Forum for Social Economics

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: www.tandfonline.com/journals/rfse20

For Whom Does One Toil? Time Use Differentials, Social Reproduction, and Occupational Prestige

David M. Fields, Jacqueline Strenio, Odile Mackett & Iris Buder

To cite this article: David M. Fields, Jacqueline Strenio, Odile Mackett & Iris Buder (25 Aug 2024): For Whom Does One Toil? Time Use Differentials, Social Reproduction, and Occupational Prestige, Forum for Social Economics, DOI: 10.1080/07360932.2024.2394459

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/07360932.2024.2394459

Published online: 25 Aug 2024.

FORUM FOR SOCIAL ECONOMICS
https://doi.org/10.1080/07360932.2024.2394459

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

RESEARCH ARTICLE

For Whom Does One Toil? Time Use Differentials, Social Reproduction, and Occupational Prestige

David M. Fields[a], Jacqueline Strenio[b], Odile Mackett[c] and Iris Buder[d]

[a]Utah Department of Commerce, Salt Lake City, UT, USA; [b]School of Business, Norwich University, Northfield, VT, USA; [c]School of Governance, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa; [d]Idaho State University, Pocatello, ID, USA

ABSTRACT

Social reproduction theory builds upon Marxist theories that center on the extent to which labor power is the source of capital's growth through the exploitation of the working class, providing a unique lens for analyzing how labor power differences may contribute to structural inequity. While research has shown that women and girls are primarily responsible for the majority of unpaid reproductive labor, little research has considered how time spent in unpaid work may also vary by social class position. We utilize nationally representative data from the American Time Use Survey to estimate time use differentials across occupational prestige deciles, separately by gender, to address this question. We find that higher occupational prestige is significantly associated with less time spent on unpaid household labor for women, but not for men. Our results highlight the complex nature of unpaid reproductive work under capitalism, emphasizing the importance of considering social class positions when examining inequities in the unpaid work burden.

KEYWORDS: Social reproduction, occupational prestige, time use, intersectionality, social class
JEL CODES: J16, J22, B54

1. Introduction

Common measures of national production, such as gross domestic product (GDP), miss a key component of social provisioning by excluding the value of household production. Unpaid household labor (i.e. housework or unpaid care work) is a critical economic activity, contributing to the well-being of individuals, their families, and society (Ferrant et al., 2014; Stiglitz et al., 2007). In industrialized countries, people spend a significant amount of time on activities such as housework and shopping; roughly half the amount of time they spend in paid employment (Stratton, 2015). Policy-making and economic modeling, on the other hand, often fail to consider the allocation of time, especially time spent in unpaid labor, which limits our understanding of economic and social inequalities. How a person can allocate their time shapes individual and societal well-being, in addition to impacting inequalities in employment and economic empowerment (Ferrant et al., 2014). As women and girls,

globally, continue to be disproportionately responsible for unpaid work, a gendered perspective on questions of time use and its implications for employment and economic empowerment are of particular importance.

Women's participation in the labor market has increased significantly in the United States, with 30% of women in heterosexual dual-income marriages reporting being the 'breadwinner' of the family according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). Nevertheless, more women report doing housework compared to men, and the women that do, spend disproportionately more time on housework relative to men. In 2018, the BLS estimated that 84% of women and 69% of men spent some time performing housework on an average day. Women spent an average of 2.6 h per day on housework, while men only spent an average of 2.0 h (BLS, 2019). These inequalities in housework are largely driven by gendered social norms and labor market discrimination, including a gender wage gap (Ferrant et al., 2014; Stratton, 2015). In addition, women often choose to take on paid work in addition to fulfilling their unpaid and reproductive roles (Ferrant et al., 2014), leading to the double burden of work (i.e. the burden associated with unpaid and paid work). Therefore, reducing gender inequalities in time spent on housework is another important means of achieving gender equality apart from making changes to the conditions of paid labor (Ferrant et al., 2014).

While a number of studies, reviewed in the next section, have examined gender inequality in time use allocation, the link between occupational prestige and time use by gender and race/ethnicity remains understudied. Occupational prestige refers to the social standing, or social perception, ascribed to one's occupation, which we proxy for using the Nam-Powers-Boyd (NPB) occupational rankings (Boyd & Nam, 2015). The NPB occupational prestige scores provide a ranking of a worker's occupation on a continual scale (i.e. from lowest to highest) based on the average education level and average income associated with that particular occupation (Boyd & Nam, 2015). The prestige associated with an occupation can also serve as a proxy for social standing and a means of social comparison via prevailing social valuations of rank of economic position. It provides a subjective means of social comparison which cannot be measured through income alone (Buder et al., 2022). Our study extends the literature on time use differentials by exploring the association between occupational prestige and time spent on housework, paying attention to differences by gender, race, and ethnicity.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Social Reproduction Theory and Intersectionality

We use insights from social reproduction theory (SRT) to focus greater attention on analyzing how social status and social class inequalities (i.e. social positioning in the Weberian sense and economic positioning in the Marxist sense) are perpetuated and interpret our results through a SRT lens. By examining what it takes to reproduce human labor-power and positing it as essential to the reproduction of the capitalist mode of production, we argue that SRT brings to light how capitalist social structure and symbolic categories of rank, like occupational prestige, constitute the legitimation of capitalist social stratification (see Klebaner & Montalban, 2020). In this sense, SRT is a helpful lens for highlighting the degree to which social hierarchies within

and beyond the household and social inequalities in the labor market reinforce one another, contributing to the reproduction of uneven social roles and expectations in society.

In Marx's employ, capitalism is socially reproduced at the intersection of unpaid household labor time and commodity production (Munro, 2019). This, nevertheless, overlooks the broader social conditions that constitute the reproduction of labor (Rao & Akram-Lodhi, 2021). How, and by whom, labor is maintained and created is treated not as a mutually exclusive phenomenon, but the outcome of a historically evolving social system, governed by a logic of social competition, that is, a hegemonic coercive force of social struggle, which imposes the logic of capital in the determination of who does what kind of labor (Palermo, 2017). SRT is the unitary framework for assessing these social forces that establish the production of goods and services and their relationship to that which allows for the very maintenance of human life (Bhattacharya, 2017a, p. 3; Blackledge, 2018; Rao & Ramnarain, 2022), that is, the very constitution of capital itself (Bohrer, 2019, pp. 131–135).

Following Bhattacharya (2017b), who recommends that SRT be employed as a methodology to critically explore labor, power, and labor power under capitalism, we operationalize the paradigm as a framework to inform our understanding of power differentials that generate social stratification in the paid labor force, measured using occupational prestige and time spent in unpaid household work. Both paid and unpaid labor time, central for social reproduction, can be examined along three dimensions: the daily maintenance of workers; the reproduction of labor, (for example, giving birth and raising children); and the reproduction of workers as a class, which includes the intergenerational transfer of social attitudes that seemingly naturalize capital-labor social relations (Rao & Akram-Lodhi, 2021). In this sense, the social relations of the reproductive process are doubly mediated; physically, by means of sustained procreation, and socially, which is the social relationship to the means of capitalist production (Gimenez, 2019, pp. 70–72). SRT provides the lens to critically examine the underlying forces in capitalist society that foster social stability among an active labor force, which is a necessary condition for capitalism to be sustained (Engels, 1972; Vogel, 2013). Given the extent to which women's unpaid work constitutes the foundation for the reproduction of human labor power, women's oppression and exploitation are linked to worker exploitation under capitalism.

SRT emphasizes that differently gendered and differently sexed bodies experience social class differently. In this paper, we argue that social inequalities stemming from gender and sex identities, can manifest differently depending on one's social class, which we identify by the relationship between time use in the household and occupational prestige. This acknowledges that social class oppression involves varying amounts of penalty and privilege for different groups of people depending on other forms of social positioning (Lake, 2018). These are the foundational elements of intersectionality theory, that is, the interplay between social positioning—race, class, gender, etc.—and social disadvantage (Al-Faham et al., 2019). Therefore, we combine the SRT approach with a lens of intersectionality that illuminates the heterogeneous characteristics of women. While women may share a common struggle from a perspective of gender identity, they have unique experiences in relation to the intersections of gender with race/ethnicity and class identity. Glenn (1992), for instance, highlights how racial and ethnic minorities in the US have historically occupied a subordinate position relative to White women within the labor market as capitalist

development evolved. She further encourages an alternative approach to theorizing the household of racial and ethnic minorities by considering the subordinate position of disadvantaged men (as compared to White men) in the labor market (Glenn, 1985). In this way, she challenges the notion of the household as a site of conflict for women and the primary responsibility for unpaid housework as exploitative, writing:

> The issue for racial ethnic women was not so much economic equality with husbands, but rather the adequacy of overall family income. Because racial ethnic men earned less, women's wages comprised a larger share of total family income in dual wage-earner families. (Glenn, 1985, p. 103)

She further adds about unpaid work, that '[w]omen do a great deal of the work of keeping the family together and teaching children survival skills. This work is experienced as a form of resistance to oppression rather than as a form of exploitation by men' (Glenn, 1985, p. 103), highlighting the importance of an intersectional approach and re-imagining the household and its bargaining and distribution mechanisms. Some households may be cooperative or conflicting to a greater or lesser degree, but the nature of household bargaining is importantly underpinned and compounded by economic circumstances outside the household.

Our research question is novel in that it acknowledges the interconnection between worker identities and social stratification within the working class by using occupational prestige as a proxy variable. Occupational prestige constitutes a specific source of social inequality based on the ability to make an effective claim to social esteem. It is a multidimensional 'social estimation of honor' (Weber, 1922, p. 932) that captures the expected likelihood that one will show deference to another (Freeland & Hoey, 2018). Categorical sensitivities concerning occupational identity enable mechanisms for in-group/out-group polarizations regarding respect and dignity (Avent-Holt & Tomaskovic-Devey, 2014). The disposition to accept, admire, and rationalize distinctive occupational positions disrupts the ability to foster working class solidarity, since ceremonial employment rewards instill labor rivalry and mutual distrust, thus undermining the capacities to foster social equality (Veblen, 1899). Social comparisons and social standing, which we proxy using occupational prestige, hence, illuminate the degree to which there are disparities in the distribution of social and economic resources (Buder et al., 2022).

2.2. Empirical Evidence on Time Allocation of Housework

While we use SRT and intersectional theory to inform our research on time allocation, economists have used several other models to examine the allocation of time spent in housework, such as the conventional neoclassical model (i.e. the household production function), the economic dependency model (i.e. the feminist model), and the time availability perspective model. In addition, various theories speculate that the earning power of spouses is associated with how they negotiate the allocation of their time, established either through bargaining power, based on an individual's relative earnings, or the opportunity cost of housework, based on an individual's absolute income (Procher et al., 2018). In addition, the allocation of housework may be determined based on social norms regarding 'traditional' gender roles, often

referred to as 'doing gender' (Procher et al., 2018) or a result of hegemonic masculinity (Small, 2023). All three models (i.e. bargaining, feminist, and time availability) focus on interactions between partners and therefore, apply only in multi-person households, implicitly assumed to be heterosexual ones. Our study is novel in that we examine time spent on housework among all workers (i.e. married, partnered, and single) in a representative sample of diverse racial and ethnic identities.

Current research presents conflicting evidence on the role of income on time spent on housework and also highlights the importance of distinguishing between an individual's relative income (i.e. the bargaining approach) and absolute income (i.e. the opportunity cost approach). Studies (e.g. Hersch & Stratton, 1994) demonstrate the importance of bargaining power, finding that women spend more time on housework activities when their male partner's income share was higher relative to their own (Procher et al., 2018). Other studies, however, indicate that it is absolute income (i.e. the opportunity cost) that influences the allocation of time spent on housework. Gupta and Ash (2008), for example, show that women tend to spend fewer hours on housework when their own income increases, regardless of their partner's earnings, as they can find market substitutes for their housework (e.g. cleaning services) to limit the opportunity cost of foregone earnings (Gupta & Ash, 2008; Presser, 1994). In addition to these theories, social norms around gender and gender identity may also influence the division of housework, where partners compensate for role reversals observed in the labor force. This view ascribes that women who contribute more income to the household take on larger shares of housework, while men who contribute less to income spend less time on housework (Procher et al., 2018).

Using German national longitudinal data for the period 1992–2011, Procher et al. (2018) explore the allocation of time spent in housework centered on the three main contributing factors: opportunity costs, bargaining power, and gender identity. They find support for the gender identity perspective, as women in dual-income households continue to bear the brunt of housework. Specifically, they find that female breadwinners conduct more housework relative to women earning equal to or less than their spouse (Procher et al., 2018). In addition to support for the gender identity model, Procher et al. (2018) also find that both relative income (i.e. bargaining power) and absolute income (i.e. opportunity costs) impact household division of labor in Germany. They find that increased bargaining power (i.e. higher relative incomes) among women is associated with a decrease in the time they spend in housework, but an increase in the time men spend in housework. An increase in absolute income is shown to reduce the amount of time spent on housework equally for men and women. Overall, Procher et al. (2018) note that due to the similar effects that income and employment status have on the division of labor within the household, the observed decrease in time spent on housework for women is 'modestly' attributed to increases in women's incomes. These results are similar to those found in the United States. For example, Bertrand et al. (2015) find that in opposite-sex households, when women earn more than their partners, the gender gap in housework is larger than among couples with more even earnings. A more recent study finds that among women with children in the US, when a woman's salary surpassed that of her husband, there was an increase in the time she spent on housework. However, men decreased time spent in housework when their wives' salaries were

higher (Syrda, 2023). These findings imply that women's higher income alone may not be the great equalizer in the allocation of housework.

Our study is also informed by the work of Deutsch et al. (1993) who analyze the impact of relative economic resources (i.e. income, occupational prestige, and education) on the allocation of childcare and housework, among a small longitudinal sample of couples. Their findings suggest that the division of housework stems from power struggles due to a husbands' higher income (i.e. greater resources). However, when husbands had higher levels of education or occupational prestige relative to their wives, men were not 'exempt' from their housework responsibilities. Of note, their findings show that the higher women's occupational prestige the more time the wife spent on housework, relative to her husband (Deutsch et al., 1993). Their results, however, lack generalizability as their sample was almost exclusively White.

Using Panel Study of Income Dynamic (PSID) data from the US, Small (2023) finds that women and men in the highest income groups report the smallest amount of housework hours. However, the work here also highlights the importance of disaggregating analyses of housework by race and income. For example, Small finds an overall gender gap in housework hours between opposite sex couples (where women do more housework than their partners) that increases by a significant amount when the woman out-earns her male partner. However, when disaggregated by race and income tercile, the result is strongest among high- and middle-income couples with White men. Among low-income couples with White men and most couples with Black men, no similar evidence of an increased gender gap in housework exists. The limitation of this analysis is that it focuses on nuclear-type households or households formed by heterosexual couples that does not allow for an interrogation of how individuals in alternative household structures (e.g. extended households and single-parent households) spend their time.

3. Methods & Methodology

3.1. Data

The pooled cross-sectional data we use for this study come from the nationally representative American Time Use Survey (ATUS) for years 2003–2019, which provides information on how individuals allocate their time (Hofferth et al., 2020). Each survey respondent is randomly selected from households that are participating in the Current Population Survey (CPS). Throughout this analysis, we refer to 'housework' as household labor which is defined as 'unpaid work done to maintain family members and/or a home' (Shelton & John, 1996, p. 300).

Individuals are asked to provide information with regards to their allocation of time over a designated 24-h period (i.e. a diary day) along with providing information on various demographic and economic characteristics (Hofferth et al., 2020). To account for differences in the allocation of time spent on activities by days of the week, the ATUS diary days are distributed accordingly: 50% of the diary days come from weekdays (each weekday accounting for 10% of the diary days) and 50% of the diary days come from weekends (with Saturdays and Sundays each providing 25% of the diary days). Over half of the surveys conducted (55%) complete a usable interview (Hofferth et al., 2020).

We restrict our analyses to those in the working age population (between the ages of 18–64) and those who were actively employed, as measured by their labor force status. While it is possible that individuals could have more than one job, an individual's occupational prestige score is based on their main occupation. To avoid any potential outliers, we limit minutes spent on housework to within three standard deviations of the mean (i.e. less than or equal to 515 min per day). After imposing these restrictions and dropping observations with missing data, the resultant sample size for our analysis is 107,587 workers.

3.2. Variables

Household labor is an aggregate measure of time spent on housework-related activities, which is measured on a continuous scale and has classically been defined as domestic production that could be performed by a third person for pay (Reid, 1934). Specifically, we assess unpaid household labor time (measured in minutes) spent in the following activities: interior housework (including interior cleaning, laundry, sewing, repairing and maintaining textiles, and storing interior household items, including food); food and drink preparation (which includes presentation, kitchen and food clean-up); interior maintenance, repair, and decoration (which includes interior arrangement, building and repairing furniture, heating and cooling); exterior maintenance, repair, and decoration (which includes exterior cleaning); household management (which includes financial management, household and personal organization and planning, household and personal mail and messages, household security, and household and personal email); and time spent taking care of children. All of these variables include travel time related to these activities.

In addition, we control for relevant demographic and socioeconomic factors and include certain restrictions. Occupational prestige rankings are based on the Nam-Powers-Boyd (NPB) occupational status score, which measures prestige on a continuous scale from 1 to 100, with 1 associated with the lowest prestige ranking and 100 the highest prestige ranking. For example, those that are employed in paid social reproductive work (e.g. nannies or domestic workers) generally have low occupational prestige scores (Jennings et al., 2022). We present a selection of occupations ranked by NPB scores in Table 1, highlighting that some of the lowest ranked occupations in the NPB ranking system used in this paper include housekeeping cleaners (NPB score of 6), food preparation workers (NPB score of 13), and childcare workers (NPB score of 21) (Boyd & Nam, 2015). In addition to utilizing prestige rankings as a continuous measure, we analyze outcomes by prestige deciles which enables us to compare time use for those in different deciles.

We also control for age using a categorical variable for those between the ages of 18–34 (reference), 35–49, and 50–64. We categorize worker race and ethnicity as one of the following: White non-Hispanic (reference), Black non-Hispanic, Asian non-Hispanic, and Hispanic. ATUS asks respondents to indicate their sex rather than gender identity, so we categorize sex as female or male and use the terms 'sex,' 'male,' and 'female' in our results section to reflect that. However, in our discussion we use gendered language as we are discussing the social constructs that influence unpaid work time rather than biological differences. We control for educational attainment using categorical variables for less than high school (reference), high school or equivalent, some college, and having obtained a college degree. We also

Table 1. Examples of occupational titles and Nam-Powers-Boyd score, ranked from lowest (least prestigious) to highest (most prestigious).

Occupational title	Nam-Powers-Boyd score
Housekeeping cleaners	6
Food preparation workers	13
Childcare workers	21
Retail salespersons	34
Tax preparers	45
Preschool and kindergarten teachers	50
Writers and authors	74
Social workers	77
Economists	98
Physicians and surgeons	100

Note: Source: Boyd and Nam (2015). A full list of occupations and scores is available at www.nps-ses.info.

control for household composition factors such household size (i.e. number of people in the household) and age of youngest child present in the household, where age groupings were categorized as follows: child between the ages of 0–5, child between the ages of 6–17, and no children (reference). We categorize marital status as spouse present (reference), unmarried partner present, or no spouse/unmarried partner present. We proxy for family wealth using a binary variable for household tenure, categorized as either owned by a household member or rented for cash/occupied without payment of cash rent (reference). Lastly, we control for the survey year, whether the diary day came from a weekend or not, and whether the diary day was conducted on a holiday or not.

3.3. Statistical Analysis

We utilize a standard housework framework but give due cognizance to the role that social norms regarding gender play in the allocation of time spent in housework through the incorporation of occupational prestige. Occupational prestige rankings, which facilitate social class compositions of privilege and disadvantage (Grönlund & Magnusson, 2013; García-Mainar et al., 2018; Valentino, 2020) are rooted in social processes associated with the organization of the household division of labor (Gimenez, 2019, p. 252). In this sense, observed systemic differences of employment prestige, which have wide-ranging implications with regards to wealth and income inequalities, are socially reproduced by a seemingly perennial source of household conflict, that is, household work. As such, our model is as follows, estimated separately for female workers and male workers:

(1) *household labor = f(age, household size, income, education, marital status, age of youngest child, occupational prestige, race/ethnicity, day of week, holiday, household tenure, year)*

We analyze occupational prestige deciles throughout this study as a means of analyzing groupings (i.e. class structures). Workers in decile 1 are those at the bottom of the occupational prestige hierarchy, workers in decile 5 are in the mid-tier of the prestige hierarchy, and those in decile 10 are in the highest occupational prestige hierarchy group. We conduct regression analyses utilizing ordinary least squares (OLS). First, we conduct separate regression analyses for female workers and male workers to assess the impact of occupational prestige rankings (through comparison of deciles) on minutes spent on housework by sex (Table 2). Next, we

analyze the impact of occupational prestige rankings by race/ethnicity and sex by running separate regressions for each race/ethnicity category for female workers (Table 3) and male workers (Table 4). We utilize appropriate ATUS survey weights in all analyses to adjust for oversampling of minority group members and weekend day diaries.[1]

4. Results

4.1. Descriptive Statistics

We present weighted descriptive statistics in Table 5. The majority of our sample is classified as male (54%) and White (68%), with Black workers, Asian workers, and Hispanic workers representing approximately 11%, 4% and 16% of the sample population, respectively. More than half of the sample population has a spouse present (56%), 38% have no spouse or unmarried partner present, and 6% have an unmarried partner present. The majority of the population owns their home (72%) and lives in a metropolitan area (85%). Thirty-sex percent of the sample has a college degree and 37% is between the ages of 18–34. Over half of the sample does not have any children (57%) while 18% of the sample's youngest child is between the ages of 0—5 years and 25% of the sample's youngest child is between the ages of 6—17 years. The average household size is 3.10 individuals, and the average occupational prestige ranking is 54.36. In addition, individuals spend, on average, approximately 88 min per day on housework. Lastly, 28% conducted their diary day on a weekend and less than 2% conducted their diary day on a holiday.

While we do not find significant differences in mean occupational prestige scores by sex, we do observe several differences regarding the distribution of occupational prestige deciles by race/ethnicity and by sex within racial/ethnic groupings (Table 6). Overall, we find that Hispanic and Black workers are disproportionately represented in lower occupational prestige deciles (i.e. Deciles 1–3). Among the Hispanic worker population, 24% of the sample occupy occupations in the lowest decile, 19% in decile 2, and 10.5% in decile 3. Among Black individuals, these values correspond to 14%, 13.81%, and 13.64%, respectively. Black and Hispanic workers are thus over-represented in the lower deciles, with more than 50% of Black individuals and 65% of Hispanic individuals located in the lowest four deciles. White workers are more evenly distributed across the occupational prestige hierarchy, though lower representation is found among those in the lowest decile and moderately higher is represented in the mid-ranked occupational prestige hierarchy. Asian workers have a lower proportion of individuals who are in the lower deciles and a higher representation among those in the upper deciles. In fact, among Asian workers, one fifth fall within the top decile of occupational prestige.

When analyzing the occupational prestige decile distribution by race/ethnicity *and* sex, we observe some noticeable differences. First, Asian males are more likely

[1]Given the bounded nature of the dependent variable, Tobit analyses were conducted; given the similarity in results to the OLS estimates, OLS estimates are presented. All analyses were conducted utilizing Stata/MP 15.1. Throughout, condition indices and variance inflation factors indicate no signs of multicollinearity throughout the analyses.

Table 2. Separate weighted ordinary least squares (OLS) by sex on total housework.

	Females only	Males only
	Coefficient (standard error)	Coefficient (standard error)
Intercept	84.49***	26.82**
	(3.96)	(2.81)
Black non-Hispanic	−19.73***	−13.50***
	(1.68)	(1.42)
Asian non-Hispanic	8.30***	−4.93***
	(3.15)	(2.23)
Hispanic	0.98	−12.05***
	(2.02)	(1.35)
Unmarried partner present	−16.46***	−1.55
	(2.71)	(2.19)
No spouse/unmarried partner	−35.30***	−8.52***
	(1.49)	(1.25)
Ages 35–49	23.95***	12.76***
	(1.52)	(1.16)
Age 50–64	28.10***	7.63***
	(1.72)	(1.37)
Tenure	−3.59***	3.39***
	(1.48)	(1.09)
Household size	−0.29	−2.84***
	(0.85)	(0.48)
Metropolitan area	−0.27	4.08***
	(1.65)	(1.29)
Youngest child (0–5)	114.17***	70.26***
	(2.50)	(1.84)
Youngest child (6–17)	54.31***	26.03***
	(2.16)	(1.51)
Holiday	43.11***	26.59***
	(6.21)	(4.95)
Weekend	34.66***	32.93***
	(1.19)	(0.94)
Decile 2	0.09	4.78***
	(2.89)	(2.16)
Decile 3	−4.71*	5.83***
	(2.84)	(2.43)
Decile 4	−4.69	1.81
	(3.04)	(2.20)
Decile 5	−2.73	7.73***
	(2.90)	(2.47)
Decile 6	−6.34***	4.63**
	(2.95)	(2.29)
Decile 7	−11.84***	8.44***
	(2.62)	(2.18)
Decile 8	−6.68***	15.31***
	(2.58)	(2.43)
Decile 9	−13.26***	12.12***
	(2.61)	(2.20)
Decile 10	−9.41***	13.73***
	(2.99)	(2.24)
Year	−0.25***	0.49***
	(0.13)	(0.09)
Sample size	**53,885**	**53,702**
R-squared	**0.20**	**0.13**
F-statistic	**105.86**	**219.80**

Note: Coefficients from OLS regression analyses on the outcome variable total daily time spent in housework (minutes), standard errors are reported in parentheses. ***Statistically significant at the 1% level; **Statistically significant at the 5% level; *Statistically significant at the 10% level. Deciles refer to occupational prestige decile with decile 10 being the most prestigious and decile 1 being the least prestigious.

Table 3. Separate weighted OLS regression analyses by race/ethnicity for females by deciles (controlling for all variables; full results available upon request).

	White NH coefficient (Std. Error)	Black NH coefficient (Std. Error)	Asian NH coefficient (Std. Error)	Hispanic coefficient (Std. Error)
Decile 1 (reference)	–	–	–	–
Decile 2	0.68	5.47	−8.01	1.24
	(3.94)	(6.36)	(16.01)	(6.15)
Decile 3	−2.76	4.53	−10.97	−11.87*
	(3.99)	(5.68)	(15.31)	(6.45)
Decile 4	−3.74	9.07	4.91	−10.90
	(3.95)	(6.64)	(18.59)	(8.08)
Decile 5	−0.53	1.78	−23.71	−10.54*
	(3.92)	(5.32)	(13.76)	(6.29)
Decile 6	−3.32	−7.17	−0.45	−25.53***
	(3.96)	(6.49)	(16.09)	(6.93)
Decile 7	−9.26***	−3.78	−7.83	−21.93***
	(3.50)	(5.94)	(13.51)	(6.97)
Decile 8	−5.05	5.55	−18.50	−7.10
	(3.43)	(5.89)	(12.99)	(7.47)
Decile 9	−8.34***	−3.53	−21.06*	−39.26***
	(3.51)	(6.09)	(11.38)	(6.97)
Decile 10	−8.86***	10.14	−2.48	−27.50***
	(3.88)	(7.60)	(12.38)	(9.38)
Control variables	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sample size	**36,318**	**7,856**	**2,014**	**7,121**
R-squared	**0.21**	**0.16**	**0.23**	**0.17**
F-statistic	**105.07**	**48.62**	**23.69**	**48.90**

Note: Coefficients are from OLS regression analyses on the outcome variable total daily time spent in housework (minutes), standard errors are reported in parentheses. ***Statistically significant at the 1% level; **Statistically significant at the 5% level; *Statistically significant at the 10% level. Deciles refer to occupational prestige decile with decile 10 being the most prestigious and decile 1 being the least prestigious. White NH refers to White, non-Hispanic workers, Black NH refers to Black non-Hispanic workers, Asian NH refers to Asian non-Hispanic workers, and Hispanic includes all Hispanic workers regardless of racial identity.

to be in the top occupational prestige deciles than Asian females; 27% of Asian males fall into decile 10 compared to 15% of Asian females. Asian females also have a higher representation in the lower deciles compared to Asian males. Similarly, 12.3% of White males fall into decile 10 while only 6.57% of White females do. We observe similar distributions for Black and Hispanic workers by sex. The data show that Hispanic and Black females are the worst off in terms of their distribution across the occupational deciles. More than 50% of Black females fall into the lowest four deciles while more than 50% of Hispanic females fall into the lowest three deciles. For White and Asian females, these patterns are reversed as more than 50% of White and Asian females are in the top four deciles. For males, the patterns are similar, but more exaggerated for the non-White population. While Black (51%) and Hispanic (68%) male workers are overrepresented in the lowest four deciles, over 50% of Asian male workers are in the top three deciles.

4.2. Regression Analysis

Results from our weighted regression analyses by sex show that female workers, on average, spend significantly more time on housework than their male counterparts (Table 2). We find a few inconsistent signs and differences in magnitudes of the coefficients in the control variables. Specifically, home ownership (i.e. tenure) is

Table 4. Separate weighted OLS regression analyses by race/ethnicity for males by deciles (controlling for all variables; full results available upon request).

	White NH coefficient (Std. Error)	Black NH coefficient (Std. Error)	Asian NH coefficient (Std. Error)	Hispanic coefficient (Std. Error)
Decile 1 (reference)	–	–	–	–
Decile 2	8.00**	−7.59	18.92	4.18
	(3.30)	(4.79)	(16.05)	(3.36)
Decile 3	5.69**	7.76	11.60	3.13
	(3.56)	(5.81)	(13.43)	(4.30)
Decile 4	3.75	−7.58*	10.71	1.61
	(3.28)	(4.56)	(14.32)	(3.93)
Decile 5	9.81**	−3.00	−2.72	8.38*
	(3.48)	(5.91)	(13.15)	(4.83)
Decile 6	5.20	4.90	6.07	5.41
	(3.27)	(6.02)	(14.07)	(4.41)
Decile 7	9.10***	16.17	12.00	8.99**
	(3.12)	(13.88)	(14.90)	(4.51)
Decile 8	16.52***	9.39	5.76	24.24***
	(3.41)	(13.03)	(13.76)	(6.22)
Decile 9	13.63***	10.05	7.14	10.67**
	(3.17)	(12.65)	(13.40)	(4.77)
Decile 10	14.20***	16.95	14.39	17.53***
	(3.20)	(12.73)	(13.56)	(6.82)
Sample size	**37,422**	**5,294**	**2,247**	**8,202**
R-squared	**0.14**	**0.11**	**0.17**	**0.08**
F-statistic	**185.22**	**20.20**	**19.20**	**27.48**

Note: Coefficients are from OLS regression analyses on the outcome variable total daily time spent in housework (minutes), standard errors are reported in parentheses. ***Statistically significant at the 1% level; **Statistically significant at the 5% level; *Statistically significant at the 10% level. Deciles refer to occupational prestige decile with decile 10 being the most prestigious and decile 1 being the least prestigious. White NH refers to White, non-Hispanic workers, Black NH refers to Black non-Hispanic workers, Asian NH refers to Asian non-Hispanic workers, and Hispanic includes all Hispanic workers regardless of racial identity.

negatively correlated with housework for females while it is positively correlated for males. In comparison to White males, Black, Asian, and Hispanic males spend less time on housework. For females, Black females spend less time on housework while Asian females spend more time on housework compared to their White counterparts; no statistical difference in housework is observed between Hispanic and White females. Consistent across sexes, we see that those who are older (compared to their younger counterparts) spend more time on housework, more time is spent on housework on holidays and on weekends, and more time is spent on housework among those who have children present in the household, with greater housework associated with children of younger age for both sexes. In comparison to those who have a partner present, those with no spouse or unmarried partner present spend less time on housework; among females, those with an unmarried partner present spend less time on housework in comparison to their counterparts who have a spouse present.

Occupational prestige is statistically significantly associated with time spent on housework within both the female sample (with the exception of deciles 2, 4, and 5) and male sample (with the exception of decile 4). Among female workers, we find that those in higher prestige deciles spend less time on housework than those in lower prestige deciles. For example, compared to those in the lowest occupational prestige decile, those who are in the top decile spend approximately 9 min less on

Table 5. Weighted descriptive statistics by overall sample, females only, and males only.

Variable	Mean/proportions (standard deviation) Overall sample ($N = 107,587$)	Mean/proportions (standard deviation) Females ($N = 53,885$)	Mean/proportions (standard deviation) Males ($N = 54,200$)
Sex			
Female	46.36% (0.50)	–	–
Male	53.64% (0.50)		
Race/Ethnicity			
White non-Hispanic (reference)	68.22% (0.47)	68.28% (0.47)	68.18% (0.47)
Black non-Hispanic	10.88% (0.31)	12.54% (0.33)	9.45% (0.29)
Asian non-Hispanic	4.32% (0.20)	4.36% (0.21)	4.28% (0.20)
Hispanic	15.49% (0.36)	13.74% (0.34)	17.01% (0.38)
Marital status			
Spouse present (reference)	56.42% (0.50)	53.59% (0.50)	58.86% (0.49)
Unmarried partner present	5.82% (0.23)	5.90% (0.24)	5.76% (0.23)
No spouse or unmarried partner	37.76% (0.48)	40.51% (0.49)	35.38% (0.48)
Education			
Less than high school (reference)	8.55% (0.28)	6.74% (0.25)	10.12% (0.30)
High school	28.06% (0.45)	25.64% (0.44)	30.16% (0.46)
Some college	27.45% (0.45)	29.89% (0.46)	25.34% (0.44)
College degree	35.94% (0.48)	37.74% (0.49)	37.38% (0.49)
Age			
Ages 18–34 (reference)	36.82% (0.48)	36.53% (0.48)	37.07% (0.48)
Age 35–49	35.21% (0.48)	34.60% (0.48)	35.73% (0.48)
Ages 50–64	27.97% (0.45)	28.87% (0.45)	27.19% (0.45)
Household size	2.30 (0.97)	2.26 (0.97)	2.34 (0.97)
Housework (in minutes)	88.45 (107.62)	116.50 (118.07)	64.21 (90.98)
Occupational prestige	54.26 (26.92)	54.36 (26.25)	54.17 (27.51)
Holiday (1 = yes, 0 = no)	1.63% (0.13)	1.64% (0.13)	1.61% (0.13)
Weekend (1 = yes, 0 = no)	27.85% (0.45)	27.93% (0.45)	27.78% (0.45)
Age of youngest child			
No children (reference)	56.91% (0.50)	56.58% (0.50)	57.19% (0.50)
Child aged 0–5 years	18.37% (0.39)	17.34% (0.39)	19.27% (0.40)
Child aged 6–17 years	24.71% (0.43)	26.08% (0.44)	23.54% (0.42)
Household tenure (1 = own, 0 = not)	71.93% (0.45)	72.23% (0.45)	71.67% (0.45)
Metro area (1 = yes, 0 = no)	85.06% (0.36)	85.12% (0.36)	85.01% (0.36)
Occupational prestige deciles			
Decile 1 (lowest decile–reference)	10.91% (0.31)	9.97% (0.30)	10.83% (0.31)
Decile 2	11.31% (0.32)	9.98% (0.30)	12.47% (0.33)
Decile 3	9.37% (0.29)	10.07% (0.30)	8.76% (0.28)
Decile 4	10.09% (0.30)	7.35% (0.26)	12.45% (0.33)
Decile 5	10.28% (0.30)	14.63% (0.35)	6.51% (0.25)
Decile 6	8.29% (0.28)	7.81% (0.27)	8.70% (0.28)
Decile 7	10.77% (0.31)	9.97% (0.30)	11.47% (0.32)
Decile 8	10.24% (0.30)	13.21% (0.34)	7.67% (0.27)
Decile 9	10.17% (0.30)	9.97% (0.30)	10.34% (0.30)
Decile 10 (highest decile)	8.57% (0.28)	6.00% (0.24)	10.80% (0.31)

Note: All estimates have been weighted using ATUS survey weights to adjust for survey design.

housework per day and those who are in the seventh occupational prestige decile spend approximately 11 min less on housework per day. Among male workers, we find that compared to those in the lowest occupational prestige decile, those in the higher deciles spend more time on housework per day. For example, compared to

Table 6. Weighted descriptive statistics by occupational prestige deciles – race/ethnicity & sex.

Overall sample	White NH	Black NH	Asian NH	Hispanic
Decile 1	7.63%	14.43%	7.82%	23.76%
Decile 2	9.49%	13.81%	7.63%	18.57%
Decile 3	8.53%	13.64%	7.50%	10.52%
Decile 4	9.94%	11.60%	4.70%	11.15%
Decile 5	10.89%	9.06%	8.23%	9.04%
Decile 6	8.71%	8.38%	7.76%	6.37%
Decile 7	12.12%	8.38%	9.30%	6.74%
Decile 8	11.44%	9.30%	10.48%	5.76%
Decile 9	11.63%	6.71%	15.17%	4.94%
Decile 10	9.62%	4.70%	21.41%	3.16%
Females only	White NH	Black NH	Asian NH	Hispanic
Decile 1	7.74%	14.36%	9.28%	24.57%
Decile 2	8.95%	11.68%	9.09%	13.99%
Decile 3	8.91%	15.70%	6.25%	11.87%
Decile 4	7.22%	8.43%	4.39%	8.13%
Decile 5	15.52%	12.57%	11.38%	12.87%
Decile 6	8.07%	7.90%	8.15%	6.10%
Decile 7	11.05%	7.78%	8.66%	6.70%
Decile 8	14.72%	11.47%	12.10%	7.82%
Decile 9	11.24%	6.32%	15.31%	5.52%
Decile 10	6.57%	3.80%	15.39%	2.43%
Males only	White NH	Black NH	Asian NH	Hispanic
Decile 1	7.53%	14.50%	6.50%	23.18%
Decile 2	9.96%	16.27%	6.32%	21.81%
Decile 3	8.20%	11.26%	8.63%	9.57%
Decile 4	12.31%	15.26%	4.98%	13.28%
Decile 5	6.84%	5.01%	5.39%	6.33%
Decile 6	9.26%	8.93%	7.40%	6.56%
Decile 7	13.06%	9.06%	9.88%	6.77%
Decile 8	8.57%	6.80%	9.01%	4.30%
Decile 9	11.96%	7.16%	15.04%	4.54%
Decile 10	12.30%	5.74%	26.85%	3.67%

Note: Deciles refer to occupational prestige decile with decile 10 being the most prestigious and decile 1 being the least prestigious. White NH refers to White, non-Hispanic workers, Black NH refers to Black non-Hispanic workers, Asian NH refers to Asian non-Hispanic workers, and Hispanic includes all Hispanic workers regardless of racial identity. Estimates have been weighted to adjust for sampling design.

those in decile 1, males in deciles 2, 7, 9, and 10 spend approximately 5 more minutes, 8 more minutes, 12 more minutes, and 14 more minutes on housework per day, respectively.

When analyzing the impact of occupational prestige on unpaid work time by race/ethnicity and sex separately (Table 3), we observe statistically insignificant results among Black females. Among White females, occupational prestige is significantly associated with time spent on housework for workers in deciles 7, 9, and 10; for Asian females, occupational prestige is statistically significant in predicting time spent on unpaid work for those in decile 9 only; among Hispanic females, occupational prestige is statistically significantly associated with unpaid work for workers in deciles 3 and 5–10, with the exception of decile 8. While the magnitudes vary, we consistently find that higher occupational prestige is associated with less time spent on housework among female workers. This is especially pronounced among Hispanic females. Among White females, compared to those in the lowest decile (decile 1) of occupational prestige, those in decile 7 spend, on average, close to 9 min less on

housework per day and those in decile 9 spend, on average, approximately 8 min less on housework. Among Asian females, compared to those in decile 1, approximately 21 min less is spent on housework per day among those in decile 9. For Hispanic females, we observe large variations in difference in housework time; compared to those in decile 1, on average, those in decile 6 spend 26 min less on housework, those in decile 7 spend 22 min less, those in decile 9 spend 39 min less on housework, and those in decile 10 spend 28 min less on housework, per day.

Occupational prestige is not statistically associated with time spent in housework for either Asian or Black males, with the exception of decile 4 among Black males (Table 4). Among White males, with the exception of deciles 4 and 6, an increase in occupational prestige is associated with more time spent on housework; for example, compared to those in decile 1, those in deciles 7, 8 and 10 spend an average of 9, 17, and 14 more minutes, respectively, on housework per day. For Hispanic males, occupational prestige is statistically significant for decile 5 and deciles 7—10. Compared to Hispanic males in decile 1, for example, males in decile 7 spend an average of 9 more minutes per day on housework, 24 more minutes if in decile 8, and 18 more minutes if in decile 10.

5. Discussion

In this analysis, we explore whether and to what extent occupational prestige is associated with time spent on unpaid housework, interpreting our findings through the lens of social reproduction theory. This paper considers occupational prestige as a measure of labor market success, taking a broader view of work by considering the social status of an occupation rather than just the wage rate extracted from the labor market. By doing so, we provide important insights into the relationship between social status and time spent on unpaid housework. We make two important contributions to the debate on time use and social status, the first being key determinants of time spent on housework for men and women, and the second, the determinants which emerge across different racial/ethnic categories.

Our analyses show that higher occupational prestige is significantly associated with less time spent on unpaid housework for women. We observe the opposite among men workers; higher occupational prestige is associated with more time spent in housework. These results highlight how class is exercised differently by men and women in the labor market, as per the prescriptions of social reproduction theorists (Bhattacharya, 2017a, 2017b; Luxton, 2006). A reduction in unpaid time use for women at higher levels of occupational prestige could reflect their ability to either outsource this labor to individuals outside of the household (likely to workers with lower levels of occupational prestige) or greater bargaining power within their households, allowing them to redistribute unpaid labor amongst other household members. The results for women are consistent with previous studies which have found that women's higher occupational status and earning power are associated with less time spent on unpaid housework (Presser, 1994). Our results for men, however, are novel. Our findings indicate that men are significantly more likely to spend more time on unpaid labor at higher levels of prestige suggesting that unpaid work may take on different meanings for individuals who have a larger range of choices about how they spend their time (assuming higher class status is associated with greater decision-making power). Some studies have suggested that at higher levels

of education, men tend to be more egalitarian in their time-use choices, both men and women may be more selective in the type of unpaid labor they perform, that perceptions of fairness in the distribution of unpaid work is a critical factor in this distribution, and that men may choose to engage in more unpaid work as a way to avoid relational threat points (Breen & Cooke, 2005; Geist, 2005; John et al., 1995; Sayer, 2005).

The results presented here for men are in sharp contrast to traditional labor market theories which base the decision to spend more hours in paid labor entirely on the wage rate and the opportunity cost of foregoing that wage (Gahramanov & Tang, 2016; MacDonald, 1984; Mincer & National Bureau Committee for Economic Research, 1962). Our results indicate that a broader range of considerations underlie the decision to balance paid and unpaid work, which vary among and between individuals who occupy different positions of occupational prestige. This finding is a radical break with the institutionalized mainstream conception of rationality and decision making (Bourdieu, 2000; Foley, 2004; Yilmaz, 2007).

From the bargaining perspective, a rise in household formation around hypogamous marriages (i.e. women marrying men with lower incomes and/or education, for instance, distinct from hypergamy, where men marry women with lower incomes and/or education (Chudnovskaya & Kashyap, 2020; Ortiz-Gervasi, 2021) and the continuation of the formation of homogamous marriages, could strengthen the bargaining power of women in the negotiation of their time, altering the time-use of men in some respects (Miller, 2020). But there is a need for understanding what types of activities men with higher levels of occupational prestige choose to participate in when they do unpaid work and why. The social meanings of unpaid labor cannot be fully interrogated with the data used in this paper, although previous evidence suggests that an understanding of such meanings may be useful for understanding why and how men and women engage with paid and unpaid labor at different levels of occupational status.

When we disaggregate analyses by gender and race/ethnicity, the results show that at higher levels of occupational prestige, White and Hispanic women, primarily in the three highest deciles, spend less time on unpaid work, although this is not represented by a linear progression in occupational prestige rankings, nor is it necessarily the case for Black and Asian women. The racially disaggregated results highlight the importance of an intersectional approach for understanding the distribution of labor. Just as the distribution of labor amongst men and women is underpinned by a complex set of considerations, differences in the ways in which diverse racial and ethnic groups manage their time is equally intricate.

One possible explanation for racial and ethnic differences in the distribution of paid and unpaid work relates to differential intra-household dynamics. Literature has shown that Black women's higher labor force participation has historically highlighted their roles as co-earners in their households rather than dependents (Cohen, 1998; Corcoran & Duncan, 1979; John & Shelton, 1997). Such households may consequently be viewed as an institution of cooperation rather than a site of conflict. As Black men, for instance, generally tend to be employed within lower ranking occupations and earn less relative to their White counterparts (Glauber, 2008), Black households may gain from greater cooperation to ensure the economic survival of the entire household. This contrasts with how mainstream feminists have tended to

theorize the household, with a more antagonistic approach (see Glenn (1985) for a discussion).

Occupational prestige explicitly highlights the differing results for men and women at the top and the bottom of the occupational hierarchy. Our results show what happens when Black men and women are in fact employed at the top of the hierarchy, rather than assuming lower levels of earnings and job quality. We find that Black women's unpaid labor time does not necessarily decrease with increased occupational prestige levels, as is the case for all other groups of women. This indicates that occupational status may not be as important to them, supporting the hypothesis that their status as co-earners is not a threat point in their households (resulting in conflict-based household negotiations). However, intrahousehold dynamics is only one of many explanatory variables for the ways in which the division of labor in households may occur.

The possibility that unpaid housework is viewed as meaningful and important, rather than a burdensome task, is an additional possible explanation for racial and ethnic differences in the association between time spent on unpaid housework and occupational prestige. The findings by race support previous studies which have shown that the social meanings which different groups adopt around family, gender, and work are significant explanatory factors in understanding the distribution of unpaid work. Glauber (2008, p. 9), for instance, states that 'gender stratification systems in families and work are racialized [resulting in more pronounced inequality] in married White and Latino families than in married Black families.' The assumptions of models which place great emphasis on conflict management between household members would thus not be useful for understanding unpaid time-use choices across all racial groups. Furthermore, the assumption which characterizes housework as undesirable (Harley, 1990; John & Shelton, 1997), is equally extraneous for a holistic understanding of how class, race, and gender may interact to explain time-use differentials. Our results by gender and race again demonstrate this point, as we find that Black women's higher prestige levels are not significantly associated with less time spent on unpaid work.

An additional element is the sociological explanation of 'doing gender', as gender is produced through housework. The extent to which such activities are gendered activities are important for understanding why workers of different races engage with unpaid work differently. As Black women, for instance, are more likely to have historically been co-earners in their households, their employment in the first instance and secondly their positioning within the labor market may not be as important in explaining changes in time spent on unpaid housework as it may be for White women. John and Shelton (1997) have found that housework is more gendered for White men than for Black men; they also find that women who may not necessarily be subordinate in their households through lower earnings, may engage in more housework as a way of reinforcing gender roles, or 'doing gender.' While the results here do not consider only married couples, the negative relationship between occupational prestige and time spent on unpaid work amongst White, Asian and Hispanic women do suggest that these groups may use their higher social status within the labor market to break free from their socially-prescribed gender roles, either through exercising their increased bargaining power and redistributing work to other household members, or using their higher earnings power to outsource

work to individuals outside of their households. While this may not have been the case for Black women, the results give credence to authors who have argued that the historically higher labor force participation rates could suggest that they view their paid and unpaid work as complementary, rather than contending activities (Glauber, 2008). Smaller inequality gaps and less traditionally defined gender roles between Black men and women could to some extent also explain our results. However, whether this outcome translates into increased well-being for any of the groups needs further investigation.

5.1. Limitations

The study has several limitations. First, our use of cross-sectional ATUS data presents a few challenges. Given that there is only one 24-h diary per respondent, a number of individuals (21% of the sample) reported spending no time on housework, which may not be reflective of their day-to-day norms, but rather just indicative of said diary day. Second is the reverse causality embedded around decisions of time-use. Decisions to spend less or more time on unpaid labor may be mediated by the time required by a worker's paid labor and the limitations of a 24-h day. This could potentially affect the way individuals of different social status spend their time, although with the given data, this reverse causality cannot be addressed. The results disaggregated by gender and race do, nonetheless, provide important insights into the distribution of unpaid work. Additionally, we do not control for differences among part-time and full-time work status which, according to previous literature (Hess et al., 2020), is an important driver of time use inequality. As the focus of this study is on the racial and gendered differences based on the primary occupation, controlling for work status was beyond the scope of this study.

Lastly, the analysis focuses on the period prior to the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, which resulted in significant and unanticipated changes in the ways households rearranged their allocation of time to various activities (e.g. Qian & Fuller, 2021). However, studies have demonstrated that this change in time use allocation was either largely temporary or mitigated by the increased prevalence of remote work, resulting in heterogeneous results across contexts in terms of the gender differences in time use (Casale & Shepard, 2021). Additionally, given the disruption to data collection during the COVID-19 pandemic, only partial-year estimates can be completed for the ATUS 2020 data. As such, given the labor market shocks, drastic changes to time use allocation (initially), and mixed evidence regarding the shift in time use allocation post COVID-19, we decided to exclude this period from our analysis.

6. Conclusion

To our knowledge, this study is one of the first to analyze the association between occupational prestige and time spent in housework by gender and race/ethnicity, interpreting the results within the framework of social reproduction theory. Interestingly, we find that occupational prestige has the opposite effect on time spent in unpaid work for men and women. In general, women workers with higher occupational prestige spend less time on housework than their lower ranked peers

while men with higher occupational prestige spend more time on housework relative to lower ranked men. However, our results also highlight that important differences exist by worker race and ethnicity, demonstrating the limitations of associating higher occupational prestige with greater agency for all workers, as per the bargaining model approach. Workers who have greater autonomy over their time outside of paid work may well choose to spend more time on unpaid work or alternatively, outsource this work to someone else. It is thus vital that studies on the racial and gendered distribution of unpaid work consider methods which can shed more light on the inter-household distribution of such work and the types of work households and the individuals within them choose to redistribute.

Our results also highlight the complex nature of decisions related to unpaid housework, which are not easily mediated by simply providing women with better jobs or equalizing men and women's wages. It also demonstrates the importance of considering the context in which work is performed and in which household formation it takes place in when developing public policy responses to combat gender inequalities. However, in general, our findings support the need for policies that create public care infrastructure to support women at the bottom of the occupational prestige rankings who engage in the largest amount of unpaid household work.

This paper considers a wide range of activities in a single category: unpaid housework. The results, however, suggest that a linear relationship between an individual's prestige ranking and the amount of time they dedicate to unpaid reproductive work is not an obvious outcome for all groups. As such, it might become useful to distinguish between different forms of unpaid housework, drawing out activities which may specifically be considered 'dirty work' such as social reproductive labor, which is considered non-nurturant, outside the public eye, and primarily performed by socially marginalized populations, for future research.

ORCID

Jacqueline Strenio http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2422-7640

References

Al-Faham, H., Davis, A. M., & Ernst, R. (2019). Intersectionality: From theory to practice. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, *15*(1), 247–265. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-101518-042942

Avent-Holt, D., & Tomaskovic-Devey, D. (2014). A relational theory of earnings inequality. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *58*(3), 379–399. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764213503337

Bertrand, M., Kamenica, E., & Pan, J. (2015). Gender identity and relative income within households. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *130*(2), 571–614. https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjv001

Bhattacharya, T. (2017a). Introduction: Mapping social reproduction theory. In Thithi Bhattacharya (Ed.)., *Social reproduction theory. Remapping class, recentering oppression* (pp. 1–20). Pluto Press.

Bhattacharya, T. (2017b). How not to skip class: Social reproduction of labor and the global working class. In Thithi Bhattacharya (Ed.)., *Social reproduction theory. Remapping class, recentering oppression* (pp. 55–72). Pluto Press.

Blackledge, P. (2018). Frederick Engels, social reproduction, and the problem of a unitary theory of women's oppression. *Social Theory and Practice*, *44*(3), 297–321. https://doi.org/10.5840/soctheorpract20186439

Bohrer, A. (2019). *Marxism and intersectionality: Race, gender, class and sexuality under capitalism*. Transcript Verlag.
Bourdieu, P. (2000). *Pascalian meditations*. Stanford University Press.
Boyd, M., & Nam, C. B. (2015). *The newest Nam-Powers-Boyd Occupational Scale: Development and insights*. Paper Presented at the Southern Demographic Association Annual Meeting, San Antonio Texas. www.npb-ses.info
Breen, R., & Cooke, L. P. (2005). The persistence of the gendered division of domestic labour. *European Sociological Review*, *21*(1), 43–57. https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jci003
Buder, I., Fields, D., Donahue, G., & Ramirez, M. (2022). Stratification economics and occupational prestige: A theoretical and empirical approach. *Review of Political Economy*, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/09538259.2022.2142464
Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). (2019). American Time Use Survey – 2019 Results. https://www.bls.gov/news.release/archives/atus_06252020.pdf
Casale, D., & Shepard, D. (2021). The gendered effects of the Covid-19 crisis and ongoing lockdown in South Africa: Evidence from NIDS-CRAM Waves 1-3. NIDS-CRAM Working Paper Series, University of Cape Town.
Chudnovskaya, M., & Kashyap, R. (2020). Is the end of educational hypergamy the end of status hypergamy? Evidence from Sweden. *European Sociological Review*, *36*(3), 351–365. https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jcz065
Cohen, P. N. (1998). Replacing housework in the service economy: Gender, class, and race-ethnicity in service spending. *Gender & Society*, *12*(2), 219–231. https://doi.org/10.1177/089124398012002006
Corcoran, M., & Duncan, G. J. (1979). Work history, labor force attachment, and earnings differences between the races and sexes. *Journal of Human Resources*, *14*(1), 3–20. https://doi.org/10.2307/145535
Deutsch, F. M., Lussier, J. B., & Servis, L. J. (1993). Husbands at home: Predictors of paternal participation in childcare and housework. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *65*(6), 1154–1166. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.65.6.1154
Engels, F. (1972). *The origin of the family, private party and the state*. International Publishers.
Ferrant, G., Pesando, L., & Nowacka, K. (2014). *Unpaid care work: The missing link in the analysis of gender gaps in labour outcomes*." OECD Development Centre.
Foley, D. (2004). Rationality and ideology in economics. *Social Research: An International Quarterly*, *71*(2), 329–342. https://doi.org/10.1353/sor.2004.0011
Freeland, R. E., & Hoey, J. (2018). The structure of deference: Modeling occupational status using affect control theory. *American Sociological Review*, *83*(2), 243–277. https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122418761857
Gahramanov, E., & Tang, X. (2016). Labor-leisure choice: Is everything as straightforward as one might have thought? *Theoretical Economics Letters*, *06*(04), 750–760. https://doi.org/10.4236/tel.2016.64079
García-Mainar, I., Montuenga, V. M., & García-Martín, G. (2018). Occupational prestige and gender-occupational segregation. *Work, Employment and Society*, *32*(2), 348–367. https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017017730528
Geist, C. (2005). The welfare state and the home: Regime differences in the domestic division of labour. *European Sociological Review*, *21*(1), 23–41. https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jci002
Gimenez, M. (2019). *Marx, women, and capitalist social reproduction*. Brill.
Glauber, R. (2008). Race and gender in families and at work: The fatherhood wage premium. *Gender & Society*, *22*(1), 8–30. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243207311593
Glenn, E. N. (1985). Racial ethnic women's labour: The intersection of race, gender and class oppression. *Review of Radical Political Economics*, *17*(3), 86–108. https://doi.org/10.1177/048661348501700306
Glenn, E. N. (1992). Servitude to service work: Historical continuities in the racial division of paid reproductive labor. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, *18*(1), 1–43. https://doi.org/10.1086/494777
Grönlund, A., & Magnusson, C. (2013). Devaluation, crowding or skill specificity? Exploring the mechanisms behind the lower wages in female professions. *Social Science Research*, *42*(4), 1006–1017. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2013.03.001

Gupta, S., & Ash, M. (2008). Whose money, whose time? A nonparametric approach to modeling time spent on housework in the United States. *Feminist Economics*, *14*(1), 93–120. https://doi.org/10.1080/13545700701716664

Harley, S. (1990). For the good of family and race: gender, work, and domestic roles in the Black community, 1880-1930. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, *15*(2), 336–349. https://doi.org/10.1086/494587

Hersch, J., & Stratton, L. (1994). Housework, wages, and the division of housework time for employed spouses. *American Economic Review*, *84*(2), 120–125.

Hess, C., Ahmed, T., Hayes, J. (2020). *"Providing unpaid household and care work in the United States: Uncovering inequality."* Institute for Women's Policy Research Briefing Paper IWPR #C487. https://iwpr.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/IWPR-Providing-Unpaid-Household-and-Care-Work-in-the-United-States-Uncovering-Inequality.pdf

Hofferth, S., Flood, S., Sobek, M., & Backman, D. (2020). American time use survey data extract builder: Version 2.8. [dataset] College Park, MD: University of Maryland and Minneapolis, MN: IPUMS. https://doi.org/10.18128/D060.V2.8Â

Jennings, J., Strenio, J., & Buder, I. (2022). Occupational prestige: American stratification. *Review of Evolutionary Political Economy*, *3*(3), 575–598. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43253-022-00075-6

John, D., & Shelton, B. A. (1997). The production of gender among Black and White women and men: The case of household labor. *Sex Roles*, *36*(3–4), 171–193. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02766266

John, D., Shelton, B. A., & Luschen, K. (1995). Race, ethnicity, gender, and perceptions of fairness. *Journal of Family Issues*, *16*(3), 357–379. https://doi.org/10.1177/019251395016003007

Klebaner, S., & Montalban, M. (2020). Cross-fertilizations between institutional economics and economic sociology: The case of régulation theory and the sociology of fields. *Review of Political Economy*, *32*(2), 180–198. https://doi.org/10.1080/09538259.2019.1674484

Lake, R. W. (2018). Locating the social in social justice. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, *108*(2), 337–345. https://doi.org/10.1080/24694452.2017.1374827

Luxton, M. (2006). Feminist political economy in Canada and the politics of social reproduction. In K. Bezanson & M. Luxton (Eds.), *Social reproduction: Feminist political economy challenges neo-liberalism* (pp. 11–44). McGill-Queen's University Press.

MacDonald, M. (1984). Economics and feminism: The dismal science? *Studies in Political Economy*, *15*(1), 151–178. https://doi.org/10.1080/19187033.1984.11675628

Miller, R. N. (2020). Educational assortative mating and time use in the home. *Social Science Research*, *90*, 102440. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2020.102440

Mincer, J. (1962). Labor force participation of married women: A study of labor supply. In National Bureau Committee for Economic Research (Ed.), *Aspects of labor economics* (pp. 63–105). Princeton University Press. http://www.nber.org/chapters/c0603

Munro, K. (2019). Social reproduction theory, social reproduction, and household production. *Science & Society*, *83*(4), 451–468. https://doi.org/10.1521/siso.2019.83.4.451

Ortiz-Gervasi, L. (2021). The advantage of daughters in hypogamous families: Parental heterogamy and educational outcomes among children of highly educated parents. *European Societies*, *23*(5), 644–674. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616696.2021.1969028

Palermo, G. (2017). Competition: A Marxist view. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, *41*(6), 1559–1585. https://doi.org/10.1093/cje/bex006

Presser, H. B. (1994). Employment schedules among dual-earner spouses and the division of household labor by gender. *American Sociological Review*, *59*(3), 348–364. https://doi.org/10.2307/2095938

Procher, V., Ritter, N., & Vance, C. (2018). Housework allocation in Germany: The role of income and gender identity. *Social Science Quarterly*, *99*(1), 43–61. https://doi.org/10.1111/ssqu.12390

Qian, Y., & Fuller, S. (2021). COVID-19 and the gender employment gap among parents of young children. *Canadian Public Policy. Analyse de Politiques*, *46*(Suppl 2), S89–S101. https://doi.org/10.3138/cpp.2020-077

Rao, S., & Akram-Lodhi, A. H. (2021). Feminist political economy. In Günseli Berik & Ebru Kongar (Eds.). *The Routledge handbook of feminist economics* (pp. 34–42). Routledge.

Rao, S., & Ramnarain, S. (2022). Gender, social protection, and crises of social reproduction: Contextualizing NREGA. *Review of Radical Political Economics*, *55*(1), 70–92. https://doi.org/10.1177/04866134221123817

Reid, M. (1934). *Economics of household production*. John Wiley.
Sayer, L. C. (2005). Gender, time and inequality: Trends in women's and men's paid work, unpaid work and free time. *Social Forces*, *84*(1), 285–303. https://doi.org/10.1353/sof.2005.0126
Shelton, B. A., & John, D. (1996). The division of household labor. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *22*(1), 299–322. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.22.1.299
Small, S. F. (2023). The political economy of hegemonic masculinity: Race, income, and housework in the United States. *Review of Radical Political Economics*, *55*(1), 26–46. https://doi.org/10.1177/04866134221132340
Stiglitz, J., Sen, A., Fitoussi, J.-P. (2007). Report on the commission on the measurement of economic performance and social progress. Paris: Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress. https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/8131721/8131772/Stiglitz-Sen-Fitoussi-Commission-report.pdf
Stratton, L. (2015). The determinants of housework time. *IZA World of Labor*. https://doi.org/10.15185/izawol.133
Syrda, J. (2023). Gendered housework: Spousal relative income, parenthood and traditional gender identity norms. *Work, Employment and Society*, *37*(3), 794–813. https://doi.org/10.1177/09500170211069780
Valentino, L. (2020). The segregation premium: How gender shapes the symbolic valuation process of occupational prestige judgments. *Social Forces*, *99*(1), 31–58. https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/soz145
Veblen, T. (1899). *The theory of the leisure class: An economic study in the evolution of institutions*. MacMillan.
Vogel, L. (2013). *Marxism and the oppression of women: Towards a unitary theory*. Brill.
Weber, M. (1922). *Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology*. Edited by G. Roth and C. Wittich. University of California Press.
Yilmaz, F. (2007). "Veblen and the Problem of Rationality.". *Journal of Economic Issues*, *41*(3), 841–862. https://doi.org/10.1080/00213624.2007.11507064