9-16-2014

Gender, Jobs and Labor: Understanding The Gendered Division of Household Labor in Dual Earner, Middle Class Families Based on Job Dynamics

Jessica Carlisle

Jessica Carlisle
Candidate

Sociology
Department

This thesis is approved, and it is acceptable in quality and form for publication:

Approved by the Thesis Committee:

Dr. Nancy Lopez , Chairperson

Dr. Robert Fiala

Dr. Aki Roberts

Gender, Jobs and Labor: Understanding The Gendered Division of Household Labor in Dual Earner, Middle Class Families Based on Job Dynamics

BY

Jessica Carlisle
B.S., Sociology and Religion, Austin College, 2009

THESIS

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts

MA Sociology

The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

May, 2011

Gender, Jobs and Labor: Understanding The Gendered Division of Household Labor in Dual Earner, Middle Class Families Based on Job Dynamics

BY

Jessica Carlisle

ABSTRACT OF THESIS

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts

MA Sociology

The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

May, 2011

Gender, Jobs and Labor: Understanding
The Gendered Division of Household Labor
in Dual Earner, Middle Class Families
Based on Job Dynamics

by

Jessica Carlisle

B.S., Sociology and Religion, Austin College, 2009

ABSTRACT

Despite the fact that women have made large strides in education and the workforce, they still do a significant amount of the traditional household labor. Past research shows that economic variables such as education, income, and available time as well as beliefs regarding gender norms and values can affect the variation of time spent in domestic labor for both men and women. However, inconsistencies in past research warrant the use of other models or theories to better understand this division. This study aims to understand this division through the use of the "job dynamics" theory. This theory consists of scores for both job stress and job autonomy. These variables are then added to the current theories and compared with past economic and gender variables. However, these comparisons reveal that job stress and job autonomy from this data set are not statistically significant. But the study does show that variables restricted to economics or gender ideology alone do not fully explain variation in this sample. Further research is needed to evaluate the usefulness of job dynamics and to better understand the variation in the gendered division of household labor.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

In 1950, less than 40% of women were active, either part or full time, in the American workforce and even fewer attended and graduated from college. As of 2009, roughly 60% of working-age women (16 or older) were labor force participants. Additionally, women comprised 46% of the American workforce and are projected to account for 47% by 2016. Additionally, women made up 51% of what the department of labor deems "high-paying management, professional, and related occupations" and had an unemployment rate of 8.1 as compared to 10.3 for men. Additionally 71% of female high school graduates will attend college as compared to 65% of male graduates (US Department of Labor 2009).

Despite the major gains made by women over the latter half of the past century, one data point has changed very little: the division of household labor. No matter the historical period, gender is by far the number one predictor of domestic work. Several factors have led to the historical changes in both men's and women's allocation of time to both paid and unpaid work. One of the many influential outcomes of the American industrial revolution was the creation of a sharply divided public and private sphere. With the loss of the family farm or home based economies, men began to head to the public sphere for work while women, who were once contributing factors to family farms or businesses, were now expected to remain as homemakers. This new arrangement quickly embedded itself within the common norms and values of American culture. However, with the economic issues of the mid century the outmoded male breadwinner/ female homemaker dichotomy was no longer maintainable (Hook 2006).

After the 1960s women began to enter the private work sphere in larger numbers. Wives' contribution to the family income became more integral to the family, and women began to be necessary contributors to household viability. Both the increase in educational participation and public employment contributed to the erosion of traditional societal gender norms. Values dictating that wives and mothers were to remain in the home began to be replaced by a higher acceptance and understanding of the need of women in the workforce. Additionally, men and women were beginning to put off both marriage and childrearing and spent more of their post graduate years solely in the workforce (Sayer 2002).

These trends led to two primary competing claims about the time allocation of men and women in paid and unpaid work. Some claimed that the time men and women spent in both public and household work was beginning to converge as women spent more time in paid labor and men were beginning to devote more time to family and the household. A second competing claim, states that while women were in fact spending more time in the paid sector, they were not decreasing time in household labor in equal measures and thus were now taking part in what was deemed "the second shift" (Hothschild 1986; Sayer 2002)

Both of these competing claims have at least some source of justification throughout the literature. Studies show that between the 1960s and 1980s the share of household labor and child care between men and women was becoming more equal (Suitor 2001, Bartley 2005). Men were performing more household tasks once seen as solely "women's work" while women were spending a larger percentage of their overall work in the paid rather than the unpaid sector (Sayer 2002). Additionally, as mentioned

earlier, gender attitudes about gender roles within the household were slowly becoming less traditional. Research showed that both men's and women's attitudes toward family responsibilities were becoming much more egalitarian. Roughly 82% of men and 90% of women strongly believed that household work should be shared equally. However, these attitudes rarely mirrored the reality.

Since the 1960s American men doubled the number of hours they spent in domestic labor while women cut theirs in half. However by 1995 women were still completing almost double the number of hours as men (Makiko 2004). The convergence or equalization found between men and women's hours is more of a reflection of 1) the outsourcing of more domestic work, 2) the decrease in the overall work actually being completed in the home and 3) the obscene number of hours women were spending in domestic labor in the 1960s and before, both relative to men and in general. Though men are now completing more domestic work, women still perform almost double the amount of domestic labor as men. Additionally the bulk of domestic labor that men are now completing is accomplished through talking and playing activities with children, often where the wife is actually still present (Craig 2006 a).

The consensus of the empirical studies done in this field, finds that the division of household labor tends to remain relatively traditional. On average women perform two to three times as much housework as men (Coltrane 2000). Women perform up to 75 percent of the traditionally female tasks (cooking, cleaning, food preparation and grocery shopping) while men tend to do 70 percent of the traditionally male work (outside repairs, car maintenance and yard care) (Greenstein 1996). Time diary studies in Australia found that men average eleven hours of domestic work per week while women

averaged 23; while comparable data in the United States shows women complete anywhere from 18 to 23 hours to men's 11 to 13 (Bittman *et al*. 2003). Longitudinal studies find that women are doing less housework than their counterparts in 1965 and that men are doing slightly more. However the increase in men's domestic work is quite small and the decrease in women's is more readily attributed to the purchase of domestic services (Coltrane 2000).

However, the study of the division of household labor is not merely a study of unequal hours worked. Studying the divisions of work in the domestic sphere aims to understand an important facet in the maintenance of society. According to Coltrane, "human existence depends on the routine activities that feed, clothe, shelter and care for both children and adults." (2000 pg 1210) Studying the interactions within the realm of unpaid family work has direct implications to interactions within the formal market economy. The division of household labor within the home is one micro example of the macro situation of gender stratification (Geist 2005).

Additionally, the division of household work can often be connected to the sense of health and happiness for individuals within the home and perceptions of marital satisfaction. Often, women who feel that household arrangements are unfair, find their perceptions of marital satisfaction decline as well (Coltrane 2000). Also, time spent in "low control" tasks, tasks that must be done on a daily-basis or at a specific time, increased both wives and husbands feelings of inequity or unfairness within the marriage (Bartley *et al.* 2005).

Finally, the stark gender divisions of domestic labor can help us understand the life cycle of gender norms and attitudes both in and outside of the home. According to the

childhood socialization theory, children see how their mothers and fathers allocate tasks or perform their roles and model after these early impressions. These early influences are often a predictor of a child's future attitudes toward household divisions of labor (Cunningham 2001, 2005). Research also shows that "the best single predictor for the pattern of division of household labor in any family may be what pattern was in the adults own families of orientation" (Cunningham 2001, pg 186). Additionally, as will be discussed later, domestic work can be seen as a display of gender for an individual or a display of gender differences for the society at large (Zimmerman 1987).

HOUSEWORK AS MEASURE

To begin this study of the household division of work, we must first understand what is meant by the term domestic labor or "housework." In most studies, housework or domestic work often refers to the routine, unpaid work that is required to maintain a house, family or home (Coltrane 2000). This most readily can include child care, cooking, cleaning, laundry, paying bills etc. Usually, the more routine and stereotypically feminine tasks are considered housework and compared against the more stereotypically masculine tasks that are often more flexible, "occasional" and at times have a leisure component attributed to them (Greenstein 1996, Coltrane 2000). These types of tasks have also been deemed "low-control" or "high-control" tasks. Low control are considered the traditionally female tasks that must be done on a set routine and that are often seen as those that people do as a service to another or that others depend on to meet their own basic needs. High control tasks are the traditionally male tasks that can be done on a discretionary basis and that do not directly impact the basic need of another in the family (Bartley *et al* 2005).

Often, empirical studies tend to focus on acts which could be more easily quantified in terms of hours spent in these tasks. Thus most studies focus on hours spent cooking, cleaning, shopping, washing, paying bills, etc (Greenstein 1996, Coltrane 2000, Bittman *et al* 2003, Baxter 2005, Noonan et al 2007). However, more recent studies have also taken into account various kinds of emotional labor. Emotional work or labor is acts that can be considered "caretaking" or actions done to meet the emotional needs of others in the home or family. These can include acts such as caring for a sick child or spouse, expressing affection or concern, praising a child/spouse for good performances at school or work or merely helping to bring someone out of a negative mood (Stevens et al 2006).

CURRENT THEORETICAL MODELS

Despite the varied methods for determining the definition of housework or domestic labor in the literature, two major theoretical models are used to try to understand why the division exists. Economic exchange or time availability theory and gender display or ideology theory dominate the theoretical background of domestic work studies. In its most basic understanding, economic exchange theory suggests that women perform household work in exchange for economic support from their husbands (Baxter 2005). According to this theory, there exists a negative correlation between income or resources and household work i.e. the more an individual in a household relationship earns, the fewer hours they will spend in domestic work (Gupta 2005, Coltrane 2000). Economic exchange theory is based upon the idea of some sort of a rational bargaining taking place between married couples. This bargaining can be defined as "partners engaged in rational arrangement where they respond to the demands of housework based on individual time and resources in order to reach equilibrium of workloads." (Hook

2006**,** 641). However, economic exchange theory has a myriad of facets and nuances that have been articulated and employed throughout the literature.

Bittman *et al* articulate a few avenues economic exchange theory can take. One way to think about economic exchange in terms of domestic housework is that of the bargaining model (Bittman *et al* 2003, Gupta 2005). This model outlines a power/dependence relationship. If one individual in a marriage is economically more independent than the other, than this spouse can give less and receive more in the marital exchange. The dependence of one partner increases what he or she has to give in the marriage. These bargaining models often include the notion of "threat points." Threat points, or "divorce threat points" claim that this bargaining in a marriage or household relationship is often done in the shadow of the possibility of divorce. The threat point is what an individual in the relationship has to fall back on if the relationship were to end, such as financial independence or the probability of remarriage (Bittman *et al* 2003).

A similar approach to this economic bargaining model is that of the Econ-Nash model**.** This model explains that the gains from marriage and the division of domestic labor are determined through a rational bargaining process where the end of the marriage is seen or understood as the threat. As either the wife or husband gain more resources (job prospects, income, education etc) they will want to bargain for less time in domestic labor (Parkman 2004). The arrangements that come from this bargaining process are based on a rational analysis of the potential earnings of each spouse. The economic theory is seen as rational in that the division of household labor is based upon who has the comparative advantage in the labor market regardless of gender. The "rational"

household does not allocate a spouse's time to domestic labor if that time is better spent in the paid sector (Fuwa 2004, Geist 2005).

Related to the bargaining process is another aspect of the economic theory: the relationship between resources and housework as a dependency issue. In the bargaining process, husbands and wives must weigh the costs and benefits of spending more hours in either the paid sector or in work for the household. When divorce is seen as a threat, women may opt to spend more time at work in order to be less dependent upon the husband. Additionally, because more often women have lower incomes or fewer relative resources than men, they often fall into a dependency situation. Because of this, they may agree to the unequal distribution of housework in order to protect the relationship and minimize the potential for divorce (Parkman 2004, Geist 2005).

Another aspect of the economic exchange model is the theory of time availability or constraints (Coltrane 2000, Greenstein 1996). This theory draws on human capital theory and posits that the more an individual works outside the house in paid labor, the less they will spend in domestic work. Additionally, many studies which employ this theory take into account other institutions or services which allow for more control over time or more available time to do housework. These studies analyze the outsourcing of domestic work to paid employees, the purchasing of domestic service products, the availability of kinship or familial networks, and the availability of state services (Bianchi et al 2000, Coltrane 2000). Economic exchange, resource availability or bargaining theory models all hinge on the understanding that the division of household labor is inextricably tied to economics and that the allocation of domestic work is done in a rational and efficient manner.

However, advocates of the gender ideology or display models believe that this is a shallow and truncated understanding of the division of domestic labor. The gender ideology theory understands that domestic labor is more contingent upon the understanding of domestic work as a display of gender norms or an arena of gender production/re-production (Baxter 2005). Gender ideology can be defined as "the beliefs or attitudes that a person has about gender roles" (Nordenmark 2003). Often the assumption made in this theory is that a traditional gender ideology (for both men and women) will be correlated with a traditional division of household labor and that a more liberal gender ideology will be correlated with a more balanced or egalitarian division of household labor. In the gender ideology perspective, the predictor for the division of household labor is not a "rational arrangement" but rather the predictor is an attitude or the performance of gender roles (Nordenmark 2003, Geist 2005).

The gender display model finds it roots in the understanding of gender as articulated by West and Zimmerman. Instead of identifying gender as a societal label, they saw gender as a series of actions and interactions. Individuals displayed their genders in their everyday actions and interactions while at the same time perceiving of others genders in the same manner and thus holding each other accountable for these gender displays (West and Zimmerman 1987). From this viewpoint, scholars then began to understand domestic work not as merely an economic, rational exchange but rather a display of deeply rooted gender ideals and an arena for learning and displaying gender identities. Gender ideology theory suggests that men and women take part (or rather do not take part in) domestic work in order to affirm and reproduce gendered selves and gender constructions (Coltrane 2000).

Gender ideology theory is also a diverse theoretical background that has been used independently and in tandem with economic exchange theory throughout the literature. Early uses of this theory focused on the gender role ideologies formed through socialization processes beginning in childhood (Bianchi et al 2000). These studies posited that norms internalized by men and women from a young age affect their understandings of gender norms. Thus the belief that men should be the breadwinners and that women should hold the responsibility of household tasks becomes learned at a young age and rearticulated throughout life (Bittman *et al* 2003). More recently sociologists have gone beyond the views of societal norms as predictors and have begun to look at the idea of "doing gender" pioneered by West and Zimmerman. The activity of housework in this perspective is not merely what one was socialized to do, but rather is an opportunity to show to oneself and to others that one is a man/woman (Coltrane 2000). Housework then becomes an enactment of gender (Bianchi et al 2003).

CURRENT FINDINGS

Though the theoretical background in the literature most often falls within either the economic exchange or gender ideology perspective, the possible predictors of the division of household labor between men and women is quite vast. Sociologists who fall more under the economic exchange umbrella tend to find several empirical predictors for men and women's share of household labor, though the strength and time directions of those predictors are not always consistent throughout. Women's employment, one of these variables, often has the strongest and most consistent effects on women's levels of housework (Coltrane 2000). Gupta (2005) tested variables of full time versus part time work for women and employed versus unemployed women as predictors of hours of

household labor worked. She found that employed women spend less time on domestic labor than employed women and that women who work full time spend less time on domestic labor than women who work part time (Gupta 2005). Additionally, Noonan *et al* used not only variables of employment but also took into consideration the time flexibility at the individual's respective jobs. They believed that the individual (man or woman's) workplace flexibility policies could also affect the amount of time available to spend in domestic work. They found that though women with more flexible work schedules did less housework, overall, the wife's workplace time use policy had little net impact on total time spent in domestic labor for dual earner households (Noonan *et al* 2007).

A second highly popular variable predictor is not just the status of being employed, but rather the actual income brought into the household, either the base amount or the proportional contribution. In general, research tends to suggest that as base income for women goes up, household work decreases; and as women share a larger percentage of the breadwinner status in the household, then the gap between male and female domestic work also decreases (Coltrane 2000). Bittman *et al*. explore the effect of both spouses' contribution to family income. They discuss how housework is divided between men and women based on the percentage both spouses contribute to the total. They speculate that as the income contributions for the couple grows closer to a fifty/fifty sharing, then so too will the division of household labor reach equality. However they find that among couples where the wife makes between 51%-100% of the household income, couples actually revert to a more traditional sharing of the household labor i.e. where the wife completed the majority. (Bittman *et al* 2003). Gupta specifically looks at

women's absolute income as related to their own household levels of work, rather than a relational model. She does not consider the husbands' financial contributions to affect the amount of hours women work in the house in any significant manner. She finds that though both husband's and wife's absolute income decreases their respective time spent in domestic labor, the effect the wife's income has on her decrease in labor is three times greater than that of the husbands (Gupta 2005).

Most economic exchange studies find a negative correlation between women's employment or income and total number of hours worked in domestic labor. Interestingly though, this correlation levels off (and even reverses) when women begin to make a larger proportion of the earnings as compared to men. However this trend does not hold true for men's employment and wages. Some studies find that dependent husbands actually do less household work than men who make more than their wives. Additionally, more wealth in a household often leads to the purchase of domestic services to complete housework rather than the increase of men's participation in it (Coltrane 2000). Bittman *et al* found that women's employment and wages had an effect on household labor that was consistent with bargaining theory. However, they found that for men, wages and employment never had a significant effect on their amount of domestic work. The movement towards a more equal sharing of household work or just the decrease in hours worked by women is reliant upon women's employment, and not men's. (Bittman *et al* 2003). Similar results were found by Gupta in 2005 when she analyzed specifically individual women's earnings and domestic work. She found that women did not benefit in a significant manner from male partners incomes. Women were far more likely to decrease hours of household labor based on their own earnings than on men's. She also

found that the difference in domestic hours worked for women with the highest earnings and women with the lowest earnings, was as large as the difference between men and women in general (Gupta 2005).

Education is another one of the major variables that is used in the economic exchange theory. Craig found that a higher education actually led to an increase, for both men and women, in the amount of time they spent in child care (though the increase was greater for women). However, Craig did not find a correlation between education and housework for men and found only a slight negative correlation for women. She found that "at skilled vocational and degree level, education for women is associated with more time in childcare and more time in paid work. This suggests that highly educated women try to simultaneously access their market opportunities and maintain time in care of their children (Craig 2006 b pg 568). Additionally in a study conducted by Jill Suitor on trends in the division of household labor for married college professors, she found that female professors still spent 43% more time on household labor than their male counterparts and 55% more when children were present. Additionally, women in her study reported a 14% longer work week (paid plus unpaid work) than men, though the amount of time women were able to spend on their own research was significantly less than men (Suitor 2001).

Researchers from the gender ideology perspective tend to either use economic variables along with gender ideology variables or eschew economic predictors all together. These studies attempt to show that rather than income contributions being a major predictor of the division of household labor, it is the traditional or more egalitarian gender ideologies of the wife and husband (Coltrane 2000). Gender ideology theories understand that economic factors can lead findings in two different directions. On one

hand, the "threat" argument suggests that women's higher wages can make men feel that their power role is threatened, thus they will actively resist the equal sharing of domestic labor or egalitarian gender ideologies on the basis that it takes away their male identity. On the other hand, the "benefit" theory suggests that men can and do benefit from their wives wages. Men will see this benefit because of difficult financial times or because of the high financial and emotional cost of maintaining the singular breadwinner role (Zuo and Tang 2000). These two competing approaches lead researchers to focus less on economic predictors and more on the individual beliefs of gender roles.

In his 1996 study, Greenstein uses levels of gender ideology, from traditionalism to full egalitarianism as predictors of levels of household work. He took into account how individual gender ideologies as well as the interplay of wives and husbands particular ideologies affect hours worked. They found that men only do a more equal sharing of the domestic labor if both they and their wives have an egalitarian gender ideology (Greenstein 1996). In a later study, Zuo and Tang (2000) looked at gender ideologies as they related to beliefs in gender roles in the household as well as how class and income affected these ideologies. They speculated whether men and women of different classes would hold different gender ideologies. They found that most individuals are moving in more of an egalitarian direction and that men who contribute less to family income and women who contribute more are the least likely to hold conventional gender ideologies (Zuo and Tang 2000).

Results from the gender ideology perspective, find that the relationship between spouses gender ideologies is important for the sharing of household labor. Some studies show that women's gender ideologies shape the sharing of the housework, while some

focus on the men's ideologies. And then other studies show that gender ideologies are predictors of the individual's contribution to house work but that they cannot predict the sharing of the labor (Coltrane 2000). Stevens *et al* found that the level of women's traditional gender ideologies had no effect on their amount of housework, but that men's did. They found that even though an egalitarian gender ideology still led to minimal housework, that men's gender ideologies were more likely to shape the division of labor in the household than the gender ideologies of the women (Stevens et al 2006). In a study of the interactive effects of wives and husbands gender ideologies, Greenstein (1996) found that husbands married to the most traditional women (whether or not they were traditional or egalitarian) did about the same percentage of house work. He also found that traditional men married to egalitarian women only did slightly more domestic work than the egalitarian men married to traditional women. In summary, he found that husbands were more likely to do a more equal share of domestic work only if both they and their wives held egalitarian gender ideologies (Greenstein 1996).

ISSUES WITH CURRENT THEORIES

In one of the few papers in which Frederich Engels commented on women, he suggested that women in the working class had a greater chance of reaching an equal footing with their husbands (at least within in the public sphere) than bourgeois women. This suggestion, that class somehow had an effect on the equality between husband and wife, made me wonder whether this was 1) true and 2) could transfer into the private sphere. Though the research on the gendered division of household work is quite vast and has a rich history, I believe that it is lacking in a few regards in relation to the interplay between class, work and gender.

First of all, it is quite complicated and even contradictory at times. Studies done using economic factors as predictors, often find a correlation between women's employment and household work but do not agree on how or if this employment affect men's household work. Also, they often fail to take into consideration the class of the women or the type of job she has (whether or not it is a professional, managerial, domestic, has high occupational prestige etc). When men's employment is taken into consideration, even more contradictions are found. Some studies find that men who are employed fewer hours do a greater proportion of the housework while some studies find no relationship. Additionally, some studies find that men who are unemployed or are not the main breadwinner of the house do more work, and others find that they do little if any. Also, any interpretations do not hold across all levels of incomes. How women and men at the top of the earnings ladder share housework can be quite different than men and women in the middle or near the bottom (Coltrane 2000).

In addition to these contradictory findings and in spite of some of the other strong correlations found within the economic exchange research, there is a strong reason to believe that gender ideology or gender norms are in fact shaping economics. Someone living in a traditional system may be more likely to live and act more in line with this ideology in all facets of life. Thus women may perform more consistently with these norms and do more in the public sphere while men will work towards more of a "bread winner" status (Nordenmark 2003). Since one's gender norms and values are developed in childhood prior to work in the paid or unpaid sector, the causal affect between gender, economic and the division of household labor could look more like this:

Division of household labor ← Gender → Economics

Additionally, even with the large scale gains made by women in the paid sector, they do not always overthrow the power of the traditional male status. When a husband's career is considered primary, the wives occupational influence is weakened and thus the negative correlation between income and household labor is negated. Considering the strong affect that traditional gender norms can still have, it is not surprising that the husband's career is often (or always) viewed as primary (Bartley 2005).

The connections between occupation, class and gender ideologies are important to the study of the household division of labor. However, the literature on this division is not complete. Though Noonan *et al* (2007) do take into consideration an occupational dynamic: the workplace time-use policies, they use it as a means to understand the individual's available time rather than how the rigors of the occupation itself may be translated into the share of domestic labor in the household. Understanding the dynamics of both spouse's occupations is necessary to fully understand the dynamics of the division of domestic work. How do the daily tasks or stress of a man's or woman's occupation affect how much work they do at home, or how they feel about this work? If a woman is in an occupation which rewards her high responsibility, autonomy, power over subordinates and a high paycheck, will she be less likely to do 70 percent of the domestic labor when she comes home? Additionally, how does the interplay between her and her husband's occupations affect housework? What is the interplay of varying levels of responsibility on the job, job autonomy, job stress, income, education and job type?

In order to better understand these questions and to have a deeper understanding of the division of household labor, I am going to compare what I will call "job dynamics theory" to the present economic and gender theories. For the purpose of this study, "job

dynamics" will consist of occupational conditions relating to job stress and job autonomy. In their in depth analysis of the work and family literature of the 1990's, Jenkins *et al.* (2000) found that two of the major themes to emerge were that of "work socialization" and "work stress". The theme of "work socialization" claims that conditions on the job such as autonomy, complexity, self direction etc. can shape the values and beliefs of a worker who in turn might play out these values in their home or social lives. Additionally, the theme of "work stress" addresses how the worker's experience with stress on the job can affect the worker's behavior both at work and home. The research shows that "chronic job stressors" can overload or cause tension between the individual's work and home life, which in turn can have an impact on all family members (Jenkins *et al* 2000). Thus, both job autonomy and job stress can affect facets of home or family life such as the division of household labor.

I believe that while economics (salary, number of hours worked, education etc) and gender ideology play a role in understanding the division of household labor, job dynamics are equally important. My hypotheses will come from both an analysis of the "older" economic exchange and gender ideology theories on their own and then from an analysis comparing the three models as a whole. First, as for the economic and gender theories, I believe that the results will be consistent with past literature in that increases in income, education, and number of hours worked as well as movement towards more liberal or egalitarian gender beliefs will be related with decreases in the amount of time women spend in domestic labor. Additionally, with my job dynamics variables I believe that job dynamics will affect the time men spend on domestic tasks more so than for women. (i.e. as stress and autonomy go up for men, time spent at domestic tasks will

decrease). As for the comparison of the three models, I believe that, holding all other variables constant, the model including the "job dynamics" variables will improve upon the models with only the economic predictors and gender ideology variables. I am not attempting to debunk gender ideology or economic theories but rather to show that job dynamics is an integral part of the research in this field and that a deeper understanding of household labor can be understood through the inclusion of job dynamics within quantitative studies.

METHODS AND DATA

In order to test my theory I will be using the "500 Family Study" conducted by the Child Care and Early Education Research Connections project out of the National Center for Children in Poverty (Schneider and Waite 2000). This is a comprehensive survey on the nature of American households and covers topics ranging from education, child care, income, domestic work, role responsibilities, gender ideologies and careers. Surveys were given to both husband and wife and also to the respective children. The 500 Family Study was conducted between 1998 and 2000 and was comprised of approximately 500 dual career, middle class families residing in eight communities across the country. Sites for the survey were located in the Midwest (five sites), the Southeast (one site) the Northeast (one site) and the West Coast (one site). The communities represented varying levels of urbanization, labor force, and socioeconomic status. The majority of the sample was middle class with at least a college education. The family type included families with adolescent children (327), with children kindergarten or below (157) and with a combination (28) (Schneider and Waite 2000).

For my study, I will be using data from 303 couples (606 total respondents) who are currently married, both currently employed and who have at least one child in the household. I will be focusing my attention on dual earner, married couples where children are present for a few reasons. Though some studies may also include married couples, single earner households, and/or cohabitating couples, I chose to focus on this specific demographic. First of all 54% of all married couples in the United States are made up of men and women who both work outside of the home (Bartley *et al.* 2005). Additionally, the crux of my theory of job dynamics rests on the idea that factors or conditions of one's occupation affects the division of household labor. Simply put, this theory cannot be tested if one does not have an occupation in which to affect domestic work.

Next I chose only married couples because of the unique issues that come into play in the institution of marriage. Though, as stated earlier, many gender beliefs, attitudes or roles are developed in childhood, research is showing that these gender roles may not become "activated" as strongly until entry into marriage. Gender differences in hours spent in household labor are much more pronounced and increase significantly when men and women enter into marriage and are lower or non-existent prior to or after a marriage ends. Among single men and women, there is more of an equal participation in domestic labor, it is the context of marriage that induces men and women to perform different types and levels of domestic labor than they had while single (Perkins and Demeis 1996, Cunningham 2001). And finally, I chose to focus on households with children because, similarly with entry into marriage, a context where children are present also seems to activate more traditional gender roles. "The presence of children increases

both the degree to which housework is segregated by gender and the amount performed by women relative to men." (Cunningham 2005 pg 1042)

In order to avoid violating the independence of my observations, I will be using "couples" as my unit of analysis instead of individuals. Violating the independence of observations is a common issue in statistical analysis that is referred to as autocorrelation. Whenever men and women (who are married) are used individually as units of analysis, they are not independent observations because the error term associated with wife's household labor hours could be related to the error term associated with husband's (or vice versa) violating the independence of each observation. Combining the husband and wife into one unit of analysis averts this issue because then error terms of each observation (now couples) are not correlated with one another. Also, independence of observations is important so that the assumptions to properly use and run OLS are not violated (Hanushek and Jackson 1977).

No other past study I noticed (Bianchi *et al* 2000, Suitor 2001, Greenstein 2004, Parkman 2004, Bartley *et al* 2005, Gupta 2006) employed couples as their units of analysis, whether using OLS or not, so I see this as an improvement upon the statistical methods commonly employed. By using couples as the unit of analysis, I hope that my analysis lead to more precise results. In order to create the unit "couple", I merely combined the individuals into married groups and then renamed my variables with the pre-fix of either "wife" or husband". My dependent variable then became "wife's percentage of domestic tasks" which will be further addressed below.

Independent variables for the economic theory include: education (broken into three dummy variables: everything below a four year degree, four year degree, and MA

or professional degree), hours worked per week, number of jobs worked (for both the wife and husband) and the wife's percent contributed to household salary. For this particular data set, salary was reported on a scale, i.e. 0-20,000, 20,001-35,000 etc. In order to get a proper percentage of total income each contributed, I turned salary into a continuous variable by multiplying the top number of the lowest category by.8, taking the middle value of each subsequent category, and multiplying the top number of the highest income category by 1.25. I then added husbands and wives individual income and found the proportion both contributed to family income.

Independent variables for the gender ideology theory will include a question as to who should provide for the family and a gender equity score (for both the wife and husband). For "who should provide to the family income" respondents were allowed to choose from the following categories:

1. Your spouse entirely
2. Your spouse more than you
3. Equally
4. You more than your spouse
5. You entirely
6. Other

Because the response rates for the category of spouse "entirely" or "more" for husbands and you "entirely" or "more" for wives was so low, for this analysis the categories have been truncated into:

1. Your spouse more or entirely (only for wife)
2. Equally

3. You more or entirely (only for husband)

4. Other

Because of low response rate, "your spouse more or entirely" was combined with other for husbands and "you more or entirely" was combined with other for wives. Thus, category one is only applicable for wives and category three is only applicable for husbands.

Gender equity is a score that was combined from a series of questions on the survey that included:

1. It should not bother the husband if the wife's job sometimes requires her to be away from him overnight
2. If a wife works full time, a husband should share equally in household chores such as cooking, cleaning and washing
3. It is more important for a wife to help her husband's career than to have a career herself
4. Parents should encourage as much independence in their daughters as sons

With these questions, respondents were asked to choose a level of agreement ranging from one for strongly disagree to four for strongly agree. I then added the scores together to come up with an overall gender equity score. Scores range from four for least equitable beliefs of gender to a high of sixteen for most equitable beliefs of gender.

For the "job dynamics" hypothesis the variables job autonomy and job stress (for both the wife and husband) will be used. Job autonomy is a score that was created by combining a series of questions related to the respondent's job.

1. I have a lot of opportunity to make my own decisions.

2. I have a lot of say over what happens on my job.

3. I can design or plan most of my daily work.

Respondents were asked to choose a level of agreement ranging from one for "not true at all" and four for "very true." The scores were then compounded to create the variable job autonomy. Possible scores range from three for low autonomy to twelve for high autonomy. Job stress was similarly created by combining the scores from a question relating to the work conditions for the respondent's primary occupations.

1. Do you finish your workday feeling physically exhausted
2. Do you come home from work feeling angry or hostile
3. Do you come home from work feeling drained of energy
4. Do you find work stressful
5. Are you bored at work
6. Do you work in dangerous conditions
7. Do you work in unhealthy conditions
8. Do you work in physically unpleasant conditions
9. Do you feel discriminated against at work
10. Do you receive unwanted sexual attention at work

Again respondents were able to choose scores ranging from zero for "never" to four for "always. Possible scores range from zero for low or no job stress to forty for high job stress.

My dependent variable for all three theories will be the average hours of work per week in different domestic tasks. Because I am using couples as my unit of analysis, the dependent variables will be the percentage that the wife worked (since it is a percentage

we can infer the husbands participation from this as well). Based on the past literature, I will be breaking this variable into two parts: traditionally female domestic labor and traditionally male domestic labor. Both variables are given both as total number of hours worked per week and percentage of total for both husband and wife. Percentages were taken from the husbands and wives self responses. The traditionally female domestic labor activities include:

1. Shopping for household
2. Cooking
3. Washing the dishes
4. Cleaning the house
5. Laundry
6. Taking the kids to and from activities
7. Family paperwork, like paying bills and balancing the checkbook
8. Helping the kids with their homework.

The traditionally male household labor activity includes: yard and home maintenance (throughout the literature this is the only activity that regularly falls into the "male sphere"). Table one highlights the independent and dependent variables for the three models based on economic exchange and gender ideology theories and the job dynamic hypothesis.

For all of the models, I will be including several control variables in the analysis. I will be using race, religion and family type. Though respondents were allowed to choose from a number of possible race responses, based on both the size of each response group and the need to simplify the categories, I broke race into three groups: white, black,

and other. The other racial category consisted of categories such as Native American, Asian, Pacific Islander, Hispanic etc. Similarly respondents were allowed to choose from more than fifteen responses for religion. Again because of the very small response sizes of some categories and a need to simplify, religion was broken into three categories: Christian (protestant), Roman Catholic and other.

Table 1. Independent and Dependent Variables for all Three Models

Model	**Economic Exchange**	**Gender Ideology**	**Job Dynamics**
Variable			
Wife's % hours spent in "female tasks"	Y	Y	Y
Wife's % hours spent in "male tasks"	Y	Y	Y
Education	X		
Hours worked per week	X		
Number of jobs worked	X		
Percent contributed to household salary	X		
Who Should Provide to Family Income		X	
Gender Equity Score		X	
Job Autonomy			X
Job Stress			X
Race	X	X	X
Religion	X	X	X
Family type	X	X	X

Table one

The other category consisted of choices such as Muslim, Buddhist, Greek or Russian orthodox etc. as well as "no religion" or atheist. Since couples are my unit of analysis, both race and religion will be represented as two different variables: wife's race or religion and husband's race or religion (not as the mixed race or religion of the couple).This particular data set designated families by "family type" rather than having variables for the exact number and age of the child(ren). Family type consisted of "tot family (those with children in the household only of kindergarten age (between 5 or 6) and below) "teen family" (those with children of elementary to high school age or 7 to 18) and "tot/teen family" (those with children from both age groups).

Like any data set based on survey research, the possibility of missing data is always present. Often participants either miss some questions in a survey, do not know how to answer, or merely choose to skip a question (Little and Rubin 1989). Missing data can be missing for several different reasons. If the data is missing because of factors that do not relate to any other values in the study, then the data is said to be "missing completely at random". Also missing data may be deemed "missing at random." This would occur when the missing data is related to another variable within the study but is not a function of its own value. Finally, if the missing data is not either "missing completely at random" or "missing at random", than it is considered to be "missing not at random". This means that there is, theoretically, some model that could be written to explain the missing-ness. While this model would need to be created before "missing not at random" data could be used in regressions, "missing completely at random" and "missing at random" variables can be dealt with without a model (Howell 2008).

In my data, I have 149 missing observations for different variables. In the case of missing data for this data set I will impute means for the observations missing for each variable based on the average of the respective variable (Little and Rubin 1989, Howell 2008). In order to keep my statistical analysis rigorous, I would rather not merely drop the 149 observations since it would make my total N smaller. Displays for both the number of missing observations from each variable and the total observations with missing data can be found in the appendix in A1.

Demographically and economically, my sample is fairly skewed to the white, middle class, highly educated persuasion (demographics can be seen in table two and three). While religion is fairly evenly distributed between Protestant, Catholic and other for both men and women, race is decidedly not. Roughly 83% of women and 89% of men self reported as white, only 5% and 6% self reported as black and 12% and 5% reported as "other". Additionally 57% of women and 67% of men hold higher than a four year degree and 23% combined held less than a four year degree. The average household income was 131,934 with women making more than 47,000 on average while men made more than 84,000 on average. A majority of both men and women reported only working one job (84% and 83% respectively) with only 17% of women and 16% of men working two. Additionally, the sample often put in the average 40-hour work week (or more) with men working an average of 48 hours a week and women working roughly 35 hours per week.

As for the independent variables relating to both the gender and job dynamics models under consideration for this study, averages for men and women were often fairly consistent, with just a few interesting deviations. As far as the gender ideology model

was concerned, both men and women seemed to be more egalitarian than traditional. Women averaged a gender equity score of 11.5 and men averaged 11 (both out of 14). A large majority of both men and women had gender equity scores in the upper 10-14 range with less than 22% of either men or women receiving less than a ten.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics

(Numerical Variables)

	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Hours per week spent in traditionally female tasks				
Wife	29.70	13.20	3	71
Husband	18.66	10.24	6	79
Hours per week spent in traditionally male tasks				
Wife	2.40	2.48	0	18
Husband	3.47	2.75	0	18
Hours worked per week (public)				
wife	34.74	12.89	12	75
husband	48.05	10.54	12	75
Current Salary				
Wife	47,541	30687.82	16,000	125,000
Husband	84,392	34177.51	16,000	125,000
Family	131,934	48608.74	43,500	250,000
Gender equity				
Wife	11.52	2.73	0	14
Husband	11.02	2.88	0	14
Job Autonomy score				
Wife	9.58	2.57	3	12
Husband	9.94	2.30	3	12
Job Stress				
Wife	10.49	4.04	2	32
Husband	10.69	3.73	0	24

Table Two
Note: N=303

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics

(Categorical Variables)

	Frequency	Percent
Education		
Wife No four year degree or below	39	12.87
Husband no four year Degree or below	30	9.9
Wife Four year degree	91	3.01
Husband Four year degree	71	23.43
Wife MA or Professional Degree	173	57.09
Husband MA or Professional Degree	202	66.67
Number of Jobs		
One (wife)	253	83.5
One (husband)	256	84.49
Two (wife)	50	16.5
Two (husband)	47	15.51
Who should provide main income?		
Your Spouse more or entirely (wife)	120	39.6
Equally (wife)	135	44.55
Equally (husband)	99	32.67
You more or entirely(husband)	162	53.46
Other (wife)	48	15.84
Other (husband)	42	13.86
Race/ethnicity descriptor		
Wife White	251	82.83
Husband White	268	88.44
Wife Black	15	4.95
Husband Black	19	6.27
Wife Other	37	12.21
Husband Other	16	5.28
Religion		
Wife Protestant	111	36.63
Husband Protestant	105	34.65
Wife Roman Catholic	97	32.01
Husband Roman Catholic	89	29.37
Wife Other	95	31.35
Husband Other	109	35.97
Family Type		
Teen family	193	63.69
Tot family	98	32.34
Teen/tot family	12	3.96

Table Three
N= 303

For the question “who should provide the main income”, it is less than surprising to note that less than 1% of men reported “spouse entirely” or “spouse more than you” while 40% of women reported such. Additionally, while it is interesting to note that the largest percentage of women and second largest percentage of men answered “equally”, this is slightly counteracted by the fact that the majority of men (53%) reported “you more or entirely .

The independent variables relating to my theory of job dynamics: job stress and job autonomy, scores for men and women were also fairly consistent with one another with only some slight deviations. Both men and women in this study experienced relatively high levels of job autonomy and middle to lower levels of job stress. Women averaged 10.4 on job stress and 9.6 on job autonomy while men averaged 10.6 on job stress and 9.9 on job autonomy. Roughly 71% of women and 77% of men had job autonomy scores of nine or above and only 10% of women and 6% of men had job autonomy scores lower than five. Additionally, 54% of women and 50% of men had stress levels between eight and twelve and less than 1% of both men and women reported stress above 24.

A brief look at the dependent variables: average time men and women spend in both traditionally male and traditionally female work shows us that women are completing a majority of the traditionally female work while men complete more of the traditionally male tasks. On average, households in this sample spend about 47.7 hours a week in traditionally female labor. Women contribute 29.7 hours (62%) and men contribute 18.7 hours (38%). For the traditionally male work, households only complete

about 5.8 hours of this type of work in a week. Men do the most with 3.5 hours (60%) and women complete roughly 2.4 hours (40%).

As briefly discussed above, I will be running a basic ordinary least squared (OLS) regression for the economic exchange and gender ideology theories. When I compare my theory against both gender ideology and economic exchange I will be looking at improvements from one model to the next based on the F-test. First, I will run an OLS regression for the older models and discuss how the results from this data set compare to past research. Next, I will add the independent variables for gender ideology to economic theory and use these as my base model. Next I will add the independent variables for job dynamics to the both the economic and gender theory and run an F-test to see if or how this model improved upon the "older" model. Besides merely trying to show the complexity of the issue and the need for a diverse range of theories, my major hypotheses include:

1) As the education, hours spent at work, number of jobs worked, and proportion of wife's income increases, a wife's contribution to household labor will decrease. Additionally movement made towards a more liberal gender ideology by husbands, a wife's contribution to domestic work will decrease (all in line with past research).

2) As job stress and job autonomy increase for husbands, wife's contribution to domestic work will also increase and as job stress and job autonomy increase for wives, their contribution to domestic work will decrease.

3) The inclusion of the "job dynamics hypothesis" variables (job stress and job autonomy) will improve upon both economic exchange theory and gender ideology.

FINDINGS

To begin my analysis, I started with a quick correlation matrix of all the major X variables. Because a few variables seemed to be correlated in a significant manner with one another, I also ran a VIF or Variance Inflation test to make sure my results would not be affected. There is not a well understood or accepted critical value for determining whether or not a VIF score is too high to indicate a problem. However, some statisticians often show that ten is a reasonable cut-off (Stine 1995, Craney and Surles 2002). So, using ten as my cut-off, I found no variables to be an issue with the VIF test. I also ran a VIF after each regression for the different models. Results for the tests can be seen below in the appendix in tables A3-A6.

Traditionally Female Domestic Labor
Interpretation for Economic Exchange (Model 1)

The first set of regressions run was for traditionally female work for the economic and gender theories. My hypothesis for both the economic and gender ideology theories were that they would be consistent with past literature. For all regressions under consideration I used a .05 significance level (though I also take into consideration results that may fall slightly above this). As stated earlier, the variables for economic exchange model were husband's and wife's education, hours worked per week in paid labor by each, number of jobs worked by each, wife's percent contribution to household income; as well as the control variables of wife's and husband's race and religion and the couple's family type. For the economic theory model for traditionally female work (results of which can be seen in table four), the R-squared is .2461 or roughly 25% of the variance in female work can be explained by this theory. The results show that though education is

not significant, some differences between husband's educational categories are. Also, data shows that hours worked per week for wives and husbands, wives' number of jobs as well as the wives percent contributed to household income were also statistically significant.

Because education is a categorical variable with more than two dummy variables produced, an F-test was run to establish significance. For husband's and wife's education a degrees of freedom of 283 for the denominator and 2 for the numerator was used and an F-stat of 2.69 for husbands and .472 for wives was calculated. The F-calculated for education was not found to be significant for either husbands or wives, as an F-stat of roughly 3.0 was needed for significance. However, some of the differences between different educational categories for husbands were found to be significant.

First, there was a significant difference in wives percent contributed to domestic labor between those couples where husbands had an MA or PhD and where husbands did not have at least a four year degree. When husbands had no four year degree, wives percent contributed to domestic labor was 8% higher than when the husband had an MA or PhD. However there was no significant difference in wives contribution between couples where the husband had an MA or PhD and where husbands only had a four year degree. Next I switched out the original reference category of MA or PhD and found that when husbands had no four year degree, wives percent contributed to domestic labor was 8.2% higher than when the husband had a four year degree. So, a wife's contribution to domestic work is highest for couples where the husband did not have a four year degree, followed by where the husband had an MA or PhD and then a four year degree. However, statistical significance was only found between the without four year degree and with

four year degree categories and between the without four year degree and with MA or PhD categories. This suggests that wife's percent contributed to domestic labor is higher for those women who are married to men without a college degree than those women married to men with higher academic degrees.

Statistical significance for number of hours worked per week by husbands and wives, the wife's number of jobs as well as percent of income contributed by women was also found. As the number of hours worked per week (outside the home) increased by an hour for the wives, their participation in domestic labor decreased slightly (less than one percent). As number of hours worked by husbands increased by one, the wife's percentage of time spent in traditionally female domestic labor increased slightly (roughly one percent or less). Also as the wife's number of jobs increased from one to two, her contribution to domestic labor decreased by 4.4%. And finally, as the wife's contribution to family income increased by one percent, wife's participation in domestic labor decreased by .22%.

In addition an F-test was run to find the significance of the control variables, since they too were categorical variables producing more than one dummy variable. Again, using 283 as the degrees of freedom for the denominator and 2 for the numerator, only wife's race was found to be significant with an F-calculated of 5.69, since at least three was needed. F-tests for male race at 2.586, female religion at .0236, male religion at .0164 and family type at .0333 were all too low to reveal significance. Additionally, some differences between different racial categories for both women and men were also significant. Wives percent contributed to domestic labor was highest for wives choosing the racial category black, followed by white and then "other". Black wives contributed

15.5% more than the "other" racial category and white wives contributed 9.4% more. However when using "other" as the reference category, no statistically significant difference was found between black and white. Finally for the husbands' racial category, two racial categories had a significant difference: "other" and white. Wives with white spouses contributed 9.5% more than wives with husbands choosing the "other" racial category.

Despite their statistical significance, not every significant variable may have an impact in a real life setting. For both husband's and wife's hours worked per week, the variables are statistically significant, but this significance does not seem to carry over in a real life setting. For instance, as a husband's hours worked per week increases one hour, his wife's contribution to domestic labor increases .38%, less than one percent. If we look at a five hour increase in hours worked per week, we see that domestic labor increases 1.9%, and with a ten hour increase domestic labor increases 3.8%. Also when women work two jobs as opposed to one, their contribution to domestic labor increases by 4.4%, or roughly an hour and a half (based on a thirty hour work week). And finally, as a wife's number of hours worked per week increases one hour, her time contributed to domestic labor decreases .21%, again not a large change. With a five hour increase we see a 1% decrease and with a ten hour increase we see a 2% decrease. With an average of 30 hours worked in domestic labor by women, these changes in domestic labor (1% to 4.4%) are reflected as only an hour or slightly more a week, not a significant amount of time.

However, the various differences between categories within both husband's education and race do have more significance in a real life setting. The 8% to 8.2% differences that we see between different educational categories for men are relatively

large percentages that can equate to a two to three hour a week difference in the amount of time women spend in traditionally female tasks (based on the average thirty hours worked by women a week). Additionally the 9.4% to 15.5% differences seen between different racial categories is also a relatively large difference. Based on the average thirty hours women worked a week, differences of these size can equate to between a two and five hour difference a week between the different racial categories.

Interpretation of Gender Ideology (Model 2)

Next I ran the gender ideology model which included the variables of wife's and husband's answers to "who should provide to main income," wife's and husband's gender equity score, and the control variables of wife's and husband's race and religion as well as the couple's family type. For the gender ideology theory (results of which can be seen in table four), the R-squared was .1644, or roughly 16% of the variance in traditionally female work can be explained by this theory. Though the gender equity scores in the gender ideology theory were not statistically significant for this particular data set, the variable of who should provide to the family income was far more telling. Since the variables for "who should contribute to income" and the control variables were broken into dummy categories, an F-test was completed for significance. The F-test revealed that both "who should contribute to income" and wife's race were statistically significant. Additionally, the p-value shows that some of the differences between categories within these two variables were also significant.

For "who should provide to main income" 286 was used as the degrees of freedom for the numerator and two for the denominator. An F-calculated of 7.23 for wives' responses and 1.535 for husbands was revealed, which was high enough to show

significance only for wives for this variable. No statistically significant differences existed between categories for husbands, but two did for categories for wives. There was a 5.5% difference in wives contribution towards domestic labor between the category where women chose "other" and where women chose "equally," with women choosing "other" contributing more. Since "other" was the original reference category for this variable, it was switched out, and another significant difference was found between couples where the wife chose "spouse all or more" and where she chose "equally". Women who chose "spouse all or more" contributed 9.3% more to traditionally female domestic labor than women who chose "equally". So we can see that wives contribution to domestic labor was highest for wives who chose "spouse all or more" followed by "other" and then "equally" as the lowest (though there was no statistically significant difference between "spouse all or more" and "other").

The F-test completed to find significance for the control variable for wife's and husband's race, religion and couple's family type used 286 for degrees of freedom for the numerator and 2 for the denominator. Since roughly three was needed, the calculated F's for husband's race at .6096, female religion at .0434, male religion at .6928 and family type at .2767 were not high enough to show significance. However, the F-calculated for wife's race was 7.013, which was high enough to reveal significance. Wives' contribution to domestic labor was again highest for black women, followed by white and then "other. Additionally, the differences that existed between the categories of "other" and white as well as "other" and black were statistically significant. Wives choosing the racial category of black contributed 15.2% more towards domestic labor than women

choosing “other”; while those choosing white contributed 10.5% more than women who chose “other” as their racial category.

Some of the variables within this theory that were statistically significant also seem to be large enough to warrant significance in a real world manner. First of all, for the differences within the “who should provide to main income,” the 5.5% difference between the categories “equally” and “other” seems to be large enough to make an impact in a real woman’s life. A 5.5% difference (either an increase or decrease) would equate to about a 1.65 hour change in domestic labor worked in one week (based on an average 30 hours worked per week). Also the 9.3% difference between “spouse all or more” and “equally” could equate to about 2.8 to 3 hour change a week. When we think of this 5.5% to 9.3% change for women as also a 5.5% to 9.3% change in the opposite direction for men, it is more understandable how a two to three hour increase for a wife in conjunction with a decrease for her husband could make a real impact in her household life. And finally, the 15.2% difference between the black and “other” racial category and the 10.5% difference between white and “other” also seem to be significant in a real life setting since this difference could equate to a three to five hour increase for black and white women as compared to those choosing “other” (again based on the average 30 hours per week).

Model Comparison Among Economic (Model 1) Gender Ideology (Model 2) and Gender and Economic Combined (Model 3)

For the comparison of the models for traditionally female work, I began with the economic exchange theory combined with the gender ideology theory as my base model. This combined model was then compared to the individual economic exchange and

gender ideology models separately to establish if either were improved upon by the combined model. First I ran F-tests comparing both the economic and gender models individually to the combined model (model three). For the F-test comparing the economic exchange model to the combined model, a degree of freedom of 277 for the denominator and a 6 for the numerator was used, and a calculated F of 2.0247 was found. Despite the fact that a 2.1 was needed to show model improvement, since this is an arbitrary critical value, we can still say (with some confidence) that model three improved upon model one. For comparisons of the gender ideology model (two) and the combined model (three), a degree of freedom of 277 for the denominator and 9 for the numerator was used and a calculated F of 4.827 was found. Since an F of about 1.9 was needed, this F-test shows that the combined model improved upon the model with gender ideology variables alone.

Since model three improved upon both the economic exchange model and the gender ideology model alone, the different statistically significant variables should be re-interpreted from within the model three regression. From table four we can see that the wife's and husband's number of hours worked per week, wife's percent income and some differences between husband's educational categories and male and female racial categories were statistically significant. First of all, similar to model one, as the number of hours a wife worked per week increased one hour, her contribution to domestic labor decreased by .17%. Also, as the number of hours the husband worked per week increased one hour, the wife's contribution to domestic labor decreased .373%. Finally as wives' percent contributed to family income increased, wives' contribution to domestic labor decreased .162%. However, these changes are small if not negligible real life impacts

since even a ten hour increase in wives' and husbands' hours worked per week and a 10% increase in wives' percent income only equate to about an hour or less change in the time women work in domestic labor per week.

For the variables with categories which produced more than two dummy categories, F-tests were run for statistical significance. Using 2 and 277 for the degrees of freedom, an F-calculated of roughly three was needed to show significance. Neither wife's education (1.349), husbands' responses to "who should provide to main income" (.821), husbands' race (1.927), husbands' religion (.239) wives' religion (.411) or family type (.409) were found significant. However, husband's education (2.86) was nearing significance while wives' responses to "who should provide to main income" (4.15) and wives race (5.04) were both significant.

Within some categorical variables, differences were also found significant in model three. Since "MA or PhD" was the original reference category, it was also switched out with the category of four year degree in order to find any significant differences between no four year degree and four year degree. After doing this, I was able to see that for husband's education, wives' contribution was highest for husbands without a four year degree, followed by husbands with an MA or PhD and then husbands with a four year degree. Though there was no significant difference between husbands with a four year degree and husbands with an MA or PhD, there was one between no four year degree and MA or PhD as well as no four year degree and four year degree. Wives contribution to domestic labor was 8.1% higher for husbands without a four year degree than husbands with an MA or PhD. And wives contribution was 8.7% higher for husbands without a four year degree than husbands with a four year degree.

Also the variable of wives' responses to "who should provide to main income" was also significant. Wives contribution to domestic labor was highest for women who chose "spouse all or more" followed by those who chose other and then equally. However, only the difference between wives who chose equally and wives who chose "spouse all or more" was statistically significant with wives choosing "spouse all or more" contributing 6.7% more than wives choosing equally. Again, the real life impact of this change in wives' contribution would equate to about a two hour difference (based on a 30 average week). This change could be quite noticeable for women who already contribute 62% of the average household labor, especially when compared with the subsequent change in the husband's participation

Since female race was also found significant with the F-test, the same process of switching out the original reference category (other) was completed. From this I found that wives contribution to domestic labor was highest for the racial category of black, followed by white and then "other." Two of these differences were statistically significant: the difference between black and "other" and between white and "other." Women choosing the racial category of black contributed 13.5% more to domestic labor than the "other" racial category, while those choosing white contributed 8.9% more than women choosing "other." Additionally, though male race was not statistically significant, the difference between white and "other" was for this model. Wives' contribution to domestic labor was 8.2% higher for wives with white husbands as compared to wives with husbands choosing the racial category of "other." As discussed earlier, these eight to nine percent changes based on both husbands' education and race can be seen as making real or significant impacts in an actual household. Since these changes equate to a two to

three hour difference for women (based on an average 30 hours worked per week) and a subsequent change for men as well, these changes would be noticeable by wives in a household, especially relative to their husbands' contributions.

Model Comparison Between Combined Model (Model 3) and Combined Plus Job Dynamics Variables (Model 4)

In order to test how or if my model improved upon past research, I conducted the F-test (Hanushek and Jackson 1977) for an original or "smaller" model compared to a "larger" model. The smaller model consisted of the combined economic exchange and gender ideology models while the larger model included the economic variables, gender variables, and the variables from the job dynamics hypothesis. The variables that were added to the combined model (model 3) were the job dynamics variables of wife's and husband's job stress and wife's and husband's job autonomy. When the gender and economic variables are run together, the sum of squared residuals for this model was 6.8351. Whenever I ran the regression to include both this "older" model and the job dynamics variables, the sum of squared residuals was 6.7824. My calculated F for this comparison was .5379. When this calculated F is compared to that on the table (where S=4 and degrees of freedom = 273) it is discovered that the calculated F is not larger (.534>2.4), thus the variables for job dynamics did not improve upon the model with the "older" theories' variables. Additionally, the effects of most of the other X's are similar to model three in terms of both direction and statistical significance. However, the difference between the wife's educational categories of MA or PhD and four year degree is suddenly significant in model four, despite not being so in models one or three. Model

four shows that women with a four year degree contribute 3.83% less to domestic labor than women with an MA or PhD.

Comparisons of Variables Throughout all Models

Despite the fact that the addition of the job dynamics variables did not improve upon the economic exchange and gender ideology combined models, it is worth exploring the different variables throughout all of the models under study. When we look at the regressions for all of the models together (which can be seen in table four), we can see how, if at all, variables affected the variation in the percentage of time wives contributed to housework across the different models. From the economic exchange theory, the difference between husbands without a four year degree and those with an MA or PhD, the number of hours the husband worked (outside the home) and the percentage the wife contributed to household income were all statistically significant throughout the models.

Consistently throughout the models, women who had husbands who had not completed a four year degree contributed more to domestic labor than those who had completed an MA or PhD. Also, as the number of hours husbands worked outside the home increased, the percentage of time women worked in the home increased in each between .37 and .38 through the models. And finally, increases in the percentage of the income contributed by the wife were consistently associated with .14% to .22% decreases in the percentage of time wives spent in domestic labor.

Table 4: All Variables Associated with Variation in the Percentage of Housework Time Spent on Traditional Female Domestic Labor

Independent Variable	Model 1 (Economic)	Model 2 (Gender)	Model 3 (Economic +Gender)	Model 4 (All)
ECONOMIC EXCHANGE				
Without 4 Year Degree Wife [a]	-.477 (3.293)		-1.882 (3.324)	-1.865 (3.360)
4 year degree wife	-2.108 (2.220)		-3.697 (2.252)	-3.831(2.267)*
Without 4 Year Degree Husband	7.928 (3.586)*		8.123 (3.631)*	7.356 (3.731)*
4 year degree Husband	-.280 (2.324)		-.609 (2.319)	-.457 (2.340)
Hours/ week Wife	-.201 (.091)*		-.168 (.091)*	-.158 (.094)*
Hours/ week Husband	.388 (.096)*		.373 (.095)*	.372 (.096)*
Number of Jobs Wife	-4.402 (2.608)*		-3.834 (2.614)	-3.777 (2.625)
Number of Jobs Husband	2.256 (2.711)		2.046 (2.800)	1.928 (2.822)
Percent House Income Wife	-.222 (.072)*		-.162 (.0754)*	-.172 (.077)*
GENDER IDEOLOGY VARIABLES				
Spouse more or entirely provide (Wife) [b]		3.710 (3.009)	3.119 (2.897)	3.123 (2.915)
Equally Provide (Wife)		-5.591 (2.853)*	-3.536 (2.759)	-3.583 (2.806)
Equally Provide (Husband)		.307 (3.131)	3.081 (3.012)	3.096 (3.032)
You more or entirely provide (Husband)		4.018 (3.083)	3.743 (2.971)	3.357 (3.004)
Gender Equity score (Wife)		-.297 (.391)	-.089 (.383)	-.119 (.391)
Gender Equity score (Husband)		.187 (.376)	-.002 (.372)	-.002 (.374)
JOB DYNAMICS VARIABLES				
Job Autonomy (Wife)				-.004 (.392)
Job Autonomy (Husband)				.036 (.454)
Job Stress (Wife)				-.079 (.252)
Job Stress (Husband)				.371 (.268)
CONTROL VARIABLES				
Wife race White [c]	9.446 (2.913)*	10.586 (3.001)*	8.959 (2.899)*	9.614 (2.952)*
Wife race Black	15.562 (8.003)*	15.161 (8.314)*	13.503 (8.000)*	13.588 (8.206)*
Husband race Black	8.314 (7.795)	6.103 (8.101)	9.069 (7.751)	9.357 (7.879)
Husband race White	9.561 (4.212)*	4.706 (4.366)	8.211 (4.209)*	8.033 (4.241)*
Wife religion Protestant [d]	-1.613 (2.641)	-.738 (2.790)	-1.791 (2.670)	-1.581 (2.694)
Wife religion Catholic	-2.543 (2.711)	-.174 (2.824)	-2.441 (2.741)	-2.284 (2.757)
Husband religion Protestant	1.096 (2.641)	-.105 (2.695)	.974 (2.595)	736 (2.627)
Husband religion Catholic	-.8723 (2.740)	-2.805 (2.819)	-.753 (2.769)	-1.124 (2.802)
Family type tot [e]	5.622 (5.049)	-.786(5.158)	3.825 (5.053)	3.848 (5.083)
Family type teen	4.792 (4.851)	-2.240(5.019)	2.362 (4.867)	2.592 (4.903)
R2	**.246**	**.164**	**.277**	**.283**

Table four: N=303, SE's in parentheses * Denotes Significance p≤.05 (One tailed test)

a. With Ma or PhD as reference
b. With other as reference
c. With other as reference
d. With other as reference
e. With teen/tot family as reference

As for the gender ideology variables, only one was significant throughout the different models. The F-tests revealed that "who should provide to main income" for women was significant throughout all of the models. However, though some differences between categories for this variable were found significant in model two, none were found to be significant in the subsequent models three and four.

For the control variables, we see that consistently throughout each model, the variables for family type and husband's and wife's religion did not increase or decrease time spent in domestic labor and F-tests revealed that these variables were not significant in any model. However, F-tests completed for each of the models reveals that the variable for wife's race was statistically significant in each model. Additionally, the p-values from each model show that at least one difference between categories was consistently statistically significant in all models. Being a white female, as compared to choosing the racial category "other," increased the percentage of time wives spent in domestic labor in each model between 8% and 10%. No other race variable was significant throughout each of the models. However, these results are difficult to apply to a general population since the sample for this study was extremely white (83% to 5% black).

Traditionally Male Work

Interpretation of Economic Exchange (Model 1)

Next I will briefly look at how time spent in traditionally male tasks may be affected by these different variables within all three models. Though most literature spends most if not all of its time focusing on traditionally female tasks, I thought an understanding of fluctuations in traditionally male tasks might also be interesting.

However, regressions run for both the economic and gender ideology theories reveal that much of the variance found in the percentage of time wives contribute to traditionally male tasks is not explained by these variables (results can be found in table five). For the economic exchange theory, the R-squared was only .0480, meaning roughly 5% of the variance was explained by this model. Also, the findings show that none of the variables, or the differences within different variable's categories, were found to be significant to the .05 cut off. Finally, none of the F-tests run for the variables that consisted of more than two dummy categories revealed statistical significance for these variables.

Interpretation of Gender Ideology (Model 2)

For the gender ideology theory, only one variable was found to be significant to the .05 cutoff: "who should provide to main income." First of all, when F-tests were run for those variables which consisted of more than two dummy categories, the wife's response as to "who should provide to main income" was the only variable which was significant. For the F-test for this dummy variable a degrees of freedom of 286 was used for the denominator and two for the numerator. From this, an F-calculated of 4.326 was found which was larger than the needed F of 3.0 and thus able to reveal significance. Additionally, the differences between two different categories within this variable were also significant. There was a difference between couples where the wife chose "spouse all or more" and where the wife chose "equally" as well as a difference between where the wife chose "spouse all or more" and "other." Women who chose "spouse all or more" contributed 10.6% more to traditionally male tasks than women who chose "equally" and 10% more than women who chose "other." Thus wives' contribution to traditionally

male tasks is highest for those women who chose “spouse all or more” followed by “other” and then those who chose “equally.”

However, the differences between these categories for “who should provide more to income” do not seem to be large enough to show significance in a real world setting. For instance, the 10% and 10.6% more that women who chose “spouse all or more” as compared to women who chose “equally” and “other”, respectively, contributed equates to about twelve more minutes a week (based on the average two hours a week women spend in traditionally male tasks).

Model Comparisons for Economic (Model one) Gender (Model two) Combined (Model three) and Combined with Job Dynamics (Model four)

When the economic and gender models were each compared with the combined (economic plus gender models) for model improvement with the use of the F-test, we see that neither the economic model nor the gender ideology model were improved upon by the combined model (model three). For the economic and combined model comparison, a degrees of freedom of six for the numerator and 277 for the denominator were used but the F-calculated, 1.351 was not high enough since roughly 2.1 was needed. Additionally, for the gender ideology and combined comparison, 277 was used for the denominator and nine for the numerator. A calculated F of .772 was found and was not high enough to reveal statistical significance since roughly 2 was needed.

Table 5: All Variables Associated with Variation in the Percentage of Housework Time Spent on Traditional Male Tasks

Independent Variable	Model 1 (Economic)	Model 2 (Gender)	Model 3 (Economic +Gender)	Model 4 (All)
ECONOMIC EXCHANGE				
Without 4 Year Degree Wife[a]	-5.450 (5.711)		-5.827 (5.804)	-6.096 (5.877)
4 year degree wife	1.952 (3.849)		.632 (3.931)	.727 (3.964)
Without 4 Year Degree Husband	6.739 (6.217)		8.029 (6.339)	9.491 (6.525)
4 year degree husband	4.566 (4.030)		4.589 (4.048)	4.456 (4.093)
Hours/ week Wife	.084 (.157)		.101 (.159)	.105 (.164)
Hours/ week Husband	.049 (.166)		.055 (.167)	.058 (.168)
Number of Jobs Wife	.444 (4.522)		.987 (4.564)	1.006 (4.591)
Number of Jobs Husband	6.516 (4.699)		8.07 (4.890)	8.255 (4.934)
Percent House Income Wife	-.235 (.125)*		-.169 (.132)	-.146 (.134)
GENDER IDEOLOGY				
Spouse more or entirely provide (Wife)[b]		10.074 (4.946)*	9.536 (5.058)*	9.614 (5.098)
Equally Provide (Wife)		-.517 (4.689)	-.286 (4.817	.306 (4.908)
Equally Provide (Husband)		1.931 (5.146)	1.631 (5.259)	1.364 (5.302)
You more or entirely provide (Husband)		1.031 (5.068)	-.436 (5.188)	.208 (5.253)
Gender Equity score (Wife)		.705 (.643)	.667 (.669)	.721 (.683)
Gender Equity score (Husband)		.069 (.618)	.319 (.649)	.298 (.655)
JOB DYNAMICS VARIABLES				
Job Autonomy (Wife)				-.302 (.685)
Job Autonomy (Husband)				.384 (.793)
Job Stress (Wife)				-.105 (.439)
Job Stress (Husband)				-.370 (.468)
CONTROL VARIABLES				
Wife race White [c]	3.743 (5.051)	2.985 (4.932)	2.474 (5.060)	1.832 (5.164)
Wife race Black	5.432 (13.875)	4.567 (13.664)	4.710 (13.968)	4.773 (14.352)
Husband race Black	.499 (13.515)	1.987 (13.313)	.508 (13.532)	-.063 (13.780)
Husband race White	6.584 (7.302)	4.336 (7.175)	4.838 (7.349)	4.672 (7.416)
Wife religion Protestant [d]	1.589 (4.579)	.607 (4.585)	.921 (4.662)	.422 (4.712)
Wife religion Catholic	3.343 (4.701)	3.076 (4.641)	2.756 (4.785)	2.438 (4.821)
Husband religion Protestant	-.678 (4.521)	-1.096 (4.429)	-.565 (4.531)	.023 (4.594)
Husband religion Catholic	-5.081 (4.751)	-5.099 (4.632)	-5.512 (4.836)	-5.005 (4.899)
Family type tot [e]	6.413 (8.755)	4.950 (8.476)	4.456 (8.822)	4.022 (8.890)
Family type teen	6.509 (8.411)	5.212 (8.249)	4.495 (8.498)	3.950 (8.574)
R2	**.0480**	**.0519**	**.0751**	**.0792**

Table five: N=303, SE's in parentheses * Denotes significance p≤.05 (two-tailed test)
a.With Ma or PhD as reference
b.With other as reference
c.With other as reference
d.With other as reference
e.With teen/tot family as reference

When the variables for job dynamics were added to the models, they too were not statistically significant nor were any other variables significant in models three or four.

Finally, the F-tests were run for the comparison of models with the addition of the job dynamics theory. Using a degrees of freedom of 277 for the denominator and 4 for the numerator, an F-calculated of .308 was found. However, for this model comparison an F calculated of roughly 2.4 was needed to show significance. Thus, the addition of the job dynamic variables did not show a significant improvement over the model with only the economic and gender dynamic variables.

Discussion

As stated earlier, when it comes to the economic exchange/time availability theory and the gender ideology theory, I hypothesized that my results would be consistent with past research in that income, education, hours worked, and gender equity would all be associated with increases and decreases in the amount of time wives spent in domestic labor. For the economic exchange model, the data did show that employment and income for women as well as employment and education for men all attributed to decreases in contributions to domestic labor. Additionally, for gender ideology, though the gender equity score did not reveal any significant findings, the questions as to how household income contributions should be divided did reveal that more liberal or less traditional gender beliefs were associated with decreases in wives' contribution to domestic labor. As far as stereotypically male work is concerned, the data showed no statistically significant variables. However, this is not inconsistent with past research. In studies where the dependent variable was separated into male and female tasks, the results were often inconsistent across different studies (Greenstein 1996, Coltrane 2000). Because of the restrictive nature of traditionally female tasks (they have to be completed on a daily basis rather than at one's leisure) and the lower level of prestige associated with them, the

crux of the story of the gendered split of domestic labor is based on these traditionally female tasks.

The most striking and consistent finding revealed in this data is that women in the 21st century still continue to complete a majority of household labor. No other variable was as strong as gender in this study. So the question remains: what could contribute to this continuing variation in domestic labor? Research suggests that it is based on either what economic advantages either spouse brings to the household or that the traditional or non-traditional gender ideologies of the individual is seen through their respective completion of household tasks. However, based on this study, the overarching story revealed here is that despite relatively high income and education, as well as liberal gender ideologies, women are still completing a majority of the traditionally female domestic labor.

This study reveals that both the economic and gender ideology models still hold some weight when attempting to understand the variations of time spent in domestic labor. As far as the economic exchange model is concerned, we cannot deny that employment, income, and husband's education help us understand why women are doing the majority of the domestic labor. Women who are employed and are contributing more to the household income do have a logical reason to assume that their husband's contributions to domestic labor should be more on par with their own. When a wife is more equal in terms of economic contributions to the household and when she has her own demands at work, the contributions her and her husband make towards domestic labor should logically move towards equal.

Also, the husband's educational level may help to understand this variation in domestic labor. In the study, we saw that having a husband with either no four year degree or with an MA or PhD increased a wife's contribution to domestic labor. Husband's education could be contributing to this variation in domestic labor because the effects of differing educational levels on the husband may be seen as primary in the household. For example, overcoming the negative effects of not having a four year degree (lower income, less occupational prestige etc) by not contributing more to "menial" labor may be seen as more important for the husband because his role as the "husband" is viewed as primary to that of the wife's. Conversely, husbands with an MA or PhD likely have more pressing time constraints than men with a four year degree or no degree, and they cannot or will not spend more time in domestic labor.

Additionally, the gender ideology model also shows that a more liberal or non-traditional ideology regarding the traditional male breadwinner status also helps to explain why some women are completing more domestic labor than others. The question as to who should provide income revealed that non-traditional beliefs about the male breadwinner status were associated with decreases in the wife's contribution to domestic labor as compared to couples with more traditional beliefs. This may be contributed to the fact that the role of male breadwinner is still a strongly held belief and that deviations from this role are more indicative of liberal gender attitudes and more liberal gender roles within the household.

However, in this study, we also see that the economic exchange and gender ideology models fall short of explaining this continued variation in some cases. First of all, for the economic exchange model, a wife's education did not affect her contribution

to domestic labor but her husband's did. Despite the fact that women were relatively highly educated in this sample, this education did not have an effect on their contributions to domestic labor. If this situation is because of what I mentioned earlier, that men's educations are seen as primary, than this relationship between education and domestic labor is not related to economics but rather to gender beliefs. Additionally, within the gender ideology model, the fact that the gender equity score did not explain any variation in domestic labor but that the question as to who should contribute to household income did, is also interesting. If it is not one's gender beliefs in general which help explain this variation but rather their beliefs towards breadwinner status, than this perhaps is related more to economic variables than to gender. These two issues highlight the complexity within the division of household labor that neither model alone can explain.

Within both of these models, we see that perhaps the demographics of the individuals in the study, the control variables in this case, could also help us understand this division in domestic labor. Though one would assume that the age of the children in the household would be related to the wife's and husband's contributions to domestic labor, this study reveals that this is not the case. The make-up of the household does not seem to explain the variation in the sharing of domestic labor. However, the race of the wife does seem to explain some of this variation. The basic consensus through the models was that women choosing the racial category of black contributed the most to domestic labor, followed by white and then the racial category of "other". The fact that women choosing the racial category of black contributed the highest proportion to domestic labor could be attributed to relatively lower levels of income or even education in this data set.

However, hypothesis made about the reasons for the differences between racial categories are difficult to ascertain given the large majority of the sample that was white. Understanding the division of household labor based on race is an entire study in its own right.

These various issues point to the importance of approaching the study of the division of household labor with new and varied models, thus the importance of the job dynamics hypothesis. Unfortunately, the job dynamics variables were not found to be statistically significant in the final model as individual variables or as a sign of model improvement for this particular sample. Though none of the job dynamics variables were statistically significant, the husbands' job stress and job autonomy did follow at least the directional hypothesis I made. Both job stress and job autonomy for husband had a positive coefficient, meaning that if significant, they would have contributed to an increase in wives' contribution to domestic labor. Despite these "non-findings", this study still reveals the need for new approaches. The models used in this study do not paint a full picture as to the understanding of why women continue to contribute more to domestic labor. However, the study does help to establish the necessity for the use of new variables for understanding this division.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

As I stated early on in the paper, I was under no illusions that my new theory would completely undermine past research and theories or that it would somehow revolutionize the field. I wanted to show that in the study of gender dynamics, particularly as it relates to the interplay between the public and private, the story is quite complex. On its own, understanding gender is extraordinarily difficult. Gender attitudes

and roles are so embedded in our everyday lives that it is difficult to weed out any sort of correlation of cause and effect. Similarly when another layer, occupation or work life, is added to the mix, the story becomes even more complicated. Studying and trying to find the relationships embedded in gender attitudes and actions in both the public and private sphere necessitates the use of multiple research methods and the knowledge that the findings will rarely if ever be rosy.

For this particular study, I was hindered in the fact that my data was not gathered for my specific research questions and that it was both skewed towards the middle class, white, educated side. Most of the variables I had to construct from the original variable forms and mold to a form that was applicable towards my study. Unfortunately, data sets that are so comprehensive that they cover gender beliefs, household work, public work, attitudes, and a detailed demographic background are hard to come by. Despite all of this, I am grateful that I was able to find a data set that was able to cover (in some manner) all of the variables that go into this study. I believe that despite the somewhat inferior findings of this particular data set, it still revealed a modest defense for my theory and pointed to the need for new approaches and variables in the field.

The complexity of this research topic will only be understood better by the inclusion of a diverse sample. Race, education, income, religion etc. all contribute to the story, and when the sample does not adequately take that into consideration, it is difficult to properly portray that complexity. If data were to be collected with this particular study in mind, the first thing that would need to be fixed is that the sample would need to be more varied and more representative of a general population. The sample would need to have more individuals from a lower or working class who would, possibly, have

occupations that are more of a strain on their lives and (have) less of an economic reward. Additionally, a sample with fewer individuals with higher degrees (four year or graduate) and more with less education could also give a better picture. Also, since I do understand the context of marriage and presence of children to be so important, more detailed information on the number, age and even gender of the children would have helped to show, if at all, children at different life stages may affect the wives and husbands number and type of contributions.

Additionally, the survey should have more questions which dig deeper into the individual's occupational characteristics. For example, a time diary survey could be beneficial. Participants could be given a beeper, and when it signals them to do so, they could describe how stressed and/ or fulfilled, powerful, autonomous, they feel in their occupations at the moment. Additionally, variables like job dynamics and job autonomy could be turned into a difference ratio for the husbands and wives. Perhaps understanding the differences between the husband's and wife's respective job dynamics would explain some of the variations in how they divide domestic labor.

However despite any of this, this data sample did reveal two major findings that support my underlying belief that this field is in need of new and varied theories. First of all the fact that the individuals in the sample were located so towards the white, wealthy, educated and rather liberal persuasion, yet women still completed 62% of all traditionally female domestic labor is rather telling. Given past theories, this data set contains all the necessary variables for a relatively egalitarian sharing of domestic labor: high education, high income and egalitarian beliefs. However men in this study still contributed a starkly low percentage of the domestic labor. Second, the fact that many of my findings for the

older theories (economic and gender) were inconsistent with past research highlights how weak many past assertions in this field can be. Both this study and past research using the economic and gender variables are often conflicting. Thus something more is needed to understand this division of household labor, even if it is not job dynamics.

The study of gender, and dynamics related to it, has a very strong cyclical component. For example, with the division of labor, do these variables such as job, education, occupational dynamics or gender ideology affect the division or does the strongly embedded or oft-considered "natural" role of women as the main accomplishers of these domestic tasks affect their prospects in education and the economy and shape one's view about gender roles? The complexity and ever growing field of questions relating to gender dynamics or how gender is played out on a daily basis (such as in the division of domestic tasks) is not means for an inability to study but rather a sign for the necessity of even more varied and dynamic approaches or perspectives. My job dynamics theory is just one example of that type of new perspective. Every approach, as long as it understands the complexity of the study, will add to the understanding of gender role dynamics and will benefit not only the academic field but the social progression of egalitarian gender attitudes.

I know that given my time and level of work this study will be far from comprehensive, but I believe that it is a starting point and will highlight the host of predictors of the division of household labor, the inner-workings of these predictors and the ability of quantitative research to gain a deeper understanding of a complicated social issue. Despite these issues, job dynamics theory adds to the study of the division of household labor. Gender is a confusing and multifaceted institution which can be both

created and recreated in both the public and private spheres. Thus any activity either impacted by, a creation of, or simply related to gender will carry some of the multiplicity inherent in the study of gender. While this may seem a detriment for those looking for the clean, attractive findings often found in the so called “hard” sciences, it is not necessarily so. One of the beauties of the scientific process is that all research, regardless if it is considered a success or a failure, dramatically contributes to the understanding of the particular field of study.

Appendix:

Table A1. Missing Data (prior to imputations)

Variable	Missing	Total
WIFE PERCENT IN FEMALE WORK	0	303
WIFE PERCENT IN MALE TASKS	9	303
WIFE EDUCATION	8	303
HUSBAND EDUCATION	0	303
WIFE HOURS PER WEEK	2	303
HUSBAND HOURS PER WEEK	24	303
WIFE NUMBER OF JOBS	0	303
HUSBAND NUMBER OF JOBS	0	303
WIFE CURRENT SALARY	18	303
HUSBAND CURRENT SALARY	14	303
WIFE WHO SHOULD PROVIDE MAIN INCOME	22	303
HUSBAND WHO SHOULD PROVIDE MAIN INCOME	15	303
WIFE GENDER EQUITY	0	303
HUSBAND GENDER EQUITY	0	303
WIFE JOB AUTONOMY	9	303
WIFE JOB STRESS	9	303
HUSBAND JOB AUTONOMY	9	303
HUSBAND JOB STRESS	8	303
WIFE RACE	2	303
HUSBAND RACE	0	303
WIFE RELIGION	0	303
HUSBAND RELIGION	0	303
FAMILY TYPE	0	303
Total Observations with missing data:	*149*	

Table A1.

Table A2. Correlation Matrix

	REL. PRO WIFE	REL. RC WIFE	RE. RC HUSB.	REL. PRO. HUSB	WIFE BLACK	WIFE WHITE
Rel. Pro Wife	1.0000					
Rel. rc wife	-0.5218	1.0000				
Rel husb rc	-0.1144	0.3651	1.0000			
Rel husb rc	0.3964	-0.0983	-0.4696	1.0000		
Wife black	0.1107	-0.0914	-0.0804	0.0896	1.0000	
Wife white	-0.0354	-0.0066	-0.0524	-0.0364	-0.5014	
1.0000						
Husb black	0.0576	-0.0316	-0.0174	0.0691	0.8196	-0.4238
Husb white	-0.0467	0.0488	-0.0163	-0.0189	-0.5839	
0.3832						
Tot family	-0.0571	0.0700	0.0653	0.0006	0.0699	
0.0153						
Teen family	0.0755	-0.0851	-0.0556	-0.0127	-0.0492	-0.0160
Job auto wife	0.0174	-0.0368	-0.0754	0.0189	-0.1287	
0.0450						
Job stress wife	-0.0264	-0.0100	-0.0175	0.0453	0.1268	-0.0074
Gender id. wife	0.0245	0.0548	0.0353	-0.0104	-0.1835	
0.1486						
# of jobs wife	-0.0612	-0.0573	-0.0720	-0.0248	-0.0605	-0.0335
# of jobs husb.	-0.0987	0.0186	0.1240	-0.2162	0.0703	
0 .0016						
Job auto. husb	-0.0091	0.0003	-0.0612	-0.0435	-0.0797	
0.1055						
Job stress husb	-0.0201	0.0394	0.0842	0.0097	0.0474	-0.1573
Gender id. husb	-0.0091	-0.0286	0.0946	-0.0114	-0.2025	
0.1214						
Hrs/week husb	0.0117	0.0190	-0.0367	0.0592	-0.1002	
0.0439						
Hrs/week wife	0.0562	-0.0992	0.0842	0.0288	0.0967	-0.0627
Wife % income	-0.0078	-0.0177	0.1105	-0.0360	-0.0247	-0.0636
No 4 yr wife	0.0555	-0.0102	0.0983	-0.0314	0.2303	-0.1126
4 yr wife	-0.0200	0.1369	0.0991	0.0070	-0.0499	-0.0837
No 4 yr husb.	0.0461	0.0331	0.0046	0.0140	0.1790	-0.1129
4 yr husb.	-0.0002	0.0880	0.1393	0.0065	0.0174	-0.0375
“spouse more”						
wife	0.0566	0.0229	-0.0333	0.0343	0.0018	0.0643
“equal” wife	-0.0338	0.0111	0.0779	-0.0528	0.0403	-0.0675
“spouse more”						
husb	0.0226	-0.0559	-0.0526	0.0263	-0.0186	-0.0710
“equal” husb	-0.1353	0.1102	0.1533	-0.0637	0.0357	-0.0375
“me more”						
husb	0.1326	-0.0831	-0.0956	0.0398	-0.0006	0.0316
“me more”						
wife	0.0226	0.0314	0.1264	-0.0594	-0.0186	0.0371

Table A2

A2 Correlation matrix continued.

	HUSB. BLACK	HUSB WHITE	TOT FAM.	TEEN FAM.	JOB AUTO WIFE
Husb black	1.0000				
Husb white	-0.7157	1.0000			
Tot family	0.0831	-0.0371	1.0000		
Teen family	-0.0595	0.0278	-0.9158	1.0000	
Job auto. wife	-0.0851	0.0737	0.0030	-0.0270	1.0000
Job stress wife	0.0393	-0.0583	-0.0615	0.0495	-0.1920
Gender id. wife	-0.1147	0.0999	0.1102	-0.1367	0.1819
# of jobs wife	-0.0783	0.0216	-0.1553	0.1137	0.0241
# of jobs husb.	0.0772	-0.1018	0.0740	-0.0367	-0.0082
Job auto husb	-0.0995	0.1113	0.0495	-0.0564	0.2320
Job stress husb	0.0067	0.0007	0.0475	-0.0530	-0.1194
Gender id. husb	-0.1531	0.1314	0.0034	-0.0315	0.0108
Hrs/week husb	-0.1100	0.0293	-0.1588	0.0897	0.0908
Hrs/week wife	0.0823	-0.0320	-0.1230	0.1497	0.0801
Wife % income	-.0287	0.0743	0.0481	-0.0064	0.0095
No 4 yr wife	0.1851	-0.1386	-0.0761	0.0647	-0.1561
4 yr wife	0.0087	0.0566	-0.0067	0.0305	-0.0445
No 4 yr husb.	0.1422	-0.0531	-0.0402	0.0664	-0.0836
4 yr husb.	0.0497	0.0049	0.0339	-0.0198	-0.0706
"spouse more" wife	-0.0424	0.0815	-0.0550	0.0921	-0.0018
"equal" wife	0.0694	-0.1331	-0.0236	-0.0137	0.0403
"spouse more/" husb	-0.0211	-0.0981	0.0308	-0.0232	0.0451
"equal" husb	0.0810	-0.0565	0.0448	-0.0448	-0.0672
"me more" husb	-0.0316	0.0148	-0.1329	0.1350	0.0539
"me more" wife	-0.0211	0.0295	0.0308	-0.0232	-0.0661

	WIFE JOB STRESS	WIFE GDR ID	WIFE # JOBS	HUSB # JOBS	HUSB JOB AUTO
Wife job stress	1.0000				
Wife gdr id	-0.0319	1.0000			
Wife # jobs	-0.0035	-0.0725	1.0000		
Husb # jobs	0.0291	-0.0724	0.1042	1.0000	
Husb job auto	-0.1648	0.1336	0.0121	-0.0121	1.0000
Husb job stress	0.0379	-0.0280	-0.0254	0.0279	-0.3009
Husb gender id	0.0206	0.3713	-0.0892	-0.2530	0.1040
Husb hrs/week	0.0124	0.0130	0.0594	-0.1746	0.1094
Wife hrs/week	0.2872	0.0486	-0.1101	-0.0157	-0.0818
Wife % income	0.2045	0.0358	-0.1204	0.0099	-0.1641
No 4 yr wife	0.0435	-0.2367	0.0946	-0.0013	-0.1137
4 yr wife	-0.1012	-0.0416	-0.0779	-0.0222	-0.0260
No 4 yr husb	0.1321	-0.2543	-0.0581	-0.1115	-0.1447
4 yr husb	-0.0771	0.0507	-0.0990	-0.0649	-0.0527
"sp. more" wife	-0.1354	-0.1361	0.0036	-0.0301	0.1218
" equal" wife	0.1507	0.0564	0.0666	0.0745	-0.1863
" sp. more" husb	0.0305	0.0142	-0.0362	-0.0349	0.0022
"equal" husb	0.1226	0.1034	-0.0064	-0.0264	0.0557
"me more" husb	-0.1322	-0.1481	0.0226	0.0890	-0.0686
"me more" wife	0.0911	0.0292	-0.0362	0.0777	-0.0155

Table A2 continued

A2 Correlation matrix continued

	HUSB JOB STRESS	HUSB GDR ID	HUSB HRS/WK	WIFE HRS/WK	WIFE% INC
Husb job stress	1.0000				
Husb gender id	-0.0266	1.0000			
Husb hrs/week	0.0124	0.0130	1.0000		
Wife hrs/week	-0.0157	-0.0818	0.0329	1.0000	
Wife % income	-0.1641	0.1183	0.0544	-0.2550	1.0000
No 4 yr wife	0.0528	-0.1668	-0.1509	0.0435	0.0001
4 yr wife	0.0501	-0.0313	0.0219	-0.1424	-0.1228
No 4 yr husb	0.1874	-0.1326	-0.0731	0.0683	0.1092
4 yr husb	-0.0194	-0.1269	0.0081	0.0095	-0.0032
"spouse more" wife	-0.1338	0.0750	-0.2487	-0.3512	0.0716
" equal" wife	0.0780	-0.0923	0.2795	0.3154	-0.0075
" spouse more" husb	0.0563	0.0035	0.0317	0.0707	-0.0313
"equal" husb	0.1894	-0.1457	0.2267	0.3488	-0.0156
"me more" husb	-0.2456	0.1287	-0.2171	-0.3671	0.0227
"me more" wife	0.0261	-0.0146	-0.1650	0.0428	0.1266

	4 yr wife	no 4 yr husb	4 yr husb	"spouse more" wife
4 yr wife	1.0000			
No 4 yr husb	-0.0002	1.0000		
4 yr husb	0.1815	-0.1834	1.0000	
"spouse more" wife	0.2055	0.0253	0.0300	1.0000
"equal wife"	-0.1817	0.0141	-0.0726	-0.7259
"spouse more" husband	0.0355	-0.0270	-0.0451	-0.0660
"equal" husband	-0.0419	0.0753	0.0632	-0.2764
"me more" husband	0.1349	-0.0895	0.0006	0.3902
"me more" wife	0.0355	-0.0270	-0.0451	-0.0660

	"equal" wife	"sp. more" husb	"equal" husb	"me more husb"	"me more" wife
"equal wife"	1.0000				
"spouse more" husband	0.0089	1.0000			
"equal" husband	0.2533	-0.0568	1.0000		
"me more" husband	-0.2952	-0.0874	-0.7467	1.0000	
"me more" wife	-0.0731	-0.0066	0.0301	-0.0874	1.0000

Table A2 continued

Table A3. Variance of Inflation Scores for
Economic Exchange Variables
Model One

Variable	VIF	1/VIF	
Family type tot		6.71	0.149122
Family type teen		6.54	0.152890
Husband race black		4.29	0.232972
Wife race black		3.62	0.276086
Male race white		2.18	0.459075
Wife religion Protestant		1.95	0.513902
Wife religion Roman Catholic		1.92	0.520027
Husband religion Roman Catholic		1.87	0.534136
Male religion Protestant		1.85	0.540424
Wife % income		1.70	0.587711
Wife hours per week		1.64	0.611364
No 4 year degree (wife)		1.46	0.683838
Wife race white		1.45	0.689679
No 4 year degree (husband)		1.38	0.725273
4 year degree (wife)		1.24	0.803217
Husband hours per week		1.23	0.814847
4 year degree husband		1.17	0.858154
Husband number of jobs		1.16	0.864151
Wife number of jobs		1.13	0.887508
Mean VIF		2.34	

Table A3.

Table A4. Variance of Inflation Scores for
Gender Ideology Variables
Model Two

Variable	VIF	1/VIF
Family type teen	6.39	0.156484
Family type tot	6.39	0.156614
Husband race black	4.26	0.234871
Wife race black	3.57	0.280124
You more or entirely (husband)	2.69	0.371073
Spouse more or entirely (wife)	2.44	0.409442
Equally (husband)	2.44	0.409460
Equally (wife)	2.29	0.436562
Husband race white	2.19	0.456050
Wife religion Protestant	1.99	0.503652
Wife religion Roman Catholic	1.90	0.525395
Husband religion Roman Catholic	1.83	0.546797
Husband religion Protestant	1.80	0.554550
Wife race white	1.42	0.706653
Husband gender equity	1.29	0.775622
Wife gender equity	1.25	0.801299
Spouse more or entirely (husband)	1.09	0.917030
You more or entirely (wife)	1.08	0.929099
Mean VIF	2.57	

Table A4.

Table A5. Variance of Inflation Scores for
Economic plus Gender Variables
Model Three

Variable	VIF	1/VIF
Family type tot	6.86	0.145765
Family type teen	6.73	0.148650
Husband race black	4.34	0.230654
Wife race black	3.70	0.270412
You more or entirely (husband)	2.70	0.370656
Spouse more or entirely (wife)	2.46	0.405711
Equally (husband)	2.45	0.408079
Equally (wife)	2.31	0.433033
Husband race white	2.22	0.449916
Wife religion Protestant	2.03	0.492091
Wife religion Roman Catholic	2.01	0.498086
Husband religion Roman Catholic	1.95	0.511644
Wife % income	1.90	0.525497
Husband religion Protestant	1.87	0.533894
Wife Hour per Week	1.69	0.592424
No four year degree (wife)	1.52	0.657165
Wife race white	1.47	0.681985
No four year degree (husband)	1.44	0.692412
Husband gender equity	1.40	0.713249
Wife gender equity	1.34	0.745378
4 year degree (wife)	1.31	0.764484
Husband number of jobs	1.26	0.792141
Husband hours per week	1.24	0.806159
4 year degree husband	1.18	0.844319
Wife number of jobs	1.16	0.864628
Mean VIF	2.34	

Table A5.

Table A6. Variance of Inflation Scores for
Full Model
Model Four

Variable	VIF	1/VIF
Family type tot	6.90	0.144839
Family type teen	6.78	0.147420
Husband race black	4.48	0.222968
Wife race black	3.87	0.258591
You more or entirely (husband)	2.86	0.350238
Equally (husband)	2.57	0.389356
Spouse more or entirely (wife)	2.56	0.390994
Equally (wife)	2.50	0.400303
Husband race white	2.32	0.431647
Wife religion Protestant	2.06	0.484756
Wife religion Roman Catholic	2.02	0.495142
Husband religion Roman Catholic	2.01	0.498367
Wife % income	1.98	0.505000
Husband religion Protestant	1.91	0.524519
Wife hours per week	1.79	0.560120
No 4 year degree (wife)	1.57	0.635485
No 4 year degree (husband)	1.54	0.649125
Wife race white	1.52	0.658730
Husband gender equity	1.42	0.704154
Wife gender equity	1.39	0.721964
4 year degree (wife)	1.35	0.742175
Job autonomy (husband)	1.33	0.751316
Husband hours per week	1.28	0.780974
Husband number of jobs	1.27	0.784667
Wife job stress	1.27	0.786784
Wife job autonomy	1.24	0.808346
Husband job stress	1.23	0.812781
4 year degree (husband)	1.22	0.819618
You more or entirely (wife)	1.18	0.850714
Wife number of jobs	1.16	0.862671
Spouse more or entirely (husband)	1.13	0.885451
Mean VIF	2.18	

Table A6.

Works Cited

Baxter, Janeen (2005). To marry or not to marry: Marital status and the household division of labor. *Journal of Family Issues,* 26 (3), 300-321.

Bartley, Sharon J and Priscilla W. Blanton and Jennifer L. Gilliard. (2005). Husbands and wives in dual-earner marriages: decision-making, gender role attitudes, division of household labor and equity. *Marriage and Family Review,* 37(4), 69-94.

Bianchi, Suzanne and Melissa A. Milkie, Liana C. Sayer, John P. Robinson (2000). Is anyone doing the housework? Trends in the gender division of household Labor. *Social Forces,* 79 (1), 191-228.

Bittman, Michael and Paula England, Nancy Folbre, Liana Sayer, George Matheson (2003). When does gender trump money? Bargaining and time in household work. *The American Journal of Sociology,* 109 (1), 186-214.

Coltrane, Scott (2000). Research on household labor: Modeling and measuring the social embeddness of routine family work. *Journal of Marriage and the Family,* 62(4), 1208-1233.

Craig, Lyn. (2006 a). Does father care mean fathers share?: A comparison of how mothers and fathers in intact families spend time with children. *Gender and Society,* 20, 259-281.

Craig, Lyn. (2006 b). Parental education, time in paid work and time with children: an Australian time-diary analysis. *The British Journal of Sociology,* 57 (4), 553-575.

Craney, Trevor A. and James G. Surles (2002). Model-dependent variance inflation factor cut-off values. *Quality Engineering*, 14(3), 391–403.

Cunningham, Mark (2001). Parental influences on the gendered division of housework. *American Sociological Review,* 66(2), 184-203.

Cunningham, Mark (2005). Gender in cohabitation and marriage: the influence of gender ideology on housework allocation over the life course. *Journal of Family Issues,* 26 (8), 1037-1061.

Duffy, Mignon (2007). Doing the dirty work: gender, race and reproductive labor in historical perspective. *Gender and Society,* 21(3), 313-336.

Fuwa, Makiko. (2004). Macro-level gender inequality and the division of household labor in 22 countries. *American Sociological Review,* 69, 751-767.

Geist, Claudia (2005). The welfare state and the home: regime differences in the domestic division of labour. *European Sociological Review,* 21(1), 23-41.

Greenstein, Theodore N. (1996). Husbands participation in domestic labor: interactive effects of Wives' and Husbands' gender Ideologies. *Journal of Marriage and the Family,* 58(3), 585-595.

Gupta, Sanjiv (2005). Her Money, her time: Women's earnings and their housework hours. *Social Science Research,* 35, 975-999.

Hanushek, Eric A. and John E. Jackson (1977). *Statistical Methods for Social Scientists.* Academic Press Inc: Orlando, Florida.

Hook, Jennifer L. (2006). Care in context: men's unpaid work in 20 countries, 1965-2003. *American Sociological Review,* 71, 639-660.

Howell, D.C. (2008). The analysis of missing data. In Outhwaite, W. & Turner, S. *Handbook of Social Science Methodology*. London: Sage.

Keene, Jennifer Reid and John R. Reynolds (2005). The job costs of family demands: Gender differences in negative family-to-work spillover. *Journal of Family Issues,* 26(3), 275-299.

Little, Roderick JA and Donald B. Rubin (1989). The analysis of social science data with missing values. *Sociological Methods and Research.* 18 (2-3), 292-326.

Noonan, Mary C. and Sarah Beth Estes, Jennifer L. Glass (2007). Do workplace flexibility policies influence time Spent in domestic labor? *Journal of Family Issues,* 28(2), 263-288.

Nordenmark, Mikael. (2004). Does gender ideology explain differences between countries regarding the involvement of women and of men in paid and unpaid work? *International Journal of Social Welfare,* 13, 233-243.

Parkman, Allen M. (2004). Bargaining over housework: the frustrating situation of secondary wage earners. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology,* 63(4), 765-794.

Perkins, H. Wesley and Debra K. DeMeis (1996). Gender and family effects on the "second shift" domestic activity of college educated young adults. *Gender and Society,* 10 (1), 78-93.

Perry-Jenkins, Maureen, Rena L Repetti and Ann C. Crouter. (2000). Work and family in the 1990's. *Journal of Marriage and the Family,* 62, 981-998.

Pitt, Richard N. and Elizabeth Borland (2008). Bachelorhood and men's attitudes about gender roles. *The Journal of Men's Studies,* 16(2) 140-159.

Sayer, Liana C. (2005). Gender, time and inequality: trends in women's and men's paid work, unpaid work and free time. *Social Forces,* 8491), 285-303.

Schneider, Barbara, and Linda J Waite. The 500 Family Study [1998-2000: United States] [Computer file]. ICPSR04549-v1. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2008-05-30. doi:10.3886/ICPSR04549

Stevens, Daphne Pedersen and Krista Lynn Minnotte, Susan E. Mannon, Gary Kiger (2006). Family work performance and satisfaction: gender ideology, relative resources, and emotion work. *Marriage and Family Review,* 40(4), 47-85.

Stevens, Daphne Pedersen and Krista Lynn Minnotte, Susan E. Mannon, Gary Kiger (2007). examining the "neglected side of the work-family interface": antecedents of positive and negative family-to-work spillover. *Journal of Family Issues,* 28 (2), 242-262.

Stine, Robert A. (1995). Graphical interpretation of variance inflation factors. The American Statistician, 49(1), 53-56

.

Suitor, J. Jill and Dorothy Mecom and Ilana S. Feld. (2001). Gender, household labor, and scholarly productivity among university professors. *Gender Issues*, 50-67.

Teig, Stacey and Joshua E. Susskind (2008). Truck Driver or Nurse? The Impact of Gender roles and occupational status on children's occupational preferences. *Sex Roles,* 58, 848-863.

US Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2009). *Employment and earnings, 2009 annual averages and the monthly labor review*Washington,DC: Retrieved http://www.dol.gov/wb/stats/main.htm

West, Candace and Don H. Zimmerman (1987). Doing Gender. *Gender and Society,* 1(2) 125-151.

Zuo, Jiping and Shengming Tang (2000). Breadwinner status and gender ideologies of men and women regarding family roles. *Sociological Perspectives,* 43(1) 29-43.