

ABSTRACT

Title of thesis: EXAMINING AND EXPLAINING RACIAL/ETHNIC
VARIATION IN MEN'S AND WOMEN'S
HOUSEHOLD LABOR PARTICIPATION

Kristin Reid Hunt, Master of Arts, 2007

Thesis directed by: Professor Suzanne Bianchi
Department of Sociology

Using American Time Use Survey (ATUS) data from a national sample of 3,641 married dual-earner men and 4,440 married dual-earner women interviewed in 2003 and 2004, I examine racial/ethnic variation in men's and women's time spent doing housework and its covariates. The ratio of women's to men's total housework time is greatest for Asians and Hispanics and smallest for whites and blacks. Household composition variables are good predictors of white and Asian women's housework time; resources are good predictors for Hispanic and black women; relative resources have some predictive power for white, Hispanic, and Asian women's housework time. For men, own work hours are negatively associated with housework time for white and black dual-earner men; for Hispanic men, having a wife who works more, as compared with a wife who works less, is associated with an increase in housework time. Resources show some predictive power for all dual-earner men across race/ethnicity.

EXAMINING AND EXPLAINING RACIAL/ETHNIC VARIATION IN MEN'S AND
WOMEN'S HOUSEHOLD LABOR PARTICIPATION

by

Kristin Reid Hunt

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
2007

Advisory Committee:

Professor Suzanne M. Bianchi, Chair
Professor Joan R. Kahn
Professor Harriet B. Presser

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Statement of the Problem.....	1
Literature Review.....	5
Purpose of Current Study.....	17
Research Questions and Expectations.....	18
Data and Methods.....	20
Plan of Analysis.....	28
Results.....	28
Conclusions.....	36
Bibliography.....	40

Statement of the Problem

The gender division of household labor has received increasing attention in the past few decades as scholars have focused on both the explanations for gender specialization in domestic tasks, as well as the consequences of the time men and women spend in housework. Attempting to address the importance of men's and women's housework contributions, this literature generally suggests negative consequences for women when they spend substantially more time doing housework than men. These negative consequences include a direct, negative effect of the time women spend on housework on their market earnings (Coverman 1983; Hersch 1985, 1991; Hersch & Stratton 1994; McAllister 1990; Shelton & Firestone 1988) as well as a positive association between women's household labor time and both women's and men's reports of disagreements (Lye & Biblarz 1993) and women's likelihood of experiencing depression (Glass & Fujimoto 1994; Golding 1990; Kurdek 1993; Ross et al. 1983; Shamir 1986).

In addressing the question of why men and women perform certain types of tasks and why they allocate their time differently, the literature posits three explanations for the gender division of housework: the relative resources perspective, the time availability perspective, and the gender perspective. One variation of the relative resources perspective, advanced by Blood and Wolf in 1960, asserts that the power derived from having more education or higher earnings than one's partner will be used to avoid domestic labor. Another variation of the relative resources framework, from neoclassical economics (Becker 1991), posits that couples allocate housework to women to maximize efficiency and utility given men's relative wage advantage in the labor market. The time-

availability perspective, put forth by Coverman in 1985, posits a negative relationship between each partner's time in market labor and their time in household labor, given a rational calculation of who has time for household labor. Finally, the gender perspective, posited by Berk (1985) and West and Zimmerman (1987) asserts that the performance of housework helps men and women define and express appropriate gender roles. Support for each of these theories has been found in the extant literature (Bianchi et al 2000; Presser 1994; South and Spitze 1994; Brines 1994).

Where the literature is lacking, however, is in an investigation of racial/ethnic variation in men's and women's housework time and consideration of whether these three theoretical perspectives are equally applicable across racial/ethnic groups. Scholars of race, class, and gender suggest a need for studies which examine the links between gender and race, positing that race and gender cannot be discussed separately (Collins 1990; Reid & Comas-Diaz 1990; Zinn 1991). Thus, in order to gain a fuller understanding of how men and women balance their work and family responsibilities, we must include separate analyses for men and women of different racial/ethnic groups. Previous research suggests that perceptions of time constraints and household responsibilities vary by gender and race (Shelton & John 1993; John & Shelton 1997), and that these perceptions reflect normative gender expectations. If racial/ethnic variation exists in the degree to which gender is produced, we would expect to find racial/ethnic differences in the responses to time constraints and household responsibilities, and thus in the gender division of household labor.

Indeed, there is some suggestion that the production of gender varies by race/ethnicity. For example, Shelton & John (1993) note that because of the historically

different patterns of labor force participation among women of different race/ethnic groups, men's adoption of family roles and women's adoption of paid labor force roles may also vary by race/ethnicity (Beckett & Smith 1981; McAdoo 1990). The three perspectives on gender and housework produce different predictions of what one would expect the rank orderings of the within-group gender gap in housework to be across racial/ethnic groups. For example, the time availability and gender ideology perspectives would predict a larger gender gap in housework among Hispanics and Asians and a smaller gap among blacks and whites. This is because black men and women and white men and women tend to have smaller gender gaps in labor force participation (Cotter et al. 2000) and more egalitarian gender ideologies as compared to Asians and Hispanics (Kane 2000). Conversely, the relative resources perspective would predict a larger gender gap in housework time among whites and Asians and a smaller gap among blacks and Hispanics because the gender gap in earnings is smallest among Hispanics and blacks and largest among whites and Asians (Blau, Ferber, and Winkler 2006).

In this paper, I examine time in housework, using a sample of women and men in dual-earner families. The sample is derived from recent time-diary data from the American Time Use Survey (ATUS 2003 and 2004), which provides a time diary for one individual in the household. Thus, the women and men in my sample are not married to each other. I investigate 1) the housework time of married dual-earner men and women within racial/ethnic groups, and examine 2) time availability and relative resource predictors of housework and whether the associations vary by race/ethnicity. The ATUS provides large enough samples for the examination of four race/ethnic groups: (non-Hispanic) whites, blacks, Hispanics, and Asians. No previous study has included Asians

and the information we have on housework participation among blacks and Hispanics is limited.

The paper is organized as follows. First, I review the literature on the gender division of housework and the theories that have been used to explain it. Then I review what is known about race and the gender division of housework. Next I discuss the goal of the current study and posit hypotheses for the analysis. Following a discussion of data and methods, I move to the analysis in which I examine racial/ethnic variation in married dual-earner men's and women's time spent in housework and in the covariates of time spent in housework.

Literature Review

The Gender Division of Housework

In their 2000 *Social Forces* article, Bianchi et al. (2000) investigated the gender gap in unpaid labor. The authors divided housework tasks into two types: "core" tasks (cooking, cleaning, and laundry), which comprise almost two-thirds of total housework hours and which continue to be largely performed by women, and "other" tasks (outdoor chores, repairs, gardening/animal care, and bill paying), which are less time-intensive and more discretionary (Bianchi et al 2000). Using cross-sectional time diary data, the authors found that while men's and women's time spent in core tasks became more similar during the period 1965 to 1995, women were still spending much more time on core tasks than men. In 1995, all women were averaging 13.9 hours per week in core household tasks, while men averaged just 3.8 hours, a ratio of 3.7. Similar patterns were

obtained using National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH) data¹: the authors found that wives were spending 3.6 times as many hours as husbands on core housework tasks (Bianchi et al 2000: 215). The gap was much smaller for total housework, where the average time spent in total housework for all women was 17.5 hours per week, while for all men this figure was 10.0 hours, a ratio of 1.8. The gap was smallest and in men's favor within the "other" housework category, with all men averaging 6.2 hours per week and all women averaging 3.6 hours per week, a ratio of 0.6 (Bianchi et al 2000: Table 1). These findings are consistent with past research on the gender division of labor and with findings from other data sources, and suggest that women continue to do more housework than men, particularly more of the routine day-to-day tasks of cooking and cleaning (Presser 1994; Ross 1987; Maret & Finlay 1984). The question is why these gender differences persist.

Theoretical Perspectives on the Gender Division of Household Labor

Three theoretical perspectives on the gender division of household labor have emerged in the literature and attempts have been made to test their explanatory power. These include the time availability perspective, the relative resources perspective, and the gender perspective.

Time Availability Perspective

The time-availability perspective argues that the gender division of household labor is based on a rational calculation of who has the time for household labor (Coverman 1985). This perspective views men's and women's participation in housework and childcare as the outcome of the demand for their participation and the

¹ Estimates of hours from the survey questions in the NSFH were higher than time diary estimates, but ratios of women's to men's average time in housework were similar.

time available to participate. Thus, the perspective posits a negative relationship between each partner's time spent in market labor and their time spent in household labor. Time availability is typically measured by employment status and/or hours per week worked (South and Spitze 1994). The presumption is that those who are employed and those who work more hours will do less housework than those not employed or who work fewer hours. If a gender division in household labor exists, it is because men are more often employed and work longer hours and hence have less time available for housework than women. The existing literature finds support for the time availability perspective, with the overall conclusion that, for both men and women, employment status affects time spent in housework, such that the nonemployed do significantly more housework than those employed full or part time (Bianchi et al. 2000; Shelton & John 1996).

The presence and age of children are also commonly included as measures of time availability, given that (young) children increase the demand for participation in housework and childcare. Children have the potential to create, as well as to perform housework and the likelihood of doing so is largely determined by their age and their numbers (South and Spitze 1994). In a review of the literature on the division of household labor, Shelton and John (1996) note that preschool aged children increase women's, and to a lesser extent men's, time spent in housework. Goldscheider & Waite (1991) found that teenage girls may reduce housework time for household adults, either by creating less or performing more housework than teenage boys. The findings regarding the presence of children, however, are not gender-neutral, in that "children increase housework more for women than for men" (Bianchi et al. 2000: 211).

Another variable which is sometimes considered in relation to time constraints and the demand for participation in housework is the presence of other adults in the household. The presence of another adult in the household can serve to increase or decrease time demands. To the extent that the additional adult contributes to housework, s/he may reduce time demands, but s/he also has the potential to increase such demands (John and Shelton 1997). An additional adult in the household is especially likely to increase housework time demands for the wife (South and Spitze 1994). As is the case among children, adult women are expected to reduce the time an individual devotes to housework, while adult men are expected to increase time in housework for an individual (South and Spitze 1994).

Relative Resources Perspective

A second perspective aimed at explaining why women do more housework than men is the relative resources perspective. The first framework emphasizes power, dependency, and bargaining in relationships. The second emphasizes efficiency, specialization, and gains from trade.

Power

The first framework asserts that each partner's time in household labor is negatively linked to their resources (level of education and/or income) (Blood & Wolf 1960). The partner with more education and/or income will spend less time in household labor because their resources allot them more power in the relationship which they can use to avoid domestic labor. A related argument is the dependency model which argues that women's economic dependence disables them from bargaining out of housework (Brines 1994). This framework of the relative resources perspective would therefore

predict that the partner with a higher level of education and/or income will do less household labor due to their greater power within the relationship.

Where data on the respondent's spouse/partner is available, educational attainment relative to spouse/partner is used as a measure of power within the relationship. This is also the case for income. Age is often included as a measure of power under the assumption that the older spouse possesses more authority within the relationship (Presser 1971, 1994). When operationalized in these ways, the relative resources perspective yields mixed results. In support of the perspective, most studies find that a more equal division of household labor emerges when the gap in husbands' and wives' earnings is small (Shelton and John 1996). When individual, rather than relative earnings are examined, however, the effect of earnings on men's and women's housework time is found to be stronger for women than for men, suggesting support for the notion of housework as a mechanism through which to display appropriate gender roles (see gender section below) (Shelton and John 1996). Additionally, most studies find that women's level of education is negatively associated with their housework time (Shelton and John 1996). Conversely, men's educational attainment is positively associated with their housework time, indicating that education may also be a proxy for gender role ideology (Shelton and John 1996).

Efficiency and Specialization

The second relative resources framework, referred to as the efficiency model, asserts that partners engage in specialization, dividing household labor in a way that will maximize efficiency and utility (well-being) (Becker 1991). Thus, within a couple, the partner who earns more in paid labor allocates his or her time to the market, while the

other partner allocates his or her time to non-market work – household labor – effectively maximizing the couple’s utility. This framework of the relative resources perspective would therefore predict that, because men typically earn more in market labor, couples will allocate household labor to women and market labor to men to maximize efficiency and increase gains from trading one type of labor for another. The negative association between earnings and housework time is taken as support for this interpretation.

Gender Perspective

The cultural or gender perspective argues that who does housework is not only about time or money, but is also about gender. Housework is “a symbolic enactment of gender relations...its performance by women and men helps define and express gender relations within households” (West and Zimmerman 1987). Through (lack of) participation in household labor, women and men “do gender”, reasserting their feminine and masculine roles, respectively (Berk 1985). This perspective would predict that gender role ideologies will play a large role in determining how housework is divided among couples. Support for this notion is found in the literature, though men’s gender ideology is a stronger predictor of the division of household labor than is women’s (Shelton & John 1996). Thus, for men with traditional ideologies, in order to demonstrate appropriate sex roles, they will participate to a minimal degree in household labor, while women will bear the brunt of the housework load and thereby define their femininity. Evidence for this perspective is found in Brines’ (1994) investigation of why housework remains women’s work. Brines found that husbands who had “failed” in their role as provider attempt to reassert their masculinity by contributing less to housework; husbands who are dependent upon their wives for income do less housework the more

dependent they are (Brines 1994). Bittman et al. (2003) reach a similar conclusion, noting that couples in which the woman out-earns the man tend to compensate with a more traditional division of household labor.

Racial/Ethnic Variation in Time Spent in Housework

What is clear from the above discussion is that gender differences exist in the amount of time invested in housework. In addition to gender differences in the allocation of household labor, a small body of research also indicates that racial/ethnic differences exist in the amount of time men and women spend on household labor.

Recent studies have measured differences in household labor time for whites and blacks (John & Shelton 1997) but this has often been done with the goal of simply describing the differences (Maret & Finlay 1984). Shelton and John (1993) examined the gender division of household labor among whites, blacks, and Hispanics, focusing on how the division is affected by the market labor time of married men. To date, only one study has incorporated race into the analysis of the explanatory power of the three theoretical perspectives just introduced (John & Shelton 1997).

Using 1987 National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH) data, John and Shelton (1997) compared black men and women to white and Hispanic men and women (Shelton and John 1993) and found that Hispanic women average the greatest hours per week in housework, followed by black women, white women, black men, Hispanic men, and lastly, by white men. Similar results were obtained in Ross's (1987) study, using a 1978 telephone survey of a national probability sample of U.S. households. In line with Shelton and John's (1993 & 1997) findings, Ross observed that the husband is likely to do more housework in black couples than in white couples (Ross 1987). In a more recent

study, using 1994 NSFH data and focusing on the middle-class, Landry (2000) found that not only were black husbands contributing more time to housework than white husbands, they were also contributing more time to female-type tasks than whites. In contrast to John and Shelton (1993 and 1997), Maret and Finlay (1984), using the 1967-1977 National Longitudinal Surveys of Work Experience (NLS) cohort file on mature American women, found that black women have relatively lower levels of home responsibility than white women. This was the case both before and after the authors adjusted for the effects of income and residence.

Because the racial/ethnic variation in women's and men's time spent in housework has been examined in only four studies (all using data more than 10 years old), it is unclear how the racial/ethnic groups rank in the time men and women spend in housework and whether the explanations for participation in housework vary by race/ethnicity. The three perspectives have somewhat different predictions of what one would expect the rank orderings of the within-group gender gap in housework to be across racial/ethnic groups.

Time Available

The amount of time spent in market labor, as well as the presence and age of children and other adults in the household – who create or reduce time demands – have been posited to affect the time spent in household labor. Thus, differences between racial/ethnic groups in labor force participation and household composition could lead one to expect differences in time spent in housework.

The levels of labor force participation vary substantially by racial/ethnic group, with relatively higher participation among white and Asian men as compared with black

and Hispanic men, and white and black women as compared with Hispanic and Asian women (Cotter et al. 2000). In addition, gender gaps in work hours within racial/ethnic groups vary with implications for the gender gap in household labor time. In their review of the housework literature, Shelton and John (1996) note that women's paid work hours are negatively associated with their housework time and positively associated with the housework time of their husbands, while men's paid work time is negatively associated with their housework time. Given that the gender gap in labor force participation rates is largest among Hispanics and Asians, slightly smaller among whites, and nonexistent among blacks (Cotter et al. 2000), based on time availability alone, one might expect a smaller gender gap in household labor time among black men and women, followed by whites, and a larger gap among Hispanics and Asians.

Differences in average household size may help explain why white men and women spend the least amount of time in household labor when compared to other men and women across black, Asian, and Hispanic groups. Hispanics average the largest household size of 4 members while Asians and blacks average 3. Whites have a mean household size of 2 members (<http://factfinder.census.gov>).

Given the larger household sizes among Hispanics, Asians, and blacks, there should logically be more housework to perform, on average, in these households than in white households. However, there might also be more individuals to contribute to housework tasks in minority households, which could cut down the amount of time each person is spending in housework. Thus, it is unclear how differences in family size across racial/ethnic groups will affect the within-group gender gap in housework participation.

Relative Resources

The relative resources perspective posits a negative relationship between each partner's educational attainment and/or income and the amount of time s/he spends in household labor. Racial/ethnic variation in earnings and education, and specifically the spousal gap in income and education, may therefore contribute to racial/ethnic differences in the gender gap in housework.

Clear differences exist in the gender gap in earnings across racial/ethnic groups. In 2003, the gender gap was smallest among Hispanics, where women earned 86% as much as men; followed by blacks, where women's earnings were 84% of men's. The largest gender gap in earnings occurred among Asians and whites, where women's median earnings are only 76% of men's median earnings among whites, and 72% among Asians (Blau, Ferber, and Winkler 2006). If relative earnings matter, one might expect less gender equality in household labor time among whites and Asians and more equality in household labor participation among blacks and Hispanics.

In addition to a gender gap in earnings, there is also evidence of a gender gap in educational attainment and this gap also varies by race (Stoll 2000). Among blacks, women are somewhat more highly educated than men whereas the opposite is true for whites. Such heterogeneity in educational attainment both within gender by race and within race by gender implies that blacks may display more similar levels of housework participation than whites.

Gender

The gender perspective argues that something else beyond time availability and relative resources explains differences in housework. The perspective asserts that in an

effort to demonstrate appropriate gender roles, men participate minimally in household labor, while women bear the brunt of the housework load. Gender-role attitudes or ideology are indicators of how women and men identify with these roles. As with time availability and relative resources, racial/ethnic differences emerge in gender ideology as well. Such differences may lead to distinct household labor participation levels and patterns among the various racial/ethnic groups.

Kane (2000) provides a review of the literature on racial/ethnic variation in attitudes toward gender roles and suggests that, among Hispanics, blacks, and whites, Hispanic Americans hold the most traditional gender-role attitudes. The small number of studies that have examined gender-related attitudes among Asian Americans suggest more traditional gender-role attitudes among this group compared with whites, Hispanics, or blacks (Kane 2000, Anderson & Johnson 2003). Thus, among whites, blacks, Hispanics, and Asians, the latter two groups hold more traditional, less egalitarian gender-role attitudes.

The literature on white-black differences in gender ideology is much more extensive than for Hispanics and Asians. The findings, however, are inconclusive (see Kane 2006 for a review of this literature). Some of the studies reviewed in Kane (2006) find no significant difference in the gender-role attitudes of whites and African Americans, while others find that whites are more traditional, and less egalitarian than African Americans in their beliefs about gender roles. Still other studies find that African Americans, and African American men in particular, are more traditional regarding issues related to women's leadership and the centrality of motherhood as the source of women's fulfillment (Kane 2006).

An additional consideration, especially pertinent to the gender-role ideologies and division of household labor among Asians and Hispanics, is immigrant status.

Immigrants in these groups often come to the United States with a set of beliefs regarding gender roles, but may find that those beliefs are in contrast to the realities of life in another country. One mechanism for coping with this discordance is for husbands to undermine their wife's financial contributions, viewing their wives as working by choice, not by necessity, and continuing to view her main responsibility as tending to children and family-related duties (Dion and Dion 2001). In this type of situation, despite the probability of a smaller gap in work hours and earnings, immigrant men would continue to contribute little in the way of housework, while women would bear the brunt of the load.

Conversely, when spouses/partners are separated for lengthy periods due to the fact that the husband immigrates first, for example, and is joined later by the wife, each partner may acquire responsibilities traditionally assumed by the other spouse. Upon their reunion, these couples may display a less traditional gender division of household labor, having grown accustomed to their new roles (Dion and Dion 2001). Thus, immigration can serve to narrow the gap in the gender division of household labor or to underscore its importance.

At present, findings on black-white differences in gender-role attitudes are inconsistent, and the effects of immigration are unclear. In addition, there is limited empirical evidence on the role of gender ideology among immigrant families. Despite these shortcomings, the literature suggests that gender ideology varies by race/ethnicity

and that such variation may influence the levels of participation in household labor as well as the breakdown of household tasks by gender across racial/ethnic groups.

Purpose of Current Study

The purpose of the current study is two-fold: (1) Assess how racial/ethnic groups differ on the ratio of women's to men's housework time, focusing on a sample of employed individuals married to an employed spouse, and, (2) Explore whether predictors of housework are similar for women and men of different race-ethnic groups. Past research reveals differences in the amount of time spent in housework by gender across race/ethnicity. However, research on this topic is not conclusive as divergent findings appear in the literature.

The data used in this analysis (the ATUS) have several advantages over those used in past studies. First, the ATUS data provide much more recent estimates of the time men and women spend in housework. Two recent publications examining variation in the gender division of housework by race use data that are almost twenty years old (Shelton & John 1993; John and Shelton 1997). Other studies use data that are even older (Maret & Finlay 1984; Ross 1987). The 2003-04 ATUS data used in this analysis provide up-to-date estimates of time spent in housework.

Second, sample sizes are large enough to study time allocated to housework among white, black, Hispanic, and Asian men and women. Asians have been largely excluded from analyses of housework time due to small sample sizes. The ATUS provides a sufficiently large sample of Asians to include this group in the analysis. The

large sample of Hispanics, in addition to that of Asians, allows an analysis which moves beyond white-black differences in time spent in housework.

Finally, the use of time diary data to measure the dependent variable – time spent in housework – is superior to other previously used data. Past research has demonstrated that time-diary estimates are more accurate than stylized survey questions on housework time. For example, survey questions result in over-estimates of time spent in certain activities (Sayer et al. 2004). Over-estimation is reduced in time-diary studies as a result of (1) the approach of walking respondents through the activities of the previous day instead of attempting to recall total time spent in activities over the given time period and, (2) because activities are coded after the interview, eliminating the respondent's responsibility for classifying their activities by type and minimizing his or her ability to exaggerate time spent in housework (Sayer et al. 2004).

Research Questions and Expectations

1. Are the gender gaps in the housework time of men and women in a dual-earner marriage smaller for some race/ethnic groups than for others? Past research has not provided conclusive evidence about which racial/ethnic groups display the largest gap in time spent in housework, but there is some suggestion that the gap is smallest within black couples. Given smaller gender gaps in labor force participation among whites and blacks, and more liberal ideologies among white and black men, I expect gender gaps in housework participation to be most similar among blacks and whites and most dissimilar among Asians and Hispanics.

2. Are dual-earner men's levels of participation in housework in general, and in female type tasks in particular, higher among some race/ethnic groups than others?

Given previous research which has found a more traditional breakdown of tasks among whites than blacks, I expect the level of engagement in core tasks, which often are performed by women, to be lower among white men than black men. Given their more traditional gender role attitudes, I expect Asian men to participate the least in core tasks, followed by Hispanic men, and then white men. Black men are expected to participate the most in core tasks.

3. Are the theoretical perspectives equally predictive for men and women of each racial/ethnic group? Previous research suggests that time availability and relative resources measures are not equally predictive of housework time across gender. For example, children increase women's housework time more than men's and the effect of earnings is stronger for women than for men. Given that measures of time availability and resources do not operate uniformly across gender, they also may not affect the time allocation to housework in the same way for all racial/ethnic groups either. For instance, relative resources may be of little importance in Hispanic households where a strong desire to enact a machismo ideology would trump issues of time and money. I therefore expect to find a difference in the predictive power of the perspectives across men and women of each racial/ethnic group.

Given that the ATUS does not provide a direct measure of gender ideology, the portion of the racial/ethnic difference in the housework time of men and women left unexplained by time availability or relative resources raises the possibility that gender ideology plays a role in influencing men's and women's levels of housework. The

racial/ethnic differences in the explanatory power of the time availability and relative resources perspective, as well as differences in nativity status across racial/ethnic groups, imply differences in the explanatory power of the gender perspective. The racial/ethnic difference left unexplained by the time availability and relative resources perspective can be assumed to be consistent with an explanation based partially on the gender perspective.

Data and Methods

Description of the Data Set

This analysis examines respondent-reported time diary data from the 2003 and 2004 American Time Use Surveys (ATUS). The sample universe of the ATUS is the same as that of the Current Population Survey (CPS), as the ATUS sample is drawn from the CPS. Thus the ATUS sample universe is comprised of the approximately 105 million households in the United States and is a stratified, three-stage sample, drawn from households that have completed their eighth (final) interview for the CPS. In the first stage of selection, a subsample of the CPS is taken to obtain the ATUS sample, which is distributed across the states proportionate to size. In the second stage, households are stratified by race/ethnicity, the presence and age of children, and the number of adults in adults-only households. Households in which the householder is Hispanic or non-Hispanic black, as well as households with children are oversampled. To ensure that each group is correctly represented in the population, sampling weights provided by the ATUS are applied in analyses to avoid misleading results. In the third stage of selection, a civilian household member at least 15 years of age who is neither an active military

member nor residing in an institution is selected to be the designated respondent for the ATUS.

Within a sample household, all eligible persons have the same probability of being selected as the ATUS designated person. The designated person is interviewed by telephone one time about his or her activities on the diary day (the day before the interview), with the diary day pre-assigned by ATUS and with weekend days over-sampled. The time diary portion of the ATUS interview asks respondents to recount the activities they engaged in between 4 a.m. on the day before the interview and 4 a.m. on the day of the interview. Because the ATUS sample is not uniformly distributed across the days of the week, sampling weights provided by the ATUS are applied in analyses. For each activity, the respondent reports how long the activity lasted. Information is also provided on who was with the respondent during an activity and where the activity took place. If the respondent was engaged in more than one activity at a time, they are asked to identify the main (primary) activity. Household roster information from the last CPS interview (2-4 months prior to the ATUS interview) is updated in the ATUS and information on the employment status of the respondent and his or her spouse is included.

Sample

The sample for this analysis is restricted to individuals aged 18 to 64 who are employed and who are married with an employed spouse present in the home, i.e., dual-earners, and who identify their race/ethnicity as white, black, Hispanic, or Asian American. Thus, the women and men in my sample are not married to each other. The sample consists of 8,081 respondents (3,641 males and 4,440 females) (See Appendix A for sample restrictions). Table 1 provides information on the sample of interest and

corresponding sample sizes. The non-Hispanic white subsample contains 2,939 males and 3,630 females; the Hispanic subsample consists of 354 males and 427 females; the black non-Hispanic subsample contains 241 males and 241 females; the non-Hispanic Asian subsample consists of 107 males and 142 females. Non-Hispanic individuals who defined themselves as any race other than white, black, or Asian were not included in the analysis due to their small sample sizes. Because the demographic data available on spouses comes from the respondent and diary data is only available for the respondent, not for a couple, mixed-race and mixed-ethnicity couples are coded as the respondent's reported race/ethnicity. (Mixed race/ethnic couples comprise approximately 7% of the sample.)

The choice to restrict the analysis to married individuals with a spouse present in the home was motivated by the fact that the three perspectives on the gender division of household labor pertain to (married) couples. Additionally, the relative resources perspective requires that we know something about the respondent's partner. While it would have been ideal to focus on all cohabiting couples, the ATUS does not collect data on non-married or cohabiting individuals' partners. Thus, it is not possible to incorporate relative measures of age and education in an analysis of these individuals' housework time².

² Clearly issues of selectivity must be considered in discussing the housework time of married persons only, especially given the lower percents married among some race/ethnic groups. In order to evaluate differences between the married and total populations, Appendix Table 1 provides an examination of housework time for all individuals age 18-64 and shows the ratio of housework hours of the married versus the total population. The total population does about 85% as much housework on average as the married population. Ratios of women's to men's housework hours are always somewhat higher among the married population than for the total population but ratios are actually quite similar. Restricting the analysis to married individuals does not alter greatly the race/ethnic gender ratios in housework time.

The choice to further restrict the analysis to dual-earner individuals was motivated by the need to include a measure of relative earnings and work hours in the analysis. The criteria for dual-earner status is that both spouses are wage or salary workers (the earnings of the respondent's spouse come from the final CPS interview, while the earnings of the respondent come from the ATUS and are therefore slightly more up-to-date than the CPS measure for the spouse). Thus for dual-earner individuals only, data on the work hours and earnings of ATUS respondents and their spouses are complete and allow an examination of relative resources. The self-employed are excluded because earnings are only ascertained for wage and salary workers in the CPS/ATUS.

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable in this analysis is the respondent's average minutes per day spent in housework activities. The total time spent in housework activities is derived by summing respondent time-diary reports of time spent in nine different types of activities (see Appendix B): housework; food and drink preparation, presentation, and clean-up; interior maintenance, repair, and decoration; exterior maintenance, repair, and decoration; lawn, garden, and houseplants; animals and pets; vehicles; appliances and tools; household management; and household activities, not elsewhere classified. The respondent's time spent in each of these nine activities is reported in minutes per day and is calculated based on the time elapsed between the start and end time of the activity.

Time spent in housework activities is broken down into categories following Bianchi et al.'s (2000) schema. Bianchi et al. (2000) use the categories "core tasks" and "other tasks" to examine the household labor of men and women. Core tasks are those

more often performed by women and include work that is more time-consuming and less discretionary than other tasks. For this analysis, core tasks include the following time-intensive activities: interior cleaning; laundry; sewing, repairing, maintaining textiles; food and drink preparation; food presentation; and kitchen and food cleanup. Other tasks include the following more discretionary activities: heating and cooling; vehicle repair and maintenance (by self); appliance and tool set-up, repair, and maintenance (by self); storing interior household items, including food; interior arrangement, decoration and repairs; building and repairing furniture; exterior cleaning; exterior repair, improvements, and decoration; lawn, garden, and houseplant care; ponds, pools, and hot tubs; care for animals and pets; financial management; household and personal organization and planning; household and personal mail and messages (except e-mail); household and personal e-mail messages; and home security. For a full description of the activities that comprise each of the categories in this analysis, see Appendix B.

Independent and Control Variables

Time Available

Three characteristics of respondents or their households tap either the time they have available for housework or the extent of housework demand on their time. How much paid work a respondent does affects their available time, but presence of children and other adults also affect how much housework there is to do – children either reduce housework through contributions or add to housework (and may also constrain time available for housework because they require time for care); other adults can either add to the housework burden or decrease it for a respondent if they contribute to doing

housework. Thus, three measures of time-availability are included in the analysis: work hours, presence of children by age, and presence of an additional household adult.

In the analysis of married dual-earner men and women, respondent's usual hours worked per week (TEHRUSL1) and the usual hours worked per week of the respondent's spouse (TESPUHRS) are used to create a measure of relative work hours with the following categories: husband works more than 5 hours more per week than wife (the omitted category in the regressions); difference between husband and wife's weekly work within 5 hours; and wife works more than 5 hours more per week than husband. Because certain respondents (N=400) and/or respondent's spouses (N=519) reported that their usual hours worked per week vary, I impute values of work hours based on the gender and full- or part-time status of the individual.

Two household composition variables are included in the analyses as measures of the demand for participation in housework and/or supply of others who might assist with housework. Consistent with South and Spitze (1994), four dichotomous variables capture the presence of children of different ages: the presence of children less than 5 years of age, the presence of children ages 5 through 11, the presence of male children ages 12 through 18, and the presence of female children ages 12 through 18. Previous research finds that preschool children increase housework time for household adults (Shelton & John 1996; Bianchi et al. 2000) and that teenage girls may reduce housework time for household adults, either by creating less or performing more housework than teenage boys (Goldscheider and Waite 1991).

Finally, I construct a variable (HHADULT) where 1 indicates the presence of an additional adult in the household who is not the respondent or their spouse, and 0 where

there is no additional adult in the household. Past research finds that an additional adult in the household can increase or decrease the time demands of men and women.

Relative Resources of Spouses

How much housework an individual does may also be a result of how much power s/he has to bargain out of housework with his/her spouse. Several variables are included to capture the bargaining resources of the individual relative to his/her spouse: differences in age, education, and earnings.

The model includes age of the respondent and age relative to spouse. Age (TEAGE) is a continuous variable ranging from 18 to 64. Following Bianchi et al. (2000), relative age is classified into three categories: (1) wife is at least three years younger than the husband, (2) husband and wife's ages fall within two years of each other (the omitted category in the regressions), and (3) the husband is at least three years younger than the wife. Due to missing data on the respondent's spouse's age, I impute age values for 60 spouses, based on the gender and race of the respondent.

I include a measure of the respondent's education along with his/her education relative to spouse. The respondent's education (PEEDUCA) is coded into five dummy variables: less than high school (the omitted category in this analysis), high-school diploma, some college education, college degree, and beyond college education. Relative education is also included and is coded into a series of three dummy variables: (1) husband has a higher level of educational attainment than wife, (2) husband and wife have same level of education (the omitted category in the regressions), and (3) wife has a higher level of education than husband.

The model includes the earnings of the respondent and earnings relative to spouse. The weekly earnings of the respondent are multiplied by 0.0001 in the regression analyses so that a weekly earnings figure of \$49999 (\$499.99) would equal 4.9 in the analysis. I use respondent's and spouse's weekly earnings (TRERNSWA and SPERNSWA) to create a relative income variable with the following three categories: (1) husband's weekly earnings are more than 10% higher than wife's (the omitted category in the analysis), (2) husband and wife earn weekly wages within 10% of each other (same weekly wage), and (3) wife's weekly earnings are more than 10% higher than husband's. For the 1,178 spouses who were not asked what their weekly earnings are, I impute earnings values based on their sex and full- or part-time status.

Controls

In addition to the variables discussed above, I also include several controls in the model. School enrollment (TESCHFT and PESCHFT) is measured by two dummy variables, one for the respondent and one for his/her spouse, coded 1 if enrolled in school full-time at the time of the ATUS interview and 0 otherwise. Respondents who were not asked this question were coded as not enrolled in school. Among this sample, female respondents never had a spouse enrolled full-time in school. Therefore, this variable is not included as a control in the models for women.

Two additional controls account for whether the interview occurred on a weekend or on a holiday – days on which either more or less housework than average might be performed. Thus, weekend diary day (TUDIARYDAY) is coded 1 if the respondent was interviewed on a Saturday or Sunday and 0 otherwise. Holiday diary day (TRHOLIDAY) is coded 1 if the respondent was interviewed on a holiday and 0

otherwise. I also include a diary quality control variable – the total number of activities reported. Those who report more activities may more conscientiously record their diary day.

Plan of Analysis

The first goal of this study is to describe racial/ethnic variation in the household labor of individuals in married dual-earner couples. First, I calculate the average minutes per day spent in housework for Asian, Hispanic, white, and black men and women and test for significant differences across groups in time spent in housework. The second goal of this study is to determine whether the predictors of housework vary by race/ethnicity. Second, I examine the effects of race/ethnicity on housework time and how this relationship changes when additional explanatory variables are included in the models. Finally, I estimate models predicting housework time for men and women in each racial/ethnic group separately.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Racial/Ethnic Variation in Time Spent in Housework

Table 2 displays the mean minutes spent doing housework tasks each day by gender and racial/ethnic group and shows whether race/ethnic differences are statistically significant. Among women, Hispanics average the greatest number of minutes per day in total housework (141 minutes). Asian women report the next highest amount, averaging 139 minutes per day spent in housework, followed by white women (130 minutes). Black women spend the least amount of time in housework, averaging 92 minutes per

day, a figure statistically significantly lower than that for any other group of women. Hispanic, Asian, and white married dual-earner women all average over 2 hours of housework per day, compared with the 1½ hour average for blacks.

Among men, whites average the greatest number of minutes per day in total housework (89 minutes), followed by blacks (81 minutes) and Hispanics (73 minutes). Asian men average the least amount of time in total housework per day (54 minutes). The average for white married men of 1½ hours per day is statistically greater than for other groups. The difference between black and Hispanic men is not statistically significant, though both log significantly more housework time per day than Asian men.

The gender gap in housework time is assessed in the bottom two panels of table 2. Panel 3 presents women's average minutes minus men's average for each racial/ethnic group and the bottom panel shows the ratio of women's to men's average housework time. Within groups, married women average more minutes in housework than men. Consistent with the first hypothesis, the gender gap in total housework time is smallest among blacks (women average 11 more min/day than men), and whites exhibit the next smallest gender gap in total housework (women average 41 more min/day than men). The gender gaps are largest for Hispanics (women average 68 min/day more than men) and Asians (women average 85 more min/day than men). When the focus is on the ratios in panel four, Hispanics and Asians are distinct from whites and blacks, with women's housework averaging two times men's housework in the former groups, but only around one and a half times men's in the latter two groups.

For core tasks, again Hispanic women average the greatest number of minutes per day (126 minutes), followed by Asian (120 minutes) and white (93 minutes) women.

Black women average the least number of minutes per day in core tasks (80 minutes).

Consistent with the second hypothesis, among men, blacks average the greatest time per day in core tasks (40 minutes), followed by Hispanic (32 minutes) and white (28 minutes) men. Asian men average the least amount of time in core tasks (26 minutes/day). When comparing men's and women's time in core tasks, a similar pattern emerges as was found for total housework time. The gender gap in time spent in core tasks is again smallest among blacks (women average 40 more min/day than men), followed by whites (women average 65 more minutes/day than men) and Hispanics and Asians (women average 94 more minutes/day than men). In all groups, women do far more of this type of work than men, but race/ethnic differences are large. Asian married women average 4.7 times as much core housework as Asian married men, compared with a much lower ratio of 2.0 for married black women relative to married black men.

For other tasks, white women average the greatest number of minutes per day (37 minutes), followed by Asian (19 minutes) and Hispanic (16 minutes) women. Black women average the least time in such activities (12 minutes/day). Among men, whites average the most time in other tasks (61 minutes/day), followed by black and Hispanic men (41 minutes). Asian men average about 28 minutes/day in other tasks. Black, white, and Hispanic men perform about twenty to thirty more minutes per day of other tasks than women, while Asian men average 10 more minutes per day in other tasks than women.

Predicting Variation in Housework Time: Are the Theoretical Perspectives Equally Predictive for Men and Women Across Each Racial/Ethnic Group?

In order to understand racial/ethnic differences in housework, it is instructive to examine whether measures of time availability and demand and relative resources are predictive of housework time for each group. Hence, I move to multivariate analyses assessing the correlates of housework time among white, black, Hispanic, and Asian men and women.

Tables 3 and 4 present the means and standard deviations for women and men, respectively, for the independent variables in the analysis of housework time. Groups differ on the measures of time availability and time demands. Hispanic women have the highest likelihood of having a child under age 12 in the household and have the lowest average earnings, while Hispanic men have the highest likelihood of earning more than their spouses and of living in a household where an additional adult is present. These circumstances may explain why Hispanic women average more time in total and core housework than women in other racial/ethnic groups and why there is such a large gender gap in housework time among Hispanic men and women.

On the other hand, black women average the greatest number of hours worked per week and have the highest likelihood of being in a couple in which the wife earns more than the husband and of being in a couple in which the wife has more education than the husband. Black men have the highest likelihood of having children between the ages of 12 and 18 and of having a wife with a higher level of education. This may explain why black women average the least amount of time in total and core housework, why black men average the most time in core housework, and why the gender gaps in these activities are smallest for this group.

White women have the highest likelihood of being in a couple in which the husband works five or more hours per week more than the wife. The latter is true for white men as well and, in addition, white men have the highest likelihood of being in a relationship in which the wife works five or more hours more per week than the husband. This may help explain why white men contribute the most to total housework and why the gender gap in housework is relatively small among whites.

Asian women have the highest average earnings and the highest likelihood of having a daughter age 12-18 and an additional adult present in the household. They also have the highest likelihood of working within five hours per week of their husband's hours, of earning within 10% of their husband's earnings, of having a husband with more education, and of having a husband with higher earnings. Asian men also have the highest average earnings and the highest likelihood of having a child under 5, of working within five hours per week of their wife's hours, of having a wife who works more than five hours more per week than the husband, of being more well-educated than their wife, of earning within 10% of their wife's wages, and of having a wife who earns more. Given these characteristics, it is not clear why the gender gap in housework is so large among Asians.

Regression Results

Regression results reveal that, consistent with the third hypothesis, the theoretical perspectives are not equally predictive of the housework time of men and women across each racial/ethnic group.

Predicting Housework Time by Race/ethnicity

Table 5 predicts minutes per day spent in total housework for married dual-earner women and men, aged 18-64. These analyses suggest that the incorporation of time availability, including work hours and relative work hours, and relative resources measures, including earnings and relative earnings, reduces the race/ethnic differences in the housework time between subgroups of women, and white and Hispanic women in particular. For men, the addition of time availability, relative resources, and control variables in model two, increases the differences between racial/ethnic groups³. However, these regressions do not reveal whether these measures are equally predictive of housework for the different race/ethnic groups of dual-earner women and men. In order to examine racial/ethnic differences in the explanatory power of time availability and relative resources measures, Tables 6 and 7 display separate models for each racial/ethnic group.

Time Availability and Dual-Earner White, Hispanic, Black, and Asian Women's Housework Time

Table 6 reveals that among dual-earner women, time availability is a good predictor of housework time for white women, has little explanatory power for Asian women, and provides little explanatory power for black and Hispanic women. For all women, the presence of children age 5-11 is associated with an increase in housework time (though only statistically significant for white and Asian women). Female children age 12-18 are also associated with more housework time for white women, as is an

³ Table 4 shows that, relative to white men, all other racial/ethnic groups are oversampled on weekends. Given that more housework is performed on weekends, this oversampling may artificially increase the housework time of black, Hispanic, and Asian men relative to white men. Thus, in model two, when the "diary day is a weekend day" is controlled, the differences between the three groups relative to whites become more pronounced. This may be one explanation for the large increase in the difference in time spent in housework between whites as compared to blacks, Hispanic, and Asian men.

additional household adult. Conversely, for Asian women, the presence of an additional household adult is associated with less housework time. For white women, compared to a scenario in which the husband works five or more hours per week more than the wife, women spend less time in housework when their hours fall within five hours of their husbands' hours. When white and Hispanic women work five or more hours per week more than their husbands, they also perform less housework than wives who work the same amount of hours per week as their husband (though only statistically significant for white women). Conversely, black and Asian women who work more than five hours per week more than their husbands, do more housework than wives who work the same amount of hours per week as their husband (though not statistically significant). These findings are consistent with the third hypothesis and suggest that the time availability perspective does not apply equally to all racial/ethnic groups of women.

Relative Resources and Dual-Earner White, Hispanic, Black, and Asian Women's Housework Time

While time availability offers strong predictive power to explaining the housework time of white women and somewhat less power in explaining the housework time of Asian women, resources appear to be good predictors of the housework time of black and Hispanic women, and provide some limited explanatory power for white and Asian women. Focusing specifically on the earnings measure reveals a negative association between earnings and housework time for Asian, Hispanic, and white women (though only statistically significant for Asian women). Earning within 10% of one's spouse's earnings, as compared to earning less than one's spouse, is associated with doing less housework for Hispanic, white, and black women, and more housework for

Asian women (though not statistically significant for any group). Earning more than one's spouse is associated with doing more housework among Hispanic and white women and less housework among black and Asian women (though not statistically significant for any group). These findings are consistent with the third hypothesis, suggesting racial/ethnic variation in the predictive power of the relative resources perspective. The findings specific to relative earnings are inconsistent with expectations that higher earnings relative to one's spouse would be associated with significantly less housework time.

White, Hispanic, Black, and Asian Dual-Earner Men's Housework Time: Time Availability and Relative Resources

Table 7 reveals that the predictive power of time availability and relative resources measures are much less consistent across racial/ethnic groups for dual-earner men than for women. For white, black, and Asian men, work hours are negatively associated with housework time (though not statistically significant for Asians). Having a spouse who works the same number of hours per week, as compared to a spouse who works less, is associated with more housework time for white men and less housework time for Hispanic, black, and Asian men (though not statistically significant for any group). Having a spouse who works more hours per week, as compared to a spouse who works less, is associated with more housework time for Hispanic and white men (though only statistically significant for Hispanic men). Earnings are positively associated with housework time for all men (though only statistically significant for Asian men). Earning within 10% of one's spouse, as compared to earning more, is associated with more housework among Hispanic, Asian, and white men (though not statistically significant for

Asian men), and less housework for black men (though not statistically significant). Earning less than one's spouse, as compared to earning more, is associated with more housework time for white, black, and Asian men, and less housework time for Hispanic men (though not statistically significant for any group). Overall, these findings suggest that time availability and relative resources provide some limited explanatory power for the housework time of all dual-earner men. For men, the relative earnings variables behave somewhat more in line with expectations – white and Hispanic men do significantly more housework when their earnings are more similar to those of their wives.

Conclusions

This analysis uses the 2003 and 2004 American Time Use Survey data to examine the housework time of married dual-earner white, black, Asian, and Hispanic men and women ages 18-64, and the covariates of housework and how they vary by race/ethnicity.

Hispanic, Asian, and white women spend the most time in housework, averaging over two hours per day. Black women spend significantly less time in housework per day, averaging just 1½ hours per day. White men average about an hour and a half per day in housework, while black and Hispanic men spend just over an hour on average per day, and Asian men average less than an hour per day in housework. Gender differences in time spent in housework are large and vary somewhat by race/ethnicity. Consistent with the time availability and gender ideology perspectives, the gender gap in housework time is largest for Hispanic and Asian women. Asian women spend an average of two and a half times as much time in housework per day than Asian men, while Hispanic

women spend about twice as much time per day in housework as Hispanic men. The gap is smallest for white and black women, who spend about 1.5 and 1.1 times as much time, respectively, in housework on average than men spend per day. Despite racial/ethnic variation in the gender gap in housework, women are found to invest more time in housework than men in all racial/ethnic groups analyzed here.

In the second part of the analysis, I examined the explanations for the housework time of men and women and found that, among married dual-earner men and women, racial/ethnic differences are observed in the predictive power of the time availability and relative resources perspectives. Among dual-earners, household composition variables are good predictors of white and Asian women's housework time. Employment lends explanatory support to the housework time of white dual-earner women, while resources are good predictors for Hispanic and black women and relative resources have some predictive power of white, Hispanic, and Asian women's housework time.

For men, household composition variables achieve only one statistically significant effect – male children age 12-18 are positively associated with Asian men's housework time. Work hours are negatively associated with the housework time of white and black dual-earner men, and for Hispanic men, having a wife who works more, as compared with a wife who works less, is associated with an increase in housework time. Resources show some predictive power for all dual-earner men across race/ethnicity.

Past research has relied heavily on the time availability and relative resources perspectives to provide an understanding of men's and women's participation in housework and how paid work and family work are traded off against each other. The findings of this analysis suggest that the explanations for men's and women's

participation in housework vary across racial/ethnic groups. Furthermore, the variables associated with each perspective do not produce uniform effects across racial/ethnic groups of men and women. For example, children under five increase housework time for some women, while decreasing it for others. Thus, it is incorrect to assume that the three perspectives on the gender division of housework can be applied equally across racial/ethnic groups to explain men's and women's participation in housework and the processes through which paid work and family work are traded off against each other.

These findings provide support for Chafetz's (1997) assertion that "Prior theoretical efforts have been too middle class, white, and heterosexist, and that ... theory must recognize diversity among women [and men]" (Chafetz 1997: 116). Critical social theories emerging in sociology have argued that the experiences of women and men of color and members of similarly oppressed groups are shaped by complex power relations (Collins 1990). As a result of the far-reaching influence of forces such as racism, sexism, and classism, the experiences of women and men of color are not the same as those of members of dominant social groups, such as white men and women. Accordingly, theoretical and empirical work on women and men of color must consider the complex power relations shaping these people's lives in order to produce valid information on their lived experiences. This means practically that sociological analyses of housework and the gendered division of labor must at the very least disaggregate samples and not merely control for race in order to understand the relationships between identity categories such as race/ethnicity and gender. When theory based on white, middle-class and male-centered perspectives is used as the basis of analyses of multiple race/ethnic-gender groups, we see (as evidenced by my research) that potentially meaningful differences are

made invisible. In order to illuminate these differences in experience that are shaped by intersecting power relations, we must incorporate critical social theoretical perspectives that better explain the relationships between identity categories. By acknowledging that these categories are interrelated, we can potentially produce innovative theoretical and empirical research that serves to better explain and predict the gender division of housework across racial/ethnic groups.

Table 1. Unweighted Sample Sizes and Weighted Percentage Distributions of Married Dual-Earner Men and Women Age 18-64 by Race/Ethnicity

	Unweighted Sample Size		Weighted Percent Distribution	
	Husbands	Wives	Husbands	Wives
Total ^a	3641	4440	100%	100%
White	2939	3630	77	80
Hispanic	354	427	12	11
Black	241	241	8	6
Asian	107	142	3	3

^a Total is the number of individuals who are in a dual-earner couple.

Table 2. Significance Tests of Mean Minutes Spent Doing Housework Each Day, by Sex Type of Task, and Gender and Racial/Ethnic Group: Married Dual-Earner Individuals, Age 18-64

	Total ^a	White	Hispanic	Black	Asian
<i>Women</i>					
Total housework	129.1	130.0 ^e	141.2 ^b	91.8 ^{b e g}	138.5 ^g
Core Tasks	96.3	92.7 ^{c e f}	125.7 ^{b c}	79.6 ^{b e g}	119.6 ^{f g}
Other Tasks	32.9	37.3 ^{e c f}	15.5 ^{d c}	12.2 ^e	18.8 ^{d f}
N	4,440	3,630	427	241	142
<i>Men</i>					
Total housework	85.2	88.8 ^{f c}	72.8 ^{d c}	80.8 ^g	53.8 ^{g f d}
Core Tasks	28.9	27.5	31.5	39.4	25.5
Other Tasks	56.4	61.3 ^{e f c}	41.3 ^c	41.4 ^e	28.3 ^f
N	3,641	2,939	354	241	107
<i>Difference (W-M)</i>					
Total housework	43.9	41.2	68.4	11.0	84.7
Core Tasks	67.4	65.2	94.2	40.2	94.1
Other Tasks	-23.5	-24.0	-25.8	-29.2	-9.5
<i>Ratio (W/M)</i>					
Total housework	1.5	1.5	1.9	1.1	2.6
Core Tasks	3.3	3.4	4.0	2.0	4.7
Other Tasks	0.6	0.6	0.4	0.3	0.7

^a Total population includes dual-earner 18-64 year olds who are married with a spouse present and who identify themselves as Hispanic, White(NH), Black(NH), or Asian(NH)

^b Difference between Hispanic and Black significant at $p < 0.05$

^c Difference between Hispanic and White significant at $p < 0.05$

^d Difference between Hispanic and Asian significant at $p < 0.05$

^e Difference between White and Black significant at $p < 0.05$

^f Difference between White and Asian significant at $p < 0.05$

^g Difference between Black and Asian significant at $p < 0.05$

Standard deviations are shown in Appendix Table 2

Activities comprising each category shown in Appendix D

Table 3. Means and Standard Deviations of the Independent and Control Variables: Married Dual-Earner Women age 18-64

	Total		White-Non Hispanic		Hispanic Origin		African American		Asian	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
<i>Independent Variables</i>										
Time Availability										
Parental Status										
Children <5 yrs old in household	18.7	37.9	17.1	36.2	30.4	47.1	20.9	42.0	15.7	35.5
Children 5-11 years old in household	26.8	42.9	24.7	41.4	38.7	49.8	33.6	48.8	24.1	41.8
Male children 12-18 years old in household	14.5	34.2	14.2	33.5	14.8	36.4	19.7	41.0	11.4	31.0
Female children 12-18 years old in household	13.5	33.2	13.2	32.5	15.0	36.6	13.7	35.5	17.3	36.9
Presence of additional household adult	19.8	38.6	18.4	37.2	24.5	44.0	25.9	45.2	27.0	43.4
Employment										
Hours worked per week	36.0	10.9	35.9	11.0	36.6	10.2	37.1	9.7	35.2	9.8
Husband works >5 hrs/wk more than wife	43.7	48.1	45.7	47.8	36.4	49.3	36.6	49.7	31.0	45.1
Husband and wife's hrs/wk of work within 5	47.7	48.4	45.2	47.7	54.9	50.9	60.0	50.6	62.5	47.3
Wife works >5 hrs/wk more than husband	8.6	27.3	9.1	27.6	8.7	28.8	3.4	18.8	6.5	24.1
Resources										
Age	41.8	9.8	42.5	9.6	37.1	10.3	41.3	9.9	42.2	8.9
Relative Age										
Wife >2 years younger than husband	36.2	46.6	34.1	45.5	44.3	50.8	43.7	51.2	47.7	48.8
Husband and wife's ages within 2 years	54.0	48.3	56.5	47.6	41.3	50.4	47.4	51.6	46.9	48.7
Husband >2 years younger than wife	9.8	28.9	9.4	28.0	14.5	36.0	9.0	29.5	5.4	22.0
Education										
Less than high school	5.9	22.8	2.5	14.9	30.7	47.2	8.1	28.2	4.5	20.2
High School	28.8	43.9	29.5	43.7	27.7	45.8	25.5	45.0	23.2	41.2
Some College	28.5	43.8	30.1	44.0	21.7	42.2	28.4	46.6	12.2	31.9
College Graduate	24.5	41.7	25.3	41.7	13.5	35.0	27.2	45.9	37.3	47.2
Beyond College	12.3	31.8	12.7	32.0	6.3	24.9	10.7	31.9	22.9	41.0
Relative Education										
Husband has higher level of education than wife	25.3	42.2	25.9	42.0	20.8	41.5	23.2	43.6	30.0	44.8
Husband and wife have same level of education	47.6	48.4	46.8	47.9	52.6	51.1	48.3	51.6	47.6	48.8
Wife has higher level of education than husband	27.1	43.1	27.3	42.7	26.6	45.2	28.6	46.7	22.4	40.7

Table 3 continued on next page

Table 3 continued	Total		White-Non Hispanic		Hispanic Origin		African American		Asian	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
<i>Relative Income</i>										
Earnings	6.3	4.6	6.5	4.5	4.6	3.8	6.5	4.9	6.8	5.5
Husband's hourly earnings higher than wife's	54.7	48.3	54.8	47.7	54.4	51.0	51.0	51.6	58.5	48.1
Husband and wife earn same hourly wage	10.8	30.1	10.1	28.9	14.3	35.8	12.1	33.7	14.6	34.5
Wife's hourly earnings higher than husband's	34.5	46.1	35.1	45.8	31.3	47.5	36.9	49.8	26.9	43.3
<i>Control Variables</i>										
Wife in school full-time	2.0	13.8	1.9	13.0	1.0	10.4	5.5	23.6	3.7	18.4
Husband in school full-time	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Diary day is a weekend	28.3	43.7	27.8	43	31.4	47.5	28.1	46.4	31.6	45.4
Diary day is a holiday	1.5	11.6	1.3	10.9	2.1	14.8	2.8	17.0	0.7	8.2
N	4,440		3,630		427		241		142	

Table 4. Means and Standard Deviations of the Independent and Control Variables: Married Dual-Earner Men age 18-64

	Total		White-Non Hispanic		Hispanic Origin		African American		Asian	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
<i>Independent Variables</i>										
Time Availability										
Parental Status										
Children <5 yrs old in household	20.1	41.3	18.5	39.1	28.0	51.1	20.5	46.6	29.4	46.2
Children 5-11 years old in household	29.0	46.7	24.8	43.5	41.3	56.1	45.2	57.4	43.3	50.3
Male children 12-18 years old in household	14.4	36.2	13.7	34.6	17.3	43.0	18.2	44.5	12.4	33.4
Female children 12-18 years old in household	15.6	37.4	14.5	35.5	18.4	44.1	22.1	47.9	14.4	35.7
Presence of additional household adult	19.8	41.1	18.3	38.9	30.4	52.4	16.1	42.4	27.7	45.4
Employment										
Hours worked per week	44.3	9.5	44.6	9.6	43.7	8.5	43.6	10.2	40.5	7.35
Husband works >5 hrs/wk more than wife	42.5	50.9	43.8	50.0	42.0	56.2	36.4	55.5	27.1	45.1
Husband and wife's hrs/wk of work within 5	50.1	51.5	48.4	50.3	52.9	56.8	56.7	57.2	66.0	48.1
Wife works >5 hrs/wk more than husband	7.3	26.9	0.08	26.9	5.1	25.1	0.07	29.4	7.0	25.8
Resources										
Age	42.9	10.20	43.6	10.1	39.6	10.83	42.2	10.73	41.3	8.0
Relative Age										
Wife >2 years younger than husband	39.8	50.4	38.2	48.9	45.3	56.7	43.0	57.1	51.2	50.7
Husband and wife's ages within 2 years	50.3	51.5	51.2	50.3	44.5	56.6	48.3	57.6	46.0	50.6
Husband >2 years younger than wife	9.9	30.8	10.2	30.5	10.2	34.4	0.09	32.6	0.03	16.7
Education										
Less than high school	7.6	27.3	0.04	20.5	30.7	52.5	0.07	29.0	0.02	15.2
High School	30.1	47.2	30.4	46.3	30.2	52.3	32.6	54.1	13.1	34.2
Some College	26.7	45.6	26.5	44.4	23.1	48.0	37.0	55.7	16.1	37.3
College Graduate	22.9	43.3	25.0	43.6	10.6	35.0	17.3	43.7	35.8	48.6
Beyond College	12.7	34.3	13.8	34.7	0.05	25.5	0.06	28.0	32.7	47.6
Relative Education										
Husband has higher level of education than wife	25.3	44.8	26.4	44.4	19.1	44.8	22.4	48.1	27.6	45.3
Husband and wife have same level of education	47.8	51.5	46.1	50.2	60.4	55.7	43.7	57.2	53.2	50.6
Wife has higher level of education than husband	27.0	45.7	27.5	45.0	20.5	45.9	34.0	54.6	19.2	40.0

Table 4 continued on next page

Table 4 continued	Total		White-Non Hispanic		Hispanic Origin		African American		Asian	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
<i>Relative Income</i>										
Earnings	9.7	6.1	10.2	6.1	6.99	4.8	8.2	5.8	11.8	7.1
Husband's hourly earnings higher than wife's	71.2	46.7	71.6	45.4	73.7	50.1	65.7	54.8	65.5	48.2
Husband and wife earn same hourly wage	11.0	32.2	10.4	30.7	12.2	37.3	13.0	38.8	14.9	36.1
Wife's hourly earnings higher than husband's	17.8	39.4	18.0	38.7	14.1	39.6	21.3	47.2	19.6	40.3
<i>Control Variables</i>										
Wife in school full-time	0.4	6.7	0.0	0.05	0.00	0.07	0.02	14.6	1.7	13.0
Husband in school full-time	1.2	11.1	0.01	11.4	0.00	0.07	0.0	10.3	1.9	14.0
Diary day is a weekend	29.1	46.8	27.8	45.1	34.6	54.2	32.9	54.2	30.3	46.6
Diary day is a holiday	1.6	12.8	0.02	12.6	0.01	0.13	0.02	14.8	1.2	10.9
N	3,641		2,939		354		241		107	

Table 5. OLS Estimates of Housework (minutes per day): Married Women and Men age 18-64 Who Are Wage or Salary Workers in Dual-Earner Couples¹

	Women		Men	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Race/Ethnicity^a				
Hispanic	11.24 + (6.14)	8.13 (7.18)	-15.99 * (6.33)	-25.68 *** (7.45)
Black (NH)	-38.20 *** (7.90)	-35.28 *** (7.62)	-8.01 ** (7.42)	-13.67 + (7.30)
Asian (NH)	8.47 (10.72)	9.72 (11.68)	-35.02 (12.28)	-44.47 *** (13.38)
Time Availability				
Presence of children by age				
Children <5 years old in household		-2.67 (5.38)		1.54 (5.64)
Children 5-11 years old in household		11.42 ** (4.37)		1.94 (4.68)
Male children 12-18 years old in household		5.34 (5.17)		-1.95 (5.73)
Female children 12-18 years old in household		9.78 + (5.35)		2.72 (5.54)
Presence of additional household adult ^b		11.92 * (4.71)		-0.86 (5.18)
Employment ^c				
Hours worked per week		-0.54 * (0.22)		-0.52 * (.26)
Difference between husband and wife's hours within 5		-14.66 ** (4.61)		4.88 (4.66)
Wife works > 5 more hours/week than husband		-20.27 ** (7.83)		9.22 (8.99)
Resources				
Age		1.14 *** (0.22)		0.29 (0.24)
Relative Age ^d				
Wife at least 3 years younger than husband		4.07 (3.93)		3.02 (4.31)
Husband at least 3 years younger than wife		-13.32 * (6.30)		0.43 (6.84)

Table 5 continued on next page

Table 5 cont'd.	Women		Men	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Education ^e				
High School		-20.60 *		0.66
		(8.79)		(8.50)
Some College		-31.77 ***		2.79
		(9.07)		(8.91)
College Graduate		-26.76 **		-8.14
		(9.43)		(9.60)
Beyond College		-38.96 ***		-20.67 +
		(10.67)		(11.04)
Relative Education ^f				
Husband has a higher level of education than wife		-6.40		11.44 *
		(4.50)		(5.22)
Wife has a higher level of education than husband		-2.54		-5.54
		(4.55)		(4.92)
Relative Earnings ^g				
Earnings		-0.65		0.71 +
		(.50)		(.43)
Husband and wife earn same weekly wage		-2.32		14.18 *
		(6.24)		(6.57)
Wife's weekly earnings higher than husband's		2.24		7.30
		(4.35)		(5.87)
Controls				
Wife in school		-23.22 +		-46.74
		(12.96)		(30.43)
Diary day is a weekend		68.87 ***		-38.60 *
		(4.00)		(18.40)
Diary day is a holiday		41.27 **		71.18 ***
		(14.95)		(4.32)
Total number of activities		1.68 ***		78.65 ***
		(0.22)		(15.79)
				0.39
				(0.29)
Intercept	129.99 ***	77.59 ***	88.78 ***	69.23 ***
	(2.11)	(16.10)	(2.31)	(20.37)
R-squared	0.007	0.115	0.004	0.088

Table 5 cont'd.

¹ Analysis based on weighted sample of 4,440 women and 3,641 men

^a White omitted ^b No additional household adult omitted ^c Husband works >5 hours/week more than wife omitted

^d Husband and wife's ages within 2 years omitted ^e Less than high school omitted

^f Husband and wife have same level of education omitted ^g Husband's weekly earnings higher than wife's omitted

*** p<.001 ** p<.01 * p<.05 + p<.10

Table 6: Predicting Housework (minutes per day) by Racial/Ethnic Group: Married Women age 18-64
Who are Wage or Salary Workers in Dual-Earner Couples

	White	Hispanic	Black	Asian
Time Availability				
Presence of children by age				
Children <5 years old in household	-2.37 (6.28)	-8.56 (14.55)	0.99 (23.00)	2.21 (25.47)
Children 5-11 years old in household	8.55 + (5.03)	16.65 (12.52)	15.74 (18.96)	32.06 + (20.63)
Male children 12-18 years old in household	4.77 (5.84)	3.97 (17.28)	-5.92 (19.77)	40.86 (25.49)
Female children 12-18 years old in household	11.21 + (6.08)	6.33 (17.04)	-8.95 (21.96)	11.73 (21.78)
Presence of additional household adult ^b	13.71 * (5.42)	-0.01 (14.51)	14.40 (18.20)	-36.03 + (20.52)
Employment ^c				
Hours worked per week	-0.66 ** (.25)	-0.11 (0.78)	0.73 (.91)	-0.93 (1.09)
Difference between husband and wife's hours within 5	-15.49 ** (5.22)	-10.00 (15.33)	-12.39 (17.75)	-0.79 (24.47)
Wife works >5 more hours/week than husband	-22.23 ** (8.64)	-22.73 (26.55)	9.24 (44.61)	12.24 (41.29)
Resources				
Age	1.07 *** (.25)	0.87 (.72)	1.92 + (1.10)	2.38 * (1.15)
Relative Age ^d				
Wife at least 3 years younger than husband	2.14 (4.40)	28.47 * (13.38)	6.25 (16.00)	-19.74 (18.30)
Husband at least 3 years younger than wife	-12.50 + (7.15)	-17.30 (18.29)	12.82 (27.24)	10.31 (34.86)
Education ^e				
High School	5.42 (13.47)	-26.49 (16.29)	-87.92 ** (31.15)	34.32 (42.54)
Some College	-5.84 (13.64)	-57.27 ** (19.12)	-53.89 + (31.31)	5.04 (44.38)
College Graduate	0.99 (14.00)	-60.79 ** (21.78)	-93.37 ** (34.70)	22.94 (43.88)

Table 6 continued on next page

Table 6 continued	White	Hispanic	Black	Asian
Beyond College	-10.77 (15.09)	-76.58 ** (29.38)	-84.50 * (40.27)	-12.94 (45.82)
Relative Education ^f				
Husband has a higher level of education than wife	-2.32 (5.03)	-35.81 * (15.55)	-9.41 (19.48)	-23.93 (22.00)
Wife has a higher level of education than husband	-4.42 (5.09)	-2.32 (15.78)	2.22 (19.04)	36.71 (23.16)
Relative Earnings ^g				
Earnings	-0.46 (0.57)	-1.42 (2.02)	0.75 (2.16)	-2.89 + (1.90)
Husband and wife earn same weekly wage	-1.99 (7.18)	-6.28 (18.22)	-3.88 (23.76)	14.80 (26.05)
Wife's weekly earnings higher than husband's	3.77 (4.86)	8.65 (14.89)	-26.08 (18.06)	-17.83 (21.89)
Wife in school	-38.09 * (15.24)	13.02 (59.30)	7.57 (36.85)	43.13 (44.29)
Diary day is a weekend	73.95 *** (4.49)	53.75 *** (13.07)	65.92 *** (16.58)	41.78 * (18.08)
Diary day is a holiday	59.85 *** (17.70)	-20.41 (41.44)	87.59 + (47.97)	-99.32 (91.84)
Total number of activities	1.53 *** (.25)	2.92 *** (.83)	1.42 (.97)	1.76 (1.09)
Intercept	60.35 ** (19.51)	73.16 + (43.52)	10.04 (72.92)	28.88 (73.53)
(N) Total Women	3630	427	241	142
R-squared	0.114	0.150	0.149	0.328

^b No additional household adult omitted ^c Husband works >5 hours/week more than wife omitted

^d Husband and wife's ages within 2 years omitted ^e Less than high school omitted

^f Husband and wife have same level of education omitted ^g Husband's weekly earnings higher than wife's omitted

*** p<.001 ** p<.01 * p<.05 + p<.10

Table 7: Predicting Housework (minutes per day) by Racial/Ethnic Group: Married Men age 18-64
Who are Wage or Salary Workers in Dual-Earner Couples

	White	Hispanic	Black	Asian
Time Availability				
Presence of children by age				
Children <5 years old in household	-4.16 (6.61)	20.61 (15.98)	33.06 (22.85)	-13.14 (18.86)
Children 5-11 years old in household	2.83 (5.47)	8.49 (12.95)	-21.07 (19.24)	0.14 (15.73)
Male children 12-18 years old in household	-7.43 (6.64)	3.55 (16.92)	35.81 (22.60)	65.49 (30.87) *
Female children 12-18 years old in household	-2.60 (6.42)	21.61 (16.65)	19.25 (20.36)	15.94 (21.35)
Presence of additional household adult ^b	-2.35 (5.98)	-1.73 (14.62)	14.99 (23.72)	3.10 (19.36)
Employment ^c				
Hours worked per week	-0.52 + (.28)	1.35 (.99)	-2.20 + (1.13)	-1.01 (1.35)
Difference between husband and wife's hours within 5	6.65 (5.25)	-0.40 (14.36)	-4.35 (21.45)	-20.80 (20.79)
Wife works >5 more hours/week than husband	8.19 (10.04)	55.71 + (31.48)	-14.67 (36.53)	-5.86 (39.32)
Resources				
Age	0.21 (.27)	1.34 (.84)	-1.43 (1.10)	0.30 (1.27)
Relative Age ^d				
Wife at least 3 years younger than husband	2.22 (4.86)	2.04 (13.83)	31.35 + (17.98)	-15.72 (17.02)
Husband at least 3 years younger than wife	-4.61 (7.59)	11.48 (21.10)	27.82 (31.40)	-74.47 (48.03)
Education ^e				
High School	6.38 (11.48)	-16.95 (16.85)	-6.98 (35.50)	83.51 (60.41)
Some College	4.69 (11.79)	23.32 (20.45)	-3.42 (38.18)	113.65 + (59.25)
College Graduate	-9.84 (12.32)	33.14 (27.28)	-13.41 (43.11)	115.42 + (61.95)

Table 7 continued on next page

Table 7 continued	White	Hispanic	Black	Asian
Beyond College	-23.58 + (13.69)	-12.16 (35.51)	91.51 (56.18)	66.50 (64.52)
Relative Education ^f				
Husband has a higher level of education than wife	17.40 ** (5.88)	-14.96 (17.47)	-14.31 (22.71)	-5.94 (21.08)
Wife has a higher level of education than husband	-6.39 (5.56)	17.71 (16.53)	-15.58 (20.60)	-5.71 (25.33)
Relative Earnings ^g				
Earnings	0.60 (.46)	1.13 (1.89)	1.20 (2.16)	3.15 + (1.65)
Husband and wife earn same weekly wage	12.67 + (7.61)	51.40 ** (19.30)	-30.53 (25.36)	26.81 (27.34)
Wife's weekly earnings higher than husband's	3.80 (6.62)	-14.78 (19.64)	39.51 (24.63)	30.65 (24.74)
Wife in school	-57.96 (44.57)	-105.13 (90.90)	-67.83 (68.47)	-163.38 (146.75)
Husband in school	-41.20 * (19.73)	-0.30 (94.93)	-53.34 (91.47)	109.87 (134.07)
Diary day is a weekend	79.52 *** (4.94)	54.76 *** (12.78)	28.96 + (18.08)	45.79 ** (16.39)
Diary day is a holiday	101.01 *** (17.66)	-28.59 (53.09)	-41.27 (65.53)	-149.64 * (72.17)
Total number of activities	0.30 (.32)	-0.20 (1.01)	-0.02 (1.29)	0.24 (1.44)
Intercept	63.61 ** (22.98)	-87.35 (60.57)	201.53 * (87.46)	-54.20 (96.74)
(N) Total Men	2939	354	241	107
R-squared	0.104	0.121	0.158	0.279

^b No additional household adult omitted ^c Husband works >5 hours/week more than wife omitted

^d Husband and wife's ages within 2 years omitted ^e Less than high school omitted

^f Husband and wife have same level of education omitted ^g Husband's weekly earnings higher than wife's omitted

*** p<.001 ** p<.01 * p<.05 + p<.10

Appendix Table 1. Mean Minutes Spent Doing Housework Each Day, by Sex Type of Task, and Gender and Racial/Ethnic Group: All Individuals age 18-64

	Total ^a	White	Hispanic	Black	Asian
<i>Women</i>	All	All	All	All	All
Total housework	135.7	138.0	166.9	93.6	124.3
Core Tasks	100.3	95.8	145.3	79.2	101.4
Other Tasks	35.3	42.2	21.5	14.3	22.9
N	14,860	10,702	1,833	1,928	397
<i>Men</i>					
Total housework	77.7	84.1	62.4	62.5	48.9
Core Tasks	27.6	27.6	25.2	32.7	20.8
Other Tasks	50.1	56.5	37.2	29.7	28.1
N	11,775	8,794	1,463	1,157	361
<i>Difference (W-M)</i>					
Total housework	58	53.9	104.5	31.1	75.4
Core Tasks	73	68.2	120.1	46.5	80.6
Other Tasks	-15	-14.3	-15.7	-15.4	-5.2
<i>Ratio (W/M)</i>					
Total housework	1.7	1.6	2.7	1.5	2.5
Core Tasks	3.6	3.5	5.8	2.4	4.9
Other Tasks	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.8
<i>Ratio (All M/Married M)</i>					
Total housework	0.87	0.88	0.96	0.82	0.87
Core Tasks	0.97	0.95	1.11	0.96	0.87
Other Tasks	0.83	0.85	0.88	0.70	0.87
<i>Ratio (All W/Married W)</i>					
Total housework	0.85	0.87	0.85	0.79	0.80
Core Tasks	0.83	0.84	0.83	0.81	0.76
Other Tasks	0.89	0.94	1.03	0.71	1.04

^a Total population includes 18-64 year olds who identify themselves as Hispanic, White(NH), Black(NH), or Asian(NH)

Appendix Table 2. Mean Minutes Spent Doing Housework Each Day, by Sex Type of Task, and Gender and Racial/Ethnic Group: Includes Standard Deviations

	Total ^a	White	Hispanic	Black	Asian
<i>Women</i>					
Total housework	129.1 (122.2)	130.0 (122.2)	141.2 (129.4)	91.8 (115.7)	138.5 (94.9)
Core Tasks	96.3 (100.7)	92.7 (97.1)	125.7 (122.7)	79.6 (107.3)	119.6 (86.1)
Other Tasks	32.9 (64.8)	37.3 (68.5)	15.5 (37.6)	12.2 (42.5)	18.8 (42.1)
N	4,440	3,630	427	241	142
<i>Men</i>					
Total housework	85.2 (126.2)	88.8 (126.0)	72.8 (127.0)	80.8 (142.1)	53.8 (72.9)
Core Tasks	28.9 (59.4)	27.5 (54.2)	31.5 (69.9)	39.4 (97.9)	25.5 (40.2)
Other Tasks	56.4 (109.1)	61.3 (110.7)	41.3 (106.5)	41.4 (104.5)	28.3 (57.6)
N	3,641	2,939	354	241	107

^a Total population includes 18-64 year olds who are married with a spouse present and who identify themselves as Hispanic, White(NH), Black(NH), or Asian(NH)

Activities comprising each category shown in Appendix B

Appendix A. Tracing the sample and accounting for drops.

Variable	Total	Men	Women
Beginning Population	34693	15175	19518
White, Black, Asian, or Hispanic ^a	34069	14894	19175
Married, spouse present	18388	8721	9667
Age 18-64	15577	7191	8386
Wage/salary worker	10478	5419	5059
Respondent is a dual-earner	8081	3641	4440

^aThe Hispanic category was created using the variable PEHSPNON (=1) and includes individuals who defined themselves as Hispanic

- 1 Hispanic
- 2 Non-Hispanic

^aThe White, Black, and Asian categories were created using the variables PEHSPNON (=2) and PTDTRACE (=1, 2, or 4)

and includes individuals who defined themselves as White, Black, or Asian. The 624 cases that were dropped were PTDTRACE = 3 or 5 and greater

- 1 White only
- 2 Black only
- 3 American Indian, Alaskan Native only
- 4 Asian only
- 5 Hawaiian/Pacific Islander only
- 6 White-Black
- 7 White-American Indian
- 8 White-Asian
- 9 White-Hawaiian
- 10 Black-American Indian
- 11 Black-Asian
- 12 Black-Hawaiian
- 13 American Indian-Asian
- 14 Asian-Hawaiian
- 15 White-Black-American Indian
- 16 White-Black-Asian
- 17 White-American Indian-Asian
- 18 White-Asian-Hawaiian
- 19 White-Black-American Indian-Asian
- 20 2 or 3 race
- 21 4 or 5 races

Appendix B. Activity Codes for Household Activities

American Time Use Survey, 2003 and 2004

(from American Time Use Survey Activity Lexicon 2003, p. 2 and 2004, p. 2)

02 Household Activities

01 Housework

- 01 Interior Cleaning
- 02 Laundry
- 03 Sewing, repairing, and maintaining textiles
- 04 Storing interior household items, including food
- 99 Housework, n.e.c.*

02 Food and Drink Preparation, Presentation, and Clean-up

- 01 Food and drink preparation
- 02 Food presentation
- 03 Kitchen and food clean-up
- 99 Food and drink prep, presentation, and clean-up, n.e.c.

03 Interior Maintenance, Repair, and Decoration

- 01 Interior arrangement, decoration, and repairs
- 02 Building and repairing furniture
- 03 Heating and cooling
- 99 Interior maintenance, repair, and decoration, n.e.c.

04 Exterior Maintenance, Repair, and Decoration

- 01 Exterior cleaning
- 02 Exterior repair, improvements, and decoration
- 99 Exterior repair, improvements, and decoration, n.e.c.

05 Lawn, Garden, and Houseplants

- 01 Lawn, garden, and houseplant care
- 02 Ponds, pools, and hot tubs
- 99 Lawn and garden, n.e.c.

06 Animals and Pets

- 01 Care for animals and pets (not veterinary care)
- 99 Pet and animal care, n.e.c.

07 Vehicles

- 01 Vehicle repair and maintenance (by self)
- 99 Vehicles, n.e.c.

08 Appliances and Tools

- 01 Appliance and tool set-up, repair, and maintenance (by self)
- 99 Appliances and tools, n.e.c.

09 Household Management

- 01 Financial management
- 02 Household and personal organization and planning
- 03 Household and personal mail and messages (except e-mail)
- 04 Household and personal e-mail and messages
- 05 Home security
- 99 Household management, n.e.c.

99 Household Activities, n.e.c.

- 99 Household activities, n.e.c.

*Not elsewhere classified

Bibliography

- Anderson, Stacey J., and Joel T. Johnson. (2003). "The Who and When of 'Gender-Blind Attitudes: Predictors of Gender-Role Egalitarianism in Two Different Domains.'" *Sex Roles* 49(9/10):527-32.
- Becker, Gary S. (1991). *A Treatise on the Family*. Harvard University Press.
- Beckett, J.O., and Smith, A.D. (1981). "Work and family roles: Egalitarian marriage in black and white families." *Social Service Review* 55(2): 314-326.
- Berk, Sarah Fenstermaker. (1985). *The Gender Factory*. Plenum Press.
- Bianchi, S.M., M.A. Milkie, L.C. Sayer, and J.P. Robinson. (2000). "Is Anyone Doing the Housework? Trends in the Gender Division of Household Labor." *Social Forces* 79(1):191-228.
- Bittman, Michael, Paula England, Nancy Folbre, Liana Sayer, and George Matheson. (2003). "When Does Gender Trump Money? Bargaining and Time in Household Work." *American Journal of Sociology* 109(1): 186-214.
- Blau, Francine D., Marianne A. Ferber, and Anne E. Winkler. (2006). *The Economics of Women, Men, and Work*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Blood, Robert O., and Donald M. Wolf. (1960). *Husbands and Wives: The Dynamics of Married Living*. Free Press.
- Brines, Julie. (1994). "Economic Dependency, Gender, and the Division of Labor at Home." *American Journal of Sociology* 100:652-88.
- Chafetz, J. S. 1997. "Feminist Theory and Sociology: Underutilized Contributions for Mainstream Theory." *Annual Review of Sociology*, 23: 97-120.
- Collins, P. H. (1990/2000). *Black feminist thought: knowledge, consciousness and the politics of empowerment*, (2nd Ed.). New York & London: Routledge.
- Cotter, David A., Hermsen, Joan M., and Reeve Vanneman. (2000). "Gender Inequality at Work." Russell Sage Foundation.
- Coverman, Shelley. (1985). "Explaining Husbands' Participation in Domestic Labor at Home." *American Journal of Sociological Quarterly* 26:81-97.
- . (1983). "Gender, domestic labor, and wage inequality." *American Sociological Review*, 48: 623-37.

- Dion, Karen K. and Kenneth L. Dion. (2001). "Immigrant Perspectives and Adaptations: Gender and Cultural Adaptation in Immigrant Families." *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(3): 511-521.
- Glass, J. and T. Fujimoto. (1994.) "Housework, paid work, and depression among husbands and wives." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 35: 179-91.
- Golding, J.M. (1990.) "Division of household labor, strain, and depressive symptoms among Mexican Americans and non-Hispanic Whites." *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 14: 103-17.
- Goldscheider, Frances K., and Linda J. Waite. (1991). "Spouses' Time Allocation to Household Work: A Review and Critique." *Lifestyles: Family and Economic Issues* 12:253-94.
- Hersch J. (1991.) "The impact of nonmarket work on market wages." *The American Economic Review*, 44: 157-160.
- (1985.) "Effect of housework on earnings of husbands and wives: evidence from full-time piece rate workers." *Social Science Quarterly*, 66: 210-17.
- Hersch J., Stratton L.S. (1994.) "Housework, wages, and the division of housework time for employed spouses." *American Economic Review*, 84: 120-25.
- John, Daphne, and Beth Anne Shelton. (1997). "The Production of Gender Among Black and White Women and Men: The Case of Household Labor." *Sex Roles* 36(3/4):171-93.
- Kane, Emily W. (2000). "Racial and Ethnic Variations in Gender-related Attitudes." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26:419-39.
- Kurdek, L.A. (1993.) "The allocation of household labor in gay, lesbian, and heterosexual married couples." *Journal of Social Issues*, 49: 127-34.
- Landry, Bart. (2000). *Black Working Wives: Pioneers of the American Family Revolution*. University of California Press.
- Lye, D.N., Biblarz, T.J. (1993.) "The effects of attitudes toward family life and gender roles on marital satisfaction." *Journal of Family Issues*, 14: 157-88.
- Maret, Elizabeth, and Barbara Finlay. (1984). "The Distribution of Household Labor among Women in Dual-earner Families." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 46:357-64.

- McAdoo, H.P. (1990). A portrait of African American families in the United States. In S.E. Rix (Ed.), *The American Woman 1990-1991: A status report* (pp. 71-93). New York: W.E. Norton.
- McAllister, I. (1990.) "Gender and the division of labor: employment and earnings variation in Australia." *Work and Occupations*, 17: 79-99.
- Presser, Harriet B.. (1994). "Employment Schedules among Dual-earner Spouses and the Division of Household Labor by Gender." *American Sociological Review* 59:348-364.
- (1971). "Age Differences Between Spouses." *American Behavioral Scientist* 19:190-205.
- Reid, P.T., and Comas-Diaz, L. (1990). "Gender and ethnicity: Perspectives on dual status." *Sex Roles* 22(7/8): 397-408.
- Ross, Catherine E. (1987). "The Division of Labor at Home." *Social Forces* 65(3):816-833.
- Ross, C.E., J. Mirowski, and J. Huber. (1983.) "Dividing work, sharing work, and in-between: marriage patterns and depression." *American Sociological Review*, 48: 809-23.
- Sayer, Liana C., Suzanne M. Bianchi, and John P. Robinson. (2004). "Are Parents Investing Less in Children? Trends in Mothers' and Fathers' Time with Children." *American Journal of Sociology* 110(1):1-43.
- Shamir, B. (1986.) "Unemployment and household division of labor." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 48: 195-206.
- Shelton, Beth Anne, and J. Firestone. (1988.) "An examination of household labor time as a factor in composition and treatment effects on the male-female wage gap." *Sociological Focus*, 21: 265-78.
- Shelton, Beth Ann, and Daphne John. (1996). "The Division of Household Labor." *Annual Review of Sociology*, 22: 299-322.
- (1993). "Ethnicity, Race, and Difference: A Comparison of White, Black, and Hispanic Men's Household Labor Time." In *Men, Work and Family*, ed. J.C. Hood, 1: 131-150. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- South, S.J. and G. Spitze. (1994). "Housework in Marital and Nonmarital Households." *American Sociological Review* 59:327-47.

Stoll, Michael A. (2000). "African Americans and the Color Line." Russell Sage Foundation.

West, Candace, and Don H. Zimmerman. (1987). "Doing Gender." *Gender and Society* 1:125-51.

Zinn, M.B. (1991). Family, feminism and race in America. In J. Lorber and S.A. Farrell (Eds.), *The Social Construction of Gender* (pp. 110-134). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.