

# Journal of Family Issues

<http://jfi.sagepub.com>

---

## **Effects of Union Type on Division of Household Labor: Do Cohabiting Men Really Perform More Housework?**

Shannon N. Davis, Theodore N. Greenstein and Jennifer P. Gerteisen Marks  
*Journal of Family Issues* 2007; 28; 1246 originally published online Jun 28,  
2007;

DOI: 10.1177/0192513X07300968

The online version of this article can be found at:  
<http://jfi.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/28/9/1246>

---

Published by:

 SAGE Publications

<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:

National Council on Family Relations

**Additional services and information for *Journal of Family Issues* can be found at:**

**Email Alerts:** <http://jfi.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

**Subscriptions:** <http://jfi.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

**Reprints:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

**Permissions:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

**Citations** (this article cites 44 articles hosted on the  
SAGE Journals Online and HighWire Press platforms):  
<http://jfi.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/28/9/1246>

# Effects of Union Type on Division of Household Labor

## Do Cohabiting Men Really Perform More Housework?

Shannon N. Davis

*George Mason University, Fairfax, VA*

Theodore N. Greenstein

Jennifer P. Gerteisen Marks

*North Carolina State University, Raleigh*

Using data from 17,636 respondents in 28 nations, this research uses multilevel modeling to compare the reported division of household labor and factors affecting it for currently married and currently cohabiting couples. Cohabiting men report performing more household labor than do married men, and cohabiting women report performing less household labor than do married women. The findings provide support for the time-availability, relative-resources, and gender-ideology perspectives. The effects of time availability and relative resources on the division of household labor are substantially the same for both union types, but gender ideology is more influential on the division of labor reported by cohabiting than by married respondents. Implications and suggestions for future research are discussed.

**Keywords:** *cohabitation; cross-national; division of household labor*

The past several decades have seen increases both in the international phenomenon of nonmarital cohabitation and in the volume of research devoted to its exploration (e.g., Smock, 2000). Family researchers have been studying married couples and the processes within their households for a number of years. Studying cohabiting couples allows examination of family processes and dynamics in another way, by comparing them to and contrasting them with married couples. Both spouses and cohabitators are presumed to share an intimate emotional and sexual relationship and a degree of commitment in addition to physical living space. However, cohabiting couples do not

share the same legally and socially sanctioned status afforded married couples. The question for many researchers is whether the absence of this sanctioned status translates into different relational processes. For example, this article asks whether cohabitators and spouses negotiate the division of household labor in similar or different ways. Specifically, we examine whether three theoretical processes (time availability, relative resources, and gender ideology) operate the same in cohabiting and married couples. By addressing these questions, this article provides a key contribution to our understanding of the connection between relationship processes and legal context.

## Union Type and Division of Household Labor

Cohabitators, as a fairly new demographic, can be tricky terrain for family researchers. Prior to the recent, fairly dramatic increase in cohabitation (Smock, 2000), sociologists studied single people and we studied married people—but cohabitation is a relationship type that is theoretically between these two points. Therefore, much of the original research on cohabitators compared them to singles and to spouses (Rindfuss & Vandenheuevel, 1990). Some generalizations about cohabitators as a group have thus developed: that they tend towards egalitarianism (Kaufman, 2000), political liberalism (Wilhelm, 1998), and a lower degree of religiosity than married people (Stanley, Whitton, & Markman, 2004; Thornton, Axinn, & Hill, 1992). Considering relational characteristics of cohabitators in comparison to spouses, findings include lower levels of commitment and relationship quality (Nock, 1995a), although there is some evidence that (in the United States) intent to marry may reduce this association (Brown & Booth, 1996). One relational aspect common to both cohabitation and marriage is the negotiation of the allocation of household labor. Research on the division of household labor

---

**Authors' Note:** Order of authorship is alphabetical. All authors contributed equally to the completion of this manuscript. An earlier version of this manuscript was presented at the 67th Annual Meeting of the Southern Sociological Society in Atlanta, GA. The Family and Changing Sex Roles III survey was fielded as part of the International Social Survey Program (ISSP). The data utilized in this research were documented and made available by the Zentralarchiv für Empirische Sozialforschung, Koeln. The data for the ISSP were collected by independent institutions in each country. Neither the original data collectors nor the Zentralarchiv bear any responsibility for the analyses or conclusions presented here. This manuscript was completed while Davis was a post-doctoral scholar at the Carolina Population Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, funded by a grant from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development/National Institute of Health (T32-HD07168-26). Please direct all correspondence regarding this manuscript to Jennifer P. Gerteisen Marks, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, North Carolina State University, Campus Box 8107, Raleigh, NC 27695-8107, USA; e-mail: Jennifer\_Marks@ncsu.edu.

thus far (generally in marital households) has yielded several factors or processes hypothesized to play a role in its allocation: work outside the home, gender ideology, and gender.

Although women have made strides in the workplace, their gains have not been paralleled inside the home, where they have been shown to spend 2-3 times as many hours in routine housework as men (Coltrane, 2000). Several theoretical approaches have been developed to explain the discrepancy in household labor contributions. Whereas the time-availability approach to explaining the division of household labor posits that household members will divide household tasks according to the time they each have available, some research has shown that even full-time-employed wives do more housework than their husbands who work the same or fewer hours (Brines, 1994). However, there is some support for this perspective. For example, Arrighi and Maume (2000) found that employed spouses with jobs that do not require long hours were more likely to participate in household labor, and that men with longer work weeks were less likely to do so.

The relative-resources approach to explaining the division of household labor is based upon the premise that housework is distasteful and preferably avoided; those in the household with greater resources (e.g., money or earning power) will leverage those resources to bargain their way out of housework. There are, however, empirical findings that contradict this approach (Brines, 1993, 1994), showing that wives do more housework than husbands even when wives earn more than their husbands.

Gender ideology and gender construction have become prevalent frameworks of late for exploring the persistent gender gap in the division of household labor. Gender ideology, usually measured via attitude scales, is generally conceived of as a spectrum, ranging from traditional (favoring a strict male breadwinner/female homemaker structure based on the Western notion of separate spheres) to egalitarian (spouses being equal partners, sharing equally in work inside and outside the home). There is some support for gender-ideology hypotheses—that is, hypotheses that posit an inverse relationship between traditional gender ideology and men's housework contributions. Arrighi and Maume (2000) found that egalitarian men spend more time in housework than traditional men; Greenstein (1996) found that gender ideology was a significant factor for men married to egalitarian women, such that increasingly traditional gender ideology was negatively associated with housework contributions. However, studying married and cohabiting couples in Moscow, Cubbins and Vannoy (2004) found no effect of gender beliefs on the division of household labor.

Related to gender ideology is gender construction, which, for our purposes, refers to the idea that gender is “a routine accomplishment embedded in everyday interaction” (West & Zimmerman, 1987); that the household is a

“gender factory” (Berk, 1985) in which not only goods and services, but also gender, are created through the allocation of household tasks. For men, taking out the trash and not mopping floors are ways of “doing gender” (West & Zimmerman, 1987), of reinforcing and reproducing their identities as men, and as not women. Greenstein (2000), for example, found that men who were dependent on a woman financially did less housework. This phenomenon has been characterized as gender-deviance neutralization; that is, in the face of nonnormative gender situations, people will go beyond the bounds of practical behavior to neutralize any perceptions of gender deviance.

Cubbins and Vannoy’s (2004) study of couples in Moscow found an inverse relationship between wives’ earnings and their housework contributions when their husbands’ earnings were very low; they also found that when husbands’ earnings were high, the relationship between wives’ earnings and wives’ contributions to household labor switched direction. This would suggest that once a husband achieves a certain earnings threshold, his wife is compelled to neutralize her gender deviance as her earnings increase—but the compulsion is not there when her relative resources are much greater than her husband’s. It becomes apparent, then, that the negotiation of household tasks is a complex process that may best be explained using multiple theoretical perspectives in tandem.

Furthermore, there is reason to suspect that these theoretical processes are universal across relationship types but that they are not as influential among cohabitators as they are among spouses. The time-availability and relative-resources perspectives, for example, are based on norms of reciprocity and exchange—but do these norms operate differently for cohabitators than they do for spouses? Marriage is generally accompanied by expectations of permanence that may not be the case in a cohabiting relationship. Cohabitators, therefore, may be more prone to aggressive bargaining when it comes to exchanges of time and effort in the household, and less willing to do more than what they perceive of as their fair share. Indeed, Brines and Joyner (1999) showed that cohabiting unions fare better under conditions of equality (in terms of earnings and time spent working), whereas for married couples, there was a somewhat beneficial effect on relationship stability of increased specialization.

When considering the gender-based processes, we return to the attitudinal research on cohabitators. If cohabitators are more likely to be egalitarian, and egalitarian gender ideology is associated with a less gendered division of household labor, then we might expect a selection effect of gender ideology on both the propensity to cohabit and the division of household labor.

Because of the recent nature of the cohabitation increase and the resulting lack of data on cohabitators, the body of research that addresses cohabitation and the division of household labor is—almost necessarily—rather small.

Thus far, findings have included that premarital cohabitation is associated with a more-equal marital division of household labor (Batalova & Cohen, 2002; Cunningham & Antill, 1994); that although cohabiting women still contribute more than their partners, the gender gap is smaller in such households than in marital households (Shelton & John, 1993; South & Spitze, 1994); and that for cohabiting men, housework hours are positively related to their intent to marry their partner (Ciabattari, 2004), although they still spend less time on housework upon entering a union than they did when single (Gupta, 1999). The limited research on cohabitation and the division of household labor in nations other than the United States is broadly consistent with research examining American couples (Baxter & Kane, 1995; Hamplova, 2002)—that is, findings indicate a more egalitarian division of household labor in cohabiting households than in marital ones, with male cohabitators contributing more than husbands to household tasks.

## A Cross-National Perspective

Our interest in the processes through which household labor is allocated between partners is informed by awareness of not only union type but also of macro-level social context as potentially important factors. Housework is a gendered social phenomenon internationally, although the meaning of gender may vary across nations. A handful of researchers have examined the division of household labor in several nations, either performing comparative disaggregated analyses (Baxter, 1997; Calasanti & Bailey, 1991; Geist, 2005; Kamo, 1994; Sanchez, 1993, 1994) or using multilevel analyses (Batalova & Cohen, 2002; Fuwa, 2004; Yodanis, 2005). Cross-national research that compares married and cohabiting couples or the processes through which household labor is divided in their households has not yet come to fruition. Batalova and Cohen's (2002) widely cited research uses cross-national data to examine the division of household labor and premarital cohabitation. However, their sample includes only currently married respondents and compares them on the basis of the experience of premarital cohabitation. Though an important contribution, their research still leaves unexplored direct comparisons of currently married and currently cohabiting couples, an important distinction between their work and the current research.

Much of the research thus far, then, has been generally descriptive in nature, and conducted using single-nation data. The current research, however, addresses more explanatory concerns. We wish to determine whether and how the same processes and factors affect the division of household labor

in cohabiting versus married households cross-nationally. If cohabitators are demographically and attitudinally different from married couples, it is possible that the process through which cohabiting couples negotiate their division of household labor differs from the process married couples use. More specifically, if cohabitators are more egalitarian, we would expect that not only would the division of household labor be more egalitarian but that, compared to married couples, gender ideology/construction would not have the same effect. Similarly, the more egalitarian nature of cohabitators should diminish the effect of relative resources and time availability as compared to married couples, as the cohabiting couple would be more likely to focus on equality than the bargaining power provided by status. A lack of differences between the two household types would indicate that the same processes are at work in both household types, and that descriptive differences may be related to the fact that cohabitation is, as Nock (1995b) argues, “an incomplete institution.” Finally, as previous research has shown, both the demography and lived experience of cohabitators differ based upon nation of residence (Kiernan, 2001, 2004; La Bourdais & Lapierre-Adamcyk, 2004; Seltzer, 2004); thus, any research using multinational data on cohabiting couples needs to take national context into consideration.

## Research Questions

Based on the ideas presented above, our analyses are organized around three basic research questions. First, do cohabiting couples report a more egalitarian division of household labor than do married couples? That is, do cohabiting men report performing more housework than do married men? Previous research (primarily with U.S. samples) suggests this is the case, although the cross-national data are mixed on this issue.

Our second research question presumes a difference in the division of household labor based upon union type. Specifically, does the amount of household work reportedly performed by cohabiting men as compared to married men differ cross-nationally? That is to say, is the variance component for the effect of union type in our analyses statistically significant? Previous research suggests significant cross-national variation in the reported division of household labor for married individuals. Other research also suggests that the lived experience of cohabitators differs widely based upon nation of residence.

Our final research question considers the three main theoretical perspectives used to explain the division of household labor—time availability, relative resources, and gender ideology—and asks whether these processes work the same way for cohabiting couples as for married couples. That is, regardless of

whether there are main effects of ideology, resources, or time availability on the division of household labor for all couples in this study, are the effects moderated by union type? Research on this type of interaction effect—especially research using cross-national data—is nearly nonexistent. Given the variation in acceptance of cohabitators across the nations studied here (Kiernan, 2004), and given the consistently strong support for the three theoretical perspectives in explaining the division of labor among married couples regardless of nation of residence, determining whether the processes through which household work is divided differ based upon union type will provide a key contribution to our understanding of the ways in which the legal status of relationships informs the construction of the relationships themselves, the legal context of the nation notwithstanding.

## Method

### Data

The data for these analyses come from the Family and Changing Gender Roles III Survey under the auspices of the International Social Survey Program (ISSP)—a cross-national collaboration in which independent institutions replicate survey questions in their own nations (Zentralarchiv für Empirische Sozialforschung, 2004). We use data gathered in 2002 from 28 nations: Australia, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany (both the former East and West), Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Latvia, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Russia, the Slovak Republic, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

The focus of these analyses is all currently married or currently cohabiting couples in these nations. Although these data were gathered from individuals (only one member of each couple was interviewed), respondents were asked questions about their partners' employment status, earnings, and household work. The total working sample size after elimination of cases with missing data was 17,636 (8,119 male respondents and 9,517 female respondents). The 28 nations contributed between 273 cases (former East Germany) and 1,361 cases (Spain) about evenly divided between female and male respondents in each nation.

### Measurement

*Dependent variable.* All respondents were asked: "On average, how many hours a week do you personally spend on household work, not including

childcare and leisure activities?" Respondents were also asked: "And what about your partner? On average, how many hours a week does she/he personally spend on household work, not including childcare and leisure activities?" From these two measures a proportion of total hours spent on household work by the respondent was calculated.

*Independent variables.* The key independent variable is whether the respondent is currently married or is in a cohabiting relationship. Respondents who were not married were asked: "Do you live together with a steady partner?" We then created a dummy indicator of whether the individual was cohabiting (referent category is currently married). The percentage of individuals currently in unions who were cohabiting ranged from 0.32% (Portugal) to 33.09% (Sweden).

*Time availability.* As indicators of time availability we included dummy variables indicating whether the husband was employed full-time and whether the wife was employed full-time.

*Relative resources.* Respondents were asked: "Considering all sources of income, between you and your spouse/partner, who has the higher income?" The response choices were "My spouse/partner has no income," "I have a much higher income," "I have a higher income," "We have about the same income," "My spouse/partner has a higher income," "My spouse/partner has a much higher income," and "I have no income." The first three categories were combined into a "respondent has higher income" category, and the last three were combined into a "partner has a higher income" category. To represent relative income a three-category variable was then constructed with categories indicating that the male spouse or partner had the higher income, the female spouse or partner had the higher income, or that the incomes were approximately equal.

*Gender ideology.* We constructed a measure of gender ideology from six items in the ISSP questionnaire. The questions began with the phrase: "Do you agree or disagree . . ." ("A working mother can establish just as warm and secure a relationship with her children as a mother who does not work"; "A preschool child is likely to suffer if his or her mother works"; "All in all, family life suffers when the woman has a full-time job"; "A job is all right, but what most women really want is a home and children"; "Being a house wife is just as fulfilling as working for pay"; and "A man's job is to earn money; a woman's job is to look after the home and family") with response categories

*strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, and strongly disagree.* The response categories were rescaled so that higher responses indicated more traditional or more “separate spheres” ideologies. The six items were then summed to produce an index of gender ideology (higher scores indicate more traditional ideologies). On this measure, if a respondent had more than one instance of missing data (out of six items) the respondent was dropped from the analysis; if there was only one missing response, the gender-specific sample mean was substituted for the missing value. The six-item index has a Cronbach’s  $\alpha$  reliability of .74.

*Education.* Respondent’s education was represented by a dummy variable indicating whether he or she had a college degree.

*Age.* A second-order effect of age was included in the models because much of this literature (see, for example, Batalova & Cohen, 2002) had suggested that age has a curvilinear (inverted-U) effect on the amount of housework performed.

*Household size.* Because the amount of housework is typically related to the number of residents in a household, household size was included in the model.

*Family relative income.* Because of problems of comparability of income values cross-nationally, the total reported family income was divided by the national mean (calculated from all ISSP respondents in a particular country) so that a family whose income was at the national mean had a relative income score of “1,” those with incomes twice that of the national mean had a score of “2,” those at half the national mean had a score of “0.5,” and so on.

*Gender equity.* We also included two nation-level control variables in the model. The World Economic Forum (Lopez-Claros & Zahidi, 2005) has created a “Global Gender Gap” measure that incorporates measures relevant to women’s economic participation, economic opportunity, political empowerment, educational attainment, and health and well-being. Indicators from official government statistics and qualitative data from the Executive Opinion Survey (Lopez-Claros, Porter, & Schwab, 2005) were used to create a rank on each of the five dimensions. The nation’s rank on each of the five dimensions was averaged to produce an index score that potentially ranges from 1 (*least equitable*) to 7 (*most equitable*). Sweden had the highest score on this index (5.53) and Mexico had the lowest (3.28).

We also included a measure of the extent of cohabitation at the national level by calculating the percentage of all ISSP unions in a particular country that were cohabiting couples.

## Analytic Strategy

We used hierarchical linear models (Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002) to test whether the division of labor differs in married and cohabiting couples, controlling for other individual-level characteristics. As the respondents are nested within nations, we used hierarchical linear models to control for the nonindependence of individuals within the sample. This technique allowed us to examine if the average division of household labor differs across nations. Based on previous research, as described above, we also controlled for the nation-level characteristics of gender equity and cohabitation rate.

The equation for the individual level is:

$$Y_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_{1j}C_{ij} + \beta_{2j}MF_{ij} + \beta_{3j}FF_{ij} + \beta_{4j}MI_{ij} + \beta_{5j}FI_{ij} + \beta_{6j}G_{ij} + \beta_{7j}C_{ij}MF_{ij} \\ + \beta_{8j}C_{ij}FF_{ij} + \beta_{9j}C_{ij}MI_{ij} + \beta_{10j}C_{ij}FI_{ij} + \beta_{11j}C_{ij}G_{ij} + \sum \beta_{kj}X_{ikj} + R_{ij}$$

Where  $Y_{ij}$  equals the division of labor in household  $i$  and country  $j$ , and  $\beta_0$  is the individual-level intercept.  $C_{ij}$  is a dummy variable indicating whether the individual is currently cohabiting;  $MF_{ij}$  is a dummy variable indicating whether the male partner is employed full-time;  $FF_{ij}$  is a dummy variable indicating whether the female partner is employed full-time;  $MI_{ij}$  is a dummy variable indicating whether the male partner earns more than the female partner;  $FI_{ij}$  is a dummy variable indicating whether the female partner earns more than the male partner;  $G_{ij}$  is respondent's gender ideology;  $C_{ij}MF_{ij}$  and  $C_{ij}FF_{ij}$  are the interaction terms for the products of the union-type indicator and two dummy variables for employment status;  $C_{ij}MI_{ij}$  and  $C_{ij}FI_{ij}$  are the interaction terms for the products of the union-type indicator and the dummy variables for relative income;  $C_{ij}G_{ij}$  is the interaction term for the product of the union-type indicator and respondent's gender ideology;  $X_{ikj}$  is the set of individual-level control variables, and  $\beta_{kj}$  is the vector of coefficients associated with the control variables. Finally,  $R_{ij}$  is the level 1 error term.

The complete nation-level equation is:

$$\beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}(GGG_j) + \gamma_{02}(\text{Cohabitation rate}_j) + U_{0j}$$

$$\beta_{1j} = \gamma_{10} + U_{1j}$$

$$\beta_{2j} = \gamma_{20} + U_{2j}$$

$$\beta_{3j} = \gamma_{30} + U_{3j}$$

$$\beta_{4j} = \gamma_{40} + U_{4j}$$

$$\beta_{5j} = \gamma_{50} + U_{5j}$$

$$\beta_{6j} = \gamma_{60} + U_{6j}$$

$$\beta_{7j} = \gamma_{70} + U_{7j}$$

$$\beta_{8j} = \gamma_{80} + U_{8j}$$

$$\beta_{9j} = \gamma_{90} + U_{9j}$$

$$\beta_{10j} = \gamma_{100} + U_{10j}$$

$$\beta_{11j} = \gamma_{110} + U_{11j}$$

$$\beta_{kj} = \gamma_k$$

Where  $\gamma_{00}$  is the intercept for the nation-level model of the division of labor;  $\gamma_{01}$  is the effect of the global gender-gap measure on  $\beta_{0j}$ ;  $\gamma_{02}$  is the effect of nation cohabitation rate on  $\beta_{0j}$ ;  $\gamma_{10}$  is the intercept for the union type slope;  $\gamma_{20}$  is the intercept for the male partner employment status slope;  $\gamma_{30}$  is the intercept for the female partner employment status slope;  $\gamma_{40}$  is the intercept for the male partner has higher income slope;  $\gamma_{50}$  is the intercept for the female partner has higher income slope;  $\gamma_{60}$  is the intercept for the gender ideology slope;  $\gamma_{70}$  is the intercept for the slope of the Union Type  $\times$  Male Employment Status interaction term;  $\gamma_{80}$  is the intercept for the slope of the Union Type  $\times$  Female Employment Status interaction term;  $\gamma_{90}$  is the intercept for the slope of the Union Type  $\times$  Male Partner Has Higher Income interaction term;  $\gamma_{100}$  is the intercept for the slope of the Union Type  $\times$  Female Partner Has Higher Income interaction term; and  $\gamma_{110}$  is the intercept for the slope of the Union Type  $\times$  Gender Ideology interaction term.  $U_{0j} - U_{11j}$  are error terms, and  $\gamma_k$  represents the fixed effects of the individual-level control variables. In all models, the variables were grand-mean centered; therefore, the intercept is interpreted as the average division of household labor in an average couple in a nation with average nation characteristics. We estimate models for male and female respondents separately.

We will be able to answer our first research question (“Do cohabiting men perform more household labor than do married men?”) by examining the parameter estimate of  $\gamma_{10}$ .  $U_{0j}$  is the variance component that will be used to answer our second research question (“Does the amount of housework reportedly performed by cohabiting men as compared to married men differ

**Table 1**  
**Individual-Level Descriptive Statistics for Male ( $N = 8,119$ )**  
**and Female ( $N = 9,517$ ) Respondents**

Variable	Male Respondents	Female Respondents
Housework (hours per week)	9.41 ( $SD = 10.28$ )	21.13 ( $SD = 16.04$ )
Housework (% of total)	31.9	73.9
Currently cohabiting (%)	13.5	14.7
Man employed full-time (%)	65.5	68.0
Woman employed full-time (%)	37.4	40.0
Man earns more (%)	72.2	66.3
Woman earns more (%)	12.4	17.8
Gender ideology <sup>a</sup>	18.08 ( $SD = 4.95$ )	17.00 ( $SD = 5.23$ )
Respondent finished college (%)	14.3	14.6
Age (years)	48.61 ( $SD = 14.54$ )	44.09 ( $SD = 13.85$ )
Household size	3.26 ( $SD = 1.45$ )	3.37 ( $SD = 1.46$ )
Relative family income <sup>b</sup>	1.03 ( $SD = 1.00$ )	.99 ( $SD = 1.16$ )

Note: Table entries are means and standard deviations for continuous variables and category percentages for categorical variables.

a. Higher scores indicate more traditional ideologies.

b. A family whose income was at the national mean had a relative income score of 1, those with income twice that of the national mean had a score of 2, those at half the national mean had a score of 0.5, and so on.

cross-nationally?"). The parameter estimates for  $\gamma_{70} - \gamma_{110}$  will be used to answer our third research question: whether the processes of time availability, relative resources, and gender ideology work the same way for cohabiting couples as for married couples.

## Results

Table 1 presents individual-level descriptive data for the 17,536 respondents in the 28 ISSP nations, reported separately for male and for female respondents. Table 2 presents nation-level descriptive data.

Approximately 14% of both male and female respondents were coded as currently cohabiting with an unmarried partner. It is important to note that the population here is that of all residents in the 28 nations who are currently in a union (either married or cohabiting).

For male respondents, the mean hours of housework performed (per week) was 9.41, or about 32% of the total hours. For female respondents, the mean was 21.13 hr (about 74%). It is important to note that these estimates are based on the respondents' own self-reports, and because only one member of each

**Table 2**  
**Descriptive Statistics for 28 Nations**

Nation	<i>N</i>		Housework		Gender Equity	Cohabitation Rate
	Men	Women	Men	Women		
Australia	459	422	39.1	70.3	4.61	9.88
Austria	466	686	27.8	78.8	4.13	15.89
Brazil	423	468	26.3	84.5	3.29	23.91
Bulgaria	275	324	34.1	71.2	4.06	3.01
Chile	388	445	24.0	81.1	3.46	16.97
Czech Republic	291	527	32.2	28.6	4.19	10.15
Denmark	431	469	37.1	68.5	5.27	22.89
Finland	367	415	35.2	69.3	5.19	26.09
France	392	775	30.9	78.3	4.49	23.56
Germany (East)	140	133	30.1	70.6	4.61	16.12
Germany (West)	278	275	28.0	73.6	4.61	17.18
Hungary	280	328	28.2	74.4	4.19	11.51
Ireland	292	392	28.3	78.8	4.40	9.21
Israel	329	426	29.7	75.1	3.94	3.44
Latvia	252	286	38.1	66.7	4.60	10.41
Mexico	347	484	36.2	70.4	3.28	4.57
Netherlands	394	388	29.6	74.4	4.48	16.37
New Zealand	322	361	32.6	73.3	4.48	13.32
Norway	497	534	32.2	67.8	5.39	25.32
Poland	327	398	37.9	65.2	4.36	3.59
Portugal	264	357	24.5	84.0	4.21	0.32
Russia	343	437	35.8	68.6	4.03	9.49
Slovak Republic	331	374	35.2	68.6	4.28	4.40
Spain	648	713	25.2	81.3	4.13	9.55
Sweden	325	358	36.3	67.3	5.53	33.09
Switzerland	304	242	27.4	75.2	3.97	15.57
United Kingdom	460	541	35.0	73.3	4.75	12.69
United States	261	353	37.3	70.6	4.40	11.89

Note: Housework percentages are self-reports of own housework contributions and so they may not add to 100%. Cohabitation rate was estimated by taking the percentage of all ISSP (International Social Survey Program) adults in unions who reported being in a cohabiting relationship.

couple was interviewed the percentages of housework performed will not usually equal 100%.

About 66% of the male respondents reported working full-time compared to 40% of the female respondents. About 72% of the male respondents reported that they earned more than their female partners, whereas about 66% of the female respondents reported that their male partners earned more

than they did. On the gender-ideology measure, male respondents had somewhat more traditional attitudes. About 14% of the male respondents had completed a university education, whereas about 15% of the female respondents had done so. Male respondents averaged 48.61 years of age, whereas the female respondents were about 4½ years younger. Households averaged about 3.3 members for both male and female respondents.

Table 2 presents the nation-level descriptive data. With no exception, women and men in all 28 nations report that women perform more household work than do men. Sweden, Norway, and Finland have the highest gender-equity scores, that is, they are the nations with the least gender stratification among the nations in this study. Sweden, Norway, and Finland also have the highest percentage of unions that are cohabiting couples, whereas Portugal, Bulgaria, and Poland have the lowest cohabitation rates.

Table 3 presents the findings from our analyses for male respondents, and Table 4 presents the findings for female respondents. Each of these tables shows three models, as variables are added both at the individual and nation level. Model A includes the intercept, nation-level measures (gender equity and cohabitation rate), and the individual-level indicator of being in a nonmarital union, and permits the intercept to vary across the 28 nations. These models show that there is statistically significant between-nation variance remaining (the variance component for the intercept), suggesting that the average division of labor varies across nations in the sample.

For male respondents, Model A shows that all of the fixed effects are statistically significant. Men's contributions to housework are predicted to be higher in nations with higher levels of gender equity, lower in nations with higher cohabitation rates, and higher if they are currently cohabiting. For women, the situation is similar, although the effects are in the opposite direction: Women do less housework in nations with higher levels of gender equity, do more housework in nations with higher cohabitation rates, and do less housework if they are currently cohabiting. Furthermore, Model A shows that the variance component associated with the currently cohabiting slope is statistically significant for both men's and women's reports. This suggests that the association between union type and reported division of household labor varies across nations in the sample.

Model B in both tables adds five indicators representing time availability, relative resources, and gender ideology to the model, and permits the corresponding slopes to vary across nations. Cohabiting males report performing significantly more housework than do married males, and cohabiting females report performing more housework than do married females. For male respondents, all five indicators have statistically significant effects in

**Table 3**  
**Multilevel Models Predicting Effects of Union Type on Division of Household Labor for Male Respondents (N = 8,119)**

Variable	Model A	Model B	Model C
Intercept	.3196 <sup>a</sup>	.3216 <sup>a</sup>	.3214 <sup>a</sup>
Nation-level predictors			
Gender-equity measure	.0641 <sup>a</sup>	.0342 <sup>a</sup>	.0346 <sup>a</sup>
Cohabitation rate	-.2704 <sup>a</sup>	-.1420	-.1368
Individual-level predictors			
Currently cohabiting	.0632 <sup>a</sup>	.0460 <sup>a</sup>	.0367 <sup>a</sup>
Male works full-time		-.0591 <sup>a</sup>	-.0613 <sup>a</sup>
Female works full-time		.0806 <sup>a</sup>	.0810 <sup>a</sup>
Male earns more		-.0482 <sup>a</sup>	-.0486 <sup>a</sup>
Female earns more		.0235 <sup>a</sup>	.0223 <sup>a</sup>
Gender ideology		-.0038 <sup>a</sup>	-.0036 <sup>a</sup>
Respondent completed college			-.0031
Age			-.0032 <sup>a</sup>
Age squared			.0000 <sup>a</sup>
Household size			-.0035
Relative family income			-.0017
Variance components			
Intercept	.0013 <sup>a</sup>	.0012 <sup>a</sup>	.0012 <sup>a</sup>
Currently cohabiting slope	.0013 <sup>a</sup>	.0004	.0004
Male works full-time slope		.0006 <sup>a</sup>	.0016 <sup>a</sup>
Female works full-time slope		.0011 <sup>a</sup>	.0011 <sup>a</sup>
Male earns more slope		.0003	.0003
Female earns more slope		.0009	.0009
Gender-ideology slope		.0000	.0000
Level 1 (residual)	.0383	.0341	.0340
Deviance statistic (parameters)	-3,370.60 (8)	-4,254.86 (38)	-4,278.49 (43)

Note: Table entries are unstandardized, full-maximum-likelihood estimates.

a. Estimate at least twice its standard error.

the expected direction. Men who are employed full-time report doing less housework, and men whose female partners are employed full-time report doing more housework. Men who earn more than their partners report doing less housework, and those whose partners have higher relative incomes report performing more housework, as do more egalitarian men. The effects of these variables are relatively consistent across all 28 nations with the exception of the full-time-employment indicators (as noted by the significant variance component for both full-time-employment slopes).

For female respondents, four of the five predictors have effects in the expected direction. Women who work full-time report performing less housework. Women

**Table 4**  
**Multilevel Models Predicting Effects of Union Type on Division of Household Labor for Female Respondents ( $N = 9,517$ )**

Variable	Model A	Model B	Model C
Intercept	.7341 <sup>a</sup>	.7362 <sup>a</sup>	.7363 <sup>a</sup>
Nation-level predictors			
Gender-equity measure	-.0789 <sup>a</sup>	-.0557 <sup>a</sup>	-.0528 <sup>a</sup>
Cohabitation rate	.3440 <sup>a</sup>	.1778 <sup>a</sup>	.1818 <sup>a</sup>
Individual-level predictors			
Currently cohabiting	-.0421 <sup>a</sup>	-.0241 <sup>a</sup>	-.0116 <sup>a</sup>
Male works full-time		.0493 <sup>a</sup>	.0533 <sup>a</sup>
Female works full-time		-.0621 <sup>a</sup>	-.0594 <sup>a</sup>
Male earns more		.0309 <sup>a</sup>	.0306 <sup>a</sup>
Female earns more		-.0099	-.0100
Gender ideology		.0036 <sup>a</sup>	.0032 <sup>a</sup>
Respondent completed college			.0194 <sup>a</sup>
Age			.0034 <sup>a</sup>
Age squared			-.0000 <sup>a</sup>
Household size			.0074 <sup>a</sup>
Relative family income			-.0030
Variance components			
Intercept	.0016 <sup>a</sup>	.0014 <sup>a</sup>	.0014 <sup>a</sup>
Currently cohabiting slope	.0017 <sup>a</sup>	.0007 <sup>a</sup>	.0006
Male works full-time slope		.0004 <sup>a</sup>	.0004 <sup>a</sup>
Female works full-time slope		.0007 <sup>a</sup>	.0007 <sup>a</sup>
Male earns more slope		.0001	.0001
Female earns more slope		.0002	.0001
Gender-ideology slope		.0000 <sup>a</sup>	.0000 <sup>a</sup>
Level 1 (residual)	.0311	.0286	.0284
Deviance statistic (parameters)	-5,918.13 (8)	-6,670.57 (38)	-6,754.00 (43)

Note: Table entries are unstandardized, full-maximum-likelihood estimates.

a. Estimate at least twice its standard error.

who have partners who work full-time, have partners who earn more than they do, and more egalitarian women report doing more housework. Furthermore, the effects of employment and gender ideology vary significantly across the 28 nations, as does the effect of union type, as noted by the significant variance component for these slopes.

For both men and women, the magnitude of the effect of national cohabitation rate declines by about half from Model A to Model B, suggesting that there is an association between the national cohabitation rate and the individual-level characteristics of employment status, relative income, and gender ideology for respondents within a particular nation.

Model C represents the full model predicting reported division of household labor, with all individual-level and nation-level control variables included. Model C in Table 3 shows that cohabiting men report performing more housework than do married men, even when nation-level differences and other sociodemographic characteristics are controlled. All of the effects reported for Model B are found in Model C at approximately the same levels of magnitude. For men, age has a statistically significant nonlinear effect on percentage of housework performed; neither completing college, nor household size, nor relative family income has statistically significant effects. As in Model B, the effects of full-time employment vary across the 28 nations.

Model C in Table 4 shows results similar to that from Model B. All of the effects that were statistically significant in Model B are also statistically significant in Model C, and at about the same level of magnitude. For women, completing college, age, and household size all have statistically significant effects.

To test for gender differences in the magnitude of the effects, we computed *t* tests of statistical significance between the coefficients for men in Model C from Table 3 and for women in Model C from Table 4. All of these coefficients are significantly different with the exception of the family relative income variable. The fact that 13 of these 14 coefficients are different by gender supports our decision to analyze the data separately for men and for women.

Tables 5 and 6 report analyses that include individual-level interactions to examine whether the effects of relative earnings, respondents' full-time employment, and gender ideology on the division of household labor differ based upon union type. These models explicitly address our third research question. Models A, B, and C report tests for interaction effects for employment (time availability), relative income (relative resources), and gender ideology. Only the interactions of gender ideology with union type are statistically significant: The effects of ideology on the performance of housework are larger in cohabiting unions than in marital unions. This effect is statistically significant and of approximately the same magnitude even in Model D, which includes all five interaction effects simultaneously. Although not reported in Tables 5 and 6, none of the random effects are statistically significant. In summary, these tables show that gender ideology has a stronger association with reported division of household labor in cohabiting households than in married-couple households, although we cannot reject the null hypothesis that time availability and relative resources affect the division of labor in cohabiting households in approximately the same fashion as in married-couple households.

**Table 5**  
**Multilevel Models Estimating Effects on Division of Household Labor of Interactions With Union Type for Male Respondents ( $N = 8,119$ )**

Effect	Model A	Model B	Model C	Model D
Intercept	.3222 <sup>a</sup>	.3214 <sup>a</sup>	.3217 <sup>a</sup>	.3221 <sup>a</sup>
Nation-level predictors				
Gender-equity measure	.0117	.0293 <sup>a</sup>	.0346 <sup>a</sup>	.0239 <sup>a</sup>
Cohabitation rate	-.0805	-.1495	.1585	-.1200
Individual-level predictors				
Currently cohabiting	.0242 <sup>a</sup>	.0243	.0788 <sup>a</sup>	.0650 <sup>a</sup>
Male works full-time	-.0648 <sup>a</sup>	-.0620 <sup>a</sup>	-.0617 <sup>a</sup>	-.0638 <sup>a</sup>
Female works full-time	.0849 <sup>a</sup>	.0814 <sup>a</sup>	.0806 <sup>a</sup>	.0855 <sup>a</sup>
Male earns more	-.0483 <sup>a</sup>	-.0507 <sup>a</sup>	-.0487 <sup>a</sup>	-.0496 <sup>a</sup>
Female earns more	.0232 <sup>a</sup>	.0221 <sup>a</sup>	.0222 <sup>a</sup>	.0229 <sup>a</sup>
Gender ideology	-.0036 <sup>a</sup>	-.0036 <sup>a</sup>	-.0033 <sup>a</sup>	-.0033 <sup>a</sup>
Interaction effects				
Cohabiting × Male Works Full-Time	.0175			.0063
Cohabiting × Female Works Full-Time	-.0085			-.0108
Cohabiting × Male Earns More		.0181		.0151
Cohabiting × Female Earns More		.0021		.0035
Cohabiting × Ideology			-.0024 <sup>a</sup>	-.0025 <sup>a</sup>
Deviance statistic (parameters)				
	-4,293.13 (62)	-4,285.11 (62)	-4,284.64 (52)	-4,305.03 (98)

Note: All models also include controls for all effects in Tables 3 and 4 (age, age squared, college education, household size, and family relative income). Table entries are unstandardized, full-maximum-likelihood estimates.

a. Estimate at least twice its standard error.

## Discussion

In this article we have examined the relationship between union status and the division of household labor using a cross-national sample. To the question raised in our title (and our first research question)—do cohabiting men perform more housework?—the evidence presented here suggests they do. When comparing cohabitators' and spouses' reports of the division of household labor, both men and women who are cohabiting report a more egalitarian division of household labor than their married counterparts. These findings are consistent with the research suggesting that cohabitators have more egalitarian expectations

**Table 6**  
**Multilevel Models Estimating Effects on Division of Household Labor of Interactions With Union Type for Female Respondents (*N* = 9, 517)**

Effect	Model A	Model B	Model C	Model D
Intercept	.7366 <sup>a</sup>	.7366 <sup>a</sup>	.7359 <sup>a</sup>	.7365 <sup>a</sup>
Nation-level predictors				
Gender-equity measure	-.0540 <sup>a</sup>	-.0534 <sup>a</sup>	-.0475 <sup>a</sup>	-.0506 <sup>a</sup>
Cohabitation rate	.2219 <sup>a</sup>	.1881 <sup>a</sup>	.1816 <sup>a</sup>	.2090 <sup>a</sup>
Individual-level predictors				
Currently cohabiting	-.0216 <sup>a</sup>	-.0170 <sup>a</sup>	-.0410 <sup>a</sup>	-.0679 <sup>a</sup>
Male works full-time	.0531 <sup>a</sup>	.0541 <sup>a</sup>	.0533 <sup>a</sup>	.0540 <sup>a</sup>
Female works full-time	-.0628 <sup>a</sup>	-.0599 <sup>a</sup>	-.0595 <sup>a</sup>	-.0127 <sup>a</sup>
Male earns more	.0301 <sup>a</sup>	.0288 <sup>a</sup>	.0303 <sup>a</sup>	.0283 <sup>a</sup>
Female earns more	-.0104	-.0130	-.0102	-.0127 <sup>a</sup>
Gender ideology	.0032 <sup>a</sup>	.0031 <sup>a</sup>	.0029 <sup>a</sup>	.0028 <sup>a</sup>
Interaction effects				
Cohabiting × Male Works Full-Time	.0037			.0034
Cohabiting × Female Works Full-Time	.0147			.0188
Cohabiting × Male Earns More		.0050		.0601
Cohabiting × Female Earns More		.0122		.0122
Cohabiting × Ideology			.0018 <sup>a</sup>	.0024 <sup>a</sup>
Deviance statistic (parameters)				
	-6,765.02 (62)	-6,767.65 (62)	-6,758.40 (52)	-6,783.73 (98)

Note: All models also include controls for all effects in Tables 3 and 4 (age, age squared, college education, household size, and family relative income).

a. Estimate at least twice its standard error.

for their relationships and behave in more egalitarian ways than do married couples. However, when it comes to the issue of causality—whether cohabitators are more egalitarian because they are cohabiting—the data here cannot provide a clear-cut answer. We find support for the gender-ideology/gender-construction perspective, as the results show a negative association between traditional gender ideology and a more egalitarian reported division of household labor for both men and women. That the magnitude of the effect differs by nation of residence is consistent with previous research (Arrighi & Maume, 2000; Cubbins & Vannoy, 2004). On average, men who hold more egalitarian beliefs tend to behave in a more egalitarian manner and report

performing more housework, and women who hold more egalitarian beliefs are less likely to report performing all of the housework.

Furthermore, the data support the notion that not only do cohabiting women and men have a more egalitarian division of household labor across the 28 nations under study here, but also that the influence of gender ideology on housework hours differs on the basis of union type. Having a traditional gender ideology is more influential for cohabiting couples than for married couples when it comes to both women's and men's reports of the division of labor. This is consistent with both the traditionalizing of gender ideology once married that has been found in the United States (Fan & Mooney Marini, 2000) as well as the notion that the legal status of marriage creates a different kind of context than does cohabitation for both women and men to do gender. The respective contexts of marriage and cohabitation may differentially facilitate the enactment of traditional or egalitarian beliefs for both women and men. In particular, it might be that the association between gender ideology and the division of household labor is weaker among married respondents because of the traditional context of marriage. This is an interesting question for future exploration, and could be informed by more in-depth, qualitative research.

When we account for nation-level and sociodemographic characteristics, we find support for the time-availability perspective for both women's and men's reports of the division of household labor. Respondents who work full-time report performing less household labor than those working less than full-time. Furthermore, both women and men whose partners work full-time report performing more housework than respondents whose partners work less than full-time. The magnitude of this relationship differs by nation of residence, not by union type. Both married and cohabiting women's and men's reports of housework hours decrease when they work full-time and increase when their partners work full-time.

We also find support for the relative-resources perspective. By both women's and men's accounts, couples where the male partner earns more have a less egalitarian division of labor in the home. However, being in a couple where the woman earns more is correlated with the reported division of labor only for men's reports. Similar to Davis and Greenstein (2004), we find that women's relative income is correlated with men's reports—but not women's own reports—of the division of household labor, at least in the case of the nonnormative arrangement where the female partner earns more than the male partner. Men whose partners earn more than they do report performing more housework than do men whose partner equally contributes to the household income. Perhaps this nonnormative financial arrangement figures

prominently in men's minds as they think about the number of hours of housework they perform, or perhaps these men are more willing than others to report performing more housework because of their nonnormative financial arrangements. That this relationship is not present in women's reports is telling. Women's reports reflect nonnormative financial arrangements when they become equal contributors to the household. These findings lead to the question whether the relative-resources perspective—that places financial contributions in an exchange relationship with household hours—is in itself gendered. That is, are men more likely to see money as a way to “buy out” of housework, and women more likely to view money as power within the relationship that is not as directly tied to hours of housework? Again, this is a dynamic which could be examined further in future, qualitative research. It is noteworthy that relative financial contributions are a key determinant of household division of labor across these 28 nations. We see this as further support for the idea that one mechanism for providing opportunities for equality inside the home is to provide opportunities for financial equality outside the home.

Our results indicate that individual-level characteristics are the primary contributors to variation in the division of household labor cross-nationally. However, nation-level characteristics—specifically, the gender-equity measure and overall cohabitation rate—are associated with the reported division of housework. Interestingly, men's reports are not affected by the same contextual characteristics as are women's.

Consistent with previous research, we find reports of a more egalitarian division of labor in nations where there is greater gender equity. By separating male and female respondents, we can see that the gender-equity measure has a direct effect for both men and women, but that the magnitude of the effect differs significantly. This suggests that the extent of women's empowerment influences the culture within a nation, which subsequently impacts both men and women: Men apparently feel it is necessary to report performing more of the household labor in nations where women overall have more power, and women perhaps feel less compelled to report a more traditional division of household labor. The larger effect for women may be due to their having a greater personal stake in increasing—or seizing—equity in their own households.

The second nation-level predictor included in our analyses, the nation's overall cohabitation rate, is significantly related to women's, but not men's reports. Specifically, we find women report a more egalitarian division of household labor in nations where the overall cohabitation rate is higher. For women, national-level predictors such as the cohabitation rate and overall gender equity are both indicative of a cultural climate that is more egalitarian

in nature, a climate in which it is safer to demand or negotiate equity in their own households. Men's reports of the division of household labor, however, are influenced only by the gender-equity measure. This is somewhat consistent with Smith's (1987) perspective on gender inequality, in which men are more attentive to the public, or "extralocal" realm. The national gender-equity measure is arguably a more extralocal measure (incorporating women's political and workplace participation) than the cohabitation rate of a nation's cultural climate. However, the fact that the gender-equity measure is also a significant predictor of women's reports further provides support for the efficacy of facilitating local-level equality by reducing nation-level inequality.

Of the individual-level predictors, only the effects of family relative income did not differ between men and women. College-educated women reported doing more housework than women without college degrees, but there was no effect for men. Whereas women's reports of housework performed were associated with household size, men's reports were not. For both women and men, working full-time was associated with doing less housework, as was having higher earnings than one's partner. Finally, the effects of age on the amount of housework performed by women are generally positive, whereas they are negative for men.

Although we find that the division of household labor is generally more equitable in cohabiting households than in married households, the processes through which household labor is divided—at least in terms of relative resources and time availability—are not necessarily moderated by union type. That is to say, the negotiating strategies seem to be consistent across relationship types, at least as far as the objective measures (relative income and employment status) used to negotiate are concerned. Thus, on average, cohabiting couples decide how to divide housework like married couples do when determining who has more time to commit to household tasks and determining who can bargain their way out of these tasks. The meaning of time and money does not seem to differ for women and men whether they are in a marital or cohabiting union. However, as we noted above, gender ideology appears to operate differently, depending on whether a relationship is legally sanctioned. Gender ideology is more influential in cohabiting unions than in marriages. This suggests that relationship context facilitates the activation of belief systems. We consider this finding a key contribution of this research: Egalitarian ideologies are more likely to translate into egalitarian divisions of household labor when present in cohabiting relationships than in marriages, and this association is supported with data from 28 nations.

We must acknowledge some limitations to our work. First and perhaps most important, these are not couple data; although we are making inferences

about couples, each respondent (male or female) is reporting about his or her own behavior and that of his or her partner. Researchers studying intimate relationships have long been aware of the methodological issues surrounding the study of couples (Miller, Rollins, & Thomas, 1982; Thompson & Walker, 1982) using data gathered from only one member of a dyad, but at the present time the ISSP data are probably the best-available data source for this research.

We presume in this research that all of the cohabiting respondents are in heterosexual relationships. As the ISSP does not request a cohabiting partner's gender (thereby presuming living as married can only occur between heterosexual individuals), we are forced to make this assumption in our research. We recognize that some of the respondents are likely to be in same-sex relationships. Without data on both partners' gender, we cannot examine the effect this may have on our findings. Previous research has found that lesbian/bisexual/gay couples negotiate the division of household labor in ways similar to heterosexual couples (Carrington, 1999). In addition, because our research is focused on whether the legal status of the union affects the division of household labor (and whether the processes of dividing the labor differ by union status), the fact that some of the unions may be same-sex does not detract from our general findings. Future data-collection strategies should include sexual orientation of partners in unions to help disentangle some of these issues, although recent research (Kurdek, 2004) indicates that some other relationship processes may in fact operate similarly across sexuality.

Finally, it is possible that the effects of relative earnings on the amount of housework performed may be the result of spurious effects such as selection or poor health. For example, men or women who have chronic illnesses are probably likely to have lower earnings and are likely to do less housework. However, the growing literature on relative income and the division of household labor (e.g., Bittman, England, Folbre, Sayer, & Matheson, 2003; Brines, 1994; Greenstein, 2000) suggests that this is a "real" effect, and that men and women respond to relative-earnings levels by altering their contributions to domestic labor.

## Implications for Future Research

As previously mentioned, we believe our study has brought up some interesting questions that might be addressed by future research of a more qualitative nature. In addition, we see at least three other areas of potential research to build upon our findings here. First, union-type differences found in the division of household labor based upon union may reflect the power

of the notion of “marriage as an institution.” The belief in marriage as a sacred institution with its accompanying roles and responsibilities might not be as powerful in other nations as it is in the United States, thus explaining the significant variation in the relationship between union type and the number of housework hours across nations. Yodanis (2005) found that the extent to which a nation reflects a “culture of divorce” is positively correlated with marital gender equality. Accordingly, future research should explore whether there are differences across nations in beliefs about marriage that might change the nature of the relationship between union type and reported division of household labor.

On a related note, it is also possible that the meaning of cohabitation differs across nations. Paraphrasing Hoem and Hoem (1988), Kiernan (2001) describes stages through which nations transition as the ways individuals become couples and partners change over time. In 2002, when our data were collected, cohabitation may have developed in some nations as a long-term replacement for marriage, whereas in others it may have been mainly a precursor to marriage, and in still others it may have tended to be a casual, short-term relationship unconnected to marriage. If this were true, our analyses could be masking additional union-type differences between nations. As noted above, the significant relationship between the cohabitation rate and women’s reports of the division of household labor suggests that cultural differences in the meaning of cohabitation between nations matter more for women than for men. Further disaggregated comparative analyses could be performed to examine whether the theoretical processes of time availability and relative resources do differ by union type between nations, but in ways that are lost once all nations are averaged together. These disaggregated analyses could also suggest other conceptually relevant contextual differences in the meaning of cohabitation and marriage in each of the included nations.

Finally, other research has also shown the theoretical perspectives described in this article to have empirical support cross-nationally (Fuwa, 2004). We find that the use of time availability and relative resources as strategies to allocate household tasks do not differ by union type. If those processes do not differ by union type and yet the contributions do vary by union type, then more research is needed to address whether the greater egalitarianism in cohabiting unions is the result of selection of more egalitarian individuals into cohabitation or of the experience of cohabitation itself (cohabitation as a causal mechanism). Longitudinal cross-national research on couples (similar to the National Survey of Families and Households in the United States) would provide additional data and more powerful analytic tools with which to address these concerns.

## References

- Arrighi, B. A., & Maume, D. J. (2000). Workplace subordination and men's avoidance of housework. *Journal of Family Issues*, 21, 464-487.
- Batalova, J. A., & Cohen, P. N. (2002). Premarital cohabitation and housework: Couples in cross-national perspective. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64, 743-755.
- Baxter, J. (1997). Gender equality and participation in housework: A cross-national perspective. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 28, 220-248.
- Baxter, J., & Kane, E. W. (1995). Dependence and independence: A cross-national analysis of gender inequality and gender attitudes. *Gender & Society*, 9, 193-215.
- Berk, S. F. (1985). *The gender factory: The apportionment of work in American households*. New York: Plenum.
- Bittman, M., England, P., Folbre, N., Sayer, L., & Matheson, G. (2003). When does gender trump money? Bargaining and time in household work. *American Journal of Sociology*, 109, 186-214.
- Brines, J. (1993). The exchange value of housework. *Rationality and Society*, 5, 302-340.
- Brines, J. (1994). Economic dependency, gender, and the division of labor at home. *American Journal of Sociology*, 100, 652-688.
- Brines, J., & Joyner, K. (1999). The ties that bind: Principles of cohesion in cohabitation and marriage. *American Sociological Review*, 64, 333-355.
- Brown, S. L., & Booth, A. (1996). Cohabitation versus marriage: A comparison of relationship quality. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 58, 668-678.
- Calasanti, T. M., & Bailey, C. A. (1991). Gender inequality and the division of household labor in the United States and Sweden: A socialist-feminist approach. *Social Problems*, 38, 34-53.
- Carrington, C. (1999). *No place like home: Relationships and family life among lesbians and gay men*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ciabattari, T. (2004). Cohabitation and housework: The effects of marital intentions. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66, 118-125.
- Coltrane, S. (2000). Research on household labor: Modeling and measuring the social embeddedness of routine family work. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 62, 1208-1233.
- Cubbins, L. A., & Vannoy, D. (2004). Division of household labor as a source of contention for married and cohabiting couples in metropolitan Moscow. *Journal of Family Issues*, 25, 182-215.
- Cunningham, J. D., & Antill, J. K. (1994). Cohabitation and marriage: Retrospective and predictive comparisons. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 11, 77-93.
- Davis, S. N., & Greenstein, T. N. (2004). Cross-national variations in the division of household labor. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66, 1260-1271.
- Fan, P.-L., & Mooney Marini, M. (2000). Influences on gender-role attitudes during the transition to adulthood. *Social Science Research*, 29, 258-283.
- Fuwa, M. (2004). Macro-level gender inequality and the division of household labor in 22 countries. *American Sociological Review*, 69, 751-767.
- Geist, C. (2005). The welfare state and the home: Regime differences in the domestic division of labour. *European Sociological Review*, 21, 23-41.
- Greenstein, T. N. (1996). Husbands' participation in domestic labor: Interactive effects of wives' and husbands' gender ideologies. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 58, 585-595.
- Greenstein, T. N. (2000). Economic dependence, gender, and the division of labor in the home: A replication and extension. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 62, 322-335.

- Gupta, S. (1999). The effects of transitions in marital status on men's performance of housework. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 61*, 700-711.
- Hamplova, D. (2002). Marriage and cohabitation: Qualitative differences in partnership arrangements. *Sociologicky Casopis, 38*, 771-788.
- Hoem, B., & Hoem, J. M. (1988). The Swedish family: Aspects of contemporary developments. *Journal of Family Issues, 9*, 397-424.
- Kamo, Y. (1994). Division of household work in the United States and Japan. *Journal of Family Issues, 15*, 348-378.
- Kaufman, G. (2000). Do gender role attitudes matter? Family formation and dissolution among traditional and egalitarian men and women. *Journal of Family Issues, 21*, 128-144.
- Kiernan, K. (2001). Cohabitation in Western Europe: Trends, issues, and implications. In A. Booth & A. C. Crouter (Eds.), *Just living together: Implications of cohabitation on families, children, and social policy* (pp. 3-31). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Kiernan, K. (2004). Redrawing the boundaries of marriage. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 66*, 980-987.
- Kurdek, L. A. (2004). Are gay and lesbian cohabiting couples really different from heterosexual married couples? *Journal of Marriage and Family, 66*, 880-900.
- Le Bourdais, C., & Lapierre-Adamcyk, É. (2004). Changes in conjugal life in Canada: Is cohabitation progressively replacing marriage? *Journal of Marriage and Family, 66*, 929-942.
- Lopez-Claros, A., Porter, M. E., & Schwab, K. (Eds.). (2005). *Global competitiveness report 2005-2006: Policies underpinning rising prosperity*. Houndsmills, UK: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Lopez-Claros, A., & Zahidi, S. (2005). *Women's empowerment: Measuring the global gender gap*. Geneva, Switzerland: World Economic Forum.
- Miller, B. C., Rollins, B. C., & Thomas, D. L. (1982). On methods of studying marriages and families. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 44*, 851-873.
- Nock, S. L. (1995a). A comparison of marriages and cohabiting relationships. *Journal of Family Issues, 16*, 53-76.
- Nock, S. L. (1995b). Commitment and dependency in marriage. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 57*, 503-514.
- Raudenbush, S. W., & Bryk, A. S. (2002). *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rindfuss, R. R., & Vandenheuevel, A. (1990). Cohabitation: A precursor to marriage or an alternative to being single? *Population and Development Review, 16*, 703-726.
- Sanchez, L. (1993). Women's power and the gendered division of domestic labor in the third world. *Gender & Society, 7*, 434-459.
- Sanchez, L. (1994). Material resources, family structure, resources, and husbands' housework participation: A cross-national comparison. *Journal of Family Issues, 15*, 379-402.
- Seltzer, J. A. (2004). Cohabitation in the United States and Britain: Demography, kinship, and the future. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 66*, 921-928.
- Shelton, B. A., & John, D. (1993). Does marital status make a difference: Housework among married and cohabiting men and women. *Journal of Family Issues, 14*, 401-420.
- Smith, D. E. (1987). *The everyday world as problematic: A feminist sociology*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Smock, P. J. (2000). Cohabitation in the United States: An appraisal of research themes, findings, and implications. *Annual Review of Sociology, 26*, 1-20.
- South, S. J., & Spitze, G. D. (1994). Housework in marital and nonmarital households. *American Sociological Review, 59*, 327-347.

- Stanley, S. M., Whitton, S. W., & Markman, H. J. (2004). Interpersonal commitment and premarital or nonmarital cohabitation. *Journal of Family Issues, 25*, 496-519.
- Thompson, L., & Walker, A. J. (1982). The dyad as the unit of analysis: Conceptual and methodological issues. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 44*, 889-900.
- Thornton, A., Axinn, W. G., & Hill, D. H. (1992). Reciprocal effects of religiosity, cohabitation, and marriage. *American Journal of Sociology, 98*, 628-661.
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & Society, 1*, 125-151.
- Wilhelm, B. (1998). Changes in cohabitation across cohorts: The influence of political activism. *Social Forces, 77*, 289-313.
- Yodanis, C. L. (2005). Divorce culture and marital gender equality: A cross-national study. *Gender & Society, 19*, 644-659.
- Zentralarchiv für Empirische Sozialforschung. (2004). *The International Social Survey Programme*. Retrieved February 20, 2004, from [http://www.gesis.org/en/data\\_service/issp](http://www.gesis.org/en/data_service/issp)