



5-1995

## Division of Labor and the Economic Determinants of Divorce

Virginia (Ginny) Shull '95  
*Illinois Wesleyan University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/econ\\_honproj](https://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/econ_honproj)



Part of the [Economics Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Shull '95, Virginia (Ginny), "Division of Labor and the Economic Determinants of Divorce" (1995). *Honors Projects*. 57.

[https://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/econ\\_honproj/57](https://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/econ_honproj/57)

This Article is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by Digital Commons @ IWU with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this material in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/ or on the work itself. This material has been accepted for inclusion by faculty at Illinois Wesleyan University. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@iwu.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@iwu.edu).

©Copyright is owned by the author of this document.

MAY 11 1995

Division of Labor and the Economic  
Determinants of Divorce

By

Ginny Shull

May 1995

Committee Members:

Dr. Seeborg\*  
Dr. Chapman  
Dr. Renner  
Dr. Simeone

## **Division of Labor and the Economic Determinants of Divorce**

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

The theme of the 1992 National Republican Convention rang out with such phrases as the "traditional family" and "family values," and many conservatives asserted that a return to these molds of the established institutions of marriage and family would be the solution to the societal ills America now faces. As the number of single parent households skyrocketed in the 1980's and more single-headed household incomes began to fall at or below the poverty line, America as a whole began to feel the economic burden of a booming population of families economically dependent on federal and state social programs.

It is generally understood that the family has drastically changed since World War II. "From 1950 to 1977 the legitimate birth rate declined by about one-third, the divorce rate of married women with young children more than tripled, and the percent of households headed by women with dependent children also almost tripled (Schultz; 350)." More recent statistics show that between 1960 and 1992 the number of female headed households has grown over 250% (Stat. Abstract; 73). It has been asserted that these changes are the consequences of the growth in the earning power of women (Schultz; 350). However, I believe that the rise in labor force participation was not merely an effect of marital instability, but was a major cause of the dissolution of

marriages. And if one logically deduces from the neoclassical economic model of the family (that is the mainstream perception of a traditional family structure), it becomes apparent that one of the economic causes of the dissolution of marriages and the disruption of the "traditional family" could be the participation of both spouses within the workforce.

This paper will explore how the economic structure of a marriage determines the viability of the marriage over time. More specifically, it will attempt to test a hypothesis implied by Gary Becker's theory of the family that the lack of division of labor between two spouses, that is both spouses working full time outside the home, causes a greater probability of divorce. Hence, a "traditional family", with only one spouse as the primary wage earner and the other spouse primarily producing non-marketable commodities within the home is "better off" than a non-traditional family because that family unit is more likely to realize economies from divisions of labor and to remain permanent.

## **II. MARRIAGE IN AMERICA: AN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE**

"Divorce rates in the United States have exhibited a sustained upward trend since at least the 1860's" (Schoen & Weinick; 738). In fact, in a study conducted by Schoen and Weinick it was estimated that currently 43% of marriages end in divorce; this figure represents a slight decline in the



probability of a marriage dissolving in comparison to previous years (742, 738). Although the probability of divorce and divorce rates themselves seemed to have peaked and reached a plateau in recent years, the high percentage of faltering marriages still give evidence and reason for concern.

"In an analysis using the 1985 CPS [Current Population Survey]" it was "estimated that approximately two-thirds of all recent first marriages are likely to end in separation or divorce within forty years of marriage" (Schoen & Weinick; 738). This figure was then adjusted and re-estimated to be approximately 60% (738). Currently, a typical couple "has only a small probability of being separated by death during their first 15 years of marriage, but perhaps 10 times as high a probability of being separated by divorce" (Becker, Landes & Michael; 1141). With these facts in mind, the theoretical framework for the hypothesis will next be explained.

### III. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The foundation of the theoretical framework lies in the theory of the division of labor, the differences in human capital investment between spouses, and the use of time allocation within a family. Gary S. Becker applies the idea of comparative advantage which is derived from international trade theory to marriage and households. Although there are several other significant reasons for marriages and divorce, this paper solely

explores the economic factors relating to these occurrences.

Becker asserts that the added benefits from marriage (a higher utility level) arise from the utilization of the comparative advantages of both spouses. "The theory of comparative advantage implies that the resources of members of a household (or any other organization) should be allocated to various activities according to their comparative or relative efficiencies" (Becker 1991; 32). By optimizing the comparative advantages of each spouse, the sum of the contributions given to the family by each spouse is greater than the sum of the contributions each spouse would have given to their respective family if they would have remained single; the whole becomes greater than the sum of its parts (For a less specific definition of comparative advantage see Appendix A).

Becker states, "Two principles form the heart of the analysis. The first is that, since marriage is practically always voluntary, either by the persons marrying or their parents, the theory of preferences can be readily applied, and persons marrying (or their parents) can be assumed to expect to raise their utility level above what it would be were they to remain single" (Becker 1973;814). Simply stated, there must be a benefit resulting from marriage which can not be gained from remaining single. The utility from marriage must exceed the utility of being single. This is the economic reasoning given for marrying in the first place.

This argument rests on the premise that each spouse does indeed have his or her own, unique relative efficiency in some task. Logically, if both spouses were equally efficient at the same tasks and performed those tasks using equal time allocation, the economic reasons for that marriage, relating to the division of labor to realize comparative advantages and maximize output, would dissipate. For instance, if both spouses spent equal time on work inside as well as outside the home, specialization may not occur to its fullest extent within the family unit, and the economic reasoning for the marriage falters.

The potential gains from marriage as opposed to remaining single, therefore, depend upon investments in human capital which create skills that are specialized in a particular area of labor (Becker, Landes, & Michael; 1146). It has been posited that, historically, the biological differences between men and women which have delineated or created, for that matter, each gender's labor specialization. "Sex of household members is an important distinguishing characteristic in the production and care of children, and perhaps also in other household commodities and in the market sector" (Becker 1991;38).

Becker continues this reasoning and states, "biological differences in comparative advantage between the sexes explain not only why households typically have both sexes, but also why women have usually spent their time bearing and rearing children and engaging in other household activities (Becker 1991; 39)."

To clarify, this paper is not asserting that women are not capable of work outside the home nor is it asserting that a "woman's place is in the home", rather because of the nature of gender differences and the nurturing of each gender, women generally have a comparative advantage in the production of non-marketable commodities. The normative question of whether or not this should be the case, is a question which must be answered outside the realm of neo-classical economics and in other disciplines.

Neither is this paper arguing the "exploitation" of women. The correct appropriation of goods and human capital can not be equated with the idea of exploitation. When the division of labor is decided upon in the household, the deciding party imposes the most efficient division of labor which maximizes household output as well as their own individuals' benefits, their own "take" (Becker 1991; 62). "A husband may enjoy the labor of his wife...but simultaneously reciprocate equivalent value by, for example, producing goods for her consumption or sharing his wage. The issue revolves around the hours and intensity that women worked both for wages and domestically, the hours and intensity that men worked, and the distribution of consumption within the family" (Humphries; 271).

It is equally conceivable that the opposite of the former mentioned division of labor could occur. The majority of men, over time, could begin specializing in household commodities.

The division of labor would no longer be linked to sex: "husbands would be more specialized to housework and wives to market activities in about half the marriages, and the reverse would occur in the other half" (Becker 1991; 78-79). Regardless of which spouse specializes in each task, "married households...still gain considerably from a division of labor in the allocation of time and investments" (Becker 1991; 78-79).

It is inconsequential which spouse performs which function within the marriage, as long as a comparative advantage in the production of a specific commodity (ie. intermediate goods derived from the labor force or non-marketable household commodities) is achieved through investment "in human capital specific to that activity" (Becker 1991; 57). Becker continues development of this theory by stating, "If all members of a household have different comparative advantages, no more than one member would invest in both market and household capital. Members specializing in the market sector, would invest only in market capital, and members specializing in the household sector would invest only in household capital" (Becker 1991; 34).

Assuming that each spouse has a different comparative advantage than the other (for this assumption must be true because maximization of output is the economic reasoning behind marriage), everyone possessing a greater comparative advantage in the market will specialize in the market, and everyone with a comparative advantage in the household will specialize there

(Becker 1991; 33).

The last theoretical foundation on which this research rests is the household production function which states that the maximum utility of an "individual or a family welfare function" for non-marketable commodities is based upon a combination of intermediate goods and time. Intermediate goods, in this case, are market inputs (Juster & Stafford; 486). An optimum is reached when the correct combination of intermediate goods and time creates the preferred amount of non-marketable commodities. "Households are assumed to use non-market time and market goods to produce non-marketable commodities. Each person maximizes the utility from the commodities that he or she expects to consume over his lifetime" (Becker, Landes, & Michael; 1143). Put simply, households purchase " 'goods' on the market and combines them with time in a 'household production function' to produce 'commodities'" (Pollak & Wachter; 255). It is these commodities which satisfy the household utility function; market goods and time are only desired as mere inputs into the production of these commodities (Pollak & Wachter; 255).

Assuming that commodity production functions have constant or increasing returns to scale, members of efficient households specialize completely in the market or household sector and additionally invest in capital in either sector (Becker 1991; 35). The biological nature of each spouse differs as well as investments in capital, one spouses time is not a perfect

substitute for the time of the other respective spouse (Becker 1991; 39). The spouse who has been trained and nurtured to produce market commodities can not complete the tasks of the household sector as efficiently, in terms of time and production, as the spouse who specializes in household production.

Hence to maximize utility, a marriage will devote one spouse to a particular division of labor and the other spouse to another division. If both spouses perform the same function, the economic gains from the marriage decrease and, in theory, the marriage becomes more likely to dissolve.

#### **IV. EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS**

To test the hypothesis that the correct division of labor, according to Becker, within a household creates a greater probability that marriage will remain intact, a sample of approximately 915 young adult respondents who were married in 1983 were followed through to the year 1990 to determine whether their marriage remained intact. It is hypothesized that marriages are more likely to remain intact if there is a traditional division of labor. For purposes of this study, all respondents are categorized as "traditional" or "non-traditional." In general, traditional couples are couples where one spouse allocates relatively more time to home production, while the other spouse concentrates on market work and allocates relatively more time to it. Non-traditional family structures

are those where both spouses are more equally involved in both market work and home production.

The analysis proceeds in two stages. The first stage, Sections A, B, C, and D, presents descriptive statistics showing the relationship between the division of labor within the family and the probability that the marriage is still intact by 1990. The results of the first stage of the analysis are presented and discussed in Section A. Several different variables were used as measures to categorize families as "traditional" or "non-traditional."

The second stage presents regressions which were conducted to test the extent to which division of labor and other variables affected the probability of divorce in the sample. These regressions will be presented in section E.

Data were obtained using the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY) which collected data through yearly interviews with 12,686 youths between the years 1979 and 1991. The NLSY gathered much information about the respondents, including variables such as marital status, number of dependents, time usage, division of labor within the home, occupation, and hours worked outside the home. A complete list of variables used can be found in appendix B.



## **SECTION A: DIVISION OF LABOR DEFINED BY HOURS WORKED.**

### **1. RESEARCH DESIGN**

A representative sample of respondents who were already married in 1983 were chosen thereby making the youngest respondent in the sample 23 years of age in 1983 and the oldest 25. This sample was used throughout this entire study. However, for purposes of this section, this group was further narrowed by including only those respondents who were male. Looking at one gender being interviewed by the survey, for this particular section, greatly simplified statistical procedures. This second narrowing of the sample was done primarily to delineate between husband and wife within the sample. A mean ratio of husband's work hours per year versus wife's work hours per year was then established for the years 1983 through 1990. This sample was then divided into two groups based upon family structure. For this particular analysis, the respondents were categorized as having a traditional family structure if they met the following two criteria: the work ratio between husband and wife must be equal to or greater than two (making the male work twice as much as the female) and the male must work more than 1820 hours per year (approximately fifty-two, thirty-five hour work weeks per year). Thus, a traditional family is defined in this section of the empirical study as one in which the male works at least 35 hours per week and the female works no more than half that amount

outside the home. All families failing to meet this criterion are categorized as non-traditional families.

Using these categories, a cross-tabulation between family structure (non-traditional or traditional) and marital status was conducted for the years 1983 through 1990. Respondents, whose marriages remained intact over the time period studied, were categorized as traditional or non-traditional based upon divisions of labor within their household for the year 1989. That is, the work ratio for those still married in 1990 was observed in 1989, and it was that work ratio which determined whether the family was traditional or non-traditional. Then the percentage of marriages remaining intact for each categorization of family structure was observed.

## **2. RESULTS**

Results, to an extent, were inconclusive; they neither confirm nor deny Becker's theory of the division of labor within the family. Eighty percent of marriages categorized as non-traditional remained intact through the seven year time span observed. Similarly, 77.6% of marriages viewed as traditional remained intact. These percentages are extremely close and do not provide an apparent distinction between family structures and the viability of a marriage having a particular division of labor.

### **3. IMPLICATIONS**

Findings of this first empirical test were inconclusive and did not provide support for Becker's neo-classical model of the family. Becker asserts that gains from division of labor within a family are not realized within a marriage unless both spouses are working at the task they are more, efficient at performing, relatively speaking. If they are not utilizing their unique relative efficiencies, the economic gains of the marriage are not fully realized; hence, there exists a greater probability of divorce. If results would have supported Becker's neo-classical model of the family, a discrepancy between the viability rates of marriage of traditional and non-traditional families would have been apparent. However, this was not the case. Therefore, results of this preliminary empirical test imply that the division of labor within a family may not be a significant determinant of divorce.

## **SECTION B: DIVISION OF LABOR DEFINED BY SPECIFIC HOUSEHOLD RESPONSIBILITIES.**

### **1. RESEARCH DESIGN**

Next, a comparison of the marital status of traditional and non-traditional families was conducted by observing the divisions of labor in the production of specific non-marketable household commodities. This method of categorization of families is predominately based upon traditional gender roles within a

marriage. Specifically, two variable types were used. Actual divisions of labor to produce non-marketable commodities within the home were the first type, and the second set of variables were attitudinal variables about division of labor within the home. Although the research design used with both variable types is identical, results of the comparison of marital status and attitudes towards division of labor within the home can be found in Section D.

In total, there are ten household task variables which are used to identify families as traditional or non-traditional. Each task variable asks how frequently the respondent does a particular task. Consider the task of washing dishes. The survey question asks "Are you the one who usually washes the dishes?" If the respondent is male, the division of labor is considered traditional if he answered "almost never" or "some." Division of labor within the home is considered non-traditional if the male respondent answered "about half", "much", or "almost all." On the other hand, if the respondent is female, the division of labor is considered traditional if she answered that she washed the dishes "about half", "much", or "almost all" of the time. The division of labor is considered non-traditional if the female respondent replied "almost never" or "some." For a complete look at the categorization of these variables see Appendix B.

For simplicity of analysis, the sample was divided into two

separate sub-samples by gender. Specific sample sizes for each task variable can be found in Appendix C. Divisions of labor for specific tasks were then used to determine whether the family was traditional or non-traditional based upon perceived traditional gender roles for each task. For instance, families were deemed as having a traditional family structure if meals were primarily prepared by the female spouse. Similarly, families were deemed as non-traditional if such tasks as outdoor chores and paperwork were performed by the female spouse.

The purpose of this analysis is to determine whether those respondents who had traditional divisions of labor were more likely to have marriages which remained intact than those respondents who had non-traditional division of labor. The results of the analysis are presented in the following section.

## **2. RESULTS**

Tables One and Two show the percent of marriages remaining intact by selected divisions of specific household tasks for the male and female sample respectively. For example, consider the variable CLEANING found in Table One. The first two columns show the percentage of traditional and non-traditional respondents whose marriages remained intact. For the particular task of CLEANING, 70.30% of respondents who had a traditional division of labor for this task had marriages which remained intact. 67.27% of the respondents with a non-traditional division of labor for this task had viable marriages throughout the time

**TABLE 1: PERCENT OF MARRIAGES INTACT BY SELECTED DIVISIONS  
OF HOUSEHOLD LABOR: MALE SAMPLE**

Variable	Traditional	Non-Traditional	Difference	Chi Square	Prob. Value
CLEANING	70.30%	67.27%	3.03%	0.33608	0.5621
SHOPPING	69.81%	68.90%	0.91%	0.03598	0.8496
ERRANDS	68.84%	70.06%	-1.22%	0.06485	0.799
OUTDOOR CHORES	72.63%	66.50%	6.13%	1.65898	0.1977
LAUNDRY	69.64%	68.75%	0.89%	0.02684	0.8699
DISHES	68.46%	72.16%	-3.70%	0.46567	0.495
MEALS	67.37%	75.82%	-8.45%	2.32295	0.1275
PAPERWORK	71.29%	68.73%	2.56%	0.228	0.633
CHILDCARE	64.04%	71.76%	-7.72%	2.23029	0.1353
MAINTENANCE	70.80%	67.30%	3.50%	0.50931	0.4754

**TABLE 2: PERCENT OF MARRIAGES INTACT BY SELECTED DIVISIONS  
OF HOUSEHOLD LABOR: FEMALE SAMPLE**

Variable	Traditional	Non-Traditional	Difference	Chi Square	Prob. Value
CLEANING	64.43%	61.84%	2.59%	0.18908	0.6637
SHOPPING	63.23%	68.13%	-4.90%	0.7892	0.3743
ERRANDS	62.82%	64.57%	-1.75%	0.14662	0.7018
OUTDOOR CHORES	64.98%	59.04%	5.94%	1.07605	0.2996
LAUNDRY	64.14%	63.49%	0.65%	0.00998	0.9204
DISHES	63.89%	65.22%	-1.33%	0.0461	0.83
MEALS	63.56%	66.67%	-3.11%	0.30649	0.5798
PAPERWORK	66.04%	62.08%	3.96%	0.91578	0.3386
CHILDCARE	64.39%	61.76%	2.63%	0.1781	0.673
MAINTENANCE	60.70%	64.50%	-3.80%	0.34632	0.5562

period studied. Column Three gives the percent difference between marriages which remained intact having traditional divisions of labor and those remaining intact that had non-traditional divisions of labor. For the task of cleaning, there were 3.03% more families with traditional divisions of labor which remained intact than those with non-traditional divisions of labor.

The Chi Square statistic measures the extent of association between two categorized variables: marital status in 1990 and whether the division of labor with respect to the particular task (in this case, cleaning) is traditional or non-traditional. The higher the Chi Square the greater the association between the two variables. In this case, the association between division of labor for cleaning and marital status is minimal with the Chi Square statistic being 0.3361. The last column gives the probability value of the Chi Square statistic. A probability value less than 0.10 indicates a statistically significant level of association between division of labor for the particular task and marital status. The variable of cleaning is found to have a probability value of 0.5621, and the association is therefore insignificant.

No specific task variables were found to be statistically significant although some were very close to being so. In the male sample, the task variables of MEALS and CHILDCARE were almost significant. However, in both cases there were more



families having a non-traditional division of labor which remained intact over those who had traditional divisions.

### **3. IMPLICATIONS**

Results from empirical models, once again, failed to give support to Becker's theory of division of labor within a marriage. Results show no significant difference between the percentage of non-traditional families remaining intact from 1983 to 1990 and that of respondents having traditional divisions of labor and viable marriages during the same time span. Becker's theory of division of labor to produce specific household commodities was not supported.

Testing Becker's theory using traditional gender roles in the production of specific household commodities failed to support Becker's economic reasoning for marriage. No pattern was evident between the viability of marriages and divisions of labor for specific tasks. Furthermore, in total, out of the ten task variables explored within each gender sample, none were found to have statistical significance. According to these results, traditional divisions of labor, as defined in this section, does not necessarily have a bearing on the probability that one's marriage will stay intact.

## **SECTION C: DIVISION OF LABOR DEFINED BY A TIME ALLOCATION INDEX.**

### **1. RESEARCH DESIGN**

The variables of household production which showed the actual division of labor used to produce non-marketable commodities within the home, was also cross-tabulated with marital status in a second way to determine family structure without accounting for traditional gender roles. All ten household task variables were used to create a "time allocation index" to classify households as being either super-traditional, somewhat traditional, or not traditional. The ten household task variables used to compute the time allocation index are: CHILDCARE, PAPERWORK, HOME MAINTENANCE, HOUSEHOLD CHORES, ERRANDS, SHOPPING, CLEANING, LAUNDRY, DISHES, and MEAL PREPARATION.

If the same spouse performed eight or more of the ten household functions at least most of the time, the household was categorized as having a traditional family structure. If one spouse performed six or seven of these tasks at least most of the time, the household was categorized as somewhat traditional. The remainder of respondents, having the same spouse perform five or less of these functions, were deemed as having non-traditional family structures.

This test is consistent with Becker's theory that if one spouse primarily performed all of the household functions of

cooking, cleaning and what not, that household, according to Becker would more likely remain intact. The spouse specializing in these functions may possess a comparative advantage in producing these commodities as opposed to each spouse producing commodities within the home without specialization occurring. One spouse performing the majority of household functions also frees up time for the other spouse to engage primarily in market work.

## **2. RESULTS**

Similar results occurred when looking at the division of labor for non-marketable production without accounting for gender. Results again showed no significant difference between the percentage of non-traditional families remaining intact from 1983 to 1990 and that of respondents having traditional family structure and viable marriages during the same time span. 66.7% of marriages categorized as super-traditional remained intact while 61.5% of those deemed somewhat traditional had marriages remaining viable until 1990.

Only 58.8% of marriages categorized as having a non-traditional family structure remained intact. This was the only result statistically significant at the 90% level. This variable had a probability value of .0852.

## **3. IMPLICATIONS**

Although findings of this particular section are somewhat more consistent with Becker's theory, they generally lack

statistical significance. Once again, it appears that division of labor is not a very strong determinant of the viability of a marriage.

## **SECTION D: ATTITUDES TOWARDS DIVISION OF LABOR IN THE HOUSEHOLD**

### **1. RESEARCH DESIGN**

The second variable type which was alluded to in Section B are survey questions relating to the respondents attitude toward gender roles within the home. In total eighteen variables are used to identify families as traditional or non-traditional. These attitudinal variables were used to compare the marital status of respondents having traditional attitudes towards roles and responsibilities within the home to those having non-traditional attitudes. For instance, consider the attitude variable TIME87. The survey question reads "A wife who carries out her full family responsibilities doesn't have time for outside employment." If the respondent indicated "agree" or "strongly agree" to this statement, they were considered to be traditional. If the respondent indicated "strongly disagree" or "disagree," they were considered non-traditional. The research design is identical to that presented in Section B, and sample size for each attitudinal variable can be found in Appendix C.

### **2. RESULTS**

Tables Three and Four explore the attitudes held by the interview respondents. The tables present the percentages of

marriages remaining intact among those with non-traditional and traditional attitudes towards divisions of labor. For purposes of this model, it is assumed that the sample respondents act out their attitudes toward division of labor within a marriage.

Consider the variable SHARE79. The survey question states "Men should share the work around the house with women, such as doing dishes, cleaning and so forth." If the respondent indicated "agree" or "strongly agree" to the statement, he/she was deemed as having a non-traditional family structure since a traditional family structure would have only one spouse performing these functions. Results showed for this particular variable that 0.80% more families (male sample) with non-traditional attitudes remained intact over those with traditional family attitudes. 68.75% of families which were classified as traditional remained intact, and 69.55% of families which were categorized as non-traditional remained intact. This variable was found to be statistically insignificant having a probability value of 0.8992.

Several of these variables were found to have a significant association with marital status and the attitude held by the respondent. For the male sample the attitudinal variables of ROLE82 and USEFUL87 were found to be statistically significant. These variables also had more marriages with traditional attitudes remaining intact over those with non-traditional attitudes. ROLE82, which can be seen in Table Three, was found

to be highly significant for this sample with a probability value of 0.0093. If the respondent indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed to the statement that "it is much better for everyone concerned if the man is the achiever outside the home and the woman takes care of the home and family," they were categorized as traditional. 77.54% of those marriages having a traditional attitude towards this topic remained intact, and 64.71 percent of the respondents having a non-traditional attitude had marriages which were viable through the year 1990. If the respondent indicated that he/she attended religious services at least once a week they were categorized as traditional. 8.14 percent more families being categorized as traditional for this variable remained intact over those being categorized as non-traditional.

Within the female sample of respondents, results for three attitudinal variables were found to be statistically significant with a higher percentage of marriages holding traditional attitudes remaining viable than marriages holding non-traditional attitudes. FREQREL79, USEFUL87, and SHARE87 were found to be statistically significant. USEFUL87 was found to be extremely significant with a probability value of 0.000. The survey question states, "A working wife feels more useful than one who doesn't hold a job." If the respondent agreed or strongly agreed to this statement they were categorized as holding a non-traditional attitude. If the respondent indicated disagree or

**TABLE 3: PERCENT OF MARRIAGES INTACT BY SELECTED ATTITUDES TOWARDS HUSBANDS AND WIVES RESPONSIBILITIES: MALE SAMPLE**

Variable	Traditional	Non-Traditional	Difference	Chi Square	Prob. Value
HAPPY79	74.34%	67.30%	7.04%	1.84299	0.1746
SHARE79	68.75%	69.55%	-0.80%	0.01606	0.8992
ROLE79	70.39%	68.53%	1.86%	0.15334	0.6954
USEFUL79	64.21%	71.17%	-6.96%	1.62173	0.2029
TIME79	63.49%	72.40%	-8.91%	3.13123	0.0768
PLACE79	65.49%	71.10%	-5.61%	1.17416	0.2785
FREQREL82	76.19%	68.05%	8.14%	1.63649	0.2008
PLACE82	72.73%	68.40%	4.33%	0.59374	0.441
TIME82	70.14%	68.97%	1.17%	0.05762	0.8103
USEFUL82	71.15%	68.75%	2.40%	0.20477	0.6509
ROLE82	77.54%	64.71%	12.83%	6.77302	0.0093
SHARE82	78.43%	68.00%	10.43%	2.25936	0.1328
HAPPY82	72.99%	67.36%	5.63%	1.29952	0.2543
PLACE87	75.00%	68.59%	6.41%	1.04894	0.3058
TIME87	75.58%	67.59%	7.99%	1.99712	0.1576
USEFUL87	77.78%	66.04%	11.74%	4.99144	0.0255
SHARE87	65.38%	69.71%	-4.33%	0.2137	0.6439
HAPPY87	78.85%	65.81%	13.04%	1.3746	0.7421

**TABLE 4: PERCENT OF MARRIAGES INTACT BY SELECTED ATTITUDES TOWARDS HUSBANDS AND WIVES RESPONSIBILITIES: FEMALE SAMPLE**

Variable	Traditional	Non-Traditional	Difference	Chi Square	Prob. Value
HAPPY79	59.71%	65.58%	-5.87%	1.53954	0.2147
SHARE79	59.55%	64.96%	-5.41%	0.94207	0.3317
ROLE79	63.82%	64.20%	-0.38%	0.00794	0.929
USEFUL79	66.09%	62.50%	3.59%	0.74019	0.3896
TIME79	63.11%	64.34%	-1.23%	0.06121	0.8046
PLACE79	53.85%	66.14%	-12.29%	4.96429	0.0259
FREQREL79	70.13%	61.62%	8.51%	3.45578	0.063
FREQREL82	68.42%	62.34%	6.08%	1.75168	0.1857
PLACE82	59.78%	64.94%	-5.16%	0.88208	0.3476
TIME82	62.57%	64.86%	-2.29%	0.27768	0.5982
USEFUL82	67.61%	61.03%	6.58%	2.50605	0.1134
ROLE82	61.41%	65.44%	-4.03%	0.85155	0.3561
SHARE82	61.82%	64.32%	-2.50%	0.13371	0.7146
HAPPY82	61.82%	65.05%	-3.23%	0.51974	0.471
PLACE87	67.16%	63.62%	3.54%	0.32047	0.5713
TIME87	64.29%	64.03%	0.26%	0.00179	0.9663
USEFUL87	72.38%	54.58%	17.80%	18.38826	0.000
SHARE87	84.00%	63.09%	20.91%	4.52841	0.0333
HAPPY87	66.91%	63.07%	3.84%	0.6602	0.4165



strongly disagree they were deemed as traditional. For this particular attitude 17.80% more respondents holding a traditional view remained married than those holding a non-traditional view.

### **3. IMPLICATIONS**

Results, on a whole, give only limited support to Becker's neo-classical theory on the family. Few significant differences were found between the percentage of non-traditional families remaining intact from 1983 to 1990 and that of respondents having non-traditional attitudes and viable marriages during the same time span. It is interesting to note, however, that more attitudinal variables were found to be statistically significant than the household task variables explored in the last section, indicating that perhaps attitudes and how spouses view their respective roles are more of a determinant of a viable marriage than actual division of labor for specific household tasks.

## **SECTION E: MULTI-VARIATE ANALYSIS**

### **1. THE EMPIRICAL MODEL**

Lastly, logistic regressions were conducted to test hypotheses about Becker's neo-classical model of the family. LOGIT analysis was chosen over OLS regressions because of the dichotomous dependent variable of remaining married (either one is married or one is not). Unlike OLS analysis, LOGIT coefficients cannot be treated as probability values, but the signs and significance of the coefficients can be treated in the

same manner. Two separate logistic regressions were conducted to investigate the economic determinants of whether a marriage will remain intact and to observe some of the independent effects of each of these determinants. The probability of a marriage remaining intact was regressed against ten independent variables in two separate regression sets. Information on these variables can be found in Appendix B. The independent variables are as follows:

Frequency of Church Attendance	FRQREL
Total Net Family Income	INCOME
Number of Children	CHILDREN
Division of Market Labor	TRAD83
Attitudinal Measure	ROLE79
Division of Household Labor	DISHES81
Over-Employment	OVER83
Under-Employment	UNDER83
Division of Household Labor	SUPERTRAD
Division of Household Labor	SOMETRAD

All these variables are dummy variables taking the value of one if conditions were met and zero if conditions were not met with the exception of the variables INCOME and CHILDREN. These ten variables were chosen for numerous reasons.

Frequency of church attendance was used because past

research has shown that a more active religious life leads to greater family stability and less of a likelihood for divorce (Lehrer & Chiswick). This is due to socialization benefits of involvement in religious organizations and the ideals such an organization instills in its members. If a family has a traditional division of labor, with one spouse predominately working at home, church attendance can serve as a socialization outlet for the "at-home" spouse. Also, shared values between spouses enhance the probability that a marriage will remain intact. It is posited that the a more frequent attender of religious functions has a higher probability of their marriage remaining intact.

The second variable chosen was total net family income because a higher income leads to a greater overall economically stable household; hence, there would be less of a likelihood for divorce when net family income is high. A higher income increases the opportunity cost of divorce; the opportunity cost of divorce becomes the higher pooled income. This variable is also needed to hold income constant while observing the effects of other variables. It should be noted that pooled income and shared resources create the opportunity for economies of scale within the marriage that are lost when the marriage ceases.

Number of children in the household was captured to account for the fact that the presence of children within a household tend to decrease the probability of divorce because the existence

of children serve as a justification for continuing a marriage which normally would cease. This occurs for economic as well as non-economic reasons.

Children could be considered an economic asset of the marriage. Unlike other household assets, children are indivisible. While the benefits of children can be shared in marriage, these benefits can not be utilized to the extent they were in the marriage when it ceases to exist. Hence, there are more assets to lose when ending a marriage when children are present. Similarly, the benefits of time input and investment in the development of human capital are also lost, as far as children are concerned, when a marriage dissolves. It is expected then that children in a household tend to decrease the likelihood of divorce.

Next the work ratio (TRAD83) developed in Section A was used to test Becker's theory on the division of labor within the home. If the household was categorized as traditional it, according to Becker, would have been more likely to remain intact than those categorized as non-traditional.

Similarly, the attitudinal measure of ROLE79 was used because typically attitudes or preferences are a reflection of the actual structure of the household. If the respondent agreed with the statement that "it is much better for everyone concerned if the man is the achiever outside the home and the woman takes care of the home and family," they were deemed as having a

traditional family structure and, hence, more likely to have a marriage which remains viable.

The variable DISHES81 was used to observe the effects of the division of labor in the production of non-marketable commodities within the household on marriage. If typically, the household had a traditional division of labor for these tasks, with the female predominately performing this task, it is posited that their marriage would more likely remain intact.

The next independent variables investigated are OVER83 and UNDER83. A family is considered under-worked if the combined hours worked by each spouse do not exceed 2080 hours in one year which is equivalent to each spouse working 52 weeks with 20 hours worked each week. OVER83 is the polar opposite of UNDER83. A family unit is considered overworked if total hours worked per year exceed 4160 which is equivalent to each spouse working at least 52 weeks with 40 hours worked per week. If the household is overworked, it is expected that there is less of a likelihood for the marriage to remain intact.

As Becker asserts, the higher the amount of hours worked outside the home the less likely a marriage is to remain viable because, if both spouses spend the same amount of time working outside the home, specialization does not occur to its fullest extent within the family unit. Moreover, the economic benefits which potentially could occur within the marriage are lost, and the economic reasoning for the marriage falters. If a family

unit is under-worked outside the home, once again, specialization is not occurring (both spouses are producing commodities within the home) and the economic reasoning for the marriage is not met.

Secondly, if spouses work "too much" or "not enough" outside the home, they do not achieve their household production function optimum. Recall that a household production function optimum is reached when the correct combination of intermediate goods (market input) and time created the preferred amount of non-marketable commodities. If a family is overproducing or underproducing these intermediate goods, working too much or not enough outside the home, the optimum utility level for goods and time is not reached, and the economic benefits from the marriage once again lessen.

Two different regressions were conducted using these variables. First, a marriage remaining viable is a function of frequency of religion, total net family income, number of children in household, family structure, attitudinal measures, division of labor within the home, existence of a state of excessive work outside the home by each spouse, and existence of not enough work outside the home by each spouse. The first regression model is as follows:

Probability of a marriage remaining viable is a function of: FRQREL, INCOME, CHILDREN, TRAD83, ROLE79, DISHES81, OVER83, and UNDER83.

The second logistic regression is like the first regression with the addition of two variables, SOMETRAD and SUPERTRAD, and the deletion of one variable, DISHES81. These changes were made to capture the division of labor for household production as a whole, instead of focusing on the division of labor for a specific household task such as cleaning dishes. The second regression model is as follows:

Probability of a marriage remaining viable is a function of: FRQREL79, INCOME, CHILDREN, ROLE79, OVER83, UNDER83, SOMETRAD, and SUPERTRAD.

## **2. RESULTS**

To begin assessing the relationship between the division of labor and family structure the two logistic regressions explained above were conducted. Results are shown in Table Five. Results failed to give support to Becker's theory of division of labor within the family but did give insight into other variables which effected the probability of a marriage remaining intact. The four variables which most directly captured the division of labor within a marriage, TRAD83, SOMETRAD, SUPERTRAD and DISHES83, failed to give support to Becker's neo-classical theory on the family. However, the variables of INCOME, CHILDREN, OVER83, and UNDER83 lend insight into other economic factors affecting the

viability of a marriage.

The division of labor measure, TRAD83, was found to have a negative relationship with the viability of a marriage. This result was significant at the .10 level. This result was inconsistent with the hypothesis. Having a traditional family structure, where the male works twice as much as the female outside the home, was hypothesized to increase the probability that the marriage would remain intact. This result does not confirm the hypothesis in regards to this definition of a traditional division of labor.

The variable SOMETRAD, which measured the division of labor within the home, was found to have a negative relationship with the viability of a marriage. It is significant at the .10 level.

In both regression models income was found to have a positive relationship with the dependent variable. This relationship was statistically significant at the .10 level.

OVER83 was observed as having a negative relationship to the probability of a marriage remaining intact. This result was found to be significant at the .01 level in the first regression, and the .05 level in the second regression. UNDER83 was found to have a significant positive relationship with the viability of a marriage in the first regression model.

Both regressions showed frequency of religion as having a positive relationship with the viability of a marriage. This relationship was significant at the .01 level. This result is



**TABLE FIVE: LOGIT REGRESSION**

Dependent Variable: Married from 1983-1990. Standard errors are given in parentheses. Significance Level: * = .10 ** = .05 *** = .01							
Independent Variable	Expected Sign	Regression One		Regression Two			
FREQREL	+	.5056***		0.4831***			
		(.1845)		(.1840)			
TRAD83	+	-.4869*		-0.4648**			
		(.2549)		(.2531)			
OVER83	-	-.5841***		-0.5692**			
		(.2219)		(.2216)			
UNDER83	-	.3186*		0.3			
		(0.1857)		(.1838)			
INCOME	+	1.15E-05*		1.15E-05*			
		(6.340E-06)		(6.372E-06)			
CHILDREN	+	0.0131		0.03			
		(0.0895)		(.0921)			
ROLE79	+	(.0576)		-0.0307			
		(.1585)		(.1571)			
SOMETRAD	?			-0.3724*			
				(.2074)			
SUPERTRAD	+			-0.1996			
				(.1947)			
constant		0.3122	-2 log likelihood 985.7	0.536	-2 log likelihood 986.11		
		(.2157)	Model Chi-Square 24.80***		Model Chi-Square 24.39**		
			Sample Size 802	(.2102)	Sample Size 802		

consistent with previous research (Lehrer & Chiswick).

To gain more insight into the meaning of regression results, the LOGIT cumulative distribution function was used to estimate probabilities that a marriage will not end in divorce, given values for the independent variables<sup>1</sup>. These probabilities revealed interesting results and more clearly reflect the relationship between the independent variable and the probability of a marriage remaining intact.

For instance, a respondent who is a regular church attender increases the probability of the marriage remaining intact by 11.10%. But having four children, as opposed to having none, increases the probability of a marriage remaining intact by only 1.04%. Another striking difference can be found in the UNDER83 variable. Holding all other variables constant a family deemed as under-work increases their probability of remaining intact by 21.50%. Surprisingly, a family whose income per year is \$36,000 has only a 4.12% more of a probability of remaining intact than a family whose total income per year is \$18,000.

These results indicate that division of labor within the family does not necessarily determine whether a marriage will remain intact, however, several of the other variables play a crucial role in the viability of a marriage. The implications to these results are numerous.

### **3.IMPLICATIONS**

Results of LOGIT regression analysis fail to give support to Becker's theory on the division of labor within the family. However, several other conclusions not directly related to Becker's neo-classical theory of the family can be drawn from the results.

It was not surprising that income had a positive effect on the viability of a marriage, but TRAD83 reveals that a traditional division of labor decreases the probability of a marriage remaining intact. These results fail to give support to Becker's theory of division of labor leading one to believe that other factors such as shared attitudes and total time allocations to the labor market play more of a pertinent role in the determination of family structure.

As expected, frequency of church attendance was found to be a very significant variable. These results give merit to the idea that shared values have more of an effect on the viability of a marriage than division of labor within the household.

Similarly, time spent within the home (UNDER83) was found to have a positive relationship with the viability of a marriage while OVER83 was found to have a negative relationship with the viability of a marriage. It can be deduced from these results that perhaps there is an optimum to be reached for time spent inside the home.

An increase in time input inside the home fosters a sense of emotional investment into the household and creates an added

emotional benefit which could not be gained if that time was not spent inside the household with the family members. Total time spent allocated to the home appears to be more pertinent than exactly how that time is specifically allocated within the home. That is, it makes no difference whether one is doing laundry or running errands as long as a significant amount of time is spent within the home. Time spent in the home coupled with a high income seems to foster an environment in which a marriage has more of a chance to remain viable.

## **V. CONCLUSIONS**

Although findings were inconclusive, this study revealed the need for further research within the area. Results did not support Becker's neo-classical model of the family nor did they completely negate it. Division of labor between market work and household production were found to have no significant effects on the viability of a marriage. Furthermore, division of labor within the home itself without regard to market work was found to have no significant effect on the viability of a marriage. This same result was found without regard to traditional gender roles and when gender roles were accounted for.

Further research into the economic causes of marital stability is necessary, and this preliminary study serves as a vehicle for development of more research into the area. This study focussed on but one of the many economic theories relating

to marriage and family structure. The results of this study, however, revealed several areas of productive future research into the area of economic determinants of marital stability.

For example, a strong linkage was found between total family income and the viability of a marriage. Furthermore, a strong association was found between time spent in the home and the viability of a marriage. These are economic aspects of the family which merit more research. Similarly, another future research possibility is to further explore shared values and the effect they have on actions taken within the marriage and the viability of that marriage. Another interesting research design would be a comparison of the economic factors affecting the first and second marriages of respondents who divorce and remarry. Comparing the economic factors of these marriages would give more insight into the economic determinants of divorce.

There exists several possible reasons for the results failing to generate a relationship between spousal division of labor and the viability of a marriage. The first possibility deals with the data used, and the other limitations deal with the theoretical framework upon which the empirical model is based. This study could have more accurately accounted for the relationship between the viability of a marriage and division of labor if the data used would have covered a more extensive period of time. Moreover, this study was somewhat limited in the scope of marriages studied. The respondents studied were all within

the same general age bracket, and these results could reveal the division of labor and attitudes held for this specific section of the populace.

Three casual observations pertaining to Becker's neo-classical theory of the family explore the possible limitations of the theoretical framework used. These criticisms relate to gender rearing and roles, the possibility of "roundabout" production, and the marriage market itself.

Much of Becker's theory was developed in the late 1970's and based the division of labor within a family upon traditional gender roles. Becker writes that "Sex of household members is an important distinguishing characteristic in the production and care of children, and perhaps also in other household commodities and in the market sector" (Becker 1991: 38). Although, the biological advantage which women have in child rearing is indisputable, specialization in other household functions is questionable.

Today, no real distinction can be found in investment in human capital in relation to gender. That is, women are not necessarily better trained in the production of non-marketable commodities than men. Men and women may not be trained differently enough to produce a comparative advantage in household production. In this particular study, empirical analysis took gender in account at times and at other times did not distinguish gender. It should be noted however, that Becker

argues for relative efficiencies. He does not necessarily state that all females are not trained to be efficient in labor market work but hypothesizes that females are relatively more efficient in household production than males.

Secondly, the possibility of "roundabout" production of household tasks was not considered. Supposing both spouses were equally capable of producing within the market, a comparative advantage in the production of household commodities could be found in hired "help." Perhaps the production function optimum of the household is found when both spouses work outside the home and an outside employee performs the household chores. Economic benefits of this division of labor could be greater than a traditional division of labor if the time of each spouse was best optimized when used outside the home.

One more point should be considered when looking at Becker's neo-classical theory of the family. Becker has theorized not only on marriage, but also on the competitive market of potential spouses. Divorce, could be, not an indication of the division of labor within a marriage faltering, but perhaps it is a natural reaction to the market of potential mates. If there are greater benefits to be gained from another mate or living alone, then divorce is the best action. A marriage ceasing to exist then should not be viewed as a symptom of incorrect allocation of resources within the family, but rather, it should be viewed as a step toward equilibrium in the whole potential spouse market.

Divorce and remarriage occurs until the specialization and comparative advantages among the entire populace are arranged in such a way as to maximize utility not only for specific marriage but for households as a whole. Although this is one facet of Becker's theory, it was generally not discussed in the course of this particular research paper, and results necessitated a brief note pertaining to the marriage market as a whole.

Results of this research indicate several directions in which future research can be taken, and this research lays a solid foundation for the continuance of exploration into economic aspects of the family. Although Becker's theory relating specifically to the division of labor was not supported, evidence was found in regards to other economic factors such as income and time allocation. These variables should be explored within the context of a variety of economic theories on marriage.



### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> The cumulative distribution function for LOGIT, which is used to determine probabilities, is as follows:

$$P_i = (1/1 + e)^{-Z_i}, \text{ where } Z_i = b_1 + b_2X_{2i} + b_3X_{3i} + \dots + b_nX_{ni}$$

Specific variables Z value was calculated as the variable's (mean value LOGIT coefficient).

## **APPENDIX A**

### **TERMS AND CONCEPTS**

Comparative advantage, which is continuously a relative concept, is "the ability to produce a good or service at a lower opportunity cost" (Miller; 32). For instance, Mexico has a comparative advantage in labor-intensive industries while the United States has a comparative advantage in high technological and highly skilled labor industries. Hence, since these activities yield highest return for time and resources used with lower opportunity costs for each country respectively, it is inherent that Mexico will produce goods made by labor-intensive industries while the United States will specialize in more highly-skilled labor industries (Miller; 32). In Becker's economic theory of the family, a family unit uses the comparative advantage of both spouses by dividing the labor within the family unit according to which spouse has a comparative advantage in a respective task.

Division of Labor is "the segregation of a resource into different specific tasks" (Miller; 33). Adam Smith wrote the most famous example of the division labor using the production of pins as the example.

"One man draws out the wire, another straightens it, a third

cuts it, a fourth points it, a fifth grinds it at the top for receiving the head; to make the head requires two or three distinct operations; to put it on is a peculiar business, to whiten the pins is another; it is even a trade by itself to put them into the paper." Division of labor increases output by organizing labor in such a way as to increase "the amount of output possible from the fixed resources available" (Miller; 33).

## APPENDIX B

### VARIABLES

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>DEFINITION</u>
FREQREL79	<p>SURVEY QUESTION: In the past year, about how often have you attended religious services?</p> <p>TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated once per week or more than once per week.</p> <p>NON-TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated not at all, infrequently, once per month, or two to three times per month.</p>
TIME79	<p>SURVEY QUESTION: A wife who carries out her full family responsibilities doesn't have time for outside employment.</p> <p>TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated agree or strongly agree.</p> <p>NON-TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated strongly disagree or disagree.</p>
USEFUL79	<p>SURVEY QUESTION: A working wife feels more useful than one who doesn't hold a job.</p> <p>TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated agree or strongly agree.</p> <p>NON-TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated agree or strongly agree.</p>

\*Survey questions relating to household tasks are categorized as traditional or non-traditional from the perspective that the respondent is male.

ROLE79

SURVEY QUESTION: It is much better for everyone concerned if the man is the achiever outside the home and the woman takes care of the home and family.

TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated agree or strongly agree.

NON-TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated disagree or strongly disagree.

SHARE79

SURVEY QUESTION: Men should share the work around the house with women, such as doing dishes, cleaning and so forth.

TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated strongly disagree or disagree.

NON-TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated agree or strongly agree.

HAPPY79

SURVEY QUESTION: Women are much happier if they stay at home and take care of their children.

TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated strongly agree or agree.

NON-TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated strongly disagree or disagree.

MEALS81

SURVEY QUESTION: Are you the one who usually prepare meals?

TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated almost never or some.

NON-TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated about half, much, or almost all.

DISHES81

SURVEY QUESTION: Are you the one who usually washes the dishes?

TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated almost never or some.

NON-TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated about half, much, or almost all.

LAUND81

SURVEY QUESTION: Are you the one who usually does the laundry?

TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated almost never or some.

NON-TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated about half, much, or almost all.

CLEAN81

SURVEY QUESTION: Are you the one who usually cleans the house?

TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated almost never or some.

NON-TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated about half, much, or almost all.

SHOP81

SURVEY QUESTION: Are you the one who usually does grocery shopping?

TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated almost never or some.

NON-TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated about half, much, or almost all.

ERRAND81

SURVEY QUESTION: Are you the one who usually runs errands?

TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated about half, much, or almost all.

NON-TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated almost never or some.

OUTCHR81

SURVEY QUESTION: Are you the one who usually does outdoor chores?

TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated much or almost all.

NON-TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicate almost never, some, or about half.

MAIN81

SURVEY QUESTION: Are you the one who usually fixes things around the house?

TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated much or almost all.

NON-TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated almost never, some, or about half.

PAPER81

SURVEY QUESTION: Are you the one who usually does household paperwork?

TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated much or almost all.

NON-TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated almost never, some, or about half.

CHILD81

SURVEY QUESTION: Are you the one who usually takes care of the children in your household?

TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicate almost never, some or about half.

NON-TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicate much or almost all.

FREQREL82

SURVEY QUESTION: In the past year, about how often have you attended religious services?

TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated once per week or more than once per week.

NON-TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated not at all, infrequently, once per month, or two to three times per month.

PLACE82

SURVEY QUESTION: A women's place is in the home, not in the office or shop.

TRADITIONAL: respondent indicated agree or strongly agree.

NON-TRADITIONAL: respondent indicated strongly disagree or disagree.

TIME82

SURVEY QUESTION: A wife who carries out her full family responsibilities doesn't have time for outside employment.

TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated agree or strongly agree.

NON-TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated strongly disagree or disagree.

USEFUL82

SURVEY QUESTION: A working wife feels more useful than one who doesn't hold a job.

TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated disagree or strongly disagree.

NON-TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated agree or strongly agree.

ROLE82

SURVEY QUESTION: It is much better for everyone concerned if the man is the achiever outside the home and the woman takes care of the home and family.

TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated agree or strongly agree.

NON-TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated disagree or strongly disagree.

SHARE82

SURVEY QUESTION: Men should share the work around the house with women, such as doing dishes, cleaning and so forth.

TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated strongly disagree or disagree.

NON-TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated agree or strongly agree.



HAPPY82	<p>SURVEY QUESTION: Women are much happier if they stay at home and take care of their children.</p> <p>TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated strongly agree or agree.</p> <p>NON-TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated strongly disagree or disagree.</p>
PLACE87	<p>SURVEY QUESTION: A women's place is int he home not in the office or shop.</p> <p>TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated agree or strongly agree.</p> <p>NON-TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated strongly disagree or disagree.</p>
TIME87	<p>SURVEY QUESTION: A wife who carries out her full family responsibilities doesn't have time for outside employment.</p> <p>TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated agree or strongly agree.</p> <p>NON-TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated strongly disagree or disagree.</p>
USEFUL87	<p>SURVEY QUESTION: A working wife feels more useful than one who doesn't hold a job.</p> <p>TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated disagree or strongly disagree.</p> <p>NON-TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated agree or strongly agree.</p>
ROLE87	<p>SURVEY QUESTION: It is much better for everyone concerned if the man is the achiever outside the home and the woman takes care of the home and family.</p> <p>TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated agree or strongly agree.</p>

	NON-TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated disagree or strongly disagree.
SHARE87	<p>SURVEY QUESTION: Men should share the work around the house with women, such as doing dishes, cleaning and so forth.</p> <p>TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated strongly disagree or disagree.</p> <p>NON-TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated agree or strongly agree.</p>
HAPPY87	<p>SURVEY QUESTION: Women are much happier if they stay at home and take care of their children.</p> <p>TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated strongly agree or agree.</p> <p>NON-TRADITIONAL IF: respondent indicated strongly disagree or disagree.</p>
SPOSHR83	Measures hours worked in 1983 by respondent's spouse.
R1145200	Hours worked in 1983 by respondent.
PERC83	Ratio of hours worked by respondent (husband) in 1983 and wife's hours.
TRAD83	TRADITIONAL IF: PERC83 is greater than two and R1145200 is greater than 1820.
UNDER83	A family unit is considered underworked if total hours worked per year do not exceed 2080 which is equivalent to each spouse working 52 weeks with 20 hours worked per week.
OVER83	A family unit is considered underworked if total hours worked per year exceed 4160 which is equivalent to each spouse working at least 52 weeks with 40 hours worked per week.
FAMHRS83	Total family hours for 1983.

R0898600	Total net family income in the year 1982.
R0898838	Number of own children in the household in 1982.
SUPERTRAD	A household is considered super-traditional if the same spouse performs eight or more of the following ten household tasks on a regular basis: childcare, paperwork, home maintenance, household chores, errands, shopping, cleaning, laundry, dishes, and meal preparation.
SOMETRAD	A household is considered somewhat traditional if the spouse performs six or seven of the following ten household tasks on a regular basis: childcare, paperwork, home maintenance, household chores, errands, shopping, cleaning, laundry, dishes, and meal preparation.
NOTTRAD	A household is considered non-traditional if the same spouse performs five or less of the following ten household tasks on a regular basis: childcare, paperwork, home maintenance, household chores, errands, shopping, cleaning, laundry, dishes, and meal preparation.

**TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE FOR TASK AND ATTITUDE VARIABLES  
BROKEN DOWN BY TRADITIONAL AND NON-TRADITIONAL  
CATEGORIZATION: MALE SAMPLE**

<b>TASK VARIABLES</b>	<b>TRADITIONAL</b>	<b>NON-TRADITIONAL</b>
CLEANING	266	110
SHOPPING	212	164
ERRANDS	199	177
OUTDOOR CHORES	179	197
LAUNDRY	280	96
DISHES	279	97
MEALS	285	91
PAPERWORK	101	275
CHILDCARE	114	262
MAINTENANCE	226	150
<b>ATTITUDES</b>		
HAPPY79	113	263
SHARE79	64	312
ROLE79	179	197
USEFUL79	95	281
TIME79	126	250
PLACE79	113	263
FREQREL82	63	313
PLACE82	88	288
TIME82	144	232
USEFUL82	104	272
ROLE82	138	238
SHARE82	51	325
HAPPY82	137	239
PLACE87	60	316
TIME87	86	290
USEFUL87	108	268
SHARE87	26	350
HAPPY87		
FREQREL79	78	298

**TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE FOR TASK AND ATTITUDE VARIABLES  
BROKEN DOWN BY TRADITIONAL AND NON-TRADITIONAL  
CATEGORIZATION: FEMALE SAMPLE**

<b>TASK VARIABLES</b>	<b>TRADITIONAL</b>	<b>NON-TRADITIONAL</b>
CLEANING	76	461
SHOPPING	91	446
ERRANDS	381	156
OUTDOOR CHORES	83	454
LAUNDRY	63	474
DISHES	69	468
MEALS	87	450
PAPERWORK	269	268
CHILDCARE	68	469
MAINTENANCE	61	476
<b>ATTITUDES</b>		
HAPPY79	139	398
SHARE79	89	448
ROLE79	199	338
USEFUL79	233	304
TIME79	122	415
PLACE79	91	446
FREQREL82	152	385
PLACE82	92	445
TIME82	187	350
USEFUL82	247	290
ROLE82	184	353
SHARE82	55	482
HAPPY82	165	372
PLACE87	67	470
TIME87	70	467
USEFUL87	286	251
SHARE87	25	512
HAPPY87	139	398
FREQREL79	154	383

### Works Cited

- Becker, Gary S. "A Theory of Marriage: Part I." Journal of Political Economy. Vol. 81 July/August 1973: 813-846.
- Becker, Gary S. "A Theory of Marriage: Part II." Journal of Political Economy. Vol. 82 No. 2 March/April 1974: 511-526.
- Becker, Gary S. A Treatise on the Family. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts. 1991.
- Becker, Gary S., Landes, Elisabeth M., and Michael, Robert T. "An Economic Analysis of Marital Instability." Journal of Political Economy. Vol. 85 December 1977: 1141-1187.
- Center for Human Resource Research (1992): The National Longitudinal Surveys, Columbus Ohio: The Ohio State University.
- Juster, Thomas F., Stafford, Frank P. "The Allocation of Time: Empirical Findings, Behavioral Models, and Problems of Measurement." Journal of Economic Literature. Vol. XXIX June 1991; 471-522.
- Humphries, Jane. "The Sexual Division of Labor and Social Control: An Interpretation." Review of Radical Political Economics. Vol. 23 1991: 269-295.
- Lehrer, Evelyn L., Chiswick, Carmel. "Religion as a Determinant of Marital Stability." Demography. Vol. 30 No. 3 August 1993: 385-404.
- Miller, Roger LeRoy. Economics Today. Eighth Ed. Harper Collins College Publishers: 1994.
- Pollack, Robert A., Wachter, Michael L. "The Relevance of the Household Production Function and Its Implication for the Allocation of Time." Journal of Political Economy. Vol. 83 No. 2 1975: 255-277.
- Schoen, Robert, Weinick, Robin W. "The Slowing Metabolism of Marriage: Figures from 1988 U.S. Marital Status Life Tables." Demography. Vol. 30 No. 4 November 1993: 737-746.
- Stafford, Frank P. "Women's Use of Time Converging with Men's." Monthly Labor Review. Vol. 103 1980: 57-59.

Statistical Abstract of the United States. Bernan Press: Lanham,  
Maryland, 1993: 100, 873.