Women's Employment in Mostly Male Occupations and the Household Division of Labor

Carrie L. Shandra
Department of Sociology
Population Studies and Training Center
Brown University

Research on work and family has suggested that as women's employment characteristics more closely resemble men's employment characteristics – usually via economic compensation and time investment – men and women become increasingly likely to engage in a more equal division of domestic work. However, given demographic shifts in both the gender composition of the workforce and the social institution of the family, it is also important to consider how women's male-dominated paid work might affect unpaid work with their male partners. Longitudinal analyses of the NSFH indicate that women's participation in mostly-male occupations increases their likelihood of engaging in a more equal division of household labor. This effect remains after considering demographic characteristics, household attributes, gender ideology, and the elevated socioeconomic status and increased earnings which may accrue to women who participate in mostly-male occupations. These results suggest that processes of gender segregation are related across work and family contexts.

April 7, 2008

*DRAFT: Do not cite without author's permission

Please direct correspondence to: Carrie L. Shandra, Brown University Department of Sociology, Box 1916, Providence, RI 02912; phone 508-344-4483; email Carrie_Shandra@brown.edu.

Women's participation in paid labor has shifted tremendously in the last half-century. Not only has the percentage of women in the civilian labor force risen from 34% in 1950 to 59% in 2004, women's share of the total workforce has also increased from 30% to 46% (Fullerton 1999, U.S. Department of Labor 2007). Despite the trend toward parity in the occupational realm, however, little has changed about women's share of unpaid work in the domestic sphere as women continue to perform the majority of housework (Coltrane 2000; Bianchi et al. 2000; Sayer 2005).

This persistence of traditionally gendered domestic behaviors despite changes in paid labor participation has led to a large body of research on the interrelatedness of unpaid work with other social contexts. While education (Presser 1994), race (Orbuch & Eyster 1997), marital status (Gupta 1999) and ideology (Artis and Pavalko 2003; Greenstein 1996) have all been regarded as consistent (although often inconclusive; see Coltrane 2000 for a review) indicators of household labor, many studies emphasize the importance of women's employment in determining men's and women's domestic contributions. Not only do dual-earner couples share more family work than male-only breadwinning families (Blair and Lichter 1991; Maret and Finlay 1984); women's longer employment hours (Brayfield 1992; Kalleberg and Rosenfeld 1990), more proportionate relative earnings with male partners (Coltrane 1996; Heath and Bourne 1995), and non-overlapping scheduling and shift work (Presser 1994) have also been associated with a more egalitarian allocation of labor.

Despite evidence that characteristics of women's paid work have significant implications for their share of unpaid work, the effect of the gender composition of occupations on household behaviors remains under-researched. Because gender is the

single most important predictor of household labor (e.g. Coltrane 2000), the occupational sphere remains highly gender segregated (Charles and Grusky 2004; U.S. Department of Labor 2007), and a growing body of research indicates the confluence of work roles and family roles in women's lives (e.g. Harenstam and Bejerot 2001; Marks and MacDermid 1996; Milkie and Peltola 1999; Nordenmark 2002), it is important to look beyond the economic and temporal effects of paid work to examine how gendered social and organizational occupational environments might affect workers in mostly-male versus "traditionally" female employment.

This paper uses longitudinal data from the National Survey of Families and Households (Sweet, Bumpass and Call 1988; Sweet and Bumpass 1996) to examine the effect of women's participation in mostly-male, "nontraditional" occupations on the likelihood of engaging in an egalitarian division of household labor. The relationship between the division of paid and unpaid labor by gender remains largely under-explored, with existing studies limited to regional subsamples of women and producing mixed results (Hanson and Pratt 1995; Hardesty and Bokemeier 1989). The present analysis expands upon these findings and adds to the current literature on gender stratification by examining a national sample of women over time and by situating household egalitarianism within the larger literatures on occupational segregation and family resource-sharing. The concurrent examination of these dual stratification processes contributes to a further understanding of the interrelatedness of gendered interactions and negotiations across social contexts.

OCCUPATIONAL GENDER SEGREGATION

While women comprise almost half of the current labor force, they are not equally represented across occupations. Over 80% of women age 16 and over are concentrated in five occupational groups: administrative support, service workers, sales, professional specialty, and executive, administrators and managerial (U.S. Census Bureau 2007). Because men and women are distributed unequally across occupations, many occupations are composed of predominantly one gender and thus can be described as being male- or female-dominated. While definitions vary in the existing literature[1], studies consistently suggest that mostly-male and mostly-female occupations provide their employees with highly disparate rewards.

The unequal rewards of male- and female-dominated occupations

Occupational gender segregation has been considered a social problem (Okamoto and England 1999) because of the inequality created by the observed wage gap in earnings by gender (e.g. England et al. 1988; Peterson and Morgan 1995; Tomaskovic-Devey 1993). However, male- and female-dominated occupations are also associated with other economic consequences. Many predominantly-male occupations often have higher earning potentials (McLaughlin 1978), allow for increased occupational mobility (Wolf and Rosenfeld 1978), and provide greater promotional opportunities (Glass 1990; Hultin 2003) than predominantly-female occupations. Furthermore, mostly-female occupations often involve less training than male-dominated occupations, either because they require less (Tam 1997) or because they afford their employees lesser access (Tomaskovic-Devey & Skaggs 2002). Overall, this research suggests that employees of mostly-female occupations are likely to experience monetary and nonmonetary

disadvantages in their economic compensation relative to employees of mostly-male occupations.

Male- and female-dominated occupations are also associated with differing levels of workplace autonomy, flexibility, and authority – although the forms of workplace control and the mechanisms through which they occur are somewhat debated. Jaffee (1989) found that occupational sex segregation reduced the extent to which employees control the conceptual aspects of work. While Glass (1990) did not find that mostly-female occupations entail less challenging work than mostly-male occupations, she did find that workers in predominantly female occupations had significantly less unsupervised free time and were less likely to report that their jobs were flexible. Adler (1993) reports that authority position at work is more instrumental in explaining the gender gap in job autonomy than the gender composition of occupations; however, Huffman's (1995; Huffman and Cohen 2004) results indicate that occupational segregation accounts for most of the gap in supervisory authority and that the odds of possessing work authority decline as the number of women in an occupation increases. Overall, this research suggests that employees in female-dominated occupations experience a reduction in some form of autonomy relative to employees in male-dominated occupations – either as a direct consequence of occupational segregation or indirectly via their decreased likelihood of holding authority positions.

Finally, an occupation's social environment is also likely to be different as a consequence of its gender composition. Research on organizational demography supports Kanter's (1977) original thesis that relative proportions affect the context of social interaction at work (Ely 1995; Pfeffer 1991; see Reskin, McBrier and Kmec 1999

for a review). Floge and Merril's (1986) work suggests that women in predominantly male occupations do experience some form of heightened visibility, contrast or exaggeration of differences, and assimilation or generalization of gender stereotypes. However, they and other scholars (Yoder 1991; Zimmer 1988) assert that tokenism is not a gender-neutral process, implying that women in male-dominated occupations are likely to experience different social contexts – and thus, different social interactions – than women in female-dominated occupations.

Theoretical perspectives on occupational gender segregation

While researchers generally agree that male- and female-dominated occupations offer differential rewards for their employees, the process by which occupations become and remain segregated is of considerable debate. These competing perspectives make different assumptions about the way women enter into gender-segregated occupations, thus implying different relationships between women and the control of their own labor – a distinction that is important when considering how work is allocated in the household.

The supply-side approach places the locus of segregation on individual workers. Human capital/neoclassical economic theories assert that gender segregation results from women's expectations that household work and childrearing will limit their commitment to market work (Mincer and Polacheck 1974; Polacheck 1979). Under this perspective, women who anticipate domestic responsibilities will thus make fewer investments in their own human capital and select into occupations with higher initial wages and greater flexibility around labor force interruptions – occupations that are presumably female-dominated. Similarly, the gender socialization approach (Marini and Brinton 1984; Marini and Greenberger 1978) posits that women are socialized around domestic and

caretaking roles and thus develop values and occupational aspirations which reflect these roles. Under this perspective, women who believe that certain occupations are more gender appropriate will develop more "feminine" occupational skills and enter into jobs with "traditionally female" working conditions.

Conversely, demand-side approaches attribute segregation to the individual actions of employers or the organizational procedures of the employing institution (Bielby and Baron 1986; Kmec 2005). On the individual level, employers contribute to occupational gender segregation through overt discrimination or preference when assigning or promoting workers to jobs based on ascribed gender characteristics rather than achieved qualifications (Glick 1991; Skuratowicz and Hunter 2004). From this perspective, employers appoint women to female-dominated occupations and exclude them from male-dominated occupations because they believe that men and women's traditionally ascribed gender roles make them better suited for certain types of jobs. On the organizational level, personnel procedures – including hiring, transfer, and promotional processes – can also affect the gender composition of jobs by creating barriers for job applicants of a certain gender, permitting gender to be used as a salient source of information in hiring decisions, and allowing employer ascription to disadvantage certain groups (Fernandez and Sosa 2005; Kmec 2005; Reskin and McBrier 2000). Under this framework employers still contribute to the distribution of men and women into different occupations, however, formal or informal employer procedures such as recruitment, screening, or evaluation are the mechanisms through which segregation is produced and maintained.

Many studies have cast doubt on the consistency of human capital theories of gender segregation because female-dominated occupations have not been found to better accommodate women with domestic responsibilities. They are not associated with higher starting pay or lower penalties for discontinuous employment (England 1984; England et al. 1988). They are also less likely than male-dominated occupations to offer their employees unsupervised time with which to coordinate family tasks (Glass 1990).

Other research suggests that supply and demand approaches alone are insufficient for explaining how occupations become gender segregated. Reskin and Roos' (1990:29) queuing perspective frames occupational composition as a dual process whereby "labor queues order groups of workers in terms of their attractiveness to employers, and job queues rank jobs in terms of their attractiveness to workers." This concurrent consideration of employers' preferred credentials for their workers and workers' preference for 'desirable' jobs addresses the sex composition both within occupations and across the labor market. Tomaskovic-Devey (1993:6) similarly argues that supply- and demand-side explanations are unable to account for inequalities because they fail to address the way that gender operates as an organizational process. Instead, *status closure* (the process of workplace discrimination by which sex determines who has access to employment) and *status composition* (the process by which the sex-type of a job influences the work done and the organizational evaluation of the work) influence labor markets, the organization of work, and the inequalities produced by the segregation of men and women in occupations.

Regardless of where the locus of responsibility for occupational gender segregation is placed, existing literature suggests that women in male-dominated and

women in female-dominated occupations are likely to have very different employment experiences. Relative to women in female-dominated occupations, women in male-dominated occupations are likely to face different barriers to hiring, different economic compensation, different opportunities for advancement, and different social interactions. As a result, women in mostly-male and mostly-female occupations are likely to "do gender" (West and Zimmerman 1987) differently because of their different social (because of who is interpreting their actions and behaviors; West and Fenstermaker 1995) and institutional (because of the way gender affects the structure of organizations; Acker 1990) contexts. Gender scholars have found that gender is enmeshed in individual identities across structural contexts (Ridgeway and Smith-Lovin 1999) and institutions are interrelated in their reproduction of gender differences (Kruger and Levy 2001), therefore women in male- and female-dominated occupations may do gender differently in the domestic realm as well.

DIVISION OF HOUSEHOLD LABOR

Much like the occupational sphere, the domestic sphere continues to be highly segregated along gender lines. A review of the literature suggest that women have decreased their average total investment in domestic work and that men's relative share of domestic chores has increased (Shelton and John 1996), however, the average woman still performs two to three times the amount of routine housework as the average man (Coltrane 2000; Demo and Acock 1993). There is considerable debate around the causal mechanisms behind women's asymmetrical household share (see Coltrane 2000 for a review); most important for these analyses is a consideration of the ways in which the

three predominant theoretical perspectives on gender segregation at home might be affected by gender segregation at work.

Time Availability

The time availability framework originates from Becker's (1981) neoclassical economic theory and – much like the application of human capital in the paid labor sphere – assumes that household members rationally allocate their time to maximize utility. Given the rise in dual-earner households and the historical decrease in the probability of men and women specializing in either paid *or* unpaid work, time availability more typically frames household labor as one demand among other commitments which are fulfilled according to available time. Employment is thus considered a constraint which prevents women from allocating time to the household – as is the presence of children and spousal employment. Women's longer work hours have been associated with a decrease in the proportion of their housework time (Blair and Lichter 1991; Brayfield 1992), lending some support to this model. Under this perspective, the gender composition of occupations would be inconsequential in determining the share of household tasks and the amount of time each partner spent in paid employment would account for the division of domestic work.

Relative Resource/Exchange Theory

The exchange or resource theory of household labor suggests that the greater the amount or value of resources contributed by a spouse, the greater his or her power within the relationship and the more he or she will have to offer in exchange for domestic work within the home (Seccombe 1986; Brines 1993). Building on the research of Blood and

Wolfe (1960), this variant of new household economics views social and economic resources - and the costs and rewards involved in the transaction of these resources - as vital determinants of bargaining power which are directly linked to household decision-making (Ross 1987). Earnings are considered to be a valuable household resource because they measure the ability to attain market goods and opportunities (Brines 1993). In support of this theory, wives' more proportionate *share* of earnings is often associated with a more equal division of labor (Coltrane 1996; Heath and Bourne 1995). However, earnings are not the only asset that can be exchanged for household work. According to Brines (1993), this framework assumes that any resource that is recognized by both partners is admissible for bargaining.

Under this perspective, the gender composition of occupations might affect the share of household tasks in several ways. Because employees of male-dominated occupations are likely to earn more than employees of female-dominated occupations, they might contribute a more proportionate share of the household income and thus be better situated to bargain for a more equal division of domestic labor. While the other disparate rewards of many mostly-male occupations are likely to enter into household negotiations, the gendered nature of predominantly male occupations may also be important. In other words, the paid labor sphere is a site of gender stratification where "women's work" is often associated with fewer valued resources than "men's work" (Chafetz 1991). However, women whose paid labor takes place in a mostly-male occupation cannot be ranked lower in the gender hierarchy relative to men based on the gendered characteristics of their jobs. As a result, the paid labor experience of women in mostly-male occupations may be considered more comparable to the paid labor

experience of their male partners. Thus, these women may be better positioned to "bargain" for a more equitable division of labor at home.

Because gender is so important in determining who does what in the household, several scholars have criticized the time availability and exchange perspectives for their gender neutrality. Ferree (1991) points out that even if a wife worked as many hours as her husband, she would still be likely to earn less and thus have less bargaining power in the relationship. Theories which assume a one-to-one trade-off of hours worked or wages earned fail to consider how the disadvantage that women face because of their gender in the wider society will be transmitted into the power structure of the individual household (Blumberg and Coleman 1989). As a result, even when time availability and relative resources are taken into account, "gendered beliefs about housework relate to variation in who actually performs the tasks. Power and values apparently interact in gender-specific ways to sustain this division of labor" (Ferree 1991:178). Ferree and other feminist scholars propose that theories of domestic gender stratification consider the structural and symbolic framework in which these negotiations take place.

Socialization and Gender Construction

Given the limitations of economic theories to account for much of the variation in household share, a large body of research acknowledges that women's and men's attitudes about and experiences with domestic labor may differ because of their gender. The socialization approach to household labor suggests that women and men perform different types and amounts of domestic work because of what they have come to believe about appropriate female and male behavior. Similarly, a gender construction approach frames gender as symbolic and performative, suggesting that women and men accomplish

different tasks to affirm and display membership in a sex category (Berk 1985, West and Fenstermaker 1993). Unlike the socialization approach, gender construction does not frame gendered behaviors as fixed or rigid; rather, they are a dynamic part of individual identification and social relations which are recreated across contexts and interactions (West and Zimmerman 1987). The process of accomplishing gender is not always conscious (Berk 1985; Hochschild 1989) and the ideologies which presumably correspond with socialization do not always directly predict behaviors (Greenstein 1996), however, these frameworks address how men and women with similar market labor participation engage in dissimilar domestic labor where rational choice models cannot.

There are several ways the gender composition of occupations might affect the share of household tasks according to these perspectives. The socialization hypothesis posits that women who hold traditional gender role ideologies are likely to both perform a larger share of housework and aspire to and enter more female-dominated occupations. Conversely, women who hold nontraditional gender role ideologies are likely to perform a more proportionate share of housework and will aspire to and enter more male-dominated occupations. Jerry Jacob's (1989) research on sex segregation across women's careers challenges this simple selection process. Not only does he find that the sex composition of the occupations to which young women aspire changes over time, he also provides extensive evidence that the relationship between the sex type of women's vocational goals and the sex type of the jobs they obtain is weak. His results suggest that, "While sex-role socialization is important, since it instills values and goals, it is inadequate by itself to maintain the system of sex segregation" (Jacobs 1989: 8-9). If, as Jacobs suggests, sex-type attitudes and behavior remain adaptable and the process of

socialization does not produce a unidirectional relationship between gender ideologies at home and gender ideologies at work, it might be expected that women's experience in male-dominated jobs may affect what they learn and come to believe about gender behavior at home.

Similarly, the work socialization framework recognizes the potential overlap between work and family roles by viewing the workplace as a context for adult socialization such that occupational self-direction socializes a worker's values and attitudes in life outside the workplace (see Mortimer and Simmons 1978 for a review). The processes of learning, generalization, and attribution lead adults to universalize ideologies from one social sphere to another (Mortimer and Borman 1988). Under this perspective, women's experience of performing a similar division of paid labor as men in at work will inform their experience of performing a similar division of unpaid labor with their male partners in the home.

Finally, gender construction theories suggest competing hypotheses of the way the gender composition of occupations might affect the share of household tasks. According to West and Zimmerman (1987), successful gender displays must be managed and behaviors must be designed so they are interpreted as appropriate for particular contexts. Therefore, women in male-dominated occupations who experience gender-nontraditional work as appropriate in the occupational context may also consider it appropriate to accomplish a gender-nontraditional division of labor in the domestic context. Conversely, women in male-dominated occupations who experience tokenism at work such that they are subjected to increased attention, exaggerated differences, and

stereotyped roles (Kanter 1977) may work to counteract these nontraditional occupational experiences to assert a more traditional gender identity at home.

DATA AND METHODS

This analysis draws on data from waves 1 and 2 of the National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH), a national probability sample which includes extensive sociodemographic background measures as well as information on household task sharing and employment information (Sweet, Bumpass and Call 1988; Sweet and Bumpass 1996). NSFH is especially well-suited for these analyses because it provides hourly reports of specific household tasks, therefore enabling a high degree of precision in the construction of the dependent variable. NSFH collects this data at all survey waves, thus allowing for a longitudinal examination of the same women's domestic and paid labor involvement over time. Cohabiting couples, newly married persons, blacks, Puerto Ricans, and Mexican Americans are oversampled, facilitating comparisons across household arrangements. 13,007 primary respondents were interviewed in wave 1 (1987-1988); 10,007 of which were reinterviewed in wave 2 (1992-1994).[2]

This analysis aims to understand if the housework share of women in mostly-male occupations differs from that of women in mostly-female occupations. As a result, the sample focuses on working women, including all those who report that they are working in paid employment and in a heterosexual married or cohabiting relationship at both times of interview.[3] An age limitation of 20-59 at NSFH1 is imposed on the sample in order to represent the adult labor force in the United States. In order to take full advantage of information from all women from all couples in the dataset, data from both female main respondents and female secondary respondents (the partners or spouses of

male main respondents) at NSFH1 are used.[4] The final longitudinal analysis includes 1,143 women for whom complete data on employment and time spent on household tasks are available for the respondent and her male partner at both waves.

Dependent measure: Household Progressivism

The dependent variable is derived from a series of questions which ask respondents the number of weekly hours residential members spend on various household tasks. Because this analysis focuses on the reproduction of traditionally gendered domestic behaviors, housework measures are calculated from 4 female-typed tasks: preparing meals, washing dishes and cleaning up after meals, cleaning house, and washing, ironing, and mending.[5] As utilized in previous studies of household labor (Noonan 2001; Press and Townsley 1998; Presser 1994), this female-typed measure is particularly appropriate for the examination of domestic gender segregation because it captures the source of the most variation between men's and women's task allocation. Not only are these tasks disproportionately performed by women, they are also the most time-intensive and the most routinized household responsibilities. Because domestic tasks – like occupational participation – are differentially allocated by gender, this dual focus on gender segregation in the home and gender segregation in the workplace allows for the examination of stratification processes across paid and unpaid labor contexts.

The division of household labor is then calculated by dividing women's own self-reported female-typed housework hours by her report of the total female-typed housework hours contributed by herself and her male partner. This measure is useful in capturing the relative *share* of domestic labor independent of other factors (such as household ownership or the presence of other adults in the household) which may

influence the amount of necessary total housework (Greenstein 2000). Given the focus on the effect of women's work experiences on their domestic behaviors, female respondents' estimates – rather than male partner reports – are utilized in the operationalization of housework share.

Finally, a dichotomous measure (herein "progressivism") is constructed to capture egalitarianism – where male partners contribute an equal share (50%) of household tasks – *or* progressivism – where male partners invest in a greater share (51% or more) of domestic work. Operationalized in this manner, household progressivism examines two forms of nontraditional households: those that are completely equitable in their division of labor and those where men are primarily responsible for housework. 17% of the women in this sample report a progressive division of labor in either survey wave.

Independent measures

Occupational characteristics Male-dominated (or women's "nontraditional") employment is defined according to the Women's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Labor to encompass all occupations in which women comprise 25% or fewer of the total employees (Women's Bureau 2007). To operationalize mostly-male employment in the NSFH, annual occupational sex ratios are calculated using the March Supplement of the Current Population Survey (CPS) (King, Ruggles and Sobek 2003) to correspond to the year of interview at NSFH1 and NSFH2. As each wave of NSFH is comprised of multiple survey years, weighted CPS values are averaged within survey waves (1987-1988 for NSFH1 and 1992-1994 for NSFH2) to minimize annual reporting variation and more accurately reflect yearly aggregate gender differences in occupational participation. A time-varying dichotomous measure is constructed to differentiate the women who

work in occupations with 25% or fewer women from all other women workers. Ten percent of women in this sample hold a male-dominated occupation in either survey wave.

Several other time-varying occupational measures are also included in the analysis. A measure of relative earnings is constructed as the ratio of women's total earnings over the combined couple earnings – including all wage, salary, and self-employment income – in order to approximate economic resource-sharing in the household. A dichotomous measure of part (1-34 average hours of paid work per week; reference category) and full-time (35 hours or more) work is used to indicate work status based on the number of hours per week a respondent usually works. Finally, Stevens and Cho's (1985) occupational socioeconomic index is also included as a measure of occupational status.

Demographic and Household Measures Several variables are included which measure women's demographic background and household characteristics. Race/ethnicity compares black and Hispanic respondents to non-Hispanic whites. Education compares women with a high school degree or less to those with any education greater than a high school degree but less than a college degree and those with a college degree or greater. This categorization is useful for understanding the effect of gaining an Associate's degree or any additional vocational training beyond the high school level. Marital status is included to compare currently married respondents to cohabiters. The presence of children in the household is measured by early (0 through 2 years of age) and later (3 through 12 years of age) childhood and adolescence (13 through 18 years of age) as compared to the reference category of women with no children in the household.

Finally, male partner's employment status compares men who report they are working for pay as of the survey wave to the reference category of male partners who are not working for pay during the survey wave.

Gender ideology While several gender ideology measures are available for inclusion in the analysis, one is particularly relevant in the examination of egalitarian household share among heterosexual couples. In Wave 1, respondents are asked the extent to which they agree with the statement, "If a husband and wife both work full-time, they should share household tasks equally." In Wave 2, the instrument changes slightly to, "A husband whose wife is working full-time should spend just as many hours doing housework as his wife." These measures are coded such that higher values represent more egalitarian viewpoints.

Methods

Nonlinear Generalized Estimating Equations (GEEs) are used to analyze the dichotomous dependent measure of household progressivism across survey waves. This procedure is especially advantageous for the examination of longitudinal data, as it allows for efficient population-averaged coefficient estimates and robust standard errors despite the correlation which arises when the same individuals are measured at different points in time (Diggle, Liang and Zeger 1994; see Allison 2005 for further elaboration). Test statistics and standard errors are based on empirical estimates, which are robust to misspecifications of the assumed structure imposed on the working correlation matrix (Allison 1999). The odds ratios produced by GEE for the variables of interest can be interpreted as the odds of an average woman in a mostly-male occupation engaging in a progressive division of household labor compared with the odds of an average woman

who is not in a mostly-male occupation engaging in a progressive division of household labor (Neuhas, Kalbfleisch and Hauck 1991; Neuhas 1992).

The analysis has several objectives. First, a basic model (Model 1) with demographic and household characteristics is estimated to examine the relationship between women's education, marital status, race/ethnicity, age, presence of children, and spousal employment status and the likelihood of engaging in household progressivism. Next, women's employment characteristics (Model 2) and beliefs about housework share (Model 3) are included to empirically explore the time availability, relative resource, and gender ideology hypothesis. Model 4 introduces the measure of employment in a mostly-male occupation. Finally, it may be that the effect of laboring in a mostly-male occupation on household progressivism operates through the propensity for these women to have higher relative income, elevated occupational socioeconomic status, or more egalitarian gender ideology. Model 5- Model 7 test for interactions between participation in mostly-male occupation and these possible moderating effects.

[Table 1 about here]

RESULTS

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics for all variables in the analysis by type of work in each survey wave. Immediately apparent is the sharp difference between the percentages of women in each group who participate in a progressive division of household labor. 17.4% of women employed in mostly-male occupations at NSFH1 and 18.4% of women employed in mostly-male occupations at NSFH2 report engaging in household progressivism versus 7.6% and 11.5% of women, respectively, who are not in these occupations. A greater proportion of women engage in household egalitarianism in

NSFH2, however, significant differences exist between women who labor in male-dominated occupations and all other women at both survey waves.

Descriptive results reveal few demographic differences between women who labor in mostly-male versus mostly-female occupations. Mostly-male occupations are significantly different from other occupations in their higher proportion Hispanic in NSFH1. Both groups are equally likely to have a college degree; however, women who work in male-dominated occupations are less likely to have more than a high school degree (including other forms of occupational certification and accreditation). They are also less likely to be married at both survey waves; however, other family characteristics are highly comparable and not statistically different between groups.

As expected, women who labor in male-dominated occupations have, on average, higher occupational socioeconomic standing (statistically significant in both waves) and command a greater share of the couples' relative earnings in NSFH2. They are also more likely to work fulltime than women in other occupations. There is little between-group difference in the concurrence with egalitarian ideologies about household labor in either survey wave.

[Table 2 about here]

Table 2 presents GEE regression results estimating longitudinal changes in household progressivism. Most interestingly, the time-varying measure of participation in male-dominated occupations in Model 4 is positive and significantly associated with the likelihood of engaging in a progressive division of labor. The odds of an average woman in a mostly-male occupation engaging in a progressive division of household labor are 1.827 times greater than the odds of an average woman who is not in a mostly-

male occupation engaging in a progressive division of household labor, net of all other measures in the model. Furthermore, Models 5-7 indicate that the effects of laboring in a male-dominated occupation are not moderated by occupational socioeconomic status, relative earnings, or ideology. Aside from relative earnings, no other demographic, household, employment, or ideological characteristic has a larger effect on the odds of engaging in a progressive division of household labor than participation in a mostly-male occupation.

Results from other models are highly consistent with previous findings. Having a male partner who is employed and having infants and children ages 12 and under in the household are all negative and significantly related to a progressive labor share. Higher relative earnings and more egalitarian beliefs about housework are both positive and significantly associated with the odds of engaging in a progressive division of labor, indicating that relative resources and ideology are important for housework sharing. Working full-time – versus working part-time – has no effect on household labor share in these analyses. Finally, the effect of time remains significant in all models; women are more likely to engage in household progressivism in NSFH2 than in NSFH1.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Like previous studies, the analyses in this paper support several hypotheses about the division of household labor. The positive effect of relative earnings provides evidence for the relative resource theory, as women who command a higher share of the couple's earnings are also more likely to engage in a more equal division of housework. Gender ideology and childrearing also matter for working women; while having more egalitarian views about household labor increases a women's likelihood of progressivism,

having children exacerbates gender inequality in the home by reducing a women's likelihood of progressivism.

However, these analyses add to the literature on gender stratification by suggesting that another facet of women's employment – the gender composition of occupations – is also important for women's negotiation of domestic work. Women who are employed in a male-dominated occupation have significantly higher odds of engaging in a progressive division of household labor than women in all other occupations, even after considering the elevated socioeconomic status and increased relative income which may accrue to women in these types of occupations. Furthermore, there is no evidence that more advantageous employment characteristics *or* more egalitarian gender ideology are moderating the effect of mostly-male employment on household progressivism. In sum, these results indicate that women's gender-segregated paid work and their gender-segregated domestic work are very much related.

Insights from previous qualitative and firm-based studies are useful for informing this finding. Women in mostly-male occupations may develop different ideas about the gendered division of labor than women in mostly-female occupations because of their different reference groups at work. Prior research has suggested that women in mostly-female work environments are likely to use other women – with similar earnings and rewards – as a reference group to assess their own satisfaction (Crosby 1982). As a result, they may not see the disparate rewards of mostly-female jobs as inequitable (Hodson 1989). Conversely, women in mostly-male work environments who have greater opportunities for male reference group comparisons may have an increased

awareness of unequal compensation by gender (Buchanan 2005) which may subsequently inform a more egalitarian approach to the division of gendered domestic chores.

Similarly, social identity theorists posit that members of less-represented out-groups will attempt to both assimilate with the dominant in-group and psychological separate from their own out-group (e.g. Tajfel and Turner 1986). From this perspective, women in male-dominated occupations may be more likely to deemphasize traditionally gendered roles of wife and mother and assimilate with the male dominant status group to gain equal access to occupational resources. Empirical evidence of women adopting more masculine practices and approaches to gain acceptance in male-dominated work settings supports such a framework (Coppolino and Seath 1987, Gutek 1985).

Aside from these potential social consequences of laboring in a male-dominated work environment, it may also be that the same women who enter into mostly-male occupations are also likely to engage in household progressivism. Selection is a concern for these analyses; however, existing studies suggest that entry into male-dominated paid work is also conditional upon many processes which are distinct from the negotiation of household work. First, research on occupational choice suggests that women are likely to evaluate predominantly male occupations more desirably than predominantly female occupations because of both their monetary and nonmonetary rewards (Jencks, Perman, and Rainwater 1988). Williams' (1991; 1995) research on nontraditional occupations even suggests that – given a choice – women may prefer mostly male occupations because they are generally better paying, more prestigious, carry more authority, and offer more opportunities for advancement than comparable female-dominated work. Furthermore, entry into mostly-male occupations is conditioned by structural limitations

such as geographic proximity (Hanson and Pratt 1995) and the expansion of opportunities (Jacobs 1989) which affect all women. Finally, both qualitative and quantitative examinations of entry into nontraditional work suggest that atypical sex-role socialization is not a precondition for women's participation in male-dominated occupations (Jacobs 1989; Walshok 1981). Descriptive statistics of this specific sample of working women (Table 1) indicate that no significant difference exists for egalitarian ideology at either survey wave between women in mostly-male versus other occupations.

Another important consideration about women's participation in mostly-male occupations is that women may not have access to the same occupational benefits as their male coworkers. Previous research has documented occupational gender segregation along two axes – men are both disproportionately allocated to the best-paid and most desirable occupations *and* they are also more likely to hold jobs within those occupations which have a higher rank or status then those held by women. Case studies suggest that women may often be concentrated in lower-paying specialties within male-dominated occupations (Reskin and Roos 1990). While information on within-occupation job segregation by gender are not available in most survey data, evidence for a related outcome – differential earnings and wage promotion of men and women in predominantly male occupations – is mixed. Maume's (1999) analysis of the Panel Study of Income Dynamics finds that women in male-dominated occupations do not experience wage mobility comparable to men and are more likely to transition to joblessness. However, Waite and Berryman's (1986) use of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979 finds no evidence that being in a male-dominated occupation increases the chance that a young woman will leave her employer and Budig's (2002) use of the same

data finds that all workers in male-dominated occupations benefit “from the fact that the job is associated with the more valued gender”. While women in male-dominated occupations may face additional barriers to advancement than men, research suggests that the overall monetary and nonmonetary benefits of work in a mostly-male occupation outweigh those of mostly-female positions.

While researchers have been interested in the way women’s employment affects their home lives since wives and mothers entered the workforce, the relationship between the division of paid and unpaid labor by gender is largely under-explored and existing results are mixed. Hardesty and Bokemeier’s (1989:264) examination of women in nonmetropolitan Kentucky proclaims that “women employed in male-dominated occupations are not any more likely to hold liberal work-role attitudes or engage in a nontraditional division of housework”. However, a footnote in a study on labor market and domestic activity in Worcester, Massachusetts (Hanson and Pratt 1995:243) suggests “It is worth noting that the gender of occupation is a better ‘predictor’ of household division of labor than are the characteristics that are frequently cited in the existing academic literature.”

This analysis has used national data over time to demonstrate the importance of women’s gender segregated employment for their gender division of household labor. These results underscore the significance of understanding how gender disparities are reproduced and reinforced at the intersection of organizational and interpersonal dynamics. While research on work and family has emphasized the importance of gender in determining behaviors and ideologies across roles, it is crucial to move beyond the investigation of unequal gendered outcomes to scrutinize the mechanisms which

perpetuate continued segregation. In his reflections on mobility, Baron (1994:387) suggests that “the organizational context is important not simply because it influences the resources available to be distributed to workers…but also because it influences what workers come to value [and] how they gauge their attainment relative to various comparison groups”. As an axis of stratification, gender is no less salient of an attribute in determining how labor is organized – and thus, how resources are distributed – in the home place as in the work place. This research suggests that processes of gender stratification across these contexts are not unrelated.

Recent national (e.g. National Alliance for Partnerships in Equity 2007; Wider Opportunities for Women 2007) and statewide (e.g. New York State Project for Nontraditional Employment and Training 2007; Nontraditional Career Resource Center 2007) initiatives have begun to develop training programs and occupational resources which assist women in entering mostly male work. While this paper makes no claims about the causal relationship between male-dominated employment and progressive households, it does suggest that women’s greater involvement in mostly-male occupations may reduce more than financial disadvantage and gender segregation in the labor force. Future research is needed to understand if – and how – these paths to gender equity can converge.

ENDNOTES

1. Commonly cited is the Women's Bureau of the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2007) classification whereby an occupation is nontraditional for women if it is comprised of 25% or fewer women.

2. A third wave is also available; however, it is not used because it includes a highly restricted subsample of original respondents (Sweet and Bumpass 2002).

3. Limiting the sample to women who are working at both waves may admittedly restrict the analysis to women who are both most "committed" to the labor force and most likely to share household labor. Separate analyses (available from the author) were run on the sample of all women who were working at NSFH1, including the present sample as well as those who "opted out" of the labor force in NSFH2. Results utilizing the time-varying dependent and demographic independent measures along with a time-invariant measure of mostly-male employment at NSFH1 indicate that employment in a mostly-male occupation at NSFH1 – regardless of employment status at NSFH2 – was positive and significantly associated with the likelihood of engaging in household progressivism. The inclusion of other time-invariant NSFH1 employment characteristics did not mediate this effect, nor did a dummy measure controlling for women's non-participation in the labor force in NSFH2.

4. Because individual sampling weights are only available in NSFH for main respondents, all analyses use unweighted data. In their examination of sampling design effects in NSFH, Johnson and Elliott (1998:1000) suggest that the effect of design effects is larger on the variability of descriptive properties of the sample than regression results. Furthermore, they conclude, "It is likely that statistical inferences in previous studies involving family variables that did not account for design effects were not substantially biased." To further address the concern for national representativeness, separate analyses using only the main sample and excluding the non-representative oversample were run and yielded nearly identical results.

5. After recoding non-numerical responses, missing data was imputed for 13% of the sample using the procedure developed by South and Spitze (1994) for respondents who provided 3 out of 4 responses to their own or their spouses' household tasks. Alternative methods of handling missing data provided highly comparable results.

REFERENCES

Acker, Joan. 1990. “Hierarchies, Job, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations.” *Gender and Society* 4:139-158.

Adler, Marina A. 1993. “Gender Differences in Job Autonomy: The Consequences of Occupational Segregation and Authority Position.” *Sociological Quarterly* 34:449-465.

Allison, Paul D. 1999. *Logistic Regression Using the SAS System: Theory and Application*. Cary, NC: SAS Institute Inc.

Allison, Paul D. 2005. *Fixed Effects Regression Methods for Longitudinal Data Using SAS.* Cary, NC: SAS Institute Inc.

Artis, Julie E. and Eliza K. Pavalko. 2003. “Explaining the Decline in Women’s Household Labor: Individual Change and Cohort Differences.” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 65:746-761.

Baron, James N. 1994. “Reflections on Recent Generations of Mobility Research.” Pp. 384-394 in *Social Stratification*, edited by David B. Grusky. Colorado: Westview Press.

Becker, Gary S. 1981. *A Treatise on the Family.* Harvard University Press.

Berk, Sarah Fenstermaker. 1985. *The Gender Factory.* Springer.

Bianchi, Suzanne M., Melissa A. Milkie, Liana C. Sayer and John P. Robinson. 2000. “Is Anyone Doing the Housework? Trends in the Gender Division of Household Labor.” *Social Forces* 79:191-228.

Bielby, William T. and James N. Baron. 1986. “Men and Women at Work: Sex Segregation and Statistical Discrimination.” *American Journal of Sociology* 91:759-799.

Blair, Sampson Lee and Daniel T. Lichter. 1991. “Measuring the division of household labor: Gender segregation of housework among American couples.” *Journal of Family Issues* 12:91–113.

Blood, Robert O. and Donald M. Wolfe. 1960. *Husbands and Wives: The Dynamics of Family Living.* New York: Free Press.

Brayfield, April A. 1992. "Employment resources and housework in Canada." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 54:19–30.

Brines, Julie. 1993. "The Exchange Value of Housework." *Rationality and Society* 5:302-340.

Buchanan, Tom. 2005. "The Paradox of the Contented Female Worker in a Traditionally Female Industry." *Sociological Spectrum* 25:677-713.

Budig, Michelle J. 2002. "Male Advantage and the Gender Composition of Jobs: Who Rides the Glass Escalator." *Social Problems* 49:258-277.

Chafetz, Janet Saltzman. 1991. "The Gender Divison of Labor and the Reproduction of Female Disadvantage." Pp. 74-94 in *Gender, Family and Economy: The Triple Overlap*, edited by Rae Lesser Blumberg. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Charles, Maria and David B. Grusky. 2005. *Occupational Ghettos: The Worldwide Segregation of Women and Men.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Coltrane, Scott. 1996. *Family man: Fatherhood, Housework, and Gender Equity.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Coltrane, Scott. 2000. "Research on Household Labor: Modeling and Measuring the Social Embeddedness of Routine Family Work." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 62:1208-1233.

Coppolino, Y. and C.B. Seath. 1987. "Women Managers: Fitting the Mould or Moulding the Fit." *Equal Opportunities International* 6:4-10.

Crosby, Faye J. 1982. *Relative Deprivation and Working Women.* Oxford University Press.

DeMeis, Debra K. and H.Wesley Perkins. 1996. "'Supermoms' of the Nineties: Homemaker and Employed Mothers' Performance and Perceptions of the Motherhood Role." *Journal of Family Issues* 17:776–792.

Demo, David H. and Alan C. Acock. 1993. "Family Diversity and the Division of Household Labor: How Much Have Things Really Changed?" *Family Relations* 42:323-331.

Diggle, Peter J., Kung-Yee Liang and Scott L. Zeger. 1994. *The Analysis of Longitudinal Data.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Ely, Robin J. 1995. "The Power in Demography: Women's Social Constructions of Gender Identity at Work." *Academy of Management Journal* 38:589-634.

England, Paula. 1984. "Wage Appreciation and Depreciation: A Test of Neoclassical Economic Explanations of Occupational Sex Segregation." *Social Forces* 62:726-749.

England, Paula, George Farkas, Barbara Stanek Kilbourne and Thomas Dou. 1988. "Explaining Occupational Sex Segregation and Wages: Findings from a Model with Fixed Effects" *American Sociological Review* 53:544-558.

Fernandez, Roberto M. and M. Lourdes Sosa. 2005. "Gendering the Job: Networks and Recruitment at a Call Center." *American Journal of Sociology* 111:859-904.

Ferree, Myra Marx. 1991. "The Gender Division of Labor in Two-Earner Marriages: Dimensions of Variability and Change." *Journal of Family Issues* 12:158-180.

Floge, Liliane and Deborah M. Merril.1986. "Tokenism Reconsidered: Male Nurses and Female Physicians in a Hospital Setting." *Social Forces* 64:925-947.

Fullerton, Howard N. 1999. "Labor Force Participation: 75 Years of Change, 1950-98 and 1998-2025." *Monthly Labor Review* December.

Glass, Jennifer. 1990. "The Impact of Occupational Segregation on Working Conditions." *Social Forces* 68:779-796.

Glick, Peter. 1991. "Trait-Based and Sex-Based Discrimination in Occupational Prestige, Occupational Salary, and Hiring." *Sex Roles* 25:351-378.

Greenstein, Theodore N. 1996. "Husbands' Participation in Domestic Labor: Interactive Effects of Wives' and Husbands' Gender Ideologies." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 58:585-595.

Greenstein, Theodore N. 2000. "Economic Dependence, Gender, and the Division of Labor in the Home: A Replication and Extension." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 62:322-335.

Gupta, Sanjiv. 1999. "The Effects of Marital Status Transitions on Men's Housework Performance." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 61:700–711.

Gutek, Barbara A. 1985. *Sex and the Workplace.* Jossey-Bass.

Hanson, Susan and Geraldine Pratt. 1995. *Gender, Work, and Space.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Harenstam, Annika and Eva Bejerot. 2001. "Combining Professional Work with Family Responsibilities – A Burden or a Blessing?" *International Journal of Social Welfare* 10:202-214.

Hardesty, Constance and Janet Bokemeier. 1989. "Finding Time and Making Do: Distribution of Household Labor in Nonmetropolitan Marriages." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 51:253-267.

Heath, Julia A. and W. David Bourne. 1995. "Husbands and Housework: Parity or Parody." *Social Science Quarterly* 76:195–202.

Hodson, Randy. 1989. "Gender Differences in Job Satisfaction: Why Aren't Women More Satisfied?" *The Sociological Quarterly* 30:385-399.

Huffman, Matt L. 1995. "Organizations, Internal Labor Market Policies, and Gender Inequality in Workplace Supervisory Authority." *Sociological Perspectives* 38:381-397.

Huffman, Matt L. and Philip N. Cohen. 2004. "Occupational Segregation and the Gender Gap in Workplace Authority: National Versus Local Labor Markets." *Sociological Forum* 19:121-147.

Hultin, Mia. 2003. "Some Take the Glass Escalator, Some Hit the Glass Ceiling? Career Consequences of Occupational Sex Segregation." *Work and Occupations* 30:30-61.

Jacobs, Jerry. 1989. *Revolving Doors: Sex Segregation and Women's Careers.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Jaffee, David. 1989. "Gender Inequality in Workplace Autonomy and Authority." *Social Science Quarterly* 70:375-390.

Jencks, Christopher, Lauri Perman and Lee Rainwater. 1988. "What is a Good Job? A New Measure of Labor-Market Success?" *The American Journal of Sociology* 93:1322-1357.

Johnson, David R. and Lisa A. Elliott. 1998. "Sampling Design Effects: Do They Affect the Analyses of Data from the National Survey of Families and Households?" *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 60:993-1001.

Kalleberg, Arne. L. and Rachel.A. Rosenfeld. 1990. "Work in the Family and in the Labor Market: A Cross-National, Reciprocal Analysis." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 52: 331–346.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1977. *Men and Women of the Corporation.* New York: Basic Books.

King, Miriam, Steven Ruggles, and Matthew Sobek. 2003. *Integrated Public Use Microdata Series, Current Population Survey: Preliminary Version 0.1.* Minneapolis: Minnesota Population Center, University of Minnesota.

Kmec, Julie A. 2005. "Setting Occupational Sex Segregation in Motion: Demand-Side Explanations of Sex Traditional Employment." *Work and Occupations* 32:322-354.

Kruger, Helga and Rene Levy. 2001. "Linking Life Courses, Work, and the Family: Theorizing a Not So Visible Nexus between Women and Men." *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 26:145-166.

Maret, Elizabeth and Barbara Finlay. 1984. "The Distribution of Household Labor among Women in Dual-Earner Families." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 46:357-364.

Marini, Margaret M. and Mary C. Brinton. 1984. "Sex Typing in Occupational Socizliation." Pp. 192-232 in *Sex Segregation in the Workplace*, edited by Barbara Reskin. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Marini, Margaret M. and Ellen Greenberger. 1978. "Sex Differences in Occupational Aspirations and Expectations." *Work and Occupations* 5:147-178.

Marks, Steven R. and Shelley M. MacDermid. 1996. "Multiple Roles and the Self: A Theory of Role Balance." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 58: 417-432.

Maume, David J. 1999. "Occupational Segregation and the Career Mobility of White Men and Women." *Social Forces* 77:143-1459.

McLaughlin, Steven D. 1978. "Occupational Sex Identification and the Assessment of Male and Female Earnings Inequality." *American Sociological Review* 43:909-921.

Milkie, Melissa A. and Pia Peltola. 1999. "Playing All the Roles: Gender and the Work-Family Balancing Act." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 61:476-490.

Mincer, Jacob and Solomon Polachek. 1974. "Family Investments in Human Capital: Earnings of Women." *The Journal of Political Economy* 82:76-108.

Mortimer, Jeylan T. and Roberta G. Simmons. 1978. "Adult Socialization." *Annual Review of Sociology* 4:421-454.

Mortimer, Jeylan T. and Kathryn M. Borman. 1988. *Work Experience and Psychological Development Through the Lifespan.* Westview Press.

National Alliance for Partnerships in Equity. 2007. "Nontraditional Occupations, Nontraditional Careers, Gender Equity." Retrieved May 15, 2007 (http://www.napequity.org).

Neuhaus, John M., Jack D. Kalbfleisch, and Walter W. Hauck. 1991. "A Comparison of Cluster-Specific and Population-Averaged Approaches for Analyzing Correlated Binary Data." *International Statistical Review* 59:25–35.

Neuhaus John M. 1992. "Statistical Methods for Longitudinal and Clustered Designs with Binary Responses." *Statistical Methods in Medical Research* 1:249–273.

New York State Project for Nontraditional Employment and Training. 2007. "Promoting Gender Equity in Education and the Workforce." Retrieved May 15, 2007 (http://www.albany.edu/nontraditionalcareers/).

Nontraditional Career Resource Center. 2007. "Nontraditional Career Resource Center." Retrieved May 15, 2007 (http://www.ncrc.rutgers.edu/).

Noonan, Mary C. 2001. "The Impact of Domestic Work on Men's and Women's Wages." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 63:1134-1145.

Nordenmark, Mikael. 2002. "Multiple Social Roles – A Resource or a Burden: Is it Possible for Men and Women to Combine Paid Work with Family Life in a Meaningful Way?" *Gender, Work, and Organization* 9:125-145.

Okamoto, Dina and Paula England. 1999. "Is There a Supply Side to Occupational Sex Segregation?" *Sociological Perspectives* 42:557-582.

Orbuch, Terry L. and Sandra L. Eyster. 1997. "Division of Household Labor among Black Couples and White Couples." *Social Forces* 76:301–332.

Peterson, Trond and Laurie A. Morgan. 1995. "Separate and Unequal: Occupation-Establishment Sex Segregation and the Gender Wage Gap." *American Journal of Sociology* 101:329-365.

Pfeffer, Jeffrey. 1991. "Organizational Theory and Structural Perspectives on Management." *Journal of Management* 17:789-803.

Polachek, Solomon W. 1979. "Occupational Segregation Among Women: Theory, Evidence and a Prognosis," Pp. 137-157 in *Women and the Labor Market*, edited by Cynthia B. Lloyd, Emily Andrews, and Curtis Gilroy. New York: Columbia University Press.

Press, Julie E. and Eleanor Townsley. 1998. "Wives' and Husbands' Housework Reporting: Gender, Class, and Social Desireability." *Gender and Society* 12:188-218.

Presser, Harriet B. 1994. "Employment Schedules among Dual-Earner Spouses and the Division of Household Labor by Gender." *American Sociological Review* 59:348–364.

Reskin, Barbara F., Debra B. McBrier and Julie A. Kmec. 1999. "The Determinants and Consequences of Workplace Sex and Race Composition." *Annual Review of Sociology* 25:335-61.

Reskin, Barbara F. and Debra Branch McBrier. 2000. "Why Not Ascription? Organizations' Employment of Male and Female Managers." *American Sociological Review* 65:210-233.

Reskin, Barbara F. and Patricia A. Roos. 1990. *Job Queues, Gender Queues: Explaining Women's Inroads into Male Occupations.* Pennsylvania: Temple University Press.

Ridgeway, Cecilia and Lynn Smith-Lovin. 1999. "The Gender System and Interaction." *Annual Review of Sociology* 25:191-216.

Ross, Catherine E. 1987. "The Division of Labor at Home." *Social Forces* 65:816-833.

Sayer, Liana C. 2005. "Gender, Time, and Inequality: Trends in Women's and Men's Paid Work, Unpaid Work and Free Time." *Social Forces* 84:285-303.

Seccombe, Karen. 1986. "The Effects of Occupational Conditions upon the Division of Household Labor: An Application of Kohn's Theory." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 48:839-848

Shelton, Beth Anne and Daphne John. 1996. "The Division of Household Labor." *Annual Review of Sociology* 22:299-322.

Silver, Hillary and Francis Goldscheider. 1994. "Flexible Work and Housework: Work and Family Constraints on Women's Domestic Labor." *Social Forces* 72:1103–1119.

Skuratowicz, Eva and Larry W. Hunter. 2004. "Where Do Women's Jobs Come from? Job Resegregation in an American Bank." *Work and Occupations* 31:73-110.

South, Scott and Glenna Spitze. 1994. "Housework in Marital and Nonmarital Households." *American Sociological Review*. 59:327-347.

Stevens, Gillian and Joo Hyun Cho. 1985. "Socioeconomic Indexes and the New 1980 Census Occupational Classification Scheme." *Social Science Research* 14:142-168

Sweet, James A. and Larry L. Bumpass. 1996. The National Survey of Families and Households - Waves 1 and 2: Data Description and Documentation. Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin-Madison (http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/nsfh/home.htm).

Sweet, James, Larry Bumpass, and Vaughn Call. 1988. "The Design and Content of The National Survey of Families and Households." Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin-Madison, NSFH Working Paper #1.

Tajfel, Henri and John C. Turner. 1986. "The Social Identity Theory of Inter-Group Behavior." In S. Worchel and L. W. Austin (eds.), *Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. Chigago: Nelson-Hall.

Tam, Tony. 1997. "Sex Segregation and Occupational Gender Inequality in the United States: Devaluation or Specialized Training?" *American Journal of Sociology* 102:1652-92.

Tomaskovic-Devey, Donald. 1993. *Gender & Racial Inequality at Work: The Sources and Consequences of Job Segregation* New York: ILR Press.

Tomaskovic-Devey, Don and Sheryl Skaggs. 2002. "Sex Segregation, Labor Process Organization, and Gender Earnings Inequality." *American Journal of Sociology* 108:102-128.

United States Department of Labor. 2007. "Women in the Labor Force in 2004." Washington, DC: Bureau of Labor Statistics. Retrieved January 20, 2007 (http://www.dol.gov/wb/factsheets/Qf-laborforce-04.htm).

United States Census Bureau. 2007. "Fast Facts About Women in the Labor Force." Washington, DC: Public Information Office. Retrieved May 13, 2007. (http://www.census.gov/pubinfo/www/multimedia/WomensHistory.html).

Waite, Linda J. and Sue E. Berryman. 1986. "Job Stability among Young Women: A Comparison of Traditional and Nontraditional Occupations." *American Journal of Sociology* 92: 568-595.

Walshok, Mary L. 1981. *Blue-Collar Women: Pioneers on the Male Frontier.* Anchor Books.

West, Candace and Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. "Doing Gender." *Gender & Society* 1:125-151.

West, Candace and Sarah Fenstermaker. 1995. "Doing Difference." *Gender and Society* 9:8-37.

Wider Opportunities for Women. 2007. "Work 4 Women." Retrieved May 15, 2007 (http://www.work4women.org).

Williams, Christine L. 1991. *Gender Differences at Work: Men and Women in Nontraditional Occupations.* California: University of California Press.

Williams, Christine L. 1995. *Still a Man's World: Men who do "Women's Work."* University of California Press.

Wolf, Wendy C. and Rachel Rosenfeld. 1978. "Sex Structure of Occupations and Job Mobility." *Social Forces* 56:823-844.

Women's Bureau. 2007. "Quick Facts on Nontraditional Occupations for Women." Washington, DC: United States Department of Labor. Retrieved May 1, 2007. (http://www.dol.gov/wb/factsheets/nontra2006.htm).

Yoder, Janice D. 1991. "Rethinking Tokenism: Looking Beyond Numbers." *Gender and Society* 5:178-192.

Zimmer, Lynn. 1988. "Tokenism and Women in the Workplace: The Limits of Gender-Neutral Theory." *Social Problems* 35:64-77.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Variables in the Analysis: NSFH1 (1987-1988) and NSFH2 (1992-1994)

	Wave 1		*Wave 2*	
	Women employed in male-dominated occupations	Women employed in all other occupations	Women employed in male-dominated occupations	Women employed in all other occupations
Dependent measure				
Household progressivism	0.174	0.076 ***	0.184	0.115 *
	(0.382)	(0.266)	(0.390)	(0.320)
Demographic and household characteristics				
Age	33.536	34.588	39.184	40.379
	(8.422)	(8.409)	(8.128)	(8.421)
High school degree plus some college	0.261	0.306	0.184	0.358 *
	(0.442)	(0.461)	(0.390)	(0.480)
College degree or higher	0.319	0.318	0.342	0.342
	(0.469)	(0.466)	(0.478)	(0.475)
Black	0.072	0.079	0.092	0.078
	(0.261)	(.270)	(0.291)	(0.268)
Hispanic	0.058	0.034 **	0.026	0.037
	(0.235)	(0.182)	(0.161)	(0.188)
Married	0.841	0.922 ***	0.947	0.962 *
	(0.369)	(0.269)	(0.225)	(0.192)
Male partner is employed	0.884	0.844	0.921	0.906
	(0.323)	(0.363)	(0.271)	(0.292)
Children age 2 and under in household	0.203	0.216	0.184	0.146
	(0.405)	(0.412)	(0.390)	(0.353)
Children ages 3-12 in household	0.391	0.420	0.434	0.443
	(0.469)	(0.494)	(0.499)	(0.497)
Children ages 13-18 in household	0.232	0.243	0.250	0.244
	(0.425)	(0.429)	(0.436)	(0.429)
Employment characteristics				
Fulltime employment	0.816	0.713	0.882	0.724 ***
	(0.394)	(0.452)	(0.325)	(0.447)
Occupational socioeonomic index	44.143	41.094 ***	45.56	43.261 ***
	(25.608)	(17.546)	(27.055)	(17.497)
Relative earnings	0.230	0.230	0.545	0.461
	(0.248)	(0.253)	(0.259)	(0.267)
Ideology				
Working couples should share household tasks	4.377	4.304	3.776	3.812
	(0.750)	(0.726)	(1.001)	(0.965)
	N = 69	N = 1074	N = 76	N = 1067

Note: Data shown are unweighted means with standard deviations in parentheses

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$ indicates significant difference between group means

Table 2. Odds Ratios from Generalized Estimating Equations of Progressive Division of Household Labor, NSFH1 - NSFH2

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7
Intercept	0.306 **	0.088 ***	0.026 ***	0.025 ***	0.026 ***	0.025 ***	0.025 ***
	(0.380)	(0.471)	(0.599)	(0.603)	(0.601)	(0.603)	(0.607)
Year (reference = NSFH2)	0.649 ***	0.834	0.720 *	0.720 *	0.720 *	0.719 *	0.720 *
	(0.131)	(0.167)	(0.153)	(0.154)	(0.154)	(0.154)	(0.154)
Demographic and household characteristics							
Age 30-39 at first interview	0.987	0.984	1.026	1.038	1.037	1.037	1.037
	(0.197)	(0.198)	(0.201)	(0.201)	(0.201)	(0.200)	(0.200)
Age 40-49 at first interview	0.984	1.025	1.083	1.108	1.111	1.106	1.108
	(0.233)	(0.236)	(0.237)	(0.239)	(0.240)	(0.239)	(0.239)
Age 50-59 at first interview	1.000	1.041	1.068	1.075	1.075	1.071	1.075
	(0.321)	(0.321)	(0.320)	(0.320)	(0.320)	(0.320)	(0.320)
High school degree plus some college	1.047	1.044	1.010	1.046	1.046	1.048	1.046
	(0.178)	(0.183)	(0.185)	(0.187)	(0.187)	(0.187)	(0.187)
College degree or higher	1.253	1.025	0.975	1.003	1.005	1.005	1.003
	(0.182)	(0.213)	(0.217)	(0.219)	(0.219)	(0.219)	(0.219)
Black	1.208	1.093	1.112	1.134	1.131	1.131	1.134
	(0.304)	(0.303)	(0.304)	(0.300)	(0.299)	(0.298)	(0.300)
Hispanic	1.674	1.704	1.640	1.643	1.644	1.638	1.643
	(0.303)	(0.305)	(0.306)	(0.307)	(0.307)	(0.307)	(0.308)
Married	1.191	1.199	1.265	1.302	1.301	1.309	1.302
	(0.306)	(0.300)	(0.301)	(0.305)	(0.305)	(0.307)	(0.305)
Male partner is employed	0.436 ***	0.529 **	0.529 **	0.520 ***	0.521 **	0.519 ***	0.520 ***
	(0.183)	(0.198)	(0.197)	(0.199)	(0.199)	(0.199)	(0.199)
Children age 2 and under in household	0.499 **	0.531 **	0.519 **	0.514 **	0.512 **	0.515 **	0.514 **
	(0.230)	(0.238)	(0.238)	(0.240)	(0.241)	(0.239)	(0.240)
Children ages 3-12 in household	0.547 ***	0.614 **	0.590 **	0.587 **	0.587 **	0.587 **	0.587 **
	(0.173)	(0.179)	(0.181)	(0.181)	(0.181)	(0.181)	(0.181)
Children ages 13-18 in household	0.707	0.751	0.761	0.756	0.757	0.758	0.756
	(0.182)	(0.182)	(0.184)	(0.184)	(0.184)	(0.184)	(0.184)
Employment characteristics							
Fulltime employment		1.388	1.446	1.414	1.416	1.415	1.414
		(0.194)	(0.193)	(0.193)	(0.194)	(0.193)	(0.193)
Occupational socioeconomic index		1.008	1.007	1.006	1.006	1.006	1.006
		(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Relative earnings		2.486 ***	2.532 ***	2.483 ***	2.488 ***	2.551 ***	2.483 ***
		(0.270)	(0.270)	(0.272)	(0.272)	(0.278)	(0.272)
Ideology							
Working couples should share household tasks			1.360 **	1.357 **	1.358 **	1.356 **	1.358 **
			(0.096)	(0.096)	(0.096)	(0.096)	(0.098)
Gender type of employment							
Male-dominated occupation				1.827 *	1.661	2.097	1.860
				(0.260)	(0.567)	(0.509)	(1.344)
Gender type interactions							
Participation in male-dominated occupation*Occupational socioeconomic index					1.002		
					(0.011)		
Participation in male-dominated occupation*Relative earnings						0.738	
						(0.894)	
Participation in male-dominated occupation*Ideology							0.996
							(0.314)
Log Likelihood	-713.574	-700.798	-693.792	-690.202	-690.152	-689.971	-690.189

Note: Data shown are odds ratios calculated from nonlinear GEE regression estimates with empirical standard error estimates in parentheses; N = 1143
*p < .05 ** p < .01 ***p < .001 (two-tailed tests)