

THE UNIVERSITY OF HERTFORDSHIRE
BUSINESS SCHOOL

WORKING PAPER SERIES

The Working Paper series is intended for rapid dissemination of research results, work-in-progress, innovative teaching methods, etc., at the pre-publication stage. Comments are welcomed and should be addressed to the individual author(s). It should be remembered that papers in this series are often provisional and comments and/or citation should take account of this.

For further information about this, and other papers in the series, please contact:

University of Hertfordshire Business School
College Lane
Hatfield
Hertfordshire
AL10 9AB
United Kingdom

Working Time and Family Life in the UK

Christine Cousins and Ning Tang

Abstract

This paper explores the relationship between working time flexibility and family life in the UK using data from a national survey of households carried out in the spring of 2001. The paper focuses on working hours and working-time preferences, the spillover of the working-time regime into the home, employment patterns and childcare arrangements, and work and family conflicts. The findings suggest that men and women's working time preferences and behaviour are shaped by the policy and institutional context of the working-time regime of the UK as well as the social and domestic circumstances in which they live. The findings are highly relevant to a number of current policy issues in the UK.

Working Time and Family Life in the UK

Christine Cousins and Ning Tang

This paper explores the relationship between working time flexibility and family life in the UK. The research forms part of a current EU Framework Programme 5 project (name withheld for anonymity) with eight participating countries in central, east and west Europe.¹ The aim of this EU project is to look comparatively at the impact of patterns of flexible employment, including the flexibilisation of time, place and conditions, upon household organisation and quality of life. This paper presents findings from the UK research² and is based on data from a national survey of 945 working-age households carried out in the spring of 2001.³

The study brings together several issues at the forefront of current policy and academic debate. The first of these concerns the nature and impact of the UK's flexible labour market. After two decades this is still the subject of extensive academic debate. Recent studies, for example, have been concerned with examining the pressures for increased flexibility (Burchell *et al.* 1999, Cousins 1999, DTI 2001), the costs and benefits of flexible work (Purcell *et al.* 1999), whether flexible work leads to pathways out of unemployment (White and Forth 1998), the insecure worker thesis (Heery *et al.* 2000, Burchell *et al.* 1999 and Sennett 1998) and the core/periphery workforce thesis (Gallie *et al.* 1998, Conley 2000). On the policy agenda, the new Labour government remains committed to a flexible labour market as the basis of the country's economic competitiveness.⁴

The second issue concerns the impact of flexible working on family life. In the US in the 1990s social scientists began to describe the family stress, long hours culture and personal insecurity caused by the experience of flexible working (for example, Hochschild 1997, Schor 1991, Sennett 1998,). In the UK, too, there was a shift in the research agenda in that the family came to the forefront, especially families' relationship to the labour market (Dex *et al.* 1999). This research agenda has also been stimulated by the policy agenda of new Labour with its recognition of the need to promote family-friendly policies and extend childcare provision. Recent research has, therefore, been

concerned with investigating the stress imposed on family life by intensified workloads, long and unsocial hours, as well as the difficulties of parenting in the context of lack of child care and elderly care (for example, Ferri and Smith 1996, EOC, Burchell *et al.* 1999, DTI 2000, Burghes 1997).

The nature of the gendered working-time regime in the UK, with its short hours for women and long hours for men, has received particular policy and academic attention. It is now well documented that male full-time workers in the UK work the longest hours in Europe (for example, EIRO 2002, Fagan 2001, TUC 2002). With respect to policy concerns the Working Times Regulations 1998 have been found to have left existing working practices largely intact and the long hours culture remains entrenched (DTI 2001, EIRO November 2001). In this context, the TUC and the Industrial Society have recently joined forces to condemn the UK's long hours' culture and urge employers to adopt a more positive approach to work-life balance. Further, the long working hours of men are complemented by the short part-time working hours of women and especially mothers. Here, recent academic debate has focused on the disadvantageous nature of female part-time employment as a distinctive segment of the UK labour market (for example, Dex and McCulloch 1995, Gallie *et al.* 1998, Perrons and Hurstfield 1998, Purcell 2000). There has also been a long debate about the extent to which part-time work represents a life-style choice or a constraint for women in the context of lack of childcare (Hakim 1991, 1996, 2000, Bruegel 1996, Crompton and Harris 1998, Ginn *et al.* 1996, Scheibl 1999).

This paper addresses a number of these academic and policy debates. The research findings are, therefore, highly relevant to a number of current issues, namely, the long hours' work culture in the UK, working-time preferences, the spillover of the working-time regime into the home, employment patterns and childcare arrangements, and work and family relations.

The (EU) project is concerned with examining how work flexibility affects individuals and their households and particularly their ability to combine family and work. We wished to include a broad definition of work, including paid work, casual work, unpaid and domestic work and social or communal work.⁵ The project therefore examines the ways in which members of the household put together these different forms

of work and the impact of such work on the household and on quality of life. The main research instrument used has been a national survey of around 1000 households in each of the eight countries based on a comparable questionnaire. Background papers for the project have documented how the discourse and policies on flexibility differ in the different national contexts.⁶ A key feature of the project is therefore to place the national survey findings within the institutional and policy context of each country.

While recognising the diverse meanings of the term flexibility, the project defined flexibility of work in terms of flexibility of time (for example, working hours), flexibility of place (for example, at home or various locations) and flexibility of contractual conditions of work (for example, different types of contract). The project was also interested in attitudes to flexible work and preferences for working arrangements. A series of grids in the questionnaire asked respondents about the work arrangements of other members of the households, and their perceptions of work and family arrangements. Finally, the questionnaire focused on economic resources of the household, income, living conditions and access to resources. Space in this paper precludes an in-depth presentation of all research findings from this rich source of data. The following discussion, therefore, focuses on issues of current academic and policy concern with respect to working time identified above. The first section of the paper examines the working hours of respondents and their partners as well as their working time preferences. The second section of the paper considers the employment patterns of parents with dependent children, childcare and the domestic division of labour and work and family relations.

WORKING HOURS PATTERNS AND PREFERENCES

Working Hours

In this section we consider the working hours of respondents and their partners in the sample who are in paid work. That is, of the sample of 945 respondents, 70 per cent are in paid work, 76 per cent of men and 65 per cent of women.⁷ The (EU) survey

confirmed the gendered nature of the working-time regime in the UK, that is the 'short hours for women' and 'long-hours for men' pattern. Over two-thirds of men work more than 40 hours per week and 29 per cent more than 50 hours (Table 1). At the other end of the spectrum, 44 per cent and 24 per cent of women work less than 30 and 20 hours per week respectively.⁸ The gender difference is similar to the national LFS figures in Spring 2000.

However, as Table 1 shows and consistent with other research findings, fathers work longer hours than men with no dependent children (Dex *et al.* 1999, Ferri and Smith 1996). Three-quarters of fathers worked more than 40 hours per week and over one third more than 50 hours a week. In contrast, the presence of children has a marked effect on mothers' time flexibility, 58 per cent of coupled mothers worked less than 30 hours per week, and almost one third less than 20 hours per week.

We were also interested in how different members of the family combine their working hours. Dual-earner families made up 58 per cent of coupled households. The most common mode of working for all dual earners is for both partners to be in full-time employment (55 per cent), although if families with dependent children are considered then nearly 60 per cent comprise one full-time and one part-time partner. Table 2 shows the working hours of respondents and their partners in these different earner types of families.

In families with two full-time working parents, 88 per cent of respondent fathers work over 40 hours per week and 38 per cent more than 50 hours. As Table 2 shows over one third of their partners work more than 40 hours per week. With respect to respondent mothers, one fifth work more than 40 hours and nearly 80 per cent of their partners work over 40 hours a week. In two full-time worker families without children men also work very long hours, but less than fathers. Women without children, however, are more likely to work longer hours than mothers, as might be expected. For example, nearly half of the partners of male respondents without children in this type of earner family work longer than 40 hours.

The vast majority of families in the full-time/part-time pattern consisted of a male full-timer and a female part-timer. While respondent fathers in this family type work long hours, these are complemented by the very short hours of their partners. For

example, nearly half (45 per cent) of the partners of respondent fathers work under 20 hours. Two-fifths of part-time respondent mothers work less than 20 hours per week and nearly 80 per cent of their partners more than 40 hours.

Thus, while the ‘short hours for women’, ‘long hours for men’ pattern is common for some households, especially those with children, many of those in two full-timer earner families are working very long hours indeed. This is consistent with the research of Harkness (1999) where she found that for full-time workers the working week had clearly lengthened in the past decade. The reasons she suggests for this is the dramatic increase in both paid and unpaid overtime. The (EU) survey also found that the proportion of respondents who stated that they worked overtime at least once a week was high. Almost half of female respondents and two-thirds of men report working overtime at least once a week in the evenings, at nights or at weekends. As many as 80 per cent of fathers (and 45 per cent of mothers) said that they worked overtime at least once a week during these times. Female part-timers however are less likely to work these overtimes, one third compared to 56 per cent of full-time women workers.

Attitudes to Flexibility and Working Hours Preferences

In order to examine respondents’ attitudes to full-time and part-time working they were asked about their working time preferences and the reasons for these preferences. In addition a further question enabled the examination of respondents’ willingness to work full-time. In this question respondents were asked if they would be willing to work more than 40 hours a week, first, in a condition of a negative incentive, that is, if they had no job, and secondly, in a condition of positive incentive, that is, if they could earn twice their salary.

Table 3 shows there are very large gender differences in respondents’ willingness to work more than 40 hours per week. Men are more than twice as likely as women to say they would be willing to work more than 40 hours per week if they had no job and almost twice as likely in the positive incentive situation of being able to earn twice their salary. Even higher proportions of fathers in coupled families say that they are willing to work more than 40 hours, reflecting perhaps their status as primary breadwinner.

Mothers, on the other hand, are much less willing to work long hours than other women, indicating the time constraints that they face.

With respect to working hour's preferences, one third of fathers wished to work fewer hours and this is related to spending more time with their family. However, there is also a strong relationship with long working hours and a wish to reduce hours. Over three-quarters of fathers working over 50 hours in two full-time worker families (and 71 per cent of fathers with part-time partners) wished to reduce their hours. Almost all of these fathers gave as their reason a desire to spend more time with their family.

However, if we consider female workers in different types of earner families then there are large differences in their willingness to work more than 40 hours per week. For example, with respect to those female workers in two full-time earner families, unsurprisingly, the presence of children makes a considerable difference to women's willingness to work long hours. As Table 4 shows only 19 per cent of full-time working mothers would be willing to work more than 40 hours per week if they had no job compared to 43 per cent of full-time working women without children. In the positive situation of earning twice their salary more mothers (45 per cent) would work more than 40 hours but this is still much lower than women without children (76 per cent). If we also consider full-time working mothers' working hours preferences, then they are much more likely than other women to say that they would prefer to reduce their working hours (41 per cent compared to 26 per cent of other full-time working women). The majority (two-thirds) of these mothers gave as their reason the wish to spend more time with their family.

However, full-time mothers are still more likely than part-timers to say that they would be willing to work more than 40 hours a week. As Table 4 demonstrates the vast majority of female part-timers are not prepared to work more than 40 hours in either the negative or positive incentive situation. One possible interpretation of this is that this is perhaps unsurprising given that the marginal difference in hours would be much greater for part-timers, and unlike their full-time sisters they would have to make additional childcare arrangements. That is, mothers may answer this question taking account of their present situation which may act as a constraint on the degrees of freedom they are able to use in any 'choice' that they make.⁹

We were also interested in the discussion in the literature about part-time mothers whose children have grown up (for example, Bruegel 1996, Walsh 1999). As Bruegel has remarked '(There are) very interesting questions of why women remain in part-time work even after their children have left school' (1996:176). In a later paper she suggests that this path dependency of part-time mothers may be a cohort effect and 'that as the children of the current generation of mothers reach teenage years, their mothers, better educated than their grandmothers and more at risk of divorce, may seek to move out of low paid part-time work' (2000:1). However, as Table 4 shows part-time women with grown up children are as likely as those mothers with dependent children to state a desire not to work more than 40 hours per week. Path dependency rather than a cohort effect would appear to be characteristic of this sample of part-time mothers. There is also little difference in the personal, job and work history characteristics of the two groups of mothers (Table 5).

With respect to working hour's preferences the vast majority of part-time mothers prefer to work their existing hours, that is 90 per cent and 87 per cent of mothers with dependent and independent children respectively. A large majority also gave as the reason for this preference the need to meet domestic commitments. That is, two thirds and 60 per cent of mothers with dependent and independent children respectively gave this reason.

As Table 5 shows female part-timers generally have more disadvantageous working conditions than female full-timers. For example, between 13-15 per cent of part-timers have no employment contract, and one fifth have been employed for less than one year (and therefore do not qualify for employment protection). Female part-timers are also far less likely to have experienced promotion than full-time working women. Further, one half of female part-timers earned a net monthly income in the lowest quartile (less than £780), compared to 13 per cent of full-timers without children and one quarter with children. However, it is the difference between part-timers with and without children which is interesting. Although the numbers are small, part-timers without children are on average older and have less educational qualifications (Table 5). They have held their current job for several years, for example, 80 per cent have been in their current job for 5 years or more, compared to 31 per cent of part-time mothers with

dependent children and 56 per cent of men. Further, half have no experience of employment changes in the past 12 years, compared to 19 per cent of part-time mothers and 23 per cent of men. They do not, therefore, exhibit greater instability in their employment than men (see the debate between Hakim 1995, Ginn *et al.* 1996 and Bruegel 1996). Despite relatively long tenure, however, very few had been promoted in the past decade. They remain highly content with low paying jobs that offer little chance of promotion and the vast majority do not want a full-time job even if they could earn twice their salary. Whilst the vast majority are happy with their existing hours of work (87 per cent) far fewer gave domestic commitments as the reason for this, that is 39 per cent compared with two-thirds of mothers with dependent children.

Clearly, full-time and part-time women workers have different attitudes and preferences with respect to their working time. This would appear to support Hakim's preference theory (2000) that female part-time workers are qualitatively different from female full-time workers in their labour market behaviour, attitudes and orientations. Yet, the presence of children for both full-time and part-time women affects their attitude to working long hours. The evidence discussed above suggests that both groups of mothers experience time constraints. Many full-time mothers would like to reduce their hours to spend more time with their family and part-time mothers demonstrate a preference for short hours because of their domestic commitments. These working time preferences should also be put in the context of the long, and in some cases very long, working hours of their partners. Mothers' experience of time constraints becomes even clearer when we examine childcare and domestic arrangements in the second section of this paper.

FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN, CHILDCARE, DOMESTIC TASKS AND WORK AND FAMILY RELATIONS

In this section of the paper we focus on the relationship between different combinations of employment within families and childcare and the domestic division of labour. We also consider the extent to which work and family impinge on one another and the extent to which this generates conflict and disagreements.

Families with dependent children constitute nearly one quarter (22 per cent) of all households in the sample. The majority of parents are in paid work. In 65 per cent of couple families with children both parents work, although only in just over one quarter of families (28 per cent) did both parents work full-time. The most common mode of working was the full-time/part-time pattern, 38 per cent of families. In 21 per cent of families the male was the sole breadwinner and in a small minority of families, 5 per cent, the mother was the sole earner.

Respondents were asked who was mainly responsible for taking daily care of children or taking care of children when they are sick. Table 6 shows the responses in the different earner types of families. It is clear that daily childcare and care of a sick child is almost invariably the responsibility of the mother or shared equally. In two full-time earner families, 8 per cent of fathers take daily responsibility for childcare, which although low is a higher proportion than all other fathers. However, in this family type one third of fathers and 44 per cent of mothers report that daily child care is shared equally.¹⁰

None of the respondent fathers with part-time or non-working partners take responsibility for daily childcare and lower proportions than those with full-time partners share childcare equally. Among respondent mothers working part-time, only 2 per cent of their partners take responsibility for childcare and far fewer take joint responsibility than in families where the mother worked full-time. For non-working mothers, daily childcare is almost entirely their responsibility with no involvement of their partners. These findings are consistent with other research studies which show that fathers' involvement in childcare increased according to their partners' level of participation in the labour market (for example, Ferri and Smith 1996, Brannen and Moss 1991).

Whilst there was no direct question on childcare arrangements when parents were at work, what is striking about the survey findings is that responsibility for childcare is contained within the household with an extremely high reliance on mothers themselves, or sharing between partners. Only 5 respondents (2 per cent) use other sources of daily childcare, two mention a son or daughter, another a person outside the household and two respondents say that they pay for childcare. This is despite the extension of childcare places through the Childcare Strategy since 1997. With respect to caring for a sick child,

only four respondents mention either a grandmother or a person outside the household. Childcare, therefore, remains a private responsibility with little public support or indeed even help from grandmothers/grandfathers, other members of the household, or neighbours or friends. This so even for two full-time worker families and indicates the high levels of juggling which must be involved in everyday life. This is compounded when mothers commute to work in a different area in which they live. This is the case for 38 per cent of mothers in two full-time worker families.

With respect to household tasks, respondent fathers in two full-time earner families were rather more likely to report that they take the main responsibility for cooking and shopping than other fathers (Table 7). Partners in this family type were also in general more likely to share domestic tasks, especially according to respondent mothers (with the exception of shopping). Overall, however, it is mothers who take main responsibility for household chores in all types of households. Furthermore, responsibility for these domestic tasks is also almost entirely contained within the family. The proportion receiving paid or unpaid help with domestic tasks from outside the immediate family ranges from 0 per cent for shopping to 5 per cent for cleaning.

Perceptions of Family/Work Arrangements

In order to estimate the extent to which work and family impinge on one another, respondents were asked if they had experienced the following:

Work makes it difficult to do household tasks

Work makes it difficult to fulfil family responsibilities

Family responsibilities prevented me from working adequately

Table 8 shows that men are more likely than women to state that they experience a conflict between work and family life. Further, whilst higher proportions of parents experience such conflict it is also much higher for fathers than mothers. This is a rather surprising finding, given that women carry the major responsibility for childcare and domestic work. However, one reason for this may be that, as Table 7 shows, long

working hours in the UK are clearly related to difficulties in combining work and family life and this particularly so for parents.

The vast majority of fathers working 50 hours or more per week (86 per cent) state that work makes it difficult to do household tasks or fulfill family responsibilities. More mothers, too (although they do not work such long hours as other women), also state that work makes it difficult to do household tasks or fulfill family responsibilities. It is noticeable though that the vast majority of women working short hours (under 20 hours per week) state that they do not experience difficulties between work and family life, although this is less the case for those mothers working between 30-39 hours per week. It can be suggested here that women working short hours have already accommodated to the demands of family life by reducing their working hours and are therefore less likely to experience work and family conflict (see also Ginn and Sandell 1997).

With respect to the question on 'family responsibilities prevented me from working adequately' there is more reluctance in general to agree with this statement. Nevertheless, just over one quarter of fathers stated that family responsibilities prevented them from working adequately and this rises to 40 per cent of fathers who worked more than 50 hours per week.

Respondents were also asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed with other household members with respect to issues such as household finances, household tasks, time spent together and time spent at work. As Table 9 shows less than one in five state that they always or sometimes disagree with other household members on these issues. A slightly higher proportion of female respondents report disagreements over household tasks.

However, the highest levels of disagreement are to be found in families with children where parents are working long hours (Table 9). Fathers working 50-59 hours per week are almost three times more likely as all men to report disagreements about time spent at work and over twice more likely to disagree on time spent together. Mothers working 40-49 hours were also three times more likely than all women to report disagreements over time spent at work. However, mothers' long working hours are not related to disagreements about household tasks, although this is the case for women working under 30 hours and between 30-39 hours. This supports the suggestion made

earlier that families containing two full-time working parents are more egalitarian, in the sense of sharing domestic tasks.

CONCLUSION

The survey findings have demonstrated the working hours patterns and working hour preferences of different family types in the UK. For families with dependent children the most common mode is the 'short hours for women', 'long hours for men' pattern. However, 40 per cent of families with dependent children contained two full-time working adults. In these families many parents worked long hours, especially fathers, with high levels of overtime.

With respect to attitudes to full-time work we have seen a substantial difference between men and women and full-time and part-time female workers in their willingness to work more than 40 hours per week. Nevertheless, for both full-time and part-time working mothers with dependent children there was a marked reluctance to work more than 40 hours per week. It was noted that over two-fifths of full-time mothers wished to reduce their working hours and that this was related to a desire to spend more time with their families. In contrast around two-thirds of part-time mothers had chosen to work shorter hours because of their family commitments. These working time preferences indicate the constraints surrounding mothers' time for paid and unpaid work, and suggest that part-time employment is a 'constrained choice' (Walsh 1999). The findings should also be placed in the context of their partners' long, and in some cases very long, working hours.

Mothers' working time preferences also became clearer when childcare arrangements and the domestic division of labour were examined. Childcare responsibilities are almost completely contained within the immediate family, with 98 per cent of parents taking daily care of children themselves. Whilst there is evidence of a shift to more equal sharing of childcare (especially in two full-time working parent families) the responsibility for childcare was overwhelmingly taken by mothers. Only 2 per cent made use of other sources of childcare. Responsibility for other domestic

household tasks was also predominantly taken by mothers. These findings highlight one of the most distinctive features of the family/work relationship in the survey. Families, and particularly mothers, take on the responsibility of childcare entirely themselves with little public support or indeed even help from grandmothers/grandfathers, other members of the household, or neighbours or friends.

Evidence of the stress imposed on family life by long working hours was provided by the finding that mothers and fathers working long hours were much more likely to report disagreements with their partners on time spent at work and time spent together. One surprising finding of the survey, however, is that men, and particularly fathers, experience more difficulty in reconciling work and family life than women. The reason for this it is suggested is that conflict between work and family was found to be strongly related to long hours of work. It is noticeable that the experience of work and family conflict is much lower for women working less than 20 hours per week. Here it was suggested that women working short hours have already accommodated the demands of family life by reducing their working hours, an option not available to most fathers.

Nevertheless, consistent with other research it was also noted that part-time working was far more disadvantageous than full-time working. However, the part-time labour force is far from homogeneous (Walsh 1999, Bruegel 1996). This was clear from the small group of part-time women with no children. The vast majority, 87 per cent, did not want a full-time job and they remained highly satisfied with low paying jobs that offer little chance of promotion. Yet they did not exhibit higher levels of job instability than men and the majority engaged in part-time work for reasons other than domestic commitments.

Whilst Hakim (2000) is correct to argue that we must take into account women's agency and the heterogeneity of women in relation to their labour market preferences and life-style choices, this paper has demonstrated that we should also take account of the domestic and caring constraints surrounding women's choices as well as the social and policy context in which these are framed. It can be argued, therefore, that men and women's working time preferences and behaviour are shaped by the policy and institutional context of the working-time regime of the UK as well as the social and

domestic circumstances in which they live (see also Fagan 2001). In particular, the constraints surrounding women's choices of employment include the presence of children and childcare problems, the long-hours culture for those in full-time work and the persistence of the traditional domestic division of labour.

REFERENCES

- Brannen, J. and Moss, P. (1991) *Managing Mothers: Dual Earner Households After Maternity Leave*, London: Macmillan
- Bruegel, I (1996) 'Whose Myths are They Anyway ? *British Journal of Sociology* 47 (1):175-7.
- Bruegel, I (2000) 'Male Breadwinners, Fatherhood and the Feminisation of Employment' paper presented at ESRC Seminar "Impact of a Changing Labour Market on Families, Children and Mental Health, Aberdeen University, November.
- Burchell, B. J. *et al.* (1999) *Job Insecurity and Work Intensification: Flexibility and the Changing Boundaries of Work* York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Burghes, L *et al.* (1997) *Fathers and Fatherhood in Britain*, London: Family Policy Studies Centre.
- Conley, H, (2000) Temporary Labour in the Public Sector: Employers' Policies and Trade Union Responses in Social Services and Schools, unpublished PhD, Department of Sociology, Warwick University.
- Cousins, C. (1999) 'Changing Regulatory Frameworks and 'Non-standard Employment in Europe' in A. Felstead and N. Jewson (eds.) *Global Trends in Flexible Labour* London: Macmillan.
- Crompton, R. and Harris, F. (1998) 'Explaining Women's Employment Patterns: Orientations to Work Revisited' *British Journal of Sociology*, 49 (10): 118-143.
- Dex, S.(ed.) (1999) *Families and the Labour Market: Trends, Pressures and Policies*, London: Family Policy Studies Centre.
- DSS (2000) *Client Group Analysis: Quarterly Bulletin on the Population of Working Age on Key Benefits* –August 2000, DSS Analytical Services Division.
- Dex, S. and McCulloch, A.(1995) *Flexible Employment in Britain: A Statistical Analysis*, London: Equal Opportunities Commission.
- DTI (1998) White Paper on *Fairness at Work*, May London:Department of Trade and Industry
- DTI (2000) *Parents and Work* <http://www.dti.gov.uk/er/review.htm>
- DTI (2001) *Implementation of the Working Time Regulations* F. Neathy and J. Arrowsmith: Employment Relations Research Series No. 11

- EIRO (Nov. 2001) Working Time Developments and the Quality of Work, UK
<http://www.eiro.eurofound.ie/2001/11/StudyUK/TN111143S.html>
- EIRO (Dec. 2001) CBI Conference Urges Government to Resist Further Employment Legislation' <http://www.eiro.eurofound.ie/2001/12/InBrief/UK0112103N.html>
- EIRO (Feb. 2002) Working Time Developments – annual update 2001
<http://www.eiro.eurofound.ie/2002/Update/tn0202103u.html>
- Eurostat (1998) *Labour Force Survey* Luxembourg, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Ferri, E. and Smith, K (1996) *Parenting in the 1990s*, London: Family Policy Studies Centre.
- Fagan, C. (2001) 'Time, Money, and the Gender Order: Work-orientations and Working-Time Preferences in Britain' *Gender, Work and Organization*, 8 (3) 239-266.
- Gallie, D *et al.* (1998) *Restructuring the Employment Relationship* Oxford: OUP.
- Ginn, J. *et al.* (1996) 'Feminist Fallacies: a Reply to Hakim on Women's Employment' *British Journal of Sociology* 47 (1):175-7.
- Ginn, J. and Sandell, J. (1997) 'Balancing Home and Employment: Stress Reported by Social Services Staff', *Work, Employment and Society*, 11 (3): 413-434.
- Hakim, C. (1991) 'Grateful Slaves and Self-Made Women: Fact and Fantasy in Women's Work Orientations', *European Sociological Review* 7 (2): 101-21.
- Hakim, C. (1995) 'Five Feminists myths about Women's Employment' *British Journal of Sociology* 46 (3): 429-55.
- Hakim, C. (1996) *Key Issues in Women's Work: Female Heterogeneity and the Polarisation of Women's Employment* London: Athlone Press
- Hakim, C. (2000) *Work-Lifestyle Choices in the 21st Century: Preference Theory*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harkness, S. (1999) 'Working 9 to 5?' in P.Gregg and J.Wadsworth *The State of Working Britain*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Heery, E. and Salmon, J. (2000) 'The Insecurity Thesis' in E. Heery and J. Salmon (Eds.) *The Insecure Workforce*, London: Routledge.
- Hochschild, A. (1997) *The Time Bind: When Work becomes Home and Home becomes Work* New York: Henry Holt and Company.

- Perrons, D. and Hurstfield, J. (1998) 'United Kingdom' in D. Perrons (ed.) *Flexible Working and the Reconciliation of Work and Family Life – A New Form of Precariousness*, Final Report to the Community Action Programme on Equal Opportunities for Women and Men (1996-2000) Brussels: European Commission.
- Purcell, K. *et al.* (1999) *Whose Flexibility? The Costs and benefits of 'Non-standard Working Arrangements and Contractual Relations*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Purcell, K. (2000) 'Gendered Employment Insecurity?' in E. Heery and J. Salmon (eds.) *The Insecure Workforce*, London: Routledge.
- Scheibl, F. (1999) *Theorising Commitment and Constraint in Women's Post Childbirth Careers*, unpublished PhD, University of Hertfordshire.
- Schor, J. B. (1991) *The Overworked American*, New York: Basic Books.
- Sennett, R. (1998) *The Corrosion of Character: The Personal Consequences of Work in the New Capitalism*, London: W.W.Norton & Co.
- TUC (2002) 'One in Six UK Workers put in more than 48 Hours a week' Press Release February 4.
- Walsh, J. (1999) 'Myths and Counter Myths: an Analysis of Part-time Female Employees and their Orientations to Work and Working Hours', *Work, Employment and Society*, 13 (2): 179-203.
- White, M and Forth, J. (1998) *Pathways Through Unemployment: The Effects of a Flexible Labour Market*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

NOTES

¹ The participating countries are the Netherlands, Sweden the UK in west Europe, and Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Romania and Slovenia in central east Europe.

² The authors are the UK partners in the EU Framework 5 research programme 'Households, Work and Flexibility', contract number HPSE-1999-00030. The project extends from April 2000 to April 2003.

³ The survey was carried out by NFO World Group between February and May 2001 and consisted of a nationally representative sample of 945 adults aged between 18 and 64. A standardized questionnaire was administered using CAPI in face to face interviews.

⁴ See the DTI White Paper *Fairness at Work* 1998. In November 2001 the Prime Minister also emphasized that there would be no dilution of the UK's flexible labour market, 'there will be no new ramp of employment legislation taking us back to the 1970s. The basic settlement of the last parliament will remain' (EIRO Dec. 2001).

⁵ In the comparative report for the EU project household self-provisioning will also be examined.

⁶ Details of these papers and their availability can be found at: <http://www.hwf.at>

⁷ These employment rates are similar to the national Labour Force Survey 2001 rates of 79 per cent and 69 per cent for men and women respectively.

⁸ One half of those working more than 50 hours are in the higher social class groups (ISCO 1 Legislators, senior officials and managers and ISCO 2 Professionals). In contrast nearly 60 per cent of those working under 20 hours are in social groups 4 (Clerical and secretarial) and 5 (Services workers, shop and market sales workers). The sample overall showed a very high level of gender occupational segregation with 80 per cent of Groups 4 and 5 containing female workers and over 90 per cent of Group 7 (Craft and Related Trades) comprised of male workers.

⁹ We are grateful to Geraldine Healy for this point.

¹⁰ However, these are much lower proportions reporting that childcare is shared equally than in the Ferri and Smith (1996) cohort study of 33 year old parents. In their study, of those in two full-time worker families, 72 per cent of cohort fathers and 66 per cent of cohort mothers reported that childcare was equally shared.

Table 1 Usual weekly working hours of respondents and parents by gender

Hours per week	Male %	Female %	Fathers %	Mothers %
1 – 9	<1	7	-	11
10 – 19	4	17	2	21
20 – 29	5	20	4	26
30 – 39	20	31	17	30
40 – 49	39	18	42	11
50 – 59	17	2	17	1
60 – 99	12	2	18	-
Refused/DK	2	3	-	-
Total N. = 663	100	100	100	100

Table 2 Working hours of respondents and their partners in dual earner families by gender of respondents

Two full-time earner families N. = 151								
Hours of work	Without children				With children			
	M %	Partner %	F %	Partner %	M %	Partner %	F %	Partner %
<20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<30	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
>40	75	47	35	73	88	35	21	79
>50	22	33	5	19	38	9	-	17

Part-time/full-time earner families N. = 126								
Hours of work	Without children				With children			
	M %	Partner %	F %	Partner %	M %	Partner %	F %	Partner %
<20	-	22	40	-	-	45	39	-
<30	-	89	100	-	-	83	92	-
>40	78	-	-	69	74	-	-	79
>50	44	-	-	44	26	-	-	28

Table 3 Willingness to work more than 40 hours per week and working time preferences by gender (%)

N. = 610	All male working respondents	All female working respondents	Coupled fathers	Coupled mothers
Willingness to work more than 40 hours				
If no job	80	31	84	15
For twice the salary	81	47	85	32
Happy with hours worked	65	70	62	74
% saying to meet domestic commitments	25	44	43	63
Prefer fewer hours	28	20	34	16
% saying to spend more time with family	53	45	68	67

Table 4 Willingness to work more than 40 hours per week and working time preferences of women workers in different family types

	2 full-time worker families N. = 151		Female part-time and male full-time families N. = 126		
	Mothers with dependent children %	Women without children %	Mothers with dependent children %	Mothers with grown up children %	Women without children %
Willingness to work more than 40 hours					
If no job	19	43	8	9	13
For twice the salary	45	76	20	20	20
Happy with hours worked	56	68	90	87	87
% saying to meet domestic commitments	69	60	67	57	-
Prefer fewer hours	41	26	2	-	39
% saying to spend more time with family	63	50	-	-	-

Table 5 Personal and work related characteristics of female workers in different family types.

Personal characteristics	Female part-time/male full-time families N. = 126		Two full-time worker families N. = 151	
	With Dependent children %	Without children %	With Dependent children %	Without children %
Age				
Av age (years)	35	47	37	42
Under 30	26	6	-	-
31-40	54	13	56	28
41-50	17	38	29	15
51-65	2	44	-	36
Age of dependent children				
Children under 6	54	-	50	-
Children aged 7-15	67	-	65	-
Educational level				
Higher (ISCED 5-6)	24	7	21	41
Middle (ISCED 3-4)	25	29	39	15
Low or no education (ISCED 1-2)	51	64	39	44
Work related characteristics				
No employment contract	14	13	-	-
Hours of work (mean)	20	20	36	38
Earning low income	54	50	26	13
Satisfied with job in general	86	93	94	79
Work history				
Duration of job less than one year	21	-	3	13
Duration of job between 1-5 years	48	20	38	37
Duration of job more than 5 years	31	80	59	50
Not experienced any employment changes in past 12 years	19	50	24	26
Experience of promotion in past 12 years	29	13	41	33

Table 6 Who takes responsibility for child care in earner types of families with dependent children.

	Full-time working respondent fathers N. = 72			Respondent mothers with full-time working partner N. = 145		
	Partner works			Mother works		
	Full time %	Part time %	Non-working %	Full Time %	Part time %	Non-working %
Daily childcare						
Respondent	8	-	-	50	71	96
Partner	46	70	70	6	2	-
Shared equally	33	30	25	44	27	-
Care of sick child						
Respondent	8	-	-	50	78	96
Partner	58	78	80	6	-	-
Shared equally	33	22	20	42	19	4

Table 7 Who takes responsibility for domestic task in earner types of families with dependent children.

	Full-time working respondent fathers N. = 72			Respondent mothers with full-time working partner N. = 145		
	Partner works			Mother works		
	Full time %	Part time %	Non-working %	Full time %	Part Time %	Non-working %
Cooking						
Respondent	33	19	20	71	85	72
Partner	46	59	60	9	10	12
Shared equally	21	22	15	18	6	12
Cleaning						
Respondent	8	4	-	56	75	80
Partner	54	74	85	6	4	4
Shared equally	38	19	10	29	19	8
Washing						
Respondent	8	7	-	79	89	92
Partner	79	82	90	-	2	4
Shared equally	13	11	5	21	10	4
Shopping						
Respondent	25	7	10	77	67	76
Partner	58	74	60	9	6	4
Shared equally	17	19	30	15	27	20

Table 8 Experience of family/work conflict by hours of work - % saying sometimes, often, always

(N. = 663)	All working men		All working women		Working fathers		Working mothers	
Hours of work per week	%		%		%		%	
Work makes it difficult for me to do household tasks								
1-19			21				26	
20-29			47				62	
30-39	25		41		14		50	
40-49	46		53		59		67	
50+	69		65		85		57	
All	48		39		61		47	
Work makes it difficult for me to fulfil family responsibilities								
1-19			16				23	
20-29			32				52	
30-39	12		32		21		38	
40-49	28		35		41		50	
50+	49		59		68		57	
All	31		29		46		37	
Family responsibilities prevented me from working adequately								
1-19			17				18	
20-29			17				21	
30-39	10		12		14		15	
40-49	17		9		24		17	
50+	24		6		35		14	
All	18		11		28		13	

Table 9 Disagreements on family/work arrangements all respondents and parents by hours of work per week (% of men and women saying always or sometimes disagree)

	Household finances		Household tasks		Time spent together		Time spent at work	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
All respondents N. = 945	14	14	19	26	15	16	15	17
Hours of work Parents N. = 279								
Parents < 30	20	19	20	40	-	23	20	19
Parents 30-39	7	20	14	41	27	21	29	21
Parents 40-49	21	17	21	17	18	25	15	50
Parents 50-59	21	-	36	-	36	-	43	-
Parents 60 +					20	-	27	-