This article examines the effects of full-time and part-time employment of women on various aspects of a household’s arrangements. It argues that only full-time employment represents a significant transformation in women’s roles, thus providing the bargaining resources that allow them to affect the household’s arrangements. The authors see part-time involvement in market work as a way to maintain, rather than change, the traditional division of labor. Based on data collected in the fall of 1994 from a representative sample of the Israeli Jewish population, the authors find that although full-time employment contributes to gender equality within the household, part-time employment does not. Husbands of fully employed wives are more likely to participate in housework chores that are female-dominated, and full-time employed women are more likely than part-time employed or housewives to take part in the household’s financial and expenditure responsibilities. Part-time workers gain no advantage over housewives within their families.
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During the past 50 years, the labor force participation of women, and especially married women, has increased steadily. Consequently, women’s share of the labor force is now approaching that of men (Bergmann, 1986; Bianchi & Spain, 1986; Spain & Bianchi, 1996). Concomitant with increasing participation of women in the paid economy, a growing proportion of the female labor force is engaged in part-time employment arrangements (Duffy & Pupo, 1992; Main, 1988; Mincer, 1985). The phenomenon of part-time work is widespread and its proliferation is evident in most industrial countries, in many of which as much as 40% of the salaried female labor force is employed part-time (Beechey & Perkins, 1987; Delsen, 1998; Robinson, 1979).

Women’s participation in paid employment represents a significant change in gender roles; in particular, it underscores a shift from the do-
mestic into the public domain. Such a transition is expected to affect the organization of the household. The vast literature on household division of labor points to two major observations. First, gender-role attitudes changed toward a more egalitarian gender ideology (Presser, 1994). Second, the division of labor and responsibilities within the household was not altered to a similar extent (Brines, 1994). During the last decades, men increased only slightly their participation in housework, mainly in child care, whereas women reduced their housework time (Coltrane, 1996; Pleck, 1993). Although these changes are slow, it would be inaccurate to assert that nothing had changed in the working of the household. Most notably in this respect is a change from a normative division of labor and responsibilities to a power-bargaining arrangement of household activities. From the latter perspective (Blood & Wolfe, 1960; Brayfield, 1992; England & Farkas, 1986; Ferree, 1991; Horney & McElroy, 1988; Shelton & John, 1996), paid employment granted women the resources (economic as well as social) that allow them to negotiate the household’s division of activities and responsibilities. It is possible, however, that an egalitarian division of labor in the household does not arise directly from women’s participation in the labor force. Rather, the authors argue that it depends on whether women work on a full-time or on a part-time basis.

The significance of part-time work for women’s career prospects and labor market rewards has been the subject of a sizeable body of research (Blossfeld & Hakim, 1997; Duffy & Pupo, 1992; Gornick & Jacobs, 1996; Kishler & Alexander, 1987; Long & Jones, 1981; Main, 1988; Sundstrom, 1992). Yet, its bearing on household arrangements and the division of labor in the household has not received similar attention. Although the relationship between women’s economic activity and the division of household labor, especially time spent doing housework by each spouse, has been addressed both theoretically and in empirical research (for a comprehensive review, see Shelton & John, 1996), the effect of part- or full-time employment of women on other dimensions of household arrangements (e.g., decision making in various areas and allocation of household money) has received only scant mention in the literature.

In light of the proliferation of female part-time employment and in view of the growing interest in potential determinants of gender equality, this article proposes to examine whether full-time and part-time employment affect differently the allocation of tasks and responsibilities in the household. Regarding this relationship, the authors argue that there is a threshold effect according to which only full-time employment represents a significant transformation in women’s roles. Full-time employment is associated with rewards that constitute bargaining resources that affect the
distribution of tasks and responsibilities within the household. As opposed to full-time employment, the authors see part-time involvement in market work as a way to maintain rather than change the traditional division of labor. The authors focus on three areas of activity—housework, responsibility for household expenditures, and money management—to examine whether households in which women are employed full-time are more prone to operate under egalitarian arrangements than other households are. The authors further examine to what extent women’s full-time employment increases men’s participation in activities traditionally dominated by women and whether, at the same time, full-time employed women became more involved in male domains.

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE HOUSEHOLD AND WOMEN’S EMPLOYMENT

Students of gender inequality have long regarded employment of women as an important determinant of the household’s organization. Specifically, it is argued that women’s employment leads to more egalitarian relations in the household. There are several reasons underlying this proposition. First, access to independent income increases women’s power position within the household and allows them to more favorably negotiate the allocation of tasks and responsibilities, access to money resources, and participation in important areas of decision making within the household (Blood & Wolfe, 1960; Brayfield, 1992; Horney & McElroy, 1988; Morris, 1990; Ross, 1987; Sorensen & McLanahan, 1987; Vogler & Pahl, 1993). Second, although employed wives still carry a disproportionate share of the burden of housework compared to their spouses, time limitations that result from their market activities impel husbands to increase their participation in child care and other home activities (Baxter, 1992; Goldscheider & Waite, 1991; Kalleberg & Rosenfeld, 1990; Ross, 1987; South & Spitze, 1994). In this regard, past research has indeed found that employment outside the home reduces the time spent by women in housework and slightly increases the contribution of husbands (Brayfield, 1992; Goldscheider & Waite, 1991; Pleck, 1979; Presser, 1994).

Past studies have focused in large part on the time allocation between housework tasks. Studies that looked at task allocation in the household have found extensive gender segregation according to which women are typically assigned the more time-consuming chores (Aytac & Teachman, 1992; Blair & Lichter, 1991; van Berkel, 1997). Even when men increase
their participation in familial obligations, they tend to take on tasks that are less time-consuming so that the overall time allocation of men and women remains essentially unchanged. Indeed, recent research on men’s attitudes toward gender roles and the household division of labor has indicated that although a growing proportion of men are ready to participate in housework, they are willing to do so only on their own terms; men want to do what is pleasant and easier for them to perform (Presser, 1994; Simon & Landis, 1989).

In this article, the authors argue that the emphasis on time allocation in the household’s division of labor may have overlooked important qualitative changes that lead to a modified task allocation among spouses. Specifically, the authors examine whether spouses of full-time, but not of part-time, employed women are more likely to be engaged in household activities that are atypical for men and whether at the same time full-time employed women are more likely than those in part-time jobs to take part in household responsibilities that are typically male. The authors are interested in the extent of sharing tasks traditionally segregated by gender rather than time allocation in specific tasks. To the extent that full-time employment of women indicates a preference for market over domestic work, the command of (independent) financial resources that it entails may serve as a basis for bargaining over the reallocation of household tasks (see Brayfield, 1992; Presser, 1994; Shelton, 1990, for a similar argumentation). According to the same logic, women employed full-time will have greater access to typical male domains, such as the management of the households’ financial affairs and decision making, from which they were excluded in the past (Vogler & Pahl, 1993).

PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT AND
HOUSEHOLD DIVISION OF ACTIVITIES

Most research on the effect of wives’ employment on household activities and responsibilities either distinguishes between working and non-working women or examines the effect of hours of paid work on time spent in housework (Baxter, 1992; Brayfield, 1992; Goldscheider & Waite, 1991; Horrel, 1994; Kalleberg & Rosenfeld, 1990; Presser, 1994; Pyke & Coltrane, 1996; Shelton & John, 1993; South & Spitze, 1994). Goldscheider and Waite found that although the husband contributed more to housework when the wife worked long hours, the husband’s share in housework hardly increased when the wife worked part-time (Goldscheider & Waite, 1991). Based on this finding, they concluded that it is
not the wives’ employment per se but rather the extent of the wives’ paid workload that affects the involvement of men in housework. Time availability is considered by most researches cited earlier as a major determinant of time spent on housework.

The specification of the relationship between women’s hours at work and their husbands’ participation in housework, discussed earlier, presupposes a continuous and monotonous effect proportionate to the number of hours women work outside the household. It assumes that the impact of part-time employment is some fraction of the impact of full-time employment. This formulation overlooks the possibility that part-time employment is a distinct and discrete employment category. Horrel’s (1994) work, which distinguishes between full- and part-time employment of women, revealed that the relationship between women’s work and men’s contribution to housework is not linear; men and women are more likely to share the household responsibilities when the woman is employed full-time, but this is much less likely when the woman is employed part-time. There seems, then, to be a threshold effect whereby the likelihood that household responsibilities will be shared shoots up when women are employed full-time.

The focus on the effect of women’s hours of work outside the household underscores the importance of time constraints and is particularly pertinent to issues of household’s time allocation. Yet, its implications for women’s bargaining power within the household or their economic independence are not straightforward. In contrast to time spent in housework, which is primarily affected by time obligations outside the household, task allocation, financial responsibilities, and diverse areas of decision making are less constrained by time availability. They derive mainly from the relative status of individuals within families. In this respect, the distinction between full- and part-time employment is instructive. Studies that examined households’ money arrangement generally found that women’s employment increases their access to the household’s money resources and increases their involvement in financial responsibilities (Morris, 1990; Pahl, 1989, 1990; Treas, 1993; Vogler & Pahl, 1993). Yet, as Vogler and Pahl (1993) stated “financial equality depends on a wife’s full-time employment, since part-time work only operates to reduce calls on the husband’s wage without ever increasing wife’s influence over finances” (p. 80).

There are several reasons why part-time (as opposed to full-time) employment would be inconsequential to the issue of egalitarian households’ arrangements. First, access to independent money is an important factor that affects the power position of family members. Past research has dem-
onstrated the importance of earnings to the household’s division of labor and its decision making (Blood & Wolfe, 1960; Brayfield, 1992; Horney & McElroy, 1988; Morris, 1990; Presser, 1994; Ross, 1987; Sorensen & McLanahan, 1987). Part-time employment usually yields lower income and inferior prospects in the labor market than full-time employment (Beechey & Perkins, 1987; Duffy & Pupo, 1992; Gornick & Jacobs, 1996; Waldfogel, 1997). Thus, part-time employment provides little opportunity for women to increase their power position within the household through their economic resources.

Second, part-time workers have lower demands on their time; thus, wife’s part-time employment may have only a minimal effect on the activities of other family members. Women’s participation in the labor market is typically in addition to their full-time involvement in housework and child-care activities. When women work full-time, the entire household must adjust and new rules may be put into effect not only concerning housework but with respect to other activities and responsibilities as well. Because participation in the labor force on a part-time basis presents limited demands on the worker’s time and often permits substantial flexibility, women’s part-time employment may take place with little change in the spouse’s contribution to housework and with minimal modification in household arrangements. Part-time employment thus disguises women’s paid work and maintains the image of the perfect homemaker (Kessler-Harris & Sacks, 1987).

Third, part-time employment is often viewed as nonessential work and in some labor markets even as marginal (Blossfeld, 1997; Duffy & Pupo, 1992). The literature on part-time employment emphasizes the relationship between women’s domestic responsibilities and their pattern of involvement in the labor market. Indeed, some authors have argued that part-time work provides a way for women to engage in productive activities outside the household while at the same time coping with the burden of housework and child care (Beechey & Perkins, 1987; Duffy & Pupo, 1992; Ferree, 1976; Hakim, 1997; Oakley, 1974). Consequently, some scholars view part-time work as specifically a women’s labor market category, indicative of a “new fluidity” in the movement of women between family and work (Jones, Marsden, & Tepperman, 1990). Taking this view to the extreme, Clegg and Dunkerley (1984) argued that part-time work embodies the externalization of domestic labor as something outside of and separate from the construct of work organization per se.

Women’s engagement in part-time employment may derive from the possibility it affords to combine paid work and family obligations rather than from the appeal of the specific work they are doing or their general
orientation toward market work. From this point of view, part-time employment is perceived by women as a secondary activity that can be carried out with minimal strain on family roles. As such, part-time employment does not serve as a legitimate basis for women to bargain with their spouses over responsibility for and performance of household’s activities. To the extent that women are interested in egalitarian division of household labor (see Sanchez, 1994), those holding part-time jobs will be worse off not only in comparison to women who work full-time but also to women who do not participate in paid employment. The former are more likely to establish egalitarian division of labor, and the latter do not have to contend with the demands of the family and the labor market at the same time.

GENDER SEGREGATION IN THE ALLOCATION OF HOUSEHOLD TASKS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Studies of household organization have demonstrated significant gender segregation in domestic tasks (Aytac & Teachman, 1992; Blair & Lichter, 1991; Brayfield, 1992; Presser, 1994; van Berkel, 1997). Accordingly, men have specialized in a limited number of activities such as doing small repairs in the household or shopping. In a recent study, van Berkel (1997) argued that men participate in those activities that they perceive as pleasant. Shopping and preparation of meals, for example, were found to be more attractive to men and women alike compared to all other household activities (van Berkel, 1997). House cleaning and laundry, chores that are heavily dominated by women, are highly disliked by men.

Responsibility for household expenditures as opposed to housework is not necessarily women’s work. Pahl (1990) reported on gender differences in responsibility for expenses; Women were more likely to be responsible for food, clothing, and children’s needs; husbands were responsible for their own clothing, car expenses, household maintenance, bills and insurance payments, and leisure activities; and both shared responsibility for major expenses such as the household’s durable goods, although men were more likely than women to take responsibility for this activity. Although in general the level of cooperation of spouses on financial issues, especially account management, is high (Treas, 1993), it increases with women’s independent access to income (Blumstein & Schwartz, 1983; Morris, 1990, 1993; Pahl, 1989, 1990; Vogler & Pahl, 1993, 1994).

Gender segregation in household activities can derive from two different processes. The first suggests that men refuse to take part in specific activities because they dislike it and refuse to allow women to share tasks.
they prefer to control. The second suggests that women are reluctant to allow men to participate in activities they prefer to dominate and have no interest to enter male-dominated activities (Goldscheider & Waite, 1991).

The two processes lead to a similar consequence: high gender segregation in household activities and responsibilities. However, their underlying motivations, which are difficult to disentangle, are clearly different. Studies that examined perception of equity and satisfaction in household’s division of labor report on a relatively high sense of fairness and satisfaction with household’s allocation of activities (mainly housework). Nonetheless, the studies indicate that women’s sense of equity and fairness increases when husbands participate in housework and mainly in female-dominated activities (Blair & Johnson, 1992; Pleck, 1985; Sanchez, 1994). The authors argue that the relationship between women’s full-time employment and gender segregation in household activities should differ depending on which of the two processes described earlier dominate. If men resist participation (in those areas they dislike), then one would expect that the realization of women’s increasing power in the household should be denoted by men’s participation increased in the female-type, less attractive household chores (for a similar argument, see Brayfield, 1992, and Presser, 1994). In other words, men’s participation in the unpleasant tasks (e.g., doing laundry) will be higher if their wives are employed full-time compared to cases where the wives are employed part-time or do not participate in paid employment. Similarly, the authors argue that women who were employed on a full-time basis will be in position to bargain for increasing control over the household expenses and a shared management of the household incomes (Morris, 1990; Vogler & Pahl, 1993). If, on the other hand, the division of household labor reflects women’s preferences to dominate specific areas and to refrain from others, then one would not expect differences in task or responsibility allocation (especially in tasks that are not time-consuming) due to women’s full-time involvement in market activity.

The present study, then, focuses on women’s type of employment (i.e., whether they work full- or part-time) and the role it plays in shaping the working of the household. In light of the arguments presented earlier, the authors examine whether women’s work arrangements (full-time, part-time, or nonemployment) have an impact on the level of gender equality within the household. Specifically, the authors consider three dimensions of household arrangements: housework, money arrangements, and responsibility for household expenditures. It is argued that the actualization of women’s bargaining power cannot be revealed simply by hours spent by both spouses on housework. Rather, it is important to explore which
household activities are more likely to be negotiated and subject to change.

The authors would like to stress that the main question is not who does more of the household tasks or who has more control over the finances but rather, does part-time employment as compared to full-time employment make a difference for the organization of the household. In particular, the authors are focusing on the extent of equal sharing in the tasks, responsibilities, and money arrangements. The authors are aware of the fact that egalitarian households are not necessarily more efficient than households that exercise higher specialization. In the authors’ view, however, egalitarian households contribute more to gender equality within (and probably also outside) the family.

DATA AND MEASUREMENTS

The analysis is based on data collected in the fall of 1994 from a representative sample of the urban adult Jewish population in Israel. The survey was part of the International Social Survey Program (ISSP) project on family and gender-role attitudes. In addition to attitude items, the questionnaire administered in Israel included supplementary questions concerning financial arrangements and the allocation of responsibilities within the family. The total sample included 1,287 respondents. However, the analysis is carried out on a subsample of 807 respondents who were parents and married or cohabited at the time of the survey. The sample was restricted to parents only because the authors are interested mainly in the relationship between mothers’ employment and household responsibilities. All respondents provided detailed background and employment information for spouse as well as themselves. This made it possible to construct a couples file so that information was provided on wife’s and husband’s characteristics and on household arrangements.

Three dimensions of household activities are examined: housework, responsibility for household expenditures, and control of household finances. Respondents were asked to report who is primarily responsible for household chores (the wife, the husband, both equally, or a third person) in four different areas of housework. These included doing the laundry, home repairs, care for sick family members, and shopping. Of these, doing the laundry is a female-dominated activity and is also considered the least pleasant (Kaufmann, 1998; van Berkel, 1997); home repairs is clearly a male-dominated task (Presser, 1994), and shopping is not gender specific and is considered (by both spouses) as a pleasant activity (Presser,
Taking care of sick family members is a chore that has not been studied frequently in the context of family division of labor. Nonetheless, studies that have focused on care work within the household found that it tends to be women’s chore (Aronson, 1992). In line with the proposition discussed earlier, it was expected that when women are employed full-time, less desirable tasks such as doing the laundry and taking care of sick family members become more equally shared. This, however, should not affect the distribution of the other two tasks.

A second area of family arrangements is responsibility for household’s expenditures. More specifically, this refers to the person (husband, wife, or both) primarily responsible for expenditures in each of six different areas: expenditure on food, expenditure on vacation, payment of municipal taxes, payment of bills, purchase of household goods, and household maintenance expenses. Expenditures in all areas are expected to be managed on a more egalitarian basis in households where the women hold full-time jobs.

Last, the topic of money management refers to whether the wife, the husband, or both manage the household money. Respondents were asked whether the husband administers the family financial resources and relegates the wife a certain share, whether the wife does this, whether they pool their financial resources and have independent access, or whether each takes care of his or her money separately. The authors regard as equal sharing all cases in which the couple pools their resources and both have access to the household’s money. It is expected that in households where women are employed full-time, the control of household finances will be more equally shared compared to households in which women are full-time housewives or hold a part-time job.

In all, the authors examine four aspects of housework tasks, six areas of household expenditure, and one indicator of money management. In each of the analyses, the dependent variable denotes whether both the husband and the wife are equally responsible for the specific task. All the analyses thus use a logistic regression technique to estimate the likelihood of egalitarian arrangements. Employment status, the main independent variable, classifies women into one of three categories: housewife, part-time, or full-time worker. In addition to employment status, the models included several control variables that are commonly used in the study of household division of labor. These include husband’s labor force status, wife’s and husband’s education, whether the wife’s earnings are equal or more than her husband earnings, the presence of young children at home, and wife’s ethnicity. The operational definition of these variables and the descriptive statistics of the sample are presented in Table 1.
Table 1 shows that 35% of all women in the sample were employed on a full-time basis and that another 27% held a part-time job. Among the husbands, the majority (80%) was employed full-time. Also, more than a third of all women and more than 40% of men had some post-high-school education, whereas about a quarter of husbands and wives did not finish high school. Only 19% of the women had earnings higher than their husbands’ had. Thirty-five percent of households had preschool children at home, and an additional 22% had school-age children. Last, about half (57.6%) of the women in the sample were of European origin.
The distribution of household management indicators is presented in the upper panel of Table 2. As expected, the authors find that some of the household activities are female dominated (e.g., laundry), others are male dominated (home repairs), and still others are shared. Contrary to anticipation, caring for sick family members is more likely to be shared than to be carried by the wife. It is noteworthy that although husbands frequently share with their wives the responsibility for shopping and caring, they seldom assume full responsibility for these tasks. For example, in approximately half of all households, the care for sick members of the family is a duty performed by both spouses equally. However, only in 3% of the households husbands assume sole responsibility for caring, whereas in 45% of the households, women perform this task by themselves. Although far from being a male chore, shopping is the responsibility of men in a sizable portion of households (18%).

Couples share more equally the responsibility for household expenditures than housework, as can be seen in the lower panel of Table 2. In 44% of all households, both spouses are responsible for food expenditures, and in a similar proportion of households, women have the sole responsibility...
for this chore. Major household expenditures are mostly made together by both spouses: In 76% of the households, both are responsible for the purchase of household goods, and in a similar proportion of all households, spouses decide jointly about their vacations. Men more than women are responsible for maintenance. In almost half of all households, men have sole responsibility in this area compared to only 7% of households where women are responsible for this task. Men are also more likely to take care of taxes and maintenance bills—in a third of all households only men do this task compared to less than fifth of the households where only women are responsible for these activities. As for the household’s money management, in more than 70% of the households, control of money is shared by both spouses; in 14% of households, husbands assume control; and wives control the accounts in less than 9% of all households.

The authors’ main interest is in the effect of women’s employment on the organization of the different household activities. As mentioned earlier, a multivariate logistic regression was employed in the analysis in which the effects of women’s type of employment on each household activity is examined. Table 3 presents the logistic regression results for the division of household tasks. The authors find that women’s full-time employment increases the likelihood of sharing in the most undesired female-dominated activity—doing the laundry. Equal sharing is 2.2 times ($e^{0.799}$) more likely to take place in households where the woman is employed full-time compared to households where the wife is a full-time housewife. The rate of sharing is 1.8 ($e^{(0.799 - 0.212)}$) times higher in households where she is employed full-time compared to households where the wife is employed on a part-time basis. No significant differences were found in the rate of sharing between housewives and women employed part-time. As expected, women’s employment (full- or part-time) did not affect the likelihood of shared responsibility for shopping and for home repairs. The care for sick family members, however, tends to be equally shared when women have a paid job (log coefficients of 0.390 and 0.383, respectively) irrespective of whether employed full-time or part-time. It may be the case that care for sick members is based on the parents’ time schedules and their ability to be absent from work more than on their power position. It is worth noting that men’s employment status hardly affects the likelihood to share except for a clear reduction in sharing of laundry ($b = -0.851$) when the husband is employed full-time.

Equality in the household division of labor is related to education, mostly that of the wife. Although the effect of education is nonlinear, women’s academic education increases the amount of sharing in laundry
by a factor of 3 ($e^{1.152}$), independent of her employment status and her husband’s education. The same (although to a lesser extent) is true for caring for sick family members and for shopping. Women’s education thus may serve as an indicator for attitudes toward an egalitarian division of labor more than a bargaining resource. Above and beyond the level of their wives’ education, men’s education does not play a significant role in affecting the level of sharing in household chores (except for the case of shopping, in which men with high school education are significantly more likely, $b = 0.519$, than men with a lower level of education to share). The presence of preschool children has no effect on the household division of labor, whereas school-age children decrease the level of sharing in caring

### TABLE 3

Employment Status Effects on Equal Performance of Household Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Doing Laundry</th>
<th>Small Repairs</th>
<th>Caring for Sick Members</th>
<th>Shopping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wife’s labor force status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full-time</td>
<td>.799* (.281)</td>
<td>.205 (.298)</td>
<td>.390* (.195)</td>
<td>.105 (.188)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed part-time</td>
<td>.212 (.289)</td>
<td>.286 (.285)</td>
<td>.383* (.188)</td>
<td>-.126 (.183)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife’s education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>.604 (.335)</td>
<td>.107 (.325)</td>
<td>.325* (.203)</td>
<td>.199 (.201)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary nonacademic</td>
<td>.297 (.427)</td>
<td>.033 (.420)</td>
<td>.495 (.263)</td>
<td>.125 (.260)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>1.152* (.386)</td>
<td>.389 (.396)</td>
<td>.635* (.263)</td>
<td>.481* (.254)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife from European origin</td>
<td>.047 (.233)</td>
<td>-.342 (.241)</td>
<td>.019 (.160)</td>
<td>.515* (.155)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband’s employment status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full-time</td>
<td>-.851* (.256)</td>
<td>-.111 (.290)</td>
<td>-.125 (.197)</td>
<td>.066 (.188)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>-.061 (.319)</td>
<td>.272 (.327)</td>
<td>.242 (.204)</td>
<td>.519* (.201)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than high school</td>
<td>.018 (.328)</td>
<td>.262 (.347)</td>
<td>.285 (.221)</td>
<td>.044 (.217)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative earnings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife earns more</td>
<td>.207 (.265)</td>
<td>.110 (.307)</td>
<td>.127 (.218)</td>
<td>-.003 (.208)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children younger than 6 in household</td>
<td>.128 (.236)</td>
<td>-.245 (.268)</td>
<td>-.003 (.174)</td>
<td>-.107 (.217)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children 6 to 12 in household</td>
<td>-.604 (.323)</td>
<td>.007 (.293)</td>
<td>-.634* (.200)</td>
<td>-.229 (.195)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female respondent</td>
<td>-.336 (.202)</td>
<td>.015 (.218)</td>
<td>-.578* (.145)</td>
<td>-.241 (.140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-.1667</td>
<td>-.2666</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>-.443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model $\chi^2$ (13 df)</td>
<td>56.30*</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>61.23*</td>
<td>42.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.
for sick members and similarly, although not statistically significant, decrease the level of sharing in laundry.

Table 4 presents the effect of the wife’s employment status on the different indicators of household arrangements: responsibility for household expenses and the management of the household’s money. One general conclusion that can be drawn from this table is that part-time employment does not increase the level of sharing in financial responsibilities in comparison to nonemployment (none of the coefficients are significant). Full-time employment, however, seems to affect most of the areas of expenditures and money management. Women’s full-time employment increases significantly the level of shared responsibilities for food expenditures, vacation expenditures, payment of bills and taxes, and the management of money. For example, having a full-time employed wife increases the level of sharing in vacation expenditures nearly twofold ($e^{0.638}$) in comparison to having a full-time housewife or a part-time employed wife. Responsibility for food expenditures increased similarly by a factor of 1.7 ($e^{0.518}$) when the wife is employed full-time. Sharing in the payment of bills and taxes is 1.5 times more likely to take place in households where women are full-time employed compared to households with full-time housewives. Similarly, the likelihood to share the management of the household’s money is 1.8 times ($e^{0.595}$) as high when the woman has a full-time job in contrast to all other households. Clear male-dominated activity such as household maintenance was not affected by the women’s employment status (either full- or part-time), indicating that there is less negotiation in the decision of responsibilities in these areas.

The husband’s employment is less consequential to the allocation of financial responsibilities. Educated women have higher egalitarian arrangements, although the difference is mostly between women with less than high school education (the reference category) and all other women. Again, husband’s education does not add much to the household arrangements after controlling for the wives level of schooling. Only in respect to the management of money, men with high school education were significantly more likely ($b = 0.497$) than men with lower levels of education to share. Women of European origin are more likely to have access to the household money ($b = 0.375$) and tend to have more egalitarian arrangement of responsibilities for food expenses ($b = 0.353$) compared to women of Asian African origin. These ethnic differences, which are independent of the effects of education or employment status, may reflect cultural variation in household money arrangements. Most other variables had no significant effect on the level of household equality.
### Table 4: Effects of Wife’s Employment Status on Household Decision Making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed full-time</td>
<td>.518* (.189)</td>
<td>.331 (.223)</td>
<td>.638* (.251)</td>
<td>.019 (.189)</td>
<td>.374* (.191)</td>
<td>.394* (.190)</td>
<td>.595* (.221)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed part-time</td>
<td>.124 (.185)</td>
<td>.079 (.205)</td>
<td>.031 (.217)</td>
<td>-.204 (.185)</td>
<td>-.003 (.188)</td>
<td>.250 (.186)</td>
<td>-.051* (.195)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>.457* (.206)</td>
<td>.248 (.221)</td>
<td>.423 (.243)</td>
<td>.271 (.204)</td>
<td>.751* (.211)</td>
<td>.722* (.210)</td>
<td>-.085* (.211)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary nonacademic</td>
<td>.276 (.263)</td>
<td>.617* (.304)</td>
<td>.516 (.328)</td>
<td>.471 (.261)</td>
<td>.680* (.267)</td>
<td>.827* (.267)</td>
<td>.622* (.311)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>.490* (.255)</td>
<td>.650* (.298)</td>
<td>.620* (.324)</td>
<td>.106 (.258)</td>
<td>.722* (.263)</td>
<td>.880* (.263)</td>
<td>.409* (.287)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife from European origin</td>
<td>-.353* (.157)</td>
<td>.225 (.179)</td>
<td>.301 (.196)</td>
<td>.050 (.157)</td>
<td>.147 (.159)</td>
<td>.014 (.159)</td>
<td>.375* (.172)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband’s employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full-time</td>
<td>-.048 (.190)</td>
<td>.170 (.214)</td>
<td>.344 (.238)</td>
<td>-.030 (.191)</td>
<td>-.257 (.195)</td>
<td>-.267 (.194)</td>
<td>.143 (.205)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband’s education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>.017 (.206)</td>
<td>.066 (.230)</td>
<td>.051 (.250)</td>
<td>.111 (.204)</td>
<td>.249 (.208)</td>
<td>.266 (.206)</td>
<td>.497* (.217)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than high school</td>
<td>-.026 (.220)</td>
<td>-.291 (.248)</td>
<td>-.308 (.273)</td>
<td>.159 (.218)</td>
<td>.047 (.224)</td>
<td>.028 (.223)</td>
<td>.197 (.236)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative earnings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife earns more</td>
<td>.543* (.209)</td>
<td>.252 (.261)</td>
<td>.117 (.287)</td>
<td>.400* (.212)</td>
<td>.464 (.210)</td>
<td>.556* (.211)</td>
<td>-.264* (.240)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children younger than 6 in household</td>
<td>-.088 (.170)</td>
<td>.085 (.199)</td>
<td>-.477* (.220)</td>
<td>-.157 (.171)</td>
<td>-.094 (.174)</td>
<td>-.119 (.173)</td>
<td>.158 (.193)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children 6 to 12 in household</td>
<td>-.341* (.199)</td>
<td>.048 (.228)</td>
<td>-.432* (.251)</td>
<td>.137 (.195)</td>
<td>-.133 (.199)</td>
<td>.011 (.199)</td>
<td>.324 (.226)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female respondent</td>
<td>-.087 (.142)</td>
<td>-.173 (.165)</td>
<td>-.323 (.183)</td>
<td>.141 (.142)</td>
<td>.034 (.144)</td>
<td>-.055 (.143)</td>
<td>.005 (.159)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-.809</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>1.241</td>
<td>-.779</td>
<td>-.1022</td>
<td>-.879</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model χ² (13 df)</td>
<td>50.05*</td>
<td>21.87</td>
<td>33.72*</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>46.80*</td>
<td>52.57*</td>
<td>48.93*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N = 888

*p < .05.
CONCLUSION

Part-time employment has become a prominent feature of women’s labor force participation. It is a form of employment that is preferred by many women and by many employers because it constitutes a compromise between the demand for women’s time and commitment to the family on the one hand and to their market activity on the other hand. The availability of part-time employment contributed to the rising participation of women in the labor force but at the same time also limited their opportunities in the labor market. Past studies on labor market outcomes revealed women’s disadvantage in rewards and career prospects. In the current study, the authors have examined the effect of women’s employment pattern on their households’ arrangements. The authors demonstrated in their analysis that whereas full-time employment contributes to equality in household work and responsibilities, part-time employment has no different effect than nonmarket work.

The analyses show that part-time workers gain no advantage over housewives within their families: The traditional division of household tasks and responsibilities is not altered by their engagement in paid employment. In terms of hours of work, they have a higher workload than housewives and less cooperation than full-time working wives. Paradoxically, their second-shift effort does not improve their standing within the family in terms of access to the household’s resources and decision making.

It is clear that part-time employment is not just reduced-time employment but rather is qualitatively different from full-time involvement in market activity. These findings combined with prior research lead to the conclusion that part-time workers suffer from a double disadvantage: namely, in the labor market as well as in the family. Their economic activity is devalued, they are not perceived as committed workers, and they are largely invisible in prime labor market positions. The work of women who are employed part-time is also invisible in the household. They gain no legitimate ground to demand of other household members increased participation in housework. Furthermore, women’s part-time work does not necessarily lead to greater participation in household decision making. From this point of view, their participation in the labor market is unrewarded. Whereas their full-time counterparts have visible gains both in the market and in the family, women who work part-time do not differ from women who do not participate in paid employment.
NOTES

1. The concept of power within marriage derives from command over resources and as such indicates two aspects—ample resources free individuals from dependency on others and at the same time give them the ability to control others by potentially providing them with their needs. Power, therefore, is embedded in the relationship among household members and the exchange processes that take place within the household (Blau, 1964; Emerson, 1962; Horney & McElroy, 1988).

2. The International Social Survey Program (ISSP) is a collaborative effort to conduct comparative international studies on population attitudes. The present analysis is based on the Israeli data. This data set contains unique information on household arrangements (e.g., household expenditure) that was not included in the international survey.

3. The ISSP survey implemented only selected items of housework that do not represent the entire domain of housework. Nonetheless, the tasks represent female, male, and neutral activities and thus are proper for testing the hypotheses.

4. The measures of housework, responsibility for expenditures, and money management were self-reported. Studies have documented the biases that result from the tendency of respondents to increase their own share of activity (Berk, 1985). In the current study, the information provided by men is about half the cases and by women in the other half. In separate analyses, the authors found that men tend to report a higher rate of equal sharing in female housework tasks, but there were no significant sex differences in other activities. To correct for possible biases, the authors included in all of the models a control for the sex of the respondent.

5. Respondents reported whether their job (or their spouses’ in case of male respondents) is considered full- or part-time. Information on actual hours of work is available for respondents only, therefore the authors could not use this information to construct the wife’s employment status variable. On average, a full-time female employee worked 42 hours a week. A part-time employee worked for 24 hours.

6. About 90% of the Israeli Jewish population are either foreign born or have foreign-born parents. It is common to differentiate between two major ethnic groups: those who originated from European or North American countries and those who originated in Asian or north African countries. Asian African represent a more traditional group, thus ethnicity controls for cultural differences in the population.
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