Sex Roles, Vol. 32, Nos. 3/4, 1995

Role Conflict and Perceptions of Gender Roles (The Case of Israel)[1]

Dahlia Moore[2]
Department of Sociology

Abraham Gobi
School of Education

The present study focuses on work–family role conflict among Jewish women employed in a female-typed occupation (secondary school teachers) and a male-typed occupation (university professors). The major hypotheses of the study are that women who work in different occupation types employ different strategies to reduce role conflict and that family roles contribute more to role conflict than work roles. The findings support the hypotheses and show that women in a male-typed occupation spend less time on family and domestic roles, and increase their hours of work. Consequently, their burden at home decreases while their burden at work increases. Because the burden at home contributes more to role conflict than the burden at work, women in male-typed occupations report less role conflict than women in a typically female occupation.

Researchers indicate that employed women are over-committed and find combining work and family conflictual and stressful (Cowan, 1983; Fuchs, 1989). They experience role conflict as a result of performing diverse social roles that demand incompatible behaviors (Chassin, Zeiss, Cooper, & Reaven, 1985; Davis & Robinson, 1991). The main source of women's role conflict is insufficient time to perform all the tasks expected of them and

[1]An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Society for the Advancement of Socio-Economics Conference, Paris, 1994. We wish to acknowledge our gratitude to Dafna Izraeli for her insightful critique. We also thank the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments. This research was funded jointly by Schein Institute and The Eshkol Foundation.
[2]To whom correspondence should be addressed at Department of Sociology, The Hebrew University Jerusalem, Israel 91905.

0360-0025/95/0200-0251$07.50/0

meet all their obligations especially when they are married and mothers of small children and when their paid work demands long, inflexible hours (Cooke & Rousseau, 1984; Crosby, 1990; Fox & Nickols, 1983; Moen & Dempster-McClain, 1987).

But there is contradictory empirical evidence regarding the impact of heavier loads (including responsibilities, obligations and burden both at home and at work) on role conflict. Some research shows that role conflict is stronger for working mothers (Ruble, Cohen, & Ruble, 1984), while other research arrives at the opposite conclusion (Crosby, 1987; Epstein, 1988; Kulman, 1986). Several factors were offered as explanations of the inconsistent findings: historical changes (Ross, Mirowsky, & Huber, 1983), spouse participation at home (Epstein, 1988), and developing strategies for reducing time pressure and role conflict (Thoits, 1987). We believe that heavier load in one sphere leads to stronger role conflict only if the load at the other sphere is not reduced. Thus, heavier family load will lead to stronger role conflict if the work load is not reduced; similarly, heavier work load will lead to stronger role conflict if the domestic load is not reduced.

In many societies, especially in the more traditional ones, choosing work over family is not a conceivable option for women, and the same applies to Israel (Izraeli, 1993). In such cases, women's major strategy to reduce stress is to curtail their work roles by going into part-time jobs, employment in time-flexible occupations, and/or "Mommy tracks" (Bergman, 1992; Fiorentine, 1988; Fowlkes, 1987; Weitzman, 1984). Such employment is more available in female-typed occupations, i.e., occupations in which women form the majority of all workers (Charles, 1992; Moore, 1991, 1992). Because of their reliance on women workers, female-typed occupations also tend to be more "female friendly" in terms of flexibility, less compulsory overtime, and adjusting working hours to women's needs than male-typed occupations (Kaufman, 1992; Jacobs, 1989).

Male-typed occupations, on the other hand, are insensitive to time bound family obligations. In fact, their structure is based on the assumption that the work role is the worker's primary role, and that work time will spill over into family time. These occupations are constructed to accommodate the breadwinner or careerist roles rather than the home-maker role and typically entail less flexible, longer working hours and greater work commitment than female-typed occupations (Moore, 1992). By this analysis, married women (and especially mothers) who select male-typed occupations are more likely to be under more pressing time obligations and to experience role conflict than women who join female-typed occupations.

This study examines whether the women who work in male-typed occupations do in fact have stronger time pressure and role conflict than

women who work in female-typed occupations and whether the sources of role conflict are the same for the two groups. Moreover, it investigates the possibility that women who work in male-typed occupations do not give up creating families but rather select a different strategy for reducing work-family conflict than women in female-typed occupations: shifting priorities from domestic to work roles, and limiting the time spent on family and domestic obligations. It also attempts to determine which of the two strategies—the "limited family role" strategy or the "limited work role" strategy—is more effective for limiting role conflict.

We assume that women's choices regarding work and family are not necessarily of an "either-or" type but rather of a "more-or-less" type. Thus, women's options are not limited to "family first and foremost" or "work first and foremost" and women may have different time allocation strategies. Consequently, without relinquishing either of the two roles, some women allocate more of their time to the domestic sphere and less to the work sphere while other women reverse the order of priorities (Anderson, 1993; Stacey, 1990).

Women's decisions regarding role priorities may be construed as different strategies for reducing role conflict: the "limited work role" strategy means reducing role conflict by limiting the time and burden at work, and the "limited family role" strategy means reducing role conflict by limiting the time and burden at home. The choice of strategy may be dependent on women's preferences and needs, but may also depend on the occupational-types: their time demands and rewards. Male-typed occupations have less flexible working hours, and require women to spend more time at work and reduce the time they allot to family work. In female-typed occupations, where working hours are more flexible, women may choose to spend less time at work and more time on family roles.[3]

We hypothesize that controlling for marital status and number of children, women who work in male-typed occupations do not report stronger role conflict than women in female-typed occupations. They perceive the domestic roles as less central, spend less time on their family obligations and more time at work, and experience domestic work as less burdensome than do women in female-typed occupations. In other words—they would choose a strategy more similar to men's to deal with role conflict. To examine these issues we analyzed the perceptions of role conflict, time allocation, burden and some of the major social roles: spouse, parent, homemaker, breadwinner and careerist of the two groups.

[3]The choice between the two strategies may have been made before the person chose a specific occupation and therefore may have affected the occupational choice. It could have also been made *after* joining the labor market and therefore influenced by the occupation.

The Impact of Occupation Type

Enhancement of status in modern societies is attainable mainly through gainful employment (Blumberg, 1979; Chafetz, 1990). Although many women are employed (Richmond-Abbott, 1992), most (about 70% both in Israel and the United States) are concentrated in a small number of large female-typed occupations (e.g., teachers, secretaries, nurses). However, status enhancement in these occupations is more difficult to attain (Betz & Fitzgerald, 1987) because the jobs they contain tend to be characterized by more routine tasks that require less work-commitment and pay lower wages (Izraeli, 1988; Major, 1993; Ollenburger & Moore, 1992). Women turn to these occupations to minimize conflict with family roles because they are more time-flexible (Bergman, 1986; Bielby & Bielby, 1984; Spade & Reese, 1991; Wiley, 1991).

Male-typed occupations, on the other hand, usually entail longer working hours, higher work commitment, place women in direct competition with men and compel them to prove their ability vis-à-vis men's (especially when they are in "Token's" positions, see Kanter (1977)). Therefore, women's work in atypical occupations is often considered more stressful than work in female-typed occupations, and an indication of deviation from the traditional expectations (Berger, Wagner, & Zelditch, 1985; Ridgeway, 1993). It is also possible that women who are less traditional in the sense that they perceive their work as very important are those who join male-typed occupations (see also Carlson, 1992; Evans, 1993).

Furthermore, because male-typed occupations pay higher wages than female-typed ones (Moore, 1990), women in these occupations are better able to pay for outside services such as child-care, cleaning, and cooking (Kulman, 1986; Thoits, 1987). Thus, women in male-typed occupations enhance their power position at home and induce greater sharing of home responsibility (Crosby, 1987). Consequently, we expect women who work in male-typed occupations to be less home-oriented and attribute less importance to their traditional feminine roles than women who work in female-typed occupations. More specifically, we hypothesize that women in a male-typed occupation attribute less importance to women's roles of parent, spouse and homemaker than women in a female occupation, and higher importance to women's roles of breadwinner and careerist.

Women who work in female-typed occupations may find themselves in a time crunch more often than women who work in male-typed occupations because the first have less domestic help (from paid helpers or other family members), and therefore they have more areas of responsibility in which they have pressing obligations (Hochschild, 1989; Schooler, Miller, Miller, & Richtand, 1984; Sekeran, 1986). We also believe that time

crunches will happen more often to women who attribute great importance to domestic roles than to women who attribute less importance to these roles (see also Kelley & Evans, 1993; Svallfors, 1993). These obligations are usually related to raising children (Crouter, 1984), and the quality of child-care that they manage to find (Van Meter & Agronow, 1982). Most women who choose careers in male-typed occupations say that spouse cooperation is an essential ingredient in the reduction of their domestic burden and their success at work (Crosby, 1990). The cliché "Cherchéz la femme" applies here in reverse: "Cherchéz l'homme."

The Israeli Context

Israeli society is simultaneously an industrialized, urbanized society and a traditional one in terms of the structure of family life (Peres & Katz, 1981; Izraeli, forthcoming). It is a family centered society. Most people (91%) under the age of 40 are married; the divorce rate is approximately 20%; the average number of children is 2.7 per family (Israeli Bureau of Statistics, 1992). The family is considered women's primary responsibility.

Women constitute about 40% of the labor force (Israeli Bureau of Statistics, 1992). Only about 30 percent of them are employed in male-typed occupations, mostly those requiring higher education and entailing higher status (Effroni, 1980; Moore, 1991). They constitute about 90% of all the teachers in secondary schools, but less than 10% of university professors (Israeli Bureau of Statistics, 1992). The expectation that employers make allowances for women's family obligations is institutionalized in labor relations (Bernstein, 1983; Izraeli, 1993), especially in female-typed occupations. Women are entitled to 12 weeks paid maternity leave and up to one year leave without pay. Collective agreements in the public sector (where more than 80% of the women are employed) grant women with small children the privilege of working shorter days (Harpaz, 1992).

Comparing professional women in mid-life in the United States and Israel, Lieblich (1987) notes the lower centrality that Israeli women attach to their professional identities when compared with American women. Studies of women in Israel have found that the great majority have a traditional division of labor in the home. There is no relation between the amount of moral support women report receiving from their husbands and the amount of family work that husbands do (Mannheim, 1993). Women's employment does not affect the amount of time husbands spend in housework and child care. Employed women, however, spend less time in these activities than full time homemakers either because they "buy" outside help or because they settle for less qualitative and extensive house work (Peres

& Katz, 1984). Since buying extensive outside help is not common among teachers and professors, the latter seems to be the more common solution.

RESEARCH METHOD

The Samples

The data were collected in 1991 from a sample of university professors including *all* women currently associate or full professors (N-83) in Israel's three major universities (Tel-Aviv, Jerusalem and Haifa) and from a sample of secondary school teachers drawn from the same three cities in which the universities reside to control for geographic variance.[4]

Looking at the domestic characteristics of professors and teachers, a striking similarity can be seen: the proportion of marriages among both professors and teachers is similar (71% and 79%, respectively) and teachers tend to have more children than professors, but the difference is not statistically significant (87% of the teachers and 75% of the professors have children). Examination of their work-related characteristics shows a significant dissimilarity: professors have much greater seniority (27 years of experience) than teachers (13.4 years), and they tend to engage in additional tasks at work much more than teachers (89% of the professors and 44% of the teachers had additional tasks at work). Also, because attaining professorship is a lengthy process in Israel[5] and teachers tend to leave the occupation before the pension age (65) because of burnout (Antman and Shirom, 1987), Professors tend to be older than teachers in the sample (51 and 37, respectively).

Questionnaires were sent to the university professors and returned by mail. Questionnaires were handed out to 100 women teachers in the biggest secondary schools.[6] When a specific teacher was not present in the school,

[4]Of the remaining four academic institutions in Israel, one is a religious institution, another has no women professors, and the remaining two are not universities.

[5]The age differences are caused by the very long and difficult process of attaining professorship. In Israel, academic education begins at a much older age than in the United States or Europe because of compulsory military service, and it is a more prolonged process. Most Israelis begin their academic careers past the age of 35, taking 6–8 years to gain tenure, and 5 more years to attain the rank of associate professor. As for teachers, the education process is much shorter and tenure is gained after only 2 years. These age differences may account, at least in part, for the differences regarding the time spent on child-care by teachers and professors.

[6]The sample of women teachers was selected so that it matched a men's sample. The original data base includes a sample (N = 85) of all men teachers in the big secondary schools of the three cities (N = 112), and women teachers were matched by years of experience and the subjects they teach.

a questionnaire was left for her and retrieved a week later. Different data collection techniques were used because each professor chooses to work in different days and hours and are not available in the universities when they are not teaching, while teachers all work from 8 to 1 o'clock every day and were easier to reach. After two mailed reminders and several telephone calls, the final sample includes 40 professors and 72 teachers.[7] The main reasons for non-response were: lack of time; not in the country; lack of interest in gender issues.

Variables and Measures

Dependent Variable. Role conflict was measured as an 11 item index, using a 6-point Likert scale with 1 = totally applicable and 6 = totally inapplicable. Cronbach α = .80 for the 11 items. A varimax rotated factor analysis revealed 3 distinct factors of role conflict. The first factor ("the cost of parenthood") deals with the impact of children on the functioning of workers and explains 45% of the variance. The second factor ("Home-work conflict") focuses on the generalized perception of home-work role conflict and explains 16% of the variance. The third factor ("Benefits of role combination") refers to the *positive* aspect of role combination. Those who rate high on this factor perceive compatibility between home and work roles and benefit from both. This factor explains 13% of the variance (Appendix I).

Independent Variables. The perception of home burden was measured by a 9-item index asking respondents to indicate how burdensome to them is each of the 9 activities: cleaning, shopping, cooking, maintenance, caring for spouse, child-care, children's education, caring for parents, payments and insurance. The items were measured on a 5-point Likert scale with 1 = no burden at all and 5 = a very heavy burden. Cronbach α = .86.

Varimax rotated factor analysis (Appendix II) shows that these tasks represent three distinct domains: "burden of home-making" (cleaning, cooking, shopping and maintenance), "burden of dependents" (mainly children), and "burden of outside tasks" (this factor includes taking care of spouse, parents and "outside" tasks like paying bills. Since both taking care of parents and payments are done outside the home, and both are stronger than taking care of spouse, this factor takes its meaning from those items and was so labeled). The three measures are orthogonal and weakly correlated. They explain 42%, 17% and 12% of the variance, respectively. We

[7]The samples include Jews of Western origin only because there are no Arab or Eastern origin women professors in any of the Israeli universities. To maintain gender similarity, we avoided Arab and Eastern origin teachers as well.

used factor loadings to provide differential weights to the diverse dimensions of burden created by domestic obligations when we analyzed the three dimensions of role conflict.

Time allotted to domestic roles was measured by the same 9-item index used for the measurement of burden, but here respondents were asked to indicate how much time they estimate spending during an average week on these domestic activities. The items were measured on a 5-point Likert scale with 1 = very little time and 5 = a great deal of time. Factor analysis (see Appendix II) shows that nearly the same factorial structure found for perceptions of burden applies to time allocation. The three factors were labeled: "time for home-making" (cleaning, cooking, shopping and maintenance), "time for family members" (spouse and children), and "time for outside tasks" (parents and payments). They explained 36%, 17% and 14% of the variance, respectively. We used the factor loadings as weights for the diverse dimensions of time spent on domestic obligations when we analyzed role conflict. Cronbach $\alpha = .78$.

Subjective measures of perceived time investment and feelings of burden were used because it is the feeling of "a great deal of time" rather than the actual time spent on performing tasks that will lead to the perception of burden (Orthner and Pittman, 1986). Also, the research method (questionnaires, not logbooks or time-management diaries) dictates a subjective rather than an objective measure of the amount of time.

Work burden was measured by a 3-item index asking respondents to indicate how applicable to themselves are diverse work descriptions: (1) My work is wearing and exhausting; (2) My work demands heavy responsibilities; (3) If I could, I would quit my job. The items were measured on a 5-point Likert scale with 1 = totally inapplicable and 5 = totally applicable. Factor analysis created a single factor (see Appendix III) and it explains 47% of the variance. Cronbach $\alpha = .58$.

Work time was measured by two variables: number of working hours per week, and having additional tasks at work. Scale: Respondent has additional tasks (like head of department, school's social activity coordinator) = 1; respondent has no additional tasks = 0.

Perceptions of relative importance of gender roles was measured by a 5-item index asking respondents to indicate how important they consider each role to be: woman as spouse; woman as mother; woman as homemaker; woman as breadwinner; woman as careerist. The items were measured on a 6-point Likert scale with 1 = totally unimportant and 6 = very important. A varimax rotated factor analysis revealed two distinct factors (see Appendix IV): importance of domestic roles and importance of work roles. The factors explain 36% and 26%, respectively. Cronbach $\alpha = .84$.

Analysis Strategy

First, we used *t*-tests to analyze the significance of differences between the two groups regarding all the variables and measures. The purpose of the analysis is to ascertain that women who turn to male- and female-typed occupations represent distinct groups. Second, regression analysis was used to determine the major factors that contribute to the role conflict of the two groups. This analysis aims to show the relative impact of the domestic and the work spheres on role conflict of women in the two occupation types. Finally, using discriminant analysis we examined the characteristics that maximize the distance between the two groups and contribute significantly to their defining profiles.

RESULTS

Table I presents the attitudinal and demographic characteristics of teachers and professors. Examination of the demographic characteristics shows that the seniority of professors is much higher than teachers' (t = 8.8. This may reflect the age differences between the two groups). In addition, professors work longer hours (t = 15.4) and have much higher incomes (t = 21.6), and are more likely than teachers to have additional tasks (t = 5.8). No differences between the two groups were found regarding marital status (t = 1.0) or having children (t = 1.6).

Comparison of the two samples shows that there are no significant differences between them regarding "The cost of parenthood" (t = –.33), and no differences regarding "Home-work role conflict" (t = 1.2). However, there are significant differences between them regarding the perceived "Benefits of role combinations" (t = 2.5): Women in the female-typed occupation perceive role combination as more beneficial than those who work in the male-typed occupation. Those who rate high on this factor perceive home and work roles to be compatible and benefit from both.

Examination of their time allocation (both at home and at work) shows that there are no significant differences between the two groups regarding time spent on outside tasks (caring for parents, paying bills, t = 1.6), but professors spend less time on house work (cleaning, cooking, shopping) and on their dependents (mainly their children, t = –4.2 and t = –4.8, respectively) and they work longer hours outside their homes than teachers (t = 15.4). Moreover, professors feel less burdened by their house work and their dependents (t = –5.2 and t = –2.7, respectively), and they also feel less burdened by their paid work (t = –6.4). They do feel more burdened by "outside" tasks than teachers (see Tables I and II).

Table I. Occupation-Type Differences (T-Test)

Variable	Professors (N = 40)	Teachers (N = 72)	T-Value
Role conflict			
Factor 1 = The cost of parenthood	-.16	.30	-.33
Factor 2 = Home-work role conflict	.19	-.06	1.2
Factor 3 = Benefits of role combinations	-.27	.24	2.5[b]
Burden at home			
Factor 1 = House work	-.53	.46	-5.2[c]
Factor 2 = Dependents	-.19	.33	-2.7[b]
Factor 3 = Outside tasks	.20	-.32	2.6[b]
Time at home			
Factor 1 = House work	-.47	.30	-4.2[c]
Factor 2 = Dependents	-.47	.42	-4.8[c]
Factor 3 = Outside tasks	.03	-.27	1.6
Burden at work	-.69	-.41	-6.4[c]
Time at work			
Hours of work per week	48.8	22.7	15.4[b]
Relative importance of gender roles			
Factor 1 = Importance of family roles	-.22	.10	-2.0[c]
Factor 2 = Importance of work roles	.17	-.11	1.7
Demographic characteristics			
Marital Status (Married = 1; not married = 0)	.71	.79	1.0
Children (Has = 1; does not have = 0)	.75	.87	1.6
Seniority (Years, continuous)	27.1	13.4	8.8[c]
Additional Tasks at Work (Has tasks = 1; has no tasks = 0)	.89	.44	5.8[b]
Monthly Earnings (New Israeli Shekels)	4594.5	1877.4	21.6[c]

[a] $p < .005$.
[b] $p < .01$.
[c] $p < .05$.

Their perceptions of gender roles are also different: Teachers attribute higher importance to women's family roles (mother, spouse, and homemaker) than professors ($t = -2.0$), and they attribute somewhat lower importance to their work roles (breadwinner and careerist, $t = 1.7$). The result is a dissimilar time allocation of women in the male- and the female-typed occupations, according to which teachers invest significantly more time on the ongoing day-to-day domestic activities and less time at work than professors.

To determine whether there are different predictors (or sources) of role conflict for the two occupational groups, we regressed occupation type,

Table II. Time and Burden at Home (T-Test)

Role	Professors (N = 40)	Teachers (N = 72)	T-Value
Amount of time spent			
Cleaning house	1.71	2.74	46.0[b]
Shopping	1.88	2.41	23.2[b]
Cooking	2.17	2.62	4.81[a]
House maintenance	1.77	2.66	42.0[b]
Care for spouse	1.91	2.57	5.66[b]
Child-care	2.69	3.40	15.9[b]
Children's education	2.51	3.41	19.2[b]
Caring for parents	2.40	1.77	3.69[b]
Payments, insurance	1.52	1.40	1.01
Perceived burden			
Cleaning house	2.04	3.58	18.4[b]
Shopping	1.91	2.42	3.83[c]
Cooking	2.00	2.71	4.90[c]
House maintenance	1.74	2.18	2.91
Care for spouse	1.41	1.40	.01
Child-care	1.56	1.68	.70
Children's education	1.65	2.06	3.44[c]
Caring for parents	2.06	1.64	5.42[c]
Payments, insurance	1.81	1.80	.10

[a] $p < .005$.
[b] $p < .01$.
[c] $p < .05$.

roles' importance, time, burden, work and demographic characteristics on each of the three dimensions of role conflict: "The cost of parenthood", "Home-work role conflict", and "Benefits of role combinations" (see Table III).[8] The analysis of "Home-work role conflict" shows that there are significant differences between the two occupations with teachers reporting stronger role conflict than professors. The major variables that contribute to this role conflict are feelings of burden at the domestic sphere and at the work sphere. Both the domestic and the work roles contribute to the explaining of role conflict, but in opposite directions: whereas perceiving domestic roles as highly important increases role conflict, perceiving work roles as highly important decreases role conflict. Income level also reduces role conflict: the higher the income, the lower the role conflict.

[8]We would have preferred to run separate regressions for each occupation type. This is impossible because of samples' sizes. Instead, we performed a regression analysis using a dummy variable for occupational type to examine whether different patterns exist for the two occupation types.

Table III. Regression Analysis on Role Conflict[a]

	Role conflict					
	Factor 1 = Costs of Parenthood		Factor 2 = Home-Work		Factor 3 = Role Combinations	
Variable	B	β	B	β	B	β
Burden: combined factors	.17	.32[b]	.16	.27[c]	.02	.03
Time: combined factors	−.08	−.14	.15	.23[d]	−.00	−.00
Burden at work	.05	.06	.20	.21[d]	−.17	−.18
Hours of work	.01	.12	.01	.13[d]	−.03	−.50[c]
Importance of family roles	.18	.19[d]	.19	.22[d]	−.11	−.12
Importance of work roles	−.01	−.01	−.24	−.24[d]	.09	.09
Family status (1 = married; 0 = not married)	.38	.19[d]	.14	.06	.17	.08
Seniority (years)	−.01	−.06	.02	.09	.01	.14
Wages (New Israeli Shekels)	.00	.14	−.00	−.40[c]	.00	.07
Occupation type (1 = Professors; 0 = teachers)	−.04	−.02	.60	.32[c]	−.81	−.42[d]
Constant	−.64[d]		.12		.17	
R^2	.19		.36		.22	
F	2.5[c]		2.6[c]		3.0[b]	

[a]The dependent variables are factor scores for the 3 factors created by the original 11 items.
[b]$p < .001$.
[c]$p < .01$.
[d]$p < .05$.

There are no significant differences between the two occupational types in the "Cost of parenthood", and it is based solely on factors at the domestic sphere: burden at home and the attribution of high importance to family roles (mother and spouse). The greater the burden and the higher the importance attributed to family roles, the stronger this type of role conflict will be. Thus, although women in both occupation types see these roles as the most important role of women (see Appendix IV), for teachers it adds to role conflict.

The strongest difference between the two occupational types is in the perception of "Benefits of role combinations": Teachers feel that they benefit from role combinations more than professors. This is especially true for women who work fewer hours outside their homes and for those who value the domestic roles more highly. Benefits of role combinations are not influenced by time and burden in either the domestic or the work sphere.

Table IV. Discriminant Analysis: Professors (1) (N = 40) vs. Teachers (2) (N = 72)

Canonical correlation	.66
Wilks' lambda	.54
F	51.2
Variables in the equation	
Hours of work	.60
Monthly earnings	.55
Time: house work	-.36
Seniority	.21
Burden: children	-.20
Importance of family roles	-.20
Home-work role conflict	-.19

To examine whether the two occupation types provide the basis for different profiles, or different strategies for reducing role conflict, we performed discriminant analysis that distinguishes between the two occupation types (see Table IV). The analysis shows that the profiles include few of the demographic and attitudinal characteristics. However, these few variables were enough to enable the model to re-classify both teachers and professors to their respective groups with great accuracy: 93% of the teachers and 96% of the professors were accurately classified (i.e., using the discriminant function coefficients, the model can accurately predict which of the respondents is a professor and which is a teacher).

Examination of the variables used in the analysis reveals that the factors that distinguish between the two groups are hours of work, monthly earnings, seniority, time spent on housework, burden regarding children, perception of the importance of women's family roles, and home-work role conflict. Thus, professors work longer hours, for higher pay, with higher seniority than teachers. They see women's family roles as less important and spend less time on these chores. They also feel less burdened by their children (which may be due to the fact that their children are likely to be older than teacher's children). Home-work role conflict was found to be higher among women in the female-typed occupation than among women in the male-typed occupation.

DISCUSSION

Women in the female-typed occupation (school teachers) tend to attribute greater importance to their family roles and lower importance to

their work roles. They invest more time in fulfilling family obligations, feel more burdened by them, and report stronger home-work role conflict. Women who work in the male-typed occupation (university professors) tend to attribute greater importance to their work roles, invest more time at work and less time on domestic obligations, they feel less burdened by their domestic responsibilities and, despite their heavier burden at work, they report less role conflict than women in the female-typed occupation.

These findings support our hypothesis that the sources of role conflict are different for the two groups: family obligations contribute more to the role conflict of teachers than do work roles, and the opposite is true for professors. Because the home-work role conflict was found to be somewhat stronger among women in the female-typed occupation than among women in the male-typed occupation, we conclude that the impact of domestic obligations on role conflict is stronger than the impact of work obligations.

Also, burden at home contributes more to role conflict than burden at work. Therefore, women who limit their domestic obligations report less role conflict than women who limit their work obligations. Women professors tend to curtail their family and domestic roles more than women teachers, thus, even though their work commitment is higher, they do not experience stronger role conflict and we may conclude that women who join male-typed occupations do not pay a heavier price in terms of role conflict.

Our data indicate the existence of two distinct strategies for minimizing role conflict: The "limited family role" strategy espoused mainly by professors that tend to reduce role conflict by decreasing family commitment, and the "limited work role" strategy espoused mainly by teachers who tend to reduce role conflict by curtailing their work obligations. The "limited family role" strategy seems to be more effective in reducing role conflict than the "limited work role" strategy.

The "limited family role" strategy does not mean that women in the male-typed occupation undervalue their family roles. Our findings show that these roles are as important to them as they are to women in female-typed occupation. However, unlike the teachers, professors perceive their work roles as important as their family roles. Because of that, and because this occupation demands greater investment of time and commitment, they work longer hours and are more likely to have additional tasks than teachers. They spend less time on family obligations and their balance of time allocation is different from teachers'. Also, professors earn higher wages than teachers and can purchase more domestic services. In that, they seem to choose a strategy that is similar to men's.

The "limited work role" strategy accords highest priority to family and domestic roles. This strategy is possible for persons employed in part-time work or in time flexible jobs. Because they work shorter hours and for lower wages, workers in such occupations (like the teachers) need—and can afford—less help with domestic obligations. They spend more time on family and domestic obligations than professors, and they also feel more burdened by these responsibilities. However, even the greater family burden does not necessarily result in role conflict. To the contrary—combining diverse roles is perceived by these women as beneficial (see Crosby, 1987).

Deconstructing the differences between the two strategies and those who espouse them indicates that they may be due to differences in the basic dispositions or attitudes of women who turn to male-typed occupations and those who turn to female-typed ones. Occupational choice is not random, so that those who become teachers and those who become university professors may have different predisposing characteristics. Whereas individuals with different characteristics self-select themselves for different occupations, occupations also shape the behaviors of those who enter them. If predispositions determine the strategy that will be employed, then women with different characteristics will turn to different occupation types, and the strategy they espouse reflects their preferences. If, on the other hand, the occupation imposes the strategy, then women have less freedom to choose the strategy and are "forced" into certain occupations in which they can implement the strategy that fits their needs and constraints of their lives. The different strategies may also be due to a combination of the two so that workers with a certain disposition turn to occupations in which a specific strategy is required while workers with different dispositions turn to occupations in which a different strategy is more prevalent. (The question of precedence remains open, and this study cannot determine which of the two elements influences the choice of strategy more strongly.)

It may also be that work in male-typed occupations is adjusted to the traditional division of labor that attributes greater importance to men's work roles than to their family roles and therefore, all workers in them are forced to follow the "limited family role" strategy. In contrast, female-typed occupations have no inherent or predetermined strategy and therefore workers in them can prefer to emphasize either the family sphere or the work domain. In either case, women cannot be treated as a homogeneous group, for whom a single and specific strategy is applicable.

Our data sets may have a selection problem as we lack the data about people who left these occupations if they could not handle role strain. Ac-

tual role conflict may, therefore, be stronger than depicted in this paper. Hence, the conflict we find may be but "the tip of the iceberg". The examination of these characteristics is beyond the scope of this paper. Further research is needed to examine this issue.

Appendix I. Factor Structure: Dimensions of Role Conflict

Items	Reported Role Conflict[a] Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Difficult to be both good worker and good parent	.825[b]	-.005	-.137
Children are a heavy burden	.767[b]	.131	-.014
Parenthood reduces ability to advance	.698[b]	-.044	.020
Success at work interferes with family life	.648[b]	.332	-.104
Work interferes with home	.268	.778[b]	.005
Weight of conflicting demands	.013	.715[b]	-.014
Home interferes with work	.282	.711[b]	-.030
Family supports me	-.105	-.159	.739[b]
I give support when needed	-.033	-.034	.670[b]
Work gives meaning to life	-.037	.291	.645
Family gives meaning to life	.165	.181	.439[b]
Percent explained variance	45%	16%	13%
Eigenvalue	3.03	1.63	1.36

[a]Factor 1 = the cost of parenthood; Factor 2 = home-work role conflict; Factor 3 = the benefits of role combinations.
[b]

Appendix II. Factor Structure: Time and Burden at Home

Items	Amount of time spent[a] Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Perceived burden[b] Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Cleaning house	.83[c]	.21	.01	.84[c]	.23	-.05
Shopping	.77[c]	.04	.01	.81[c]	.01	.31
Cooking	.71[c]	.07	-.02	.80[c]	.15	.09
Home maintenance	.76[c]	.27	.19	.61[c]	.22	.46
Care for spouse	.16	.58[c]	.44	.18	.42	.63[c]
Child-care	.16	.92[c]	.05	.25	.89[c]	.14
Children's education	.17	.91[c]	.00	.13	.92[c]	.11
Caring for parents	-.08	.13	.77[c]	.01	.23	.70[c]
Payments, insurance	.14	-.07	.78[c]	.30	-.29	.67[c]
Pct. explained variance	36.4%	17.0%	14.4%	41.6%	16.8%	12.3%
Eigenvalue	3.19	1.54	1.30	3.66	1.51	1.09

[a]Factor 1 = time for house work; Factor 2 = time for dependents; Factor 3 = time for outside tasks.
[b]Factor 1 = burden of house work; Factor 2 = burden of dependents; Factor 3 = burden of outside tasks.
[c]

Appendix III. Factor Structure: Burden at Work

Items	Factor
My work is wearing and exhausting	.83[a]
My work demands heavy responsibility	.75[a]
If I could, I would quit my job	.38[a]
Pct. explained variance	46.8
Eigenvalue	1.4

[a]

Appendix IV. Factor Structure: Relative Importance of Gender Roles[a]

Items	Factor 1	Factor 2
Role of women as spouse	.71[a]	.03
Role of woman as mother	.77[a]	.01
Role of woman as homemaker	.76[a]	.13
Role of woman as breadwinner	.16	.83[a]
Role of woman as careerist	.04	.85[a]
Percent explained variance	36.4%	26.0%
Eigenvalue	1.82	1.30

[a]Factor 1 = importance of family roles; Factor 2 = importance of work roles.
[b]

REFERENCES

Andersen, M. L. (1993). *Thinking about women. Sociological perspectives on sex and gender.* New York: Macmillan.

Antman, S., & Shirom, A. (1987). Organizational, occupational and individual factors of burnout among secondary school teachers. *Megamot, 30,* 349-361 (Hebrew).

Berger, J., Wagner, D. G., & Zelditch, M., Jr. (1985). Expectations state theory: Review and assessment. In J. Berger & M. Zelditch (Eds.), *Status rewards and influence: How expectations organize behavior.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bergman, B. (1986). *The economic emergence of American women.* New York: Basic Books.

Bergman, B. (1992). The job of housewife. In J. A. Kouraney, J. P. Sterba, & R. Tong (Eds.) *Feminist philosophies.* Englewood Cliffs: NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bernstein, D. (1983). Economic growth and female labor: the case of Israel. *The Sociological Review, 31,* 263-292.

Beroader, D. H., Shehan C. L., & Leslie, G. R. (1987). A residue of tradition: Jobs, careers and spouses' time in housework. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 49,* 381-390.

Betz, N. E & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1987). *The career psychology of women.* New York: Academic Press.

Bielby, D. D., & Bielby, W. T. (1984). Work commitment, sex role attitudes and women's employment. *American Sociological Review 49,* 234-247.

Blumberg, R. L. (1979). A paradigm for predicting the position of women: Policy implications and problems. In J. Lipman Blumen & J. Bernard (Eds.), *Sex roles and social policy.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Carlson, S. M. (1992). Trends in race/sex occupational inequality: conceptual and measurement issues. *Social Problems, 39,* 268-283.

Chafetz, J. S. (1990). *Gender equity.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Charles, M. (1992). Cross-national variations in occupational sex segregation. *American Sociological Review, 57,* 483-502.

Chassin, L., Zeiss, K., Cooper, K., & Reaven, J. (1985). Role perceptions, self-role congruence and marital satisfaction in dual career couples with pre-school children. *Social Psychology Quarterly 48,* 301-311.

Cooke, R., & Rousseau, D. (1984). Stress and strain from family roles and work role expectations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 69,* 252-260.

Coverman, S. (1986). Changes in men's housework and child care time: 1965–1975. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48,* 413-422.

Crosby, F. J. (1987). Introduction. In F. J. Crosby (Ed.), *Spouse, parent, worker: On gender and multiple roles.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Crosby, F. J. (1990). *Juggling.* (Draft).

Cowan, R. S. (1983). *More work for mother.* New York: Basic Books.

Crouter, A. C. (1984). Spillover from family to work: The neglected side of the work–family interface. *Human Relations, 37,* 425-442.

Davis, N. J., & Robinson, R. V. (1991). Men's and women's consciousness of gender inequality: Austria, West Germany, Great Britain, and the United States. *American Sociological Review, 56,* 72-84.

Effroni, L. (1980). Advancement and pay in the Israeli government service—are women discriminated against? Research Report, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem: The Institute for Labor and Welfare Research.

Epstein, C. F. (1988). Deceptive distinctions: Sex, gender, and the social order. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Evans, G. (1993). Is gender on the "new agenda"? *European Journal of Political Research, 24,* 135-158.

Fiorentine, R. (1988). Increasing similarity in the values and life plans of male and female college students? Evidence and implications. *Sex Roles, 18,* 143-158.

Fowlkes, M. R. (1987). Role combinations and role conflict: Introductory perspective. In F. J. Crosby (Ed.), *Spouse, parent, worker.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Fox, K. D., & Nickols, S. Y. (1983). The time crunch: Wife's employment and family life. *Journal of Family Issues, 4,* 61-82.

Fuchs, V. R. (1989). Women's quest for economic equality. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 3,* 25-41.

Harpaz, I. (1992). *The meaning of work in Israel.* New York: Praeger.

Hochschild, A. (1989). *The second shift.* New York: Avon Books.

Izraeli, D. N. (1988). Burning out in medicine: A comparison of husbands and wives in dual career couples. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 3,* 329-346.

Izraeli, D. N. (1993). Work/family conflict among women and men managers in dual career couples in Israel. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 8,* 371-388.

Izraeli, D. N. (forthcoming). Money matters: Spousal incomes and family/work relations among Physician couples in Israel. *Sociological Quarterly, 35*(1).

Jacobs, J. (1989). *Revolving doors: Sex segregation and women's careers.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation.* New York: Basic.

Kaufman, D. R. (1992). Professional women: How real are the recent gains? In J. A. Kouraney, J. P. Sterba, & R. Tong (Eds.), *Feminist philosophies.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kelley, J., & Evans M. D. R. (1993). The legitimation of inequality: occupational earnings in nine nations. *American Journal of Sociology, 99,* 75-125.

Kessler-Harris, A. (1990). *A woman's wage: Historical meanings and social consequences.* Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky.

Kulman, A. (1986). Working mothers and the family context: Predicting positive coping. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 28,* 241-253.

Lieblich, A. (1987). Preliminary comparison of Israeli and American successful career women at mid-life. In D. N. Izraeli (Guest Ed.), *Israeli social science research* (vol. 5).

Major, B. (1993). Gender, entitlement and the distribution of family labor. *Journal of Social Issues, 49,* 141-159.

Mannheim, B. (1993). Gender and the effects of demographics, status, and work values on work centrality. *Work and Occupations, 20,* 3-22.

Marini, M. M., & Brinton, M. C. (1984). Sex stereotyping in occupational socialization. In B. Reskin (Ed.), *Sex segregation in the work place: Trends, explanations and remedies.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Moen, P., & Dempster-McClain, D. (1987). Employed parents: Role strain, work time and preferences for working less. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 49,* 579-590.

Moore, D. (1990). Discrimination and deprivation: The effects of social comparisons. *Social Justice Research, 4,* 49-64.

Moore, D. (1991). Entitlement and justice evaluations: Who should get what and why? *Social Psychology Quarterly, 54,* 208-223.

Moore, D. (1992). *Labor market segmentation and its implications: Social justice, relative deprivation and entitlement.* New York: Garland Publishing.

Ollenburger J. C., & Moore, H. A. (1992). *A sociology of women: The intersection of patriarchy, capitalism and colonization.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Orthner, D. K., & Pittman, J. F. (1986). Family contributions to work commitment. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48,* 573-581.

Peres, Y., & Katz, R. (1981). Stability and centrality: The nuclear family in modern Israel. *Social Forces, 59,* 687-704.

Reagan, M. C., & Roland, H. E. (1985). Rearranging family and career priorities—professional women and men of the eighties. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 47,* 985-992.

Richmond-Abbott, M. (1992). Women wage earners. In J. A. Kouraney, J. P. Sterba, & R. Tong (Eds.), *Feminist Philosophies.* Englewood Cliff, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Ridgeway C. L. (1993). Gender, status, and the social psychology of expectations. In P. England (Ed.), *Theory on Gender, Feminism on Theory.* New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Roos, P. A. (1985). *Gender and work: A comparative analysis of industrial societies.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Ross, C., Mirowsky, J., & Huber, J. (1983). Dividing work, sharing work, and in between: Marriage patterns and depression. *American Sociological Review, 48,* 809-823.

Ruble, T. L., Cohen, R., & Ruble, D. N. (1984). Sex stereotypes: Occupational barriers for women. *American Behavioral Scientist, 27,* 339-356.

Sekeran, U. (1986). *Dual career families.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Schooler, C., Miller, J., Miller, K. A., & Richtand, C. N. (1984). Work for the household: Its nature and consequences for husbands and wives. *American Journal of Sociology, 90,* 97-125

Spade, Z., & Reese, C. A. (1991). We've come a long way, maybe: College students plans for work and family. *Sex Roles, 24,* 309-320.

Stacey, J. (1990). *Brave new families: Stories of domestic upheaval in late twentieth century America.* New York: Basic Books.

Svallfors, S. (1993). Dimensions of inequality: a comparison of attitudes in Sweden and Britain. *European Sociological Review, 9,* 267-287.

Thoits, P. A. (1987). Negotiating roles. In F. J. Crosby (Ed.), *Spouse, parent, worker: On gender and multiple roles.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Van Meter, M. J., & Agronow, S. (1982). The stress of multiple roles: The case of role strain among married college women. *Family Relations, 31,* 131-138.

Weitzman, L. J. (1984). Sex role socialization: A focus on women. In J. Freeman (Ed.), *Women: A feminist perspective.* Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.

Wiley, M. G. (1991). Gender, work and stress: The potential impact of role identity salience and commitment. *The Sociological Quarterly, 32,* 495-510.