

The Distribution of Welfare: Inequality, Earnings Capacity and Household Production in a Comparative Perspective

Author:

Saunders, Peter; O'Connor, Inge; Smeeding, Timothy M.

Publication details:

Working Paper No. 51
SPRC Discussion Paper
0733409628 (ISBN)
1447-8978 (ISSN)

Publication Date:

1994

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.26190/unsworks/192>

License:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/au/>

Link to license to see what you are allowed to do with this resource.

Downloaded from <http://hdl.handle.net/1959.4/33985> in <https://unsworks.unsw.edu.au> on 2024-04-20

SPRC

SOCIAL POLICY RESEARCH CENTRE

Discussion Papers

No. 51

November 1994

The Distribution of Welfare: Inequality, Earnings Capacity and Household Production in a Comparative Perspective

by

Peter Saunders, Inge O'Connor
and Timothy Smeeding



THE UNIVERSITY OF
NEW SOUTH WALES

The Social Policy Research Centre (formerly the Social Welfare Research Centre) was established in January 1980 under an Agreement between the University of New South Wales and the Commonwealth Government. In accordance with the Agreement the Centre is operated by the University as an independent unit within the University. The Director of the Centre is responsible to the Vice-Chancellor and receives advice in formulating the Centre's research agenda from a Management Board.

SOCIAL POLICY RESEARCH CENTRE DISCUSSION PAPERS are intended as a forum for the publication of selected research papers on research within the Centre, or commissioned by the Centre, for discussion and comment in the research community and/or welfare sector prior to more formal publication. Limited copies of each DISCUSSION PAPER will be available on a first-come, first-served basis from the Publications and Information Officer, Social Policy Research Centre, University of New South Wales, Sydney NSW 2052 [tel: (02) 385 3857]. A full list of DISCUSSION PAPERS can be found at the back of this DISCUSSION PAPER.

The series is indebted to Diana Encel for her continuing editorial contribution.

As with all of the Centre's publications, the views expressed in this DISCUSSION PAPER do not reflect any official position on the part of the Centre.

Anthony King
Editor

The Distribution of Welfare: Inequality, Earnings Capacity and Household Production in a Comparative Perspective

Peter Saunders, Inge O'Connor and Timothy Smeeding

ISSN 1037 2741
ISBN 0 7334 0962 8

Peter Saunders is Director of the Social Policy Research Centre. Inge O'Connor and Timothy Smeeding are both at the Centre for Policy Research, The Maxwell School, Syracuse University, USA and are also associated with the Luxembourg Income Study, Walferdange, Luxembourg. This paper was originally presented to the Aldi Harenaars Memorial Conference held at Leyden University in the Netherlands on 28-29 August 1994. The authors wish to acknowledge the comments provided at the Conference by the discussant, Ashgar Zaidi, and those provided subsequently by Anthony King, but accept full responsibility for any errors.

Abstract

The use of data from the Luxembourg Income Study (LIS) has greatly improved comparative analysis of the distribution of monetary incomes in industrial nations. The differences which emerge from studies using the LIS data raise new questions about why they exist and what nation-specific factors they reflect. This paper explores the role of differences in attachment to the labour force in explaining observed differences in the degree of inequality of income. A human capital model is used to estimate the earnings capacity of the individual members of couples aged between 25 and 55 in five countries: Australia, Canada, (West) Germany, the Netherlands and the United States. Because non-participation in paid work is often associated with (unpaid) domestic work (or household production) the earnings capacity estimates can be interpreted as proxies for the value of domestic production estimated using the opportunity cost method. Having derived the estimates of earnings capacity, these are used to replace the actual earnings (whether zero or positive) of the individual members of prime age couples and the resulting distributions of earnings capacity and actual earnings are compared. These comparisons reveal that the differences are substantial in absolute terms. They also indicate that the main patterns to emerge from cross-country difference in the distributions of actual earnings (and incomes) do not reflect different levels of labour market attachment in each country. When differences in labour force attachment are held constant by comparing earnings capacity, a clearer inequality ranking of countries emerges, but not one which differs from that based on the actual distribution of market earnings.

1 Introduction

The Luxembourg Income Study (LIS) project has for the last decade been involved in the reorganisation and recoding of national unit record data on household incomes into a common conceptual and methodological framework. By making progress in the area of data comparability, the LIS database has achieved one of its main objectives - to facilitate cross-country comparisons of poverty, income distribution and related distributional issues. Such analysis was possible prior to the advent of LIS, but results were always susceptible to criticism on the grounds of non-comparability of data. This had the consequence that the conclusions of individual studies were always questionable (and often were questioned) while results from different studies could rarely be compared with any confidence.

The LIS project has managed to reduce these uncertainties by establishing a 'lowest common denominator' framework of data consistency which allows a good deal of confidence to be attached to the comparisons which emerge from analyses using the LIS data. By greatly reducing data inconsistencies as an explanation of the observed differences in inequality, LIS has increased the degree of confidence which can be attached to results, and has thus made possible a greater understanding of cross-country differences. It has also opened up a new set of questions focusing on the nature of those differences and why they exist.

One area of income distribution analysis of increasing interest and policy relevance concerns the contribution of the earnings of a second earner in families (normally the wife) to the level and distribution of family earnings and income. Recent studies for a range of countries suggest that the earnings of wives has had, and continues to have, an equalising effect on the distribution of family income, including in Australia (Saunders, 1993), the Netherlands (Nelissen, 1990), Sweden (Björklund, 1992) the United Kingdom (Machin and Waldfogel, 1994) and the United States (Danziger, 1980; Cancian, Danziger and Gottschalk, 1993). However, several of these studies reveal that the distributional impact of wives' earnings is not stable over time, while the LIS-based study by Cancian and Schoeni (1992) reveals that it is also not stable across countries.

This evidence raises questions about the extent to which the observed cross-country differences in the distribution of income among families or households reflect differences in the labour force participation and earnings of married women in each country. The counterpart to the increased market earnings of married women is a decline in either the number of hours of domestic production worked in the home or in leisure. The resulting changes in the value of home production and leisure act to offset the increase in money income, so that the change in the economic welfare of the family is overstated by the change in money income alone.

Furthermore, the degree of such overstatement is likely to vary across families within and between countries, thus affecting the interpretation of national and cross-national differences in the distribution of (money) income. Such considerations in turn raise issues about the extent to which public policies (e.g., tax and transfer systems and child care provisions and costs) influence the labour force decisions of second earners (whether by intent or not) and about the implications of the rise of the two-earner couple for the design of such policies.

The empirical results presented here are intended to indicate the contribution that LIS data can make to understanding this aspect of cross-country differences in the distribution of income. The details of our methodology and our results themselves are, at this stage, preliminary. They are primarily intended to illustrate one particular approach to this issue, and to give initial estimates of its empirical consequences.

Central to the topic we address is the question of how best to estimate the impact of the value of household production on the distribution of welfare. This question has received considerable attention in many countries, and at many different levels. Some have seen it as important in providing alternative aggregate measures of economic product to those derived from the National Accounts. A good example of this approach is provided by the recent study of unpaid work undertaken by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS, 1994). Using a range of alternative methods, the ABS estimates that, in 1992, the value of unpaid work (including domestic work and the value of volunteer and community work) lies in the range from \$206

billion to \$272 billion - equivalent to between 52 per cent and 67 per cent of gross domestic product in 1992 (ABS, 1994, Table A).¹

Our aim in this paper is to focus attention at a more microeconomic level on the consequences of the value of household production for the level of economic well-being within the household and for its distribution between households. The approach we use to estimate the value of household production is based on the concept of earnings capacity applied in this context by Garfinkel and Haveman (1977) and Haveman and Buron (1993). Although this concept has sometimes been referred to as extended income or full income (Becker, 1965), we prefer to use the term earnings capacity, leaving the term full income to refer to the sum of cash income, household production and estimated noncash income in the form of subsidised provision of government services in education, health, housing, and so on (Smeeding et al., 1993).

Hence, full income adds noncash subsidies to earnings capacity. The term extended income (Jenkins and O'Leary, 1994) is used in a more general sense when time-use data are utilised to impute a value to household production using either earnings forgone (as with earnings capacity) or alternative values of home production time (e.g., replacement cost). No one has as yet gone so far as to combine all three components: cash, home production, and noncash subsidies to measure full income in its broadest meaning.

The earnings capacity approach involves replacing actual earnings (whether positive or zero) by an estimate of full-time earnings capacity derived from estimates of conventional human capital earnings functions. While our version of the method is only rudimentary and subject to a number of limitations, the approach has the advantage that it does not require detailed time-use data as used in more sophisticated approaches to estimating the value of home production (e.g. Jenkins and O'Leary, 1994). This means that we can apply the method relatively easily using the existing LIS database and investigate its distributional consequences in a comparative context.

1 The differences in these estimates reflect differences in the method used to estimate the value of unpaid work and in the wage rate at which hours of unpaid work were valued. Further details are provided in ABS (1990; 1994).

The paper is organised as follows: in Section 2 we review recent developments in non-participation in the labour market and in female labour supply (particularly among married women) and assess their distributional consequences within and between nations. Section 3 considers some of the relevant literature and reviews the conceptual and practical issues involved in estimated earnings capacity. The range of potential distributional consequences of substituting actual earnings by earnings capacity is also discussed, and the extent and impact of public policies on labour supply behaviour (and hence individual and family earnings) are briefly reviewed. In Section 4, we explain how and why our sample (of countries and, within countries, of families) was selected and outline our methodology in a little more detail, focusing on aspects where conceptual elegance had to be sacrificed on the twin altars of comparative research: practicality and data availability. Our main results are presented, analysed and discussed in Section 5, while our (tentative) main conclusions are summarised in Section 6.

2 Spouses' Labour Supply, Market Earnings and Income Distribution

Most OECD countries experienced the same broad trends in employment and labour force participation during the 1980s. For males, the overall participation rate remained fairly stable or declined slightly, although many countries experienced more substantial declines in participation among males in late middle-age (aged 55 and over). At the same time, as Table 1 shows, for the countries included in this study, female participation rates rose significantly and the percentage of females in the labour force who were married also rose (OECD, 1992) suggesting an even greater rise in participation among this group.

These changes saw the 'two-earner couple' increase in significance, to the point where it became more common than the single-earner couple in a number of countries. For those in employment, the rate of part-time employment has traditionally been much higher for females than for males and even though part-time employment among males has risen, females still occupy the bulk of all part-time jobs (Table 2). Within these broadly similar trends there is, however, a considerable diversity of experience within individual countries, as is apparent from Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1: Participation Rates by Gender, 1980-90 (Percentages)

	Males			Females		
	1980	1985	1990	1980	1985	1990
Australia	87.6	85.0	85.7	52.5	54.1	61.9
Canada	87.6	86.2	86.3	57.9	63.5	69.0
Germany	84.3	82.3	81.4 ^(a)	52.8	52.9	56.9 ^(a)
Netherlands	78.3	75.8	80.0	36.3	41.0	53.1
United States	87.8	87.1	87.6	61.3	65.5	69.6

Note: a) 1989

Source: *OECD Labour Force Statistics, 1970-1990, Part III.*

Table 2: Part-time Employment, 1990 (Percentages)

	Part-time employment as a percentage of total employment			Female part-time employment as a percentage of total part-time employment
	Males	Females	Total	
Australia	8.0	40.1	21.3	78.1
Canada	8.1	24.4	15.4	71.0
Germany	2.6	33.8	15.2	89.7
Netherlands	15.8	61.7	33.2	70.4
United States	10.0	25.2	16.9	67.6

Source: *OECD Employment Outlook, July 1993, Table D.*

There are also significant cross-country differences in the incidence of non-employment due to either unemployment or inactivity (non-participation in the formal labour market). There is also a strongly gendered pattern to these differences. Table 3 indicates that even among those of prime workforce age (25 to 54 years), around an eighth of all men and between a third and a half of all women were non-employed, on average, over the 1980s. Over the decade, higher unemployment saw the rate of non-employment among males rise (except in the Netherlands), while increased participation caused the opposite trend for women (OECD, 1994, Table 17). Again, these broadly similar trends conceal substantial differences in the experience of individual countries.

Since these differences are unlikely to have neutral consequences for measures of income distribution, they assume particular significance in the context of cross-country distributional comparisons. Two specific concerns can be identified. The first relates to the effects of different national labour market configurations on cross-country comparisons of inequality at a point in time, and the second to the effects of changing labour market trends on comparisons of income distribution and inequality within individual countries over time. Both the prevailing patterns and the way they are changing vary between countries, which means that comparisons of inequality at a point in time and over time will both be affected. Unless an attempt is made to control for these differences, it will not be possible to gauge the extent to which they contribute to the observed differences in inequality.

The degree to which one of these factors can influence cross-national comparisons of income distribution is illustrated in Figure 1, which compares two measures of income inequality among families with the female labour force participation rate.² Although no clearly discernible pattern emerges from these data, there is a tendency for income inequality to be lower in those countries (Finland, Norway, Sweden) where female

2 The inequality measures have been derived from the second wave of LIS data by Atkinson, Rainwater and Smeeding and are not yet ready for quotation. They refer to the (person-weighted) distribution of equivalent household disposable income. (Atkinson, Rainwater and Smeeding, forthcoming). The female participation rates refer to the same year as the LIS data and are taken from *OECD Labour Force Statistics, 1970-1990* (OECD, 1992).


Table 3: Non-employment Rates, by Age and Gender (Average annual percentages)

Country/Year	Males aged			Females aged		
	15 - 24	25 - 54	55 - 64	15 - 24	25 - 54	55 - 64
Australia (1980-91)						
Inactivity	26.0	6.6	63.9	35.0	40.8	89.4
Unemployed	10.5	4.9	1.9	8.8	3.4	0.3
Total	36.6	11.4	65.9	43.8	44.2	89.7
Canada (1980-91)						
Inactivity	29.1	6.2	30.5	35.2	31.0	65.7
Unemployed	11.7	7.0	4.7	8.6	5.8	2.3
Total	40.8	13.2	35.3	43.8	36.9	68.0
Germany (1980-89)						
Inactivity	37.6	6.1	37.9	43.3	40.5	74.1
Unemployed	4.8	5.0	5.4	5.1	4.3	2.6
Total	42.4	11.0	43.3	48.3	44.9	76.7
Netherlands (1987-89)						
Inactivity	38.4	6.6	54.2	40.7	43.1	84.1
Unemployed	7.0	4.9	1.6	8.1	6.3	0.7
Total	45.4	11.5	55.8	48.8	49.4	84.8
United States (1980-91)						
Inactivity	27.0	7.0	32.1	36.9	30.3	57.5
Unemployed	9.7	5.1	2.9	8.0	4.0	1.6
Total	36.7	12.1	35.0	44.9	34.3	59.0

Source: OECD, 1994, Table 17.

participation rates are highest, compared with countries like Ireland and Italy which are characterised by low female participation and relatively high inequality. Several countries do not conform to this general pattern, however, notably the United States and the Benelux countries, which lie above and below it, respectively. There is also no clear pattern among those countries where the female participation rate varies in the middle range, i.e., from between 55 per cent and 65 per cent. Nevertheless, Figure 1 provides

Figure 1: Cross-national Relationships Between Income Distribution and Female Labour Force Participation



at least some circumstantial evidence to suggest that cross-country female participation rate variations are one factor underlying cross-country differences in the distribution of income between families.³

One way of overcoming the complications to which this gives rise is to compare not the actual distributions of family income, but an estimate of what those distributions would be if each country had the **same** female participation rate. This approach has been employed to estimate the distributional impact of female earnings on family income inequality in the national studies cited earlier, as well as in the cross-country study using the LIS database by Cancian and Schoeni (1992).⁴ The approach used in these studies involves comparing the actual distribution of income with the 'zero earnings counterfactual' in which the earnings of all wives are set to zero. Comparison of the two distributions then forms the basis for estimating the distributional impact of the earnings of married women.

Table 4 applies the 'zero earnings counterfactual' method using mid-1980s' LIS data for the five countries studied here: Australia, Canada, (West) Germany, the Netherlands, and the United States.⁵ The upper panel of Table 4 compares the distribution of the annual earnings of the male partner in all couples aged 25 to 55 years with the distribution of the combined earnings of both partners. In the United States and Canada, but not elsewhere, the distribution of the combined earnings of both partners Lorenz-dominates the distribution of the earnings of the head. Overall, the extent of the decline in inequality (measured by the percentage reduction in the Gini coefficient) varies considerably, from less than one per cent in the Netherlands to over 10 per cent in the United States.

-
- 3 Slottje, Hayes and Shackett (1922) provide evidence of a significant negative impact of female (and male) labor force participation on inequality of family income across states in the United States.
 - 4 The countries included in the study by Cancian and Schoeni are: Australia*, Canada*, France, (West) Germany*, Israel, Netherlands*, Norway, Sweden*, United Kingdom and the United States*. Only those marked with an asterisk had data from the mid-1980s available at the time that the paper was written.
 - 5 All subsequent discussion and results refer only to these five countries, and to the specific age group included in Table 4, as they are the primary focus of this paper.

Table 4: Zero Earnings Counterfactual Comparisons of Earnings and Income Distributions Among Prime-Aged Couples (Decile Shares)

Decile	United States (1986)		Canada (1987)		Australia (1986)		Netherlands (1987)		Germany (1984)	
	Earnings of the head	Earnings of head and spouse	Earnings of the head	Earnings of head and spouse	Earnings of the head	Earnings of head and spouse	Earnings of the head	Earnings of head and spouse	Earnings of the head	Earnings of head and spouse
First	1.2	2.1	0.8	1.8	0.4	1.2	1.8	3.1	2.3	3.7
Second	4.1	4.7	4.2	5.0	5.4	5.4	6.5	6.0	6.5	6.0
Third	5.9	6.2	6.4	6.5	7.4	6.9	7.4	6.8	7.5	6.9
Fourth	7.1	7.3	7.8	7.7	8.4	8.1	8.1	7.6	8.3	7.7
Fifth	8.4	8.5	9.1	8.9	9.3	9.2	8.9	8.5	8.9	8.7
Sixth	9.7	9.7	10.3	10.0	10.3	10.2	9.7	9.5	9.6	9.7
Seventh	11.1	11.1	11.6	11.0	11.3	11.3	10.7	10.9	10.6	11.0
Eighth	12.9	12.7	13.1	12.8	12.5	12.6	12.0	12.5	12.2	12.4
Ninth	15.3	15.3	15.0	14.9	14.4	14.6	14.2	14.5	14.4	14.4
Tenth	24.1	22.5	21.6	20.9	20.5	20.4	20.8	20.5	19.8	19.4
Gini coefficient	0.345	0.310	0.314	0.291	0.285	0.282	0.262	0.261	0.251	0.244
Percentage change in Gini	-10.1%		-7.3%		-1.1%		-0.4%		-2.8%	
Decile	Gross family income (GFI)	GFI minus earnings of spouse	Gross family income (GFI)	GFI minus earnings of spouse	Gross family income (GFI)	GFI minus earnings of spouse	Gross family income (GFI)	GFI minus earnings of spouse	Gross family income (GFI)	GFI minus earnings of spouse
First	2.6	2.1	3.1	2.7	2.9	2.5	4.7	3.8	4.6	3.7
Second	4.8	4.4	5.5	5.1	5.5	5.7	6.1	6.3	6.0	6.3
Third	6.2	5.8	6.8	6.5	6.7	6.8	6.9	7.1	7.0	7.2
Fourth	7.3	6.9	7.9	7.7	7.7	7.6	7.7	7.9	7.9	7.8
Fifth	8.4	8.2	8.8	8.8	8.6	8.5	8.5	8.6	8.8	8.7
Sixth	9.5	9.4	9.9	9.9	9.6	9.4	9.5	9.4	9.8	9.5
Seventh	10.9	10.8	11.1	11.0	10.7	10.4	10.7	10.5	10.8	10.7
Eighth	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.1	11.7	12.2	11.8	12.1	12.3
Ninth	15.2	15.3	14.4	14.6	14.1	13.9	14.1	14.1	14.1	14.1
Tenth	22.6	24.7	20.1	21.0	22.1	23.4	19.7	20.3	18.8	19.6
Gini coefficient	0.301	0.332	0.259	0.277	0.277	0.287	0.232	0.240	0.225	0.239
Percentage change in Gini	10.3%		6.9%		3.6%		3.4%		6.2%	

Source: LIS database.

These comparisons also highlight the extent of cross-country differences in the distribution of earnings itself, a topic which has received considerable attention in several recent studies using the LIS data (Green, Coder and Ryscavage, 1992; Bradbury, 1993; Fritzell, 1993; Gottschalk, 1993; Jänti, 1993) as well as in an OECD study using national labour force data (OECD, 1993). Table 4 indicates that the earnings distributions in even this small range of countries vary considerably. This is illustrated by noting that, aside from the lowest two deciles, the distribution of family earnings in the United States is less equal than the distribution of the earnings of the male partner alone in Germany - despite the equalising impact of the earnings of American wives.

The lower panel of Table 4 broadens the analysis by comparing the distribution of (unadjusted) gross family income (GFI) with the 'zero earnings counterfactual' in which the earnings of all wives are set to zero and GFI re-calculated. This again indicates that married women's earnings cause a reduction in inequality among couples. The patterns within and between countries are similar to those based on the distribution of earnings just discussed. Again, the United States stands out as having the greatest degree of inequality. In this case, the zero earnings counterfactual distributions in all countries except Australia are more equal than the actual distribution of gross family income in the United States. Again, therefore, we see that while the distributional impact of female earnings on family income inequality is significant within countries, there are other factors which play a more important role in explaining distributional differences between countries.⁶

The comparisons presented in Table 4 highlight the effect of variations in the earnings of married women, but in a way which is, at best, rudimentary and mechanical. Any analytical advantage that they bestow is probably more than outweighed by the reduced relevance of assuming female labour supply is reduced to zero (with no induced behavioural adjustments). The approach is also flawed because it constrains all married women to leave the

6 The comparisons in Table 4 are simplistic because they take no account of behavioral response in the labour market (and hence earnings) of the head and the spouse, nor (in relation to the lower panel) of how changes in the earnings of either partner influence other components of gross family income (e.g., government cash transfers).

labour force simultaneously, yet takes no account of how the associated increase in home production and leisure affect the level and distribution of economic welfare among couples. In addition, no account is taken of variations in the participation and employment rates of males which, as Tables 1, 2 and 3 indicate, also differ across countries, nor of the effect of massive labour force change on levels of unemployment, wages, prices, and other macroeconomic variables.

These observations suggest that while the zero earnings counterfactual approach reduces some of the cross-national variations in labour market behaviour, it does so by artificially holding these constant at the wrong level. In the remainder of this paper, we explore the implications of holding such variations constant, not at zero, but at the level corresponding to the full utilisation of existing labour skills and potentialities represented by our estimates of earnings capacity.

Before moving on to consider the earnings capacity approach in more detail, it is worth emphasising that although the results in Table 4 are consistent with the other studies cited earlier in that they show married women's earnings to have an equalising effect on income distribution, there can be no presumption that this will always be the case (Cancian, Danziger and Gottschalk, 1993). Neither can it be assumed that evidence of past equalising effects in some countries will necessarily continue into the future, or be replicated in other countries. It is possible, for example, as noted by Saunders (1993), that the size of the equalising impact could decline over time, leading to a disequalising effect in relation to the change in inequality over that period. Finally, it is important to emphasise that this entire discussion focuses only on income and ignores the welfare consequences of the value of home production and leisure which are forgone in order to participate in the labour market and receive monetary earnings. This latter issue is taken up in the next section.

3 Earnings Capacity and the Distribution of Welfare

The Measurement and Impact of Earnings Capacity

The limitations of using market income (even when adjusted for need using an equivalence scale) to measure economic welfare are well known. These

include the fact that market income reflects tastes and preferences for leisure as compared with work, and that survey-based measures of market income contain transitory elements which cannot be separated from permanent income. In addition, money income only reflects the financial return to labour supplied to the market economy and thus takes no account of the value of work undertaken in the domestic economy, the value of home production.

For these reasons, comparisons of the monetary incomes of different families at a point in time, or of the income of a given family at different points in time, are likely to provide misleading indications of the relative level (and hence the distribution) of economic welfare and how this is changing over time. Gottschalk and Meyer (1994) have recently noted, for example, that the increased incomes of many families in the United States reflect the increased labour force participation of married women, yet associated with this rise in money income is a fall in the value of household production (and/or leisure). This argument, which applies equally to most other industrial countries, means that the change in money income overstates the gain in economic welfare.

Taking account of changes in the value of home production thus has the potential to cause prevailing views on the size and trend in inequality to be re-considered, particularly when these reflect increased female labour supply, as they clearly do to a considerable extent. The complexities this introduces for evaluating the change in inequality within a single country are compounded when the focus shifts to comparing inequality between countries, particularly where the level and structure of female labour force participation varies. The available evidence on time-use indicates that patterns of household work vary in several key dimensions, including within families according to the labour force status of both parents (ABS, 1994; Flood and Klevmarken, 1992, Figure 4), between countries (Flood and Klevmarken, 1992, Table 1), and over time within countries (Gershuny and Robinson, 1988). Taking account of how these changes in the value of home production affect living standards and the various dimensions of inequality is thus an important task.

This requires, as a first step, that the value of home production can be estimated with some degree of accuracy. Two approaches have been developed for this purpose: the service price (or replacement cost) method

in which domestic work is valued at the market price of the equivalent services performed in the domestic economy; and the **opportunity cost** method in which the potential market wage is used to value hours worked in the domestic economy. Several variants exist within each approach, each of which embody different assumptions and have different data requirements.⁷

Detailed discussions of the merits of these alternative methods by Chadeau (1992) and Goldschmidt-Clermont (1993) agree on at least one point, which is that the opportunity cost method produces estimates which are inconsistent with the National Accounts framework. As Chadeau puts it:

....the 'opportunity cost of time' method.... is not very plausible as it imputes different values to identical services depending on who produces them. In addition, it values services produced in the household at the cost of producing quite different goods or services on the market. (Chadeau, 1992: 101)

Despite these criticisms, the opportunity cost method has been used extensively in micro-studies of living standards and inequality, under the guise of the estimation of earnings capacity. Moreover, from a micro-behavioural maximisation perspective, the opportunity cost approach is appealing precisely because of the difference between opportunity cost and replacement cost. When women can work in the market, use the earnings they receive to purchase replacement services (housework, prepared meals, child care, etc.), cover work-related costs (transportation, clothing, etc.) **and still have extra money income left over**, the household may, in fact, achieve a higher overall level of well-being from having more than one adult in market-based employment.⁸

The earnings capacity method involves identifying the factors which determine the earnings of those who are in paid employment and using the

7 These alternative valuation methods are explained and compared in the two ABS reports referred to earlier (ABS, 1990; 1994). Both reports also contain a range of international comparisons of the estimated value of unpaid household work.

8 It might be argued that the true addition to household well-being is, in fact, only the difference between opportunity cost and replacement cost. Most measures of earnings capacity fail to adjust for the extra costs of market workers and hence, overstate the gain in net economic well-being.

resulting model to predict the forgone earnings of those who are not in paid employment. These earnings capacity estimates can then be used to replace the actual earnings of those actually in employment (including those who may not be working to their full capacity) and to impute earnings for those not actually receiving market earnings.

Ideally, the method is used to estimate the hourly wage, from which the value of home production can be calculated given information on the time spent performing household tasks. Where such information is not available (as is the case with the LIS database) weekly or annual earnings capacity can be calculated from data on the earnings of full-year, full-time workers. The value of home production can then be estimated as being equal to the earnings capacity of those who are not participating in the labour market. This is the income that these people could earn if they were participating in the labour market, but it must be recognised as an imprecise estimate of the value of home production because it takes no account of how much time is **actually** spent on household work while they are not participating in the labour market.

Conceptually, the earnings capacity approach can be criticised because it assumes that those not in the labour force are free to choose to work to their maximum capacity in the labour market if they wish and that they face no constraints which prevent them from receiving their potential wage, even if they all did so simultaneously.⁹ Also, the method takes no account of the costs of joining the labour market. Where these are substantial (particularly where the second partner joins and where there are young children in the household), the replacement cost of forgone household services might exceed the net earnings capacity of the household worker, thus resulting in the finding that market work reduces household well-being, everything else being equal. Finally, the effects of massive increases in labour market participation by all those part-time workers currently working at less than full capacity might have a serious indirect impact on wages, jobs, and levels of pay, yet no account is taken of these.

9 Garfinkel and Haveman (1977) also note that the estimates of earnings capacity for those with low labour force participation are likely to be over-estimated relative to those with high participation rates because of tastes, labour market scarring effects and other self-selection biases.

These limitations of the earnings capacity approach are acknowledged and should be kept in mind when reviewing our results. Our main response to them is not to downplay their significance, but rather to argue that there is still considerable merit in exploring the implications of the method, particularly in a comparative context. The alternative, after all, is to assume in effect that the imputed market wage (as well as the value of all non-market activities) for those underemployed, unemployed or not in the labour force, is zero.

What does previous research tell us about the difference that the use of earnings capacity makes to conventional estimates of inequality based on observed earnings (or income)? In their original study, Garfinkel and Haveman (1977) found that in the United States, the distribution of the combined earnings capacity of the head and spouse (gross or net of child care costs) was virtually identical to the distribution of gross family income, but was more equal than the distribution of pre-transfer income for the whole population. For the non-aged population, however, gross earnings capacity was distributed more equally than either gross family income or pre-transfer income.

In both cases, the Gini coefficient for the (gross) earnings capacity distribution was about 82 per cent of that for pre-transfer income, leading to the conclusion that around 18 per cent of the observed variation in pre-transfer income resulted from variations in the utilisation of earnings capacity. More recently, Gottschalk and Meyer (1994) have found that using the earnings capacity approach to estimate the value of home production causes a reduction in both the level and the post-1976 increase in inequality in the United States. Furthermore, these conclusions are not affected by the method used to estimate the value of home production (replacement cost or opportunity cost), nor by whether income is adjusted using an equivalence scale or not.

The Role of Public Policies

It has already been noted that one advantage of the use of earnings capacity rather than actual money income as a proxy for economic welfare is that the former, unlike the latter, abstracts from the effects of tastes and preferences which influence decisions about labour market participation. Of course,

while tastes for work or for having children play an important role in labour market choices, such decisions also reflect constraints, as well as the market incentive and disincentive structures and the ways in which these are moderated or exacerbated by public policies.

The range of public policies of relevance in this context is very broad, including any interventions which influence the supply or demand for labour, or the structure of earnings (directly or indirectly).¹⁰ Tax policies, for example, will influence labour supply decisions at the margin (hours of work) or in total (the participation decision), particularly the tax treatment of husbands and wives. Where there is some form of joint taxation, the incentive for both partners in a couple to join the labour force may be less than where tax is levied on an individual basis.¹¹ One might, on this basis, thus expect fewer married women to be in the labour force in countries with joint taxation, in which case the earnings capacity adjustments have the potential to have a bigger impact in these countries.

Another range of policy instruments likely to be important concern the ways in which eligibility and entitlement for social security cash transfers are defined and structured. Where, as in the case of Australia for example, benefits are means-tested and paid on a family unit basis, the incentive for the wife of an unemployed man (or of a part-time male worker receiving a means-tested social benefit) to seek work will be less than in a system such as the United States, where benefits are earnings-related and determined on an individual basis. The level of social benefits paid in respect of children and whether they are paid on a universal or means-tested basis are also likely to influence the labour supply behaviour of at least one parent, possibly both parents. The nature, extent and cost of child care provisions will also affect the labour supply decisions of women with younger children, because child care provisions facilitate labour force participation, but also and because they lower the financial costs of joining the workforce. Finally, some nations (e.g., Germany, Luxembourg, Netherlands) have

10 The role these factors play in influencing married women's labor force participation decisions is explored (using the LIS database) by Wolff (1990).

11 Income tax operates on an individual basis in Australia, Canada and (since 1973) the Netherlands, while the United States has joint taxation and Germany an optional (income-splitting) system (OECD, 1991).

entire institutional structures including limits on shopping hours, higher pay levels for married men, and direct subsidies for non-working spouses which are likely to impact on the labour market behaviour of married couples.

In addition to these more obvious and direct mechanisms, workforce decisions will be influenced by a range of other factors which are likely to vary from country to country.¹² Attitudes to the role of women in society are changing, but at different speeds in different places and from differing starting points. On the demand side, the structure of employment opportunities, combined with the level and pattern of spending on education, will influence the wage structure and hence affect earnings capacity. The extent of non-wage labour costs will also affect the pattern of labour demand, while employment-related provisions like vacation, sickness and parental leave and so on will influence the attractiveness of work and affect choices made about the balance between work and family responsibility.

The range of such indirect effects is potentially enormous, as are their consequences for the level and distribution of earnings capacity. In a comparative context in which different countries follow different policy regimes and pursue different goals, there is little likelihood that the balance of forces affecting earnings capacity will even-out to anything like the same extent in different countries.

Discussion of some of the more directly relevant policies in place in the five countries studied here is thus useful in providing a background to our results. We do not undertake any formal or systematic attempt to link the differences in our results to the policy differences which may have caused them. Such an exercise is far beyond the scope of this paper. Rather, in describing some of the policy differences in our sample of countries, we hope to provide a policy context which will assist with the understanding and interpretation of our findings.

The Family Policy Climate in Australia, Germany, the Netherlands and the United States

It is an extremely difficult task to encapsulate all of the relevant policy differences in a single or small number of indicators. Rather than attempt

12 For a more detailed discussion of these issues, see Hewitt (1993).

this, we have relied upon recent research which investigates how tax and benefit programs in a range of OECD countries (including all of those studied here except Canada) implicitly recognize the value of wifely labour (Shaver and Bradshaw, 1993; forthcoming). These comparisons have a bearing on the cross-country pattern of incentives encouraging married women to join the labour force or remain in the home, and are thus relevant to how the pattern of earnings capacity is likely to differ from that of actual earnings in each country studied.

The estimates presented by Shaver and Bradshaw (forthcoming) are derived from a broader comparative study of support for children undertaken by Bradshaw et al., (1993). That study incorporates a large range of public programs which provide support for families with children at different levels of market earnings, including taxes (central and local government), relevant tax reliefs and concessions, rental subsidies, subsidies for health care, pre-school and school education benefits, income support benefits for families with children and the costs of child care (Bradshaw et al., 1993; chapter 3 and Appendix). The analysis undertaken by Shaver and Bradshaw adopts a narrower approach, focusing on the impact of the income tax system, social security contributions and income-related and non-income related cash benefits for children.

Table 5 brings together some of the results presented in this comparative analysis of the different packages of support for different family types.¹³ The results in the first four rows of Table 5 estimate the extent to which the tax-benefit system provides support to 'dependent' (non-earning) wives, by comparing the net income of a single person with that of a working man and non-working wife at different income levels. The larger the differences, the greater the system implicitly values a non-working (more accurately, a non-earning) wife. It can be seen that (except at very low incomes) Germany values non-earning wives most highly, followed by the Netherlands and Australia (where the value of the benefit package declines sharply as income rises) and the United States (where the value of the package increases with income). For a couple with one school-age child, the value of benefits for a non-earning wife is still highest (and more so) in

13 The estimates refer to the situation in each country in May 1992.

Table 5: Cross-country Comparisons of the Tax-Benefit Package for Different Family Types, May 1992 (Percentages)

	Australia	Germany	Netherlands	United States
Support for a non-earning wife ^(a)				
Without children				
0.5 x AME ^(b)	10.1	8.3	10.0	5.9
1.0 x AME	4.9	11.9	6.6	3.8
1.5 x AME	3.6	13.9	6.0	8.4
With one school-age child				
1.0 x AME	8.2	17.3	11.5	5.2
Support for an earning wife ^(c)				
Without children				
Increase in net earnings: AME plus 0.66 x AFE ^(b)	50	41	62	42
Increase in gross earnings: AME plus 0.66 x AFE	51	48	53	43
With one preschool child ^(d)				
Increase in net earnings: AME plus 0.66 x AFE	70	86	60	35

- Notes: a) Percentage difference between the net disposable income of a single person and a one-earner couple at the same gross income level.
b) AME = average male earnings; AFE = average female earnings.
c) Percentage difference between the net disposable incomes of single-earner and dual-earner couples compared to (net or gross) average male earnings.
d) Includes the value of the child benefit package net of child care costs.

Source: Shaver and Bradshaw, forthcoming, Tables 1, 3 and 4.

Germany, followed by the Netherlands, Australia (now well below the Netherlands because of the relatively low value of Australian cash benefits for children) and, lastly, the United States.

The lower part of Table 5 estimates in a similar fashion the implied value placed by the tax and benefit system on an earning wife by comparing the gross (and net) earnings of a two-earner couple to that of a single-earner couple on (male) average earnings. The net earnings comparisons show that earning wives are valued most highly in the Netherlands (where net family

earnings rise by 62 per cent) and valued least in Germany and the United States (where net earnings rise by around 40 per cent). However, cross-country comparisons of these figures must be interpreted with care, as they reflect differences in the ratio of female to male earnings in each country, in addition to any differences arising from the tax-benefit package itself.¹⁴

To overcome this, the estimates in the sixth row of Table 5 are derived from calculations of the changes in gross family income which occur when the wife becomes an earner. This has the effect of increasing the German figure, decreasing the Netherlands figure but leaving the other two much the same. The impact of differential relative earnings can now be avoided by comparing the net and gross earnings estimates in rows five and six. This indicates that in Australia and the United States, where the net and gross figures are the same, the system is neutral in its treatment of earning wives (relative to the treatment of the husband's earnings). In Germany, the system treats the earnings of the wife more harshly than those of the husband, while the reverse is true in the Netherlands.¹⁵ The final row of Table 5 repeats the net earnings calculations for a couple with a preschool age child in child care. These figures include an estimate of the cost of child care in each country. They show the percentage of the net earnings of the wife which is left after adding in the value of the child benefit package and deducting child care costs. Germany now ranks first, well ahead of Australia and the Netherlands, with the United States again least generous.

14 According to Bradshaw et al. (1993, Table 3.2) the ratio of average female earnings to average male earnings in 1992 was 78 per cent in Australia, 70 per cent in Germany, 75 per cent in the Netherlands and 66 per cent in the United States. These differences are interesting in themselves, and it is worth noting that there is less justification for abstracting from them in the current context, where the focus is on comparing the structure of the incentives to participate in the labor market than on comparing the relative value of the child benefit package in different countries. Some countries have introduced mandatory limits on gender earnings relativities precisely so as to influence labor market incentives (as well as for equity reasons).

15 This result for the Netherlands is somewhat surprising in light of the low participation rate of women generally in that country (see Table 1), a point also noted by Shaver and Bradshaw.

Summary

As a prologue to our methodological and empirical work, we have attempted to sketch out the theoretical and institutional forces which come into play when estimating a value for household production (or leisure) of adults, primarily married women, using an earnings capacity framework. Clearly, differences in tastes and preferences, cultural differences and a range of public policy differences will affect the financial dimensions which influence the choice of working in the market versus working in the home in each nation.

The nations that we have decided to study here are typical of the wide range of perspectives found in modern nations. While there is a clear trend toward increased labour force participation by married women in every nation studied, these differences reflect changes in the balance of forces within every (potential) multiple-earner household and every nation. Several sets of these forces and issues present us with a wide range of choices concerning the methods and techniques which could be employed to carry out the estimation of earnings capacity. We now, in a much more modest and tentative version, turn to the central choices we have made in carrying out this exploration.

4 Methodology and Sample Selection

Methodology

Having provided a justification for our use of the earnings capacity approach, we now describe in a little more detail how we have applied the method. We have been guided in this exercise by the initial methodology developed by Garfinkel and Haveman (1977) and its recent application by Haveman and Buron (1993). Central to the method is the application of the human capital model to estimate an earnings function in which the level of earnings is assumed to be a function of a vector of human capital variables (h_1, \dots, h_m), a vector of personal characteristics variables (p_1, \dots, p_n), and a vector of job characteristics variables (c_1, \dots, c_k). Thus:

$$\log(e) = f(h_1, \dots, h_m; p_1, \dots, p_n; c_1, \dots, c_k) \quad (1)$$

where $\log(e)$ is the logarithm of annual gross wage and salary income.

We excluded earnings from self-employment because of the conceptual problems of separating this into a return to labour and a return to capital, as well as the practical limitations on the accuracy of household income survey data on self-employment incomes (Atkinson and Micklewright, 1983; Smeeding and Schmaus, 1990; Atkinson, Rainwater and Smeeding, forthcoming).¹⁶

We estimated the earnings function (1) from a sample which included all full-year, full-time (FYFT) workers, single people as well as those in couple families. As noted earlier, the LIS database does not make it generally possible to derive estimates of the hourly wage rate, so we were forced to use total (annual) wage and salary income. However, we decided to focus on FYFT workers only so as to minimise the effect of variations in hours worked. We included single people (aged 25 to 55) as well as couples in this age range, in order to obtain better point estimates of the parameters of the earnings function.

Once estimated, the parameters of equation (1) were used to predict the earnings capacity (e^*) of each individual in our sample of couple families (described below) given data on their human capital, personal and other relevant characteristics. These estimates of earnings capacity then replaced the actual earnings (whether positive or zero) of all partners in our sample of couples and the resulting distribution was compared with that of actual earnings.

This latter step in the exercise was undertaken in a series of separate stages. First, we estimated the earnings capacity of FYFT workers only, then we extended the exercise in several sequenced steps to include, at each successive stage, part-time (PT) workers, then those people who were unemployed (UN) and, finally, those who were not in the labour force

16 We included the self-employed themselves in our sample, a procedure which, because of the exclusion of income from self-employment, meant that our samples contained a large number of cases of zero wage and salary incomes, even among FYFT workers, i.e., those who were self-employed. The percentages of family heads with zero reported wage and salary income were: Australia (18.8 per cent), Canada (13.8 per cent), Germany (10.0 per cent), Netherlands (8.1 per cent) and the United States (12.5 per cent). The treatment of low or zero incomes for the self-employed in the LIS database is discussed by Green, Coder and Ryscavage (1992).

(NILF).¹⁷ At each stage in this sequence, the actual earnings of each individual in each group was replaced by the estimate of earnings capacity, the implied distribution of earnings capacity was derived and the degree of inequality calculated.¹⁸ At the stage of estimating these various distributions, the unit of analysis was changed from the individual to the family (in our case couple families only; see below). This is partly because the family is a more appropriate unit of analysis for distributional purposes, and partly because we wish to investigate the impact of differences in individual earnings (and earnings capacity) on inequality between families.

To summarise, we thus have the following five distributions to estimate and compare:

D1 = the distribution of actual gross annual wage and salary income (hereafter earnings) among prime-aged (25 to 55) couples;

D2 = the distribution of earnings among couples where the actual earnings of all FYFT workers are replaced by their estimated earnings capacity;

D3 = as for D2 with the actual earnings of all PT workers also replaced by their estimated FYFT earnings capacity;

D4 = as for D3 with estimated FYFT earnings capacity included as earnings for the unemployed; and

D5 = as for D4, with the estimated FYFT earnings capacity included as earnings for those not in the labour force.

17 It was possible to identify fairly precisely FYFT workers on the LIS data tapes. Part-time (PT) workers were defined to include all other individuals with positive wage and salary income over the year and thus include those defined as part-time in terms of either hours worked per week or weeks worked per year. The unemployed (UN) and those not in the labor force (NILF) were identified as those individuals with zero annual wage and salary income whose current status (i.e., at the time of the survey) was unemployed or not in the labor force, respectively. Appendix Table A1 presents the derivation of the labor force variables in each country.

18 This sequenced analysis of inequality is similar to that recently undertaken by Gottschalk (1993).

This structure allows us to estimate the overall distributional impact of replacing actual earnings by earnings capacity as we move sequentially from those with strongest attachment to the labour force to those with weaker or no such attachment.

One of the problems with comparing the distributions of observed earnings and earnings capacity is that the latter is derived from an estimated model which leaves a good deal of the actual variation in earnings unexplained. Unless some account is taken of this, it is difficult to ascribe the differences which emerge in the two distributions to differences in labour force participation behaviour (which cause actual earnings to be below earnings capacity) as compared with differences which are a consequence of the weak predictive performance of the model used to predict earnings capacity.

This explains why, in the first stage of our sequenced analysis described above, we replace actual earnings by earnings capacity for our sample of FYFT workers. This stage provides an indication of the extent to which poor model prediction alone accounts for differences between the levels and distributions of actual earnings and earnings capacity. By then using the latter distribution (D2) as a benchmark against which to compare our subsequent distributions, the impact of the accuracy of the regression predictions on the distributional differences is minimised (though admittedly not avoided all together).

One final adjustment to the method draws on the analysis of earnings capacity and poverty undertaken by Garfinkel and Haveman (1977) and, more recently, by Haveman and Buron (1993). The latter authors observe that use of the human capital earnings predictions to replace actual earnings omits several important factors known to influence earnings, and note that:

By adopting this procedure, each individual with the same set of characteristics is assigned the same earnings capacity. Such an assignment procedure, however, neglects the role of unobserved human capital and labour demand characteristics and 'luck' in the earnings determination process, and hence leads to an artificially compressed distribution of predicted EC (earnings capacity) for each race-gender group and for the entire population. (Haveman and Buron, 1993: 145)

In order to overcome these problems, we followed the procedure applied by Haveman and Buron. This involves shocking each individual earnings prediction within a cell by a randomised component drawn from a normal distribution with zero mean and standard deviation based on the standard error of the regression equation estimated for all FYFT workers.¹⁹ The results described in Section 5 below have thus all been derived after this randomisation procedure was applied to the actual earnings regression predictions of earnings capacity.

Once the five alternative distributions (D1 to D5) had been derived, the differences between them were compared, both within and across countries. We relied on comparisons of decile mean incomes (more accurately, mean earnings) to get an assessment of the absolute levels of the earnings capacity adjustments at each stage, and on the decile shares, Gini coefficient and percentile ratios in our distributional analysis.²⁰ It is also worth emphasising that our earnings capacity estimates enter cumulatively as we move from distribution D1 to distribution D5.

One of the issues which motivated this paper was to try and assess, in a comparative cross-country context, the distributional consequences of including an estimate of the value of home production into conventional earnings distribution comparisons. Our results allow us to approach this through a comparison of distributions D4 and D5, where the latter imputes earnings capacity to those not in the labour force, while the former assumes FYFT earnings capacity earnings for all members of the labour force. The great majority (though not all) of those entered at this last stage of the analysis will be married women currently engaged in domestic (or voluntary) work. However, some domestic work will also have been performed by women (and men) who enter the comparisons at an earlier

19 Haveman and Buron note (1993, footnote 7: 145) that there are in fact two components of the earnings residual, one relating to unmeasured individual-specific human capital variables and the other related to random fluctuations in earnings. Following them, we assumed that each component is normally distributed with a zero mean and constant (and independent) variance. The authors would like to thank Larry Buron for his advice and assistance on this aspect of the paper.

20 In general, the percentile ratio P_i/P_j expresses the ratio of the income level corresponding to the i^{th} percentile of the distribution to that corresponding to the j^{th} percentile of the distribution. The percentile P_{50} is, by definition, equal to the median income level.

stage in the chain of comparisons, while some of those who enter at the final stage may not necessarily have been engaged in home production. There is thus something of a difference between what we set out to do and what we actually ended up doing, and this should be kept in mind when interpreting our results.²¹

Sample Selection

The broad structure and features of the LIS database have been described elsewhere (e.g., Smeeding, O'Higgins and Rainwater, 1990) and will not be repeated here. In choosing our sample of countries from the LIS database, we were guided by the objectives of our analysis and restricted by what could be achieved in practice. Because one of our main interests was in investigating the different contributions of the earnings of wives to earnings inequality among families, we restricted our analysis to couple families where earnings were most likely to be the primary source of family income. Thus we included only those couples where both partners were aged between 25 and 55 years and who were not identified as containing at least one partner with a disability which prevented participation in the labour market.²²

We included couples both with and without children, but did not use an equivalence scale to adjust for differences in need. This was because our emphasis is on comparing alternative distributions of earnings rather than investigating how earnings and other sources of income influence living standards. However, the one study of this type which did use equivalence adjustments found that they did not affect the results (Gottschalk and Meyer, 1994). In our framework, the presence or absence of children is likely to influence labour force behaviour and hence earnings, and we attempt to capture such an effect in our earnings model. However, we do

21 In order to separate out the differences in value due to household production by spouses, we estimated the sum of earnings capacity for the male plus actual wife's earnings as a sub-stage between calculating the distributions D4 and D5. These results show that at least 80 per cent (Canada) and up to 95 per cent (Germany) of the difference between calculating the distributions D4 and D5 is due to married women with no earnings who are not in the labour force.

22 This focus on those in prime workforce age range accords with recent studies of earnings distribution undertaken by Green, Coder and Ryscavage (1992), Bradbury (1993) and Saunders and Fritzell (1993).

not go beyond this to investigate the demands placed on those earnings by the needs arising from the existence of the children themselves.²³ We further restricted ourselves to countries with data available in the 'second wave' (circa 1985) of the LIS database and to those countries for whom it was possible to derive comparable estimates of the earnings function. This left us with the following five countries (years in brackets): Australia (1986); Canada (1987); (West) Germany (1984); the Netherlands (1987) and the United States (1986).²⁴

Table 6 presents a breakdown of the (unweighted) samples in each country by family type and labour force status. Our sample size ranged from around 1350 couples in Germany to almost 3600 in Canada. Comparison of the different national sample structures reveals some substantial differences in the pattern of labour force attachment in each country. In total, between 85 per cent (Canada) and 93 per cent (Australia, the Netherlands and Germany) of husbands were in employment, although the prevalence of part-time male employment was more variable, being highest (16.5 per cent) in the United States, but very much lower in Australia (2.9 per cent) and the Netherlands (6.2 per cent), with Canada and Germany in between with a figure of around 12 per cent. Although these estimates are broadly similar to the figures presented earlier in Tables 1, 2 and 3, there are also several notable differences. These arise primarily because the estimates in Table 6 are unweighted, but also because Table 6 is derived from household income surveys (not labour force surveys), because the categories themselves are not defined solely on the basis of current labour force status, and because our figures refer to prime-aged couples only, not to the total labour force.

23 Here we depart from Garfinkel and Haveman (1977) and Haveman and Buron (1993), both of whom deduct an estimate of child care costs in deriving net (as opposed to gross) earnings capacity. While netting out the additional costs of working, including not only child care costs, but other costs is theoretically appropriate, we have not carried out such an imputation at this time. To do so would require information on the net costs of child care which will vary widely across countries due to differences in subsidy rates by age of children, tax treatment and non-profit provisions (e.g., German and Dutch kindergartens).

24 The Australian data refer to the financial year (beginning 1 July) 1985-86, but the survey was actually conducted in the latter months of 1986. It is worth noting that our sample is a subset of the sample of countries included in the recent LIS-based study by Cancian and Schoeni (1992).

Table 6: Sample Size, by Gender and Labour Force Status^(a) (Unweighted)

	United States 1986	Canada 1987	Australia 1986	Netherlands 1987	Germany 1984
Couples: Both With and Without Children					
Husbands	3284	3587	2351	1705	1345
Employed FYFT ^(b)	2402	2617	2111	1491	1078
Employed < FYFT	543	418	68	106	169
Unemployed	243	255	95	76	66
Not in Labour Force	96	297	77	32	32
Wives	3284	3587	2351	1705	1345
Employed FYFT ^(b)	1052	1129	654	187	267
Employed < FYFT	982	1094	687	392	408
Unemployed	210	263	103	216	84
Not in Labor Force	1040	1101	907	910	586
Couples With Children					
Husbands	2324	2616	1781	1231	920
Employed FYFT ^(b)	1717	1915	1609	1079	753
Employed < FYFT	378	300	38	74	109
Unemployed	169	183	81	58	43
Not in Labour Force	60	218	53	20	15
Wives	2324	2616	1781	1231	920
Employed FYFT ^(b)	601	689	351	39	111
Employed < FYFT	738	847	576	267	273
Unemployed	150	203	94	163	60
Not in Labour Force	835	877	760	762	476
Couples Without Children					
Husbands ^(b)	960	971	570	474	425
Employed FYFT ^(b)	685	702	502	412	325
Employed < FYFT	165	118	30	32	60
Unemployed	74	72	14	18	23
Not in Labour Force	36	79	24	12	17
Wives	960	971	570	474	425
Employed FYFT ^(b)	451	440	303	148	156
Employed < FYFT	244	247	111	125	135
Unemployed	60	60	9	53	24
Not in Labour Force	205	224	147	148	110

Notes: a) The sample includes individuals aged between 25 and 55 years.

b) FYFT = full-year, full-time.

Source: LIS database.

Not surprisingly, cross-country variations in employment rates are much greater for wives than for husbands. In the three non-European countries, the total employment rate of wives was between 57 per cent and 62 per cent: in Germany, it was 50 per cent and in the Netherlands 34 per cent. Much of this difference is explained by differences in the full-time employment rate of wives, with the rate of part-time employment varying in a relatively small range, from 23 per cent (in the Netherlands) to close to 30 per cent in the other four countries.

An illustration of the size of these differences among wives' employment can be gained by noting that if wives in the Netherlands were to conform to the same employment patterns as those in the United States, an additional 359 married women (out of a total of 1705, equivalent to over 21 per cent) would have been in FYFT employment and a further 118 wives (7 per cent) would have been employed part-time. Clearly, these differences have the potential to have a considerable impact on the distribution of family earnings in the Netherlands, and thus how the degree of inequality compares with that in the United States.

Further comparison of the employment ratios of wives according to whether or not there are children in the family provides additional insight into the differences shown in Table 6.²⁵ In all five countries, the full-time employment rate is greater for wives without children than for those with children. However, this differential varies considerably across countries, from a factor of almost ten to one in the Netherlands (where almost no married women with children are in full-time work) to around three to one in Germany, about 2.7 to one in Australia, to around 1.8 to one in North America. Generally, the rate of part-time work among wives shows much less variation with the presence or absence of children, although the rate is higher for those with children (outside of Europe). These patterns suggest that part-time work is the preferred option for most married women in all five countries and that this option (unlike full-time work) is not greatly constrained by the presence of children.

In summary, Table 6 reveals that the biggest cross-country differences in employment rates occur among wives and in relation to the prevalence of

25 These comments must be interpreted with care because of the fact that the estimates in Table 6 are unweighted.

full-time work for those with children. These differences are likely to reflect prevailing social values and attitudes to the role of women as (unpaid) mothers or (paid) workers, combined with factors such as the availability, quality and cost of child care and the nature of the incentives built into the tax and transfer systems. These and other facilitative mechanisms shape and reinforce prevailing social attitudes by constraining the nature of labour market choices and influencing the terms on which those choices can be exercised.

5 Results

Earnings Regressions

As explained previously, the first step in our analysis involves estimating the human capital earnings function shown in general terms in equation (1). In undertaking this, we restricted ourselves to include only those variables which could be specified in a broadly comparable way for each country, to aid in comparing our results across countries. In some instances, this required us to aggregate variables into a smaller (but common) list of classifications than we would have chosen if we had been studying only one country. In others, we decided to omit variables entirely in order to maintain the comparability of our estimates. The full list of explanatory variables used is specified and defined in Table 7 and the resulting earnings function regression estimates are provided in Tables 8 and 9 for wives and husbands, respectively.

The two key human capital variables shown in Table 7 are years of experience and level of education. The former variable was constructed by assuming that schooling began at age 6 and that there had been continual labour force attachment for all individuals since leaving the education system. This is known to be an invalid approximation, particularly for women, though increasingly for men, but it was the best that could be done with the available data.²⁶ The education, occupation and industry variables

26 While they do not consider women in their analysis, Lorenz and Wagner (1990) include a similar experience variable in their earnings functions using the LIS database, as do many others who have examined both men and women (e.g., Phipps, 1993; Knudsen and Peters, 1994).

Table 7: List of Explanatory Variables Included in the Estimated Earnings Functions^(a)

Variable name	Definition
EXPER	Age in years minus years of education minus five
EXPSQD	EXPER squared
EDUC1	No or very low education
EDUC2	Low education
EDUC3*	Education to high school level or equivalent
EDUC4	Education beyond high school but below college level
EDUC5	College level education or higher
OCC1	Professional or administrative occupation
OCC2	Sales, service or clerical occupation
OCC3*	Blue collar occupation
IND1	Primary industry
IND2*	Manufacturing industry
IND3	Commerce industry
IND4	Other service industry
IND5	Financial service industry
IND6	Utilities industry
IND7	Construction industry
NATIVE	Equals 1 if native born, equals zero otherwise (i.e. overseas-born)
MARRIED	Equals 1 if married, equals zero otherwise
YNGCHILD	Equals 1 if youngest child aged under 6, equals zero otherwise
OLDCHLD	Equals 1 if youngest child aged 6 or over, equals zero otherwise
Note: a) Variables indicated with an asterisk(*) were used as the control in the estimated regression equations.	

were also fairly rudimentary, but were specified with a view to maximising the degree of cross-country comparability. We experimented with a number of other personal characteristics variables (see below) but those shown in Table 7 (place of birth, marital status, and the presence and age of children) performed consistently best overall (though not necessarily always in each individual country).

Table 8: Regression Estimates for Women Aged 25-55 who Worked Full-Year, Full-time
(Dependent variable = log wage: standard errors in parentheses)

	United States 1986	Canada 1987	Australia 1986	Netherlands 1987	Germany 1984
Sample size	1811	1747	951	267	405
Constant	9.398* (0.070)	9.581* (0.096)	9.42* (0.134)	10.003* (0.081)	10.060* (0.116)
Experience	0.034* (0.006)	0.029* (0.007)	0.009 (0.011)	0.052* (0.007)	0.019* (0.010)
Experience Squared (X10,000)	-7.912* (1.3410)	-5.132* (1.615)	-1.251 (2.718)	-8.322* (1.660)	-2.826 (2.459)
Low/No education ^(a)	-0.254* (0.096)	-0.307* (0.071)	na	-0.371* (0.041)	na
Low education	-0.135* (0.049)	-0.186 (0.043)	-0.019 (0.065)	-0.135* (0.036)	-0.222* (0.051)
Other education	-0.138* (0.031)	0.108* (0.034)	0.095 (0.065)	na	-0.010 (0.061)
College education	0.366* (0.034)	0.330* (0.043)	0.321* (0.082)	0.299* (0.053)	0.268* (0.072)
Professional ^(b)	0.254* (0.049)	0.375* (0.065)	0.405* (0.072)	na	0.309* (0.078)
Sales, service, clerical	0.034 (0.056)	0.094 (0.062)	0.155* (0.058)	na	0.119* (0.058)
Primary ^(c)	-0.194* (0.106)	-0.045 (0.097)	-0.222 (0.151)	0.211 (0.220)	0.430 (0.347)
Commerce	-0.308* (0.045)	-0.218* (0.060)	-0.193* (0.072)	-0.079 (0.054)	-0.109 (0.072)
Other service	-0.172* (0.038)	-0.148* (0.053)	0.100 (0.062)	0.099* (0.044)	-0.053 (0.054)
Financial services	-0.074 (0.048)	-0.142* (0.064)	0.093 (0.083)	na	0.070 (0.074)
Utilities	0.122* (0.057)	0.014 (0.071)	-0.034 (0.099)	0.113 (0.074)	0.092 (0.132)
Construction	0.106 (0.115)	-0.016 (0.126)	0.126 (0.209)	0.065 (0.105)	0.234 (0.162)
Native-born	0.019 (0.027)	-0.009 (0.037)	0.006 (0.042)	na	0.001 (0.050)
Married	-0.037 (0.027)	-0.085* (0.029)	0.022 (0.042)	0.039 (0.028)	0.005 (0.040)
Child < 6	-0.104* (0.036)	0.000 (0.042)	-0.338* (0.065)	0.007 (0.084)	-0.138* (0.066)
Child ≥ 6	-0.126* (0.027)	-0.156* (0.032)	-0.150* (0.048)	-0.155* (0.052)	-0.128* (0.043)

Notes: a) The missing education category is High school education.

b) The missing occupational category is Blue collar.

c) The missing industry category is Manufacturing.

* = statistically significant at the 10 per cent level.

Table 9: Regression Estimates for Men Aged 25-55 who Worked Full-Year, Full-Time
(Dependent variable = log wage: standard errors in parentheses)

	United States 1986	Canada 1987	Australia 1986	Nether- lands 1987	Germany 1984
Sample size	3352	3460	2709	1776	1603
Constant	9.483* (0.055)	9.835* (0.051)	9.572* (0.067)	10.203* (0.051)	10.005* (0.151)
Experience	0.029* (0.005)	0.033* (0.004)	0.026* (0.006)	0.051* (0.004)	0.043* (0.004)
Experience Squared (X10,000)	-4.287* (1.063)	-5.135* (0.842)	-4.851* (1.370)	-6.984* (0.819)	-8.010* (0.977)
Low/No education ^(a)	-0.492* (0.079)	-0.221* (0.034)	na	-0.479* (0.025)	na
Low education	-0.252* (0.034)	-0.090* (0.024)	-0.059* (0.035)	-0.173* (0.025)	-0.119* (0.025)
Other education	0.168* (0.027)	0.087* (0.022)	0.025 (0.033)	na	0.090* (0.023)
College education	0.411* (0.028)	0.286* (0.028)	0.220* (0.042)	0.271* (0.031)	0.290* (0.028)
Professional ^(b)	0.147* (0.027)	0.107* (0.023)	0.236* (0.026)	na	0.276* (0.026)
Sales, service, clerical	-0.035 (0.029)	-0.058* (0.024)	0.078* (0.031)	na	0.102* (0.020)
Primary ^(c)	-0.224* (0.061)	0.069 (0.032)	-0.209* (0.045)	-0.085 (0.062)	-0.013 (0.050)
Commerce	-0.165* (0.031)	-0.170* (0.027)	-0.113* (0.034)	0.001 (0.024)	-0.062* (0.026)
Other service	-0.228* (0.027)	-0.156* (0.025)	-0.070* (0.031)	-0.002 (0.020)	-0.096* (0.021)
Financial services	0.019 (0.051)	-0.101* (0.045)	0.012 (0.041)	na	0.140* (0.038)
Utilities	0.083* (0.034)	-0.003 (0.027)	0.095* (0.033)	-0.014 (0.030)	-0.061* (0.028)
Construction	-0.043 (0.039)	-0.154 (0.036)	-0.015 (0.043)	-0.032 (0.028)	-0.096* (0.029)
Native-born	0.178* (0.025)	0.062* (0.024)	0.018 (0.023)	na	0.060* (0.024)
Married	0.112* (0.025)	0.054* (0.023)	0.090* (0.029)	0.057* (0.022)	0.018 (0.022)
Child < 6	0.014 (0.027)	0.002 (0.023)	0.002 (0.028)	0.022 (0.021)	0.025 (0.022)
Child > = 6	0.029 (0.022)	0.005 (0.020)	-0.004 (0.027)	0.021 (0.020)	0.005 (0.017)

Notes: (a) The missing education category is High school education.

(b) The missing occupational category is Blue collar.

(c) The missing industry category is Manufacturing.

* = statistically significant at the 10 per cent level.

Turning to the results themselves, it is important to recall that we estimated the earnings functions on all individuals aged 25 to 55 years who were FYFT workers in each country. This explains why the sample sizes shown in Tables 8 and 9 differ from those which define our samples of couples shown in Table 6.²⁷ Before discussing the results themselves, some commentary on the alternative earnings function specifications experimented with is in order. Initially, we experimented with AGE (in years) and AGE squared instead of the experience variables (EXP and EXP squared), and even though the experience variables could be specified only approximately, they performed better. This, combined with our preference for the experience variables on theoretical grounds, explains why we kept those in our preferred model estimates.

We also tried several variants of the family structure variables, including (in addition to marital status) whether or not there were any children (aged under 18) present in the family, and whether or not the individual was a sole parent. We also experimented with five dichotomous family structure dummy variables (single person; childless couple; couple with children; sole parent; and other family type) but were unable to produce better estimates than those shown in Tables 8 and 9. Finally, we tried various formulations of the children variables before deciding that the specifications shown were superior.²⁸

Our preferred results for women indicate that the human capital variables (experience and education) are generally significant, except in Australia where only the college education variable was statistically significant (Table 8).²⁹ For the remaining four countries, the earnings-experience profile follows an inverted U-shape which reaches its maximum value after 21 years (in the United States), 28 years (in Canada), 31 years (in the

27 This also explains the inclusion of the marital status variable in the estimated earnings models. In addition, to be included in the regression sample only the individual needed to be age 25-55 while to be included in the sample of couples, both partners had to meet the age restriction.

28 Our preferred specifications and the general features of our results contain a number of similarities with the earnings functions estimated for married women from the LIS data by Phipps (1993) and Knudsen and Peters (1994).

29 The performance of the experience variable is encouraging, in light of the limitations of its specification for women, particularly for married women.

Netherlands) and 34 years (in Germany). The education variables generally conform to the anticipated pattern, with higher financial returns associated with higher levels of formal education. Our estimates indicate that the returns to college education are higher in North America than in Europe. Those with no or very low education in the Netherlands appear to face a particular disadvantage in terms of earnings. Native-born women have slightly higher earnings than foreign-born women in three out of four countries, but the differences are not significant. In North America, women who are married tended to have lower earnings than single women, but the presence of children has an even larger (negative) impact on female earnings than marriage itself - in Europe as in America.³⁰

Somewhat to our surprise, the presence of young children did not have a statistically significant impact on female earnings in two countries, and only in Australia was the size of the impact of young children considerably larger in absolute terms than the impact of older children. In the other two countries (the United States and Germany) where both child variables had a significant effect on female earnings, the size of the effect showed little variation with the age category of the child (though both effects were bigger in Germany than in the United States).

Turning to the results for men in Table 9, we again found the human capital variables performed well, even in Australia. The earnings-experience profile reaches its peak after 34 years in the United States, 32 years in Canada, 27 years in Australia and Germany and 36 years in the Netherlands. In all cases these peaks occur some years later than the earnings peak for women. Again, the estimated returns to education are highest for males in the United States, while males with no or very low education in the United States and in the Netherlands have very low relative earnings. There is a pronounced earnings differential in favour of native-born as compared to overseas-born men. This differential is particularly large in the United States, where it refers to white versus non-white men regardless of place of birth.

30 This last finding is consistent with that derived from the LIS data by McLanahan, Casper and Sorensen (1992) who conclude that a woman's risk of poverty is increased by motherhood or childbearing, rather than by marriage or (lack of) work.

Our estimates indicate that married men have higher earnings than single men with the same characteristics in all five countries, significantly so in four of them. This contrasts with the negative effects of marriage on female earnings in three countries shown in Table 8. Only in Canada was the marital status variable significant for both men and women, indicating a positive effect on male earnings and a negative effect on female earnings. Finally, nowhere did either of the two child variables have a significant effect on male earnings. In combination with the estimated negative impact of children on female earnings, it is clear that, in terms of earnings at least, women bear most of the direct financial burden associated both with getting married and with child-rearing. Neither event has a negative effect on male earnings; in fact, there is a clear 'marriage premium' in the male earnings structures in all five countries.³¹

Distributional Analysis

Having presented and discussed our estimated earnings regressions, we now use these to estimate the distributional impact of earnings capacity in the series of sequenced stages described earlier. The focus of our analysis is now narrowed to the samples of prime-aged couple families summarised in Table 6. We discuss our results in two stages, focusing first on the level of mean earnings, followed by a more explicit assessment of their distributional implications.

Mean Earnings

We first show (in Table 10) how the level of mean earnings varies in each country as we move from the distribution of actual family earnings to the progressive replacement of actual earnings by earnings capacity in the series of stages described earlier.³² As previously noted, the first stage in this

31 This is consistent with the LIS work by Schoeni (1990) who found that married men earn more than single men, all else equal.

32 When earnings capacity was predicted from the estimates in Tables 8 and 9 for the unemployed and those not in the labor force, zero values were assigned to the occupation and industry variables. This implies that these individuals are assumed to work in blue collar manufacturing industry occupations (see Table 7).

Table 10: Decile Mean Earnings for Actual Earnings and Alternative Earnings Capacity Populations^(a) (National currencies)

Country/decile	Actual family earnings (1)	Earnings capacity (FYFT) (2)	Earnings capacity (PT) (3)	Earnings capacity (UN) (4)	Earnings capacity (NILF) (5)	Ratio (5)/(1)
United States, 1986						
First	7836	7607	10896	12533	20618	2.63
Second	17829	16794	20577	21929	27960	1.57
Third	23548	22095	26255	27318	32933	1.40
Fourth	27940	26837	30885	31937	37809	1.35
Fifth	32228	31440	35886	37200	42428	1.32
Sixth	37111	36773	41370	42624	47446	1.28
Seventh	42210	42780	47082	48669	53816	1.27
Eighth	48513	50630	55311	56659	61071	1.26
Ninth	58221	62076	66539	68372	72577	1.25
Tenth	85726	94064	98616	99981	103760	1.21
Total	38116	39110	43342	44722	50042	1.31
Canada, 1987						
First	7959	8896	13004	15821	26001	3.27
Second	21517	20423	24812	26849	34054	1.58
Third	27870	26480	30696	32282	39199	1.41
Fourth	33301	31338	36214	37665	43937	1.32
Fifth	38363	36307	41906	43494	48454	1.25
Sixth	43294	42036	47495	49049	53384	1.23
Seventh	48947	48254	53735	54910	58993	1.21
Eighth	55399	56131	61340	62239	66182	1.19
Ninth	64448	66948	72291	73040	76568	1.19
Tenth	90565	95942	101895	103175	106343	1.17
Total	43166	43276	48339	49851	55311	1.28
Australia, 1986						
First	3630	6304	7223	10520	19010	5.24
Second	16800	15601	17014	18775	25450	1.51
Third	21379	20003	22153	23580	29323	1.37
Fourth	25147	24062	26506	27481	33452	1.33
Fifth	28377	27989	30503	31407	37688	1.33
Sixth	31608	32512	35445	36302	41893	1.33
Seventh	34891	37539	40975	41557	45958	1.32
Eighth	39109	42987	46418	46896	51284	1.31
Ninth	45197	51539	54420	55005	59733	1.32
Tenth	63139	74541	78037	79708	84255	1.33
Total	30928	33308	35869	37123	42805	1.38

(Continued over page)

Table 10: Decile Mean Earnings for Actual Earnings and Alternative Earnings Capacity Populations^(a) (National currencies) (Continued)

Country/decile	Actual family earnings (1)	Earnings capacity (FYFT) (2)	Earnings capacity (PT) (3)	Earnings capacity (UN) (4)	Earnings capacity (NILF) (5)	Ratio (5)/(1)
Netherlands, 1987						
First	17972	17185	18513	27996	56440	3.14
Second	34932	34188	34856	38034	65587	1.88
Third	39921	40308	41242	45416	72046	1.80
Fourth	44501	45652	47858	53815	77982	1.75
Fifth	49735	51490	55254	62283	82903	1.67
Sixth	55537	57534	63812	70930	87768	1.58
Seventh	63522	64704	73533	79680	93749	1.48
Eighth	72609	73488	83118	88045	102102	1.41
Ninth	84420	86160	96275	100483	112942	1.34
Tenth	119701	116716	126264	129257	140412	1.17
Total	58285	58743	64073	69594	89193	1.53
Germany, 1984						
First	20390	19361	22948	27001	46490	2.28
Second	32833	32219	34793	38188	55205	1.68
Third	37887	38295	42514	45579	61780	1.63
Fourth	42492	43564	49203	51862	67532	1.59
Fifth	47780	48576	55625	58300	72468	1.52
Sixth	53537	54523	62033	64566	77859	1.45
Seventh	60443	60847	68594	71399	84144	1.39
Eighth	68417	67859	76882	79506	92259	1.35
Ninth	79315	79567	89520	91716	104006	1.31
Tenth	106800	110887	120477	121825	130326	1.22
Total	54989	55570	62259	64994	79207	1.44

Note: a) The structure of this table is explained in the main text. All figures have been rounded to the nearest 10 currency units.

Source: LIS database.

process involves the replacement of actual earnings by earnings capacity for FYFT workers only, and provides evidence on the predictive accuracy of the estimated earnings functions. This step causes mean earnings to rise slightly overall in all five countries, though to varying degrees.³³ The

33 Part of the reason for this is that the self-employed now have an earnings capacity attributed to them, whilst previously (as explained earlier) because their self-employment income was excluded, their earnings were low or zero.

change in mean earnings within each decile is, however, not always positive (e.g., in Canada) and the effect tends to be generally smaller in the middle of the distribution than at either extreme. In Canada and Australia, the largest proportionate increase in decile mean earnings occurs in the lowest decile - probably a reflection of the treatment of self-employment income described earlier.

The next three columns in Table 10 allow an estimate to be made of the impact of replacing actual earnings by estimated (FYFT) earnings capacity for part-time workers, the unemployed and those not in the labour force, respectively. In general, the smallest effects are associated with including earnings capacity for the unemployed, while the largest effects occur when estimated earnings capacity is incorporated for those who are not in the labour force.³⁴ Since the great majority of those not in the labour force are women working in the domestic economy, (i.e. involved in household production), these aspects of the results illustrate the overall magnitude of the value of home production relative to market earnings. The overall cumulative effect of the four sequenced earnings adjustments causes mean earnings to rise by 28 per cent from their observed value in Canada, 31 per cent in the United States, 38 per cent in Australia, 44 per cent in Germany and 53 per cent in the Netherlands.

Earnings Shares and Inequality

Table 11 shows the effects of including earnings capacity on the distribution of earnings at each stage, while the final distributional results in Table 12 show the percentile ratios which summarise the degree of inequality in each of the distributions.³⁵ In terms of the overall distributional impact of including earnings capacity, a similar pattern emerges within each country.

34 Earnings capacity can be less than actual earnings for several reasons, including because of the influence of good fortune, or the possibility that earnings capacity is over-utilised. In relation to the latter, we note that we made no attempt to adjust hours of work for those who were working beyond the full-time limit in each country.

35 Green, Coder and Ryscavage (1992) note that use of the percentile ratios also avoids the problems arising from top-coding of high (and, in some countries, bottom-coding of low) incomes which, if they differ between countries, can affect cross-country inequality comparisons.

Table 11: Decile Earnings Shares for Actual Earnings and Alternative Earnings Capacity Populations (Percentages)

Country/decile	Actual family earnings (1)	Earnings capacity (FYFT) (2)	Earnings capacity (PT) (3)	Earnings capacity (UN) (4)	Earnings capacity (NILF) (5)	(5) minus (1)
United States, 1986						
First	2.1	1.9	2.5	2.8	4.1	2.0
Second	4.7	4.3	4.7	4.9	5.6	0.9
Third	6.2	5.6	6.1	6.1	6.6	0.4
Fourth	7.3	6.9	7.1	7.1	7.6	0.3
Fifth	8.5	8.0	8.3	8.3	8.5	0.0
Sixth	9.7	9.4	9.5	9.5	9.5	-0.2
Seventh	11.1	10.9	10.9	10.9	10.8	-0.3
Eighth	12.7	12.9	12.8	12.7	12.2	-0.5
Ninth	15.3	15.9	15.4	15.3	14.5	-0.8
Tenth	22.5	24.1	22.8	22.4	20.7	-1.8
Gini coefficient	0.310	0.337	0.308	0.300	0.256	-17.4^(a)
Canada, 1987						
First	1.8	2.1	2.7	3.2	4.7	2.9
Second	5.0	4.7	5.1	5.4	6.2	1.2
Third	6.5	6.1	6.4	6.5	7.1	0.6
Fourth	7.7	7.2	7.5	7.6	7.9	0.2
Fifth	8.9	8.4	8.7	8.7	8.8	-0.1
Sixth	10.0	9.7	9.8	9.8	9.7	-0.3
Seventh	11.3	11.2	11.1	11.0	10.7	-0.6
Eighth	12.8	13.0	12.7	12.5	12.0	-0.8
Ninth	14.9	15.5	15.0	14.7	13.8	-1.1
Tenth	20.9	22.2	21.1	20.7	19.2	-1.7
Gini coefficient	0.291	0.309	0.283	0.269	0.222	-23.7^(a)
Australia, 1986						
First	1.2	1.9	2.0	2.8	4.4	3.2
Second	5.4	4.7	4.7	5.1	5.9	0.5
Third	6.9	6.0	6.2	6.4	6.9	0.0
Fourth	8.1	7.2	7.4	7.4	7.8	-0.3
Fifth	9.2	8.4	8.5	8.5	8.8	-0.4
Sixth	10.2	9.8	9.9	9.8	9.8	-0.4
Seventh	11.3	11.3	11.4	11.2	10.7	-0.6
Eighth	12.6	12.9	12.9	12.6	12.0	-0.6
Ninth	14.6	15.5	15.2	14.8	14.0	-0.6
Tenth	20.4	22.4	21.8	21.5	19.7	-0.7
Gini coefficient	0.282	0.313	0.303	0.285	0.233	-17.4^(a)

(Continued over page)

Table 11: Decile Earnings Shares for Actual Earnings and Alternative Earnings Capacity Populations (Percentages) (Continued)

Country/decile	Actual family earnings (1)	Earnings capacity (FYFT) (2)	Earnings capacity (PT) (3)	Earnings capacity (UN) (4)	Earnings capacity (NILF) (5)	(5) minus (1)
Netherlands, 1987						
First	3.1	2.9	2.9	4.0	6.3	3.2
Second	6.0	5.8	5.4	5.5	7.4	1.4
Third	6.8	6.9	6.4	6.5	8.1	1.3
Fourth	7.6	7.8	7.5	7.7	8.7	1.1
Fifth	8.5	8.8	8.5	8.9	9.3	0.8
Sixth	9.5	9.8	10.0	10.2	9.8	0.3
Seventh	10.9	11.0	11.5	11.4	10.5	-0.4
Eighth	12.5	12.5	13.0	12.7	11.4	-1.1
Ninth	14.5	14.7	15.0	14.4	12.7	-1.9
Tenth	20.5	19.9	19.7	18.6	15.7	-4.8
Gini coefficient	0.261	0.258	0.269	0.240	0.147	-43.7^(a)
Germany, 1984						
First	3.7	3.5	3.7	4.2	5.9	2.2
Second	6.0	5.8	5.6	5.9	7.0	1.0
Third	6.9	6.9	6.8	7.0	7.8	0.9
Fourth	7.7	7.8	7.9	8.0	8.5	0.8
Fifth	8.7	8.7	8.9	9.0	9.1	0.4
Sixth	9.7	9.8	10.0	9.9	9.8	0.1
Seventh	11.0	10.9	11.0	11.0	10.6	-0.4
Eighth	12.4	12.2	12.3	12.2	11.6	-0.8
Ninth	14.4	14.3	14.4	14.1	13.1	-1.3
Tenth	19.4	20.0	19.4	18.7	16.5	-2.9
Gini coefficient	0.244	0.251	0.246	0.230	0.169	30.7^(a)

Note: a) Percentage reduction.

For other Notes and Source, see Table 10.

The replacement of actual earnings by earnings capacity for FYFT workers causes inequality to rise in the United States and Germany but has an ambiguous impact on inequality in the other three countries. Each of the next three steps causes a decline in inequality in the United States, Canada and Australia, and while this is not always true for each pairwise comparison in the other two countries, the final distribution of earnings capacity always Lorenz-dominates the distribution of actual family earnings among FYFT workers.

Table 12: Indicators of Inequality in Five Distributions in Five Countries^(a)
(Percentile ratios)

Percentile ratios	Actual family earnings	Earnings capacity (FYFT)	Earnings capacity (PT)	Earnings capacity (UN)	Earnings capacity (NILF)
United States, 1986					
P ₉₀ /P ₅₀	1.87	2.07	1.94	1.91	1.79
P ₅₀ /P ₁₀	2.38	2.54	2.25	2.17	1.77
P ₉₀ /P ₁₀	4.45	5.28	4.37	4.14	3.17
P ₈₀ /P ₅₀	1.49	1.64	1.55	1.53	1.48
P ₅₀ /P ₂₀	1.68	1.72	1.63	1.61	1.47
P ₈₀ /P ₂₀	2.50	2.83	2.52	2.46	2.17
Canada, 1987					
P ₉₀ /P ₅₀	1.75	1.92	1.77	1.73	1.66
P ₅₀ /P ₁₀	2.36	2.38	2.14	1.98	1.63
P ₉₀ /P ₁₀	4.11	4.58	3.78	3.43	2.72
P ₈₀ /P ₅₀	1.46	1.57	1.48	1.46	1.92
P ₅₀ /P ₂₀	1.63	1.65	1.60	1.56	1.92
P ₈₀ /P ₂₀	2.38	2.58	2.36	2.28	1.92
Australia, 1986					
P ₉₀ /P ₅₀	1.64	1.91	1.82	1.80	1.67
P ₅₀ /P ₁₀	2.32	2.41	2.43	2.11	1.73
P ₉₀ /P ₁₀	3.81	4.61	4.42	3.79	2.89
P ₈₀ /P ₅₀	1.39	1.54	1.50	1.48	1.38
P ₅₀ /P ₂₀	1.54	1.67	1.67	1.58	1.44
P ₈₀ /P ₂₀	2.15	2.58	2.52	2.34	1.99
Netherlands, 1987					
P ₉₀ /P ₅₀	1.77	1.74	1.77	1.64	1.42
P ₅₀ /P ₁₀	1.62	1.78	1.92	1.96	1.38
P ₉₀ /P ₁₀	2.87	3.09	3.41	3.22	1.96
P ₈₀ /P ₅₀	1.49	1.45	1.50	1.39	1.26
P ₅₀ /P ₂₀	1.40	1.46	1.55	1.60	1.24
P ₈₀ /P ₂₀	2.08	2.12	2.32	2.23	1.56
Germany, 1984					
P ₉₀ /P ₅₀	1.74	1.75	1.68	1.63	1.51
P ₅₀ /P ₁₀	1.69	1.79	1.89	1.83	1.46
P ₉₀ /P ₁₀	2.95	3.12	3.17	2.99	2.20
P ₈₀ /P ₅₀	1.44	1.40	1.41	1.38	1.29
P ₅₀ /P ₂₀	1.42	1.46	1.51	1.44	1.29
P ₈₀ /P ₂₀	2.05	2.04	2.12	1.99	1.66

Note: a) The distributions are described in the main text.

Source: LIS database.

Some interesting and informative patterns emerge from the Gini coefficients shown in Table 11. In all countries except the Netherlands, the replacement of actual earnings by earnings capacity for FYFT workers causes the Gini coefficient to increase. Imputing earnings capacity for part-time workers causes the Gini coefficient to decline, except in the Netherlands. These first two steps tend to offset each other in terms of their impact on the Gini coefficient in all countries so that the coefficients in columns (1) and (3) of Table 11 are virtually the same. Imputing earnings capacity to the unemployed and to those not in the labour force causes the Gini to decline further in all countries, with the largest effects arising from non-participation. The results thus indicate that the existence of **both** unemployment **and** non-participation cause actual earnings inequality to be greater than it would be if all labour was fully utilised at market earnings capacity.

The effect on inequality of non-participation alone can be estimated from the Gini coefficients in columns (4) and (5). These show that this adjustment causes a decline in the Gini of around 15 per cent in the United States, 17 per cent in Canada, 18 per cent in Australia, 38 per cent in the Netherlands and 27 per cent in Germany. These reductions explain much of the overall decline in the Gini coefficients between the first and last stages shown in the final column of Table 11 and point to the quantitative significance for inequality of our implied estimates of the value of home production. Perhaps of greater significance than the overall size of these effects, however, is its variation across countries, specifically the very large effects estimated for the Netherlands.

Overall, these results thus indicate that both non-employment (due to either unemployment or the absence of labour force participation) and underemployment (due to part-time work) cause the distribution of earnings to be more unequal than would be the case if everyone worked full-time, full year and earned to the limits of their capacity. The summary statistics in Table 12 reinforce those in Table 11, and also serve to highlight the fact that the biggest distributional effects occur at the bottom of the distribution (as is also apparent from Tables 10 and 11) and that those associated with

part-time work and non-participation in the labour force dominate those associated with unemployment.³⁶

The earnings capacity estimates included in the final stage of the analysis refer to those who are not in the labour force, the great majority of whom (as noted earlier) are women. Comparison of the estimates in the columns of Tables 10, 11, and 12 are thus relevant to assessing the effects on living standards and the distribution of earnings of including a value for home production when it is estimated using the earnings capacity approach.

Inequality Comparisons: A Summary

Our first interest lies in assessing the distributional impact of the value of household production (and the other adjustments), particularly in seeing how this varies across countries and thus affects cross-country comparisons of inequality. To do this, we compared the observed distributions shown in the first column of Tables 11 and 12 with the full earnings capacity distributional estimates shown in the last column of each Table. On the basis of the actual distributions of earnings, Table 11 shows Germany to have the most equal distribution of earnings. An unambiguous inequality ranking of the remaining four countries is not possible, although the Netherlands has a more equal distribution than Canada, while Australia has considerable inequality at the bottom of the distribution whereas in the United States inequality is mainly at the top of the distribution.

Thus, even given the lower participation rates of married women in Germany and the Netherlands, in combination with the fact that wives' earnings have an equalising effect on family earnings (Table 4), the distributions of family earnings in Germany and the Netherlands are still relatively equal compared with those in Australia, Canada and the United States. This observation suggests that a clearer earnings inequality ranking should emerge when cross-country variations in underemployment and non-employment are eliminated by replacing actual earnings by earnings capacity.

36 This may be due to the fact that the unit of analysis being used is the couple rather than the individual, combined with the relatively low incidence of unemployment compared with part-time work and non-participation (see Table 6).

The inequality measures in Tables 10, 11 and 12 bear out this expectation. When the full earnings capacity distributions are compared across countries, an unambiguous inequality ranking emerges, with the Netherlands now exhibiting the least inequality of earnings capacity, followed by Germany, Canada, Australia and the United States (in that order). These results thus confirm that the earnings inequality ranking of countries produced in other studies using the LIS database are not purely a result of country differences in the degree of labour market attachment among members of the population of workforce age. Indeed, the methods we have used to standardise these differences provides not only a clearer cross-country ranking of family earnings inequality, but one which reinforces the picture which others (e.g., Gottschalk, 1993) have already documented.

Value of Home Production

The second major objective of this paper is to ascertain the gross value of home production using the earnings capacity approach to measure the opportunity cost of home production. We have not tried to estimate a net value of added market work, e.g., taking gross earnings capacity and netting-out the additional costs of working (e.g., transportation, work clothing, etc.) the costs of replacement services (e.g., child care, home services, etc.) or the taxes on additional earnings, to arrive at a true net added value of out-of-home work. Our objective is to get an idea of the gross value of home production relative to actual earnings by determining its opportunity costs. Our home production values come from time underemployed (working part-time), time unemployed, and time not in the labour force. Moreover, the aggregate values include home production by both men and women. We then disaggregate the contribution of each sex to this aggregate value.

Aggregate Values

We begin (Table 13) by taking actual overall average earnings and overall average earnings capacity from Table 10 and placing each in a ratio format. Thus, we estimate the value of home production relative to the actual

Table 13: Estimated Gross Values of Home Production by Men and Women^(a)

Country	Actual Family Earnings	Earnings Capacity			
		PT	<FYFT	UN	NILF
<i>Panel A: Home Production Relative to Actual Earnings</i>					
United States	100	103	114	117	131
Canada	100	100	112	115	128
Australia	100	108	116	120	138
The Netherlands	100	101	110	119	153
Germany	100	101	113	118	144
<i>Panel B: Home Production Relative to Earnings Capacity</i>					
		Earnings Capacity			
		FYFT	PT	UN	NILF
<i>Panel B: Home Production Relative to Earnings Capacity</i>					
United States		100	111	114	128
Canada		100	112	115	128
Australia		100	108	111	129
The Netherlands		100	109	118	152
Germany		100	112	117	143

Source: LIS database and Table 10.

earnings of prime age men and women working full-year, full-time (Panel A) and relative to our estimate of earnings capacity for these same full-year, full-time men and women (Panel B).³⁷

As might be expected, the overall value of home production (as a percentage of either actual earnings or earnings capacity) varies inversely with the rates of unemployment, part-time work, and labour force non-participation (the latter being of particular importance for married women). Germany and the Netherlands tend to have the highest overall value added for home production, with Canada having the least, relative to actual earnings. Here,

37 Recall that our estimates of full-year, full-time earnings capacity (D2) differed from actual earnings for various reasons, including the existence of more than full-year, full-time earnings for some men, estimation errors and our treatment of the self-employed.

the total value added varies from 28 per cent to 53 per cent of actual earnings.

If the basis on which home production is calculated is expressed relative to **earnings capacity** (not to actual earnings), the total value added varies from 28 per cent to 52 per cent of the base, with Germany and the Netherlands still highest, but with the other three nations more closely bunched at around 29 per cent in each case. The contribution of various types of workers to home production is also quite varied. In Australia, home production for part-time workers is 16 per cent of total earnings all by itself (Panel A, second column). Unemployment adds between 3 per cent and to 9 per cent as a separate factor, while the largest adjustment is for those not in the labour force, where 13 per cent to 34 per cent of the total value of home production is added to the other components.

Production by Men and Women

The total value of home production can be separated for men and women as shown in Table 14. Here, the estimates of home production relative to either actual full-year, full-time earnings or estimated earnings capacity from Table 13 are broken down by gender. To obtain the percentage of value added attributed to men and to women at each stage, an additional step was added to the calculations in Table 13. When moving from actual earnings to the value added of part-time workers and in sequence to those not in the labour force, the value added was first calculated for men and then for both men and women, with the difference being attributed to women.

The percentage of the total value of home production attributable to women (based on actual earnings) ranged from around 68 per cent in the United States to 87 per cent in the Netherlands. If the value of home production is expressed relative to earnings capacity, the general trend remains the same though the actual proportion of the value added which is attributable to women is higher in all five countries. Whichever base is used, countries with the highest total value added (Germany and the Netherlands) are also the countries with the largest percentage of the value attributable to women.

Table 14: Gross Values of Home Production - Percentage Attributable to Men and Women

	Actual Family Earnings	PT	Percent Male	Earnings Capacity		NILF	Percent Male	Total Change Percent Male	Percent Female
				UN	Percent Male				
<i>Panel A: Home Production Relative to Actual Earnings</i>									
United States	100	114	50	117	67	131	14	32	68
Canada	100	112	33	115	33	128	23	29	71
Australia	100	116	50	120	50	138	11	19	81
Netherlands	100	110	20	119	22	153	9	13	87
Germany	100	113	23	118	60	144	4	16	84
	FYFT	PT	Percent Male	Earnings Capacity		NILF	Percent Male	Total Change Percent Male	Percent Female
				UN	Percent Male				
<i>Panel B: Home Production Relative to Earnings Capacity</i>									
United States	100	111	36	114	66	128	14	29	71
Canada	100	112	33	115	66	128	15	29	71
Australia	100	108	9	111	66	129	11	16	84
Netherlands	100	109	11	118	22	152	9	12	88
Germany	100	112	17	117	40	143	4	12	88
Source: LIS database and Table 10.									

All of these estimates must, however, be interpreted carefully because they are derived not by valuing the **actual** amount of time spent on home production by men and women, respectively but by **assuming** that all time not spent in full-time market work is devoted, by men and women alike, to household production. This assumption is at odds with the evidence from time-use surveys, which indicates that women devote a good deal more time to unpaid domestic work than men (e.g. ABS, 1994). However, we chose to explore the earnings capacity methodology because we were not able, using the LIS data, to base our estimates on time-use studies.

6 Summary and Conclusion

This paper has produced the first comparable estimates of earnings capacity across five nations using the LIS database. While our methods should be seen as exploratory and our results preliminary, several interesting findings have emerged with respect to our estimates of the overall gross value of home production and its effect on cross-national comparisons of inequality among married couple households.

Measures of inequality in earnings capacity (assumed to equal the sum of market earnings and household production) reinforce patterns found in market earnings alone when large differences in unemployment, part-time work and labour force non-participation in each nation have been removed by the earnings capacity methodology. Moreover, the gross value of home production (including both men and women with no adjustments for the costs of working, child care, or household work forgone) is both large and varies substantially across countries.

The earnings capacity measure of the gross value of time not spent in paid work was at a minimum of 28 per cent of total actual earnings in Canada in 1987 and at a maximum of 53 per cent in the Netherlands in the same year. But the source of the majority of the value added by home production depends on the country studied and the basis of comparison. In all five countries, married women make the largest contribution to home production based on non-labour force participation.

Additional research will be aimed at refining these estimates, netting-out various work-related costs, and considering more carefully how to estimate

the net value added by home production. We might also attempt to adjust for time paid for but not worked (vacations and holidays). Germany and the Netherlands which have the highest overall value of home production (relative to earnings) also have the highest total number of vacation days and holidays. Finally, a good deal of scope exists for improving the way this kind of analysis treats the self-employed and income from self employment. We believe that we have only just begun this line of research.

Appendix One

Table A.1: Derivation of Labour Force Status Variables

	United States 1986	Canada 1987	Australia 1985-86	The Netherlands 1987	Germany 1984
HRSHD/HRSSP	number of hours	number of hours	0: Nonworker 1: < 10 hours 2: 10-19 hours 3: 20-24 hours 4: 25-29 hours 5: 30-34 hours 6: 35-39 hours 7: 40-44 hours 8: 45-49 hours 9: 50+ hours	number of hours	number of hours
WEEKHDT/WEEKSPFT	number of weeks	number of weeks	number of weeks	number of weeks	number of weeks
HEAD/SPOUSE					
1. FYFT	HRSHD(SP) ≥ 35 and WEEKSHD(SP)FT ≥ 48				
2. <FYFT	HRSHD(SP) 1-34 and WEEKHD(SP)FT ≥ 48 or HRSHD(SP) > 0 and WEEKHD(SP)FT < 48				
3. No work	HRSHD(SP) = 0				
LFSD/LFSSP	-1: No spouse 1: Employed + working 2: Employed, not at work 3: Unemployed 4: NILF keeping house 5: NILF school 6: NILF disabled/ill 7: NILF other	-1: No spouse 1: Employed 2: Unemployed 3: NILF	-1: No spouse 3: NILF school 4: Unpd. volunteer 5: Employed FT 6: Employed PT 7: Unemployed 8: NILF	-1: No spouse 0: Not labeled 1: NILF 2: Looking for work 3: In labour force 4: School	-1: No spouse 0: missing/NA 1: NILF 2: Looking or layoff 3: Employed civilian 4: School 5: Mandatory military 6: Professional Soldier

(Continued)

Table A.1: Derivation of Labour Force Status Variables (Continued)

	United States 1986	Canada 1987	Australia 1985-86	The Netherlands 1987	Germany 1984
Labour Force Status					
1. FYFT	HEAD = 1	LFSHD = 1 and HEAD = 1	LFSHD = 5	LFSHD = 3 and HEAD = 1	LFSHD = 3 and HEAD = 1
2. < FYFT	HEAD = 2	LFSHD = 1 and HEAD = 2	LFSHD = 6	LFSHD = 3 and HEAD = 2	LFSHD = 3 and HEAD = 2
3. Unemployed	LFSHD = 2 or LFSHD = 3	LFSHD = 2	LFSHD = 7	LFSHD = 2 or LFSHD = 3 and HEAD = 3	LFSHD = 2 or LFSHD = 3 and HEAD = 3
4. NILF	LFSHD GT = 3	LFSHD = 3	LFSHD = 3 or LFSHD = 4 or LFSHD = 8	LFSHD = 0 or LFSHD = 1 or LFSHD = 4	LFSHD = 0 or LFSHD = 1 or LFSHD = 4
Source: LIS database.					

References

- Atkinson, A. B. and J. Micklewright (1983), 'On the reliability of income data in the family expenditure survey 1970-77', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, Series A, 146, 33-61.
- Atkinson, A. B., L. Rainwater, and T. M. Smeeding (forthcoming), *Income Distribution in OECD Countries: The Evidence from the Luxembourg Income Study (LIS)*, OECD, Paris.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics (1990), *Measuring Unpaid Housework: Issues and Experimental Estimates*, Catalogue No. 5236.0, ABS, Canberra.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics (1994), *Occasional Paper. Unpaid Work and the Australian Economy, 1992*, Catalogue No. 5240.0, ABS, Canberra.
- Becker, G. (1965). 'A theory of the allocation of time', *Economic Journal*, 75, 493-517.
- Björklund, A. (1992), 'Rising female labour force participation and the distribution of family income—the Swedish experience', *Acta Sociologica*, 35, 299-309.
- Bradbury, B. (1993), *Male Wage Inequality Before and After Tax: A Six Country Comparison*, Discussion Paper No. 42, Social Policy Research Centre, University of New South Wales, Sydney.
- Bradshaw, J., J. Ditch, H. Holmes, and P. Whiteford (1993). *Support for Children: A Comparison of Arrangements in Fifteen Countries*, Report No. 21, Department of Social Security Research, HMSO, London.
- Cancian, M., S. Danziger, and P. Gottschalk (1993), 'Working wives and family income inequality among married couples', in S. Danziger and P. Gottschalk, eds, *Uneven Tides: Rising Inequality in America*, Russell Sage, New York, 195-221.
- Cancian, M. and R. F. Schoeni (1992), *Female Earnings and the Level and Distribution of Household Income in Developed Countries*, LIS-CEPS Working Paper No. 84, The Luxembourg Income Study.
- Chadeau, A. (1992). 'What is households' non-market production worth?', *OECD Economic Studies*, 18, Spring, 85-103.
- Danziger, S. (1980), 'Do working wives increase family income inequality?', *Journal of Human Resources*, 15, 444-451.
- Flood, L. and A. Klevmarken (1992), 'Market Work, Household Work and Leisure: An Analysis of Time-Use in Sweden', paper presented to the 22nd General Conference of the International Association for Research on Income and Wealth, Flims, Switzerland, August-September.
- Fritzell, J. (1993), 'Income inequality trends in the 1980s: a five-country comparison', *Acta Sociologica*, 36, 47-62.
- Garfinkel, I. and R. Haveman (1977), *Earnings Capacity, Poverty and Inequality*, Academic Press, New York.
- Gershuny, J. and J. Robinson (1988), 'Historical changes in the household division of labour', *Demography*, 25, 537-52.

- Goldschmidt-Clermont, L. (1993), 'Monetary valuation of non-market productive time: methodological considerations', *Review of Income and Wealth*, 39, 419-33.
- Gottschalk, P. (1993). 'Changes in inequality of family income in seven industrialised countries', *American Economic Review. Papers and Proceedings*, 83, 136-42.
- Gottschalk, P. and S. Meyer (1994), 'Changes in home production and trends in economic inequality', paper presented to the RAND Conference on *Reshaping the Family: Social and Economic Changes and Public Policy*, January.
- Green, G., J. Coder, and P. Ryscavage (1992), 'International comparisons of earnings inequality for men in the 1980s', *Review of Income and Wealth*, 38, 1-15.
- Haveman, R. and L. F. Buron (1993), 'Escaping poverty through work - the problem of low earnings capacity in the United States, 1973-88', *Review of Income and Wealth*, 39, 141-58.
- Hewitt, P. (1993), *About Time: The Revolution in Work and Family Life*, Rivers Oram Press, London.
- Jänti, M. (1993), *Changing Inequality in Five Countries: The Role of Markets, Transfers and Taxes*, LIS-CEPS Working Paper No. 91, The Luxembourg Income Study.
- Jenkins, S. and N. C. O'Leary (1994), 'Household Income Plus Household Production: The Distribution of Extended Income in the UK', paper presented to the 23rd General Conference of the International Association for Research on Income and Wealth, St. Andrews, New Brunswick, Canada, 21-27 August.
- Knudsen, C. and E. Peters (1994), *An International Comparison of Married Women's Labour Supply*, LIS-CEPS Working Paper No. 106, The Luxembourg Income Study.
- Lorenz, W. and J. Wagner (1990), *A Note on Returns to Human Capital in the Eighties: Evidence from Twelve Countries*, LIS-CEPS Working Paper No. 54, The Luxembourg Income Study.
- Machin, S. and J. Waldfogel (1994), *The Decline of the Male Breadwinner: Changing Shares of Husbands' and Wives' Earnings in Family Income in the UK*, Working Paper WSP/103, Welfare State Programme, London School of Economics.
- McLanahan, S. S., L. M. Casper, and A. Sorensen (1992), *Women's Roles and Women's Poverty in Eight Industrial Countries*, LIS-CEPS Working Paper No. 77, The Luxembourg Income Study.
- Nelissen, J. H. M. (1990), 'The effect of increased labour force participation of married women on the distribution of family income in the Netherlands', *De Economist*, 38, 47-62.
- OECD (1991), *The Tax-Benefit Position of Production Workers, 1987-1990*, OECD, Paris.
- OECD (1992), *Labour Force Statistics, 1970-1990*, OECD, Paris.

- OECD (1993), *Employment Outlook, July 1993*, OECD, Paris.
- OECD (1994), *New Orientations for Social Policy*, Social Policy Studies No.12, OECD, Paris.
- Phipps, S. A. (1993), *Determinants of Women's Labour Force Participation: An Econometric Analysis for Five Countries*, LIS-CEPS Working Paper No. 99, The Luxembourg Income Study.
- Saunders, P. (1993), 'Married women's earnings and family income inequality in the eighties', *Australian Bulletin of Labour*, 19, 199-217.
- Saunders, P. and J. Fritzell (1993), 'Wage and Income Inequality in Two Welfare States: Australia and Sweden', paper presented to the Conference on Comparative Research on Welfare States in Transition, Oxford, September.
- Schoeni, R. (1990), *The Earnings Effect of Marital Status: An International Comparison*, LIS-CEPS Working Paper No. 43, The Luxembourg Income Study.
- Shaver, S. and J. Bradshaw (1993), *The Recognition of Wifely Labour by Welfare States*, Discussion Paper No. 44, Social Policy Research Centre, University of New South Wales, Sydney.
- Shaver, S. and J. Bradshaw (forthcoming), 'The recognition of wifely labour by welfare states', *Social Policy and Administration*, 29.
- Slottje, D. J., K. J. Hayes, and J. Shackett (1992), 'Labour force participation, race, and human capital: influence on earnings distributions across states', *Review of Income and Wealth*, 38, 27-38.
- Smeeding, T. M., M. O'Higgins, and L. Rainwater, eds (1990), *Poverty, Inequality and Income Distribution in Comparative Perspective: The Luxembourg Income Study*, Harvester Wheatsheaf, Hemel Hempstead.
- Smeeding, T. M., P. Saunders, J. Coder, S. Jenkins, J. Fritzell, A. J. M. Hagenaars, R. Hauser, and M. Wolfson (1993), 'Poverty, inequality and family living standards impacts across seven nations: the effect of noncash subsidies for health, education and housing', *Review of Income and Wealth*, 39, 229-56.
- Smeeding, T. M. and G. Schmaus (1990), 'The LIS Database: technical and methodological aspects', in T. M. Smeeding, M. O'Higgins and L. Rainwater, eds, *Poverty, Inequality and Income Distribution in Comparative Perspective: The Luxembourg Income Study*. London, Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1-19.
- US Bureau of the Census (1993), *Money Income of Households, Families, and Persons in the United States: 1992, Current Population Reports, Series P-60*, No. 184, US Government Printing Office, Washington, DC.
- Wolff, K. (1990), *An International Comparison of Married Women's Labour Force Participation: A Cross-Country Analysis for Employees in Seven Countries*, LIS-CEPS Working Paper No. 48, The Luxembourg Income Study.

SOCIAL POLICY RESEARCH CENTRE DISCUSSION PAPERS:

✦ No longer available.

✧ Published in Journal (list follows)

- | | | | |
|--------|--|--|----------------|
| 1. ✧✧ | The Labour Market Position of Aboriginal People in Non-Metropolitan New South Wales | Russell Ross | August 1988 |
| 2. ✧ | Welfare Fraud, Work Incentives and Income Support for the Unemployed | Bruce Bradbury | August 1988 |
| 3. ✧✧ | Taxation and Social Security: An Overview | Peter Whiteford | August 1988 |
| 4. ✧✧ | Income Inequality in Australia in an International Comparative Perspective | Peter Saunders & Garry Hobbes | August 1988 |
| 5. ✧✧ | Family Size Equivalence Scales and Survey Evaluations of Income and Well-Being | Bruce Bradbury | December 1988 |
| 6. ✧✧ | Income Testing the Tax Threshold | Peter Whiteford | December 1988 |
| 7. ✧ | Workers' Compensation and Social Security Expenditure in Australia: Anti-Social Aspects of the 'Social' Wage | Don Stewart & Jennifer Doyle | December 1988 |
| 8. ✧ | Teenagers in the Labour Market: 1983-1988 | Russell Ross | December 1988 |
| 9. ✧ | A Legacy of Choice: Economic Thought and Social Policy in Australia, the Early Post-War Years | Paul Smyth | May 1989 |
| 10. ✧✧ | The 'Family Package' and the Cost of Children | Bruce Bradbury | May 1989 |
| 11. ✧ | Towards an Understanding of Commonwealth Social Expenditure Trends | Peter Saunders | May 1989 |
| 12. ✧✧ | A Comparative Study of Home and Hospital Births: Scientific and Normative Variables and their Effects | Cathy Boland | July 1989 |
| 13. ✧ | Adult Goods and the Cost of Children in Australia | Bruce Bradbury | July 1989 |
| 14. ✧✧ | Some Australian Evidence on the Consensual Approach to Poverty Measurement | Peter Saunders & Bruce Bradbury | July 1989 |
| 15. ✧✧ | Income Inequality in Australia and New Zealand: International Comparisons and Recent Trends | Peter Saunders, Garry Hobbes & Helen Stott | September 1989 |
| 16. ✧✧ | Trends in the Disposable Incomes of Australian Families, 1982-83 to 1989-90 | Bruce Bradbury, Jennifer Doyle & Peter Whiteford | January 1990 |
| 17. ✧✧ | Selectivity and Targeting in Income Support: The Australian Experience | Peter Saunders | February 1990 |

- | | | | |
|--------|--|----------------------------------|----------------|
| 18. ♦♦ | How Reliable are Estimates of Poverty in Australia? Some Sensitivity Tests for the Period 1981-82 to 1985-86 | Bruce Bradbury & Peter Saunders | February 1990 |
| 19. ♦ | The Labour Supply Behaviour of Single Mothers and Married Mothers in Australia | Russell Ross & Peter Saunders | July 1990 |
| 20. ♦♦ | Income Poverty Among Aboriginal Families with Children: Estimates from the 1986 Census | Russell Ross & Peter Whiteford | July 1990 |
| 21. ♦ | Compensating Low Income Groups for Indirect Tax Reforms | Peter Saunders & Peter Whiteford | August 1990 |
| 22. ♦♦ | Reflections on the Review of the Home and Community Care Program | Peter Saunders | August 1990 |
| 23. ♦♦ | Sole Parent Families in Australia | Peter Saunders & George Matheson | September 1990 |
| 24. ♦♦ | Unemployment, Participation and Family Incomes in the 1980s | Bruce Bradbury | September 1990 |
| 25. ♦♦ | Employment Growth and Poverty: An Analysis of Australian Experience, 1983-1990 | Peter Saunders | September 1990 |
| 26. | Gender, Social Policy Regimes and the Welfare State | Sheila Shaver | November 1990 |
| 27. | A Probit Analysis of the Factors Influencing Labour Market Success of Aborigines in New South Wales | Russell Ross | November 1990 |
| 28. ♦♦ | Efficiency and Effectiveness in Social Policies: An International Perspective | Peter Saunders | December 1990 |
| 29. | Take-up of Family Income Supplement in 1986 - A Research Note | Peter Whiteford & Jennifer Doyle | February 1991 |
| 30. ♦ | An Ever-Rising Tide? Poverty in Australia in the Eighties: | Peter Saunders & George Matheson | May 1991 |
| 31. ♦ | Are Immigrants Over-Represented in the Australian Social Security System? | Peter Whiteford | March 1992 |
| 32. | Measuring the Cost of Children | Bruce Bradbury | May 1992 |
| 33. ♦ | The Impact of Family Assistance Changes on Patterns of Unemployment Benefit Receipt | Bruce Bradbury | August 1992 |
| 34. ♦ | Recent Trends in the Size and Growth of Government in OECD Countries | Peter Saunders | September 1992 |
| 35. ♦ | Noncash Income, Living Standards, Inequality and Poverty: Evidence from the Luxembourg Income Study | Peter Saunders et al. | November 1992 |
| 36. ♦♦ | The Mixed Economy of Support for the Aged In Australia: Lesson for Privatisation | Peter Saunders & Michael Fine | November 1992 |

37.	The Welfare Interpretation of Family Size Equivalence Scales	Bruce Bradbury	November 1992
38. ♦	Body Rights, Social Rights and the Liberal Welfare State	Sheila Shaver	December 1992
39. ♦	Unemployment and Income Support: Challenges for the Years Ahead	Bruce Bradbury	May 1993
40. ♦	Married Women's Earnings and Family Income Inequality in the Eighties	Peter Saunders	May 1993
41	Women and the Australian Social Security System: From Difference Towards Equality	Sheila Shaver	June 1993
42.	Male Wage Inequality Before and After Tax: A Six Country Comparison	Bruce Bradbury	June 1993
43. ♦	The Fragmented Structure of Community Support Services: A Community Case Study	Michael Fine	June 1993
44. ♦	The Recognition of Wifely Labour by Welfare States	Sheila Shaver & Jonathan Bradshaw	August 1993
45.	Postmodernism and Social Policy: A Great Leap Backwards?	Peter Taylor-Gooby	September 1993
46. ♦	Making Ends Meet in Australia and Sweden: A Comparative Analysis of the Consensual Approach to Poverty Measurement	Peter Saunders, Björn Halleröd & George Matheson	October 1993
47.	Economic Adjustment and Distributional Change: Income Inequality and Poverty in Australia in the Eighties	Peter Saunders	November 1993
48. ♦	Poverty and Inequality: Social Security in Australia in the 1990s	Peter Saunders	May 1994
49. ♦	Rising on the Tasman Tide: Income Inequality in Australia and New Zealand in the 1980s	Peter Saunders	June 1994
50.	A New Approach to the Direct Measurement of Consensual Poverty	Björn Halleröd	October 1994
51.	The Distribution of Welfare: Inequality, Earnings Capacity and Household Production in a Comparative Perspective	Peter Saunders Inge O'Connor & Timothy Smeeding	November 1994
52.	Immigrants and the Distribution of Income: National and International Comparisons	Peter Saunders	November 1994
53.	The Role, Value and Limitations of Poverty Research	Peter Saunders	November 1994
54.	The Use of Replacement Rates In International Comparisons of Benefit Systems	Peter Whiteford	January 1995

The following Discussion Papers have been published in journals. Where indicated, Reprints of the articles are available from the SPRC at the cost of \$2.00 each. To order reprints, quote the Reprint number and attach a cheque or money order made out to the Social Policy Research Centre. Send orders to:

The Publications Officer
Social Policy Research Centre
University of New South Wales
Sydney NSW 2052
Australia

DP No.	Published as	SPRC Reprint No. (if applicable)
1.	Russell Ross (1988), 'The labour market position of Aboriginal people in non-metropolitan New South Wales', <i>Australian Bulletin of Labour</i> , 15(1), December, 29-56.	48
3.	Peter Whiteford (1989), 'Taxation and social security: an overview', <i>Australian Tax Forum</i> , 6(1), 2-39.	49
4.	Peter Saunders and Garry Hobbes (1988), 'Income inequality in an international comparative perspective', <i>Australian Economic Review</i> , 3rd Quarter, 25-34.	47
5.	Bruce Bradbury (1989), 'Family size equivalence scales and survey evaluations of income and well-being', <i>Journal of Social Policy</i> , 18(3), July, 383-408.	52
6.	Peter Whiteford (1989), 'Taxation reform and the tax threshold', in John G. Head, ed., <i>Australian Tax Reform in Retrospect and Prospect</i> , papers presented at a conference organised by the Centre of Policy Studies, Monash University, Conferences Series no. 8, Australian Tax Research Foundation, Sydney, 219-47.	
10.	Bruce Bradbury (1989), 'The "family package" and the cost of children', <i>Australian Social Policy</i> , 1(12), Winter, 21-51.	59
12.	Cathy Boland (1989), 'A comparative study of home and hospital births: scientific and normative variables and their effects', in <i>Celebrating a Revolution in Birth: Proceedings of 10th National Homebirth Conference</i> , Sydney, 19-33.	
14.	Peter Saunders and Bruce Bradbury (1991), 'Some Australian evidence on the consensual approach to poverty measurement', <i>Economic Analysis and Policy</i> , 21(1), March, 47-73.	62
15.	Peter Saunders, Helen Stott and Garry Hobbes (1991), 'Income inequality in Australian and New Zealand: international comparisons and recent trends', <i>Review of Income and Wealth</i> , 37(1), March, 63-79.	47
16.	Bruce Bradbury, Jenny Doyle and Peter Whiteford (1993), 'Trends in the Disposable Income and Housing Costs of Australian Families', Greg Mahoney, ed., <i>The Australian Economy under Labor</i> , Allen and Unwin, Sydney, 137-158.	71

DP No.	Published as	SPRC Reprint No. (if applicable)
17.	Peter Saunders (1991), 'Selectivity and targeting in income support: the Australian experience', <i>Journal of Social Policy</i> , 20(3), 299-326.	
18.	Bruce Bradbury and Peter Saunders (1990), 'How reliable are estimates of poverty in Australia? Some sensitivity tests for the period 1981-82 to 1985-86', <i>Australian Economic Papers</i> , 29(55), December 154-81.	60
19.	Russell Ross and Peter Saunders (1993), 'The Labour Supply of Sole Mothers and Married Mothers in Australia: Evidence from the 1986 Income Distribution Survey', <i>Australian Economic Papers</i> , Vol. 32, June, 116-133.	
20.	Russell Ross and Peter Whiteford (1992), 'Poverty in 1986: Aboriginal families with children', <i>Australian Journal of Social Issues</i> , 27(2), May, 92-111.	61
21.	Peter Saunders and Peter Whiteford (1990), 'Compensating low income groups for indirect taxes', <i>Australian Tax Forum</i> , 7(4), 443-64.	
22.	Peter Saunders (1990), 'Reflections on the review of the HACC program', in A. Howe, E. Ozanne and C. Selby Smith, eds, <i>Community Care Policy and Practice: New Directions in Australia</i> , Public Sector Management Institute, Monash University, Victoria, 201-12.	63
23.	Peter Saunders and George Matheson (1991), 'Sole parent families in Australia', <i>International Social Security Review</i> , 44(3), 51-75.	
24.	Bruce Bradbury (1992), 'Unemployment, participation and family incomes in the 1980s', <i>Economic Record</i> , 68(203), December, 328-42.	73
25.	Peter Saunders (1991), 'Employment growth and poverty: an analysis of the Australian experience 1982-1990', in Michael Johnson, Peter Kriesler and Anthony D. Owen, eds, <i>Contemporary Issues in Australian Economics</i> , The Economic Society of Australia, Macmillan, Australia, 105-33. (Also excerpts in <i>ACTCOSS News</i> , 5, October, 12-14.)	
28.	Peter Saunders (1991), 'Efficiency and effectiveness in social policies: an international perspective', in T. P. Hardiman and Michael Mulreany, eds, <i>Efficiency and Effectiveness in the Public Domain</i> , Institute of Public Administration, Dublin, 78-117.	
30.	Peter Saunders and George Matheson (1991), 'An ever rising tide?: Poverty in Australia in the eighties', <i>Economic and Labour Relations Review</i> , 2(2), December, 142-71.	67

DP No.	Published as	SPRC Reprint No. (if applicable)
31.	Peter Whiteford (1991), 'Are immigrants over-represented in the Australian social security system?', <i>Journal of the Australian Population Association</i> , 8(2), November, 93-109.	
33.	Bruce Bradbury (1993), 'Family Assistance and the Incomes of Low Wage Families', <i>Social Security Journal</i> , March, 1-18. and Bruce Bradbury (1993), 'Family Assistance, Replacement Rates and the Unemployment of Married Men', <i>Australian Bulletin of Labour</i> , Vol. 19, No. 2, June, 114-132.	70
34.	Peter Saunders (1993), 'Recent trends in the size and growth of government in OECD countries', in Normal Gemmell, ed., <i>The Growth of the Public Sector: Theories and International Evidence</i> , Edward Elgar, Aldershot, 17-33.	
35.	Timothy M. Smeeding, Peter Saunders, John Coder, Stephen Jenkins, Johan Fritzell, Aldi J. M. Hagenars, Richard Hauser and Michael Wolfson (1993), 'Poverty, Inequality and Family Living Standards Impacts Across Seven Nations: The Effects of Noncash Subsidies for Health, Education and Housing', <i>The Review of Income and Wealth</i> , Series 39, No. 3, September, 229-256.	
36.	Peter Saunders and Michael Fine (1992), 'The mixed economy of support for the aged in Australia: lessons for privatisation', <i>Economic and Labour Relations Review</i> , 3(2), December, 18-42.	69
38.	Sheila Shaver (1993), 'Body rights, social rights and the liberal welfare state', <i>Critical Social Policy</i> , Issue 39, Winter 1993/94, 66-93.	72
39.	Bruce Bradbury (1993), 'Unemployment, and Income Support: Challenges for the Years Ahead', <i>Economic Papers</i> , Vol. 12, No. 2, June, 14-31.	
40.	Peter Saunders (1993), 'Married Women's Earnings and Family Income Inequality in the Eighties', <i>Australian Bulletin of Labour</i> , Vol. 19, No. 3, 3-22.	
46.	Peter Saunders, Björn Halleröd and George Matheson (1994), 'Making Ends Meet in Australia and Sweden: A Comparative Analysis Using the Subjective Poverty Line Methodology', <i>Acta Sociologica</i> , Vol. 37, No. 3, 3-22.	
48.	Peter Saunders (1993), 'Poverty and Inequality: Social Security in the 1990s', in J. Disney and L. Briggs, eds, <i>Social Security Policy: Issues and Options</i> , papers from the Conference, 'Social Security Policy: The Future', November, AGPS 29-48.	
49.	Peter Saunders (1994), 'Rising on the Tasman Tide: Income Inequality in Australia and New Zealand', <i>Social Policy Journal of New Zealand</i> , Issue 2, July, 97-114.	