A healthy work–life balance has become increasingly important to people trying to cope with the pressures of contemporary society. This trend highlights the fallacy of assessing well-being in terms of finance alone; how much time we have matters just as much as how much money. The authors of this book have developed a novel way to measure ‘discretionary time’: time which is free to spend as one pleases. Exploring data from the US, Australia, Germany, France, Sweden and Finland, they show that temporal autonomy varies substantially across different countries and under different living conditions. By calibrating how much control people have over their time, and how much they could have under alternative welfare, gender or household arrangements, this book offers a new perspective for comparative cross-national enquiries into the temporal aspects of human welfare.
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For purposes of both social accounting and behavior modeling, a uniform 'currency' in which concepts can be structured and behavioral parameters estimated is of enormous value. Historically, the only such science with such a currency has been economics, where money has served as a measuring rod by which a large number of decisions can be understood, evaluated and aggregated. (Juster 1985a, pp. 19–20)

Real economy – savings – consists in the saving of working time ... Economising, therefore, does not mean the giving up of pleasure, but the development of power and productive capacity, and thus both the capacity for and the means of enjoyment ... To economise on labour time means to increase the amount of free time, i.e., time for the complete development of the individual. (Marx 1858/1972, p. 148)
Contents

List of figures xi
List of tables xiv
Preface xvii

Part I Introduction 1
1 Time and money 3
  1.1 Time matters 3
  1.2 Measuring rods: time and money 7
  1.3 Two surveys, six countries 19
  1.4 Welfare and gender regimes 24
2 Discretionary time and temporal autonomy 27
  2.1 The value of temporal autonomy 27
  2.2 Operationalizing discretionary time 34
  2.3 Validating the measure 54
3 The distribution of discretionary time 61
  3.1 Large variation 61
  3.2 Common patterns 65
  3.3 Country differences 65

Part II Time pressure 67
4 Time pressure: a new problem? 69
  4.1 Time pressure in a broad historical perspective 70
  4.2 Contemporary sources of additional time stress 73
  4.3 Better off but busier 77
5 Time pressure: a new measure 81
  5.1 Conceptualizing time pressure 83
  5.2 Magnitude and sources of time pressure 86
5.3 Distribution of time pressure among subgroups of the population 89
5.4 The best and the worst 93
5.5 Another example: burden-sharing in male-breadwinner families 95
6 Is it really an illusion? 99
   6.1 Blaming the victims 101
   6.2 Choice and the quality of options 109
   6.3 Temporal neutrality 111

Part III Welfare regimes matter 113
7 How welfare regimes differ 115
   7.1 Defining ‘welfare’ 115
   7.2 Welfare policy: a potted history 117
   7.3 Three welfare regimes 122
   7.4 Standard ways of classifying countries 125
   7.5 Other dimensions of welfare: child care, for example 128
8 A temporal perspective on welfare regimes 131
   8.1 Welfare measures: money and time 132
   8.2 Differing state impacts on temporal welfare: the big picture 133
   8.3 Differing state impacts on parents 137
   8.4 Differing state impacts by household types 141
   8.5 State impacts on subgroups of regime-specific concern 143
9 Welfare regimes and temporal autonomy 149

Part IV Gender regimes matter 151
10 How gender regimes differ 153
   10.1 Capturing gender: the challenge 155
   10.2 Two modes of maternalism 157
   10.3 Abstracting models of gender regimes 164
   10.4 Classifying countries: some standard indicators 169
   10.5 Taking lone mothers into account 171
11 A temporal perspective on gender regimes 177
   11.1 Gender regimes: the big picture 178
   11.2 Gendered impacts on parents 182
## Part VI  Conclusions

17  Conclusions

17.1  Major findings

17.2  So what?

17.3  Implications concerning public policy

---

### Appendix 1: Methodology

271

### Appendix 2: Data

326

### Bibliography

426

### Index

454
Figures

1.1 A temporal measure of tax impact: Tax Freedom Day 2005  
1.2 Poverty rates, money and time  
3.1 Mean discretionary time, overall and by gender  
3.2 Mean discretionary time, by household type  
5.1 Magnitude of time-pressure illusion nationwide  
5.2 Components of time-pressure illusion nationwide  
5.3 Magnitude of time-pressure illusion, by gender and parental status  
5.4 Magnitude of time-pressure illusion by household type  
5.5 The difference between households with the most and least time pressure  
5.6 Decomposition of the time-pressure illusion of childless dual-earners  
5.7 Time pressure on parents in traditional male-breadwinner households  
6.1 Mean wage rates of prime-aged wage-earners with high, medium and low time-pressure illusion (as percentage of national mean)  
8.1 Pre- and post-government discretionary time, whole population  
8.2 State impact (decomposed) on discretionary time, whole population  
8.3 State impact on discretionary time, by parental status  
8.4 State impact (decomposed) on discretionary time of parents  
8.5 State impact on discretionary time, by household type  
8.6 State impact on discretionary time of single-earner couples with children, by earner status  
11.1 Pre- and post-government discretionary time, by gender
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>State impact on gender gap in discretionary time</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>State impact on discretionary time, by gender and parental status</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>State impact (decomposed) on mothers’ discretionary time</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>State impact on mothers’ discretionary time, by household type</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>State impact (decomposed) on coupled mothers’ discretionary time, by employment status</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>State impact (decomposed) on lone mothers’ discretionary time</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>State impact (decomposed) on working mothers’ discretionary time, lone mothers versus partnered mothers</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>Changes in discretionary time through the life cycle, US versus Sweden (first approximation)</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>Proportion of wives with higher wage rates than their husbands</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>Effect of alternative household rules on average household discretionary time</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>Effect of alternative household rules on discretionary time, by gender</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>Gender gap in discretionary time under alternative household rules</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>Paternity penalty under alternative household rules</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>Gap in discretionary time between custodial and non-custodial parents under alternative divorce rules</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>Temporal consequences of shifting from single Atomistic individuals to Dual-earner couples without children</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>Temporal consequences of shift from Conventional Dual-earner couples without children to Conventional Dual-earner couples with children</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>Temporal consequences of shift from Conventional Dual-earner household with children to Gendered Divorce with children</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>Temporal consequences of shift from Conventional Dual-earner household with children to Male-Breadwinner household with children</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of figures

15.5 Temporal consequences of shift from Male Breadwinner with children to Most-efficient Breadwinner with children  247
15.6 Temporal consequences of shift from Conventional Dual-earner with children to Equal Temporal Contribution with children  249
15.7 Temporal consequences of shift from Gendered Divorce with children to Financially Egalitarian Divorce with children  250
15.8 Temporal consequences of shift from Financially Egalitarian Divorce with children to Strictly Egalitarian Divorce with children  251
### Tables

1.1 Income and time-use surveys used  

2.1 Percentages of the population doing less than minimally necessary in three realms  

2.2 Subjective time pressure as a function of spare and discretionary time  

2.3 Satisfaction with life as a whole, as a function of time and money  

7.1 Welfare regime characteristics  

7.2 Classifying countries into welfare regimes  

10.1 Gender-relevant differences across countries  

10.2 Fundamental divides in gender regimes with respect to mothers  

12.1 Fundamental divides in gender regimes with respect to mothers (revised)  

A1.1 Years and national currencies  

A1.2 Necessary time in personal care (hours per week)  

A1.3 Half of median household ‘equivalent’ actual time in ‘cross-nationally comparable’ unpaid household labour (equivalent hours per week)  

A1.4 Hourly costs of child care per child (national currency per hour per child)  

A1.5 The poverty line (equivalent national currency per year)  

A1.6 Expected alimony and child support received for households that receive alimony or child support (national currency per year)  

A1.7 Households’ expected ‘taxes-and-transfers’ (national currency per year)  

A1.8 Mean actual time in travel to/from work during workdays (hours per day)  

A2.1 Discretionary time, US  

A2.2 Spare time, US
### List of tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A2.3</td>
<td>The state impact on discretionary time and the time-pressure illusion, US</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.4</td>
<td>Discretionary time (post-taxes, post-transfers, post-child-care-support) under alternative household rules, US</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.5</td>
<td>Discretionary time, Australia</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.6</td>
<td>Spare time, Australia</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.7</td>
<td>The state impact on discretionary time and the time-pressure illusion, Australia</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.8</td>
<td>Discretionary time (post-taxes, post-transfers, post-child-care-support) under alternative household rules, Australia</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.9</td>
<td>Discretionary time, Germany</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.10</td>
<td>Spare time, Germany</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.11</td>
<td>The state impact on discretionary time and the time-pressure illusion, Germany</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.12</td>
<td>Discretionary time (post-taxes, post-transfers, post-child-care-support) under alternative household rules, Germany</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.13</td>
<td>Discretionary time, France</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.14</td>
<td>Spare time, France</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.15</td>
<td>The state impact on discretionary time and the time-pressure illusion, France</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.16</td>
<td>Discretionary time (post-taxes, post-transfers, post-child-care-support) under alternative household rules, France</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.17</td>
<td>Discretionary time, Sweden</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.18</td>
<td>Spare time, Sweden</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.19</td>
<td>The state impact on discretionary time and the time-pressure illusion, Sweden</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.20</td>
<td>Discretionary time (post-taxes, post-transfers, post-child-care-support) under alternative household rules, Sweden</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.21</td>
<td>Discretionary time, Finland</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.22</td>
<td>Spare time, Finland</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.23</td>
<td>The state impact on discretionary time and the time-pressure illusion, Finland</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.24</td>
<td>Discretionary time (post-taxes, post-transfers, post-child-care-support) under alternative household rules, Finland</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preface

One thing leads to another, in scholarship as in life. The project reported here grows out of Goodin’s earlier collaboration with Bruce Headey, Ruud Muffels and Henk-Jan Dirven on *The Real Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. That book used a very different sort of data from ongoing ‘panels’ to examine the real impact of each of the three main types of welfare regimes on various standard indicators of social concern: poverty, equality, efficiency, social stability, social integration. In addition to all those standard indicators, we thought that we ought also try to assess their impact on people’s ‘autonomy’, somehow construed.

We floundered searching for a good measure. Eventually we hit upon one that seemed particularly telling: a time-and-money measure of ‘combined resource autonomy’, representing the proportion of the population earning at least a poverty-level income and spending no more than the internationally agreed maximum of 40 hours a week in paid labour to do so.

The proportion of people failing that standard might be said to be in ‘time-or-money poverty’. In countries representing corporatist and social-democratic welfare regimes, that proportion was only a shade higher than the proportion in money poverty alone. But in the liberal US welfare regime, where money poverty was already twice as high as in the other two regimes, ‘time-and-money poverty’ was double that again – a whopping 35 per cent.¹

We were mightily impressed by that finding. So was Nobel Laureate Robert Solow, in his long and appreciative review of our work in the *New York Review of Books*.² Clearly, it was something that merited much further investigation. Alas, there was no way of pursuing the matter further within the confines of standard data sets focusing on

income alone. A different approach, employing specifically time-use data, was clearly required. Hence the present project.

Goodin mapped out the basic conceptual strategy for calculating ‘discretionary time’ in a paper for a May 1998 ‘Workshop on Social Policy and Political Theory’ convened by Stein Ringen for the Maison des Sciences de l’Homme in Paris. Invaluable early advice was received at that point from Abram de Swaan, Bernd Marin, Ulrich Mückenberger, Claus Offe, Einar Overbye, Stein Ringen and Philippe Van Parijs. Later we benefited from the hospitality of the Institute for Social and Economic Research at the University of Essex and received excellent advice from Kimberly Fisher and Jay Gershuny on how the Multinational Time Use data set might best be used in our project. Along the way, we benefited from the continuing advice of several of ANU’s distinguished Adjunct Professors – Nancy Folbre, Bob Haveman, Claus Offe, David Soskice and Bobbi Wolfe – during their recurring visits to RSSS over many years. Extraordinarily helpful comments on near-final drafts of the book as a whole have come from Nancy Folbre, Paul ’t Hart, Kieran Healy and Sandy Jencks.

Our initial attempts at implementing that strategy empirically came in a pair of preliminary, exploratory papers. One was co-authored with Michael Bittman and Peter Saunders, the other with Olli Kangas. While various aspects of our methodology have shifted since, and the findings reported here supplant those earlier ones in certain ways, we remain greatly indebted to those early collaborators for help getting us started.

Versions of these arguments have been presented at various conferences and seminars: to the annual conference of RC19 of the International Sociological Association, meeting in Orviedo, Spain; to the ‘Time Use and Economic Well-Being’ conference of the Levy Economics Institute of Bard College, Annandale-on-Hudson, New York; to the International Association for Time Use Research meetings in Halifax, Nova Scotia, and Copenhagen; and to seminars at the University of Bergen, the Norwegian Business School, the Stockholm Institute for Future Studies, the University of Turku, Social Policy Research Centre, UNSW, Sydney and ANU. For discussions then and later, we are grateful to Sara Arber, Tony Atkinson, Christine Benesch, Geoff Brennan, Frank Castles, Kenny Easwaran, Marc Fleurbaey, Marzia Fontana, Bruno Frey, Paul Frijters, Jay Gershuny, Diane Gibson, Bruce Headley, Karl Hinrichs, Charlotte Koren, Andrew Leigh, Bernard Manin, Julie McMillan, Sue Mendus, Jane Millar,
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David Miller, Dennis Mueller, Claus Offe, Joakim Palme, Axel West Pedersen, Thomas Pogge, Alf Erling Risa, Richard Rose, Tim Smeeding, Cass Sunstein, David Tait, Bertil Tungodden, Philippe Van Parijs and Robert van der Veen. We are grateful to them all, and have only ourselves to blame for shortcomings that remain.

Above all, for permission to use their data we are grateful to the Australian Bureau of Statistics, the Multinational Time Use Study, the German Institute for Economic Research, the Luxembourg Income Study, Statistics Finland and Statistics Sweden. Our work on the ‘Discretionary Time Project’ has been carried out with the financial support of Australian Research Council Discovery Grant DP0450406, for which we are also most grateful.

Finally, we are grateful for the permission of the editors, publishers and our other co-authors of the following articles to rework some material from them for this book:


