Published in final edited form as:

J Fam Issues. 2013 March 1; 34(3): 394–427.

Explaining Racial/Ethnic Variation in Partnered Women's and Men's Housework: Does One Size Fit All?

Vanessa R. Wight¹, Suzanne M. Bianchi², and Bijou R. Hunt³

¹Columbia University, New York, NY, USA

²University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, USA

³Sinai Urban Health Institute, Chicago, IL, USA

Abstract

Using a national sample of 12,424 partnered women and 10,721 partnered men from the 2003–2006 American Time Use Survey, this article examines racial/ethnic variation in women's and men's housework time and its covariates. The ratio of women's to men's housework hours is greatest for Hispanics and Asians and smallest for Whites and Blacks. White and Hispanic women's housework hours are associated with household composition and employment suggesting that the time availability perspective is a good predictor for these women, but may have less explanatory power for other race/ethnic groups of women. Relative resources also have explanatory power for White women's housework time but are weak predictors for women of Other race/ethnicities. Time availability and relative resource measures show some association with White men's housework time but are generally poor predictors among other race/ethnic groups of men, suggesting that traditional models of housework allocation do not “fit” all groups equally.

Keywords

race/ethnicity; gender; housework

The gender division of housework has received a great deal of attention in the past few decades as scholars have focused on both the explanations for gender specialization in domestic tasks and the consequences for women of the unequal division of labor in the home. Women continue to do more housework than men, particularly more of the routine day-to-day tasks of cooking and cleaning (Bianchi, Milkie, Sayer, & Robinson, 2000; Maret & Finlay, 1984; Presser, 1994; Ross, 1987). Findings generally suggest negative consequences for women when they spend substantially more time doing housework than men. Women earn less (Coverman, 1983; Hersch, 1985, 1991; Hersch & Stratton, 1994, 1997, 2002; Keith & Malone, 2005; McAllister, 1990; Shelton & Firestone, 1988), couples

© The Author(s) 2012

Corresponding Author: Vanessa R. Wight, Mailman School of Public Health, National Center for Children in Poverty, Columbia University, 215 W. 125th Street, Third Floor, New York, NY 10027, USA vw2179@columbia.edu.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

report more disagreements (Lye & Biblarz, 1993), and women have a higher likelihood of experiencing depression the more time they spend doing housework—particularly when they perceive the division of labor in the home to be unfair (Glass & Fujimoto, 1994; Golding, 1990; Kurdek, 1993; Ross, Mirowski, John, & Huber, 1983; Shamir, 1986).

In addition to the large amount of research on the gender division of labor among American couples, there is an emerging literature on cross-cultural patterns of housework negotiation. Here, the focus is on the effect of macrolevel gender equality (as measured by egalitarian social policies) on microlevel processes, such as the division of household labor among couples (Batalova & Cohen, 2002; Baxter, 1997; Cooke, 2006, 2007; Fuwa, 2004; Fuwa & Cohen, 2007). What is largely missing from the literature is comparative research within the United States on the racial/ethnic variation in women's and men's housework allocation. A handful of studies suggest that Black husbands may contribute more to household labor than White husbands, although all the assessments use data that were collected more than a decade ago (Kamo & Cohen, 1998; Landry, 2000; Orbuch & Eyster, 1997; Ross 1987; Shelton & John, 1993; John & Shelton, 1997). In addition, there are a few cross-cultural studies of the division of labor that use Japanese and Taiwanese samples, but no previous study includes Asians within the U.S. context, and the information we have on housework participation among Hispanics is limited (Hu & Kamo, 2007; Kamo, 1994).

At least three competing explanations or theoretical perspectives (described in the next section) have been used to explain differences in women's and men's housework time: time availability, relative resources, and the gender perspective. Comparative research suggests that the determinants of the division of labor may be similar across race and cultural groups, but it remains an open question whether these theoretical perspectives “fit” the empirical evidence for different race and ethnic groups in the United States (Calasanti & Bailey, 1991; Davis & Greenstein, 2004; Kalleberg & Rosenfeld, 1990; Kamo, 1994). In this article, we use data from the 2003–2006 American Time Use Survey (ATUS) to examine gender differences in housework time among a sample of women and men in married or cohabiting unions. The ATUS data are ideal because they are recent and provide a large enough sample for the examination of four race/ethnic groups: Hispanics and non-Hispanic Whites, Blacks, and Asians. We use the ATUS data to first assess whether the housework patterns of women and men are similar by race/ethnicity. Next, we empirically assess the degree to which measures of time availability and relative resources are associated with women's and men's housework time and whether the associations vary by race/ethnicity. We argue that the experiences of minority women and men are not the same as their peers in dominant social groups, such as White women and men, and this results in variation in the observed differences in and determinants of housework patterns by race/ethnicity.

Theoretical Perspectives on the Gender Division of Household Labor

Research on the gender division of labor has generally focused on three theoretical perspectives: time availability, relative resources, and gender role ideology. The time availability perspective argues that the gender division of household labor is based on a rational calculation of who has time for household labor (Coverman, 1985). Men's and women's participation in housework and childcare is an outcome of the demand for their

participation and the time available to participate (South & Spitze, 1994). Those who are employed and those who work more hours are presumed to have less time for housework than those not employed or who work fewer hours. In households where children or additional adults are present, there will be more or less housework, given these individuals' potential to create, as well as to perform housework.

Among both men and women, the nonemployed spend more time on housework than those employed full time or part time (Bianchi et al., 2000; Shelton & John, 1996). Women's paid work hours are negatively associated with their housework time and positively associated with the housework time of their husbands, whereas men's paid work time is negatively associated with their housework time (Shelton & John, 1996). Parents, especially mothers, of preschool-aged children spend more time doing housework than those without children or who only have older children (Bianchi et al., 2000; Shelton & John, 1996). Having teenage girls in the household may reduce housework time for household adults, perhaps because teenage daughters create less or do more housework than teenage sons (Goldscheider & Waite, 1991). Additional adults in the household can either increase or decrease the housework demands on others (South & Spitze, 1994).

Two quite distinct perspectives argue that the relative economic position of women and men influences each partner's time in household labor. On one hand are perspectives that emphasize power differentials and bargaining (Blood & Wolf, 1960; Brines 1994). Under these conceptualizations, partners with higher market wage rates spend less time in housework because their resources give them more power in the relationship, which in turn allows them to bargain out of domestic labor. Other perspectives rely on the assumption that partners cooperate or agree on specialization in housework by rationally assessing each partner's comparative advantage in home production versus market production. 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 nonmarket work, effectively maximizing the couple's utility (Becker, 1991). Because men typically earn more in the labor market, couples allocate household labor to women and market labor to men to maximize efficiency and increase gains from trading one type of labor for another.

Most studies find that a more equal division of household labor emerges when the gap in husbands' and wives' earnings is small (Blair & Lichter, 1991; Kamo, 1988; Shelton & John, 1996). However, the effect of earnings on men's and women's housework time is stronger for women than for men, suggesting that housework allocation is based on more than relative earnings power. In addition, when wives outearn their husband, studies find that husbands do less housework than one might expect from either a time availability or relative resources perspective (Bittman, England, Folbre, Sayer, & Matheson, 2003; Brines, 1994). This leads to a third explanation of the unequal division of labor in the home, the gender perspective.

The gender perspective argues that housework is "a symbolic enactment of gender relations ... its performance by women and men helps define and express gender relations within households" (West & Zimmerman, 1987). Doing housework may be a means through which appropriate gender roles are displayed (Shelton & John, 1996). Through participation in

household labor (or lack thereof), women and men “do gender,” reasserting their feminine and masculine roles, respectively (Berk, 1985). To demonstrate appropriate gender roles, men with traditional ideologies participate to a minimal degree in household labor whereas women bear the brunt of the housework load, thereby defining their femininity. Also, whereas women’s level of education is negatively associated with their housework time (Shelton & John, 1996), men’s educational attainment is positively associated with their housework time (Blair & Lichter, 1991). These findings suggest that education may also be a proxy for gender role ideology with more highly educated men subscribing to a more egalitarian outlook (Shelton & John, 1996). The literature provides general support for the gender perspective, but it is often indirect. For example, South and Spitze (1994) find that all things being equal, married women and men have the largest gap in housework hours compared with their unmarried counterparts. Similarly, Gupta (1999) shows that women’s housework hours increase when they marry whereas men’s hours decrease then they marry. These findings underscore the power of marriage in reinforcing traditional gender roles. Furthermore, husbands who “fail” in their role as providers attempt to reassert their masculinity by contributing less to housework and women who outearn their husbands tend to compensate with a more traditional division of household labor (Bittman et al., 2003; Brines, 1994).

Race/Ethnic Variation in the Predictors of Housework Time

There is considerable variation in the socioeconomic status, cultural backgrounds, and historical experiences among race and ethnic groups in the United States. These differences might lead us to expect smaller (or larger) gender gaps in housework time for some groups relative to others. We argue that these cultural experiences specific to various race/ethnic groups not only influence the types of characteristics that affect the propensity to do housework and the actual amount of housework there is to be done, but they also may be related to the degree to which the three theoretical perspectives explain race/ethnic differences in housework time.

According to the time availability perspective, differences in employment status and work hours are usually hypothesized to result in differential availability to engage in housework. Some race/ethnic groups have smaller gender differences in paid employment and work hours than other groups, suggesting that gender differences in “time available” to do domestic work should be smaller, on average, for some groups than for others. Black women have historically exhibited strong ties to the labor force whereas Black men have generally had weak ties and low rates of employment, particularly when compared with their White counterparts (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2009; Broman, 1991; Fullerton & Toossi, 2001; Kamo & Cohen, 1998). Recent estimates from the Bureau of Labor Statistics indicate Black women’s and men’s participation in the labor force are the most similar relative to other race/ethnic groups. Among those aged 25 to 54 years, Black women’s participation rate is 78% compared with 84% for Black men—a difference of 6 percentage points (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2009). The gender gap in employment is relatively larger among Whites, Asians, and Hispanics. The difference in labor force participation rates among White women and men is much larger than among Blacks with a 16 percentage point difference (i.e., 76% of White women vs. 92% of White men aged 25–54 years are in the labor force). Asian

American women and men have a 19 percentage point difference in labor force participation rates, similar to the White gap—73% of Asian women aged 25 to 54 years are in the labor force versus 92% of Asian men. The gap in labor force participation rates between Hispanic women and men of 26 percentage points is the widest of all groups—largely because women’s participation is relatively low and men’s is relatively high when compared with their race/ethnic counterparts. Among those aged 25 to 54 years, Hispanic women’s participation rate is 67% compared with 93% for Hispanic men (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2009).

In addition to differences in labor force participation rates, Hispanics also have larger households. Hispanic women have a higher fertility rate (i.e., a larger number of births per 1,000 women aged 15–44 years) and a higher level of completed fertility (number of children ever born to women aged 40–44 years) compared with their White, Black, and Asian counterparts (U.S. Census Bureau, 2005, 2006).

The bargaining power of men and women in households is often measured by their relative earning power. Here too, minority groups differ from non-Hispanic Whites. Among wage and salary workers employed full year in 2008, White women’s earnings averaged 73% of White men’s earnings. The comparable percentage for Blacks was 84%, for Hispanics 87%, and for Asians 85%.¹ Finally, gender role ideologies vary across race/ethnic groups. Hispanic and Asian Americans tend to hold more traditional gender role attitudes than Whites or Blacks, with Blacks more egalitarian in their gender role attitudes than Whites (Kane, 2000). To the degree that gender role ideologies are important predictors of housework time, we might expect the withingroup gap in housework time to vary by race/ethnicity.

These factors suggest that there are race–ethnic compositional differences in the population that may influence how much housework there is to do in households, who may have more or less time to participate in housework tasks, and who may be better equipped to bargain into or out of housework. Beyond compositional differences, the distinct historical, cultural, and socioeconomic experiences of each race/ethnic group may influence housework time and perhaps make factors such as relative resources less predictive of the household division of labor for some groups compared with others.

Among Black women and men in the United States, there is a long history of role sharing and fluidity in the work and family roles that extends back to the slavery era (see Broman, 1991 for review). Historically, poverty, racism, and discrimination limited Black men’s labor force options, depressed their wages, and created a situation where Black women needed to be employed to ensure economic survival (Billingsley, 1968; Broman, 1991; Stack, 1974). Given the economic imperative for Black women to work outside the home, Black men may have been forced to perform traditional women’s work such as housework tasks. Black women and men may also have developed more egalitarian attitudes about women’s and men’s work and family roles and may have become more accepting of sharing

¹Based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau (2009). Percentages are calculated from Table PINC-10 “Wage and salary workers—people 15 years old and over by total wage and salary income in 2008, work experience in 2008, race, Hispanic origin and sex” available at http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/cpstables/032009/perinc/new10_000.htm

these kinds of tasks (Kane, 2000; Landry, 2000). Exposure to disadvantage coupled with a more gender egalitarian allocation of time to the labor market may encourage Black families to pool all available resources and focus more on maximizing the well-being of the overall family, rather than that of the individual (Kamo & Cohen, 1998). Thus, exchanges of resources between women and men may play a smaller role in determining the allocation of housework than has been observed among Whites.

The underlying assumption of individual self-interest implicit in the relative resources perspective may also be more problematic for Asians than for Whites. That is, partners in a dyad are assumed to act in order to maximize their own individual well-being and advantage and become dissatisfied unless the exchange of resources is equal. Housework is assumed to be a task that both partners seek to avoid and bargain out of doing. Yet Asians tend to live in larger, extended-family households compared with Whites and have a cultural ethos that emphasizes filial piety and obligation and stresses the importance of the family unit over the individual (Staples & Mirandé, 1980; U.S. Census Bureau, 2006; Xu & Lai, 2002). Furthermore, in Japan, relationships within the family tend to be communal and characterized by each person's concern for the welfare of others. Household work within the family is based on what others need rather than on one's economic contribution to the family (Kamo, 1994). In other words, what is considered a "fair" exchange is not necessarily based on an equal exchange of economic contributions. Thus, under conditions that privilege family over individual well-being or where housework is perceived as an integral part of one's identity and duty to the community, relative resources may not provide a meaningful explanation of women's and men's housework arrangements. Previous research on Japan has found a weak association between relative resources and housework arrangements, providing some empirical support for this notion (Kamo, 1994).

Gender role ideologies may combine with different cultural norms about familism versus individualism to move groups away from the patterns of the dominant group and be more or less salient in influencing housework time. Given non-Western ideologies that espouse a more powerful patriarchal social norm than that endorsed by American Christianity, Asians have historically had more conservative attitudes toward women's and men's roles, a lower fertility rate, and fewer births to single mothers compared with other race/ethnic groups (Anderson & Johnson, 2003; Kamo, 1994; Kane, 2000; Staples & Mirandé, 1980; U.S. Census Bureau, 2005; Xu & Lai, 2002). Previous research on Japan suggests that the demands of paid work may keep men from assuming family roles while Asian women have largely been absent from the types of "career" jobs that require long work hours and have historically remained responsible for unpaid family work (Greenhalgh, 1985; Kamo, 1994). Although we do not assume that Asian women and men living in the United States perform paid and unpaid work in the same ways or for the same reasons as their race/ethnic counterparts in other countries, we do assume that there is a level of cultural continuity that may be shared across these populations.

Hispanic men tend to have strong ties to the labor force whereas their female counterparts do not. Some have argued that Hispanic men tend to exert traditional masculinity by maintaining the sole breadwinner role in order to acquire status when other roles have been denied due to structural discrimination (Zinn, 1991a, 1991b). Others point to barriers that

Hispanic women faced historically when seeking gainful employment in the United States (Segura, 1994). As noted above, rates of employment remain low for Hispanic women relative to other groups of women and relative to Hispanic men. This gender difference in employment coupled with cultural norms supporting a more traditional male breadwinner/female homemaker model may be a particularly important factor influencing the housework time of Hispanic women and men.

In sum, there are enough differences across race/ethnic groups to raise questions about whether the dominant perspectives in the literature on housework “fit” other groups as well as Whites. Given what we know about the negotiation of housework in general, we suspect that available time may be an important correlate of housework time for all race/ethnic groups because there is probably some threshold of housework that is deemed necessary and when time permits, both women and men will devote some time to these tasks. However, we expect that indicators of available time will be particularly salient for women who regardless of race/ethnicity, still do more housework on average than men. But when it comes to relative resource explanations, it is less clear that these factors will be as predictive of housework time for minorities as for White men and women.

What we know about the gender division of labor in the home is based mainly on analyses of the overall population, which means it is heavily weighted toward analysis of the White population in the United States. This also means that empirical support for the theoretical perspectives that seem to characterize gender relations in the home is largely based on analysis of the White population. We therefore conclude that it is time to reassess and expand the literature on housework time by asking (a) Is the gender gap in housework the same for minority race/ethnic groups as it is for Whites? (b) Do the same factors predict the housework of women and men of different race/ethnic groups? Fortunately, newly available time-use data exist with which to address these questions.

Research Questions and Expectations

In this study, we first assess whether the gender gap in the average housework time of men and women is smaller for some race/ethnic groups than for others, with the expectation that housework participation may be most similar among Black men and women and most dissimilar among Asian and Hispanic men and women. Second, we assess whether men’s levels of participation in housework in general, and in female-type tasks in particular, is higher among some race/ethnic groups than others. Here, we expect time in core tasks, which often are performed by women, to be lower among Asian and Hispanic men than among Black and White men given more traditional gender role attitudes. Third, we examine the relative importance of the main theoretical perspectives to assess whether they are equally predictive for men and women of each racial/ethnic group. The time availability and relative resources perspective can be estimated with general measures of respondents’ demographic, labor force, and family characteristics. Testing the gender perspective is significantly limited in the ATUS, as the data do not include direct assessments of a respondent’s attitudes about women’s and men’s work and family roles. Educational attainment may proxy gender role attitudes to some extent, with more highly educated individuals tending to be more egalitarian in their attitudes. Other things equal, older

individuals might be expected to be less gender egalitarian than younger individuals. Finally, marriage versus cohabitation, as discussed earlier, may be an additional indirect correlate of gender ideology, with married men and women less egalitarian than those in cohabiting relationships.

Data and Method

This analysis examines respondent-reported time diary data from the 2003–2006 ATUS. The ATUS sample is drawn from households that have completed their eighth and final interview in the Current Population Survey (CPS). Household roster information from the last CPS interview (2–5 months prior to the ATUS interview) is updated in the ATUS along with information on the employment status of the respondent. The time diary portion of the ATUS telephone 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. The diary day is a preassigned day of the week with weekend days oversampled. Because the ATUS sample is not uniformly distributed across the days of the week, sampling weights provided by the ATUS are applied in analyses to equally weight all 7 days of the week.

The time diary data used in this analysis offer several advantages. First, the ATUS data provide recent, up-to-date estimates of the time men and women spend in housework. Second, sample sizes are large enough to study time allocated to housework among White, Black, Hispanic, and Asian women and men. Asians have been largely excluded from analyses of housework time in the United States because of small sample sizes in previous surveys. Finally, the time diary format produces estimates of housework that are more accurate than those produced from stylized survey questions (Bianchi et al., 2000). Overestimation is reduced in time diary studies as a result of (a) the approach of walking respondents through the activities of the previous day instead of asking them to recall total time spent in activities, such as housework over a given time period and (b) because activities are coded after the interview, eliminating the respondent's responsibility for classifying activities by type and minimizing a respondent's ability to exaggerate time spent in housework (Sayer, Bianchi, & Robinson, 2004). The time diary approach also helps respondents provide estimates that are realistic and consistent with the fact that there are only 24 hours in the day.

Sample

The sample for this analysis is restricted to individuals, aged 18 to 64 years, who are in a marital or cohabiting union and who identify their race/ ethnicity as White, Black, Hispanic, or Asian American.² Because only one individual per household fills out a time diary, the women and men in the analysis are not married to or living with each other. However, because the ATUS is drawn from the CPS, we have detailed information on the demographic characteristics, educational attainment, labor force participation, and earnings of both the ATUS respondent and his or her partner.³ The sample consists of 23,145 partnered respondents (12,424 women and 10,721 men). The non-Hispanic White subsample

²These groups are not homogeneous. All embody a mixture of ancestry groups. In addition, Hispanics and Asians have a higher proportion who are recent immigrants than is the case for Whites and Blacks.

contains 9,426 women and 8,142 men; the Hispanic subsample consists of 1,728 women and 1,378 men; the Black non-Hispanic subsample contains 835 women and 818 men; the non-Hispanic Asian subsample consists of 435 women and 383 men.⁴ Non-Hispanic individuals who defined themselves as any race other than White, Black, or Asian were not included in the analysis because of their relatively small sample sizes and heterogeneity ($n = 486$, a mix of American Indians and those identifying as “other race”).⁵ Mixed-race and mixed-ethnicity couples are coded as the respondent’s reported race/ethnicity.⁶

The choice to restrict the analysis to married and cohabiting individuals with a partner present in the home is motivated by the fact that the three perspectives on the gender division of household labor pertain to couples. For ease in interpretation, a female partner is referred to as a wife and a male partner is referred to as husband but samples include cohabitators. The ATUS respondents and their spouse/partners included in our sample may be employed or unemployed. However, time diary respondents who are self-employed or whose partner is self-employed are excluded from the sample because earnings are only ascertained for wage-and-salary workers in the CPS/ATUS. This restriction results in the loss of 5,780 respondents. In results not reported here, we explored the characteristics and housework time allocation of all partnered ATUS respondents, including those who are self-employed. Results were essentially the same as for the sample that excludes the self-employed. Hence, we feel relatively confident that our exclusion of the self-employed does

³.Using the unique identification number of the time diary respondent in the American Time Use Survey (ATUS), the line number of the partner, and gender and age, we match selected variables of the spouse/partner to the time diary respondent’s record. Because respondents to the ATUS are randomly selected from respondents completing their final Current Population Survey (CPS) interview, there is a lag of 2 to 5 months between the final CPS and the ATUS interviews. During this time, it is possible that an ATUS respondent could experience a change in partnership status. Therefore, we restrict our sample to respondents who were married or cohabiting at the time of the ATUS. By doing so, we remove the small number of time diary respondents in the ATUS who were partnered at the time of the CPS, but whose partnership dissolved by the time they completed their time diary. We use the age of the partner at the time of the CPS and ATUS to identify changes in partner status and to minimize erroneous matches. In a few cases, ATUS respondents were not in a partnership at the time of their CPS interview, but in a partnership when the time diary was administered. In these cases, we do not have information on the partner’s earnings and education, which are used to construct measures of relative resources, and therefore rely on imputation to estimate this missing information. In seven cases, the ATUS respondent reported having a spouse at the time of the CPS, but a cohabiting partner at the time of the ATUS. In four of the seven cases, the age of the spouse and cohabiting partner were exactly the same. In the remaining three cases, the age of the cohabiting partner in the ATUS was 1-year older than the age of the spouse reported on the CPS. Because the CPS did not allow reporting of a cohabiting union, it is most likely that the partners in these seven cases were reported as a spouse in the CPS and as a cohabiting partner in the ATUS. Furthermore, we think the likelihood of dissolving a marriage and beginning a cohabiting partnership within 2 to 5 months is remote, and this assumption appears to be supported by the fact that we only identified seven of these cases in our sample of 23,000 respondents. Thus, we assume that the spouse and cohabiting partner in each of the seven cases are the same person and treat them as such. Among those with a spouse at both the CPS and ATUS, we did not find any evidence that age of partner changed between the two surveys. Although it is theoretically possible that an ATUS respondent could dissolve a marriage and marry someone new of exactly the same age between the time of the CPS and ATUS, we find this somewhat implausible and so feel relatively confident that we have matched the correct partner information and minimized erroneous matches in our data.

⁴.Samples of partnered men are smaller than samples of partnered women. There are likely two reasons for this. Men, especially younger men, are more likely to not respond to surveys than women. Fortunately, the sample weights that we use adjust for differential nonresponse. Second, because women marry at younger ages than men, our upper age bound of 64 years probably truncates the sample of partnered men slightly more than the sample of partnered women.

⁵.Although respondents could report more than one race, very few respondents did so (less than 1%). They are included as “other” and eliminated from the analysis.

⁶.A little less than 12% of Whites report a spouse’s race as different from their own, usually Hispanic. Similarly, about 15% of Hispanics report a spouse’s race as different from their own, the vast majority reporting “White” for their spouse. About 8% of Blacks are partnered with a spouse of a different race, with much higher percentages among Asians where more than one quarter are partnered with someone of another race. Even with the large ATUS samples, our sub-samples of minority men and women are small especially in comparison with Whites. Hence, we did not attempt to examine individuals in mixed-race couples separately from those in same-race couples. Except perhaps for Hispanic White couples, the sample sizes were too small to analyze. As more and more waves of the ATUS accumulate, examining the gender division of labor in various types of mixed-race couples may become feasible in the future.

not introduce considerable selection bias and is preferable to trying to impute work hours and earnings for this group.

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable in this analysis is the respondent's hours per day spent in housework activities. The total time spent in housework activities is derived by summing respondent reports of minutes per day spent in nine different types of activities: food and drink preparation, presentation, and cleanup; interior cleaning; exterior cleaning; clothing care; car repair and maintenance; time spent on other repair (by respondent; i.e., building/repairing furniture, appliance repair); plant care; animal care; other housework (i.e., time spent on bills, personal organization or planning, other household activities, not elsewhere classified). Housework time is then divided by 60 to produce estimates in hours, rather than minutes per day.

For descriptive purposes, housework is further broken down into two categories: core tasks and other tasks following Bianchi et al. (2000).⁷ Core tasks are those more often performed by women than men and include work that is more time-consuming and less discretionary than other tasks. Core tasks include food and drink preparation, presentation, and cleanup; interior cleaning; and clothing care. "Other" tasks include all other activities: exterior cleaning, car repair and maintenance, time spent on other repair, plant care, animal care, and other housework.

Independent and Control Variables

Time availability—We use the respondent's hours of paid work, the presence of children, and the presence of other household adults to capture available time. Respondent's usual hours worked per week are measured as a continuous variable. We also include a measure of relative work hours coded into three categories: the husband's work hours exceed the wife's by more than 5 hours per week (the omitted category in the regressions); the difference between a husband's and wife's weekly work hours is less than or equal to 5 hours; and the wife's work hours exceed the husband's hours by more than 5 hours per week. Because some respondents ($N = 472$), or their partners ($N = 457$), or both ($N = 62$) reported that their usual work hours vary per week, we impute work hours based on the gender and full- or part-time labor force status of the individual. We estimated models with and without an imputation flag and found the indicator was not significant and the results did not change with the addition of the flag. Results reported are from models that do not include a control for imputation.⁸

We use a series of four dichotomous variables to capture the presence of children by age and gender. Respondents are coded 1 if they report having (a) a child younger than 5 years; (b) a

⁷All major studies of housework that use the two best data sources—time diary data or the National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH)—use a comprehensive measure of housework that includes all the categories we include in our housework measure. Although we provide a descriptive analysis of housework, distinguishing between "core" housework, that is heavily weighted toward female-typed tasks, and "other," we use the comprehensive measure of housework (i.e., the combination of both "core" and "other") in our regressions.

⁸Because imputation was required for relatively few cases and our initial empirical work suggested that the imputation had little effect on the results, we did not match on an extensive set of characteristics or undertake multiple imputation.

child aged 5 to 11 years; (c) a female child aged 12 to 18 years; or (d) a male child aged 12 to 18 years (and 0 for all others). Finally, we include a dichotomous variable coded 1 if there is an additional adult in the household who is not the respondent or partner.

Relative resources—Several variables are included to capture the resources of a respondent relative to his/her partner: differences in age, education, and earnings. Age is a continuous variable ranging from 18 to 64 years. Relative age is classified into three categories: wife is 3 or more years younger than the husband; husband and wife's ages fall within 2 years of each other (the omitted category in the regressions); and the husband is 3 or more years younger than the wife.

We construct an hourly wage by dividing weekly earnings by hours worked per week for pay.⁹ In some cases, respondents and/or their partners are not employed at the time of the ATUS and are assigned a 0 as their hourly wage. Earnings were imputed for the partners of ATUS respondents who were present and employed at the time of the ATUS, but not present at the CPS when earnings were assessed ($N = 551$). Partners were assigned a mean value on earnings based on their gender and race/ethnicity. Like work hours, models were estimated with and without an earnings imputation flag and the results indicate the flag was not significant, and there were few changes in the coefficients. All models are estimated without a control for imputation.¹⁰

We use respondent's and spouse's hourly wage to create a relative wage variable with the following three categories: the husband's hourly wage is more than 10% higher than the wife's (the omitted category in the analysis); the husband and the wife earn hourly wages within 10% of each other (same hourly wage); and the wife's hourly wage is more than 10% higher than the husband's wage.

As mentioned above, education may be an indicator of gender ideology and the degree to which one supports egalitarian gender roles among women and men. Yet given that education may proxy one's earning potential, *relative* measures of education between partners may also be an indicator of the degree to which one partner is able to negotiate out of housework. We use two general sets of educational measures. The first is a direct measure of the respondent's education, which is coded into five dummy variables: less than high school (the omitted category in this analysis); high-school diploma; some college education;

⁹There is evidence in the literature that time spent on housework lowers wages, housework may be exogenous to wages but perhaps not vice versa, and that women's hours of market work and housework are jointly determined (Hersch, 1985; Hersch & Stratton, 1997, 2002; Hundley, 2000; Keith & Malone, 2005; McAllister, 1990; Shelton & Firestone, 1988). With the cross-sectional data in the ATUS, it is difficult if not impossible to sort out these issues of endogeneity. We use usual labor market hours, ascertained outside the diary, to predict housework on the diary day. This at least gets around the issue that market hours and housework hours on the diary day are jointly determined and constrained by the 24-hour time frame of the diary data collection. We appreciate that an individual's desire or need to invest in household work might limit the likelihood of employment and constrain hours of employment and thus decisions about employment may have been influenced by housework demands at some point in the past.

By using employment hours, wages, and relative employment and earnings, we follow practices that have become standard in the sociological literature on the gender division of housework. Results should be viewed as indexing the strength of association between covariates and housework time—rather than as a strict causal model. We interpret results about these associations as consistent or not consistent with the various theoretical perspectives. In this way, we are to some extent treating wages and work hours as if they were exogenous, although we understand that we cannot definitively capture the joint influence, or rule out reverse causality, with the cross-sectional ATUS data. Thus, our work is exploratory and suggestive of the causal processes that may operate to influence the housework time of different race-ethnic groups.

¹⁰Again, because our initial empirical work suggested that the imputation had little effect on the results, we did not match on an extensive set of characteristics or undertake multiple imputation.

college degree; and beyond college education. The second is a relative measure of education and is coded into a series of three dummy variables: the husband has a higher level of educational attainment than the wife; the husband and the wife have same level of education (the omitted category in the regressions); and the wife has a higher level of education than the husband. In the case of 738 respondents, the education of their partner was missing.¹¹ Partners missing information on education were assigned the modal category based on their gender and race/ethnicity.

Gender ideology—Although indirect, we have measures that may tap gender ideology. These include age and educational attainment, as just described. In addition, we also include a measure of being married (vs. cohabiting) that may proxy for a more conservative, less egalitarian gender division of labor in the home.

Controls—Two 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. Weekend diary day is coded 1 if the respondent was interviewed on a Saturday or Sunday. Holiday diary day is coded 1 if the respondent was interviewed on a holiday.

Method

First, we describe racial/ethnic variation in the household labor of partnered individuals. We calculate the average hours per day spent in all housework tasks and in our two subcategories of “core” and “other” housework for White, Hispanic, Black, and Asian women and men. We also test for significant differences across groups in time spent in housework. Next, we estimate ordinary least squares regression models separately for women and men in each racial/ethnic group to assess whether the predictors of housework are the same or vary across race/ethnic groups.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 shows the mean hours per day spent doing housework by gender and racial/ethnic group. Hispanic women average the greatest number of hours per day in housework (3.2 hours). White and Asian women report the next highest amounts, with both groups averaging 2.6 hours. Black women spend the least amount of time in housework, averaging 2.1 hours per day. Among partnered men, Whites average significantly more hours in housework (1.6 hours) than Hispanics (1.2 hours), Blacks (1.1 hours), or Asians (1.0 hours).

The gender gap in housework time is assessed in the bottom two panels of Table 1. Panel 3 presents women’s average hours minus men’s average hours for each racial/ethnic group, and the bottom panel shows the ratio of women’s to men’s average housework time. Among all groups, women average more hours in housework than men. The gender gap in total housework time is smallest among Blacks (women average 0.9 more hours/day than men), and Whites exhibit the next smallest gender gap in total housework (women average 1 more

¹¹Information on partner’s education is missing because for some ATUS respondents, the partner present at the time of the ATUS interview was not present 2 to 5 months prior when the CPS measured educational attainment of spouse/partners.

hour/day than men). The gender gap is much larger among Hispanics (women average 2 more hours/day than men) and Asians (women average 1.6 more hours/day than men). When the focus is on the ratios in Panel 4, Hispanics and Asians are again distinct from Whites and Blacks, with women's housework averaging 2.6 to 2.7 times men's housework in the former groups, but only 1.6 to 1.8 times men's housework in the latter two groups.

The gender gap in time spent in core tasks—or the most female-typed tasks—is again smallest among Blacks (women average 1.2 more hours/day than men), followed by Whites (women average 1.4 more hours/day than men), Asians (women average 1.7 more hours/day than men), and Hispanics (women average 2.4 more hours/day than men). In all groups, women do far more of this type of work than men and race/ethnic differences are large. Hispanic women average 6.5 times as much core housework as Hispanic men; Asian women average about 4 times as much core housework as Asian men, compared with somewhat lower ratios of 3.7 for White women relative to White men and 3.2 for Black women relative to Black men.

Table 2 presents means and standard deviations for the independent variables separately for women and men. Compared with other women, Hispanic women have the highest likelihood of having a child under age 12 years in the household and have the lowest average wages, while, compared with other men, Hispanic men have one of the highest likelihoods of earning more than their partner and of living in a household where an additional adult is present. Black women average the greatest number of hours worked per week, have the highest likelihood of being in a couple in which the wife earns a higher hourly wage than the husband, and of being in a couple in which the wife has more education than the husband. White women and White men both tend to be older than Asians and Hispanics. In addition, White women have the highest likelihood of having a husband with a higher level of education than the wife. Asian women have the highest average earnings of all groups and the highest likelihood of working similar hours as their husband's hours. Asian men have the highest average earnings of all groups and are more likely than other groups of men to have a higher level of education than their wife and to earn more than their wife.¹²

Regression Results

To examine racial/ethnic differences in the explanatory power of time availability and relative resources measures, Tables 3 (for women) and 4 (for men) display separate models for each racial/ethnic group. The results in Table 3 suggest that among partnered women, time availability factors are significant predictors of housework time for White and Hispanic women but have less explanatory power for Black and Asian women. The presence of children aged 5 to 11 years, female children aged 12 to 18 years, and a household adult are associated with more housework time among White and Hispanic women. The size of the

¹²Reports of relative age, labor force participation, education, and earnings are for the most part consistently reported by the samples of married men and women. Differences arise from the fact that although the ATUS respondent reports his or her characteristics at the time of the ATUS, spouse variables more often come from the CPS conducted a few months before the ATUS. The CPS interviews one respondent who reports for members of the household and the ATUS respondent was not necessarily the respondent in the CPS. Thus, there is probably more error in reports of spouse characteristics than in reports of the respondent's own characteristics. In addition, given the relatively small sample sizes for Asians and also the smaller sample sizes for minorities in general, there is more sampling variability around the estimates for Asians, Hispanics, and Blacks than there is for the sample of Whites.

coefficients is quite large and the strength of the association is quite high, particularly among White women. For all race/ethnic groups, work hours are a significant predictor of housework time, although the effect size is somewhat small in magnitude: a 1-hour increase in work hours is associated with a .03 decrease in housework hours.

For all race/ethnic groups, very few of the measures of resources and relative resources explain the variation in women's housework time. Education appears to be significantly associated with Hispanic women's housework time. Effect sizes are as large for Black and Asian women, though not statistically significant, perhaps because of the smaller sample sizes for these two groups. Among White, Hispanic, and Black women, having more than a bachelor's degree is significantly associated with less housework relative to their peers without a high-school diploma, with an effect size that varies from .32 hours among White women to more than 1 among Hispanic women. Among White women, having higher earnings than a husband is associated with a .22 reduction in housework hours relative to a White woman whose husband earns more than she does. Among Asian women, having a higher overall wage is associated with less housework, although the size of this coefficient is quite small.

Table 4 reveals that the predictive power of time availability and relative resources measures are even less consistent across racial/ethnic groups for partnered men than for women and provide a limited explanation of Hispanic, Black, and Asian men's housework time. Only among Hispanic men is the presence of children aged 5 to 11 years significantly associated with a .36-hour increase in housework time. For White and Black men, work hours are negatively associated with housework time, although the size of the coefficients are small ($b = .02$ and $.01$, respectively). When a wife works more hours per week than her husband, White, Hispanic, and Asian men do more housework, with an effect size that ranges from .45 hours among White men to just more than 1 hour among Asian men. For all race/ethnic groups, age is associated with more hours in housework, but the size of the coefficient indicates the increase in housework hours is small. With the exception of White men, very few of the (relative) resources measures are significantly associated with men's housework hours. Among White men, having a high school degree, some college, or a bachelor's degree are all associated with about a half hour more of time spent in housework relative to White men without a high school diploma. An increase in hourly wages is significantly associated with fewer hours in housework among White men only, but the coefficient is effectively zero. Among Black men, having a wife with higher hourly earnings, relative to lower hourly earnings is associated with a .46-hour increase in housework time. The results for White men suggest that being married is associated with a .26 increase in housework hours relative to men in cohabiting unions, which is somewhat unexpected.

Conclusion

The ATUS is the first source of time diary data with large-enough sample sizes to assess racial/ethnic differences in women's and men's housework time and the factors that predict these differences. Gender differences in time spent in housework are large and vary by race/ethnicity. Women invest more time in housework than men in all racial/ethnic groups but the gender gap in housework time is larger for Hispanic- and Asian partnered women than for

Whites and Blacks. Asian and Hispanic women spend an average of two and a half times as much time in housework per day as Asian and Hispanic men, whereas a much smaller difference characterizes Black and White women who spend about 1.8 and 1.6 times as much time, respectively, as men.

We also find results for men that differ from past research. Much of what we know about race/ethnic differences in housework is based on data that are nearly two decades old. Findings from a handful of these older studies suggested that Black husbands contribute more to household labor than White husbands. Our results, using recent time diary data on large samples, suggest otherwise. Partnered White men appear to spend *more* time on average in housework than partnered Black men.¹³

Comparing gender gaps across racial groups requires a focus on both men's and women's housework hours. Hispanic women spend a lot of time in housework relative to other women. Hispanic men, on the other hand, do less housework than White men but not necessarily less than other minority men. Asian men's time spent doing housework is low relative to the other groups of men whereas Asian women's housework hours are similar to Whites (though higher than Blacks). Black men do an average amount of housework relative to other groups of men but Black women do far less housework, on average, than other groups of women and they do low levels of housework regardless of whether they are in a strong or weak economic position to bargain out of it. Finally, among Whites, women do an average amount of housework but White men's housework time is high relative to other groups of men.

Hence, an analysis such as this highlights that some groups may be better at increasing men's involvement in housework (or decreasing women's) while others find it more difficult, and this begins to redirect the questions. What frees Black women from housework—or the pressures to perform so much of it? What influences White men's participation in domestic work to a much larger extent than other groups of men? Why do Hispanic women appear to shoulder so much of the burden of housework in their households?

The theoretical perspectives of time availability and relative economic resources have dominated the housework literature and past research has relied heavily on these frameworks to provide an understanding of men's and women's participation in housework and how paid and family work are traded against each other. The findings for Whites, in the first columns of Tables 3 and 4, suggest why these perspectives may dominate the literature. The measures of time availability and relative resources are predictive of how much housework Whites do, although they are more highly correlated with women's than with men's time in housework.

¹³Using 1987 NSFH data, Kamo and Cohen (1998) found that housework was more gender egalitarian for Blacks, but the gap in total workloads (labor market hours plus housework hours) was larger for Blacks than for Whites. Our results are suggestive of a change in women's and men's total work time (paid and unpaid) and a shift in White-Black differences. When we combine weekly-paid work hours from the CPS with a weekly estimate of housework from the ATUS (housework minutes/60 × 7), we find that White women have a total workload of 43.8 hours per week compared with 40.6 for Black women. White men have the highest total workload of 50.9 hours per week and Black men have a total workload nearly equal to White women—43.4 hours per week. Thus, our results suggest that it is *Whites* who are both more gender egalitarian in their housework and also have a larger gap in total workloads between women and men. Furthermore, the distribution of paid and unpaid work across these groups suggests that White women and men are more gender specialized in their work and family roles than their Black counterparts.

The number of hours worked per week is a significant predictor of women's housework, regardless of race/ethnicity, which supports the explanation that available time is particularly salient to women's housework time. Black women's (and men's) housework hours are sensitive to their hours worked. The total number of hours worked is particularly salient to Asian women's housework time. Asian men's time appears to be sensitive to his work hours relative to his wife's. When she works more hours, he does more housework. Measures of time availability were significant predictors of Hispanic women's housework time as well. For Hispanic men, there is also some evidence that his housework is sensitive to his available time.

There was also some support for relative resources explanations. For example, a Black man's housework hours are associated with how much his wife earns relative to his earnings. If she earns more, he does more housework. Although we do not detect significant associations between measures of relative earnings and Asians housework time, we do find that as an Asian woman earns more, her housework time goes down.

In general, our results suggest that partnered men do not do large amounts of housework, either in absolute terms or relative to partnered women. On the margin, this may be due to time availability or relative resources—but in general, there are relatively few significant correlates of men's time in housework. One limitation of this research is that the ATUS data do not include direct measures of women's and men's gender role attitudes. Future research in this area should consider the important role of gender role attitudes— particularly given the variation in these attitudes by race and ethnicity reported in the literature (Kane, 2000).

Critical social theories emerging in sociology argue 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 racism, sexism, and classism, the experiences of minority women and men 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 to produce meaningful information on their lived experiences. This means, practically, that the sociological analysis of the gendered division of labor must at the very least disaggregate identity categories, such as race/ethnicity and gender, in order to understand them. By acknowledging that the experiences of minority women and men differ from those of their White, middle-class peers and that one-size-fits-all theorizing does not account for important differences across these groups, we can potentially produce innovative theoretical and empirical research that serves to better explain and predict racial/ethnic variation in the gender division of labor.

Acknowledgments

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

- Anderson SJ, Johnson JT. The who and when of gender-blind attitudes: Predictors of gender-role egalitarianism in two different domains. *Sex Roles*. 2003; 49:527–532.
- Batalova JA, Cohen PN. Premarital cohabitation and housework: Couples in cross-national perspective. *Journal of Marriage and Family*. 2002; 64:743–755.
- Baxter J. Gender equality and participation in housework: A cross-national perspective. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*. 1997; 28:220–247.
- Becker, GS. A treatise on the family. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; 1991.
- Berk, SF. The gender factory. New York, NY: Plenum Press; 1985.
- Bianchi SM, Milkie MA, Sayer LC, Robinson JP. Is anyone doing the housework? Trends in the gender division of household labor. *Social Forces*. 2000; 79:191–228.
- Billingsley, A. Black families in white America. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall; 1968.
- Bittman M, England P, Folbre N, Sayer L, Matheson G. When does gender trump money? Bargaining and time in household work. *American Journal of Sociology*. 2003; 109:186–214.
- Blair SL, Lichter DT. Measuring the division of household labor: Gender segregation of housework among American couples. *Journal of Family Issues*. 1991; 12:91–113.
- Blood, RO.; Wolf, DM. Husbands and wives: The dynamics of married living. New York, NY: Free Press; 1960.
- Brines J. Economic dependency, gender, and the division of labor at home. *American Journal of Sociology*. 1994; 100:652–688.
- Broman CL. Gender, work-family roles, and psychological well-being of blacks. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 1991; 53:509–519.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. Employment and earnings. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office; 2009.
- Calasanti T, Bailey CA. Gender inequality and the division of household labor in the United States and Sweden: A socialist-feminist approach. *Social Problems*. 1991; 38:34–53.
- Collins, PH. Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness and the politics of empowerment. New York, NY: Routledge; 1990.
- Cooke LP. Policy, preferences, and patriarchy: The division of domestic labor in East Germany, West Germany, and the United States. *Social Politics*. 2006; 13:117–143.
- Cooke LP. Persistent policy effects on the division of domestic tasks in reunified Germany. *Journal of Marriage and Family*. 2007; 69:930–950.
- Coverman S. Gender, domestic labor, and wage inequality. *American Sociological Review*. 1983; 48:623–637.
- Coverman S. Explaining husbands' participation in domestic labor at home. *American Journal of Sociological Quarterly*. 1985; 26:81–97.
- Davis SN, Greenstein TN. Cross-national variations in the division of household labor. *Journal of Marriage and Family*. 2004; 66:1260–1271.
- Fullerton HN Jr, Toossi M. Labor force projections to 2010: Steady growth and changing composition. *Monthly Labor Review*. 2001; 124:21–38.
- Fuwa M. Macro-level gender inequality and the division of household labor in 22 countries. *American Sociological Review*. 2004; 69:751–767.
- Fuwa M, Cohen PN. Housework and social policy. *Social Science Research*. 2007; 36:512–530.
- Glass J, Fujimoto T. Housework, paid work, and depression among husbands and wives. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*. 1994; 35:179–191. [PubMed: 8064124]
- Golding JM. Division of household labor, strain, and depressive symptoms among Mexican Americans and non-Hispanic Whites. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. 1990; 14:103–117.
- Goldscheider FK, Waite LJ. Spouses' time allocation to household work: A review and critique. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*. 1991; 12:253–294.
- Greenhalgh S. Sexual stratification: The other side of “growth with equity” in East Asia. *Population and Development Review*. 1985; 11:265–314.

- Gupta S. The effects of transitions in marital status on men's performance of housework. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 1999; 61:700–711.
- Hersch J. Effect of housework on earnings of husbands and wives: evidence from full-time piece rate workers. *Social Science Quarterly*. 1985; 66:210–217.
- Hersch J. The impact of nonmarket work on market wages. *American Economic Review*. 1991; 44:157–160.
- Hersch J, Stratton LS. Housework, wages, and the division of housework time for employed spouses. *American Economic Review*. 1994; 84:120–125.
- Hersch J, Stratton LS. Housework, fixed effects, and wages of married workers. *Journal of Human Resources*. 1997; 32:285–307.
- Hersch J, Stratton LS. Housework and wages. *Journal of Human Resources*. 2002; 37:217–229.
- Hu C-Y, Kamo Y. The division of household labor in Taiwan. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*. 2007; 38:105–124.
- Hundley G. Male/female earnings differences in self-employment: The effects of marriage, children and the household division of labor. *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*. 2000; 54:95–114.
- John D, Shelton BA. The production of gender among black and white women and men: The case of household labor. *Sex Roles*. 1997; 36:171–193.
- Kalleberg AL, Rosenfeld RA. Work in the family and in the labor market: A cross-national, reciprocal analysis. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 1990; 52:331–346.
- Kamo Y. Determinants of household division of labor: Resources, power, and ideology. *Journal of Family Issues*. 1988; 9:177–200. [PubMed: 12281761]
- Kamo Y. Division of household work in the United States and Japan. *Journal of Family Issues*. 1994; 15:348–378.
- Kamo Y, Cohen EL. Division of household work between partners: A comparative of black and white couples. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*. 1998; 29:131–145.
- Kane EW. Racial and ethnic variations in gender-related attitudes. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 2000; 26:419–439.
- Keith K, Malone P. Housework and the wages of young, middle-aged, and older workers. *Contemporary Economic Policy*. 2005; 23:224–241.
- Kurdek LA. The allocation of household labor in gay, lesbian, and heterosexual married couples. *Journal of Social Issues*. 1993; 49:127–134.
- Landry, B. *Black working wives: Pioneers of the American family revolution*. Berkeley: University of California Press; 2000.
- Lye D, Biblarz TJ. The effects of attitudes toward family life and gender roles on marital satisfaction. *Journal of Family Issues*. 1993; 14:157–188.
- Maret E, Finlay B. The distribution of household labor among women in dual-earner families. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 1984; 46:357–364.
- McAllister I. Gender and the division of labor: Employment and earnings variation in Australia. *Work and Occupations*. 1990; 17:79–99.
- Orbuch TL, Eyster SL. Division of household labor among black couples and white couples. *Social Forces*. 1997; 76:301–332.
- Presser HB. Employment schedules among dual-earner spouses and the division of household labor by gender. *American Sociological Review*. 1994; 59:348–364.
- Ross CE. The division of labor at home. *Social Forces*. 1987; 65:816–833.
- Ross CE, Mirowski J, Huber J. Dividing work, sharing work, and in-between: Marriage patterns and depression. *American Sociological Review*. 1983; 48:809–823. [PubMed: 6666885]
- Sayer LC, Bianchi SM, Robinson JP. Are parents investing less in children? Trends in mothers' and fathers' time with children. *American Journal of Sociology*. 2004; 110:1–43.
- Segura, D. Inside the work worlds of Chicana and Mexican immigrant women. In: Zinn, MB.; Dill, BT., editors. *Women of color in US society*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press; 1994. p. 95–111.
- Shamir B. Unemployment and household division of labor. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 1986; 48:195–206.

- Shelton BA, Firestone J. An examination of household labor time as a factor in composition and treatment effects on the male-female wage gap. *Sociological Focus*. 1988; 21:265–278.
- Shelton, BA.; John, D. Ethnicity, race, and difference: A comparison of White, Black, and Hispanic Men's household labor time. In: Hood, JC., editor. *Men, work and family*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE; 1993. p. 131-150.
- Shelton BA, John D. The division of household labor. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 1996; 22:299–322.
- South SJ, Spitze G. Housework in marital and nonmarital households. *American Sociological Review*. 1994; 59:327–347.
- Stack, CB. *All our kin: Strategies for survival in a black community*. New York, NY: Harper Colophon; 1974.
- Staples R, Mirandé A. Racial and cultural variations among American families: A decennial review of the literature on minority families. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 1980; 42:887–903.
- U.S. Census Bureau. *Fertility of American women: June 2004*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office; 2005.
- U.S. Census Bureau. *America's families and living arrangements: 2006*. 2006. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/hh-fam/cps2006.html>.
- U.S. Census Bureau. *Current population survey. Annual Social and Economic Supplement*. 2009. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/cpstables/032009/perinc/new10_000.htm
- West C, Zimmerman DH. Doing gender. *Gender & Society*. 1987; 1:125–151.
- Xu X, Lai S. Resources, gender ideologies, and marital power: The case of Taiwan. *Journal of Family Issues*. 2002; 32:209–245.
- Zinn, MB. Chicano men and masculinity. In: Kramer, L., editor. *The sociology of gender*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press; 1991a. p. 221-232.
- Zinn, MB. Family, feminism and race in America. In: Lorber, J.; Farrell, SA., editors. *The social construction of gender*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE; 1991b. p. 110-134.

Table 1

Significance Tests of Mean Hours per Day Spent Doing Housework, by Gender, Type of Task, and Gender and Racial/Ethnic Group: Partnered Women and Men Aged 18 to 64 Years

	Total	White	Hispanic	Black	Asian
Panel 1: Women's (W) Housework Hours					
Total housework	2.6 (2.4)	2.6 ^{ab} (2.4)	3.2 ^{de} (2.6)	2.1 ^f (2.3)	2.6 (2.2)
Core tasks	2.0 (2.0)	1.9 ^{ac} (1.9)	2.8 ^{de} (2.5)	1.8 ^f (2.1)	2.2 (2.0)
Other tasks	0.6 (1.3)	0.7 ^{abc} (1.3)	0.3 (.9)	0.3 (.8)	0.4 (.8)
N	12,424	9,426	1,728	835	435
Panel 2: Men's (M) housework hours					
Total housework	1.5 (2.3)	1.6 ^{abc} (2.3)	1.2 (2.1)	1.1 (2.1)	1.0 (1.6)
Core tasks	0.5 (1.1)	0.5 ^a (1.0)	0.4 ^d (1.1)	0.6 (1.3)	0.5 (1.1)
Other tasks	1.0 (2.0)	1.1 ^{abc} (2.0)	0.7 ^{de} (1.9)	0.6 (1.6)	0.4 (1.0)
N	10,721	8,142	1,378	818	383
Panel 3: Difference (W – M)					
Total housework	1.2	1.0	2.0	0.9	1.6
Core tasks	1.5	1.4	2.4	1.2	1.7
Other tasks	-0.3	-0.4	-0.4	-0.3	-0.1
Panel 4: Ratio (W/M)					
Total housework	1.8	1.6	2.7	1.8	2.6
Core tasks	4.1	3.7	6.5	3.2	4.1
Other tasks	0.7	0.7	0.4	0.5	0.8

Note: Total population includes respondents 18 to 64 years old, who are married with a spouse present, and who identify themselves as Hispanic, White (non-Hispanic [NH]), Black (NH), or Asian (NH). Source: Authors' calculations from the 2003–2006 American Time Use Survey.

^a Difference between White and Hispanic significant at $p < .05$.

^b Difference between White and Black significant at $p < .05$.

^c Difference between White and Asian significant at $p < .05$.

^d Difference between Hispanic and Black significant at $p < .05$.

^e Difference between Hispanic and Asian significant at $p < .05$.

f , Difference between Black and Asian significant at $p < .05$.

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations^a of the Independent and Control Variables: Partnered Women and Men Aged 18 to 64 Years

	Women					Men				
	Total	White	Hispanic	Black	Asian	Total	White	Hispanic	Black	Asian
Independent variables										
Time availability										
Parental status										
Children <5 years old in household	0.22	0.20	0.35	0.19	0.25	0.22	0.19	0.33	0.20	0.32
Children 5–11 years old in household	0.26	0.24	0.39	0.27	0.24	0.27	0.24	0.39	0.33	0.36
Male children 12–18 years old in household	0.13	0.12	0.18	0.14	0.13	0.13	0.12	0.15	0.14	0.12
Female children 12–18 years old in household	0.12	0.11	0.16	0.12	0.10	0.12	0.11	0.15	0.16	0.12
Presence of additional household adult	0.20	0.18	0.28	0.22	0.25	0.20	0.17	0.31	0.19	0.28
Employment										
Hours worked per week	24.62 (19.58)	25.57 (19.36)	18.74 (19.36)	25.95 (20.59)	25.09 (19.25)	39.29 (19.35)	39.84 (19.15)	38.59 (18.85)	35.66 (22.99)	39.93 (15.37)
Husband works >5 hours/week than wife	0.48	0.48	0.57	0.38	0.42	0.54	0.54	0.63	0.42	0.51
Husband and wife's hours/week of work within 5	0.37	0.37	0.32	0.43	0.45	0.34	0.34	0.29	0.40	0.41
Wife works >5 hours/week than husband	0.15	0.15	0.11	0.19	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.09	0.18	0.08
Absolute and relative resources										
Age	42.05 (11.39)	42.91 (11.31)	37.54 (10.82)	42.91 (11.46)	39.96 (10.69)	43.22 (11.75)	44.29 (11.43)	38.48 (12.38)	43.09 (12.04)	41.45 (9.55)
Relative age										
Wife >2 years younger than husband	0.42	0.41	0.46	0.47	0.49	0.37	0.35	0.42	0.38	0.52
Husband and wife's ages within 2 years	0.49	0.51	0.43	0.44	0.44	0.51	0.53	0.45	0.47	0.39
Husband >2 years younger than wife	0.09	0.09	0.12	0.09	0.07	0.12	0.12	0.13	0.16	0.09
Education										
Less than high school	0.11	0.05	0.40	0.13	0.04	0.12	0.06	0.41	0.09	0.04
High school	0.32	0.33	0.29	0.34	0.17	0.32	0.33	0.29	0.39	0.10
College	0.26	0.28	0.17	0.26	0.16	0.25	0.26	0.18	0.31	0.17

	Women					Men				
	Total	White	Hispanic	Black	Asian	Total	White	Hispanic	Black	Asian
College graduate	0.21	0.22	0.10	0.15	0.37	0.20	0.23	0.09	0.13	0.35
Beyond college	0.11	0.11	0.03	0.11	0.26	0.12	0.13	0.04	0.07	0.35
Relative education										
Husband has more education than wife	0.27	0.28	0.24	0.24	0.27	0.26	0.27	0.21	0.25	0.33
Husband and wife have same education	0.46	0.45	0.54	0.43	0.49	0.47	0.46	0.54	0.44	0.52
Wife has more education than husband	0.27	0.27	0.22	0.33	0.23	0.27	0.27	0.25	0.30	0.14
Relative earnings										
Hourly wage	11.43 (14.14)	12.13 (14.30)	6.53 (9.16)	11.77 (15.63)	15.11 (8.99)	19.07 (17.18)	20.53 (17.78)	13.35 (12.03)	14.52 (14.18)	25.12 (17.57)
Husband's hourly wage higher than wife's	0.59	0.59	0.68	0.47	0.59	0.62	0.62	0.69	0.52	0.71
Husband and wife earn same hourly wage	0.16	0.16	0.15	0.20	0.14	0.14	0.15	0.12	0.16	0.12
Wife's hourly wage higher than husband's	0.25	0.26	0.17	0.32	0.27	0.24	0.24	0.19	0.32	0.16
Married	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.91	0.95	0.93	0.93	0.92	0.87	0.97
Control variables										
Diary day is a weekend	0.29	0.29	0.31	0.26	0.27	0.28	0.27	0.32	0.30	0.30
Diary day is a holiday	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.03
N	12,424	9,426	1,728	835	435	10,721	8,142	1,378	818	383

Source: Authors' calculations from the 2003–2006 American Time Use Survey.

^aWhere applicable, standard deviations are shown in parentheses.

Table 3
Coefficients From Ordinary Least Squares Regression of Partnered Women's Housework (Hours per Day) by Racial/Ethnic Group

	White		Hispanic		Black		Asian	
	Beta	SE	Beta	SE	Beta	SE	Beta	SE
Time availability								
Presence of children by age								
Children <5 years old in household	0.08	.07	0.26	.15	-0.06	.23	0.18	.27
Children 5–11 years old in household	0.21***	.06	0.27*	.13	0.27	.19	-0.10	.24
Male children 12–18 years old in household	0.27***	.07	0.20	.16	0.24	.22	0.54	.30
Female children 12–18 years old in household	0.32***	.08	0.52**	.16	0.26	.23	0.06	.34
Presence of additional household adult ^a	0.14*	.06	0.27*	.14	0.44*	.19	0.49	.25
Employment^b								
Hours worked per week	-0.03***	.00	-0.03***	.00	-0.03***	.01	-0.03***	.01
Husband and wife's hours/wk of work within 5	-0.11	.07	-0.11	.18	0.11	.21	-0.24	.29
Wife works >5 hours/week than husband	-0.07	.09	-0.39	.26	0.17	.29	0.65	.41
Absolute and relative resources								
Age	0.03***	.00	0.04***	.01	0.00	.01	0.03**	.01
Relative age^c								
Wife at least 3 years younger than husband	0.19***	.05	0.18	.13	0.11	.16	-0.16	.21
Husband at least 3 years younger than wife	-0.09	.09	0.13	.20	-0.08	.28	-0.47	.40
Education^d								
High school	-0.16	.11	-0.18	.15	-0.28	.25	-1.07	.55
Some college	-0.29*	.12	-0.44*	.20	-0.46	.28	-0.66	.55
College graduate	-0.23	.12	-0.70**	.24	-0.26	.33	-0.51	.53
Beyond college	-0.32*	.14	-1.11**	.39	-0.72*	.36	-0.61	.56
Relative education^e								
Husband has more education than wife	0.01	.06	-0.28	.15	-0.22	.20	0.06	.25
Wife has more education than husband	0.03	.06	-0.04	.17	0.09	.19	0.47	.26
Relative earnings^f								

	White		Hispanic		Black		Asian	
	Beta	SE	Beta	SE	Beta	SE	Beta	SE
Hourly wage	0.00	.00	-0.01	.01	-0.01	.01	-0.01*	.01
Husband and wife earn same hourly wage	-0.07	.08	0.25	.19	0.35	.23	0.28	.33
Wife's hourly wage higher than husband's	-0.22**	.07	0.04	.21	-0.14	.23	-0.46	.29
Married	0.01	.10	-0.08	.24	-0.01	.27	0.16	.49
Diary day is a weekend	0.54***	.05	-0.04	.13	0.36*	.17	0.31	.22
Diary day is a holiday	0.63***	.18	0.07	.45	1.75**	.67	0.44	.72
Intercept	1.72***	.18	2.50***	.40	1.88***	.55	1.97*	.82
R^2	.12		.15		.11		.17	
Total number of women	9,426		1,728		835		435	

Source: Authors' calculations from the 2003–2006 American Time Use Survey.

^a. No additional household adult omitted.

^b. Husband works >5 hours/week more than wife omitted.

^c. Husband and wife's ages within 2 years omitted.

^d. Less than high school omitted.

^e. Husband and wife have same level of education omitted.

^f. Husband's hourly wage higher than wife's omitted.

* $p < .05$.

** $p < .01$.

*** $p < .001$.

Coefficients From Ordinary Least Squares Regression of Partnered Men's Housework (Hours per Day) by Racial/Ethnic Group

Table 4

	White		Hispanic		Black		Asian	
	Beta	SE	Beta	SE	Beta	SE	Beta	SE
Time availability								
Presence of children by age								
Children <5 years old in household	-0.05	.07	0.21	.13	0.23	.18	0.18	.19
Children 5-1 years old in household	0.11	.06	0.37**	.11	0.04	.15	0.10	.17
Male children 12-18 years old in household								
Male children 12-18 years old in household	0.05	.08	-0.20	.14	0.35	.19	0.02	.25
Female children 12-18 years old in household								
Female children 12-18 years old in household	0.02	.08	0.25	.15	0.01	.17	-0.44	.25
Presence of additional household adult ^a	0.10	.07	0.14	.11	-0.22	.17	0.11	.20
Employment ^b								
Hours worked per week	-0.02***	.00	-0.01	.00	-0.01**	.00	0.00	.01
Husband and wife's hrs/wk of work within 5	0.08	.06	0.11	.13	0.19	.16	0.19	.19
Wife works >S hours/week than husband	0.45***	.11	0.61*	.26	0.14	.26	1.02**	.38
Absolute and relative resources								
Age	0.01***	.00	0.02***	.01	0.02**	.01	0.02*	.01
Relative age ^c								
Wife at least 3 years younger than husband	0.04	.05	-0.22*	.11	0.16	.14	-0.03	.17
Husband at least 3 years younger than wife	0.14	.08	0.00	.16	0.29	.19	0.27	.29
Education ^d								
High school	0.23*	.11	-0.13	.13	-0.20	.24	0.26	.47
Some college	0.33**	.11	0.23	.16	0.05	.26	0.89	.46
College graduate	0.29*	.12	0.09	.23	-0.21	.32	0.45	.45
Beyond college	0.14	.14	-0.18	.32	0.08	.38	0.38	.48
Relative education ^e								
Husband has more education than wife	0.10	.06	0.03	.15	-0.03	.17	0.28	.19
Wife has more education than husband	-0.06	.06	0.08	.12	0.03	.15	0.06	.25
Relative earnings ^f								

	White		Hispanic		Black		Asian	
	Beta	SE	Beta	SE	Beta	SE	Beta	SE
Hourly wage	0.00*	.00	0.01	.01	0.01	.01	0.01	.01
Husband and wife earn same hourly wage	0.16	.08	0.20	.20	-0.21	.22	0.30	.31
Wife's hourly wage higher than husband's	0.02	.07	0.22	.16	0.46**	.17	0.30	.25
Married	0.26*	.10	-0.11	.20	0.05	.20	-0.42	.46
Diary day is a weekend	0.93***	.05	0.61***	.11	0.45**	.14	0.80***	.17
Diary day is a holiday	0.78***	.19	-0.19	.37	0.82	.50	-1.04*	.53
Intercept	0.64**	.21	0.04	.36	-0.43	.55	-1.36	.78
R ²	0.08		0.06		0.07		0.13	
Total number of men	8,142		1,378		818		383	

Source: Authors' calculations from the 2003–2006 American Time Use Survey.

^a. No additional household adult omitted.

^b. Husband works >5 hours/week more than wife omitted.

^c. Husband and wife's ages within 2 years omitted.

^d. Less than high school omitted.

^e. Husband and wife have same level of education omitted.

^f. Husband's hourly wage higher than wife's omitted.

* $p < .05$.

** $p < .01$.

*** $p < .001$.