Comparisons of At-Home and Breadwinner Parents' Time Use: What matters most, gender or jobs?

Noelle Chesley [a]
Sarah Flood [b]

December 2013

Paper prepared for presentation at the Minnesota Population Center Seminar Series, November 4, 2013

Working Paper No. 2013-13
https://doi.org/10.18128/MPC2013-13

[a] Associate Professor, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Department of Sociology, NWQ B Room #7488, 2025 E. Newport Avenue, Milwaukee, WI 53211; chesley@uwm.edu.

[b] Research Associate, University of Minnesota-Twin Cities, Minnesota Population Center, 50 Willey Hall, 225 19th Avenue South, Minneapolis, MN 55455; floo0017@umn.edu.

Comparisons of At-Home and Breadwinner Parents' Time Use:

What matters most, gender or jobs?

ABSTRACT

Explanations for gender difference often focus on relative differences in time and money connected to employment within couples and cultural (e.g. doing gender) arguments to pinpoint the mechanisms that lead to gender-based inequality. However, previous research indicates clear differences in how heterosexual couples allocate time to childcare, housework, and leisure, suggesting that time/money tradeoffs and cultural pressures may operate in different ways across different areas of time use. Further, research points to couples with atypical work/family allocations, like those with a stay-at-home father or breadwinner mother, as drivers of gender similarity or difference in some areas, finding that families with a breadwinner mother and at-home father are the most equal when it comes to childcare time, but the least equal when it comes to housework allocations. However, a rigorous examination of time use in these atypical families has not been conducted drawing on a population sample. We use integrated American Time Use Survey (ATUS) data and seemingly unrelated regression (SUR) analyses to extend previous research focused on pinpointing the mechanisms that underlie gender difference and investigate whether time in childcare, housework, leisure, exercise, and sleep differ among a nationally representative sample of at-home and breadwinner parents to better understand how very unequal employment and care obligations (primary parenting vs. breadwinning) and gender shape these time allocations. Overall, we find that mothers and fathers across employment conditions are more alike than different, suggesting that gender, not jobs, has a stronger influence on time use, even in couples with very unequal paid work commitments.

Comparisons of At-Home and Breadwinner Parents' Time Use:

What matters most, gender or jobs?

Explanations for gender difference often focus on relative differences in time and money connected to employment within couples and cultural (e.g. doing gender) arguments to pinpoint the mechanisms that lead to gender-based inequality (Raley, Bianchi, & Wang, 2012; Sarkisian & Gerstel, 2004). Primary responsibility for household and parenting tasks versus earning within couples is argued to be a micro-level mechanism that produces and reinforces often unequal power dynamics that are linked to more broadly observed gender divisions at the macro level (Davis & Greenstein, 2013). Previous research indicates clear differences in how men and women allocate time to childcare (Raley et al., 2012; Sullivan, 2013), housework (Schneider, 2011; Sullivan, 2011), leisure (M. Bittman & Wajcman, 2000; Mattingly & Sayer, 2006), exercise (Cusatis, 2013; Nomaguchi & Bianchi, 2004) , and sleep (Burgard & Ailshire, 2013; Maume, Sebastian, & Bardo, 2009). The findings suggest that time/money tradeoffs anchored in paid employment and cultural pressures around gender operate in different ways across different areas of time use, with most patterns supporting culturally entrenched gender differences that are unchanged or reinforced by employment responsibilities. However, this research also presents a puzzle in that men and women in couples with gender-atypical work/family allocations, like those with a stay-at-home father or breadwinner mother, are the most equal when it comes to childcare time (Raley et al., 2012), but the least equal when it comes to housework time (Schneider, 2011, although see criticism in Sullivan, 2011). Thus, employment differences within couples matter when it comes to time allocations, but they produce very different outcomes, pulling fathers into greater child care time, but also potentially pulling mothers into greater housework time once they are breadwinners.

While previous studies have recognized these differences in families with very atypical gender-based work/family allocations, there has been little effort to systematically analyze time use in these families. However, increases in the numbers of at-home fathers and breadwinning mothers raises questions about the importance of time/money tradeoffs and gender in "role-reversal" families. Some scholars argue that the very act of role-reversal, in which fathers experience life as primary caregivers to children while mothers are the primary earners, has the potential to lead to behavior and identity changes over time that may reduce gender difference and promote more egalitarian experiences (Chesley, 2011). While this may be in place with respect to involvement in the daily care of children, qualitative studies of at-home father/breadwinner mother households indicate that it can be much more difficult to shift gender-based housework patterns in these families (Chesley, 2011; Latshaw & Hale, 2013; Legerski & Cornwall, 2010). Further, investigations of other areas of time use, like leisure, exercise, and sleep in these families, along with any evidence drawing from population-based sources, is limited.

In this paper, we assess the role that time/money tradeoffs related to employment and cultural mechanisms, like the prescriptive and sanctioning processes associated with "doing" gender, play in influencing time allocations to key family (childcare, housework) and personal (leisure, sleep, exercise) activities using data from the American Time Use Survey (ATUS). We address a gap in knowledge, building on previous qualitative research, by investigating whether and how very unequal employment responsibilities and gender might operate at the population level in families with at-home fathers and breadwinner mothers. We also extend previous research on the gender-based division of labor with respect to childcare and housework by comparing the experiences of men and women in identical employment positions (at home parent, breadwinner) across gender. While we cannot observe gender mechanisms directly using these data, we can augment recent qualitative work that identifies gender-based identity

formation and social sanctioning processes around paid and unpaid work to assess whether parents that share the same gender, but differ substantially in their own employment commitments, are more similar than we might expect given differences in time availability and relative earnings, or whether similar employment (and earning) statuses for individuals and their spouses mean that breadwinner mothers and fathers are more alike in their time allocations. What matters most in at-home parent/breadwinner families: gender or jobs?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Time and Money Differences in Couples

Bargaining (Becker, 1981; Lundberg & Pollak, 1996) and exchange (Brines, 1994; Greenstein, 2000) theories posit that relative differences in earnings in couple households influence allocations to paid and unpaid labor. In particular, these models predict that individuals in couples with higher earning potential will devote more time to employment, and less time to unpaid household work, while individuals with lower earning potential will devote more time to unpaid work and less time to paid market work. Bargaining/exchange theories link time allocations and gender inequality, in part, because Becker (1981) argued that women had a comparative advantage in childcare because they bear children. This comparative advantage leads women to specialize in unpaid household work, while men specialize in paid employment. However, women's increasing labor force participation, particularly among mothers of young children, along with the availability of substitutes (paid caregivers, baby formula), technologies that support breastfeeding for working mothers, and gender gaps in education that favor women, weaken Becker's claims that men will always have a comparative advantage in market work. Overall, while there is some support for the role that bargaining plays in time allocations to paid and unpaid work, there is also evidence that gender gaps in time use persist—even in contexts where bargaining/exchange models suggest they should not. We know, for example, that fathers do more childcare the more their wives work (Connelly & Kimmel, 2009; Raley et al.,

2012), consistent with expectations in bargaining/exchange. However, there is also evidence that breadwinner mothers do more housework than their spouses (Schneider, 2011), which is not what bargaining/exchange models would predict. Thus, other explanations for differences in time allocations to paid and unpaid work have to be developed. Many of these are rooted in social arguments about gender.

Doing and Undoing Gender

The primary social theory explaining how cultural mechanisms create gender difference is the "doing gender" theoretical perspective (Deutsch, 2007; West & Zimmerman, 1987; West & Zimmerman, 2009). This perspective links the physiological differences of sex to social interactions that construct gender. Individuals continuously construct gender, and gender differences, by engaging in activities and displays that are accepted by others in their social group as masculine or feminine, as well as appropriate for a particular race/ethnicity and class. Further, as West and Zimmerman (1987; 2009) emphasize, individuals are accountable to others for gender-based behavior. Thus, when one engages in activities that others see as non-normative for one's sex category, such as when men engage in full-time parenting in lieu of employment, this can disrupt subsequent social interactions and lead to conflict or social sanctions in ways that reinforce gender difference. West and Zimmerman also emphasize the connection between gender difference and inequality by arguing that gender differences matter because these differences become linked to power and resource differentials, such as the wage structure, that vary significantly by the gender of the worker. Indeed, family scholars have long been interested in how gendered patterns in work/family responsibilities create or maintain power and resources differentials in heterosexual couples that undergird more broadly distributed forms of gender inequality in society (Davis & Greenstein, 2013; Tichenor, 1999).

While the doing gender perspective has largely been used to understand how gender differences can remain entrenched over time, some scholars have argued that the logic of "doing" gender can also be used to explain diminishing gender differences or inequality (Deutsch, 2007; Risman, 2009). This theoretical work has emphasized that the same two mechanisms that support gender inequality (social accountability processes and links between gender difference and power/resource differentials) can also dismantle it. However, periods of rapid economic or social change likely undergird either mechanism. Events such as large economic shifts (like severe recessions) or social movements (like the women's movement) can disrupt the ability of many individuals to enact "appropriate" gender displays (Legerski & Cornwall, 2010). This creates conditions whereby many individuals are simultaneously and consistently unable to behave in gender-normative ways, disrupting the sanctioning processes that previously enforced differences. In addition, rapid economic or social changes may diminish as well as strengthen links between gender differences and power and resource differentials. Thus, even if social accountability processes remain unaffected during these periods, structural conditions may alter the power or resource returns that accrue in ways that favor greater, rather than less, gender equality. For example, claims that the Great Recession weakened men's labor force attachment while simultaneously strengthening women's attachment (Smith, 2012) suggest a potential for work/family change that could favor greater gender equality (Bouchey, 2009). The overall theoretical argument is that rapid, large-scale shifts in the economy or society create opportunities to undermine, as well as reinforce, gender disparities via these two mechanisms. It is possible to undo, as well as do, gender.

At-Home Fathers, Breadwinner Mothers, and Undoing Gender

Dual-earner families replaced breadwinner father/at-home mother families as the dominant married couple family form during the second half of the 20th Century with over half of married couples in arrangements where both husband and wife are employed (Jacobs &

Gerson, 2001). Although most married-couple families adopt a dual-earner structure, families with a primary breadwinner or caregiver have not disappeared. Among heterosexual married couple families with children under 18, 29.5 percent of families contained an employed father and a non-employed mother while 4.1 percent contained an employed mother and a non-employed father in 2012 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). While dual-earner couples continue to be the normative family structure among couples with children, breadwinner father families are the second most prevalent family form, with very few married couple families adopting a female breadwinner/at-home father household structure (although some evidence suggests the Census Bureau may undercount at-home fathers, see Latshaw, 2011). Research also suggests that families with at-home fathers and breadwinner mothers are becoming more prevalent over time, while the proportion of families with at-home mothers and breadwinner fathers has stayed constant, particularly over the past few decades (Kramer, Kelly, & McColloch, 2013).

Evidence that adoption of an at-home father/ breadwinner mother family arrangements dismantles gendered work/family attitudes or behavior is mixed. For example, qualitative studies drawing on small, non-representative samples in Canada (Doucet, 2006) and various regions of the U.S. including the east coast (Harrington, Van Deusen, & Mazar, 2012; Latshaw & Hale, 2013) and midwest (Chesley, 2011) or U.S. generally (Rochlen, Suizzo, McKelly, & Scaringi, 2008b) all point to findings that are indicative of greater gender equality. For example, Doucet (2006) describes how the fathers she studied come to recognize both the challenge and value of providing intensive family care work and how this can transform their commitment to women to better share both work and family responsibilities. She describes changes in women, as well, as they broaden their notion of femininity to include more masculine elements (like supporting a family) and as they shift their ideas about what good parenting looks like to incorporate men's approaches. Chesley (2011), drawing on a sample of at-home father/breadwinner mother couples living in the Midwest finds similar patterns in that at-home men's greater involvement in

parenting is transformative in terms of valuing caregiving, even after some men return to the workforce. Like Doucet (2006), Chesley (2011) finds that women, too, show hints of changing their approach to work in ways that should increase their commitment to employment and finds, like Harrington and colleagues (2012), that at-home men's support provides real career benefits to breadwinner mothers by enhancing their ability to work longer hours, travel for work, or simply be at work without worries about what is happening with their children. As a whole, these qualitative studies suggest that they very act of being in at-home father/breadwinner mother arrangements, even when not actively chosen or preferred, can shift both men's and women's attitudes and behavior in ways that favor greater gender equality.

However, most of these studies also document evidence that speaks to the entrenched nature of gender and its role in shaping work/family allocations and outcomes. For example, Chesley (2011) finds that feelings of jealousy and guilt, particularly about father's increased time with children, are prevalent among the Breadwinner women she studied, and may very well limit women's ability to fully support their husband's efforts as primary parents. Harrington and colleagues (2012) document similar patterns in their sample, all of which point to the influence that intensive parenting pressures, or the social pressure to spend a lot of time and money investing and caring for one's children (Hays, 1996) may play in these families, particularly for mothers. Similarly, many qualitative or non-representative studies document the pressures and sanctioning processes that at-home men can experience as they buck social norms that dictate that men should be financial providers for their families (Chesley, 2011; Doucet, 2006; Harrington et al., 2012; Rochlen, McKelley, Suizzo, & Scaringi, 2008a; Rochlen et al., 2008b).

Many of these studies also point to challenges around housework. While both Harrington and colleagues (2012) and Chesley (2011) find that men's participation in and responsibility for housework increases after the transition to at-home fatherhood, Chesley (2011) finds much greater variation in just how much more at-home fathers do than do Harrington and colleagues

(2012) who find generally large increases in at-home father's housework involvement. Indeed, most of the studies here document breadwinner mother's dissatisfaction with housework with respect to how much at-home fathers do, what they do, their ability or willingness to initiate housework tasks and the quality with which they complete housework tasks. This may be why Latshaw and Hale (2013) find evidence that at-home men surrender both childcare and housework responsibilities to their wives upon their return from work and on weekends, raising doubts about men's willingness or ability to manage the full range of household tasks that have traditionally been the purview of at-home mothers. Overall, then, the limited research base to date has not determined whether adopting gender atypical work/family arrangements generally leads to concrete changes in gendered attitudes or behavior that might be expected to reduce gender inequality. Further, much of what we know about gendered patterns in work/family allocations in these families has been drawn from small, idiosyncratic samples that may not fully represent the population of at-home fathers and breadwinner mothers.

Parents and Time in Housework, Childcare, and Leisure

Previous research on time spent in housework (e.g. Michael Bittman, England, Folbre, Sayer, & Matheson, 2003 ; Brines, 1994; Greenstein, 2000; Schneider, 2011), childcare (e.g. Connelly & Kimmel, 2009; Raley et al., 2012), and leisure (M. Bittman & Wajcman, 2000; Mattingly & Bianchi, 2003) has clearly documented gendered patterns in how men and women use their time. With respect to parent's time in housework, we know that: 1) mothers spend more time on a range of housework tasks than fathers; 2) that fathers' time on housework has been increasing steadily since 1965; 3) that as mothers work more, they report spending less time on housework tasks; and 4) unemployed mothers do more housework than any other parent group (Bianchi, Robinson, & Milkie, 2007). There is also evidence that mothers find housework more meaningful than fathers (Wang, 2013).

However, studies focused on how relative earnings in heterosexual married couples (with and without children) shape time in housework show two distinct trends relevant to study of at-home and breadwinner parents. First, among men with very low earnings (Schneider, 2011; Sullivan, 2011), some studies find that *lower* relative earnings in a couple leads men to do *less* housework (Brines, 1994; Greenstein, 2000, although see null findings in Bittman, 2003 and Schneider, 2011), even though women with lower relative earnings tend to do more housework. Second, some studies find a curvilinear relationship between a couple's relative earnings and housework time for women in that, while more earnings leads to less housework up to a point, once a woman is a primary breadwinner, she does more housework, in spite of higher relative earnings (Schneider, 2011, although see null findings in Gupta 2007 and discussion in Sullivan, 2011). A handful of qualitative studies focused on at-home fathers or breadwinner mothers support these findings from time use research (Doucet, 2006; Latshaw & Hale, 2013; Legerski & Cornwall, 2010) and point to patterns that suggest that parents' gender plays a strong role in time allocations to housework in couples with atypical work/family structures. This body of work generally supports the "gender deviance neutralization hypothesis" (Brines, 1994; Greenstein, 2000; Raley et al., 2012; Schneider, 2011), in which it is assumed that once women violate norms of male superiority in terms of work hours or earnings, they do more housework to compensate. Taken as a whole, past research suggests the following hypotheses:

H1: At-home mothers will report more time on housework tasks than any other parent group (Breadwinner mothers, fathers, or at-home fathers)

H2: Breadwinner mothers will spend more time on housework than at-home fathers

H3: Breadwinner fathers will report less time on housework tasks than any other parent group

Turning to parents' time in childcare, previous research demonstrates that: 1) mothers generally spend more time on childcare activities than fathers; 2) fathers' time in childcare has been increasing over time; and 3) non-employed mothers spend more time with their children than employed mothers (Bianchi et al., 2007; Raley et al., 2012). There is also evidence that parents find childcare to be one of the most meaningful activities they engage in (Wang, 2013). Recent findings drawn from an analysis of the 2003-7 ATUS focused on dual-earner parents (Raley et al., 2012) shows that fathers' time with children is a function of his and his wife's employment. Fathers do less child care when employed and when they work more hours, but solo time with children goes up when their wives work. Thus, breadwinning fathers should be spending less time on childcare than at-home fathers. Mothers' employment also shapes time with children. The more mothers work, the less time they spend with children; as with fathers, we should expect that breadwinner mothers will spend less time on childcare than at-home mothers. Looking at comparisons across gender and the role of own and spousal employment on childcare time, previous research would clearly indicate that at-home mothers do substantially more childcare than breadwinner fathers.

It is trickier to predict differences in childcare time comparing at-home fathers and breadwinning mothers. While women's time with children is reduced by employment, Raley and colleagues' (2012) work also shows that it is shaped by absolute earnings; all else equal, women with higher absolute earnings spend more time with their children. Further, work by Connley and Kimmel (2009) suggests that women's time with children is unresponsive to relative differences in a couples' work hours or earnings. Finally, qualitative work by Chesley (2011) focused on at-home fathers and their breadwinner wives, finds that while at-home fathers increase their involvement with children while their wives work, their wives do not necessarily reduce their time with children in response, a finding that is reinforced by Raley and colleagues (2012), who note that ratios of fathers' to mothers' childcare time in their data show that the

most equal allocations are in at-home father/breadwinner mother families. Given this background, we test the following hypotheses with respect to atypical work/family arrangements and time in child care:

H4: Breadwinner fathers will spend less time on child care tasks, or with children, than either at-home mothers/fathers or breadwinner mothers

H5: At-home mothers will spend more time with children, and on child care tasks, than breadwinner parents

H6: There will be no difference in childcare time or overall time with children among at-home fathers and breadwinner mothers

While less attention has been paid to gender differences in leisure time in at-home/breadwinner families, there is evidence of a clear gendered pattern in overall leisure and time for sleep and exercise; time in these activities is also influenced by own and spousal employment. Among parents, fathers report more total leisure time than mothers (Bianchi et al., 2007). There is also evidence of a gender gap in exercise that favors men (Cusatis, 2013) and fathers (Bianchi et al., 2007; Nomaguchi & Bianchi, 2004). Nomaguchi and Bianchi (2004) draw on 2000 National Health Interview Survey (NHIS) data to investigate how work/family characteristics and gender shape exercise time. Parenting young children and long hours of employment both contribute to less time spent in exercise. In general, however, their findings point to the expectation that fathers will spend more time in exercise than similarly situated mothers. While Bianchi and colleagues find no differences in overall sleep time between married mothers and fathers (Bianchi et al., 2007), Burgard (2013) analyzes the ATUS and finds that, after controlling for work and family characteristics, women generally sleep a bit more than men. However, working mothers are more than twice as likely as working fathers to interrupt their sleep to do caregiving work net of socio-demographic characteristics including resources such

as education, income, and work hours relative to spouses (Burgard, 2011). Other work drawing on a non-representative sample also finds that caregiving responsibilities shape a gender gap is sleep that favors fathers (Maume et al., 2009). When it comes to sleep, we would expect that, comparing mothers and fathers in similar structural positions (at-home vs. breadwinner), any observed gender differences should favor women, since caregiving responsibilities seem important in shaping sleep time. Based limited previous research, we posit:

H7: At-home and breadwinner fathers will report more leisure time than at-home and breadwinner mothers

H8: At-home and breadwinner fathers will report more exercise time than at-home and breadwinner mothers

H9: At-home parents will report less time in sleep than breadwinner parents

Overall, previous theory and research underscore the potential for both gender and own and spousal employment to shape time allocations in housework, childcare, and leisure activities. To the extent that variation in couples' employment is important, we might expect to see more clear evidence of the influence of employment if we focus on individuals who are in couples with large employment differences, like households with clear breadwinners or at-home parents. Indeed, previous research finds the biggest contrast in both childcare and housework time in these families. We build and extend this previous work by comparing similarly situated individuals (at-home or breadwinner parents) across a greater range of activities to better examine role that employment and gender play in shaping time allocations.

METHOD

Data

We use integrated American Time Use Survey (ATUS) data for our analyses (Hofforth, Flood, & Sobek, 2013). The ATUS is a time diary study of a nationally representative sample of Americans. ATUS data are collected using a computer assisted telephone interview (CATI), and the respondents report the activities they engaged in over a 24-hour period from 4:00 a.m. of a specified day until 4:00 a.m. of the following day, as well as where, when, and with whom activities were done. Data are collected all days of the week, and weekends are oversampled. Sample weights correct for the survey design such that aggregating across different days of the week results in a representative picture of average time use among the population. Our results are based on pooled cross-sections from 2008 to 2012. We limit our sample to these years to incorporate a key measure of disability that is only available for ATUS respondents beginning in 2008.

ATUS sample members are invited to complete the survey following exit from the Current Population Survey (CPS). The CPS is a household survey of the civilian, noninstitutionalized population. One individual aged 15 or older per former CPS participating household was randomly selected to report their activities over one 24 hour period as part of the ATUS during the two to five months following their exit from the CPS. ATUS response rates were over 50% for each of the survey years (Bureau of Labor Statistics and U.S. Census Bureau 2011). Fatigue is the most common reason for ATUS nonresponse, which is a result of using CPS as the sampling frame (O'Neill & Sincavage, 2004). Nonresponse bias in the ATUS is not problematic except in the case of volunteering in which estimates are inflated because volunteers are more likely to respond to the survey (Abraham, Helms, & Presser, 2009).

The 2008 to 2012 ATUS data include daily diary entries of a nationally representative sample of 64,038 civilians age 15 and older. Though the data may not typify any one respondent's daily activities, aggregations of the data are representative of the American population. The availability of a spouse/respondent disability measure, which is an important control in our analysis, beginning with August 2008 reduces our sample to 55,525. We then restrict our sample to heterosexual married respondents with a spouse and one (or more) child(ren) under 18 in the household (N=15,136) at the time of the ATUS interview and who do not have missing data on family income and respondent/spouse difficulty (both described below) yielding a sample of 14,481. Our focus on at-home and breadwinner parents based on usual hours worked (see *Family definition*) excludes couples without an earner (N=337), dual-earner couples (N=7,428), and couples where one or both members' usual work hours vary (N=2,162). Our final sample of respondents in either a breadwinner or at-home work/family arrangement with a co-resident child under 18 yields a final sample of 4,554.

Measures

Family definition. All respondents in our sample are in a couple where at least one member usually works for pay. We distinguish between respondents who are at-home parents and breadwinner members of a couple. Our definition is based on both the respondent's and his/her spouse's usual hours worked per week. A respondent is classified as "at home" if he/she 1) does not work for pay, or 2) works 25% or fewer hours than his/her spouse. A "breadwinner" works for pay and is either 1) the spouse of a person who does not work for pay, or 2) one who works four or more times as much as his/her spouse. For example, if an ATUS respondent typically works 30 hours per week and her spouse usually works 5 hours per week, the ATUS respondent would be coded as a "breadwinner mother" and her spouse would be coded as an "at-home father." The 2,162 couples in which either the respondent's or spouse's usual hours of work varied were excluded from the analysis.

The relative usual hours worked definition (definition 5 in Appendix A) we employ is consistent with our goal to identify couples in which involvement in paid work is very unequal. Under the relative hours definition, 6.15% of the sample is in a stay at-home father household and 34.88% is in a stay at-home mother household (see Appendix A). The relative hours definition is largely consistent with the more restrictive no work and less precise part-time work definitions. For reference we compare our at-home/breadwinner definition to definitions based on a combination of both usual hours worked and income during the previous year (100% income and >50% income definitions in Appendix A) from the CPS (Kramer & McCulloch, 2010). Our estimates of at-home mothers and fathers are higher than the 100% income definition from the CPS because that definition requires that the non-working member of the couple not earn any income during the past year while the relative hours definition we employ (#5) considers usual hours worked per week. Both quantitative (Latshaw, 2011) and qualitative (Chesley, 2011; Doucet, 2006) studies of at-home fathers suggest that excluding men with any part-time work undercounts the number of men who are legitimately thought of as fathers with primary care responsibilities relative to their wives. Unfortunately, income data in the ATUS are limited and we are unable to replicate the 100% income and >50% income definitions used by Kramer and McCulloch (2010).

Dependent variables. We analyze four sets of dependent variables: housework, childcare, leisure, and health behaviors. We distinguish between three types of housework—female-typed, male-typed, and gender-neutral (see Kroska, 2003). Female-typed household activities are routine and are done almost daily whereas male-typed household tasks are irregular and done less frequently (Berk, 1985). Female-typed housework includes activities such as interior cleaning, laundry, and meal preparation (see Appendix B for a detailed list of codes). We classify activities such as home maintenance, yard work, and vehicle repair as

male-typed housework. Gender-neutral activities include caring for animals, household management, and organizational activities.

Primary childcare activities include playing with children, physical care of children, and other childcare-related activities such as education, transportation, and doctor's visits (see Appendix B). We also analyze time spent in secondary childcare and time spent with children in non-childcare activities. Secondary childcare information is collected by asking all respondents with a co-resident child under 13 at the end of the interview whether they were caring for a child while doing the primary activities reported. Time spent with children uses information about who the respondent was with during each activity and sums the time allocated to activities when an own household child under age 18 was with the respondent.

Our leisure dependent variables include television watching and other leisure (including eating). Television watching includes television or movies. Other leisure includes eating and drinking as well as socializing with others, playing games, reading, and attending social events (see Appendix B for detailed activities). We also examine time in exercise and sleep. Exercise consists of participation in sports and exercise and walking or biking as a mode of transportation. For all activities reported, respondents were asked where the activity was done or about the form of transportation; we draw on the mode of transportation characteristic of the activity to include in our exercise variable time spent walking or biking. Sleep includes sleeping as well as napping but does not include episodes of sleeplessness.

Independent variables. We include couple-level measures of age, education, and race. Age is the difference between the husband's age and the wife's age in years. Education categories include both have a college degree (reference), neither have a college degree, wife has a college degree but husband does not, and husband has a college degree but wife does not. Race is coded as both white (reference), both non-white, and mixed race couple. We also

control for the husband's and wife's usual work hours. For at-home parents with no employment, we control for employment intentions. We consider respondents and spouses as intending to find work under the following conditions: 1) those who are non-working and are looking for work; 2) those who are currently not working but who intend to look for work during the next year; 3) those who are currently unemployed. Because previous research indicates that disability status may be an important factor shaping at-home fathers' unemployment (Kramer et al., 2013), we incorporate two dichotomous variables (one each for the respondent and spouse) indicating the presence of difficulties in personal care, vision, hearing, mobility, walking/climbing stairs, and remembering. We also control for family income distinguishing between <$25,000, $25,000-$49,999, $50,000-$74,999, and >$75,000 (reference). We include controls for the age of the youngest household child under 18 and the number of co-resident children under 18. Additional covariates include whether the respondent reported about a weekend (reference) or weekday and the year of data collection where 2008 is the reference. Tables 1 and 2 contain the means for all of the measures used in this analysis by whether the ATUS respondent is an at-home or breadwinner mother or father.

Analytic Strategy

The often large number of zeros in time diary data along with the fact that time spent in one activity (like housework) is not independent of time spent in another (like paid work) has led to disagreement about the appropriate modeling strategy for time diary data. In terms of inflated numbers of zeros, there is evidence that OLS models produce less biased estimates than Tobit models (Stewart, 2009), even if the models produce qualitatively similar results (Foster & Kalenkoski, 2013). As a result, many contemporary studies successfully employ OLS regression to model time spent in specific activities, like childcare (e.g.Raley et al., 2012). However, the dependencies across activities in a day suggest that the assumption of uncorrelated error terms necessary to perform a series of OLS regressions may be violated when time across different

activities is examined. Indeed, tests of correlated error terms in these data indicate that this assumption is not met here.

To address this problem, we employ Seemingly Unrelated Regression (SUR). SUR allows us to simultaneously estimate a set of linear equations while relaxing the assumption of independent error terms. This approach has been used successfully in other time use studies that estimate multiple models of time spent on a series of related activities (Hook, 2004). Thus, we use SUR models to estimate time allocated to housework, childcare, leisure, exercise, and sleep, using STATA 12.1 (sureg). Our focus is on comparisons by gender and work/family arrangements net of couple-level and diary day characteristics. We estimate six models for each dependent variable. We focus on gender differences by comparing 1) at-home men and women, and 2) breadwinner men and women. We focus on work/family arrangement effects by examining: 3) at-home versus breadwinner women, and 4) at-home versus breadwinner men; and the combination of gender *and* work/family arrangement by contrasting 5) at-home women and breadwinner men, and 6) at-home men and breadwinner women.

RESULTS

Table 1 documents descriptive statistics for the sample by household type. Men are, on average, about two years older than their wives in breadwinner father families (the age difference in at-home mother families is 2.7 years). Men are almost four years older than their wives in at-home father families (this difference is closer to three years in breadwinner mother households). In just over a quarter of couples, both couple members have college degrees except in stay-at-home father or breadwinner mother households, where a greater share of couples contain mothers with a college degree and fathers without a college degree. Further, the proportion of couples in which neither has a college degree is higher in both at-home father and breadwinner mother households than in others. The majority of couple members are both white across households, however, there are slightly fewer white couples and slightly more non-

white and mixed-race couples in stay-at-home father and breadwinner mother households. Indeed, the majority of couples in at-home father arrangements have one or more couple members that is non-white or of mixed race.

[Table 1 About Here]

In terms of work hours, breadwinner fathers work the highest number of weekly hours (46) followed by breadwinner mothers (38). Since our definition of at-home parents allows for some part-time work, we find that at-home mothers work, on average, a bit more than at-home fathers, but involvement in regular paid work is quite limited for both sets of at-home parents. Among at-home parents, both mothers and fathers work less than an hour a week if we include all parents, and less than 10 hours per week (mothers work 7.7 hours while fathers work 7.2 hours) if we look only at employed at-home parents (not shown). Among those at-home parents with no work involvement, twice as many at-home fathers (56%) report that they are looking or intend to find work compared to 25% of at-home mothers. Similarly, higher proportions of breadwinner mothers are married to spouses who say they are looking or intend to find work (27%) than breadwinner fathers (just 15% of their spouses indicate this work intention). In addition, greater proportions of at-home fathers (32%) were in the labor force in the preceeding two-to-five month period, compared with just 13% of at-home mothers (not shown).

It is also clear that at-home fathers have much higher rates of physical or cognitive health disability, as measured by difficulty performing activities of daily living (ADL). Among at-home fathers, 17% have ADL difficulty compared with 4% of at-home mothers. These patterns are replicated in breadwinner households in that 8% of breadwinner women have a spouse with ADL difficulty while just 3% of breadwinner fathers are married to spouse with these difficulties. Very few breadwinner parents (1.9 mothers, 1.6 fathers) have any ADL difficulty. It is also clear that incomes vary by household type. Smaller proportions of both at-home father and

breadwinner mother families report family incomes of $75,000 or higher (27% and 29%, respectively) compared with at-home mother (37%) and breadwinner father (39%) families. At-home father and breadwinner mother households have fewer children in the home than at-home mother and breadwinner father households (1.8 vs. 2.1) and the children in at-home father and breadwinner mother households tend to be older, on average, than those in at-home mother and breadwinner father households (7.5 vs. 5.6). Overall, the patterns in Table 1 indicate that households with an at-home father or breadwinner mother have very different demographic profiles when compared with households that contain an at-home mother or breadwinner father.

Table 2 lists the mean minutes spent in various activities by family type. We document large differences in time spent on housework that are patterned by gender and household structure. Comparing at-home parents, mothers spend about twice as much time engaged in female-typed housework than fathers and fathers spend more than three times as much time engaged in male-typed housework than mothers. Time spent in gender neutral housework tasks is about equal among at-home parents. Overall, at-home mothers spend more time engaged in housework tasks than at-home fathers. These patterns are also present when comparing breadwinner parents. Breadwinner mothers spend more than three times as much time engaged in female typed housework tasks than breadwinner fathers. As we saw for at-home parents, breadwinner fathers spend more than three times as much time as mothers engaged in male-typed housework tasks. Breadwinner mothers do spend more time on gender neutral tasks than fathers, but the absolute differences in time are not dramatic (about six minutes more). However, overall, breadwinner mothers spend much more time engaged in housework than breadwinner fathers. In general, the descriptive time use patterns support hypotheses 1 and 3. It appears that at-home mothers report the most housework time (H1), while breadwinner fathers report the least housework time (H3). However, the descriptive data do not identify

differences in housework time when at-home fathers and breadwinner mothers are compared, contrary to hypothesis 2.

[Table 2 about here]

With respect to childcare, at-home mothers spend significantly more time engaged in play and children's physical care than at-home fathers. They also spend significantly more time in secondary childcare and in overall time with their children than at-home fathers. Although estimates of at-home mothers' time in educational and other activities is larger than at-home fathers', this difference is not statistically significant. When we compare breadwinner parents, mothers spend more time on childcare activities than fathers with the exception of playing with household children. However, there is no difference in the time breadwinner parents spend in secondary childcare, or overall time with children. Based on the descriptive patterns, it does appear that breadwinner fathers report the lowest childcare time (H4) and it also appears that at-home mothers spend more time caring for children than breadwinner mothers (H5). Contrary to hypothesis 6, descriptive patterns suggest that at-home fathers spend more time playing with children, performing secondary childcare, and just being with children compared to breadwinner mothers, though differences in physical care and education are not significant.

Turning to leisure time, at-home fathers spend significantly more time watching TV than at-home mothers; however there are no discernible differences in non-TV leisure time among at-home parents. Among breadwinner parents, fathers also spend more time watching TV than mothers; they also have more non-TV leisure time than breadwinner mothers. Thus we see partial support here for our hypothesis that fathers will have more leisure time than mothers (H7). In terms of time for exercise, at-home parents and breadwinner fathers all spend more time in exercise than breadwinner mothers, patterns that support hypothesis 8. Finally, when it

comes to sleep, at-home parents get more sleep than breadwinner parents, contrary to the expectation outlined in hypothesis 9.

Table 3 reports key coefficients and standard errors from SUR regression models (full model results are in Appendices C1-C6). Beginning with models of time spent on housework, the patterns exhibited in mean daily times in Table 2 hold in the regression results and underscore that the division of housework remains highly gendered, regardless of the very extreme differences in employment in respondents' families. Regardless of work/family structure, mothers do more female-typed housework than fathers, and fathers do more male-typed housework than mothers. For example, at-home mothers spend almost an hour and a half more per day (B = 94.8***) engaged in female-typed housework than at home fathers. They also spend about forty-five minutes less per day engaged in male-typed housework than at-home fathers (B = -47.2***), with no significant differences in time spent in gender neutral housework tasks (B = 0.05 n.s.). These patterns are similar when breadwinners are compared, although breadwinner mothers appear to spend about six minutes more on gender neutral housework tasks (B = 5.9**) when compared with breadwinner fathers. The next set of comparisons allows us to compare the experiences of parents in gender atypical and gender traditional families. The housework trends in both types of families are very similar, with mothers doing a lot more housework overall (despite fathers' time in male-typed activities), and breadwinner mothers doing more gender-neutral housework than at-home fathers. The last set of comparisons holds gender constant, and varies employment, by contrasting the housework time of different mothers and fathers. There are no differences in time spent in female- or male-typed housework among mothers, in spite of very different levels of employment. Further, breadwinner mothers do about twenty-seven more minutes gender-neutral housework (B = 26.8**) in a typical day than at-home mothers. There are no differences in housework time when at-home and breadwinner fathers are compared. Thus, the multivariate results do not support the expectation

that at-home mothers do more housework than all other parents (H1), nor do they support the expectation that breadwinner fathers do the least housework (H3). However, we do find general support for the expectation that breadwinner mothers do more housework than at-home fathers (H2).

[Table 3 About Here]

Turning to time in childcare, we find that at-home mothers spend significantly more time engaged in physical care of children than at-home fathers (about fifteen minutes per day; B = 15.32***). At-home mothers also spend significantly more time engaged in secondary childcare (B = 51.7***) and with their children overall (B = 69.28***) than at-home fathers when a range of demographic and other characteristics are controlled. Comparing breadwinner parents, breadwinner mothers spend more time than fathers on all childcare activities except play (B = -8.59**). While breadwinner mothers spend more time in secondary care activities (B = 49.34***), there are no differences in the overall time spent with children among breadwinner parents (B = 9.90 n.s.). In general, these patterns illustrate that gender processes shaping time in childcare are present, since comparisons are being made across individuals of different genders in similar work/family arrangements. Similarly, comparisons within gender, but across employment conditions, show that there are no differences in child care time when at-home and breadwinner mothers are compared. However, at-home fathers appear to spend almost half an hour more per day engaged in education and other tasks (B = 29.19**) than breadwinner fathers. We also see that, breadwinner mothers and at-home fathers are equally engaged in childcare (there are no statistically detectable differences in their time in these different areas, a pattern which supports hypothesis 6), whereas at-home mothers spend more time on all childcare tasks compared with breadwinner fathers with the exception of play (B = -7.36 n.s.). These comparisons suggest that breadwinner fathers probably do the least amount of childcare, providing support for hypothesis 4. However, there are no significant differences in at-home

versus breadwinner mothers' time in childcare, contrary to the expectation in hypothesis 5. Overall, gender atypical work/family arrangements are associated with the most equal childcare allocations across parents. However, the congruence across at-home and breadwinning mothers also provides strong evidence that gender processes shape time with children. Among at-home and breadwinning mothers, jobs do not matter when it comes to childcare time, but they do matter when it comes to shaping fathers' time in childcare.

The regression results also demonstrate that mothers generally have less leisure than fathers, although the differences are most pronounced for breadwinner mothers. For example, at-home fathers watch about 68 minutes more TV daily than at-home mothers (B = -68.32***) However, at-home parents have similar levels of non-TV leisure (B = 1.92 n.s.), In addition, breadwinner fathers have more TV (B = -31.89***) and non-TV(B = -25.43***) leisure than breadwinner mothers. Thus, breadwinner mothers are the real losers when it comes to leisure time. As a whole, the patterns here provide partial support for the expectation that fathers have more leisure time than mothers (H7). Similar patterns are present for exercise. At-home fathers spend about eight minutes more in exercise (B = -7.57) than breadwinner mothers and breadwinner fathers spend about thirteen minutes more in exercise (B = -13.11) than breadwinner mothers. Both of these patterns are consistent with the expectation that fathers generally have more time for exercise than mothers (H8). Finally, when it comes to time in sleep, at-home fathers sleep about an hour less per night than breadwinner fathers (B = -60.56**) . It also appears that at-home mothers sleep less than breadwinner fathers (B = 24.77+) although this result is not significant at conventional levels. Thus, we find partial support for the idea that at-home parents sleep less than breadwinning parents (H9).

DISCUSSION

So, what does matter most for time allocations to housework, childcare, and leisure in at-home/breadwinner families: gender or jobs? Admittedly, setting up our research question this

way creates too stark a contrast, because, of course, the answer is both gender and employment shape time use. However, our findings point to places, namely childcare, where changes in work/family roles—like more women breadwinners and at-home fathers—may indeed be providing the structural conditions that minimize gender difference in some areas of family life. Patterns in reported sleep also suggest that parents with primary caregiving responsibilities—whether mothers or fathers—may be at risk for less sleep. Our findings also point to places--like housework, leisure, and exercise--where gender processes that support difference appear to be much more entrenched—in spite of gender-atypical work/family arrangements.

Time spent in a range of child care tasks is one place that appears to be in flux, particularly in families with an at-home father or breadwinner mother. Our comparisons of at-home parents (mothers vs. fathers) documents clear differences between them. At-home mothers spend more time in physical care than at-home fathers and almost an hour more per day in secondary care and in overall time with their children than at-home fathers after controlling for differences in numbers and ages of children, their own part-time employment and the work hours of their spouse, and health differences across at-home parents among other factors; thus, it is not differences in family size, work hours, or heath that drive these patterns. Similarly, comparisons of breadwinner parents illustrate that breadwinner mothers do more physical care and spend more time on education and other activities than breadwinner fathers. Breadwinner mothers also spend more time in secondary care activities, while breadwinner fathers spend more time playing with their children. When we compare at-home and breadwinner mothers, we see no differences in childcare time. Regardless of having very different paid work commitments, both types of mothers look exactly the same when it comes to time spent caring for children. Overall, then, these findings are consistent with past research

documenting gendered parenting behavior, and suggest that time in childcare is about gender, not jobs.

However, how similar or different mothers' and fathers' time allocations to childcare are depends on the gender of the primary caregiver. For example, if we compare the childcare time allocations of at-home fathers and breadwinner mothers, what we see is no difference in childcare time in any of the categories we studied. While the individuals in our ATUS sample are not married to one another, the breadwinner women in our sample are likely married to men *like* the at-home men we study, and these patterns suggest that time spent caring for children is relatively equal among at-home fathers and their spouses. Contrast this with comparisons of at-home mothers and breadwinner fathers. Here, at-home mothers provide more care than breadwinner fathers in all areas except play. Further, at-home fathers are spending more time on education and other tasks, and perhaps in secondary care activities ($p<.10$) than breadwinner fathers even if breadwinner mothers still engage in childcare at levels similar to at-home mothers. Thus, involvement in gender atypical work/family arrangements is linked to differences in *fathers'* involvement with children; fathers who work less do more childcare and engage in different areas of care, than fathers who work more. Jobs matter, but only for fathers.

Overall, these patterns support earlier research (Chesley, 2011; Connelly & Kimmel, 2009; Doucet, 2006; Raley et al., 2012) which suggests that fathers respond to women's greater labor force participation by spending more time caring for their children (particularly in at-home father families where providing parental care is often a key factor in the decision to adopt these arrangements, see Chesley, 2011). This body of work also indicates that employed women, particularly those that are most highly educated (Sullivan, 2013) do not decrease their childcare time in response to this greater involvement on the part of men. Indeed, Raley and colleagues (2012) draw on the ATUS to examine ratios of fathers' to mothers' childcare time and find that the ratios are higher the more a woman earns. These "ratios grow closer to parity the more the

wife contributes to the couple's earnings, with the most equal caregiving arrangement being that of wife sole breadwinner" (Raley et. al 2012, p. 1448). Our findings confirm this result and illustrate that this "equal" pattern is not mirrored in at-home mother/breadwinner father families which underscores the role that very unequal earnings that favor women play in shaping these patterns. It also raises questions about whether similar time in childcare can be a marker of "undoing" gender when employment commitments vary so greatly across couple members, and when mothers, particularly breadwinning mothers have so little time for leisure and exercise relative to parents in other arrangements.

What explains these results? The central explanation supported by previous research is that of gendered intensive parenting norms in which mothers, more so than fathers, face both social and internalized pressures to be heavily involved with their children (Raley et al., 2012). Support for this explanation in gender-atypical families is provided by qualitative work examining the experiences of at-home fathers and breadwinner mothers which document evidence of feelings of guilt and jealousy associated with at-home fathers increased involvement with children as well as potential "gatekeeping" behaviors on the part of mothers that are indicative of pressures created by intensive mothering norms among women breadwinners (Chesley, 2011; Doucet, 2006; Harrington et al., 2012; Latshaw & Hale, 2013). In fact, based on these patterns, Chesley (2011) posits that these pressures may actually be *greater* for breadwinner rather than dual-earner mothers because of internal comparisons to the involvement of their at-home spouses, a comparison that is less problematic in dual-earner families that outsource childcare and where differences in fathers' and mothers' childcare time are less pronounced. Further, qualitative research points to the possibility that at-home fathers are less subject to intensive parenting pressures than at-home mothers, which may be one reason why we find that at-home fathers spend less time on some childcare tasks than at-home mothers.

However, a less explored explanation for differences in childcare involvement across gender and gender-traditional vs. atypical work/family allocations is rooted in employment structures that can also be highly gendered. Previous research has shown that employed fathers can face serious barriers to increasing their family involvement relative to mothers when it comes to their ability to use family-friendly arrangements to step up their involvement at home (Berdahl & Moon, 2013; Williams, Blair-Loy, & Berdahl, 2013). Thus, it may simply be easier for mothers of all sorts to make the workplace adjustments necessary that facilitate their continued involvement with their children than it is for fathers to do this. This could be why we see greater time allocation differences between at-home and breadwinner fathers. Of course, evidence of greater pressure on fathers to be "financial providers" may also explain these patterns (Townsend, 2003). Qualitative research provides solid evidence that at-home fathers can experience problems "feeling like a man" when they are not financially supporting their families (Chesley, 2011; Doucet, 2006).

While it does appear that involvement in atypical work/family arrangements may be weakening gendered childcare patterns in some respects, they do not appear to be doing much for time spent in housework. We parsed housework tasks into those that are broadly perceived to be "female" and "male" and the data paint a clear picture that suggests that time in gender-appropriate housework tasks is not much affected by differences in employment, even in couples with very extreme differences that do not map on to traditional gender roles. Our findings show that all mothers spend significantly more time in female-typed housework tasks than fathers and that all fathers spend significantly more time in male-typed tasks than mothers. One problem with the gendered division of household labor is that significantly more time is allocated to the female-typed tasks per day than the male-typed tasks, which translates into mothers spending more time on housework tasks in general than fathers. Comparisons within and across gender illustrate that at-home and breadwinner mothers look more similar to one

another than to their opposite-sex counterparts in similar work/family arrangements. Indeed, statistical comparisons of at-home and breadwinner mothers' (and fathers') time in housework indicate no differences in housework time. Gender, not jobs, is the story here. The question, as always, is why?

Obviously, men may be resistant to engaging in housework, particularly when that work is perceived as work done by women, as the gender deviance neutralization hypothesis (Brines, 1994; Greenstein, 2000; Raley et al., 2012; Schneider, 2011) suggests. Previous research underscores the connection between women's domestic work and threats to men's masculinity (e.g. Legerski & Cornwall, 2010) in households where women are the primary earners and shows that female breadwinners do more, not less housework, than their husbands (Schneider, 2011). Evidence also suggests that men and women face different social assessments linked to their housekeeping abilities, with breadwinner women facing greater social judgments in this regard relative to at-home men (Doucet, 2006). An additional body of work underscores the different meanings that men and women may place on various household tasks (e.g. Kroska, 2003). The most recent evidence indicates that while both mothers and fathers report that childcare is one of the most meaningful activities in their lives, more mothers than fathers find meaning in housework (Wang, 2013). Thus, one possibility is a connection between housework and mothering that may not be present for fathers. If maintaining a consistent level of involvement with children is important to mothers regardless of work status, as mounting evidence indicates, and if women perceive that domestic work is, in part, an expression of that mothering, than this might also explain why breadwinner and at-home mothers look so similar when it comes to time in female-typed domestic tasks. For instance, in Chesley's (2011) qualitative work, one breadwinner woman, when asked about how life is different having dad rather than mom at home said: "…mom tends to make more cookies a few more times than dad – so they'll want mom home to make cookies …" In a different family, an at-home father

described how his wife took their daughter grocery shopping every Saturday as part of a special mother-daughter ritual they had. These are anecdotes that require more systematic investigation, but they do underscore that women's continued heavy involvement in key domestic tasks could be, in part, linked to expressions of their mothering in ways that make transferring these tasks to fathers more difficult in spite of women's breadwinner status.

In fact, such transfers may be especially difficult in at-home father/breadwinner mother families precisely because men are already so heavily involved with children in a way that fathers in dual-earner families are not. Indeed, if intensive mothering pressures are actually exacerbated in at-home father/breadwinner mother families, as limited qualitative work suggests (Chesley, 2011), and if performance of many female-typed domestic tasks are linked to women's expressions of their mothering, then it makes sense that breadwinner women, in particular--and perhaps in contrast to mothers in dual-earner households--would be reluctant to relinquish many of these tasks. Further, given breadwinner mothers' more limited time with children, domestic mothering work can be performed (and mothering accomplished) even when children are asleep or otherwise unavailable. It can also be a strategy mothers can use to distinguish their parenting contributions from those of fathers, as when mothers bake cookies or do the grocery shopping with their children. This is not the same logic that underlies the gender deviance neutralization hypothesis in which we assume breadwinner women do more housework to somehow make up for emasculating their husbands via their superior employment or earnings. Rather, this is an explanation that is rooted in the types of domestic activities that may undergird intensive mothering behaviors against a research base that increasingly underscores how important such pressures are for contemporary mothers. As such, this explanation only works when there are children present.

Patterns in leisure and exercise also underscore the role of gender, rather than jobs, in shaping time allocations. Breadwinner and at-home mothers spend less time watching television

than similarly situated fathers and breadwinner fathers have more non-TV leisure than breadwinner mothers, all patterns that underscore the importance of gender over employment in shaping time use. However, at-home mothers and all fathers have similar levels of non-TV leisure time; thus, everyone has more non-TV leisure than breadwinner mothers. These findings add to a limited evidence base documenting a leisure deficit for women, especially employed mothers, relative to men (Bianchi et al., 2007; Mattingly & Bianchi, 2003). Mothers are also in the worst position when it comes to allocating time to exercise. Our findings show that mothers engage in significantly less exercise than similarly-situated fathers. Both at-home and breadwinner fathers are able to access time for exercise in ways that mothers are not. However, unpublished research that examines survey responses to exercise time, drawing on both the National Health Interview Survey and the ATUS finds that gender differences in exercise disappear when exercise measures include or reference time in vigorous housework tasks (Cusatis, 2013). Even so, our findings suggest that gender processes appear more important than variations in employment in shaping leisure time and time in exercise. Gender, not jobs, matter most here.

In terms of time spent in sleep, our findings underscore the role that responsibility for primary caregiving vs. primary earning may play in shaping sleep experiences. We find some support for the idea that at-home parents sleep less than breadwinner parents. Contrasts of fathers show that at-home fathers sleep less than breadwinner fathers, as do at-home mothers (although this latter result is not significant at conventional levels). This pattern could be linked to primary caregiving responsibilities of at-home parents. Indeed, qualitative studies of at-home fathers have documented that men's role as the primary caregiver in these families often translates into children's preferences to have fathers, rather than breadwinning mothers, attend to their needs (Chesley, 2011; Doucet, 2006). While differences in sleep time among breadwinner mothers and at-home fathers and mothers are not statistically significant, the

direction of the difference is consistent with the notion that breadwinners likely get more sleep than at-home parents. Thus, when it comes to sleep time, being an at-home parent may translate into less sleep, regardless of gender, and in spite of a general gender difference in sleep that tends to favor women (Burgard, 2011).

This study has a several limitations that must be acknowledged in interpreting our results. First, the cross-sectional, one respondent per household design of the study limits our ability to understand how gender and employment processes operate within couples under changing circumstances. Such an analysis would require longitudinal, couple-level data with information about how time allocations change or stay the same as work/family arrangements change. Yet this limitation is also a real advantage in that we have adequate sample sizes to study relatively small subpopulations of individuals in atypical work/family arrangements such as at-home fathers and breadwinner mothers. Second, while the ATUS allows us to document differences and similarities in behavior among at-home and breadwinner parents, we are unable to distinguish between choice and constraint. We cannot know, for example, whether breadwinner mothers use housework as a way to maintain some control over the traditionally women's sphere or whether they do large amounts of housework because their at-home husband is not doing it.

Even with these limitations, this study adds valuable knowledge about the ways in which gender and employment differences shape different areas of contemporary family life. Our data highlight the experiences of individuals in families with at-home or breadwinner parents and show that, on balance, gender processes still appear relatively more important in shaping many aspects of family life, especially when it comes to accessing time for housework, leisure, and exercise, and even in families with gender-atypical work/family arrangements. Even in these families, parents do gender. One area, though, where the influence of relative employment differences is evident is childcare time. Mothers' employment does appear important in shaping

fathers' greater involvement in the daily care of their children. Thus, in at-home father/breadwinner mother family structures, in particular, gender differences in time spent caring for children are minimal. However, whether such patterns are indicative of an "undoing" of gender that leads to greater equality is not clear. Overall, however, time allocations in these families across a range of activities appear driven by entrenched, gendered processes that generally favor fathers, raising questions about how easy it will be to create or harness conditions that can "undo" gender.

Abraham, K. G., Helms, S., & Presser, S. (2009). How social processes distort measurement: The impact of survey nonresponse on estimates of volunteer work in the United States. *American Journal of Sociology, 114*, 1129-1165.

Becker, G. S. (1981). *A Treatise on the Family*. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England: Harvard University Press.

Berdahl, J. L., & Moon, S. H. (2013). Workplace mistreatment of middle class workers based on sex, parenthood, and caregiving. *Journal of Social Issues 69*(2), 341-366.

Berk, S. F. (1985). *The gender factory: The apportionment of work in american households*. New York: Plenum Press.

Bianchi, S. M., Robinson, J. P., & Milkie, M. A. (2007). *Changing rhythms of American family life*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bittman, M., England, P., Folbre, N., Sayer, L., & Matheson, G. (2003). When does gender trump money? Bargaining and time in household work. *The Amercian Journal of Sociology, 109*(1), 186-214.

Bittman, M., & Wajcman, J. (2000). The rush hour: the character of leisure time and gender equity. *Social Forces, 79*(1), 165-189.

Bouchey, H. (2009). The new breadwinners *The Shriver Report* (pp. Retrieved 9/5/13 from www.americanprogress.com). Washington, DC: The Center for American Progress.

Brines, J. (1994). Economic Dependency, Gender, and the Division of Labor at Home. *American Journal of Sociology, 100*(3), 652-689.

Burgard, S. A. (2011). The needs of others: Gender and sleep interruptions for caregivers. *Social Forces, 89*(4), 1189-1216.

Burgard, S. A., & Ailshire, J. A. (2013). Gender and time for sleep amoung U.S. Adults. *American Sociological Review, 78*(1), 58-69; DOI: 10.1177/0003122412472048.

Chesley, N. (2011). Stay-at-Home Fathers and Breadwinning Mothers: Gender, Couple Dynamics, and Social Change. *Gender & Society, 25*(5), 642-664; DOI: 610.1177/0891243211417433.

Connelly, R., & Kimmel, J. (2009). Spousal economic factors in ATUS Parents' Time Choices. *Social Indicators Research, 93*(1), 147-152.

Cusatis, R. (2013). *Self-reports of physical activity: Do different methods of data collection tell a different story?* Unpublished Master's Paper. University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Sociology Department

Davis, S., & Greenstein, T. N. (2013). Why study housework? Cleaning as a window into power in couples. *Journal of Family Theory & Review, 5*(June), 63-71; DOI: 10.1111/jftr.12004.

Deutsch, F. M. (2007). Undoing gender. *Gender & Society, 21*, 106-127.

Doucet, A. (2006). *Do Men Mother?* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Foster, G., & Kalenkoski, C. M. (2013). Tobit or OLS? An empirical evaluation under different diary window lengths. *Applied Economics, 45*(20), 2994-3010.

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*(2), 322-335.

Harrington, B., Van Deusen, F., & Mazar, I. (2012). The new dad: Right at home (pp. Retrieved 9/5/13 from http://www.bc.edu/content/dam/files/centers/cwf/pdf/The%20New%20Dad%20Right%20at%20Home%20BCCWF%202012.pdf). Boston, MA: Boston College Center for Work & Family.

Hays, S. (1996). *The cultural contradictions of motherhood*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Hofforth, S. L., Flood, S. M., & Sobek, M. (2013). American Time Use Survey Data Extract System: Version 2.4 [machine readable database]. from Maryland Population Research Center; Minnesota Population Center

Hook, J. L. (2004). Reconsidering the divison of household labor: Incorporating volunteer work and informal support. *Journal of Marriage and Family 66*, 101-117.

Jacobs, J. A., & Gerson, K. (2001). Overworked individuals or overworked families? Explaining trends in work, leisure, and family time. *Work and Occupations, 28*(1), 40-63.

Kramer, K. Z., Kelly, E. L., & McColloch, J. B. (2013). Stay-at-home fathers: Definitions and characteristics based on 34 Years of CPS data. *Journal of Family Issues (online first)*, 1-23; DOI: 10.1177/0192513X13502479.

Kramer, K. Z., & McCulloch, J. B. (2010). *Stay-at-home fathers: Definition and characteristics based on 42 years of CPS data*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America, April 15-17 2012, Dallas, TX.

Kroska, A. (2003). Investigating gender differences in the meaning of household chores and child care. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 65*, 456-473.

Latshaw, B. A. (2011). Is fatherhood a full-time job? Mixed methods insights into measuring stay-at-home fatherhood. *Fathering, 9*(2), 125-149.

Latshaw, B. A., & Hale, S. I. (2013). *"The domestic handoff": A mixed-methods assessment of fathers' time use in female breadwinner families*. Paper presented at the Paper presented at the 2013 Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Legerski, E. M., & Cornwall, M. (2010). Working-class job loss, gender, and the negotiation of household labor. *Gender & Society, 24*, 447-474; DOI: 410.1177/0891243210374600.

Lundberg, S., & Pollak, R. A. (1996). Bargaining and Distribution in Marriage. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives, 10*(4), 139-158.

Mattingly, M. J., & Bianchi, S. M. (2003). Gender differences in the quantity and quality of free time: The U.S. experience. *Social Forces, 81*(3), 999-1030.

Mattingly, M. J., & Sayer, L. C. (2006). Under pressure: Gender differences in the relationship between free time and feeling rushed. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 68*(February), 205-221.

Maume, D. J., Sebastian, R. A., & Bardo, A. R. (2009). Gender differences in sleep disruption among retail food workers. *American Sociological Review, 74*(6), 989-1007.

Nomaguchi, K. M., & Bianchi, S. M. (2004). Exercise Time: Gender Differences in the Effects of Marriage, Parenthood, and Employment. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 66*(2), 413-430.

O'Neill, G. E., & Sincavage, J. R. (2004). Response analysis survey: A qualitative look at response and nonresponse in the American Time Use Survey (pp. http://www.bls.gov/ore/pdf/st040140.pdf).

Raley, S., Bianchi, S. M., & Wang, W. (2012). When do fathers care? Mothers' economic contribution and fathers' involvement in child care. *American Journal of Sociology, 117*(5), 1422-1459.

Risman, B. J. (2009). From doing to undoing: Gender as we know it. *Gender & Society, 23*(1), 81-84 DOI: 10.1177/0891243208326874.

Rochlen, A. B., McKelley, R. A., Suizzo, M.-A., & Scaringi, V. (2008a). Predictors of relationship satisfaction, psychological well-being, and life satisfaction among stay-at-home fathers. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 9*(1), 17-28.

Rochlen, A. B., Suizzo, M.-A., McKelly, R. A., & Scaringi, V. (2008b). "I'm just providing for my family: A Qualitative Study of Stay-at-Home Fathers. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 9*(4).

Sarkisian, N., & Gerstel, N. (2004). Explaining the gender gap in help to parents: The importance of employment. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 66*, 431-451.

Schneider, D. (2011). Market earnings and household work: New tests of gender performance theory. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 73*(August), 845-860.

Smith, K. (2012). Recessions accelerate trend of wives as breadwinners *The Carsey Institute at the Scholars' Repository. Paper 181.* http://scholars.unh.edu/carsey/181: University of New Hampshire.

Stewart, J. (2009). *Tobit or Not Tobit*. IZA Discussion Paper No. 4588.

Sullivan, O. (2011). An end to gender display through the performance of housework? A review and reassessment of the quantiative literature using insights from the qualitative literature. *Journal of Family Theory & Review, 3*(March), 1 - 13; DOI:10.1111/j.1756-2589.2010.00074.x.

Sullivan, O. (2013). What do we learn about gender by analyzing housework separately from child care? Some considerations from time use evidence. *Journal of Family Theory & Review, 5*(June), 72-84; DOI:10.1111/jftr.12007.

Tichenor, V. (1999). Status and income as gendered resources: The case of marital power. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 61*(3), 638-650.

Townsend, N. W. (2003). *The package deal: Marriage, work, and fatherhood in men's lives*. Phiadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2012). Familes and Living Arrangments, Table FG1 (pp.). Washington DC: U.S. Department of Commerce.

Wang, W. (2013). Parents' time with kids more rewarding than paid work--and more exhausting. Washington, D.C.: PEW Research Center; Retrieved October 15, 2013 from www.pewresearch.org.

West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & Society, 1*(125-155).

West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (2009). Accounting for Doing Gender. *Gender & Society, 23*`(1), 112-122 DOI: 110.1177/0891243208326529.

Williams, J. C., Blair-Loy, M., & Berdahl, J. L. (2013). Cultural Schemas, Social Class, and the Flexibility Stigma. *Journal of Social Issues, 69*(2), 209-234.

Table 1. Means/Percentages of Selected Demographic Characteristics

	Stay at Home Father	Stay at Home Mother	Breadwinner Father		Breadwinner Mother
Age (in Years)					
Mother	39.10 [ab]	36.69 [ac]	37.15 [bd]	bd	38.79
Father	42.90 [ab]	39.37 [ac]	39.40 [b]	b	41.98
Age difference (Father-Mother)	3.80 [ab]	2.69 [ac]	2.26 [bd]	bdf	3.18 [cd]
Couple-level Education					
Both college	19.06 [abe]	29.49 [ac]	29.12 [bd]	bdf	23.00 [cde]
Neither college	57.25 [ab]	53.64 [ac]	52.11 [bd]	bdf	56.57 [cd]
Mother college, father no college	18.75 [ab]	5.74 [ac]	8.01 [bd]	bdf	17.01 [cd]
Father college, mother no college	4.94 [ab]	11.13 [ac]	10.76 [bd]	bdf	3.41 [cd]
Couple-level Race					
Both White	45.33 [ab]	56.34 [a]	57.47 [b]	bf	57.51
Both non-White	41.56 [ab]	35.90 [a]	32.39 [b]	bf	32.27
Mixed Race	13.11 [a]	7.76 [ac]	10.13		10.22 [c]
Usual Hours Worked Per Week					
Respondent	0.43 [ae]	0.73 [ac]	46.15 [d]	df	38.13 [cde]
Spouse	40.65 [abe]	46.03 [ac]	1.24 [bd]	bdf	0.35 [cde]
Unemployed, Looking, or Intend to Find Work					
Neither	43.60 [abe]	75.14 [a]	85.02 [bd]	bdf	73.10 [de]
Husband	56.40 [e]	--	--		26.90 [e]
Wife	--	24.86	14.98		--
Difficulty (ADL)					
Respondent	17.17 [abe]	4.02 [ac]	1.59 [b]	bf	1.90 [ce]
Spouse	1.27 [be]	1.53 [c]	2.81 [bd]	bd	8.03 [cde]
Family Income					
<$25,000	16.79	17.74	14.64	f	17.32
$25,000-49,999	33.73 [ab]	27.16 [a]	25.33 [b]	bf	27.46
$50,000-74,999	22.59	17.72	21.21		25.79
$75,000+	26.89 [abe]	37.38 [ac]	38.82 [bd]	bdf	29.43 [cde]
Number of Children Under 18	1.75 [ab]	2.13 [ac]	2.14 [bd]	bdf	1.83 [cd]
Age of Youngest Child	7.54 [ab]	5.60 [ac]	5.66 [bd]	bd	7.51 [cd]
N=	415	2351	1426		362

Source: Authors' calculations using the 2008-2012 American Time Use Survey (ATUS).

a=SAHF different than SAHM (p<.05)

b=SAHF different than Breadwinner Fathers (p<.05)

c=SAHM different than Breadwinner Mothers (p<.05)

d=Breadwinner Fathers different than Breadwinner Mothers (p<.05)

e=SAHF different than Breadwinner Mothers (p<.05)

Table 2. Time Use Patterns of Stay-at-Home Parents and Breadwinner Parents (N=4,554)

	Stay-at-Home Father			Stay-at-Home Mother			Breadwinner Father			Breadwinner Mother		
Housework	Mean	SD		Mean	SD		Mean	SD		Mean	SD	
Female-typed	91.40	116.65	ab	181.89	137.73	ac	29.24	59.09	bd	98.24	116.99	cd
Male-typed	55.99	121.94	abe	13.93	54.46	ac	28.13	78.16	bd	7.28	38.76	cde
Other	17.17	49.71	b	19.03	47.39		9.95	27.82	bd	16.45	41.90	d
Childcare												
Play	23.19	80.16	ae	35.84	74.89	ac	18.04	49.39	d	10.37	36.35	cde
Physical care	30.96	64.47	ab	61.18	80.80	ac	21.13	63.30	b	27.75	56.14	c
Education and other activities with household children	39.28	97.19	b	54.93	83.55	c	17.47	43.88	bd	26.16	52.62	cd
Secondary childcare	313.03	280.44	abe	420.84	263.66	ac	233.75	261.38	b	255.96	254.30	ce
With child(ren)	373.76	261.66	abe	502.81	236.23	ac	279.45	247.23	b	280.98	222.66	ce
Leisure and Health												
Television watching	208.94	182.76	abe	122.85	127.96	ac	123.28	141.13	bd	103.30	132.73	cde
Socializing, relaxing, leisure (excluding TV), and eating	177.30	143.91	be	170.96	123.73	c	145.14	122.51	bd	124.14	94.04	cde
Exercise (including walking or biking as mode of transport)	23.38	55.00	e	18.54	44.18	c	21.42	63.49	d	9.83	25.46	cde
Sleep	530.62	137.42	be	529.71	117.44	c	484.13	120.01	b	498.57	121.79	ce

Source: Authors' calculations using the 2008-2012 American Time Use Survey (ATUS).

a=SAHF different than SAHM (p<.05)

b=SAHF different than Breadwinner Fathers (p<.05)

c=SAHM different than Breadwinner Mothers (p<.05)

d=Breadwinner Fathers different than Breadwinner Mothers (p<.05)

e=SAHF different than Breadwinner Mothers (p<.05)

Table 3. Family Type SUR Coefficients for Minutes Spent in Housework, Childcare, Leisure, and Health on the ATUS Diary Day, 2008-2012.

	Housework		
	Female-Typed	Male-Typed	Other
At-home Mother vs At-home Father (ref)	94.80***	-47.20***	0.05
	(7.38)	(3.96)	(2.68)
Breadwinner Mother vs Breadwinner Father (ref)	64.28***	-23.04***	5.86**
	(4.75)	(4.73)	(2.01)
Breadwinner Mother vs At-home Father (ref)	188.24***	-31.16	36.59**
	(28.33)	(22.92)	(11.50)
At-home Mother vs Breadwinner Mother (ref)	6.10	10.32	-26.88**
	(24.47)	(9.89)	(8.63)
At-home Mother vs Breadwinner Father (ref)	161.07***	-31.23***	-1.66
	(14.08)	(8.24)	(5.10)
At-home Father vs Breadwinner Father (ref)	-2.54	-18.62	-2.49
	(14.04)	(16.33)	(6.31)

	Childcare				
	Playing	Physical Care	Education & Other	Secondary Care	With Children
At-home Mother vs At-home Father (ref)	2.19	15.32***	6.79	51.67***	69.28***
	(3.96)	(3.86)	(4.67)	(12.65)	(11.68)
Breadwinner Mother vs Breadwinner Father (ref)	-8.59**	8.90*	9.27**	49.34***	9.90
	(2.97)	(3.95)	(2.98)	(14.68)	(13.97)
Breadwinner Mother vs At-home Father (ref)	-18.24	17.01	-7.17	-50.26	60.04
	(15.73)	(14.06)	(20.08)	(58.76)	(54.54)
At-home Mother vs Breadwinner Mother (ref)	3.02	12.01	-4.66	57.46	22.44
	(12.21)	(12.84)	(14.43)	(40.95)	(37.72)
At-home Mother vs Breadwinner Father (ref)	-7.36	32.80***	18.54*	182.84***	122.18***
	(7.79)	(8.64)	(8.65)	(28.67)	(27.29)
At-home Father vs Breadwinner Father (ref)	0.02	-17.58	29.19**	81.44+	-29.34
	(10.38)	(11.23)	(11.14)	(42.93)	(41.62)

	Leisure & Health			
	TV Watching	Non-TV Leisure	Exercise	Sleep
At-home Mother vs At-home Father (ref)	-68.32***	1.92	-7.57**	7.41
	(7.53)	(7.08)	(2.62)	(6.68)
Breadwinner Mother vs Breadwinner Father (ref)	-31.89***	-25.43***	-13.11***	-1.19
	(8.79)	(7.48)	(3.84)	(7.48)
Breadwinner Mother vs At-home Father (ref)	-152.02***	-63.58*	-19.29+	30.97
	(38.95)	(30.66)	(11.28)	(32.22)
At-home Mother vs Breadwinner Mother (ref)	32.65	34.82	12.97	-18.43
	(23.10)	(22.20)	(7.91)	(21.31)
At-home Mother vs Breadwinner Father (ref)	-22.68	-24.36	-0.78	-24.77+
	(16.24)	(15.29)	(6.72)	(14.41)
At-home Father vs Breadwinner Father (ref)	55.24*	12.55	6.37	-60.56**
	(26.96)	(22.85)	(11.42)	(22.02)

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

Note: Coefficients are from SUR models controlling for couple-level age, education and race; respondent's and spouse's usual hours worked per week and difficulty; family income, age of youngest child, number of children, weekday, and year. Standard errors are in parentheses.

Appendix A. Comparison of Stay-at-Home Father (SAHF), Stay-at-Home Mother (SAHM) and Dual-Earner Household Definitions.

Definitions

	2000-2009 CPS Earnings		2003-2012 ATUS Hours			2003-2012 ATUS Earnings		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	100% Income	>50% Income	No Work	Part-Time Work <10 hrs	4X Usual Hours	4X Weekly Earnings	4X Usual Hours (4X Weekly Earnings if Missing)	4X Weekly Earnings (4X Usual Hours if Missing)
SAHF	3.40%	18.60%	6.09%	6.66%	6.15%	13.67%	7.36%	13.25%
SAHM	25.70%	81.40%	32.60%	35.90%	34.88%	42.47%	36.88%	43.83%
Dual-earners	70.80%	--	61.31%	57.43%	58.97%	43.86%	55.76%	42.92%
N			38084	36992	34765	35326	37909	37909

1: 100% Income Definition -- Stay-at-home father households are those in which the husband is not part of the labor force and had not received any income in the previous year while the wife works 35+ hours per week and earns 100% of the household income (Kramer and McCollough 2010).

2: >50% Income Definition -- Stay-at-home father households are those in which the wife earns more than half of the total household income (Kramer and McCollough 2010).

3: No Work Definition -- Stay-at-home father households are those in which the husband is not employed and the wife is employed and works 35+ hours per week.

4: Part-Time Work Definition -- Stay-at-home father households are those in which the husband is not employed OR works 10 hours per week or less and the wife is employed and works more than 10 hours per week.

5: Relative Hours Definition -- Stay-at-home father households are those in which the husband is not employed OR works 25% or fewer hours than the wife and the wife is employed.

6: Relative Earnings Definition -- Stay-at-home father households are those in which the husband's earnings are 25% or fewer than the wife's earnings.

7: Definition 5 except in cases of missing data in which case definition 6 is used.

8: Definition 6 except in cases of missing data in which case definition 5 is used.

Appendix B. Activities included in Housework, Childcare, Leisure, and Health Behaviors: ATUS-X Codes and Labels

Code	Label
Housework	
Female-Typed Housework	
020101	Interior cleaning
020102	Laundry
020103	Sewing, repairing, and maintaining textiles
020104	Storing interior household items, including food
020199	Housework, n.e.c.
020201	Food and drink preparation
020202	Food presentation
020203	Kitchen and food clean-up
020299	Food and drink preparation, presentation, and clean-up, n.e.c.
Male-Typed Housework	
020301	Interior arrangement, decoration, and repairs
020302	Building and repairing furniture
020303	Heating and cooling
020399	Interior maintenance, repair, and decoration, n.e.c.
020401	Exterior cleaning
020402	Exterior repair, improvements, and decoration
020499	Exterior maintenance, repair, and decoration, n.e.c.
020501	Lawn, garden, and houseplant care
020502	Ponds, pools, and hot tubs
020599	Lawn and garden, n.e.c.
020701	Vehicle repair and maintenance (by self)
020799	Vehicles, n.e.c.
020801	Appliance, tool, and toy set-up, repair, and maintenance (by self)
020899	Appliances and tools, n.e.c.
Gender-Neutral Housework	
020601	Care for animals and pets (not veterinary care) (2003-2007)
020602	Care for animals and pets (not veterinary care) (2008+)
020603	Walking, exercising, playing with animals (2008+)
020699	Pet and animal care, n.e.c.
020901	Financial management
020902	Household and personal organization and planning
020903	Household and personal mail and messages (except e-mail)
020904	Household and personal e-mail and messages

020905 Home security
020999 Household management, n.e.c.
029999 Household activities, n.e.c.

Childcare

Physical Care of Children

030101 Physical care for household children

Playing with Children

030103 Playing with household children, not sports
030105 Playing sports with household children

Educational and Other Childcare-Related Activities

030102 Reading to or with household children
030104 Arts and crafts with household children
030106 Talking with or listening to household children
030107 Helping or teaching household children (not related to education) (2003)
030108 Organization and planning for household children
030109 Looking after household children (as a primary activity)
030110 Attending household children's events
030111 Waiting for or with household children
030112 Picking up or dropping off household children
030199 Caring for and helping household children, n.e.c.
030201 Homework (household children)
030202 Meetings and school conferences (household children)
030203 Home schooling of household children
030204 Waiting associated with household children's education
030299 Activities related to household child's education, n.e.c.
030301 Providing medical care to household children
030302 Obtaining medical care for household children
030303 Waiting associated with household children's health
030399 Activities related to household child's health, n.e.c.

Leisure

Television Watching

120303 Television and movies (not religious)
120304 Television (religious)

Other Leisure (Including Eating)

110101 Eating and drinking
110199 Eating and drinking, n.e.c.
110201 Waiting associated with eating and drinking

110299 Waiting associated with eating and drinking, n.e.c.
119999 Eating and drinking, n.e.c.
120101 Socializing and communicating with others
120199 Socializing and communicating, n.e.c.
120201 Attending or hosting parties, receptions, or ceremonies
120202 Attending meetings for personal interest (not volunteering)
120299 Attending or hosting social events, n.e.c.
120301 Relaxing, thinking
120302 Tobacco and drug use
120305 Listening to the radio
120306 Listening to or playing music (not radio)
120307 Playing games
120308 Computer use for leisure (excluding games)
120309 Arts and crafts as a hobby
120310 Collecting as a hobby
120311 Hobbies, except arts and crafts and collecting
120312 Reading for personal interest
120313 Writing for personal interest
120399 Relaxing and leisure, n.e.c.
120401 Attending performing arts
120402 Attending museums
120403 Attending movies or film
120404 Attending gambling establishments
120405 Security procedures related to arts and entertainment
120499 Arts and entertainment, n.e.c.
120501 Waiting associated with socializing and communicating
120502 Waiting associated with attending or hosting social events
120503 Waiting associated with relaxing or leisure
120504 Waiting associated with arts and entertainment
120599 Waiting associated with socializing, n.e.c.
129999 Socializing, relaxing, and leisure, n.e.c.

Education

060101 Taking class for degree, certification, or licensure
060102 Taking class for personal interest
060103 Waiting associated with taking classes
060104 Security procedures related to taking classes
060199 Taking class, n.e.c.
060201 Extracurricular club activities
060202 Extracurricular music and performance activities
060203 Extracurricular student government activities
060204 Waiting associated with extracurricular activities (2004+)
060299 Education-related extracurricular activities, n.e.c.

060301 Research or homework for class (for degree, certification, or licensure)
060302 Research or homework for class (for personal interest)
060303 Waiting associated with research or homework
060399 Research or homework, n.e.c.
060401 Administrative activities: class for degree, certification, or licensure
060402 Administrative activities: class for personal interest
060403 Waiting associated with administrative activities (education)
060499 Administrative for education, n.e.c.
069999 Education, n.e.c.

Health Behaviors

Sleeping

010101 Sleeping

Exericse

130100 Participating in Sports, Exercise, or Recreation
130101 Doing aerobics
130102 Playing baseball
130103 Playing basketball
130104 Biking
130105 Playing billiards
130106 Boating
130107 Bowling
130108 Climbing, spelunking, caving
130109 Dancing
130110 Participating in equestrian sports
130111 Fencing
130112 Fishing
130113 Playing football
130114 Golfing
130115 Doing gymnastics
130116 Hiking
130117 Playing hockey
130118 Hunting
130119 Participating in martial arts
130120 Playing racquet sports
130121 Participating in rodeo competitions
130122 Rollerblading
130123 Playing rugby
130124 Running
130125 Skiing, ice skating, snowboarding
130126 Playing soccer
130127 Playing softball

130128 Using cardiovascular equipment
130129 Vehicle touring or racing
130130 Playing volleyball
130131 Walking
130132 Participating in water sports
130133 Weightlifting or strength training
130134 Working out, unspecified
130135 Wrestling
130136 Doing yoga
130199 Playing sports, n.e.c.
------ Walking or biking as a mode of transportation

Source: www.atusdata.org

Appendix C1. Family Type (At-home Mothers vs. At-home Fathers) SUR Coefficients for Minutes Spent in Housework, Childcare, Leisure, and Health on the ATUS Diary Day, 2008-2012.

	Housework			Childcare					Leisure & Health			
	Female-Typed	Male-Typed	Other	Playing	Physical Care	Education & Other	Secondary Care	With Children	TV Watching	Non-TV Leisure	Exercise	Sleep
Work/Family Arrangement												
At-home Father (reference)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
At-home Mother	94.80***	-47.20***	0.05	2.19	15.32***	6.79	51.67***	69.28***	-68.32***	1.92	-7.57**	7.41
	(7.38)	(3.96)	(2.68)	(3.96)	(3.86)	(4.67)	(12.65)	(11.68)	(7.53)	(7.08)	(2.62)	(6.68)
Age difference (Father-Mother)	0.51	0.46+	-0.10	0.26	-0.26	-0.46	-0.91	-0.04	-0.02	0.49	0.07	-0.54
	(0.49)	(0.26)	(0.18)	(0.26)	(0.26)	(0.31)	(0.84)	(0.78)	(0.50)	(0.47)	(0.17)	(0.44)
Couple-level Education												
Both college (reference)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Neither college	18.89**	13.52***	-6.90**	-9.52*	-6.91+	-16.25***	20.36+	-10.38	64.52***	-22.82***	-1.44	24.36***
	(7.08)	(3.79)	(2.57)	(3.80)	(3.70)	(4.48)	(12.12)	(11.20)	(7.22)	(6.79)	(2.52)	(6.40)
Mother college, father no college	-3.64	-1.22	-5.33	-11.45*	-2.62	-1.21	20.96	25.12	43.25***	-18.06+	-0.48	12.72
	(10.45)	(5.60)	(3.79)	(5.61)	(5.46)	(6.62)	(17.90)	(16.53)	(10.65)	(10.03)	(3.71)	(9.45)
Father college, mother no college	16.04+	4.06	-3.86	-7.75	-4.04	-16.01**	-20.19	-48.34**	33.25***	-40.33***	-0.84	22.10*
	(9.52)	(5.11)	(3.45)	(5.11)	(4.98)	(6.03)	(16.31)	(15.07)	(9.71)	(9.14)	(3.38)	(8.61)
Couple-level Race												
Both White (reference)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Both non-White	36.46***	-19.48***	-11.14***	-17.78***	1.38	1.86	8.40	-1.76	11.92*	-23.01***	0.60	27.11***
	(5.89)	(3.16)	(2.14)	(3.16)	(3.08)	(3.73)	(10.09)	(9.32)	(6.00)	(5.65)	(2.09)	(5.33)
Mixed Race	8.13	-19.13***	-3.88	-0.70	-1.18	4.10	-23.71	1.09	8.67	12.05	-2.92	8.54
	(9.44)	(5.06)	(3.42)	(5.06)	(4.93)	(5.98)	(16.17)	(14.94)	(9.63)	(9.06)	(3.36)	(8.54)
Usual Hours Worked Per Week												
Respondent	-0.76	-1.09+	-0.47	-0.49	-0.42	-1.66*	-3.58*	-4.35**	1.26	-1.74+	0.36	-1.82+
	(1.05)	(0.56)	(0.38)	(0.56)	(0.55)	(0.66)	(1.80)	(1.66)	(1.07)	(1.01)	(0.37)	(0.95)
Spouse	0.28	0.09	0.13+	0.16	-0.17+	0.05	-0.38	0.84**	-0.42*	-0.28	0.02	-0.22
	(0.19)	(0.10)	(0.07)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.12)	(0.32)	(0.30)	(0.19)	(0.18)	(0.07)	(0.17)
Unemployed/Looking/Intends to Find Work												
Respondent	14.05*	-0.24	-1.34	-5.98+	-4.40	-8.59*	-13.12	-36.96***	-13.67*	5.88	-0.30	-8.98+
	(5.92)	(3.18)	(2.15)	(3.18)	(3.10)	(3.75)	(10.15)	(9.37)	(6.04)	(5.68)	(2.11)	(5.36)
Spouse	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Difficulty (ADL)												
Respondent	-29.62**	-39.46***	3.08	1.19	11.58*	6.51	-56.16**	-30.24+	34.24**	2.11	-12.48**	20.84*
	(11.18)	(6.00)	(4.06)	(6.00)	(5.85)	(7.08)	(19.16)	(17.70)	(11.40)	(10.73)	(3.98)	(10.12)
Spouse	-6.56	5.24	-1.10	-5.21	-3.22	-16.15	9.04	-9.93	5.72	-36.71+	-3.03	-24.23
	(21.77)	(11.68)	(7.90)	(11.68)	(11.38)	(13.79)	(37.30)	(34.46)	(22.20)	(20.89)	(7.74)	(19.70)
Family Income												
<$25,000	21.58*	-2.16	-3.66	5.97	-7.75+	-9.87+	10.73	37.32**	9.22	-2.22	-4.03	10.76
	(8.88)	(4.76)	(3.22)	(4.76)	(4.64)	(5.62)	(15.20)	(14.05)	(9.05)	(8.52)	(3.15)	(8.03)
$25,000-49,999	22.55**	-7.50+	-4.03	6.87+	0.22	-0.43	14.67	20.95+	15.15*	-14.14*	-9.06***	15.93*
	(7.45)	(3.99)	(2.70)	(4.00)	(3.89)	(4.72)	(12.76)	(11.79)	(7.60)	(7.15)	(2.65)	(6.74)
$50,000-74,999	4.30	1.34	-5.22+	7.46+	-1.35	0.39	-12.25	26.70*	9.43	0.06	-6.28*	8.02
	(7.70)	(4.13)	(2.79)	(4.13)	(4.02)	(4.88)	(13.19)	(12.18)	(7.85)	(7.39)	(2.74)	(6.97)
$75,000+ (reference)												
Number of Children Under 18	9.92***	2.24	-0.66	-10.84***	-0.31	21.41***	11.57**	22.39***	-12.67***	-4.85*	0.98	-12.46***
	(2.56)	(1.37)	(0.93)	(1.37)	(1.34)	(1.62)	(4.38)	(4.04)	(2.61)	(2.45)	(0.91)	(2.31)
Age of Youngest Child	2.94***	1.69***	0.42*	-5.60***	-7.59***	0.98**	-25.45***	-21.54***	1.40*	1.05*	0.21	-1.02*
	(0.54)	(0.29)	(0.19)	(0.29)	(0.28)	(0.34)	(0.92)	(0.85)	(0.55)	(0.52)	(0.19)	(0.49)
Weekday	37.06***	-2.30	2.59	4.30	27.58***	32.70***	-117.87***	-50.47***	-23.85***	-39.21***	2.11	-37.30***
	(5.55)	(2.97)	(2.01)	(2.98)	(2.90)	(3.51)	(9.50)	(8.78)	(5.66)	(5.32)	(1.97)	(5.02)
Year												
2008 (reference)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2009	1.69	-5.30	4.95	8.50	-25.84***	-3.83	28.03	-22.69	-5.32	23.90*	12.45**	7.41
	(11.48)	(6.16)	(4.17)	(6.16)	(6.00)	(7.27)	(19.67)	(18.17)	(11.71)	(11.02)	(4.08)	(10.39)
2010	8.78	-8.97	-4.87	14.69*	-24.75***	-4.98	15.71	-27.64	-12.39	20.13+	12.54**	3.71
	(11.34)	(6.08)	(4.11)	(6.08)	(5.93)	(7.18)	(19.42)	(17.94)	(11.56)	(10.88)	(4.03)	(10.26)
2011	2.31	-3.55	-1.11	12.12*	-25.84***	-2.93	40.80*	-19.47	-12.26	27.02*	9.57*	13.83
	(11.28)	(6.05)	(4.09)	(6.05)	(5.90)	(7.14)	(19.33)	(17.85)	(11.50)	(10.83)	(4.01)	(10.21)
2012	3.46	-7.29	-3.34	12.75*	-28.06***	-1.56	22.07	-12.49	-3.93	20.70+	9.65*	22.36*
	(11.27)	(6.04)	(4.09)	(6.04)	(5.89)	(7.13)	(19.30)	(17.83)	(11.49)	(10.81)	(4.00)	(10.19)

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

Appendix C2. Family Type (Breadwinner Mothers vs. Breadwinner Fathers) SUR Coefficients for Minutes Spent in Housework, Childcare, Leisure, and Health on the ATUS Diary Day, 2008-2012

	Housework			Childcare					Leisure & Health			
	Female-Typed	Male-Typed	Other	Playing	Physical Care	Education & Other	Secondary Care	With Children	TV Watching	Non-TV Leisure	Exercise	Sleep
Work/Family Arrangement												
Breadwinner Father (reference)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Breadwinner Mother	64.28***	-23.04***	5.86**	-8.59**	8.90*	9.27**	49.34***	9.90	-31.89***	-25.43***	-13.11***	-1.19
	(4.75)	(4.73)	(2.01)	(2.97)	(3.95)	(2.98)	(14.68)	(13.97)	(8.79)	(7.48)	(3.84)	(7.48)
Age difference (Father-Mother)	0.17	-0.35	-0.11	-0.40+	-0.41	-0.31	0.35	-0.60	0.51	-0.02	0.26	-0.63
	(0.34)	(0.34)	(0.14)	(0.21)	(0.28)	(0.21)	(1.05)	(1.00)	(0.63)	(0.54)	(0.27)	(0.53)
Couple-level Education												
Both college (reference)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Neither college	3.01	11.13*	-1.41	-1.44	-6.49	-1.72	22.22	14.67	31.59***	-7.08	-2.26	4.88
	(4.87)	(4.85)	(2.06)	(3.05)	(4.05)	(3.06)	(15.06)	(14.33)	(9.02)	(7.68)	(3.94)	(7.67)
Mother college, father no college	-2.66	3.87	-6.70*	9.31*	0.88	-1.09	-2.90	20.19	6.71	-1.94	-9.03+	-6.65
	(6.58)	(6.56)	(2.79)	(4.12)	(5.48)	(4.14)	(20.35)	(19.36)	(12.19)	(10.38)	(5.33)	(10.37)
Father college, mother no college	1.85	17.51**	2.76	1.82	-12.49*	-6.14	42.79*	11.10	28.98*	-3.85	-5.95	-16.07
	(6.52)	(6.50)	(2.76)	(4.08)	(5.43)	(4.10)	(20.18)	(19.19)	(12.08)	(10.28)	(5.28)	(10.28)
Couple-level Race												
Both White (reference)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Both non-White	-6.83+	-13.91***	-6.51***	-5.86*	-8.17*	-3.89	-20.41	-12.74	9.61	-0.63	-7.68*	1.46
	(4.14)	(4.12)	(1.75)	(2.59)	(3.44)	(2.60)	(12.81)	(12.18)	(7.67)	(6.53)	(3.35)	(6.52)
Mixed Race	8.00	-5.12	2.42	-2.73	3.65	-3.25	-4.80	10.40	-8.03	8.88	-3.92	-10.58
	(5.90)	(5.87)	(2.50)	(3.69)	(4.91)	(3.71)	(18.24)	(17.35)	(10.92)	(9.30)	(4.77)	(9.29)
Usual Hours Worked Per Week												
Respondent	-0.56***	-0.41**	-0.19**	-0.28**	-0.59***	-0.22*	-0.79+	-2.18***	-0.88**	-0.93***	0.06	-1.86***
	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.06)	(0.09)	(0.12)	(0.09)	(0.46)	(0.44)	(0.28)	(0.23)	(0.12)	(0.23)
Spouse	0.39	0.95	0.14	0.19	0.70	-0.21	-0.53	4.12*	-1.48	1.99*	0.24	-0.48
	(0.63)	(0.63)	(0.27)	(0.40)	(0.53)	(0.40)	(1.96)	(1.87)	(1.18)	(1.00)	(0.51)	(1.00)
Unemployed/Looking/Intends to Find Work												
Respondent	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Spouse	0.92	-0.49	-1.89	-2.34	-5.95	-1.45	17.37	-4.67	2.72	6.31	3.38	-10.39
	(4.66)	(4.64)	(1.98)	(2.92)	(3.88)	(2.93)	(14.42)	(13.72)	(8.63)	(7.35)	(3.77)	(7.35)
Difficulty (ADL)												
Respondent	9.29	2.46	1.94	-1.77	-4.07	3.26	-46.76	9.71	47.44+	4.37	-14.09	-2.29
	(13.41)	(13.36)	(5.68)	(8.39)	(11.15)	(8.43)	(41.47)	(39.45)	(24.83)	(21.14)	(10.85)	(21.13)
Spouse	8.95	-2.08	1.12	2.16	-2.69	12.02*	-13.73	-30.08	0.12	-22.48	9.43	-28.00+
	(9.15)	(9.11)	(3.88)	(5.72)	(7.61)	(5.75)	(28.29)	(26.91)	(16.94)	(14.42)	(7.40)	(14.41)
Family Income												
<$25,000	-5.59	4.47	-0.35	6.26	-6.35	-8.83*	-31.50	-32.18+	-17.19	6.62	-6.81	12.23
	(6.31)	(6.29)	(2.67)	(3.95)	(5.25)	(3.97)	(19.52)	(18.57)	(11.69)	(9.95)	(5.11)	(9.95)
$25,000-49,999	7.54	7.94	1.69	-2.69	-9.23*	-12.59***	12.77	2.09	22.38*	-8.15	-5.49	20.66*
	(5.27)	(5.25)	(2.23)	(3.30)	(4.39)	(3.31)	(16.30)	(15.51)	(9.76)	(8.31)	(4.27)	(8.31)
$50,000-74,999	-2.63	2.95	-0.63	5.94+	2.49	-6.39*	-22.49	-6.65	-2.08	0.78	-2.12	4.05
	(4.88)	(4.86)	(2.07)	(3.06)	(4.06)	(3.07)	(15.10)	(14.37)	(9.04)	(7.70)	(3.95)	(7.70)
$75,000+ (reference)												
Number of Children Under 18	1.44	2.81	-0.24	-2.50*	-2.81+	5.48***	20.23***	11.57*	-8.79**	-1.85	-0.71	-2.78
	(1.78)	(1.78)	(0.76)	(1.12)	(1.48)	(1.12)	(5.52)	(5.25)	(3.31)	(2.81)	(1.44)	(2.81)
Age of Youngest Child	0.49	1.25***	0.36*	-2.14***	-3.09***	-0.13	-13.52***	-9.55***	0.51	-0.36	0.22	0.64
	(0.36)	(0.36)	(0.15)	(0.23)	(0.30)	(0.23)	(1.12)	(1.07)	(0.67)	(0.57)	(0.29)	(0.57)
Weekday	-27.93***	-19.98***	-3.68*	-14.28***	3.96	-4.47+	-256.14***	-241.86***	-76.44***	-74.40***	-13.00***	-72.01***
	(3.78)	(3.77)	(1.60)	(2.37)	(3.15)	(2.38)	(11.70)	(11.14)	(7.01)	(5.97)	(3.06)	(5.96)
Year												
2008 (reference)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2009	1.78	-12.06*	0.30	4.23	-2.75	-2.47	20.39	38.48*	-15.36	12.19	2.09	-7.11
	(5.54)	(5.52)	(2.35)	(3.47)	(4.61)	(3.48)	(17.14)	(16.31)	(10.27)	(8.74)	(4.49)	(8.74)
2010	-5.66	-0.81	1.43	8.77*	-9.45*	-3.03	-2.70	22.03	-18.95+	12.29	5.08	-16.14+
	(5.53)	(5.50)	(2.34)	(3.46)	(4.60)	(3.47)	(17.09)	(16.26)	(10.23)	(8.71)	(4.47)	(8.71)
2011	-2.91	-12.15	-4.26	7.44	-11.30	-5.14	2.15	15.14	-2.44	-3.71	15.33*	-11.71
	(8.35)	(8.31)	(3.54)	(5.22)	(6.94)	(5.24)	(25.81)	(24.55)	(15.46)	(13.16)	(6.75)	(13.15)
2012	-2.39	-21.74*	-2.03	6.41	-13.09+	9.87+	32.47	9.76	-21.78	-1.13	9.48	-27.21+
	(9.22)	(9.18)	(3.91)	(5.77)	(7.67)	(5.79)	(28.51)	(27.13)	(17.08)	(14.54)	(7.46)	(14.53)

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

Appendix C3. Family Type (Breadwinner Mothers vs. At-home Fathers) SUR Coefficients for Minutes Spent in Housework, Childcare, Leisure, and Health on the ATUS Diary Day, 2008-2012.

	Housework			Childcare					Leisure & Health			
	Female-Typed	Male-Typed	Other	Playing	Physical Care	Education & Other	Secondary Care	With Children	TV Watching	Non-TV Leisure	Exercise	Sleep
Work/Family Arrangement												
At-home Father (reference)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Breadwinner Mother	188.24***	-31.16	36.59**	-18.24	17.01	-7.17	-50.26	60.04	-152.02***	-63.58*	-19.29+	30.97
	(28.33)	(22.92)	(11.50)	(15.73)	(14.06)	(20.08)	(58.76)	(54.54)	(38.95)	(30.66)	(11.28)	(32.22)
Age difference (Father-Mother)	1.41*	0.33	-0.06	0.19	0.04	-0.17	-0.75	-0.16	-0.47	-0.45	0.32	-0.64
	(0.66)	(0.53)	(0.27)	(0.37)	(0.33)	(0.47)	(1.37)	(1.27)	(0.91)	(0.71)	(0.26)	(0.75)
Couple-level Education												
Both college (reference)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Neither college	13.62	18.50+	-7.30	-5.58	-13.61*	4.70	-12.84	-4.58	82.32***	-10.51	10.06*	9.95
	(11.98)	(9.69)	(4.86)	(6.65)	(5.94)	(8.49)	(24.84)	(23.06)	(16.47)	(12.96)	(4.77)	(13.62)
Mother college, father no college	18.12	2.83	-11.47*	0.56	-2.89	9.06	18.97	80.03**	42.88*	-10.20	2.61	-7.04
	(13.42)	(10.86)	(5.45)	(7.45)	(6.66)	(9.51)	(27.84)	(25.84)	(18.45)	(14.52)	(5.34)	(15.26)
Father college, mother no college	8.90	14.94	4.07	2.45	-8.00	-10.03	14.08	25.76	12.60	31.46	7.36	-41.38+
	(21.94)	(17.75)	(8.91)	(12.18)	(10.89)	(15.55)	(45.51)	(42.25)	(30.17)	(23.75)	(8.73)	(24.95)
Couple-level Race												
Both White (reference)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Both non-White	-1.37	-38.49***	-11.24**	-18.24***	0.78	7.60	6.54	-23.75	32.56*	-20.26*	1.18	12.01
	(9.30)	(7.52)	(3.77)	(5.16)	(4.61)	(6.59)	(19.28)	(17.90)	(12.78)	(10.06)	(3.70)	(10.57)
Mixed Race	5.80	-23.89*	3.35	-11.08	1.93	7.06	-2.74	10.30	-2.47	13.84	-4.39	-25.87+
	(13.66)	(11.06)	(5.55)	(7.58)	(6.78)	(9.69)	(28.34)	(26.31)	(18.79)	(14.79)	(5.44)	(15.54)
Usual Hours Worked Per Week												
Respondent	-2.91***	-0.16	-0.80***	0.01	-0.42	-0.41	-0.50	-2.23*	1.20	-0.60	0.02	-1.30*
	(0.55)	(0.44)	(0.22)	(0.30)	(0.27)	(0.39)	(1.14)	(1.05)	(0.75)	(0.59)	(0.22)	(0.62)
Spouse	1.21***	0.81**	0.12	-0.13	0.11	-0.38	-0.72	0.93	0.08	-0.98**	-0.11	-0.14
	(0.34)	(0.27)	(0.14)	(0.19)	(0.17)	(0.24)	(0.70)	(0.65)	(0.47)	(0.37)	(0.14)	(0.39)
Unemployed/Looking/Intends to Find Work												
Respondent	28.83*	-4.81	4.80	1.38	-1.02	-2.42	7.18	3.05	-45.12**	-1.84	1.06	16.83
	(12.00)	(9.71)	(4.87)	(6.66)	(5.95)	(8.51)	(24.89)	(23.10)	(16.50)	(12.99)	(4.78)	(13.65)
Spouse	-6.19	2.39	0.89	-5.78	-8.83	4.08	-3.69	-35.19	-24.85	-5.02	3.37	-14.68
	(14.50)	(11.73)	(5.89)	(8.05)	(7.20)	(10.28)	(30.08)	(27.92)	(19.94)	(15.70)	(5.77)	(16.49)
Difficulty (ADL)												
Respondent	-7.51	-70.93***	4.68	0.95	4.07	15.24	-23.30	-10.08	26.21	20.85	-8.76	41.61*
	(14.59)	(11.81)	(5.92)	(8.10)	(7.24)	(10.34)	(30.26)	(28.09)	(20.06)	(15.79)	(5.81)	(16.59)
Spouse	4.66	-28.20	-0.18	5.54	-2.84	3.91	-34.82	-51.46	17.03	-32.13	-8.12	3.44
	(21.40)	(17.31)	(8.69)	(11.88)	(10.62)	(15.17)	(44.38)	(41.19)	(29.42)	(23.15)	(8.52)	(24.33)
Family Income												
<$25,000	7.21	13.52	3.23	18.84*	-2.82	-4.59	53.64+	54.25*	10.32	-15.74	-16.47**	-10.73
	(14.29)	(11.57)	(5.80)	(7.93)	(7.09)	(10.13)	(29.65)	(27.52)	(19.65)	(15.47)	(5.69)	(16.25)
$25,000-49,999	22.76+	-6.36	8.95+	4.55	-5.16	3.25	29.02	22.71	29.98+	-31.94*	-7.11	29.22*
	(11.92)	(9.64)	(4.84)	(6.62)	(5.91)	(8.45)	(24.72)	(22.95)	(16.39)	(12.90)	(4.74)	(13.55)
$50,000-74,999	-1.72	-1.96	1.42	2.82	11.67+	-0.80	-15.85	7.59	-11.03	-21.17	-8.10+	18.86
	(12.03)	(9.74)	(4.89)	(6.68)	(5.97)	(8.53)	(24.96)	(23.17)	(16.55)	(13.02)	(4.79)	(13.69)
$75,000+ (reference)												
Number of Children Under 18	7.58	5.12	-1.47	-1.59	-5.90*	12.38***	13.70	25.32**	-13.50*	-2.23	-0.76	-11.58*
	(4.97)	(4.02)	(2.02)	(2.76)	(2.46)	(3.52)	(10.30)	(9.56)	(6.83)	(5.37)	(1.98)	(5.65)
Age of Youngest Child	0.02	3.53***	0.50	-3.05***	-4.53***	-0.89	-20.91***	-15.04***	0.84	0.63	-0.17	-0.90
	(0.86)	(0.70)	(0.35)	(0.48)	(0.43)	(0.61)	(1.79)	(1.66)	(1.19)	(0.93)	(0.34)	(0.98)
Weekday	-17.51*	8.18	1.44	-0.77	15.55***	15.70*	-142.09***	-130.04***	-38.67**	-43.00***	-2.37	-38.60***
	(8.90)	(7.20)	(3.61)	(4.94)	(4.42)	(6.31)	(18.46)	(17.13)	(12.24)	(9.63)	(3.54)	(10.12)
Year												
2008 (reference)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2009	-5.78	-18.78	11.11	10.00	-26.78**	-5.88	-23.14	-13.45	-25.25	21.13	4.29	25.94
	(17.47)	(14.14)	(7.10)	(9.70)	(8.67)	(12.39)	(36.24)	(33.64)	(24.03)	(18.91)	(6.96)	(19.87)
2010	-3.34	-19.48	7.15	8.77	-22.22**	-15.00	-27.75	-29.75	-19.17	4.00	8.37	1.09
	(17.24)	(13.95)	(7.00)	(9.57)	(8.56)	(12.22)	(35.77)	(33.20)	(23.71)	(18.66)	(6.86)	(19.61)
2011	-8.45	-25.01+	17.26*	3.51	-27.28**	-1.42	1.22	5.17	-34.60	24.33	-0.65	24.97
	(18.21)	(14.73)	(7.39)	(10.11)	(9.03)	(12.91)	(37.76)	(35.05)	(25.03)	(19.70)	(7.25)	(20.70)
2012	15.24	-36.11*	4.32	17.89+	-26.76**	26.87*	3.12	64.17+	-3.66	16.50	9.44	-1.41
	(18.87)	(15.27)	(7.66)	(10.47)	(9.36)	(13.38)	(39.14)	(36.33)	(25.95)	(20.42)	(7.51)	(21.46)

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

Appendix C4. Family Type (At-home Mothers vs. Breadwinner Mothers) SUR Coefficients for Minutes Spent in Housework, Childcare, Leisure, and Health on the ATUS Diary Day, 2008-2012.

	Housework			Childcare					Leisure & Health			
	Female-Typed	Male-Typed	Other	Playing	Physical Care	Education & Other	Secondary Care	With Children	TV Watching	Non-TV Leisure	Exercise	Sleep
Work/Family Arrangement												
Breadwinner Mother (reference)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
At-home Mother	6.10	10.32	-26.88**	3.02	12.01	-4.66	57.46	22.44	32.65	34.82	12.97	-18.43
	(24.47)	(9.89)	(8.63)	(12.21)	(12.84)	(14.43)	(40.95)	(37.72)	(23.10)	(22.20)	(7.91)	(21.31)
Age difference (Father-Mother)	0.97+	0.19	0.08	0.31	-0.14	-0.16	0.12	1.56*	0.13	0.39	0.08	-0.10
	(0.50)	(0.20)	(0.18)	(0.25)	(0.26)	(0.30)	(0.84)	(0.77)	(0.47)	(0.46)	(0.16)	(0.44)
Couple-level Education												
Both college (reference)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Neither college	22.09**	8.87**	-6.69**	-9.08*	-9.13*	-15.91***	28.58*	-12.90	58.43***	-25.08***	-5.17*	23.67***
	(7.19)	(2.91)	(2.54)	(3.59)	(3.77)	(4.24)	(12.04)	(11.09)	(6.79)	(6.52)	(2.33)	(6.26)
Mother college, father no college	-17.15	1.96	-6.86+	-11.70*	2.92	-0.08	4.83	-4.58	30.55**	-16.60+	-0.40	5.00
	(10.85)	(4.39)	(3.83)	(5.42)	(5.69)	(6.40)	(18.16)	(16.73)	(10.25)	(9.85)	(3.51)	(9.45)
Father college, mother no college	23.42*	5.36	-5.77+	-9.58*	-4.57	-14.20*	-13.43	-42.47**	31.88***	-41.52***	-3.20	25.79**
	(9.57)	(3.87)	(3.37)	(4.77)	(5.02)	(5.64)	(16.01)	(14.75)	(9.03)	(8.68)	(3.09)	(8.33)
Couple-level Race												
Both White (reference)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Both non-White	34.01***	-9.50***	-12.24***	-13.77***	1.38	-1.91	5.87	-2.42	13.20*	-23.40***	-1.00	30.46***
	(6.05)	(2.44)	(2.13)	(3.02)	(3.17)	(3.57)	(10.12)	(9.32)	(5.71)	(5.49)	(1.96)	(5.27)
Mixed Race	-4.68	-10.58**	-5.07	-0.26	-5.30	-3.32	-22.34	-6.89	7.46	11.64	-1.62	22.42**
	(9.87)	(3.99)	(3.48)	(4.92)	(5.18)	(5.82)	(16.51)	(15.21)	(9.31)	(8.95)	(3.19)	(8.59)
Usual Hours Worked Per Week												
Respondent	-1.89***	-0.04	-0.69***	-0.12	-0.45	-0.75*	-1.96*	-3.22***	-0.38	-0.44	0.17	-1.39**
	(0.55)	(0.22)	(0.19)	(0.27)	(0.29)	(0.32)	(0.91)	(0.84)	(0.51)	(0.49)	(0.18)	(0.47)
Spouse	0.13	-0.10	0.14+	0.24*	-0.23*	0.17	-0.36	0.86**	-0.63**	-0.07	0.09	-0.30
	(0.21)	(0.08)	(0.07)	(0.10)	(0.11)	(0.12)	(0.35)	(0.32)	(0.20)	(0.19)	(0.07)	(0.18)
Unemployed/Looking/Intends to Find Work												
Respondent	9.71	1.02	-2.64	-5.71+	-4.27	-9.05*	-9.78	-37.72***	-6.75	10.74+	-0.44	-13.77*
	(6.48)	(2.62)	(2.29)	(3.23)	(3.40)	(3.82)	(10.85)	(9.99)	(6.12)	(5.88)	(2.10)	(5.65)
Spouse	-4.46	1.67	0.24	-7.95	-13.97+	4.49	-8.44	-44.14+	-22.04	-3.50	4.12	-22.05
	(15.77)	(6.37)	(5.56)	(7.87)	(8.27)	(9.30)	(26.39)	(24.31)	(14.89)	(14.30)	(5.10)	(13.73)
Difficulty (ADL)												
Respondent	-24.74+	-12.85*	0.12	-0.36	6.27	0.32	-92.39***	-43.76*	41.65**	-11.64	-11.39*	26.95*
	(14.14)	(5.71)	(4.98)	(7.05)	(7.42)	(8.34)	(23.66)	(21.79)	(13.35)	(12.82)	(4.57)	(12.31)
Spouse	-6.67	-3.16	-1.89	-10.26	4.25	0.19	16.40	-27.50	-16.03	-18.26	-2.98	-54.55***
	(17.86)	(7.21)	(6.30)	(8.91)	(9.37)	(10.53)	(29.88)	(27.53)	(16.85)	(16.20)	(5.77)	(15.55)
Family Income												
<$25,000	23.71**	-8.63*	-2.32	0.65	-3.83	-6.01	3.13	36.38**	-3.57	2.28	1.06	12.21
	(9.10)	(3.68)	(3.21)	(4.54)	(4.78)	(5.37)	(15.24)	(14.03)	(8.59)	(8.26)	(2.94)	(7.93)
$25,000-49,999	23.69**	-7.29*	-3.92	6.59+	5.97	-2.13	19.84	31.48**	2.09	-4.25	-7.06**	16.20*
	(7.68)	(3.10)	(2.71)	(3.83)	(4.03)	(4.53)	(12.86)	(11.84)	(7.25)	(6.97)	(2.48)	(6.69)
$50,000-74,999	-0.09	-0.18	-5.53*	6.93+	0.73	2.61	-3.77	39.43***	1.23	4.23	-5.83*	5.20
	(7.66)	(3.09)	(2.70)	(3.82)	(4.02)	(4.52)	(12.82)	(11.81)	(7.23)	(6.95)	(2.48)	(6.67)
$75,000+ (reference)												
Number of Children Under 18	10.20***	1.51	-0.25	-11.34***	-0.44	19.82***	10.83*	19.32***	-12.96***	-3.01	1.74*	-12.17***
	(2.54)	(1.03)	(0.89)	(1.27)	(1.33)	(1.50)	(4.25)	(3.91)	(2.40)	(2.30)	(0.82)	(2.21)
Age of Youngest Child	3.30***	0.88***	0.64***	-5.22***	-7.41***	1.31***	-25.45***	-20.47***	1.25*	1.00*	0.40*	-0.96*
	(0.54)	(0.22)	(0.19)	(0.27)	(0.28)	(0.32)	(0.90)	(0.83)	(0.51)	(0.49)	(0.17)	(0.47)
Weekday	32.93***	-8.53***	2.85	0.96	25.07***	29.57***	-126.53***	-69.20***	-30.41***	-37.32***	1.29	-44.25***
	(5.64)	(2.28)	(1.99)	(2.81)	(2.96)	(3.33)	(9.44)	(8.69)	(5.32)	(5.11)	(1.82)	(4.91)
Year												
2008 (reference)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2009	-1.61	5.17	5.47	7.25	-19.20**	-2.49	13.82	-18.74	-2.55	7.40	11.35**	3.29
	(11.21)	(4.53)	(3.95)	(5.59)	(5.88)	(6.61)	(18.76)	(17.28)	(10.58)	(10.17)	(3.62)	(9.76)
2010	3.56	0.71	-3.96	12.93*	-18.07**	-4.38	-3.27	-25.10	-11.86	12.32	10.23**	6.74
	(11.12)	(4.49)	(3.92)	(5.55)	(5.83)	(6.56)	(18.61)	(17.15)	(10.50)	(10.09)	(3.60)	(9.69)
2011	-6.71	7.99+	-3.61	13.50*	-19.00**	-3.69	27.05	-17.69	2.17	11.03	8.91*	12.48
	(11.16)	(4.51)	(3.94)	(5.57)	(5.85)	(6.58)	(18.68)	(17.20)	(10.54)	(10.12)	(3.61)	(9.72)
2012	-7.85	5.51	-3.81	8.96	-22.81***	-7.09	1.81	-27.79	-1.78	8.25	7.30*	27.10**
	(11.24)	(4.54)	(3.96)	(5.61)	(5.90)	(6.63)	(18.81)	(17.33)	(10.61)	(10.20)	(3.63)	(9.79)

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

Appendix C5. Family Type (At-home Mothers vs. Breadwinner Fathers) SUR Coefficients for Minutes Spent in Housework, Childcare, Leisure, and Health on the ATUS Diary Day, 2008-2012.

	Housework			Childcare					Leisure & Health			
	Female-Typed	Male-Typed	Other	Playing	Physical Care	Education & Other	Secondary Care	With Children	TV Watching	Non-TV Leisure	Exercise	Sleep
Work/Family Arrangement												
Breadwinner Father (reference)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
At-home Mother	161.07***	-31.23***	-1.66	-7.36	32.80***	18.54*	182.84***	122.18***	-22.68	-24.36	-0.78	-24.77+
	(14.08)	(8.24)	(5.10)	(7.79)	(8.64)	(8.65)	(28.67)	(27.29)	(16.24)	(15.29)	(6.72)	(14.41)
Age difference (Father-Mother)	0.08	0.01	-0.08	-0.03	-0.46+	-0.36	0.00	-0.02	0.25	0.55	0.13	-0.51
	(0.38)	(0.22)	(0.14)	(0.21)	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.78)	(0.74)	(0.44)	(0.41)	(0.18)	(0.39)
Couple-level Education												
Both college (reference)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Neither college	12.78*	11.46***	-3.62+	-6.15*	-5.51+	-12.77***	30.34**	3.50	44.96***	-16.83**	-4.10+	17.87***
	(5.14)	(3.01)	(1.86)	(2.85)	(3.16)	(3.16)	(10.48)	(9.97)	(5.94)	(5.59)	(2.46)	(5.27)
Mother college, father no college	-13.39+	1.49	-3.96	-2.95	0.07	-3.37	-5.13	-7.06	24.98**	-11.27	-4.99	6.10
	(7.95)	(4.65)	(2.88)	(4.40)	(4.88)	(4.88)	(16.19)	(15.41)	(9.17)	(8.63)	(3.80)	(8.14)
Father college, mother no college	12.80+	10.78**	-1.25	-5.81	-8.03*	-13.18**	3.25	-30.44*	31.08***	-30.30***	-4.72	12.41+
	(6.61)	(3.87)	(2.40)	(3.66)	(4.06)	(4.06)	(13.46)	(12.81)	(7.63)	(7.18)	(3.16)	(6.77)
Couple-level Race												
Both White (reference)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Both non-White	26.90***	-11.67***	-8.35***	-12.01***	-3.52	-0.84	-1.76	0.44	7.41	-13.47**	-3.36	18.28***
	(4.40)	(2.58)	(1.60)	(2.44)	(2.70)	(2.71)	(8.97)	(8.54)	(5.08)	(4.78)	(2.10)	(4.51)
Mixed Race	3.05	-8.88*	-2.10	1.62	0.74	-2.00	-20.16	-2.29	3.00	8.84	-3.08	5.01
	(6.74)	(3.94)	(2.44)	(3.73)	(4.13)	(4.14)	(13.72)	(13.06)	(7.77)	(7.32)	(3.22)	(6.90)
Usual Hours Worked Per Week												
Respondent	0.27	-0.43**	-0.14+	-0.30*	-0.44**	-0.36*	-0.56	-1.58***	-1.15***	-1.02***	0.13	-1.77***
	(0.23)	(0.14)	(0.08)	(0.13)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.47)	(0.45)	(0.27)	(0.25)	(0.11)	(0.24)
Spouse	-0.00	-0.05	0.15*	0.27**	-0.23*	0.16	-0.50	0.92**	-0.68***	0.11	0.07	-0.34+
	(0.18)	(0.10)	(0.06)	(0.10)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.36)	(0.34)	(0.20)	(0.19)	(0.08)	(0.18)
Unemployed/Looking/Intends to Find Work												
Respondent	13.98*	0.59	-2.67	-5.91+	-3.64	-9.38**	-4.04	-34.85**	-4.48	9.14	-0.15	-11.61*
	(5.58)	(3.26)	(2.02)	(3.09)	(3.42)	(3.43)	(11.36)	(10.81)	(6.44)	(6.06)	(2.66)	(5.71)
Spouse	-0.53	1.53	-1.07	-0.65	-5.05	-2.98	23.51	7.02	10.04	13.61	0.03	-6.73
	(8.04)	(4.70)	(2.92)	(4.45)	(4.93)	(4.94)	(16.37)	(15.59)	(9.28)	(8.73)	(3.84)	(8.23)
Difficulty (ADL)												
Respondent	-21.59+	-9.98	1.99	-1.49	4.79	0.77	-80.00***	-33.34	41.85**	-10.65	-16.69**	7.01
	(11.06)	(6.47)	(4.01)	(6.12)	(6.79)	(6.80)	(22.53)	(21.45)	(12.77)	(12.01)	(5.28)	(11.32)
Spouse	-1.95	2.25	1.63	0.02	4.05	0.71	26.78	-0.33	-15.66	-23.30	10.49+	-29.72*
	(13.36)	(7.81)	(4.84)	(7.39)	(8.20)	(8.21)	(27.20)	(25.89)	(15.41)	(14.50)	(6.38)	(13.67)
Family Income												
<$25,000	12.42+	-3.72	-3.22	3.05	-7.11+	-8.20*	-17.71	5.55	-4.75	4.85	-2.13	17.11*
	(6.61)	(3.87)	(2.40)	(3.66)	(4.06)	(4.06)	(13.47)	(12.82)	(7.63)	(7.18)	(3.16)	(6.77)
$25,000-49,999	13.86*	-0.75	-4.13*	3.50	-3.29	-5.81+	10.54	11.86	14.53*	-6.25	-7.80**	16.38**
	(5.54)	(3.24)	(2.01)	(3.07)	(3.40)	(3.41)	(11.29)	(10.75)	(6.40)	(6.02)	(2.65)	(5.67)
$50,000-74,999	4.95	1.20	-4.32*	8.86**	-2.28	-1.52	-15.54	17.26	7.09	4.84	-3.81	2.03
	(5.44)	(3.18)	(1.97)	(3.01)	(3.34)	(3.34)	(11.08)	(10.55)	(6.28)	(5.91)	(2.60)	(5.57)
$75,000+ (reference)												
Number of Children Under 18	6.88***	2.31*	-0.27	-8.64***	-0.65	15.46***	15.02***	17.19***	-10.92***	-3.97*	0.66	-8.36***
	(1.82)	(1.06)	(0.66)	(1.01)	(1.12)	(1.12)	(3.70)	(3.52)	(2.10)	(1.97)	(0.87)	(1.86)
Age of Youngest Child	2.44***	1.07***	0.37**	-4.45***	-6.01***	0.93***	-20.49***	-16.75***	1.08*	0.44	0.36+	-0.25
	(0.39)	(0.23)	(0.14)	(0.22)	(0.24)	(0.24)	(0.80)	(0.76)	(0.45)	(0.43)	(0.19)	(0.40)
Weekday	18.89***	-13.61***	-0.24	-4.33+	17.98***	18.56***	-181.00***	-128.68***	-46.54***	-56.18***	-3.97*	-54.25***
	(4.04)	(2.36)	(1.47)	(2.24)	(2.48)	(2.48)	(8.23)	(7.83)	(4.66)	(4.39)	(1.93)	(4.14)
Year												
2008 (reference)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2009	7.69	-7.55+	0.72	5.73	-7.92+	-2.16	31.45*	19.92	-11.32	14.80*	6.65*	-4.22
	(6.92)	(4.05)	(2.51)	(3.83)	(4.25)	(4.25)	(14.09)	(13.42)	(7.99)	(7.52)	(3.31)	(7.08)
2010	5.88	-1.84	-2.95	12.89***	-12.07**	-2.05	13.56	11.65	-19.75*	17.25*	7.64*	-6.75
	(6.87)	(4.02)	(2.49)	(3.81)	(4.22)	(4.22)	(14.00)	(13.33)	(7.93)	(7.47)	(3.28)	(7.04)
2011	5.89	-1.47	-5.34+	11.93**	-11.69*	-3.10	35.62*	8.92	-11.34	13.65	10.12**	-0.04
	(7.68)	(4.49)	(2.78)	(4.25)	(4.71)	(4.72)	(15.63)	(14.88)	(8.86)	(8.33)	(3.67)	(7.86)
2012	4.11	-4.43	-4.66+	8.29+	-14.22**	-6.19	20.87	2.60	-13.05	10.12	6.85+	13.06+
	(7.69)	(4.50)	(2.79)	(4.25)	(4.72)	(4.72)	(15.65)	(14.90)	(8.87)	(8.35)	(3.67)	(7.87)

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

Appendix C6. Family Type (At-home Fathers vs. Breadwinner Fathers) SUR Coefficients for Minutes Spent in Housework, Childcare, Leisure, and Health on the ATUS Diary Day, 2008-2012.

	Housework			Childcare					Leisure & Health			
	Female-Typed	Male-Typed	Other	Playing	Physical Care	Education & Other	Secondary Care	With Children	TV Watching	Non-TV Leisure	Exercise	Sleep
Work/Family Arrangement												
Breadwinner Father (reference)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
At-home Father	-2.54	-18.62	-2.49	0.02	-17.58	29.19**	81.44+	-29.34	55.24*	12.55	6.37	-60.56**
	(14.04)	(16.33)	(6.31)	(10.38)	(11.23)	(11.14)	(42.93)	(41.62)	(26.96)	(22.85)	(11.42)	(22.02)
Age difference (Father-Mother)	-0.27	0.08	-0.23	-0.23	-0.50+	-0.59*	-0.69	-2.21*	0.09	0.00	0.30	-0.94+
	(0.35)	(0.41)	(0.16)	(0.26)	(0.28)	(0.28)	(1.07)	(1.04)	(0.67)	(0.57)	(0.28)	(0.55)
Couple-level Education												
Both college (reference)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Neither college	-0.15	16.62**	-1.45	-3.58	-5.07	-1.34	14.23	18.78	42.03***	-3.34	2.34	5.87
	(4.99)	(5.81)	(2.24)	(3.69)	(3.99)	(3.96)	(15.27)	(14.80)	(9.59)	(8.13)	(4.06)	(7.83)
Mother college, father no college	5.96	1.15	-4.93+	7.80	-1.13	0.59	21.62	62.49**	22.01+	-3.67	-7.67	0.20
	(6.67)	(7.75)	(3.00)	(4.93)	(5.33)	(5.29)	(20.39)	(19.77)	(12.80)	(10.85)	(5.42)	(10.46)
Father college, mother no college	-2.02	17.95*	5.05+	2.05	-11.66*	-8.69	31.67	2.96	31.97*	-4.74	-2.31	-17.90+
	(6.80)	(7.91)	(3.05)	(5.03)	(5.44)	(5.39)	(20.79)	(20.16)	(13.06)	(11.07)	(5.53)	(10.66)
Couple-level Race												
Both White (reference)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Both non-White	1.19	-27.26***	-5.06**	-12.07***	-7.91*	3.42	-14.65	-8.71	7.41	-1.68	-4.76	0.55
	(4.21)	(4.90)	(1.89)	(3.12)	(3.37)	(3.34)	(12.88)	(12.49)	(8.09)	(6.86)	(3.43)	(6.61)
Mixed Race	11.83*	-14.26*	2.48	-3.39	5.06	1.49	-19.18	0.16	-7.22	6.49	-6.15	-22.76*
	(5.94)	(6.91)	(2.67)	(4.39)	(4.75)	(4.71)	(18.16)	(17.60)	(11.40)	(9.67)	(4.83)	(9.31)
Usual Hours Worked Per Week												
Respondent	-0.22	-0.61**	-0.08	-0.28*	-0.63***	-0.15	-0.76	-1.92***	-0.84*	-0.99***	0.09	-2.02***
	(0.17)	(0.20)	(0.08)	(0.13)	(0.14)	(0.13)	(0.52)	(0.50)	(0.33)	(0.28)	(0.14)	(0.27)
Spouse	0.95***	0.89***	0.07	-0.09	0.21	-0.35*	-0.57	1.17+	0.22	-0.69+	-0.07	-0.02
	(0.22)	(0.25)	(0.10)	(0.16)	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.67)	(0.65)	(0.42)	(0.36)	(0.18)	(0.34)
Unemployed/Looking/Intends to Find Work												
Respondent	24.14**	-6.33	3.42	-1.13	0.39	-3.95	23.14	-0.61	-47.77**	-7.26	3.22	14.73
	(7.91)	(9.20)	(3.55)	(5.85)	(6.33)	(6.28)	(24.19)	(23.45)	(15.19)	(12.88)	(6.43)	(12.41)
Spouse	5.82	0.88	-1.32	-0.58	-5.42	-3.44	23.00	7.78	9.28	12.51	0.43	-5.51
	(5.70)	(6.62)	(2.56)	(4.21)	(4.56)	(4.52)	(17.42)	(16.89)	(10.94)	(9.27)	(4.63)	(8.93)
Difficulty (ADL)												
Respondent	-8.04	-51.18***	7.46+	1.89	3.66	14.76*	-19.88	1.04	30.72+	16.51	-11.22	22.42
	(8.75)	(10.17)	(3.93)	(6.47)	(7.00)	(6.94)	(26.75)	(25.94)	(16.80)	(14.24)	(7.11)	(13.72)
Spouse	7.91	-3.18	4.89	13.85	-8.31	7.14	-15.89	-24.45	12.44	-42.11*	12.82	0.59
	(11.56)	(13.44)	(5.19)	(8.55)	(9.24)	(9.17)	(35.34)	(34.27)	(22.19)	(18.81)	(9.40)	(18.13)
Family Income												
<$25,000	-9.54	11.29	-1.37	15.57**	-12.70*	-12.41*	-22.88	-25.91	-2.60	-0.28	-12.77*	10.40
	(6.42)	(7.47)	(2.88)	(4.75)	(5.14)	(5.09)	(19.63)	(19.04)	(12.33)	(10.45)	(5.22)	(10.07)
$25,000-49,999	5.16	5.69	1.24	1.19	-14.22***	-8.45*	7.69	-5.98	35.30***	-19.87*	-7.98+	20.09*
	(5.29)	(6.15)	(2.37)	(3.91)	(4.23)	(4.19)	(16.16)	(15.67)	(10.15)	(8.60)	(4.30)	(8.29)
$50,000-74,999	3.14	3.55	-0.77	7.56*	1.77	-8.50*	-30.14+	-18.53	6.04	-4.71	-3.35	5.09
	(5.15)	(5.99)	(2.31)	(3.81)	(4.12)	(4.08)	(15.74)	(15.26)	(9.89)	(8.38)	(4.19)	(8.07)
$75,000+ (reference)												
Number of Children Under 18	0.72	4.32*	-0.97	-2.13	-2.98*	7.87***	20.58***	15.04**	-8.31*	-4.05	-1.61	-3.66
	(1.89)	(2.20)	(0.85)	(1.40)	(1.51)	(1.50)	(5.78)	(5.60)	(3.63)	(3.07)	(1.54)	(2.96)
Age of Youngest Child	0.11	2.39***	0.10	-2.80***	-3.47***	-0.47	-14.01***	-11.33***	0.62	-0.36	0.05	0.58
	(0.38)	(0.44)	(0.17)	(0.28)	(0.31)	(0.30)	(1.17)	(1.13)	(0.73)	(0.62)	(0.31)	(0.60)
Weekday	-17.22***	-10.41*	-3.68*	-8.52**	8.30**	3.07	-235.88***	-206.15***	-64.73***	-74.60***	-10.82***	-60.56***
	(3.89)	(4.52)	(1.75)	(2.87)	(3.11)	(3.08)	(11.88)	(11.52)	(7.46)	(6.32)	(3.16)	(6.09)
Year												
2008 (reference)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2009	6.69	-23.00***	-0.18	4.04	-6.88	-1.81	25.45	33.75+	-19.24+	24.66*	2.85	-6.30
	(5.99)	(6.96)	(2.69)	(4.43)	(4.79)	(4.75)	(18.31)	(17.75)	(11.50)	(9.75)	(4.87)	(9.39)
2010	1.66	-10.36	0.78	9.34*	-13.01**	-2.32	10.28	20.71	-19.83+	16.27+	7.21	-19.69*
	(5.94)	(6.91)	(2.67)	(4.39)	(4.75)	(4.71)	(18.16)	(17.61)	(11.40)	(9.67)	(4.83)	(9.31)
2011	8.77	-24.78**	5.65	0.50	-17.98**	0.22	15.10	17.88	-49.44**	28.92*	12.72+	-6.29
	(8.01)	(9.32)	(3.60)	(5.93)	(6.41)	(6.36)	(24.50)	(23.75)	(15.38)	(13.04)	(6.51)	(12.56)
2012	21.20**	-36.51***	-1.07	13.93*	-14.86*	22.10***	45.51+	67.72**	-16.07	16.97	13.11*	-29.55*
	(8.13)	(9.45)	(3.65)	(6.01)	(6.50)	(6.45)	(24.84)	(24.09)	(15.60)	(13.22)	(6.61)	(12.74)

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