions based on compensating differentials and social exchange theories that the disutility derived from working at an undesirable time should be offset by other beneficial job characteristics.

For groups where penalty wage rates for weekend work generally do not apply – the self-employed and employees in managerial and professional occupations – weekend work is not associated with significantly higher levels of satisfaction with pay. Despite this, workers in these groups do not report lower levels of overall job satisfaction, suggesting there is something else

about weekend work that they value sufficiently to offset the disutility of weekend work times. Unfortunately, our analysis did not help us identify what these compensating factors are. It is certainly not greater working time flexibility, with almost all groups of weekend workers identified reporting significantly lower levels of satisfaction with the flexibility to balance work and non-work commitments.

There were also relatively few gender differences. While weekend work was associated with modestly higher levels of overall job satisfaction among women, the difference with men was both small and statistically insignificant. While this finding was unexpected in the face of women's greater non-work demands, it is in line with the findings of Bryce (2021). Initial results did suggest that men who work weekends, but not women, were more satisfied with their pay. This result, however, was driven by gender differences among the self-employed and in the occupational composition of employment. Among employees, and with the exception of managerial and professional occupations, weekend work was associated with higher levels of satisfaction with pay among both men and women, and gender differences within broad occupational groups were mostly absent. More significant was the gender difference in satisfaction with job security, with only female employees reporting significantly higher levels of satisfaction when working weekends. Such results, however, may be indicative of systematic gender differences in the specific types of jobs that female and male weekend workers do within broader occupational groups and industries that our analyses did not pick up on.

One result that was unexpected was the lack of marked differences between parents and non-parents. Previous research using the HILDA Survey data has reported weekend work to be associated with higher levels of work-family conflict among working parents (Laß and Wooden 2022). Despite this, the difference in satisfaction with working time between parents and non-parents who worked weekends was modest, while differences in overall job satisfaction were non-existent.

The nature of the data analyzed – a large sample with repeated observations spanning up to 21 annual waves – gives us good reason to feel confident that the results obtained are robust. Nevertheless, the data and method are not without limitations. First, and like all analyses of longitudinal data employing fixed-effects methods, while potential biases from time-invariant omitted variables were controlled for, we cannot dismiss the possibility of bias due to time-varying omitted variables. Second, the HILDA Survey only collects data on satisfaction with five job characteristics. There are obviously many other job characteristics that influence overall job satisfaction, and as a result we were unable to identify all of the potential sources of the compensating differential for the disutility associated with weekend work. Third, a sizable fraction of the Australian workforce – and 8.2% of our sample – have more than one job, and some (if not many) of these second jobs will involve work on the weekend. While the HILDA Survey identifies which workers have more than one job at the time of each annual interview, the only information about those second jobs collected is the number of weekly hours they usually involve: We do not know when during the week those hours are worked.

Overall, and the limitations noted above notwithstanding, our analyses strongly suggest that the hypothesis that weekend workers generally dislike their jobs can be rejected. This is not to say that there may not be negative consequences of regular weekend work. Notably, weekend work has been linked to adverse health impacts (e.g., Jamal 2004; Lambert et al. 2026; Lee et al. 2015; Sato et al. 2020; Takada et al. 2009; Zilanawala and McMunn 2024). Finally, our results provide additional justification for the presence of penalty wage rates in industry awards. Less clear is whether the current levels of those penalty rates are under- or over-compensating workers for the disutility of weekend work. This seems a fruitful topic for future research.

References

- Australian Bureau of Statistics. 2025. *Working Arrangements*. Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics. Viewed 29 April 2026. <<https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/labour/earnings-and-working-conditions/working-arrangements/aug-2025>>.
- Baetschmann, G., A. Ballantyne, K.E. Staub, and R. Winkelmann. 2020. “feologit: A New Command for Fitting Fixed-Effects Ordered Logit Models.” *The Stata Journal* 20(2): 253–275.
- Boulin, J.Y., and L. Lesnard. 2016. “Sunday Work, Time Use and Social and Family Life: An Analysis Based on the Time Use Survey.” *Economie & Statistique*, nos. 486-487: 149–182.
- Bryce, A.M. 2021. “Weekend Working in 21st century Britain: Does it Matter for the Well-Being of Workers?” *The Manchester School* 89(6): 541–68.
- Craig, L., and J.E. Brown. 2014. “Weekend Work and Leisure Time with Family and Friends: Who Misses Out?” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 76(4): 710–727.
- Craig, L., and J.E. Brown. 2015. “Nonstandard Employment and Nonwork Activities, Time Alone and With Others: Can Weekend Workers Make Up Lost Time?” *Journal of Industrial Relations* 57(1): 3–23.
- Crawley, T. 2021. “The Effect of Weekend Work on Shared Leisure Time.” *Australian Economic Review* 54(3): 406–415.
- Fagan, C., and B. Burchell. 2002. *Gender, Jobs and Working Conditions in the European Union*. European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions.
- Ferrer-i-Carbonell, A., and P. Frijters. 2004. “How Important is Methodology for the Estimates of the Determinants of Happiness?” *The Economic Journal* 114(497): 641–659.
- Frey, B., and A. Stutzer. 2000. “Happiness, Economy, and Institutions.” *The Economic Journal* 110(466): 118–138.
- Harris, R., E. Kavaliotis, S.P. Drummond, and A.P. Wolkow. 2024. “Sleep, Mental Health and Physical Health in New Shift Workers Transitioning to Shift Work: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.” *Sleep Medicine Reviews* 75: 101927.

- Higgins, C., L. Duxbury, and K.L. Johnson. 2000. "Part-Time Work for Women: Does it Really Help Balance Work and Family?" *Human Resource Management* 39(1): 17–32.
- Homans, G.C. 1958. "Social Behavior as Exchange." *American Journal of Sociology* 63(5): 597–606.
- Hook, J.L. 2012. "Working on the Weekend: Fathers' Time with Family in the United Kingdom." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 74(4): 631–642.
- Hudson, K., and A.L. Kalleberg. 2019. "How good is half a job? Part-time employment and job quality in the US." In H. Nicolaisen, H. Cecilie Kavli and R. Steen Jensen (eds.), *Dualisation of Part-Time Work* (pp. 187–216). Policy Press.
- Jamal, M. 2004. "Burnout, Stress and Health of Employees on Non-Standard Work Schedules: A Study of Canadian Workers." *Stress and Health* 20(3): 113–119.
- Lambert, A., C. Tiwari, and C. Rauch. 2026. "Nonstandard Work Schedules and Parental Mental Health: The Moderating Influences of Social Support and Gender in France." *Community, Work & Family*. Published online ahead of print.
- Lane, A.M., and G. Rozner. 2017. *Penalising Work – A Historical Account of Penalty Rates in Australia*. Institute of Public Affairs. <https://apo.org.au/sites/default/files/resource-files/2017-07/apo-nid97976.pdf>
- Laß, I., E. Vera-Toscano, and M. Wooden. 2025. "Working from Home, COVID-19, and Job Satisfaction." *ILR Review* 78(2): 330–354.
- Laß, I., and M. Wooden, M. 2019. "The Structure of the Wage Gap for temporary Workers: Evidence from Australian Panel Data." *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 57(3): 453–478.
- Laß, I., and M. Wooden, M. 2020. "Trends in the Prevalence of Non-Standard Employment in Australia." *Journal of Industrial Relations* 62(1): 3–32.
- Laß, I., and M. Wooden, M. 2022. "Weekend Work and Work–Family Conflict: Evidence from Australian Panel Data." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 84(1): 250–272.

- Lavetti, K. 2023. "Compensating Wage Differentials in Labor Markets: Empirical Challenges and Applications." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 37(3): 189–212.
- Lee, H.E., H.R. Kim, J.O. Kong, T.W. Jang, J.P. Myong, J.W. Koo, and I. Kim 2015. "Weekend Work and Depressive Symptoms Among Korean Employees." *Chronobiology International* 32(2): 262–269.
- Martin, J.E., J. Lynn-Senter Wittmer, and A.M. Lechhook. 2011. "Attitudes towards Days Worked Where Sundays are Scheduled." *Human Relations* 64(7): 901–926.
- Niedhammer, I., T. Lesuffleur, E. Algava, and J.F. Chastang. 2015. "Classic and Emergent Psychosocial Work Factors and Mental Health." *Occupational Medicine* 65(2): 126–134.
- Pichler, F. 2009. "Determinants of Work-Life Balance: Shortcomings in the Contemporary Measurement of WLB in Large-Scale Surveys." *Social Indicators Research* 92(3): 449–469.
- Sato, K., S. Kuroda, and H. Owan. 2020. "Mental Health Effects of Long Work Hours, Night and Weekend Work, and Short Rest Periods." *Social Science & Medicine* 246: 112774.
- Steiber, N. 2009. "Reported Levels of Time-Based and Strain-Based Conflict Between Work and Family Roles in Europe: A Multilevel Approach." *Social Indicators Research* 93(3): 469–488.
- Summerfield, M., B. Garrard, R. Kamath, N. Macalalad, M.K. Nesa, N. Watson, and R. Wilkins. 2025. *HILDA User Manual – Release 24*. Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research, The University of Melbourne.
- https://melbourneinstitute.unimelb.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0008/5465492/HILDA-User-Manual-Release-24.0.pdf
- Täht, K., and M. Mills. 2012. "Nonstandard Work Schedules, Couple Desynchronization, and Parent–Child Interaction: A Mixed-Methods Analysis." *Journal of Family Issues* 33(8): 1054–1087.
- Taiji, R., and M.C. Mills. 2020. "Non-Standard Schedules, Work–Family Conflict, and the Moderating Role of National Labour Context: Evidence From 32 European Countries." *European Sociological Review* 36(2): 179–197.

- Takada, M., A. Suzuki, S. Shima, K. Inoue, S. Kazukawa, and M. Hojoh. 2009. "Associations between Lifestyle Factors, Working Environment, Depressive Symptoms and Suicidal Ideation: A Large-Scale Study in Japan." *Industrial Health* 47(6): 649–655.
- Tausig, M., and R. Fenwick. 2001. "Unbinding Time: Alternate Work Schedules and Work-Life Balance." *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 22(2): 101–19.
- Tilly, C. 1996. *Half a Job: Bad and Good Part-time Jobs in a Changing Labor Market*. Temple University Press.
- Torquati, L., G.I. Mielke, W.J Brown, N.W. Burton, and T.L. Kolbe-Alexander. 2019. "Shift Work and Poor Mental Health: A Meta-Analysis of Longitudinal Studies." *American Journal of Public Health* 109(11): e13–e20.
- US Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2025. *American Time Use Survey - 2025 Results* (Economic News Release, 25 June). <https://www.bls.gov/news.release/atus.htm>
- Wanger, S. 2017. *What Makes Employees Satisfied with Their Working Time? The Role of Working Hours, Time-Sovereignty and Working Conditions for Working Time and Job Satisfaction* (IAB Discussion Paper no. 20/2017). Institut für Arbeitsmarkt- und Berufsforschung (IAB).
- Weston, G., A. Zilanawala, E. Webb, L. Carvalho, and A. McMunn. 2024. "Work Hours, Weekend Working, Nonstandard Work Schedules and Sleep Quantity and Quality: Findings from the UK Household Longitudinal Study." *BMC Public Health* 24(1): 309.
- Winston, G.C. 1982. *The Timing of Economic Activities: Firms, Households, and Markets in Time-Specific Analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wirtz, A., F. Nachreiner, and K. Rolfes. 2011. "Working on Sundays – Effects on Safety, Health, and Work-Life Balance." *Chronobiology International* 28(4): 361–370.
- Zilanawala, A., and A. McMunn. 2024. "Nonstandard Work Schedules in the UK: What are the Implications for Parental Mental Health and Relationship Happiness?" *Community, Work & Family* 27(1): 54–77.

Zhao, Y., A. Richardson, C. Poyser, P. Butterworth, L. Strazdins, L., and L.S. Leach. 2019.

“Shift Work and Mental Health: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.” *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health* 92(6): 763–793.

Endnotes

¹ For a history of the development of weekend penalty rates in Australian awards, see Lane and Rozner (2017).

² The principal exception is persons who have a child with an original sample member. They are added to the sample on a permanent basis.

³ Estimates of the incidence of weekend work in Australia were initially reported by the ABS on an annual basis for the period 2008 to 2013 in its Forms of Employment Survey. Subsequently they have been reported on a biennial basis as part of its Characteristics of Employment Survey.

⁴ Owner-managers of incorporated businesses have been classified as self-employed. This differs from the practice adopted by the ABS in its Labour Force Survey, which classifies such workers as employees (of their own business).

TABLE 1. Summary statistics (means) by whether works weekends

Variable	Works weekends	Does not work weekends	Total
<i>Outcome variables</i>			
Satisfaction with pay (0-10)	7.041	7.227	7.168
Satisfaction with job security (0-10)	8.021	7.990	8.000
Satisfaction with work itself (0-10)	7.667	7.687	7.681
Satisfaction with hours (0-10)	6.963	7.498	7.328
Satisfaction with flexibility (0-10)	7.270	7.722	7.579
Satisfaction with job overall (0-10)	7.658	7.763	7.730
<i>Control variables</i>			
Age group			
15-24 years (reference group)	0.265	0.125	0.169
25-34 years	0.210	0.237	0.228
35-44 years	0.178	0.233	0.216
45-54 years	0.178	0.222	0.208
55-64 years	0.128	0.147	0.141
65 years or more	0.041	0.036	0.038
Marital status			
Single (reference group)	0.411	0.295	0.332
Partnered	0.589	0.705	0.668
Presence and age of children in the household			
No children (reference group)	0.650	0.548	0.581
Youngest child aged <5	0.126	0.158	0.148
Youngest child aged 5 to 14	0.141	0.187	0.173
Youngest child is dependent aged 15 to 24	0.051	0.071	0.065
Youngest child is independent	0.032	0.035	0.034
Has work limiting long-term health condition	0.099	0.087	0.091
Highest education attainment			
Year 11 or lower (reference group)	0.244	0.160	0.186
Year 12	0.199	0.153	0.168
Trade qualification or diploma	0.361	0.321	0.334
Degree or higher	0.196	0.367	0.312
Full-time student	0.162	0.048	0.084
Occupation			
Managers	0.144	0.137	0.139
Professionals	0.139	0.299	0.248
Technicians and trades workers	0.127	0.134	0.132
Community and personal service workers	0.187	0.080	0.114
Clerical and administrative workers	0.049	0.174	0.134
Sales workers	0.166	0.048	0.085
Machinery operators and drivers	0.076	0.051	0.059
Laborers (reference group)	0.111	0.077	0.088
Usual weekly hours of work (in main job)	35.70	35.42	35.51
Employment contract type			
Permanent employee (reference group)	0.450	0.649	0.586
Fixed-term contract employee	0.056	0.091	0.080
Casual employee	0.278	0.139	0.183

Self-employed	0.206	0.117	0.145
Other	0.009	0.004	0.005
Work schedule			
Regular daytime (reference group)	0.472	0.896	0.762
Regular nights or evenings	0.095	0.027	0.048
Shift work	0.237	0.025	0.093
On call or irregular	0.197	0.051	0.097
Job tenure (with current employer)			
Less than 1 year (reference group)	0.219	0.187	0.197
1 to <2 years	0.105	0.088	0.093
2 to <5 years	0.265	0.254	0.258
5 to <10 years	0.172	0.200	0.191
10 to < 20 years	0.140	0.172	0.162
20 or more years	0.099	0.100	0.100
% of weekly work hours worked from home			
Zero (reference group)	0.773	0.699	0.723
1 to 19%	0.087	0.121	0.110
20-39%	0.036	0.064	0.055
40-59%	0.019	0.030	0.026
60-79%	0.013	0.017	0.016
80-99%	0.010	0.010	0.010
100%	0.054	0.052	0.052
Hours vary	0.008	0.008	0.008
Multiple job holder	0.091	0.077	0.081
Has supervisory responsibilities	0.461	0.442	0.448
Trade union member	0.238	0.218	0.224
Employer (firm) size			
Less than 20 employees (reference group)	0.358	0.286	0.309
20-99 employees	0.117	0.140	0.133
100 to 499 employees	0.085	0.121	0.110
500 or more employees	0.378	0.410	0.400
Unknown	0.062	0.043	0.049
Industry			
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	0.056	0.017	0.029
Mining	0.031	0.012	0.018
Manufacturing (reference group)	0.054	0.091	0.079
Electricity, gas, water and waste services	0.007	0.012	0.010
Construction	0.065	0.094	0.084
Wholesale trade	0.014	0.037	0.030
Retail trade	0.185	0.055	0.096
Accommodation and food services	0.147	0.024	0.063
Transport, postal and warehousing	0.054	0.038	0.043
Information media and telecommunication	0.011	0.021	0.018
Financial and insurance services	0.008	0.048	0.035
Rental, hiring and real estate services	0.015	0.013	0.014
Professional, scientific & technical services	0.032	0.099	0.078
Administrative and support services	0.021	0.034	0.030
Public administration and training	0.037	0.079	0.066
Education and training	0.027	0.136	0.101
Health care and social assistance	0.159	0.144	0.149

Arts and recreation services	0.030	0.013	0.018
Other services	0.046	0.035	0.039
Sector (Public sector = 1)	0.134	0.253	0.215
Location type			
Major city (reference group)	0.575	0.670	0.640
Inner regional	0.269	0.228	0.241
Outer regional or remote	0.156	0.102	0.119
State			
New South Wales (reference group)	0.279	0.294	0.289
Victoria	0.245	0.264	0.258
Queensland	0.229	0.206	0.213
South Australia	0.088	0.085	0.086
Western Australia	0.098	0.088	0.091
Tasmania	0.035	0.029	0.031
Northern Territory	0.010	0.009	0.009
Australian Capital Territory	0.016	0.027	0.023
<i>Moderator variables</i>			
Gender			
Female	0.465	0.497	0.486
Male	0.535	0.503	0.514
Employment status			
Employee	0.787	0.881	0.851
Self-employed	0.206	0.117	0.145
Occupation			
Managers and professionals	0.283	0.435	0.387
Clerical and administrative workers	0.049	0.174	0.134
Sales and service workers ^a	0.353	0.128	0.200
Blue-collar workers ^b	0.314	0.262	0.279
Parental status			
Parent: youngest child aged <5	0.126	0.158	0.148
Parent: youngest children aged 5-14	0.141	0.187	0.173
Other workers	0.733	0.655	0.679
Total	65,461	140,865	206,326
<i>Wave 17 to 24 sub-sample</i>			
Hours usually worked on weekends			
Zero (reference group)	0.000	1.000	0.701
1 to 6	0.215	0.000	0.064
6 to 10	0.351	0.000	0.105
11 to 15	0.140	0.000	0.042
16 to 20	0.200	0.000	0.060
More than 20	0.093	0.000	0.028
Total	25,175	58,836	84,125

Notes:

- a. This grouping comprises two major occupation groups: Community and personal services workers; and Sales workers.
- b. This grouping comprises three major occupation groups: Technicians and trades workers; Machinery operators and drivers; and Laborers.

TABLE 2. Weekend work and job satisfaction by gender: two-way fixed effects regression results summary

Outcome variable	Weekend work variable		N		Overall R ²	Rho	F
	β	SE	Obs.	Persons			
<i>Males</i>							
Satisfaction with:							
(1) Pay	0.100**	0.021	105,853	13,217	0.023	0.515	16.97**
(2) Job security	0.042*	0.019	105,815	13,125	0.062	0.503	25.66**
(3) Work itself	0.030	0.018	105,930	13,138	0.033	0.521	14.60**
(4) Hours of work	-0.178**	0.021	105,925	13,137	0.064	0.496	23.21**
(5) Flexibility	-0.178**	0.022	105,845	13,134	0.089	0.499	26.42**
(6) Job overall	0.021	0.016	105,925	13,138	0.020	0.527	14.82**
<i>Females</i>							
Satisfaction with:							
(7) Pay	0.023	0.024	100,240	12,917	0.031	0.501	15.35**
(8) Job security	0.121**	0.022	100,241	12,916	0.069	0.480	27.97**
(9) Work itself	0.097**	0.021	100,340	12,921	0.038	0.487	16.30**
(10) Hours of work	-0.134**	0.023	100,344	12,922	0.071	0.460	19.42**
(11) Flexibility	-0.152**	0.024	100,278	12,918	0.101	0.455	31.14**
(12) Job overall	0.042*	0.019	100,329	12,920	0.023	0.497	15.31**

Notes: All models include control variables, as listed in Table 1. The standard errors (SE) are cluster-robust. Rho is the fraction of the variance in the dependent variable attributable to the individual fixed effects. ** and * denote statistical significance at the .01 and 0.05 levels, respectively.

TABLE 3. Weekend work and job satisfaction by gender and employment status: coefficient on weekend work in two-way fixed effects regressions

Outcome variable	Employees		Self-employed	
	Males	Females	Males	Females
Pay	0.166** (0.023)	0.104** (0.025)	-0.078 (0.044)	-0.183** (0.063)
Job security	0.041 (0.021)	0.166** (0.024)	-0.026 (0.040)	-0.112 (0.059)
Work itself	0.007 (0.021)	0.092** (0.023)	0.047 (0.029)	0.029 (0.041)
Hours of work	-0.165** (0.025)	-0.121** (0.026)	-0.236** (0.038)	-0.207** (0.055)
Flexibility	-0.205** (0.027)	-0.168** (0.027)	-0.178** (0.036)	-0.153** (0.051)
Job overall	0.022 (0.019)	0.045* (0.021)	-0.030 (0.030)	-0.012 (0.042)

Notes: Figures in parentheses are cluster-robust standard errors. All models include control variables, as listed in Table 1. ** and * denote statistical significance at the .01 and 0.05 levels, respectively.

TABLE 4. Weekend work and job satisfaction by gender and occupation among employees: coefficients on weekend work in two-way fixed effects regressions

Satisfaction with:	Managers / Professionals		Clerical and administrative		Sales / Service ^a		Blue-collar ^b	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Pay	0.017 (0.043)	-0.018 (0.046)	0.061 (0.118)	0.185* (0.080)	0.211** (0.059)	0.170** (0.042)	0.212** (0.033)	0.185* (0.077)
Job security	0.022 (0.046)	0.069 (0.044)	-0.038 (0.122)	0.168* (0.081)	0.115* (0.052)	0.170** (0.038)	0.018 (0.030)	0.156* (0.067)
Work itself	0.026 (0.041)	-0.033 (0.041)	-0.199 (0.108)	0.167* (0.072)	-0.011 (0.053)	0.114** (0.037)	0.023 (0.031)	0.117 (0.067)
Hours of work	-0.222** (0.049)	-0.227** (0.051)	-0.213 (0.119)	-0.284** (0.086)	-0.121 (0.063)	-0.053 (0.042)	-0.138** (0.035)	0.030 (0.076)
Flexibility	-0.203** (0.056)	-0.192** (0.054)	-0.184 (0.133)	-0.184 (0.094)	-0.136* (0.064)	-0.081 (0.043)	-0.176** (0.040)	-0.048 (0.076)
Job overall	-0.016 (0.038)	-0.065 (0.038)	-0.146 (0.093)	0.004 (0.069)	0.093 (0.048)	0.111** (0.034)	0.026 (0.028)	0.128 (0.066)

Notes:

a. This grouping comprises two major occupation groups: Community and personal services workers; and Sales workers.

b. This grouping comprises three major occupation groups: Technicians and trades workers; Machinery operators and drivers; and Laborers.

Figures in parentheses are cluster-robust standard errors. All models include control variables, as listed in Table 1.

** and * denote statistical significance at the .01 and 0.05 levels, respectively.

TABLE 5. Weekend work and job satisfaction by gender and presence and age of children: coefficients on weekend work in two-way fixed effects regressions

Satisfaction with:	Parents of children aged <5		Parents of children aged 5-14		Other workers	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
Pay	0.137** (0.050)	0.004 (0.067)	0.145** (0.055)	-0.031 (0.061)	0.098** (0.025)	0.042 (0.028)
Job security	0.076 (0.052)	0.127 (0.066)	0.119* (0.051)	0.112 (0.057)	0.016 (0.023)	0.115** (0.027)
Work itself	0.056 (0.046)	0.173** (0.057)	0.053 (0.044)	0.086 (0.052)	0.030 (0.021)	0.098** (0.025)
Hours of work	-0.201** (0.057)	-0.232** (0.071)	-0.179** (0.055)	-0.196** (0.061)	-0.152** (0.025)	-0.103** (0.028)
Flexibility	-0.169** (0.061)	-0.112 (0.070)	-0.019 (0.060)	-0.100 (0.061)	-0.181** (0.026)	-0.168** (0.029)
Job overall	0.079 (0.044)	0.028 (0.050)	0.062 (0.045)	0.046 (0.049)	0.012 (0.019)	0.049* (0.023)

Notes: Figures in parentheses are cluster-robust standard errors. All models include control variables, as listed in Table 1. ** and * denote statistical significance at the .01 and 0.05 levels, respectively.

TABLE 6. Any weekend work and hours worked on weekends and job satisfaction: coefficients from two-way fixed effects regressions (waves 17-24)

Gender / Satisfaction outcome	Any weekend work		Hours usually worked per week on weekend					N
		N	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	>20	
<i>Males</i>								
Pay	0.077* (0.030)	42,461	-0.018 (0.045)	0.066 (0.038)	0.070 (0.056)	0.171** (0.054)	0.272** (0.073)	42,389
Job security	0.033 (0.031)	42,458	0.063 (0.045)	0.048 (0.038)	0.058 (0.056)	0.032 (0.057)	-0.101 (0.068)	42,385
Work itself	0.009 (0.027)	42,488	-0.023 (0.040)	0.052 (0.040)	-0.059 (0.049)	-0.017 (0.050)	0.057 (0.066)	42,415
Hours of work	-0.163** (0.033)	42,488	-0.192** (0.048)	-0.168** (0.041)	-0.182** (0.059)	-0.174** (0.060)	0.120 (0.082)	42,415
Flexibility	-0.174** (0.035)	42,456	-0.094* (0.048)	-0.180** (0.046)	-0.109 (0.066)	-0.285** (0.068)	-0.208* (0.092)	42,383
Job overall	-0.024 (0.025)	42,489	-0.060 (0.037)	-0.001 (0.032)	-0.025 (0.045)	-0.043 (0.046)	0.057 (0.058)	42,416
<i>Females</i>								
Pay	0.061 (0.038)	41,719	0.031 (0.052)	0.022 (0.046)	0.122 (0.063)	0.134* (0.060)	0.234* (0.107)	41,640
Job security	0.113** (0.034)	41,728	0.112* (0.048)	0.116** (0.042)	0.119* (0.055)	0.180** (0.057)	0.208* (0.103)	41,649
Work itself	0.034 (0.032)	41,756	0.056 (0.043)	0.016 (0.039)	0.069 (0.057)	0.029 (0.055)	-0.088 (0.097)	41,675
Hours of work	-0.153** (0.038)	41,766	-0.255** (0.051)	-0.162** (0.046)	-0.102 (0.066)	-0.049 (0.065)	0.131 (0.116)	41,685
Flexibility	-0.122** (0.040)	41,726	-0.076 (0.051)	-0.068 (0.048)	-0.258** (0.071)	-0.131 (0.072)	-0.185 (0.139)	41,645
Job overall	0.016 (0.029)	41,748	0.002 (0.038)	0.018 (0.036)	0.015 (0.054)	0.040 (0.050)	0.054 (0.090)	41,668

Notes: Figures in parentheses are cluster-robust standard errors. All models include control variables, as listed in Table 1. ** and * denote statistical significance at the .01 and 0.05 levels, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY APPENDIX

TABLE S1

Weekend Work and Satisfaction with Pay by Gender: Detailed Two-Way Fixed Effects Regression Results

	Women		Men	
	Coeff.	Robust SE	Coeff.	Robust SE
Weekend work	0.023	0.024	0.100**	0.021
Age group (ref. = 15-24)				
25-34 years	-0.065	0.037	-0.085*	0.036
35-44 years	-0.116*	0.055	-0.083	0.051
45-54 years	-0.158*	0.071	-0.161*	0.066
55-64 years	-0.169*	0.086	-0.160*	0.080
65 years or more	0.038	0.109	-0.036	0.102
Partnered	0.047	0.029	-0.022	0.028
Age of youngest child (ref. = No children)				
<5	-0.057	0.034	-0.043	0.029
5 to 14	-0.022	0.035	0.007	0.032
Dependent aged 15 to 24	0.023	0.036	-0.009	0.035
Youngest child is independent	0.066	0.041	0.013	0.041
Work limiting long-term health condition	-0.127**	0.029	-0.151**	0.029
Highest education attainment (ref. = Year 11 or lower)				
Year 12	-0.017	0.054	-0.199**	0.059
Trade qualification or diploma	-0.030	0.060	-0.140*	0.063
Degree or higher	-0.289**	0.076	-0.478**	0.086
Full-time student	0.122**	0.038	0.181**	0.042
Occupation (ref. = Labourers)				
Managers	0.007	0.059	0.127**	0.041
Professionals	0.021	0.058	0.142**	0.044
Technicians & trades workers	-0.096	0.070	-0.006	0.038
Community & personal service workers	-0.129*	0.056	0.078	0.059
Clerical & administrative workers	0.105	0.058	0.061	0.048
Sales workers	-0.017	0.058	-0.001	0.048
Machinery operators & drivers	0.087	0.105	0.031	0.044
Usual weekly hours of work (in main job)	0.001	0.003	0.011**	0.003
Hours squared ($\times 10^3$)	0.028*	0.036	-0.042*	0.032
Employment contract (ref. = Permanent)				
Fixed-term contract employee	0.058*	0.025	0.011	0.026
Casual employee	0.401**	0.029	0.185**	0.030
Self-employed	-0.230**	0.054	-0.254**	0.041
Other	-0.708**	0.131	-0.380**	0.134
Work schedule (ref. = Regular daytime)				
Regular nights or evenings	0.154**	0.041	0.135**	0.040
Shift work	0.044	0.031	0.076*	0.030
On call or irregular	-0.041	0.028	-0.042	0.027
Job tenure (ref. = <1 year)				
1 to <2 years	-0.161**	0.023	-0.157**	0.022

2 to <5 years	-0.188**	0.020	-0.169**	0.019
5 to <10 years	-0.146**	0.025	-0.171**	0.024
10 to < 20 years	-0.134**	0.034	-0.199**	0.030
20 or more years	-0.172**	0.050	-0.274**	0.040
% of weekly work hours worked from home (ref. = Zero)				
1 to 19%	0.074**	0.026	0.029	0.021
20-39%	0.047	0.030	0.003	0.030
40-59%	0.098*	0.042	-0.011	0.042
60-79%	0.081	0.054	-0.201**	0.056
80-99%	0.097	0.065	-0.125	0.065
100%	0.117**	0.041	-0.078	0.044
Hours vary	-0.069	0.069	-0.005	0.066
Multiple job holder	-0.056*	0.027	-0.005	0.030
Has supervisory responsibilities	0.012	0.018	0.062**	0.017
Trade union member	-0.008	0.025	0.134**	0.026
Employer (firm) size (ref. = <20)				
20-99 employees	0.048	0.032	0.098**	0.029
100 to 499 employees	0.041	0.036	0.146**	0.034
500 or more employees	0.061	0.033	0.174**	0.032
Unknown	0.032	0.040	0.111*	0.044
Industry (ref. = Manufacturing)				
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	-0.151	0.138	-0.042	0.086
Mining	0.659**	0.138	0.592**	0.069
Electricity, gas, water & waste services	0.456**	0.151	0.379**	0.091
Construction	0.410**	0.093	0.190**	0.046
Wholesale trade	0.089	0.086	-0.048	0.048
Retail trade	-0.080	0.073	-0.221**	0.052
Accommodation & food services	-0.272**	0.075	-0.398**	0.063
Transport, postal and warehousing	0.194	0.100	-0.014	0.055
Information media & telecommunication	-0.080	0.117	0.006	0.079
Financial and insurance services	0.223*	0.100	0.165	0.086
Rental, hiring and real estate services	0.043	0.107	-0.130	0.087
Professional, scientific & technical	0.008	0.075	-0.015	0.050
Administrative and support services	0.172*	0.083	0.062	0.062
Public administration and training	0.283**	0.081	0.090	0.061
Education and training	0.142	0.080	-0.055	0.075
Health care and social assistance	0.100	0.073	0.110	0.068
Arts and recreation services	-0.094	0.102	-0.098	0.077
Other services	0.161	0.089	-0.116*	0.059
Public sector	0.326**	0.035	0.168**	0.040
Location (ref. = Major city)				
Inner regional	0.123**	0.045	-0.026	0.040
Outer regional or remote	0.133*	0.066	0.033	0.062
State (ref. = NSW)				
Victoria	0.072	0.095	-0.012	0.094
Queensland	-0.052	0.092	-0.148	0.078
South Australia	-0.024	0.145	0.033	0.129
Western Australia	0.131	0.145	0.067	0.108
Tasmania	-0.046	0.167	-0.316	0.215
Northern Territory	0.127	0.176	0.129	0.153

Australian Capital Territory	0.156	0.128	0.082	0.107
Survey wave (ref. = Wave 24)				
Wave 4	-0.758**	0.068	-0.925**	0.060
Wave 5	-0.766**	0.065	-0.909**	0.057
Wave 6	-0.728**	0.062	-0.870**	0.054
Wave 7	-0.662**	0.060	-0.810**	0.053
Wave 8	-0.664**	0.057	-0.749**	0.050
Wave 9	-0.661**	0.056	-0.766**	0.048
Wave 10	-0.647**	0.053	-0.684**	0.047
Wave 11	-0.584**	0.050	-0.701**	0.044
Wave 12	-0.521**	0.048	-0.620**	0.043
Wave 13	-0.484**	0.046	-0.605**	0.041
Wave 14	-0.409**	0.044	-0.595**	0.039
Wave 15	-0.397**	0.042	-0.567**	0.037
Wave 16	-0.385**	0.040	-0.473**	0.036
Wave 17	-0.326**	0.039	-0.419**	0.035
Wave 18	-0.305**	0.038	-0.395**	0.034
Wave 19	-0.221**	0.036	-0.335**	0.032
Wave 20	0.036	0.034	-0.061*	0.030
Wave 21	0.080*	0.033	0.020	0.029
Wave 22	-0.027	0.031	-0.016	0.028
Wave 23	-0.029	0.028	-0.027	0.025
Constant	7.468**	0.139	7.495**	0.123
Observations	100,240		105,853	
Individuals	12,917		13,127	
F	15.35**		16.97**	
Rho	0.501		0.515	
Overall R-squared	0.031		0.023	

** and * denote statistical significance at the .01 and 0.05 levels, respectively.

Rho is the fraction of the variance in the dependent variable attributable to the individual fixed effects.

TABLE S2

Weekend Work and Satisfaction with Job Security by Gender: Detailed Two-Way Fixed Effects Regression Results

	Women		Men	
	Coeff.	Robust SE	Coeff.	Robust SE
Weekend work	0.121**	0.022	0.042*	0.019
Age group (ref. = 15-24)				
25-34 years	0.014	0.034	-0.085*	0.033
35-44 years	-0.043	0.052	-0.118*	0.048
45-54 years	-0.079	0.067	-0.084	0.063
55-64 years	-0.005	0.083	0.023	0.077
65 years or more	0.299**	0.107	0.429**	0.097
Partnered	0.052*	0.027	0.009	0.028
Age of youngest child (ref. = No children)				
<5	-0.088**	0.032	-0.088**	0.027
5 to 14	-0.097**	0.033	-0.055	0.030
Dependent aged 15 to 24	-0.020	0.035	-0.055	0.037
Youngest child is independent	0.006	0.040	-0.033	0.041
Work limiting long-term health condition	-0.148**	0.028	-0.190**	0.030
Highest education attainment (ref. = Year 11 or lower)				
Year 12	-0.148**	0.046	-0.172**	0.053
Trade qualification or diploma	-0.158**	0.054	-0.245**	0.059
Degree or higher	-0.341**	0.069	-0.462**	0.080
Full-time student	0.207**	0.035	0.279**	0.036
Occupation (ref. = Labourers)				
Managers	-0.146**	0.053	0.005	0.038
Professionals	-0.127*	0.054	-0.051	0.042
Technicians & trades workers	-0.018	0.065	-0.026	0.036
Community & personal service workers	-0.073	0.051	0.094	0.051
Clerical & administrative workers	-0.058	0.052	-0.022	0.046
Sales workers	-0.077	0.052	-0.078	0.043
Machinery operators & drivers	-0.027	0.097	-0.042	0.041
Usual weekly hours of work (in main job)	0.002	0.002	0.009**	0.002
Hours squared ($\times 10^3$)	0.044*	0.030	-0.032*	0.026
Employment contract (ref. = Permanent)				
Fixed-term contract employee	-0.945**	0.034	-0.502**	0.030
Casual employee	-0.770**	0.030	-0.713**	0.031
Self-employed	-0.797**	0.048	-0.693**	0.040
Other	-0.869**	0.105	-0.703**	0.117
Work schedule (ref. = Regular daytime)				
Regular nights or evenings	0.045	0.038	-0.036	0.037
Shift work	-0.042	0.028	-0.118**	0.029
On call or irregular	-0.143**	0.027	-0.110**	0.026
Job tenure (ref. = <1 year)				
1 to <2 years	0.091**	0.023	0.095**	0.022
2 to <5 years	0.185**	0.019	0.146**	0.018
5 to <10 years	0.180**	0.025	0.127**	0.023

10 to < 20 years	0.144**	0.032	0.053	0.029
20 or more years	0.056	0.049	-0.112**	0.041
% of weekly work hours worked from home (ref. = Zero)				
1 to 19%	0.058*	0.025	0.045*	0.020
20-39%	0.030	0.031	-0.006	0.030
40-59%	-0.020	0.041	-0.135**	0.042
60-79%	-0.118*	0.051	-0.158**	0.056
80-99%	0.011	0.063	-0.226**	0.060
100%	0.067	0.037	-0.093*	0.041
Hours vary	-0.069	0.067	-0.113	0.067
Multiple job holder	-0.080**	0.026	0.008	0.029
Has supervisory responsibilities	0.135**	0.017	0.184**	0.016
Trade union member	-0.053*	0.026	-0.081**	0.025
Employer (firm) size (ref. = <20)				
20-99 employees	-0.064*	0.029	-0.022	0.027
100 to 499 employees	-0.128**	0.033	-0.063	0.032
500 or more employees	-0.091**	0.030	-0.033	0.031
Unknown	-0.112**	0.037	-0.139**	0.043
Industry (ref. = Manufacturing)				
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	0.273*	0.115	0.066	0.074
Mining	-0.366**	0.131	-0.206**	0.068
Electricity, gas, water & waste services	-0.077	0.140	0.034	0.092
Construction	0.079	0.087	-0.024	0.045
Wholesale trade	0.194*	0.078	0.141**	0.045
Retail trade	0.177**	0.064	0.262**	0.049
Accommodation & food services	0.186**	0.066	0.321**	0.059
Transport, postal and warehousing	0.047	0.096	0.118*	0.053
Information media & telecommunication	-0.112	0.109	-0.359**	0.085
Financial and insurance services	0.094	0.086	0.156	0.081
Rental, hiring and real estate services	0.135	0.099	0.245**	0.091
Professional, scientific & technical	-0.047	0.067	0.031	0.049
Administrative and support services	0.097	0.076	0.122	0.066
Public administration and training	0.153*	0.077	0.395**	0.060
Education and training	0.028	0.074	0.052	0.076
Health care and social assistance	0.264**	0.065	0.372**	0.063
Arts and recreation services	-0.007	0.090	0.166*	0.077
Other services	0.184*	0.077	0.177**	0.055
Public sector	-0.008	0.033	0.206**	0.040
Location (ref. = Major city)				
Inner regional	0.063	0.041	0.061	0.037
Outer regional or remote	0.104	0.061	0.040	0.059
State (ref. = NSW)				
Victoria	0.062	0.087	0.222**	0.081
Queensland	0.009	0.082	0.094	0.071
South Australia	0.031	0.144	0.141	0.112
Western Australia	0.057	0.126	0.140	0.114
Tasmania	-0.290	0.169	0.013	0.190
Northern Territory	0.452**	0.175	0.318*	0.131
Australian Capital Territory	0.331*	0.135	0.204	0.111
Survey wave (ref. = Wave 24)				

Wave 4	-0.164*	0.066	-0.225**	0.059
Wave 5	-0.205**	0.062	-0.263**	0.055
Wave 6	-0.119*	0.059	-0.241**	0.053
Wave 7	-0.021	0.056	-0.099*	0.050
Wave 8	-0.115*	0.055	-0.229**	0.049
Wave 9	-0.221**	0.053	-0.330**	0.048
Wave 10	-0.158**	0.050	-0.232**	0.046
Wave 11	-0.244**	0.048	-0.338**	0.043
Wave 12	-0.369**	0.046	-0.403**	0.042
Wave 13	-0.459**	0.045	-0.491**	0.041
Wave 14	-0.469**	0.043	-0.516**	0.040
Wave 15	-0.422**	0.041	-0.516**	0.038
Wave 16	-0.395**	0.040	-0.422**	0.036
Wave 17	-0.292**	0.038	-0.327**	0.035
Wave 18	-0.242**	0.037	-0.278**	0.034
Wave 19	-0.240**	0.035	-0.266**	0.032
Wave 20	-0.274**	0.034	-0.231**	0.031
Wave 21	-0.094**	0.032	-0.027	0.030
Wave 22	0.143**	0.030	0.141**	0.027
Wave 23	0.068*	0.027	0.104**	0.025
Constant	8.487**	0.131	8.144**	0.116
Observations	100,241		105,815	
Individuals	12,916		13,125	
F	27.97**		25.66**	
Rho	0.480		0.503	
Overall R-squared	0.069		0.062	

** and * denote statistical significance at the .01 and 0.05 levels, respectively.

Rho is the fraction of the variance in the dependent variable attributable to the individual fixed effects.

TABLE S3

Weekend Work and Satisfaction with Work Itself by Gender: Detailed Two-Way Fixed Effects Regression Results

	Women		Men	
	Coeff.	Robust SE	Coeff.	Robust SE
Weekend work	0.097**	0.021	0.030	0.018
Age group (ref. = 15-24)				
25-34 years	0.001	0.034	0.013	0.032
35-44 years	-0.019	0.048	0.034	0.044
45-54 years	0.011	0.061	0.104	0.055
55-64 years	0.050	0.073	0.110	0.067
65 years or more	0.170	0.092	0.228**	0.082
Partnered	-0.052*	0.024	-0.011	0.024
Age of youngest child (ref. = No children)				
<5	0.001	0.029	0.004	0.024
5 to 14	0.024	0.028	-0.016	0.026
Dependent aged 15 to 24	0.024	0.030	-0.026	0.028
Youngest child is independent	0.026	0.033	-0.018	0.033
Work limiting long-term health condition	-0.178**	0.025	-0.144**	0.024
Highest education attainment (ref. = Year 11 or lower)				
Year 12	-0.226**	0.047	-0.188**	0.053
Trade qualification or diploma	-0.198**	0.050	-0.205**	0.057
Degree or higher	-0.250**	0.066	-0.141	0.076
Full-time student	0.034	0.034	0.135**	0.036
Occupation (ref. = Labourers)				
Managers	0.543**	0.053	0.411**	0.036
Professionals	0.766**	0.055	0.502**	0.039
Technicians & trades workers	0.643**	0.066	0.377**	0.034
Community & personal service workers	0.683**	0.052	0.655**	0.050
Clerical & administrative workers	0.377**	0.054	0.127**	0.043
Sales workers	0.294**	0.053	0.162**	0.043
Machinery operators & drivers	0.447**	0.106	0.159**	0.039
Usual weekly hours of work (in main job)	-0.001	0.002	0.001	0.002
Hours squared ($\times 10^3$)	0.047*	0.032	0.011*	0.022
Employment contract (ref. = Permanent)				
Fixed-term contract employee	0.027	0.022	0.006	0.022
Casual employee	-0.017	0.025	-0.139**	0.026
Self-employed	0.162**	0.041	0.103**	0.030
Other	-0.010	0.084	0.151	0.082
Work schedule (ref. = Regular daytime)				
Regular nights or evenings	-0.085*	0.037	-0.104**	0.037
Shift work	-0.102**	0.027	-0.028	0.028
On call or irregular	-0.014	0.024	0.015	0.021
Job tenure (ref. = <1 year)				
1 to <2 years	-0.141**	0.021	-0.172**	0.020
2 to <5 years	-0.224**	0.018	-0.218**	0.017
5 to <10 years	-0.283**	0.022	-0.339**	0.021

10 to < 20 years	-0.369**	0.028	-0.381**	0.026
20 or more years	-0.454**	0.040	-0.431**	0.033
% of weekly work hours worked from home (ref. = Zero)				
1 to 19%	0.106**	0.022	0.107**	0.017
20-39%	0.123**	0.026	0.113**	0.025
40-59%	0.220**	0.035	0.144**	0.035
60-79%	0.180**	0.044	0.160**	0.042
80-99%	0.234**	0.051	0.153**	0.049
100%	0.114**	0.033	0.138**	0.032
Hours vary	0.180**	0.055	0.152**	0.045
Multiple job holder	-0.095**	0.023	-0.061**	0.026
Has supervisory responsibilities	0.068**	0.016	0.057**	0.015
Trade union member	-0.070**	0.022	-0.016	0.021
Employer (firm) size (ref. = <20)				
20-99 employees	-0.140**	0.027	-0.106**	0.024
100 to 499 employees	-0.204**	0.031	-0.139**	0.029
500 or more employees	-0.273**	0.028	-0.187**	0.027
Unknown	-0.229**	0.033	-0.190**	0.038
Industry (ref. = Manufacturing)				
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	0.052	0.102	0.160**	0.070
Mining	0.040	0.130	0.119	0.063
Electricity, gas, water & waste services	0.011	0.155	0.049	0.075
Construction	0.026	0.078	0.222**	0.040
Wholesale trade	-0.053	0.069	0.022	0.043
Retail trade	-0.139*	0.060	-0.019	0.047
Accommodation & food services	-0.469**	0.063	-0.226**	0.055
Transport, postal and warehousing	0.131	0.087	0.109**	0.047
Information media & telecommunication	0.103	0.094	0.130	0.069
Financial and insurance services	-0.065	0.083	0.057	0.075
Rental, hiring and real estate services	0.039	0.095	0.266**	0.083
Professional, scientific & technical	0.006	0.061	0.151**	0.044
Administrative and support services	-0.240**	0.070	0.059	0.057
Public administration and training	0.146*	0.070	0.138**	0.055
Education and training	0.293**	0.065	0.436**	0.063
Health care and social assistance	0.221**	0.059	0.349**	0.060
Arts and recreation services	0.333**	0.084	0.415**	0.067
Other services	0.236**	0.070	0.189**	0.050
Public sector	0.021	0.029	0.146**	0.035
Location (ref. = Major city)				
Inner regional	0.078*	0.037	0.036	0.033
Outer regional or remote	0.086	0.055	0.036	0.052
State (ref. = NSW)				
Victoria	-0.050	0.080	-0.090	0.073
Queensland	0.130	0.077	-0.173**	0.066
South Australia	0.033	0.119	-0.055	0.118
Western Australia	0.031	0.128	-0.036	0.115
Tasmania	0.053	0.180	-0.162	0.149
Northern Territory	-0.089	0.150	-0.066	0.132
Australian Capital Territory	0.155	0.121	-0.089	0.095
Survey wave (ref. = Wave 24)				

Wave 4	-0.338**	0.057	-0.223**	0.050
Wave 5	-0.333**	0.055	-0.256**	0.048
Wave 6	-0.278**	0.052	-0.221**	0.046
Wave 7	-0.258**	0.051	-0.258**	0.045
Wave 8	-0.214**	0.048	-0.184**	0.043
Wave 9	-0.317**	0.047	-0.250**	0.042
Wave 10	-0.263**	0.045	-0.242**	0.041
Wave 11	-0.211**	0.042	-0.184**	0.038
Wave 12	-0.186**	0.040	-0.194**	0.037
Wave 13	-0.237**	0.039	-0.189**	0.035
Wave 14	-0.156**	0.037	-0.163**	0.034
Wave 15	-0.142**	0.037	-0.160**	0.032
Wave 16	-0.144**	0.035	-0.119**	0.031
Wave 17	-0.124**	0.033	-0.153**	0.031
Wave 18	-0.108**	0.032	-0.097**	0.030
Wave 19	-0.096**	0.031	-0.072**	0.028
Wave 20	-0.047	0.030	-0.009	0.027
Wave 21	-0.025	0.029	0.026	0.027
Wave 22	-0.044	0.028	0.027	0.025
Wave 23	-0.041	0.026	0.013	0.024
Constant	7.715**	0.118	7.721**	0.103
Observations	100,340		105,930	
Individuals	12,921		13,138	
F	16.30**		14.60**	
Rho	0.487		0.521	
Overall R-squared	0.038		0.033	

** and * denote statistical significance at the .01 and 0.05 levels, respectively.

Rho is the fraction of the variance in the dependent variable attributable to the individual fixed effects.

TABLE S4

Weekend Work and Satisfaction with Hours Worked by Gender: Detailed Two-Way Fixed Effects Regression Results

	Women		Men	
	Coeff.	Robust SE	Coeff.	Robust SE
Weekend work	-0.134**	0.023	-0.178**	0.021
Age group (ref. = 15-24)				
25-34 years	0.030	0.036	-0.028	0.035
35-44 years	-0.071	0.053	-0.068	0.049
45-54 years	-0.140*	0.067	-0.061	0.062
55-64 years	-0.101	0.082	-0.064	0.076
65 years or more	0.194	0.107	0.145	0.095
Partnered	0.025	0.027	-0.066*	0.027
Age of youngest child (ref. = No children)				
<5	-0.060	0.033	-0.059*	0.027
5 to 14	-0.089**	0.033	-0.011	0.029
Dependent aged 15 to 24	-0.101**	0.035	-0.041	0.033
Youngest child is independent	-0.005	0.040	-0.004	0.039
Work limiting long-term health condition	-0.109**	0.029	-0.144**	0.028
Highest education attainment (ref. = Year 11 or lower)				
Year 12	-0.241**	0.054	-0.208**	0.058
Trade qualification or diploma	-0.193**	0.059	-0.187**	0.060
Degree or higher	-0.379**	0.073	-0.526**	0.084
Full-time student	0.189**	0.038	0.182**	0.042
Occupation (ref. = Labourers)				
Managers	0.134*	0.057	0.060	0.039
Professionals	0.277**	0.057	0.155**	0.042
Technicians & trades workers	0.272**	0.067	0.141**	0.036
Community & personal service workers	0.164**	0.055	0.122*	0.056
Clerical & administrative workers	0.380**	0.057	0.092*	0.045
Sales workers	0.176**	0.058	0.031	0.049
Machinery operators & drivers	0.453**	0.095	0.094*	0.042
Usual weekly hours of work (in main job)	0.039**	0.006	0.031**	0.004
Hours squared ($\times 10^3$)	-0.928**	0.096	-0.609**	0.044
Employment contract (ref. = Permanent)				
Fixed-term contract employee	0.012	0.025	0.023	0.026
Casual employee	-0.264**	0.028	-0.289**	0.030
Self-employed	-0.066	0.046	-0.132**	0.036
Other	-0.029	0.101	-0.065	0.101
Work schedule (ref. = Regular daytime)				
Regular nights or evenings	-0.308**	0.045	-0.414**	0.044
Shift work	-0.346**	0.031	-0.288**	0.034
On call or irregular	-0.305**	0.029	-0.313**	0.027
Job tenure (ref. = <1 year)				
1 to <2 years	-0.095**	0.023	-0.111**	0.022
2 to <5 years	-0.132**	0.020	-0.191**	0.019
5 to <10 years	-0.180**	0.024	-0.266**	0.023

10 to < 20 years	-0.241**	0.031	-0.358**	0.028
20 or more years	-0.305**	0.046	-0.450**	0.038
% of weekly work hours worked from home (ref. = Zero)				
1 to 19%	-0.072**	0.026	-0.042*	0.021
20-39%	-0.128**	0.032	-0.076*	0.031
40-59%	-0.018	0.041	0.030	0.042
60-79%	0.073	0.051	0.016	0.051
80-99%	0.177**	0.066	0.056	0.060
100%	0.136**	0.038	0.068	0.040
Hours vary	-0.120	0.065	0.053	0.060
Multiple job holder	-0.082**	0.026	-0.068*	0.029
Has supervisory responsibilities	-0.066**	0.018	-0.080**	0.016
Trade union member	-0.102**	0.025	-0.023	0.025
Employer (firm) size (ref. = <20)				
20-99 employees	-0.056	0.030	-0.051	0.027
100 to 499 employees	-0.072*	0.035	-0.065*	0.032
500 or more employees	-0.120**	0.030	-0.072*	0.030
Unknown	-0.134**	0.038	-0.006	0.042
Industry (ref. = Manufacturing)				
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	0.254*	0.100	0.022	0.073
Mining	0.203	0.136	0.287**	0.074
Electricity, gas, water & waste services	0.213	0.156	0.058	0.083
Construction	0.130	0.083	0.004	0.041
Wholesale trade	-0.074	0.072	-0.021	0.044
Retail trade	-0.232**	0.063	-0.175**	0.051
Accommodation & food services	-0.363**	0.067	-0.365**	0.061
Transport, postal and warehousing	0.065	0.085	-0.148**	0.053
Information media & telecommunication	-0.008	0.097	0.006	0.076
Financial and insurance services	0.062	0.085	-0.018	0.072
Rental, hiring and real estate services	0.068	0.101	-0.082	0.093
Professional, scientific & technical	-0.094	0.065	-0.046	0.047
Administrative and support services	0.029	0.072	0.082	0.058
Public administration and training	0.158*	0.071	0.088	0.058
Education and training	0.044	0.070	-0.008	0.068
Health care and social assistance	0.070	0.062	0.216**	0.062
Arts and recreation services	-0.184*	0.088	0.042	0.076
Other services	-0.034	0.075	-0.040	0.058
Public sector	0.024	0.032	0.257**	0.039
Location (ref. = Major city)				
Inner regional	0.022	0.038	0.024	0.037
Outer regional or remote	0.070	0.060	0.110	0.061
State (ref. = NSW)				
Victoria	0.060	0.083	0.071	0.077
Queensland	0.043	0.074	-0.098	0.075
South Australia	0.182	0.130	0.019	0.109
Western Australia	0.212	0.121	0.047	0.120
Tasmania	0.043	0.171	-0.063	0.158
Northern Territory	0.287	0.166	0.039	0.154
Australian Capital Territory	0.236	0.127	0.203	0.109
Survey wave (ref. = Wave 24)				

Wave 4	-0.470**	0.064	-0.588**	0.057
Wave 5	-0.461**	0.061	-0.570**	0.055
Wave 6	-0.472**	0.058	-0.564**	0.053
Wave 7	-0.457**	0.057	-0.492**	0.051
Wave 8	-0.426**	0.055	-0.462**	0.049
Wave 9	-0.480**	0.053	-0.518**	0.047
Wave 10	-0.458**	0.051	-0.499**	0.046
Wave 11	-0.439**	0.048	-0.411**	0.043
Wave 12	-0.357**	0.046	-0.364**	0.041
Wave 13	-0.370**	0.044	-0.373**	0.040
Wave 14	-0.375**	0.044	-0.380**	0.039
Wave 15	-0.327**	0.042	-0.365**	0.037
Wave 16	-0.337**	0.040	-0.286**	0.036
Wave 17	-0.323**	0.038	-0.299**	0.035
Wave 18	-0.240**	0.037	-0.241**	0.034
Wave 19	-0.256**	0.036	-0.206**	0.032
Wave 20	-0.103**	0.034	-0.052	0.031
Wave 21	-0.073*	0.033	-0.023	0.031
Wave 22	-0.022	0.032	-0.035	0.029
Wave 23	0.010	0.029	-0.019	0.026
Constant	7.978**	0.144	8.131**	0.124
Observations	100,344		105,925	
Individuals	12,922		13,137	
F	19.42**		23.21**	
Rho	0.460		0.496	
Overall R-squared	0.071		0.064	

** and * denote statistical significance at the .01 and 0.05 levels, respectively.

Rho is the fraction of the variance in the dependent variable attributable to the individual fixed effects.

TABLE S5

Weekend Work and Satisfaction with Flexibility to Balance Work and Non-work
Commitments by Gender: Detailed Two-Way Fixed Effects Regression Results

	Women		Men	
	Coeff.	Robust SE	Coeff.	Robust SE
Weekend work	-0.152**	0.024	-0.178**	0.022
Age group (ref. = 15-24)				
25-34 years	-0.003	0.040	0.070	0.040
35-44 years	-0.055	0.059	0.060	0.055
45-54 years	-0.085	0.074	0.083	0.069
55-64 years	-0.110	0.090	0.049	0.084
65 years or more	-0.004	0.115	-0.037	0.104
Partnered	-0.009	0.029	-0.047	0.030
Age of youngest child (ref. = No children)				
<5	-0.277**	0.036	-0.085**	0.030
5 to 14	-0.120**	0.036	-0.048	0.033
Dependent aged 15 to 24	-0.063	0.037	-0.002	0.035
Youngest child is independent	-0.001	0.041	0.010	0.042
Work limiting long-term health condition	-0.136**	0.030	-0.105**	0.029
Highest education attainment (ref. = Year 11 or lower)				
Year 12	0.095	0.051	0.035	0.060
Trade qualification or diploma	0.109	0.057	-0.028	0.067
Degree or higher	-0.052	0.075	-0.234**	0.087
Full-time student	-0.075*	0.038	-0.044	0.043
Occupation (ref. = Labourers)				
Managers	0.064	0.056	0.103*	0.043
Professionals	0.097	0.056	0.072	0.046
Technicians & trades workers	0.102	0.071	0.038	0.040
Community & personal service workers	0.000	0.054	0.032	0.059
Clerical & administrative workers	0.196**	0.055	0.032	0.051
Sales workers	0.111*	0.057	0.085	0.050
Machinery operators & drivers	0.238*	0.093	0.047	0.047
Usual weekly hours of work (in main job)	-0.024**	0.004	-0.022**	0.003
Hours squared ($\times 10^3$)	-0.210**	0.060	-0.146**	0.037
Employment contract (ref. = Permanent)				
Fixed-term contract employee	-0.003	0.029	-0.074**	0.029
Casual employee	0.152**	0.028	0.007	0.032
Self-employed	0.316**	0.047	0.235**	0.039
Other	0.062	0.094	0.046	0.115
Work schedule (ref. = Regular daytime)				
Regular nights or evenings	-0.127**	0.041	-0.226**	0.044
Shift work	-0.234**	0.033	-0.227**	0.037
On call or irregular	-0.099**	0.028	-0.149**	0.028
Job tenure (ref. = <1 year)				
1 to <2 years	-0.031	0.024	0.010	0.024
2 to <5 years	0.000	0.020	0.026	0.021
5 to <10 years	-0.042	0.026	-0.026	0.026

10 to < 20 years	-0.126**	0.033	-0.073*	0.031
20 or more years	-0.169**	0.049	-0.139**	0.041
% of weekly work hours worked from home (ref. = Zero)				
1 to 19%	0.107**	0.029	0.151**	0.022
20-39%	0.261**	0.034	0.262**	0.031
40-59%	0.519**	0.043	0.391**	0.039
60-79%	0.693**	0.049	0.503**	0.049
80-99%	0.664**	0.057	0.511**	0.059
100%	0.565**	0.038	0.436**	0.041
Hours vary	0.309**	0.068	0.288**	0.060
Multiple job holder	-0.238**	0.028	-0.182**	0.032
Has supervisory responsibilities	-0.062**	0.019	-0.047**	0.018
Trade union member	-0.201**	0.027	-0.130**	0.027
Employer (firm) size (ref. = <20)				
20-99 employees	-0.152**	0.033	-0.200**	0.031
100 to 499 employees	-0.162**	0.036	-0.228**	0.035
500 or more employees	-0.244**	0.032	-0.261**	0.033
Unknown	-0.189**	0.039	-0.262**	0.046
Industry (ref. = Manufacturing)				
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	0.094	0.107	0.099	0.083
Mining	-0.012	0.152	0.108	0.083
Electricity, gas, water & waste services	0.108	0.158	-0.037	0.092
Construction	0.045	0.087	-0.020	0.049
Wholesale trade	-0.110	0.074	-0.003	0.051
Retail trade	-0.192**	0.065	-0.195**	0.055
Accommodation & food services	-0.279**	0.069	-0.296**	0.069
Transport, postal and warehousing	-0.052	0.098	-0.180**	0.058
Information media & telecommunication	0.026	0.107	0.035	0.079
Financial and insurance services	-0.028	0.093	0.036	0.075
Rental, hiring and real estate services	-0.088	0.110	0.191*	0.093
Professional, scientific & technical	-0.011	0.066	0.070	0.050
Administrative and support services	-0.021	0.072	0.112	0.065
Public administration and training	0.132	0.074	-0.004	0.065
Education and training	-0.236**	0.074	-0.124	0.075
Health care and social assistance	0.000	0.065	0.175*	0.074
Arts and recreation services	-0.155	0.090	0.070	0.074
Other services	0.050	0.078	-0.040	0.064
Public sector	0.005	0.035	0.148**	0.043
Location (ref. = Major city)				
Inner regional	0.079	0.045	-0.006	0.042
Outer regional or remote	0.068	0.065	0.000	0.067
State (ref. = NSW)				
Victoria	0.163	0.096	0.094	0.089
Queensland	0.043	0.083	-0.100	0.080
South Australia	0.247	0.136	0.097	0.136
Western Australia	0.020	0.129	-0.112	0.136
Tasmania	0.018	0.171	0.120	0.178
Northern Territory	0.311	0.187	-0.071	0.167
Australian Capital Territory	0.151	0.133	0.163	0.101
Survey wave (ref. = Wave 24)				

Wave 4	-0.155*	0.068	-0.388**	0.064
Wave 5	-0.254**	0.066	-0.327**	0.060
Wave 6	-0.215**	0.063	-0.311**	0.058
Wave 7	-0.120*	0.061	-0.257**	0.056
Wave 8	-0.179**	0.059	-0.269**	0.054
Wave 9	-0.206**	0.057	-0.269**	0.052
Wave 10	-0.180**	0.055	-0.277**	0.050
Wave 11	-0.124*	0.052	-0.211**	0.047
Wave 12	-0.100*	0.050	-0.205**	0.046
Wave 13	-0.107*	0.047	-0.224**	0.044
Wave 14	-0.128**	0.046	-0.225**	0.042
Wave 15	-0.142**	0.045	-0.249**	0.040
Wave 16	-0.176**	0.043	-0.191**	0.039
Wave 17	-0.151**	0.042	-0.243**	0.039
Wave 18	-0.038	0.040	-0.151**	0.037
Wave 19	-0.106**	0.039	-0.149**	0.035
Wave 20	-0.089*	0.038	-0.053	0.034
Wave 21	-0.104**	0.036	-0.082*	0.033
Wave 22	-0.018	0.035	-0.033	0.032
Wave 23	0.002	0.033	-0.044	0.030
Constant	8.909**	0.140	9.136**	0.127
Observations	100,278		105,845	
Individuals	12,918		13,134	
F	31.14**		26.42**	
Rho	0.455		0.499	
Overall R-squared	0.101		0.089	

** and * denote statistical significance at the .01 and 0.05 levels, respectively.

Rho is the fraction of the variance in the dependent variable attributable to the individual fixed effects.

TABLE S6

Weekend Work and Overall Job Satisfaction by Gender: Detailed Two-Way Fixed Effects
Regression Results

	Women		Men	
	Coeff.	Robust SE	Coeff.	Robust SE
Weekend work	0.042*	0.019	0.021	0.016
Age group (ref. = 15-24)				
25-34 years	-0.019	0.030	-0.073**	0.028
35-44 years	-0.041	0.043	-0.049	0.040
45-54 years	-0.058	0.056	-0.034	0.052
55-64 years	-0.045	0.068	-0.022	0.063
65 years or more	0.135	0.085	0.148	0.079
Partnered	-0.022	0.022	-0.071**	0.022
Age of youngest child (ref. = No children)				
<5	0.002	0.025	-0.045*	0.022
5 to 14	0.015	0.025	-0.016	0.024
Dependent aged 15 to 24	0.013	0.027	-0.050	0.027
Youngest child is independent	0.028	0.030	-0.026	0.032
Work limiting long-term health condition	-0.182**	0.023	-0.178**	0.023
Highest education attainment (ref. = Year 11 or lower)				
Year 12	-0.179**	0.039	-0.202**	0.044
Trade qualification or diploma	-0.151**	0.044	-0.255**	0.049
Degree or higher	-0.354**	0.056	-0.436**	0.066
Full-time student	0.148**	0.029	0.198**	0.032
Occupation (ref. = Labourers)				
Managers	0.219**	0.046	0.216**	0.032
Professionals	0.325**	0.046	0.229**	0.034
Technicians & trades workers	0.286**	0.055	0.150**	0.030
Community & personal service workers	0.247**	0.045	0.312**	0.044
Clerical & administrative workers	0.256**	0.046	0.096**	0.037
Sales workers	0.152**	0.046	0.049	0.038
Machinery operators & drivers	0.323**	0.083	0.041	0.034
Usual weekly hours of work (in main job)	0.003	0.002	0.005*	0.002
Hours squared ($\times 10^3$)	-0.128**	0.027	-0.083**	0.021
Employment contract (ref. = Permanent)				
Fixed-term contract employee	-0.013	0.020	-0.052*	0.021
Casual employee	-0.031	0.022	-0.150**	0.024
Self-employed	0.117**	0.035	0.030	0.029
Other	-0.018	0.079	0.011	0.087
Work schedule (ref. = Regular daytime)				
Regular nights or evenings	-0.067*	0.032	-0.135**	0.033
Shift work	-0.129**	0.025	-0.078**	0.025
On call or irregular	-0.083**	0.021	-0.090**	0.021
Job tenure (ref. = <1 year)				
1 to <2 years	-0.131**	0.018	-0.155**	0.018
2 to <5 years	-0.214**	0.016	-0.209**	0.015
5 to <10 years	-0.282**	0.019	-0.313**	0.019

10 to < 20 years	-0.392**	0.025	-0.385**	0.023
20 or more years	-0.489**	0.036	-0.484**	0.030
% of weekly work hours worked from home (ref. = Zero)				
1 to 19%	0.068**	0.020	0.085**	0.016
20-39%	0.085**	0.023	0.100**	0.023
40-59%	0.185**	0.031	0.162**	0.031
60-79%	0.228**	0.039	0.154**	0.038
80-99%	0.301**	0.048	0.208**	0.046
100%	0.232**	0.029	0.140**	0.031
Hours vary	0.088	0.053	0.178**	0.049
Multiple job holder	-0.149**	0.021	-0.056*	0.023
Has supervisory responsibilities	-0.009	0.014	0.017	0.013
Trade union member	-0.104**	0.019	-0.020	0.020
Employer (firm) size (ref. = <20)				
20-99 employees	-0.086**	0.025	-0.047*	0.023
100 to 499 employees	-0.137**	0.028	-0.044	0.026
500 or more employees	-0.169**	0.025	-0.053*	0.024
Unknown	-0.153**	0.030	-0.082*	0.036
Industry (ref. = Manufacturing)				
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	0.098	0.089	0.076	0.062
Mining	0.112	0.105	0.260**	0.055
Electricity, gas, water & waste services	0.148	0.142	0.126	0.068
Construction	0.164*	0.071	0.096**	0.035
Wholesale trade	-0.054	0.063	0.003	0.039
Retail trade	-0.153**	0.052	-0.127**	0.041
Accommodation & food services	-0.389**	0.056	-0.331**	0.049
Transport, postal and warehousing	0.050	0.077	-0.008	0.043
Information media & telecommunication	0.014	0.084	-0.050	0.060
Financial and insurance services	0.033	0.073	0.050	0.062
Rental, hiring and real estate services	-0.098	0.081	0.025	0.075
Professional, scientific & technical	-0.056	0.054	0.055	0.039
Administrative and support services	-0.071	0.061	0.023	0.052
Public administration and training	0.191**	0.060	0.100*	0.049
Education and training	0.144*	0.059	0.088	0.057
Health care and social assistance	0.115*	0.053	0.222**	0.053
Arts and recreation services	0.085	0.071	0.135*	0.059
Other services	0.104	0.063	0.013	0.047
Public sector	0.102**	0.025	0.221**	0.031
Location (ref. = Major city)				
Inner regional	0.053	0.032	0.031	0.030
Outer regional or remote	0.082	0.048	0.062	0.045
State (ref. = NSW)				
Victoria	0.034	0.070	0.103	0.066
Queensland	0.093	0.063	-0.093	0.060
South Australia	0.041	0.108	0.011	0.100
Western Australia	0.068	0.108	0.036	0.096
Tasmania	-0.093	0.148	-0.066	0.167
Northern Territory	0.068	0.126	0.011	0.107
Australian Capital Territory	0.190	0.100	0.095	0.083
Survey wave (ref. = Wave 24)				

Wave 4	-0.323**	0.052	-0.363**	0.047
Wave 5	-0.350**	0.050	-0.392**	0.045
Wave 6	-0.293**	0.048	-0.374**	0.043
Wave 7	-0.269**	0.046	-0.336**	0.042
Wave 8	-0.260**	0.044	-0.331**	0.041
Wave 9	-0.330**	0.043	-0.331**	0.039
Wave 10	-0.303**	0.041	-0.341**	0.038
Wave 11	-0.250**	0.039	-0.309**	0.036
Wave 12	-0.242**	0.037	-0.295**	0.034
Wave 13	-0.243**	0.036	-0.297**	0.032
Wave 14	-0.193**	0.034	-0.275**	0.031
Wave 15	-0.200**	0.033	-0.295**	0.030
Wave 16	-0.227**	0.032	-0.210**	0.029
Wave 17	-0.177**	0.031	-0.216**	0.028
Wave 18	-0.135**	0.029	-0.189**	0.027
Wave 19	-0.108**	0.028	-0.131**	0.026
Wave 20	-0.042	0.027	-0.046	0.025
Wave 21	-0.024	0.027	0.020	0.024
Wave 22	-0.008	0.026	0.000	0.023
Wave 23	0.010	0.024	0.002	0.021
Constant	8.230**	0.105	8.249**	0.097
Observations	100,329		105,925	
Individuals	12,920		13,138	
F	15.31**		14.82**	
Rho	0.497		0.527	
Overall R-squared	0.023		0.020	

** and * denote statistical significance at the .01 and 0.05 levels, respectively.

Rho is the fraction of the variance in the dependent variable attributable to the individual fixed effects.

TABLE S7

Weekend Work and Job Satisfaction by Gender: Fixed Effects Ordered Logit Results
Summary

	Weekend work variable		N		Pseudo R ²	Log likelihood	Wald chi ²
	β	SE	Obs.	Persons			
<i>Males</i>							
Satisfaction with:							
(1) Pay	0.128**	0.025	101,825	10,036	0.032	-165,899.4	1759.1**
(2) Job security	0.056*	0.025	99,953	9,726	0.046	-158,206.6	2703.0**
(3) Work itself	0.043	0.025	101,391	9,922	0.026	-143,468.1	1532.4**
(4) Hours of work	-0.203**	0.025	101,954	10,063	0.048	-168,507.3	2385.0**
(5) Flexibility	-0.204**	0.025	101,177	9,924	0.047	-178,613.2	2655.6**
(6) Job overall	0.033	0.025	101,357	9,906	0.025	-130,145.7	1485.3**
<i>Females</i>							
Satisfaction with:							
(7) Pay	0.028	0.027	96,346	9,885	0.028	-167,127.7	1501.0**
(8) Job security	0.159**	0.028	94,737	9,579	0.054	-153,022.5	3024.3**
(9) Work itself	0.131**	0.027	96,144	9,800	0.029	-145,664.2	1636.7**
(10) Hours of work	-0.136**	0.026	96,455	9,881	0.045	-170,798.1	1897.7**
(11) Flexibility	-0.164**	0.027	95,731	9,715	0.054	-173,248.7	3018.6**
(12) Job overall	0.060*	0.028	95,856	9,723	0.024	-129,306.7	1508.4**

All models include control variables, as listed in Table 1.

The standard errors (SE) are cluster-robust.

** and * denote statistical significance at the .01 and 0.05 levels, respectively.

