

Endnotes

- 1 For example, between 1986 and 2000 the rate of employment of women with a youngest child aged less than five years increased from 35.7 to 45.0 per cent. There has been a similar increase in the employment rate of women with a youngest child aged 5–15 years from 58.4 to 66.8 per cent (ABS Catalogue No. 6224.0).
- 2 A third possibility is for organisations deemed to be family-friendly to increase the size of their workforces, relative to those that are not.
- 3 It is estimated that in June 1999, 35 per cent of the Australian population used a mobile telephone (OECD 1999).
- 4 It is sometime argued that permanent part-time employees miss out on organisation-provided training and opportunities for promotion, thus limiting subsequent carer development and reducing the “family-friendliness” of permanent part-time employment (Junor 1998). Notwithstanding such concerns, survey-based evidence consistently reveals that women with children value permanent part-time work as a way of reconciling work and family responsibilities.
- 5 For example, evidence from the Australian Bureau of Statistics Time Use Surveys reveals that Australian mothers contribute 74 per cent of the time devoted to the physical care of children (Bittman and Pixley 1997).
- 6 A number of studies have taken the approach of comparing the earnings of women with access to a family-friendly work practice to those of women who do not. These studies have usually found that women who have access to the work practice have higher earnings than do otherwise similar women. Such studies usually fail to adequately take account of unmeasured differences between women such as innate ability or motivation. This means that it is impossible to disentangle the impacts of the work practices and other unmeasured differences on wages. Gruber (1994) gets around this difficulty by using the natural experiment provided by the mandating of maternity benefits in some US states but not in others. Gruber uses the State variation in the mandating of maternity benefits to isolate the effects of maternity benefits on wages as compared to other factors.
- 7 Detailed discussions of the AWIRS95 survey can be found in Morehead *et al.* (1997) and Wooden and Bora (1999).
- 8 The respondents were given several options to choose from, ranging from “a lot” to “a little”.
- 9 The higher proportion of employees reporting being able to get permanent part-time employment as being not relevant to them is largely the result of males being much more likely to not consider part-time work relevant (unreported estimates from AWIRS95 data set). This probably reflects strongly held beliefs about the role of men.

- 10 If the access of individual i in workplace n is given by x_{in} then the overall average (across all employees in all workplaces) is given by $\bar{x} = \sum_i \sum_n x_{in} / (nT_i)$ where n is the number of workplaces and T_i is the number of employees at workplace i . The *between workplace measure* is given by $\bar{x}_i = \sum_n x_{in} / T_i$. The measure of differences between employees within firms is given by $(x_{in} - \bar{x}_i + \bar{x})$. The standard deviations of each of these measures gives a measure of the variation in that variable. If a variable does not vary between employees at the same workplace, its *within workplace* standard deviation will be zero.
- 11 This is illustrated by the fact that the average workplace size in the AWIRS95 is 187 as compared to 290 among workplaces that had 10 or more employee interviews. A sensitivity analysis was conducted using 5 and 15 employee responses as the cut-off. There was found to be very little difference in the *within workplace* distribution in the use of family-friendly work practices using these different cut-offs. The analysis is therefore restricted to workplaces with valid responses from 10 or more employees.
- 12 On average 1.6 ways of usually taking time off for family reasons were nominated.
- 13 In addition to unobserved differences between workplaces there may be unobserved differences between employees. These can include differences in innate ability, preferences and extent of family responsibilities. In order to control for unobserved employee heterogeneity, longitudinal (that is, multiple observations on each employee) linked employee–employer data is needed. Such data sets do not exist for Australia.
- 14 In technical terms the appropriate estimator depends upon whether there is correlation between any of the explanatory variables and the unobserved workplace effects. If there is no correlation between any of the explanatory variables and the unobserved workplace effects then the appropriate estimator is the RE probit. If there is correlation between any of the explanatory variables and the unobserved workplace effect then the appropriate model is the FE logit. While it is not possible to formally test whether there is correlation between the explanatory variables and the unobserved workplace effects, it is possible to indirectly test the sensitivity of the results by comparing the FE and RE model. The results of the FE logit are presented in Appendix F. While it is not possible to compare the magnitudes of the coefficient estimates between the RE probit and FE logit estimation, it is possible to compare the direction of the estimated effect and statistical significance. Overall there are few differences in the direction of the estimated effects or statistical significance. This provides confidence in the results of the RE probit.
- 15 The standard ABS classification of countries as English and non-English-speaking countries is used. The countries classified as being English-speaking are United Kingdom, United States of America, New Zealand, South Africa and Canada.
- 16 The proportion of the variance explained by the panel level variance component is statistically significantly different from zero.
- 17 Unreported estimates from the AWIRS95 data set.
- 18 An alternative explanation is that the employees who join a trade union are those who have the least amount of bargaining power.