

Transitions through the Lifecourse and Time Spent on Housework

Janeen Baxter*, Belinda Hewitt* and Michele Haynes*

School of Social Science, University of Queensland

Please direct all correspondence to Associate Professor Janeen Baxter, Head, Sociology Program, School of Social Science, The University of Queensland, St. Lucia, QLD, 4072. AUSTRALIA. (Email: j.baxter@uq.edu.au)

Paper prepared for the 99th Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, 14-17 August, 2004, San Francisco and the NLC Workshop, The University of Queensland, 29-30th June 2004

Abstract

This paper examines differences in men's and women's time spent on housework as they move through key lifecourse transitions. Most research on housework has examined change indirectly by using cross-sectional data to compare time spent on housework across groups with different characteristics. This paper adopts a longitudinal approach to directly examine differences in time spent on housework in relation to employment, marital and parental transitions. This is an important issue as the pathways that individuals take through the lifecycle have changed dramatically in recent decades. For example, many individuals experience periods of de facto cohabitation prior to marriage, periods of separation and divorce, and longer periods with none or fewer children in the household compared to previous generations. It is important to examine how these differing pathways affect the gender division of labor in housework time. We use national panel data from Australia at two time points, 1996/97 and 2000. The results show that women spend far more time on housework than men, but that time on housework varies considerably in relation to key lifecourse transitions, in particular changes in marital status. We conclude that the varying paths individuals take through the lifecourse influences time spent on housework.

Despite major changes in the timing, patterning and frequency of various life course events, such as marriage, child bearing and rearing and participation in paid employment, gender stratification within households remains relatively constant. In spite of beliefs held by those active in the second wave feminist movement, women's increased participation in paid work has not led to major changes in the domestic division of labor (Coltrane 2000; Baxter 2002). Rather than men taking on a greater share of the load, women's increased labor force participation has been associated with women reducing their time on housework as a way of coping with the dual burden of paid and unpaid work (Baxter 2001; Baxter 2002). Further, earlier research has suggested that the domestic division of labor may be shaped by the experience of previous relationships (Thompson 1991; Ishii-Kuntz and Coltrane 1992; South and Spitze 1994; Sullivan 1997). But most research to date has concentrated on the experience of remarriage, arguing that couples that experienced conflict over housework or unfair divisions of labor in a previous marriage, will seek more equitable and congenial arrangements with their new partner. But as South and Spitze (1994: 345) point out, if people do increasingly move through transitions during their lives from never married to de facto, to married, divorced and remarried, it is important to examine the time men and women spend doing housework in each of these living arrangements. The current paper examines how time spent on housework changes as men and women move through key life course transitions. To do this we use Australian panel data from two periods, 1996/97 and 2000, to assess change in time spent on housework as a result of change in marital status, employment status, and parental status.

Changing Patterns of Family Formation and Dissolution in Australia

There is little doubt that patterns of family formation and dissolution in Australia have undergone considerable changes in recent decades. Although marriage remains very popular,

with the bulk of the Australian population marrying at least once in their lives, marriage rates have declined significantly since the mid-1970s, and moreover, the pathways to marriage and family formation have changed dramatically over this period. For example, Australia, like many other advanced countries, has experienced a huge growth in the percentage of couples choosing to cohabit with their partner in a de facto relationship rather than to marry (Glezer 1997; Australian Bureau of Statistics 1998). In Australia, the percentage of married couples who had cohabited prior to marriage was 16 per cent in 1976, 56 per cent in 1992 and over 60 per cent by 2002 (De Vaus and Wolcott 1997, Australian Bureau of Statistics 2000).

But while the percentage of people who cohabit in a de facto relationship at some stage of their lives has increased dramatically, the proportion of couples in de facto relationships at any given time is relatively small (De Vaus and Wolcott 1997; Glezer 1997). In Australia in 1996, de facto couples comprised only about 10 per cent of all couples (Australian Bureau of Statistics 1999). Some of these cohabitation unions will dissolve, but many others will move on to legal marriage. This suggests that de facto relationships should be seen as a stage in the 'courtship' process, or as a trial marriage, with many people then choosing to marry (Glezer 1997). For many couples, then, de facto cohabitation appears to be an alternative at a particular stage in the life course, rather than a long-term rejection of marriage.

A number of studies have investigated the impact of previous marital relationships on the domestic division of labor in current marriages (Ishii-Kuntz and Coltrane 1992; Sullivan 1997). Underlying the research is the notion that couples compare their current situation to a previous relationship as a means of justifying current arrangements, or alternatively negotiating for a different kind of relationship. The idea of a comparison referent stems from the work of Thompson (1991) who argued that women's sense of entitlement in terms of domestic work is based on comparisons with people other than their husbands. For example,

women may compare their domestic load with that of their mothers or female friends. Hence women may be more likely to perceive their current arrangements as fair and equitable than if they compared themselves with their husbands. South and Spitze (1994) take this further suggesting that “spouses may compare themselves to their own past or projected experiences in another marital status, or even to others who are not currently married ...” (South and Spitze 1994: 344).

Gupta (1999) has examined the impact of transitions in marital status on changes in men’s time on housework. This is one of only two previous studies that have examined the impact of the transition from de facto cohabitation to marriage on the domestic division of labor. Using two waves of the National Survey of Families and Households in 1987-1988 and 1992-1993, he finds that men substantially decrease their housework hours when they enter coresidential unions while women substantially increase their housework hours when they enter unions. Furthermore he finds that never married men decrease their housework time by the same amount when they cohabit in a de facto relationship and when they marry, while women increase their housework by the same amount when they cohabit in a de facto relationship and when they marry suggesting that “entry into a coresidential union is of greater consequence than the form of that union” (1999:710). Finally he finds no differences for either men’s or women’s housework time when they move from de facto cohabitation to marriage.

On the other hand, Batalova and Cohen (2002), using data from 22 countries in the International Social Survey Programme, find that couples’ premarital cohabitation experience contributes to greater equality in housework sharing. They suggest that this is consistent with the view that “former cohabitators bring more egalitarian expectations and experiences to their subsequent marriages” (2002: 753). This supports earlier research by Baxter (2004) who

found that housework arrangements in de facto couple households are more egalitarian than in married couple household

Australia also has one of the lowest fertility levels of all OECD nations at just below 1.8 births per woman. The high point for Australian fertility levels occurred in the early 1960s, with women bearing an average of 3.5 babies in their lifetime. This rate fell considerably over the next two decades, to just below replacement level (2.1) in 1976. During the 1970s and 1980s, fertility levels remained stable, but they have fallen again during the 1990s to below 1.8 (Weston et al. 2001). Interestingly there are marked variations in fertility levels by age. While the fall in fertility is apparent across all age groups, the fall has been most marked among younger women below the age of 30. In contrast, the proportion of women over age 30 giving birth has risen in recent decades, and increasingly these women tend to be first-time mothers (Weston et al. 2001). This reflects the trend away from teenage women giving birth and the general trend towards delaying child-bearing (De Vaus and Wolcott 1997).

Most research on the impact of children on housework hours has found that it is the age of children in the household rather than the number of children that has the most dramatic effect on time spent on housework (Baxter 2002). Moreover this effect varies for men and women. For example, the presence of children aged 5 years and under leads to an increase in women's time spent on housework, but a decrease in men's time spent on housework. This may be due to the fact that when there are young children at home women withdraw from the labor market in greater numbers than men, while men may work longer hours in paid employment to compensate for wives reduced earnings. So we would expect that a decline in the fertility rate would be evidenced by less time spent on housework for women over the lifecycle. On the other hand, research has also shown that men and women are investing more time and energy into parenthood than in previous generations (Bittman 1995). This may

mean that the effect of fewer children per household is effectively cancelled out by the greater emotional and time investment that men and women devote to parenthood and homemaking.

At the other end of the marriage cycle, the rate of divorce has also risen dramatically since the mid-1970s. In the early part of the twentieth century the number of divorces was negligible, rising slightly in the 1940s, possibly due to the instability and disruption caused by war, and then falling again throughout the 1960s (Weston et al. 2001). In 1975 the Family Law Act was introduced in Australia providing for no-fault divorce. The act allowed a divorce based on irretrievable breakdown as measured by at least twelve months of separation (Weston et al. 2001). Following the introduction of the act, there was a sharp increase in the rate of divorces, rising to 4.5 per 1,000 population in 1976. Since then the rate has declined to approximately 2.5 to 2.9 per 1,000 population, and has remained steady. These trends in family formation and dissolution are not unique to Australia. Similar patterns have been documented for Canada (Baker 1996, 2001; Eichler 1997) the US (Bumpass and Lu 2000) and Europe (Kiernan 2000), although the pace of change varies across countries.

Most research on the impact of divorce on housework time has examined how remarriages vary in relation to first marriages (Ishii-Kuntz and Coltrane 1992). In this paper we examine the impact of separation on time spent on housework. We expect that separation will lead to greater amounts of time spent on housework for men compared to their married or de facto counterparts due to the loss of the labor usually performed by wives and partners. On the other hand, we expect separation to lead to less time on housework for women compared to their married and de facto counterparts due to the absence of a husband or partner in the household and the consequent loss of many of the homemaking duties that characterise women's role within a couple.

Changing Patterns of Labor Force Involvement for Men and Women in Australia

The movement of married women into paid employment since the end of the Second World War has been one of the major social changes in advanced capitalist societies. For example, in 1954 less than one in three women in Australia aged 15-64 (29 per cent) were employed and only 31 per cent of these women were married. By 1998 60 per cent of women were employed and 61 per cent were married (Australian Bureau of Statistics 1998). Most strikingly, the labor force participation rate of married women has increased from 34 per cent in 1968 to 63 per cent in 1998 (Australian Bureau of Statistics 1998). These changes have been brought about by a combination of changing labor market structures, such as the decline of the manufacturing sector and rise of the service sector, the removal of legal barriers, such as the marriage bar forcing women to resign from public sector employment upon marriage (Deacon 1989), and the passing of other forms of legislation that improved women's access to paid work, such as equal pay for equal work legislation in 1969, the Equal Employment Opportunity Act in 1986 and the Sex Discrimination Act in 1986, as well as changing social attitudes about gender roles.

Despite these massive increases in female labor force participation rates however, and *married* women's labor force participation rates in particular, women's employment patterns over the lifecourse still look very different to men's employment patterns. Specifically, most women work part-time for a significant proportion of their working lives, particularly when there are young children in the household, while the majority of men work full-time for the duration of their working lives. Women's participation is closely tied to the age of their youngest child. In 1997 46 per cent of married mothers with a child aged 0-4 were employed, but most of these mothers were in part-time employment (Australian Bureau of Statistics 1998). While the participation of men in part-time employment has also increased slightly in recent years, the increase is associated with men's increased participation in higher education

during the early years of the lifecourse, and at the other end of the lifecourse, a tendency to work part-time during the retirement years. The dominant pattern then is for men to enter full-time employment after they complete their education and to remain in full-time employment until retirement. For women, the dominant pattern is to enter full-time employment after education and to remain there until the birth of the first child. Employment then usually declines dramatically, although not completely, until the youngest child enters school (Evans 2000). Women with teenage and older dependent children are more likely to work full-time than women with children in primary school.

It is not difficult to understand why women leave employment or move into part-time employment upon the birth of the first child. First the Australian labor market is structured around a male breadwinner model of employment with hours and conditions that leave little room for the flexibility needed to accommodate the needs and timetables of young children. Second, compared to countries such as Sweden and Norway that have specifically sought to develop policies that enable parents to combine paid and unpaid work (such as generous maternity and paternity leave policies), there is little in the way of work and family policies in Australia that encourage women to maintain full-time employment when they have young children (Baxter 2001). Third, childcare is typically expensive and often difficult to access. Fourth despite over three decades of equal pay for equal work legislation, the gender gap in earnings between men and women is still clearly evident and possibly growing, thereby encouraging women rather than men to withdraw from paid work to take on caring responsibilities.

In this paper we examine how employment transitions impact on housework hours by investigating differences in housework hours for men and women according to movement into and out of the work force. Earlier research has shown that men tend to adjust their housework hours in response to the demands of paid employment while for women the

relationship is stronger in the opposite direction with women adjusting paid work hours in response to the demands of home and family (Western and Baxter 2001). This leads us to expect a stronger relationship between employment transitions and housework hours for men than women. On the other hand, since the variability in men's paid employment hours is so small with most men employed full-time, the pattern may be more marked for women than for men.

In summary, Australia has witnessed major shifts in family formation and dissolution, and forms of participation in the paid work force (especially for women). This has led to different experiences at the individual level. In the current paper, we investigate differences in time spent on housework in relation to three key lifecourse transitions: marital status transitions (including de facto unions), employment transitions, and parental transitions. We extend earlier research by examining not only the impact of transitions across different kinds of relationships on the domestic division of labor, but also examine the impact of change in parental status and employment status. Moreover we use longitudinal data to examine differences in housework time directly, rather than comparing groups with differing characteristics.

Methods

The Data

The data used in this paper come from wave 1 (1996/1997) and wave 2 (2000) of a national Australian panel survey titled "Negotiating the Life Course: Gender, Mobility and Career Trajectories" (McDonald et al 2000). The wave 1 (time 1, henceforth T1) sample comprised 2,231 respondents between the ages of 18 and 54 randomly selected from listed telephone numbers in the electronic white pages. Each respondent was randomly selected from all 18 to 54 year olds in the household. The data were collected using computer assisted telephone

interviewing (CATI), with an overall response rate estimated between 52 and 63 per cent depending on the denominator used (McDonald et al 2000). Despite the relatively low response rate the overall sample is comparable to the Australian population for age, marital status, family status, and employment status, although the sample has a higher representation of women, 56% versus 50%, than the Australian population more generally (McDonald et al 2000). The wave 2 sample (time 2, henceforth T2) comprised 1,768 of wave 1 respondents. The response rate at T2 was 79%.

Analytic Sample

We include all people who were married or in a de facto relationship in T1. Respondents not in a relationship at time 1 were not asked questions about the domestic division of labor and hence were ineligible for inclusion in the current analyses. We also confine the sample to those who had data collected at both T1 and T2. The final analytic sample comprises 1130 men and women.

Variables

The means and standard deviations of all variables by gender are presented in Table 1. The dependent variable is the respondent's weekly hours spent undertaking household tasks, including meal preparation, doing dishes, shopping, laundry, vacuuming and cleaning reported at T2. Preliminary diagnostics indicated that the distribution was skewed to the right. We have therefore logged the housework hours variable so that the data better approximate a normal distribution.

Table 1 about here

The three primary independent variables are marital, employment and birth transitions between time 1 and time 2. The marital status transition measure has five categories 1) Married T1 and T2, 2) De facto T1 and T2, 3) de facto T1 to married T2, 4) married T1 to

separated T2, and 5) de facto T1 to separated T2, with married T1 and T2 as the reference group. The employment transition measure comprises four categories 1) employed T1 and T2 2) not employed T1 and not employed T2 3) employed T1 and not employed T2, and 4) not employed T1 and employed T2, where employed T1 and T2 is the reference category. Birth transition has three categories, 1) no birth between T1 and T2, 2) birth of first child, and 3) higher order birth, a dummy was included for missing values, and no birth is the reference category. In addition we include a control for number of children living in the households at T1, a continuous measure ranging from 0 – 7.

In addition to the three transition variables, we include a number of controls that previous literature has found to be associated with housework hours. Two gender income gap scores were developed. The first measure represents the relative proportion of gross financial year income (1995/1996) that the respondent contributed to household income measured at T1. Household income was defined as the sum of the gross financial year income of the male-head and female-head of the household. To illustrate, in a household where the male-head earns \$65,000, and the female head earns \$30,000, there is a total household income of \$95,000. In this example the male head contributes 68 per cent of household income and the female head 32 per cent. The second measure represents the change in the gender income gap scores between T1 and T2. Using the above illustration, if the male partner received a pay increase to \$75,000 a year by T2, but the female partner had ceased employment by T2 and had income of \$0, their relative proportions would change to 100 per cent for the male head, and 0 per cent for the female head at T2. The change in the income gap between T1 and T2 for the male head would be +32 per cent (100 per cent – 68 per cent) and for the female head –32 per cent (0 per cent – 32 per cent). Both gender income gap measures are continuous, with missing values coded to 0 and a dummy for missing values included in the models.

We include a control for the respondents housework hours reported at time 1. A continuous measure for age is also included in all analyses. Gender, taken from responses at T1, is coded 1 male and 2 female.

Analytic approach

Given that our dependent variable is continuous and, with the log transformation, has an approximately normal distribution we use OLS regression to examine the association between the independent variables and housework hours at T2. Analysis proceeded in two stages. First, we fit a model including all independent variables. Because we are primarily interested in gender differences in housework, we arrived at a model where all explanatory variables were interacted with sex. Second, we saved the predicted values from the model in step one and produced cross tabulations of the marginal means on the log scale, for each of the transition variables by gender. These tables show patterns in the differences in predicted marginal mean housework hours between men and women. Finally, we convert the transformed means back to the original scale to allow comparisons among actual mean housework hours.

Results

Results from the full model are presented in Table 2. The control variables that have a significant effect on housework hours at T2 are gender, housework hours at T1 and the change in income gap from T1 to T2. Not surprisingly, housework hours at T2 increase with the number of housework hours at T1. By far the most significant impact on the number of housework hours is that of gender revealing that, on average, women do a great deal more housework than men.

Table 2 about here

Our results focus on the associations between marital transitions, employment transitions, parental transitions and housework hours by gender. Therefore, the findings presented in Tables 3-5 only report differences in marginal mean housework hours that vary according to life course transitions experienced between T1 and T2 .

The full model contains terms representing both main effects of the independent variables and the interaction effects of these variables by gender. Consequently, the results for the main effect of a variable and the corresponding interaction with gender effects, should be interpreted together. For marital transitions by gender, the main effect results indicate that women tend to do more housework than men and that on average housework hours tend to increase with the transition from being married at T1 to being separated at T2, compared to remaining married. In addition, the interaction effects for transition in marital status by gender show that this increase in housework is significantly smaller for women who were married at T1 but are separated at T2, as compared to men on average and women who remain married. This trend is apparent in Table 3 which shows that the predicted marginal means are much greater for women than men over all marriage transitions, but that the predicted mean housework hours for men who were married at T1 and are separated at T2 (11.32 hours) is much greater than for men who have remained married (6.64 hours). The corresponding difference in housework hours for women is negligible.

Table 3 about here

For employment transitions, Table 2 shows that housework hours at T2 are significantly higher for individuals who are not employed at T2, regardless of whether they were employed or not at T1. There are no significant interaction effects for employment transitions by gender indicating that this trend is similar for both men and women. Table 4 shows this similarity in the trends of predicted marginal means for housework hours by employment transitions. In particular, the marginal means for those who are not employed at

T2 are considerably greater than those who were employed at both T1 and T2. Again the gender differences are evident where women do many more housework hours compared to men.

Table 4 about here

For birth transitions, Table 2 shows that if the birth of a second or higher order child occurs between T1 and T2 then on average, for both men and women, the number of housework hours at T2 is significantly lower than if no birth occurred between T1 and T2. However, the interaction effect of birth transition by gender shows that housework hours are significantly greater for women. This interaction effect is positive, with a larger magnitude than the negative main effect, thus indicating that women who have experienced a higher order birth, spend more hours on housework than men in general and women who have not experienced a birth between T1 and T2. The predicted marginal means for birth transitions are presented in Table 5. Similarly to Tables 3 and 4, it is apparent that women do many more hours of housework than men. Table 5 also shows that the predicted mean housework hours for women who experience a higher order birth (24.84 hours) is much greater than for women who experience their first birth (18.57 hours) or no birth at all (19.85 hours). The predicted mean hours of housework for men does not differ greatly across birth transitions.

Table 5 about here

Discussion

We examine how time spent on housework varies as individuals move through key lifecourse transitions. Compared to earlier generations where the stages of the lifecourse were stable, routinised and largely predetermined, patterns of family formation and dissolution are now much more fluid and individualised. Further women, particularly married women, have moved into paid employment in greater numbers than in previous generations. It is thus

important to examine how these changing demographic and social patterns influence time spent on housework. Overall it is clear that women still spend far greater amounts of time on housework than men. Gender differentiation within the family remains despite massive changes over the last few decades in patterns of family formation and dissolution, as well as significant increases in women's labor force participation rates. Our results, like all other studies of time spent on housework in western countries, show that women devote far greater amounts of time to domestic work than men. According to our data, women in Australia spend an average of 24 hours per week on domestic work compared to an average of 9 hours per week for men.

But our data also indicate significant variations around the mean in relation to the three lifecourse transitions under examination here. The largest variations are evident for marital transitions. Here we see that women who were married at both time points in our analyses spend most time on housework per week (22 hours). On the other hand, women who were in a de facto relationship at time 1 but had then married by time 2, spend only 16 hours per week on housework. This supports earlier research indicating that time spent in a de facto relationship where housework is more equally shared may influence arrangements after marriage (Baxter 2004). On the other hand, women who were married at time 1 but separated by time 2 still spend almost as much time on housework as women who remained married (21 hours). Taken together these results suggest that patterns established in a prior relationship carry over even after the end of that relationship. For women with experience in a de facto relationship the more egalitarian patterns established during this period carry over into the marital relationship. On the other hand, women who have moved from marriage to separation still spend almost as much time on housework as they did when married.

For men the pattern is different and at a much lower magnitude. Men who have moved from a de facto relationship to a married relationship spend about an hour more per

week on housework compared to men who were married at both time points (8 hours per week compared to 7 hours per week). This supports the view that patterns established in earlier relationships carry over to subsequent relationships. Interestingly men who were married at time 1 and separated at time 2 spend significantly more time on housework than men who have experienced other transitions suggesting that the absence of a wife leads to considerably more time on housework for men.

In relation to employment transitions we also see evidence of the importance of previous arrangements for understanding current patterns. For example, women who moved from no paid employment in time 1 to paid employment in time 2 spend just as much time on housework than women who were in employment at both time points. Although we have not controlled for length of time spent in paid employment, it appears that these women are still managing to devote considerable amounts of time to domestic work, as they did when not in employment. Not surprisingly women not in paid employment at both time points spend the most time on housework (30 hours per week). This is also the case for men, although men do less than half the amount of housework that women do (13 hours) when not in employment at both time points.

Finally in relation to birth transitions we find the least amount of variation, particularly for men. Women who experienced a higher order birth between the two time points spend much more time on housework than women who experienced a first birth or no birth. For men on the other hand, those with a first child born in this period do the most housework, compared to those who experienced no births or a higher order birth.

Overall we draw two broad conclusions from this research. First our analyses point to the resilience of gender stratification in time spent on housework. Despite broad social and economic changes in patterns of household formation and labor market composition, the gender division of time on housework in Australia is remarkably stable with women spending

far or time than men on domestic work. This is a pattern consistent with international studies. Second, there is evidence that variations in lifecourse transitions at the individual level affect time spent on housework. Most notably, the experience of previous relationships appears to impact most significantly on time spent on housework in subsequent relationships. This implies that variations in the pathways individuals take through different relationship types is significant for understanding time spent on housework.

References

- Australian Bureau of Statistics. 1998. *Australian Social Trends 1998*. Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics. Catalogue No.4102.0.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. 1999. *Australian Social Trends 1999*. Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics. Catalogue No.4102.0.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. 2000. *Marriages and Divorces*. Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics Catalogue No. 3310.0.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. 2000. *Marriages and Divorces*. Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics Catalogue No. 3310.0.
- Baker, Maureen (ed) 1996. *Families: Changing Trends in Canada (third edn)*. Toronto: McGraw Hill Ryerson.
- Baker, Maureen. 2001. *Families. Labour and Love*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.
- Baxter, Janeen. 2001. "The Links between Paid and Unpaid Work: Australia and Sweden in the 1980s and 1990s," in Baxter J. and Western, M. (eds), *Reconfigurations of Class and Gender*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, Pp. 81-104.
- Baxter, J. (2002) "Patterns of Change and Stability in the Gender Division of Household Labour in Australia, 1986-1997." *Journal of Sociology*, 38 (4): 399-424.
- Baxter, Janeen. 2004 (in press) "To Marry or Not to Marry: Marital Status and the Household Division of Labor." *Journal of Family Issues*.
- Bittman, Michael. 1995. "Changes at the Heart of Family Households. Family Responsibilities in Australia 1974-1992." *Family Matters* 40: 10-15.
- Bumpass, Larry and Hsien-Hen Lu. 2000. "Trends in Cohabitation and Implications for Children's Family Contexts." *Population Studies* 54: 29-41.

- Coltrane, Scott. 1996. *Family Man: Fatherhood, Housework, and Gender Equity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Coltrane, Scott. 2000. "Research on Household Labor: Modeling and Measuring the Social Embeddedness of Routine Family Work." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 64 (4): 1208-1233.
- Deacon, Desley. 1989. *Managing Gender: The State, the New Middle Class and Women Workers 1830-1930*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- De Vaus, David and Ilene Wolcott. 1997. *Australian Family Profiles. Social and Demographic Profiles*. Melbourne: Australian Institute of Family Studies.
- Eichler, Margrit. 1997. *Family Shifts. Families, Policies, and Gender Equality*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Evans, Mariah. 2000. 'Women's Participation in the Labour Force: Ideals and Behaviour'. *Australian Social Monitor* 3(2): 49-57.
- Ferree, Myra Marx. 1990. "Beyond Separate Spheres: Feminism and Family Research." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 52 November: 866-884.
- Kiernan, Kathleen. 2000. "European Perspectives on Union Formation." In Linda Waite (ed) *The Ties that Bind. Perspectives on Marriage and Cohabitation*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter. Pp 40-58.
- Korn, E.L. and Graubard, B.I. (1995). 'Analysis of large health surveys: Accounting for the sampling design.' *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series A (Statistics in Society)* 158(2): 263-295.
- Glezer, Helen. 1997. "Cohabitation and Marriage Relationships in the 1990s." *Family Matters* Issue No. 47 Winter: 5-9.
- Gupta, Sanjiv. 1999. "The Effects of Transitions in Marital Status on men's Performance of Housework." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 61: 700-711.

- Ishii-Kuntz, Masako and Scott Coltrane. 1992. "Remarriage, Stepparenting, and Household Labor." *Journal of Family Issues* 13 (2) June: 215-233.
- South, Scott J. and Glenna Spitze. 1994. "Housework in Marital and Nonmarital Households." *American Sociological Review* 59 (3), June: 327-347.
- StataCorp. (2003). *Stata Statistical Software: Release 8.0*. College Station, TX: Stata Corporation.
- Sullivan, Oriol. 1997. "The Division of Housework among 'Remarried' Couples." *Journal of Family Issues* 18 (2): 205-224.
- Watson, Nicole., and Wooden, Mark. (2002). *The Household, Income and Labor Dynamics in Australia (HILDA) Survey: Wave 1 Survey Methodology*. HILDA project technical paper series, NO. 1/02, May 2002.
- Weston, R., D. Stanton, L. Qu and G. Soriano. 2001. "Australian Families in Transition: Sociodemographic Trends 1901-2001." *Family Matters* 60: 6-11.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics for variables

<i>Dependent Variable</i>	Men (n=470)		Women (n=660)	
	Mean	(SD)^a	Mean	(SD)^a
T2 housework hours	8.91	(6.6)	24.07	(13.7)
<i>Independent variables</i>				
Marital Status Transition:				
Married T1 & T2	.86		.80	
DeFacto T1 & T2	.05		.08	
DeFacto T1 – Married T2	.04		.03	
Married T1 – Separated T2	.03		.07	
DeFacto T1 – Separated T2	.02		.02	
Employment Status Transition:				
Employed T1 & T2	.87		.54	
Not employed T1 & T2	.03		.20	
Employed T1 - Not employed T2	.04		.12	
Not employed T1 –Employed T2	.06		.14	
Birth transitionT1 – T2:				
No birth	.87		.79	
First birth	.03		.06	
Higher order birth	.04		.13	
Missing	.06		.02	
Controls				
Age (T1)	39.10	(7.9)	38.46	(8.3)
T1 housework hours	8.56	(6.7)	24.43	(14.2)
T1 Number of Children				
Income Gap T1	65.13	(22.5)	34.78	(23.5)
Change in income gap T1 – T2	- 8.74	(38.1)	- 9.07	(31.9)
Missing Income gap (1=yes)	.01		.01	

a Standard Deviations are only reported for continuous measures.

Table 2: The effect of marital, work and birth transitions on housework hours

Variables	T2 Housework Hours (ln)
Main effects	
<i>Primary Independent Variables:</i>	
Married T1 & T2	-
DeFacto T1 & T2	0.14
DeFacto T1 – Married T2	-0.01
Married T1 – Separated T2	0.30*
DeFacto T1 – Separated T2	-0.03
Employed T1 & T2	-
Not employed T1 & T2	0.52*
Employed T1 – Not Employed T2	0.39*
Not Employed T1 – Employed T2	-0.16
No Birth T1- T2	-
First Birth T1- T2	-0.03
Higher Order birth T1- T2	-0.18*
<i>Controls:</i>	
Age	-0.002
Female	0.82**
T1 housework hours	0.04**
T1 Number of Children	-0.02
T1 Gender income gap	-0.001
Change in Gap T1 – T2	0.002*
Interaction effects	
<i>Primary Independent Variables:</i>	
Female x DeFacto T1 & T2	-0.29
Female x DeFacto T1 – Married T2	-0.07
Female x Married T1 – Separated T2	-0.35*
Female x DeFacto T1 – Separated T2	-0.21
Female x Not employed T1 & T2	-0.29
Female x Employed T1 – Not Employed T2	-0.16
Female x Not Employed T1 –Employed T2	0.11
Female x First birth	-0.19
Female x Higher order birth	0.25*
<i>Controls:</i>	
Female x T1 housework hours	-0.03**
Female x T1 Number of Children	0.08**
Female x T1 Gender income gap	-0.002
Female x Change in Gap T1 – T2	-0.004**
N	1130
R-squared	0.55

*p<.05, **p<.01

Table 3: Marginal mean scores on housework hours for marital transitions by gender

	Men		Women	
	Mean (ln) ^a Hours ^b	(SE)	Mean (ln) Hours	(SE)
Married T1 & T2	2.03 6.64	(0.3)	3.11 21.52	(0.3)
Married T1 – Separated T2	2.51 11.32	(0.6)	3.09 20.97	(0.4)
DeFacto T1 – Married T2	2.08 6.98	(0.3)	2.85 16.28	(0.3)
DeFacto T1 & T2	2.15 7.59	(0.3)	2.80 15.52	(0.3)
DeFacto T1 – Separated T2	2.31 9.07	(0.6)	2.52 11.45	(0.5)

a The marginal mean score for logged T2 housework hours.

b The marginal mean score for T2 housework hours: we converted the log transformed mean back to original scale to show actual mean housework hours.

Table 4: Marginal mean scores on housework hours for employment transitions by gender

	Men		Women	
	Coeff (ln) ^a Hours ^b	(SE)	Coeff (ln) Hours	(SE)
Not Employed T1 & T2	2.62 12.79	(0.3)	3.43 29.78	(0.3)
Employed T1 – Not Employed T2	2.42 10.20	(0.3)	3.25 24.86	(0.3)
Not Employed T1 – Employed T2	2.14 7.52	(0.7)	3.05 20.10	(0.3)
Employed T1 & T2	2.02 6.54	(0.3)	2.91 17.29	(0.3)

a The marginal mean score for logged T2 housework hours.

b The marginal mean score for T2 housework hours: we converted the log transformed mean back to original scale to show actual mean housework hours.

Table 5: Marginal mean scores on housework hours for birth transitions by gender

	Men		Women	
	Coeff (ln) ^a Hours ^b	(SE)	Coeff (ln) Hours	(SE)
Higher order birth	1.97 6.16	(0.5)	3.25 24.84	(0.3)
First Birth	2.15 7.61	(0.4)	2.97 18.57	(0.3)
No Birth	2.07 6.89	(0.3)	3.04 19.85	(0.3)

a The marginal mean score for logged T2 housework hours.

b The marginal mean score for T2 housework hours: we converted the log transformed mean back to original scale to show actual mean housework hours.