Is Women's Work Never Done?
Gender Differences in Total Work Time in Australia and the United States

Liana C. Sayer, Ohio State University

Paula England, Northwestern University

Michael Bittman, University of New South Wales

Suzanne M. Bianchi, University of Maryland

September 29, 2004

Paper submitted to the Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America, Boston, Mass., April 2004. Address correspondence to Liana Sayer, Department of Sociology, The Ohio State University, 344 Bricker Hall, 190 N. Oval Mall, Columbus, OH 43210, sayer.12@sociology.osu.edu, 614-292-8402.

Is Women's Work Never Done?
Gender Differences in Total Work Time in Australia and the United States

ABSTRACT

Empirical analyses of gender differences in total work time appear to debunk the conventional wisdom that women work more than men. U.S. and international studies report, however, that while gender differences in total work load are relatively small, the gender penalty varies across countries (Bittman and Wajcman 2000; Gershuny 2000). Given the substantial cross-national variation in work and family policies and efforts by the state to reduce gender inequality, it is plausible that macrosociological differences in gendered expectations about the organization of work and family are associated with cross-national variation in the second shift and in total work time. Yet, our understanding of the processes associated with macro variation is quite limited. The main contribution of our analysis is its comparative examination of whether total work time varies by couple employment status and parental status and whether the processes that alter the second shift and total work time vary cross-nationally. To address these questions we analyze data from Australian and U.S. time diary surveys collected in the late 1990s and 2000. In preliminary analyses we find that women's full-time employment is associated with longer total work hours more so in the U.S. than Australia, due to greater gender specialization in work in Australia. In both countries, having young children carries a time penalty in that they increase women's and men's total work load. Additionally, men's unpaid work time appears to respond more to the presence of children than it does to changes in levels of women's employment.

"Feminism: The Movement That Brought Women More Work." An unlikely popular slogan to be sure, but nonetheless, the statement is at the heart of criticism leveled by some against the feminist movement of the 1960s.[1] The widespread movement of women into paid work, and the lack of equivalent movement among men into unpaid work, has been interpreted as evidence that women have added a shift of paid work to a shift of unpaid work and thus are putting in two work shifts versus one shift worked by men (Hochschild 1989). The popular and scholarly literature is replete with anecdotes about time pressured women bearing a double burden of domestic labor and paid employment. Have women exchanged the "problem with no name," identified by Betty Friedan in *The Feminine Mystique* (Friedan 1963) for the problem of no time? Or is the story a bit more complex?

The few empirical analyses of gender differences in total work time in the United States (e.g. paid work plus unpaid work) appear to debunk the conventional wisdom that women work more than men. To be sure, the studies indicate that women spend more time doing housework and child care than men, but they also indicate that women spend less time doing paid work than men. As a result, the combined amount of time spent in paid and unpaid work seems to be roughly equal (Blau 1998; Robinson and Godbey 1999; Zick and McCullough 1991). International studies also report that gender differences in total work load are relatively small (Bittman and Wajcman 2000; Gershuny 2000). They indicate, however, that the gender penalty varies across countries, ranging from a 5 hour higher weekly work load for Italian women compared to Italian men to a 2.5 hour weekly higher work load for men compared to women in the Netherlands. Given the substantial cross-national variation in work and family policies and

[1] "That may be feeding some of the backlash against feminism among some women. People are saying that all feminism ever got us was more work." Heidi Hartmann, interview with Steven A. Holmes, *Is This What Women Want?*, New York Times, December 15, 1996.

efforts by the state to guarantee social rights for individuals and reduce gender inequality (Sainsbury 1999a), it is plausible that macrosociological differences in gendered expectations about the organization of work and family are associated with cross-national variation in the second shift and thus total work time. Our understanding of the processes associated with macro variation is quite limited, however, because past research has typically simply reported total work time rather than delving into national variation in the constitution and maintenance of gender inequality, particularly in the unequal division of paid and unpaid work (Shaver 1998).

The main contribution of our analysis is its comparative examination of whether total work time varies by couple employment status and parental status and, whether the processes that alter the second shift (e.g. those that change women's and/or men's time allocations) vary cross-nationally. To address these questions we analyze data from Australian and U.S. time diary surveys collected in the late 1990s and 2000. The contrasts and similarities between Australia and the United States in levels of gender inequality, state support for families and children, and norms about the appropriate division of paid and unpaid work between women and men, offer a fruitful context for exploring whether macro-level differences in gender relations translate into differences in the second shift. We include time in "primary" paid and unpaid work activities (e.g. those activities that are the major focus of attention) and time in "secondary" work activities (e.g. those activities done simultaneously with a primary activity). Prior research on time use has conceptualized the 24-hour day as the "ultimate constraint" on human activity (Juster 1999). However, people may circumvent the 24-hour constraint by "stretching" their time through engagement in simultaneous activities. Including time in secondary activities increases estimates of child care by 40 to 70 percent (Ironmonger 1996; Zick and Bryant 1996). Additionally, Stinson (1999) notes that a 1997 U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics time use pilot test study found

that one hour per day of unpaid work occurred simultaneously with other activities. Consequently, the inclusion of time in simultaneous activities provides a more accurate assessment of the second shift.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 1 clarifies the meaning of the second shift and briefly reviews the literature on gender differences in time use; Section 2 discusses how the different "gender regimes" in Australia and the United States might influence the second shift; Section 3 discusses data and methods; and Section 4 discusses preliminary results and outlines next steps.

What is the Second Shift?

The meaning of the second shift is murky (Bittman and Wajcman 2000; Bittman and Matheson 1996). In the book that popularized the term, Hochschild (1989) appears to define the "second shift" as the time women invest in unpaid work on top of time in paid work. "Adding together the time it takes to do a paid job and to do housework and childcare, I averaged estimates from the major studies on time use done in the 1960s and 1970s, and discovered that women worked roughly fifteen hours longer each week than men. Over a year, they worked an *extra month of twenty-four-hour days a year*...Most women work one shift at the office or factory and a 'second shift' at home" (Hochschild 1989:3-4, emphasis in the original). Some scholars have interpreted this literally and defined the second shift as the addition of an eight hour shift of paid work to an unchanged eight hour shift of unpaid work. However, it appears that Hochschild (1989) instead bases the "second shift" concept on two assumptions: first, that women's increased time in paid work has not been balanced by a comparable decrease of time in unpaid work because women are still responsible for ensuring all necessary housework and child care

gets accomplished; and second, that men's unpaid work time has not responded to shifts in women's time allocations. Hence, the notion rests on the assumption that not only is the total amount of time women spend in paid and unpaid work larger than the amount of time men spend working, but also the division of time between paid work and unpaid work is deeply gendered, with women bearing much more of the responsibility for housework and child care. In this analysis, we define the second shift as the shift of unpaid work that is combined with the "first shift," e.g. paid work time. We refer to combined hours in paid work and unpaid work as "total work load."

Gendered Time

The gendered division of labor, with men doing more paid work and women more unpaid work, is extensively documented. Two theoretical explanations of gender differences in time use predominate in the literature: the economic perspective and the gender perspective (Risman 1998; Coltrane 2000; Shelton and John 1996). The economic perspective posits that women specialize in unpaid work and men specialize in paid work because specialization is more efficient and thus maximizes household utility. The reason specialization is more efficient and the reason men specialize in paid work while women specialize in unpaid work is because of human capital and biological differences that result in a comparative advantage for each partner in their respective domains (Becker 1991).

Additionally, the theory indicates that a dissimilar allocation of men's and women's time should not lead to inequities in total work load. Men may continue to allocate more time to market work, and women may continue to allocate more time to unpaid work, because demographic and economic trends may not have completely erased women's comparative

advantage in housework and child care. Or, societal norms may not have altered to the point where exact equivalence of men's and women's paid and unpaid time is desired or acceptable.

Empirical analyses drawing on the economic perspective have tended to stress sheer quantity of total work load instead of gender differentiated allocation patterns (Bittman and Wajcman 2000). One reason may be that the notion that women's work load is greater than men's flies in the face of economic models of rational allocations of time use as well as contemporary notions of "egalitarian" intimate relationships (Giddens 1992; Becker 1991; 1965). Indeed, studies analyzing U.S. time diary data suggest that there is little gender imbalance in total work load. Robinson and Godbey (1999) note that in 1995 employed women's total weekly work time was only two hours higher than employed men's. Zick and McCullough (1991) report that the unpaid work time married women have shed as they have increased paid work hours has been met by an equivalent increase in married men's unpaid work time, hence total work loads are similar. Additionally, studies that have analyzed men's and women's time in paid work and housework (excluding child care activities) also note that total work time has remained roughly comparable over the past three decades for men and women despite women's increased market work (Blau 1998; Juster and Stafford 1991; Marini and Shelton 1993; Ferree 1991). Similar findings have been reported for men's and women's total work time in Western industrialized countries, with women's total work load per week on average across all countries only 1 hour 22 minutes longer than men's (Bittman and Wajcman 2000).

In contrast, the gender perspective tends to focus on the stubborn persistence of the gendered division of paid and unpaid work, and contends the main reason for its persistence is that the gendered division of labor is based on demarcating "men's" time from "women's" time (Twiggs, McQuillan, and Ferree 1999; West and Fenstermaker 1993; West and Zimmerman

1987). Gender is omnipresent in all societal institutions and everyday interactions serve as occasions for displaying "essential" masculine and feminine natures (Thompson and Walker 1995; West and Fenstermaker 1993). Unpaid work is not comprised of a gender-neutral bundle of chores that women perform out of comparative advantage or lower resources but instead is a key aspect of the social production and reproduction of unequal power relations between women and men (Thompson and Walker 1995). Further, not doing unpaid work, or at least avoiding certain activities, is one way men display masculinity and reinforce their structural and cultural power (Brines 1994).

Moreover, gender theorists contend that time itself is not distributed equally between men and women because women's domestic responsibilities define women's time as a "collective" household resource subject to the demands of husbands and children while men's time is more of an "individual" resource (Davies 1990; Berk 1985; Hochschild 1989). Shifts in the conceptualization of time wrought by industrialization altered the relationship between time and gender relations (Adam 1990; Davies 1990). With industrialization, men increasingly spent the majority of their time outside the home doing paid "productive" work, while women increasingly spent their time in the home doing unpaid work. Consequently, since time now equaled money, and men were earning money with their time, while (most) women were not, men's time, by definition, had more value. Because of men's engagement in "productive" wage earning labor, men were entitled both to "free time" and to the provision of household goods and services by women. In essence, time use became a fundamental aspect of the creation and perpetuation of gender inequality, with men having more control over the use of not only their time but also some of women's time (Adam 1990; Davies 1990). Hence, despite women's increased

investment in paid work, they continue to be responsible for ensuring that all unpaid work gets done.

Attitudes about the gender division of labor have become more egalitarian in Australia and the U.S. (Badgett et al. 2000; Bittman and Pixley 1997; Brewster and Padavic 2000). However, correlations between abstract gender role norms and housework behavior, while present, are very small (Wilkie, Ferree, and Ratcliff 1998). Behavior is much less egalitarian, and has changed much less, than attitudes.

Men's hours of household work have increased in the U.S. since 1965; however, the increase in women's paid work hours and decrease in their household work hours is much more dramatic (Bianchi et al. 2000). Studies of the division of housework in married couple families indicate that wives continue to perform between 65 to 80 percent of all housework (Berardo, Shehan, and Leslie 1987; Berk 1985; Calasanti and Bailey 1991; Coltrane 2000; Ishii-Kuntz and Coltrane 1992; Greenstein 2000; Kamo 1988; Spitze 1986).

Bittman and Pixley (1997:113) review evidence showing that, even when both Australian partners are working full time, women still do an overwhelmingly large proportion of laundry, physical child care, cooking, and cleaning. In a U.S. sample, Fenstermaker Berk (1985) showed that when spouses both worked full-time, wives often did several hours of household work at night while husbands did less than one.

In sum, studies drawing on the economic perspective assume gender equality in time use exists because total work load balances. In contrast, studies drawing on the gender perspective question whether dissimilar and gendered allocations of time to paid work and unpaid work truly indicate gender equality, given quite different societal rewards for paid work and unpaid work (Bittman and Matheson 1996).

Gender Relations in Australia and the United States

Family policies and programs can be designed to either reinforce traditional familial dependencies, where women are dependent on men for economic support and men dependent on women for caregiving; or to break down gender hierarchies by facilitating women's involvement in paid work and men's involvement in caregiving (Orloff 1996). Gendered assumptions about the appropriate division of employment and caregiving between women and men are especially salient in structuring cross-national variation in work/family policies and the basis on which citizens are entitled to claim state resources (Sainsbury 1999b; Orloff 1996). The mutual feedback between family policy and gender relations, as well as whether entitlements are granted on the basis of wage earning, caregiving, or earner/carer models, undoubtedly affects the amount of time mothers and fathers invest in paid work and unpaid work.

There are many institutional differences that might affect the level of the second shift in Australia and the U.S. In essence, the Australian "gender logic" rests on a foundation of a male breadwinner supporting a dependent wife and children (O'Connor, Orloff, and Shaver 1999; Shaver 1998). The idea of a male breadwinner and a "family wage" for men was actually enshrined in law during decades of governmental wage-setting, while for this same period it was assumed that women should be paid less because they had no dependents and were not family breadwinners (O'Connor et al. 1999; Ryan and Conlon 1975). Moreover, family policies and social insurance programs have been developed under the assumption of "gender-difference," e.g. men have access to benefits via waged employment whereas women have access to benefits via family relationships of spouse and mother (O'Connor 1999). While this logic has been destabilized by the move to more "gender-neutral" social insurance policies, restructuring of

gender differentiated benefits occurred only in the late 1980s and some changes have actually been reversed with retrenchment in the Australian welfare state (O'Connor 1999; O'Connor et al. 1999; Shaver 1998). Additionally, while Australia is a liberal democracy with the orientation that family matters are private individual concerns with which the state does not have the prerogative to interfere, Australian policy has entered the family realm through some public provision of child care and financial assistance for poor mothers because of gendered presumptions about the appropriate division of paid and unpaid work (O'Connor et al. 1999).

In contrast, whereas the U.S. also favored a male breadwinner model, the right of American men to earn a family wage was never legally protected to the same extent. Moreover, American policy is based on a "gender-sameness" model which stresses providing equal opportunity to paid employment for women and men (at least since the passage of Civil Rights legislation and equal pay protections in the latter 1960s and early 1970s) and strict adherence to market primacy. The presumption is that caregiving is an individual matter and any necessary goods and services required by individuals to meet caregiving responsibilities should be provided by the market, not by the state.

These differences are illustrated by employment statistics. Most Australian women with children work part-time (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2000), whereas many American mothers work full-time hours even when their children are preschoolers (Casper and Bianchi 2002:290). The effect of these different gender orientations on the second shift and total work loads is unclear. On the one hand, we might expect the second shift to be greater in Australia compared to the U.S. because of more entrenched gender norms and orientations that squarely place responsibility for unpaid work on women with no expectation that men contribute to unpaid

work. While behavior has lagged normative shifts, in the United States there is increasingly an expectation that husbands will share housework and child care with their wives.

On the other hand, though, we might expect the second shift to be less in Australia than the U.S. because of different orientations to the appropriate interrelationship among family, state, and markets and different "gender logics." The Australian state has instituted measures, such as a tax system designed to encourage part-time work among wives, some public provision of child care, and financial support for mothers who do not have access to husband's earnings, that are designed to ease the burden (or existence) of the second shift, either by decreasing some of women's caregiving responsibilities or by freeing them from market dependence (O'Connor et al. 1999; Sainsbury 1999b). This is not the case in the United States, in which women have to rely on individual strategies or the market for assistance in meeting household responsibilities. These could include doing less housework and childcare, bargaining with husbands to increase their household labor, or purchasing an expanding array of domestic services through the market. These individual strategies may be less effective in reducing total work load, however, than when the state assumes more of the responsibility for easing caregiving burdens.

The nexus of the second shift and notions of gender equality further clouds the issue. Are things more "equal" in Australia if women's and men's total work burdens are similar but this is achieved by women spending more time in unpaid work vis-à-vis men while men spend more time in paid work, vis-à-vis women? Or is the U.S. situation more equal, where total work loads for women are higher, but the gap between women's and men's paid work and unpaid work is smaller than it is in Australia?

Data and Methods

Our analysis is based on data from a 1997 time diary survey conducted in Australia and two time diary surveys conducted in the United States in 1999 and 2000. The Australian data were collected by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (Trewin 1999). Time diaries were collected on designated days from a random sample of households at four separate periods over the calendar year (so as to capture seasonal variation and include equal proportions of diaries representing each day of the week). Two-day diaries were completed by 7,250 persons over 15 years of age in 4,059 households in the national probability sample. The response rate was 84 percent.

The American data are from two time diary surveys conducted in 1998-1999 and 2000 with funding by the National Science Foundation and the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation (Bianchi, Robinson, and Sayer 2001). Data were collected by the Survey Research Center at the University of Maryland. In the 1998-1999 study, 24-hour time diaries were collected from a nationally representative sample of 1,151 American adults age 18 and over. In the 2000 study, 24-hour time diaries were collected from a nationally representative sample of 2,000 American parents living with children under age 18. Diaries were collected through computer assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) procedures and cover the day prior to the telephone interview. The response rate in the 1998-1999 survey was 56 percent; in the 2000 survey, the response rate was 64 percent. The two surveys were done by the same organization with similar procedures. We combine the two studies to increase sample sizes of parents. Distributions across time use categories are comparable for parents in each survey.

In each of the surveys, respondents provided information on individual and household characteristics, in addition to the detailed time diary. The time diary collects information on each activity episode (e.g. primary activities), including what activity is taking place, whether another

activity is being engaged in (e.g. secondary or simultaneous activities), where the activity takes place, and who else is present during the activity.

Considerable research has established that estimates of unpaid work from time diary studies are more accurate than estimates from stylized survey questions, such as "how much time do you typically spend in [activity] over an average day / week?" (Juster 1985; Robinson 1985; Marini and Shelton 1993). Stylized estimates of unpaid work activities are higher than estimates from time diary surveys and the difference is larger for activities that occur with some frequency and intermittence. Higher stylized estimates may be the result of difficulties in recalling and quickly adding up time in disjointed activities over a "typical" time period and different interpretations of what activities to include in estimates of housework or child care. In contrast, time diary studies provide a more familiar "accounting" framework as most respondents have experience describing how they spent their time over the course of a day to family and friends (Gershuny 2000). Additionally, time diary studies also minimize the possibility of respondents presenting themselves in a more socially desirable light, since to do so they would have to make-up an entire day (Robinson 1985). While the Australian and American time diary surveys differ in terms of their mode of data collection (in-person paper and pencil "tomorrow" diaries in Australia versus telephone "yesterday" diaries in the United States), research indicates that this should not compromise the comparability of estimates (Gershuny 2000).

Time Use Classification

The time use literature distinguishes among four major categories of activities thought to be mutually exclusive and based on meaningful distinctions: paid work, unpaid work, self care, and free time (Robinson and Godbey 1999). Activities are grouped into four distinct clusters:

paid work time in employment and employment-related activities; unpaid work time in housework, child care, and shopping; self care time in sleeping, grooming, eating, and medical care; and free time in discretionary activities, such as education (excluding on-the-job training), volunteer and civic activities, recreation, entertainment, and media (e.g. watching television, reading newspapers, listening to music). Appendix Table A lists the four major categories of time use, and the specific activities included within each broad category.

We restrict our analytic sample to women and men who are married and age 18 and older (age 20 and older in Australia due to differences in coding of age variable). The Australian time diary survey collected information from both husbands and wives in couple households but the U.S. surveys collected information from only one individual in the household (although selected spouse characteristics such as employment status and educational attainment were ascertained). Hence, our sample consists of women and men who are married but is not a sample of married couples. The U.S. sample includes 718 women and 592 men (1310 total); the Australian sample consists of 3164 women and 3020 men (6184 total). We exclude women and men who are not employed and whose spouse is also not employed because it is unclear what the second shift means in nonemployed couple families. We also exclude male respondents who are employed part-time and female respondents who report their spouse is employed part-time because we have no measures of poor health or disability that are likely associated with men's part-time employment and time in unpaid work.

Measurement of Total Work Time

In our preliminary assessment of the second shift, we analyze three indicators of "work" time, one for paid work and two for unpaid work, all created from respondent activity records in the

time diaries. The first measure is hours per week in paid work activities and includes time in primary employment activities (as well as seeking work if unemployed) and time commuting to a job. The other two measures are alternative specifications of unpaid work time. The first only uses time in primary activities and is hours per week in primary unpaid work activities (e.g. housework, child care, and shopping). The second measure of unpaid work is more expansive in that it combines primary unpaid work time with secondary unpaid work activities that are done in conjunction with free time activities.[1] We then create two measures of total work time: the first includes time in primary paid work and the first specification of unpaid work, primary unpaid work (Total 1 on table 1); the second includes time in primary paid work and the second specification of unpaid work, primary and secondary unpaid work (Total 2 on table 1). By the time of the PAA meetings in April, we plan to analyze additional measures created from the chronological time diary activities records to assess more qualitative differences in the second shift. These may include measures of scheduling of unpaid work (e.g. do women spend time in the evenings after employment doing unpaid work while men are more likely to have "free time"? Is men's unpaid work time clustered on weekends while women engage in unpaid work activities daily?) and simulations of parental "on-call" time to create a measure (albeit imperfect) of unpaid work time that includes often "invisible" time when one has to be available to children but is not actively engaged in child care or other activities with children (e.g. we will assume that a nonemployed wife with preschool kids is "on-call" for children all day (8 hours) and assume that a mother employed part-time with school-age children is "on-call" between the end of the school day and 6 p.m. and so forth).

[1] The small amount of time when two unpaid work activities are combined is not included so as not to "double-count" time.

Measurement of Sociodemographic Factors

Time in paid work and unpaid work is a function of socioedemographic characteristics and beliefs and feelings about appropriate marital roles for women and men. Employment and parental status are particularly salient in influencing time allocations. In the preliminary analysis presented here, we use measures of couple employment status to classify married respondents into three groups: dual breadwinner couples in which both spouses are employed full-time (35 hours or more per week); "neotraditional" couples in which the husband is employed full-time and the wife is employed part-time (34 hours or less per week); and single earner couples in which the husband is employed full-time and the wife is not employed (Moen and Sweet 2003; Raley et al. 2003). (Note that couple employment status is based on respondent's reports of their spouse's employment status). We then further distinguish women and men by the presence of children under age 6.

In planned multivariate analyses, we will include other variables found in the literature to be related to time in paid and unpaid work, particularly age, education, and number of children. We also plan to control for whether the diary was recorded on a weekday or a weekend.

Analysis Plan

Our preliminary analysis describes gender differences in married women's and men's paid and unpaid work time. We assess how the second shift varies across our couple employment and parental types and between Australia and the United States. We also examine whether adding "secondary" unpaid work time to total work time affects the gender gap in total work time and whether this differs between Australia and the United States. By the time of the PAA meetings, we plan to assess variation in more qualitative dimensions of the second shift. We also plan to

estimate a series of regression models to determine whether the processes that alter the second shift (e.g. factors associated with an increase or decrease in hours of unpaid work) operate in the same fashion in both countries.

Preliminary Results

Table 1 shows women's and men's average hours per week in paid, unpaid, and total work time by employment status and presence of young children in the United States and Australia. Panel A shows means for women and men in dual breadwinner couples; Panel B for women and men in neotraditional couples; and Panel C for women and men in single earner couples. In each panel, average hours are shown for the total, then for women and men in couples with no young children present, and then for women and men in couples with young children present.

[Table 1 here]

Inspection of Table 1 reveals several interesting facts. First, we see that women's full-time employment is associated with a significantly longer total work hours than men's in the United States more so than in Australia. For example, looking at columns 5 and 6 in Panel A (total 1), American women work almost 6 hours more per week compared to American men (71 hours versus 65 hours). The total work week clocks in at a less onerous 1 hour more for women than men in Australia: 67 working hours for women and 66 working hours for men.

Even in the dual breadwinner category, gender specialization in work is greater in Australia than the U.S. There is only a two hour difference in paid work hours between U.S. men and women who work full-time (women work 43 hours compared with 45 hours for men) whereas it is 10 hours in Australia (where women average 39 hours compared with 49 hours for men). Proportionately more of Australian than U.S. women's time is in unpaid work, although

the actual number of hours per week is the same (28 hours on average). In sum, total work loads of men and women are more similar in Australia but also more gender specialized. Whether this means total work loads of breadwinner couples are more "equal" in Australia is not entirely clear. Gender differences in both the first and the second shift are smaller in the less specialized U.S. but the total workload of full-time employed women is high in the U.S., both in absolute terms and relative to men. The situation in the U.S. when young children are present in dual breadwinner couples is not quite the literal interpretation of the second shift but it comes close. American mothers of young children who are employed full-time are working more than one and one-half shifts: a full shift of paid work (43 / 5 = 8.6 hours per day assuming a standard work schedule) and over one-half shift of unpaid work (34 / 7 = 4.86, assuming an even spread of unpaid work across all days of the week).

Across the three couple employment statuses, having young children leads women to ratchet up unpaid work compared to women with no young children present. For example, in dual breadwinner couples, American mothers with young children spend 34 hours per week in unpaid work compared with 25 hours when no young children are present (see column 3) and Australian mothers of young children spend 36 hours per week in unpaid work compared to 27 hours per week when young children are not present (see column 4). Additionally, whereas in dual breadwinner couples, mothers of young children spend a similar amount of time in paid work compared with mothers with no young children, in neotraditional couples, mothers of young children spend substantially less time in paid work than mothers with no young children, which no doubt is related to their larger increase in unpaid work.

In both countries across all three couple employment statuses, the presence of young children carry a time penalty in that they increase their parents' total work load.

It is the combination of full-time market work and young children that seems to result in an onerous second shift. The absolute hours of total work time are greatest in dual breadwinner couples with young children. This is the case for women and men in the U.S. and Australia. Comparing across panels, American dual breadwinner mothers with young children work 77 hours per week; in neotraditional employment couples, mothers with young children work 67 hours per week; and non-employed mothers with young children (e.g. single earner category) work 59 hours per week (see column 5). Comparable figures for Australian mothers with young children are 74 hours for dual breadwinner couples, 70 hours for neotraditional couples, and 61 hours for nonemployed mothers in single earner couples (column 6). Part-time employment or nonemployment thus appear to be effective strategies in reducing total work load, albeit perhaps one carrying a price in terms of future financial well-being.

Decreasing paid work hours also appears to be a more effective strategy than sharing the load with men. In both countries, men's unpaid work appears to respond more to children than it does to the level of women's employment. American women in dual breadwinner and neotraditional couples work more than American men regardless of the presence of children, because men do not alter their unpaid work hours significantly in response to changes in women's employment hours. For example, among American fathers, dual breadwinners with young children work 71 hours; neotraditionals with young children work 65 hours; and single earners with young children work 63 hours. The difference in work load stems more from changes in men's paid work across couple employment types rather than from changes in unpaid work. Comparing across panels (see column 1), American men with young children spend 46 hours in paid work in dual breadwinner couples, 41 hours in paid work in neotraditional couples, and 40 hours in paid work in single earner couples; the range of unpaid work hours is small,

from 25 in dual breadwinner couples, to 24 hours in neotraditional couples, and to 23 hours in single earner couples (see column 3).

In Australia, women's total workload is higher than men's only among dual breadwinner couples and the gap is larger for those with young children. In neotraditional and single earner couples, men work more hours than women when no children are present, and in single earner couples, even when they have young children. Australian men with young children actually do less unpaid work in dual breadwinner couples (20 hours, column 4) than they do in neotraditional couples (21 hours) or single earner couples (22 hours). The reverse is true for Australian men's paid work, as it increases from 42 hours in single earner couples with young children, to 49 hours in neotraditional couples with young children, to 51 hours in dual breadwinner couples with young children. While we cannot tease out causality, for Australian men, the tradeoff appears to be that if they do more paid work they do less unpaid work, regardless of their wife's level of employment.

Table 1 also indicates men in single earner couples have substantially longer total work hours than women, particularly when no young children are present. For example, in America the gap in total work hours is 24 hours per week in couples with no young children (see panel 3, column 5) and in Australia the gap is 10 hours per week (see panel 3, column 6). When young children are present, the total work time of men and women is more similar but men still have longer work weeks compared to women (and obviously since these are single earner couples the division of labor is quite gender specialized). Additionally, American men in single earner couples with young children work fewer hours in total compared to those with no young children because of a 20 hour drop in paid work hours (from 60 to 40, see column 1) but only an 11 hour increase in unpaid work (from 11 to 23, column 3). In contrast, Australian men in single earner

couples with young children work the same total amount as those with no young children present because they balance a 5 hour decline in paid work hours (from 47 to 42, as compared with men in single earner couples with no young children, see column 2) with a comparable increase in unpaid work (see column 4).

Finally, as conjectured in the feminist time use literature, the gender gap in total work time increases when time in simultaneous unpaid work activities is included (compare columns 9 and 10, Total 2, with columns 5 and 6, Total 1). This suggests that women are meeting work and family responsibilities by multitasking. Men also multitask but to a lesser extent than women. This may have implications for individual and family well-being since stress related to time pressures has negative health outcomes and increase marital strife. Nonetheless, the gap in total work time is larger in the U.S. than Australia regardless of whether total work time is restricted to primary unpaid work or includes secondary unpaid work.

Next Steps:

In sum, our preliminary analyses indicate that women's full-time employment is associated with longer total work hours more so in the U.S. than Australia. This is due to greater gender specialization in "working" time in Australia than the U.S. Additionally, in both countries, having young children carries a time penalty in that they increase their parents' total work load, and men's unpaid work time appears to respond more to the presence of children than it does to changes in levels of women's employment. We plan to follow up on these intriguing findings by analyzing additional dimensions of gender differences in total work time with more qualitative measures of the second shift and assessing whether factors that alter the second shift and total work time vary between Australia and the United States.

Literature Cited

Adam, Barbara. 1990. *Time and Social Theory*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Australian Bureau of Statistics. 2000. "Time Use Survey Australia: User's Guide". *Report* Catalog no. 4150.0, Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS).

Badgett, Lee, Pamela Davidson, Nancy Folbre, and Jeannette Lim. 2000. "Breadwinner Dad, Homemaker Mom: An Interdisciplinary Anlaysis of Changing Gender Norms in the United States, 1977-1998".

Becker, Gary S. 1965. "A Theory of the Allocation of Time." *The Economic Journal* 75:493-517.

------. 1991. *A Treatise on the Family*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Berardo, Donna H., Constance L. Shehan, and Gerald R. Leslie. 1987. "A Residue of Tradition: Jobs, Careers, and Spouses' Time in Housework." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 49:381-90.

Berk, Sarah F. 1985. *The Gender Factory: the Apportionment of Work in American Households.* New York: Plenum Press.

Bianchi, Suzanne M., Melissa A. Milkie, Liana C. Sayer, and John P. Robinson. 2000. "Is Anyone Doing the Housework? Trends in the Gender Division of Household Labor." *Social Forces* 79:191-228.

Bianchi, Suzanne M., John P. Robinson, and Liana C. Sayer. 2001 "Family Interaction, Social Capital, and Trends in Time Use Study (FISCT)." . Ann Arbor, Mich., Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR).

Bittman, Michael and George Matheson. 1996. "Changes in Gender Equity". *Report* 72, *Social Policy Research Centre Discussion Paper,* Social Policy Research Centre, University of New South Wales.

Bittman, Michael and Jocelyn Pixley. 1997. *The Double Life of the Family: Myth, Hope, and Experience*. Sydney:

Bittman, Michael. and Judy Wajcman. 2000. "The Rush Hour: The Character of Leisure Time and Gender Equity." *Social Forces* 79:165-89.

Blau, Francine D. 1998. "Trends in the Well-Being of American Women, 1970-1995." *Journal of Economic Literature* 36:112-65.

Brewster, Karin L. and Irene Padavic. 2000. "Change in Gender Ideology, 1977-1996: the Contributions of Intracohort Change and Population Turnover." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 62:477-87.

Brines, Julie. 1994. "Economic Dependency, Gender, and the Division of Labor at Home." *American Journal of Sociology* 100:652-88.

Calasanti, Toni M. and Carol A. Bailey. 1991. "Gender Inequality and the Division of Household Labor in the United States and Sweden: a Socialist-Feminist Approach." *Social Problems* 38:34-52.

Casper, Lynne M. and Suzanne M. Bianchi. 2002. *Continuity and Change in the American Family*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

Coltrane, Scott. 2000. "Research on Household Labor: Modeling and Measuring the Social Embeddedness of Routine Family Work." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 62:1208-33.

Davies, Karen. 1990. *Women, Time, and the Weaving of the Strands of Everyday Life.* Aldershot, England: Avebury Publishers.

Ferree, Myra M. 1991. "The Gender Division of Labor in Two-Earner Marriages." *Journal of Family Issues* 12:158-80.
Friedan, Betty. 1963. *The Feminine Mystique*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc.
Gershuny, Jonathan. 2000. *Changing Times: Work and Leisure in Postindustrial Society.* New York: Oxford University Press.
Giddens, Anthony. 1992. *The Transformation of Intimacy: Sexuality, Love, and Eroticism in Modern Societies.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
Greenstein, Theodore N. 2000. "Economic Dependence, Gender, and the Division of Labor in the Home: A Replication and Extension." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 62:322-35.
Hochschild, Arlie. 1989. *The Second Shift*. New York: Avon Books.
Ishii-Kuntz, Masako and Scott Coltrane. 1992. "Predicting the Sharing of Household Labor: Are Parenting and Housework Distinct?" *Sociological Perspectives* 35:629-47.
Juster, F. T. 1985. "The Validity and Quality of Time Use Estimates Obtained From Recall Diaries." Pp. 63-91 in *Time, Goods, and Well-Being*, edited by F. T. Juster and Frank P. Stafford. Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan.
Juster, F. T. and Frank P. Stafford. 1991. "The Allocation of Time: Empirical Findings, Behavioral Models, and Problems of Measurement." *The Journal of Economic Literature* 29:471-522.
Kamo, Yoshinori. 1988. "Determinants of Household Division of Labor: Resources, Power, and Ideology." *Journal of Family Issues* 9:177-200.
Marini, Margaret M. and Beth A. Shelton. 1993. "Measuring Household Work: Recent Experience in the United States." *Social Science Research* 22:361-82.
Moen, Phyllis and Stephen Sweet. 2003. "Time Clocks: Couples' Work Hour Strategies." in *Its About Time*, edited by Phyllis Moen. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
O'Connor, Julia S. 1999. "Employment Equality Strategies in Liberal Welfare States." Pp. 47-74 in *Gender and Welfare State Regimes*, edited by Diane Sainsbury. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
O'Connor, Julia S., Ann S. Orloff, and Sheila Shaver. 1999. *States, Markets, Families: Gender, Liberalism and Social Policy in Australia, Canada, Great Britain and the United States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Orloff, Ann. 1996. "Gender in the Welfare State." *Annual Review of Sociology* 22:51-78.
Raley, Sara, Marybeth Mattingly, Suzanne M. Bianchi, and Erum Ikramullah. 2003. "Wives Who Earn More Than Their Husbands: Documenting Change Since 1970." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, August 2003, Atlanta, Georgia.
Risman, Barbara J. 1998. *Gender Vertigo: American Families in Transition*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
Robinson, John P. 1985. "The Validity and Reliability of Diaries Versus Alternative Time Use Measures." Pp. 33-62 in *Time, Goods, and Well-Being*, edited by F. T. Juster and Frank P. Stafford. Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan.
Robinson, John P. and Geoffrey Godbey. 1999. *Time for Life: The Surprising Ways Americans Use Their Time.* University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
Ryan, Edna and Anne Conlon. 1975. *Gentle Invaders: Australian Women at Work*. Melbourne:

Sainsbury, Diane. 1999a. "Introduction." Pp. 1-11 in *Gender and Welfare State Regimes*, edited by Diane Sainsbury. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
------. 1999b. "Taxation, Family Responsibilities, and Employment." Pp. 185-209 in *Gender and Welfare State Regimes*, edited by Diane Sainsbury. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Shaver, Sheila. 1998. "Extension Amidst Retrenchment: Gender and Welfare State Restructuring in Australia and Sweden". *Report* No. 92, *SPRC Discussion Paper*, Social Policy Research Centre, University of New South Wales, Sydney.
Shelton, Beth A. and Daphne John. 1996. "The Division of Household Labor." *Annual Review of Sociology* 22:299-322.
Spitze, Glenna. 1986. "The Division of Task Responsibility in U.S. Households: Longitudinal Adjustments to Change." *Social Forces* 64:689-701.
Thompson, Linda and Alexis J. Walker. 1995. "The Place of Feminism in Family Studies." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 57:847-65.
Trewin, Dennis. 1999. "Information Paper: Time Use Survey Australia, Confidentialised Unit Record File 1997". *Report* 4151.0, Australian Bureau of Statistics.
Twiggs, Joan E., Julia McQuillan, and Myra M. Ferree. 1999. "Meaning and Measurement: Reconceptualizing Measures of the Division of Household Labor." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 61:712-24.
West, Candace and Sarah Fenstermaker. 1993. "Power, Inequality, and the Accomplishment of Gender." Pp. 151-174 in *Theory on Gender / Feminism on Theory*, edited by Paula England. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
West, Candace and Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. "Doing Gender." *Gender & Society* 1:125-51.
Wilkie, Jane R., Myra M. Ferree, and Kathryn S. Ratcliff. 1998. "Gender and Fairness: Marital Satisfaction in Two-Earner Couples." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 60:577-94.
Zick, Cathleen D. and Jane L. McCullough. 1991. "TRENDS IN MARRIED-COUPLES TIME USE - EVIDENCE FROM 1977-78 AND 1987-88." *Sex Roles* 24:459-87.

Table 1. Mean Hours Per Week in Paid, Unpaid, and Total Work of Married Women and Men by Employment Status and Presence of Preschooler, United States and Australia

	United States	Australia	United States	Australia	United States	Australia	United States	Australia	United States	Australia
	Paid Work		Unpaid Work 1		Total 1		Unpaid Work 2*		Total 2	
	Diary Hours		*Primary Time Only*				*Primary + Secondary Time*			
Panel A: Dual Breadwinner										
U.S. N = 355 women, 304 men; Australia N 1141 Women, 1095 Men										
Women	43	39	28	28	71	67	30	31	73	70
Men	45	49	21	17	65	66	22	18	67	67
Difference (Women-Men)	-1.8	-10.0	7.5	11.0	5.7	1.0	8.1	13.0	6.2	3.0
No Preschooler										
N = 229 women, 201 men										
Women	43	39	25	27	68	66	27	29	69	68
Men	43	49	18	16	62	65	19	18	63	67
Difference (Women-Men)	-0.9	-10.0	7.0	11.0	6.1	1.0	7.3	11.0	6.4	1.0
Preschooler Present										
N = 126 women, 103 men										
Women	43	38	34	36	77	74	37	42	80	80
Men	46	51	25	20	71	71	27	24	73	75
Difference (Women-Men)	-3.4	-13.0	9.0	16.0	5.6	3.0	9.9	18.0	6.6	5.0
Panel B: Neotraditional										
U.S. N = 189 women, 131 men; Australia N = 1085 Women, 1042 Men										
Women	21	19	45	43	66	62	48	48	70	67
Men	42	48	21	18	62	66	22	21	64	69
Difference (Women-Men)	-20.3	-29.0	24.2	25.0	4.0	-4.0	26.4	27.0	6.1	-2.0
No Preschooler										
N = 100 women, 70 men										
Women	26	20	39	41	65	61	42	44	69	64
Men	42	48	18	17	59	65	19	19	61	67
Difference (Women-Men)	-15	-28	21	24	6	-4	23	25	8	-3
Preschooler Present										
N = 89 women, 61 men										
Women	16	17	51	53	67	70	55	60	71	77
Men	41	49	24	21	65	70	25	26	67	75
Difference (Women-Men)	-25.9	-32.0	27.5	32.0	1.6	0.0	30.2	34.0	4.3	2.0
Panel C: Single Earner										
U.S. N = 174 women, 157 men; Australia N = 938 Women, 883 Men										
Women	1	3	55	54	56	57	61	59	62	62
Men	48	46	18	19	66	65	20	21	68	67
Difference (Women-Men)	-47.9	-43.0	37.4	35.0	-10.5	-8.0	41.5	38.0	-6.4	-5.0
No Preschooler										
N = 53 women, 60 men										
Women	0	3	47	52	47	55	53	56	53	59
Men	60	47	11	18	71	65	12	19	72	66
Difference (Women-Men)	-59.7	-44.0	35.9	34.0	-23.8	-10.0	40.9	37.0	-18.8	-7.0
Preschooler Present										
N = 121 women, 97 men										
Women	1	1	59	60	59	61	64	69	65	70
Men	40	42	23	22	63	64	25	27	66	69
Difference (Women-Men)	-39.7	-41.0	35.8	38.0	-4.0	-3.0	39.1	42.0	-0.6	1.0

Source: U.S. Data 1998-99 Family Interaction, Social Capital, and Trends in Time Use Study & 2000 Sloan Study; Australian Data 1997 Time Use Study

* Unpaid work 2 includes all "secondary" nonmarket work done with primary free time activities. Secondary nonmarket work done with other nonmarket work, paid work, or personal care activities is excluded.

Appendix Table A. Activity Classification Typology

Category	Specific Activity	Category	Specific Activity
Paid Work	Main job	**Free Time**	
	Unemployment		
	Second job	***Education***	Attending full-time school
	Work breaks		Other classes
	Travel during job		Homework
	Travel to and from job		Other education
			Travel, education
Unpaid Work			
		Organizational	Professional and union
Housework	Meals		Political and civic
	Cleaning		Volunteer and helping
	Meal Cleanup		Religious groups
	Housecleaning		Religious practices
	Clothes care		Other oganizational
	Male/Shared		Travel, organizational
	Outdoor chores		
	Repairs and maintenance	***Entertainment***	Sports events
	Garden and animal care		Other events
	Other household chores		Movies and videos
			Theatre
Child Care	Daily Care		Museums
	Baby care (children under 5)		Visiting with others
	Child care (children 5 and over)		Social gatherings
	Medical care of child		Bars and lounges
	Other child care		Travel, social
	Travel, child related activities		
	Teaching/Playing	***Recreation***	Active Sports
	Helping and teaching		Outdoor recreation
	Talking or reading		Exercise
	Indoor play		Hobbies
	Outdoor play		Domestic crafts
			Art
Shopping and Services	Shopping		Music, drama and dance
	Shopping for food		Games
	Shopping for durable goods		Other recreation
	Services		Travel, Recreation
	Personal care appointments		
	Medical appointments	***Media***	Radio
	Government and financial services		Television
	Repair services		Records or tapes
	Other services		Reading books
	Errands		Reading magazines, other
	Travel, shopping and services		Reading newspapers
			Conversations
Self Care	Grooming		Letter writing
	Medical care		Thinking or relaxing
	Care and help of adults		Travel, communication
	Meals		
	Sleep		
	Sex, other private		
	Travel, personal care		