This study investigates how several dimensions of gender, including an individual's sex, gender ideology, and the gender composition of an occupation, influence the accommodations people make in reconciling employment and family life. Using data from the 1996 General Social Survey, we find that women and men sometimes make different kinds of job-family trade-offs, that people in male-dominated occupations make more family trade-offs and fewer employment trade-offs than people in other occupations, and that individual gender attitudes have little effect on job-family trade-offs. Our findings illustrate how gender, as an embedded social institution, contributes to the clash between employment and family responsibilities.

Job-Family Trade-offs

The Multidimensional Effects of Gender

SUE FALTER MENNINO
APRIL BRAYFIELD
Tulane University

Many people consider job-family balance to be strictly a time management issue. Indeed, time constraints are more problematic today than in prior decades (Schor, 1991). Whether it is referred to as the *time bind* (Hochschild, 1997), the *time squeeze* (Schor, 1991), or the *time famine* (Googins, 1997), the phenomenon is widespread. Time, however, is not the only problem; many households need more than one earner to sustain a decent standard of living (Gerson, 1998). In addition, many workers are unsure of their financial futures because jobs are less secure today than for previous generations (B. Rubin, 1996). It is not surprising that many women and men report difficulties in constantly trying to balance the double duties of employment and family in an atmosphere of economic insecurity, demanding jobs, and unsupportive workplaces (Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 1997).

Many people try to balance a job with their family life by making trade-offs. *Trade-offs* are the compromises, sacrifices, adjustments, or

Authors' Note: *We thank Daniel B. Cornfield, Charles J. Brody, Beth A. Rubin, and an anonymous reviewer for their comments and suggestions. Direct correspondence to Sue Falter Mennino, Department of Sociology, 220 Newcomb Hall, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA 70118; e-mail: smennin@tulane.edu or aprilb@tulane.edu.*

WORK AND OCCUPATIONS, Vol. 29 No. 2, May 2002 226-256

accommodations that people make in their job and/or their personal life to attain their objectives or fulfill responsibilities. There are two dimensions of accommodations: employment trade-offs and family trade-offs. Employment trade-offs are sacrifices that people make in their jobs because of their family responsibilities. Likewise, family trade-offs are compromises that people make in their family lives because of their job responsibilities. Trade-offs, however, are not limited to interrole conflict; scholars also study intrarole conflict, in which one relinquishes some aspect of a work role for another, for example, giving up some job flexibility for a promotion (e.g., Barnett & Gareis, 2000). Job-family scholars typically investigate the trade-offs that people make between their roles in the workplace and in the family. For example, sacrificing time at home to spend long hours on the job increases feelings of job-family conflict (Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992; Gutek, Searle, & Klepa, 1991).

Our study examines the trade-offs that women and men make as they attempt to balance their employment and family obligations, and the multiple ways that gender affects these trade-offs. We use data from the 1996 General Social Survey (Davis & Smith, 1996) to document how several factors predict the job sacrifices that people make because of their family responsibilities (i.e., employment trade-offs) and the family sacrifices that people make to accommodate their jobs (i.e., family trade-offs). The central focus of our study is how three dimensions of gender —an individual's sex, gender ideology, and the gender composition of an occupation—influence specific job-family trade-offs. Our research highlights how gender is intertwined in, and transcends, the structures of the workplace and the family.

PRIOR RESEARCH ON JOB-FAMILY TRADE-OFFS

Research indicates that men experience feelings of job-family conflict on a par with women (Frone et al., 1992; Glass & Estes, 1997; Gutek et al., 1991; Kmec, 1999; Milkie & Peltola, 1999). Bond, Galinsky, and Swanberg (1998) found that 68% of all employed parents experience job-family conflict but found no difference between mothers and fathers.

Yet, despite expressing similar levels of job-family conflict, there is ample evidence that women, much more than men, adjust their jobs around their family responsibilities (Gerson, 1985; Hochschild, 1989; Reskin & Padavic, 1994). Research suggests that women use a variety of employment adjustments, such as arranging informal flextime, doing shift work, scaling back to part-time jobs, or changing jobs to find a more amenable type of work

(Aronson, 1999; Cox & Presser, 2000; Hertz, 1997; Hinze, 2000; Presser, 1994; Wharton, 1994). Women with children, particularly married women, are the most likely to either temporarily leave the labor force (Hinze, 2000) or cut back on employment by working part-time or part of the year (Carlisle, 1994; Estes & Glass, 1996; Shelton, 1992). Women are also more likely than men to take leave from their jobs to care for others rather than themselves (Gerstel & McGonagle, 1999; Sandberg, 1999; Sandberg & Cornfield, 2000). Women who are responsible for elder care suggest that employed women either cut back on work, miss overtime opportunities, or turn down new job opportunities to fulfill their caregiving duties (Bond et al., 1998; Franklin, Ames, & King, 1994; Gibeau & Anastas, 1989). Conversely, some women, depending on their financial circumstances, do not temporarily leave the labor force to care for children but temporarily enter the labor force to supplement their husband's income (L. Rubin, 1994).

Parents, typically mothers but also single fathers, often make a temporary trade-off when their children are young by confining their paid work to jobs that they consider to be more family friendly than others (Casey & Pitt-Catsouphes, 1994; Grief, Demaris, & Hood, 1993). In fact, some researchers contend that employers organize traditional women's professions, such as nursing, social work, librarianship, and elementary school teaching, specifically to allow women to take time out for childbearing and child rearing (Lorber, 1994). Other researchers, however, argue that there is nothing inherent in female-dominated jobs that make them more compatible with women's family roles than other jobs (Glass, 1990; Jacobs & Steinberg, 1990). Indeed, women might choose female-typed jobs because they assume these jobs will facilitate job-family balance, but they often discover that this is not the case. Most restaurant workers and nurses, for example, are women, but these jobs often require working nonstandard shifts when child care is more difficult to obtain.

Fathers and mothers often struggle to find reasonable compromises about how to best care for their children. Mothers sometimes choose evening or night employment because of their concerns about child care; these shifts allow them to share child care with their husbands or other relatives (Brayfield, 1995). Some women, particularly those in professional occupations such as corporate management, law, and medicine, sort out child care accommodations by sharing the responsibility with their husbands or by hiring live-in help (Carlisle, 1994; Davies-Netzley, 1998; Gerson, 1985). One study of married couples found that, in some cases, both partners make employment trade-offs to better facilitate job-family balance (Risman & Johnson-Sumerford, 1998).

Prior research demonstrates that women also adjust their family lives around their employment. Some women decide not to have children at all because of the demands of their chosen careers; other women limit the number of children they have (Davies-Netzley, 1998; Gerson, 1985). Some women reduce the amount of time they spend doing household chores by either arranging a more equitable division of labor with their husbands or by just cutting back on housework (Shelton, 1992; South & Spitz, 1994; Thompson & Walker, 1989). For example, spouses tend to share housework more equally when both spouses are in professional or managerial occupations and their earnings are equitable (Brayfield, 1992; Carlisle, 1994; Presser, 1994). Some couples, if they can afford it, hire someone else to take care of the household chores (Carlisle, 1994; Risman & Johnson-Sumerford, 1998).

Most studies of job-family conflict focus on the similarities and differences between women and men. Very few studies analyze the myriad of ways the gender system influences job-family trade-offs beyond the gender of the individual. In addition, most studies examine only one aspect of job-family trade-offs. Some researchers have measured the attitudinal adjustments that people make, such as lowering their standards for housecleaning (Risman & Johnson-Sumerford, 1998; Robinson & Milkie, 1998). Other researchers have examined the employment trade-offs that people make, such as choosing a job with lower pay but a more flexible schedule (Estes & Glass, 1996) or changing the number of hours that they work (Sanchez & Thomson, 1997). Researchers also have studied the family trade-offs that people make, such as buying household services like food preparation and cleaning (Hochschild, 1997) or using vacation time to care for a sick child (Casey & Pitt-Catsouphes, 1994). In this study, we extend prior research in two important ways: by simultaneously examining the effect of both household and job characteristics on both types of job-family trade-offs for both women and men and by exploring the multiple ways gender influences these trade-offs.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND HYPOTHESES

The theoretical framework that guides our analysis is the social construction of gender, especially as it pertains to the myriad of ways that gender operates as a social structure (Lorber, 1994; Potuchek, 1997; Risman, 1998). According to this perspective, gender is a fundamental organizing principle of social life that is continuously reconstructed though everyday routines, yet is resistant to change because gender as a system has been institutionalized

into the social fabric of society. We contend that a fundamental aspect of contemporary gender ideology is the notion of a gendered division of labor with separate spheres for workplace and family. The idea of the separation of job and family is a cultural standard in our society, despite the realities of many people's lives. Furthermore, ideologically as well as structurally, women are viewed as primarily responsible for work in the family domain, and men are viewed as primarily responsible for work in the public domain. Many studies demonstrate that women and men are rewarded for behaving in ways that conform to this cultural ideal and are sanctioned for behaving in ways that defy it. There are, however, two important barriers to this gendered separate spheres model. First, economic conditions place some restrictions on individual choices, and, second, individual preferences, skills, and abilities come into play, and individuals often challenge social norms. Consequently, we argue that women and men make decisions about job-family trade-offs by considering economic factors but also within the constraints of their own gender ideology as well as the gendered nature of societal institutions, especially the social organization of the workplace. Accordingly, we develop hypotheses about the multidimensional influence of gender on job-family trade-offs.

GENDER OF THE PERSON

When women entered the labor force in large numbers 30 years ago, balancing employment and family was exclusively a woman's problem: Women were "closely and unreflectively tied with children" (Thorne, 1987, p. 96). Most women unquestioningly accepted their role of family caregiver and added the responsibility of paid work to their domestic duties (Googins, 1997). Even today, women, more than men, consider the needs of their families when they decide when to enter and leave the workforce and how many hours to work and at what time of day (Hertz, 1997; Thompson & Walker, 1989). Just as women's family responsibilities shape their employment decisions, men retain the responsibility and the recognition as the family breadwinner (Gerson, 1985; Thompson & Walker, 1989). Some research, however, shows that women and men report feeling similar levels of job-family conflict (Frone et al., 1992; Milkie & Peltola, 1999). Other research suggests that the connection between work and family operates differently for women and men (e.g., Hinze, 2000). Thus, even though women and men report feeling similar levels of job-family conflict, they may exhibit different behavior patterns in relation to that conflict.

In addition, employers' policies reflect the ideological assumption that women are the primary caregivers in the family. Companies who developed

the earliest family policies tailored them specifically for women (Martin et al., 1988). Today, although family policies are scarce, most are gender neutral in language. Yet many employers and employees still consider these policies to be exclusively women's policies (Bruce & Reed, 1994; Burstein & Bricher, 1997). In some instances, family benefits are available only to people in female-dominated jobs (Reskin & Padavic, 1994) or are offered by companies that face a shortage of skilled women employees (Bruce & Reed, 1994).

Therefore, because women-as-caregivers and men-as-providers are still predominant family roles and because the operation of the workplace reflects and supports this notion, we assert the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1A: Men are more likely than women to make family trade-offs.
Hypothesis 1B: Women are more likely than men to make employment trade-offs.

GENDER ATTITUDES

The social expectations of homemaker-wife/mother and breadwinner-husband/father exert a powerful normative influence today although they are a fairly recent social construction (Blau & Ferber, 1992). Those with traditional gender attitudes believe, for example, that men should earn a living and women should stay home and care for the family and household, that preschool children suffer if their mother works, that women should not expect their husbands to help around the house after a hard day's work, and that the man of the house should make the important family decisions (Thornton, 1989). Some women and men continue to subscribe to traditional gender attitudes, although some studies show that, overall, gender attitudes are more egalitarian now than in the past (Kozimer-King & Leicht, 1999; Thornton, 1989) and that most women and men today are, at least to some degree, performing dual roles as breadwinner and caregiver. Presumably, some women with traditional gender attitudes are in the labor force and would rather be at home than in the workplace. Likewise, some men with traditional gender attitudes may be taking on some household chores, but presumably they would rather have a traditional housewife to handle these tasks so they could devote time and energy to breadwinning tasks. Thus, we suggest the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 2A: Men with more traditional gender attitudes are more likely to make family trade-offs than are men with less traditional gender attitudes.
Hypothesis 2B: Women with more traditional gender attitudes are more likely to make employment trade-offs than are women with less traditional gender attitudes.

GENDER OF THE OCCUPATION

Some researchers attribute occupational sex segregation, at least in part, to the fact that female-dominated occupations are more family friendly, and, because women are responsible for the family, they choose jobs in these occupations to balance their job and family obligations (Richardson, 1981). But researchers disagree as to whether traditionally female-dominated occupations are, in fact, more family friendly. Researchers once suggested that these occupations are more accommodating to family responsibilities because of flexible work schedules, including the availability of temporary and/or part-time work (e.g., Grimm & Stern, 1974). More recent studies, however, find that there is nothing different about women's occupations; they are just as demanding as others (Glass, 1990; Jacobs & Steinberg, 1990). Glass (1990) found that female-dominated jobs are actually less flexible in scheduling and time off than other jobs. Similarly, Jacobs and Steinberg (1990) found that female-dominated jobs as well as other jobs can be associated with undesirable working conditions, such as an expectation of overtime, stress, a harmful physical environment, and difficult job responsibilities.

Nevertheless, informal workplace culture often reflects the traditional gender ideology of separate spheres; both women and men in the labor force are expected to give their jobs priority over their families (Kelly, 1999). We suggest that this expectation is even greater for those holding the jobs that offer the highest workplace rewards, that is, male-dominated jobs, because they fit the expected pattern of gendered behavior. Thus, based on the idea that the informal culture of the workplace contributes to the traditional separation of job and family, especially for male-dominated jobs, we test the following hypothesis:

> *Hypothesis 3:* Both women and men in male-typed occupations make more family trade-offs and fewer employment trade-offs than do those in other types of occupations.

EMPLOYMENT DEMANDS

The nature of the workplace has been transformed by more diverse employment schedules (Presser, 1994), an increase in contingent workers (Clinton, 1997), the deskilling of many jobs (B. Rubin, 1996), an increase in part-time employment (Williams, 1995), the growth of low-paying service sector jobs, and a decrease in higher-paying manufacturing jobs (Acker, 1992). Yet, the so-called flexibility of different shifts, temporary positions,

and part-time positions often benefits the employer and not the worker (B. Rubin, 1995; Smith, 1993).

Likewise, workers in every occupation are working longer hours than ever before (Bond, Galinsky, & Swanberg, 1998; Rones, Ilg, & Gardner, 1997).[1] This extra work includes staying late, taking work home, and holding second jobs (Schor, 1991). Higher-paying professional jobs are often the most demanding, requiring not only extra time at the workplace but also a commitment from the worker to prioritize the job over family responsibilities (Fried, 1998; Hochschild, 1997; Perlow, 1995; Rones et al., 1997; Seron & Ferris, 1995). In addition, family-friendly policies are often available only to people in higher-paid professional or managerial occupations, in which the policies are often unused because of potential career repercussions. The opportunity costs for these employees are higher; they may be passed over for promotion, be assigned the less desirable work, or be more vulnerable to a cutback (Powell, 1997). The workplace, then, is male oriented in the sense that it continues to operate as if employees have no outside commitments and as if their sole responsibility is to the company (Acker, 1990; Gerson, 1998; Smith, 1993). These circumstances prompt the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 4A: People in more demanding jobs are more likely to make family trade-offs and less likely to make employment trade-offs than are those in less demanding jobs.

Hypothesis 4B: Women in more demanding jobs are more likely to make both types of trade-offs than are men.

FAMILY DEMANDS

Just as some jobs are more demanding than other jobs, so are some family configurations. Namely, different types of families have different needs, whether in terms of time, money, or care. Families with babies, for example, have a greater need for child care services than families with teenagers. Likewise, people without young children do not need child care, but they may have a live-in elderly parent who requires care and/or financial assistance. In short, some people experience greater family demands than others, and caregiving demands, in particular, are most often met by women. Even if many women and men do not adhere to traditional gender prescriptions, research demonstrates a perceptible shift toward a more traditional division of labor when they marry and have children (Gerstel & McGonagle, 1999; Sanchez & Thomson, 1997; Thompson & Walker, 1989). Therefore, we test the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 5A: People with greater family demands are more likely than other people to make employment trade-offs.

Hypothesis 5B: Women with greater family demands are more likely to make employment trade-offs than are men with similar family demands.

HUMAN CAPITAL

Researchers once contended that differences between women and men in the workplace, particularly salary inequalities, were due to differences in human capital, that is, their stock of education, training, and job experience (e.g., Mincer & Polacheck, 1974). According to human capital theory, women who plan to be family caregivers do not invest as much in education and choose jobs with the lowest penalties for taking time out of the workforce for childrearing (Becker, 1964). However, the gap between women and men on many human capital measures is lower today than in previous years, and most researchers now agree that human capital theory does not solely explain workplace inequity between women and men (Blau & Ferber, 1992; Jacobs & Steinberg, 1990; Reskin & Padavic, 1994).

Although human capital theory does not adequately explain gender differences in the workplace, it may partially explain differences in the types of job-family trade-offs that people make. Workers with more education, training, and work experience are more valuable to employers. These workers may have a better sense of job security and more flexibility in the workplace; they may have more options. Conversely, people with lower human capital may not have as much flexibility in their job choices. People may have different levels of human capital for reasons other than being a family caregiver, but having lower human capital may still be conducive to being a family caregiver because of the types of available jobs. Yet some jobs that are family friendly in the sense that they offer flexible hours are often lower-paying and have little job security (Smith, 1993). Some employers offer family leave on the books but they often penalize the employees who use it (Powell, 1997). Therefore, we propose the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 6: Women and men with higher human capital are more likely to make employment trade-offs and less likely to make family trade-offs than are those with lower human capital.

To summarize, we analyze the concessions that people make within the structural constraints of the workplace and the family. We test hypotheses that focus on the integrated relationship between gender and job-family trade-offs in several ways. We examine how the gender of the individual, gender attitudes, and gender of the occupational setting influence job-family

trade-offs. We also consider how employment demands, family demands, and human capital affect job-family trade-offs. For many individuals, trying to balance employment and family responsibilities means making some sacrifices in jobs and/or family life, and we seek greater understanding of the conditions that prompt such sacrifices.

DATA AND MEASUREMENT

DATA

We used data from the 1996 General Social Survey (GSS) (Davis & Smith, 1996), which contains a topical module on a variety of gender issues including job-family trade-offs. This gender module surveyed 1,460 of the total 2,904 GSS respondents. We further limited our analytic sample to respondents who reported that they are working full-time or part-time and to respondents who have a job but are not working due to illness, strike, or vacation; we eliminated 466 respondents who were laid off or unemployed, retired, in school, keeping house, or not participating in the labor force for some other reason. We limited the sample to respondents who are currently employed because some of our independent variables assume that the respondent currently has a job. Fewer employment-related variables were asked of respondents who are currently retired, in school, keeping house, or otherwise not in the labor force but had previously worked for as long as 1 year. The choice was either (a) to limit the study to only currently employed respondents and retain the employment-related variables of interest or (b) to include all respondents who had ever worked and drop several employment-related variables from our analysis. Because indicators of job demands are critical to our study, we chose to limit the sample to currently employed respondents. This constraint reduced the sample to 994 respondents. We also deleted respondents with missing data on any of the dependent variables (n = 20) or on any of the independent variables (n = 50), with the exception of income and supervisor status (see our discussion of the independent variables). These deletions result in a final sample size of 924: 464 women (50.2%) and 460 men (49.8%).

DEPENDENT VARIABLES

The 1996 GSS Gender Module contains a subset of seven questions about the trade-offs respondents have made in their attempts to balance their work and family responsibilities. These questions are: In your present job, have

you ever done any of the following because of your family responsibilities? (yes or no) (a) Refuse a job promotion? (b) Take on additional paid work? (c) Refuse to work overtime or extra hours? (d) Cut back on your work? and In your present job, have you ever done any of the following because of your responsibilities to the job? (yes or no) (e) Missed a family occasion or holiday? (f) Been unable to care for a sick child or relative? (g) Been unable to do the work you usually do around the house? We used each item as a separate dichotomous dependent variable, with an affirmative response signifying that the respondent has made that particular trade-off. Unfortunately, the dichotomous nature of these items precludes an empirical analysis of the respondent's perception of the severity of the trade-offs.

Four of these variables are family trade-offs: missed a family occasion, unable to do regular chores at home, unable to nurse a sick child or relative, and taken on extra work because of family. Each of these actions is a trade-off of family time that a person has made either because of the requirements of the job or to provide economic resources to the family. These trade-offs may differ, however, in magnitude. The first two items—missed a family occasion and unable to do chores—may be less catastrophic than the others. Missing a family occasion could be missing a cousin's wedding or it could be missing a child's first soccer game; it may or may not be a critical event. Likewise, being unable to do regular household work could mean being unable to vacuum or it could mean being unable to cook dinner. The third trade-off, unable to nurse a sick child, is arguably a more adverse family trade-off. Even though the fourth trade-off, taking on extra work, is grouped by the GSS with the other employment trade-offs, we include it as a family trade-off because a person sacrifices potential family time to take on extra work.

The other three dependent variables are employment trade-offs: refused a promotion, refused to work extra hours, and cut back on work. These trade-offs also may differ in magnitude. Refusing a promotion is a decision with potential long-term financial and career consequences, whereas refusing to work extra hours is a more temporary decision that may have differential consequences, depending on the worker's particular situation.[2] For example, exempt employees do not collect overtime wages so there is no immediate financial penalty, but refusing to work extra hours may jeopardize a career. Also, employees protected by a labor union may have the benefit of optional overtime with no career repercussions. The other employment trade-off, cut back on work, may also have long-term consequences, depending on the extent of the cutback. It may mean cutting back from a 70-hour week to a 45-hour week or cutting back from a 40-hour week to three mornings a week.

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

A key independent variable is gender of the respondent. We assigned a code of 1 to women and 0 to men.

Gender Attitude

Prior studies use a variety of questions to measure gender attitudes (see Cassidy & Warren, 1996). Like some prior studies (Rice & Coates, 1995; Thornton, 1989), we use four standard items from the GSS to tap respondent's attitudes toward women's and men's family and job roles: (a) a working mother can establish just as warm and secure a relationship with her children as a mother who does not work, (b) it is usually better for everyone involved if the man is the achiever outside the home and the woman takes care of the home and family, (c) it is more important for a wife to help her husband's career than to have one herself, and (d) a preschool child is likely to suffer if the mother works.

Responses to each item range from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree*. We recode cases with missing information on any of these items as "no opinion." Thus, response categories for all four items are 0 (*strongly agree*), 1 (*agree*), 2 (*no opinion*), 3 (*disagree*), and 4 (*strongly disagree*). We also reverse the scoring on Items 2, 3, and 4 so that when we combine the items together into an additive index, a high score denotes a traditional attitude. Scores range from 0 to 16, and the index is highly reliable, with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .73.

Gender-Type of Occupation

We use the percentage of women in each occupation to determine the gender of an occupation. To do this, we merge data from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (U.S. Department of Labor, 1998) to the individual-level data from the GSS by matching the three-digit 1980 census occupational code and the title of the occupation. We group respondents' occupations into three gender categories: female, integrated, and male. We combine respondents who work in occupations that are less than 25% female into "male-typed," those who work in occupations that are between 25% and 75% female into "integrated," and those who work in occupations that are more than 75% female into "female-typed," with male-typed occupations serving as the reference group. Some researchers measure the gender-type of an occupation as

a continuous variable (Glass, 1990) or as a categorical variable using different percentages to denote male-type and female-type occupations, such as 80% (Bielby & Baron, 1986). As Reskin (1993) pointed out, these cutting points are arbitrary. We chose to use a categorical variable because preliminary analysis indicated that there was a nonlinear relationship between the gender-type of an occupation and the dependent variables. After closer examination of the occupations that fall into the 75% to 80% female and 75% to 80% male categories, we chose 75% as the cutoff to include such occupations as file clerk and cashiers as female-typed and guards and freight handlers as male-typed because these occupations have been sex-segregated for more than 20 years.

Employment Demands

GSS indicators of employment demands include the number of hours worked per week, whether the respondent is self-employed, whether the respondent is a supervisor, and the respondent's occupation. We include the number of hours worked per week as a crude measure of employment demands. Although people working longer hours may choose to do so voluntarily, it is still a workplace demand that will increase the likelihood of making family trade-offs. We chose to use the number of hours worked rather than a full-time/part-time indicator because it is a more accurate indicator of time spent on the job. Despite full-time status, workers often work more than a standard 40-hour week. In our sample, although the average number of hours worked for part-time workers is 23, the respondents' actual hours worked ranges from 2 to 72. Similarly, full-time workers in our sample worked an average of 46 hours per week.

Prior research reports that self-employed workers report that their jobs are demanding, even though they might have chosen to become self-employed to alleviate some of the demands of working for someone else (Glass & Fujimoto, 1995; Jurik, 1998). We dummy-coded self-employed status as 0 (work for someone else) and 1 (self-employed).

We assume that professional/managerial workers and supervisors experience a greater magnitude of employment demands than other workers because of the nature of their career ladders and responsibilities. We dummy-code occupation as 1 (managerial/professional) and 0 (all other occupations). We coded supervisor status as either yes, no, or don't know, with supervisors serving as the reference group. We included the category "don't know" because an unusually high percentage of respondents reported that they didn't know, and we did not want to drop them from the analysis.

Family Demands

Unfortunately, the GSS lacks vital family and household information. For example, we cannot determine whether the children in the household are the respondent's own children because the GSS asks only whether the children in the household are related to the head of household, not to the respondent. Also, if there are multiple adults in the household who are not married or not related to one another, we cannot determine if they consider themselves to be a couple, let alone what kind of couple, such as cohabiting, heterosexual, gay, or roommates.

Therefore, we created a new variable, household type, to differentiate respondents living with other adults and no children, respondents living with children only, and respondents living with other adults and children. Because we could not determine either the couple status of adults living together or the parental status of adults living with children for all GSS respondents, we grouped households according to the number of adults and the presence of children. We created dichotomous variables for respondents in each household type, and we designated single adults without children as the reference group.[3]

Human Capital

We measured human capital with two variables: age and years of education. We used age as a rough proxy for work experience. We acknowledge that age is a better proxy for men's work experience than for women's because women are the ones who tend to take time out of the workforce for child rearing. However, this gap is closing as more and more young women continue to work during their child-rearing years (Blau & Ferber, 1992).

Control Variables

We used race as a control variable because prior research suggests that different racial and ethnic groups use different job-family strategies (L. Rubin, 1994). We combined Black respondents and all other non-White respondents into one category because, unfortunately, there are so few minorities in the sample.

We also controlled for size of the respondent's workplace. Firms with more than 100 employees have better formal job-family programs (Glass & Estes, 1997), and men who work in large firms are more likely than women to take leave (Sandberg, 1999), but firms with fewer than 100 employees offer

more supportive informal workplace environments for mothers (MacDermid, Williams, Marks, & Heilbrun, 1994). Therefore, we combined respondents who work in locations with fewer than 100 people into one category and those who work in locations with 100 or more people into another category. We dummy-coded the first category as 0 for small and the latter category as 1 for large.

Previous research indicates that relative resources influence how husbands and wives share housework (Brayfield, 1992). We used respondent's relative contribution to household income as a control variable because individuals may consider relative resources when they make job-family decisions. We calculated the respondent's share of household income by dividing the respondent's income by the total household income. Both household income and respondent's income were originally measured on an ordinal-ranked categorical scale, ranging from 0 (less than $1,000) to 21 ($75,000 or more). Like other researchers, we substituted the midpoints for each category, and we used the Pareto curve to set the midpoint for the last category at $103,869.05 for household income and $97,462.11 for respondent's income (Parker & Fenwick, 1983). We also substituted the mean for cases with missing information on either of these variables.[4] In addition, we constructed a mean substitution variable to determine whether people who did not provide information on either income variable are significantly different from the rest of the sample in their responses to any of the dependent variables.

We also controlled for region of residence because there are important cultural differences among geographic regions, especially between the South and the rest of the country (e.g., Rice & Coates, 1995). We dummy-coded region as 1 for the South and 0 for all other regions.

RESULTS

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics for the independent variables. The differences between women and men are noteworthy, but not surprising. Men have more traditional gender-role attitudes than do women. Women are more likely to be in female-dominated occupations, and men are more likely to be in male-dominated occupations. Women are employed fewer hours than men, on average. There are no significant differences between women and men in self-employment status, supervisory status, or managerial/professional occupation. Women are more likely than men to be the only adult in households with children; there are no other significant differences between women and men for the other household configurations. Both women and men in this sample average about 40 years of age, both average

TABLE 1: Means and Standard Deviations of the Independent Variables, by Sex of Respondent

	*Women (*n = *464)*		*Men (*n = *460)*		
Variable	M	SD	M	SD	t *Ratio*
Traditional gender attitude	4.91	3.33	6.74	3.47	8.18***
Occupation gender-type					
Male	0.06	0.25	0.44	0.50	14.58***
Integrated	0.45	0.50	0.50	0.50	1.25
Female	0.48	0.50	0.06	0.24	–16.16***
Employment demands					
Hours	39.71	13.92	45.26	14.10	6.03***
Self-employed	0.13	0.34	0.15	0.36	0.91
Supervisor					
Yes	0.22	0.42	0.27	0.44	1.53
No	0.39	0.49	0.38	0.48	–.44
Unknown	0.38	0.49	0.36	0.48	–.92
Managerial/professional occupation	0.35	0.48	0.30	0.46	–1.88
Family demands					
Household type					
Sole adult, without children	0.26	0.44	0.26	0.44	0.15
Sole adult, with children	0.10	0.31	0.01	0.11	–6.08***
Multiple adults, without children	0.34	0.47	0.40	0.49	2.01
Multiple adults, with children	0.30	0.46	0.32	0.47	0.80
Human capital					
Age	40.18	12.14	40.99	13.07	0.98
Education	14.10	2.56	13.76	2.85	–1.89
Controls					
White	0.80	0.40	0.84	0.36	1.66
Large workplace	0.36	0.48	0.35	0.48	–.31
Household income($)	42,136.13	28,349.60	47,751.62	29,259.20	2.96**
Share of household income	67.28	31.22	75.94	26.28	4.57***
South	0.34	0.47	0.36	0.48	0.78

**$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

approximately 14 years of education, both are likely to be White, and both are likely to work in a small workplace. Men report higher average household incomes ($47,752) than women ($42,136); this difference is related to the larger proportion of female-headed households in our sample and the continuing gender pay gap. Likewise, men also report that they contribute more to

TABLE 2: Percentage Reporting Each Trade-Off, by Gender of Respondent

Questions About Job-Family Trade-Offs	*Total (N = 924)*	*Women (n = 464)*	*Men (n = 460)*	χ^2
In your present job, have you ever done any of the following because of your responsibilities to the job?				
Miss a family occasion or holiday?	53.2	45.0	61.5	25.197***
Been unable to care for a sick child or relative?	18.4	20.0	16.7	1.680
Been unable to do the work you usually do around the house?	51.9	52.2	51.7	0.016
In your present job, have you ever done any of the following because of your responsibilities to members of your family?				
Refuse a job promotion?	11.4	11.4	11.3	0.003
Take on additional paid work?	42.4	36.2	48.3	13.759***
Refuse to work overtime or extra hours?	25.8	27.4	24.1	1.268
Cut back on your work?	25.4	25.4	25.4	0.000

***$p < .001$.

the household income at 76% than do women at 67%. The unusually high income share for women is due to the fact that 36% of the women in this sample live in sole-adult households, either with or without children. There are no significant differences between women and men in their region of residence.

Overall, slightly more than half of the respondents indicate that they have missed a family occasion or been unable to do their usual work around the house, but only 18.4% have been unable to care for a sick child or relative (see Table 2). Only 11.4% of the respondents have refused a promotion, but almost half (42.4%) have taken on additional paid work because of their family responsibilities. Approximately one-quarter of the respondents have refused to work overtime (25.8%) or have cut back on their work (25.4%) because of family duties.

Interestingly, there are only two significant differences in job-family trade-offs between women and men (see Table 2). More men than women have taken on additional paid work and have missed a family occasion. Nearly half (48.3%) of the men have taken on additional work, compared with 42.4% of the women. In addition, 61.5% of the men but only 53.2% of the women have missed a family occasion. There are no other significant zero-order differences between women and men in job-family trade-offs.[5]

Table 3 presents logistic regression equations for family trade-offs, and Table 4 presents logistic regression equations for employment trade-offs. We

TABLE 3: Logistic Regression Coefficients, Standard Errors, and Related Statistics for Models of Four Family Trade-Offs

Variable	*Missed a Family Occasion*	*Unable to Do Regular Work at Home*	*Unable to Nurse a Sick Child/Relative*	*Taken on Extra Work*
Woman	–0.308	0.256	0.458*	–0.361*
	(0.172)	(0.173)	(0.222)	(0.173)
Traditional attitude	–0.005	0.033	0.019	–0.001
	(0.022)	(0.021)	(0.027)	(0.021)
Occupation gender-type (Male)				
Integrated	0.006	0.143	–0.313	–0.411*
	(0.194)	(0.190)	(0.246)	(0.190)
Female	–0.484*	–0.178	–0.350	–0.254
	(0.235)	(0.232)	(0.297)	(0.232)
Employment demands				
Hours	0.016**	0.015**	0.002	0.013*
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.007)	(0.005)
Self-employed	0.030	0.068	0.260	0.294
	(0.217)	(0.214)	(0.266)	(0.215)
Managerial/professional occupation	–0.349	0.317	0.011	–0.178
	(0.190)	(0.186)	(0.243)	(0.191)
Supervisor status (Yes)				
No	–0.655***	–0.205	–0.503*	–0.096
	(0.185)	(0.182)	(0.222)	(0.181)
Unknown	–0.287	–0.324	–0.594**	–0.357*
	(0.184)	(0.180)	(0.224)	(0.182)
Family demands				
Household type (Sole adult without children)				
Sole adult with children	–0.485	0.366	0.574	0.170
	(0.323)	(0.318)	(0.397)	(0.326)
Multiple adults without children	–0.064	0.272	0.347	0.237
	(0.198)	(0.195)	(0.272)	(0.198)
Multiple adults with children	–0.068	0.608**	1.133***	0.608**
	(0.210)	(0.208)	(0.271)	(0.209)
Human capital				
Age	–0.011	–0.012*	0.008	0.007
	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.008)	(0.006)
Education	–0.027	0.053	–0.008	0.001
	(0.033)	(0.032)	(0.041)	(0.032)
Controls				
White	–0.008	0.077	–0.394	0.132
	(0.185)	(0.183)	(0.220)	(0.185)

(continued)

TABLE 3 Continued

Variable	*Missed a Family Occasion*	*Unable to Do Regular Work at Home*	*Unable to Nurse a Sick Child/Relative*	*Taken on Extra Work*
Large workplace	0.104	0.210	0.305	0.244
	(0.153)	(0.151)	(0.194)	(0.153)
Household income	0.008	–0.001	–0.001	0.005
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.003)
Share of income	0.005	0.006*	0.005	–0.000
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.003)
Missing income	0.312	–0.022	0.273	0.406
	(0.227)	(0.223)	(0.272)	(0.224)
South	0.140	0.067	–0.110	–0.338*
	(0.148)	(0.146)	(0.190)	(0.149)
Constant	0.636	–1.900**	–2.243**	–0.682
	(0.670)	(0.670)	(0.843)	(0.664)
Model chi-square	78.501***	59.005***	44.916**	55.762***
Degrees of freedom	20	20	20	20

NOTE: $N = 924$. Numbers in parentheses are standard errors. For polytomous categorical variables, the reference category is in parentheses. Income coefficients multiplied by 10,000.
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

present two models for some trade-offs: The first equation is the baseline main-effects model, and the second equation is the interactive model, if any, in which gender interacts with one or more variables in the equation. We include in the interactive model only those multiplicative terms that significantly improve the model. Taken together, these two tables demonstrate that gender is a complicated, multifaceted factor in the decisions people make about reconciling employment and family life.

Table 3 shows that, contrary to Hypothesis 1A, men are not more likely than women to make three of the four family trade-offs. Men, however, are more likely than women to take on extra paid work, thereby leaving men with less time for family matters. Also, refuting Hypothesis 1A, women are more likely than men to be unable to nurse a sick child or relative. Contrary to Hypothesis 2A, gender attitude has no effect on any family trade-off for men.

In contrast, the results do support Hypothesis 3. People in male-typed occupations are more likely than those in female-typed occupations to miss a family occasion and are more likely than those in integrated occupations to take on extra work.

Working long hours and being a supervisor are both significantly related to two of the family trade-offs, which supports Hypothesis 4A, but the effect

TABLE 4: Logistic Regression Coefficients, Standard Errors, and Related Statistics for Models of Three Employment Trade-Offs

	Refused a Promotion		*Refused Extra Hours*	*Cut Back on Work*	
Variable	*Main Effects Model*	*Interactive Model*	*Main Effects Model*	*Main Effects Model*	*Interactive Model*
Woman	0.040	0.794	0.226	–0.019	0.019
	(0.263)	(0.474)	(0.196)	(0.197)	(0.343)
Traditional attitude	0.070*	0.129**	0.001	0.040	0.039
	(0.032)	(0.045)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)
Occupation gender-type (Male)					
Integrated	0.732*	0.746*	–0.192	–0.217	–0.283
	(0.314)	(0.317)	(0.216)	(0.220)	(0.224)
Female	0.631	0.676	–0.287	0.078	0.042
	(0.380)	(0.383)	(0.262)	(0.264)	(0.266)
Employment demands					
Hours	0.003	0.003	–0.010	–0.002	–0.002
	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
Self-employed	–0.105	–0.133	0.428	0.668**	0.638**
	(0.333)	(0.336)	(0.239)	(0.226)	(0.228)
Managerial/professional occupation	–0.576*	–0.582*	–0.315	0.343	0.398
	(0.293)	(0.293)	(0.215)	(0.210)	(0.212)
Supervisor status (Yes)					
No	–0.839**	–0.835**	0.090	–0.199	–0.184
	(0.280)	(0.281)	(0.209)	(0.207)	(0.208)
Unknown	–0.365	–0.393	0.121	0.038	0.015
	(0.258)	(0.259)	(0.207)	(0.200)	(0.202)
Family demands					
Household type (Sole adult without children)					
Sole adult with children	0.242	0.213	0.513	0.245	3.009**
	(0.552)	(0.552)	(0.355)	(0.379)	(1.135)
Multiple adults without children	0.353	0.353	0.141	0.051	–0.115
	(0.339)	(0.340)	(0.236)	(0.230)	(0.307)
Multiple adults with children	0.777*	0.761*	0.850***	0.385	0.491
	(0.343)	(0.345)	(0.238)	(0.237)	(0.303)
Human capital					
Age	–0.001	–0.002	–0.014*	–0.008	–0.007
	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)
Education	0.066	0.067	0.069	0.078*	0.074*
	(0.051)	(0.051)	(0.037)	(0.036)	(0.037)
Controls					
White	0.538	0.511	0.304	0.276	0.214
	(0.332)	(0.333)	(0.214)	(0.222)	(0.223)

(continued)

TABLE 4 Continued

	Refused a Promotion		*Refused Extra Hours*	*Cut Back on Work*	
Variable	*Main Effects Model*	*Interactive Model*	*Main Effects Model*	*Main Effects Model*	*Interactive Model*
Large workplace	0.230	0.250	0.411*	0.150	0.134
	(0.235)	(0.236)	(0.171)	(0.175)	(0.176)
Household income	0.005	0.005	0.002	0.004	0.003
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Share of income	–0.002	–0.003	0.000	–0.003	–0.003
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Missing income	0.067	0.082	0.282	0.064	0.080
	(0.351)	(0.352)	(0.245)	(0.252)	(0.253)
South	0.272	0.269	0.050	0.075	0.084
	(0.224)	(0.225)	(0.167)	(0.166)	(0.168)
Woman × Traditional Attitude		–0.123*			
		(0.064)			
Woman × Sole Adult With Children					–3.284**
					(1.229)
Woman × Multiple Adults Without Children					0.346
					(0.419)
Woman × Multiple Adults With Children					–0.216
					(0.426)
Constant	–4.571***	–4.989***	–1.964**	–2.533**	–2.405**
	(1.056)	(1.090)	(0.756)	(0.750)	(0.757)
Model chi-square	38.232**	42.059***	49.236***	47.689***	60.787***
Degrees of freedom	20	21	20	20	23

NOTE: $N = 924$. Numbers in parentheses are standard errors. For polytomous categorical variables, the reference category is in parentheses. Income coefficients multiplied by 10,000.
*$p \leq .05$. **$p \leq .01$. ***$p \leq .001$.

is the same for women and men, which refutes Hypothesis 4B. Contrary to our expectations, being self-employed or having a managerial/professional occupation have no effect on family trade-offs.

Although we did not offer a hypothesis about the effect of family obligations on family trade-offs, the presence of children and multiple adults in a household increases the likelihood of being unable to do regular chores at home, being unable to nurse a sick child or relative, and taking on extra work.

Interestingly, women in households with multiple adults report that they are more likely than their male counterparts to be unable to nurse a sick child.

As Hypothesis 6 predicts, older respondents are less likely than younger respondents to be unable to do their regular work at home.

Two control variables achieve statistical significance. Respondents who contribute a higher percentage of the household income are more likely to be unable to do their regular work at home, and respondents who live in the South are less likely than those who live elsewhere to take on extra work.

Table 4 shows that women and men are equally likely to make employment trade-offs, thereby refuting Hypothesis 1B. As predicted by Hypothesis 2B, traditional women are more likely than nontraditional women to refuse a promotion. We also find support for Hypothesis 3. People in male-typed occupations are less likely to make employment trade-offs than those in gender-integrated occupations.

Several employment demands significantly affect the likelihood of making employment trade-offs, but not uniformly in the direction predicted by an employment demands perspective (Hypothesis 4A). Also as expected, people in managerial or professional occupations are less likely than people in other occupations to refuse a promotion or to cut back on work. Also, supervisors are less likely than nonsupervisors to cut back on work. Self-employed people, however, are more likely than people who work for someone else to cut back on work. Our results also fail to support Hypothesis 4B; women with demanding jobs are not more likely to make employment trade-offs than their male counterparts.

We find support for Hypothesis 5A: People who live with children and other adults are more likely to refuse a promotion and refuse to work extra hours than are people who live alone without children. Men who live with children but no other adults, however, are more likely than women in the same situation to cut back on work, thereby refuting Hypothesis 5B.

As predicted by Hypothesis 6, people with more education are more likely than people with less education to cut back on work. Contrary to Hypothesis 6, however, older respondents are less likely than younger respondents to refuse to work extra hours. Only one control variable is significant in one employment trade-off model. People who work in large workplaces are more likely than those who work in small workplaces to refuse to work extra hours.

DISCUSSION

Our primary focus is the multidimensional effects of gender on women's and men's job-family trade-offs. This study provides mixed support for our

hypotheses. Several hypotheses (2B, 3, 4A, and 5A) are partially supported, but other hypotheses are not supported at all (1B, 2A, and 4B). The findings both support and contradict two other hypotheses (1A and 6) and completely contradict one other hypothesis (5B). Despite these mixed findings, our study illustrates that the effects of gender are not attributable to the gender of an individual alone. Gender pervades our institutional order as a multifaceted construct: Gender—as an individual trait, as an ideology, and as a structural phenomenon—is embedded in our division of labor. Consequently, gender shapes how individuals, families, organizations, and societies make decisions about work-family accommodations, often in hidden, indirect, and complex ways.

Our first hypothesis predicted that women would make more employment trade-offs and men would make more family trade-offs. However, we found only two differences between women and men in our main effects models, one in support of and one in contradiction to our hypotheses, and only a few differences in the multiplicative models. As predicted, women are more likely than men to refuse a promotion, but this gender gap decreases with more traditional gender attitudes. Contrary to our prediction, men are more likely than women to cut back on work, although this occurs only in sole adult households with children. Also contrary to our prediction, women are more likely than men to be unable to nurse a sick child or relative. Consistent with our prediction, men are more likely than women to take on extra work. We contend that these findings indicate that the gender of the individual alone matters only in certain circumstances and that this effect is consistent with a traditional division of labor. Men as breadwinners are more likely than women to take on extra work because of family responsibilities, whereas women as caregivers are more likely than men to be unable to nurse a sick child or relative. Women may feel the obligation to nurse the sick more than men, and thus women may be more aware of and more likely to report this trade-off. In other circumstances, gender matters but only in conjunction with other factors, in this case, the composition of the respondent's household and the individual's attitude toward gender-specific behavior.

We find scant support for our second hypothesis: There is no difference between traditional and nontraditional men in making family trade-offs, and traditional and nontraditional women differ only in one employment trade-off. The interaction of gender and gender attitude in refusing a promotion supports the notion of a traditional division of labor: Traditional women are more likely than nontraditional women to refuse a promotion.

Our third hypothesis highlighted another dimension of gender, that is, the gender composition of an occupation. We find that respondents in male-typed occupations are more likely than their counterparts in female-typed

occupations to miss a family occasion, are more likely than their counterparts in gender-integrated occupations to take on extra work, and are less likely than those in gender-integrated occupations to refuse a promotion. These findings are also consistent with a traditional gendered division of labor. Both women and men in male-typed occupations tend to make trade-offs based on traditional masculine expectations by missing out on some family functions, taking on extra work when necessary, and refusing to decline a promotion.

Our fourth hypothesis stated that people with demanding jobs would be more likely to make family trade-offs and less likely to make employment trade-offs than those in other jobs but that women in demanding jobs would be more likely than men to make trade-offs of both types. That is, we expected that people in demanding jobs would also follow traditional masculine expectations, regardless of their actual gender, but that this would be more difficult for women. Contrary to our hypothesis, however, there is no difference between women and men with such jobs. Not surprisingly, some of the characteristics of demanding jobs—working long hours and having a supervisory position—are associated with making at least some family trade-offs. Two characteristics of demanding jobs, having a managerial/professional position and being self-employed, have no effect on making any family trade-offs.

One effect of demanding jobs on employment trade-offs is somewhat puzzling. People who are self-employed are more likely, not less likely, to cut back on work. Perhaps the autonomy associated with being self-employed gives these respondents more control over their work schedules. Nevertheless, other findings support our predictions about employment demands. People in managerial or professional occupations are less likely to refuse a promotion. Similarly, supervisors are less likely than nonsupervisors to refuse a promotion.

We find substantial support for our fifth hypothesis about family demands. Family demands are indeed influential, but contrary to our expectations, the demands often operate similarly for women and men. Women and men in households with children and multiple adults are more likely than those in households without children and with only one adult to refuse a promotion and to refuse to work extra hours. Interestingly, both women and men in households with children and one adult, presumably single parents, do not refuse promotions or extra hours. Men, but not women, in such households are much more likely than those in sole adult households with no children to cut back on work. We suspect that this employment trade-off is more available to men because of the gender gap in income: Single fathers can probably afford to cut back on work to care for their children, whereas single mothers cannot.

Human capital factors do influence some of the trade-offs, as we predicted in our sixth hypothesis, but not always in the direction we expected. Younger people, not older, are more likely to refuse to work extra hours. Perhaps age is not a good proxy for job experience. As predicted, those with more education are more likely to cut back on work and less likely to make the family trade-off of getting their regular chores done at home. Neither of the human capital characteristics, however, has an effect on any other trade-off.

CONCLUSION

Gender theorists contend, and we concur, that gender as a structural system is complex, continually undergoing modification while at the same time appearing relatively stable because of its incorporation into social institutions. Although a quantitative, cross-sectional study such as ours cannot examine the nature, rate, or magnitude of change, it can and does capture a comprehensive snapshot of the gender system. Our findings illustrate how gender influences job-family trade-offs in intricate and hidden ways. Although some women and men are equally likely to make the same job-family trade-offs, our analysis reveals that the gender of an individual interacts with other factors, namely gender attitudes and household composition. Moreover, this study suggests that the social organization of occupations, especially as it relates to the gender composition of occupations, may influence personal decisions about how best to accommodate family and employment responsibilities. For example, the finding that people in male-typed occupations make more job-family trade-offs overall than people in either integrated or female-typed occupations suggests that male-typed occupations, regardless of whether they are held by women or men, have characteristics that are less accommodating to job-family balance. Future researchers should investigate which features of male-typed occupations might make them less amenable to job-family balance. Such data will be useful to corporate policy makers who are genuinely interested in supporting their employees' attempts to successfully balance a job with a personal life. Likewise, public policy makers can also draw on such data when creating family-friendly legislation that addresses the needs of all members of the labor force, not just those in traditionally female-typed occupations.

Our analysis also illustrates how the ubiquitous separate spheres ideology influences job-family trade-offs and how gender exacerbates those effects. The finding that people with more demanding jobs make more family trade-offs than those with less demanding jobs and the finding that people with more demanding families make more employment trade-offs as well as more

family trade-offs than people with less demanding families, highlight the difficulty people have in keeping job and family separate. If, instead, employers and the general public recognize that the domains of the workplace and the family are interwoven, people, even those with demanding jobs or demanding families, would not be forced to choose between success in their jobs and success in their families. As it stands, however, because of the ideology of separate spheres, people try to maintain a boundary between the two and thus often make costly trade-offs in the process.

Future research should focus on several measurement issues. First, as others have noted (e.g., Kmec, 1999), even though the GSS 1996 Gender Module is an improvement over previous measures of job-family trade-offs, there are several constraints with the particular items we use as dependent variables. The questions about job-family trade-offs do not measure either the magnitude or the timing of the trade-off, asking only about the occurrence of ever making a trade-off. In addition, the question asks about trade-offs only in the context of the respondent's current job and current family circumstances. The length of time in one's current job may affect the probability of making an employment trade-off, and one's household characteristics almost certainly would affect both types of trade-offs. Finally, women and men may make trade-offs differently because of their assumed role responsibilities (Milkie & Peltola, 1999). For example, a married father may not report being unable to nurse a sick child because both he and his wife assume that it is her responsibility to do so. Nevertheless, despite these limitations, these measures of trade-offs are useful to job-family researchers interested in the choices that people make while trying to balance their job and family responsibilities.

Our study also hints at the contention made by previous researchers (e.g., Barnett & Gareis, 2000): Trade-offs are not equal. We suggest that there are two major differences among the trade-offs. First, the cost of making some trade-offs may be higher than for others. For example, people may be more willing to miss out on a family occasion or unable to do some of their chores at home rather than be unable to nurse a sick child. Second, some of the trade-offs imply taking action on the part of the respondent, whereas others seem to be more reactionary. Refusing a promotion or refusing to work extra hours is a trade-off made presumably in response to an offer of a promotion or overtime work. On the other hand, cutting back on work or taking on extra work implies that the respondent initiated the trade-offs. It is evident from our results that one empirical model does not predict all types of trade-offs. Future surveys should measure these differences in trade-offs to further refine the empirical models presented here.

In sum, our study extends previous research by investigating how three dimensions of gender—an individual's sex, gender ideology, and the gender composition of an occupation—affect job-family trade-offs. Researchers who continue to confine their analysis to the gender of the person alone, especially as a main effect only, misspecify their models and cannot capture the influence of the gender system on individual behavior. Using the notion of gender as a basic organizing system of society, our study begins to explain the multidimensional significance of gender on an important dilemma in the lives of most people in contemporary society.

NOTES

1. Elsewhere, however, Robinson and Godbey (1997) find that most Americans have more, not less, free time than ever before.

2. Of course, negative responses to the trade-off questions include respondents who have not made a particular trade-off as well as those who have not had the opportunity to do so. For example, not all respondents have been offered a promotion or have had a sick child to care for. Nonetheless, positive responses to the trade-off questions clearly represent trade-offs that respondents have made.

3. We tested an alternative measurement in preliminary analyses. When we constructed a household variable based on marital status and the presence of children in the household, we reduced the sample by 124 respondents because of missing values or unknown relationships between the adults in the household. This procedure created a sample selection bias; we discovered that this constructed variable inadvertantly eliminated men who tend to have less traditional gender role attitudes, live in multiple adult households without children, work in female-type jobs, live in households with lower incomes, and contribute less to the household income. It also eliminated women who tend to have more traditional gender role attitudes, live in multiple adult households without children, have less education, are non-White, do not live in the South, and live in households with lower incomes. Thus, rather than risk misspecification of the model, we use a less restrictive measure of household configuration.

4. In several cases, respondents gave their individual income but not the household income or gave the household income but not their own income. For these respondents, we examine the number of earners in the household. If there is one earner, we set the missing income equal to the given income. In four cases with more than one earner, respondents gave their individual income but not the household income, and the respondent's income was greater than the average household income used for mean substitution. We deleted these cases from the analysis. In one case with one earner, the respondent gave a different amount for household income and for respondent income. We also deleted this case from the analysis.

5. These results are very similar to those found by Kmec (1999), who also used the 1996 GSS Gender Module in a study of job-to-home spillover; she focused on three of the seven trade-offs: missed a family occasion, unable to do regular chores, and unable to nurse a sick child. Our results, however, are somewhat different than those reported by Milkie and Peltola (1999), who also used the 1996 GSS Gender Module. They found, as did we, a significant difference between women and men for the above-mentioned trade-offs: More men than women have taken on additional work and missed a family occasion. However, Milkie and Peltola found one more significant difference: More women than men have been unable to care for a sick child. The disparity in

our findings is largely due to sample composition. We both restricted our samples to employed respondents, but they further restricted their sample to only those respondents who are married. We should also note that Milkie and Peltola used the job-family trade-off variables differently than we do. Whereas we analyze these seven trade-offs separately as dependent variables, they collapsed the trade-offs into two independent variables, sacrifices at work and sacrifices at home, in an analysis of the respondent's subjective perception of success in balancing work and family responsibilities.

REFERENCES

Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender & Society*, 4: 139-158.

Acker, J. (1992). The future of women and work: Ending the twentieth century. *Sociological Perspectives*, *35*, 53-68.

Aronson, P. (1999). The balancing act: Young women's expectations and experiences of work and family. *Research in the Sociology of Work*, *7*, 55-83.

Barnett, R. C., & Gareis, K. C. (2000). Reduced-hours employment: The relationship between difficulty of trade-offs and quality of life. *Work and Occupations*, *27*, 168-187.

Becker, G. (1964). *Human capital*. New York: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Bielby, W. T., & Baron, J. N. (1986). Men and women at work: Sex segregation and statistical discrimination. *American Journal of Sociology*, *91*, 759-799.

Blau, F. D., & Ferber, M. A. (1992). *The economics of women, men, and work*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bond, J. T., Galinsky, E., & Swanberg, J. E. (1998). *The 1997 national study of the changing workforce*. New York: Families and Work Institute.

Brayfield, A. (1992). Employment resources and housework in Canada. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *54*, 19-30.

Brayfield, A. (1995). Juggling jobs and kids: The impact of employment schedules on fathers' caring for children. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *57*, 321-332.

Bruce, W., & Reed, C. (1994). Preparing supervisors for the future work force: The dual-income couple and the job-family dichotomy. *Public Administration Review*, *54*, 36-43.

Burstein, P., & Bricher, M. (1997). Problem definition and public policy: Congressional committees confront work, family, and gender, 1945-1990. *Social Forces*, *75*, 135-169.

Carlisle, W. (1994). Sharing home responsibilities: Women in dual-career marriages. In C. W. Konek & S. L. Kitch (Eds.), *Women and careers: Issues and challenges* (pp. 141-152). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Casey, J. C., & Pitt-Catsouphes, M. (1994). Employed single mothers: Balancing job and homelife. *Employee Assistance Quarterly*, *9*, 37-53.

Cassidy, M. L., & Warren, B.O. (1996). Family employment status and gender role attitudes: A comparison of women and men college graduates. *Gender & Society*, *10*, 312-329.

Clinton, A. (1997). Flexible labor: Restructuring the American work force. *Monthly Labor Review*, *120*(8), 3-27.

Cox, A. G., & Presser, H. B. (2000). Nonstandard employment schedules among American mothers. In T. L. Parcel & D. B. Cornfield (Eds.), *Work & family: Research informing policy* (pp. 97-130). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Davies-Netzley, S. A. (1998). Women above the glass ceiling: Perceptions on corporate mobility and strategies for success. *Gender & Society*, *12*, 339-355.

Davis, J. A., & Smith, T. W. (1996). *General Social Surveys, 1972-1996: Cumulative codebook* (machine-readable data file). Chicago: National Opinion Research Center.

Estes, S. B., & Glass, J. L. (1996). Job changes following childbirth: Are women trading compensation for family-responsive work conditions? *Work and Occupations*, *23*, 405-436.

Franklin, S. T., Ames, B. D., & King, S. (1994). Acquiring the family eldercare role. *Research on Aging*, *16*, 27-42.

Fried, M. (1998). *Taking time: Parental leave policy and corporate culture*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Frone, M. R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. L. (1992). Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict: Testing a model of the job-family interface. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *77*, 65-78.

Gerson, K. (1985). *Hard choices: How women decide about work, career, and motherhood*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gerson, K. (1998). Gender and the future of the family: Implications for the postindustrial workplace. In D. Vannoy & P. J. Dubeck (Eds.), *Challenges for work and family in the twenty-first century* (pp. 11-21). New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Gerstel, N., & McGonagle, K. (1999). Job leaves and the limits of the Family and Medical Leave Act. *Work and Occupations*, *26*, 510-534.

Gibeau, J. L., & Anastas, J. W. (1989). Breadwinners and caregivers: Interviews with working women. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work*, *14*, 19-40.

Glass, J. (1990). The impact of occupational segregation on working conditions. *Social Forces*, *68*, 779-796.

Glass, J., & Estes, S. B. (1997). The family responsive workplace. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *23*, 289-313.

Glass, J., & Fujimoto, T. (1995). Employer characteristics and the provision of family responsive policies. *Work and Occupations*, *22*, 381-411.

Googins, B. K. (1997). Introduction. In T. A. Lilly, M. Pitt-Catsouphes, & B. K. Googins (Eds.), *Work-family research: An annotated bibliography* (pp. xiii-xviii). Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Grief, G. L., Demaris, A., & Hood, J. C. (1993). Balancing work and single fatherhood. In J. C. Hood (Ed.), *Men, work, and family* (pp. 176-194). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Grimm, J. W., & Stern, R. N. (1974). Sex roles and internal labor market structures: The "female" semi-professions. *Social Problems*, *21*, 690-705.

Gutek, B. A., Searle, S., & Klepa, L. (1991). Rational versus gender role explanations for work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *76*, 560-568.

Hertz, R. (1997). A typology of approaches to child care: The centerpieces of organizing life for dual-earner couples. *Journal of Family Issues*, *18*, 355-385.

Hinze, S. W. (2000). Inside medical marriages: The effect of gender on income. *Work and Occupations*, *27*, 464-499.

Hochschild, A. R. (1989). *The second shift*. New York: Avon.

Hochschild, A. R. (1997). *The time bind: When work becomes home and home becomes work*. New York: Metropolitan Books.

Jacobs, J. A., & Steinberg, R. J. (1990). Compensating differentials and the male-female wage gap: Evidence from the New York State comparable worth study. *Social Forces*, *69*, 439-468.

Jurik, N. C. (1998). Getting away and getting by: The experiences of self-employed homeworkers. *Work and Occupations*, *25*, 7-35.

Kelly, E. L. (1999). Theorizing corporate family policies: How advocates built "the business case" for "family-friendly" programs. *Research in the Sociology of Work*, *7*, 169-202.

Kmec, J. A. (1999). Multiple aspects of work-family conflict. *Sociological Focus*, *32*, 265-285.

Kozimer-King, M., & Leicht, K. T. (1999). Sources of convergence and divergence in attitudes about work and family roles among women. *Research in the Sociology of Work*, *7*, 85-108.

Lorber, J. (1994). *Paradoxes of gender.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

MacDermid, S. M., Williams, M., Marks, S., & Heilbrun, G. (1994). Is small beautiful? Work-family tension, work conditions, and organizational size. *Family Relations*, *43*, 159-167.

Martin, P. Y., Seymour, S., Courage, M., Godbey, K., & Tate, R. (1988). Work-family policies: Corporate, union, feminist, and pro-family leaders' views. *Gender & Society*, *2*, 385-400.

Milkie, M. A., & Peltola, P. (1999). Playing all the roles: Gender and the work-family balancing act. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *61*, 476-490.

Mincer, J., & Polacheck, S. W. (1974). Family investments in human capital: Earnings of women. *Journal of Political Economy*, *82*(Supp.), S76-S108.

Parasuraman, S., & Greenhaus, J. H. (1997). The changing world of work and family. In S. Parasuraman & J. H. Greenhaus (Eds.), *Integrating work and family: Challenges and choices for a changing world* (pp. 3-14). Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Parker, R. N., & Fenwick, R. (1983). The Pareto curve and its utility for open-ended income distributions in survey research. *Social Forces*, *76*, 301-332.

Perlow, L. A. (1995). Putting the work back into work/family. *Group & Organization Management*, *20*, 227-239.

Potuchek, J. L. (1997). *Who supports the family? Gender and breadwinning in dual-earner marriages.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Powell, G. N. (1997). The sex difference in employee inclinations regarding work-family programs: Why does it exist, should we care, and what should be done about it (if anything)? In S. Parasuraman & J. H. Greenhaus (Eds.), *Integrating work and family: Challenges and choices for a changing world* (pp. 167-174). Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Presser, H. B. (1994). Employment schedules among dual-earner spouses and the division of household labor by gender. *American Sociological Review*, *59*, 348-364.

Reskin, B. (1993). Sex segregation in the workplace. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *19*, 241-270.

Reskin, B., & Padavic, I. (1994). *Women and men at work*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Rice, T. W., & Coates, D. L. (1995). Gender role attitudes in the southern United States. *Gender & Society*, *9*, 744-756.

Richardson, M. S. (1981). Occupational and family roles: A neglected intersection. *Counseling Psychologist*, *9*, 13-23.

Risman, B. J. (1998). *Gender vertigo: American families in transition*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Risman, B. J., & Johnson-Sumerford, D. (1998). Doing it fairly: A study of postgender marriages. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *60*, 23-40.

Robinson, J. P., & Godbey, G. (1997). *Time for life: The surprising ways Americans use their time*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Robinson, J. P., & Milkie, M. A. (1998). Back to the basics: Trends in and role determinants of women's attitudes toward housework. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *60*, 205-218.

Rones, P. L., Ilg, R. E., & Gardner, J. M. (1997). Trends in hour of work since the mid-1970s. *Monthly Labor Review*, *120*(4), 3-14.

Rubin, B. A. (1995). Flexible accumulation: The decline of contract and social transformation. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, *14*, 297-323.

Rubin, B. A. (1996). *Shifts in the social contract: Understanding change in American society.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Rubin, L. B. (1994). *Families on the fault line: America's working class speaks about the family, the economy, race, and ethnicity.* New York: HarperCollins.

Sanchez, L., & Thomson, L. (1997). Becoming mothers and fathers: Parenthood, gender, and the division of labor. *Gender & Society*, *11*, 747-772.

Sandberg, J. C. (1999). The effects of family obligations and workplace resources on men's and women's use of family leaves. *Research in the Sociology of Work*, *7*, 261-281.

Sandberg, J. C., & Cornfield, D. B. (2000). Returning to work: The impact of gender, family, and work on terminating a family or medical leave. In T. L. Parcel & D. B. Cornfield (Eds.), *Work & family: Research informing policy* (pp. 161-184). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schor, J. B. (1991). *The overworked American: The unexpected decline of leisure*. New York: Basic Books.

Seron, C., & Ferris, K. (1995). Negotiating professionalism: The gendered social capital of flexible time. *Work and Occupations*, *22*, 22-47.

Shelton, B. A. (1992). *Women, men and time: Gender differences in paid work, housework, and leisure*. New York: Greenwood.

Smith, V. (1993). Flexibility in work and employment: The impact on women. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, *11*, 195-216.

South, S. J., & Spitz, G. (1994). Housework in marital and nonmarital households. *American Sociological Review*, *59*, 327-347.

Thompson, L., & Walker, A. J. (1989). Gender in families: Women and men in marriage, work, and parenthood. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *51*, 845-871.

Thorne, B. (1987). Re-visioning women and social change: Where are the children? *Gender & Society*, *1*, 85-109.

Thornton, A. (1989). Changing attitudes toward family issues in the United States. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *51*, 873-893.

U.S. Department of Labor. (1998). *Employed persons by detailed occupation, sex, race, and Hispanic origin. Labor Force Statistics from the Current Population Survey.* Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor. Retrieved March 27, 1998, from ftp://146.142.4.23/pub/special.requests/fl/AA96/aat11.txt at http://stats.bls.gov.datahome.htm

Wharton, C. S. (1994). Finding time for the "second shift": The impact of flexible work schedules on women's double days. *Gender & Society*, *8*, 189-205.

Williams, D. R. (1995). Women's part-time employment: A gross flows analysis. *Monthly Labor Review*, *118*(4), 36-44.