

Family Structure, Usual and Preferred Working Hours, and Egalitarianism in Australia *

Robert Drago

**Department of Labor Studies and Industrial Relations
Pennsylvania State University**

Yi-Ping Tseng and Mark Wooden

**Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research
The University of Melbourne**

Melbourne Institute Working Paper No. 1/04

ISSN 1328-4991 (Print)

ISSN 1447-5863 (Online)

ISBN 0 7340 3143 2

February 2004

* This paper is based on research being undertaken as part of the research program “The Dynamics of Economic and Social Change: An Analysis of the Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia Survey”. It is supported by an Australian Research Council Discovery Grant (DP0342970). The authors are grateful to Janeen Baxter for helpful comments and advice.

The paper uses the data in the confidentialised unit record file from the Department of Family and Community Services’ (FaCS) Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia Survey, which is managed by the Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research. The findings and views reported in the paper, however, are those of the authors and should not be attributed to either FaCS or the Melbourne Institute.

Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research

The University of Melbourne

Victoria 3010 Australia

Telephone (03) 8344 5330

Fax (03) 8344 5630

Email melb-inst@unimelb.edu.au

WWW Address <http://www.melbourneinstitute.com>

Abstract

Data from a representative survey of adult Australians are analysed for usual and preferred working time across family types. We discover a time divide regardless of gender and family type: many short hours individuals desire longer hours of employment, while many long hours individuals prefer shorter hours. The latter group is larger such that the average employee desires fewer hours across family types, with the exception of lone mothers. For dual-earner couples with children, men average approximately 20 hours more per week than women, a difference that would only decline to 18 hours per week if preferred hours were realized. However, approximately one-fifth of these couples exhibited egalitarian or nearly equal working hours. Egalitarian couples averaged a combined 84 hours per week of employment, tended to share the care of children, were more likely to be non-Australian born, and included marked numbers of women holding degrees and in professional occupations.

1. Background

Most research on work and family, and on working time, informs us about experiences in the United States. There is much to be learned from moving beyond the borders of the U.S. and examining relevant issues in other countries, such as Australia. Patterns of family structure and of paid working time in Australia and the U.S. exhibit some similar trends but also marked divergence. On the demographic front, both societies have witnessed a long-term increase in rates of divorce and cohabitation, along with declining marriage rates and the expansion of lone parent families. For example, 11 percent of Australian children lived in single-parent families as of 1982, a figure that had climbed to 18 percent by 1997. In the U.S., eight percent of dependent children lived in a single-parent family as of 1950, while 28 percent of children did so in 1998.ⁱ

In the labor market, both nations have experienced the massive entrance of women and mothers into the labor force. In the U.S., the percentage of wives employed rose from 24 percent in 1950 to 60 percent as of 1999, while the percentage of mothers who are employed more than quadrupled during the same period, such that almost two-thirds of all mothers of preschoolers are in the labor force. In Australia, the participation rate of wives rose from 29 percent in 1966 to 58 percent by 2002, and 48 percent of all female lone parents of dependent children are now employed.ⁱⁱ

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

Drago (2000) presents evidence that working hours polarization in the U.S. is related to a “time divide”, such that many employees working long hours prefer shorter hours, and many of those working part-time desire longer hours (see also Jacobs & Gerson, 2001). It seems unlikely that employees sought out the polarization in working time that exists given

the time divide, and instead that the changing structure of jobs and employer preferences explain the result. We document the extent of time divides in Australia below.

The time divide can be conceived as a simple difference between preferred and actual working hours resulting from constraints on employers. For example, assembly line technologies may dictate certain structures of working time, or consumer expectations of around-the-clock service may limit the potential combinations of working hours for various employees. Alternatively, if the fixed costs of employment are very high, long hours of employment will be required to recoup these fixed costs, explaining the prevalence of long hours among some employees who would otherwise prefer more moderate hours.

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

The ideal worker norm will likely clash with other norms, particularly historical norms around working weeks of 40 (or 38) hours. Such norms are enshrined in the U.S. Fair Labor Standards Act. In Australia similar standards have long existed in industrial awards. Covering around 80 percent of all Australian employees (Joint Governments’ Submission 2000, Table 5.12, p. 104), awards are documents that are close to U.S. collective bargaining agreements in the level of detail regarding pay, benefits and working conditions, and typically presume a 38 or 40 hour workweek as a norm.ⁱⁱⁱ Recognizing these norms is crucial for our analysis because they can explain why many employees anchor their stated hours preferences around the 40 hour week.^{iv}

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

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

Becker (1986) provides part of the explanation for the emergence of neotraditional families. He argues that the gains from specializing in employment or housework are sufficiently large that egalitarian families will suffer severe economic penalties. Becker concludes that egalitarianism, if it appears, should take the form of men specializing in employment in half of all couples, and specializing in housework in the other half, with women taking on the opposing role. To the extent this argument is relevant, as it certainly would be with some professional occupations, we might expect to encounter egalitarian families where both adults specialize in paid work, purchasing housework and child care, or we might see such families emerging where there is some expectation of divorce.

There are nonetheless crucial differences between the societies. Relevant to both the extent of the neotraditional family and of any potential time divide, rates of part-time employment among women are far higher in Australia. Although the figures are not precisely comparable, defining part-time employment as 35 hours per week or less and considering all adult women, recent figures find 14.2 percent of women in the U.S. employed part-time in 2002, while almost 24 percent of Australian women fell into that category as of August 2002. Considering only women performing paid work, 25 percent of this group worked part-time in the U.S. The comparable figure in Australia is 46 percent.^v Indeed, although women have risen rapidly as a proportion of full-time employees in the U.S. in recent decades, Bardoel, Tharenou and Ristov (2000) argue that virtually all of women’s increased labor force participation in Australia can be accounted for by the expansion of part-time jobs.

Differences in the division of household tasks mirror labor market divergence. Although equality is still distant, the U.S. has witnessed a dramatic convergence of child care time within heterosexual families, with fathers increasing time on child care. For example,

Sandberg and Hofferth (2001) report that between 1981 and 1997, fathers whose wives were not employed increased time with children from 19.97 to 22.40 hours per week, while those with employed wives increased their time from 17.01 to 22.94 hours per week.

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

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

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

Other evidence consistent with men’s changing role in the U.S., relative to Australia, comes from the gender mix of lone parents. In the U.S., men currently comprise approximately one-quarter of all lone parents (Fields and Kasper, 2000), whereas in Australia the comparable ratio is around one in seven.^{vi} The relative shift towards egalitarian outcomes in the U.S. is indeed marked.

The differences in the division of child care labor across the two societies might be traced to two causes. First, attitudes and norms may play a role, with the egalitarian dreams of second wave feminists in the U.S. leading to new preferences among women in recent

decades, along with stepped-up demands on male husbands and partners. Egalitarian beliefs thus may be more prevalent in the U.S. Second, economic incentives could contribute, since part-time employment in the U.S. is poorly remunerated relative to full-time employment, and superannuation and health insurance benefits are typically lost in any switch from full to part-time employment (Budig and England, 2001). In contrast, part-time employees in Australia have been guaranteed pay equity since the 1970s, and typically lose neither superannuation nor health insurance benefits when switching from full- to part-time employment. Further, most Australian part-timers are also “casual” employees, who are employed at-will, but receive a higher hourly wage to compensate for foregone leave entitlements.^{vii} By making part-time employment relatively attractive, Australia may shore up inequality in the division of household labor.

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

Carrington’s (2002) research on lesbian and gay families may help to explain the slightly different question of why egalitarian families are so rare in both nations. Carrington found that virtually all of these families believed in the “egalitarian myth” – that lesbian and gay families escape the dynamics of gendered power relations, so are inherently more equal. Nonetheless, the vast majority of these families exhibited an unequal division of household labor. Becker’s (1986) arguments suggest that an unequal division of labor enhances joint productivity, which may provide part of the explanation here. In addition or instead, the prevalence of the ideal worker norm, and the structure of jobs and employment may push individuals towards either very long or very short hours. In either case, the same forces creating a time divide in the U.S. and Australia may militate against egalitarian families.

If these arguments are correct, then it might require an extreme belief in egalitarianism to sustain relevant practices within any given family. Mitigating factors may also be relevant. As suggested earlier, the potential for divorce may drive both members of a couple to seek the economic security associated with full-time employment. Somewhat differently, households where grandparents or other relatives are present and available to perform child

care might facilitate full-time employment for both parents and egalitarian families as a result. We consider attitudinal data later to gauge the extent of these dynamics.

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

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

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

2. The HILDA Data

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

Households were selected into the sample by a multi-stage process. First, a random sample of 488 Census Collection Districts (CDs), based on 1996 Census boundaries, was selected from across Australia (each of which consists of approximately 200 to 250 households). Second, within each of these CDs all dwellings were fully enumerated and a sample of 22 to 34 dwellings randomly selected.^{ix} Third, given dwellings can contain more than one household, rules were devised for the selection of households within dwellings. These rules stipulated that where a dwelling contained three or fewer households, all such households should be sampled. Where there were four or more households occupying one dwelling, all households had to be enumerated and a random sample of three households obtained (based on a predetermined pattern).

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

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

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

Table 1 lists the variables used in the main analyses that follow. Most of the variables are self-explanatory. Most importantly, the usual and preferred hours questions were designed precisely for the sort of analyses performed below. Usual hours includes any paid or unpaid overtime during a typical week, and covers all jobs for multiple jobholders. The

preferred hours question asks about a comparable time period, and specifically asks the respondent to account for the possibility that income might decline if hours declined.

3. Analyses

3.1. *Families, Work Hours and Demographics*

To examine usual and preferred work hours across diverse families, we begin with a glimpse at lone individuals and lone parents. In this and all of the other samples analyzed here, men and women are treated separately. We then turn to couples, beginning with a depiction of all couples, then honing in on couples with children, and finally looking at various dual-earner couples with children. For the latter subsample, we initially consider egalitarian couples, as defined by usual work hours for each partner that are within five hours per week of the other (i.e. difference ≤ 5). Couples that are not egalitarian (i.e., difference > 5) are analyzed next. We finally consider the subset of nonegalitarian couples that express a preference for an egalitarian division of work hours.

For these analyses, it is important to note that we are not discussing the division of child care labor *per se*. However, we include information on the number of average usual weekly hours parents actively spend with their children (defined in the HILDA Survey as “playing with your children, helping them with personal care, teaching, coaching or actively supervising them, or getting them to child care, school and other activities) to consider any connection between egalitarian work hours and egalitarian child care arrangements.

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

In terms of working hours, the employed men report around five hours per week more than the employed women. Differences in average preferred hours are in fact larger, with

men working close to the hours they prefer, while the average woman in this subsample would prefer to work a little over half an hour per week less.

Turning to lone parents, these are described in Table 3. As mentioned earlier, there are relatively few lone fathers: less than one-half of one percent of the adult population. We therefore focus the discussion here on the far larger group of lone mothers. This group has an average of 1.8 children, is far younger than the lone women group, and is about average in terms of immigrant status and ESL. However, lone mothers are less educated relative to other groups of women analyzed here. They are also less likely to be employed, and less often hold professional positions where employed, relative to other women analyzed here excepting lone individuals.

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

Table 3 also includes information on average time spent with children by employed lone mothers and fathers. We focus on the employed subsample to ensure comparability with hours of employment.^x Among the employed, lone mothers average around four hours more per week of time with their child compared to lone fathers. That mothers spend more time with children is not surprising, but is striking in that these same mothers report preferences for longer hours of employment.

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

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

Within the sample of couple households lies the subsample of couples with dependent children in the home, a group that comprises just under one-third of the adult population. The characteristics of this subsample are provided in Table 5. Relative to all couples, this group has around twice as many children, is younger by the better part of a decade, is more highly educated, and is far more frequently employed, undoubtedly because fewer retirees appear in this group.

For those who are employed, average reported hours of employment are higher for fathers and (by around 1.5 hours) and lower for mothers (by over three hours) relative to work hours for all men and women in couple families covered in Table 4. This difference is suggestive of the prevalence of neotraditional families. Indeed, for those who are employed, mothers average less than 60 percent of father working hours.

In addition, the mothers average a full 10 hours more with children each week, or almost double the time spent by men. These differences in time with children are far larger than figures reported for the U.S. by Sandberg and Hofferth (2001), and suggest that neotraditional families are far more prevalent in Australia.

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

We now consider the even smaller subsample of couples with children who exhibit egalitarian working hours, as reported in Table 5. Compared to all couples with children, the women and men in this group tend to be a little older, have slightly fewer children, and are far more likely to have English as a second language. The ESL figure rises from around 14 percent for all parent couples, to over 22 percent for egalitarian couples. Other differences

include the finding that the women in egalitarian families are over 10 percent more likely to hold a degree, and are over seven percent more likely to work in a professional occupation.

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

Figures for time with children are consistent with a positive correlation between egalitarian working time arrangements and the sharing of child care. Women in the egalitarian subsample spend an average of less than 18 hours per week with their children, compared to over 22 hours for all dual-earner couples with children. Nonetheless, this connection has no basis in differences in men's behavior. Men in the couples with egalitarian working hours arrangements spend virtually the same amount of time with children (11.41 hours) as their counterparts in all dual-earner couples with children (12.12 hours).

This brief description is consistent with two possibilities regarding the causes of egalitarian families. First, the high proportion of ESL adults might be connected to either difficulties for foreign-born men in obtaining high wage jobs, or perhaps there is a greater availability of extended family or community members to perform child care, facilitating a more equal division of employment hours – anchored on full-time work, or perhaps immigrant women place greater importance on employment, regardless of the presence of children (Wooden and VandenHeuvel, 1997). Second, the job demands placed on women with higher levels of education than their partners, and with professional careers, may push the family towards egalitarian hours. In neither case does an egalitarian ethos necessarily play a major role, consistent with preferences for gender differences in hours.

Within the subsample of dual-earner couple parents, the complement of the egalitarian group with children is the nonegalitarian group where the men report more than five additional hours per week of employment relative to their partners, as reported in Table 7.^{xi} This group of neotraditional families is almost five times as large as the egalitarian subsample, and just over 17 percent of dual-earner couples with children are egalitarian.

The nonegalitarian group is slightly younger. Relative to egalitarian families, the nonegalitarian subsample has slightly more children in the household (around an extra one-third of a child per family), is Australian born around 10 percent more frequently, and less

likely to be classified as ESL. The men are slightly less educated, while the women hold a degree around 11 percent less frequently. A major switch can be seen with regard to professional employment: in the egalitarian couples, women are around seven percent more likely than the men to be professionals, while in the nonegalitarian group, men are around eight percent more likely than the women to hold such positions.

Working hours differences are even more striking, with men in the nonegalitarian subsample working around 28 hours more per week than the women. Even if preferred hours were to be realized, this difference would only shrink to around 22 hours per week.

Differences in time with child reflect the greater divergence in working hours in nonegalitarian couples, with women spending over six hours per week more with their children in these relative to the egalitarian families. Again, however, it is notable that father time with children is relatively constant regardless of working time arrangements.

The fact that preferred hours differences by gender rise from around five for the egalitarian group to over 22 for the nonegalitarian group is consistent with preferences largely being met within the labor market. However, some nonegalitarian couples may wish to be egalitarian. To consider this group, we turn in Table 8 to the subsample of nonegalitarian couples whose preferred working hours are egalitarian.

This subsample is small: just under 10 percent of nonegalitarian couples state a preference for egalitarian hours arrangements. The subsample may nonetheless provide information on who would take advantage of egalitarian opportunities if these were expanded. The group does not diverge much from other nonegalitarian couples in terms of age or number of children, is slightly less often Australian born and more often claims ESL, and exhibits elevated levels of education. More dramatic differences exist in terms of professional status: while men more often hold professional positions in most nonegalitarian families, women tend to do so in most of those with a stated preference for egalitarian hours. The figures for time with children fit these preferences. While time with children remains about constant for the men in this and other groups, the mothers here exhibit time with children (19.35 hours) closer to that found in egalitarian families (17.96) relative to non-egalitarian families (24.20).

3.2. *The Time Divide*

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

To get at potential time divides, preferred work hours are subtracted from actual hours, and these are regressed against a constant and actual work hours. If the coefficient on the constant is negative, and the coefficient on actual work hours is positive, then we can infer that low hours individuals prefer to work more, and that this difference disappears as actual hours rise. We can also calculate a zero point where the regression finds a match between preferred and actual hours. For hours beyond the zero point, the relationship between actual and preferred work hours reverses: longer hours individuals prefer shorter hours. If the zero point were, say, well over 40 hours per week, then the time divide interpretation would not be appropriate: we would simply be uncovering a stated preference for greater working hours. At the polar extreme, if the zero point were around, say, 20 hours per week, then most individuals would simply prefer shorter hours than they in fact have. The adjusted R^2 for the equation provides rough information on the strength of the time divide.^{xii}

Starting in Table 9 with the regressions for men across different family types, evidence of a time divide exists for respondents in each group: sole parents, egalitarian families, nonegalitarian families, and for the group who prefer but are not in egalitarian families. The coefficients on the constant terms are uniformly negative, the hours coefficients are positive, the zero points all lie above 20 and below 40 hours, and the lowest adjusted R^2 is .300, a reasonable fit for these regressions (see Drago, 2000). These findings are consistent with a time divide affecting men across diverse families.

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

finding is partly attributable to the construction of the subsample: these men work more hours than their partners, but would like to work the same hours.

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

Turning to results for women in Table 10, some of the time divide results are similar to those for the men. The coefficients for the constant are consistently negative, those for actual hours are all positive, the zero point is well above 20 and well below 40 hours, and the adjusted R^2 figures fit the time divide story as well. As was true for the men, the weakest evidence for a time divide comes from the subsample of women in egalitarian families. Although the coefficient on the constant is absolutely larger than for the nonegalitarian families, the coefficient on actual hours is absolutely smaller, and the adjusted R^2 figure is smaller by over ten percentage points. This interpretation of the findings – that many men and women in nonegalitarian families prefer something closer to egalitarian hours – needs to be tempered by a comparison of the zero points across Tables 9 and 10. Excepting the subsample of nonegalitarian families who wish to be egalitarian, the zero point for men is close to 40 hours per week, while that for women varies from 22 to 32 hours. By construction of the zero point, these differences imply that women working more than 32 hours per week prefer fewer hours, but this preference is not true for men until they work upwards of and beyond 40 hours per week.

A conservative interpretation of these findings is that a substantial segment of Australians, both men and women, across a variety of family types, are subject to a time divide. Many individuals who are working short hours state a preference for longer hours, and many longer hours individuals prefer shorter hours. Nonetheless, even if the time divide were eliminated, the average father would work longer hours than the average mother. As can be inferred from the earlier analysis of actual and preferred hours, the percentage of egalitarian families, out of all dual earner couples with children, would in that case rise from slightly over 17 percent, to just over 25 percent. A majority of families would maintain a neotraditional pattern.

3.3. *Miscellaneous Issues*

A final exercise involves asking about arrangements for children, attitudes and the ideologies of several of the subgroups, to explore the effects and the reasons families either are or wish to be egalitarian. For comparability, we only analyze dual-earner couples with children and employed lone parents.^{xiii} For men and separately for women, we explore how behaviors and attitudes are linked to the reality and preferences for egalitarianism.

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

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

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

Turning to marital satisfaction, rates across both men and women are highest in families that both are and prefer to be neotraditional. This result fits the argument that norms make it easier to be a neotraditional family. Supportive evidence for this interpretation comes from Deutsch's (1999) U.S. study of couples that exhibited egalitarian work and child care arrangements. After going to a great deal of trouble to identify parent couples who were egalitarian in deed as well as in words, Deutsch found that a majority of the mothers, but only a small fraction of fathers, felt "bad" about their parenting. It seems likely that the norm of motherhood remained inside the psyches of these egalitarian parents, driving the women to feel insufficiently committed to their children, while the men felt like they were spending enough time with their kids. Alternatively, it could be that specialization is efficient, such that egalitarian families suffer low marital satisfaction due to inefficiencies in such arrangements.

Turning to the related issue of satisfaction with performance as a parent, the highest levels of satisfaction for the men appear in egalitarian families (Table 11). For women, however, the highest levels appear in the families where the adults prefer but do not experience egalitarian hours. Given these women have pushed their hours with children down towards levels found for mothers in egalitarian families, these results are comforting: satisfaction with parenting is not solely related to the amount of time spent with children.

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

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

4. Discussion

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

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

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

Just under one-fifth of dual-earner couples with children exhibited egalitarian work hours – wherein men's and women's usual work hours are close (within five hours per week). The women in these couples report performing more child care than the men, child care time is somewhat more equally distributed by gender in these families, and there is some evidence of a belief in the sharing of child care among these families. Nonetheless, the women in these couples still perform more child care than the men, and the men perform no more child care in these compared to other couple families with children.

We contrasted egalitarian families with neotraditional families wherein the father performs at least five hours of additional paid work relative to the mother. In those families, the men averaged over 50 hours per week of paid work, while the women averaged less than 23 hours per week of paid work. Such families comprised over 80 percent of all Australian dual-earner couples with children.

The conditions that support egalitarian families include being foreign born and having English as a Second Language, a result that might be related to the greater availability of relatives and community members for child care, limited job opportunities for men with ESL, a more egalitarian ethos among some immigrant groups, or a high value placed upon employment among immigrant women. Only further evidence could tease out the relevant causal linkages here.

More striking were educational and occupational distinctions between egalitarian and neotraditional families. In the egalitarian families, 11 percent more women than men held degrees, while in the neotraditional families, women held degrees 2.5 percent more often. These results make it appear that women are more educated than men, something that is not true *per se*. What is instead going on is that average education levels for men and women are quite similar across all couples (see Table 4), but that women with less education tend to stay out of the labor market. Regarding occupation, in the neotraditional families, men were employed as professionals over six percent more frequently than women, while for egalitarian families, women appeared as professionals over seven percent more often than the men.^{xiv}

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

For those who believe in the neotraditional family, the evidence here provides some support. Women typically express preferences for fewer hours than men. Such families do comprise the vast majority of dual-earner couples with children, and the evidence is consistent with Becker's implication that stable families will tend to favor adults who specialize in either paid work or housework. In addition, measured marital satisfaction was highest for these couples.

Moreover, all is not sweetness and light for the egalitarian couples analyzed here. These couples averaged long hours of work – above 84 combined hours per week, compared to 74 hours in total for the dual-earner neotraditional couples. Organizations that promote the

shared care of children would view the working time of our egalitarian couples as overly long.^{xv}

For those who believe egalitarian arrangements are desirable, the results provide some rays of hope as well. Most obviously, these families already exist in substantial numbers, accounting for just under one-fifth of all dual-earner couples with children. While far from a majority, these families are no longer unusual. Further, women's continuing movement into professional careers in Australia will likely promote egalitarian families, as will expanded educational opportunities for women. Perhaps of greater importance are the opportunities that currently exist in Australia for reduced hours employment, opportunities that are far more limited in the U.S. If fathers were motivated to use such arrangements, the proportion of egalitarian families would likely rise, and without the long hours of employment associated with Australian egalitarian families at present.

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

References

- ABS. Australian Bureau of Statistics (1982). *Australian families 1982* (Catalogue no. 4408.0). Canberra: ABS.
- ABS. (1997). *Family characteristics, Australia, April 1997* (Catalogue no. 4442.0). Canberra: ABS.
- ABS. (2001). *Labour Force, Australia, Preliminary*. Catalogue No. 6202.0, May.
- ABS (2002). *Labour force, Australia, August 2002* (Catalogue no. 6203.0). Canberra: ABS.
- Bardoel, E.A., Tharenou, P., & Ristov, D. (2000). The changing composition of the Australian workforce relevant to work-family issues. *International Human Resource Issues*, 1, 58-77.
- Barnett, R.C. (1999). A new work-life model for the twenty-first century. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 562, 143-158.
- Baxter, J. (2002). Patterns of change and stability in the gender division of household labour in Australia, 1986-1997. *Journal of Sociology*, 38, 399-424.
- Becker, G.S. (1985). Human capital, effort, and the sexual division of labor. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 3, S33-S58.
- Bittman, M. (1995). Changes at the heart of family households: Family responsibilities in Australia 1974-1992. *Family Matters*, 40, 10-15.
- Budig, M.J., & England, P. (2001). The wage penalty for motherhood. *American Sociological Review*, 66, 204-225.
- Carrington, C. (2002). Domesticity and the political economy of lesbian families. In Gerstel, N., Clawson, D., & Zussman, R. (Eds.), *Families at work: Expanding the bounds*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Costa, D. (2000). The wage and the length of the working day: From the 1890s to 1991. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 156, 156-181.
- Council of Economic Advisors. (2000). *Economic report of the president*. Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Deutsch, F. (1999). *Halving it all: How equally shared parenting works*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Drago, R. (2000). Trends in working time in the U.S.: A policy perspective. *Labor Law Journal*, 51, 212-218.
- Fields, J., & Kasper, L.M. (2000). America's families and living arrangements: Population characteristics. *Current Population Reports*, P20-537, Washington DC: U.S. Census Bureau.
- Grandey, A.A. (2001). Family friendly policies: Organizational justice perceptions of need-based allocations. In Cropanzano, R. (Ed.), *Justice in the workplace: Applications*, Vol 2. Mahwah NJ: Erlbaum, pp. 145-174.
- Hochschild, A.R. (1989). *The second shift*. New York: Avon.
- Jacobs, J.A., & Gerson, K. (2001). Overworked individuals or overworked families? Explaining trends in work, leisure, and family time. *Work and Occupations*, 28, 40-63.
- Joint Governments' Submission(2000). *Safety Net Review – Wages: 1999-2000*. Canberra: Commonwealth Department of Employment, Workplace Relations and Small Business.
- Moen, P. (2000). The Career Quandary. *Reports on America* 2(1), Washington, DC: Population Reference Bureau.
- Russell, G., & Bowman, L. (2000). Work and family: Current thinking, research and practice. Background paper for the National Families Strategy. Canberra: Department of Family and Community Services.
- Sandberg, J., & Hofferth, S. (2001). Changes in children's time with parents, 1981-1997. PSC Research Report no. 01-475, University of Michigan, May. [available on-line <http://www.psc.isr.umich.edu/pubs/papers/rr01-475.pdf>]
- U.S. Census Bureau for the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2000). Current population news releases, USDL 00-333, Work experience in the population 1999. Available [on-line]: <ftp://146.142.4.23/pub/news.release/work.txt>
- Waldfoegel, J. (1998). Understanding the 'family gap' in pay for women with children. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 12, 137-156.
- Watson, N. and Wooden, M. (2002), The household, income and labour dynamics in Australia (HILDA) survey: Wave 1 survey methodology. HILDA Project Technical Paper Series No. 1/02, May 2002 (Revised September 2002), Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research, University of Melbourne.

Williams, J. (1999). *Unbending gender: Why work and family conflict and what to do about it*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wooden, M. (2001). The growth in 'unpaid' working time. *Economic Papers*, 20, 29-44.

_____, Freidin, S., & Watson, N. (2002). The household, income and labour dynamics in Australia (HILDA) survey: Wave 1. *Australian Economic Review*, 35, 339-348.

_____ and VandenHeuvel, A. (1997). Family composition and the labour supply choices of married immigrant women. *Australian Journal of Labour Economics* 1, 121-142.

Endnotes

ⁱ Australian figures from ABS (1982, 1997). U.S. figures from Council of Economic Advisors (2000, p. 166).

ⁱⁱ U.S. figures from Moen (2000, pp. 2-3), and Australian figures from ABS (2002).

ⁱⁱⁱ The 38 and 40 hour figures are both used here because many awards specify a "rostered day off" each month, such that employees work 40 hours for three weeks, then work 32 hours the next with a day off. The average is therefore 38, although the mode is 40.

^{iv} For U.S. evidence regarding such anchoring, see Drago (2000).

^v All part-time figures were constructed from U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Current Population Survey (available on-line at www.bls.gov/cps), and the Australian Bureau of Statistics (2002, Table 1), respectively.

^{vi} Calculated from ABS (2002, Table 30, p. 34).

^{vii} The "casual loading" typically involves a 20 percent higher hourly wage relative to non-casual employees in similar positions, and is specified in the awards mentioned earlier.

^{viii} The argument is slightly more complicated. In particular, mothers in the U.S. may use long hours to escape hourly wage penalties associated with part-time employment, and they

may believe that working ideal worker hours will help them to evade the wage penalty for motherhood.

^{ix} The number of selections made varied with the expected response and occupancy rates within each area.

^x Figures for time with children among the non-employed are not reported in the text. The figures for the non-employed are as follows (mean, st. dev.). For lone fathers (28.54, 6.51), lone mothers (28.49, 2.07), men in couple households with children (14.59, 1.45), women in couple households with children (30.81, 1.08). By way of comparison with figures for employed parents reported in Tables 3 and 5, reported time with children is consistently higher for the non-employed. The smallest difference is for men in couple households with children (around two and a half hours more per week when not employed), and the largest differences, of around eight hours, are for lone mothers and mothers in couple households, again with longer hours of child time associated with non-employment.

^{xi} A very small group of dual-earner couples with children, around one percent of the adult population, exhibit longer hours for the mother than the father. The characteristics of that group are very similar to those for the egalitarian families, so they are not discussed further here. See Appendix Table A1 for relevant results.

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

^{xiii} For completeness, responses to these questions for individuals in other family arrangements are reported in Appendix Tables A2 and A3.

^{xiv} There is some cause for believing that income maximization is at work here, since women with relatively greater earning power are more likely to be employed, and in egalitarian families. Something more, however, is at work, since men exhibit a similar pattern, but in far smaller numbers (see, for example, Table A1).

^{xv} See, for example, the Third Path's world-wide web site at thirdpath.org.

TABLE 1
Variables and Characteristics of the Entire Sample

<i>Characteristic</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Dev.</i>
Average age (years)	45.10	16.96
Number of children Aged under 15 years, including own child, step child and foster child.	0.63	1.07
Australian born %	0.74	0.44
English as second language % Based on responses to question: Is English the first language you learned to speak as a child?	0.13	0.34
Degree and above % Based on highest educational qualification obtained.	0.20	0.40
Urban % An urban area is any area classified as a “major city” in the Accessibility Remoteness Index of Australia used by the ABS.	0.59	0.49
Employed % Based on standard ABS labour force classification.	0.62	0.49
Professional % (emp) Employed in broad occupational grouping: managers, administrators and professionals.	0.32	0.47
Average usual working hours (emp) Usual hours worked per week, including overtime, in <u>all</u> jobs?	38.51	16.37
Average preferred working hours (emp) Preferred hours of work per week in all jobs, after taking into account how changes in hours would affect income.	36.16	14.09

TABLE 2**Characteristics of Men and Women Lone Individuals**

<i>Characteristics</i>	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>
Average age in yrs.	37.59 (0.42)	46.85 (0.50)
Number of children	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)
Australian born %	78.32 (0.94)	77.73 (0.92)
English as second language %	11.08 (0.72)	12.05 (0.72)
Degree and above %	13.65 (0.79)	20.63 (0.91)
Urban %	63.88 (1.10)	65.53 (1.06)
Employed %	64.99 (1.09)	51.41 (1.11)
Professional % (emp)	22.53 (1.19)	27.95 (1.39)
Average usual working hours (emp)	38.98 (0.44)	34.01 (0.46)
Average preferred working hours (emp)	38.72 (0.39)	33.41 (0.39)
% of entire population	14.44	15.35

Note: “(emp)” is for employed subsample. The standard error of the mean is reported in parentheses.

TABLE 3**Characteristics of Men and Women Lone Parents**

<i>Characteristic</i>	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>
Average age in yrs.	39.65 (1.05)	36.08 (0.41)
Number of children	1.48 (0.10)	1.77 (0.05)
Australian born %	75.38 (5.34)	77.97 (2.06)
English as second language %	9.23 (3.59)	11.63 (1.60)
Degree and above %	11.11 (3.96)	17.36 (1.93)
Urban %	56.92 (6.14)	57.92 (2.46)
Employed %	56.92 (6.14)	48.76 (2.49)
Professional % (emp)	30.56 (7.68)	28.93 (3.23)
Average usual time with children (emp)	16.34 (2.05)	20.15 (1.36)
Average usual working hours (emp)	43.38 (2.65)	27.75 (0.95)
Average preferred working hours (emp)	40.43 (2.03)	29.79 (0.79)
% of entire population	0.49	3.06

Note: “(emp)” is for employed subsample. The standard error of the mean is reported in parentheses.

TABLE 4**Characteristics of Men and Women in Couple Households**

<i>Characteristics</i>	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>
Average age in yrs.	48.21 (0.23)	45.35 (0.22)
Number of children	0.86 (0.02)	0.87 (0.02)
Australian born %	71.00 (0.70)	72.84 (0.67)
English as second language %	13.77 (0.53)	14.05 (0.52)
Degree and above %	20.65 (0.63)	21.73 (0.63)
Urban %	56.02 (0.76)	56.28 (0.74)
Employed %	72.74 (0.68)	56.72 (0.74)
Professional % (emp)	36.43 (0.87)	33.03 (0.93)
Average usual working hours (emp)	46.19 (0.26)	31.50 (0.31)
Average preferred working hours (emp)	42.23 (0.23)	29.03 (0.26)
% of entire population	32.14	33.82

Note: “(emp)” is for employed subsample. The standard error of the mean is reported in parentheses.

TABLE 5**Characteristics of Men and Women in Couple Households with Children**

<i>Characteristics</i>	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>
Average age in yrs.	39.89 (0.18)	37.32 (0.16)
Number of children	1.98 (0.02)	1.98 (0.02)
Australian born %	73.26 (1.03)	74.48 (0.99)
English as second language %	13.70 (0.80)	14.45 (0.79)
Degree and above %	23.86 (1.00)	25.24 (1.00)
Urban %	54.62 (1.16)	54.57 (1.12)
Employed %	89.95 (0.70)	61.41 (1.10)
Professional % (emp)	36.20 (1.18)	33.75 (1.36)
Average usual time with children (emp)	12.12 (0.29)	22.20 (0.61)
Average usual working hours (emp)	47.56 (0.33)	27.85 (0.44)
Average preferred working hours (emp)	43.67 (0.28)	26.23 (0.35)
% of entire population	13.95	14.85

Note: “(emp)” is for employed subsample. The standard error of the mean is reported in parentheses.

TABLE 6**Characteristics of Egalitarian Couples with Children, Dual-Earners Only**

<i>Characteristics</i>	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>
Average age in yrs.	41.46 (0.54)	38.83 (0.51)
Number of children	1.62 (0.05)	1.62 (0.05)
Australian born %	64.09 (3.57)	68.51 (3.45)
English as second language %	22.10 (3.08)	22.10 (3.08)
Degree and above %	29.61 (3.41)	40.56 (3.66)
Urban %	55.80 (3.69)	55.80 (3.69)
Employed %	100.00 (0.00)	100.00 (0.00)
Professional %	34.25 (3.53)	41.99 (3.67)
Average usual time with children (emp)	11.41 (0.89)	17.96 (1.48)
Average usual working hours	42.55 (0.87)	42.16 (0.87)
Average preferred working hours	40.91 (0.77)	36.09 (0.81)
% of entire population	1.37	1.37

Note: “(emp)” is for employed subsample. The standard error of the mean is reported in parentheses.

TABLE 7

Characteristics of Nonegalitarian Couples with Children (men work more than 5 hours longer than women), Dual-Earners Only

<i>Characteristics</i>	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>
Average age in yrs.	40.30 (0.23)	37.91 (0.21)
Number of children	2.02 (0.03)	2.02 (0.03)
Australian born %	78.81 (1.44)	79.55 (1.42)
English as second language %	7.93 (0.95)	8.18 (0.96)
Degree and above %	26.41 (1.56)	28.90 (1.63)
Urban %	51.43 (1.76)	51.43 (1.76)
Employed %	100.00 (0.00)	100.00 (0.00)
Professional %	40.80 (1.73)	32.84 (1.65)
Average usual time with children (emp)	11.51 (0.39)	24.20 (0.77)
Average usual working hours	50.61 (0.44)	22.69 (0.41)
Average preferred working hours	45.01 (0.39)	22.69 (0.36)
% of entire population	6.12	6.12

Note: “(emp)” is for employed subsample. The standard error of the mean is reported in parentheses.

TABLE 8

**Characteristics of Nonegalitarian Couples with Children Who Prefer Egalitarianism,
Dual-Earners Only**

<i>Characteristics</i>	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>
Average age in yrs.	41.33 (0.70)	38.48 (0.63)
Number of children	1.71 (0.09)	1.71 (0.09)
Australian born %	81.25 (3.98)	66.67 (4.81)
English as second language %	9.38 (2.97)	17.71 (3.90)
Degree and above %	30.53 (4.72)	39.58 (4.99)
Urban %	52.08 (5.10)	52.08 (5.10)
Employed %	100.00 (0.00)	100.00 (0.00)
Professional %	43.16 (5.08)	50.00 (5.10)
Average usual time with children (emp)	10.19 (1.12)	19.35 (2.07)
Average usual working hours	45.69 (1.55)	35.45 (1.40)
Average preferred working hours	36.19 (0.73)	34.66 (0.74)
% of entire population	0.73	0.73

Note: “(emp)” is for employed subsample. The standard error of the mean is reported in parentheses.

TABLE 9

Predictions of Actual less Preferred Work Hours – The Time Divide for Men in Diverse Families

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Sole Parent</i>	<i>Egalitarian Family</i>	<i>Nonegalitarian Family</i>	<i>Prefer but not Egalitarian Family</i>
Constant (s.e)	-23.72 (5.18)	-17.53 (2.25)	-17.79 (1.17)	-29.40 (2.21)
Hours coefficient (s.e.)	.615 (.112)	.451 (.051)	.464 (.023)	.852 (.046)
Zero point	38.59	38.90	38.35	34.53
Adjusted R ²	.447	.300	.317	.782
Sample size	37	181	873	96

TABLE 10

Predictions of Actual less Preferred Work Hours –The Time Divide for Women in Diverse Families

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

TABLE 11**Behavior and Attitudes of Men in Diverse Circumstances, Means (standard deviations)**

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Egalitarian Family</i>	<i>Prefer but not in Egalitarian Family</i>	<i>Prefer and in Neo-traditional Family</i>	<i>Lone Parents</i>
Difficulty juggling multiple childcare arrangements (HQ Q4 g)	1.31 (2.66)	2.26 (3.28)	1.31 (2.59)	1.73 (3.19)
Child looks after self (HQ Q7 03, hours)	.25 (.44)	.27 (.45)	.18 (.38)	.11 (.31)
Father and mother divorced or separated at any time (PQ B3a)	.20 (.40)	.22 (.42)	.15 (.36)	.30 (.46)
Marital satisfaction (SCQ B11 a)	8.40 (1.66)	8.01 (2.17)	8.51 (1.76)	...
Parental satisfaction (SCQ B11 b)	8.72 (1.31)	8.56 (1.57)	8.64 (1.55)	7.86 (2.00)
Weekly hours caring for disabled spouse/relative or elders (SCQ B16 f)	.23 (.87)	.74 (4.36)	.26 (1.68)	1.78 (7.18)
A father should be as heavily involved in the care of his children as the mother (SCQ D1 n)	5.99 (1.31)	5.66 (1.38)	5.70 (1.37)	6.19 (1.17)
Approx. # observations	180	96	715	37

TABLE 12

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

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Egalitarian Family</i>	<i>Prefer but not in Egalitarian Family</i>	<i>Prefer and in Neo-traditional Family</i>	<i>Lone Parents</i>
Difficulty juggling multiple childcare arrangements (HQ Q4 g)	1.31 (2.66)	2.26 (3.28)	1.31 (2.59)	2.14 (3.37)
Child looks after self (HQ Q7 03, hours)	.25 (.44)	.27 (.45)	.18 (.38)	.24 (.43)
Father and mother divorced or separated at any time (PQ B3a)	.22 (.41)	.22 (.42)	.19 (.40)	.30 (.46)
Marital satisfaction (SCQ B11 a)	7.88 (2.33)	8.06 (2.28)	8.30 (1.93)	...
Parental satisfaction (SCQ B11 b)	8.65 (1.59)	8.84 (1.34)	8.81 (1.35)	8.45 (1.71)
Weekly hours caring for disabled spouse/relative or elders (SCQ B16 f)	.51 (2.61)	2.24 (13.98)	.49 (2.44)	.51 (1.75)
A father should be as heavily involved in the care of his children as the mother (SCQ D1 n)	6.22 (1.17)	6.09 (1.19)	5.76 (1.31)	6.17 (1.18)
Approx. # Observations	181	96	718	196

TABLE A1

**Characteristics of Nonegalitarian Couples with Children (women work more than 5
hours longer than men), Dual-Earners Only**

<i>Characteristics</i>	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>
Average age in yrs.	42.52	40.00 (0.79)
Number of children	1.65	1.65 (0.10)
Australian born %	78.26	69.57 (5.54)
English as second language %	11.59	17.39 (4.56)
Degree and above %	27.54	42.65 (6.00)
Urban %	52.17	52.17 (6.01)
Employed %	100.00	100.00 (0.00)
Professional %	34.78	47.83 (6.01)
Average usual time with children (emp)	11.27	15.26 (1.82)
Average usual working hours	32.97	50.41 (1.98)
Average preferred working hours	34.06	38.25 (1.80)
% of entire population	0.52	0.52

Note: “(emp)” is for employed subsample. The standard error of the mean is reported in parentheses.

TABLE A2**Attitudes and Behavior of Fathers in Single- and No-earner Couples**

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

TABLE A3**Attitudes and Behavior of Mothers in Single- and No-Earner Couples and Lone Parent****Non-employed Families**

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Couple, Only Man Employed</i>	<i>Couple, Only Woman Employed</i>	<i>Couple, Neither Employed</i>	<i>Lone, Non- employed Mothers</i>
Difficulty juggling multiple childcare arrangements (HQ Q4 g)	.55 (1.91)	.87 (2.33)	.55 (1.95)	1.08 (2.74)
Child looks after self (HQ Q7 03, hours)	.15 (.38)	.25 (.50)	...	.33 (.58)
Father and mother divorced or separated at any time (PQ B3a)	.26 (.44)	.28 (.46)	.20 (.40)	.41 (.49)
Marital satisfaction (SCQ B11 a)	8.46 (1.94)	8.19 (2.14)	8.78 (1.99)	
Parental satisfaction (SCQ B11 b)	9.14 (1.18)	8.71 (1.69)	9.37 (.96)	8.76 (1.66)
Weekly hours caring for disabled spouse/relative or elders (SCQ B16 f)	1.16 (7.67)	4.23 (16.08)	3.09 (12.16)	2.84 (13.19)
A father should be as heavily involved in the care of his children as the mother (SCQ D1 n)	5.73 (1.41)	6.13 (1.52)	5.92 (1.46)	5.92 (1.49)
Approx. # observations	530	43	114	186