

Marriage and the Economy

Theory and Evidence from Advanced Industrial Societies

Edited by

SHOSHANA A. GROSSBARD-SHECHTMAN

San Diego State University

Foreword by

JACOB MINCER

Columbia University



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia
Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain
Dock House, The Waterfront, Cape Town 8001, South Africa
<http://www.cambridge.org>

© Shoshana A. Grossbard-Shechtman 2003

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without
the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2003

Printed in the United States of America

Typeface Times Ten 10/13 pt. *System* L^AT_EX 2_ε [TB]

A catalog record for this book is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Marriage and the economy : theory and evidence from advanced industrial
societies / edited by Shoshana A. Grossbard-Shechtman.
p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-521-81454-5 – ISBN 0-521-89143-4 (pb.)

1. Marriage – Economic aspects – Developed countries. 2. Married people –
Employment – Developed countries. 3. Family – Economic aspects – Developed
countries. 4. Social values – Developed countries. 5. Industrialization – Developed
countries – History – 20th century. 6. Economics – Developed countries – History –
20th century. I. Grossbard – Shechtman, Shoshana, 1948–

HQ518 .M325 2003
306.81'09–dc21 2002073690

ISBN 0 521 81454 5 hardback

ISBN 0 521 89143 4 paperback

Contents

<i>List of Figures</i>	<i>page</i> ix
<i>List of Tables</i>	x
<i>List of Contributors</i>	xiii
<i>Foreword</i>	xix
Jacob Mincer	
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xxi
1 Marriage and the Economy	1
<i>Shoshana Grossbard-Shechtman</i>	
PART I. THE ECONOMICS OF MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE	
2 The Economics of Marriage and Household Formation	37
<i>Michael J. Brien and Michelle E. Sheran</i>	
3 The Economics of Divorce	55
<i>Evelyn L. Lehrer</i>	
4 The Effects of Public Policy on Marital Status in the United States	75
<i>Leslie Whittington and James Alm</i>	
PART II. EFFECTS OF MARRIAGE ON INCOME USES	
5 Control over Money in Marriage	105
<i>Frances Woolley</i>	
6 Marriage, Assets, and Savings	129
<i>Joseph P. Lupton and James P. Smith</i>	
7 The Economics of Child Support	153
<i>Andrea H. Beller and John W. Graham</i>	

8	Marriage Prospects and Welfare Use <i>John Fitzgerald</i>	177
PART III. EFFECTS OF MARRIAGE ON TIME USES		
9	Marriage, Household Production, and Earnings <i>Joni Hersch</i>	201
10	Marriage and Work for Pay <i>Shoshana Grossbard-Shechtman and Shoshana Neuman</i>	222
11	Marriage, Work for Pay, and Childcare <i>Rachel Connelly and Jean Kimmel</i>	248
12	Marriage and Home-Based Paid Employment <i>Elizabeth Field-Hendrey and Linda N. Edwards</i>	271
PART IV. MARRIAGE AND THE MACROECONOMY		
13	Married Households and Gross Household Product <i>Duncan Ironmonger and Faye Soupourmas</i>	293
14	Marriage, Parental Investment, and the Macroeconomy <i>Shirley Burggraf</i>	318
	<i>Index</i>	339

Figures

1.1	Market for Work-in-Marriage	<i>page</i> 10
2.1	Percent of Never-Married Men and Women, by Age: 1950–98	39
2.2	Median Age at First Marriage: 1900–98	40
5.1	Possible Divisions of Resources in Marriage	107
5.2	Dimensions of Family Financial Organization	111
8.1	Proportion on Welfare, Spouse Availability, and Employed Males/Females	184
12.1	Diagrammatic Model of Labor Supply by Work Site	277
13.1	Types of Married and Not Married Households, Australia 1993–4	296
13.2	Time Spent on Household Production and Market Work, Australia 1993–4	302

Tables

2.1	Life Estimates of Cohabitation and Marriage before the Age of Twenty-Five	<i>page</i> 41
2.2	Marriage and Out-of-Wedlock Childbearing in Developed Countries	43
4.1	Some Recent Studies of the Effect of Welfare on Marital Status and Family Headship	79
4.2	1998 Tax Treatment of a Couple Earning \$80,000 as Single versus Married	84
4.3	Some Recent Studies on the Effects of the Income Tax on Marital Status	88
4.4	Some Recent Studies on the Effects of Changes in Divorce Laws on Marital Status	93
4.5	Some Marriage Tax Relief Proposals Introduced in the 106 th Congress	97
5.1	Studies Based on Family Expenditure Data	109
5.2	Accounts Held by Men and Women Separately and Joint Accounts, in Percentages	115
5.3	Who Does What in Male-Name Accounts, in Percentages of All Male-Name Accounts	116
5.4	Who Does What in Female-Name Accounts, in Percentages of All Female-Name Accounts	116
5.5	Who Does What in Joint Accounts, in Percentages	117
5.6	Descriptive Statistics on Explanatory Variables	121
5.7	Determinants of Control over Money	123
5.8	Multinomial Logit Regression Results	125
6.1	HRS Net Worth by Marital Status	134
6.2	Composition of Wealth: Shares of Total Wealth	136
6.3	Net Worth by Sex of Head	137

6.4	Total Wealth Distributions	138
6.5	Net Worth by Type of Marital Transition	140
6.6	PSID Family Income by Type of Marital Transition	141
6.7	Baseline Models of Active Savings between PSID Waves	144
6.8	Augmented Models of Active Savings between PSID Waves	146
6.9	Within-Household Models of Change in Savings: PSID	149
7.1	Child Support for Custodial Mothers and Fathers: 1995–6	156
7.2	Child Support for Custodial Mothers: 1978–96	158
8.1	Percentage of First AFDC Spell Beginnings Associated with Specific Events	178
8.2	Percentage of First AFDC Spell Endings Associated with Specific Events	179
8.3	Means and Definitions of Explanatory Variables	190
8.4	Estimated Proportions Expected to Remain on Welfare at Various Durations	191
8.5	AFDC Exit Rate Hazard Models	194
9.1	Summary of Housework Time Reported in Representative Studies	205
10.1	Labor Force Participation and Attachment, by Married Status: Women Ages Thirty to Thirty-Four and Men Ages Thirty-Two to Thirty-Six, 1990 to 2000	224
10.2	Sex Ratios for Thirteen Generations (United States)	229
11.1	Differences in Employment Status, Wages, and Hours Worked by Marital Status and Full-Time/Part-Time Employment	259
11.2	Childcare Mode Choice and Weekly Expenditures by Mode of Care for Employed Mothers	262
11.3	Percentage of Family Income Spent on Childcare	264
12.1	Percentage of Individuals Age Twenty-Five to Fifty-Five in Each Labor Force Class, by Sex and Marital Status	280
12.2	Percentages of Women Age Twenty-Five to Fifty-Five Exhibiting Fixed-Cost/Joint Productivity and Personal Characteristics, by Marital Status	282
12.3	Predicted Probability of Home-Based Work for Pay by Marital Status	284
12.4	(Appendix): Multinomial Logit Coefficients	288
13.1	Australian Households, 1993–4	299
13.2	Gross Household Product, Australia, 1993–4	311
13.3	Household Production Labor and Equipment and Housing, Australia, 1993–4	313
13.4	Contribution of HPI to Extended Income, Australia, 1993–4	314
14.1	Profit-and-Loss Statement, Medium-Income Family	321
14.2	Social Profit-and-Loss Statement, Medium-Income Family	324

Contributors

James Alm is Professor and Chair of the Department of Economics in the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies at Georgia State University in Atlanta, Georgia. Much of his research has examined the responses of individuals and firms to taxation, in such areas as tax reform, the tax treatment of the family, the line item veto, social security, housing, indexation, tax and expenditure limitations, and tax compliance. He has also worked extensively on fiscal and decentralization reforms in Bangladesh, Indonesia, Jamaica, Grenada, Turkey, Egypt, Hungary, China, the Philippines, the Russian Federation, Nigeria, and Uganda. He is currently on the Advisory Board of the National Tax Association and the editorial boards of *Economic Inquiry* and *Review of Economics of the Household*, and he is also Associate Editor of *Public Finance Review*. More information and links to publications can be found at <http://www.gsu.edu/~ecojra>.

Andrea H. Beller is a professor of family economics at the University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign (UIUC). She coauthored *The Economics of Child Support* (Yale University Press, 1993). Beller is on the editorial boards of *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance* and the *Review of Economics of the Household*, the board of the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession, and Illinois' Child Support Advisory Committee. She received the Senior Faculty Award for Excellence in Research in the College of Agricultural, Consumer and Environmental Sciences at UIUC in 2001 and the Distinguished Alumni Award from Case-Western Reserve University in 2000. Her Web address is <http://www.ace.uiuc.edu/faculty/bellerah.html>.

Michael J. Brien is an economist in the Economics Consulting Group of Deloitte & Touche LLP. Prior to joining Deloitte & Touche, he was an assistant professor of economics at the University of Virginia. He has also served as a senior economist on the President's Council of Economic Advisers, specializing in labor and social policies. His research interests include the economics of marriage, the impact of teen childbearing, and the analysis of social programs.

Shirley Burggraf is a professor of economics at Florida A&M University in Tallahassee and a recent Bunting Fellow at Radcliffe College. She is the author of the *Feminine Economy and Economic Man*, published by Addison Wesley in 1997.

Rachel Connelly is an associate professor of economics at Bowdoin College. She has written extensively on the subject of the economics of childcare. Connelly is currently involved in research on the value of employer-subsidized childcare in the United States, turnover and wages of childcare workers in the United States, and the demand for childcare arrangements in Minnesota.

Linda N. Edwards is Associate Provost and a professor of economics at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York and serves on the Advisory Board of the City of New York Independent Budget Office. Edwards has written extensively (with Elizabeth Field-Hendrey) on home-based work and is currently researching wage differentials between home-based and on-site women workers.

Elizabeth Field-Hendrey is Chair of the Department of Economics at Queens College and a professor of economics at Queens College and the Graduate Center of the City University of New York. Her research interests include labor economics and economic history. She is engaged in a long-term collaboration with Linda Edwards on home-based work; they are currently investigating wage differentials between home-based and on-site workers. She is also doing research into the substitutability of male and female labor, and she is completing a project on the relative efficiency of slave labor in the antebellum United States.

John Fitzgerald is a professor of economics at Bowdoin College. He has written articles on determinants of time on welfare, home production, attrition in panel surveys, and earnings instability. Current projects include a study of the impact of welfare reform on female headship and the impact of income variability on food stamp use.

John W. Graham is a professor of economics at Rutgers University. He coauthored *The Economics of Child Support* (Yale University Press, 1993). His Web address is <http://newark.rutgers.edu/~jwgraham>.

Shoshana Grossbard-Shechtman is a professor of economics at San Diego State University and past Fellow at the Center for Advanced Studies in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford. Her books include *On the Economics of Marriage* (Westview Press, 1993) and *The Expansion of Economics* (M. E. Sharpe, 2002). Her articles have appeared in economics, sociology, and anthropology journals. She is founding editor of the *Review of Economics of the Household* (forthcoming, Kluwer Academic Publishers) and serves on the editorial board of the *Journal of Socio-Economics* and the *Journal of Bioeconomics*. More information and links to publications can be found at <http://www-rohan.sdsu.edu/faculty/sgs/index.html>.

Joni Hersch is a lecturer on law at Harvard Law School, where she teaches a course on empirical methods for lawyers. She has published numerous articles on gender differences in labor market outcomes, the economics of home production, the stock market effects of litigation, smoking regulations, and risk-taking behavior. Hersch has taught at the California Institute of Technology, Duke, Northwestern, and Harvard. She was Professor of Economics at the University of Wyoming until December 1999. She has served on the board of the American Economic Association's Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession and was a recipient of the National Science Foundation Visiting Professorship for Women grant.

Duncan Ironmonger is an associate professor of economics and director of the Households Research Unit at the University of Melbourne. He is known internationally for his research on the reactions of consumers to new commodities and for his pioneering work on household input-output tables for measuring and valuing household productive and leisure activities. In this field, he has been a consultant to the United Nations and official statistical offices in Australia, Canada, Finland, New Zealand, Norway, and Sweden.

Jean Kimmel is an associate professor of economics at Western Michigan University in Kalamazoo, Michigan. Prior to joining the faculty at WMU in August 2001, she was Senior Economist at the W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, where she was a researcher for twelve years. She is a labor economist whose research interests include childcare,

welfare-to-work policies, employment-related health and disability issues, and multiple-job holding. Her research papers have been published in a number of journals in economics and labor relations. She is currently serving as board member and Midwest representative to the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession (CSWEP).

Evelyn L. Lehrer is a professor of economics at the University of Illinois–Chicago. She has written extensively on union formation and dissolution, women’s labor supply, fertility, childcare arrangements, family income distribution, and the economics of religion. More information on her research, which has been published in economic and demographic journals, may be found at <http://www.uic.edu/~elehrer>.

Joseph P. Lupton is an economist at the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in Washington, DC. He has worked as a research associate for both the Panel Study of Income Dynamics and the Health and Retirement Study since 1997. His research focuses on household wealth accumulation and the various state dependencies of saving behavior.

Jacob Mincer is the Bottenweiser Professor of Economics Emeritus at Columbia University. He is an elected member of the National Academy of Sciences and a distinguished Fellow of the American Economic Association. Mincer is a member of the editorial board of the *Journal of Labor Economics* and the *Economics of Education*. He is the author of *Schooling, Experience, and Earnings*, published by Columbia University Press in 1974, and *Collected Studies in Human Capital and Labor Supply*, published by Edward Elgar in 1993.

Shoshana Neuman is an associate professor of economics at Bar-Ilan University, Israel. She is a research Fellow at the Center for Economic Policy Research in London, a research Fellow at the Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA) in Bonn, Germany, and a participant in the European Union’s project on Labor Demand, Education, and the Dynamics of Social Exclusion. She is the author of many articles on labor supply, earnings, marriage, fertility, and education.

Michelle E. Sheran is an assistant professor of economics at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. She is currently working on a theoretical and empirical study of women’s life-cycle career and family decisions. Her research interests include marriage, childbearing, foster care, and women’s labor supply.

James P. Smith is Senior Economist in the Labor and Population Program at Rand. He is a member of the Committee on Population at the National Academy of Sciences, a member of the Advisory Council at the Public Policy Institute of California, and a past member of the board of editors of the *American Economic Review*. Smith has written many books and articles. His books include the recent *The New Americans: The Economic, Demographic, and Fiscal Effects of Immigration* (National Academy Press, 1997) and *Female Labor Supply: Theory and Estimation* (Princeton University Press, 1999).

Faye Soupourmas is a research Fellow in the Households Research Unit, Department of Economics, at the University of Melbourne. As part of the Households Research Unit, Soupourmas has worked on a number of projects related to the measurement of the economic value of the household economy. She has made a valuable contribution to the innovative research undertaken by the Households Research Unit on the valuation of household production in Australia.

Leslie Whittington was an associate professor of public policy and formerly associate dean of policy studies at Georgetown University. She had published numerous articles exploring the impact of public policy on family structure and decision-making in leading economic and demographic journals. She died with her family when their plane was hijacked and crashed into the Pentagon on September 11, 2001. She was on her way to spend a sabbatical in Australia at the Australian National University.

Frances Woolley is an associate professor of economics at Carleton University in Ottawa, Canada. She has written extensively on the economics of family decision making, public policy toward families, and feminist economics. She is on the editorial board of *Feminist Economics*, a vice-president of the International Association for Feminist Economics, and a former member of the Canadian Economics Association Executive Council. She was recently awarded the Doug Purvis Memorial Award for her work on taxing Canadian families. More information and links to publications can be found at <http://www.carleton.ca/~fwoolley>.

ONE

Marriage and the Economy

Shoshana Grossbard-Shechtman

The institution of marriage is found in nearly all human societies. This fact clearly reflects the importance of sexual and reproductive functions in human life. Marriage entails commitment between sexual partners. Why do societies develop marital institutions that encourage commitment between spouses? In her presidential address to the Population Association of America in 1995, Linda Waite, a professor of sociology at the University of Chicago, emphasized how commitment in marriage can benefit earnings. Married workers may earn more because they are more productive.¹ *Marriage and the Economy* extends the work by Waite and others by exploring more in depth how marriage possibly influences labor supply and workers' productivity and by presenting analyses of other channels by which marriage may have an impact on the economy: savings, consumption, and government programs such as welfare programs and social security.

This book is an economics book because it deals with the "economy," the part of society that centers around exchanges of goods and services. The "economy" is an aggregate and involves a macroeconomic perspective. Until recently it was standard practice to focus on monetized transactions when calculating the value of an economy, and to overlook the

¹ Waite also discussed the benefits of marriage from the perspective of health (including mental health), children's achievements, and sexual satisfaction. Space limitations led me to exclude the topic of health and marriage from this book (see Waite and Maggie Gallagher 2000).

I thank James Alm, Edward Balsaon, Andrea Beller, Michael Brien, Shirley Burggraf, John Fitzgerald, Joni Hersch, Duncan Ironmonger, Evelyn Lehrer, Jacob Mincer, Zev Shechtman, Leslie Whittington, and Frances Woolley for useful comments.

value of the non-monetary household economy. Marriage influences the household economy at least as much as it affects the monetized economy. *Marriage and the Economy* adds to our understanding of how marriage influences both the monetized economy and the household economy. Marriage institutions are to the household economy what business institutions are to the monetized economy.

The study of the economics of marriage includes analyses of how marriage influences the economy (a macro perspective) as well as economic analyses of marriage, divorce, and behavior within marriages (a micro perspective). Let us start with an overlook of the microeconomics of marriage.

MICROECONOMIC THEORETICAL TOOLS

Economic theories of marriage can accommodate a wide range of assumptions and institutional constraints, including a variety of assumptions regarding the roles of men and women, ideals about love, and biological constraints. To better understand how these various dimensions can be incorporated into an economic analysis of marriage, let us look at the basic theoretical constructs that economists use when analyzing marriage. Most economic analyses of marriage have been part of applied microeconomics, and they have relied on the same theoretical tools that economists use in all microeconomic applications of economics: cost/benefit analysis, game theory, and market analysis.²

- The most basic economic theory of marriage is *cost/benefit analysis*.³ Costs and benefits can be compared whether one searches for lasting romantic love, or for a companion who will replace the maid. Men and women may all perform such analyses, even if the factors that they consider as costs and benefits may differ somewhat. Cost/benefit theories of marriage are rational choice theories.⁴
- *Game theory* is a second theoretical tool that economists of marriage commonly use. Game theories apply whenever behavior is strategic. Whether its goal is holy matrimony or the satisfaction of biological needs, marriage involves strategic behavior and therefore game the-

² Market analysis is really a particular type of game theory.

³ All three theoretical tools have been used in Gary S. Becker's seminal articles (Becker 1973, 1974).

⁴ Such rational choice theories have become increasingly popular among sociologists.

ory is applicable.⁵ If strategies differ by gender, economists can use game theories to model gender wars or cooperative behavior between husbands and wives.

- *Market analysis* applies whenever choices are available on a demand side or a supply side.⁶ The existence of any possible substitute opens the door to potential competition. If there can be competition, there is a market, even if the competitive spirit is totally eradicated, and if the workings of a market for mates are not so obvious to most observers. The process of competition for potential mates can be observed universally, but takes different forms from one culture to the next. In the West, it can be observed at bars, church socials, proms, and such. In India it is more likely to take the form of a list of available grooms and brides printed in the local newspaper. In Japan and Korea, the need to compete drives parents to circulate numerous copies of the resumé of their marriageable children.

Reactions to the Microeconomics of Marriage

Economists started paying more attention to the institution of marriage after Jacob Mincer and Gary S. Becker started the New Home Economics (NHE) in the early 1960s, when they were both professors of economics at Columbia University. The NHE brought the analysis of household production into formal economic analysis.⁷ In the 1970s, Becker pioneered

⁵ Game-theoretical analyses of marriage were pioneered by Marilyn Manser and Murray Brown (1980) and Marjorie B. McElroy and Mary Jean Horney (1981). See also Elizabeth H. Peters (1986), McElroy (1990), Paul S. Carlin (1991), and Chapter 5 in this book.

⁶ The insight that marriage market conditions influence many individual decisions follows from Becker's (1973) competitive market model, which originally appeared in the first part of his theory of marriage published by the *Journal of Political Economy*. Becker (1981) later reproduced this model in the second chapter of his *Treatise on the Family*, a chapter dealing with polygamy. Becker's (1973, 1974, 1981) explanations of marriage also contain a matching model that is very different from the competitive market model (see Chapter 2 in this book). Other market theories of marriage include Amyra Grossbard (1976), Michael C. Keeley (1977), David M. Heer and Amyra Grossbard-Shechtman (1981), and Robert Cherry (1998). Economic analyses of marriage can also be found in Bertrand Lemennicier (1988), Alejandro Cigno (1991), Grossbard-Shechtman (1993), Yoram Weiss (1997), and Francisco Cabrillo (1999).

⁷ Mincer's econometric applications provided insights into the secular growth in women's participation in the labor force and into changes in fertility behavior. For more on the history of the NHE, see Grossbard-Shechtman (2001b). Earlier economic analyses of household decisions include the work of Hazel Kyrk and Margaret Reid (see Andrea H. Beller and Elizabeth D. Kiss 1999 and Yun-Ae Yi 1996). The NHE was also enriched by the work of Robert A. Pollak (1985) emphasizing similarities between firms and households.

the economics of marriage.⁸ It is in part for his work in this area that he received the Nobel Prize in economics in 1992. Thirty years after the start of the study of the economics of marriage, business and money institutions – not marriage and other family institutions – still frame most of the ideas that economists write about.⁹

The reasons why the economics of marriage is unpopular relative to other applications of economics include unpopular positions regarding gender, economists' tendency to focus on materialistic concerns, and resistance from other disciplines.

Gender. The economics of marriage as developed by Becker and other NHE economists assumed that men and women behave according to traditional gender roles.^{10,11} The underlying assumption that homemaking is a woman's job has come under criticism by feminist economists such as those in the United States, Canada, and France.¹² In fact, it is a misconception to think that the economics of marriage depends on any particular assumptions regarding gender differences.

Materialism. Most existing economic analyses of marriage have emphasized the materialistic dimensions of marriage, in contradistinction with the idealistic beliefs leading most Westerners to want to marry: romantic love and holy matrimony. It is data limitations that lead economists to focus on the mundane and the materialistic, not the essence of our theories. Matters of love, happiness, and soulfulness are difficult to measure. Throwing out economic analyses of marriage because of their emphasis on measurable and more materialistic dimensions of life is like throwing out the baby with the bath water. Economic analyses of marriage are applicable even if people approach marriage out of pure idealism. They will still be faced with some mating choices for themselves or their children.

⁸ An earlier Marxist tradition also included economic analyses of gender roles (see Grossbard-Shechtman 1999).

⁹ While most microeconomists ignore the institution of marriage, even power macroeconomists pay attention to marriage institutions.

¹⁰ An instance of a NHE-based model making old-fashioned assumptions about gender roles is Reuben Gronau (1977). Consider for instance, Gronau's conclusion that the increase in the divorce rate in the United States followed the entry of women into the labor force. The reasoning goes like this: Women are supposed to be homemakers; their homemaking creates stable marriages; if they enter into the labor force, less is produced in marriage and divorce increases.

¹¹ Such reasoning is also found in Becker (1981).

¹² An example of a U.S. economist who has been critical of Becker's work on marriage is Barbara Bergmann (1995). Canadian and French examples are Frances Woolley (1996) and Catherine Sofer (1985).

Even those who dream of romance or get elevated by ideas about holy matrimony cannot remain totally oblivious of the hard realities involved in breadwinning and housecleaning. As long as there is work involved, cost/benefit analysis taking account of opportunity costs applies. As long as there is a choice between two potential recipients of romantic love, or at least two potential soul mates, a market analysis applies.

Biology and Sociology. A third possible objection to economic analyses of marriage could come from those who believe that biological theories matter more than economic theories. Economists have in fact incorporated many biological assumptions in their theories.¹³ Traditionally, sociologists have been doing most of the research on marriage and divorce. Since the 1990s, Becker's theory of marriage has become influential among sociologists of the family. Sociologists studying marriage do not bring an economic approach to their analyses to the same degree that economists do. Exceptions include Waite and Maggie Gallagher (2000) and sociological studies of marriage markets.¹⁴

MARRIAGE MARKETS AND THE ECONOMY

Practically every idea in this book contains a macroeconomic side to it. In economics, one way to establish a connection between micro and macro is by way of market analysis. A market is basically an abstract concept that brings together many small (micro) decision makers by aggregating them into market demands and supplies, and recognizing that demand and supply interact.

Macroeconomists aggregate markets for all products and then analyze how these are connected to markets for monetized labor and capital. They occasionally recognize that a household economy exists side by side with the monetized economy, as is evident from Chapter 13.¹⁵ However, macroeconomists typically ignore marriage markets.

The household economy is linked to the monetized economy due to the following connections: (1) Labor supply is jointly determined with the

¹³ See, for example, Theodore C. Bergstrom's (1997) review article in the *Handbook of Population Economics* and a special issue of the *Journal of Bioeconomics*.

¹⁴ More on market theories of marriage by sociologists can be found in Grossbard-Shechtman (1993, Chapter 2). For a more comprehensive comparison between economic and sociological analyses of marriage, see Grossbard-Shechtman (2001a), Chapters 8 and 9.

¹⁵ Some macroeconomic analyses that deal with fertility are found in William Lord (2002).

supply of work in household production; and (2) commercial consumption of goods and services (also savings) is jointly determined with the consumption of goods and services produced in the home. Given that most household production occurs in marriages, and that marriage markets affect not only decisions about marriage and divorce but also the allocation of time and income to household production, marriage markets play an important role in both of these connections between the monetized economy and the household economy.

The link between marriage markets and supply of labor is especially potent. This connection is based on an essential principle: Household production is time-intensive. If the household is a married household, time in household production may take the form of labor to the extent that household production time is not the individual's preferred activity. Let us call "Work-in-Marriage" the time in marital household production that is work in the sense of time that has an opportunity cost, that is, there is a more valuable activity that was forgone. Next, markets for Work-in-Marriage can be modeled along the lines used to model other labor markets.¹⁶ The analysis starts with individual supply and demand.

Individual Supply of Work-in-Marriage

The supply of Work-in-Marriage is conceptually very similar to the supply of paid labor. In both cases, individuals make a decision about working for others – a firm in the case of labor, and a spouse in the case of Work-in-Marriage. In both the cases of labor and Work-in-Marriage, the opportunity cost of labor is the value of the most valuable foregone opportunity, and both labor and Work-in-Marriage are assumed to be less valuable activities than other forms of household production that are more self-satisfying.^{17, 18}

¹⁶ This follows Grossbard-Shechtman (1984), which also includes a macroeconomic perspective. The idea of applying analyses from labor markets to the study of marriage can also be found in microeconomic analyses of marriage such as Grossbard (1976) and Keeley (1977). The marriage markets found in Becker's theory of marriage are quite different from labor markets.

¹⁷ The idea that husbands and wives may possibly negotiate their leisure in marriage does not fit in simple models of leisure and labor, such as the classical Lionel Robbins (1930) model, which ignores household production. What activities actually are considered as Work-in-Marriage will vary from one individual to the next, although there are certain activities that most people consider to be chores.

¹⁸ Individual supplies of work and of Work-in-Marriage are a function of an individual choice between three uses of time: work, production of self-consumed goods, and Work-in-Marriage. Three uses of time are also found in Gronau's (1977) labor supply model, but his definitions of leisure and household production time differ from mine.

Personnel economics teaches us that there are three kinds of incentives that possibly motivate workers to supply labor: threat, non-pecuniary reward, and compensation:

- *Threat.* Workers may be forced to work if the employer threatens to punish them, or if the threat is hunger or other undesirable results. This is a motive based on fear.
- *Non-pecuniary rewards.* Such rewards include the satisfaction from doing one's duty, loyalty, or the enjoyment out of supplying the product or doing the activity (the intrinsic reward).¹⁹
- *Compensation.* This incentive takes the form of barter or pay.

These incentives can apply to any kind of work, including Work-in-Marriage. When it comes to non-pecuniary rewards, work and Work-in-Marriage are similar. One can serve one's family out of love, which is reminiscent of loyal service to a firm and of military service motivated by patriotism. The two forms of work differ significantly in the degree to which people supply them for the other two incentives: expected compensation and threat.

In the case of Work-in-Marriage, compensation often takes the form of barter – for instance, an agreement whereby a husband washes dishes if his wife cooks. Such barterers are also found in the labor force, as in the case of a barter deal between an accountant and a stockbroker within a firm. A major difference between the two forms of labor is that paid compensation in the form of wages is the norm in the case of work, whereas monetary compensation for Work-in-Marriage is a rare occurrence.

While there is no institutionally supported wage for Work-in-Marriage that is the equivalent of wages in the labor market, a closer look reveals some interesting parallels between monetary compensations for work and Work-in-Marriage.²⁰ Most workers in the labor force receive a pay

¹⁹ Others, such as children, may also benefit from this work.

²⁰ In a historical perspective, the differences between work and Work-in-Marriage become even less obvious. Wages are a relatively new invention. Until a few centuries ago, most workers were agricultural workers who were trading goods for protection services offered by their feudal lord. I am struck by some of the parallels between this feudal system and the way that husbands have traditionally treated women supplying Work-in-Marriage in many parts of the world. This feudal system also characterized the way that industrialists often treated workers in the early stages of industrialization. In all these feudal-style systems, workers had very limited power relative to the power of those who benefited from their work and owned most productive resources. Under feudalism, fear of hunger and need for physical protection played an important role in motivating workers. Agricultural

package consisting of their wage earnings and pecuniary benefits – that is, benefits that have a clear monetary value, such as health insurance. Similarly, compensation for Work-in-Marriage suppliers often includes benefits of a pecuniary nature, such as access to goods purchased with a spouse's income or access to a spouse's retirement benefits.²¹ Other possible benefits offered to suppliers of Work-in-Marriage include payments made prior to marriage (such as dowry or bridewealth) or after the marriage ends (such as alimony payments, transfers of assets after divorce, or cashing of a life insurance policy after the death of a provider). We can call *quasiwages* contemporaneous benefits that can be considered as compensation for Work-in-Marriage.

An individual labor supply is the willingness to work at different wage levels. Economists assume that a competitive labor market establishes wage levels, and they investigate how an individual responds to various wage levels. The law of supply applied to labor markets implies that the higher the wage, the more people are willing to work.²² In the case of Work-in-Marriage, wages are not in evidence but we can model an individual supply of Work-in-Marriage as the willingness to supply Work-in-Marriage at various quasiwage levels. Both men and women can have such supply, and one expects the law of supply to apply here as well: The higher the quasiwage, the more people will supply Work-in-Marriage.

workers' power was limited by the lack of alternative opportunities for employment: lack of alternative professions and lack of alternative employers within their profession. Likewise, until recently, married women in the West could barely find employment outside the homemaking profession, and the lack of divorce opportunities led them to be stuck to their husband, even if he was abusive. Fear of hunger and need for protection from rape and other dangers were major reasons why women supplied Work-in-Marriage. This situation still exists in some segments of industrialized societies, and is found on a large scale in many of the world's agriculture-based societies.

²¹ This quasiwage can be related to Becker's concept of implicit price in marriage and can be defined as a share of the gain from marriage. The difference between the approach presented here and Becker's implicit price in marriage is that Becker's theory of marriage does not have a supply of work in married household production in the sense that economists define labor supply: a positive relationship between the amount of labor an individual supplies and the reward for that labor. For a similar and more recent theory in sociology, see Grossbard-Shechtman (2001a, Chapter 8). Intramarriage allocation of goods can be analyzed as the result of a quasiwage payment for Work-in-Marriage. Alternative economic models of intramarriage allocation of goods assume that no goods are produced in marital household production and all goods are purchased from commercial firms (see, for instance, Pierre-Andre Chiappori 1992).

²² There are rare exceptions to this law, as in the case of the backward-bending labor supply.