

The Economic and Social Review, Vol. 38, No. 3, Winter, 2007, pp. 323–354

Work Rich, Time Poor? Time-Use of Women and Men in Ireland*

FRANCES MCGINNITY

HELEN RUSSELL

The Economic and Social Research Institute, Dublin

Abstract: Are we running out of time? This paper uses data from a recently completed time-use survey in Ireland to consider whether the recent employment growth has led to high workloads, time-pressure and a lack of free time. We examine levels of total committed time, that is, time spent on employment/education, unpaid work (caring and household work) and travel, across different groups in the population. We find high workloads among the employed and those caring for young children and adults. High levels of committed time are found to be associated with greater subjective feelings of time-pressure. Our evidence suggests that recent employment growth is likely to have contributed to time poverty and feelings of time-pressure.

I DEBATES ON WORK AND LEISURE

Are we ‘running out of time’? There has been a growing controversy in the international literature in the last decade about whether economic growth has led to a perverse result – more work and less leisure. It seems possible

*The data on which this study is based was funded by the NDP Gender Equality Unit of the Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform and is publicly available from the Data Archive in University College Dublin. We would like to thank the staff of the Unit and the Central Statistics Office (CSO) for their advice on the project. We would also like to gratefully acknowledge our colleagues James Williams and Sylvia Blackwell, for their work on the development of the *Irish National Time-Use Survey*. Thanks also to two anonymous ESR reviewers for their helpful comments.

Corresponding author: Dr Frances McGinnity, ESRI, Whitaker Square, Sir John Rogerson’s Quay, Dublin 2. Email: Fran.McGinnity@esri.ie.

that new constraints and pressures have neutralised the benefits of increased prosperity: we are now 'work rich' (and income rich) and 'time poor'. Against this background of increasing time-pressure there have been a variety of claims and counter-claims about changes in paid working hours and the amount of leisure time (Schor, 1991; Robinson and Godbey, 1997; Gershuny, 2000; Jacobs and Gerson, 2004).

Some of the strongest support for the idea that we are running out of time comes from subjective indicators. International evidence points to a growth in the proportion of people feeling rushed and stressed (Bittman, 2004a). This growth in time-pressure is associated with mental and physical health problems and deteriorating quality of life. From this evidence there seems to be general support for Schor's 'Overworked American', and her proposition that leisure has declined. The book certainly had an enthusiastic reception in the US.

But international evidence from time-use data suggests that free or uncommitted time – the time available for leisure – has actually increased. Robinson and Godbey for the US (1997) show an increase in free time, as do Aguiar and Hurst (2007). Gershuny (2000), using the pooled multinational time-use survey, which includes nineteen countries, confirms this. Between the 1960s and the 1990s there has been an increase in weekly free time of 7 hours for women and 5½ hours for men across countries (Bittman, 2004a).

So why are people feeling busier? Why is there an inescapable feeling of time-pressure? Linder, in his book *The Harried Leisure Class* as early as 1970 argues that as productivity increases so does growth in leisure consumption – leading to an increase in the 'intensity' of leisure (Linder, 1970). So, far from being relaxing or 'time out', leisure, and the pressure to consume it, becomes a source of time-pressure itself.

Others have pointed to the increased dispersion of working hours. Bittman (2004a) cites evidence that while the average working week in the US has barely changed in the last decades, this is partly due to a growth in those working longer hours and a growth in 'zero hours', unemployment. Jacobs and Gerson (2004) argue, in a different vein, that the subjective impression of time poverty in the US is based on changes in the distribution of household employment and the spread of the dual-earner household. Households are now supplying more labour to the market, and the feelings of time-pressure are from dual-earner households struggling to manage the greater load of work, paid and unpaid, than earlier generations of male breadwinner households. It is the increase in proportion of dual-earner households, not any increase in the workload of dual-earner households that has caused the increase. The increase in free time at the aggregate level in the US is a result of higher levels of unemployment, earlier retirement and ageing populations. So certain

individuals are under considerably more time-pressure, others under much less. Jacobs and Gerson (2004) rely on paid labour statistics, and speculate on time spent on unpaid labour. Time-use data is more appropriate for examining their argument as it permits analysis of both paid and unpaid labour. More recent work by Bianchi and colleagues uses time-use data to analyse the changing time-use patterns of American parents (Bianchi *et al.*, 2006). Following the shift to dual-earner families, they find less leisure time for both mothers and fathers in dual-earner families than in the past, and greater overall workloads, along with some reallocation of tasks between men and women. However, they point to the role of subjective expectations in adding to time-pressure. Working parents, particularly mothers, feel a time squeeze because they feel they *should* be spending more time with children – even though mothers are spending as much time interacting with children as they were 40 years ago (Bianchi *et al.*, 2006).

Gershuny (2005), in a recent article, “Busyness as the badge of honour”, argues that the reason people are feeling busier is that there is now a positive view of busyness and lack of leisure. He takes as his starting point Becker’s (1965) important argument that time and goods are substitutable. People with higher earning power will work more and concentrate on ‘goods intensive’ leisure to maximise utility; lower earners with lower purchasing power will favour ‘time intensive’ leisure and purchase fewer commodities. Thus higher wage rates mean longer hours of paid work. Gershuny’s addition is to stress the importance of paid work relative to leisure for privileged social positions. He argues that there has been a shift from leisure having high status to work having high status. Historically, those who could afford a life of ‘idleness’ had the highest status. “Access to leisure was perhaps the prime means through which the superordinate class differentiated itself from the subordinate” (Gershuny, 2005, p. 49). However, the emergence of mass unemployment, along with other social changes, devalued ‘idleness’ and it is argued that being busy is now a positive, privileged position and it is high status people who work long hours and feel busy. In a recent paper using US time-use data Aguiar and Hurst (2007) find evidence consistent with this hypothesis. In the last forty years the largest increase in leisure has been for the less educated. There is now a growing inequality in leisure that is the inverse of inequality of wages and expenditure: the income poor are ‘time rich’ and the income rich are ‘time poor’.

In this paper we consider the issue of time poverty and perceptions of time-pressure in post-Celtic Tiger Ireland. In the following section we look at changing patterns of employment and working time in Ireland using evidence from existing labour market data before turning to examine these issues using new time-use data for Ireland.

1.1 *Changing Employment Patterns in Ireland*

Does Irish evidence on paid work suggest that we are overworked? The economic boom that Ireland has been experiencing since the mid-1990s has led to a rapid increase in employment (O'Connell and Russell, 2007). This rise in employment has been particularly dramatic for women. The proportion of women in paid employment increased from 38 per cent to 56 per cent over the period 1993 to 2004. The proportion of men in paid employment also increased, but at a more modest rate, rising from 64 per cent in 1993 to 76 per cent in 2004. The unemployment rate fell from 16 per cent in 1993 to 4.4 per cent in 2004. While these changes have occurred very rapidly, the overall rate of employment in Ireland is not exceptional in European terms, though unemployment is lower than the EU average.

While there has been an increase in the number of people in employment the average number of hours worked per week has been declining gradually. Between 1994 and 2004 average hours of work fell from 45.1 hours among men and 34.7 hours among women to 41.2 hours and 32.3 hours respectively. These changes are part of a longer-term downward trend in working hours.¹ A similar decline has occurred in the proportion of workers recording very long working hours (O'Connell and Russell, 2007).

There has also been considerable change in the distribution of employment across households (Russell *et al.*, 2004). Between 1994 and 2000, among working age households, the proportion of workless households (that is, those with no adults in paid employment) declined from 22 per cent to 14 per cent. The share of 'work-rich' households in which all adults are employed grew from 35 per cent to 49 per cent. This trend was evident across different types of households but the changes were particularly marked for households with dependent children.

The increased rate of work-rich households is also reflected in *couples'* employment status. Among couples there has been a significant increase in the proportion of dual-earners between 1994 and 2000. By the end of this period dual-earnership had become more common than the traditional male breadwinner/female homemaker arrangement among working age couples see Table 1.

¹ CSO *Labour Force Survey* and *Quarterly National Household Survey*. Self-reported 'usual hours' per week. Estimates from such self-report questions vary from those produced by time-use surveys. Respondents are found to over-report long hours of work in self-reported hours (Robinson and Bostrom, 1994; Gershuny, 2000).

Table 1: *Couples Under 65 Years, Changes in Employment Status 1994-2000*

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Male Breadwinner	45.0	43.7	39.7	37.2	36.5	35.8	36.2
Dual-Earner	34.6	36.8	39.8	44.8	47.3	49.2	50.7
No-Earner	16.1	15.0	15.8	13.3	12.3	11.3	8.5
Female Breadwinner	4.2	4.5	4.7	4.7	3.9	3.8	4.6
	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Source: Russell *et al.* (2004), Table 5.11.

As a consequence of these employment and demographic changes such as the increasing number of lone parents and population ageing there are an increasing number of people combining working and caring (O'Connell and Russell, 2005; Cullen *et al.*, 2004). This has led to an increasing focus on issues of work-life tensions in Irish debates, and indeed the trends in employment described here are consistent with the type of compositional change that Jacobs and Gerson (2004) describe as lying behind growth in perceived time-pressure. Given that in Ireland the proportion of households where both parents are juggling family and work responsibilities has increased dramatically in the past decade, we might expect a growth in feelings of time-pressure.

1.2 Research Questions

However, to really answer the question are we 'work-rich time poor', we need time-use data on paid work *and* unpaid work. Time-use diaries are generally seen as a more accurate method of gathering information on unpaid labour than asking respondents directly how much time they spend on activities.² In a time-use diary the respondent (and sometimes the spouse/partner) is asked to complete a diary accounting for his/her time for a 24-hour period. Reliability tests of time-use diaries have found very high correlations using different diaries. The validity of time-use diaries have been assessed by comparing respondents' and spouses' accounts of when an activity occurred, as well as by comparing activities recorded in time diaries with those occurring when respondents reported their activity at the signal of a random beeper (Robinson and Godbey, 1998). These studies lend considerable support for the diary method of collecting time-use for measuring paid and unpaid work and leisure: more specific measurement issues are considered when discussing the *Irish National Time-Use Survey 2005* below.

² There are problems of recall using direct questions, and self-reported accounts of domestic labour and caring often reflect aspirations rather than actual time spent.

Picking up on some of the international debates, in this paper we consider three questions on time-use and the distribution of work and leisure in Ireland for the first time. Our first research question is: are people in Ireland time poor? The literature generates conflicting hypotheses about whether leisure has declined in the last decades. Because we report results of the first time-use study carried out in Ireland, we cannot evaluate whether leisure has declined over time. However, we can compare the balance of work and leisure in Ireland compared to other European countries to assess whether recent economic growth has led to Irish adults being ‘overworked’ and time poor, relative to other countries (Section III).

Our second research question is: who are the time poor in Ireland? Here we look at the characteristics of those with high levels of paid and unpaid work – their gender, employment status, caring commitments, age, education etc. – to identify which individuals and households in Ireland are ‘time poor’. We examine household employment status to assess whether the growth in dual-earner households may have contributed to an increased feeling of time-pressure, as Jacobs and Gerson propose for the US. We also test Gershuny’s hypothesis that high status individuals are more likely to be time poor by comparing work and free time among different income groups and educational levels. Do we detect the same ‘inequality’ in free time, where low-income/low education groups have the most leisure, as Aguiar and Hurst (2007) find in the US?³

Our third research question is: to what extent do Irish people *feel* time-pressure and who feels under most time-pressure? Here we examine responses on feeling rushed and stressed. We explicitly examine the link between feeling rushed and ‘objective’ time poverty (Section IV). Can we find an association with being time poor and feeling rushed in Ireland, and what is the strength of the association? Can this help us explain people’s feeling of busyness and the perception that the pace of life is speeding up?

Before investigating time poverty and its effects in more depth, we discuss the collection and structure of the data on which this paper is based, the *Irish National Time-Use Survey, 2005* and overall patterns of time-use in Ireland (Section II).

³ The focus of this paper is on time poverty: we do not consider the ‘intensity of leisure’ by looking at the number of leisure activities. Gershuny (2005) does this for Britain and finds no increase in the number of leisure activities from 1961 to 2001, concluding that this is not linked to people feeling busier.

II THE IRISH NATIONAL TIME-USE SURVEY, 2005

The data which form the basis of this paper were collected between April and July 2005 in a single-purpose, dedicated, nationally representative survey carried out by the ESRI on behalf of the NDP Gender Equality Unit of the Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform (McGinnity *et al.*, 2005). As this was a scoping study the target sample was small – 1,000 adults, 500 men and 500 women.

To select a nationally representative random sample a two-staged clustered design was adopted, based on the National Electoral Register as a population frame. Interviewers attempted to recruit *all* persons aged 18 years and over in each selected household (for details on sampling procedures see McGinnity *et al.*, 2005).⁴ Each adult was asked to complete a weekday and also a weekend diary on two days specified by the interviewer.

The survey adopted a ‘light’ diary methodology. The ‘light’ diary contains a relatively short but comprehensive list of pre-coded activity categories and respondents are required to indicate which they were involved in for each period of the day. The diary ran from 4.00 a.m. to 4.00 a.m. the following morning broken down into 96, 15-minute blocks or “time slots”.⁵ In recording activities the respondent was asked to tick (✓) a box for each 15-minute time slot to indicate which of 26 activities he/she was engaged in throughout the day. The activities are outlined in Table 2 below.

While few respondents reported activities not covered by the list, nevertheless, in common with all light time-use diaries, the categories do impose a normative structure on people’s lives and require them to ‘fit their lives’ into 26 pre-defined categories. Respondents were permitted to record two activities per time-slot in order to capture multiple simultaneous activities – ‘multi-tasking’.⁶ Respondents were also asked to specify where they were and whom they were with during each time period. The diaries were essentially filled out on a self-completion basis following instruction from an interviewer. Accordingly, the structure and content of the diary was relatively straightforward and was designed for self-completion by the respondent in the absence

⁴ To take account of this clustering of individuals within households, and potential time-use correlations, the models in this paper were also run with robust standard errors. The results do not differ from those presented.

⁵ 15 minutes is a commonly used unit of time in time-use surveys and strikes a balance between respondent burden and detail of response.

⁶ Previous research on time-use finds that people often combine activities. Certain types of activity, eg. childcare, are more likely to be combined than others, so confining respondents to one activity would underestimate such activities. Many recorded more than two simultaneous activities, of which up to four were recorded (see McGinnity *et al.*, 2005 for further details).

Table 2: *Activity Categories Used in the Irish National Time-Use Survey 2005*

<i>Major Group</i>	<i>Activity</i>
PERSONAL CARE/RESTING	1. SLEEPING. 2. RESTING/RELAXING doing nothing, 'time out'. 3. PERSONAL CARE washing, dressing, toilet. 4. EATING/DRINKING/HAVING A MEAL.
TRAVEL	5. TRAVEL including travel to and from work as well as leisure and domestic travel.
PAID EMPLOYMENT OR STUDY	6. PAID EMPLOYMENT includes paid and unpaid overtime, work from home, self-employment and farm work. Exclude lunch and other breaks. 7. STUDY, EDUCATION include courses, night classes, studying at home. Exclude lunch and other breaks. 8. BREAKS FROM WORK OR STUDY include tea/coffee, smoking and lunch breaks.
HOUSEWORK AND OTHER HOUSEHOLD TASKS	9. COOKING and preparing food (including making lunches), washing-up. 10. CLEANING the house, doing the laundry, ironing, hoovering, tidying up. 11. HOUSE REPAIRS and maintenance, DIY, gardening.
SHOPPING AND APPOINTMENTS	12. SHOPPING, MESSAGES/ERRANDS and APPOINTMENTS shopping for food or leisure, services e.g. hairdressers, visiting doctor, paying bills.
CARING FOR OTHERS	13. CHILDCARE looking after children, physical care, supervision. 14. PLAYING AND TALKING WITH CHILDREN include reading, games, helping with homework, accompanying children to activities. 15. CARING FOR ADULTS with special needs or elderly persons, either in your home or elsewhere (e.g. help with personal care).
VOLUNTARY AND RELIGIOUS ACTIVITY	16. VOLUNTARY ACTIVITY for a charitable organisation, sports club or other organisation, includes meetings and informal helping outside the home. 17. RELIGIOUS ACTIVITY Attending religious services, prayer.
SOCIALISING AND GOING OUT	18. SPENDING TIME / CHATTING WITH FAMILY, FRIENDS, NEIGHBOURS including spouse. 19. PHONING/TEXTING FAMILY, FRIENDS, NEIGHBOURS include writing a letter. 20. EATING OUT/GOING TO THE PUB include going to cafes, bars, restaurants, and nightclubs. 21. GOING OUT to concerts, theatre, cinema, galleries, sporting events, bookies, and bingo.
SPORTS and LEISURE	22. PLAYING SPORTS, EXERCISE AND OUTDOOR ACTIVITY including playing football, walking the dog, going to the park. 23. COMPUTER/INTERNET FOR PERSONAL USE e.g. play station, x-box, surfing the net, email, using computer for leisure, shopping. 24. HOBBIES AND OTHER LEISURE ACTIVITIES e.g. playing musical instruments, playing cards, other games.
TV, RADIO, READING	25. WATCHING TV and videos/DVD's. 26. READING a book, magazine or newspaper or LISTENING to radio or music.

of the interviewer. Additional demographic and satisfaction information was collected through a self-completion questionnaire attached to the diary.

A total of 585 households participated in the survey, giving a household participation rate of just under 58 per cent of those targeted. Not everyone filled in both diaries, and not all diaries which were completed by household members could be used in the analysis: diaries with more than 15 empty time-slots (2 hours) were excluded. In total 79 per cent of eligible individuals within households contributed at least one useable diary.

The sample was re-weighted, controlling for gender, age, household composition, region, educational attainment and principal economic status, to represent the national population (see Appendix Table B1).⁷ All descriptive tables presented in this report are based on these reweighted data (see McGinnity *et al.*, 2005 for further details of re-weighting).

2.1 Overall Patterns of Time-Use in Ireland

The survey asked respondents to complete two time-use diaries one for a weekday and one for a weekend. We generally present results separately for weekday time-use and weekend time-use as these vary considerably: for European comparisons we combine these to give an 'average' day. As respondents were permitted to record multiple activities (to reflect the reality that individuals often carry on more than one activity at a time) the total time recorded often adds to more than 24 hours. In order to limit the total time to 24 hours, where respondents undertake more than one activity at once, we impose alternative definitions of which is the 'main' activity. For this paper we impose the following priority order for defining the main activity: 1 childcare and adult care; 2 employment and study; 3 household work; 4 travel; 5 personal care and eating; 6 leisure and voluntary activity; 7 sleeping and 8 unspecified time-use. If two or more activities are recorded in a time-slot priority is given to the activity that appears first in the list.⁸

While prioritising tasks is necessary to reduce very complex data into something that can be meaningfully analysed, it does have certain implications for time-use estimates (see Gershuny, 2000 for a discussion). In

⁷ From Appendix Table B1 we can see from the unweighted data that women and those over 45 years were overrepresented in the sample. Those with highest education Leaving Certificate and in employment were also over-represented, as were those with no children, married and respondents from the BMW region. As later analysis will reveal, some of these characteristics increase the likelihood of being 'time poor', some reduce it. However, as the weighting procedure adjusts the sample to be representative of the population on these key indicators, we expect any bias remaining after weighting to be negligible.

⁸ Results using an alternative priority setting – 1. employment and study, 2. travel, 3. personal care and eating, 4. housework and shopping, 5. caring, 6. leisure and voluntary activity, 7. sleeping and 8. unspecified time-use – are discussed in McGinnity *et al.*, 2005, Appendix B.

this classification ‘committed’ time (paid and unpaid work) is given a higher priority than ‘free time’. A specific example is that childcare combined with leisure will count as childcare. Thus care may be overestimated, and leisure underestimated.⁹ An alternative strategy is to divide the time lost equally between each of the activities. For example, if paid work, eating and travel are recorded together in one 15 minute time-slot, each activity is assigned 5 minutes. Estimates using these time-use estimates are presented in Appendix A. While intuitively appealing, this may not be as close to how people actually experience time as giving one activity priority. We thus prefer to present estimates using the priority settings in the main text of this paper.

The figures on weekday/weekend time-use applying the main activity definition are presented in Table 3. The allocation of sub-activities to these summary groups is evident from the previous table (Table 2).¹⁰ Note that the average time spent on any activity across the sample is a function of both the proportion of people who engage in that activity and the amount of time those individuals spend on the activities. (In the main survey report we present figures on the proportion of men and women participating in each activity, and also further details of time spent on each of the 26 activities, see McGinnity *et al.* (2005)).

From Table 3 we see that on weekdays women spend almost five times longer on caring activities than men. Domestic labour is also significantly higher for women than men. In contrast, employment/study is significantly higher for men. If we add these three categories together women spend an average of 7 hours 48 minutes on these three activities and men spend an average of 7 hours 28 minutes. On average men spend 21 minutes more than women on leisure and voluntary activities,¹¹ while women spend 16 minutes more time sleeping than men on weekdays.

Similar gender patterns emerge for the weekend. Men continue to spend longer in paid employment/study (almost one hour more), while women spend twice as much time on caring and household work (5 hours versus 2 hours 24 minutes). This leads to a significant leisure gap between women and men

⁹ Some researchers have listed activity combinations, i.e. childcare plus watching TV. However, the number of different activity combinations in the Irish Time-Use data meant it was not feasible to pursue this strategy.

¹⁰ Note that in grouping activities we have followed normal conventions. For example, gardening, DIY and shopping are counted as household tasks, whereas in some instances and/or for some people these might be seen as leisure activities. It is not possible to incorporate this variation in the ‘status’ of activities in such simple activity groupings but it should be noted that some blurring of the boundaries between activity groups occurs.

¹¹ It should be remembered that voluntary and religious activity only account for a small proportion of time within this broad category (see Table 2.2 McGinnity *et al.*, 2005). This category includes both active leisure such as physical activity/going out and passive leisure (e.g. watching TV, doing nothing, reading).

Table 3: *Average Time (hours:minutes) Spent on Main Activities, Weekdays and Weekends*

	<i>Caring for Others</i>	<i>Emp. and Study</i>	<i>House- hold Work</i>	<i>Travel</i>	<i>Personal Care and Eating</i>	<i>Leisure, and Vol./ Relig. Activity</i>	<i>Sleep</i>	<i>Unspec. Time Use</i>	<i>Total</i>
	HH:MM	HH:MM	HH:MM	HH:MM	HH:MM	HH:MM	HH:MM	HH:MM	HH:MM
<i>Weekday</i>									
All	1:33	4:14	1:53	1:07	1:47	4:58	8:05	0:22	24:00
Male	0:34	5:46	1:08	1:18	1:49	5:09	7:57	0:19	24:00
Female	2:31	2:44	2:36	0:57	1:45	4:48	8:13	0:25	24:00
<i>Weekend</i>									
All	1:40	1:23	2:05	0:56	2:00	6:57	8:38	0:20	24:00
Male	0:53	1:52	1:31	1:03	2:00	7:41	8:39	0:20	24:00
Female	2:24	0:56	2:36	0:50	2:01	6:15	8:37	0:20	24:00

Source: *Irish National Time-Use Survey, 2005*.

Note: Where multiple activities are recorded for one time slot we apply the priority setting outlined in the text to decide which activity is the main activity. Note that these figures are not decimals but hours and minutes.

at the weekends: men on average have almost 1½ hours more leisure time than women. On weekend days women and men spend a similar time sleeping, both sleeping more than on weekdays.

III ARE PEOPLE IN IRELAND TIME POOR? EVIDENCE FROM TIME-USE DIARIES

The central idea of the debates on work and leisure is that individuals have an increasing number of calls on their time and have little ‘free’ time. A key question then becomes how to measure ‘time poverty’ or ‘time squeeze’. In the literature these issues have been conceptualised and measured in a range of ways. As with the measurement of poverty there is no one perfect way of capturing this concept, so we discuss a number of different definitions and measures.

The first issue is how to define ‘committed’ and ‘free’ time. Our preferred measure of committed time includes time spent on paid work, study, unpaid work (caring and housework) and time spent on travel. Some measures of committed time exclude travel, while others allocate travel depending on its purpose. We have included travel with committed time because the majority of time spent on travel is linked to employment, especially on weekdays.¹² Our

inclusion of travel is also guided by the prominence of commuting in discussions of time-pressures and quality of life in public debate in Ireland. Uncommitted time includes leisure, personal care, eating and sleeping. An alternative definition of ‘free’ time *excludes* personal care, eating and sleeping, and is closest to the idea of leisure time. This is the ‘free’ time used in the European comparisons presented below. It should be noted that leisure time includes active and more passive leisure (resting, watching TV) and there are likely to be considerable differences in the *quality* of leisure time by income, health status and other factors.¹³

A second issue is whether to use a continuous measure or a threshold measure of time poverty. Again we use a range of measures to investigate whether some groups are experiencing time poverty. We begin by looking at the mean levels of committed time among different groups, and then consider a threshold measure of ‘time poverty’, examining which groups are most likely to be ‘time poor’.

3.1 Are People in Ireland Time Poor Compared to Other Countries?

Much of the debate about work and leisure has centred on the question of whether leisure has declined in recent decades as a result of economic progress. As this is the first time-use survey in Ireland we cannot investigate how paid and unpaid work and leisure have changed as a result of the boom, however, we can compare Irish time-use to time-use in other European countries. For this we take comparable estimates of time-use from Eurostat’s *How Men and Women Spend their Time*. A range of countries are presented in Tables 4 and 5 – from the UK to Central Europe (France and Germany), one East European country (Hungary) and one Scandinavian (Sweden). As Eurostat reports of time-use are for an ‘average day’ we combine our weekday and weekend time-use estimates, giving a weight of 5 to weekdays and 2 to weekend days, dividing by 7 to give an ‘average Irish day’. Note that these figures are averages for the whole populations and do not account for compositional differences, which strongly influence time use (e.g. age structure, education, labour market participation, presence of dependant children). The Irish estimates also prioritise caring, paid work and unpaid work, which will tend to overestimate these and underestimate leisure, the implications of this are discussed below.

¹² This will lead to misclassification of a small amount of travel-time which is associated with leisure activities. Tests on the models in Section 3.4 show that the exclusion of travel time does not change the results. At a descriptive level excluding travel increases the gap between women and men and reduces the gap between employed and non-employed.

¹³ Bittman and Wajcman (2004) argue that women’s leisure is more often combined with other activities for example caring and, therefore, may be ‘less leisurely’.

Table 4: *Time-Use in Ireland Compared to Selected European Countries, Men Aged 20-74 Years: Average Day (Combining Weekend and Weekday Information)*

	<i>Ireland*</i>	<i>UK</i>	<i>Hungary</i>	<i>France</i>	<i>Germany</i>	<i>Sweden</i>
	<i>HH:MM</i>	<i>HH:MM</i>	<i>HH:MM</i>	<i>HH:MM</i>	<i>HH:MM</i>	<i>HH:MM</i>
Free time**	5:59	5:30	5:29	4:46	5:53	5:24
Meals, Personal Care	1:51	2:04	2:31	3:01	2:33	2:11
Sleep	8:04	8:18	8:31	8:45	8:12	8:01
Travel	1:15	1:30	1:03	1:03	1:27	1:30
Unpaid Work	1:59	2:18	2:39	2:22	2:21	2:29
Paid Work, Study	4:53	4:18	3:46	4:03	3:35	4:25
Total	24:00	24:00	24:00	24:00	24:00	24:00
Total Committed Time (Paid + Unpaid Work, Travel)	8:07	8:06	7:28	7:28	7:23	8:24

Source: *Irish National Time-Use Survey* for Ireland; Eurostat 2004, Table 1.2 for other countries.

Note: *Irish estimates of time-use generated using the priorities described above, with caring and domestic work given priority. Appendix A presents alternative estimates of time-use for Ireland.

**Free time includes active and passive leisure, voluntary and religious activity and unspecified time-use.

From Table 4 we see that, at least in terms of free time, Irish men are not time poor relative to the other countries shown. At 6 hours per average day, their free time is slightly higher than that for other countries, though their sleep time and personal care is lower. They also record the lowest levels of unpaid work (caring and domestic work), despite the fact that caring and domestic work is given priority in these estimates. However, the average time they spend on paid work is higher than in other countries, even Britain, which gives a total committed time, defined as a combination of paid and unpaid work and travel, of just over 8 hours per day. Committed time for Irish men is higher than for Hungarian, French and German men, but about the same as for British men and lower than for Swedish men.¹⁴

Irish women's free time, at 5 hours 17 minutes, while significantly less than that of Irish men, is high compared to other European women, second only to German women in the countries presented. However, unpaid work time for Irish women is substantially higher than other countries. This is partly a function of the care priority implicit in these estimates: if we give caring a

¹⁴ Committed time for Irish men is lower when we use 'split' time slots described in Appendix A.

Table 5: *Time-Use in Ireland Compared to Selected European Countries, Women Aged 20-74 Years: Average Day (Combining Weekend and Weekdays)*

	<i>Ireland*</i>	<i>UK</i>	<i>Hungary</i>	<i>France</i>	<i>Germany</i>	<i>Sweden</i>
	<i>HH:MM</i>	<i>HH:MM</i>	<i>HH:MM</i>	<i>HH:MM</i>	<i>HH:MM</i>	<i>HH:MM</i>
Free Time, Unspecified						
Time Use	5:17	5:05	4:38	4:08	5:24	5:03
Meals, Personal Care	1:47	2:16	2:19	3:02	2:43	2:28
Sleep	8:11	8:27	8:42	8:55	8:19	8:11
Travel	0:58	1:25	0:51	0:54	1:18	1:23
Unpaid Work	5:26	4:15	4:57	4:30	4:11	3:42
Paid Work, Study	2:20	2:33	2:32	2:31	2:05	3:12
Total	24:00	24:00	24:00	24:00	24:00	24:00
Total Committed Time (Paid and Unpaid Work, Travel)	8:44	8:10	8:20	7:55	7:34	8:17

Source: *Irish National Time-Use Survey* for Ireland; Eurostat 2004, Table 1.1 for other countries.

Note: *Irish estimates of time-use generated using the priorities described above, with caring and domestic work given priority. Appendix A presents alternative estimates of time use for Ireland.

**Free time includes active and passive leisure, voluntary and religious activity and unspecified time use.

lower priority by estimating split times (see Section II for a discussion), the unpaid work time average falls to 4 hours 41 minutes (see Appendix Table A1). We argue the best estimate would be somewhere in between this and 5 hours 17 minutes. This still leaves Irish women spending more time on unpaid work than most other European women considered. National difference in female (paid) employment rates will also affect the comparisons. Once again the estimate for total committed time is most accurately somewhere between 8 hours (see Appendix Table A1) and 8 hours 45 minutes, which leaves Irish women at the upper end of committed time.

On the basis of these estimates it is difficult to say that Irish men and women are leisure poor. Despite rapidly increasing employment rates, they still find time for leisure. The estimates of committed time reported by Irish men are also similar to other European men. However, total committed time is high for Irish women, compared to other European women. Irish women compensate for this by less sleep and eating/personal care than other European women. What is clear is that Irish men do less unpaid work and more paid work than their European counterparts, while women do more unpaid work than other European women, which suggests a traditional

gender division of labour in Ireland relative to other countries. This traditional gender division of labour, in particular women's greater involvement in unpaid work is associated with interrupted labour force attachment, lower lifetime earnings, increased exposure to poverty, increased dependence on a male 'provider' (Bittman, 2004b).

3.2 Who in Ireland is Overworked? Examining Overall Committed Time

On week days the highest levels of *committed time* are observed among the 25 to 44 year age group, the employed, particularly the self-employed, those with young children, those with third level education and those in the highest income quartile, which suggests that these are the groups at greatest risk of 'time poverty'.

While there are strong gender differences in the amount of time spent on paid and unpaid work, there is no difference in overall committed time on weekdays, consistent with the findings reported in Gershuny (2000). The age patterns are strongly linked to employment status with those above retirement age having a much lower level of committed time and much higher levels of leisure time.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, the factor that has the strongest influence on committed/uncommitted time on weekdays is employment status.¹⁵ The presence and age of children is the second most influential factor on weekdays, and on weekends children are the biggest influence on the amount of committed time. Those with children under 5 years of age report the highest levels of committed time of any group reported here, this holds true for both weekends and weekdays.

The amount of committed time increases with income level and education. Those in the top quartile have just over 10 hours of committed time on weekdays compared to an average of 7½ hours for those living in households in the bottom income quartile. It is not possible to tell from these bivariate associations whether these are simply reflecting underlying age/employment status differences. These issues are examined in the multivariate models below.

In order to address the hypothesis that changes in *household* employment patterns have been instrumental in increasing perceptions of time-pressure (i.e. that the increasing incidence of dual earner couples leads to high levels of paid and unpaid work within households) we examine time-use patterns by household employment.

There is some support for this view. Both men and women in dual-earner couples have high levels of committed time. On weekdays women in dual-

¹⁵ 'Strongest' and 'influential' here do not refer to statistical testing: the relative strength of these effects will be formally tested in the model (see Table 9).

Table 6: *Mean Levels of Committed Time*

<i>HH:MM</i>	<i>Weekdays</i>			<i>Weekend</i>		
	<i>Total Paid</i>	<i>Total Unpaid</i>	<i>Total Committed</i>	<i>Total Paid</i>	<i>Total Unpaid</i>	<i>Total Committed</i>
All	4:14	3:26	8:47	1:29	3:46	6:11
Male	5:46	1:42	8:46	2:00	2:24	5:26
Female	2:44	5:08	8:49	0:59	5:05	6:54
Primary	2:22	3:39	6:36	0:51	3:01	4:35
Intermediate Certificate	4:23	3:26	8:48	1:32	3:42	6:05
Leaving Certificate	4:20	3:25	9:06	1:45	3:51	6:27
Post-secondary	5:07	3:21	9:49	1:35	4:09	6:56
Employed	6:03	2:55	10:21	1:34	3:60	6:39
Self-employed	7:08	2:24	10:52	3:57	2:26	7:08
Student	5:11	1:21	7:55	2:56	1:46	5:33
Home Duties	0:10	7:28	8:17	0:06	6:48	7:41
Retired	0:25	3:27	4:28	0:14	2:43	3:58
Other not employed*	1:25	3:02	5:07	0:16	2:37	3:30
Child Under 5 years	4:40	6:32	12:23	0:49	7:29	9:21
Child 5-10 years	4:31	5:15	11:02	1:04	6:37	8:16
Child 11-17 years	4:41	4:04	10:08	1:41	4:29	7:04
Under 18 unknown age	5:01	4:03	10:26	0:59	4:56	6:56
No kids <18 years	4:02	2:22	7:29	1:42	2:23	5:05
Bottom Income Quartile	2:05	4:37	7:30	0:47	4:07	5:33
Income Quartile 2	3:51	3:25	8:28	1:24	3:25	5:46
Income Quartile 3	4:58	2:52	9:00	1:21	3:26	5:45
Top Income Quartile	5:57	2:50	10:05	1:24	4:08	6:42

Source: Irish National Time-Use Survey, 2005.

Notes: Total paid includes time spent on education; Total unpaid = housework and caring; Total committed = paid work, unpaid work and travel.

* Other not employed includes sick/disabled, unemployed, training and other.

earner households have the highest level of committed time of all, followed by men in male breadwinner households. Combining the mean scores of men and women in these households, we find that dual earner households have 1 hour 10 minutes more committed time on weekdays than male breadwinner couples (the next busiest household type).¹⁶ However, this is not true at weekends:

¹⁶ Note that we simply add the measures of individual men and women in different household types, we have not calculated the mean for each couple. For an analysis of couples' time use, see McGinnity and Russell (forthcoming).

here the combined workload of men and women in male breadwinner households is marginally higher (i.e., 15 minutes higher) than the combined workload of those in dual-earner households. However, on the basis of 5 weekdays and 2 weekend days per week, men and women in dual-earner couples have higher committed time than men and women in breadwinner couples. Note that at weekends it is the women in both dual earner and male breadwinner households who have significantly longer committed time than any other group.

Table 7: *Time-Use Among Women and Men by Household Employment*

<i>HH:MM</i>	<i>Weekday</i>		<i>Weekend</i>	
	<i>Total Committed</i>		<i>Total Committed</i>	
	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>
Single employed	9:49	8:60	6.03	6.08
Single not employed	5:27	5:53	3.60	5.01
Dual-Earner couple	10:27	11:21	6.16	8.23
Male breadwinner couple	11:09	9:28	6.27	8.28
Female breadwinner couple	7:14	10:45	5.00	7.51
No earner couple	4:23	7:41	3.20	6.45
ALL	8:42	8:45	5.27	6.38

Source: Irish National Time-Use Survey 2005.

Note: Single respondents do not necessarily live alone.

3.3 Threshold Measures of Time Poverty

A common standard for measuring (income) poverty is 50 per cent or 60 per cent of median income, with those below this threshold judged to be poor. Following Bittman (2004a), an analogous standard (60 per cent of median uncommitted time) was applied as an alternative way of investigating which individuals in Ireland are ‘time poor’, relative to others. Using this cut-off we find that less than 5 per cent of the population can be defined as time poor in terms of uncommitted time on weekdays. This threshold for uncommitted time is 8 hours and 42 minutes: which is the total amount of time available to fit in eating, sleeping, personal care, leisure, voluntary activity and religious activity. On weekends 7 per cent of respondents fall below the uncommitted time threshold.¹⁷ As people have fewer paid work commitments at the weekend the 60 per cent threshold is considerably higher than on weekdays, with the time poor defined as those with less than 10 hours 48 minutes of uncommitted time.

¹⁷ This is somewhat counter-intuitive as respondents clearly have more uncommitted and leisure time at the weekends. However, the results emerge because *variation* in free-time is wider at the weekend.

If we use the narrower definition of free-time, which is confined to time spent on leisure plus religious/civic activity, the 60 per cent median thresholds are lower (in terms of hours). On weekdays the time poor are those with less than 2 hours 42 minutes of leisure time and on weekend days it is those with less than 4 hours of leisure time. On this measure 20 per cent of respondents are defined as time poor on weekdays and 22 per cent on weekend days.

Looking at the characteristics of those who are time poor we find that the patterns are broadly similar to those emerging when we examined average time-use figures. Women are more likely to be time poor at weekends but the difference during weekdays is not statistically significant. Employment at the individual and household level continues to be important. On the uncommitted time measure 8 per cent of the self-employed are time poor on weekdays in contrast with the retired, none of whom are time poor. Similarly, on the narrower leisure based measure the self-employed have the highest risk of time poverty on weekdays and joint highest risk (along with those in home duties) on weekend days. Dual-earner couples and male-breadwinner couples show similar levels of time poverty on weekdays using both measures, and at weekends using the leisure based measure, but dual-earners are less likely to be counted as time poor at weekends using uncommitted time. Time poverty is particularly pronounced among parents of young children. On weekdays, 15 per cent of those with pre-school children are defined as 'time poor' in terms of uncommitted time and almost half (47 per cent) are time poor in terms of leisure time. This group also have the highest risk of time poverty at weekends. Children of any age under 18 years increase the risk of time poverty.

The relationship between time poverty and household income is not linear. Those in the highest income quartile experience the highest rate of time poverty using the leisure measure, which is consistent with the hypothesis that 'busyness' is higher amongst the wealthier, but this does not hold true for uncommitted time at weekends. A similar pattern emerges for education. Those with the highest education are at greatest risk of time poverty on three of the measures (not for uncommitted time at weekends) but the relationship between time poverty and the other education levels is non-linear.

3.4 Models of Committed Time

The descriptive tables outlined above do not allow us to establish the independent effect of different factors on peoples' total workload. Therefore, we construct OLS regressions of committed time for both weekends (Table 9) and weekdays (Table 10). When factors such as employment status and family status are controlled a significant gender difference in committed time

Table 8: *Threshold Measures of Time Poverty*

	<i><60 Per Cent Median Uncommitted Time</i>		<i><60 Per Cent Median Leisure Time</i>	
	Weekday	Weekend	Weekday	Weekend
<i>Threshold in Hours</i>	<i>8:42</i>	<i>10:48</i>	<i>2:42</i>	<i>4.03</i>
	%	%	%	%
All	4.1	7.2	19.6	21.9
Men	3.2	5.3	16.5	16.6
Women	5.0	9.0	22.7	26.9
Employed	5.8	8.1	26.3	24.9
Self-employed	6.8	7.7	32.5	30.8
Student	0.0	1.1	13.5	11.4
Home Duties	3.4	14.4	15.0	30.8
Retired	0.0	0.0	2.6	7.0
Other not employed	1.1	4.4	3.4	10.0
Child(ren) under 5 years	14.6	22.7	46.9	41.4
5-10 years	10.1	12.2	35.4	36.7
11-17 years	8.3	12.1	26.2	30.8
No kids <18 years	0.6	2.8	10.2	14.0
Single employed	2.4	6.0	20.2	26.2
Single not employed	0.0	2.7	4.9	11.2
Dual-Earner Couple	7.8	8.8	29.9	27.6
Male Breadwinner	8.3	15.5	28.5	29.1
Female breadwinner	0.0	12.1	17.2	18.2
No-earner couple	1.9	4.6	7.5	13.9
Primary Education	1.5	1.1	9.8	13.4
Inter/Junior Certificate level	2.5	6.0	20.3	22.3
Leaving Certificate level	3.9	10.0	18.2	21.3
Post-secondary	6.6	9.3	26.3	26.9
Bottom income Quartile	4.5	8.5	16.7	18.4
2nd income Quartile	1.9	5.1	19.3	22.8
3rd income Quartile	2.5	4.5	19.0	17.6
Top income quartile	6.8	6.3	22.7	25.7

Source: Irish National Time-Use Survey, 2005.

Note: Uncommitted time is total time available for sleep, leisure, personal care and eating. When a chi-squared test is applied, all differences between groups are significant at $p < 0.05$, except the difference between men and women under the 60 per cent median uncommitted time poverty line on weekdays.

Table 9: *OLS Model of Total Committed Time, Weekdays*

	<i>All</i>		<i>Men</i>		<i>Women</i>	
	<i>B</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
(Constant)	36.01	.000	34.77	.000	39.58	.000
Female	2.06	.017				
Age (ref . 18-24 years)						
25-44 years	-1.34	.402	0.44	.853	-1.97	.371
45-64 years	-4.01	.017	-2.02	.415	-5.46	.018
65+ years	-9.81	.000	-5.96	.058	-12.31	.000
Employment status (ref employee)						
Self-employed	2.84	.026	2.13	.192	3.76	.108
Student	-7.24	.000	-5.45	.083	-7.66	.006
Unemployed	-24.40	.000	-24.05	.000	-25.43	.000
Home Duties	-6.38	.000	-13.34	.127	-5.73	.000
Retired	-11.91	.000	-14.90	.000	-9.09	.000
Other not employed	-10.97	.000	-17.28	.000	-3.00	.290
Educ. (ref = primary)						
Intermediate/Junior						
Certificate level	2.10	.085	2.63	.153	1.12	.495
Leaving Certificate level	2.26	.061	1.68	.362	2.78	.086
Post-secondary	1.99	.110	0.91	.639	2.44	.138
Children (ref no kids <18 years)						
Youngest child <5 years	11.71	.000	9.63	.000	12.73	.000
Youngest child 5-10 years	7.43	.000	6.50	.019	7.36	.001
Youngest child 11-18 years	3.86	.009	3.34	.138	3.78	.053
Child(ren) <18 unknown age	5.55	.002	4.41	.133	6.65	.004
Lone-parent	0.82	.742	-3.36	.537	3.33	.259
Partner's employment (ref. Not employed)						
No partner	-2.28	.063	-0.72	.704	-4.78	.005
Partner employed	-0.14	.900	-0.67	.669	-0.30	.850
Adult carer	5.24	.000	3.40	.109	6.00	.000
Equivalised income	0.00	.192	0.00	.140	0.00	.817
Dublin	-0.46	.663	-1.06	.523	0.12	.929
adjusted r ²	0.472		0.449		0.501	
n	870		415		454	

Note: Committed time = employment/education + caring + housework + travel.

Note the dependent variable is measured in number of 15 minute slots.

Source: Irish National Time-Use Survey, 2005.

emerges on weekdays. Levels of committed time are also significantly higher among women than men at weekends – due to high levels of unpaid work carried out by women. Committed time is lower among older groups on weekdays but age has less effect on free-time at weekends. The level of committed time at weekends does not vary with age among women, however,

amongst men those aged under 35 years have considerably more free time than any other age group.

Employment status has a very strong effect on committed time on weekdays. All non-employed and unemployed groups have significantly less committed time than the reference group of employees. The self-employed have higher committed time levels than employees. When other factors are controlled employment status no longer influences the level of committed/uncommitted time at weekends. Only the unemployed are distinctive. This is a small group in the sample but is consistent with research, which says that levels of activity decline more generally among the unemployed because of both psychological distress and low income (Jahoda, 1992).

The presence of children increases total committed time on both weekdays and weekends. This effect is found for both men and women. The higher committed time levels among women with pre-school children on weekdays is on the margins of statistical significance ($p = .06$) but the remaining gender/child interactions are insignificant. These gender differences are more pronounced at weekends,¹⁸ which suggests that mothers have a higher workload and less free time than fathers at weekends. There is no additional effect of being a lone parent on weekdays or weekends. Caring for adults adds significantly to respondents' total workload on both weekdays and weekends. This effect is only significant for women who make up the majority of this group. Women's greater involvement in caring for both adults and children, therefore, leads to gender differences in free or uncommitted time. When employment status and age are controlled the positive impact of education and income on committed weekday time disappears. Nor is there relationship between household income and committed time at the weekends. The lowest educated group have lower levels of committed time at the weekends but the patterns by sex are rather erratic. Therefore, the objective time-use data does not support the idea that busyness is associated with high status and income when we control for other factors. However, it remains to be seen whether these groups perceive themselves to be busier when we look at subjective indicators below.

Compared to those with a non-employed partner, individuals with an employed partner have rather similar levels of committed time. However, women with no partner have less committed time than women with a partner on *weekdays*. Men with no partner have more committed time on *weekend* days.

These findings suggest firstly, that it is having a partner *per se* which affects committed time, rather than their employment status. Second, given what we know about the division of labour in the home, this may relate to unpaid work: women with a partner do more unpaid work, men with a partner

¹⁸ The interactions between children <5 years and children of unknown age are significant.

Table 10: *Models of Committed Time, Weekends*

	<i>All</i>		<i>Men</i>		<i>Women</i>	
	<i>B</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
(Constant)	9.26	.001	7.28	.065	16.09	.000
Female	4.82	.000				
Age (ref . 18-24 years)						
25-44 years	3.60	.070	6.06	.031	2.96	.307
45-64 years	4.94	.020	8.53	.004	2.60	.397
65+ years	2.28	.382	6.88	.068	-0.73	.840
Employment status (ref employee)						
Self-employed	2.02	.210	2.00	.311	3.37	.285
Student	-0.98	.706	-1.70	.658	1.13	.754
Unemployed	-12.94	.000	-10.74	.007	-15.84	.002
Home Duties	1.77	.306	-7.35	.617	1.26	.488
Retired	-3.96	.047	-4.44	.139	-3.53	.184
Other not employed	-4.82	.050	-9.46	.006	0.73	.842
Educ. (ref = primary)						
Intermediate/Junior						
Certificate level	3.74	.016	3.50	.117	4.16	.056
Leaving Certificate level	4.37	.005	3.57	.114	4.93	.021
Post-secondary	3.48	.028	4.75	.043	1.95	.367
Children (ref no kids <18 years)						
Youngest child <5 years	14.45	.000	9.83	.002	18.03	.000
Youngest child 5-10 years	9.89	.000	8.68	.008	10.26	.000
Youngest child 11-18 years	4.42	.016	2.53	.354	5.68	.022
Child(ren) <18 unknown age	6.06	.008	3.02	.383	9.73	.001
Lone-parent	-0.99	.750	-7.78	.201	2.00	.602
Partner's employment (ref. Not employed)						
No partner	2.88	.059	5.67	.011	-0.37	.866
Partner employed	1.59	.249	0.64	.737	1.22	.552
Adult carer	6.32	.000	4.52	.085	7.33	.000
Equivalised income	0.00	.343	0.00	.535	0.00	.540
Dublin	1.38	.305	0.87	.664	1.44	.430
adjusted r ²	0.235		0.126		0.290	
N	871		417		453	

Source: *Irish National Time-Use Survey 2005*.

do less unpaid work, though to fully investigate this we would need to model paid and unpaid work separately.

In the final section we examine how perceptions of time-pressure vary across social groups and consider how the patterns of committed time outlined here translate into feelings of being rushed and stressed.

IV 'SUBJECTIVE TIME POVERTY' – FEELING RUSHED AND STRESSED

Both international evidence and media reports in Ireland point to a growing sense of time-pressure. In this section we examine to what extent Irish people *feel* time-pressure and who feels under most time-pressure. We also examine the link between feeling rushed and 'objective' time poverty. Can we find an association with being time poor and feeling rushed in Ireland, and what is the strength of the association?

The measure of time-pressure used in the time-use survey asks respondents "did you feel rushed and stressed during the diary day"? While this question refers specifically to the diary day, it is seen as a good approximation of subjective time-pressure. On weekdays, 8 per cent of respondents reported feeling rushed most of the day, 38 per cent reported feeling rushed some of the day leaving 54 per cent not feeling rushed. These figures are broadly in line with international estimates of feeling rushed, though the measurement is somewhat different.¹⁹ On weekend days a much lower proportion – 28 per cent of respondents – reported feeling rushed at least some of the time.²⁰ Table 11 presents how this feeling of being rushed varies by groups on a weekday.

Overall there is no gender difference in feeling rushed, but it does vary strongly by employment status, the employed and particularly self-employed being more likely to feel rushed. Those with children, particularly young children, are more likely to report feeling rushed, as are those in dual-earner couples, as suggested by Jacobs and Gerson (2004) for the US. The highly educated (those with post-secondary qualifications) are also more likely to feel rushed. In general the subjective measure of feeling rushed is highest among the groups identified in the previous section as suffering from a 'time squeeze'.

Distinguishing those who felt rushed some or most of the day from those who did not feel rushed on a weekday, we model the impact of these factors using a logistic regression in Table 12, model A.

Model A shows a similar pattern to Table 11 for who is more likely to feel rushed and stressed. Those who feel rushed are: the employed (full-time, part-time, self-employed) and those caring for adults or young children (under 10

¹⁹ For example in Canada in 1998, 53 per cent of employed respondents said they felt rushed every day (Bittman *et al.*, 2004). The weekday figure for Ireland is higher for the employed, but much lower for this group at the weekend.

²⁰ While this is much lower than weekday estimates, 28 per cent of respondents feeling rushed at the weekend is still quite high. It suggests that while having high paid work hours is associated with feeling rushed, other factors contribute to this feeling as paid work is relatively low at weekends.

years). Once we control for employment status there are no differences between people with different levels of education.

If we introduce the effect of committed time (Model B), it is clear that those with high volumes of committed time, the time poor, feel more rushed than those with low combined paid and unpaid work. So 'objective' measures of time poverty (not having a lot of free time) and 'subjective' measures of time poverty (feeling under time-pressure) are indeed strongly associated. The model fit statistics show that introducing committed time into the model allows us to give a much better explanation of feeling rushed.

However, we can also identify a number of groups who feel rushed and stressed, over and above the effect of time use. This suggests that it is not just having high demands on time that makes individuals feel rushed. For example, those in paid employment feel more rushed, even when we account for the fact that, on average, they have higher levels of committed time than the non-employed. Interestingly, those with higher incomes are also more rushed ($p < .10$). While 'rushed' may have more negative connotations than 'busy', this finding is consistent with Gershuny's work on busyness as 'a badge of honour' (Gershuny, 2005).

To further investigate the type of time use on feeling rushed, we estimate another model (Model C) distinguishing the effect of paid work and unpaid work. Both contribute to feeling rushed, but the effect of paid work on feeling rushed is stronger). This suggests that the dramatic increase in the proportion of the adult population in paid employment in Ireland following the boom – particularly among women – may indeed be contributing to an increased feeling of people being rushed and stressed. Table 11 shows that of all household 'types', it is dual-earner couples who are the most likely to feel under time-pressure.²¹ So, following the Jacobs and Gerson argument for the US, the rise of dual-earner couples in Ireland discussed in Section I is also fuelling the feeling that 'we are running out of time'.

Previous research has found gender differences in subjective time poverty. Mattingly and Sayer (2006) find that US women are more likely to feel rushed than men, even when they controlled the amount of free time.²² They suggest that this may be due to the inferior quality of women's leisure time (e.g. more interrupted, fragmented – see also Mattingly and Bianchi, 2003) and also cultural models of motherhood, which have increased the demands on women looking after children. Overall gender differences in feeling rushed in Ireland

²¹ Couples' employment status is not included in the model as it is strongly correlated with individual employment status, especially for women.

²² Note that Mattingly and Sayer (2006) measure free time in a different way, including free time combined with childcare. In this paper all time recorded as childcare counts as childcare, and leisure is 'pure' leisure (see Section 2 above).

Table 11: *Per Cent Feeling Rush or Stressed – Weekdays*

	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	
All	53.4	46.6	100.0
Male	53.2	46.8	100.0
Female	53.6	46.4	100.0
Employed	42.7	57.3	100.0
Self-employed	35.5	64.5	100.0
Student	56.6	43.4	100.0
Home Duties	64.7	35.3	100.0
Retired	85.3	14.7	100.0
Other non-employed	72.7	27.3	100.0
Youngest Child < 5 years	33.8	66.2	100.0
Youngest 5-10 years	33.7	66.3	100.0
Youngest 11-17 years	54.1	45.9	100.0
Under 18, age unknown	37.5	62.5	100.0
No kids <18 years	60.7	39.3	100.0
Single employed	49.2	50.8	100.0
Single not employed	73.2	26.8	100.0
Dual-Earner Couple	38.2	61.8	100.0
Male Breadwinner	49.6	50.4	100.0
Female breadwinner	64.3	35.7	100.0
No-earner couple	72.0	28.0	100.0
Primary	70.2	29.8	100
Intermediate Certificate	52.3	47.7	100
Leaving Certificate	52.4	47.6	100
Post-secondary	45.6	54.4	100

Source: Irish National Time-Use Survey, 2005.

Note: Yes = Sometimes/Often feel rushed/stressed during the diary day. When a chi-squared test is applied, all differences between groups are significant at $p < 0.05$.

are negligible, both at a descriptive level (Table 11) and in models (A and B). It is only when we distinguish between paid and unpaid work in the modelling that we find women in Ireland somewhat more likely to feel rushed than men (Model C). Women have more committed time than men, but more of this is unpaid, and it is when we account for this, we find women feel more rushed than men. However, we should not overstate this finding: compared to the US, gender differences in feeling rushed in Ireland are small.

In any case we should note that while feeling rushed clearly is associated with high levels of committed time, other factors also play a role. In

Table 12: *Logistic Regression Model of Feeling Rushed, Weekdays*

	<i>Model A – Without Committed Time</i>		<i>Model B – With Committed Time</i>		<i>Model C – With Paid and Unpaid Work</i>	
	<i>B</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Female	0.299	0.094	0.206	0.262	0.437	0.025
Committed time, weekday*			0.047	0.000		
Paid work					0.058	0.000
Unpaid work					0.025	0.005
Region (ref Stheast)						
Dublin	0.112	0.615	0.138	0.546	0.115	0.618
BMW	0.071	0.675	0.132	0.452	0.130	0.461
Employed (ref employee)						
Part-time	-0.291	0.256	-0.224	0.396	-0.032	0.905
Self-employed	0.296	0.210	0.223	0.355	0.177	0.472
Home Duties	-0.971	0.000	-0.637	0.025	-0.047	0.881
Retired	-1.842	0.000	-1.113	0.001	-0.628	0.070
Other non-employed	-0.975	0.000	-0.487	0.082	-0.268	0.356
Educ (ref. Primary)						
Inter/Group						
Certificate	0.055	0.819	-0.087	0.729	-0.110	0.665
Leaving Certificate	0.090	0.703	-0.102	0.678	-0.172	0.488
Third Level	0.229	0.342	0.080	0.750	0.006	0.982
No partner	-0.100	0.664	-0.070	0.769	-0.122	0.613
Partner Employed (Ref. not employed)	-0.043	0.841	-0.021	0.922	0.030	0.893
Cares for adults	0.426	0.065	0.228	0.342	0.337	0.168
Lone parent	0.176	0.712	0.212	0.668	0.253	0.612
Child under 4 years	0.552	0.049	-0.052	0.862	0.314	0.326
Child 5-10 years	0.604	0.059	0.212	0.525	0.417	0.221
Child 5-18 years	-0.075	0.785	-0.312	0.279	-0.250	0.394
Child under 18, age unknown	0.606	0.070	0.299	0.387	0.412	0.243
Equivalised income	0.000	0.113	0.000	0.062	0.000	0.027
Constant	-0.175	0.657	-1.600	0.001	-2.063	0.000
N of cases	831		831		831	
Chi-square	113.717		160.164		177.65	
D of freedom	20		21		22	

Source: *Irish National Time Use Survey, 2005.*

Notes: Unweighted. *Committed time includes all paid employment, education, caring, domestic work and travel. In Model C, paid work includes all paid employment, education and travel: unpaid work is caring and domestic work.

qualitative research investigating the topic, Southerton (2003) argues that concentrating tasks into 'hot spots' in order to free up other time slots ('cold spots') to enjoy with family and friends contributes to individuals feeling 'harried', rather than the overall amount of time spent on tasks. Bianchi *et al.* (2006) stress the role of expectations: working parents in the US, particularly mothers, feel that they do not spend enough time with their children, even though objectively time spent interacting with children has not declined. Further research would need to investigate how committed time in Ireland is distributed throughout the day, whether and how activities are combined, how time-use relates to the time-use of others in the household, and perhaps how exactly respondents' time-use relates to their expectations of how they feel they should be spending their time.

V CONCLUSION

Both internationally and in Ireland there is an increasing sense of time-pressure and a feeling that we are running out of time. In the context of rapid employment growth over the past decade, Ireland is a particularly interesting case in which to examine 'time poverty'. While it is overstating the case to argue that new time-pressures have neutralised the benefits of increased prosperity (see McGinnity *et al.*, 2007), our evidence suggests that there may be trade-offs between increased employment and associated economic wealth, and free time.

While we could not look at over-time comparisons, we use the recently collected first national time-use survey to examine levels of total committed time, that is, time spent on employment/education, unpaid work (caring and household work) and travel, across different groups in the population. We find workloads are particularly high among the self-employed, employees, parents of young children and those caring for adults. Committed time is similar for men and women on weekdays but women have significantly less free time than men at weekends due to high levels of unpaid work. High levels of committed time are found to be associated with greater subjective feelings of time-pressure, though it is not just those with high committed time who feel under time-pressure. Those in paid employment feel more rushed, even after accounting for the fact that they have higher levels of committed time than the non-employed.

We find some evidence that 'being busy' is associated with higher incomes and education in Ireland, as Gershuny (2005) posits, though this association does not always remain when we control for employment status and age. Investigating Linder's proposition of more 'harried' or 'intense' leisure will

require further research. The Jacobs and Gerson (2004) argument that the increase in dual-earner households has fuelled the rising sense of time-pressure in the US seems particularly plausible for Ireland, given the recent rapid rise in the proportion of dual-earner households. We find that women in dual-earner households have particularly heavy workloads on weekdays and weekends and that dual-earner couples have the highest joint weekday workloads, though only slightly higher than male breadwinner couples. However, amongst men in Ireland it is those in male breadwinner households that have the highest levels of committed time.

Given the role of paid employment in time-pressure, our evidence does suggest that the rapid increase in the proportion of Irish adults in paid employment and the concomitant increase in the proportion of dual-earner households is likely to have increased levels of time poverty and feelings of being rushed and stressed in Ireland. However, for the most part, Irish men and women do not have any less leisure than their European counterparts.

What emerges most clearly from the findings is that certain groups in the population are facing a particular time-squeeze – the employed and those caring for young children and adults. To the extent that more people, particularly women, are now combining working and caring, this suggests that policies to facilitate work-life balance are needed to help ameliorate the effects of the high workload for these groups in contemporary Ireland.

REFERENCES

- AGUIAR, M. and E. HURST, 2007. "Measuring Trends in Leisure: The Allocation of Time Over Five Decades", *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, CXXII 3, pp. 969-1006.
- BECKER, G., 1965. "A Theory of the Allocation of Time," *Economic Journal*, Vol. 75, pp. 493-517.
- BIANCHI, S., J. ROBINSON and M. MILKIE, 2006. *Changing Rhythms of American Family Life*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- BITTMAN, M. and J. WAJCMAN, 2004. "The Rush Hour: The Quality of Leisure Time and Gender Equity" in N. Folbre and M. Bittman (eds.), *Family Time: The Social Organization of Care*, Routledge: London.
- BITTMAN, M., 2004a. "Parenting and Employment: What Time-Use Surveys Show" in N. Folbre and M. Bittman (eds.), *Family Time: The Social Organization of Care*, Routledge: London.
- BITTMAN, M., 2004b. "Parenthood without Penalty" in N. Folbre and M. Bittman (eds.), *Family Time: The Social Organization of Care*, Routledge: London.
- CULLEN, K., S. DELANEY AND P. DUFF, 2004. *Caring, Working and Public Policy*, Dublin: Equality Authority

- EUROSTAT, 2004. *How Europeans Spend Their Time. Everyday Life of Women and Men. Data 1998-2002*. Luxembourg: Eurostat.
- GERSHUNY, J., 2005. "Busyness as the Badge of Honour for the New Superordinate Working Class", ISER Working Paper No. 2005-09. Colchester: Institute for Social and Economic Research.
- GERSHUNY, J., 2000. *Changing Times. Work and Leisure in Post-Industrial Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- JACOBS, J. A. and K. GERSON, 2004. *The Time Divide: Work, Family and Gender Inequality*, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- JAHODA, M., 1992. *Employment and Unemployment: A Socio-Psychological Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- LINDER, S., 1970. *The Harried Leisure Class*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- MATTINGLY, M. and L. SAYER, 2006. "Under Pressure: Gender Differences in the Relationship between Free Time and Feeling Rushed", *Journal of Marriage and Family*, Vol. 68, pp. 205-221.
- MATTINGLY, M. and S. BIANCHI, 2003. "Gender Differences in the Quantity and Quality of Free Time: The U.S. Experience," *Social Forces*, Vol. 81, No. 3, pp. 999-1030.
- McGINNITY, F. and H. RUSSELL, (forthcoming). *Gender Inequalities in Time-Use: The Division of Caring, Housework and Employment among Women and Men in Ireland*. Dublin: Equality Authority/The Economic and Social Research Institute.
- McGINNITY, F., H. RUSSELL, and E. SMYTH, 2007. "Gender, Work-life Balance and Quality of Life" in T. Fahey, H. Russell and C. Whelan (eds.), *Best of Times? The Social Impact of the Celtic Tiger*. Dublin: IPA.
- McGINNITY, F., H. RUSSELL, J. WILLIAMS, and S. BLACKWELL, 2005. *Time Use in Ireland, 2005: Survey Report*. Dublin: The Economic and Social Research Institute and Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform.
- O'CONNELL, P. J. and H. RUSSELL, 2007. "Employment and the Quality of Work" in T. Fahey, H. Russell and C. Whelan (eds.), *Best of Times? The Social Impact of the Celtic Tiger*. Dublin: IPA.
- O'CONNELL, P. J. and H. RUSSELL, 2005. "Equality at Work? Equality Policies, Flexible Working Arrangements and the Quality of Work", Dublin: Equality Authority Research Series.
- ROBINSON, J. and A. BOSTROM, 1994. "The Overestimated Workweek? What Time Diary Measures Suggest", *Monthly Labor Review*, August, pp. 11-23.
- ROBINSON, J. P. and G. GODBEY, 1997. *Time for Life: The Surprising Ways Americans Use Their Time*, Pennsylvania State University Press.
- RUSSELL, H., R. LAYTE, B. MAÎTRE, P.J. O'CONNELL, C. T. WHELAN, 2004. *Work-Poor Households: The Welfare Implications of Changing Household Employment Patterns*, Policy Research Series, No. 52, Dublin: The Economic and Social Research Institute.
- SCHOR, J., 1991. *The Overworked American: The Unexpected Decline of Leisure*, New York: Basic Books.
- SOUTHERTON, D., 2003. "Squeezing Time. Allocating Practices, Coordinating Networks and Scheduling Society", *Time and Society*, Vol. 12, No.1, pp. 5-25.

APPENDIX A:
INTERNATIONAL COMPARISON USING SPLIT TIME SLOTS

Here we take an alternative approach to calculating the time spent on different activities than that applied in the paper. Instead of assigning a priority to one activity in the case of simultaneous activities (multi-tasking), we divide the time slot between the activities. Therefore, if two activities are recorded in one 15 minute time-slot we allocate 7.5 minutes to each task, if three activities are recorded at once we allocate 5 minutes to each, and so on.

This method has the advantage that involves no assumptions by the researcher as to which is the main activity. However, the disadvantage of this approach is that it ignores lessons from the time-use research literature on the way people combine activities. For example, using the splitting time slot technique means that background activities such as listening to the radio while eating breakfast will be accorded equal priority to other activities. This means that passive leisure will be over-estimated compared to studies that allow respondents to record only one activity or that ask respondents to define their main activity.

Furthermore, leisure combined with some other activity e.g., listening to radio while travelling to work will be counted as leisure even though its combination with such activities is likely to make it a less 'pure' form of leisure (Bittman and Wajcman, 2004). Sleep is assigned part of the time slot even if it is recorded with something else. Therefore, these estimates should not be seen as a superior measure of time-use than those presented in the paper. The presentation of results using alternative treatments of multiple activity allows us to assess the consequences of adopting different measurement approaches for our analyses. No one measure can be considered definitive.

In Table A1 we present alternative estimates of time use to those presented in the international comparisons, Tables 4 and 5 shown earlier, and we then discuss the implications of using alternative measures for the comparison.

Using this method of calculation we find that, free time is considerably higher among Irish men than in the other 5 countries, 31 minutes more than the next country Germany, and a greater difference than that was found with the priority measure reported in Table 4. Personal care/eating significantly is lower for Irish men than for other European men. Here the difference is also greater than what we find using the priority measure. Irish men still have the highest level of paid work of the six countries. Travel and sleep estimates are not affected by change in measurement. The total committed time of Irish men is now middle of the table rather than on the higher side, as in Table 4.

Table A1: *Figures for International Comparisons Using Split Time Methodology: Average Day (Combining Weekday and Weekend Days)*

	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>	<i>All</i>
	<i>hh:mm</i>	<i>hh:mm</i>	<i>hh:mm</i>
Free-time	6:24	5:57	6:10
Personal care and eating	1:47	1:48	1:47
Sleep	8:07	8:18	8:13
Travel	1:16	0:59	1:07
Unpaid Work (care+housework)	1:45	4:41	3:15
Paid work/study	4:41	2:18	3:28
Total	24:00	24:00	24:00
Total committed	7:42	7:57	7:50
Total paid + unpaid	6:25	6:59	6:43

Source: Irish National Time-Use Survey, 2005.

Note: Split time means when multiple activities were recorded in one time-slot the time was divided equally between activities.

For women, 'free' time is now higher than in other countries (33 minutes more than the next highest country, Germany. Meals/personal care time, sleep time and travel time show little effect of changing measure, and Irish women still show low levels of time spent on these three measures, relative to the other European women considered. Unpaid work time is reduced compared to the priority measure presented in Table 5, but is still higher than the other countries except Hungary which is now highest. Paid work levels are unchanged. The total committed time for Irish women at 7 hours, 57 minutes would be close to the average of the countries shown in Table 5 while using the priority measure was highest. As noted in the text, we expect the best estimate lies somewhere between the priority measure and the measures of time use using split times.

APPENDIX B:
THE IRISH NATIONAL TIME-USE SURVEY

Table B1: *Demographic Profile of Time-Use Survey Participants (Weekday Diaries)*

		<i>Unweighted Data</i>		<i>Weighted Data</i>	
		<i>No. of</i>		<i>No. of</i>	
		<i>Respondents</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Respondents</i>	<i>%</i>
Sex	Male	480	46.9	504	49.3
	Female	543	53.1	519	50.7
Age Group	18-24 years	141	13.8	176	17.2
	25-44 years	325	31.8	403	39.4
	45-64 years	402	39.3	299	29.2
	65+ years	155	15.2	145	14.2
Education level	Primary	195	19.1	193	18.9
	Intermediate	214	20.9	237	23.2
	Leaving	270	36.4	258	25.2
	Post-secondary	344	33.6	335	32.7
Principal Economic Status	Employed	480	46.9	468	45.7
	Self-employed	131	12.8	117	11.4
	Student	61	6.0	89	8.7
	Unemployed	26	2.5	36	3.5
	Sick/Disabled	24	2.3	30	2.9
	Home Duties	136	13.3	147	14.4
	Retired	144	14.1	113	11.1
	Other and Training	21	2.1	23	2.2
Child under 18 years?	No	641	62.7	596	58.3
	Yes	320	31.3	348	34.0
	Missing	62	6.1	79	7.7
Region	Dublin	218	21.3	304	29.7
	BMW	341	33.3	264	25.8
	South and East (excluding Dublin)	464	45.4	454	44.4
Marital Status	Single	266	26.0	344	33.6
	Married/Cohabiting	675	66.0	570	55.7
	Widow/Divorce/Sep	82	8.0	110	10.7
	Total	1,023	100	1,023	100