

GENDER, LEISURE AND TIME CONSTRAINT: EMPLOYED MEN AND WOMEN'S EXPERIENCE*

CHANG MI-HYE

Korean Women's Development Institute

The goal of this articles offer new ways to think about time as a variable in analyzing difference of time between men and women. Using time diary data including measures of household labor time and free time and how much people feel time pressure. My finding suggest that men and women do experience free time very differently. Household labor time erode men's and women's free time in different ways. This findings reveal that despite gains toward gender equality in other domains, discrepancies persist in the experience of experience of time.

Key Words: *Gender, Leisure, Time Constraint, Free time*

INTRODUCTION

Despite women's increased presence in the labor market has increased in Korean society, their disadvantages remain in the home relative to men's. This change may indicate convergence, divergence or stability in how women and men spend their time. To some extent, women's participation in the labor force challenge the notion there are separate spheres within which men and women exist and work. Media such as television commercials, popular music, and magazines and advertisements increasingly inform us that gender roles are changing so that women's and men's lives are becoming similar. Increase in women's labor force participation rates led sociologist and family researchers to examine the impact of these shifts on unequal distribution of household and free time. If there is some convergence in men's and women's paid work time, is there more convergence in household work time in Korea? Has household labor time increased or declined? If men are increasing their domestic labor time, Are they decreasing their leisure time, or changing their leisure activities to reflect new constraints on their time?

As families diversify and workers face new challenges in meeting their multiple commitments, there is a rising sense of being torn between public and private world (Parcel & Cornfield, 2000: 78). Even though most families

* This work was supported by the Korean Research foundation Grant (KRF-073-HS2001).

can no longer rely on the work of a woman at home, the structure of work has not changed sufficiently to accommodate the changes in worker's private lives. The longer the workday at the office or plant, the more people feel pressed at home to hurry, to forgo, to segment, to hyperorganize the remaining of family time (Hochschild, 1997: 215; Robinson & Godbey, 1997). Not only women but also men perceive their lives as rushed and feel that they do not have enough time to fit everything in. To be efficient is to produce something or to perform a task in the shortest possible time. That is to say, in industrial and industrializing countries faster means better (Adam, 1995: 100).

This article offers new ways of thinking about time as a variable in analyzing difference of time use between men and women. I use time diary data, including measures of household labor time and free time and how much people feel time pressure.

THE CHARACTER OF TIME USE AND GENDER EQUITY

Sociological interest has focused on the distribution of paid work, household work and therefore there are a variety of explanations of time use, complexity and scarcity of time, difference time use pattern and perception of time among men and women. Marxist analysis of time emphasizes the commodification of time as important as these are for understanding the temporal structures of modern society. Marx criticized that labor power as a commodity exchanged in the market and as labor is measured in terms of time, time is commodified. But Marxist analysis of time overlooks gender as a factor in the differential value of market labor, and market labor in the context of a gendered rest of life (Sirianni & Negrey, 2000: 60).

Many theorists have examined time scarcity in modern society. Becker (1981) argues that people maximize the allocation of scarce time by making rational choices between market work and consumption. Becker argues that "at most one member of an efficient household could invest in both market and household capital and would allocate time to both sectors (Becker, 1981: 18-9). Becker has proposed a theory of comparative advantage to explain why men specialize in paid work and women in unpaid work. His rational choice model justifies the unequal allocation of gendered labor across household and market work (Becker, 1985). According to Becker, all things being equal, the economically rational household reduces the market time of the wife in response to increases in total household labor time, since her wages are usually less and promotional opportunities are usually fewer. These time allocation theories are governed by the rules and principles of

exchange relations. These theories offer little analysis of time in the context of gendered social worlds and the various normative and institutional factors influence the lower value of women's time in the market.

Feminist scholars are aware of the variation in men's and women's household labor time and gender gap in household labor time, they have criticized the failure of neo-classical economic theories. One of the ways time is structured is through social relations of gender, and gender inequalities are reflected in the social organization of time (Siriani & Negrey, 2000: 59). They have argued that, while the division of household labor may change in response to changes in women's and men's paid work time, the initial level of household labor is not determined by a rational process (Spitze, 1986). Further, the allocation of resources within the household partially reflects normative expectations of "who should do what (Berk, 1985)." For example, in a perceptive study of women's experience of time, Davies (1990) shows that the working times of women as wives and mothers, both in and out of employment, cannot be placed in a meaningful way within perspective from objective time. As mothers, many women feel themselves on call twenty-four hours a day. These are times that operate according to non-economic principles. They can be neither forced into timetables, schedules and deadlines nor allocated a monetary value. Therefore such times are constituted outside the commodified, rationalized time of employment relation (Adam, 1995: 95).

Therefore women's increased hours of paid employment would simply be added to an undiminished quantity of time spent in unpaid work (Meissner et al. 1975). Others argue that the typical decrease in average time spent in unpaid work is not sufficient to compensate women for the increase hours of paid work (Bitman & Wajcman 2000: 168). As a result, women have more conflict between what they prefer and they feel compelled to do. That is to say, women have a distinctive experience of time that is fundamentally different from men's. Therefore it is argued that the working times of women as wives and mothers cannot be captured by perspectives that "separate work from leisure, public from private time, subjective from objective time, and task from clock time (Adam, 1995: 95). Late-modern Society creates new scarcities, not of goods but of information and time. Accordingly, time scarcity and the paucity of leisure time are at the center of discussions about the quality of contemporary life (Adam, 1995; Hochschild, 1997; Robinson & Godbey, 1997).

Because women have been more constrained, with regard to household obligations and family commitments as compared to men (Horna, 1989), women were disadvantaged with regard to time for leisure. Research on

feminism and women's leisure in the 1990s is now moving into a discourse. This shift represents the role of the new wave of thinking about feminism from totalizing and universalizing women's experiences to seeing the need for many types of feminism (Henderson, Hodges & Kivel, 2002).

Of course some scholars contend that all women are not primarily responsible for care-giving and homemaking and some women who have the economic means are able to use part of their incomes to relieve household burden and to purchase their own leisure (Kelly & Freysinger, 2000: 156). Similarly, some argue that men will participate in household labor to the extent that there are demands on them to do so (Coverman, 1985). If the differences between women and men increase with the marriage, we can see the differences as at least partially a function of gender roles within relationships (Coleman & Walters, 1989). Thus, one would expect women's greater involvement in the paid labor force to be negatively associated with their household labor time but positively associated with other family member's household labor time, specifically husband's (Ross, 1987).

Another issue of time use is meaning of work and non-work. Recently, some researchers questioned the notion of 'overwork'. Using time-use data, Robinson and Godbey (1997) argued that Americans had not increased the amount of time they devoted to work, but that the pace of their lives had quickened, with the result that many felt overworked. In consequence, there are different views over the growth of work versus leisure. But other scholars have focused on cultural shift in which home has become work and work has become home (Hochschild, 1997). More workers were putting in increasingly long hours in the workplace as a way to avoid family time. According to Hochschild, too much time at work can undermine personal and family welfare, whereas too little time can endanger a family's economic security and lower its standard of living (Jacobs & Gerson, 2001: 40). This issue is related with work and family balance. Recently, it has drawn increasing in public debate, policy analysis, and academic research (Parcel & Cornfield, 2000).

The subjective-normative influence of working is becoming more marginal in the individual's life space, as reflected in the reduction of working hours and the growing importance of leisure (Offe, 1984). In fact, until 15 years ago, leisure was an invisible area of study relatively devoid of theory. Women tend to be the coordinators of family life, it is often difficult for them to have time for themselves independent of household responsibilities (Deem, 1982; Henderson & Rannells, 1988; Griffiths, 1988). Earlier research on women and leisure demonstrated that women shared a common world in their inequality regarding opportunities for leisure (Glyptis & Chambers,

1982), social relationships in leisure (Henderson & Rannels, 1988; Leaman & Carrington, 1985), fragmented leisure time (Deem, 1982; Shaw, 1985), unstructured activities (Bialeschki & Henderson, 1986), and lacked a sense of entitlement to leisure (Glyptis & Chambers, 1982). The most recent research about women's leisure in the 1990s is now moving into discourse about the inability and inadequacy of determining that one leisure size fits all (Henderson, 1996).

The purpose of this paper is to examine differences in men's and women's investments and variations in household labor time and leisure time. Through the way people experience time, we can know about people and the society within which they live. The amount and meaning of time use can be used as an indicator of gender roles and women's and men's attitudes. Time use is related to other cultural and structural factors in society including gender ideology, family interaction, household structure, kin relations, interpersonal power, role identification and the operation of both formal and informal labor market situations.

DATA AND METHOD

The first national Time Use Survey in Korea was conducted in 1999 by Korea National Statistical Office. In this study I describe and analyze men's and women's time use in 2003. So the results of this survey provide more recent information on time spent on activities. This survey was conducted from March to April in 2003. All 1200 respondents were asked about what they do, how much time they spend doing it.

In time diary studies, individuals are asked to complete logs accounting for time spent on various activities, usually for a 24-hour period (Harvey, 1993; Robinson & Godbey, 1997). Time diaries are problematic to the extent that the diary is not representative of the general pattern of activities during a day (Shelton & John, 1996: 300). This potential problem is handled in most studies by ensuring that different days of the week are represented. In spite of these efforts, it is difficult to obtain data for times around major holidays.

Data used in this study are from 567 employed men and employed 633 women who were surveyed in 2003. The study was conducted in Korea except Cheju Island. In this study, I use time diary which contains reports of 24-hour on the workday and the weekend (Saturday). Time diary data assess gender gaps in time use pattern on different days of the week. Respondents accounted for their time spent on nineteen specific tasks. The Data allow me to capture an individual's main, or most salient, activities, referred to as the primary activity in the time diary but also secondary or

concurrent activities, and who was with the respondents during the activity.

Because most quantitative time studies have only focused on the amount of time (Twiggs, McQuillan & Ferree, 1999: 715), some scholars criticized that time diaries are problematic to the extent that the diary day is not representative of general pattern of activities during a day. Therefore, quantitative time studies are difficult to examine how the dimensions of tasks are embedded in the social construction of gender (Devault, 1991). On the other hand, qualitative research has suggested that an order and hierarchy might exist among household tasks, and the performance of certain tasks might make more probable the performance of others (Coltrane, 2000). So qualitative research has suggested that a more complete explanation of the time use pattern needs to offer theoretical accounts of the kinds of work that men and women do, as much as accounts about how much work they actually do (Blair & Lichter, 1991: 110). The time diary is not the only method for tracking respondent's time use in the survey context. In spite of some limitations, the time diary method using estimate of time expenditures is relatively robust with respect to minor variations in format and cost effective, superior to most alternatives.

I used data in which, respondents are asked twenty-four-hour period activities with close-ended probes. To measure overall quantity of time, I summed the number of hours a respondent spend in each activities on the workday and on the weekend (Saturday).

Typically time is categorized into four exhaustive and mutually exclusive categories: labor time, domestic labor time, and free time and self-care time (Robinson & Godbey, 1997). Labor time or paid work time is time com-

TABLE 1. CATEGORY OF ACTIVITY

Category of type	Activity
Labor time	Employed/Self-employed work, commuting to work, training during work, taking breaks at work.
Domestic Labor time	family care, food preparation, house cleansing, doing laundry, household management, administrative service
self-care time	sleeping, eating, washing, grooming, dressing
Free time (Total Leisure Time)	Active Leisure Time voluntary services, leisure, socializing.
	Passive Leisure Time relaxing without special activity

mitted to income-producing activities in the marketplace, such as the time spent working for a wage or that spent by self-employed persons in their business activities. In its broadest sense it also includes the time involved in commuting to work, training during work, taking breaks at work. It is controversial that engaging in voluntary work such as formal study, private lessons, other study outside school is included in labor time or leisure time.

In most studies about household work, the concept of housework or household labor is rarely defined explicitly, except for explaining how variables are measured. Also, precise method of measurement varies from study to study. Nevertheless, housework most often refers to unpaid work done to maintain family members and/or a home including family care, food preparation, house cleansing, doing laundry, household management, house maintenance and repairs, and shopping. Some of the activities that occur in the household are now defined as work. As such, emotion work and other 'invisible' types of work are typically excluded from analysis, although some studies mention the importance of this invisible labor (Shelton & John, 1996: 300). But in most studies, the definition of housework must be inferred from the way it is measured. Recently, sociologists have also expanded the definition of labor. Household works such as performing housework, and spending time with one's children are defined as work, rather than as incidental to any definition of "real work (Shelton, 1992: 63)."

Personal time is associated with the maintenance of bodily functions—sleeping, eating, washing, grooming, dressing, and receiving medical treatment. Since the activities categorized under personal time are practically constant, it makes sense to talk about a choice between work and leisure (Bitmans & Wajcman, 2000).

Time-use researchers typically classify free time as time not committed to market work, domestic caregiving, or personal care. Free time captures all activities that are not included with the other three categories. Therefore free time is a residual category of discretionary time. Free time is an important aspect of daily life. Leisure affords individuals a chance to relax and refresh after performing household and labor market responsibilities (Mattingly & Bianchi, 2003: 1000). Some activities coded as free-time activities may not be considered truly elective uses of time. For example, individuals may consider exercise as mandatory part of personal care although it is included as a free-time activities, but many would argue that they are not completely freely chosen (Marybeth, J. M. & S. M. Bianchi, 2003: 1010).

Therefore I divide free time into active leisure time and passive leisure time. Active free time includes leisure activities done in the home (watching TV and video, reading newspaper, magazine), socializing activity including

telephone conversation, and relaxing, out-door sports activities. In fact, there is an apparent contradiction in terms when we refer to "leisure." Usually, "leisure" means an activity relaxed, undemanding, and even restful. But that is one side of leisure. Leisure includes physically demanding sport, disciplined arts, and other activity that is anything but relaxing (Kelly & Freysinger, 2000: 78). In this study, the free time is separated into passive leisure time and active leisure time. Passive leisure time is relaxing without special activity.

The sample includes 567 (45.8%) males and 633 (51.3%) females. Age is coded in years, with the mean age for the sample is 31.99 years old. The mean household income of the sample is 155.29 tens of thousands wons. The mean number of children is 1.43. I also include a binary indicator coded 1 if there are children under age 6 in the home. Estimates indicate that 31.2% of sample respondents live with a child (or children) under age 6 and no presence of a preschooler was imputed values of 0. Marital status is coded as a dichotomous variable, coded 1 if respondents reported that they were married or living with a partner, and coded 0 for other responses such as married, separated, divorced, widowed. About 47.8% of the sample is mar-

TABLE 2. MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES OF REGRESSION

Demographic Characteristics		Mean, Frequency(%), Standard Deviation
Gender		male=567(45.8%) female=633(51.3%)
Age(years)		31.99(9.23)
Number of Children		1.43(0.90)
Children younger than 6		None=419(68.8%) One or More=190(31.2%)
Paid Labor Time(Hours)	Wednesday Saturday	10.55(1.92) 5.96(4.20)
Household Labor Time(Hours)	Wednesday Saturday	0.65(1.16) 1.36(2.20)
Income(Tens of thousands wons)		155.29(76.26)
Marital Status		
Never married		591(47.8%)
(married/seperated/divorced/widowed)		609(49.2%)
Education(Years of education)		13.77(2.59)

ried. Weekly work hours were measured by question: "What is the approximate number of hours per week that you spend working for pay?" And educational attainment is measured by years of school completed and the means level achieved by all survey respondents were years of education are 13.77 years.

In this study, I describe and analyze men's and women's time use. This type of analysis makes it possible to assess the men's and women's time's use pattern. T-tests were used to test for statistically significant gender difference in the means. I then estimate ordinary least squares (OLS) regression models to assess the relationships between marital, parental, and employment variables and the measures of time. Gender, age, number of children, children younger than 6, marital status, education level are included as an independent variable. Gender, children younger than 6, marital status, education paid labor time is dichotomous variable coded as follows: 1 = male, 0 = female; 0 = has no child under the age 6, 1 = has child under the age 6 ; married separated/divorced/widowed = 1, never married = 0. Educational attainment is measured by years of school completed. Finally, to test for statistically significant gender patterns, model includes interaction terms for gender and marital status, age and children under the age 6. The regression models predict total hours of household labor time and free time and attitude to time.

The primary objective was to examine the meanings of time for women and men. There are a variety of factors that influence total household labor time, free time, and gender gap of paucity of time. For the analysis of gender equity, I examine the impact of gender, age, number of children, presence of younger than age six, income, education, marital status, paid labor time as well as the interaction of gender and age, presence of younger than age six, marital status. The research was guided by a number of questions.

Ha 1. Women perform more of the household labor, including child care and housekeeping chores(Robinson & Godbey 1997: 199). As a result, Have women less free time?

Ha 2. Does the presence of children, marital status, income, level of education, paid labour time affect the pattern of time use for household labor and leisure, and is the effect the same or different for women and men?

Ha 3. Are there differences in the work hours and housework hours between the workday and the weekend (Saturday)?

Ha 4. Are there differences the average total free time of men and that of women? In contrast men, are women much more likely than men to opt for more hours for families?

Ha 5. How do women and men' experiences of free time relate to their

subjective perceptions of time pressure?

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In the USA, one-third of free time was reported to be experienced as leisure (Neulinger, 1976). Thompson suggested that women more likely to establish their leisure around their family responsibilities and tasks while most men place no restrictions around their leisure. Caregiving responsibilities of married especially constrain their leisure experience (Thompson, 1995).

Even though men are becoming more involved in childcare and housework, Table 3 indicates that there is a gap between women's and men's time spent in paid labor time, household labor time and free time. It is commonly known that employed women spend less time in paid labor than employed men. Results in Table 3 indicate that on average men work more 0.56 hours than women on the workday and more 0.89 hours on the weekend (Saturday). The imperatives of household labor may lead married women (but not men) to withdraw from the labor market completely or to reduce their attachment to it significantly, but wife's commitment to market labor does not alter the number of household tasks or a significant redistribution between men and women.

Generally, women devote about twice as many hours as men devoted to household care in United States (Robinson & Godbey, 1997: 100). Especially women still do 80 percent of the child care (Robinson and Godbey, 1997: 104). This study shows that gender gap in household labor time is greater in Korea. Korean men spent 0.29 hours on household labor that is 29.6% hours of women's on the workday. And Men spent 0.89 hours on Saturday. That is, approximately 49.7% hours of women's household labor time on Saturday. The gender gap in household labor time is greater on the workday than the weekend (Saturday). The difference in time use between men and women reflects women's double responsibility in the home as well as in the workplace. The women offered extremely detailed routines, starting early in the morning with breakfast for the family, packing school lunches, getting the children dressed and so on, and ending late at night as they did the ironing and other housework. Although employment was important to all the people, women took up a lot of their time in informal housework.

Table 3 shows a significant gender gap in both active leisure time and passive leisure time. The responsibility for routines of household maintenance reduces women's free time. That is to say, the unequal distribution of household work and child care across the gender creates an unequal distribution

TABLE 3. TIME SPENT OF EMPLOYED MEN AND WOMEN

		Men	Women	Total	Men's Time as a % of Women's	Mean Difference (Men-Women) and Significance	T-test for difference	
Paid Labor time (S. D)	Wednesday	10.84 (2.09)	10.29 (1.72)	10.55 (1.93)	105.3%	0.56***	5.056***	
Paid Labor time (S. D)	Saturday	6.43 (4.38)	5.54 (3.99)	5.96 (4.20)	116.1%	.89***	3.694***	
Household Labor time(S. D)	Wednesday	0.29 (0.87)	0.98 (1.29)	0.65 (1.16)	29.6%	-.69***	-10.692***	
Household Labor time(S. D)	Saturday	0.89 (1.88)	1.79 (2.37)	1.36 (2.20)	49.7%	-.91***	-7.244***	
Personal time (S. D)	Wednesday	9.49 (1.74)	9.60 (1.69)	9.55 (1.71)	98.85%	-.11	-2.218*	
Personal time (S. D)	Saturday	10.31 (2.34)	10.52 (2.47)	10.42 (2.41)	98.00%	-.21	-2.322*	
Free time (S.D)	Active Leisure Time	Wednesday	2.34 (1.62)	2.11 (1.54)	2.22 (1.58)	114.9%	.37***	2.463**
Free time (S. D)	Active Leisure Time	Saturday	4.25 (3.29)	3.86 (3.19)	4.04 (3.24)	113.2%	.62***	2.092*
Free time (S. D)	Passive Leisure Time	Wednesday	0.66 (1.25)	0.49 (0.89)	0.57 (1.08)	134.7%	.17***	2.756***
Free time (S.D)	Passive Leisure Time	Saturday	1.07 (1.58)	0.84 (1.40)	0.95 (1.49)	127.4%	.28***	2.639***
Free time (S.D)	Total Free Time	Wednesday	3.00 (1.90)	2.61 (1.60)	2.79 (1.76)	114.9%	.40***	3.912***
Free time (S.D)	Total Free Time	Saturday	5.32 (3.53)	4.70 (3.36)	5.00 (3.45)	113.2%	.62***	3.111***
Paucity of time of time	More time for Myself		3.76 (0.87)	3.60 (0.92)	3.67 (0.91)		.160***	3.056
Paucity of time of time	More time for family		3.92	3.96 (0.85)	3.94 (0.88)	(0.87)	-.045***	-.899
Number of Case		567	633	1200				

of free time that favors men over women (Deem, 1982). Men also spend 0.4 more hours than women on workdays and more 0.62 hours on Saturday in active leisure activity. That is, approximately 114.9% of women's free time on the ordinary day and 113.2% of women's free time on Saturday. According to Marybeth and Bianchi (2003), American men have more free time than women do, nearly half an hour more per day, on average. Table 3 indicate that Korean men have more free time 0.4 more hours on workdays and 0.62 more hours on the weekend (Saturday). If such a difference existed, men would have more free times, approximately 2.62 more hours per week except Sunday.

Men also have more active leisure time than women do nearly 10.2 minutes on workdays and 53.4 more minutes on Saturday in paid labor than women. That is, approximately 114.9% of women's on ordinary day and 113.2% of women's on Saturday. Leisure time or free time is an important aspect of daily life. Leisure affords individuals a chance to relax and refresh after performing household and labor market responsibilities. Measured as time for self-care, men have less 0.11 hours on the workday and less 0.21 hours than women on Saturday.

In this research, the respondents were asked whether they would like to increase their hours for themselves or their families. If fifth hypothesis is correct, there should still be a significant difference between men and women. I analyze two additional variables that captures individual's perception of being rushed, or paucity of time. These variables were measured by the statements: "I want to have more time for myself." and "I want to have more time for family." These variables measured coded from 1 to 5, so that higher numbers are associated with more often feeling rushed.

Table 3 shows, there are not significant differences in attitudes of time among men and women. This means that gender has not direct effect on perception of time pressure, if we hold all other factors constant. Even though the effect of gender on the perception of time not significant at $p < .01$, the association is negative, which indicate that men have less time pressure than women.

GENDER DIFFERENCES IN TIME SPENT ON HOUSEHOLD LABOR TIME

There are varieties of explanations that have been offered to account for both the variation in men's and women's household labor time and the gender gap in household labor time. Previous research on the division of household labor is dominated by quantitative studies that use one or more of

three explanations commonly referred to as the relative resources, time constraints, and ideology/sex role explanations (Ross 1987; Shelton & John, 1996). The relative resources explanation builds on the work of Blood & Wolfe (1960) and conceptualizes the division of housework as reflecting the resources men and women bring to relationships. According to this explanation, the individual with the most resources (education, earnings, occupational prestige) uses those resources to negotiate his/her way out of housework.

The regression analysis of the determinants of household labor time identify the sources of variation in women's and men's household labor time as well as to better understand the sources of the gender gap in household labor time. These models predict total hours of household labor time. Gender, age, number of children, existence of children under the age six, paid labor time, education level, income, marital status, as well as gender interaction terms for age, marital status and presence of children under the age six are included as independent variables.

Time availability refers to an explanation that characterizes the division of household labor as the result of women's and men's other time commitment (England & Farkas, 1986). This explanation suggests that men and women participate in housework and childcare to the extent that there are demands on them to do so and they have available time. The most commonly used indicators of time constraints are employment and/or hours worked, presence or number of children in the household, and work schedule.

It is commonly known that women spend more time in household labor than men. Table 4 indicates that gender does not have a direct effect on household labor time if we hold all other factors constant. Age may be associated with household labor time to the extent to which it is associated with the timing of major life course events (Shelton, 1992: 94). But Table 4 indicates that the household labor time is not affected by age. The impact of age on household labor time is not significant. So I have included an interaction term for age and gender. By including the interaction term in the model, its impact is related with to household labor time and negative for women. It means that age increase, the women's household labor time decreases.

Previous studies show that more children are associated with more hours of household labor for both men and women (Baxter, 1993). The number of children is associated with both women's and men's household labor time. Respondents with more children spent more times in household labor time than those having less children. Preschool age children are more demanding of time than older children. We would expect presence of children under the age 6 has little impact on men's household labor time. So I have included an

interaction term for children under the age 6 and gender, the significant positive interaction term for presence of children younger than six and gender indicates that the effect of presence of preschool age children on household labor time is significantly different for women and men. Each additional child younger than 6 in the household is associated with women spending over .162 hours in household labor on the weekday and .500 hours on the weekend (Saturday). For women, having a preschool age children in the household is associated with them spending more 30 minutes per day on household labor on the weekend (Saturday). These results show that women perform more of the housework when they are married and when they become parents, whereas men tend to perform less housework when they marry and assume a smaller share of the household work after their wives have children. Therefore, these data support the view that children's demands on men are primarily financial, while their demands on women are for time (Shelton, 1992: 52).

Results in Table 4 indicate that marital status is negatively associated with household labor time but the interaction term marital status and gender is significantly associated with household labor time on workday. And Both marital status and the interaction term marital status and gender are significantly associated with household labor time on workday. Paid labor time is negatively associated with household labor time. For men and women, hours of paid labor time increase, they spend fewer hours in household labor.

The observed gender gap in men's and women's household labor time is a function of differences in other factors as number of children, presence of younger than age six, income and education. Generally, those with more education spent more time in paid labor since opportunity cost of not doing so is higher for those with more education than is the case for those with less education (Shelton, 1992: 54). The result in Table 4 indicates that those with more education have direct impact on household labor time. It is commonly known that paid work hours are negatively associated with their housework time (Acock & Demo, 1994; Brayfield, A. 1995). The analysis of household labor time requires that information on paid work time is included in the analyses. From previous research, women's and men's time spent in paid labor has an effect on the amount of time they spend on household labor (Berk, 1985; Coverman, 1985). So I use a comprehensive measure of paid labor time in assessing its impact on household labor time. Results in Table 4 indicate differences in household labor time whether it is on the weekday or on the weekend (Saturday). Usual work hours are associated with household labor time on the weekend (Saturday) than ordinary day.

TABLE 4. REGRESSION OF HOUSEHOLD LABOR TIME

	Household Labor Time	
	Wednesday	Saturday
Gender ^a	-.677(-.291) ***	-.934(-.212) *
Age	.006(.050)	.004(.018)
Age*Gender	-.028(-.422) ***	-.036(-.289) **
Number of children	.298(.246) ***	.243(.106) **
Has children younger than 6 ^b	.162(.051)	.500(.083) **
Has children younger than 6*Gender	.393(.068) *	1.344(.122) ***
Income	-.001(-.041)	.000(-.015)
Education	.020(.044)	.036(.042)
Marital Status ^c	-.042(-.018)	-.772(-.175) ***
Marital Status*Gender	1.068(.388) ***	1.623(.311) ***
Paid Labor Time	-.104(-.173) ***	-.119(-.227) ***
Constant	1.691***	2.265***
R ²	45.1%	41.2%
Adjusted R ²	44.6%	40.7%
Number of Case	1198	1198

a. coded as men = 0, women = 1.

b. coded as absence of children younger under 6 = 0 presence of children younger under 6 = 1.

c. coded as never married = 0, married, seperated, divorced, widowed = 1.

Sig. level: *** p ≤ .01, ** p ≤ .05, * ≤ 1.

Overall, this model explains 45.1% of the variation in household labor time on the workday and 41.2% on Saturday. A regression analysis of the determinants of household labor time will allow me to identify the sources variation in women's and men's household labor time as well as to better understand the sources of the gender gap in household labor time. This result reveals temporal asymmetries in the distribution of household labor time among men and women. Even though many husbands and wives believed that domestic responsibilities should be shared in a dual working household, women were still doing a disproportionate amount of the housework. In conclusion, Gender inequality in many areas of social life leads to the expectation that inequality is likely to exist in leisure as well (Shaw, 1985; 1994).

GENDER DIFFERENCES IN TIME SPENT ON FREE TIME

The concept of leisure is usually defined by contrast with constrained activities. In labor economics, leisure is treated as the opposite of paid work.

In popular discourse leisure is conceived of as free time, time at one's own disposal, or "pure leisure (Bittman & Wajcman, 2000: 177). In this study, in order to more fully understand leisure time expenditures, I examine free time (total leisure time) and active leisure time separately. Leisure activities can be categorized more generally as active or passive, with passive leisure activities defined as those activities one can do at home as time becomes available. In contrast, active leisure activities require one to leave the house and may require advance planning (Shelton, 1992: 124).

Both men's and women's active leisure time is associated with a perception of leisure, lack of obligation or necessity or relative freedom. However, the constraints of leisure differ by gender (Kelly & Freysinger, 2000: 153). So feminist researchers argue that free time is an especially problematic concept for women because the boundaries between unpaid domestic responsibilities and free-time pursuits are often unclear (Griffiths, 1988: 49).

Models shown in Table 5 indicate that gender is not associated with free time. The lack of gender differences in the effects does not mean that men and women spent same amount of time on leisure activities. On the weekend (Saturday), the effect of gender on active leisure time is not significant at $p < .01$, the association is negative on weekend, which indicates that women have less free time and active leisure time on the weekend. On the contrary, men spent less free time and active leisure time than women on the ordinary day. Age may one variable whose association with passive leisure time varies by gender. But the result reveals that age is not significantly associated with free time.

In addition paid labor time and household labor time is negatively associated with free time and active leisure time on the weekend (Saturday). That is, time spent in one sphere means less time spent in another.

If commitments to household labor and household labor call for full-time participation in both, that time must come at the expense of free time. Paid labor time and household labor time which reflect great total work load are negatively associated with total free time. Usual weekly work hours are important variables. The more hours a person works for pay, the less free time he or she has. Time is a metric with a fixed upper limit, and changes in work and leisure should involve a zero-sum trade-off (Jacobs & Gerson, 2001).

Table 5 shows that paid labor time is associated with leisure time on the weekend (Saturday) after other characteristics have been taken into account. The more time people spent in paid labor time on the workday, the less time they spent on passive and active leisure time on the weekend (Saturday). For each additional hour spent in paid labor, people less spent .24 hour (14.4

TABLE 5. REGRESSION OF TOTAL LEISURE TIME(FREE TIME)

	Free Time (Active Leisure Time + Passive Leisure time)		Active Leisure Time	
	Wednesday	Saturday	Wednesday	Saturday
Gender ^a	.488(.138)	-.464(-.067)	.060(.019)	-.394(-.061)
Age	.006(.030)	-.015(-.040)	-.008(-.047)	-.018(-.052)
Age*Gender	.033(.329) **	.013(.069)	.010(.116)	.007(.036)
Number of children	.015(.008)	.159(.044)	.051(.031)	.178(.053)
Has children younger than 6 ^b	.163(.034)	-.026(-.003)	.222(.051)	.097(.011)
Has children younger than 6*Gender	-.322(-.036)	.198(.011)	-.422(-.053)	.190(.012)
Income	-.001(-.036)	.000(.000)	.000(.011)	.000(.017)
Education	-.002(-.003)	-.023(-.017)	.004(.006)	.004(.003)
Marital Status ^c	.569(.261) ***	.078(.011)	.345(.109)	.143(.022)
Marital Status*Gender	.678(.162) **	.742(.091)	.488(.130)***	.615(.080)
Paid Labor Time	-.442(-.482) ***	-.563(-.684) ***	-.236(-.287) ***	-.477(-.617)***
Labor Time Household	-.554(-.366) ***	.043(-.417) ***	-.370(-.271) ***	-.524(-.355) ***
Constant	6.554***	9.743***	4.588***	7.813***
R ²	28.7%	46.8%	11.7%	38.0%
Adjusted R ²	28.0%	46.2%	10.8%	37.3%
Number of Case	1198	1198	1198	1198

a. coded as men = 0, women = 1.

b. coded as absence of children younger under 6 = 0 presence of children younger under 6 = 1.

c. coded as never married = 1, married, seperated, divorced, widowed = 0.

Sig. level: *** p ≤ .01, ** p° ≤ .05, * ≤ .1.

minutes) on free time on the workday. And household labor time is negatively associated with passive leisure time. For each additional hour spent on household labor, people spent .37 of an hour less (22.2 minutes) on total leisure time on the workday and .52 hour less (31.2 minutes) on the weekend (Saturday). Thus household labor time and paid labor time affect leisure in similar ways. Generally, the negative effect of household labor time on free time on weekend (Saturday) is stronger than workday. Table 5 shows that women's household labor time and marital status are associated with leisure time and free time after other characteristics have been taken into account. The more time people spent in household labor time, the less time they spent on leisure activities. However, there is no evidence indicating that number of children and presence of child under the age 6 is associated both men's and women's leisure time and free time.

It is known that for those never married, weekend (Saturday) is a time to recover from the stress of the workday and begin leisure activities. Because in contrast to never married counterparts, married men and women relatively spent more time on housework and child care. Table 5 indicates that the interaction term marital status and gender is statistically significant in the model predicting free time. In Summary, this model accounts for 28.7% of the variation in free time on the workday, 46.8% on the weekend(Saturday) and 11.7% of the variation in active leisure time on the workday, 38.0% on the weekend(Saturday). Thus men's and women's leisure time varies with paid labor time and household labor time.

TIME SCARCITY AND THE PERCEPTION OF TIME PRESSURE

The objective condition of time spent at work and in other roles that either result in stress or in positive feelings that lead to the perception of having time to do the things one wants to do(Epstein & Kalleberg, 2001: 12). Thus the opportunity for equality between men and women is linked to pressured time conditions. As social relations throughout the society are gendered, free time, especially active leisure time is seen as a realm of life in

TABLE 6. REGRESSION OF THE PERCEPTION OF TIME

	More Time for myself	More Time for family
Gender ^a	-.139(-.080)	-.379(-.209)
Age	-.015(-.164)***	-.009(-.090)
Age*Gender	-.012(-.239)	-.012(-.226)
Number of children	.046(.051)	-.074(.079)
Has children younger than 6 ^b	.026(.011)	-.021(-.008)
Has children younger than 6*Gender	.047(.011)	.168(.037)
Income	.000(.032)	.000(.030)
Education	.048(.143)***	.026(.074)**
Marital Status ^c	-.199(-.155) *	-.450(-.248)***
Marital Status*Gender	-.298(-.145) *	-.146(-.068)
Weekly work hours	.001(.011)	.002(.038)
Constant	4.076***	4.020***
R ²	7.4%	5.7%
Adjusted R ²	6.5%	4.8%
Number of Case	1198	1198

a. coded as men = 0, women = 1.

b. coded as presence of children younger under 6 = 1, absence of children younger under 6 = 0

c. coded as never married=1, married, seperated, divorced, widowed = 0.

Sig. level: *** p ≤ .01, ** p ≤ .05, * ≤ .1.

which gender inequality is reproduced or perpetuated (Henderson, Hodges and Kivel, 2002: 264). I evaluate the determinants of free time, focusing on the impact of gender on both total free time and active leisure time.

Generally, women were much more likely than men to opt for longer hours with families. But Table 6 suggests that the impact of gender in the perception of time is not statistically significant. This indicates that the previously observed gender effect reflects other measured differences between men and women. And the result in Table 6 suggests that age has negative effect on the perception of the time paucity during the workday. Increase in age has related to a reduction in feelings of time pressure. That is, older people feel less time pressure than younger people because age effect may reflect greater paid labor time demands among younger people.

The effect of marital status on perception of time is somewhat different for women and men. The significant interaction term for marital status and gender indicates married women relatively want more time for themselves and their families, in contrast to never married counterparts. The results in Table 6 suggests that married women want to have more time for their families. The division of responsibility between women and men at home directly affects the feeling rushed. A second possibility for why women experience time pressure more than men's is their worrying about undone work or family issues during their free time. Men may be better able than women to disregard concerns about family life while at work or at play (Mattinly & Bianchi, 2003: 1024).

This attitude toward time is important. Related to this is the possibility that women have "dual burden", the "double day" between work and family. This means that even though less time available for themselves, women feel somewhat more time-pressured than do men. As a result, women's time spent on housework and an unequal division of household labor affect on feeling of time.

CONCLUSION

In this article, I try to explore how much hours people work, how they feel rushed, and how they integrate work with life's pleasures and responsibilities. I compare and contrastd the use and meaning of time between men and women. Time consumption differs between men and women. Although beliefs about the appropriate roles men and women in the workplace have undergone substantial shifts in the past several decades, assumptions about who should perform unpaid family work have changed more slowly. Different expectations of women and men based upon their dissimilar posi-

tions in the family and the market create gender differences in the experience of time (Mattingly & Bianchi, 2003: 999). Although the vast majority of both men and women agree that family labor should be shared, few men assume equal responsibility for household tasks. This research also shows that women perform more of the housework when they are married and become parents, whereas men tend to perform less housework when they marry and have children. The gender gap in household labor time is greater on the workday than the weekend (Saturday). On average, women perform as much three times housework as men on workday, and as much two times more housework as men on the weekend (Saturday) in Korea.

As women shoulder a disproportionate share of responsibility for housework, their perception of time paucity increases. Free time is not equally spent among women and men. The time use pattern on the weekend (Saturday) are especially different from the daily routine. This means that free time activities may not be as refreshing for women as for men. The differences in leisure patterns among men and women are more contextual than biological. Another interesting finding is that men prefer to choose their own hours rather than have the routine and discipline of regular hours than women (Hewitt, 1993: 65). Therefore Feminist research has had agendas leading to uncovering oppression and empowering women through leisure for individual and social change (Henderson, 1996: 140).

Although this study offers a perspective of gendered time, there are some several important limitations for future research and theory. First, Finding of this study does not represent the symbolic meaning of time. The result which the more time people spent in paid labor time on the workday, the less time they spent on passive and active leisure time on the weekend (Saturday) shows that in spite of the increase in the importance of leisure, work still remained central mechanism of people's life. However some scholars argue that the most important factor in determining perception of time is not quantity of time but quality of time. Gender-based research associated with one's biological sex has resulted in broader analysis of the gendered meanings of leisure (Henderson, 1996). Examining gender differences has been a useful, but it is not sufficient way to understand women's leisure (Henderson, 1996). Further understandings of women's leisure have been most likely to occur when gender differences are not the conclusion, but rather when the research focused on the meanings of gender based on theoretical perspectives (Jackson & Henderson, 1995). Therefore, the idea that time is finite and zero sum allows us an hour spent at work can never be reclaimed for non-work pursuits and vice versa.

Second, the method using an estimate of time expenditures tends to over-

estimate worktime and underestimate free time. Another problem of quantitative measures in the overall time spent performing household labor or leisure activity is that specific tasks can be misleading. Time alone does not tell the whole story (Twiggs, McQuillan & Ferre, 1999: 714). Actually, many women spend much more time on household tasks. For example, women take responsibility for monitoring and supervising the work even when they pay for domestic services or delegate tasks to others. Moreover, men and women spent the same amount of time in performing specific tasks. Therefore, in order to analysis genderd time, both qualitative and quantitative studies are needed. Qualitative studies have explored time use patterns and their meaning for some of the tasks most embedded in family life (DeVault, 1991). To analyse the question of how much household and leisure activities men and women do, researchers have used measures that accumulate time, tasks, or both.

Third, additional longitudinal research is needed to understand and anticipate the change of time use pattern between men and women. By examining general trends, we can get some idea of how time use have been redistributed in response to shifts in women's and men's labor force participation rates and in the household division of labor.

REFERENCES

- Acock, A. D. & Demo, D. H. 1994. *Family Diversity and Well Being*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Adam, B. 1995. *Timewatch: The Social Analysis of Time*. Polity Press.
- Baxter, J. 1993. *Work at home: The domestic division of labour*. Queensland, Australia: University of Queensland Press.
- Becker, G. 1981. *A Treatise on the Family*. Cambridge, MA: Havard University Press.
- _____. 1985. "Human Capital, Efforts, and the Sexual Division of Labor." *Journal of Labor Economics* 3(1): 33-58.
- Berk, S. F. 1985. *The Gender Factory: The Apportionment of Work in American Housholds*. New York: Plenum.
- Bialeschki, M. D., & Henderson, K. A. 1986. "Leisure in the common world of Bianchi, S. M. and Spain, M. 1996. "Women, Work and Family in America." *Population Bulletin* 51(3): 2-48.
- Bitman, M. & J. Wajcman. 2000. "The Rush Hour: The Character of Leisure Time and Gender." *Social Forces* 79(1): 165-189.
- Blair, S. L. & Lichter, D. T. 1991. "Measuring the division of household labor: Gender segregation of housework among Ameirican couples." *Journal of Family Issues* 12: 91-113.
- Blood, R. O. & Wolfe, D. M. 1960. *Husbands and Wives*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Brayfield, A. 1995. "Juggling jobs and kids: the impact of employment schedules on father's caring for children." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 57: 321-32.

- Coverman, S. 1985. "Explaining Husbands' Participation in Domestic Labor." *Sociological Quarterly* 26(1): 81-97.
- Coleman, M. T. & J. M. Walters. 1989. "Beyond Gender Role Explanations: The Division of Household Labor in Gay and Lesbian Households." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, August 9-13.
- Coltrane, S. 1989. "Household labor and the routine production of gender." *Social Problems* 36: 473-490.
- _____. 2000. "Research on Household Labor: Modeling and Measuring the Social Embeddedness of Routine Family Work." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 62(4):1208-1233.
- Coverman, S. 1985. "Explaining Husbands' Participation in Domestic Labor." *Sociological Quarterly* 26: 81-97.
- Davies, K. 1990. *Women and Time*. The Weaving of the Strands of Everyday Life, Aldershot: Avebury.
- Deem, R. 1982. "Women, leisure, and inequality." *Leisure Studies* 1: 29-46.
- Devault, M. 1991. *Feeding the family: The Social Organization of caring as Gendered Work*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- England, P. and G. Farkas, 1986. *Households, Employment and Gender: A Social, Economic and Demographic View*. New York: Aldine.
- Epstein, C. F. & A. Kalleberg. 2001. "Time and the sociology of Work: Issues and Implications." *Work and Occupation* 28(1): 5-16.
- Glyptis, S. & Chambers, D. 1982. "No Place like home." *Leisure Studies* 1: 247-262.
- Griffiths, V. 1988. "From 'Playing Out's to 'Dossing Out': Young Women and Leisure." Erica Wimbush and Margaret Talbot, ed., *Relative Freedoms: Women and Leisure*, pp. 48-59. Open University Press.
- Harvey, A. S. 1993. "Guidelines for time use data collection." *Social Indicators Research* 30: 197-228.
- Henderson, K. A. 1996. "One size doesn't fit all: The meaning of women's leisure." *Journal of Leisure Research* 15(2): 16-31.
- Henderson, K. A., & Rannells, J. S. 1988. "Farm women and the meaning of work and leisure: An oral history perspective." *Leisure Sciences* 10: 41-50.
- Henderson, K. A. S. Hodges and B. D. Kivel, 2002. "Contest and Dialogue in Research on Women and Leisure." *Journal of Leisure Research* 34(3): 253-271.
- Hewitt, P. 1993. *About time: The revolution in work and family life*, Rivers Oram Press.
- Hochschild, A. R. 1997. *The Time Bind: When work becomes home and home becomes work*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Hochschild, A. R. 2003. *The Commercialization of Intimate Life*. LA: University of California Press.
- Horna, J. 1989. "The Leisure Component of the Parental Role." *The Journal of Leisure Research* 21: 228-241.
- Jacobs, J. A. & K. Gerson. 2001. "Overworked Individuals or Overworked Families?" *Work and Occupations* 28(10): 40-63.
- Kelly, J. R. & V. J. Freysinger, 2000. *21st Century Leisure*. Allyn and Bacon.
- Korea National Statistical Office, 1999. Report on the time Use Survey.
- Leaman, O., & Carrington, B. 1985. "Athleticism and the reproduction of gender and ethnic marginality." *Leisure Studies* 4: 205-217.
- Marybeth, J. M. & S. M. Bianchi, 2003. "Gender Differences in the Quantity and

- Quality of Free Time: The U.S. Experience." *Social Forces* 81(3): 999-1030.
- Mattingly M. J. & S. M. Bianchi. 2003. "Gender Difference in the Quantity and Quality of Free Time: The U. S. Experience." *Social Forces* 81(3): 999-1029.
- Neulinger, J. 1976. *The Psychology of leisure*. Springfield, IL: Thomas.
- Offe, C. 1984. "Arbeitsgesellschaft." *Strukturprobleme und zukunftsprospektiven*. Frankfurt/M: Campus.
- Parcel & Cornfield. (eds.) 2000. *Work and Family: Research Informing Policy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Robinson, J. P. & G. Godbey. 1997. *Time for life: The Surprising Ways Americans Use Their Time*. 2d ed. Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Ross, C. E. 1987. "The Division of Labor at Home." *Social Forces* 65(3): 816-833.
- Shaw, S. M. 1985. "The Meaning of leisure in everyday life." *Leisure Science* 7: 1-24.
- _____. 1994. "Gender, leisure, and constraint: Towards a framework for the analysis of women's leisure." *Journal of Leisure Research* 26(1): 9-16.
- Shelton, B. A. 1992. *Women, Men and Time: Gender Differences in Paid Work, Housework and Leisure*. Greenwood Press.
- Shelton, B. A., & John, D. 1996. "The Division of household labor." *Annual Review of Sociology* 22: 299-322.
- Sirianni, C. & C. Negrey. 2000. "Working Time as Gendered Time." *Feminist Economics* 6(1): 59-76.
- Spitze, G. 1986. "The Division of Task Responsibility in U. S. Household: Longitudinal Adjustments to Change." *Social Forces* 64(3): 689-701.
- Spitze, G. 1986. "The Division of Task Responsibility in U. S. Household: Longitudinal Adjustments to Change." *Social Forces* 64(3): 689-701.
- Thompson, S. 1995. Playing around the family: Domestic labour and the gendered participation in sport. *ANZALS Leisure Research Series* 2: 125-136.
- Twiggs, J. E. J. McQuillan and M. M. Ferre. 1999. "Meaning and Measurement: Reconceptualizing Measures of the Division of household Labor." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 61(3): 712-724.

CHANG MI-HYE has a PhD in Sociology from Yonsei University and is a Research Fellow at the Korean Women's Development Institute, Korea. Her main Research Interests concerns economic analysis of consumption, cultural capital and class reproduction and cultural policies. Most recently her interest is an exploration into issues concerning development of woman resources in cultural industry in Korea.

