

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.

Women's Part-Time Employment and Gender Inequality in the Family

HAYA STIER
NOAH LEWIN-EPSTEIN
Tel Aviv University

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-

Authors' Note: This research was supported by a grant from G.I.F., The German-Israeli Foundation for Scientific Research and Development. An earlier version of the article was presented at the International Sociological Association Research Committee on Social Stratification, Stockholm, Sweden, 1996. We would like to thank Hanna Ayalon, Yitchak Haberfeld, Moshe Semyonov, Michel van Berkel, and Wout Ultee for their helpful comments.

JOURNAL OF FAMILY ISSUES, Vol. 21 No. 3, April 2000 390-410
© 2000 Sage Publications, Inc.

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).¹ 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.² 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.³ 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,

1994; van Berkel, 1997). 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 delegates 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.⁴ 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.⁵ 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.⁶ The operational definition of these variables and the descriptive statistics of the sample are presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1
Definition and Descriptive Statistics
of Variables Included in the Analysis

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Definition</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Current employment status	“What is your working status now?”	
Percentage full-time	Works full-time (at least 35 hours a week)	35.2
Percentage part-time	Works part-time (15 to 34 hours a week)	27.4
Percentage not in labor force	Not in labor force, including unemployed	37.4
Education—wife	“What was your highest degree in school?”	
Percentage less than high school		26.9
Percentage high school		34.8
Percentage post-high-school, Nonacademic		15.0
Percentage academic		23.3
Husband’s labor force status	“What is your working status now?”	
Percentage full-time	Works full-time (at least 35 hours a week)	79.2
Education—husband		
Percentage less than high school		27.8
Percentage high school		28.6
Percentage more than high school		43.6
Relative earnings	“Who in your family earns more money?”	
Wife earns equal or more than husband		18.9
Presence of children	Based on number of household members younger than 6 or between 6 to 12	
Percentage of children younger than 6 in household		34.9
Percentage of children 6 to 12		21.8
Ethnicity		
Percentage of European origin	Respondents or father were born in Europe or America	57.6

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.

TABLE 2
Distribution of Various Indicators of Household Management

	<i>Percentage Equal Sharing (include third person)</i>	<i>Percentage Mostly Woman</i>	<i>Percentage Mostly Men</i>	N
Housework				
Laundry	15.8	80.9	3.3	950
Small repairs	20.1	10.2	69.6	948
Care for sick family members	52.7	44.6	2.8	917
Shopping	47.3	34.6	18.0	949
Expenses				
Food	44.4	39.6	15.8	947
Household goods	75.8	9.9	14.3	937
Vacations	80.0	8.6	11.4	895
Maintenance	44.0	6.8	49.2	909
Municipal taxes	43.2	18.0	38.8	919
Bills	45.0	18.0	37.0	928
Money management ^a	72.4	8.6	13.6	947

a. 5.5% of the couples manage their money separately.

FINDINGS

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

TABLE 3
Employment Status Effects on Equal
Performance of Household Tasks

	<i>Doing Laundry</i>	<i>Small Repairs</i>	<i>Caring for Sick Members</i>	<i>Shopping</i>
Wife's labor force status				
Employed full-time	.799* (.281)	.205 (.298)	.390* (.195)	.105 (.188)
Employed part-time	.212 (.289)	.286 (.285)	.383* (.188)	-.126 (.183)
Wife's education				
High school	.604 (.335)	.107 (.325)	.325* (.203)	.199 (.201)
Postsecondary nonacademic	.297 (.427)	.033 (.420)	.495 (.263)	.125 (.260)
Academic	1.152* (.386)	.389 (.396)	.635* (.263)	.481* (.254)
Wife from European origin	.047 (.233)	-.342 (.241)	.019 (.160)	.515* (.155)
Husband's employment status				
Employed full-time	-.851* (.256)	-.111 (.290)	-.125 (.197)	.066 (.188)
High school	-.061 (.319)	.272 (.327)	.242 (.204)	.519* (.201)
More than high school	.018 (.328)	.262 (.347)	.285 (.221)	.044 (.217)
Relative earnings				
Wife earns more	.207 (.265)	.110 (.307)	.127 (.218)	-.003 (.208)
Presence of children				
Children younger than 6 in household	.128 (.236)	-.245 (.268)	-.003 (.174)	-.107 (.217)
Children 6 to 12 in household	-.604 (.323)	.007 (.293)	-.634* (.200)	-.229 (.195)
Female respondent	-.336 (.202)	.015 (.218)	-.578* (.145)	-.241 (.140)
Intercept	-1.667	-2.266	.369	-.443
Model χ^2 (13 df)	56.30*	7.32	61.23*	42.18*
N	890	889	858	890

* $p < .05$.

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

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

	<i>Food</i>	<i>Household Goods</i>	<i>Vacations</i>	<i>Household Maintenance</i>	<i>Municipality Taxes</i>	<i>Bills</i>	<i>Money Management</i>
Wife's employment status							
Employed full-time	.518* (.189)	.331 (.223)	.638* (.251)	.019 (.189)	.374* (.191)	.394* (.190)	.595* (.221)
Employed part-time	.124 (.185)	.079 (.205)	.031 (.217)	-.204 (.185)	-.003 (.188)	.250 (.186)	-.051 (.195)
Education							
High school	.457* (.206)	.248 (.221)	.423 (.243)	.271 (.204)	.751* (.211)	.722* (.210)	-.085 (.211)
Postsecondary nonacademic	.276 (.263)	.617* (.304)	.516 (.328)	.471 (.261)	.680* (.267)	.827* (.267)	.622* (.311)
Academic	.490* (.255)	.650* (.298)	.620* (.324)	.106 (.258)	.722* (.263)	.880* (.263)	.409 (.287)
Wife from European origin	.353* (.157)	.225 (.179)	.301 (.196)	.050 (.157)	.147 (.159)	.014 (.159)	.375* (.172)
Husband's employment							
Employed full-time	-.048 (.190)	.170 (.214)	.344 (.238)	-.030 (.191)	-.257 (.195)	-.267 (.194)	.143 (.205)
Husband's education							
High school	.017 (.206)	.066 (.230)	.051 (.250)	.111 (.204)	.249 (.208)	.266 (.206)	.497* (.217)
More than high school	-.026 (.220)	-.291 (.248)	-.308 (.273)	.159 (.218)	.047 (.224)	.028 (.223)	.197 (.236)
Relative earnings							
Wife earns more	.543* (.209)	.252 (.261)	.117 (.287)	.400* (.212)	.464 (.210)	.556* (.211)	-.264 (.240)
Presence of children							
Children younger than 6 in household	-.088 (.170)	.085 (.199)	-.477* (.220)	-.157 (.171)	-.094 (.174)	-.119 (.173)	.158 (.193)
Children 6 to 12 in household	-.341* (.199)	.048 (.228)	-.432 (.251)	.137 (.195)	-.133 (.199)	.011 (.199)	.324 (.226)
Female respondent	-.087 (.142)	-.173 (.165)	-.323 (.183)	.141 (.142)	.034 (.144)	-.055 (.143)	.005 (.159)
Intercept	-.809	.756	1.241	-.779	-1.022	-.879	.065
Model χ^2 (13 <i>df</i>)	50.05*	21.87	33.72*	16.25	46.80*	52.57*	48.93*
<i>N</i> 888	879	844	855	863	870	887	

**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.

REFERENCES

- Aronson, J. (1992). Women's sense of responsibility for the care of old people: "But who else is going to do it?" *Gender and Society*, 6, 8-29.
- Aytac, I. A., & Teachman, J. D. (1992, August). *Occupational sex segregation, marital power, and household division of labor*. Paper presented at the meetings of the American Sociological Association, Pittsburgh, PA.
- Baxter, J. (1992). Power, attitudes and time: The domestic division of labor. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 23, 165-182.
- Beechey, V., & Perkins, T. (1987). *A matter of hours: Women, part time work, and the labor market*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

- Bergmann, B. (1986). *The economic emergence of women*. New York: Free Press.
- Berk, S. F. (1985). *The gender factory: The apportionment of work in American households*. New York: Plenum.
- Bianchi, S. M., & Spain, D. (1986). *American women in transition*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Blair, S., & Johnson, M. (1992). Wife's perception of the fairness of the division of household labor: The intersection of housework and ideology. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 54, 570-581.
- Blair, S. L., & Lichter, D. T. (1991). Measuring the division of household labor. *Journal of Family Issues*, 12, 91-113.
- Blau, P. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: John Wiley.
- Blood, R. O., & Wolfe, D. M. (1960). *Husbands and wives*. New York: Free Press.
- Blossfeld, H-P. (1997). Introduction: A comparative perspective on part-time work. In H-P Blossfeld & C. Hakim (Eds.), *Between equalization and marginalization: Women working part-time in Europe and the United States of America* (pp. 1-21). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Blossfeld, H-P., & Hakim, C. (1997). *Between equalization and marginalization: Women working part-time in Europe and the United States of America*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Blumstein, P., & Schwartz, P. (1983). *American couples*. New York: William Morrow.
- Brayfield, A. A. (1992). Employment resources and housework in Canada. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 54, 19-30.
- Brines, J. (1994). Economic dependency, gender, and the division of labor at home. *American Journal of Sociology*, 100, 652-688.
- Clegg, S., & Dunkerley, D. (1984). *Organization, class, and control*. Boston: Routledge Kegan Paul.
- Coltrane, S. (1996). *Family men: Fatherhood, housework and gender equity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Delsen, L. (1998). When do men work part-time? In J. O'Reilly & C. Fagan (Eds.), *Part time prospects: An international comparison of part time work in Europe, North America and the Pacific Rim* (pp. 57-76). London: Routledge.
- Duffy, A., & Pupo, M. (1992). *The part-time paradox: Connecting gender, work and family*. Toronto, Canada: McClelland & Stewart Inc.
- Emerson, R. M. (1962). Power-dependence relations. *American Sociological Review*, 27, 31-41.
- England, P., & Farkas, G. (1986). *Household, employment, and gender: A social, economic, and demographic view*. New York: Aldine.
- Ferree, M. M. (1976). Working-class jobs: Housework and paid work as sources of satisfaction. *Social Problems*, 23, 431-441.
- Ferree, M. M. (1991). The gender division of labor in two-earner marriages: Dimensions of variability and change. *Journal of Family Issues*, 12, 158-180.
- Goldscheider, F. K., & Waite, L. J. (1991). *New families, no families? The transformation of the American home*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Gornick, J. C., & Jacobs, J. A. (1996). A cross-national analysis of the wages of part-time workers: Evidence from the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia. *Work, Employment, and Society*, 10, 1-27.
- Hakim, C. (1997). A sociological perspective on part-time work. In H-P. Blossfeld & C. Hakim (Eds.), *Between equalization and marginalization: Women working part-time in Europe and the United States of America* (pp. 22-70). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

- Horney, M. J., & McElroy, M. B. (1988). The household allocation problem: Empirical results from a bargaining model. *Research in Population Economics*, 6, 15-38.
- Horrel, S. (1994). Household time allocation and women's labor force participation. In M. Anderson, F. Bechhofer, & J. Gershuny (Eds.), *The social and political economy of the household* (pp. 198-224). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Jones, C., Marsden, L., & Tepperman, L. (1990). *Lives of their own: The individualization of women's lives*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Kalleberg, A., & Rosenfeld, R. A. (1990). Work in the family and in the labor market: A cross-national, reciprocal analysis. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 52, 331-346.
- Kaufmann, J. C. (1998). *Dirty linen: Couples as seen through their laundry*. Middlesex, **COUNTRY?**: Middlesex University Press.
- Kessler-Harris, A., & Sacks, K. B. (1987). The demise of domesticity in America. In L. Beneria & C. R. Stimpson (Eds.), *Women, households, and the economy* (pp. 65-84). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Kishler, S. B., & Alexander, L. B. (1987). The mythology of part-time work: Empirical evidence from a study of working mothers. In L. Beneria & C. R. Stimpson (Eds.), *Women, households, and the economy* (pp. 225-241). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Long, J., & Jones, E. B. (1981). Married women in part-time employment. *Industrial and Labor Relation Review*, 34, 413-425.
- Main, B.G.M. (1988). The life time attachment of women to the labor market. In A. Hunt (Ed.), *Women and paid work* (pp. 23-51). New York: Macmillan.
- Mincer, J. (1985). Intercountry comparisons of labor force trends and related developments: An overview. *Journal of Political Economy*, 82, S76-S108.
- Morris, L. (1990). *The workings of the household*. Cambridge, MA: Polity.
- Morris, L. (1993). Household finance management and the labor market: A case study in Hartlepool. *Sociological Review*, 41, 506-536.
- Oakley, A. (1974). *Women's work: The housewife, past and present*. New York: Random House.
- Pahl, J. (1989). *Money and marriage*. New York: Macmillan.
- Pahl, J. (1990). Household spending, personal spending, and the control of money in marriage. *Sociology*, 24, 119-138.
- Pleck, J. H. (1979). Men's family work: Three perspectives and some new data. *The Family Coordinator*, 28, 481-488.
- Pleck, J. H. (1985). *Working wives, working husbands*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Pleck, J. H. (1993). Are "family-supportive" employer policies relevant to men? In J. C. Hood (Ed.), *Men, work, and family* (pp. 217-237). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Presser, H. B. (1994). Employment schedules among dual-earner spouses and the division of household labor by gender. *American Sociological Review*, 59, 348-364.
- Pyke, K., & Coltrane, S. (1996). Entitlement, obligation, and gratitude in family work. *Journal of Family Issues*, 17, 60-82.
- Robinson, O. (1979). Part-time employment in the European community. *International Labor Review*, 118, 299-314.
- Ross, C. (1987). The division of labor at home. *Social Forces*, 65, 816-833.
- Sanchez, L. (1994). Gender, labor allocation, and the psychology of entitlement within the home. *Social Forces*, 73, 533-553.
- Shelton, B. A. (1990). The distribution of household tasks: Does wife's employment status make a difference? *Journal of Family Issues*, 11, 115-135.

- Shelton B. A., & John, D. (1993). Does marital status make a difference? Housework among married and cohabiting men and women. *Journal of Family Issues, 14*, 401-420.
- Shelton, B. A., & John, D. (1996). The division of household labor. *Annual Review of Sociology, 22*, 299-322.
- Simon, R. J., & Landis, J. M. (1989). The polls—a report: Women's and men's attitudes about a woman's place and role. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 55*, 265-276.
- Sorensen, A., & McLanahan, S. (1987). Married women's economic dependency, 1940-1980. *American Journal of Sociology, 93*, 659-687.
- South, S. J., & Spitze, G. (1994). Housework in marital and nonmarital households. *American Sociological Review, 59*, 327-347.
- Spain, D., & Bianchi, S. M. (1996). *Balancing act*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Sundstrom, M. (1992). Part-time work in Sweden and its implications for gender equality. In N. Folbre, B. Bergmann, B. Agarwal, & M. Floro (Eds.), *Women's work in the world economy* (pp. 213-223). New York: New York University Press.
- Treas, J. (1993). Money in the bank: Transaction costs and the economic organization of marriage. *American Sociological Review, 58*, 723-734.
- van Berkel, M. (1997). *Who dominates when?: Asymmetric patterns of influence among Dutch husbands and wives*. Nijmegen, **PLS PROVIDE COUNTRY OF PUBLISHER**: University of Nijmegen.
- Vogler, C., & Pahl, J. (1993). Social and economic change and the organization of money in marriage. *Work, Employment, and Society, 7*, 71-95.
- Vogler, C., & Pahl, J. (1994). Money, power and inequality within marriage. *Sociological Review, 42*, 263-288.
- Waldfogel, J. (1997). The effect of children on women's wage. *American Sociological Review, 62*, 209-217.