

Appendix 6c) - Results from the Family Impact Survey

Partners general health - dayshift

% within ROSTER Roster		Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor	Total
ROSTER Roster	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	8.5%	56.1%	31.7%	3.7%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	8.2%	42.9%	33.7%	15.3%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	12.0%	52.0%	32.0%	4.0%	100.0%
	Dayshift (40-60 hr)	18.8%	50.0%	20.8%	10.4%	100.0%
Total		10.7%	49.4%	30.4%	9.5%	100.0%

Population: Sample of partners of workers in Tasmanian mines n = 270.

Notes: Difference between 56 hour rotating and eventime rosters approaching significance: $X^2(3) = 7.718$ p = .052. n = 180

Partners general health - days off

% within ROSTER Roster		Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor	Total
ROSTER Roster	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	26.6%	54.4%	16.5%	2.5%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	19.8%	35.4%	30.2%	14.6%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	33.3%	50.0%	16.7%		100.0%
	Dayshift (40-60 hr)	20.5%	48.7%	23.1%	7.7%	100.0%
Total		23.5%	45.4%	23.1%	8.0%	100.0%

Population: Sample of partners of workers in Tasmanian mines n = 270.

Notes: Significant difference between 56 hour rotating and eventime rosters: $X^2(3) = 14.735$ p = .002. n = 175

a) General Mood and Emotional State

General Mood and Emotional State for Dayshift, Nightshift, and Days Off.

Partners general mood and emotional state - days off

% within ROSTER Roster		Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor	Total
ROSTER Roster	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	28.8%	53.8%	10.0%	7.5%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	21.6%	36.1%	33.0%	9.3%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	41.7%	45.8%	12.5%		100.0%
	Dayshift (40-60 hr)	17.9%	46.2%	28.2%	7.7%	100.0%
Total		25.4%	44.6%	22.5%	7.5%	100.0%

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines n = 240.

Notes: Significant difference between 56 hour rotating and eventime rosters $X^2(3) = 14.412$ p = .002. n = 177.

b) Partner's Adoption of Practices Helpful to a Shift Work Lifestyle.

Adopt practices helpful to shiftwork lifestyle: uses days off for rest and recuperation

% within Roster

		Never or sometimes	Frequently or always	Total
Roster	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	47.5%	52.5%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	47.4%	52.6%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
Total		46.5%	53.5%	100.0%

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines n = 270.

Notes: Only shift work rosters were included in analysis n permanent dayshift was removed n = 207

Notes: No significant differences n = 200.

Adopt practices helpful to shiftwork lifestyle: exercises regularly

% within Roster

		Never or sometimes	Frequently or always	Total
Roster	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	64.2%	35.8%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	81.1%	18.9%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	72.0%	28.0%	100.0%
Total		73.1%	26.9%	100.0%

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines n = 270.

Notes: Only shift work rosters were included in analysis n permanent dayshift was removed n = 207

Notes: Significant difference between the rotating rosters: $X^2(2) = 6.340$ p = .042. n = 201

Notes: Significant difference between 56 hour rotating and eventime rosters: $X^2(1) = 6.346$. p = .012. n = 176.

Adopt practices helpful to shiftwork lifestyle: controls sleep environment

% within Roster

		Never or sometimes	Frequently or always	Total
Roster	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	22.2%	77.8%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	28.1%	71.9%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	37.5%	62.5%	100.0%
Total		26.9%	73.1%	100.0%

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines n = 270.

Notes: Only shift work rosters were included in analysis n permanent dayshift was removed n = 207.

Notes: No significant differences n = 201.

Adopt practices helpful to shiftwork lifestyle: maintains balanced diet

% within Roster

		Never or sometimes	Frequently or always	Total
Roster	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	26.3%	73.8%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	32.0%	68.0%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	28.0%	72.0%	100.0%
Total		29.2%	70.8%	100.0%

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines n = 270.

Notes: Only shift work rosters were included in analysis ñ permanent dayshift was removed n = 207

Notes: No significant differences n = 202

Adopt practices helpful to shiftwork lifestyle: regulates alcohol days worked

% within Roster

		Never or sometimes	Frequently or always	Total
Roster	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	28.6%	71.4%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	28.1%	71.9%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
Total		27.9%	72.1%	100.0%

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines n =270.

Notes: Only shift work rosters were included in analysis ñ permanent dayshift was removed n = 207.

Notes: No significant differences n = 190.

Adopt practices helpful to shiftwork lifestyle: regulates alcohol days off

% within Roster

		Never or sometimes	Frequently or always	Total
Roster	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	33.8%	66.2%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	38.2%	61.8%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	37.5%	62.5%	100.0%
Total		36.3%	63.7%	100.0%

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines n =270.

Notes: Only shift work rosters were included in analysis ñ permanent dayshift was removed n = 207.

Notes: No significant differences n = 190.

Adopt practices helpful to shiftwork lifestyle: makes family time days off

% within Roster

		Never or sometimes	Frequently or always	Total
Roster	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	13.3%	86.7%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	29.6%	70.4%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	28.0%	72.0%	100.0%
Total		22.8%	77.2%	100.0%

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines n = 270.

Notes: Only shift work rosters were included in analysis ñ permanent dayshift was removed n = 207.

Notes: Significant difference between the rotating rosters: $X^2(2) = 7.247$ p = .027. n = 206

Notes: Significant difference between 56 hour rotating and eventime rosters: $X^2(1) = 6.969$, p = .008. n = 181.

c) Family's perspective of the best feature(s) of the current shift system ñ 5 most common responses

Population: Sample of partners of workers in Tasmanian mines n = 270.

Five most common responses across roster types for best feature of the shift system - Eventime Roster

Eventime Roster		
	Frequency	Percent of Eventime Roster
None	7	8.4
Time off in blocks	46	55.4
Family/home time because of roster and days off	26	31.3
Weekends off/long weekends	3	3.6
Wages	0	.0

Population: Sample of partners of workers in Tasmanian mines n = 270

Notes: Represents partners of workers who work an even-time roster n = 83

Notes: Only represents five most common responses across the mines. Percentages represent % of respondents with partners on an even-time roster endorsing that feature.

Notes: Multiple responses were possible.

Five most common responses across roster types for best feature of the shift system - 56-hour Rotating Roster

56-hour Rotating Roster		
	Frequency	Percent of 56 hour Rotating Roster
None	39	39.4
Time off in blocks	13	13.1
Family/home time because of roster and days off	10	10.1
Weekends off/long weekends	10	10.1
Wages	17	17.2

Population: Sample of partners of workers in Tasmanian mines n = 270

Notes: Represents partners of workers who work a 56-hour rotating roster n = 99

Notes: Only represents five most common responses across the mines. Percentages represent % of respondents with partners on a 56 hour rotating roster endorsing that feature.

Notes: Multiple responses were possible.

Five most common responses across roster types for best feature of the shift system - 50+-hour OtherRotating Roster

50+-hour OtherRotating Roster		
	Frequency	Percent of 50+ hour Rotating Roster
None	5	20.0
Time off in blocks	7	28.0
Family/home time because of roster and days off	0	.0
Weekends off/long weekends	4	16.0
Wages	1	4.0

Population: Sample of partners of workers in Tasmanian mines n = 270

Notes: Represents partners of workers who work a 50+ hour other rotating roster n = 25

Notes: Only represents five most common responses across the mines. Percentages represent % of respondents with partners on a 50+hour other rotating roster endorsing that feature.

Notes: Multiple responses were possible.

**Five most common responses across roster types
for best feature of the shift system - Day Shift**

Day Shift		
	Frequency	Percent of Day Shift Roster
None	1	1.9
Time off in blocks	12	23.1
Family/home time because of roster and days off	15	28.8
Weekends off/long weekends	14	26.8
Wages	1	1.9

Population: Sample of partners of workers in Tasmanian mines n = 270

Notes: Represents partners of workers who work permanent day shift n = 52

Notes: Only represents five most common responses across the mines. Percentages represent % of respondents with partners on a day shift roster endorsing that feature.

Notes: Multiple responses were possible.

**d) Family's perspective of the worst feature(s) of the current shift system n 5 most
common responses**

**Five most common responses across roster types for
worst feature of the shift system - Eventime Roster**

Eventime Roster		
	Frequency	Percent of Eventime Roster
Tiredness /irritability	5	6.0
Interruptions to or not enough family/home time	27	32.5
Working weekends	13	15.7
Long hours	12	14.5
Nightshift	11	13.3

Population: Sample of partners of workers in Tasmanian mines n = 270

Notes: Represents partners of workers who work a even-time roster = 83

Notes: Only represents five most common responses across the mines. Percentages represent % of respondents with partners on an eventime roster endorsing that feature.

Notes: Multiple responses were possible.

Five most common responses across roster types for worst feature of the shift system - 56-hour Rotating Roster

56-hour Rotating Roster		
	Frequency	Percent of 56-hour Rotating Roster
Tiredness /irritability	21	21.2
Interruptions to or not enough family/home time	41	41.4
Working weekends	9	9.1
Long hours	14	14.1
Nightshift	8	8.1

Population: Sample of partners of workers in Tasmanian mines n = 270

Notes: Represents partners of workers who work a 56-hour rotating roster n = 99

Notes: Only represents five most common responses across the mines. Percentages represent % of respondents with partners on a 56 hour rotating roster endorsing that feature.

Notes: Multiple responses were possible.

Five most common responses across roster types for worst feature of the shift system - 50+-hour Other Rotating Roster

50+-hour Other Rotating Roster		
	Frequency	Percent of 50+ hour Other Rotating Roster
Tiredness /irritability	2	8.0
Interruptions to or not enough family/home time	8	32.0
Working weekends	2	8.0
Long hours	3	12.0
Nightshift	2	8.0

Population: Sample of partners of workers in Tasmanian mines n = 270

Notes: Represents partners of workers who work a 50+ hour other rotating roster n = 25

Notes: Only represents five most common responses across the mines. Percentages represent % of respondents with partners on a 50+hour other rotating roster endorsing that feature.

Notes: Multiple responses were possible.

**Five most common responses across roster types
for worst feature of the shift system - Day Shift**

	Day Shift	
	Frequency	Percent of Day Shift Roster
Tiredness /irritability	4	7.7
Interruptions to or not enough family/home time	12	23.1
Working weekends	3	5.8
Long hours	12	23.1
Nightshift	1	1.9

Population: Sample of partners of workers in Tasmanian mines n = 270.

Notes: Represents partners of workers who work permanent dayshift n = 52

Notes: Only represents five most common responses across the mines. Percentages represent % of respondents with partners on a day shift roster endorsing that feature.

Notes: Multiple responses were possible.

- e) **Do you feel overall that the advantages of the current shift system outweigh the disadvantages.**

Do you feel that overall the advantages of the current shift system outweigh the disadvantages?

% within Roster

Roster					Total
		Probably or definitely no	Maybe	Probably or definitely yes	
Rotating	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	27.8%	31.6%	40.5%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	81.1%	5.3%	13.7%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	69.6%	30.4%		100.0%
	Dayshift (40-60 hr)	31.8%	13.6%	54.5%	100.0%
Total		53.5%	17.8%	28.6%	100.0%

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines n = 270.

Notes: Significant difference between 56 hour rotating and even-time rosters: $X^2(2) = 50.870$. $p = .000$. $n = 174$

Feelings about roster, hours and money earned

Satisfied with hours worked and money earned Crosstabulation

% within Roster

		Disagree or Strongly Disagree	Not Sure	Agree or Strongly Agree	Total
Roster	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	34.9%	20.5%	44.6%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	71.6%	12.6%	15.8%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	58.3%	8.3%	33.3%	100.0%
	Dayshift (40-60 hr)	47.1%	17.6%	35.3%	100.0%
Total		53.4%	15.8%	30.8%	100.0%

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines n =270.

Notes: Significant difference between 56 hour rotating and even-time rosters: $X^2(2) = 25.156$. $p = .000$. $n = 178$.

Like money earned but not roster

% within Roster

		Disagree or Strongly Disagree	Not Sure	Agree or Strongly Agree	Total
Roster	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	44.4%	14.8%	40.7%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	17.9%	12.6%	69.5%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	39.1%	4.3%	56.5%	100.0%
	Dayshift (40-60 hr)	58.3%	8.3%	33.3%	100.0%
Total		36.4%	11.7%	51.8%	100.0%

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines n = 270.

Notes: Significant difference between 56 hour rotating and eventime rosters: $X^2(2) = 16.804$. $p = .000$. $n = 176$.

Like fewer hours or different roster but would not accept less money

% within ROSTER Roster

		Disagree or Strongly Disagree	Not Sure	Agree or Strongly Agree	Total
ROSTER Roster	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	30.8%	14.1%	55.1%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	43.0%	17.2%	39.8%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	17.4%	4.3%	78.3%	100.0%
	Dayshift (40-60 hr)	25.0%	16.7%	58.3%	100.0%
Total		33.1%	14.9%	52.1%	100.0%

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines n = 270.

Notes: Significant difference between all rosters: $X^2(6) = 13.976$. $p = .030$. $n = 242$.

Notes: No significant difference between 56 hour rotating and eventime rosters: $X^2(2) = 4.093$. $p = .129$. $n = 171$.

Like fewer hours or different roster and would accept less money

% within ROSTER Roster

		Disagree or Strongly Disagree	Not Sure	Agree or Strongly Agree	Total
ROSTER Roster	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	67.1%	17.7%	15.2%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	30.4%	18.5%	51.1%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	79.2%	12.5%	8.3%	100.0%
	Dayshift (40-60 hr)	66.7%	16.7%	16.7%	100.0%
Total		54.3%	17.3%	28.4%	100.0%

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines n = 270.

Notes: Significant difference between 56 hour rotating and eventime rosters: $X^2(2) = 27.942$. p = .000. n = 171.

What best describes your living arrangements

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Live within travelling distance-partner travels daily	200	74.1	77.5	77.5
	Don't live within travel dist-partner stays near mine	58	21.5	22.5	100.0
	Total	258	95.6	100.0	
Missing	System	12	4.4		
Total		270	100.0		

Population: Sample of partners of workers in Tasmanian mines n = 270.

What best describes your living arrangements

% within ROSTER Roster

		Live within travelling distance-partner travels daily	Don't live within travel dist-partner stays near mine	Total
ROSTER Roster	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	73.2%	26.8%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	79.8%	20.2%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	79.2%	20.8%	100.0%
	Dayshift (40-60 hr)	80.4%	19.6%	100.0%
Total		77.7%	22.3%	100.0%

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines n = 270.

Notes: No significant difference n = 251

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines n = 270

Notes: Analysis includes those who live within traveling distance of the mine and work an even-time roster n = 60.

Notes: Respondents were able to give multiple responses- percentages will not add to 100%.

Most significant impact on family of partner's current roster.

Most significant impact on family of partners current roster - 56 hour rotating roster

	56 hour rotating roster			
	Valid		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
Loss of home/ relationship/ family time	39	39.4%	99	100.0%
Moodiness or tiredness	13	13.1%	99	100.0%
Hours /roster	7	7.1%	99	100.0%
Lack of social /community involvement	10	10.1%	99	100.0%
Working weekends	2	2.0%	99	100.0%

Population: Sample of partners of workers in Tasmanian mines n = 270

Notes: Represents partners of workers who work a 56 hour rotating roster n = 99

Notes: Some respondents gave multiple responses.

Most significant impact on family of partners current roster - 50+ hour other rotating roster

	50+ hour other rotating roster			
	Valid		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
Loss of home/ relationship/ family time	9	36.0%	25	100.0%
Moodiness or tiredness	2	8.0%	25	100.0%
Hours /roster	1	4.0%	25	100.0%
Lack of social /community involvement	2	8.0%	25	100.0%
Working weekends	2	8.0%	25	100.0%

Population: Sample of partners of workers in Tasmanian mines n = 270

Notes: Represents partners of workers who work a 50+ hour rotating roster n = 25

Notes: Some respondents gave multiple responses.

Most significant impact on family of partners current roster - day shift roster

	day shift roster			
	Valid		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
Loss of home/ relationship/ family time	14	26.9%	52	100.0%
Moodiness or tiredness	2	3.8%	52	100.0%
Hours /roster	4	7.7%	52	100.0%
Lack of social /community involvement	3	5.8%	52	100.0%
Working weekends	1	1.9%	52	100.0%

Population: Sample of partners of workers in Tasmanian mines n = 270

Notes: Represents partners of workers who work a dayshift roster n = 52
 Notes: Some respondents gave multiple responses.

Family understanding of need for partner to work the roster they do

Our family understands the need for my partner to work the roster that he/she does

% within ROSTER Roster

		Disagree or Strongly Disagree	Agree or Strongly Agree	Total
ROSTER Roster	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	9.9%	90.1%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	36.8%	63.2%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	36.0%	64.0%	100.0%
	Dayshift (40-60 hr)	14.3%	85.7%	100.0%
Total		23.6%	76.4%	100.0%

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines n = 270.

Notes: Significant difference between all rosters: $X^2(3) = 22.190$ p = .000. n = 250

Notes: Significant difference between 56 hour rotating and even-time rosters: $X^2(1) = 17.219$. p = .000. n = 176.

Family support of the roster.

Our family is not supportive of the roster my partner currently works

% within ROSTER Roster

		Disagree or Strongly Disagree	Agree or Strongly Agree	Total
ROSTER Roster	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	77.2%	22.8%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	37.9%	62.1%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	52.0%	48.0%	100.0%
	Dayshift (40-60 hr)	73.9%	26.1%	100.0%
Total		58.8%	41.2%	100.0%

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines n = 270.

Notes: Significant difference between all rosters: $X^2(3) = 33.005$ p = .000. n = 245

Notes: Significant difference between 56 hour rotating and even-time rosters: $X^2(1) = 27.032$. p = .000. n = 174.

Family liking of the roster and it fits in with family life.

I like the roster that my partner currently works and it fits in with our family life

% within ROSTER Roster

		Disagree or Strongly Disagree	Agree or Strongly Agree	Total
ROSTER Roster	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	44.9%	55.1%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	78.9%	21.1%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	Dayshift (40-60 hr)	45.8%	54.2%	100.0%
Total		61.8%	38.2%	100.0%

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines n = 270.

Notes: Significant difference between all rosters: $X^2(3) = 29.988$ p = .000. n = 246

Notes: Significant difference between 56 hour rotating and even-time rosters: $X^2(1) = 21.479$. p = .000. n = 173.

Roster has a detrimental impact on family life.

The roster has a detrimental impact on our family life

% within ROSTER Roster

		Disagree or Strongly Disagree	Agree or Strongly Agree	Total
ROSTER Roster	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	59.7%	40.3%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	23.1%	76.9%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	48.0%	52.0%	100.0%
	Dayshift (40-60 hr)	62.5%	37.5%	100.0%
Total		45.2%	54.8%	100.0%

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines n = 270.

Notes: Significant difference between all rosters: $X^2(3) = 30.429$ p = .000. n = 241

Notes: Significant difference between 56 hour rotating and eventime rosters: $X^2(1) = 23.383$. p = .000. n = 168.

Longer days worked compensated for by additional days off

Overall I think working the longer days is compensated for by the additional days off

% within ROSTER Roster

		Disagree or Strongly Disagree	Agree or Strongly Agree	Total
ROSTER Roster	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	38.2%	61.8%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	76.6%	23.4%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	70.8%	29.2%	100.0%
	Dayshift (40-60 hr)	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
Total		60.7%	39.3%	100.0%

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines n = 270.

Notes: Significant difference between all rosters: $X^2(3) = 27.183$ p = .000. n = 234

Notes: Significant difference between 56 hour rotating and eventime rosters: $X^2(1) = 25.748$. p = .000. n = 170.

Overall quality of the relationship with partner (On and Off Roster)

The overall quality of your relationship with your partner on roster is

% within ROSTER Roster

		Poor or Adequate	Good or Excellent	Total
ROSTER Roster	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	39.5%	60.5%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	61.7%	38.3%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	48.0%	52.0%	100.0%
	Dayshift (40-60 hr)	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
Total		47.6%	52.4%	100.0%

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines n = 270.

Notes: Significant difference between all rosters: $X^2(3) = 27.183$ p = .004. n = 248

Notes: Significant differences between the even-time and 56-hour rotating rosters: $X^2(1) = 8.581$ p = .003. n = 175

The overall quality of your relationship with your partner off roster is

% within ROSTER Roster

		Poor or Adequate	Good or Excellent	Total
ROSTER Roster	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	11.3%	88.8%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	16.0%	84.0%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	12.0%	88.0%	100.0%
	Dayshift (40-60 hr)	18.4%	81.6%	100.0%
Total		14.5%	85.5%	100.0%

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines n = 270.

Notes: No significant difference n = 248

Overall quality of the relationship with children (On and Off Roster)

The overall quality of your partner's relationship with his/her children on roster is

% within ROSTER Roster

		Poor or Adequate	Good or Excellent	Total
ROSTER	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	44.6%	55.4%	100.0%
Roster	Rotating (56 hr)	64.6%	35.4%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	56.3%	43.8%	100.0%
	Dayshift (40-60 hr)	41.0%	59.0%	100.0%
Total		52.8%	47.2%	100.0%

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines n = 270.

Notes: Significant difference between all rosters: $X^2(3) = 8.734$ p = .039. n = 199

Notes: Significant differences between the eventime and 56-hour rotating rosters: $X^2(1) = 5.743$ p = .017. n = 144

The overall quality of your partner's relationship with his/her children off roster is

% within ROSTER Roster

		Poor or Adequate	Good or Excellent	Total
ROSTER	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	13.6%	86.4%	100.0%
Roster	Rotating (56 hr)	31.3%	68.8%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	18.8%	81.3%	100.0%
	Dayshift (40-60 hr)	17.5%	82.5%	100.0%
Total		21.8%	78.2%	100.0%

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines n = 270.

Notes: For the rosters overall, some cell counts were too small for significance testing to be appropriate

Notes: Significant differences between the even-time and 56-hour rotating rosters: $X^2(1) = 6.280$ p = .012. n = 146

Ability to spend as much time as desired with partner (On and Off Roster)

Your ability to spend as much time as you would like together with your partner on roster is

% within ROSTER Roster

		Poor or Adequate	Good or Excellent	Total
ROSTER Roster	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	77.2%	22.8%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	90.3%	9.7%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	84.0%	16.0%	100.0%
	Dayshift (40-60 hr)	64.6%	35.4%	100.0%
Total		80.4%	19.6%	100.0%

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines n = 270.

Notes: For the rosters overall, some cell counts were too small for significance testing to be appropriate

Notes: Significant differences between the even-time and 56-hour rotating rosters: $X^2(1) = 5.545$ p = .019. n = 172

Your ability to spend as much time as you would like together with your partner off roster is

% within ROSTER Roster

		Poor or Adequate	Good or Excellent	Total
ROSTER Roster	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	22.2%	77.8%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	44.7%	55.3%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	32.0%	68.0%	100.0%
	Dayshift (40-60 hr)	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
Total		35.7%	64.3%	100.0%

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines n = 270.

Notes: Significant difference between all rosters: $X^2(3) = 10.949$ p = .012. n = 249

Notes: Significant differences between the even-time and 56-hour rotating rosters: $X^2(1) = 9.740$ p = .002. n = 175

Ability to Spend as Much Time as Desired As A Family (On and Off Roster)

Your ability to spend as much time as you would like together as a family on roster is

% within ROSTER Roster

		Poor or Adequate	Good or Excellent	Total
ROSTER Roster	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	78.9%	21.1%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	90.0%	10.0%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	90.0%	10.0%	100.0%
	Dayshift (40-60 hr)	61.4%	38.6%	100.0%
Total		80.9%	19.1%	100.0%

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines n = 270.

Notes: For the rosters overall, some cell counts were too small for significance testing to be appropriate

Notes: Significant differences between the eventime and 56-hour rotating rosters: $X^2(1) = 3.874$ $p = .049$. $n = 161$

Your ability to spend as much time as you would like together as a family off roster is

% within ROSTER Roster

		Poor or Adequate	Good or Excellent	Total
ROSTER Roster	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	28.4%	71.6%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	50.6%	49.4%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	47.4%	52.6%	100.0%
	Dayshift (40-60 hr)	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
Total		41.0%	59.0%	100.0%

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines $n = 270$.

Notes: Significant difference between all rosters: $X^2(3) = 8.576$ $p = .035$. $n = 227$

Notes: Significant differences between the eventime and 56-hour rotating rosters: $X^2(1) = 8.252$ $p = .004$. $n = 163$

Quality of communication with partner (On and Off Roster)

The quality of communication with your partner on roster is

% within ROSTER Roster

		Poor or Adequate	Good or Excellent	Total
ROSTER Roster	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	65.0%	35.0%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	Dayshift (40-60 hr)	65.3%	34.7%	100.0%
Total		67.7%	32.3%	100.0%

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines $n = 270$.

Notes: No significant difference $n = 248$

The quality of communication with your partner off roster is

% within ROSTER Roster

		Poor or Adequate	Good or Excellent	Total
ROSTER Roster	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	13.6%	86.4%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	29.5%	70.5%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%
	Dayshift (40-60 hr)	26.0%	74.0%	100.0%
Total		22.7%	77.3%	100.0%

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines $n = 270$.

Notes: Significant differences between the even-time and 56-hour rotating rosters: $X^2(1) = 6.403$ $p = .011$. $n = 176$

Partner's ability to spend time with children (On and Off Roster)

Partner's ability to spend time with the children on roster is

% within ROSTER Roster

		Poor or Adequate	Good or Excellent	Total
ROSTER Roster	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	76.2%	23.8%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	88.5%	11.5%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	82.4%	17.6%	100.0%
	Dayshift (40-60 hr)	67.5%	32.5%	100.0%
Total		79.8%	20.2%	100.0%

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines $n = 270$.

Notes: For the rosters overall, some cell counts were too small for significance testing to be appropriate

Notes: Difference between eventime and 56-hour rotating rosters approaching significance: $X^2(1) = 3.716$ $p = .054$. $n = 141$

Partner's ability to spend time with the children off roster is

% within ROSTER Roster

		Poor or Adequate	Good or Excellent	Total
ROSTER Roster	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	21.5%	78.5%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	45.6%	54.4%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	29.4%	70.6%	100.0%
	Dayshift (40-60 hr)	34.1%	65.9%	100.0%
Total		34.2%	65.8%	100.0%

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines $n = 270$.

Notes: Significant difference between all rosters: $X^2(3) = 9.347$ $p = .025$. $n = 202$

Notes: Significant differences between the eventime and 56-hour rotating rosters: $X^2(1) = 9.086$ $p = .003$. $n = 144$

Quality of partner's communication with the children (On and Off Roster)

The quality of your partner's communication with your children on roster is

% within ROSTER Roster

		Poor or Adequate	Good or Excellent	Total
ROSTER Roster	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	63.1%	36.9%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	64.7%	35.3%	100.0%
	Dayshift (40-60 hr)	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Total		67.7%	32.3%	100.0%

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines n = 270.

Notes: Significant difference between all rosters: $X^2(3) = 12.830$ p = .005. n = 201

Notes: Significant differences between the eventime and 56-hour rotating rosters: $X^2(1) = 5.809$ p = .016. n = 144

The quality of your partner's communication with your children off roster is

% within ROSTER Roster

		Poor or Adequate	Good or Excellent	Total
ROSTER Roster	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	20.9%	79.1%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	35.0%	65.0%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	23.5%	76.5%	100.0%
	Dayshift (40-60 hr)	26.8%	73.2%	100.0%
Total		27.8%	72.2%	100.0%

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines n = 270.

Notes: For the rosters overall, some cell counts were too small for significance testing to be appropriate

Notes: Difference between even-time and 56-hour rotating rosters approaching significance: $X^2(1) = 3.554$ p = .059. n = 147

Partner's ability to be involved in children's activities (On and Off Roster)

Partner's ability to be involved in children's activities (eg sporting/educational) on roster is

% within ROSTER Roster

		Poor or Adequate	Good or Excellent	Total
ROSTER Roster	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	88.1%	11.9%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	93.7%	6.3%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
	Dayshift (40-60 hr)	82.4%	17.6%	100.0%
Total		89.8%	10.2%	100.0%

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines n =270.

Notes: For the rosters overall, some cell counts were too small for significance testing to be appropriate n = 187

Partner's ability to be involved in children's activities (eg sporting/educational) off roster is

% within ROSTER Roster

		Poor or Adequate	Good or Excellent	Total
ROSTER Roster	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	32.3%	67.7%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	62.0%	38.0%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	53.3%	46.7%	100.0%
	Dayshift (40-60 hr)	45.7%	54.3%	100.0%
Total		48.7%	51.3%	100.0%

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines n = 270.

Notes: Significant difference between all rosters: $X^2(3) = 12.578$ p = .006. n = 191

Notes: Significant differences between the eventime and 56-hour rotating rosters: $X^2(1) = 12.318$ p = .000. n = 141

Ability to be involved in social/leisure activities (On and Off Roster)

Your ability to be involved in social/leisure activities on roster is

% within ROSTER Roster

		Poor or Adequate	Good or Excellent	Total
ROSTER Roster	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	89.6%	10.4%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	93.8%	6.2%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	87.5%	12.5%	100.0%
	Dayshift (40-60 hr)	81.3%	18.8%	100.0%
Total		89.4%	10.6%	100.0%

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines n = 270

Notes: For the rosters overall, some cell counts were too small for significance testing to be appropriate n=246

Your ability to be involved in social/leisure activities off roster is

% within ROSTER Roster

		Poor or Adequate	Good or Excellent	Total
ROSTER	Rotating D/N eventime roster (42 hr)	32.5%	67.5%	100.0%
	Rotating (56 hr)	59.8%	40.2%	100.0%
	Other Rotating (50+ hr)	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Dayshift (40-60 hr)	40.8%	59.2%	100.0%
Total		46.4%	53.6%	100.0%

Population: Sample of Partners of Workers in Tasmanian Mines n = 270.

Notes: Significant difference between all rosters: $X^2(3) = 13.951$ p = .003. n = 250

Notes: Significant differences between the eventime and 56-hour rotating rosters: $X^2(1) = 13.098$ p = .000. n = 177