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Introduction

In the last few decades most Western countries have witnessed a marked increase in the participation of women in the labour market. In the United States female participation exploded from 36 percent in 1960 to 70 percent in 2008 (OECD, 2008). For Europe figures are comparable, although there are some differences between countries. However, in spite of these changes, in most families the division of labour is still highly gendered. Women tend to take care of most of the household tasks and children, while most men do full-time paid work.

As women have entered the work forces of most Western countries, many of them now have to combine a job with the largest share of domestic labour; a phenomenon which has become known as the second shift (Hochschild and Machung, 1989). Women seeking to reconcile work and life are put in a time squeeze (Clarkberg and Moen, 2001). In families with young children women have to balance ‘life’ and ‘work’ particularly carefully (McDowell, 2004). One of the ways in which women do so is by reducing the number of paid hours, especially after the birth of children (Warren, 2004). Part-time work, mostly for women, has become common in many segments of the economy. In the EU, 37.5 percent of women and 6.6 percent of men work in part-time jobs, for working mothers these figures are even higher (Corral and Isusi, 2007).

In many households the part-time job, which is usually taken by the female spouse, is often an auxiliary income for the household rather than at a level with the (male) main income (Plantenga, 2002). The size of the part-time job often ‘expands’ and ‘contracts’ according to economic situation and the life phase of the household. As a consequence part-time workers generally earn less; are more readily dismissed in an economic downturn (Ginn et al., 1996); build up less social rights (pension, social security) (Ginn et al., 2002); and tend to be tied to particular ‘female’ lines of work such as health, administrative jobs and (lower) education, so called “care-work” (England et al., 2002). Part-time work is hence related to a continued gendering of labour.
Much of research on the participation of women, however, is characterised by two flaws: The first is that participation of women is too much seen as an independent factor and too little as the outcome of ongoing negotiations between partners on the level of the household. The division of paid and unpaid work between partners is dynamic and is the outcome of a complex set of decisions related to national policies, household and individual characteristics; labour market conditions and housing market contexts; and informed by gender ideologies (cultures of care, cultures of providing) (Van der Lippe et al., 2006; Van Wel and Knijn, 2006).

The second problem is that much research on labour market participation is based done at a national level or at best between regions. As Odland and Ellis (1998, p. 333) have noted, this ‘conceals important local and regional differences in women’s labor force activities’. Stated more generally, data on a large scale make it hard to identify the relationship between space and the participation in the labour market and a division of labour within households. Mainly qualitative studies have filled this gap by looking into local contexts and scrutinising the meaning of time and space for the participation in and division of labour (Jarvis, 1999, 2005; Kwan, 1999). These studies, however, have not analysed the geographical dimension for participation in and the division of labour systematically, which makes it difficult to generalize their findings.

We argue that the spatial dimension is important for the division of paid work for two main reasons:

1) Individuals and households are sorted spatially into different regions, cities, and neighbourhoods with various labour market conditions (England, 1993; Hanson and Pratt, 1992, 1995; Odland and Ellis, 1998; Pratt and Hanson, 1988; Wylly, 1999), according to (among other things) their demographic, ethnic, and socioeconomic characteristics, which simultaneously affect practices in the labour market of women and men.

2) Space plays an important role in the temporal managing of everyday life, particularly for households in a ‘time squeeze’, which means that any study of participation in paid work and the division of labour should also include the spatial dimension (De Meester et al., 2007; De Meester and Van Ham, 2009; Jarvis, 2005; Karsten, 2003; Kwan, 1999; Schwanen, 2007; Turner and Niemeier, 1997; Van Ham and Mulder, 2005).

Hence, the spatial context may influence both the participation in the labour market (of men and women) and the division of labour (domestic and paid) within a household. In this paper we report our investigation of the relationship between spatial context and the division of paid work by looking at family households and their place of residence. The question we address is: How does the division of paid work correlate spatially within an urban context and how can we tentatively explain these patterns?
In order to answer these questions, we turn to the case of the city of Amsterdam in the Netherlands. As the Netherlands leads Europe in part-time work both for women (72 percent) and for men (21 percent) (Corral and Isusi, 2007), the Dutch case offers an opportunity to explore the diversity of ways in which partners divide their paid work. We could expect a variety of number of hours worked by the man and the woman, as well as all possible variations of a division of labour. The city of Amsterdam was selected as a case because it offers the widest variety of household types as well as a wide variety of residential environments. We have concentrated on families consisting of two adults with dependent children, because it appears from the literature that the time squeeze is particularly acute in households with dependent children.

In order to show in what ways the spatial dimension is important, we first give a short literature overview. Secondly, we present data from the Netherlands that show the relationship between degree of urbanization and the division of labour. Thirdly, we zoom in at a local level by mapping the spatial distribution of family households with different arrangements for the division of paid work in the city of Amsterdam. The results are used as a starting point for tentative explanations. Finally, we set a research agenda for the type of research to be carried out in order to disentangle the complex relationship between space and participation in and the division of paid work.

**Literature Overview**

The relationship between the residential environment and labour-market participation has predominantly been analyzed from two different conceptual standpoints: labour-market participation matters for the residential environment and the residential environment matters for labour-market participation. Obviously, most research acknowledges that the relationship usually works both ways. Nevertheless, in searching for explanations for this relationship, scholars are informed by the direction in which they assume the effect to work.

The first type of research considers residential location to be a function of the demands associated with the labour-market participation of both spouses. Research (Vijgen and Engelsdorp Gastelaars, 1991, 1992) has indicated that dual-earner households in the Netherlands (both with and without children) are relatively urban in their residential orientation, while traditional breadwinner households opt more often for a suburban location. Vijgen and Van Engelsdorp Gastelaars explain this contrast by claiming that urban environments offer better opportunities for outsourcing household tasks of all kinds, and offer a better management of tight time budgets through, for instance, multi-purpose trips. These authors are inspired by the work of Bell (1968) and Gans (1968) who suggested that residential choice was related to lifestyle, which was defined as a set of preferences and attitudes.
This line of research has been continued by Droogleever Fortuijn (1993), who studied dual-earner families in various residential contexts. She builds her analysis on a typology of two dimensions: one that indicates the relative importance of a career (total amount of hours worked) that she summarizes as careerist vs familist orientation (1968); and another that indicates the degree of equality in the division of paid and unpaid work (symmetrical vs. asymmetrical). In her study she concluded that households with a careerist lifestyle and an equal division of labour were city oriented, while couples with a familist lifestyle and an asymmetrical division of labour were suburban in their orientation. The other two types assume an intermediate position.

To account for these differences, Droogleever Fortuijn builds on Hägerstrand’s time-space theories (1970). Her study introduced the time-space prism of these working families; a prism illustrates the meaning of location for organizing daily activities in a time-space setting. This part of the research explains the situational aspects of the residential environment: that is, the extent to which it offers opportunities for organizing everyday life. The meaning of residential environment (situation) is particularly important for households with a tight time-budget. As parents struggle to combine two (demanding) jobs and bringing up children, they rely heavily on the opportunities the city offers. Doogleever Fortuijn concludes that, if budgets are less tight, the site characteristics of the dwelling, such as size, number of rooms, and a garden become more important relative to situation characteristics.

Her qualitative research has been continued quantitatively, among others by Bootsma (1995). Controlling for a range of background variables such as age, educational level, and income, he found a relationship between work orientation (whether women want a career) and residential choice. His conclusions confirm the findings from Vijgen and Van Engelsdorp Gastelaars and Droogleever Fortuijn that the more women (tend to) work, the more urban is the residential orientation of the household. His research, however, did not differentiate between dual-income households with and without children. Nevertheless, he identified a negative effect for having a child on female participation.

A second standpoint regards the residential environment as instrumental in explaining labour-market participation. De Meester and colleagues (2007) scrutinized the relationship between residential environment and hours spent on paid work by men and women. In their analysis they assumed that an urban environment would positively influence female participation. Continuing on the track of time-space-budget research, they tested the effect of various variables on participation in paid work, such as job access and degree of urbanity, as they controlled for personal characteristics such as level of education, income, and age. Their conclusions for couples with children are that living in an urban environment positively influences female participation in the labour market; while for men there is a negative correlation. These authors concluded that urban environments offer
what they call a rich opportunity structure, that is, a context that offers many different amenities such as shopping opportunities and child-care facilities. Van Ham and De Meester (2009) confirmed the effect of an urban environment in their work on residential environment and working arrangements: men work part-time more often in urban environments; and dual-earner households in which both partners work full-time are overrepresented in urban areas.

Van Ham and De Meester’s study supports the findings of several earlier American studies that described the spatial entrapment of suburban women and their confinement to particular segments of the economy (Hanson and Pratt, 1992). Although England (1993) disputed the idea of ‘pink collar ghettos’, Wyly (1999) found evidence that labour-market segregation is strongly related to place and highly gendered. Labour markets are local to a large degree and tend to differ across spatial contexts. As men and women tend to slot into different sectors of the economy, the absence or poor accessibility of ‘female’ jobs could be presumed to be related to lower female participation. Correspondingly, a differentiated and accessible job market increases the likelihood of female participation in paid work (De Meester and Van Ham, 2009; Van Ham, 2002).

The literature suggests that the residential environment matters for the participation in paid work of men and women in various, sometimes ambiguous ways. In much of the research described above evidence has been sought of an independent effect of environment on participation or of labour-market participation on residential environment. As a result, the study of the relationship between residential context and labour-market participation has come to share many of the theoretical and methodological problems and limitations inherent in what are known as neighbourhood effect studies (see Galster (2008) for an overview of the problems and solutions of neighbourhood-effect studies). One of the major problems in identifying an independent effect of place is the selection effect (Manski, 1995): individuals disperse through migration into different places (countries, regions, cities, neighbourhoods), so the actual effect of the spatial context is difficult to separate out (Sampson and Sharkey, 2008).

In this study we have considered the relationship between space and participation in paid work as mutually informing. We hold that the relationship between place and paid work is an extreme complex of individual and household characteristics; gender ideologies; labour-market characteristics; and housing-market characteristics, explicitly including also the spatial configurations of both the labour and housing markets. Furthermore, we emphasize that the relationship between spatial context and participation in paid work should always be researched by looking at the household and not the individual alone. Decisions concerning work and place of residence are taken in a process of negotiation between both spouses and in accordance with the conditions of the household. Although many variations exist, feminist scholar rightfully emphasize that in the power position of men and women within the household is often unequal. Outcomes of negotiations
on the household level in many instances tend to reflect dominant ideologies about a division of labour between the sexes (England, 2005; Gregson, 2000).

Neighbourhoods are specific residential environments that are accessed by various forms of capital (mainly economic) and provide the residents with certain material goods, such as housing; and also access to amenities and jobs; but neighbourhoods also provide symbolic capital through, for example, the status of a certain neighbourhood (Boterman et al., 2010). In terms of time-space, neighbourhoods are both constraining and enabling. How they are is contingent on how members of the household deal with their patterns in time-space (Kwan, 1999; Schwanen, 2007). These patterns in time-space also depend on decisions concerning paid work. We argue that the relationship between men’s and women’s participation in paid work is the outcome of ongoing negotiation in which the configurations of the local housing market – including also the time-space consequences of that locality – are taken into account. What type of housing a family can afford also depends on both the outcome of the negotiations and the structural context of the housing market. What a family feels it can afford is not just related to objective conditions such as income but is also a matter of intra-familiar debate and depends on personal preferences. These, however, are likely to inform the position on the labour and housing market as well. Hence, the complexity of this relationship is such that we choose to look at the spatial correlations first

Data and Methods

In this study we have made use of a large dataset that comprises population statistics for all Dutch citizens: the Dutch Social Statistical Database 2005 and 2006 (SSB). This contains data for every taxpaying citizen who is individually registered and identified with a unique personal (and encrypted) code. Although these population data are rich and useful, using them requires patience and several time-consuming modifications such as aggregating personal data to the level of the household. We have drawn on this dataset to identify the spatial distribution of various models for the paid work of family households in the city of Amsterdam.

The data presented in this study are a selection made for households in the municipality of Amsterdam that only includes people who live together with a heterosexual partner, have dependent children younger than 18 years, and in which at least one of the partners has paid work. We categorized the various ways in which partners divide their paid work on the basis of the number of hours of paid work of both partners. It was therefore not possible to include households in which one of the partners was self-employed, as the dataset does not contain data on their hours worked.

These categories are suited to the Dutch context in which the majority prefer an arrangement involving women working part-time and men full-time (Corral and
Isusi, 2007), as practiced by a majority of women and a substantial large minority of men. We distinguish between various models of division of labour in which men and women work part-time, because in accordance with official emancipation policies part-time work is not considered an impediment to a serious career (SCP, 2006), particularly in the public sector, research and education, and healthcare. It is also assumed that both the division of unpaid work between the spouses and the outsourcing of housework is also a function of the arrangements for paid work (Hiller, 1984; Hiller and Philliber, 1982).

In order to provide a link with studies undertaken on the national level, (notably De Meester et al., 2007) and to put the Amsterdam case into perspective, we start by presenting the distribution of those household arrangements for paid work according to degree of urbanity for the Netherlands as a whole. These data are based on the Dutch Labour Force Survey (EBB, 2006), which is a large representative national sample that also includes other information, such as level of education, which is not available in the SSB. Where national and local data from Amsterdam are compared, the fact that the data are derived from two different sources should be taken into account. The differences are, however, clear enough to draw conclusions.

We defined the household types as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.1. Definitions of household models of division of paid work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male breadwinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Full-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symmetrical part-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Dominant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Male breadwinner model**
Men work full-time; women do not participate in paid work. Women are assumed to do the largest share of domestic work and childcare. Outsourcing is little used. As the household depends on only one income, the choice range for dwellings is limited, particularly on the expensive Amsterdam housing market. Finding a suitable family home is therefore restricted to a few areas, and disproportionately to the social sector. The traditional division of labour is expected to be associated with familist ideals (see Bell, 1968).

**1 1/2 model**
Men work full-time; women usually work two or three days a week (1-31 hours). Women provide an auxiliary income and are assumed to take care of most household tasks and childcare. Outsourcing is little used, and childcare only for two days a week.
As women have only a modest job of about 24 hours a week, household income depends mostly on the male spouse. This household model is expected to be found in those areas that present a compromise between career and family, but with an inclination towards familism.

**Dual-full-time model**
Both partners work full-time. Women are still assumed to spend more hours on domestic work and childcare than men do. However, outsourcing is a common strategy to loosen time-constraints, as it is financially more feasible. Childcare is also assumed to be largely outsourced. The location is expected to be strategically chosen, in an environment that is characterized by a rich-opportunity structure. This type of household can afford spacious and expensive dwellings. Careers are prioritized over traditional familism, although sufficient economic means make compromise less necessary.

**Symmetrical part-time model**
Both partners work part-time. The difference in the time they spend on paid work is less than four hours. Outsourcing is less common than for two full-time jobs. The division of unpaid work is assumed to be more symmetrical than in dual-full-time households. This arrangement is hypothesised because of the gender-role-breaking step for men to work part-time.

This household type is expected to opt for neighbourhoods similar to those for the dual-full-time model. However, the purchasing power of these households is expected to be somewhat lower than dual-full-time couples, which limits their choice range.

**Female dominant model**
Women work more hours (>4) than men do. Some overlap exists with the dual-full-time category as women may work more than four hours more than their male counterpart, but his job may still fall in the full-time category. This arrangement is assumed to lead to a division of unpaid work in which men do at least as much as their partner does. The degree of outsourcing is dependent on the total hours worked. As the women may also work part-time, the parents are expected to take care of children. As this model is the most gender-breaking, the location is expected to be a typically non-conformist neighbourhood.

We now show the distribution of these household models in various neighbourhoods in the Netherlands, categorized according to degree of urbanity. This is defined on the basis of the density of addresses per square kilometre (CBS). We then map the spatial patterns of various household models for the city of Amsterdam. We expected traditional household models to be less well represented in urban areas, while more symmetrical households as well as female-dominant households would be overrepresented in urban areas.
Household Arrangements for Paid work

In this paragraph we show the distribution of household types according to various residential environments. This overview serves as the starting point for our next step: looking more closely into the diversity of neighbourhoods that offer various households the environment they prefer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dual Full-time</th>
<th>Male breadwinner</th>
<th>1/2 Symmetrical part-time</th>
<th>Female Dominant</th>
<th>Other total N=100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very strongly urban</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly urban</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-urban</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EBB 2006.

From Table 3.2 it appears that the shares of dual full-time and dual part-time, as well as households in which women work more than men increase with degree of urbanity. The one-and-a-half model follows an opposite pattern: the higher the degree of urbanity, the lower the share of this household type. These results are in line with our expectations. The traditional male-breadwinner model, however, presents somewhat more puzzling results. The frequency of this model also increases with degree of urbanity, which does not fit with our expectations. The rest category ‘other household types’ includes various ways in which the division of labour is divided. These models include households where the male spouse works full-time and the woman works between 32 and 35 hours, as well as households with various divisions of part-time work. The share of other household types clearly increases with degree of urbanity.

As this Table of Dutch neighbourhoods shows, the degree of urbanity correlates with the division of labour. The variation of household types is broadest in very urban contexts, where symmetrical and gender-breaking categories are overrepresented. Although these results are in line with those from other studies (De Meester et al., 2007), the diversity of residential environments within these areas is in our opinion too great to allow conclusions to be drawn. For example, neighbourhoods in Amsterdam, which are all categorized as “very strongly urban”, may differ enormously in terms of the local housing market, the opportunity structure of local amenities, and even in terms of local job market access. A closer look into the spatial patterns within a highly urban context is needed. In the remainder of this paper we show the spatial patterns of the household models that represent different arrangements for paid work in the city of Amsterdam and to tentatively explain these patterns.
Patterns of Paid work in Amsterdam

| Table 3.3. Family household models in the Netherlands and Amsterdam |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|             | Dual Full-time | Male breadwinner | Symmetrical part-time | Female Dominant | Other | total N =100% |
| Amsterdam   | 8.6          | 35.5          | 25.2          | 3.5          | 14.9 | 11.3 | 34,000 |
| Total Netherlands | 6.3 | 23.5 | 53.0 | 2.3 | 6.0 | 9.4 | 1,597,700 |


Compared with the Dutch average, symmetrical part-time work, symmetrical full-time work, and household models in which the female partner works more hours than the man are overrepresented in Amsterdam. In contrast, the dominant Dutch one-and-a-half model is much less well represented. Hence, Amsterdam deviates from the Dutch average in terms of both gender-breaking household models as well as the one-and-a-half model. However, the male-breadwinner model in which the division of labour between the genders is organized traditionally is higher than the Dutch average. We expected that within Amsterdam these models would not be evenly distributed. We now consider some maps that show the spatial patterns of the various models for paid work within the city of Amsterdam:
Figure 3.1 shows the various spatial concentrations of the five household types in Amsterdam neighbourhoods. The dark colour indicates the neighbourhoods with high concentrations (> 1 standard deviation) of that particular household type compared with the city's average. The light colour indicates below average concentrations.
Figure 3.2 combines the various models in one map. From this it can be seen that in most neighbourhoods just one (and sometime two) particular household models are concentrated. This finding suggests that the spatial configurations of neighbourhoods correlate with the way in which labour is divided between spouses. We maintain that the relationship between residential context and the division of labour is complex and mutually informing. In order to understand why a correlation exists between specific spatial contexts and the division of labour we need to look at the characteristics of both the neighbourhoods and the various households. In our view the individual characteristics of the household members and the various aspects of the residential environment both matter.

First, in order to address the question in what types of neighbourhood are these various households concentrated, Table 3.4 summarizes the average values for the neighbourhoods that have above-average concentrations of the five different household types (the dark-coloured neighbourhoods in the maps in Figure 3.1).
Male breadwinner model
Breadwinner families are particularly concentrated in neighbourhoods in the Western part of the city, the Indische buurt, and the northern borough. Most of these areas are characterized by relatively-cheap housing, often in the social sector, and accommodating a high share of non-western and particularly Turkish and Moroccan communities. For these neighbourhoods the average income is lower than the city’s. Relatively many families live in these neighbourhoods. The population density is quite high and the number of cars per household is relatively high.

One-and-a-half model
Almost the negative of the former image is presented by the dominant Dutch one-and-a-half model. The neighbourhoods that have an above-average score for this model are located on the fringes of the city. These areas are the most typical family areas in terms of housing and household composition: the share of family households and children is clearly above average. Also a large share of the housing stock consists of larger dwellings and the number of cars per household is almost double the city average. The average income in these neighbourhoods is above the Amsterdam mean. Neighbourhoods with high concentrations of social-rented dwellings, in which relatively many Moroccans and Turks are accommodated, have a below-average score on this household model.
Dual-full-time model
Dual-full-time working families are typically over-represented in the canal-belt, the upper-middle-class, and expensive neighbourhoods in the southern borough. Even though the population density is still high, the most expensive and relatively spacious housing is found in these areas. A double income is required for the acquisition of dwellings in these neighbourhoods. This factor is reflected in the average income in these neighbourhoods of 153 percent of the Amsterdam average.

Furthermore, for this household type neighbourhoods in Amsterdam South East also stand out. In the Bijlmer area, which is a blend of one-family homes and large estates, dual full-time families are highly overrepresented. The Bijlmer area is characterized by relatively-large concentrations of people of Surinamese descent.

Symmetrical part-time model
Symmetrical part-time households are concentrated in areas located in the inner-part of the city, particularly in the 19th century belt around the historic city centre, and are characterized by high population densities. Another area that shows above-average figures for symmetrical part-time is Watergraafsmeer. This borough is characterized by older, one-family housing, often in the private sector. It is a stable (upper) middle-class area, although more affordable than the canal belt or the southern borough.

Female dominant model
Finally, the family households in which women work more hours than men overlap slightly with the neighbourhoods for symmetrical part-time and dual-full-time households (in the Bijlmer), but also tend to be overrepresented in areas where none of the other models has an edge over the city’s average. Generally, they can be found in the central parts of the city and the South East borough. Female-dominant households live in areas that are characterized by low shares of family households and low shares of children, and that have relatively few larger dwellings.

The neighbourhood statistics give an indication of what type of neighbourhood is associated with the various household types. However, the statistics do not necessarily say anything about the individuals in those households. For this purpose, some of the most important individual characteristics Table 5, 6, and 7 show descriptive statistics for individuals within the various household types in Amsterdam. Obviously, a whole range of personal characteristics could have been included. We were, however, limited by access to data so we only included ethnicity, income, and number of dependent children.
Table 3.5. Ethnicity female per households types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>native Dutch</th>
<th>Western</th>
<th>Moroccan/Turkish</th>
<th>Surinamese</th>
<th>other non-Western</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dual Full-time</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male breadwinner</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1/2</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symmetrical part-time</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Dominant</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 3.6. Income distribution per households type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>below modal income (€ 30,000)</th>
<th>30,000-60,000</th>
<th>60,000-90,000</th>
<th>&gt; € 90,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dual Full-time</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male breadwinner</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1/2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symmetrical part-time</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Dominant</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 3.7. Number of children per household type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 child</th>
<th>2 children</th>
<th>3 children</th>
<th>4 or more children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dual Full-time</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male breadwinner</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1/2</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symmetrical part-time</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Dominant</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As becomes clear from the tables, breadwinner households are strongly overrepresented amongst non-western groups, particularly Moroccans and Turks, and are underrepresented amongst native-Dutch groups. Most of the male-breadwinner households fall into the lowest income category, while only a small share falls into the highest categories. Breadwinner families have three or more children relatively often.

One-and-a-half-earner families are clearly underrepresented among the various non-western groups and overrepresented among the native-Dutch. Income levels are understandably higher than for male-breadwinner families. Only 5.8 percent of these families have an income in the lowest scale; while the rest have quite a high income. Typically, these families have one or two children.
The Surinamese in particular, but also migrants from western countries, are overrepresented among dual-full-time families. They have relatively often only one child. Moroccans and Turks are underrepresented. Unsurprisingly, dual-full-time earners have the highest incomes. The largest share of this type falls into the highest income group, while only three percent of them earn less than the modal income. Clearly the difference in income between dual-full-time and male-breadwinner families is far too great to be explained by the hours worked. The level of education and line of work also need to be taken into consideration. Symmetrical-part-time households are mainly a native-Dutch phenomenon and are underrepresented among non-western groups. These households often have only one child and are least likely to have a large family. Income levels are lower than for dual full-time families, but are still relatively high.

Households in which women work more hours than men have relatively common in non-western groups. Most of these households have one or two children, but 14 percent of them have three or more children. The Surinamese are particularly overrepresented in this type. Female-dominant households fall mainly into the lowest income group, which may imply a female-breadwinner family with a man not working at home. The female-dominant households that fall into the higher-income groups may be the product of a household strategy that prioritizes the female career.

**Figure 3.3. Income from labour per household type and ethnicity**

Source: SSB, 2006)
Figure 3.3 shows the interaction effects of ethnicity and income for the various household types. For the sake of simplicity all non-western groups were aggregated, while western and native-Dutch groups were also merged together. As becomes clear from the table, the relationship between type of household and level of income remains intact when corrected for ethnicity. Non-western groups earn much less than western and native Dutch groups do. This difference can probably be explained in part by level of education, but this is not included in the SSB data. Given the fact that non-western groups are also overrepresented in traditional household types, which also have relatively-low incomes, non-western groups have a relatively-weak position on the Amsterdam housing market. The interaction effect of ethnicity, income, and type of arrangement for the division of paid work indicate that existing differences in income level are exacerbated by the way in which families divide their paid work.

Conclusions and Discussion

In this paper we addressed the questions: How does the division of paid work correlate spatially within an urban context and how can we tentatively explain these patterns? Our findings for the Netherlands confirmed that the degree of urbanity correlates with the division of paid work (De Meester et al., 2007). Household models that have a symmetrical division of labour or in which women work more hours than men are found more frequently in urban than in less urban contexts. Conversely, the share of one-and-a-half model households – which has become the dominant model in the Netherlands – decreases with degree of urbanity. Male-breadwinner models are over-represented in urban areas. These patterns are even more clear-cut for Amsterdam.

We looked into the diversity of residential environments within a ‘very strongly urban context’ to identify the spatial relationship between neighbourhood and the division of paid work. We mapped the prevalence of the various household models within Amsterdam. It seems that, although most neighbourhoods accommodate a diversity of household types, different neighbourhoods tend to be particularly attractive for one particular type. This association may indicate that some residential environments within the city of Amsterdam are more attractive than others for different family households. Areas are therefore not ‘suitable’ for families in general, but differentiation between family households may also play a role. This conclusion is in line with previous research (Droogleever Fortuijn, 1993; Karsten, 2007) that showed that different families sort themselves out into various residential environments, not just because of the structural conditions that produce segregation such as income, but also as a result of the complex interwoven relationships of preferences, the structural conditions of housing and the job markets (De Meester & Van Ham, 2009), and objective means in the form of economic capital, which are all negotiated within the household.
In Amsterdam we find three main patterns:

1) Families mainly in non-western groups, predominantly Moroccans and Turks, who work with a traditional division of labour. These families are generally large, have little economic and social capital, might sometimes suffer discrimination on the housing market, and are therefore often particularly limited in their residential choice. As the result of their choices with respect to both the division of labour and their relatively weak socioeconomic position they gravitate geographically into the large clusters of social housing in the western part of the city and the urban renewal areas of the 1980s in the northern and eastern parts (Musterd and Ostendorf, 2003). These areas are also the only parts of the city where the social sector offers spacious dwellings that can accommodate these often large families. To some extent their residential choices, although limited, may also be related to the relatively-easy access to low-skilled jobs in the western docklands or at the international airport, which are both situated at the western side of the city.

2) Families who follow the most common Dutch trend of the man working full-time and the woman working part-time seem to be particularly oriented in the most suburban parts of the city. Most of those families are native Dutch and seem to have quite traditional familist ideals (Bell, 1968). Most of the homes are owner occupied, have a garden, and offer easy parking space. Their incomes are such that they can afford to buy homes within the city of Amsterdam, which are much more expensive than the same type of housing in truly suburban municipalities in the metropolitan region. Apparently these families are in some way more strongly connected to Amsterdam because of their work, social networks or otherwise. They may be in search of ‘compromise milieus’ (Lupi, 2008) that constitute a suburban environment within the city (Brun and Fagnani, 1994).

3) A third category consists of symmetrical, sometimes gender-breaking households. Many of these families belong to the upper-middle-class groups that are increasingly populating the city (Boterman et al., 2010). It seems that the families in which both partners work full-time in particular tend to inhabit the traditional upper-middle-class areas in the city; while families with symmetrical part-time jobs, in which the parents have good qualifications but less economic capital than the dual full-timers, reside relatively often in neighbourhoods that are socially and physically upgrading. These households may have been described elsewhere as family gentrifiers (Karsten, 2003). They may exemplify the households who seek the time-space advantages of a particular rich opportunity structure (Jarvis 2005, De Meester 2007) that they find in the more centrally-located parts of the city.
We argued that the distribution of households over different neighbourhoods, the effect of these neighbourhoods on households, and the interrelationship of these effects constitute a Gordian knot that is difficult to untie. We have not run any multivariate analyses that could show that this distribution is related to residential environment rather than just a fortuitous composition of population in terms of class, age, and ethnicity. Nonetheless, mapping the various household models for neighbourhoods in Amsterdam has suggested that there might be a causal relationship between residential environment and arrangements for paid work within Amsterdam. Our current data cannot support this claim fully as yet, but we feel that it could be hypothesised that families tend to be sorted out geographically according to division of paid work.

In future research it would be necessary to address the limitations that have only been touched on in this paper. The agenda for future research should include at least three different strains: longitudinal research to analyse the trends in what types of family are settling in what areas. This strategy would resolve some of the problems associated with selection effects. Multivariate analyses could be carried out in order to identify some independent effects and disentangle some of the overlapping and intertwined relationships. It should, however, be noted that multivariate models should not lose sight of the fact that nearly all relationships in this matter are mutually informing. Finally, qualitative research should be carried out to investigate further the complexity of those relationships and provide a better understanding of the way in which parents manage to balance work and family in various residential environments and how their residential choices are related to this balance.
Box 2: Division of Labour of Middle-Class Families

In the preceding chapter the spatial concentrations of various arrangements of division of labour within two-parent family households were based on register data on Amsterdam. There it was shown that division of paid work are geographically sorted out. In cities in general the share of non-traditional divisions of labour are more common, but also within the city of Amsterdam divisions of labour correlate spatially. In this box some extra analyses are presented that show the divisions of labour of the urban middle-class households of the sample made for this dissertation and how these arrangements changed when these couples became parents.

Figure 3b.1 shows the division of labour of couples in 2008, before they became parents: a majority of the couples works both full-time; a much smaller group has a one and a half arrangement; and only a very small group has divided their labour in a traditional male-breadwinner manner.

During the second wave, the division of labour had been altered significantly. Most dual full-time couples has chosen a different way in which they divide their paid work, resulting particularly in a growth in the number of symmetrical part-time workers. The patterns are quite different from those in Amsterdam in general. This is most probably related to the selection of the respondents, who are all higher educated and earn above-modal incomes. In Figure 3b.2 it is specified how women and men individually changed their working hours when they became parents.

**Figure 3b.1. Division of labour of cohabiting couples 2008-2010, (n=198)**

Source: source: own data.
From Figure 3b.2 becomes clear that although a substantial group of men (45%) reduced the number of working hours, women are more affected by the transition to parenthood than men. Of the new mothers, 40% works more than one full working day less and another 25% reduced the number of hours with one day or less. For only a small group, both men and women, the transition to parenthood was associated with an increase in the number of working hours.

Figure 3b.3 shows how the division of child-care is organized. As becomes clear from that figure, a large majority of women tend to take at least one day off to be with the children. About 40% of all fathers have one day with the children, but very few have more than one day. Although grandparental care in the Netherlands is rather common (De Meester, 2010), the respondents rely only limitedly on their family for care. Most parents in this study use formal, paid day-care. It is most common to have children in formal daycare for three days a week. To rely completely on formal daycare is quite exceptional: only 2% has their children five days at a kinderdagverblijf.

**Figure 3b.2. Change in hours worked 2008-2010, (n=198)**

Source: source: own data.
Figure 3B.3. Child care weekdays, (n=198)

Source: own data.