Couples' Remote Work Arrangements and Labor Supply

Sabrina Wulff Pabilonia, Ph.D.
U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics
Pabilonia.Sabrina@bls.gov

Victoria Vernon, Ph.D.
SUNY Empire State University
Victoria.Vernon@sunyempire.edu

January 22, 2025

Abstract: Using the panel component of the Current Population Survey and questions on work-from-home intensity, the authors examine the relationships between partners' work location arrangements, weekly hours worked, and within-couple labor hours inequality. Fixed-effects estimates suggest a strong positive relationship between partners' decisions to work from home. On average, remote workers work fewer hours than onsite workers, while hybrid workers work more. Both partners switching from onsite to hybrid work is associated with a 5.6% increase in couple-level hours, while both switching to fully remote work is associated with a 6.8% decrease in couple-level hours. When women switch to hybrid work while their partners switch to remote, within-couple labor hours inequality decreases; women switching to remote work increases inequality. Results suggest that hybrid, but not remote, work could improve women's position in the labor market.

JEL codes: J20; J22; J31

Keywords: working from home; telework; hybrid; remote; hours; gender inequality

Acknowledgements: We thank Leslie Stratton and Michael Zabek for excellent discussant remarks and Patrick Carey, Cindy Cunningham, Nicholas Johnson, Jenny Rudd, and Emy Sok for comments. All views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The authors have received no external funding for this project, nor do they have any conflicts of interest to declare.

The COVID-19 pandemic sparked a dramatic change in work location flexibility that continues to this day. According to the Current Population Survey (CPS), 23.3% of US workers did some work from home for pay and 10.9% worked entirely from home in November 2024 (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics 2024).

In this paper, we use new CPS questions capturing work-from-home (WFH) hours intensity in the post-pandemic period to examine coupled workers' coordination of work locations and whether individuals' hours worked vary across couple-level work location arrangements as families and firms adjust to this new normal of working from home. We begin by measuring the extent to which work is done from home and describe important differences between individuals working a fully remote or hybrid schedule and those working mainly onsite. We describe the variation in couple-level joint work location schedules by parental status, as well as differences in individuals' actual weekly hours worked across couple-level work location arrangements. Then, exploiting the short longitudinal component of the CPS to estimate individual fixed-effects (FE) models, we ask whether the work location of one member of the couple depends on the work location of the other. Couples may choose to WFH together to enjoy more joint leisure or, if there is limited workspace at home, only one member of the couple may WFH. Working hybrid schedules with alternate days at home may allow parents to take turns with caregiving responsibilities, thus parents may be less likely to coordinate work schedules to increase leisure time together than couples without children. As a secondary analysis, we use time diaries from the American Time Use Survey (ATUS) to examine differences in couples' time together and on solo and joint childcare on

WFH days versus onsite days. Finally, we examine men's and women's labor hours by their joint work location and test whether remote/hybrid work arrangements allow women to work longer hours and achieve greater within-couple labor hours equality.

Related Literature

Prior literature offers several hypotheses about how and why workers select their work location arrangements and how these arrangements may depend on their partners' work locations. Time diaries show that WFH days allow workers to save 60–75 minutes on commuting and grooming and increase their leisure time (Pabilonia & Vernon, 2022; 2024). Thus, other things equal, workers find WFH arrangements desirable (Barrreo et al. 2021). However, the literature also suggests that face-to-face work has its benefits, such as shared companionship, on-the-job training opportunities, more efficient teamwork, and more opportunities for a promotion (Emanuel et al. 2023; Pabilonia and Vernon 2023a).[1] Thus, some workers (and employers) may prefer onsite work, at least part of the time.

Turning to the literature on couple time together, Hamermesh (2002) and Hallberg (2003) find that employed couples arrange their work schedules to maximize their time together, which is positively associated with well-being (Flood and Genadek 2016; Hamermesh 2020).[2] Bryan and Sevilla (2017) find that flexible working time arrangements enable parents to better coordinate their work schedules in the UK. Providing more evidence that couples highly value joint leisure time, Georges-Kot et al.

[1] However, a randomized control trial by Bloom et al. (2024) finds no difference in promotions for hybrid and onsite workers, perhaps due to changing perceptions among managers of employee performance when they WFH.

[2] While couple time together may increase with more WFH, time alone also may increase, which is negatively associated with life satisfaction (Atalay 2024). Some of the rise in time alone during the first year of the pandemic was due to the rise in WFH (Frazis 2024).

(2024) find that about 50–60% of self-employed workers in France take a day off when their employee partners get an extra public holiday. Using a revealed preference approach, Cosaert et al. (2023) find that Dutch households with children are willing to pay 10% of the average wage to change private leisure to joint leisure. Several studies (Del Boca et al. 2019; Flood et al. 2020; Le Forner 2021; Milkie et al. 2015) also show that joint childcare is beneficial for child development and is associated with higher parental well-being than solo childcare. The increased availability of remote and hybrid arrangements could facilitate couples' togetherness, with partners being more likely to jointly select WFH arrangements, potentially leading to increases in marital quality and stability and child well-being. Because individuals tend to marry those working in similar occupations (Schwartz et al. 2021), partners may have similar propensities to WFH, which heavily depend on the task content of occupations (Dey et al. 2020; Dingel and Neiman 2020).[3]

Other research (Barnet-Verzat et al. 2011) suggests that among dual-earner couples, parents may specialize, with one parent spending more time with children and the other spending longer hours working. Fathers often work longer hours, contributing to a gender wage gap (Cortes and Pan 2019; Goldin 2014). There is also evidence that some coupled parents stagger their work hours to do tag-team parenting (Fox et al. 2013). Hybrid work could potentially allow parents to WFH on alternate days and facilitate greater sharing of childcare. Thus, we hypothesize that couples with children may have less time together relative to couples without children.

[3] However, the correlation between partners' teleworkability indexes based on Dingel and Neiman (2020) is only 0.21 in our sample.

Several papers examine differences in hours worked by WFH status for US workers since the start of the pandemic. Initially, when the pandemic hit, workers reported that they used 42% of their time savings from not commuting to work longer hours (Aksoy et al. 2023). Subsequent studies dispute this finding, at least for some workers. Using pandemic-period time diaries from the ATUS, Pabilonia and Vernon (2023b) show that actual work hours of men and women did not rise when working from home, and that a partner's WFH status mattered for one's work hours. When fathers worked onsite on the diary day, WFH mothers worked fewer paid hours, but when both partners worked from home compared with when both worked onsite, mothers and fathers were able to maintain their paid work hours. The study's inferences are based on imputed partners' work location and only a single diary workday, whereas individuals may reallocate their activities over the days of the week (Pabilonia and Vernon 2022). Also, many parents were working from home alongside their children, and social distancing restricted many activities outside the home, so their findings may not be generalizable to non-pandemic times.

Ji et al. (2024) build a household model of labor supply where spouses have differing abilities to telework and introduce both a commuting shock and a shock to men's leisure preferences to explain observed changes in hours worked during the pandemic. Their model predicts that a reduction in commuting time will increase own labor supply but decrease spousal labor supply. In addition, an increase in own preference for leisure will decrease own labor supply but increase spousal labor supply. Using the ATUS, they find that labor supply depends on whether spouses' occupations

are teleworkable. Overall, for 2021, they find that men in teleworkable occupations work fewer hours, while women in teleworkable occupations work more.

Pabilonia and Vernon (2024) examine remote-onsite differences in usual hours worked among full-time employed men and women in the 2010–2021 American Community Survey (ACS). Remote workers, a much more select group pre-pandemic, worked more hours than onsite workers before 2020, though the two worker groups' hours slowly converged over the period. By 2021, mostly remote male workers worked 21 minutes fewer per week than their onsite counterparts, whereas mostly remote female workers worked 13 minutes longer per week than females onsite. The ACS measure of WFH, however, does not capture differences in WFH intensity—respondents who worked most of their hours last week away from their workplace are classified as mostly remote workers, while hybrid workers are not identified, so some hybrid workers are part of the 'mostly remote' group.[4] The new CPS questions allow us to improve on this study in several ways. First, we can divide workers by WFH intensity into fully remote, hybrid, and onsite worker categories. Second, we have a better measure of labor supply, actual rather than usual weekly hours worked. Actual hours vary more over time for people within the same job and with WFH intensity as people vary their effort when their schedule constraints change.[5] Third, the longitudinal component of the CPS allows us to control for unobserved time-invariant differences.

[4] In 2023, 13.8% of workers in the ACS were primarily remote (U.S. Census Bureau 2023). In the CPS, we ranked all workers by their percent of hours worked from home and calculate that the top 13.8% of workers had at least 50% of their hours worked from home.
[5] We also do not examine usual hours because many CPS respondents report that their hours vary.

Finally, we examine a post-pandemic period when children are back in schools with no pandemic-era restrictions on work and leisure.

Another paper closely related to ours is Arntz et al. (2022). Using a panel of German workers from 1997–2014, they find that childless employees work an extra hour of unpaid overtime after moving to hybrid work, but no change for actual or contractual hours. However, among parents, the gender gap in actual and contractual hours is smaller after mothers and fathers move to hybrid work. They do not examine fully remote workers or the impact of partners' work locations on own hours. Their findings also are based on data with much lower WFH frequency—many were working from home only once a week. Providing evidence for the Netherlands, Possenriede et al. (2016) find that the take-up of hybrid work between 2002 and 2012 is associated with increases in actual hours worked.

Data and Descriptives

The CPS is the US labor force survey that provides data on the employed, unemployed, and those out of the labor force.[6] In October 2022, the CPS added several new questions on telework and WFH intensity to the basic monthly survey.[7] Respondents are first asked if, "At any time LAST WEEK, did you telework or work at home for pay?" If they responded yes, they are asked, "Last week, you worked (# hours worked last week at all jobs) hours (total/at all jobs). How many of these hours did you

[6] We use basic monthly CPS data available from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and U.S. Census Bureau (2022–2024a).
[7] In December 2022, the introduction for these questions changed from "I now have some questions related to how the COVID-19 pandemic affected where people work." to "I now have some questions related to where people work." Supplemental data on telework are available from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and U.S. Census Bureau (2022–2024b) through June 2024. Telework data was then added to the basic monthly CPS datasets.

telework or work at home for pay?" These two questions allow us to separate workers who work all hours from home ('remote workers') from those who work a hybrid schedule, with only some days at home ('hybrid workers'). However, we cannot determine hybrid/remote status on a job, because workers are asked about hours from home on all jobs rather than on each job.

Households are in the CPS for four months, then are out of the sample for eight months before returning for another four months, spanning 16 months; however, households may skip the survey in any given month, resulting in missing data. For our analyses, we construct an unbalanced panel of members of different-sex married and cohabiting couples using CPS longitudinal identifiers covering the period from October 2022 through November 2024.[8] We restrict both members of each couple to be among the prime-age noninstitutionalized civilian population (age 25–54 in their first observed month in our panel). We estimate all regressions at the individual level separately by sex and parental status. Because WFH intensity is asked only for those who are employed and at work in the CPS reference week, we analyze those who are employed and at work, but we allow their partners to be not employed, because some may adjust their hours or choose their work location arrangement differently if a partner is at home. Our main analyses are based on 59,322 employed men (231,952 observations) and 59,306 employed women (190,717 observations) who are observed as part of a couple in two to eight months. For more details on sample selection, see Table A.1 in the

[8] Specifically, we match individuals across months in sample using the following CPS variables: HRHHID, HRHHID2, PULINENO, and GESTFIPS. We also ensure consistency based on age (across matched months we allow age to vary by up to two years, because the Census Bureau perturbs age slightly to ensure privacy of individuals), sex, and race across observations.

Supplemental Online Appendix. Henceforth, the table and figure numbering for the Online Appendix is prefaced with an "A."

We construct several measures based on WFH intensity. First, we calculate for each worker, the percentage of hours worked last week that were worked from home for pay.[9] We use this percentage in some of our analyses as a continuous measure of WFH intensity. Based on these percentages, we also divide workers into three worker groups: 1) remote workers, with 100% of their hours worked from home, 2) hybrid workers, with 20–99% of their hours worked from home, and 3) onsite workers, with 0–19% of their hours worked from home. Thus, onsite workers may occasionally WFH, or they may bring some paid work home from the office to work on in the evenings or on weekends, but their WFH intensity is the lowest of the three groups and they are unlikely to be working a full day from home.[10] It is fairly common in the literature to consider people as hybrid workers if they work at least one day a week from home (see, for example, Possenriede et al. 2016). One can alternatively view these three groups as workers having high, medium, or low WFH intensity. In our sample, less than 1.8% of male and female workers report working 1–19% of their hours from home (Figure 1). The modal hybrid worker works 40–59% of their hours from home (corresponding to roughly 2 to 3 days per week). Women are more likely to be working remotely than men (14.9% versus 10.4%).[11]

[9] A histogram shows substantial spikes in the percentage of hours worked at home at 20, 40, 50, 60, 80, and 100% that roughly correspond to days worked from home for a full-time worker (Figure A.1).

[10] Men who work less than 20% of their hours from home average about 5.6 hours from home (standard deviation = 3 hours), while women average about 4.8 hours from home (standard deviation = 2.8 hours). In robustness checks, we vary our cutoffs to define our worker types.

[11] We conduct an exercise to see whether some of our hybrid workers are possibly working entirely from home. Because the questions about WFH specify that work should be paid, it is

Figure 2 shows trends in remote and hybrid work over the period. In October 2022, 11.7% of men and women in our sample were working entirely remotely, while 8.8% worked a hybrid schedule. The percentages of hybrid/remote workers increased over the period, with remote workers increasing to 13.1% in November 2024 and hybrid workers increasing to 13.0%.[12]

Figure 3 shows trends in the percentage of fully remote and hybrid workers by sex. Women were much more likely than men to work entirely remotely, and the percentage-points (pp) difference in remote workers widened from 4.0 in October 2022 to 5.9 in November 2024 when 16.4% of women and 10.5% of men worked fully remotely. The percentage of men and women working a hybrid schedule was more similar; however, women were still more likely to be hybrid, and the pp difference in hybrid workers widened slightly over the period. In November 2024, 13.9% of women and 12.4% of men worked a hybrid schedule, a 1.5 pp gap. Although there are sex differences, we see little difference in the percentage of hybrid workers by parental status within sex (Figure 4). However, in the more recent months, mothers were more likely to work remotely than women without children. In November 2024, 16.9% of mothers and 15.7% of women without children worked remotely, a 1.2 pp difference.

Coupled workers differ in many ways across work location arrangements (see Tables A.2 and A.3 for summary statistics by WFH intensity for men and women). On

---

possible that some workers are paid for 40 hours per week—based on standard working hours for a full-time worker—but that they work unpaid overtime. Thus, if they work 45 hours at home, they may respond that only 40 of those home hours are paid. Workers who report over 40 hours and who work 40 hours from home (only 0.4 percent of our sample), are all classified as hybrid workers. Forty-six percent are multiple job holders, so they may have been remote on one job but not the other, in which case they are less likely to have been misidentified.

[12] The percentage of aggregate hours worked from home rose from 16.3% to 19.6% (Figure A.2).

average, hybrid workers report longer hours than those working onsite, followed by remote workers, especially among women. Partners of remote workers work more hours from home and are more likely to be remote. Hybrid workers are more likely to have a partner working hybrid. Hybrid and remote workers are more likely to have an employed partner.

Remote workers are much more likely to be self-employed. Men working remotely or hybrid and women working remotely are more likely to have a self-employed partner. Hybrid workers are the least likely to be working part time and the most likely to have multiple jobs, especially among women. Among men, hybrid workers are older and more likely to be married and have an additional adult living in the household; remote workers are less likely to have children aged 1–5; and remote and hybrid workers are less likely to have children aged 6–17. Among women, remote and hybrid workers are more likely to be married, have an additional adult living in the household, and have young children; hybrid workers are less likely to have children aged 6–17. Among men, remote and hybrid workers are less likely to be Black or Hispanic or paid hourly and more likely to live in a metropolitan statistical area (MSA).[13] For women, remote and hybrid workers are less likely to be Hispanic or paid hourly and more likely to live in a MSA. Among men, remote workers are the most likely to have a college degree, followed by hybrid workers. For women, hybrid workers are the most likely to have a college degree. Male hybrid workers are more likely to be a federal government

[13] A MSA contains at least one urbanized area of 50,000 or more inhabitants along with adjacent communities that are integrated both economically and socially with that area (U.S. Census Bureau 2020).

employee than are male remote and onsite workers. Remote and hybrid workers are less likely to be a state or local government employee than are onsite workers.

Remote and hybrid workers also differ considerably in their mix of occupations and industries. Overall, they are more likely than onsite workers to be in white-collar occupations other than health care. Notably, among men, remote workers are much more likely to be in computer and mathematical occupations than hybrid workers (27% versus 17%). Remote workers are the most likely to be working in professional, scientific, and technical services industries (35% of male and 24% of female remote workers). Hybrid workers also are more likely to be working in these industries than onsite workers (24% of male and 17% of female hybrid workers; 6% of male and 5% of female onsite workers).

Figure 5 shows the percentage of couples by couple-level work arrangement and by parental status.[14] There are 15 potential work arrangement combinations. Just over half of the couples have both members working onsite, but those without children are slightly more likely to have both members working onsite compared with parents (55.3% versus 51.2%). The second most prevalent couple-level work arrangement is for the man to work onsite and the woman to be not employed (13.4% for parents and 7.5% for nonparents); the third is for the man to work onsite and the woman to work remotely (about 7% of couples). Both members working entirely remotely is uncommon (3.1% of parents and 3.8% of nonparents).

[14] Parental status is determined by the presence of own children under age 18 in the household. Nonparents may have non-own children in the household, own children living outside their household, or adult children living in the household.

Figure 6 shows average actual weekly hours worked across couple-level work arrangements by sex and by parental status.[15] There are 12 couple-level work arrangements that we here organize first by the worker's work location and then by the partner's work location (the partner can be not employed but the respondent is always employed). We observe substantial hours variation. Among parents, in most work arrangements, mothers work fewer than 38 hours, suggesting that many mothers work part time. In four of the couple-work-arrangement types, mothers work 39–40 hours per week: mothers work remotely and their partners are not employed; mothers work hybrid and their partners work remotely, hybrid, or onsite. However, mothers work more than 42 hours when working hybrid and their partners are not employed. Thus, regardless of the partner's work location, women with hybrid schedules work more hours. Among women without children, we observe a similar pattern for those working a hybrid schedule, but these women work 41 plus hours per week. For men, we see that in each couple-level work location arrangement, their hours per week exceed 40. Male remote workers, regardless of parental status, work less than male hybrid and onsite workers (slightly more than 40 hours per week). Men without children working a hybrid schedule work the most hours (43–44 hours per week). Fathers working hybrid with partners either working remotely or not at all work over 44 hours per week.

Up to this point, we have described average work location arrangements. However, our fixed-effects estimation strategy depends on workers changing their work location for identification purposes; therefore, we next provide an overview of how many individuals switch their work arrangements from one observed month to the next. First,

[15] We topcode each respondent's actual weekly hours worked at 84 hours.

examining coupled individuals who also are observed in the CPS in the previous month, we find that in any given month, about 15% of men and women transition between work locations or move to/from nonemployment (figure 7). Then, considering only months when people are employed (our sample), we find that 19.5% of men and 23.1% of women in our panel had at least one transition in their work arrangement. Table 1 shows that the most common transitions (not necessarily across consecutive months) are from onsite to hybrid and vice versa (5–6% of worker-months). Between 3% and 5% of transitions are from remote to onsite work and vice versa. Figure A.3 shows trends in month-to-month transitions. Transitions between hybrid and onsite hovered about 5–6%. Transitions between remote and onsite fell from about 5% to 2.5% over the period. Transitions between hybrid and remote work hovered around 3%. Overall, this transition analysis does not suggest a large return-to-office movement.

Because people might change their work location when they change their employer or work duties, we also examine transitions among the employed when they change employers, their duties, or neither (Table 1). Transitions between onsite and remote are about twice as frequent for those changing employers compared with those continuing with their employers; transitions between onsite and hybrid are also more frequent. Only changing duties is associated with slightly more onsite-to-remote transitions. Transitions between remote and onsite are also more frequent for those changing employers. For women only, changing duties is associated with more transitions from remote to onsite or remote to hybrid. In some of our multivariate analyses, we restrict the sample to those continuing with the same employer and duties

to examine whether our results are sensitive to changes in work location arrangements that correspond with other job changes.

Econometric Models

Work-from-home intensity models

To examine the relationship between the partners' WFH intensities, we begin by estimating the following linear model using an individual FE estimation strategy:

$$\%WFH_{it} = \beta_1 PARTNER_\%WFH_{it} + \beta_2' X_{it} + \gamma_i + \delta_t + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (1)$$

where %WFH is the percent of actual weekly hours worked from home by individual *i* at time *t*, $PARTNER_\%WFH_{it}$ is the partner's percent of actual weekly hours worked from home, X_{it} is a vector of time-varying controls for individual *i*, β_1 is our coefficient of interest measuring the relationship between the partners' WFH intensities, β_2 is a vector of coefficients on our control variables, γ_i is a vector of individual FE that allows us to control for omitted time-invariant individual and couple-level characteristics, δ_t is a vector of month and year FE, and ε_{it} represents the error term. The vector X_{it} includes indicators for partner nonemployed and partner part-time as well as a teleworkability index based on the respondent's four-digit occupation and the classification of Dingel and Neiman (2020). It also includes individual-level indicators for cohabiter, having a disability, child in the household age 0, child in the household aged 1–5, child in the household aged 5–17, other adult in household, paid hourly, part-time, federal government employee, state and local government employee, self-employed, multiple job holder, 21 occupation groups, and 20 industry groups. Standard errors are clustered at the individual level to account for potential intertemporal correlations. We estimate these models for women and men separately and also by parental status.

As a sensitivity analysis, given reverse causality is possible, we also estimate a FE instrumental variables model using the teleworkability index for the partner's four-digit occupation as an instrument, which is highly statistically significant in the first stage regression. However, we cannot reject the hypothesis that partner's percent of hours worked from home is exogeneous in all models (see Tables A.4 and A.5). Thus, our FE estimates are preferred and plausibly causal.

Hours models

To examine the relationship between one's hours worked and the couple's joint work arrangement, we estimate the following linear model using an individual FE estimation strategy:

$$\ln(hours_{it}) = \alpha_1' W_{it} + \alpha_2' Z_{it} + \theta_i + \nu_t + \mu_{it} \qquad (2)$$

where the dependent variable, $\ln(hours_{it})$, is the natural logarithm of actual weekly hours worked for individual *i* at time *t*. W_{it} is a vector of indicators for different couple-level work arrangements, with the reference group being both working onsite. Z_{it} is a vector of time-varying controls including indicators for multiple job holder, partner multiple job holder, self-employed, partner self-employed, having a disability, cohabiter, other adult in household, child in the household age 0, child in the household aged 1–5, child in the household aged 5–17, paid hourly, federal government employee, state and local government employee, 21 occupation groups, and 20 industry groups. θ_i vector of individual FE allowing us to control for omitted time-invariant individual and couple-level characteristics. ν_t is a vector of month and year FE. μ_{it} is an error term. α_1 and α_2 are vectors of parameters to be estimated. Standard errors are clustered at the individual level.

To examine the relationship between within-couple labor hours inequality and couple-level work arrangements, we estimate the following linear FE model for women in dual-earner couples only:

$$Woman_Hours_{it}/_{(Woman_Hours_{it} + Man_Hours_{it})} = \eta_1' W_{it} + \eta_2' Z_{it} + \tau_i + \rho_t + \omega_{it} \quad (3)$$

where the dependent variable is the woman's share of total couple actual weekly hours worked. W_{it} is a vector of eight indicators for the different couple-level work location arrangements, with the reference group being both working onsite. Z_{it} is defined as above. τ_i and ρ_t are vectors of individual and month and year FE, respectively. ω_{it} is an error term. η_1 and η_2 are vectors of parameters to be estimated. The model is estimated on women in dual-earner couples only to examine the extent to which work location flexibility may allow working women to achieve parity in the workplace even while they continue to do most of the housework and childcare (Pabilonia and Vernon 2023b).

Although the hours models include FE, we cannot interpret the coefficients as causal, as there may be remaining endogeneity that we are unable to control for. Unlike in model 1, we cannot use an instrumental variables approach given the numerous work location arrangements.

Results

Work-from-home Intensity

Figure 8 shows coefficients on our variable of interest in Equation (1), where we regress a respondent's percent of hours worked from home on their partner's percent of hours worked from home. All samples suggest a positive relationship between partners' WFH intensities. For all couples, a 10 pp increase in a partner's percent of hours worked from home leads to a 2.0 pp increase in hours worked from home for a woman

and a 1.5 pp increase for a man. The slightly stronger effects for nonparents than parents are not statistically significant for women based on a fully-interacted model allowing all coefficients to vary by parental status (not shown). These results are consistent with the hypothesis that couples might align their WFH arrangements to increase their time together, and parents also need to coordinate childcare. See Table A.6 for estimates for the other time-varying coefficients. Of note, partners spend more time WFH when their partners are not employed, which would allow partners to spend more time together.

In a secondary analysis using time diaries from the 2022–2023 ATUS, we examine the time that individuals spend with their partners on WFH days compared with work-away-from-home (WAFH) days, and the time that coupled parents spend on solo and joint childcare. We find that regardless of parental status, partners spend more time together on WFH days than WAFH days, which aligns with our previous results. Fathers spend 0.5 hours more alone with their partners and 0.3 hours more on joint childcare (figure 9). They also do more solo childcare on WFH days (0.5 hours). Mothers spend 0.2 hours more alone with their partners and 0.5 hours more on joint childcare (the former is not statistically significant) but do not spend more time on solo childcare on WFH days. Coupled men without children spend 1.2 hours more with their partners on WFH days, while coupled women without children spend 0.3 hours more with their partners but the latter difference is not statistically significant (figure 10). The magnitude of the differences in couple time together is in line with prior research suggesting flexible working hours increase coupled parents' daily synchronous work time by up to one hour (Byran and Sevilla 2017).

Sensitivity analyses (Table A.7) suggest that our results are not driven by the self-employed, workers who changed jobs, or the part-time workers. The magnitudes of the coefficients drop slightly in the employee-only sample, suggesting that the self-employed are better able to coordinate their work locations. The coefficient estimates are stronger in magnitude among full-time dual-earner couples. Perhaps, these workers have the most to gain by working from home together.

As an alternative specification, we replace our continuous measure of partner's percent of hours worked from home with categorical variables for partner working remotely and partner working hybrid. All models again show that one's own percent of hours worked from home increases with the partner's WFH intensity (Table A.8).

Hours Worked and Couple-level Work Arrangements

Figure 11 presents coefficients on the couple-level work arrangements for Equation (2) for all men and women, where we regress the natural logarithm of hours worked on a vector of indicator variables for the couple-level work location arrangements. (Coefficients for the full set of results are presented in tabular form in Table A.9, while sensitivity analyses are in Tables A.10–A.15). The reference group is 'both partners work onsite.' Because we are using individual FE models, we interpret the coefficients as associations between a switch (or transition) to a particular couple-level work arrangement from both working onsite and a change in a respondent's work hours. We find differences in individuals' labor supply depending on the partner's work location.[16] For men, switching to remote by themselves is associated with working 3.9%

[16] See Tables A.16 and A.17 for statistical significances for Wald tests of equality of coefficients across couple-level work location arrangements.

fewer hours, while switching to remote with their partners is associated with 5.1% fewer hours.[17] However, the estimates are not statistically significantly different from each other. If partners transition to hybrid, switching to remote is not associated with changes in hours.

For women, switching to remote either by themselves or when their partners switch to hybrid is associated with working 3.9% fewer hours, while a switch to remote together with their male partners is associated with working 9.3% fewer hours. Thus, for both men and women, the largest decreases in hours are associated with the take-up of remote work alongside their partners. This is consistent with the hypothesis that couples may take advantage of the opportunity to WFH to maximize leisure time together. At the couple-level, both switching to remote is associated with a 6.8% decrease in joint hours (relative to the couple-level average hours of 79.8 for couples working onsite).

For both men and women, a switch to hybrid is associated with longer hours regardless of their partners' work locations. When both partners switch to hybrid, men work 5.1% more hours. For men who work onsite, partners switching to hybrid is associated with a 3.1% increase in work hours, and partners stopping work is associated with a 1.3% decrease in work hours, but no change when female partners switch to remote. Women switching to a hybrid is associated with a roughly 6.3% increase in their hours, which varies little by their partners' work location arrangements. At the couple-level, both switching to hybrid is associated with a 5.6% increase in couple-level hours.

[17] Percent changes in hours are calculated as $(\exp(\beta) - 1) \times 100$.

In most cases, results are qualitatively similar for parents and nonparents, with a few exceptions (Figures 12 and 13). For women without children only, switching to remote is associated with a large drop in hours (9.9%) when male partners stop working. Only women without children staying onsite work 2% more hours when men switch to hybrid. For mothers only, switching to remote is associated with a significant decrease in hours if fathers switch to hybrid. Only for fathers is staying onsite associated with 1.4% fewer hours when women stop working.

In Table A.9, we also provide estimates for a sample of parents of children under age 6. Some estimates are slightly stronger in magnitude than in the full-parent sample. For example, fathers and mothers of young children both switching to hybrid is associated with their working 6.2% and 9.4% more, respectively, versus 5.1% and 6.2% in the full-parent sample. In addition, mothers of young children switching to hybrid alone is associated with fathers working 4.2% more hours and mothers working 7.3% more versus 3.6% and 6.4% in the full-parent sample, respectively. Thus, hybrid work appears to allow mothers to work longer, especially mothers of young children. Negative associations between remote and hours are weaker when fathers and mothers of young children both switch to remote compared with the full-parent sample. There is no statistically significant decrease for fathers and a 9.4% decrease for mothers, compared with 6.2% and 11.2% for all fathers and mothers, respectively.

As a sensitivity analysis (Table A.10), we estimate models excluding individuals who have multiple jobs or whose partners have multiple jobs in order to exclude people who we may misclassify as hybrid if they combine onsite with full-time remote jobs. Estimates are qualitatively similar to our baseline except when fathers move to remote

alone there is no decrease in their hours. If we exclude the self-employed (Table A.11), estimates are slightly smaller than our baseline estimates. When we restrict the sample to those who do not change employers or job duties from the previous month (Table A.12), our estimates are overall similar but smaller when people take up remote work, suggesting there is more opportunity to adjust hours and work location arrangements when changing the nature of the job or one's employer. Results also are qualitatively similar if we restrict the sample to full-time dual-earner couples (Table A.13), but the estimates suggest smaller declines in hours with the take-up of remote work.

To test whether results are sensitive to a potential measurement error at the top of the WFH intensity distribution, we redefine remote workers as working 81% or more hours from home (Table A.14). The estimates decrease slightly, which is consistent with our switching truly hybrid workers, who tend to work more, into the remote category. If we instead change the hybrid workers' lower bound to 1% of hours worked from home (Table A.15), the estimates are qualitatively similar; however, the estimates on both members working hybrid increase by several pp, which is consistent with our switching workers who bring extra work home from the onsite to hybrid category.

Overall, compared with the pandemic-period findings in Pabilonia and Vernon (2024), we find larger negative gaps in hours between remote and onsite/hybrid workers. Our post-pandemic findings of large positive gaps in hours between hybrid and onsite workers are consistent with the pre-pandemic findings in Arntz et al. (2022) and Possenriede et al. (2016).

Within-Couple Hours Inequality and Work Location Arrangements

Among all dual-earner couples working onsite, the average woman's share of total couple hours worked is 0.464. The average hours share is slightly higher (0.474) for women in couples with other work location arrangements.[18] Figure 14 presents coefficients on the couple-level work arrangements for Equation (3)—the relationship between couple-level work location arrangements and the woman's share of total couple hours worked. A positive coefficient indicates that a switch to that couple-level work location arrangement is associated with an increase in women's share of hours and a decrease in within-couple hours inequality. Table A.19 shows results for the full sample in tabular form and Tables A.20–A.23 shows sensitivity analyses. Tables A.24 presents statistical significances for Wald tests of equality of coefficients for the full sample.

We find that for mothers, switching to remote from onsite is associated with increased within-couple hours inequality regardless of fathers' work locations, although the association is larger if fathers switch to hybrid. For women without children, switching to remote also is associated with increased within-couple hours inequality, unless their partners also switch to remote. For all women, switching to hybrid is associated with decreased within-couple hours inequality unless their partners also switch to hybrid. Fathers switching to hybrid (but mothers staying onsite) is associated with increased within-couple hours inequality. For men without children, switching to remote (but their partners staying onsite) is associated with decreased within-couple hours inequality. The greater availability of WFH could potentially decrease within-couple hours inequality, but it depends on who works from home and how often. If the

[18] See Table A.18 for the average woman's share of total couple hours worked across the different couple-level work location arrangements.

upward trend in hybrid work for women continues, within-couple hours inequality may further decrease.

Concluding remarks

We use new CPS questions to examine differences in remote/hybrid work and hours of work by sex, by parental status, and by couple's joint work arrangement. We show that among coupled individuals in the post-pandemic period, women are more likely to work either a hybrid or remote schedule. Throughout the period, working entirely remotely was the predominant arrangement among coupled individuals working at least 20 percent of their hours from home, although the share working a hybrid schedule is trending upward.

Using individual FE models, we find that partners' WFH intensities are positively related, suggesting that partners try to align their work locations, with larger effects for women than men and for fathers than men without children. A supplementary analysis using ATUS time diary data shows that coupled parents spend almost 50 minutes more per day together in leisure and household production when at least one of the couple's members works from home. Joint childcare time is also greater on WFH days. Coupled men without children also spend more time with their partners. Thus, the increase in hybrid/remote work might have positive effects on marital quality and stability, which in turn are positively correlated with a host of economic outcomes. It may also have a positive effect on child development given prior findings that joint childcare is particularly beneficial for children. However, we cannot learn from these data whether partners working hybrid schedules work together at home on the same days of the week.

We find that couples' joint work arrangements are correlated with actual work hours. On average, fully remote workers work fewer hours than onsite workers, while hybrid workers work more hours. Changes in a partner's work location arrangement are sometimes associated with changes in the other partner's labor supply. Both partners simultaneously switching to hybrid work from onsite is associated with the largest increases in couple-level labor supply (5.6% more hours), while both partners simultaneously switching to fully remote work is associated with the largest decreases in couple-level labor supply (6.8% more hours). Hybrid work may allow mothers to work longer hours, especially mothers of young children. This could have implications for employee performance—hybrid work may induce higher effort compared with fully remote or fully onsite jobs.

Couple-level work location arrangements matter for within-couple hours inequality. Among dual-earner couples, women switching to hybrid while their partners switch to remote is associated with the largest decrease in within-couple labor hours inequality, whereas women switching to remote work while their partners switch to hybrid is associated with the largest increase in within-couple labor hours inequality.

Taken together, these results suggest that hybrid, but not fully remote, work for women has the potential to improve women's position in the labor market to the extent that there is a wage premium for working long hours and working long hours increases the likelihood of a promotion (see, for example, Cortes and Pan 2019; Frederiksen et al. forthcoming; Gicheva 2013; Goldin 2014). Hybrid work also may improve women's bargaining position within the household because it is tied to a more equal allocation of

labor hours among partners. On the other hand, hybrid work could lead to a decrease in well-being and family-work conflicts if it increases the likelihood of working outside normal working hours (Yang et al. 2023).

There are several limitations to our study. First, we do not control for relative income that might influence couple bargaining over hours worked, although our FE approach accounts for relative income differences. Second, we follow individuals over a maximum of 16 months, a short time frame during which relatively few individuals switch employment arrangements. Third, hours are constrained to some extent by employers' demands (Lachowska et al. 2024), reducing the potential magnitude of the effects, although our estimates based on a sample excluding the self-employed are similar. Fourth, we cannot control for other types of flexibility such as flexible scheduling, though location flexibility is strongly correlated with flexible hours (Pabilonia and Vernon 2022). Finally, the data does not allow us to learn why remote work is associated with shorter total hours of work but hybrid work with longer hours of work. Recent literature offers evidence that WFH improves worker productivity because of fewer distractions at home (Fenizia and Kirchmaier 2024), although other studies suggest negative selection into remote work (Emanuel and Harrington 2024). Measuring employee productivity, however, is difficult; more research is needed on how hybrid and remote work affects employee performance.

References

Aksoy, Cevat Giray, José María Barrero, Nicholas Bloom, Steven J. Davis, Mathias Dolls, and Pablo Zarate. 2023. Time savings when working from home. *AEA Papers & Proceedings* 113: 597–603. https://doi.org/10.1257/pandp.20231013

Arntz, Melanie, Sarra Ben Yahmed, and Francesco Berlingieri. 2022. Working from home, hours worked and wages: Heterogeneity by gender and parenthood. *Labour Economics* 76: 102169. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.labeco.2022.102169

Atalay, Enghin. 2024. A twenty-first century of solitude? Time alone and together in the United States. *Journal of Population Economics* 37(12). https://doi.org/10.1007/s00148-024-00978-0

Barnet-Verzat, Christine, Ariane Pailhé, and Anne Solaz. 2011. Spending time together: The impact of children on couples' leisure synchronization. *Review of Economics of the Household* 9(4): 465–86. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11150-010-9112-3

Barrero, Jose Maria, Nicholas Bloom, and Steven J. Davis. 2021. Why working from home will stick. NBER Working Paper No. 28731. https://www.nber.org/papers/w28731

Bryan, Mark L., and Almudena Sevilla. 2017. Flexible working in the UK and its impact on couples' time coordination. *Review of Economics of the Household* 15: 1415–37. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11150-017-9389-6

Cosaert, Sam, Alexandros Theloudis, and Bertrand Verheyden. 2023. Togetherness in the household. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics* 15(1): 529–79. https://doi.org/10.1257/mic.20200220.

Del Boca, Daniela, Christopher J. Flinn, Ewout Verriest, and Matthew J. Wiswall. 2019. Actors in the child development process. NBER Working Paper 25596.

Dey, Matthew, Harley Frazis, Mark A. Loewenstein, and Hugette Sun. 2020. Ability to work from home: Evidence from two surveys and implications for the labor market in the COVID-19 pandemic. *Monthly Labor Review*. https://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/2020/article/ability-to-work-from-home.htm

Dingel, Jonathan I., and Brent Neiman. 2020. How many jobs can be done at home? *Journal of Public Economics* 189: 104235. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2020.104235

Emanuel, Natalia, and Emma Harrington. 2024. Working remotely? Selection, treatment, and the market for remote work. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 16(4): 528–59. https://doi.org/10.1257/app.20230376

Emanuel, Natalia, Emma Harrington, and Amanda Pallais. 2023. The power of proximity to coworkers: Training for tomorrow or productivity today? NBER Working Paper No. 31880. https://www.nber.org/papers/w31880

Fenizia, Alessandra, and Tom Kirchmaier. 2024. Not incentivized yet efficient: Working from home in the public sector. Centre for Economic Performance Discussion Paper No. 2036. https://cep.lse.ac.uk/pubs/download/dp2036.pdf

Flood, Sarah, Ann Meier, and Kelly Musick. 2020. Reassessing parents' leisure quality with direct measures of well-being: Do children detract from parents' down time? *Journal of Marriage and Family* 82(4): 1326–39. https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12647

Flood, Sarah M., and Katie R. Genadek. 2016. Time for each other: work and family constraints among couples. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 78(1): 142–64. https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12255

Fox, Liana, Wen-Jui Han, Christopher Ruhm, and Jane Waldfogel. 2013. Time for children: Trends in the employment patterns of parents, 1967–2009. *Demography* 50: 25–49. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-012-0138-4

Frazis, Harley. 2024. Sources of increases in time alone during the COVID pandemic: Evidence from the American Time Use Survey. *Review of Economics of the Household* 22: 965–97. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11150-023-09679-1

Frederiksen, Anders, Takao Kato, and Nina Smith. Forthcoming. Working hours, top management appointments, and gender: Evidence from linked employer-employee data. *Journal of Labor Economics*. https://doi.org/10.1086/733490

Georges-Kot, Simon, Dominique Goux, and Eric Maurin. 2024. The value of leisure synchronization. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 16(1): 351–376. https://doi.org/10.1257/app.20220184

Gicheva, Dora. 2013. Working long hours and early career outcomes in the high-end labor market. *Journal of Labor Economics* 31(4): 785–824. https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/669971

Goldin, Claudia. 2014. A grand gender convergence: Its last chapter. *American Economic Review* 104: 1091–19. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.104.4.1091

Hallberg, Daniel. 2003. Synchronous leisure, jointness, and household labor supply. *Labour Economics* 10(2): 185–203. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0927-5371(03)00006-X

Hamermesh, Daniel S. 2002. Timing, togetherness and time windfalls. *Journal of Population Economics* 15: 601–23. https://doi.org/10.1007/s001480100092

Hamermesh, Daniel S. 2020. Life satisfaction, loneliness and togetherness, with an application to COVID-19 lockdowns. *Review of Economics of the Household* 18(4): 983–1000. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11150-020-09495-x

Ji, Yi, Myrto Oikonomou, Carlo Pizzinelli, et al. 2024. The Impact of reduced commuting on labor supply and household welfare: A post-pandemic analysis. http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5018803.

Lachowska, Marta, Alexandre Mas, Raffaele Saggio, and Stephen Woodbury. 2024. Work hours mismatch. SSRN Scholarly Paper No. 4990289. *Social Science Research Network*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4990289

Milkie, Melissa A., Kei M. Nomaguchi, and Kathleen E. Denny. 2015. "Does the Amount of Time Mothers Spend with Children or Adolescents Matter?" *Journal of Marriage and Family* 77(2): 355–72. https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12170

Pabilonia, Sabrina Wulff, and Victoria Vernon. 2022. Telework, wages, and time use in the United States. *Review of Economics of the Household* 20(3): 687–734. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11150-022-09601-1

Pabilonia, Sabrina Wulff, and Victoria Vernon. 2023a. Telework and time use. In *Handbook of Labor, Human Resources and Population Economics*, edited by Klaus F. Zimmermann. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-57365-6_274-2

Pabilonia, Sabrina Wulff, and Victoria Vernon. 2023b. Who is doing the chores and childcare in dual-earner couples during the COVID-19 era of working from home? *Review of Economics of the Household* 21(2): 519–65. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11150-022-09642-6

Pabilonia, Sabrina Wulff, and Victoria Vernon. 2024. Remote work, wages, and hours worked in the United States. Forthcoming *Journal of Population Economics*.

Possenriede, Daniel, Wolter H. J. Hassink, and Janneke Plantenga. 2016. Does temporal and locational flexibility of work increase the supply of working hours? Evidence from the Netherlands. *IZA Journal of Labor Policy* 5(1): 16. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40173-016-0072-y

Schwartz, Christine R., Yu Wang, and Robert D. Mare. 2021. Opportunity and change in occupational assortative mating. *Social Science Research* 99: 102600. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2021.102600

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2024. Telework or work from home for pay. https://www.bls.gov/cps/telework.htm#data

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and U.S. Census Bureau. 2022–2024a. Current Population Survey [Dataset]. https://www.census.gov/data/datasets/time-series/demo/cps/cps-basic.html

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and U.S. Census Bureau. 2022–2024b. Telework/COVID-19 data from the CPS [Dataset]. https://www.census.gov/data/datasets/time-series/demo/cps/cps-supp_cps-repwgt/telework-cps-covid.html


U.S. Census Bureau. 2020. Annual statistics 2020. https://www.census.gov/housing/hvs/files/annual20/ann20def.pdf

U.S. Census Bureau. 2023. ACS 1-year supplemental estimates means of transportation to work. https://data.census.gov/table/ACSSE2023.K200801


Yang, Duanyi, Erin L. Kelly, Laura D. Kubzansky, and Lisa Berkman. 2023. Working from home and worker well-being: New evidence from Germany. *ILR Review* 76(3): 504–31. https://doi.org/10.1177/00197939221148716

Figure 1. Work-from-home intensity among those doing some paid work from home for men (A) and women (B)

A. Men




B. Women



Note: The figures show the percentage of coupled workers with positive work from home. Estimates are based on coupled workers aged 25–54 at work during the CPS reference week, who appear in more than one month in the survey and excluding those whose partners are on vacation. CPS composite weights are used. Number of observations: 231,952 men;190,717 women.

Source: Current Population Survey (October 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations

Figure 2. Trends in the percentage of hybrid and remote workers among coupled workers




Note: Estimates are based on coupled workers aged 25–54 at work during the CPS reference week, who appear in more than one month in the survey and excluding those whose partners are on vacation. CPS composite weights are used. Number of observations: 422,669.


Source: Current Population Survey (October 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations

Figure 3. Trends in the percentage of coupled workers who were fully remote (A) and hybrid (B) workers by sex

A. Fully remote workers



B. Hybrid workers




Note: Estimates are based on coupled workers aged 25–54 at work during the CPS reference week, who appear in more than one month in the survey and excluding those whose partners are on vacation. CPS composite weights are used. Number of observations: 231,952 men; 190,717 women.


Source: Current Population Survey (October 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations

Figure 4. Trends in the percentage of coupled men and women who were fully remote (A) and hybrid (B) workers by parental status

A. Remote workers




B. Hybrid workers



Note: Estimates are based on coupled workers aged 25–54 at work during the CPS reference week, who appear in more than one month in the survey and excluding those whose partners are on vacation. CPS composite weights are used. Number of observations: 144,998 fathers; 113,381 mothers; 86,954 men without children; 77,336 women without children. Source: Current Population Survey (October 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations

Figure 5. Percentage of couples aged 25–54 by couple-level work arrangement and by parental status




Notes: The sample excludes couples where both partners are nonemployed or either member is on vacation. Couples must also appear in more than one month over the period. CPS household weights are used. Number of observations: 258,379 parents; 164,290 nonparents.


Source: Current Population Survey (October 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations

Figure 6. Average actual weekly hours worked by couple-level work arrangement for parents (A) and nonparents (B)

A. Parents




B. Nonparents



Note: Estimates are based on coupled workers aged 25–54 at work during the CPS reference week, who appear in more than one month in the survey and excluding those whose partners are on vacation. CPS composite weights are used. Number of observations: 144,998 fathers; 113,381 mothers; 86,954 men without children; 77,336 women without children.

Source: Current Population Survey (October 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations


Figure 7. Percentage of coupled individuals aged 25–54 who experienced a labor market transition between consecutive months



Note: Transitions include change to/from remote, onsite, hybrid and to/from nonemployment. We restrict the sample to individuals interviewed in more than one month and who were in the sample in the previous month. The sample excludes those in couples where both partners are nonemployed or either member is on vacation. CPS longitudinal weights are used. Number of observations: 149,893 men; 122,977 women.

Source: Current Population Survey (November 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations


Figure 8. The effect of a partner's work-from-home intensity on one's own work-from-home intensity



Note: Each dot on the graph represents the fixed-effects estimate from model 1, computed separately by sex and parental status. The bars represent 95% confidence intervals where standard errors are clustered at the individual level. The estimates show that a one percentage-point increase in the percentage of work hours the partner works from home increases the respondent's percentage of hours worked from home by the corresponding fraction of a percentage point. Estimates are based on coupled workers aged 25–54 at work during the CPS reference week, who appear in more than one month in the survey and excluding those whose partners are on vacation. CPS composite weights are used. See Table A.6 for full regression results. Number of observations: 144,998 fathers; 113,381 mothers; 86,954 men without children; 77,336 women without children.

Source: Current Population Survey (October 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations


Figure 9. Average hours per workday coupled parents spend together without children present, caring for children together, and caring for children alone during nonwork activities by work-from-home day status and sex



Notes: WFH = work-from-home. WAFH = work-away-from-home. WFH days are workdays exclusively worked from home. WAFH days are workdays with any work done away from the home. Workdays are full workdays that respondents report working at least six hours on their main jobs. Time with partner is not recorded when the activity is recorded as sleeping, grooming, personal activities, refused, and can't remember. The sample is restricted to those living with a spouse or unmarried partner where both members of the couple are aged 25–54. Averages across the WFH day statuses are statistically significantly different at the 1% level, except for couple only time for women. ATUS final weights are used. Replicate weights are used to test for statistical significance. Number of observations: 517 men and 327 women on WAFH days; 133 men and 106 women WFH days.

Source: 2022–23 American Time Use Survey, authors' calculations

Figure 10. Average hours per workday couples without children spend together during nonwork activities by work-from-home day status and sex




Notes: WFH = work-from-home. WAFH = work-away-from-home. WFH days are workdays exclusively worked from home. WAFH days are workdays with any work done away from the home. Workdays are full workdays that respondents report working at least six hours on their main jobs. Time with partner is not recorded when the activity is recorded as sleeping, grooming, personal activities, refused, and can't remember. The sample is restricted to those living with a spouse or unmarried partner where both members of the couple are aged 25–54. Averages across the WFH day statuses are statistically significantly different at the 1% level for men. ATUS final weights are used. Replicate weights are used to test for statistical significance. Number of observations: 233 men and 150 women on WAFH days; 55 men and 78 women WFH days.


Source: 2022–23 American Time Use Survey, authors' calculations

Figure 11. Full sample. Coefficients on couple-level work arrangements in log actual weekly hours of work regressions by sex (FE estimates)


A. Onsite worker switches to remote and onsite partner stays onsite or switches to



B. Onsite worker switches to hybrid and onsite partner stays onsite or switches to



C. Onsite worker remains onsite and onsite partner switches to




Note: Each dot represents the fixed-effects estimate from model 2, estimated separately by sex. The bars represent 95% confidence intervals where standard errors are clustered at the individual level. Estimates are based on coupled workers aged 25–54 at work during the CPS reference week, who appear in more than one month in the survey and excluding those whose partners are on vacation. CPS composite weights are used. See Table A.9 for full regression results. Number of observations: 258,379 men; 190,717 women.


Source: Current Population Survey (October 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations

Figure 12. Parents. Coefficients on couple-level work arrangements in log actual weekly hours of work regressions by sex (FE estimates)


A. Onsite worker switches to remote and onsite partner stays onsite or switches to



B. Onsite worker switches to hybrid and onsite partner stays onsite or switches to



C. Onsite worker remains onsite and onsite partner switches to




Note: Number of observations: 144,998 fathers; 113,381 mothers. See Figure 11 notes.


Source: Current Population Survey (October 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations

Figure 13. Nonparents. Coefficients on couple-level work arrangements in log actual weekly hours of work regressions by sex (FE estimates)


A. Onsite worker switches to remote and onsite partner stays onsite or switches to



B. Onsite worker switches to hybrid and onsite partner stays onsite or switches to




C. Onsite worker remains onsite and onsite partner switches to



Note: Number of observations: 86,954 men without children, 77,336 women without children. See Figure 11 notes.

Source: Current Population Survey (October 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations

Figure 14. Coefficients on couple-level work arrangements in the woman's share of total couple hours worked regressions (FE estimates)



Note: Estimates are based on women in dual-earner couples aged 25–54 at work during the CPS reference week, who appear in more than one month in the survey and excluding those whose partners are on vacation. Each dot on the graph represents the fixed-effects estimate from model 3, estimated separately for all women, mothers, and women with no children. The bars represent 95% confidence intervals where standard errors are clustered at the individual level. The estimates show by how much the share of women's work hours in total couple's work hours differs from an otherwise similar couple in which both partners work onsite. CPS composite weights are used. Number of observations: 177137 women; 105927 mothers; 71210 women with no children.

Source: Current Population Survey (October 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations

Table 1. Percentage of coupled-worker months with transitions in work location arrangement by transition type

Transition type	All men	All women	Changed employer: men	Changed employer: women	Changed duties: men	Changed duties: women	Same employer and duties: men	Same employer and duties: women
Onsite to hybrid	2.7	3.0	3.4	4.1	2.4	3.0	2.6	2.8
Onsite to remote	1.6	2.4	2.7	4.6	1.8	2.7	1.5	2.2
Hybrid to onsite	2.7	2.9	2.4	3.5	2.8	3.0	2.7	2.9
Hybrid to remote	1.3	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.7	1.3	1.6
Remote to onsite	1.6	2.2	2.1	3.7	1.5	2.7	1.5	2.1
Remote to hybrid	1.3	1.6	1.3	1.4	1.4	2.1	1.2	1.5
All transition types	11.2	13.7	13.4	18.8	11.3	15.2	10.9	13.1
Number of observations	175,016	142,450	2,494	2,081	3,313	2,610	153,098	124,306


Note: Unweighted estimates are for coupled workers aged 25–54 at work during the CPS reference week, who appear in more than one month in the survey and excluding those whose partners are on vacation. The numbers shown in the table are percentages of observations in which the specific transition is observed where an observation is a worker-month. However, the transition may occur over non-consecutive months. 19.5% of men and 23.1% of women report at least one transition during their time in the panel.

Source: Current Population Survey (November 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations

Supplemental Online Appendix

Couples' Remote Work Arrangements and Labor Supply


Figure A.1 Histogram of percent of hours worked from home among coupled workers reporting any paid work from home in the reference week



Notes: Estimates are based on employed coupled individuals aged 25–54 at work during the CPS reference week, who appear in more than one month in the survey and excluding those whose partners are on vacation. CPS composite weights are used. Number of observations: 59,322 men and 59,306 women.

Source: Current Population Survey (October 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations


Figure A.2 Trends in the percentage of hours worked from home by coupled workers aged 25–54



Note: Estimates are based on employed coupled individuals aged 25–54 at work during the CPS reference week, who appear in more than one month in the survey and excluding those whose partners are on vacation. CPS composite weights are used. Number of observations: 422,669.

Source: Current Population Survey (October 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations

Figure A.3. Percentage of coupled workers aged 25–54 who experienced a work location arrangement transition between consecutive months by transition type



Note: Transitions include changes to/from remote, hybrid, and onsite. The first word in the pair refers to the previous month, the second to the current month. Nonemployed episodes are removed. We also restrict the sample to employed coupled individuals interviewed in more than one month and who were in the sample in the previous month. The sample excludes those in couples where both partners are nonemployed or either member is on vacation. CPS longitudinal weights are used. Number of observations: 267,695.

Source: Current Population Survey (November 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations

Table A.1 Sample selection

Criteria	Men	Women
Individuals aged 25–58	539,970	568,271
Drop singles	358,105	383,493
Drop if missing info on spouse	335,559	335,559
Drop if same-sex couples	328,909	328,909
Drop if aged >54 at first observed month in sample	279,280	279,280
Drop if both not employed in any month	273,928	273,928
Drop if self or spouse is on vacation	260,091	260,091
Drop singletons (individuals must appear in more than one month of the panel)	248,870	248,870
Drop nonemployment episodes	231,952	190,717

Source: Current Population Survey (October 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations

Table A.2 Summary statistics by work-from-home intensity for men

Variables	Onsite	Hybrid	Remote	Onsite versus Hybrid	Hybrid versus Remote	Onsite versus Remote
Actual weekly hours of work	42.61	43.53	40.54	***	***	***
Percent remote	0.26	48.02	100.00	***	***	***
Partner percent remote	11.15	31.74	36.93	***	***	***
Partner hybrid	0.06	0.26	0.15	***	***	***
Partner remote	0.08	0.19	0.29	***	***	***
Partner nonemployed	0.25	0.20	0.21	***	-	***
Dingel and Neiman teleworkability index	0.32	0.82	0.85	***	***	***
Changed employer since last month[a]	0.02	0.01	0.01	***	**	-
Changed duties since last month[a]	0.02	0.02	0.01	-	-	-
Part-time	0.04	0.02	0.04	***	***	-
Partner part-time	0.13	0.14	0.13	***	***	-
Self-employed	0.12	0.10	0.14	***	***	***
Partner self-employed	0.06	0.08	0.08	***	-	***
Multiple job holder	0.05	0.09	0.04	***	***	***
Partner multiple job holder	0.04	0.06	0.04	***	***	-
Age	40.75	41.19	40.95	***	***	***
Cohabiting couple	0.16	0.10	0.12	***	***	***
Presence of an additional adult in household	0.27	0.16	0.17	***	***	***
Presence of children aged 0	0.04	0.04	0.04	-	-	-
Presence of children aged 1–5	0.26	0.26	0.25	-	*	***
Presence of children aged 6–17	0.47	0.46	0.43	***	***	***
Black non-Hispanic	0.10	0.06	0.06	***	-	***
Hispanic	0.23	0.09	0.09	***	-	***
Other race non-Hispanic	0.08	0.17	0.17	***	-	***
Paid hourly	0.11	0.03	0.03	***	-	***
Metropolitan residence	0.86	0.96	0.95	***	-	***
College degree	0.35	0.83	0.79	***	***	***
Government job: federal	0.03	0.05	0.03	***	***	***
Government job: state and local	0.10	0.07	0.03	***	***	***
Management occupations	0.15	0.27	0.23	***	***	***
Business and financial operations occupations	0.04	0.15	0.14	***	-	***
Computer and mathematical occupations	0.03	0.17	0.27	***	***	***
Architecture and engineering occupations	0.03	0.09	0.05	***	***	***
Life, physical, and social science occupations	0.01	0.03	0.01	***	***	***
Community and social service occupations	0.01	0.02	0.01	***	***	***
Legal occupations	0.01	0.03	0.02	***	***	***
Education instruction and library occupations	0.03	0.03	0.02	***	***	***
Arts, design, entertainment, sports, and media occupations	0.01	0.03	0.05	***	*	***
Healthcare practitioner and technical occupations	0.04	0.01	0.01	***	***	***
Healthcare support occupations	0.01	0.00	0.00	***	***	***
Protective service occupations	0.04	0.01	0.00	***	***	***
Food preparation and serving related occupations	0.03	0.00	0.00	***	***	***
Building and grounds cleaning and maintenance occupations	0.04	0.00	0.00	***	**	***
Personal care and service occupations	0.01	0.00	0.00	***	-	***
Sales and related occupations	0.07	0.09	0.10	***	***	***
Office and administrative support occupations	0.04	0.04	0.05	***	***	***
Farming, fishing, and forestry occupations	0.01	0.00	0.00	***	-	***

Variables	Onsite	Hybrid	Remote	Onsite versus Hybrid	Hybrid versus Remote	Onsite versus Remote
Construction and extraction occupations	0.13	0.01	0.00	***	***	***
Installation, maintenance, and repair occupations	0.07	0.01	0.01	***	-	***
Production occupations	0.08	0.01	0.01	***	*	***
Transportation and material moving occupations	0.11	0.01	0.01	***	-	***
Agriculture, forestry, fishing, hunting, and mining	0.03	0.01	0.01	***	-	***
Construction	0.16	0.04	0.02	***	***	***
Durable manufacturing	0.09	0.10	0.07	**	***	***
Nondurable manufacturing	0.05	0.04	0.02	***	***	***
Wholesale trade	0.03	0.03	0.02	-	***	***
Retail trade	0.08	0.05	0.05	***	**	***
Transportation and warehousing	0.08	0.02	0.02	***	***	***
Utilities	0.02	0.02	0.01	**	***	***
Information	0.01	0.05	0.07	***	***	***
Finance and insurance	0.03	0.15	0.14	***	-	***
Real estate, rental and leasing	0.02	0.03	0.02	***	***	***
Professional, scientific, and technical services	0.06	0.24	0.35	***	***	***
Management, administrative and waste management services	0.05	0.02	0.03	***	***	***
Educational services	0.05	0.05	0.03	**	***	***
Health care and social assistance	0.06	0.04	0.04	***	-	***
Arts, entertainment, and recreation	0.02	0.01	0.02	*	*	-
Accommodation and food services	0.04	0.01	0.01	***	***	***
Private households and other services	0.05	0.02	0.02	***	***	***
Public administration	0.06	0.07	0.04	***	***	***
Number of observations	185,448	23,349	23,155	***	***	***

Notes: Estimates are based on employed coupled men aged 25–54 at work during the CPS reference week, who appear in more than one month in the survey and excluding those whose partners are on vacation. CPS composite weights are used.
[a] Estimate is calculated for non-missing observations.

Source: Current Population Survey (October 2022–September 2024), authors' calculations

Table A.3 Summary statistics by work-from-home intensity for women

Variables	Onsite	Hybrid	Remote	Onsite versus Hybrid	Hybrid versus Remote	Onsite versus Remote
Actual weekly hours of work	37.21	40.60	36.68	***	***	***
Percent remote	0.26	49.65	100.00	***	***	***
Partner percent remote	9.32	30.40	33.25	***	***	***
Partner hybrid	0.06	0.28	0.16	***	***	***
Partner remote	0.06	0.17	0.25	***	***	***
Partner nonemployed	0.08	0.06	0.06	***	-	***
Dingel and Neiman teleworkability index	0.46	0.79	0.80	***	-	***
Changed employer since last month	0.02	0.01	0.01	*	-	-
Changed duties since last month	0.02	0.02	0.02	-	-	-
Part-time	0.18	0.09	0.16	***	***	***
Partner part-time	0.04	0.03	0.03	***	-	***
Self-employed	0.07	0.09	0.15	***	***	***
Partner self-employed	0.11	0.11	0.12	-	***	***
Multiple job holder	0.05	0.11	0.04	***	***	***
Partner multiple job holder	0.05	0.06	0.06	***	***	***
Age	39.28	39.25	39.25	-	-	-
Cohabiting couple	0.17	0.14	0.14	***	-	***
Presence of an additional adult in household	0.26	0.17	0.18	***	-	***
Presence of children aged 0	0.03	0.04	0.04	***	***	***
Presence of children aged 1–5	0.22	0.25	0.26	***	**	***
Presence of children aged 6–17	0.44	0.42	0.44	***	***	-
Black non-Hispanic	0.09	0.08	0.09	***	***	***
Hispanic	0.18	0.10	0.11	***	**	***
Other race, non-Hispanic	0.10	0.15	0.15	***	-	***
Paid hourly	0.13	0.05	0.07	***	***	***
Metropolitan residence	0.86	0.94	0.93	***	***	***
College degree	0.49	0.81	0.71	***	*	***
Government job: federal	0.02	0.04	0.03	***	***	***
Government job: state and local	0.18	0.12	0.05	***	***	***
Management occupations	0.11	0.23	0.20	***	***	***
Business and financial operations occupations	0.05	0.18	0.19	***	**	***
Computer and mathematical occupations	0.01	0.06	0.09	***	***	***
Architecture and engineering occupations	0.01	0.02	0.01	***	***	***
Life, physical, and social science occupations	0.01	0.03	0.02	***	***	***
Community and social service occupations	0.03	0.05	0.02	***	***	**
Legal occupations	0.01	0.04	0.02	***	***	***
Education instruction and library occupations	0.13	0.06	0.03	***	***	***
Arts, design, entertainment, sports, and media occupations	0.02	0.04	0.06	***	***	***
Healthcare practitioner and technical occupations	0.16	0.05	0.05	***	***	***
Healthcare support occupations	0.06	0.01	0.01	***	***	***
Protective service occupations	0.01	0.00	0.00	***	*	***
Food preparation and serving related occupations	0.04	0.00	0.00	***	***	***
Building and grounds cleaning and maintenance occupations	0.03	0.00	0.00	***	-	***
Personal care and service occupations	0.04	0.01	0.02	***	***	***
Sales and related occupations	0.07	0.07	0.08	-	***	***
Office and administrative support occupations	0.13	0.12	0.17	***	***	***
Farming, fishing, and forestry occupations	0.00	0.00	0.00	***	**	***
Construction and extraction occupations	0.01	0.00	0.00	***	**	***

Variables	Onsite	Hybrid	Remote	Onsite versus Hybrid	Hybrid versus Remote	Onsite versus Remote
Installation, maintenance, and repair occupations	0.00	0.00	0.00	***	-	***
Production occupations	0.03	0.01	0.01	***	*	***
Transportation and material moving occupations	0.03	0.00	0.00	***	-	***
Agriculture, forestry, fishing, hunting, and mining	0.01	0.00	0.01	***	***	***
Construction	0.02	0.02	0.02	**	***	**
Durable manufacturing	0.03	0.05	0.03	***	***	-
Nondurable manufacturing	0.03	0.04	0.02	***	***	-
Wholesale trade	0.01	0.02	0.02	***	-	***
Retail trade	0.09	0.05	0.06	***	***	***
Transportation and warehousing	0.03	0.01	0.02	***	-	***
Utilities	0.00	0.01	0.01	***	***	***
Information	0.01	0.03	0.04	***	***	***
Finance and insurance	0.04	0.11	0.14	***	***	***
Real estate, rental and leasing	0.02	0.04	0.03	***	***	***
Professional, scientific, and technical services	0.05	0.17	0.24	***	***	***
Management, administrative and waste management services	0.03	0.03	0.05	***	***	***
Educational services	0.17	0.11	0.06	***	***	***
Health care and social assistance	0.28	0.15	0.14	***	***	***
Arts, entertainment, and recreation	0.02	0.02	0.02	***	-	***
Accommodation and food services	0.06	0.01	0.01	***	***	***
Private households and other services	0.06	0.04	0.03	***	***	***
Public administration	0.05	0.09	0.04	***	***	***
Number of observations	141,451	21,822	27,444	***	***	*

Notes: Estimates are based on employed coupled women aged 25–54 at work during the CPS reference week, who appear in more than one month in the survey and excluding those whose partners are on vacation. CPS composite weights are used.

[a] Estimate is calculated for available observations.

Source: Current Population Survey (October 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations

Table A.4 Fixed effects instrumental variables estimates of a partner's work-from-home intensity on one's own work-from-home intensity among dual-earner couples aged 25–54

Explanatory variable	All men	All women	Fathers	Mothers	Men without children	Women without children
Partner % hours worked from home	0.110	0.315*	0.139	0.308	0.059	0.293
	(0.109)	(0.165)	(0.151)	(0.201)	(0.161)	(0.289)
Endogeneity test p-value	0.659	0.502	0.961	0.576	0.469	0.800
Number of observations	174572	174566	102901	103959	70916	69836
Number of individuals	43136	43115	25585	25823	17970	17705
Within R-squared	0.036	0.031	0.036	0.028	0.030	0.042

Note: Dependent variable: percent of workweek the respondent spent working from home. Partner percent of hours worked from home is instrumented for with a teleworkability index based on Dingel and Neiman (2020).The index is a [0,1] number assigned to each four-digit occupation. We restrict to dual-earner couples because the partner must be employed because we are using an occupation-based instrument for the partner. Estimates are based on employed coupled individuals aged 25–54 at work during the CPS reference week, who appear in more than one month in the survey and excluding those whose partners are on vacation. Time-varying controls include partner part-time as well as a teleworkability index based on Dingel and Neiman (2020) for own occupation and individual-level indicators for cohabiter, a disability, child in the household aged 0, child in the household aged 1–5, child in the household aged 6–17, other adult in household, paid hourly, part-time, federal and local government employee, self-employed, multiple job holder, 21 occupation groups, 20 industry groups, and month and year FEs. Standard errors clustered at the individual level are reported in parentheses. Endogeneity tests assume H_0: Partner % hours worked from home is exogenous. We cannot reject H_0. ***, **, * = statistically different from zero at the 1%, 5%, 10% level.

Source: Current Population Survey (October 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations

Table A.5 First-stage results for fixed effects instrumental variables regressions of a partner's work-from-home intensity on one's own work-from-home intensity among dual-earner couples aged 25–54

Explanatory variable	All men	All women	Fathers	Mothers	Men without children	Women without children
Teleworkability index	3.642***	3.222***	3.512***	3.649***	3.867***	2.636***
	(0.591)	(0.526)	(0.810)	(0.702)	(0.892)	(0.808)
F-statistic	38.0	37.6	18.8	27.0	18.8	10.7
Number of observations	174572	174566	102901	103959	70916	69836
Number of individuals	43136	43115	25585	25823	17970	17705

Note: Dependent variable: percent of workweek the partner spent working from home. Partner percent of hours worked from home is instrumented for with a teleworkability index based on Dingel and Neiman (2020).The index is a [0,1] number assigned to each four-digit occupation. We restrict to dual-earner couples because the partner must be employed given we are using an occupation-based instrument for the partner. Estimates are based on employed coupled individuals aged 25–54 at work during the CPS reference week, who appear in more than one month in the survey and excluding those whose partners are on vacation. Time-varying controls include partner part-time as well as a teleworkability index based on Dingel and Neiman (2020) for own occupation and individual-level indicators for cohabiter, a disability, child in the household aged 0, child in the household aged 1–5, child in the household aged 6–17, other adult in household, paid hourly, part-time, federal and local government employee, self-employed, multiple job holder, 21 occupation groups, 20 industry groups, and month and year FEs. Standard errors clustered at the individual level are reported in parentheses. The F-statistics are for the significance of the coefficients on the instrument. We conclude that our instrument is not weak. Endogeneity tests assume H_0: Partner % hours worked from home is exogenous. We cannot reject H_0. ***, **, * = statistically different from zero at the 1%, 5%, 10% level.

Source: Current Population Survey (October 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations

Table A.6 Determinants of the percent of hours worked from home for employed coupled individuals (FE estimates)

Explanatory variable	All men	All women	Fathers	Mothers	Men without children	Women without children
Partner % hours worked from home	0.150***	0.200***	0.138***	0.191***	0.170***	0.214***
	(0.005)	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.011)
Partner nonemployed	2.537***	2.620***	2.015***	2.569***	3.364***	2.639***
	(0.339)	(0.565)	(0.408)	(0.731)	(0.621)	(0.896)
Part-time worker	0.646	1.088***	0.926*	1.220***	0.268	0.387
	(0.445)	(0.359)	(0.528)	(0.437)	(0.786)	(0.611)
Partner part-time worker	0.792***	0.243	0.980***	0.348	0.315	0.343
	(0.278)	(0.506)	(0.342)	(0.675)	(0.477)	(0.748)
Multiple job holder	-0.015	0.865*	-0.477	0.897	0.641	0.636
	(0.414)	(0.501)	(0.513)	(0.664)	(0.695)	(0.771)
Teleworkability index	0.656	2.601***	1.194	2.420**	-0.109	3.121***
	(0.574)	(0.762)	(0.729)	(1.009)	(0.942)	(1.183)
Presence of another adult	-0.262	-0.331	-0.075	-0.447	-0.792	-1.283
	(0.448)	(0.550)	(0.541)	(0.721)	(0.908)	(0.967)
Self-employed	1.996***	3.867***	2.053***	3.848***	1.568	4.074***
	(0.612)	(0.949)	(0.686)	(1.252)	(1.199)	(1.477)
Disabled	0.504	0.874	0.171	2.249	1.052	0.295
	(0.922)	(1.245)	(1.138)	(1.634)	(1.483)	(1.749)
Cohabiter	-0.860	-0.611	0.332	0.694	-0.785	-0.567
	(0.919)	(1.359)	(0.984)	(3.361)	(1.225)	(1.445)
Presence of children aged 0	1.214**	1.210	1.002*	0.619	-	-
	(0.518)	(0.797)	(0.560)	(0.905)	-	-
Presence of children aged 1–5	1.099**	1.164*	0.924*	0.566	-	-
	(0.476)	(0.704)	(0.510)	(0.761)	-	-
Presence of children aged 6–17	0.722	0.633	0.311	0.936	-	-
	(0.541)	(0.660)	(0.593)	(0.724)	-	-
Paid hourly	-0.331***	0.275*	-0.278**	0.187	-0.365**	0.392*
	(0.098)	(0.152)	(0.125)	(0.206)	(0.161)	(0.225)
Government job: federal	1.337	-1.042	0.883	0.536	2.719	-0.979
	(1.444)	(1.919)	(1.801)	(2.934)	(2.461)	(1.976)
Government job: state and local	-0.773	-1.557**	-2.043**	-0.861	0.909	-1.930
	(0.816)	(0.752)	(0.966)	(0.933)	(1.430)	(1.309)
Number of observations	231,952	190,717	144,998	113,381	86,954	77,336
Number of individuals	59,322	59,306	36,271	36,571	23,051	22,735
Within R-squared	0.029	0.036	0.025	0.033	0.037	0.042

Note: Estimates are based on coupled workers aged 25–54 at work during the CPS reference week, who appear in more than one month in the survey and excluding those whose partners are on vacation. Regressions also include occupation, industry, and month and year FEs. CPS composite weights are used. Standard errors clustered at the individual level are reported in parentheses. ***, **, * = statistically different from zero at the 1%, 5%, 10% level.

Source: Current Population Survey (October 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations

Table A.7 The effect of a partner's work-from-home intensity on one's own work-from-home intensity in different samples (FE estimates)

Sample	All men	All women	Fathers	Mothers	Men without children	Women without children
Panel A: All	0.150***	0.200***	0.138***	0.191***	0.170***	0.214***
	(0.005)	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.011)
Number of observations	231952	190717	144998	113381	86954	77336
Within R-squared	0.029	0.036	0.025	0.033	0.037	0.042
Panel B: Exclude self-employed	0.139***	0.181***	0.127***	0.174***	0.158***	0.190***
	(0.005)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.011)
Number of observations	204057	174086	126552	102374	77505	71712
Within R-squared	0.024	0.030	0.021	0.028	0.033	0.035
Panel C: Exclude workers who changed employer or duties	0.147***	0.197***	0.140***	0.191***	0.161***	0.207***
	(0.006)	(0.008)	(0.007)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.013)
Number of observations	169274	137609	105932	81573	63342	56036
Within R-squared	0.028	0.036	0.027	0.034	0.036	0.041
Panel D: Full-time dual earner couples	0.170***	0.217***	0.163***	0.213***	0.179***	0.225***
	(0.006)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.012)
Number of observations	142298	142298	80296	81179	62002	61119
Within R-squared	0.039	0.041	0.038	0.039	0.046	0.046

Note: Dependent variable: percent of workweek the respondent spent working from home. Estimates are based on coupled workers aged 25–54 at work during the CPS reference week, who appear in more than one month in the survey and excluding those whose partners are on vacation. See Table A6 for controls. CPS composite weights are used. Standard errors clustered at the individual level are reported in parentheses. ***, **, * = statistically different from zero at the 1%, 5%, 10% level.

Source: Current Population Survey (October 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations

Table A.8 The effect of a partner's work-from-home intensity on one's own work-from-home intensity in an alternative model (FE estimates)

Explanatory variables	All men	All women	Fathers	Mothers	Men without children	Women without children
Partner hybrid	9.691***	11.835***	8.916***	11.737***	10.930***	11.909***
	(0.393)	(0.454)	(0.492)	(0.583)	(0.654)	(0.722)
Partner remote	13.993***	18.470***	13.067***	17.405***	15.507***	19.974***
	(0.491)	(0.644)	(0.613)	(0.821)	(0.822)	(1.055)
Number of observations	231952	190717	144998	113381	86954	77336
Within R-squared	0.028	0.035	0.025	0.033	0.036	0.040

Note: Dependent variable: percent of workweek the respondent spent working from home. Estimates are based on coupled workers aged 25–54 at work during the CPS reference week, who appear in more than one month in the survey and excluding those whose partners are on vacation. See Table A6 for control variables. CPS composite weights are used. Standard errors clustered at the individual level are reported in parentheses. ***, **, * = statistically different from zero at the 1%, 5%, 10% level.

Source: Current Population Survey (October 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations

Table A.9 Coefficients on all controls in log actual weekly hours of work regressions for the full sample (FE estimates)

Explanatory variables	All men	All women	Fathers	Mothers	Men without children	Women without children	Fathers of children <= age 5	Mothers of children <= age 5
Self remote-Partner remote	-0.050***	-0.089***	-0.060***	-0.106***	-0.041**	-0.062***	-0.036	-0.090***
	(0.011)	(0.013)	(0.015)	(0.018)	(0.017)	(0.019)	(0.022)	(0.028)
Self remote-Partner hybrid	-0.010	-0.038***	-0.013	-0.045***	-0.013	-0.020	0.003	-0.023
	(0.013)	(0.012)	(0.017)	(0.016)	(0.019)	(0.018)	(0.025)	(0.027)
Self remote-Partner onsite	-0.038***	-0.038***	-0.025***	-0.046***	-0.057***	-0.025*	-0.038**	-0.039**
	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.011)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.017)	(0.018)
Self remote-Partner nonemployed	-0.058***	-0.039	-0.064***	0.018	-0.044**	-0.094**	-0.067***	0.065
	(0.014)	(0.024)	(0.018)	(0.029)	(0.022)	(0.038)	(0.025)	(0.052)
Self hybrid-Partner remote	0.044***	0.064***	0.045***	0.061***	0.038**	0.063***	0.062***	0.078***
	(0.009)	(0.012)	(0.011)	(0.015)	(0.016)	(0.019)	(0.016)	(0.025)
Self hybrid-Partner hybrid	0.050***	0.062***	0.050***	0.060***	0.051***	0.067***	0.060***	0.090***
	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.012)	(0.013)	(0.015)	(0.016)
Self hybrid-Partner onsite	0.040***	0.061***	0.040***	0.062***	0.042***	0.060***	0.045***	0.070***
	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.012)	(0.014)
Self hybrid-Partner nonemployed	0.043***	0.062***	0.039***	0.069***	0.052***	0.054***	0.047***	0.104***
	(0.010)	(0.014)	(0.012)	(0.021)	(0.017)	(0.020)	(0.018)	(0.036)
Self onsite-Partner remote	0.003	-0.020**	0.014	-0.016	-0.013	-0.020	0.012	-0.049*
	(0.007)	(0.010)	(0.009)	(0.013)	(0.011)	(0.016)	(0.012)	(0.025)
Self onsite-Partner hybrid	0.031***	0.010	0.035***	0.004	0.027***	0.020*	0.041***	0.001
	(0.006)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.010)	(0.009)	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.016)
Self onsite-Partner nonemployed	-0.013**	-0.003	-0.014**	0.010	-0.010	-0.018	-0.012	-0.001
	(0.006)	(0.010)	(0.007)	(0.014)	(0.010)	(0.014)	(0.010)	(0.026)
Multiple job holder	0.246***	0.255***	0.246***	0.255***	0.247***	0.256***	0.232***	0.243***
	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.012)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.021)
Partner multiple job holder	-0.002	-0.004	-0.008	-0.000	0.009	-0.022	0.004	0.000
	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.021)
Self-employed	-0.065***	-0.090***	-0.057***	-0.094***	-0.079***	-0.085***	-0.065***	-0.108***
	(0.011)	(0.016)	(0.014)	(0.021)	(0.019)	(0.025)	(0.024)	(0.034)
Partner self-employed	-0.002	0.014	-0.007	0.025*	0.009	-0.007	0.001	0.019
	(0.009)	(0.012)	(0.011)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.020)	(0.017)	(0.028)
Disabled	-0.002	-0.003	0.000	-0.023	-0.003	0.006	-0.022	0.010
	(0.014)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.026)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.025)	(0.047)
Cohabiter	0.008	0.009	-0.026	-0.030	0.003	0.001	-0.059*	0.067**
	(0.023)	(0.022)	(0.028)	(0.037)	(0.031)	(0.021)	(0.034)	(0.034)
Presence of another adult	-0.002	0.004	0.002	0.011	-0.010	-0.007	-0.010	-0.005
	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.010)	(0.013)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.024)
Presence of children aged 0	-0.028***	-0.117***	-0.025***	-0.087***	-	-	-0.032***	-0.100***

	(0.008)	(0.015)	(0.008)	(0.015)	-	-	(0.010)	(0.021)
Presence of children aged 1–5	0.004	-0.039***	0.007	-0.026**	-	-	-0.012	-0.055**
	(0.006)	(0.012)	(0.007)	(0.013)	-	-	(0.015)	(0.028)
Presence of children aged 6–17	-0.001	-0.001	0.003	0.001	-	-	-0.006	-0.028*
	(0.007)	(0.009)	(0.007)	(0.010)	-	-	(0.012)	(0.017)
Paid hourly	-0.002	-0.002	-0.003	-0.002	-0.001	-0.001	-0.000	-0.009
	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.006)
Government job: federal	0.008	0.005	0.006	0.001	0.030	0.025	-0.024	0.078
	(0.018)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.033)	(0.030)	(0.028)	(0.040)	(0.091)
Government job: state and local	0.012	0.029**	0.018	0.036*	0.007	0.019	0.043	0.034
	(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.018)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.021)	(0.032)	(0.030)
Number of observations	231952	190717	144998	113381	86954	77336	64940	46531
Within R-squared	0.019	0.025	0.020	0.026	0.020	0.024	0.021	0.026

Note: Dependent variable: log of actual reported weekly hours of work last week. Coefficients not shown include month and year FE, 21 occupation groups, and 20 industry groups. Estimates are based on coupled workers aged 25–54 at work during the CPS reference week, who appear in more than one month in the survey and excluding those whose partners are on vacation. CPS composite weights are used. Standard errors clustered at the individual level are reported in parentheses. ***, **, * = statistically different from zero at the 1%, 5%, 10% level.

Source: Current Population Survey (October 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations

Table A.10 Coefficients on couple-level work arrangements in log actual weekly hours regressions excluding individuals who had multiple jobs or whose partners had multiple jobs (FE estimates)

Explanatory variables	All men	All women	Fathers	Mothers	Men without children	Women without children	Fathers of children <= age 5	Mothers of children <= age 5
Self remote-Partner remote	-0.039***	-0.071***	-0.044***	-0.087***	-0.034**	-0.044**	-0.017	-0.079***
	(0.011)	(0.013)	(0.015)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.019)	(0.023)	(0.029)
Self remote-Partner hybrid	0.003	-0.030**	0.002	-0.046***	-0.003	0.006	0.022	-0.025
	(0.013)	(0.012)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.021)	(0.019)	(0.026)	(0.026)
Self remote-Partner onsite	-0.023***	-0.031***	-0.006	-0.038***	-0.049***	-0.018	-0.015	-0.031
	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.012)	(0.014)	(0.015)	(0.018)	(0.019)
Self remote-Partner nonemployed	-0.049***	-0.036	-0.055***	0.029	-0.032	-0.101**	-0.053**	0.084
	(0.015)	(0.025)	(0.019)	(0.030)	(0.024)	(0.040)	(0.027)	(0.053)
Self hybrid-Partner remote	0.044***	0.072***	0.045***	0.065***	0.042***	0.077***	0.073***	0.091***
	(0.009)	(0.013)	(0.011)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.021)	(0.018)	(0.026)
Self hybrid-Partner hybrid	0.054***	0.067***	0.053***	0.064***	0.058***	0.075***	0.072***	0.087***
	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.011)	(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.017)	(0.017)
Self hybrid-Partner onsite	0.046***	0.060***	0.047***	0.057***	0.044***	0.065***	0.056***	0.063***
	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.010)	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.013)	(0.015)
Self hybrid-Partner nonemployed	0.052***	0.063***	0.049***	0.067***	0.062***	0.060***	0.057***	0.081**
	(0.010)	(0.015)	(0.013)	(0.021)	(0.018)	(0.021)	(0.019)	(0.034)
Self onsite-Partner remote	0.003	-0.021**	0.011	-0.017	-0.010	-0.022	0.019	-0.046*
	(0.007)	(0.011)	(0.009)	(0.014)	(0.011)	(0.016)	(0.014)	(0.026)
Self onsite-Partner hybrid	0.033***	0.003	0.038***	-0.006	0.027***	0.018	0.046***	0.004
	(0.006)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.011)	(0.010)	(0.012)	(0.013)	(0.017)
Self onsite-Partner nonemployed	-0.010*	-0.008	-0.011	0.003	-0.006	-0.020	-0.006	-0.009
	(0.006)	(0.010)	(0.007)	(0.014)	(0.011)	(0.014)	(0.011)	(0.026)
Number of observations	211045	171329	132111	101729	78934	69600	59619	42039
Within R-squared	0.005	0.010	0.005	0.011	0.005	0.008	0.008	0.014

Note: Dependent variable: log of actual reported weekly hours of work last week. Estimates are based on coupled workers aged 25–54 at work during the CPS reference week, who appear in more than one month in the survey and excluding those whose partners are on vacation. See Table A9 for control variables. CPS composite weights are used. Standard errors clustered at the individual level are reported in parentheses. ***, **, * = statistically different from zero at the 1%, 5%, 10% level.

Source: Current Population Survey (October 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations

Table A.11 Coefficients on couple-level work arrangements in log actual weekly hours regressions excluding the self-employed (FE estimates)

Explanatory variables	All men	All women	Fathers	Mothers	Men without children	Women without children	Fathers of children <= age 5	Mothers of children <= age 5
Self remote-Partner remote	-0.041***	-0.076***	-0.045***	-0.086***	-0.038**	-0.062***	-0.036	-0.060**
	(0.012)	(0.014)	(0.016)	(0.019)	(0.018)	(0.020)	(0.025)	(0.030)
Self remote-Partner hybrid	-0.002	-0.031**	-0.018	-0.041**	0.011	-0.006	-0.015	-0.011
	(0.014)	(0.012)	(0.019)	(0.016)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.026)	(0.027)
Self remote-Partner onsite	-0.030***	-0.028***	-0.023**	-0.033***	-0.042***	-0.018	-0.038**	-0.022
	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.012)	(0.015)	(0.014)	(0.018)	(0.020)
Self remote-Partner nonemployed	-0.045***	-0.018	-0.047**	0.035	-0.036	-0.069***	-0.039	0.102*
	(0.015)	(0.020)	(0.019)	(0.030)	(0.024)	(0.027)	(0.026)	(0.056)
Self hybrid-Partner remote	0.047***	0.063***	0.046***	0.059***	0.046***	0.064***	0.061***	0.078***
	(0.010)	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.014)	(0.018)	(0.020)	(0.018)	(0.024)
Self hybrid-Partner hybrid	0.046***	0.055***	0.049***	0.052***	0.041***	0.062***	0.058***	0.080***
	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.010)	(0.011)	(0.012)	(0.013)	(0.017)	(0.017)
Self hybrid-Partner onsite	0.039***	0.058***	0.039***	0.060***	0.041***	0.056***	0.044***	0.071***
	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.013)	(0.015)
Self hybrid-Partner nonemployed	0.046***	0.066***	0.043***	0.068***	0.054***	0.063***	0.047**	0.116***
	(0.010)	(0.014)	(0.013)	(0.021)	(0.018)	(0.020)	(0.019)	(0.039)
Self onsite-Partner remote	0.003	-0.023**	0.009	-0.022*	-0.006	-0.019	0.008	-0.049*
	(0.007)	(0.010)	(0.009)	(0.013)	(0.012)	(0.016)	(0.014)	(0.026)
Self onsite-Partner hybrid	0.032***	0.010	0.037***	0.001	0.027***	0.024*	0.046***	0.008
	(0.006)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.012)	(0.013)	(0.015)
Self onsite-Partner nonemployed	-0.011*	0.006	-0.012*	0.012	-0.007	-0.000	-0.008	0.000
	(0.006)	(0.010)	(0.007)	(0.014)	(0.011)	(0.013)	(0.011)	(0.025)
Number of observations	204057	174086	126552	102374	77505	71712	57218	42378
Within R-squared	0.018	0.022	0.020	0.023	0.018	0.021	0.020	0.024

Note: Dependent variable: log of actual reported weekly hours of work last week. Estimates are based on coupled workers aged 25–54 at work during the CPS reference week, who appear in more than one month in the survey and excluding those whose partners are on vacation. See Table A9 for control variables. CPS composite weights are used. Standard errors clustered at the individual level are reported in parentheses. ***, **, * = statistically different from zero at the 1%, 5%, 10% level.

Source: Current Population Survey (October 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations

Table A.12 Coefficients on couple-level work arrangements in log actual weekly hours regressions excluding workers who change employer or duties (FE estimates)

Explanatory variables	All men	All women	Fathers	Mothers	Men without children	Women without children	Fathers of children <= age 5	Mothers of children <= age 5
Self remote-Partner remote	-0.033***	-0.069***	-0.047***	-0.071***	-0.014	-0.057**	-0.020	-0.019
	(0.013)	(0.015)	(0.017)	(0.020)	(0.018)	(0.023)	(0.027)	(0.031)
Self remote-Partner hybrid	-0.010	-0.039***	-0.017	-0.046**	-0.008	-0.010	0.009	-0.014
	(0.016)	(0.014)	(0.023)	(0.019)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.033)	(0.031)
Self remote-Partner onsite	-0.037***	-0.035***	-0.024**	-0.036***	-0.058***	-0.031*	-0.045**	-0.032
	(0.009)	(0.011)	(0.012)	(0.013)	(0.015)	(0.017)	(0.021)	(0.022)
Self remote-Partner nonemployed	-0.053***	-0.028	-0.048**	0.032	-0.067**	-0.082	-0.073**	0.060
	(0.016)	(0.032)	(0.021)	(0.039)	(0.026)	(0.051)	(0.030)	(0.065)
Self hybrid-Partner remote	0.045***	0.072***	0.041***	0.064***	0.048**	0.085***	0.067***	0.104***
	(0.012)	(0.015)	(0.013)	(0.018)	(0.024)	(0.025)	(0.021)	(0.031)
Self hybrid-Partner hybrid	0.052***	0.058***	0.049***	0.058***	0.055***	0.064***	0.062***	0.111***
	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.011)	(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.016)	(0.020)	(0.021)
Self hybrid-Partner onsite	0.034***	0.053***	0.036***	0.058***	0.032***	0.049***	0.043***	0.069***
	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.011)	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.015)	(0.017)
Self hybrid-Partner nonemployed	0.051***	0.066***	0.045***	0.068***	0.061***	0.070***	0.042*	0.083**
	(0.012)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.023)	(0.021)	(0.024)	(0.023)	(0.036)
Self onsite-Partner remote	0.003	-0.012	0.014	-0.013	-0.012	-0.005	0.013	-0.053
	(0.008)	(0.013)	(0.011)	(0.016)	(0.014)	(0.020)	(0.013)	(0.032)
Self onsite-Partner hybrid	0.026***	0.017*	0.031***	0.006	0.020*	0.036**	0.031**	0.002
	(0.007)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.015)	(0.013)	(0.020)
Self onsite-Partner nonemployed	-0.014**	0.006	-0.017**	0.017	-0.005	-0.005	-0.027**	0.023
	(0.006)	(0.013)	(0.008)	(0.018)	(0.012)	(0.019)	(0.012)	(0.031)
Number of observations	169274	137609	105932	81573	63342	56036	47410	33373
Within R-squared	0.018	0.022	0.019	0.023	0.019	0.022	0.022	0.025

Note: Dependent variable: log of actual reported weekly hours of work last week. Estimates are based on coupled workers aged 25–54 at work during the CPS reference week, who appear in more than one month in the survey and excluding those whose partners are on vacation. See Table A9 for control variables. CPS composite weights are used. Standard errors clustered at the individual level are reported in parentheses. ***, **, * = statistically different from zero at the 1%, 5%, 10% level.

Source: Current Population Survey (October 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations

Table A.13 Coefficients on couple-level work arrangements in log actual weekly hours regressions for full-time dual-earner couples (FE estimates)

Explanatory variables	All men	All women	Fathers	Mothers	Men without children	Women without children	Fathers of children <= age 5	Mothers of children <= age 5
Self remote-Partner remote	-0.041***	-0.063***	-0.046***	-0.071***	-0.039**	-0.054***	-0.025	-0.051*
	(0.012)	(0.013)	(0.015)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.019)	(0.021)	(0.029)
Self remote-Partner hybrid	-0.001	-0.026**	-0.013	-0.044***	0.005	-0.001	0.003	0.010
	(0.014)	(0.012)	(0.018)	(0.017)	(0.020)	(0.018)	(0.027)	(0.028)
Self remote-Partner onsite	-0.025***	-0.023**	-0.024**	-0.029**	-0.029**	-0.016	-0.034*	-0.009
	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.013)	(0.020)	(0.021)
Self hybrid-Partner remote	0.036***	0.070***	0.031***	0.058***	0.039**	0.075***	0.068***	0.080***
	(0.010)	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.014)	(0.017)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.023)
Self hybrid-Partner hybrid	0.050***	0.067***	0.048***	0.061***	0.054***	0.077***	0.071***	0.080***
	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.012)	(0.013)	(0.017)	(0.016)
Self hybrid-Partner onsite	0.040***	0.062***	0.033***	0.060***	0.048***	0.063***	0.045***	0.072***
	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.011)	(0.010)	(0.014)	(0.015)
Self onsite-Partner remote	-0.003	-0.008	0.002	0.003	-0.010	-0.016	-0.006	-0.028
	(0.008)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.014)	(0.011)	(0.018)	(0.016)	(0.028)
Self onsite-Partner hybrid	0.038***	0.023***	0.039***	0.008	0.036***	0.041***	0.045***	0.019
	(0.006)	(0.009)	(0.008)	(0.012)	(0.010)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.017)
Number of observations	142298	142298	80296	81179	62002	61119	32605	32634
Within R-squared	0.019	0.018	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.018	0.023	0.020

Note: Dependent variable: log of actual reported weekly hours of work last week. Estimates are based on coupled workers aged 25–54 at work during the CPS reference week, who appear in more than one month in the survey and excluding those whose partners are on vacation. See Table A9 for control variables. CPS composite weights are used. Standard errors clustered at the individual level are reported in parentheses. ***, **, * = statistically different from zero at the 1%, 5%, 10% level.

Source: Current Population Survey (October 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations

Table A.14 Coefficients on all controls in log actual weekly hours of work regressions for the full sample. Hybrid is >=20 and <=80 (FE estimates)

Explanatory variables	All men	All women	Fathers	Mothers	Men without children	Women without children	Fathers of children <= age 5	Mothers of children <= age 5
Self remote-Partner remote	-0.043***	-0.079***	-0.050***	-0.094***	-0.038**	-0.057***	-0.028	-0.078***
	(0.011)	(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.017)	(0.016)	(0.018)	(0.022)	(0.028)
Self remote-Partner hybrid	-0.000	-0.029**	-0.007	-0.034**	0.001	-0.012	0.008	-0.008
	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.017)	(0.016)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.025)	(0.027)
Self remote-Partner onsite	-0.029***	-0.030***	-0.019*	-0.037***	-0.046***	-0.018	-0.032*	-0.033*
	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.011)	(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.017)	(0.018)
Self remote-Partner nonemployed	-0.048***	-0.037	-0.053***	0.022	-0.034	-0.096***	-0.058**	0.068
	(0.014)	(0.023)	(0.018)	(0.028)	(0.022)	(0.037)	(0.025)	(0.050)
Self hybrid-Partner remote	0.044***	0.063***	0.046***	0.059***	0.039**	0.063***	0.065***	0.077***
	(0.009)	(0.011)	(0.010)	(0.014)	(0.016)	(0.018)	(0.016)	(0.024)
Self hybrid-Partner hybrid	0.046***	0.058***	0.045***	0.054***	0.047***	0.066***	0.055***	0.081***
	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.012)	(0.013)	(0.016)	(0.016)
Self hybrid-Partner onsite	0.037***	0.057***	0.037***	0.057***	0.038***	0.056***	0.043***	0.070***
	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.012)	(0.014)
Self hybrid-Partner nonemployed	0.039***	0.066***	0.034***	0.068***	0.048***	0.063***	0.044**	0.104***
	(0.010)	(0.015)	(0.012)	(0.021)	(0.017)	(0.020)	(0.017)	(0.038)
Self onsite-Partner remote	0.004	-0.016	0.014	-0.010	-0.010	-0.019	0.013	-0.041*
	(0.007)	(0.010)	(0.009)	(0.013)	(0.010)	(0.016)	(0.012)	(0.024)
Self onsite-Partner hybrid	0.030***	0.007	0.036***	-0.001	0.024**	0.021*	0.041***	-0.004
	(0.006)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.016)
Self onsite-Partner nonemployed	-0.013**	-0.003	-0.015**	0.010	-0.010	-0.018	-0.011	-0.001
	(0.006)	(0.010)	(0.007)	(0.014)	(0.010)	(0.014)	(0.010)	(0.026)
Number of observations	231951	190716	144997	113380	86954	77336	64939	46530
Within R-squared	0.019	0.024	0.020	0.025	0.019	0.024	0.021	0.025

Note: Dependent variable: log of actual reported weekly hours of work last week. Coefficients not shown include month and year FE, 21 occupation groups, and 20 industry groups. Estimates are based on coupled workers aged 25–54 at work during the CPS reference week, who appear in more than one month in the survey and excluding those whose partners are on vacation. See Table A9 for control variables. CPS composite weights are used. Standard errors clustered at the individual level are reported in parentheses. ***, **, * = statistically different from zero at the 1%, 5%, 10% level.

Source: Current Population Survey (October 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations

Table A.15 Coefficients on all controls in log actual weekly hours of work regressions for the full sample. Hybrid is >0 and <100 (FE estimates)

Explanatory variables	All men	All women	Fathers	Mothers	Men without children	Women without children	Fathers of children <= age 5	Mothers of children <= age 5
Self remote-Partner remote	-0.041***	-0.078***	-0.049***	-0.095***	-0.035**	-0.053***	-0.023	-0.081***
	(0.011)	(0.013)	(0.015)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.019)	(0.022)	(0.028)
Self remote-Partner hybrid	-0.006	-0.028**	-0.003	-0.035**	-0.018	-0.008	0.013	-0.013
	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.016)	(0.015)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.025)	(0.024)
Self remote-Partner onsite	-0.028***	-0.031***	-0.016*	-0.038***	-0.046***	-0.018	-0.030*	-0.036*
	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.012)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.017)	(0.018)
Self remote-Partner nonemployed	-0.049***	-0.031	-0.054***	0.027	-0.036	-0.087**	-0.057**	0.070
	(0.014)	(0.024)	(0.018)	(0.029)	(0.022)	(0.038)	(0.025)	(0.051)
Self hybrid-Partner remote	0.059***	0.076***	0.063***	0.079***	0.051***	0.069***	0.084***	0.085***
	(0.009)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.014)	(0.015)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.024)
Self hybrid-Partner hybrid	0.069***	0.088***	0.075***	0.089***	0.063***	0.090***	0.089***	0.106***
	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.011)	(0.012)	(0.015)	(0.015)
Self hybrid-Partner onsite	0.052***	0.071***	0.052***	0.071***	0.053***	0.070***	0.055***	0.073***
	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.011)	(0.014)
Self hybrid-Partner nonemployed	0.061***	0.077***	0.059***	0.090***	0.067***	0.065***	0.064***	0.103***
	(0.009)	(0.013)	(0.011)	(0.019)	(0.017)	(0.019)	(0.017)	(0.030)
Self onsite-Partner remote	0.000	-0.021**	0.012	-0.019	-0.017	-0.017	0.007	-0.049*
	(0.007)	(0.010)	(0.009)	(0.014)	(0.011)	(0.016)	(0.013)	(0.025)
Self onsite-Partner hybrid	0.025***	0.004	0.029***	-0.002	0.020**	0.015	0.033***	0.002
	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.010)	(0.009)	(0.011)	(0.012)	(0.015)
Self onsite-Partner nonemployed	-0.014**	-0.004	-0.015**	0.008	-0.012	-0.017	-0.012	-0.001
	(0.006)	(0.010)	(0.007)	(0.014)	(0.010)	(0.014)	(0.010)	(0.026)
Number of observations	231951	190716	144997	113380	86954	77336	64939	46530
Within R-squared	0.020	0.026	0.021	0.027	0.021	0.025	0.022	0.027

Note: Dependent variable: log of actual reported weekly hours of work last week. Coefficients not shown include month and year FE, 21 occupation groups, and 20 industry groups. Estimates are based on coupled workers aged 25–54 at work during the CPS reference week, who appear in more than one month in the survey and excluding those whose partners are on vacation. See Table A9 for control variables. CPS composite weights are used. Standard errors clustered at the individual level are reported in parentheses. ***, **, * = statistically different from zero at the 1%, 5%, 10% level.

Source: Current Population Survey (October 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations

Table A.16 Statistical significances for Wald tests of equality of coefficients on couple-level work location arrangements in log actual weekly hours regressions for men

Couple-level work arrangements	Self remote-Partner remote	Self remote-Partner hybrid	Self remote-Partner onsite	Self remote-Partner nonemployed	Self hybrid-Partner remote	Self hybrid-Partner hybrid	Self hybrid-Partner onsite	Self hybrid-Partner nonemployed	Self onsite-Partner remote	Self onsite-Partner hybrid	Self onsite-Partner nonemployed
Self remote-Partner remote	-	***	-	-	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Self remote-Partner hybrid	***	-	**	***	***	***	***	***	-	***	-
Self remote-Partner onsite	-	**	-	-	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Self remote-Partner nonemployed	-	***	-	-	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Self hybrid-Partner remote	***	***	***	***	-	-	-	-	***	-	***
Self hybrid-Partner hybrid	***	***	***	***	-	-	-	-	***	**	***
Self hybrid-Partner onsite	***	***	***	***	-	-	-	-	***	-	***
Self hybrid-Partner nonemployed	***	***	***	***	-	-	-	-	***	-	***
Self onsite-Partner remote	***	-	***	***	***	***	***	***	-	***	*
Self onsite-Partner hybrid	***	***	***	***	-	**	-	-	***	-	***
Self onsite-Partner nonemployed	***	-	***	***	***	***	***	***	*	***	-

Note: ***, **, * = statistically different from zero at the 1%, 5%, 10% level.

Source: Current Population Survey (October 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations

Table A.17 Statistical significances for Wald tests of equality of coefficients on couple-level work location arrangements in log actual weekly hours regressions for women

Couple-level work arrangements	Self remote-Partner remote	Self remote-Partner hybrid	Self remote-Partner onsite	Self remote-Partner nonemployed	Self hybrid-Partner remote	Self hybrid-Partner hybrid	Self hybrid-Partner onsite	Self hybrid-Partner nonemployed	Self onsite-Partner remote	Self onsite-Partner hybrid	Self onsite-Partner nonemployed
Self remote-Partner remote	-	***	***	*	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Self remote-Partner hybrid	***	-	-	-	***	***	***	***	-	***	**
Self remote-Partner onsite	***	-	-	-	***	***	***	***	-	***	***
Self remote-Partner nonemployed	*	-	-	-	***	***	***	***	-	**	-
Self hybrid-Partner remote	***	***	***	***	-	-	-	-	***	***	***
Self hybrid-Partner hybrid	***	***	***	***	-	-	-	-	***	***	***
Self hybrid-Partner onsite	***	***	***	***	-	-	-	-	***	***	***
Self hybrid-Partner nonemployed	***	***	***	***	-	-	-	-	***	***	***
Self onsite-Partner remote	***	-	-	-	***	***	***	***	-	***	-
Self onsite-Partner hybrid	***	***	***	**	***	***	***	***	***	-	-
Self onsite-Partner nonemployed	***	**	***	-	***	***	***	***	-	-	-

Note: ***, **, * = statistically different from zero at the 1%, 5%, 10% level.

Source: Current Population Survey (October 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations

Table A.18 Average woman's share of total couple hours among dual-earner couples aged 25–54 in different couple-level work location arrangements

Couple-level work arrangement	All women	Mothers	Women without children
Man remote-Woman remote	0.473	0.464	0.485
Man hybrid-Woman remote	0.441	0.427	0.466
Man onsite-Woman remote	0.456	0.445	0.474
Man remote-Woman hybrid	0.498	0.493	0.504
Man hybrid-Woman hybrid	0.484	0.479	0.492
Man onsite-Woman hybrid	0.483	0.476	0.494
Man remote-Woman onsite	0.469	0.458	0.485
Man hybrid-Woman onsite	0.448	0.433	0.469
Man onsite-Woman onsite	0.464	0.455	0.476

Notes: Estimates are based on women in dual-earner couples aged 25–54 at work during the CPS reference week, who appear in more than one month in the survey and excluding those whose partners are on vacation. Composite weights are used. Number of observations: 177,137.

Source: Current Population Survey (October 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations

Table A.19 Coefficients on couple-level work arrangements in share of woman's hours in total couple work hours regressions for the full sample (FE estimates)

Explanatory variables	All women	Mothers	Women without children
Man remote-Woman remote	-0.007***	-0.008**	-0.005
	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Man hybrid-Woman remote	-0.018***	-0.019***	-0.013***
	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.004)
Man onsite-Woman remote	-0.010***	-0.013***	-0.005**
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)
Man remote-Woman hybrid	0.015***	0.014***	0.016***
	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.004)
Man hybrid-Woman hybrid	0.002	0.001	0.004
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)
Man onsite-Woman hybrid	0.004***	0.003*	0.006***
	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Man remote-Woman onsite	0.006***	0.004	0.010***
	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Man hybrid-Woman onsite	-0.005***	-0.006***	-0.003
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Number of observations	177137	105927	71210
Within R-squared	0.033	0.032	0.036

Note: Estimates are based on women in dual-earner couples aged 25–54 at work during the CPS reference week, who appear in more than one month in the survey and excluding those whose partners are on vacation. See Table A9 for control variables. CPS composite weights are used. Standard errors clustered at the individual level are reported in parentheses. ***, **, * = statistically different from zero at the 1%, 5%, 10% level.

Source: Current Population Survey (October 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations

Table A.20 Coefficients on couple-level work arrangements in share of woman's hours in total couple work hours regressions excluding individuals who had multiple jobs or whose partners had multiple jobs (FE estimates)

Explanatory variables	All women	Mothers	Women without children
Man remote-Woman remote	-0.006**	-0.007**	-0.003
	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Man hybrid-Woman remote	-0.016***	-0.018***	-0.009**
	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.004)
Man onsite-Woman remote	-0.009***	-0.011***	-0.005*
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)
Man remote-Woman hybrid	0.014***	0.013***	0.016***
	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.004)
Man hybrid-Woman hybrid	0.002	0.002	0.003
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)
Man onsite-Woman hybrid	0.003**	0.001	0.006**
	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Man remote-Woman onsite	0.002	0.000	0.006**
	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Man hybrid-Woman onsite	-0.007***	-0.009***	-0.004*
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Number of observations	158518	94698	63820
Within R-squared	0.006	0.007	0.006

Note: Estimates are based on women in dual-earner couples aged 25–54 at work during the CPS reference week, who appear in more than one month in the survey and excluding those whose partners are on vacation. See Table A9 for control variables. CPS composite weights are used. Standard errors clustered at the individual level are reported in parentheses. ***, **, * = statistically different from zero at the 1%, 5%, 10% level.

Source: Current Population Survey (October 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations

Table A.21 Coefficients on couple-level work arrangements in share of woman's hours in total couple work hours regressions excluding the self-employed (FE estimates)

Explanatory variables	All women	Mothers	Women without children
Man remote-Woman remote	-0.008***	-0.009**	-0.006
	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Man hybrid-Woman remote	-0.015***	-0.017***	-0.011***
	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.004)
Man onsite-Woman remote	-0.009***	-0.011***	-0.005*
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)
Man remote-Woman hybrid	0.013***	0.014***	0.014***
	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.004)
Man hybrid-Woman hybrid	0.001	-0.000	0.003
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)
Man onsite-Woman hybrid	0.003**	0.002	0.004*
	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Man remote-Woman onsite	0.005**	0.003	0.008***
	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Man hybrid-Woman onsite	-0.005***	-0.007***	-0.002
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Number of observations	161379	95415	65964
Within R-squared	0.029	0.029	0.033

Note: Estimates are based on women in dual-earner couples aged 25–54 at work during the CPS reference week, who appear in more than one month in the survey and excluding those whose partners are on vacation. See Table A9 for control variables. CPS composite weights are used. Standard errors clustered at the individual level are reported in parentheses. ***, **, * = statistically different from zero at the 1%, 5%, 10% level.

Source: Current Population Survey (October 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations

Table A.22 Coefficients on couple-level work arrangements in share of woman's hours in total couple work hours regressions excluding workers who change employer or duties (FE estimates)

Explanatory variables	All women	Mothers	Women without children
Man remote-Woman remote	-0.007**	-0.005	-0.008**
	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Man hybrid-Woman remote	-0.019***	-0.019***	-0.013***
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.005)
Man onsite-Woman remote	-0.011***	-0.013***	-0.007**
	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Man remote-Woman hybrid	0.016***	0.015***	0.018***
	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Man hybrid-Woman hybrid	0.001	0.001	0.002
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)
Man onsite-Woman hybrid	0.003**	0.002	0.005**
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Man remote-Woman onsite	0.009***	0.006*	0.015***
	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.004)
Man hybrid-Woman onsite	-0.003	-0.006**	0.001
	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Number of observations	127955	76241	51714
Within R-squared	0.030	0.030	0.034

Note: Estimates are based on women in dual-earner couples aged 25–54 at work during the CPS reference week, who appear in more than one month in the survey and excluding those whose partners are on vacation. See Table A9 for control variables. CPS composite weights are used. Standard errors clustered at the individual level are reported in parentheses. ***, **, * = statistically different from zero at the 1%, 5%, 10% level.

Source: Current Population Survey (October 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations

Table A.23 Coefficients on couple-level work arrangements in share of woman's hours in total couple work hours regressions for full-time dual-earner couples (FE estimates)

Explanatory variables	All women	Mothers	Women without children
Man remote-Woman remote	-0.004*	-0.004	-0.003
	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Man hybrid-Woman remote	-0.013***	-0.015***	-0.009**
	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.004)
Man onsite-Woman remote	-0.006***	-0.007***	-0.004*
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Man remote-Woman hybrid	0.014***	0.015***	0.014***
	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Man hybrid-Woman hybrid	0.004**	0.003*	0.005**
	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.003)
Man onsite-Woman hybrid	0.003***	0.003*	0.003*
	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Man remote-Woman onsite	0.006***	0.008***	0.006*
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)
Man hybrid-Woman onsite	-0.002	-0.004*	0.000
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Number of observations	142298	81179	61119
Within R-squared	0.026	0.025	0.030

Note: Estimates are based on women in dual-earner couples aged 25–54 at work during the CPS reference week, who appear in more than one month in the survey and excluding those whose partners are on vacation. See Table A9 for control variables. CPS composite weights are used. Standard errors clustered at the individual level are reported in parentheses. ***, **, * = statistically different from zero at the 1%, 5%, 10% level.

Source: Current Population Survey (October 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations

Table A.24 Statistical significances for Wald tests of equality of coefficients on couple-level work location arrangements in share of woman's hours in total couple work hours regressions for women from full-time dual-earner couples

Couple-level work arrangements	Man remote-Woman remote	Man hybrid-Woman remote	Man onsite-Woman remote	Man remote-Woman hybrid	Man hybrid-Woman hybrid	Man onsite-Woman hybrid	Man remote-Woman onsite	Man hybrid-Woman onsite
Man remote-Woman remote	-	***	-	***	***	***	***	-
Man hybrid-Woman remote	***	-	***	***	***	***	***	***
Man onsite-Woman remote	-	***	-	***	***	***	***	*
Man remote-Woman hybrid	***	***	***	-	***	***	***	***
Man hybrid-Woman hybrid	***	***	***	***	-	-	-	***
Man onsite-Woman hybrid	***	***	***	***	-	-	-	***
Man remote-Woman onsite	***	***	***	***	-	-	-	***
Man hybrid-Woman onsite	-	***	*	***	***	***	***	-

Note: ***, **, * = statistically different from zero at the 1%, 5%, 10% level.

Source: Current Population Survey (October 2022–November 2024), authors' calculations