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## ABSTRACT

This research investigated how gender view is distributed among the dual earner couples differently in Korea, and observed if it affects their division of domestic work, and the wife's satisfaction with it. By using the time-diary data of 2019 from statistics Korea, the study looked into the Korean dualearner couples who are living together, and put them into different groups by their gender views to see if gender ideology is adequate to explain the division of their domestic work time. The results revealed that a husband's gender view had significant effects on the domestic work time of both husband and wife, but the wife's gender view did not affect much. When the husbands have egalitarian gender views, they are more likely to spend their time in domestic work, and their wives are less likely to spend their time in domestic work, but the wives' egalitarian gender view affected neither for the wives nor husbands. The husband's gender view was also closely associated with the wife's satisfaction with the division of domestic work. The wife is more likely to be satisfied with the division of domestic work when her husband has an egalitarian gender view. This research argues that the husband's egalitarian gender view can be an important indicator for the equal division of domestic work and the wife's satisfaction with it.
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## INTRODUCTION

## Gender View in Korean Society

Gender view is an important social indicator that measures people's perspective in responsibilities and roles particularly based on gender differences. How people view gender roles in a family setting can be an important strategy for both husband and wife to maintain their well-being and happiness as a family. As one team, the husband and wife compromise money, time, and workforce based on their gender views, and perform their roles to be committed to their family. In this
process, they can have conflicts by having different gender views, and they can even feel that they are discriminated from gender inequality. This can be harder for the dual-earner couples who are supposed to juggle with their roles and responsibilities in workplaces as well as home.

On the rise of a dual-earner family model structure in Korean society, many scholars, policy makers, and TV programs have paid attention to the perplexing dilemmas of the dual-earner couples, and they raised the awareness on the issue of dualearner couples' burden in a family and work. In fact, Korean society was originally shaped by Confucian culture. In such a culture, it was very common for both men and women to
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have traditional gender views, and consider domestic work as only women's job; however, as Korean women's economic participation rate increased dramatically along with the rise in their educational level, Korean people started to reshape their gender roles and adopt an egalitarian gender view. Such a new change in gender views of Korean society increased men's participation in domestic work gradually. Domestic work is now considered as the domain of the husband and wife, and they try to take responsibility and share it together. This was welcomed by many Korean women in general. However, despite of this gradual change, women's involvement in the domestic work is still humongous compared to men, and the government, academia, and media point out that the unequal division of domestic work can postpone marriage rate of young people, interrupt career life of women, and decrease their satisfaction with the marriage life. Korean society took the first step and is moving towards the equal division of the domestic work, but we still have a far way to get there [1-5].

## Reality of Gender View

The attitudinal data from statistic Korea indicates that Korean people's perception of the division of domestic work changed dramatically from 2006 to 2020. In 2006, only 32.4 percent of Korean people believed that husband and wife should share domestic work equally, and 65.4 percent of them thought that wife should do most of the domestic work; however, as shown in Figure 1, it suggests that Korean people's perception is reshaped. In 2020, respondents who believe that they should equally share domestic work increased by about 30 percent and reached 62.5 percent. On the contrary, those who answered that women should do most of the domestic work decreased by also about 30 percent and dropped to 34.8 percent. While those who believe that men should do most of the domestic work remain still very low, Korean people's perception is changing towards an egalitarian perspective [6-11].


Source: Statistics Korea, 2021
Figure 1: Perception of the dual earner couple's division of domestic work.

On the other hand, another survey conducted by the same institution shows an ironic result. They asked dual-earner couples to see if husband and wife actually shared domestic work together in their reality. As shown in Figure 2, only 20.7
percent of men and 20.2 percent of women responded that they actually shared domestic work equally in 2020. Although Figure 2 shows that dual-earner families who shared domestic work equally have been gradually increasing since 2006, it still looks apart from the previous survey result. It implies that although people ideally pursue sharing domestic work together, women's involvement is still relatively high when it comes to reality.


Figure 2: Actual status of duel-earner couple's division of domestic work.

## Gender Ideology

In every society, people have a common understanding of what it means to be women and men in a family, and the expectations they have from a certain gender based on this common belief is so strong that it sometimes can give them pressure or even a pleasant willingness of doing their jobs as women or men. Ferre, Lorber, and Hess argued that in most of the societies, women do more domestic work than men, and some scholars believe that it is more efficient when gender roles determine the division of domestic work. For example, Becker stated that men have comparative advantages to working for paid work, whereas women specialize to work for unpaid work, however, this perspective did not please many feminist scholars who believe such an analysis is based on sexism and traditional gender roles and it can lead to gender inequality, and an irrational consideration of allocating resources.

For example, Greenstein argued that even though women and men work for the same amount of hours and make the same income level, traditional gender norms, social expectations, and personal beliefs give pressure on women to do more work than men at home. Hochschild and Machung also reviewed that even if women and men have the same income, not every couple shared the same portion of housework, but less than half of the couples distributed household work equally. In many societies, wives tend to do more domestic work than men.

In addition, individuals' gender views can also influence spouses directly in a family. There are some scholars who studied how gender view of individuals and spouses affected Korean couples' division of domestic work. Ryu and Kim suggested that the wife's gender view is not so much important in determining her time spent in domestic work,
but her egalitarian gender view affected her husband's domestic work time. They used the data from the Korean longitudinal survey of women and families, and showed that gender ideology approach explained the Korean families' division of domestic work well. It said that although the wife's egalitarian gender views did not affect her own time spent in domestic work, she increased her husband's domestic work time. This research, however, used gender view of only women so they could not verify the effects of men's gender view. Eun also looked into the impacts of the gender ideology on the division of domestic work of Korean couples by using the time-use data of 2004 from statistics Korea, but he concluded that gender ideology was not very adequate to explain the division of domestic works of Korean couples. He did not focus on dual-earner couples but he observed Korean couples in general. By using the same theory, gender ideology, this research throws some meaningful questions, and observes interesting findings adding on to what the previous literatures have shown [12-16].

## Research Questions and Hypotheses

We are interested in observing how different gender views are distributed among Korean dual-earner couples, and seeing if the gender view is adequate to explain their division of domestic work. To be more specific, we will look into how gender views of the husband and wife affect their spouse's contribution to domestic work as well as their own time spent in domestic work by putting them into different groups by their gender views. Also, we assume it is ideal for both husband and wife to have egalitarian gender views in dualearner couples in order to share their domestic work equally. Therefore, we will focus on the couples who consist of both egalitarian husband and wife and how their gender views affect their domestic work time by comparing with other couples who have different gender views. Lastly, since the wife's satisfaction with the division of domestic work is predicted to be relatively lower than their husbands, we will figure out if the husband's gender view is related to the wife's satisfaction rate with their division of domestic work. In this research, we see gender view as an important indicator related to the equal division of domestic work and satisfaction with the domestic work of the dual-earner families.

- Hypothesis 1: A husband's egalitarian gender view can increase his own domestic work time, and decrease his wife's domestic work time.
- Hypothesis 2: A wife's egalitarian gender view can decrease her own domestic work time, and increase her husband's domestic work time.
- Hypothesis 3: When both husband and wife have egalitarian gender views, the husband's domestic work will increase, and the wife's domestic work will decrease significantly.
- Hypothesis 4: The husband's traditional gender view will be negatively associated with the wife's satisfaction with division of domestic work.


## MATERIALS AND METHODS

Data: This research used the time-use data of 2019 from statistics Korea. Ever since 1999, the time-use has been conducted every 5 years. Every time, the activities of the time-use diary were updated and they became more specific representing the trend and issue of Korean society. For example, used the time-use data of 2004, but the 2019 data this research used has more specific categories of activities like paid time and socio-economic background factors like monthly income. Respondents recorded their activities in 10 minutes intervals for two days through interviews. The survey used household members aged 10 years old or older residing in Korea and its sample consists of 26,091 individuals from 12,388 households. Their activities are classified by 9 broad categories, 45 medium categories, and 153 specific categories. Based on 153 activity specific categories, respondents recorded their time diaries. They recorded major activities and secondary activities that individuals have done simultaneously, but most researchers who used time-use data focused only on major activities because an individual's daily activities would exceed 24 hours, if the secondary activities are counted. This research used only dual-earner couples who are living together as a sample. The time-diary data of husband and wife recorded their time-diary on the same days. The sample consists of 13,532 days of time-diary data of individuals. To make a data set of couples, data of husband and wife were combined as one record based on the husbands' data. There are 6,766 days of data of the dualearner couples in total.

Measures: The dependent variable used is domestic work of husbands and wives. As shown in Table 1 it includes many different types of medium activities such as cooking, laundry, cleaning, managing a house, household goods, car, pets and plants, grocery shopping, other domestic work, and commuting for domestic work. These medium activities are composed of 22 specific categories such as meal preparation, making snacks and non-routine food, washing dishes and tidying up after meals, washing, laundry drying, ironing and organizing clothes, repairing and maintaining clothes, cleaning, tidying, recycling and disposing of garbage, managing a house and vehicle, pet care, plants care, receiving pet and plants care service, offline grocery shopping, online grocery shopping, on-site purchase, online purchase, other shopping related activities, other home management, and commuting for domestic work. Domestic work is measured in a unit of minutes. This is measured on weekdays and weekends separately to compare them.

Table 1: Dependent variable in sub-activities (unit:min).

| Dependent variable | Medium category | Specific category |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Domestic work | Cooking | Meal preparation |
|  |  | Making snacks and non-routine food |
|  |  | Washing dishes and tidying up |
|  | Laundry | Washing |
|  |  | Laundry drying |
|  |  | Ironing and organizing clothes |
|  |  | Repairing and maintaining clothes |
|  | Cleaning | Cleaning |
|  |  | Tidying |
|  |  | Recycling and disposing of garbage |
|  | Managing works | Managing a house |
|  |  | Managing a vehicle |
|  |  | Pet care |
|  |  | Plants care |
|  |  | Receiving pet and plants care service |
|  | Grocery shopping | Offline grocery shopping |
|  |  | Online grocery shopping |
|  |  | on-site purchase |
|  |  | online purchase |
|  |  | Other shopping related activities |
|  | Other domestic works | Other home management |
|  | Commuting for domestic work | Commuting for domestic work |

Note: This category is used based on the time-use data conducted by statistics Korea.

## Independent Variable

Independent variables used for gender ideology are the gender view of the individual and spouse. The survey asked respondents "do you believe men should do paid work and women should do domestic work?" Responses were in 1 to 4 scale points; 1) Strongly agree, 2) Agree 3) Disagree, and 4) Strongly disagree. It can be interpreted as 1) Very traditional, 2) Traditional, 3) Egalitarian, and 4) Very egalitarian. In this research, responses 1 and 2 were combined and made it to "traditional" and 3 to 4 were combined and made it to "egalitarian" for regressions.

## Control Variables

Different demographic, socioeconomic, and family factors of individuals, and spouses were used as control variables. To be more specific, age, educational level, part-time status,
workplace type of individual, and spouse were used. Part time job status is an important control variable has found that men's domestic work time was negatively associated with their full time work status, but when men were employed as part time workers, their domestic work time correspondingly increased. On the other hand, when their wives were working as full-time employees, men's domestic work time increased. When men's wives were working as part time workers, men's domestic work time decreased. Additionally, control variables include family characteristics such as the number of family members, the number of members to care for, and the number of children under the age of 10 . Instead of using the actual number of children and members to care for, dummy variables such as three or more children under the age of 10, and three or more members to care for were used for control variables. Having many children under the age of 10 can add extra domestic works for dual-earner parents. Also, when a
dual-earner couple lives with their parents or parents in law, the dual-earner couple's domestic work time can be increased since they have to do more domestic work such as laundry and cooking for parents. Here, monthly income of individuals or spouses could give effects, but this study excluded income from control variables to focus on effects of gender view. Further study can be done by using exchange theory and including monthly income as a main independent variable Income level of individuals can be also related to whether they work full time or part time. Since this study already includes status of part time, we concluded that it is acceptable to exclude monthly income from control variables [17-20].

## Analytical Strategy

The OLS (Ordinary Least Square) regression coefficient modeling was used to find correlations between determinants and dual-earner couples' domestic work. Also, the regressions were conducted for daily time use of men and women on weekdays and weekends respectively. This research estimates regression by using the following equation:
$Y_{\text {ipt }}=\beta_{0}+\beta_{1} X_{\text {ipt }}+\beta_{2}$ men's gender view ${ }_{\text {ipt }}+\beta_{3}$ women's gender view $_{\text {ipt }}+\eta_{1}$

In the equations, the main independent variables are gender views of individuals and spouses. $\mathrm{X}_{\text {ipt }}$ includes control variables like three or more members to care for, and three or more children under the age of 10 in each household, and other demographic control variables such as age, educational level, part-time, and workplace type of individuals. $\mathrm{Y}_{\text {ipt }}$ is in minutes of domestic work done on weekdays and weekends A total of four regression models were used for each dependent variable. For example, men's domestic work time on weekdays, women's domestic work time on weekdays, men's domestic work time on weekends, and women's domestic work time on weekends are presented in the tables Four different regression models were used respectively so
the husband and wife of a couple's time-use can be easily compared on weekdays and weekends.

## RESULTS

## Descriptive Statistics

As shown in Table 2, this data sample has 13,532 days of individuals which are matched in 6,766 days of the couples in this study. This research looks into the data on weekdays and weekends separately. There are 4,046 days of the couples' data on weekdays and 2,720 days of the couple's data on weekends. To introduce basic socioeconomic background of the data, the average age of men is 52.0 years old and the average age of women is 49.2 years old. The average of the educational level of men is generally higher than women, but it does not show a very big gap between two genders since the educational level of women has been gradually increasing. 9.09 percent of men and 9.33 percent of women went to college 13.49 percent of men and 10.92 percent of women went to university. From relatively low education levels which are from none to college, women's proportion was still higher than that of men.

For the income level ranges of men and women, and it suggests that men's monthly income level was generally higher than women's. Women's relative income is the ratio of women's monthly income to couple's total income combined of husband and wife, and it ranges from 0 to 1 . When it becomes close to 1 , a wife's income contributed to a family becomes large, and when it gets close to 0 , it means that her contribution to total family income is small. The average of women's relative income is 0.38 , and it implies that women's contribution to family income is less than half, but this study excluded income level as a variable.

Table 2: Days of the data ( $\mathrm{N}, \%$ ).

| Day | Men | Women | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weekday | 4,046 | 4,046 | 8,092 |
|  | $(29.9)$ | $(29.9)$ | $(59.8)$ |
| Weekend | 2,720 | 2,720 | 5,440 |
|  | $(20.1)$ | $(20.1)$ | $(40.2)$ |
| Total | 6,766 | 6,766 | 13,532 |

Table 3 shows the dual-earner couples' gender view. 17.84 percent of men and 8.91 percent of women had traditional gender views, and 32.16 percent of men and 41.09 percent of women have egalitarian gender views. Women's gender view was closer to egalitarian than men's. On scale points of 1) Very traditional 2) Traditional 3) Egalitarian, and 4) Very egalitarian,
men's average scale point of gender view was 2.8 which was in between traditional and egalitarian, and women's average gender view was 3.2 which was in between egalitarian to very egalitarian.

Table 3: Perspectives of the sample ( $\mathrm{N}, \%$ ).

| Gender view | Men | Women | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Traditional | 2,414 | 1,206 | 3,620 |
|  | $(17.84)$ | $(8.91)$ | $(26.75)$ |
| Egalitarian | 4,352 | 5,560 | 9,912 |
|  | $(32.16)$ | $(41.09)$ | $(73.25)$ |
| Total | 6,766 | 6,766 | 13,532 |

Table 4 shows a difference in gender view of each couple. 31.7 percent of the couples showed a difference in their gender views. Among them, 24.77 percent of the husbands had a traditional view while their wives had an egalitarian view. Also, 6.92 percent of husbands had an egalitarian gender view while their wives had a traditional one. We can cautiously predict that these couples who have different
gender views are more likely to have conflicts and dissatisfaction with the division of domestic work. 68.31 percent of the couples had the same perspective in their gender views whether they were both traditional and egalitarian.

Table 4: Difference in gender views ( $\mathrm{N}, \%$ ).

| Difference in gender view of couples | Freq. | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Men: Traditional, Women: Egalitarian <br> Men and women: Same perspective (both <br> traditional, or both egalitarian) | 1,676 | 24.77 |
| Men: Egalitarian, Women: traditional | 4,622 | 68.31 |
| Total | 468 | 6.92 |

Daily domestic work time use of men and women of dualearner families are shown for weekdays and weekends in Table 5. Women spent about 4.4 times longer than men in domestic work on weekdays. Women spent 145.99 minutes, while men spent 33.02 minutes for domestic work on weekdays. On weekends, men's domestic work increased and they worked about twice more than they did on weekdays. The reason why men's domestic work increased on weekend was because men worked less for paid work on weekends than weekdays. Men spent 431.18 minutes in paid work, but it decreased to 193.79 minutes on weekends. Since men did
not do much domestic work due to their long paid work time during weekdays, they contributed to domestic work on weekends instead however, although their domestic work time increased during weekend, it was still relatively short compared to women. Women still worked three times more than men for domestic work on weekends. Women's domestic work time was generally longer than that of men.

Table 5: Average of daily time of dual-earner families (minutes).

| Domestic Work | Obs | Mean | Std. dev. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Men |  | Weekday | 54.506 |
| Women | 4,046 |  | 33.02 |
| Men | 4,046 | 145.989 | 102.357 |
| Women |  |  |  |
|  | 2,720 |  |  |


| Women | 4,046 | 338.688 | 181.21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| Men | 2,720 | 193.787 | 231.687 |
| Women | 2,720 | 128.901 | 193.71 |

As Table 6 suggests when both husband and wife had egalitarian views, the husband's domestic work was the longest; the husbands spent 51.69 minutes in domestic work on average. When men had egalitarian views and women had traditional views, men's domestic work time decreased, but men's domestic work time was still relatively long. They spent 38.77 minutes in domestic. When men and women were both traditional in their gender views, men worked 42.18 minutes in domestic work. When men had traditional gender views, and women had egalitarian views, men's domestic work time was the shortest. They spent 46.95 minutes in domestic work.

In fact, although men did not have a corresponding increase in household work as much as women did for the increase in paid jobs, men still tend to work more at home than past. In Korean society, however, men's contribution to domestic work is still very low. This research aims to find how gender views of the dual-earner couples can change their division of domestic work and satisfaction with it by observing Korean dual-earner couples based on their different gender views.

Table 6: Men's domestic work by couple's gender views.

| Cases | Obs | Mean | Std. dev. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Men's domestic work | 6,766 | 46.952 | 71.831 |
| Both egalitarian | 3,884 | 51.692 | 74.321 |
| Men=egalitarian, women =traditional | 468 | 44.423 | 67.737 |
| Both traditional | 738 | 42.182 | 71.225 |
| Men=traditional, women=egalitarian | 1,676 | 38.777 | 66.274 |

Note: Men's domestic work is measured in minutes.

## Findings

Table 7 presents the gender view effects of individuals and spouses from the OLS regression to find its associations with time spent in domestic work of dual-earner couples on weekdays and weekends respectively, adjusted for individual socioeconomic background factors. The results reveal that the effects of the husband's egalitarian were statistically
significant for both husband and wife. A husband's egalitarian gender view increased his own domestic work time, and decreased his wife's domestic work time. As the hypothesis 1 suggested, men with more gender equitable attitudes were more likely to spend 10.67 min longer on weekdays ( $p<0.001$ ) and 9.09 min longer on weekends ( $p<0.05$ ).

Table 7: Gender ideology on domestic work.

|  | Men <br> Weekday | Women <br> Weekday | Men <br> Weekend | Women <br> Weekend |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Individual gender view | $10.67^{* * *}$ | -1.174 | $9.085^{*}$ | 7.296 |
|  | (1.866) | (4.183) | (3.551) | (6.76) |
| Spouse's gender view | -1.716 | $-9.263^{* *}$ | 0.584 | -7.359 |
|  | (2.322) | (3.357) | (4.601) | (5.22) |
| Age | $0.269^{* *}$ | $1.706^{* * *}$ | $-0.855^{* * *}$ | $0.942^{* *}$ |
|  | (0.089) | (0.176) | (0.178) | (0.289) |
| Education | 1.134 | -1.74 | $3.121^{*}$ | -3.652 |


|  | (0.777) | (1.459) | (1.545) | (2.358) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Part-time | $17.82 * *$ | $48.11^{* * *}$ | 7.003 | 21.00 *** |
|  | (3.829) | (3.734) | (7.285) | (5.77) |
| Workplace | 2.188 | $23.84 * *$ | $-20.41^{* * *}$ | $-23.10^{* * *}$ |
|  | (1.867) | (3.232) | (3.603) | (5.086) |
| Family members | $-2.477^{* *}$ | $7.923{ }^{* * *}$ | -1.049 | $15.83{ }^{* * *}$ |
|  | (0.892) | (1.602) | (1.783) | (2.617) |
| $3+$ members to care | -25.31 | -34.02 | -56.68 | 174.9 |
|  | (24.33) | (43.56) | (85.79) | (125.8) |
| 3+ Children under 10 | 25.31 | 51.45 | 48.01 | -217.2 |
|  | (25.42) | (45.51) | (87.06) | (127.6) |
| _cons | 4.029 | 13.69 | $118.3^{* * *}$ | 152.0 *** |
|  | (9.561) | (17.68) | (18.79) | (28.76) |
| N | 4046 | 4046 | 2720 | 2720 |

Note: Individual gender view and spouse's gender imply that they have egalitarian gender views. Reponses of gender views are answered in: 1) Traditional and 2) Egalitarian. For men, men's domestic work, individual gender view indicates effects of men's own gender view on their own domestic work time, and spouse's view implies that effects of their wives' gender view on men's domestic work time. Responses of workplace type are answered in: 1) Corporate, government offices, non-profit organizations, and 2) Private business ${ }^{*} p<0.05,{ }^{* *} p<0.01,{ }^{* * *} p<0.001$

For women, husbands' perspective had effects on women's time spent in domestic work. Women, whose husbands' gender view is egalitarian, had a 9.26 min negative association on weekdays ( $\mathrm{p}<0.01$ ) and a 7.36 min negative association on weekends respectively on their domestic work time, but on weekend, the result was not statistically significant. The hypothesis 1 turned out to be true.

On the other hand, individual gender attitude effects of women were not so much significant. Unlike the hypothesis 2 suggested, a wife's egalitarian gender view did not affect her domestic work time significantly both on weekdays and weekends. Also, even though it was not statistically significant, women's egalitarian view rather increased her domestic work time. It showed that since men's domestic work time increased on weekends compared to weekdays, women with egalitarian gender view also tried to do more domestic work on weekends like the husbands. At the same time, women's egalitarian view did not affect her husband's domestic work time much. The hypothesis 2 turned out to be false.

The results reveal that gender ideology is adequate to explain the gendered division of domestic work, but only gender view
of husbands was significant on domestic work time of both women and men rather than gender view of wives. It implies that a husband's egalitarian gender attitude is important for the equal division of domestic work in dual-earner families.

Table 8 shows if the husband's domestic work would increase significantly, when both husband and wife have egalitarian gender views. It represents how men's gender view changed their domestic work time by groups of couples of different gender views. When both husband and wife had egalitarian gender views, men's domestic work time increased by 8.20 minutes, and it was statistically significant ( $p<0.01$ ). On the other hand, even though the wife still had an egalitarian view, if the husband's view changed to a traditional gender view, his domestic work time did not have a statistically important increase. This result is meaningful because it also shows that the husband's gender view is more important than the wife as the hypotheses 1 and 2 suggested.

Table 8: Effects of men's egalitarian gender view on men's domestic works by different family groups of gender views.

|  | Men=traditional <br> Women=egalitarian | Both egalitarian | Both traditional | Men=egalitarian <br> Women=traditional |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Individual gender view | 4.86 | $8.202^{* *}$ | -0.29 | $17.54^{*}$ |


|  | (4.945) | (2.583) | (6.954) | (7.654) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age | -0.0698 | -0.208 | 0.111 | 0.256 |
|  | (0.201) | (0.134) | (0.312) | (0.333) |
| Education | $3.088^{*}$ | $2.384^{*}$ | -2.284 | 3.349 |
|  | (1.494) | (1.116) | (2.369) | (2.817) |
| Part-time | 15.02* | 17.29** | -0.109 | 14.46 |
|  | (7.438) | (5.758) | (9.553) | (11.35) |
| Workplace | -1.397 | $-6.751^{* *}$ | -7.885 | -10.37 |
|  | (3.5) | (2.61) | (6.174) | (6.685) |
| Family members | -1.765 | -1.659 | 0.434 | $-7.373^{*}$ |
|  | (1.831) | (1.333) | (3.305) | (3.638) |
| Members to care for | -12.92 | -0.0744 | -4.867 | 72.46 *** |
|  | (11.29) | (7.355) | (14.9) | (21.59) |
| Children under 10 | 13.18 | 1.098 | 0.343 | -72.24** |
|  | (11.49) | (7.442) | (15.92) | (22.11) |
| _cons | 29.31 | $39.16{ }^{* *}$ | 55.53 | -2.919 |
|  | (19.3) | (14.44) | (30.28) | (40.51) |
| N | 1676 | 3884 | 738 | 468 |
|  |  | , ** $\mathrm{p}<0.01$ |  |  |

One thing that this research could not predict beforehand was that when men have egalitarian views and women have traditional views, men's increase in domestic work was even bigger than the couples with both egalitarian gender views. Men's domestic work time increased even higher when a husband had an egalitarian view and a wife had a traditional view. Men's egalitarian gender view increased by 17.54 minutes ( $p<0.05$ ).

From the results, we can predict that since women have traditional views, they are already highly involved in domestic work compared to women whose gender view is egalitarian, so women's contribution to domestic work should be bigger for the couples with traditional women regardless of men's gender view. Therefore, men having egalitarian views will bring a bigger change or increase to these couples compared to the couples of both egalitarian views who are already sharing domestic work relatively equally. Therefore, when men have an egalitarian gender view, the effect will be shown relatively large compared to the couples who have both egalitarian gender views.

The hypothesis 3 also suggested that when both husband and wife have egalitarian gender views, the wife's domestic work will decrease significantly, and it turned out to be true. When both husband and wife had egalitarian views, the husband's egalitarian attitude decreased the wife's domestic work time by 14.80 minutes, and it was statistically significant ( $p<0.001$ ). On the other hand, for couples whose gender view is all traditional, the husband's gender view increased a wife's domestic work time by 23.41 minutes. ( $p<0.05$ ). When the hypothesis 2 was tested in Table 7, it suggested that women's egalitarian gender view affected not much to decrease their time in domestic work, but only the husbands' egalitarian gender view matter, however, Table 9 showed a bit different results from it, and it implied that in order to decrease the wife's domestic work time, it is important for both wife and husband to have egalitarian gender views.

Table 9: Effects of men's egalitarian gender view on women's domestic works by different family groups of gender views.
$\left.\begin{array}{lccc}\hline & \begin{array}{c}\text { Men=traditional } \\ \text { Women=egalitarian }\end{array} & \text { Both egalitarian } & \text { Both traditional }\end{array} \begin{array}{c}\text { Men=egalitarian } \\ \text { Women=traditional }\end{array}\right]$

|  | (8.48) | (3.977) | (11.07) | (13.04) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Individual age | 0.629 | $1.577^{* * *}$ | $1.416^{*}$ | $2.084^{* *}$ |
|  | (0.377) | (0.223) | (0.569) | (0.632) |
| Education | -1.903 | -1.361 | -3.636 | -2.972 |
|  | (2.679) | (1.776) | (4.27) | (5.151) |
| Part-time | $30.72^{* * *}$ | $43.36 * *$ | 26.96** | $41.43^{* * *}$ |
|  | (6.533) | (4.635) | (10.17) | (11.93) |
| Work place | 0.22 | 8.278* | 4.123 | -4.514 |
|  | (5.917) | (3.884) | (9.507) | (11.23) |
| Family members | $11.13^{* * *}$ | $10.62^{* * *}$ | 2.779 | $19.53^{* *}$ |
|  | (3.154) | (2.059) | (5.253) | (6.261) |
| Members to care for | -4.612 | -17.98 | -14.51 | 41.29 |
|  | (19.45) | (11.36) | (23.78) | (36.64) |
| Children under10 | -5.45 | 19.29 | 17.21 | -40 |
|  | (19.84) | (11.49) | (25.35) | (37.4) |
| _cons | $116.8{ }^{* * *}$ | 88.06 *** | 46.84 | -25.61 |
|  | (34.2) | (22.49) | (51.55) | (70.61) |
| N | 1676 | 3884 | 738 | 468 |

Table 10 implies that dual-earner couples show different husband's gender view was very traditional, her dissatisfaction with the division of domestic work by genders. On dissatisfaction rate was 3.3, but when it was changed to very the scale points of 5 , from 1) Very satisfied to 5 ) Very egalitarian, her dissatisfaction rate decreased to 2.5 on 5 dissatisfied, women showed 2.95, while men showed 2.55 . scales. It represents that men's gender view affects not only Wives were more likely to be dissatisfied with the division of division of domestic work but also satisfaction of women on domestic work than husbands. Since a husband's gender view it. The hypothesis 4 turned out to be true. The husband's was an important determining factor for the division of traditional gender view is negatively associated with the domestic work both for husband and wife, this research wife's satisfaction with division of domestic work.
looked into how their dissatisfaction rate changes by a husband's gender view. Table 11 implies that women are more likely to be satisfied with the division of domestic work when her husband's gender view is egalitarian. When her

Table 10: Dissatisfaction on division of domestic work by gender.

| Variable | Obs | Mean | Std. dev. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Women's dissatisfaction | 6766 | 2.95 | 1.085 |
| Men's dissatisfaction | 6766 | 2.55 | 0.84 |

Note: Answers in 5 scales: 1) Very satisfied, 2) Little satisfied, 3) It is okay, 4) Little dissatisfied, and 5) Very dissatisfied.

Table 11: Women's dissatisfaction of division of domestic work by men's gender view.

| When husband's gender view is | Obs | Mean | Std. dev. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Very traditional | 340 | 3.288 | 1.264 |
| Traditional | 2,074 | 3.208 | 1.009 |
| Egalitarian | 2,932 | 2.931 | 1.012 |
| Very egalitarian | 1,420 | 2.53 | 1.15 |
| Average | 6766 | 2.95 | 1.085 |

## DISCUSSION

This study observed how Korean dual-earner couples' gender views are distributed, and tested four different hypotheses to see and if it affects the division of their domestic work and women's satisfaction with it. Out of the four hypotheses, one turned out to be false, and three hypotheses turned out to be true. The results showed that the husband's gender view affected domestic work time of his wife as well as himself, and it is important for husband to have an egalitarian view not only for equal distribution of domestic work but also for the wife's satisfaction with the division of domestic work. Korean society is moving towards a more egalitarian society, but despite of the tremendous amount of efforts, the unequal division of domestic work in a dual-earner family is still prevalent. Of course, it is not an easy process to reshape the gender view in such a short period of time since it traditional gender view is deeply rooted in Korean society, but we should be aware of that time is finite for both males and females in working families. Working women struggle with time deficit to manage their roles in work and family, and this becomes even harder when their husbands are not supportive. The husbands' contribution to domestic work is not an option anymore, and it is a key element for the dual-earner families to maintain balance in their work and family and well-being.

## CONCLUSION

This study has limitations. As it is mentioned, there are many other factors to determine domestic work of men and women such as monthly income and paid work time of individuals and spouses. For example, some studies have shown the mixed effects of gender views, monthly income and paid work of individuals and spouses. This study aimed to focus on effects of gender view only, and thus it did not include other factors, however, it would be still meaningful to observe effects of all these effects together by using the time-use data in the future.
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