

# **Workplace benefits and lifecourse stage<sup>1</sup>**

**Edith Gray\***

**Negotiating the Life Course Discussion Paper Series  
Discussion Paper DP-006  
2000**

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper was originally presented at the Australian Sociological Association conference in Adelaide December 2000

## **Abstract**

The presence of children in the household affects men and women's labour force participation differentially. This paper examines these variations in involvement in paid labour based on child status. The paper examines what workplace benefits are used by parents trying to negotiate work and home life. A comparison is made with households that do not have a child present, as this better illustrates the provisions that are utilised by parents. Findings suggest that a range of workplace provisions are needed to assist parents in traversing these seemingly conflicting life roles.

## **Background**

*'That caregiving responsibilities are a powerful source of gender differentiation in employment can be seen in the comparison of persons in all family types with the subgroup of married parents'*

(Gornick, 1999:216)

This paper examines the effect that caregiving (of young children) has on access to workplace benefits, particularly access to family friendly initiatives.

International comparisons of the employment rates of men and women show that the female/male employment ratio is substantially lower among parents than at other times in the lifecycle. This reflects the lower employment rates of women, and the higher rates of men, when there are young children present in a household (Gornick, 1999:216–17).

However, it is not simply employment rates that are lower. Even when women are involved in employment, many have reduced employment such as part-time or casual work, and lack of access to family friendly workplace initiatives.

## **Trends in labour force participation and employment**

National statistics show that in 1999, 54 per cent of women, and 73 per cent of men aged 15–64 participated in the paid labour force, with women making up 43 per cent of the paid workforce (ABS, 2000:108). This situation has led to an increase in dual-earner families. The most recent figures suggest that in 1999 around 57 per cent of couple families with dependants were dual-earner households (see Appendix Table A1). As

Russell and Bowman state, 'When statistics for the participation of couple families in the workforce are examined it is clear that the traditional family model of one working partner is fast vanishing' (2000:14).

Women and men's labour force participation is closer than at any other time in the 20th Century, and married and unmarried women now have similar rates of employment following the increase of married women's employment, particularly since the mid-1960s. However there are substantial differences in the employment of men and women.

Women are much more likely to be involved in part-time and casual work than men are. Of women working in 1999, 44 per cent were employed part-time, while for men this proportion was 13 per cent. Casual employment is also differentiated, with 22 per cent of men and 32 per cent of women working casually in 1999.

### **Part-time and casual work as aids to caregiving**

It has been suggested that these patterns of employment arrangements are 'a reflection of the situation that many women with family responsibilities prefer part-time work, and that women still carry the major burden of housework in the family' (Young, 1990:9). These ideas are affirmed by Hartley (1991), who found that young men expected an uninterrupted work pattern, while young women expected to spend time in part-time positions to balance work and family life.

Yeandle (1984:50–51), in outlining the dominant pattern of women's employment careers, found three stages which reflect the pattern of casual and part-time work discussed above. These are: (1) employment patterns before birth of the first child; (2) leaving the labour market to raise children; and (3) returning to the labour force. She suggests that the majority of women are involved in full-time employment following schooling, but leave the labour force at the birth of the first child (for a sometimes short, and sometimes longer time). This is usually followed by return to the labour force, often as a part-time employee for a significant period.

This pattern of women's employment careers is evident in Australia. Women who have young children in their household are least likely to be involved in the paid labour force. In 1999, 47.1 per cent of women with children aged zero to four years participated in

the labour force (ABS, 2000:108). In comparison, men who are in a couple relationship and have a child are the most likely to be in the labour force, with around 93 per cent in the labour force regardless of the age of youngest child (see Appendix Table A2).

In terms of full- and part-time employment, for men in couple relationships, the pattern is like that for labour force participation, in that the proportion employed full-time does not vary by age of youngest child (see Appendix Table A3). In comparison, mothers are likely to increase their employment status to full-time as their youngest child becomes of older. However, in comparison to the transformation that occurs for labour force participation, the difference for full-time employment status is not as striking. For labour force participation, women whose youngest child has reached school age have much greater participation than women whose youngest child is aged 0–4, whereas when observing movement to full-time employment, the difference occurs later.

Of particular note in exploring the variation in full-time employment by age of youngest child is that the age of the child has a great deal of impact on women's full-time work status. While there was no real difference in labour force participation for mothers with children aged 5–9 and 10–14, there is a difference in full-time employment. For mothers in a couple relationship, the proportion working full-time is 42 per cent when there is a child aged five to nine, and 47 per cent when there is a child aged 10–14.

In many ways these employment patterns represent a considerable level of involvement of women in the paid labour force. However, the pattern of women's labour force involvement previously described by Yeandle, and which is evident in these statistics, is potentially problematic for access to family friendly workplace practices.

### **The difficulties of part-time and casual employment**

Although the availability of casual and part-time labour is essential to allow caregivers the opportunity to work and care for young children, part-time and casual work schemes can be problematic. One particular issue that has been identified—mainly for casual work—is that this type of employment often has few workplace incentives or workplace benefits.

In terms of employment entitlements, employees who have regular part-time work are eligible to benefits which are advantageous in terms of balancing work and family life.

These include paid sick and holiday leave, and may include parental leave. In comparison, while provisions are made via salary loadings, casual employees have less access to the benefits available to regular part-time workers.

In investigating the situation of female casual workers, Smith and Ewer (Smith and Ewer, 1999), find that casual employees have shorter job tenure, lower access to employment benefits, and lower and more volatile earnings (despite casual salary loadings). Among their concerns, they list particular problems regarding access to family-friendly benefits such as parental and personal carer's leave. Further, they flag the difficulties present due to insecure and uncertain working hours, where they argue that 'Casual workers often have rosters that change regularly, rendering the planning of family life difficult' (Smith and Ewer, 1999:30). Given that many women are forsaking full-time permanent employment, instead using casual or part-time work to negotiate work and family life, these benefit arrangements may be less than suitable for many caregivers.

Although the increase in women's labour force participation is positive for women's status, there is also concern about women's power in casual and part-time positions. Together with having a low level of access to employment provisions, casual and part-time positions often require less skill and do not have high status, both of which are qualities that can limit negotiation in the workplace. Glezer and Wolcott, in summarising investigations into part-time work, found that even when women were in management positions they have problems with part-time work, '...women in management or with management career aspirations knew they had to pursue full-time employment to achieve their promotion goals' (2000:44).

These findings are of concern for women who want to achieve career aspirations whilst maintaining a family. Starrels (1992), in outlining the barriers to use and support of progressive family policies in the workplace, found that corporate support is essential to reduce work-family tension. She suggests that workplaces are inflexible in recognising alternate career trajectories, and that managers have many biases concerning career tracks.

Included in the list of biases managers hold are: measuring career dedication by the amount of time spent at work; careers must be a straight, uninterrupted, vertical path

through the hierarchy; and that when parents reduce their work hours to take care of children, they are essentially “on vacation” (Starrels 1992:262). These attitudes can subvert macro corporate policies aimed at work–family connections. Given these viewpoints, it is of concern that the methods used to negotiate work and family life—particularly reduced working hours—are viewed so cynically.

What is presented here is an explanation of what the differences are in eligibility to workplace benefits for those who do not have a child, and those who have a young child present in the household.

## **Data and methodology**

The data used to investigate the impact of lifecycle group, work status and age, on household labour is the Negotiating the Life Course (NLC) dataset.

NLC is a randomly selected longitudinal survey. It surveyed people aged 18–54 in the first wave, which was conducted in 1996–97. The second wave was collected this year, and is not quite ready for use. This analysis is based on the first wave only.

For the purpose of this analysis, I have used only those in heterosexual couples, as it is about the differences in workplace experiences of men and women in these households, that is, households which potentially have two persons in employment. I have excluded those aged less than 20 or greater than 49 as they are outliers in this analysis.

The model: Workplace benefits ← Lifecourse group

*Dependent variable (workplace benefits):*

There are a range of workplace benefits under examination. Seven were measured in NLC (at Appendix 1). They include items such as paid sick leave, paid maternity or parental leave, and family or carers leave.

*Independent variables:*

Lifecourse group has three categories: 1. Do not have a child, but want one in the future (No Child), 2. Youngest child under age 5, and 3. Youngest child aged 5–12. These groups are significantly different by age, with the no child group having a mean age of

28.2 years (median 27), the child <5 group having a mean age of 33.5 years (median 34), and the child 5–12 group having a mean age of 39 years (median 39).

Only those people are included in the analysis, and the total N=933.

The first group who do not have children is used to compare to those who have young children. For this purpose people who did not want children were not included as the group should be comparable, but at a different life stage.

## Findings

### Bivariate analysis

#### *Difference in employment by lifecycle group and sex*

The following describes NLC respondents' involvement in work in the week before they were interviewed. Respondents were asked about their and their partners' employment status last week. Table 1 shows that over 90 per cent of men, and over 65 per cent of women were employed in the week prior to interview. Around 60 per cent of couples are dual-earner families.

**Table 1: Percent of women and men in employment, and proportion of dual-earner couples at week prior to interview, by child-status group.**

<i>Employed last week?*</i>	No child		Child <5		Child 5–12		All three groups	
	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
	Number							
No	8	3	124	14	48	13	180	30
Yes	72	70	124	161	149	147	345	378
Total	80	73	248	175	197	160	525	408
	Per cent							
No	10.0	4.1	50.0	8.0	24.4	8.1	34.3	7.4
Yes	90.0	95.9	50.0	92.0	75.6	91.9	65.7	92.6
<i>Both parents employed?*</i>	No child		Child <5		Child 5–12		All three groups	
	Number							
No	15		222		121		358	
Yes	133		201		236		570	
	Per cent							
No	10.1		52.5		33.9		38.6	
Yes	89.9		47.5		66.1		61.4	

Notes:

\* Significant difference between child status groups for women at P<0.0001 level.

\*\* Significant difference between child status groups at P<0.0001 level.

N=933 (totals may not equal 933 due to missing data).

Source: NLC data (1997).

An examination of couple's employment status by child-status group shows that in the group who have no children, both men and women are most likely to work. Over 90 per cent of these women and men were employed in the week prior to interview. This is also reflected in the proportion of dual-earner couples, where couples who do not have a child are the most likely to have both partners working (90%).

As found in the national statistics, women who have a young child are the least likely to be involved in the paid labour market. Half of the women with the youngest child under age five worked in the week prior to interview, and there is around the same proportion of dual-earner couples in this lifecourse group.

Over 90 per cent of men are employed when the youngest child is under five years, and also when the youngest child is aged 5–12 years in the household. For women, in comparing when there is a child under five years to when there is a child aged 5–12 years present, there is a sizeable increase in the proportion of women who work. The proportion employed increases to about 75 per cent, an increase that is also reflected in the proportion of families which are dual-earner. As noted previously, there is an employment uptake when women move from having their youngest child of pre-school age, to the child being of school age.

#### *Background characteristics*

It is evident that a person's lifecourse group, and sex, impacts on their involvement in paid work. However other characteristics may be important in determining whether respondent's worked in the previous week or not. Table 2 presents the results of bivariate analyses between whether the respondent worked in the previous week, and a number of background characteristics. Together with lifecourse group and sex, age, education, marital status, number of children in the household and country of birth are explored. This explanatory investigation provides an indication of what characteristics are related to whether people are employed or not.



**Table 2: Whether respondent was employed last week by background characteristics.**

Background characteristic	Work last week?				Total
	No		Yes		
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	
Child status group**					
No child	11	7.2	142	92.8	153
Child <5	138	32.6	285	67.4	423
Child 5–12	61	17.1	296	82.9	357
Sex**					
Male	30	7.4	378	92.6	408
Female	180	34.3	345	65.7	525
Age*					
20–24	14	31.8	30	68.2	44
25–29	38	23.8	122	76.3	160
30–34	58	25.0	174	75.0	232
35–39	63	24.1	198	75.9	261
40–44	25	13.9	155	86.1	180
45–49	12	21.4	44	78.6	56
Education**					
Incomplete secondary	75	32.6	155	67.4	230
Complete secondary	52	31.0	116	69.0	168
Vocational	41	17.9	188	82.1	229
Undergrad/Assoc Dip	16	15.1	90	84.9	106
Bachelors or higher	26	13.0	174	87.0	200
Marital status					
De facto	28	22.8	95	77.2	123
De jure	182	22.5	628	77.5	810
Number of children in HH**					
0	11	7.2	142	92.8	153
1	42	22.8	142	77.2	184
2	90	25.5	263	74.5	353
3	44	25.7	127	74.3	171
4+	23	31.9	49	68.1	72
Born in Australia?					
Not born in Australia	43	23.2	142	76.8	185
Yes, born in Australia	167	22.3	581	77.7	748
<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>22.5</b>	<b>723</b>	<b>77.5</b>	<b>933</b>

Notes:

\* Significant difference between groups at P&lt;0.05 level.

\*\* Significant difference between groups at P&lt;0.0001 level.

Source: NLC data (1997).

There was a great deal of variability in employment between particular groups. As noted, the categories within sex and child status group are different, and these differences are statistically significant. There is also a relationship between work status and age, with those over age 39 being most likely to be involved in paid employment.

Similarly, there is an expected relationship between education and work, with those who have completed vocational or university education being the most likely to have worked in the week prior to interview. Like child status group, which measures group age of youngest child, work is related to the number of children in the household. Those

with no children are the most likely to be employed, and this falls from over 90 per cent employed, to about 75 per cent employed when there are children in the household.

Marital status (de facto or de jure), and whether or not the respondent was born in Australia, had no statistical relationship with work in the last week. Given that there are only couples in the sub-sample analysed, this is not a surprising result for marital status.

These variables were tested together using logistic regression to model whether the respondent worked in the previous week or not. The findings (Table 3) show that sex, child status, level of education and number of children in the household are significantly related to whether a person worked in the previous week or not. Age and country of birth are not significantly related.

**Table 3: Odds ratios and standard errors from logistic regression analysis of employment in the previous week, by background characteristics (N=933).**

<i>Background characteristic</i>	Odds ratio (Standard Error)
<b>Child status</b>	
No child (ref)	1.000
Child <5	0.233** (0.399)
Child 5–12	0.621 (0.445)
<b>Sex</b>	
Male	6.883** (0.225)
Female (ref)	1.000
<b>Education</b>	
Incomplete secondary (ref)	1.000
Complete secondary	1.411 (0.247)
Vocational qualification	2.047* (0.248)
Undergraduate or associate diploma	3.442** (0.339)
Bachelor degree or higher	3.173** (0.283)
<b>Country of birth</b>	
Born in Australia (ref)	1.000
Not born in Australia	0.699 (0.225)
<b>Age</b>	1.013
<b>Number of children in the household</b>	0.822*
<i>-2 log likelihood</i>	798.464
<i>df</i>	10

Notes:

\* Significant difference between groups at P<0.05 level.

\*\* Significant difference between groups at P<0.0001 level.

Source: NLC data (1997).

### *Difference in hours of work and job stability by lifecycle group and sex*

Of women working in the week prior to interview, there is a significant difference between the number of hours worked by child status group. Table 4 shows that when women do not have a child present in the household, the majority work over 40 hours a week. For men, this is the lifecycle stage when there is a lesser proportion working 40 hours or more; however, it is still a larger proportion than for women.

**Table 4: Number of hours worked (for those working) at week prior to interview, by sex, child-status group.**

<i>Number of hours worked*</i>	No child		Child <5		Child 5–12		All three groups	
	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
	Number							
Less than 20	4		55		47		106	
20–29 <sup>a</sup>	4	8	25	11	22	9	51	28
30–39	20	15	20	26	41	27	81	68
40+	40	44	24	122	36	110	100	276
Total	68	67	124	159	146	146	338	372
	Per cent							
Less than 20	5.9		44.4		32.2		31.4	
20–29 <sup>a</sup>	5.9	11.9	20.2	6.9	15.1	6.2	15.1	7.5
30–39	29.4	22.4	16.1	16.4	28.1	18.5	24.0	18.3
40+	58.8	65.7	19.4	76.7	24.7	75.3	29.6	74.2

Notes:

<sup>a</sup> The hours category 20–29 include all hours less than 30 for men.

\* Significant difference between child status groups for women at P<0.0001 level.

Those working, N=723 (totals may not equal 723 due to missing data).

Source: NLC data (1997).

The most notable difference is when women have a child under age five. At that time, almost half of women who are employed work less than 20 hours, and another 20 per cent work between 20 and 30 hours. Women increase their working hours when the youngest child is of school age, with over 50 per cent working more than 30 hours.

The variability of women's work by child status is also evident in workplace permanency. About 90 per cent of women are employed permanently in the group that does not have children (Table 5). This declines to about 65 per cent of women whose youngest child is under age five and are working. However, although there is an increase in hours for women whose youngest child is of school age, the level of employment permanency does not increase. For men there is no significant difference by child status group, and over 85 per cent of all working men have permanent employment.

**Table 5: Permanency of employment (for those working), by sex, child-status group.**

<i>Permanently employed?*</i>	No child		Child <5		Child 5–12		All three groups	
	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
	Number							
No	6	11	36	12	45	13	87	36
Yes	60	46	69	108	72	97	201	251
Total	66	57	105	120	117	110	288	287
	Per cent							
No	9.1	19.3	34.3	10.0	38.5	11.8	30.2	12.5
Yes	90.9	80.7	65.7	90.0	61.5	88.2	69.8	87.5

Notes:

\* Significant difference between child status groups for women at P<0.0001 level.

Those working, N=723 (totals may not equal 723 due to missing data).

Source: NLC data (1997).

### ***Difference in workplace benefits<sup>2</sup> by lifecourse group and sex***

Table 6 shows that men were more likely to have paid sick leave, paid holiday or recreation leave, and long service leave than women. Overall, around the same proportion of men and women had access to paid maternity/paternity leave, unpaid maternity/paternity leave and family/carers leave. However, there were significant differences for women by lifecourse group.

<sup>2</sup> Although seven workplace benefits were asked of respondents, only six have been used in this analysis. Whether the respondent had a company car or vehicle was omitted.

**Table 6: Access to workplace benefits (for those working), by sex, child-status group.**

<i>Do you have ... leave?</i>	No child		Child <5		Child 5–12		All three groups	
	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
	Number							
Paid sick*								
No	7	23	52	41	66	34	125	98
Yes	61	44	71	118	80	111	212	273
Paid holiday/rec <sup>*a</sup>								
No	7	27	51	44	64	35	122	106
Yes	61	40	72	115	82	110	215	265
Long service * <sup>a</sup>								
No	10	30	52	46	71	42	133	118
Yes	53	35	68	110	71	103	192	248
Paid mat/pat								
No	37	37	84	97	98	77	219	211
Yes	24	20	36	42	40	55	100	117
Don't know	7	10	3	20	8	14	18	44
Unpaid mat/pat*								
No	9	27	29	53	49	54	87	134
Yes	47	25	90	83	83	63	220	171
Don't know	11	15	4	23	14	28	29	66
Family/carers*								
No	4	39	25	81	22	75	51	195
Yes	20	15	20	26	41	27	81	68
Don't know	7	9	2	13	9	12	18	34
	Per cent							
Paid sick*								
No	10.3	34.3	42.3	25.8	45.2	23.4	37.1	26.4
Yes	89.7	65.7	57.7	74.2	54.8	76.6	62.9	73.6
Paid holiday/rec <sup>*a</sup>								
No	10.3	40.3	41.5	27.7	43.8	24.1	36.2	28.6
Yes	89.7	59.7	58.5	72.3	56.2	75.9	63.8	71.4
Long service * <sup>a</sup>								
No	15.9	46.2	43.3	29.5	50.0	29.0	40.9	32.2
Yes	84.1	53.8	56.7	70.5	50.0	71.0	59.1	67.8
Paid mat/pat								
No	54.4	55.2	68.3	61.0	67.1	52.7	65.0	56.7
Yes	35.3	29.9	29.3	26.4	27.4	37.7	29.7	31.5
Don't know	10.3	14.9	2.4	12.6	5.5	9.6	5.3	11.8
Unpaid mat/pat*								
No	13.4	40.3	23.6	33.3	33.6	37.2	25.9	36.1
Yes	70.0	37.3	73.2	52.2	56.8	43.4	65.5	46.1
Don't know	16.4	22.4	3.3	14.5	9.6	19.3	8.6	17.8
Family/carers*								
No	38.2	58.2	60.2	50.9	58.2	51.7	54.9	52.6
Yes	51.5	28.4	38.2	40.9	35.6	40.0	39.8	38.3
Don't know	10.3	13.4	1.6	8.2	6.2	8.3	5.3	9.2

Notes:

\* Significant difference between child status groups for women at P&lt;0.001 level.

<sup>a</sup> Significant difference between child status groups for men at P<0.05 level.

Those working, N=723 (totals may not equal 723 due to missing data).

Source: NLC data (1997).

Women were most likely to have access to workplace benefits when they had no child in the household. Around 90 per cent had paid sick and holiday leave, and 85 per cent had long service leave. These proportions dropped to around 55 per cent when youngest child in the household was of below school age, but did not increase when the youngest child was of school age.

Similarly, there was a decrease in the proportion who had access to family/carers leave between the no child lifecourse group and the child under five group.

It is surprising that as there was a higher proportion working longer hours by women who had an older child that there was no real increase in the proportion who have each of these benefits. This probably reflects the lack of increase in permanent employment.

The mean number of benefits has also been examined (Table 7). For this purpose, long service leave and access to company car or vehicle have been omitted. Out of the five benefits, men (2.4) overall had a higher mean number of benefits than women (1.7). However, again there were significant differences for women by child status group.

**Table 7: Mean number of workplace benefits (for those working), by sex, child-status group.**

	No child		Child <5		Child 5–12		All three groups	
	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
	Mean							
Workplace benefits*	2.9	2.0	1.3	2.4	1.7	2.5	1.7	2.4

Notes:

\* Significant difference between child status groups for women at  $P < 0.0001$  level.

Source: NLC data (1997).

Women who have no child in the household are most likely to have workplace benefits suitable to the negotiation of work and family life (2.9). Men in this group also had a substantial mean number (2.0). The group that was least likely to have the option of these benefits are women who have the youngest child under age five, where the mean score is 1.3 benefits. This is slightly lower than women with youngest child aged 5–12 (1.7). Men with children at these ages are eligible for about 2.5 benefits.

## **Implications**

What these individual-level data show us is that although national statistics inform us that women with older children are more likely to work full-time jobs, there is little difference in the situation of women with a child aged under five years to women who have a child aged 5–12. While hours increase, employment permanency does not change, and there is little difference by the age of youngest child in the workplace benefits accessible to women with children.

Future longitudinal analysis in this area will be useful to understand the employment trajectory and associated benefits as people move through lifecourse stages.

## **Appendix 1**

*Items used to examine workplace benefits in Wave 1 Negotiating the Lifecourse (1996-97)*

### ***Q117 Workplace benefits***

*Do you have any of the following benefits in your job?(Yes/No for each question)*

1. Paid sick leave
2. Paid holiday or recreation leave
3. Long service leave
4. Paid maternity or parental leave
5. Unpaid maternity or parental leave
6. Family or carers leave (for example to look after a sick child)
7. A company car or vehicle for private use



**Appendix Table A1: Proportion of dual-earner households of couples with dependants by age of youngest child, 1984–1999.**

<i>Age of youngest child</i>	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
0–4	29.3	29.9	36.1	38.7	39.3	41.1	42.7	40.4	41.3	40.0	41.6		43.6	44.0	45.2	43.6
5–9	50.6	51.6	56.3	56.6	59.8	62.3	64.0	60.8	59.2	58.3	58.1		61.9	64.3	62.5	62.9
10–14	53.9	55.2	60.7	60.9	62.5	65.2	67.8	65.1	64.3	64.1	63.4		68.6	65.0	68.8	67.7
All families with dependants	42.4	45.5	48.5	50.2	50.9	53.8	55.9	53.4	53.3	52.5	52.8		55.7	56.3	57.5	56.8

Source: ABS Catalogue No. 6224.0, various years (1984-1999).

**Appendix Table A2: Labour force participation of parents by age of youngest child and sex, 1999.**

<i>Age of youngest child</i>	Couple parent - fathers			Couple parent - mothers			Sole parent - fathers			Sole parent - mothers		
	<i>In LF</i>	Not in LF	Total	In LF	Not in LF	Total	In LF	Not in LF	Total	In LF	Not in LF	Total
	<b>'000</b>											
0–4	756.9	47.9	804.8	397.5	407.3	804.8	4.9	4.4	9.3	57.1	103.8	160.9
5–9	467.5	33.4	500.9	349.3	151.7	501.0	7.4	4.5	11.9	85.3	51.9	137.2
10–14	372.1	29.7	401.8	295.6	106.2	401.8	13.9	5.2	19.1	75.0	44.8	119.8
	<b>Per cent</b>											
0–4	94.0	6.0	100.0	49.4	50.6	100.0	52.7	47.3	100.0	35.5	64.5	100.0
5–9	93.3	6.7	100.0	69.7	30.3	100.0	62.2	37.8	100.0	62.2	37.8	100.0
10–14	92.6	7.4	100.0	73.6	26.4	100.0	72.8	27.2	100.0	62.6	37.4	100.0

Source: (ABS, 1999:20,24).

**Appendix Table A3: Full-time work status of employed parents by age of youngest child and sex, 1999.**

Age of youngest child	Couple parent - fathers			Couple parent - mothers			Sole parent - fathers			Sole parent - mothers		
	FT	Not FT	Total	FT	Not FT	Total	FT	Not FT	Total	FT	Not FT	Total
	<b>'000</b>											
<b>0-4</b>	674.1	40.2	714.3	120.4	236.2	356.6	2.0	1.5	3.5	15.4	25.8	41.2
<b>5-9</b>	422.3	24.5	446.8	134.1	188.0	322.1	4.8	1.5	6.3	29.4	43.4	72.8
<b>10-14</b>	337.0	22.7	359.7	129.6	145.8	275.4	10.5	1.8	12.3	31.7	33.9	65.6
	<b>Per cent</b>											
<b>0-4</b>	94.4	5.6	100.0	33.8	66.2	100.0	57.1	42.9	100.0	37.4	62.6	100.0
<b>5-9</b>	94.5	5.5	100.0	41.6	58.4	100.0	76.2	23.8	100.0	40.4	59.6	100.0
<b>10-14</b>	93.7	6.3	100.0	47.1	52.9	100.0	85.4	14.6	100.0	48.3	51.7	100.0

Source: (ABS, 1999:20,22).

## Bibliography

ABS (1999). *Labour force status and other characteristics of families*. Catalogue No. 6224.0. Canberra, ABS.

ABS (2000). *Australian social trends*. Catalogue No. 4102.0. Canberra, ABS.

Glezer, H. and I. Wolcott (2000). 'Conflicting commitments: Working mothers and fathers in Australia'. In L. L. Haas, P. Hwang and G. Russell (Eds) *Organizational change and gender equity: International perspectives on fathers and mothers at the workplace*. Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications, Inc: 43-56.

Gornick, J. (1999). 'Gender equality in the labour market'. In D. Sainsbury (Ed.) *Gender and welfare state regimes*. Oxford, Oxford University Press: 210-242.

Hartley, R. (1991). 'To work or not to work? Women, work and family responsibilities.' *Family Matters* 28: 36-39.

Russell, G. and L. Bowman (2000). *Work and family: Current thinking, research and practice*. Canberra, Department of Family and Community Services.

Smith, M. and P. Ewer (1999). *Choice and coercion: Women's experience of casual employment*. Sydney, Evatt Foundation, and NSW Department for Women.

Starrels, M. (1992). 'The evolution of workplace family policy research.' *Journal of Family Issues* 13(3): 259-278.

Yeandle, S. (1984). *Women's working lives*. London, Tavistock Publications Ltd.

Young, C. (1990). 'The impact of demographic change on Australia's labour force with reference to the special role of women.' *Working papers in Demography*. Canberra, Demography, Research School of Social Sciences, ANU.