



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Are part-time and full-time jobs really so different? Explaining women's working time from family, housework, individual and work characteristics.

Tijdens, K.G.

Publication date

1997

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

Time allocation and gender. The relationship between paid labour and household labour.

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Tijdens, K. G. (1997). Are part-time and full-time jobs really so different? Explaining women's working time from family, housework, individual and work characteristics. In A. van Doorne-Huiskes, K. G. Tijdens, & T. M. Willemsen (Eds.), *Time allocation and gender. The relationship between paid labour and household labour*. (pp. 171-188). Tilburg University Press.

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

10 Are part-time and full-time jobs really so different? Explaining women's working time from family, housework, individual and work characteristics

Kea Tijdens

10.1 INTRODUCTION

Part-time jobs are strongly associated with female labour. In the European Union, four out of five part-timers are women, and the majority of these women perform part-time work because of their domestic responsibilities (McRae, 1995; Hakim, 1996). Part-time work is increasing. In the ten oldest EU countries the share of part-timers in the female labour force grew from 27% in 1983 to 31% in 1991 (Plantenga, 1995).

Part-time work is said to cause a segmentation in the female labour force, because it is associated with job insecurity, awkward working hours, and restrictions on movement to full-time work (Meulders et al, 1991). It has been argued that segregation processes differ between the full-time and the part-time segments in the female labour force, resulting in higher levels of segregation in part-time employment (Hakim, 1993). In general, part-time work would reinforce women's disadvantaged position at work. Some of these issues have been questioned by Fagan and Rubery (1996). For the Netherlands, the dichotomy between part-timers and full-timers will be questioned in this paper.

The key issue here is the nature of part-time employment. Are part-time jobs a management imperative or are they created because women request reductions in their working hours in order to cope with their domestic responsibilities? McRae (1995) distinguishes between a corporate strategy where employers introduce part-time work for economic or organisational reasons and an individual strategy, where they agree to accommodate the requests of individual workers who prefer reduced working hours. Establishments that follow a corporate strategy are very likely to recruit part-timers on the external labour market, whereas establishments that follow the individual strategy are likely to employ former full-time employees in part-time jobs. A survey in eight countries of the European Union shows that part-time jobs are introduced because of management needs (41%), employees' wishes (36%), or both reasons of equal importance (22%) (Delsen, 1995).

The Netherlands is well-known for the highest part-time rate among female workers in the European Union (OECD, 1994). This has been steadily increasing since the late 1970s. In 1995, almost three out of every five working women worked between 12 to 34 hours a week (58%), whereas in 1988 this percentage was 50%. It is less well-known that in the Netherlands full-time and part-time jobs hardly differ in terms of pay levels and working conditions (Plantenga and Van Velzen, 1993). Their findings will be supported in this article.

By stressing the dichotomy between full-time and part-time work the dispersion of working hours in the female work force slowed down. This article aims to explain women's working hours from family, housework, individual and work characteristics. Section 2 sketches briefly the development of part-time work during the 1980s and 1990s. Previous studies are reviewed in section 3. In section 4, four models of factors which may explain women's working time are discussed, covering both supply and demand characteristics. Research methodology and data are provided in section 5. In section 6 the descriptive statistics are presented. Section 7 contains the results of regression analyses explaining women's working time as well as the results of logistic regressions which are used to predict who is working in short, medium-sized, and long part-time jobs and who is working full-time. Conclusions are drawn in section 8.

10.2 PART-TIME WORK IN THE NETHERLANDS

During the post-war period women were supposed to contribute to the rebuilding of society by setting up a family, and many of them did, as the baby boom in the late 1940s and early 1950s shows (this section is based on Bernasco, 1994; Tijdens, 1995). The vast majority of women left the labour market on the day of their marriage to become full-time, permanent housewives. The breadwinner system was set up in industrial relations, in wage policies as well as in general attitudes towards gender roles; male workers were supposed to earn the family wage. By the 1950s, the breadwinner system had become the dominant pattern. Yet, in the 1960s, the very rapid growth of the manufacturing and service sectors generated an increasing demand for labour in the female-dominated occupations. To overcome labour shortage, employers recruited housewives with grown children for part-time work, though married women's participation stayed below 10%. By the 1970s women's labour supply behaviour had changed. Increasingly, women preferred to remain in the labour market until they gave birth to their first child. These women mostly had changed their full-time job into a part-time job, in order to have time for household duties.

At the turn of the 1970s, women who gave birth increasingly preferred to continue working on condition that their working hours would be reduced. There may be three reasons for this. Firstly, high unemployment levels at the time reduced women's chances of re-entering the workforce with a comparable job.

Secondly, an increasing share of the female work force performed skilled jobs. Thus, the opportunity costs of a homemaker career increased. Thirdly, periods away from the labour force would cause loss of skills and thus depreciation of human capital, which would depress women's wage levels at re-entry. In growing numbers female workers succeeded in requesting employers to reduce working hours. Childcare was realised, but only informally. It was not until the late 1980s that political pressure led to the establishment of day-care centres.

In the 1970s and 1980s, growing numbers of housewives with grown children desired to re-enter the labour force. These women preferred part-time jobs over full-time jobs for three reasons. Firstly, in general, breadwinners' wages were sufficient for family needs, although from the late 1980s the breadwinner system has been under pressure. Secondly, the absence of extended families, a highly cultivated motherhood culture, insufficient childcare facilities for children over 4 years, and the absence of domestic help influenced women's preferences to work part-time instead of full-time. Thirdly, part-time jobs became increasingly available.

Increasingly, employers have adapted to women's requests for reduced working hours, and the majority of these women remained in the job they already had (Tijdens, 1997a, 1997b). In the early 1980s, some employers allowed a reduction in the individual's working time as their main strategy against union demands for a shorter working week. Then, increasingly, employers preferred skilled female employees to remain working part-time rather than not working at all because of their investments in women's training and qualifications. From the late 1980s, employers were pressed by the unions who in turn came under pressure from their own women's groups. In collective bargaining agreements were increasingly reached on the principle of reducing individual working hours when requested. In the early 1990s, some categories of employers were eager to bring staffing levels in line with the supply of work; part-time jobs fitted this strategy perfectly. Yet nowadays, particularly in health care and education, the number of part-timers has grown so much that the organisational span of control limits further growth in part-time work. Finally, to fight unemployment, government put pressure on employers to create part-time jobs. Nowadays, the dominant strategy of Dutch working women wanting to have a baby is the part-time strategy: three out of four prefer to continue their job, but the vast majority of them only want to continue if they can reduce working hours, usually by half (Tijdens et al., 1994). Furthermore, women who received reduced hours before are now requesting an expansion in working hours.

Thus, part-time jobs are decreasingly introduced because of an employment strategy and employees' wishes. For example, in the banking sector because of part-time work was predominantly key-entry, whereas nowadays it can be found in nearly all jobs. Among the employees asking for reduced hours, skilled women are over represented. Nowadays, part-time jobs are no longer the margin-

alised jobs they once were, nor is part-time work increasing predominantly in low-paid and low-status female-dominated occupations. Indeed, the evidence shows the contrary. Part-time work enables lifetime employment with the same employer and thus to tenure benefits. If women are in a disadvantaged position because of domestic responsibilities, part-time work reduces the need to seek a new job after a spell out of the labour market. For the female work force, hourly wages and job security hardly differ between part-timers and full-timers, although between sectors some differences may be found.

The acceptance of the reduction of working hours did not happen simultaneously in all industries and occupations. Part-time work was accepted in health care and education at a very early stage, whereas in the manufacturing industry and in secretarial work it was accepted later. The latter is perhaps best explained by managers' strong preferences for their secretary to be present full-time. Therefore, we expect variation in women's working hours between sectors and occupations.

10.3 EXPLAINING WOMEN'S WORKING TIME IN PREVIOUS STUDIES

Reviewing the literature on working hours results in the conclusion that many studies present descriptive statistics based on labour force surveys. Some describe developments over time, for example concerning part-time work or statutory working hours, others present recent cross-sectional data. Few studies focus on instantaneous time use, i.e. hours during the day (Hamermesh, 1996).

In the literature that aims to explain women's working hours, economic models are used to explain households' working time based on wage rates, leisure time and non-market time, whereas empirical findings explain women's working time from household-related characteristics. Research has clearly established that women's weekly working hours are negatively related to the presence of young children, according to Hamermesh (1996). For the US, Shelton (1992) finds that marital status has a negative impact on women's working time, and so has the number of children and the presence of children aged 0 to 4. Furthermore, a curvilinear relationship exists between age and working time: up to a certain age working time decreases with age, from that point it increases with age. Women's education had a positive impact on working time.

As part-time rates vary substantially between the EU countries, it is assumed that the variables influencing women's working also hours do. We will focus on Dutch studies. Henkens et al. (1994) based their findings on several large, cross-sectional housing-need studies. Weekly working hours were influenced negatively by the number of children present in the household. Furthermore, the younger the children, the fewer hours of paid work. Other effects were measured as well, but the findings varied slightly between the years studied. Neither wage rate nor the net remaining household income had the same effects in all studies.

They differed for example between married and cohabiting women, leading to the conclusion that cohabiting female employees behave with more economic independence than their married female counterparts. Furthermore, the impact of age was not the same. A study by Bernasco (1993), based on working history data, found a high possibility of working-hour reduction in households with at least one child under five and a high possibility of working-hour increase if the youngest child is over five. For Belgium, Henkens et al. (1992) found the number of children had a negative influence on married women's working time, but the children's age did not influence working time. Women's wage rates also had a negative impact on their working time, whereas the remaining household income had no impact.

To conclude, the empirical findings show that women's working time might be influenced by different variables. Yet, the impact of the number of children is negative in all analyses and so is the impact of young children. The impact of women's wage rates varies between studies. Some findings indicate a negative influence, some show a positive, and others reveal no influence at all. Work characteristics such as sector or occupation are not used to explain individual working time, which is surprising considering it is so important in the discussion on the part-time / full-time divide.

10.4 MODEL AND UNDERLYING ASSUMPTIONS

A model with four clusters of explanatory variables will be used to explain women's working hours. It will be discussed here, but first some remarks will be made about a major determining factor, i.e. unpaid household time. The dependent variable is working time. This variable will be defined in section 5.

Household time as such is not considered as an independent variable for two reasons. Firstly, we are not sure whether paid working time depends on unpaid working time; the reverse relationship might also be true. Secondly, in household work, both task performance and task frequency are not set like they are in business; there is neither supervision nor job-related training. This means that household time can vary substantially, depending very much on individual performance criteria. Therefore, instead of household time we will use its indicators, which lie predominantly in the family cycle. By doing so, for each phase in the cycle we assume a given burden of household tasks, which can be relieved by various factors, such as domestic help.

Cluster 1 incorporates the family cycle. The underlying idea is that a woman's paid working time is what remains from the time she needs for her household duties which are assumed to depend upon family cycle. If she cares for a husband or for children, her household duties will increase. If the children grow older, household duties per child will decrease. Therefore, the independent variables in-

clude partner (0=no, 1=yes), number of children and a dummy variable for the presence of a youngest child in a particular age group, i.e. youngest child aged between 0 and 3 (0=no, 1=yes), youngest child aged between 4 and 12 (0=no, 1=yes), no children and youngest child 13 years and over being the reference categories.

Cluster 2 incorporates strategies which may reduce time spent on household work, therefore leaving more time for paid work. In this cluster the independent variables include the help of a cleaning lady (0=no, 1=yes) and substantial help of a partner (0=no, 1=yes, when the husbands' help is 25% or over of the total time spent on household duties). Single women are coded 0 for partners' time spent on household duties. The size and characteristics of the house will influence the time spent on household work, i.e. to clean a ten-room residence takes more time than to clean a one-room apartment. Therefore, it is assumed that women will spend less household time when living in an apartment (0=no, 1=yes). One more variable is taken into account, which we will call a woman's attitude towards household work: it can be assumed that women who have worked continuously perform their household work more efficiently or that they minimise their household work compared to women who have re-entered the labour force. Therefore, we include a variable 'worked continuously' (0=no, 1=yes).

Cluster 3 incorporates the individual characteristics. The underlying idea is that women's working hours also depend upon individual preferences. Here we will consider the independent variables including age (age and age square/100), and the highest grade of formal schooling completed, ranging from 0 to 18 years. Naturally, individual preferences do include the household income. Two independent variables are used. Firstly, has the partner an income which is sufficient for a reasonable standard of living? A variable is used indicating a monthly additional net income of at least NLG 2,000 in the household (0=no, 1=yes). Secondly, a woman's wage rate is assumed to influence working hours. Its impact is not unambiguous. A high wage rate might go along with many working hours, because it might indicate job satisfaction. A low wage rate also might go along with many hours because of financial needs.

Cluster 4 incorporates demand characteristics. It is assumed that employment strategies vary both between sectors and between occupations. The independent variables include dummies for the sectors, i.e. manufacturing industry (0=no, 1=yes), commercial services (0=no, 1=yes), banking and insurance (0=no, 1=yes), the health sector (0=no, 1=yes), with agriculture/building industry/public sector as the reference category. This cluster also includes dummy variables for occupation. In the survey, the occupations have been classified according to the two-digit level of the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO-1968), in which over 80 occupational classes are distinguished. The largest classes for female employment have been clustered into four groups, i.e. nurs-

ing occupations (0=no, 1=yes), clerical workers (0=no, 1=yes), shop assistants and cashiers (0=no, 1=yes), caring and cleaning occupations (0=no, 1=yes), with the remaining occupations as the reference category.

The partners' working time is not incorporated into the model. Of course, it can be argued that the couple's total number of working hours determines their family income and, therefore, the two of them will aim for household equivalence. This argument has been used by economists in household production models (see e.g. Becker, 1979), as well as by the women's movement, arguing that if the male partner would spend less time on paid work, he could spend more time on household work. Yet, several studies have shown that this 'theory of communicating vessels' does not hold (Van der Lippe, 1993). Furthermore, incorporating the partners' working time causes problems because the upper tier of the distribution of working hours is limited by statutory regulations, i.e. about 95% of the male employees have a contractual full-time working week and the remaining 5% work part-time, mainly because they are students. Thus, men's working hours show very little variance. Among the full-time male employees a growing group, mainly in high-level jobs, works more than 40 hours a week, but is not paid overtime. It is assumed that they do so because of high work commitment or because they see the extra working hours as career investments. Finally, women themselves do not consider their partner's working time to be negotiable. If women prefer their partner to work fewer hours, it is not because they themselves wish to work more hours, but because they think their partner works too hard, according to the answers given in the Labour and Care survey used in this article.

10.5 RESEARCH METHOD AND CONCEPTS

For this study, a survey called Labour and Care was conducted. With a random dial technique a random sample was drawn from a very large data base containing telephone numbers provided by Dutch Telecom. Altogether, 6,292 telephone numbers were dialled. In 2,741 cases the interviewers could not get through due to closed numbers, faxes, no reply or because the number was engaged on three occasions. In 3,551 cases the interviewer was able to speak to someone. 35% of the calls found no woman aged 25 to 45 living in the home or a possible respondent was unable to speak Dutch. This left 2,297 telephone calls in the targeted group, of which 38% refused the interview. In the end, 1,420 women aged 25 to 45 were interviewed, of whom two out of three had a job (N=899). This group is used for the analyses. On average, the telephone call lasted around 15 minutes. Additional information about the survey can be found in Tijdens et al. (1994).

The choice of a survey among women aged 25-45 is based on the assumption that this generation, born in the first two decades after World War II, has taken different decisions about withdrawing from and re-entering the labour force, compared to the women who were born one or two generations before. The double-earner family is found more frequently among women aged 25-45, whereas

the single-earner family is mainly to be found among the 45 to 65 age group. Therefore, women aged 25-45 are more likely to develop time saving strategies to combine paid labour and care much more often than older women.

In the survey, detailed questions were posed about household composition, time spent on household duties, domestic help, etc. The working women were questioned about their working hours, overtime, occupation, net monthly income, and why they were satisfied with their actual working time or, if they preferred other working hours, why they were not satisfied. Furthermore, questions were posed about the partners' time allocation pattern, including a partner's help in the household.

There are several problems concerning the measurement of working time. The first problem is that for the weekly working time we have to distinguish between actual working time in the previous week and contractual working time. By asking about actual working time, the employed women, the self-employed women and the co-operating wives can be included in the analyses. By asking about contractual time, only employed persons were able to answer. For this article the contractual time for women workers and the actual time for self-employed and co-operating women were used.

The second problem is that the full-time working week is shifting due to working hour reductions in collective bargaining agreements. For decades the working week was 40 hours with a few exceptions, for example shift work. When the survey was held, a full-time working week could vary between 36 and 40 hours. This makes it difficult to identify who works part-time. Statistics Netherlands uses two definitions. Firstly, full-time or part-time work can be self-defined. Secondly, part-time work is considered less than 35 hours per week, according to contractual working time. In this chapter full-time jobs are defined as jobs of 36 hours or more per week. Long part-time jobs are between 24-35 hours a week, medium-sized part-time jobs are 16-23 hours and short part-time jobs are 16 hours or less.

10.6 DESCRIBING WOMEN'S WORKING TIME

First of all, descriptive findings will be reported, regression results will be presented in section 7. Tables 10.1 and 10.2 show that the number of working hours vary substantially for working women aged 25-45. On average, they work 27 hours per week. Women without a partner and without children work on average 38 hours a week, whereas women with a partner but no children work 34 hours. Women with children under four work only 20 hours, while working hours increase when the youngest children are older. Table 10.2 shows that, compared to the group without children or with adult children, the group with a youngest child under 13 is unlikely to work full-time, whereas they are more likely to work in a

short part-time job. These differences are significant at the 1% level. From these tables, it is indicated that family cycle is important when predicting working hours.

Cluster 2 incorporates strategies that might reduce household time. Four variables are examined. Women with domestic help work on average nearly six hours more than women who perform most of their household duties themselves. Women whose partners perform quite a substantial part of the household duties work on average nearly three more hours than women whose partners do not. Women who live in an apartment work seven more hours compared to women living in a larger house. Women who have worked continuously work on average nine more hours than re-entrant women, who are assumed not to have an efficiency attitude towards household work. Therefore, the results indicate that this group of variables also might have explanatory power.

Cluster 3 incorporates individual preferences: age, education, wage rate and additional income in the family. As expected, age shows a curvilinear relationship to working hours. Nearly half of the women aged 25-29 can be found in the full-time category, whereas women aged 30-34 are over represented in the category of jobs under 15 hours a week. Regarding education, the tables show that the longer the education, the more working hours. This relationship is particularly striking in the category of short part-time jobs. Women with little education are more likely to work more in short part-time jobs, whereas women with medium-term levels of education are over represented in the longer part-time category, and women with most education are more likely to work in full-time jobs. Women who do not have an additional income in the family of at least NLG 2,000 work on average three hours more than women who do have a sufficient additional income in the family. Women's average net hourly wage is NLG 15.13 (s.d. 4.83). From the part-time / full-time segmentation thesis significant wage differentials could be expected. Yet, although the women in the shortest part-time category earn the least on average (NLG 14.84) and the women in the longest part-time category the most (NLG 15.48), the differences are not significant. To conclude, within this cluster we will examine age, age square, education and additional family income for its explanatory power.

Cluster 4 incorporates sector and occupation. Regarding sectoral differences, the average working time does not vary substantially between the sectors, but substantial differences emerge in the distribution over working time categories. In the manufacturing and cleaning industry both the shortest part-time and full-time categories are over represented. The highest share of full-timers is to be found in the banking and insurance sector. In the health sector and in the public service, most women work in the long part-time category. These differences are significant at a 5% level. Turning to the occupational classes, the average working hours differ substantially. In the caring and cleaning occupations women work 18 hours a week, whereas the clerical workers do 28 hours and the miscellaneous group works as many as 29 hours. The caring and cleaning occupations are most

likely to be found in the short part-time category. The clerical workers and the miscellaneous group are found predominantly in the full-time category, working hardly at all in the short part-time jobs. Both the nursing and the teaching occupations can be found predominantly in the longest part-time category. The differences are significant at a 0.1% level. We conclude that sectoral and occupational differences contribute to the explanation of working hours.

Before continuing the statistical results, the reasons given by women to interviewees for their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with current working time will be sketched briefly. Two out of three women were satisfied with their current working time. Working hours do not differ significantly between the satisfied and the dissatisfied women. Although satisfaction does not differ between women with and without children, the reasons given for their satisfaction did differ. Four out of every five satisfied women without children said they were satisfied with their working hours because they matched the income they needed; slightly over half said their actual working time left them sufficient time for household duties. The satisfied women with children gave various reasons. More than nine out of ten women said their current working time left them enough time to care for their children and seven out of ten said that enough time was left for household duties. Only half of them stated their current working time was in accordance with their need for an income. For women without children, the optimal number of working hours for income is the major argument, whereas the major argument for women with children is household time, including childcare.

One out of three women was not satisfied with her current working time, preferring either less or more working hours. Those who prefer more hours on average have a working week of nearly 17 hours, and those who prefer less, work on average 36 hours. It appears that the re-entrant women particularly prefer more working hours, whereas the women without children and the women who have worked continuously, prefer less hours. One can conclude that it is the current variance in working hours that does not satisfy the 25-45 age group. They prefer to work less in short part-time jobs and less in full-time jobs. Women's preferences converge at part-time jobs between 16 and 35 hours a week.

Table 10.1 Average working hours, standard deviation, distribution, F or T-value (N=899)

	Mean	SD	Distribution	F- or T-value
Cluster 1 Family cycle				
No partner, no children	37.6	7.8	9.5%	
Partner, no children	34.3	8.8	24.9%	
Youngest child ≤ 3 year	20.3	13.5	19.4%	
Youngest child 4-12 year	21.5	11.5	30.0%	
Youngest child ≥ 13 year	25.6	12.4	16.2%	74.8***

	Mean	SD	Distribution	F- or T-value
Cluster 2 Reducing household time				
Cleaning lady				
No	25.2	12.7	74.7%	
Yes	31.0	12.5	25.3%	-6.0***
Partner's help > 25%				
No	25.6	13.7	59.7%	
Yes	28.2	11.4	40.3%	-3.0**
Living in an apartment				
No	25.9	12.9	89.2%	
Yes	33.2	10.8	10.8%	-5.3***
Continuously worked				
No	20.2	12.2	29.4%	
Yes	29.3	12.2	70.6%	-10.2***
Cluster 3 Individual characteristics				
Age 25-30 year	30.8	11.9	28.1%	
Age 31-35 year	24.4	13.5	23.5%	
Age 36-40 year	24.8	13.0	23.9%	
Age 41-45 year	25.9	12.2	24.5%	13.2***
Education				
Low	24.6	13.5	34.3%	
Medium	26.8	12.9	39.9%	
High	29.7	11.3	25.8%	10.4***
Partner's income > NLG 2000				
No	30.0	9.2	6.1%	
Yes	26.4	13.1	93.9%	2.7**
Women's net hourly wages				
1st quartile (\leq NLG 11.99)	26.5	12.1	25%	
2nd quartile (11.99 - 14.53)	28.5	10.5	25%	
3rd quartile(14.53 - 17.44)	27.6	10.0	25%	
4th quartile (\geq 17.44)	27.5	11.1	25%	1.0 ns
Cluster 4 Sector and occupational class				
manufacturing/cleaning services	26.9	12.6	6.5%	
commercial services	28.7	14.7	15.0%	
banking and insurance	28.6	13.1	10.8%	
health sector	25.3	12.1	37.3%	
other sectors	26.6	12.8	30.6%	2.4*
Occupation				
nursing	26.1	11.4	15.7%	
caring/cleaning	17.7	11.4	14.0%	
clerical	28.4	10.6	25.1%	
teaching	26.0	14.2	9.1%	
miscellaneous	29.3	14.2	36.0%	21.5***
All	26.7	12.89	100%	

*** p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05, ns is not significant

*Table 10.2 Distribution over four working time categories in percentages
(N=899)*

	<u>≤15 hrs</u>	<u>16-23 hrs</u>	<u>24-35 hrs</u>	<u>≥36 hrs</u>
Cluster 1 Family cycle				
	Row percentages			
No partner, no children	2	3	21	73
Partner, no children	2	8	38	52
Youngest child ≤ 3 year	34	30	25	11
Youngest child 4-12 year	29	32	26	13
Youngest child ≥ 13 year	20	25	30	26
Cluster 2 Help in the household				
Domestic help				
No	23	22	28	27
Yes	8	20	32	40
Partner's help > 25%				
No	22	23	25	29
Yes	15	19	34	32
Living in an apartment				
No	20	23	29	27
Yes	8	9	27	55
Continuously worked				
No	38	26	22	14
Yes	11	20	32	37
Cluster 3 Individual characteristics				
Age				
Age 25-30 year	12	13	28	47
Age 31-35 year	25	26	27	21
Age 36-40 year	20	27	28	24
Age 41-45 year	21	22	32	26
Education				
Low	27	22	24	27
Medium	20	21	30	29
High	8	22	33	37
Additional income > NLG 2000				
No	9	15	41	35
Yes	20	22	28	30
Women's net hourly wages				
1st quartile (≤ NLG 11.99)	20	25	21	33
2nd quartile (11.99 - 14.53)	12	20	36	32
3rd quartile(14.53 - 17.44)	11	24	36	28
4th quartile (≥ 17.44)	16	22	33	29

	<u>≤ 15 hrs</u>	<u>16-23 hrs</u>	<u>24-35 hrs</u>	<u>≥ 36 hrs</u>
Cluster 4 Sector and occupational class				
manufacturing/cleaning industry	25	17	21	37
trade	18	18	26	38
banking and insurance	18	21	20	41
health sector	21	23	32	23
other sectors	16	23	32	30
Occupation				
nursing	17	22	36	25
caring/cleaning	48	24	18	10
clerical	10	24	31	35
teaching	18	19	36	28
miscellaneous	15	20	27	38
All	19.1%	21.7%	29.0%	30.3%

10.7 EXPLAINING WOMEN'S WORKING TIME

The explanatory power of the model was tested by regression analysis (table 10.3). Not surprisingly, family cycle is dominant in the explanation of the working hours of women aged 25 to 45. This supports the findings reported in the literature review. A partner, the number of children, a youngest child aged 0-3 years, and a youngest child aged 4-12 contribute negatively to women's working hours. A child aged 0-3 years has the largest negative impact: having a young child reduces the working week by more than six hours compared to that of women who do not have a child in this age group; all other things remain equal. In the model the impact of the family cycle on women's working time remains solid.

Cluster 2 includes strategies that might reduce time spent on household work, and therefore leave more time for paid work. Indeed, a domestic help contributes considerably to women's working hours: women with domestic help work six hours more than women who have no help. Partner's help also contributes considerably: by more than three hours. Our assumption on the efficiency attitude of those who stayed in the labour force is supported, because these women work three hours more than re-entrant women; all other things remain equal. The assumption about an apartment rather than a large house reducing household time and thus enabling women to work more hours does not hold in any of the models. However, women are able to reduce their household time by delegating household labour to other persons, i.e. a cleaning lady or the partner, and by developing an efficiency attitude. This conclusion holds for all models.

Cluster 3 incorporates individual characteristics. Surprisingly, neither age/age square nor education contributes to the explanation of working hours, but income does. Having a partner with an additional household income of at least NLG

2,000 contributes substantially to the explanation. Women who do not have an additional family income of this kind work nearly four hours more than women who have.

In cluster 4, an impact was assumed for sectors and occupations, because sectors and occupations would subsequently adapt to suit women's part-time requests in the 1980s and 1990s. However, none of the sectors contribute to the explanation, except one. Women working in the caring and cleaning occupations have a working week which is six hours less than women working in other occupations; all other things remain equal. This is consistent with the descriptive findings. Mean working hours are very low in this occupation and workers are heavily concentrated in the shortest working time category. Altogether this model explains 37% of the variance in working time.

Table 10.3 Non-standardised regression results for women's working hours, four models (t-values in brackets, N=899)

Variable	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Cluster 1 Family cycle				
Partner	-3.50*** (-3.14)	-4.93*** (-4.35)	-4.97*** (-4.32)	-4.78*** (-4.16)
Number of children	-3.76*** (-8.87)	-2.85*** (-6.30)	-2.78*** (-6.08)	-2.49*** (-5.50)
Youngest child ≤ 3 year	-6.56*** (-5.88)	-7.80*** (-7.23)	-7.62*** (-7.02)	-7.96*** (-7.47)
Youngest child 4-12	-4.18*** (-3.88)	-4.41*** (-4.30)	-4.54*** (-4.39)	-4.77*** (-4.70)
Cluster 2 Help in the household				
Domestic help		6.65*** (8.20)	6.78*** (8.31)	6.02** (7.46)
Partner's help > 25%		3.08*** (3.98)	2.78*** (3.56)	2.30** (3.00)
Apartment		.04 (1.21)	.03 (1.03)	.03 (1.19)
Worked continuously		3.49*** (3.77)	3.42*** (3.66)	3.04** (3.32)
Cluster 3 Individual characteristics				
Age			-.03 (-.73)	-.03 (-.95)
Age SQU/100			-.02 (-.61)	-.03 (-.83)
Education			.05 (1.70)	.03 (1.10)
Additional income > 2000			-3.76* (-2.52)	-4.12** (-2.82)

Variable	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Cluster 4 Sector and occupational class				
Manufacturing/cleaning				.05 (1.74)
Trade				.05 (1.66)
Banking and insurance				-.02 (-.57)
Health sector				-.02 (-.80)
Nursing occupations				-.05 (-1.68)
Caring/cleaning occupations				-6.44*** (-6.21)
Clerical occupations				-.03 (-1.22)
Teaching occupations				-0.04 (-1.64)
(Constant)	37.19*** (36.65)	32.13*** (24.59)	35.81*** (18.36)	37.26*** (19.37)
R square	27%	34%	34%	37%

10.8 CONCLUSIONS

Does part-time work divide the female labour force? Do part-time jobs reinforce women's disadvantaged position at work? The Netherlands is known for its high part-time employment rate within the EU. Yet, for this country, the thesis that part-time jobs are marginalised compared to full-time jobs cannot be supported. We found no substantial wage differentials between four working time categories. With one exception, we also did not find any impact of a woman's sectoral or occupational category on her working time. This indicates that women's working time is predominantly introduced because of employees' wishes and not because of management needs. Furthermore, focusing on the full-time / part-time divide distracts from differences within the part-time labour force.

We argued that the female part-time workforce consists of two groups of women. The first group consists of women working in part-time jobs that were created as an employer strategy and are likely to be marginalised, i.e. have lower wages and a disproportionate amount of temporary work. Less well-educated women are likely to be over represented. The second group consists of women working in part-time jobs that used to be full-time, but these women have successfully requested reduction in their working hours due to family responsibilities. Highly skilled women are likely to be over represented in this category. While the former group has been decreasing over the past decades, the latter group has been increasing.

Women's working hours were analysed, based on the Labour and Care survey among 1,420 women aged 25-45. Four explanatory clusters were distinguished, relating to the family cycle, to household time reduction strategies, to individual characteristics and to sectoral and occupational differences. According to our expectations, the major findings are that women's working time relates strongly to the family cycle, the presence of a partner, the number of children, a youngest child aged 0-3 years and a youngest child aged 4-12. Furthermore, working time depends positively on contributions to household work from the partner or a domestic help and on a continuous working career. Working time does not relate to individual characteristics such as age and education, but it depends negatively on a partner's income when this is above the minimum standard of living. Finally, working time does not depend on sector or occupation, with the exception of the caring and cleaning occupations, which are found more often in the shortest part-time category.

In the Netherlands, the part-time and the full-time female labour forces differ substantially regarding characteristics such as family phase and women's household time-reducing strategies. Whereas the full-time workforce consists disproportionately of women in their twenties, the part-time workforce consists disproportionately of women in their thirties and forties. Women in their fifties are found disproportionately among housewives.

When starting a family in the 1990s, well-educated women are more likely to request a reduction in working hours and thus benefit from tenure, whereas low-skilled women are more likely to have a period out of the labour force. They will re-enter the labour market with a part-time job, presumably in a caring or cleaning occupation. Thus, it can be concluded that the well-educated group in the part-time workforce counterbalances the less-educated group. This results in a part-time workforce which is about equal to the full-time work force in terms of work-related characteristics such as wage or employment status.

REFERENCES

- Becker, G. 1981: *A Treatise on the Family*. Cambridge (MA), Harvard University Press.
- Bernasco, W. 1994: *Coupled careers. The effects of Spouse's Resources on Success at Work*. Amsterdam, Thesis Publishers.
- Delsen, L. 1995: *Atypical Employment: an International Perspective. Causes, Consequences and Policy*. Groningen, Wolters-Noordhoff.
- Fagan, C., Rubery J. 1996: *The Saliency of the Part-time Divide in the European Union*. *European Sociological Review*, 12/3, 227-250.
- Hakim, C. 1993: *Segregated and Integrated Occupations: A New Framework for Analysing Social Change*. *European Sociological Review*, 9: 28-314.

- Hakim, C. 1996: *Key Issues in Women's Work*. London, The Athlone Press.
- Hamermesh, D.S. 1996: *Workdays, Workhours and Work Schedules. Evidence for the United States and Germany*. Michigan (Kalamazoo), W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.
- Henkens, C.J.I.M., Siegers, J.J., Meijer, K.A. (1994): *Het arbeidsaanbod van gehuwde vrouwen en ongehuwd samenwonende vrouwen in Nederland: 1981-1989*. Sociaal Maandblad Arbeid, 49/5, p. 289-296.
- Henkens, C.J.I.M., Siegers, J.J., Van den Bosch, K. 1992: Het arbeidsaanbod van gehuwde vrouwen in België en Nederland: een vergelijkende studie. *Tijdschrift voor Arbeidsvraagstukken*, 8/1, p. 56-68.
- Lippe, T. van der 1993: *Arbeidsverdeling tussen mannen en vrouwen*. Amsterdam, Thesis Publishers.
- McRae, S. 1995: *Part-Time Work in the European Union: The Gender Dimension*. Dublin, European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions.
- OECD 1994: *Employment Outlook*. Paris, Organisation for economic co-operation and development.
- Plantenga J., Velzen S. van 1993: *Wage determination and sex segregation in employment: The case of the Netherlands*. Report for the Network of Experts on the Situation of Women in the Labour Market in Manchester.
- Plantenga J. 1995: Labour-Market Participation of Women in the European Union. In Jacques van Hoof & Anneke van Doorne-Huiskes (eds.): *Women on the European labour market*. London, Paul Chapman Publishing, pp. 1-14.
- Rubery, J., Fagan C. 1995: Comparative industrial relations research: towards reversing the gender bias. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 33: 209-236.
- Shelton, B.A. 1992: *Women, Men and Time. Gender Differences in Paid Work, Housework and Leisure*. Westport, Greenwood Press.
- Tijdens, K.G., Maassen van den Brink, H., Groot, W., Noom, M. 1994: *Arbeid en zorg. Effecten van strategieën van de combinatie van betaalde en onbetaalde arbeid*. The Hague, *Organisatie voor Strategisch Arbeidsmarktbeleid*, W-124, 132 p.
- Tijdens, K.G. 1995: Verdwijnt de huisvrouw? *Sociaal Maandblad Arbeid*, 50, (3), 161-170.
- Tijdens, K.G. 1997a: Allocation of jobs: personnel policies and women's paid working hours in banks. Forthcoming in Tijdens, K.G., A. van Doorne-Huiskes & T.M. Willemsen (eds.) *Time Allocation and Gender. The Relationship between Paid Labour and Household Labour*. Tilburg, Tilburg University Press
- Tijdens, K.G. 1997b: Gender and labour market flexibility. Forthcoming in T. Wilthagen (ed.). *Advancing theory in labour law and industrial relations in a global context*. Amsterdam, North Holland, in co-operation with The Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This paper is based on a survey commissioned by the Organisation for Strategic Labour Market Research (OSA), The Hague. The report has been published as OSA working document 124 (Tijdens et al., 1994). The research underlying this particular article was subsidised by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO-grant no. 759-717-603). An earlier draft of the paper was presented at the 1996 WESWA Conference at Utrecht University, The Netherlands.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Kea Tijdens (PhD) is a sociologist and senior research fellow at the Department of Economics, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands. Her recent papers include time allocation in households, gender and employment, and working-time issues in collective bargaining. She has published articles and books on internal labour markets, developments in office technology, occupational segregation, and ageing and careering in banking. Current research topics concern working-time reduction, expansion of opening hours and employers' staffing policies.