OCCUPATIONAL SEX COMPOSITION AND GENDERED HOUSEWORK PERFORMANCE: COMPENSATION OR CONVENTIONALITY?

Elizabeth Aura McClintock*

Assistant Professor

University of Notre Dame

This manuscript was prepared for submission to the Population Association of America 2015 meeting. Please do not cite without permission.

* Preferred contact: emcclint@nd.edu or eliabeth.aura.mcclintock@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

I examine the association between occupational sex composition (the proportion of women and men in an occupation) and housework performance, considering measures of total housework time, housework time on male-typed and female-typed tasks specifically, and the share of total housework time spent on male-typed and on female-typed tasks. These alternative measures of housework performance better test competing explanations and place gendered housework performance within the context of overall housework performance. Previous research examining male and female-typed chores separately (Schneider 2012) suggests that women and men compensate for employment in a gender-atypical occupation by increasing the gender-typicality of their housework performance (e.g., a man in a predominately-female occupation would do more "manly" chores). However, using data on single and partnered women and men from the National Survey of Families and Households (1992-1994) and the American Time Use Survey (2003-2012), I find that focusing on male-typed and female-typed tasks in isolation obscures the true relationship between occupation and housework. Rather than using gendered chores as a means of compensating for a gender-atypical occupation, women and men in gender-atypical occupations also perform a more gender-atypical combination of chores. I argue that individuals employed in gender-atypical occupations are less committed to conventional gender expectations broadly, including in the domain of housework. By expecting a more complex process (compensatory gender display), prior researchers may have overlooked a simpler explanation (gender-progressivity).

Word count: 9,096 (not counting the online supplement)
Tables: 6 tables (not counting the online supplement)

INTRODUCTION

Since the 1960s, women have cut their hours of housework in half while men have doubled the time they spend on housework—yet women still do about two-thirds of household work (Bianchi et al. 2000). As a result, women suffer fewer and more-interrupted hours of leisure (Mattingly and Bianchi 2003) and reduced earnings (Noonan 2001; Stratton 2001). Additionally, both spouses experience reduced marital quality when they perceive the division of housework to be unfair (Frisco and Williams 2003; Stevens, Kiger, and Riley 2001). Extensive sociological literature has debated the determinants of this inequity, with much of the debate centered around the economic dependence created by unequal relative income, the autonomy granted by high absolute income, and the gendered meaning of housework (Bittman et al. 2003; Brines 1994; Evertsson and Nermo 2004; Evertsson and Nermo 2007; Greenstein 2000; Gupta 2006; Gupta 2007; Gupta and Ash 2008; Killewald and Gough 2010; Parkman 2004; Schneider 2011; Shelton and John 1996).

The majority of extant literature focuses on the effects of spouses' absolute and relative *incomes* on *total* housework hours, combining all household tasks. However, the *gendered* division of "female" and "male" tasks also merits consideration, particularly because many female-typed tasks are time-inflexible (e.g., preparing meals) whereas male-typed tasks can often be put off until convenient (e.g., mowing the lawn). The time inflexibility of routine female tasks generates another dimension of inequality not captured by total hours. Moreover, insofar as housework may be an important arena for "doing" gender (West and Zimmerman 1987), the division of specific tasks by gender may provide insight into the underlying causes of task allocation. Finally, income is not the only factor that might shift power dynamics within marriage or might alter spouses' need to express their gender through housework performance. Along these lines, Schneider (2012) considers another potential determinant of gendered housework performance: Individuals' occupational sex composition. In this article I extend Schneider's work by using alternative measures of total and gendered housework performance that test competing explanations and by placing gendered housework performance within the context of overall housework hours. I argue that focusing on male-typed and female-typed tasks in isolation obscures the true relationship between occupation and housework.

BACKGROUND: THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES & EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

Gender Performance

Men working in predominately-female occupations are evaluated as inadequately "performing" masculinity through their employment (Badgett and Folbre 2003; Harding 2007; Heilman and Wallen 2010; Robinson, Hall, and Hockey 2011; Williams 1989; Williams 1995; Williams 2008). If the men themselves perceive employment in predominately-female occupations as undermining their masculinity, they might seek to offset a failed gender performance at work through *compensatory gender display* in another domain (Brines 1994). Because housework tasks are strongly-gendered, men might counter the stigma of working in a female job by reducing time on female-typed and/or increasing time on tasks male-typed tasks. Norms regarding men's appropriate participation in housework are in flux, perhaps allowing individual men scope to avoid (or embrace) household tasks. Still, although theoretically-compelling, compensatory gender

display rests on the assumption that men experience working in female jobs as a threat to masculinity—society and sociologists problematize men's employment in such professions, but men who enter predominately-female jobs might not feel that their jobs threaten their masculinity or may not value conventional masculinity. Even if such men do feel that their employment threatens their gender identity, a gender-typical housework performance might not offset a failed gender performance at work—employment and housework may represent separate and non-substitutable gendered domains.

In principle, women working in predominately-male occupations might experience a similar sense of failed gender performance and compensate by doing more female-typed housework and/or less male-typed housework than they would when working in predominately-female occupations. But men are penalized more than women for transgressing gender boundaries (England 2010), so working in a gender-atypical job might be less threatening to femininity than to masculinity. In general, masculinity is harder to "earn" and more important to "prove" than femininity (Bittman et al. 2003; Brines 1994) so there is more reason to expect compensatory gender performance among men than among women.

Indeed, Schneider (2012) found evidence that men—but not women—may offset a gender-atypical occupation through housework. Specifically, men in predominately-female occupations spend more time on "male" household tasks (yard work, car maintenance), compared to men who work in gender-balanced occupations. It is not clear from this research, however, if men in predominately-female occupations spend more time on male household tasks simply because they spend more time on *all* household tasks (including female-typed tasks) or whether the men are increasing their *relative* time on male tasks as a share of their total housework hours. It remains possible that the observed association between the sex composition of men's occupations and their time in male housework tasks is entirely driven by changes in men's *total* housework hours—that is, the men might also increase their time in female and gender-neutral tasks. If men truly use housework to offset a gender-atypical job, this should be reflected in their performance of *both* male and female tasks in absolute terms and within the context of overall housework hours. In fact, it is their performance of gendered tasks relative to total housework (e.g., male tasks as a percent of total housework time) that is most indicative of gender-typical housework performance.

> *Hypothesis 1a:* Men will spend less time on female-typed housework when they work in predominately-female occupations, in both absolute (total hours) and relative (as a share of total housework hours) terms, compared to when they work in predominately-male occupations.
>
> *Hypothesis 1b:* Men will spend more time on male-typed housework when they work in predominately-female occupations, in both absolute and relative terms, compared to when they work in predominately-male occupations.

Likewise, if women use housework to offset a gender-atypical job, this should be reflected in their male and female-typed task performance.

> *Hypothesis 2a:* Women will spend more time on female-typed housework when they work in predominately-male occupations, in both absolute and relative terms, compared to when they work in predominately-female occupations.

Hypothesis 2b: Women will spend less time on male-typed housework when they work in predominately-male occupations, in both absolute and relative terms, compared to when they work in predominately-female occupations.

Schneider (2012) finds that women whose husbands work in predominately-male occupations spend more time on female household tasks, compared to women whose husbands work in gender-balanced occupations. This reflects the inherent interdependence of spouses' housework performance— when one spouse increases (decreases) her or his housework contribution, there is less (more) housework left for the other spouse. However, spouses might also collude in (re)establishing a traditionally-gendered marriage: when one spouse works in a gender-atypical occupation, the other spouse might increase the gender-typicality of her or his own housework performance.

Hypothesis 3a: Men will spend less time on female-typed housework when their wives work in predominately-male occupations, in both absolute and relative terms, compared to when their wives work in predominately-female occupations.

Hypothesis 3b: Men will spend more time on male-typed housework when their wives work in predominately-male occupations, in both absolute and relative terms, compared to when their wives work in predominately-female occupations.

If women also offset a gender-atypical occupation through housework, this will be reflected in their partner's performance.

Hypothesis 4a: Women will spend more time on female-typed housework when their husbands work in predominately-female occupations, in both absolute and relative terms, compared to when their husbands work in predominately-male occupations.

Hypothesis 4b: Women will spend less time on male-typed housework when their husbands work in predominately-female occupations, in both absolute and relative terms, compared to when their husbands work in predominately-male occupations.

Prior studies have considered total housework hours as indicative of gender performance: men are thought to compensate for earning less than their wives by doing less housework than the men would do (if they earned the same as their w). There has been some support for this perspective (Bittman et al. 2003; Brines 1994; Evertsson and Nermo 2004; Greenstein 2000; Schneider 2011; Schneider 2012) but also many disconfirming findings (Gupta 2006; Gupta 2007; Gupta and Ash 2008; Killewald and Gough 2010). The mixed findings may result in part from the mixed nature of housework—because some tasks are female-typed and others are male-typed, individuals might perform gender by altering which tasks they perform, with or without changing their total housework hours. Partnered individuals in particular may meet less resistance from their spouse if they trade chores rather than reduce their total hours. Because total housework time is an unreliable indicator of gender performance through housework, the compensatory doing gender framework does not provide any hypothesis about how occupational gender-atypicality would alter total housework.

With few exceptions, prior authors have presented compensatory gender performance through housework as inapplicable to single men and women because it is an interactional social performance. But individuals might perform for an internal or imagined audience, and moreover, single individuals are not without a real audience. Gender performance is observed by friends, dating partners, and colleagues, including gendered housework performance. For example, a man

in a predominately-female job might ostentatiously avoid female-typed chores or show off his interest in male-typed household tasks such as auto care and home repairs. In this article, I consider both single and partnered women and men.

Gender-conventionality

Women and men who enter gender-atypical occupations differ from those who avoid these jobs. Male engineers hold more traditional gender attitudes than male elementary school counselors (Dodson and Borders 2006) and women with more liberal beliefs about gender are more likely to enter traditionally-male occupations (Okamoto and England 1999). Occupational choice may also reflect broader interests or skills. For example, a man or woman who works as a general contractor (a predominately-male job) might devote a large share of housework hours to home improvement and repair projects (male-typed tasks). An individual employed as an interior decorator (a predominately-female job) might hold high standards of household appearance and therefore devote more time to cleaning and tidying the house (female-typed tasks). These arguments suggest that women and men in gender-atypical occupations would perform a less gender-stereotypical mix of household tasks:

Hypothesis 5a: Women will spend more time on male-typed housework when they work in predominately-male occupations, in both absolute and relative terms, compared to when they work in predominately-female occupations.

Hypothesis 5b: Women will spend less time on female-typed housework when they work in predominately-male occupations, in both absolute and relative terms, compared to when they work in predominately-female occupations.

Hypothesis 5c: Men will spend more time on female-typed housework when they work in predominately-female occupations, in both absolute and relative terms, compared to when they work in predominately-male occupations.

Hypothesis 5d: Men will spend less time on male-typed housework when they work in predominately-female occupations, in both absolute and relative terms, compared to when they work in predominately-male occupations.

It is unclear whether these factors would influence total housework hours. Devoting more time to male tasks might be offset by spending less time on female tasks (and vice-versa). However, some tasks are more time-flexible and optional than others, possibly resulting in some change in overall hours. Generally, these processes would apply equally to single and married individuals, insofar as selection into occupations would function equivalently. However, married individuals may have more scope to pick the chores that interest them because spouses' housework performance is unavoidably interdependent. If one spouse works in a highly gender-(a)typical occupation and performs a disproportionate amount of gender-(a)typical tasks, there are less of these tasks for the other spouse:

Hypothesis 6a: Women will spend more time on male-typed housework when their husbands work in predominately-female occupations, compared to when their husbands work in predominately-male occupations.

Hypothesis 6b: Women will spend less time on female-typed housework when their husbands work in predominately-female occupations, compared to when their husbands work in predominately-male occupations.

Hypothesis 6c: Men will spend more time on female-typed housework when their wives work in predominately-male occupations, compared to when their wives work in predominately-female occupations.

Hypothesis 6d: Men will spend less time on male-typed housework when their wives work in predominately-male occupations, compared to when their wives work in predominately-female occupations.

Although the gender-conventionality theory arguably offers the most obvious expected relationship between occupational sex composition and housework performance, prior research has focused on the more complex compensatory gender performance theory (Schneider 2012). This may be explained by the popularity of this theory in regards to income and housework and by the standing of the theory's original proponents, West and Zimmerman (1987). Nevertheless, I argue that prior research may have overlooked the obvious by assuming a more complex process.

Prior Research on Occupation and Housework

Despite the prolific scholarship on occupational sex composition and on housework there has been little empirical research on the link between occupation and housework. Daniel Schneider (2012) uses the gender composition of men's and women's hours to predict their time spent in gender-typed household work. Schneider allows for non-linearity in the effect of occupational sex composition by including a first-order and second-order (quadratic or "squared") term for the percentage of women in a given occupation, based on US Census data. He finds that men in predominately-female and men in predominately-male occupations both spend more time on male household tasks, compared to men in gender-balanced occupations. Also, women whose husbands work in predominately-female or predominately-male occupations spend more time on female household tasks, compared to women whose husbands work in gender-balanced occupations. Schneider interprets men's higher performance of male-typed tasks and women's higher performance of female-typed tasks when the men work in predominately-female occupations, compared to gender-balanced occupations, as evidence that men and women both use housework to compensate for the men's gender-atypical occupation. In contrast, Schneider finds that women in occupations with larger shares of men spend more time on male-typed household tasks, while their husbands spend less time on male-typed household tasks—this is inconsistent with the compensatory gender display model but supports the gender-conventionality model.

However, it is not clear from this article if men are spending more time on male tasks in order to demonstrate masculinity or whether they are spending more time on *all* household tasks (including female tasks and gender-neutral tasks as well as male tasks). Although not attaining statistical significance, the coefficients on the first and second-order terms of occupational sex composition suggest that men working in predominately-female occupations might also spend more time in female-typed housework. It is possible that this effect might be statistically significant were the quadratic term to be removed.[i] Thus, there may be an increase in female-typed housework as men's occupations become more heavily-female. If so, men in predominately-male occupations may be doing more male housework only because they are doing more housework in general, including gender-neutral and female tasks. Given these concerns, I argue that extant findings supporting compensatory gender display in the context of occupational sex composition and housework performance merit closer examination.

DATA & METHODS

Datasets

The *National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH)* began in 1987 as a nationally-representative sample of U.S. households. Data from Wave 2 (1992-1994) and Wave 3 (2001-2003) contain information on housework hours for both the original respondent and the respondent's spouse or cohabiting partner (if any). Wave 3 provides more recent data but Wave 2 provides a larger sample size. I present results from Wave 2 to make my analysis more easily comparable with Daniel Schneider's analysis of these same data (2012). I use data from the *1990 U.S. Decennial Census* from the Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (Ruggles et al. 2010) to calculate occupation sex composition for the NSFH analysis.

I use data from the *American Time Use Survey (ATUS)* 2003-2012 to replicate my analysis of the NSFH. To calculate occupational sex composition for the ATUS analysis I use data from the *Current Population Survey (CPS)* because occupational codes in ATUS are easily linked to CPS data but cannot be matched to Census data (ATUS uses occupational codes introduced after the 2010 Census). To ensure an adequate sample size for even small occupations I use CPS data from 2000-2012. Workers (households) are interviewed multiple times in the CPS; I count each worker only once, during the initial CPS interview. This reduces attrition bias (some households leave the sample before completing the final interview).

Measures

Unless otherwise noted, measures are the same for the NSFH and the ATUS. In the NSFH the respondent is asked to estimate how much time she or he spends in various household tasks in an average week. In the ATUS respondents complete a detailed time diary for a single day; I use daily minutes to estimate weekly hours so that both datasets use the same scale. I largely follow Schneider (2012) in classifying housework tasks as "male," "female," or "neutral" (please see the Online Supplement for details). This yields three dependent variables: *total housework hours* (combining male, female, and neutral tasks), *hours on female tasks*, and *hours on male tasks*. In the NSFH the only gender-neutral activity is paying bills. I also calculate the *percent male-typed tasks* and the *percent female-typed tasks*, defined as the percent of total housework time that is devoted to male and female tasks, respectively (e.g., time on male tasks as a percent of total time). Because spouses' housework time is interdependent, all NSFH models control for the partner's value on the dependent variable. The ATUS data does not measure spouses' housework.

Percent occupation female is the percent of workers in an occupation who are female, calculated from 1990 U.S. Census data (for NSFH) and 2000-2012 CPS data (for ATUS). Schneider (2012) models non-linearity in the effect of occupational sex composition on housework performance by including a linear and a quadratic term. This is a common methodological choice, but I prefer a less parametric approach (I explain this preference in the Online Supplement and alos present results using linear and quadratic terms). I classify occupations as 0-25% female workers (predominately-male), 26-50% female, 51-75% female, and 76-100% female (predominately-female). These dichotomous "dummy" variables provide a simple and flexible method of modeling possible non-linearity in the effect of occupational sex composition on housework. In addition, this

coding scheme is a good fit theoretically. Approximately 40-45% of men (depending on dataset and union status) work in jobs that are 0-25% female, and almost 80% of men work in jobs that are 0-50% female. Clearly, it is highly normative for men to work in occupations that employ mostly men. Predominately-male, therefore, serves as a logical base category. About 15-19% of men work in jobs that are 51-75% female and only 4-7% work in jobs that are 76-100% female. For men, these categories represent deviations from normative employment expectations with the predominately-female category representing a very unusual occupational choice. If men commonly engage in compensatory gender display in response to occupational gender-atypicality, the 4-7% of men working in predominately-female occupations are the men most likely to do so. In the online supplement I demonstrate that results are robust to alternative methods of coding occupational sex composition.

Following Gupta (2007), I include individual *earnings* for each spouse, measured as the total earned income in the prior year. I also include a measure of *economic dependency*, developed by Sorensen and McLanahan (1987), in which the wife's annual income is subtracted from the husband's, then divided by the total of their two incomes. This creates a scale score of 1 where the husband provides all the income, 0 when each contributes equally, and -1 when the wife provides all the income. However, following Schneider (2011), I rescale this to represent the proportion of income earned by the husband. Thus, a value of 0 means that the wife earns all the income, 0.5 means that the spouses have equal incomes, and 1 means that the husband earns all the income. To allow for non-linearity in the effect of relative income, I recode this into four equally-spaced categories: The husband earns 0-25% of the income, he earns 26-50%, he earns 51-75%, and he earns 76-100%.

I classify e*ducational attainment* as less than a high school education, high school graduate, some college or post-secondary education, or four-year college graduate or higher. These are dichotomous ("dummy") variables with less than high school as the reference. I categorize *weekly hours worked* as less than 40, 40-49 (reference), and 50 or higher. In the NSFH analysis I control for *self-rated health*; this measure is not available in ATUS. I limit my analysis to those aged 18 and older and control for age, dividing it into quartiles. Education, weekly hours worked, occupational prestige, health, and age are included for both spouses because spouses' behavior is interdependent (e.g., Shafer 2011). *Marital status* is single, cohabiting, or married and in the analysis of partnered respondents I control for *cohabitation* (as opposed to marriage). Finally, I control for residential *children*, the respondent's score on an index of questions regarding gender and work-family attitudes (NSFH only; as in Schneider 2012), and the respondent's attitude about sharing housework (NSFH only).

Methods

Models and estimation: I use imputation by chained equations to impute missing values, using the ICE procedure in the statistical software program Stata 11 (Royston 2004). Compared to dropping cases with missing data, using multiple imputation reduces bias (Acock 2005). I estimate regression models using the MIM procedure in Stata 11 (Royston 2004). My sample consists of all single individuals in the labor force in a given year. I show models estimated separately by gender.

Analytic Approach: I examine the association of occupational sex composition and housework performance, considering total housework hours, hours on female and male tasks specifically, and the relative share of housework hours made up by male-typed and female-typed tasks. I begin by presenting simple descriptive statistics and then present linear regression models. The descriptive statistics provide an important check on the more complex regression (Firebaugh 2008). As an additional check to ensure the robustness of my results, I consider alternative specifications for coding the main independent variable, occupational sex composition. This is particularly important because the association of occupational sex composition and housework performance (if any) might be non-linear and because the shape of any such non-linearity is unknown a priori (given competing theoretical models which predict different empirical patterns). These analyses are available in the online supplement.

RESULTS: OCCUPATIONAL SEX COMPOSITION AND GENDERED TASK PERFORMANCE

Sample characteristics

Table 1A displays descriptive statistics on partnered (married or cohabiting) and single men in the NSFH and ATUS datasets and Table 1B presents equivalent statistics for women. Unsurprisingly, women do more total housework than men, regardless of relationship status (partnered vs. single) or dataset. Men perform more male-typed housework than women, in terms of total time spent on male tasks and also in terms of the percent of total housework hours that are spent on male tasks. However, because the vast majority of household tasks are female-typed tasks, both men and women spend more time on female-typed tasks than on male-typed tasks. Compared to partnered men, single men spend more time on female-typed tasks and less time on male-typed tasks, in both absolute and relative (as a percent of total hours) terms. This is likely because union formation is associated with a shift in responsibility for household tasks toward a more gender-stereotypical arrangement. Single men do not have the option to shunt female-typed tasks to their partners. Correspondingly, partnered women do more housework than single women and this is driven by an increase in time spent on female-typed tasks.

Like housework, occupations are also strongly gendered, with men working in occupations that are roughly one-third female and women working in occupations that are two-thirds female, on average. Only 4% of married men and 6-7% of single men work in predominately-female (76-100% female) occupations (depending which dataset). Similarly, 5-6% of married women and 6-7% of single women work in predominately-male (0-25% female) occupations. These patterns of occupational sex segregation are consistent with those in similar datasets, including the slightly higher rate of occupational gender-atypicality among single men than among partnered men (McClintock 2011).

Average housework hours by occupational sex composition.

Table 2A displays men's average housework hours by relationship status, by the men's own occupational sex composition, and by the men's partners' occupational sex composition. Table 2B displays the equivalent averages for women. I will begin by discussing the patterns in the NSFH data (in the top panels) and then compare these to those in the ATUS data (in the lower panels).

Partnered men:

In the NSFH data, married and cohabiting men working in predominately-female (76-100% female) occupations do the most total housework and this is driven by their time in both female-typed and male-typed tasks. Men's time in female tasks increases monotonically with the proportion of women in their jobs but the increase is non-linear—men in predominately-female jobs spend 14 hours on female tasks compared to 10-11 hours for other men. Men in predominately-female occupations also spend more time on male-typed tasks, compared to men in gender-mixed occupations, although it is men in predominately-male (0-25% female) occupations who spend the most time on male-typed household tasks. Still, the *percent* of total hours spent on male tasks *decreases* monotonically with increases in the percent of women in men's occupations. Men in predominately-female occupations devote more hours to male-typed tasks (compared to men in gender-mixed jobs) because they do more *total* housework—these men are also spending more time in female tasks. In fact, in the context of overall housework performance, men in predominately-female occupations are least gender-typical in their housework performance: male tasks make up the smallest percent of their overall time and female tasks make up the largest percent. Examining hours in male tasks in isolation could misleadingly seem to support a compensatory doing gender perspective, but considering male tasks within the context of female and gender-neutral task performance yields a very different interpretation.

Table 2A also indicates that men whose *wives* work in predominately-male (gender-atypical) occupations perform the most total housework hours and spend the least time on male tasks and the most time on female tasks. The percent of total hours that men spend on male tasks generally increases with increases in the percent of women in the men's wives' occupations. Seemingly, men's wives' occupational gender-atypicality is associated with men's housework performance being less gender-stereotypical, as is men's own occupational gender-atypicality.

These patterns are similar in the ATUS data. Men in predominately-female occupations spend the most time on female-typed housework while men in predominately-male occupations spend the most time on male-typed housework. Because of their high hours on female and male tasks, respectively, both groups of men do more total housework than men in gender-mixed jobs. The percentage of total housework time spent on male tasks decreases monotonically with increases in the proportion of women in men's jobs, while the percent of time spent on female-typed tasks increases. However, patterns by men's wives' occupational sex composition are less clear in the ATUS data than in the NSFH data. Men do the most total housework when their wives work in predominately-female jobs and this is driven by relatively high hours on both male and female tasks. But men with wives in gender-mixed occupations spend the least time on male-typed tasks, compared to men with wives in predominately-male or predominately-female occupations, and the percent of time in male and female tasks has neither a positive, negative, or a U-shaped association with men's wives' occupational sex composition.

Single men:

Single men's total housework does not vary much by their occupational sex composition in the NSFH data. However, the time single men devote to female tasks increases monotonically with increases in the proportion of women in the men's occupations, while the time spent in male tasks decreases. As a result, the percent of total hours that are spent on male tasks decreases

monotonically with increases in the percent of women in men's occupations while the percent of total hours that are spent on female tasks increases.

As in the NSFH data, in the ATUS data single men's total housework does not vary much by their occupational sex composition, although total hours are somewhat higher for men in predominately-male and in predominately-female occupations, compared to men in gender-mixed jobs, as are hours in female tasks. Hours in male-typed tasks, however, decrease monotonically with increases in the proportion of women in men's occupations and the percent of total hours that are spent on male tasks decreases monotonically with increases in the percent of women in men's occupations while the percent of total hours that are spent on female tasks increases. Thus, in both datasets, greater occupational gender-atypicality is associated with a less conventionally-gendered allocation of time among possible household tasks.

Partnered women:

In the NSFH data, married and cohabiting women's hours spent on female tasks is non-linearly associated with their occupational sex composition: Women in predominately-male and in predominately-female occupations spend more time on female-typed housework hours than do women in gender-mixed occupations that either lean male (26-50% female) or lean female (51-75% female). Because the vast majority of women's total housework time is spent on female tasks, this results in a similarly non-linear relationship between total housework hours and occupational sex composition. However, women in predominately-male occupations spend more time in male-typed tasks and the percent of total hours spent on female tasks increases monotonically with increases in the percent of women in women's occupations, while the percent of total time spent on male tasks decreases. These same patterns are also evident in the ATUS data. As with men's housework time, women's occupational gender-atypicality is associated with a less gender-stereotypical allocation of women's housework time in both datasets.

Interestingly, women's housework time is non-linearly associated with their husband's occupational sex composition—women with husbands in predominately-male and in predominately-female occupations spend more time on female-typed tasks and, as a result, on total housework, compared to women whose husbands work in gender-mixed jobs. There is no significant association between women's husbands' occupations and women's time on male tasks, whether measured in absolute hours or as a percent of total hours. Again, these patterns are consistent in both datasets.

Single women:

In the NSFH data, single women in predominately-male and in predominately-female occupations perform more total housework and more hours of female tasks, compared to women in gender-mixed jobs. However, women in predominately-male occupations spend more time in male-typed tasks and the percent of total hours that are spent on female tasks generally increases with increases in the percent of women in women's occupations, while time spent on male tasks generally decreases. Again, occupational gender-atypicality is associated with a less gender-stereotypical housework performance. Likewise, in the ATUS data, single women in predominately-female and predominately-male occupations do the most total housework, driven by higher hours on female tasks. As in the NSFH, women in predominately-male jobs do the most male-typed

housework and the percent of time spent on male tasks decreases with the percent of women in women's occupations while the percent of tile spent on female tasks decreases. However, these differences are not all large enough to be statistically significant.

Occupational sex composition and gendered housework performance

Although suggestive, the associations in Tables 2A and 2B may be spurious. Occupational sex composition is associated with other occupational attributes which might themselves influence housework performance. Most obviously, predominately-male jobs pay more than predominately-female jobs (England 1992; Petersen and Morgan 1995) and higher income may allow individuals to do less housework (Gupta 2007). Similarly, if workers in predominately-male occupations work longer hours, this might cause them to do less housework. In the linear regression models, described below, I control for relevant individual characteristics as well as related occupational characteristics that might change in tandem with sex composition, such as income, hours worked, and occupational prestige.

Table 3A displays coefficients from linear regression models predicting men's total housework hours, hours on female tasks, hours on male tasks, and the percent of total housework time that is spent on female and on male tasks. Table 3B presents equivalent regressions predicting women's housework performance. As in Table2A and Table 2B, the top panel contains results from the NSFH data and the lower panel contains results from the ATUS data. Table 3A and 3B do not include coefficients on most control variables; these are available in the online supplement. To demonstrate that results are robust to alternative model specifications, results using linear and quadratic terms for occupational sex composition are also available in the online supplement. Finally, Table 4A and 4B present predicted values for men and women, respectively, calculated by setting all variables other than occupational sex composition at their mean.

Partnered men:

In the NSFH data, men who work in predominately-female (76-100% female) occupations complete more total housework hours (by about 3 hours) and also complete more hours of female tasks (by 3.4 hours), compared to men who work in predominately-male occupations. Also, men who work in occupations that lean male (26-50% female) and in those that lean female (51-75% female) spend less time on male tasks, compared to men who work in predominately-male occupations, but time spent on male tasks does not differ significantly for men who work in predominately-female occupations (the coefficient is negative, however, not positive as predicted by a compensatory gender display model). Most tellingly, the percent of total housework time spent on male tasks decreases monotonically with increases in the percent of women in men's occupations, while the percent of total housework time spent on female tasks increases monotonically. All else equal, men working in predominately-male jobs are predicted to spend 39.7% of housework time on male tasks and 52.7% on female tasks whereas men working in predominately-female jobs are predicted to spend 32.4% of time on male tasks and 59.4% on female tasks (predicted values in Table 4A). Equivalently, men working in predominately-male jobs are predicted to spend 7.3% more of total housework time on male tasks and 6.7% less on female tasks, compared to men working in predominately-female jobs.

Table 3A also indicates that in the NSFH data men whose *wives* work in predominately-male occupations spend more time on female tasks, spend less time on male tasks, and devote a lower percent of total housework time to male tasks and a higher percentage to female tasks. This is not consistent with a compensatory gender display model which predicts that men whose wives work in gender-atypical occupations would compensate by performing a more gender-typical mix of household tasks.

In the ATUS data, men who work in gender-mixed occupations do less housework than men in predominately-male jobs, but do not differ significantly from men in predominately-female jobs. However, compared to men in predominately-male occupations, men in predominately-female occupations spend more time on female tasks and less time on male tasks. The percent of total housework time spent on male tasks decreases monotonically with increases in the gender-atypicality of men's occupations while the percent of total housework time spent on female tasks increases. Thus, although men in predominately-male and predominately-female jobs do not differ in total housework, they differ in the composition of this housework with men in gender-typical occupations performing more stereotypically-male tasks and fewer stereotypically-female tasks. Men working in predominately-male jobs are predicted to spend about 4.8% more of their total housework time on male tasks, and 5.1% less time on female tasks, compared to men working in predominately-female jobs (predicted values in Table 4A).

Although the effect of occupational sex composition on the relative share of total housework devoted to male and female tasks is not perfectly linear, it is consistently monotonic in both datasets. This is evident in both Table 3A which presents the regression coefficients, and in Table 4A which presents fitted (predicted) values. The evidence does not support a compensatory gender display model in which men's gendered housework performance is non-monotonically associated with occupational sex composition. When gendered housework performance is considered within the context of total housework it is clear that occupational gender-atypicality is monotonically and positively associated with time spent on gender-atypical tasks and is monotonically and inversely associated with time spent on gender-typical tasks.

Single men:

In the NSFH, single men's occupational sex composition is not significantly related to their total housework hours or their absolute time spent on male or female tasks. However, the percent of total housework time spent on male tasks decreases with increases in the percent of women in men's occupations, while the percent of time spent on female tasks increases. This is driven by a slightly higher time spent on female tasks and slightly lower time spent on male tasks for men in more heavily-female occupations, although neither of these associations is strong enough to attain statistical significance on its own. In the ATUS data, results for single men are also similar to those for partnered men. Men in predominately-female occupations do not differ in terms of total hours of housework or hours of female tasks, but they spend less time on male tasks, compared to men in predominately-male occupations. The percent of time spent on male tasks decreases with increases in single men's occupational gender-atypicality while the percent of time spent on female tasks increases. The general pattern observed for partnered men—less gender-typical housework performance among men in less gender-typical occupations—is also evident among single men, and the magnitude of the effect of occupational sex composition on housework is also similar. In the

NSFH data men in predominately-female occupations spend 6% less of their total housework time on male tasks and 7% more on female tasks, compared to men in predominately-male occupations. In the ATUS data, these values are 5% and 4%, respectively.

Partnered women:

Women in the NSFH who work in predominately-male occupations do not differ from women who work in predominately-female occupations on total housework hours or on hours of female tasks. However, women who work in predominately-male occupations spend more time on male tasks. Also, the percent of total housework time devoted to female tasks decreases monotonically with decreases in the proportion of women in women's occupations. Similarly, women working in predominately-male jobs spend a larger percent of their total housework time on male tasks, compared to women in predominately-female jobs. As with men, women who work in gender-atypical occupations perform a more gender-atypical mix of household tasks. In the ATUS data there is not as consistent a relationship between women's occupational sex composition and housework (most associations do not attain statistical significance although the direction of estimate effects is generally consistent with those in the ATUS data).

Single women:

In the NSFH data there is very little relationship between single women's occupational sex composition and their housework performance. However, in the ATUS data, women working in predominately-male occupations do more male housework, and devote a larger share of their total housework time to male tasks and a smaller share to female tasks, compared to women in predominately-female occupations. As with single and partnered men, results for single women are similar to those for married women but they are weaker. This suggests that although a similar process operates regardless of union status, the effect is stronger on partnered individuals. For example, perhaps sharing household tasks with a co-residential partner gives individuals greater scope to select certain household tasks and to avoid others. Unless they out-source, single individuals are responsible for all necessary household tasks so they may be less able to "pick and choose" certain chores.

Sensitivity analyses

These results are robust to alternative model specifications. Table A5 and Table A6 in the online supplement compare coefficient estimates for men using categorical, linear, and linear plus quadratic terms for occupational sex composition for the NSFH and ATUS data, respectively. Tables A7 and A8 present the equivalent analyses for women. Tables A9 and A10 present men's predicted housework performance from the alternative models for the two datasets. Tables A11 and A12 present the equivalent predicted values for women. For reasons discussed in the online supplement, I prefer a non-parametric coding of occupational sex composition. However, results are not sensitive to model specifications. For example, the estimates presented in Table 3A suggest an approximately-linear (and certainly monotonic) relationship between men's occupational sex composition and the percent of total housework time devoted to male-typed and to female-typed tasks. Consistent with this, the equivalent models in Tables A5 and A6 indicate a significant linear relationship, not a parabolic relationship (the quadratic term is not statistically significant). This is

further demonstrated in the similarity of the predicted values across alternative model specifications.

Limitations

The associations discussed thus far are unable to establish whether occupational sex composition has a *causal* effect on housework performance. It is likely that men and women who enter gender-atypical occupations also tend toward gender-atypicality in their performance of household tasks. Results might be driven by unmeasured factors that determine both selection into gender-(a)typical occupations and preference for gender-(a)typical housework tasks. In fact, this is my preferred explanation for the observed patterns. This problem has plagued the literature on housework performance generally—the vast majority of studies that examine the division of housework use cross-sectional data and are therefore unable to account for selection and unmeasured individual differences (Exceptions include: Evertsson and Nermo 2007; Gough and Killewald 2011; Killewald and Gough 2010).

Nevertheless, this analysis provides useful data with which to evaluate causal theoretical models. If the predictions of a given model are inconsistent with the observed associations, this undermines (but cannot "disprove") that theoretical model. If the predictions of a given model are consistent with the observed associations, this by no means "proves" the theoretical model but leaves it standing as a possible explanation that may merit further investigation. In this case, results are notably inconsistent with compensatory gender display, currently a dominant theoretical paradigm for understanding housework performance. In addition, including single individuals provides some leverage in addressing selection. If the association of housework and occupational sex composition is driven by selection of "gender-conventional" individuals into gender-typical jobs, it ought to be similar for single and partnered women and men (which it is).

Theoretical implications

The compensatory gender performance model is arguably the current dominant theoretical model for understanding housework performance and occupational gender-atypicality (Schneider 2012). It is also the dominant paradigm for understand how housework performance relates to other characteristics, notably income (beginning with Brines 1994). Compensatory gender display predicts that men will do less total housework or more male-typed housework to compensate for working in a predominantly-female occupation; women will perform more total housework and more female-typed housework to compensate for working in a predominately-male occupation. Only 4-7% of men work in occupations that are 76-100% female (predominately-female) and 15-19% work in occupations that are 51-75% female (depending on dataset and union status). Similarly, 5-7% of women work in occupations that are 0-25% female (predominately-male) and 21-24% work in occupations that are 26-50% female. Clearly, working in these occupations represents a deviation from conventional gender expectations—one that might be offset by stereotypically-gendered housework performance.

However, results are strikingly inconsistent with the compensatory gender performance model. Instead, this analysis suggests that men who work in predominantly-female occupations devote a larger share of their housework time to female tasks and a smaller share to male tasks. This pattern is also evident for single men. Thus, regardless of relationship status, the percent of

time devoted to male-typed tasks is inversely associated with the proportion of women in a man's occupation. It seems that men with "manly" jobs also perform a more "manly" mix of household tasks. This is the reverse of the pattern predicted by the compensatory gender performance model. These results are also inconsistent with the compensatory gender performance model for women. For partnered women the percent of overall housework time devoted to female-typed housework tasks increases monotonically as the proportion of women in their occupation increases and the association is similar, albeit weaker, for single women.

Methodological implications

This analysis has broad methodological implications for the study of housework time. First, the majority of research on housework time focuses on total housework time, pooling male, female, and neutral tasks (Bianchi et al. 2000; Bittman et al. 2003; Brines 1994; Evertsson and Nermo 2004; Evertsson and Nermo 2007; Gough and Killewald 2011; Greenstein 2000; Gupta 2006; Gupta 2007; Gupta and Ash 2008; Killewald and Gough 2010; Schneider 2011). This may be misleading for two main reasons. First, total time obscures other dimensions of inequality, such as time-inflexibility (female-typed tasks may more often be time-inflexible and compulsory) and fragmentation of leisure time (chores may impinge more on women's leisure: Mattingly and Bianchi 2003).

Second, prior studies considering time on gendered household tasks examine male and female tasks independently rather than considering these tasks within the context of overall housework performance (Schneider 2012). As this analysis demonstrates, context matters. For example, men in predominately-female occupations do not differ from men in predominately-male occupations in terms of time spent on male tasks (it is men in gender-mixed jobs that spend the least time on male tasks). However, men in predominately-female occupations spend more time on female tasks than all other men—the reason they spend more time on male-typed tasks relative to men in gender-mixed jobs is because men in predominately-female occupations do more total housework. This is made most clear when considering male and female tasks as a share of total housework time: As men's occupations become more heavily-female they devote a larger share of time to female chores and a smaller share of time to male chores.

DISCUSSION

The popular compensatory gender display theory predicts that women and men will use housework as a means of countering a "failed" gender performance in another domain, usually employment. The current analysis evaluates the association between employment in a gender-atypical occupation (e.g., men working in a predominately-female occupation) and housework, considering male-typed and female-typed chores individually and within the context of total housework performance (total combines female, male, and gender-neutral chores). It did not find evidence that men or women compensate for occupational gender-atypical through housework performance. Instead, occupational gender-atypicality is associated with weaker adherence to gender-stereotypical patterns of housework performance, as predicted by the gender conventionality perspective. For both genders and in both datasets, working in an occupation with a higher proportion of women is associated with devoting a larger share of total housework time to female-typed tasks. Conversely, working in an occupation with a higher proportion of men is

associated with devoting a larger share of total housework time to male-typed tasks. These findings are robust to different model specifications and are evident for partnered and single women and men, although they are stronger for men than for women and for partnered individuals than for single individuals.

The lack of evidence of compensatory gender display through housework does not necessarily undermine this theory more broadly. It is quite possible that individuals engage in compensatory gender display in some other realm in order to offset a gender-atypical occupation. For example, men in predominately-female occupations might buy new cars, take up weight lifting, grow a beard, or perform gender more scrupulously in interactions. Women in predominately-male occupations might defer to men, feign a fear of spiders, or request help carrying heavy objects. A public violation of gender performance such as occupational gender-atypicality might be best offset by an exaggerated gender performance in another public domain, such as personal appearance or deportment. Moreover, given that housework is to some extent a necessary activity, it may be difficult to greatly reduce one's housework performance or substantially alter the gendered division of tasks. Housework certainly provides an arena for performing gender, but it may be an inconvenient context for engaging in compensatory gender performances. In practice, having clean dishes may be more important than enacting masculinity by refusing to wash them.

Still, although it does not disprove compensatory gender display theory, this analysis suggests that the theory may need reconsideration. The competing gender conventionality model argues that women and men who select into gender-atypical occupations are less committed to conventional gender norms and will therefore engage in less gender-stereotypical housework performance—this prediction is supported by the data. Compensatory gender display theory overlooks self-selection into jobs. Yet because individuals exercise some degree of choice over their occupation, workers in gender-atypical jobs may be less concerned about performing gender "successfully," as defined by conventional standards, and therefore lack motivation for compensatory gender display. This logic suggests that compensatory gender display would be most prevalent among individuals who have entered a gender-atypical job unwillingly. Similarly, in the context of income and housework, compensatory gender display might be limited in scope to couples for whom the wife's higher income is unintentional.

By limiting the scope of compensatory gender display, researchers would also avoid problematizing gender-progressive couples and individuals. In many instances, gender-atypical outcomes, including employment in a gender-atypical occupation, may reflect individuals' preferences and values. Such individuals would have no need to compensate through an exaggeratedly-conventional gender performance in another domain. Although many observers may judge their gender performance as inadequate, it is patronizing and misleading to assume that individuals in gender-atypical occupations necessarily share this sense of gender-inadequacy. Indeed, this article suggests that they may attach little importance to conventional gender expectations, performing a less-gender typical combination of household chores as well as working in a gender-atypical job.

WORKS CITED:

Acock, Alan C. 2005. "Working with missing values." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 67(4):1012-1028.
Badgett, M. V. Lee and Nancy Folbre. 2003. "Job Gendering: Occupational Choice and the Marriage Market." *Industrial Relations* 42(2):270-298.
Bianchi, Suzanne M., Melissa A. Milkie, Liana C. Sayer, and John P. Robinson. 2000. "Is Anyone Doing the Housework? Trends in the Gender Division of Household Labor." *Social Forces* 79(1):191-228.
Bittman, Michael, Paula England, Liana C. Sayer, Nancy Folbre, and George Matheson. 2003. "When Does Gender Trump Money? Bargaining and Time in Household Work." *American Journal of Sociology* 109(1):186-214.
Brines, Julie. 1994. "Economic Dependency, Gender, and the Division of Labor at Home." *American Journal of Sociology* 100(3):652-688.
Dodson, Thomas A. and L. DiAnne Borders. 2006. "Men in Traditional and Nontraditional Careers: Gender Role Attitudes, Gender Role Conflict and Job Satisfaction." *The Career Development Quarterly* 54(283-296.
England, Paula. 1992. *Comparable Worth: Theories and Evidence*. New York: Aldine.
England, Paula. 2010. "The Gender Revolution Uneven and Stalled." *Gender and Society* 24(2):149-166.
Evertsson, Marie and Magnus Nermo. 2004. "Dependence Within Families and the Division of Labor: Comparing Sweden and the United States." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 66(5):1272-1286.
Evertsson, Marie and Magnus Nermo. 2007. "Changing Resources and the Division of Housework: A Longitudinal Study of Swedish Couples." *European Sociological Review* 23(4):455-470.
Firebaugh, Glenn. 2008. *Seven Rules for Social Research*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Frisco, ML and K Williams. 2003. "Perceived housework equity, marital happiness, and divorce in dual-earner households." *Journal of Family Issues* 24(1):51-73.
Gough, Margaret and Alexandra Killewald. 2011. "Unemployment in Families: The Case of Housework." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 73(5):1085-1100.
Greenstein, Theodore N. 2000. "Economic Dependence, Gender, and the Division of Labor in the Home: A Replication and Extension." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 62(322–335.
Gupta, Sanjiv. 2006. "Her Money, Her Time: Women's Earnings and Their Housework Hours." *Social Science Research* 35(975-999.
Gupta, Sanjiv. 2007. "Autonomy, Dependence, or Display? The Relationship Between Married Women's Earnings and Housework." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 69(399-417.
Gupta, Sanjiv and Michael Ash. 2008. "Whose Money, Whose Time? A Nonparametric Approach to Modeling Time Spent on Housework in the United States." *Feminist Economics* 14(1):93-120.
Harding, Thomas. 2007. "The Construction of Men Who are Nurses as Gay." *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 60(6):636-644.
Heilman, Madeline E. and Aaron S. Wallen. 2010. "Wimpy and undeserving of respect: Penalties for men's gender-inconsistent success." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 46(664-667.

Killewald, Alexandra and Margaret Gough. 2010. "Money Isn't Everything: Wives' Earnings and Housework Time." *Social Science Research* 39(6):987-1003.
Mattingly, Marybeth J. and Suzanne M. Bianchi. 2003. "Gender Differences in the Quantity and Quality of Free Time: The U.S. Experience." *Social Forces* 81(3):999-1030.
McClintock, Elizabeth Aura. 2011. "Occupational Sex Segregation and Marriage: The Romantic Cost of Gender-Atypical Jobs." in *Population Association of America Annual Meeting, Washington DC*.
Noonan, Mary C. 2001. "The Impact of Domestic Work on Men's and Women's Wages." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 63(1134-1145.
Okamoto, Dina G. and Paula England. 1999. "Is There a Supply Side to Occupational Sex Segregation? ." *Sociological Perspectives* 42(4):557-582.
Parkman, Allen M. 2004. "Bargaining Over Housework: The Frustrating Situation of Secondary Wage Earners." *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 63(4):765-94.
Petersen, Trond and Laurie A. Morgan. 1995. "Separate and Unequal: Occupation-Establishment Sex Segregation and the Gender Wage Gap." *The American Journal of Sociology* 101(2):329-365.
Robinson, Victoria, Alexandra Hall, and Jenny Hockey. 2011. "Masculinities, Sexualities, and the Limits of Subversion: Being a Man in Hairdressing." *Men and Masculinities* 14(1):31-50.
Royston, Patrick. 2004. "Multiple Imputation of Missing Values." *Stata Journal* 4(3):227-241.
Ruggles, Steven, J. Trent Alexander, Katie Genadek, Ronald Goeken, Matthew B. Schroeder, and Matthew Sobek. 2010. "Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 5.0 [Machine-readable database]." Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
Schneider, Daniel. 2011. "Market Earnings and Household Work: New Tests of Gender Performance Theory." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 73(4):845-860.
Schneider, Daniel. 2012. "Gender Deviance and Household Work: The Role of Occupation." *American Journal of Sociology* 117(4):1029-1072.
Shafer, Emily Fitzgibbons. 2011. "Wives' Relative Wages, Husbands' Paid Work Hours, and Wives' Labor-Force Exit." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 73(1):250-263.
Shelton, Beth Anne and Daphne John. 1996. "The Division of Household Labor." *Annual Review of Sociology* 22(299-322.
Sorensen, Annemette and Sara McLanahan. 1987. "Married Women's Economic Dependency, 1940-1980." *American Journal of Sociology* 93(3):659-87.
Stevens, Daphne, Gary Kiger, and Pamela J. Riley. 2001. "Working Hard and Hardly Working: Domestic Labor and Marital Satisfaction among Dual-Earning Couples." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 63(2):514-526.
Stratton, Leslie S. 2001. "Why Does More Housework Lower Women's Wages? Testing Hypotheses Involving Job Effort and Hours Flexibility." *Social Science Quarterly* 82(1):67-76.
West, Candace and Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. "Doing Gender." *Gender and Society* 1(2):125-151.
Williams, Christine L. 1989. *Gender Differences at Work: Women and Men in Nontraditional Occupations*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Williams, Christine L. 1995. *Still a Man's World: Men Who do Women's Work*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
Williams, Christine L. 2008. "The Glass Escalator: Hidden Advantages for Men in the "Female" Professions." in *The Gendered Society Reader: Third Edition*, edited by M. Kimmel and A. Aronson. New York: Oxford University Press.

[i] As functions of the same underlying variable, the first and second-order terms are also very highly correlated, as are their estimated effects, inflating standard errors. In addition, squaring a term does not simply allow for a curve, it also increases the distance between larger observations by more than it increases the distance between small observations, creating outliers and giving large values undue leverage.

Table 1A. Means and standard deviations for men. National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH), 1992-1994 (Wave 2). American Time Use Survey (ATUS), 2003-2012 (all waves).[1]

	NSFH				ATUS			
	Partnered[2]		Single		Partnered[2]		Single	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Housework hours								
Total hours	18.0	11.4	20.3	12.6	12.9	16.3	11.3	15.3
Hours on female tasks	10.6	8.9	14.8	10.3	6.7	9.9	7.2	10.5
Hours on male tasks	6.1	4.4	4.0	4.1	5.2	12.3	3.2	10.0
Percent of total male	37.0	21.5	19.5	17.2	30.5	39.9	22.4	36.5
Percent of total female	55.0	22.1	71.3	18.3	60.0	41.4	69.9	39.1
Occupational sex composition								
Proportion female	.30	.22	.34	.24	.31	.23	.33	.25
0-25% female	.45		.40		.44		.43	
26-50% female	.36		.34		.35		.32	
51-75% female	.15		.18		.16		.19	
76-100% female	.04		.07		.04		.06	
Education								
Less than high school	.08		.11		.08		.08	
High school or GED	.33		.34		.24		.30	
Some college	.28		.29		.27		.29	
College or higher	.31		.26		.41		.33	
Hours in paid work								
Average weekly hours	46.1	12.8	43.3	13.6	43.2	12.8	41.6	12.8
Under 40 hours	.07		.14		.14		.21	
40-49 hours	.58		.60		.59		.57	
50 or more hours	.35		.26		.27		.22	
Income, 2014 $10,000s								
Personal income	6.5	4.8	5.8	8.4	5.3	3.3	4.3	2.9
Relative income	.63	.19	NA	NA	.55	.15	NA	NA
Attitudes								
Gender-work-family[3]	.50	.19	.52	.17	NA	NA	NA	NA
Housework sharing[4]	.47	.19	.45	.18	NA	NA	NA	NA
Health (1 poor, 5 good)	4.1	.7	4.1	.7	NA	NA	NA	NA
Demographic traits								
Age	40.6	8.8	39.0	10.4	43.3	11.5	41.9	8.8
Cohabiting (vs. married)	.08		NA		NA		NA	
Own residential children	.63		.17		.66		.18	
Sample size	2,561		665		20,733		12,757	

[1]Missing data are imputed. Housework hours are top-coded to the 95th percentile, by task.
[2]Either married or cohabiting.
[3]A scale based on (dis)agreement to three statements regarding gendered work-family roles; scaled 0 to 1 where 1 represents most support for women's employment. The statements are: (1) "It is much better for everyone if the man earns the main living and the woman takes care of

the home and family." (2) "It is all right for children under three years old to be cared for all day in a day care center." (3) "Preschool children are likely to suffer if their mother is employed."

[4] A scale based on (dis)agreement to the statement that "A husband whose wife is working full-time should spend just as many hours doing housework as his wife"; scaled 0 to 1 where 1 represents more conservative attitudes (advocating unequal responsibility for housework).

Table 1B. Means and standard deviations for women. National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH), 1992-1994 (Wave 2). American Time Use Survey (ATUS), 2003-2012 (all waves).[1]

	NSFH				ATUS			
	Partnered[2]		Single		Partnered[2]		Single	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Housework hours								
Total hours	30.1	16.0	26.4	15.4	19.9	17.7	16.1	16.7
Hours on female tasks	26.5	14.1	22.3	13.6	16.8	15.6	13.3	14.5
Hours on male tasks	2.1	2.9	2.4	3.1	2.0	7.0	1.6	6.3
Percent of total male	6.5	7.8	9.2	10.2	8.8	22.4	10.7	25.7
Percent of total female	87.7	9.0	83.1	11.6	84.3	27.4	81.4	30.7
Occupational sex composition								
Proportion female	.66	.25	.65	.25	.67	.24	.65	.24
0-25% female	.06		.07		.05		.06	
26-50% female	.22		.24		.21		.22	
51-75% female	.30		.27		.31		.33	
76-100% female	.43		.42		.42		.39	
Education								
Less than high school	.07		.12		.04		.03	
High school or GED	.33		.35		.24		.25	
Some college	.31		.31		.30		.34	
College or higher	.29		.22		.42		.38	
Hours in paid work								
Average weekly hours	36.7	14.0	39.5	12.3	36.1	11.7	38.2	12.3
Under 40 hours	.36		.25		.38		.31	
40-49 hours	.52		.62		.53		.58	
50 or more hours	.12		.13		.09		.11	
Income, 2014 $10s								
Personal income	3.8	3.0	4.2	3.4	3.5	2.7	3.4	2.5
Relative income	.63	.19	NA	NA	.63	.19	NA	NA
Attitudes								
Gender-work-family[3]	.54	.20	.56	.19	NA	NA	NA	NA
Housework sharing[4]	.43	.19	.41	.19	NA	NA	NA	NA
Health (1 poor, 5 good)	4.1	.7	4.0	.8	NA	NA	NA	NA
Demographic traits								
Age	38.5	8.3	41.9	10.1	42.0	11.2	44.2	14.0
Cohabiting (vs. married)	.08		NA	NA	NA		NA	NA
Own residential children	.66		.49		.66		.39	
Sample size	2,561		1,265		21,106		18,065	

[1]Missing data is imputed. Housework hours are top-coded to the 95th percentile, by task.
[2]Either married or cohabiting.
[3]A scale based on (dis)agreement to three statements regarding gendered work-family roles; scaled 0 to 1 where 1 represents most support for women's employment. The statements are: (1) "It is much better for everyone if the man earns the main living and the woman takes care of

the home and family." (2) "It is all right for children under three years old to be cared for all day in a day care center." (3) "Preschool children are likely to suffer if their mother is employed."

[4] A scale based on (dis)agreement to the statement that "A husband whose wife is working full-time should spend just as many hours doing housework as his wife"; scaled 0 to 1 where 1 represents more conservative attitudes (advocating unequal responsibility for housework).

Table 2A. Men's housework by men's own occupational sex composition and by men's partners' occupational sex composition, if partnered (married or cohabiting). National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH), 1992-1994 (Wave 2) and American Time Use Survey (ATUS), 2003-2012 (all waves).[1]

	National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH)									
	Partnered men					Single men				
Occupational sex composition	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
0-25% female	18.2[b]	10.1[ab]	6.8[ab]	51.7[ab]	40.8[ab]	20.4	14.3	4.6[ab]	67.6[ab]	23.0[ab]
26-50% female	17.2	10.4	5.6	56.6	35.0	20.3	14.7	3.9	72.2	18.0
51-75% female	18.3	11.4	5.5	59.3	32.3	20.1	15.3	3.3	75.8	16.4
76-100% female	21.2	14.1	6.7	61.5	30.1	20.8	16.1	3.0	76.7	15.4
Husband, 0-25% female	19.2	12.4[b]	5.5[a]	60.1[ab]	32.5[ab]	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husband, 26-50% female	17.8	10.5	6.1	56.0	36.6	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husband, 51-75% female	18.0	10.8	5.9	57.1	35.3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husb., 76-100% female	17.9	10.1	6.4	52.4	38.9	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sample size[2]	*2,561*			*2,549*		*665*			*662*	
	American Time Use Survey (ATUS)									
	Partnered men					Single men				
Occupational sex composition	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
0-25% female	13.3[b]	6.4[ab]	6.0[ab]	58.0[ab]	32.9[ab]	12.3[ab]	7.5	4.1[ab]	68.3[a]	24.5[ab]
26-50% female	12.5	6.7	4.8	60.6	29.9	10.6	6.9	2.8	69.6	21.5
51-75% female	12.2	7.0	4.1	62.7	27.1	10.0	7.0	2.3	71.7	20.1
76-100% female	14.1	8.4	4.5	65.7	24.2	11.6	8.3	2.3	72.8	18.3
Husband, 0-25% female	12.7	6.3[a]	5.5[a]	58.6[a]	32.8[a]	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husband, 26-50% female	12.7	6.8	5.0	60.2	30.3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husband, 51-75% female	13.0	7.0	4.9	61.5	28.6	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husb., 76-100% female	13.1	6.7	5.4	59.5	30.6	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sample size[2]	*20,733*			*17,352*		*12,757*			*10,691*	

[a] $p<0.05$, Pearson's correlation. [b] $p<0.05$, ANOVA.

[1]Missing data is estimated using multiple imputation.

[2]The sample size may be slightly lower for the dependent variable measuring the percent of total housework tasks that are male-typed. This is because some respondents report zero housework hours; this measure is undefined for such respondents.

Table 2B. Women's housework by women's own occupational sex composition and by women's partners' occupational sex composition, if partnered (married or cohabiting). National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH), 1992-1994 (Wave 2) and American Time Use Survey (ATUS), 2003-2012 (all waves).[1]

	National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH)									
	Partnered women					Single women				
Occupational sex composition	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
0-25% female	30.5[ab]	26.2[ab]	2.5	85.4[ab]	7.9[ab]	27.3	23.0	2.7[a]	82.8[ab]	9.8[ab]
26-50% female	27.7	24.1	2.0	87.1	6.8	25.5	21.1	2.7	82.0	10.6
51-75% female	29.4	25.8	2.0	87.3	6.6	25.9	21.7	2.4	82.7	9.5
76-100% female	31.8	28.2	2.0	88.8	5.9	27.3	23.2	2.3	84.1	8.2
Husband, 0-25% female	32.2[ab]	28.3[ab]	2.1	88.0	6.1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husband, 26-50% female	28.3	24.8	2.0	87.4	6.8	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husband, 51-75% female	28.4	25.0	2.0	87.9	6.7	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husb., 76-100% female	30.5	27.1	1.7	88.5	5.3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sample size[2]	*2,561*			*2,561*		*1,265*			*1,263*	
	American Time Use Survey (ATUS)									
	Partnered women					Single women				
Occupational sex composition	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
0-25% female	21.2	17.7	2.4[b]	84.3	9.5	16.7[b]	13.4[b]	2.0	79.2	12.5
26-50% female	19.8	16.6	1.9	83.4	9.1	15.8	12.9	1.6	80.9	11.0
51-75% female	18.8	15.8	1.8	84.0	8.8	15.3	12.6	1.6	81.1	11.0
76-100% female	20.6	17.4	2.0	85.0	8.5	16.8	14.0	1.6	82.4	9.9
Husband, 0-25% female	20.7	17.3	2.2	84.7	8.8	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husband, 26-50% female	19.7	16.5	1.9	83.6	9.1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husband, 51-75% female	19.1	16.1	1.9	83.9	8.8	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husb., 76-100% female	20.3	17.2	1.9	84.9	8.5	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sample size[2]	*21,106*			*19,923*		*18,065*			*16,536*	

[a] $p<0.05$, Pearson's correlation. [b] $p<0.05$, ANOVA.

[1]Missing data is estimated using multiple imputation.

[2]The sample size is slightly lower for the dependent variable measuring the percent of total housework tasks that are male-typed. This is because some respondents report zero housework hours; this measure is undefined for such respondents.

Table 3A. Coefficients from linear regression models predicting men's housework. National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH), 1992-1994 (Wave 2) and American Time Use Survey (ATUS), 2003-2012 (all waves).[1]

	National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH)									
	Partnered men					Single men				
Proportion of occupation female	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
0-25% female	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF
26-50% female	-.50	.44	-.99***	3.79***	-4.35***	.92	.97	-.19	2.72	-3.42*
51-75% female	-.54	1.21*	-.80**	4.84***	-5.54***	.81	1.58	-.76ǂ	5.75**	-4.51*
76-100% female	2.94*	3.40***	-.62	6.74**	-7.21**	.53	1.72	-1.25ǂ	6.89*	-6.05*
Wife, 0-25% fem.	.79	1.64*	-.89*	6.25**	-5.33**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wife, 26-50%	-.20	.10	-.23	2.95**	-1.69	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wife, 51-75%	.02	.45	-.29	3.57***	-2.36*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wife, 76-100%	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sample size[2]	*2,561*			*2,549*		*665*			*663*	
	American Time Use Survey (ATUS)									
	Partnered men					Single men				
Proportion of occupation female	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
0-25% female	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF
26-50% female	-1.60***	-.16	-1.28***	2.48**	-1.41	-1.95***	-.84***	-1.19***	1.18	-2.43*
51-75% female	-1.82***	-.04	-1.70***	2.59*	-2.29*	-2.24***	-.65*	-1.49***	3.00*	-3.41*
76-100% female	.26	1.35**	-1.18*	5.13**	-4.83**	-.87	.58	-1.55***	4.12*	-5.29**
Wife, 0-25% fem.	-1.05*	-.53*	-.57	.01	.70	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wife, 26-50%	-.06	.02	-.11	-.13	.31	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wife, 51-75%	.17	.20	-.13	1.14	-.83	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wife, 76-100%	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sample size[2]	*20,733*			*17,352*		*12,757*			*10,691*	

ǂ p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

[1]Models are estimated using multiple imputed datasets. Tables displaying coefficients for control variables are in the Online Supplement, Table A1 (NSFH) and Table A2 (ATUS).

[2]The sample size is slightly lower for the dependent variables measuring the percent of total housework tasks that are female-typed and male-typed. Some respondents report zero housework hours; this measure is undefined for such respondents.

Table 3B. Coefficients from linear regression models predicting women's housework. National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH), 1992-1994 (Wave 2). American Time Use Survey (ATUS), 2003-2012 (all waves).[1]

	National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH)									
	Partnered women					Single women				
Proportion of occupation female	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
0-25% female	.49	-.20	.66*	-2.70**	1.96**	2.21	1.85	.47	-.61	1.15
26-50% female	-2.66**	-2.68***	.03	-1.15*	.69ǂ	.16	-.35	.54*	-1.50ǂ	2.03*
51-75% female	-1.09	-1.14ǂ	.08	-1.00*	.56	.79	.49	.30	-.70	.95
76-100% female	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF
Husband, 0-25% fem.	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husband, 26-50%	-2.22**	-1.90**	-.08	-.45	.37	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husband, 51-75%	-1.61ǂ	-1.28	-.03	.04	.27	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husband, 76-100%	-.47	.25	-.32	.69	-.95	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sample size[2]	*2,561*			*2,561*		*1,265*			*1,263*	
	American Time Use Survey (ATUS)									
	Partnered women					Single women				
Proportion of occupation female	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
0-25% female	.19	-.07	.30	-1.24	1.23	.27	-.38	.48*	-3.10*	2.54**
26-50% female	-.62	-.68	-.10	-2.72*	.57	-.71*	-.77**	.04	-.88	.81
51-75% female	-1.79***	-1.48***	-.26	-.79	.24	-1.13***	-1.06***	.05	-.79	.94
76-100% female	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF
Husband, 0-25% fem.	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husband, 26-50%	-1.03*	-.68	-.27	-.09	.06	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husband, 51-75%	-.63	-.50	-.15	-.64	.17	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husband, 76-100%	-1.22*	-.87	-.28	-.74	.23	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sample size[2]	*21,106*			*19,923*		*18,065*			*16,536*	

1. ǂ p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

[1]Models are estimated using multiple imputed datasets. Tables displaying coefficients for control variables are in the Online Supplement, Table A3 (NSFH) and Table A4 (ATUS).

[2]The sample size is slightly lower for the dependent variables measuring the percent of total housework tasks that are female-typed and male-typed. Some respondents report zero housework hours; this measure is undefined for such respondents.

Table 4A. Predicted values of men's housework by men's occupational sex composition, calculated from regression models in Table 3A. National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH), 1992-1994 (Wave 2). American Time Use Survey (ATUS), 2003-2012 (all waves).[1]

	National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH)									
	Partnered men					Single men				
Occupational sex composition	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
0-25% female	18.0	10.1	6.6	52.7	39.7	19.8	14.0	4.3	68.8	22.0
26-50% female	17.5	10.5	5.6	56.5	35.3	20.7	15.0	4.1	71.5	18.5
51-75% female	18.5	11.3	5.8	57.5	34.1	20.6	15.6	3.5	74.6	17.4
76-100% female	20.9	13.5	6.0	59.4	32.4	20.3	15.7	3.0	75.7	15.9
Sample size[2]	*2,561*			*2,549*		*665*			*662*	
	American Time Use Survey (ATUS)									
	Partnered men					Single men				
	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
0-25% female	13.8	6.7	6.0	58.6	31.4	12.4	7.6	4.0	68.8	23.8
26-50% female	12.2	6.6	4.7	61.1	30.0	10.5	6.8	2.8	69.8	21.5
51-75% female	12.0	6.7	4.3	61.2	29.1	10.2	7.0	2.5	71.6	20.5
76-100% female	14.1	8.1	4.8	63.7	26.6	11.4	8.2	2.4	72.7	18.4
Sample size[2]	*20,733*			*8,660*		*17,352*			*10,691*	

[1]Missing data is estimated using multiple imputation.

[2]The sample size may be slightly lower for the dependent variables measuring the percent of total housework tasks that are female-typed and male-typed. Some respondents report zero housework hours; this measure is undefined for such respondents.

Table 4B. Predicted values of women's housework by women's occupational sex composition, calculated from regressions in Table 3B. National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH), 1992-1994 (Wave 2). American Time Use Survey (ATUS), 2003-2012 (all waves).[1]

	National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH)									
	Partnered women					Single women				
Occupational sex composition	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
0-25% female	31.5	27.2	2.7	85.7	8.0	28.3	24.0	2.7	83.1	9.6
26-50% female	28.4	24.7	2.0	87.3	6.7	26.2	21.8	2.8	82.2	10.5
51-75% female	29.9	26.3	2.1	87.4	6.6	26.9	22.6	2.5	83.0	9.4
76-100% female	31.0	27.4	2.0	88.4	6.0	26.1	22.1	2.2	83.7	8.4
Sample size[2]	*2,561*			*2,549*		*1,265*			*1,263*	
	American Time Use Survey (ATUS)									
	Partnered women					Single women				
Occupational sex composition	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
0-25% female	20.7	17.2	2.4	83.7	9.7	17.0	13.5	2.0	79.0	12.4
26-50% female	20.0	16.7	1.9	83.4	9.0	15.9	13.0	1.6	81.4	10.6
51-75% female	18.9	16.0	1.8	84.2	8.7	15.5	12.7	1.6	81.4	10.8
76-100% female	20.6	17.4	2.0	85.1	8.4	16.6	13.8	1.6	82.2	9.8
Sample size[2]	*21,106*			*19,923*		*18,065*			*16,536*	

[1]Missing data is estimated using multiple imputation.

[2]The sample size may be slightly lower for the dependent variable measuring the percent of total housework tasks that are male-typed. This is because some respondents report zero housework hours; this measure is undefined for such respondents.

ONLINE SUPPLEMENT

Gendered classification of housework tasks

Discussion of chore classification.

Chart A1: Classification of NSFH tasks as female, male, or neutral

Chart A2: Classification of ATUS tasks as female, male, or neutral

All regression coefficients

Table A1: Regression coefficients for all variables, partnered & single men, NSFH

Table A2: Regression coefficients for all variables, partnered & single men, ATUS

Table A3: Regression coefficients for all variables, partnered & single women, NSFH

Table A4: Regression coefficients for all variables, partnered & single women, ATUS

Regression--Alternative coding of % occupation female

Discussion of methodological considerations

Table A5: Alternative specification of proportion occupation female, partnered & single men, NSFH

Table A6: Alternative specification of proportion occupation female, partnered & single men, ATUS

Table A7: Alternative specification of proportion occupation female, partnered & single women, NSFH

Table A8: Alternative specification of proportion occupation female, partnered & single women, ATUS

Predicted values--Alternative coding of % occupation female

Table A9: Alternative specification of proportion occupation female, partnered & single men, NSFH

Table A10: Alternative specification of proportion occupation female, partnered & single men, ATUS

Table A11: Alternative specification of proportion occupation female, partnered & single women, NSFH

Table A12: Alternative specification of proportion occupation female, partnered & single women, ATUS

Chore Classification

In the NSFH data I follow Daniel Schneider's (2012) classification of chores. There are fewer chore variables in the NSFH data and classifying them is relatively simple. Please see Chart A1 for details. However, I deviate from Schneider in also considering gender-neutral chores. In the NSFH there is only one gender-neutral chore (paying bills).

For the most part, I also follow Daniel Schneider's (2012) classification of chores in the ATUS data. However, I deviate in a few minor instances (minor in the sense that these chores are minor contributors to housework time) when (a) it is not obvious what housework task a given "chore" represents or (b) the gender classification in Schneider (2012) does not match the empirical distribution (e.g., Schneider classifies it as female but men spend more time on it than do women, on average). I also deviate from Schneider (2012) in considering gender-neutral chores. Please see Table A2 for details.

REFERENCES:

Schneider, Daniel. 2012. "Gender Deviance and Household Work: The Role of Occupation." *American Journal of Sociology* 117(4):1029-1072.

Chart A1: Classification of chores in the NSFH data

Code, resp.	Code, partner	Description	Average male time	Average female time	Significant gender difference? (ttest)	(M-F)/(M+F)	Daniel Schneider (2012) classification	My classification	Comments and concerns
MT1A1	CT1A1	Meals	3.46	7.77	yes	-0.38	Female	Female	
MT1B1	CT1B1	Dishes	2.61	5.31	yes	-0.34	Female	Female	
MT1C1	CT1C1	Cleaning	2.66	6.65	yes	-0.43	Female	Female	
MT1D1	CT1D1	Outdoor	4.70	1.93	yes	0.42	Male	Male	
MT1E1	CT1E1	Groceries	1.80	2.92	yes	-0.24	Female	Female	
MT1F1	CT1F1	Laundry	1.48	4.19	yes	-0.48	Female	Female	
MT1G1	CT1G1	Bills	1.66	1.89	yes	-0.07	Exclude	Neutral	
MT1H1	CT1H1	Auto	1.80	0.43	yes	0.62	Male	Male	

Chart A2: Classification of chores in the ATUS data

Code	Description	Average male time	Average female time	Significant gender difference? (ttest)	(M-F)/(M+F)	Daniel Schneider (2012) classification	My classification	Comments and concerns
020101	Interior cleaning	13.10	33.98	yes	-0.44	Female	Female	
020102	Laundry	5.23	18.66	yes	-0.56	Female	Female	
020103	Sewing	0.02	1.91	yes	-0.98	Female	Female	Sewing is female-typed, but is it a chore or a hobby? Historically, it was a chore, but these days it is often a hobby. Hemming pants or mending cloths might be a chore, but my guess is that most time spent sewing is a hobby. Of course, I have no way to know if that is correct.
020104	Storing interior household items, including food	0.86	1.84	yes	-0.36	Female	Female	
020199	Household activities, N.E.C	0.04	0.07	no	-0.27	Female	Female	
020201	Food and drink preparation	15.77	31.42	yes	-0.33	Female	Female	
020202	Food presentation	0.13	0.36	yes	-0.47	Female	Female	
020203	Kitchen and food clean-up	3.26	9.67	yes	-0.50	Female	Female	
020299	Food and drink preparation, presentation, and clean-up, N.E.C.	0.00	0.00	no	-0.60	Female	Female	

Code	Description	Average male time	Average female time	Significant gender difference? (ttest)	(M-F)/(M+F)	Daniel Schneider (2012) classification	My classification	Comments and concerns
020301	Interior arrangement, decoration, and repairs	6.00	3.56	yes	0.26	Male	Male	This one is unclear in that decorating sounds like a female task. It is mostly performed by men but women spend a non-trivial amount of time on this too. It would be problematic if the activities classified under this are qualitatively different for men and women such that they are--usually--doing gender-typical things (women are decorating, men are repairing).
020302	Building and repairing furniture	0.57	0.27	yes	0.36	Male	Male	
020303	Heating and cooling	0.99	0.13	yes	0.77	Male	Male	
020399	Interior maintenance, repair, and decoration, N.E.C.	0.06	0.01	yes	0.60	Male	Male	
020401	Exterior cleaning	2.84	0.99	yes	0.48	Male	Male	
020402	Exterior repair, improvements, and decoration	3.51	0.88	yes	0.60	Male	Male	Again, decorating sounds typically-female.
020499	Exterior maintenance, repair, and decoration, N.E.C.	0.06	0.06	no	0.01	Male	Male	

Code	Description	Average male time	Average female time	Significant gender difference? (ttest)	(M-F)/(M+F)	Daniel Schneider (2012) classification	My classification	Comments and concerns
020501	Lawn, garden, and houseplant care	16.02	7.77	yes	0.35	Male	Male	Lawn care is male-typed, but gardening and houseplant care are not. So this one is problematic. The non-trivial time women spend in this activity might not be gender-atypical if they are planting flowers or pruning their orchids rather than mowing the lawn.
020502	Ponds, pools, and hot tubs	0.34	0.17	yes	0.35	Male	Male	
020599	Lawn and garden, N.E.C.	0.04	0.00	no	1.00	Male	Male	
020701	Vehicle repair and maintenance (by self)	5.40	0.67	yes	0.78	Male	Male	
020799	Vehicles, N.E.C.	0.03	0.01	yes	0.54	Male	Male	
020801	Appliance, tool, and toy set-up	1.71	0.42	yes	0.61	Exclude	Male	
020899	Appliances & tools, n.e.c.	0.00	0.00	no	0.54	Exclude	Male	
020901	Financial management	1.94	2.09	no	-0.04	Exclude	Neutral	
020902	Household and personal organization	5.10	7.32	yes	-0.18	Exclude	Neutral	This one is problematic because household organization sounds female, but personal organization sounds neutral. In practice, the gender difference in time is small (the range is -1 to 1).
020905	Home security	0.14	0.12	no	0.09	Exclude	Neutral	

Code	Description	Average male time	Average female time	Significant gender difference? (ttest)	(M-F)/(M+F)	Daniel Schneider (2012) classification	My classification	Comments and concerns
020999	Household management, n.e.c.	0.02	0.03	no	-0.29	Exclude	Neutral	
029999	Household activities, N.E.C	0.27	0.11	yes	0.41	Exclude	Neutral	The description is vague--the description sounds gender-neutral--yet it seems male-typed in terms of time spent on it.
070101	Grocery shopping	4.98	8.52	yes	-0.26	Female	Female	
070102	Purchasing gas	0.48	0.44	yes	0.04	Female	Neutral	This is certainly not female. Men spend more time on it (slightly more) and car stuff is usually male-typed. If anything, it would be male, but the gender difference is very small. And don't most people just get gas when they are out driving and the tank is empty? Which would happen to women and men.
070103	Purchasing food (not groceries)	1.29	1.45	yes	-0.06	Female	Female	
070104	Shopping, except groceries, food, and gas	14.28	21.74	yes	-0.21	Female	Female	To what extent shopping is a chore depends on what is being bought. But this question comes from the chores section so it ought not to include recreational shopping.
070105	Waiting associated with shopping	0.07	0.08	no	-0.07	Female	Exclude	This is not obviously female.
070199	Shopping, N.E.C.	0.00	0.00	no	0.00	Female	Exclude	This is not obviously female.

Code	Description	Average male time	Average female time	Significant gender difference? (ttest)	(M-F)/(M+F)	Daniel Schneider (2012) classification	My classification	Comments and concerns
070201	Comparison shopping	0.08	0.07	no	0.05	Female	Exclude	Men spend more time on it than women--although neither gender spends enough time to matter. But it is certainly not female-typed if men do more. If anything, it is neutral. But it would depend what they are comparison shopping for to know whether it is a chore/housework. Men traditionally take charge of large consumer purchases like cars and appliances. Could that be what comparison shopping and researching purchases means?
070299	Researching purchases, N.E.C.	0.01	0.00	no	0.71	Female	Exclude	Vague and men spend more time on it than women--although neither gender spends enough time to matter.
070301	Security procedures related to consumer purchases	0.00	0.00	no	-0.58	Female	Exclude	What is this? And is it a chore? Wouldn't that depend on what the purchase was? If someone spends time securing the diamond earrings they bought themselves, that is not exactly housework. Also, shopping sounds female but security sounds male.
079999	Consumer purchases, N.E.C.	0.04	0.00	no	1.00	Female	Exclude	Vague and men spend more time on it than women--although neither gender spends enough time to matter.

Table A1. Coefficients from linear regression models predicting men's housework. National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH), 1992-1994 (Wave 2).[1]

	Partnered men					Single men				
Proportion of occupation female	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
0-25% female	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF
26-50% female	-.50	.44	-.99*	3.79*	-4.35*	.92	.97	-.19	2.72	-3.42*
51-75% female	-.54	1.21*	-.80*	4.84*	-5.54*	.81	1.58	-.76	5.75*	-4.51*
76-100% female	2.94*	3.40*	-.62	6.74*	-7.21*	.53	1.72	-1.25	6.89*	-6.05*
Wife, 0-25% fem.	.79	1.64*	-.89*	6.25*	-5.33*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wife, 26-50%	-.20	.10	-.23	2.95*	-1.69	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wife, 51-75%	.02	.45	-.29	3.57*	-2.36*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wife, 76-100%	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wife's housework										
Wife's value on DV	-.01	-.05*	.10*	-.08	.03	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Earned income										
Personal income	-.04	-.07	-.01	-.06	-.19	-.10	-.07	-.02	.06	-.09
Wife's income	.03	-.01	.04	.04	.12	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Relative income										
Husband earns 0-25%	3.58*	3.36*	-.05	5.84	-5.73	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husb. earns 26-50%	1.93*	1.67*	-.06	3.82*	-4.66*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husb. earns 51-75%	1.18	1.05*	-.10	3.98*	-4.43*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husb. earns 76-100%	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Education										
Less than high school	1.10	1.27	.13	1.71	.20	2.36	1.70	.88	2.25	-2.06
High school or GED	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF
Some college	.51	.71	-.38	4.63*	-5.41*	-1.84	-1.06	-.71	2.63	-3.28
College grad or higher	-1.63*	-.75	-1.12*	3.93*	-5.85*	-4.03	-2.05	-1.73*	6.93*	-7.23*
Wife,< high school	.60	.47	-.33	1.33	-3.88*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wife, HS or GED	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wife, some college	1.30	1.53*	-.28	4.25*	-3.69*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wife, college grad +	.49	1.17*	-.71*	5.73*	-5.40*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Paid work hours										
Less than 40 hours	-.02	.60	-.65	1.64	-2.56	-1.14	-.98	-.00	.51	-.03
40-49 hours	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF

50 or more hours	-.83	-.66	-.21	-2.11*	1.44	-1.99	-1.58	-.38	.05	-1.55
Wife, < 40 hours	.02	.08	.07	-.09	.51	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wife, 40-49 hours	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wife, 50+ hours	1.20	1.17*	-.11	.70	-1.10	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Family status										
Any children	1.28	1.22*	.18	-.05	-.15	1.42	.89	.41	-3.02	2.46
Cohabiting	1.05	2.17*	-1.46*	6.89*	-9.74	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Health										
Self-rated health	.21	.01	.19	-.29	.30	-.32	-.25	-.03	-.79	1.01
Wife, self-rated health	-.32	-.32	.04	-1.02	1.26*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Attitudes										
Gender index	.69	2.03*	-1.31*	13.79*	-10.32*	4.32	5.00*	-.51	14.09*	-8.60*
Housework equality	-4.65*	-4.68*	.16	-12.28*	10.70*	1.25	-.38	1.22	-9.59*	7.91*
Age										
First age quartile	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF
Second age quartile	.86	.78	.11	.22	.30	.70	1.20	-.47	4.40*	-3.01
Third age quartile	.53	.07	.50	-2.19	2.66	2.02	1.56	.42	2.06	-.44
Fourth age quartile	-1.31	-1.36	.12	-4.24*	4.37	1.91	1.78	-.04	2.34	-2.17
Wife, first quartile	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wife, second quartile	-.91	-.66	-.14	-1.65	1.03	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wife, third quartile	-.53	-.60	.07	-2.87	2.02	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wife, fourth quartile	-1.47	-1.36	-.43	-2.40	1.86	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sample size[2]	*2,561*			*2,549*		*665*			*663*	

* p<0.05

[1]Models are estimated using multiple imputed datasets. Tables displaying coefficients for control variables are in the Online Supplement.

[2]The sample size is slightly lower for the dependent variables measuring the percent of total housework tasks that are female-typed and male-typed. Some respondents report zero housework hours; this measure is undefined for such respondents.

Table A2. Coefficients from linear regression models predicting men's housework. American Time Use Survey (ATUS), 2003-2012.[1]

	Partnered men					Single men				
Proportion of occupation female	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
0-25% female	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF
26-50% female	-1.60*	-.16	-1.28*	2.48*	-1.41	-1.95*	-.84*	-1.19*	1.18	-2.43*
51-75% female	-1.82*	-.04	-1.70*	2.59*	-2.29*	-2.24*	-.65*	-1.49*	3.00*	-3.41*
76-100% female	.26	1.35*	-1.18*	5.13*	-4.83*	-.87	.58	-1.55*	4.12*	-5.29*
Wife, 0-25% fem.	-1.05*	-.53*	-.57	.01	.70	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wife, 26-50%	-.06	.02	-.11	-.13	.31	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wife, 51-75%	.17	.20	-.13	1.14	-.83	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wife, 76-100%	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Earned income										
Personal income	.09	.04	.01	-.18	-.03	.17*	.05	.06	-.12	.00
Wife's income	.01	-.05	.07	-.31	.37	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Relative income										
Husband earns 0-25%	-.36	.72	-1.04	4.09	-5.49	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husb. earns 26-50%	.47	.75	-.20	3.52	-2.53	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husb. earns 51-75%	.12	.26	-.03	2.17	-1.16	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husb. earns 76-100%	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Education										
Less than high school	-.48	-.53	.29	-2.35	3.41	-.98	.05	-.76*	1.38	.19
High school or GED	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF
Some college	.43	.13	.13	-.70	-1.47	.74*	.77*	-.13	-.19	-.70
College grad or higher	.87*	1.01	-.47	3.87*	-5.37*	.41	1.11*	-.82*	3.28*	-4.22*
Wife,< high school	-.92	.21	-1.15*	-.15	-.42	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wife, HS or GED	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wife, some college	-.25	.28	-.59*	3.23*	-2.93*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wife, college grad +	-.87*	.02	-1.13*	2.55*	-4.09*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Paid work hours										
Less than 40 hours	.66*	.64*	-.05	1.99*	-2.28	.24	.12	.01	-3.85	2.19
40-49 hours	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF
50 or more hours	-.75*	-.72*	.01	-2.60*	2.27	-.36	-.23	-.01	-2.35	2.58
Wife, < 40 hours	-.09	-.29	.02	-1.27	.72	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wife, 40-49 hours	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Wife, 50+ hours	-.30	.01	-.42	1.42	-1.98	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Family status										
Any children	.42	.76*	-.21	2.42*	-1.67*	2.27*	1.91*	.34	1.82	-1.75
Age										
First age quartile	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF
Second age quartile	2.62*	.90*	1.58	-.61	1.63	2.25*	1.12*	1.10*	-.82	1.04
Third age quartile	4.07*	1.21*	2.70	-3.39*	4.46*	3.57*	1.75*	1.66*	-.51	1.04
Fourth age quartile	3.69*	1.04*	2.59	-3.50	5.74*	8.80*	1.65*	1.94*	-1.19	1.52
Wife, first quartile	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wife, second quartile	-.48	-.46	-.02	-2.48*	1.40	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wife, third quartile	-1.33*	-1.35*	-.05	-5.24*	2.91*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wife, fourth quartile	-1.32*	-1.70*	.20	-6.92*	3.59	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sample size[2]		*20,733*			*17,352*			*12,757*		*10,691*

* p<0.05

[1]Models are estimated using multiple imputed datasets. Tables displaying coefficients for control variables are in the Online Supplement.

[2]The sample size is slightly lower for the dependent variables measuring the percent of total housework tasks that are female-typed and male-typed. Some respondents report zero housework hours; this measure is undefined for such respondents.

Table A3. Coefficients from linear regression models predicting women's housework. National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH), 1992-1994 (Wave 2).[1]

	Partnered women					Single women				
Proportion of occupation female	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
0-25% female	.49	-.20	.66*	-2.70**	1.96**	2.21	1.85	.47	-.61	1.15
26-50% female	-2.66**	-2.68***	.03	-1.15*	.69[t]	.16	-.35	.54*	-1.50[t]	2.03*
51-75% female	-1.09	-1.14[t]	.08	-1.00*	.56	.79	.49	.30	-.70	.95
76-100% female	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF
Husband, 0-25% fem.	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husband, 26-50%	-2.22**	-1.90**	-.08	-.45	.37	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husband, 51-75%	-1.61[t]	-1.28	-.03	.04	.27	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husband, 76-100%	-.47	.25	-.32	.69	-.95	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husband's housework										
Husb.'s value on DV	-.01	-.12*	.05*	-.02	.00	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Earned income										
Personal income	-.59*	-.53*	-.03	-.09	.11	-.51*	-.48*	-.01	-.24*	.12
Husband's income	-.08	-.09	-.00	.00	-.04	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Relative income										
Husband earns 0-25%	-.51	-.71	-.31	-2.02	.04	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husb. earns 26-50%	-1.90	-1.53	-.30	-.50	-.41	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husb. earns 51-75%	-2.36*	-1.78*	-.45*	.58	-1.01*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husb. earns 76-100%	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Education										
Less than high school	-.76	-.23	-.16	.86	-.37	-1.22	-.53	-.61*	1.54	-1.39
High school or GED	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF
Some college	-2.35*	-1.83*	-.23	.14	-.19	-2.82*	-2.58*	-.15	-1.33	.70
College grad or higher	-4.31*	-3.49*	-.35*	.34	-.00	-4.92*	-4.24*	-.45*	-.88	.32
Husband,< high school	1.74	2.06	-.52*	.48	-1.22	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husband, HS or GED	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husb., some college	-1.57	-1.21	-.15	-.02	-.09	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husb., college grad +	-2.25*	-1.82*	-.03	.53	.44	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Paid work hours										
Less than 40 hours	.75	.65	.09	-.15	.23	.30	.37	-.14	.45	-.45
40-49 hours	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF

50 or more hours	.87	.70	.17	-1.09	.31	-.88	-.73	-.26	-.10	-.78
Husband, < 40 hours	-.14	-.38	.29	-.69	.44	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husband, 40-49 hours	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husband, 50+ hours	.78	.22	.38*	-1.05*	.86	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Family status										
Any children	5.15*	5.04*	.07	1.58*	-1.13*	1.42	8.21	.02	3.19	-2.39*
Cohabiting	.18	.30	-.07	-.97	-.27	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Health										
Self-rated health	.50	.45	.05	.33	-.13	-.53	-.64	.07	-.48	.30
Husband, health	-1.07*	-.86*	-.20*	-.06	-.24	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Attitudes										
Gender index	-5.28*	-5.03*	-.29	-1.89	.25	-3.20	-2.25	-.89	2.56	-2.22
Housework equality	5.08*	4.25*	.43	.27	.07	3.91	4.28*	-.10	4.32	-1.88*
Age										
First age quartile	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF
Second age quartile	1.40	1.42	-.14	.11	-.06	2.20	1.60	.50	-1.01	.91
Third age quartile	1.78	1.60	.02	-.35	.25	1.54	.94	.60*	-1.33	1.43
Fourth age quartile	-.56	-.50	-.12	-.46	-.05	2.79*	1.86	.89*	-1.09	1.51
Husband, first quartile	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husb., second quartile	1.75	1.35	.45	-.31	.90	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husb., third quartile	.68	.33	.33	-.78	.95	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husb., fourth quartile	1.11	.50	.47	-.56	1.03	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sample size[2]		*2,561*			*2,561*			*1,265*		*1,263*

* p<0.05

[1]Models are estimated using multiple imputed datasets. Tables displaying coefficients for control variables are in the Online Supplement.

[2]The sample size is slightly lower for the dependent variables measuring the percent of total housework tasks that are female-typed and male-typed. Some respondents report zero housework hours; this measure is undefined for such respondents.

Table A4. Coefficients from linear regression models predicting women's housework. American Time Use Survey (ATUS), 2003-2012.[1]

	Partnered women					Single women				
Proportion of occupation female	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
0-25% female	.19	-.07	.30	-1.24	1.23	.27	-.38	.48*	-3.10*	2.54*
26-50% female	-.62	-.68	-.10	-2.72*	.57	-.71*	-.77*	.04	-.88	.81
51-75% female	-1.79*	-1.48*	-.26	-.79	.24	-1.13*	-1.06*	.05	-.79	.94
76-100% female	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF
Husband, 0-25% fem.	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husband, 26-50%	-1.03*	-.68	-.27	-.09	.06	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husband, 51-75%	-.63	-.50	-.15	-.64	.17	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husband, 76-100%	-1.22*	-.87	-.28	-.74	.23	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Earned income										
Personal income	-.38*	-.40*	.02	-.57*	.32	.17*	-.01	-.01	-.18	.04
Husband's income	.26*	.24*	.01	.17	-.07	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Relative income										
Husband earns 0-25%	2.45	2.77*	-.20	2.65	-1.36	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husb. earns 26-50%	2.03*	2.43*	-.33	3.87*	-2.35	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husb. earns 51-75%	.57	.94	-.28	2.86*	-1.67	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husb. earns 76-100%	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Education										
Less than high school	1.40	1.78*	-.29	-.03	-.16	-.98	1.33*	-.47*	3.58*	-1.65
High school or GED	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF
Some college	-.87	-1.16*	.04	-.59	.16	.74*	-.47	.04	-.97	-.24
College grad or higher	-.63	-1.05*	.02	-1.15	-.11	.41	-.71*	.15	-2.44*	-.38
Husband,< high school	1.47	2.12*	-.36	3.77	-2.14	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husband, HS or GED	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husb., some college	.01	.28	-.06	-.23	-.27	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husb., college grad +	-.39	.20	-.13	-.51	-.11	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Paid work hours										
Less than 40 hours	2.48*	2.03*	.22	-.82	-.05	.24	.15	.12	.01	-.06
40-49 hours	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF
50 or more hours	-.80	-.62	-.12	-.53*	.15	-.36	-1.18*	.28	-1.29	1.98*
Husband, < 40 hours	-.42	-.35	-.01	-.39	.76	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husband, 40-49 hours	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Husband, 50+ hours	.28	.21	-.01	-.39	-.15	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Family status										
Any children	2.41	2.94*	-.61*	4.13*	-3.05*	2.27*	3.83*	-.01	5.70	-3.74*
Age										
First age quartile	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF
Second age quartile	4.34*	3.43*	.62*	1.34	-.86	2.25*	2.57*	.69*	-.07	-.60
Third age quartile	7.71*	6.38*	1.12*	-3.41*	-1.05	3.57*	3.37*	1.26*	-.82	1.45
Fourth age quartile	8.26*	6.78*	1.22*	-3.83*	-1.29	8.80*	4.24*	1.34*	-.72	.82
Husband, first quartile	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husb., second quartile	-.85	-.66	-.18	-1.55	.82	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husb., third quartile	-2.54*	-2.41*	-.34	-3.96*	1.22	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husb., fourth quartile	-2.63*	-2.51*	-.35	-4.54*	2.23*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sample size[2]		*21,106*			*19,923*			*18,065*		*16,536*

* p<0.05

[1]Models are estimated using multiple imputed datasets. Tables displaying coefficients for control variables are in the Online Supplement.

[2]The sample size is slightly lower for the dependent variables measuring the percent of total housework tasks that are female-typed and male-typed. Some respondents report zero housework hours; this measure is undefined for such respondents.

Modeling non-linearity

Modeling non-linearity by including higher-order terms, such as quadratic and cubed terms, is a common choice (In the housework literature, some examples include: Bittman et al. 2003; Brines 1994; Evertsson and Nermo 2004; Schneider 2011; Schneider 2012). However, as Gupta and Ash (2008) argue, using a second-order term to model non-linearity is problematic because it imposes an assumed form of non-linearity on the data (a symmetric U-shaped relationship, possibly inverted—more formally, a parabola). If, hypothetically, the effect of occupational sex composition resembled a logarithmic, exponential, or S-shaped curve, modeling this non-linearity with a squared term imposes a U-shape. For example, Paul Allison demonstrates that fitting a quadratic equation to what is actually a logarithmic function yields good model fit statistics but the quadratic curve (an upside-down U-shape) starts to decline at the right end of the distribution while the logarithmic curve continues to increase (Allison 1999; pp.157-158). In the context of testing compensatory gender display this may generate misleading results because such studies often rely on a slight decrease (or increase) in housework in one tail of the distribution. Even when a quadratic (or higher-order) term is statistically-significant, it is generally a mistake to assume that the underlying function is truly quadratic or to over-interpret the details of the predicted curve (Allison 1999; p.161), such as slightly non-monotonicity in the tail of the distribution.

For these reasons, I prefer a categorical classification of occupational sex composition into 0-25% female (predominately-male), 26-50% female, 51-75% female, and 76-100% female (predominately-female). The resulting dichotomous variables (dummy variables) allow for non-linearity without imposing any specific form to the non-linearity. In addition, they represent substantively meaningful categories. Depending on the dataset and on union status (partnered or single), 40-45% of men work in occupations that are predominately-male, 32-36% work in occupations that are 26-50% female, 15-19% work in occupations that are 51-75% female, and only 4-7% work in occupations that are predominately-female (see Table 1A). For men, predominately-male occupations provide a logical reference (omitted category) and employment in predominately-female is clearly a strong violation of gendered expectations. Similarly, 39-43% of women work in predominately-female occupations and only 5-7% work in predominately-male occupations (Table 1B). For both genders over 70% are employed in gender-typical occupations (that is, 0-50% female for men and 51-100% female for women).

However, results are robust to alternative coding of occupational sex composition. In Tables A5-A8 I present coefficients from models using the categorical classification (as presented in the main document), from models using a linear term, and from models using a quadratic term. In Tables A9-A12 I present predicted values from these alternative model specifications. Relationships that appear to be approximately linear when using the dummy variables are also linear when using the alternative specifications (that is, the linear terms is statistically significant while the quadratic term is not). Relationships that appear to be U-shaped when using the dummy variables are also U-shaped when using the alternative specifications (that is, the quadratic term is statistically significant).

REFERENCES

Allison, Paul D. 1999. *Multiple Regression: A Primer*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Bittman, Michael, Paula England, Liana C. Sayer, Nancy Folbre, and George Matheson. 2003. "When Does Gender Trump Money? Bargaining and Time in Household Work." *American Journal of Sociology* 109(1):186-214.

Brines, Julie. 1994. "Economic Dependency, Gender, and the Division of Labor at Home." *American Journal of Sociology* 100(3):652-688.

Evertsson, Marie and Magnus Nermo. 2004. "Dependence Within Families and the Division of Labor: Comparing Sweden and the United States." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 66(5):1272-1286.
Schneider, Daniel. 2011. "Market Earnings and Household Work: New Tests of Gender Performance Theory." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 73(4):845-860.
Schneider, Daniel. 2012. "Gender Deviance and Household Work: The Role of Occupation." *American Journal of Sociology* 117(4):1029-1072.

Table A5. Coefficients from linear regression models predicting men's housework. National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH), 1992-1994 (Wave 2).[1]

	Models using dummy variables (equivalent to Table 3A in the main document)									
	Partnered men					Single men				
Proportion of occupation female	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
0-25% female	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF
26-50% female	-.50	.44	-.99*	3.79*	-4.35*	.92	.97	-.19	2.72	-3.42*
51-75% female	-.54	1.21*	-.80*	4.84*	-5.54*	.81	1.58	-.76ǂ	5.75*	-4.51*
76-100% female	2.94*	3.40*	-.62	6.74*	-7.21*	.53	1.72	-1.25ǂ	6.89*	-6.05*
Wife, 0-25% fem.	.79	1.64*	-.89*	6.25*	-5.33*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wife, 26-50%	-.20	.10	-.23	2.95*	-1.69	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wife, 51-75%	.02	.45	-.29	3.57*	-2.36*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wife, 76-100%	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Models using linear proportion occupation female									
	Partnered men					Single men				
Proportion of occupation female	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
Prop. Female (0-1)	1.25	2.71**	-1.75*	10.37*	-11.94*	-.09	1.78	-1.88*	10.34*	-9.53*
Wife, prop. female	.14	-.94	.98*	-7.74*	5.69*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Models using linear proportion occupation female and its second-order (squared) term									
	Partnered men					Single men				
	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
Prop. Female (0-1)	-7.30*	-2.13	-5.85*	12.67*	-18.32*	3.67	-.84*	-.27	11.31	-16.43
Prop. Female squared	11.42*	6.47*	5.49*	-3.12	8.51	-4.54	-.84*	-1.94	-1.18	8.33
Wife, prop. female	-4.67	-3.92	.58	1.71	3.62	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wife, prop. fem. sq.	3.87	2.40	.27	-7.76	1.63	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sample size[2]		*20,733*		*17,352*			*12,757*		*10,691*	

* p<0.05

[1]Models are estimated using multiple imputed datasets.

[2]The sample size is slightly lower for the dependent variables measuring the percent of total housework tasks that are female-typed and male-typed. Some respondents report zero housework hours; this measure is undefined for such respondents.

Table A6. Coefficients from linear regression models predicting men's housework. American Time Use Survey, 2003-2012.[1]

	Models using dummy variables (equivalent to Table 3A in the main document)									
	Partnered men					Single men				
Proportion of occupation female	Total hours	Female tasks	Total hours	Female tasks	Total hours	Female tasks	Total hours	Female tasks	Total hours	Female tasks
0-25% female	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF
26-50% female	-1.60*	-.16	-1.28*	2.48*	-1.41	-1.95*	-.84*	-1.19*	1.18	-2.43*
51-75% female	-1.82*	-.04	-1.70*	2.59*	-2.29*	-2.24*	-.65*	-1.49*	3.00*	-3.41*
76-100% female	.26	1.35*	-1.18*	5.13*	-4.83*	-.87	.58	-1.55*	4.12*	-5.29*
Wife, 0-25% fem.	-1.05*	-.53*	-.57	.01	.70	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wife, 26-50%	-.06	.02	-.11	-.13	.31	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wife, 51-75%	.17	.20	-.13	1.14	-.83	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wife, 76-100%	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Models using linear proportion occupation female									
	Partnered men					Single men				
Proportion of occupation female	Total hours	Female tasks	Total hours	Female tasks	Total hours	Female tasks	Total hours	Female tasks	Total hours	Female tasks
Prop. Female (0-1)	-2.10*	.81*	-2.87*	7.11*	-6.86*	-3.36*	-.41	-2.91*	7.20*	-8.30*
Wife, prop. female	1.08*	.62*	.54	.71	-.96	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Models using linear proportion occupation female and its second-order (squared) term									
	Partnered men					Single men				
	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
Prop. Female (0-1)	-11.14*	-2.75*	-7.79*	10.55*	-8.33	-13.22*	-5.43*	-7.75*	9.8	-14.68*
Prop. Female squared	11.19*	4.19*	6.26*	-5.11	2.59	12.36*	6.29*	6.08*	-3.2	7.98
Wife, prop. female	5.41*	3.64*	1.74	4.53	-5.13	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wife, prop. fem. sq.	-4.22*	-2.93*	-1.18	-3.66	4.01	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sample size[2]	*20,733*			*17,352*		*12,757*			*10,691*	

* p<0.05

[1]Models are estimated using multiple imputed datasets.

[2]The sample size is slightly lower for the dependent variables measuring the percent of total housework tasks that are female-typed and male-typed. Some respondents report zero housework hours; this measure is undefined for such respondents.

Table A7. Coefficients from linear regression models predicting women's housework. National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH), 1992-1994 (Wave 2).[1]

	Models using dummy variables (equivalent to Table 3A in the main document)									
	Partnered women					Single women				
Proportion of occupation female	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
0-25% female	.49	-.20	.66*	-2.70*	1.96*	2.21	1.85	.47	-.61	1.15
26-50% female	-2.66*	-2.68*	.03	-1.15*	.69ǂ	.16	-.35	.54*	-1.50ǂ	2.03*
51-75% female	-1.09	-1.14ǂ	.08	-1.00*	.56	.79	.49	.30	-.70	.95
76-100% female	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF
Husband, 0-25% fem.	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husband, 26-50%	-2.22*	-1.90*	-.08	-.45	.37	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husband, 51-75%	-1.61ǂ	-1.28	-.03	.04	.27	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husband, 76-100%	-.47	.25	-.32	.69	-.95	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Models using linear proportion occupation female									
	Partnered women					Single women				
Proportion of occupation female	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
Prop. Female (0-1)	3.58**	3.79*	-.36	2.80*	-1.89*	-2.12	-1.01	-1.14*	2.76	-3.71*
Husb., prop. female	-2.71	-1.99	-.13	.21	.10	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Models using linear proportion occupation female and its second-order (squared) term									
	Partnered women					Single women				
	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
Prop. Female (0-1)	-6.35	-4.07	-2.19	5.96	-5.29	-10.17	-9.52	-1.18	-2.10	-.30
Prop. Female squared	7.92	6.31	1.50	-2.63	2.83	6.75	7.13	.03	4.58	-2.78
Husb., prop. female	-15.87*	-14.15*	-.37	-1.82	2.62	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husb., prop. fem. sq.	17.64*	16.30*	.32	2.70	-3.35	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sample size[2]	*2,561*			*2,549*		*665*			*663*	

* p<0.05

[1]Models are estimated using multiple imputed datasets.

[2]The sample size is slightly lower for the dependent variables measuring the percent of total housework tasks that are female-typed and male-typed. Some respondents report zero housework hours; this measure is undefined for such respondents.

Table A8. Coefficients from linear regression models predicting women's housework. American Time Use Survey, 2003-2012.[1]

	Models using dummy variables (equivalent to Table 3A in the main document)									
	Partnered women					Single women				
Proportion of occupation female	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
0-25% female	.19	-.07	.30	-1.24	1.23	.27	-.38	.48*	-3.10*	2.54*
26-50% female	-.62	-.68	-.10	-2.72*	.57	-.71*	-.77*	.04	-.88	.81
51-75% female	-1.79*	-1.48*	-.26	-.79	.24	-1.13*	-1.06*	.05	-.79	.94
76-100% female	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF
Husband, 0-25% fem.	REF	REF	REF	REF	REF	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husband, 26-50%	-1.03*	-.68	-.27	-.09	.06	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husband, 51-75%	-.63	-.50	-.15	-.64	.17	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husband, 76-100%	-1.22*	-.87	-.28	-.74	.23	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Models using linear proportion occupation female									
	Partnered women					Single women				
Proportion of occupation female	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
Prop. Female (0-1)	1.39*	1.25*	.18	2.04	-.94	.52	.86	-.25	1.99	-1.97
Husb., prop. female	-1.52*	-1.00	-.42	-.85	.11	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Models using linear proportion occupation female and its second-order (squared) term									
	Partnered women					Single women				
	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
Prop. Female (0-1)	-12.15*	-8.53*	-2.23	2.94	-3.59	-12.15*	-6.73*	-2.48*	8.52	-6.19
Prop. Female squared	10.87*	7.86*	1.86	-.62	2.15	10.87*	6.47*	1.90*	-5.55	3.59
Husb., prop. female	-4.07	-2.76	-1.47	.07	-.20	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Husb., prop. fem. sq.	2.73	1.89	1.10	-.96	.34	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sample size[2]	*21,106*			*19,923*		*18,065*			*16,536*	

* p<0.05

[1]Models are estimated using multiple imputed datasets.

[2]The sample size is slightly lower for the dependent variables measuring the percent of total housework tasks that are female-typed and male-typed. Some respondents report zero housework hours; this measure is undefined for such respondents.

Table A9. Predicted values from linear regression models predicting men's housework. National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH), 1992-1994 (Wave 2).[1]

	Models using dummy variables (equivalent to Table 3A in the main document)									
	Partnered men					Single men				
Proportion of occupation female	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
0-25% female	18.0	10.1	6.6	52.7	39.7	19.8	14.0	4.3	68.8	22.0
26-50% female	17.5	10.5	5.6	56.5	35.3	20.7	15.0	4.1	71.5	18.5
51-75% female	18.5	11.3	5.8	57.5	34.1	20.6	15.6	3.5	74.6	17.4
76-100% female	20.9	13.5	6.0	59.4	32.4	20.3	15.7	3.0	75.7	15.9
	Models using linear proportion occupation female									
	Partnered men					Single men				
Proportion of occupation female	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
0% female	17.6	9.8	6.6	52.0	40.5	20.3	14.2	4.6	67.8	22.8
25% female	17.9	10.4	6.2	54.6	37.5	20.3	14.6	4.2	70.3	20.4
50% female	18.3	11.1	5.8	57.2	34.5	20.3	15.0	3.7	72.9	18.0
75% female	18.6	11.8	5.3	59.7	31.5	20.3	15.5	3.2	75.5	15.6
100% female	18.9	12.5	4.9	62.3	28.6	20.3	15.9	2.7	78.1	13.3
	Models using linear proportion occupation female and its second-order (squared) term									
	Partnered men					Single men				
Proportion of occupation female	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
0% female	18.6	10.3	7.1	51.7	41.2	19.8	14.0	4.4	67.7	23.7
25% female	17.5	10.2	6.0	54.7	37.2	20.5	14.7	4.3	70.4	20.1
50% female	17.8	10.9	5.5	57.3	34.2	20.6	15.2	3.8	73.0	17.6
75% female	19.6	12.4	5.8	59.5	32.3	20.1	15.4	3.1	75.6	16.0
100% female	22.7	14.7	6.7	61.3	31.4	18.9	15.3	2.2	78.1	15.3
Sample size[2]	*20,733*			*17,352*		*12,757*			*10,691*	

Table A10. Predicted values from linear regression models predicting men's housework. American Time Use Survey (ATUS), 2003-2012.[1]

	Models using dummy variables (equivalent to Table 3A in the main document)									
	Partnered men					Single men				
Proportion of occupation female	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
0-25% female	13.8	6.7	6.0	58.6	31.4	12.4	7.6	4.0	68.8	23.8
26-50% female	12.2	6.6	4.7	61.1	30.0	10.5	6.8	2.8	69.8	21.5
51-75% female	12.0	6.7	4.3	61.2	29.1	10.2	7.0	2.5	71.6	20.5
76-100% female	14.1	8.1	4.8	63.7	26.6	11.4	8.2	2.4	72.7	18.4
	Models using linear proportion occupation female									
	Partnered men					Single men				
Proportion of occupation female	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
0% female	13.5	6.5	6.1	57.9	32.5	12.4	7.4	4.2	67.6	24.8
25% female	13.0	6.7	5.4	59.7	30.7	11.6	7.3	3.4	69.3	22.8
50% female	12.5	6.9	4.7	61.5	29.0	10.7	7.2	2.7	71.0	20.7
75% female	12.0	7.1	3.9	63.2	27.3	9.9	7.1	2.0	72.8	18.7
100% female	11.5	7.3	3.2	65.0	25.6	9.0	7.0	1.3	74.5	16.6
	Models using linear proportion occupation female and its second-order (squared) term									
	Partnered men					Single men				
Proportion of occupation female	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
0% female	14.7	6.9	6.7	57.6	32.6	13.6	8.0	4.7	67.3	25.6
25% female	12.6	6.5	5.1	59.9	30.6	11.0	7.0	3.2	69.4	22.4
50% female	11.9	6.6	4.3	61.6	29.0	10.0	6.8	2.4	71.2	20.3
75% female	12.7	7.3	4.4	62.6	27.7	10.6	7.5	2.3	72.6	19.1
100% female	14.9	8.4	5.2	63.0	26.9	12.6	8.8	3.0	73.6	18.7
Sample size[2]	*20,733*			*17,352*		*12,757*			*10,691*	

Table A11. Predicted values from linear regression models predicting women's housework. National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH), 1992-1994 (Wave 2).[1]

	Models using dummy variables (equivalent to Table 3A in the main document)									
	Partnered women					Single women				
Proportion of occupation female	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
0-25% female	31.5	27.2	2.7	85.7	8.0	28.3	24.0	2.7	83.1	9.6
26-50% female	28.4	24.7	2.0	87.3	6.7	26.2	21.8	2.8	82.2	10.5
51-75% female	29.9	26.3	2.1	87.4	6.6	26.9	22.6	2.5	83.0	9.4
76-100% female	31.0	27.4	2.0	88.4	6.0	26.1	22.1	2.2	83.7	8.4
	Models using linear proportion occupation female									
	Partnered women					Single women				
Proportion of occupation female	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
0% female	27.9	24.0	2.3	85.9	7.7	27.9	23.0	3.2	81.3	11.7
25% female	28.7	24.9	2.2	86.6	7.3	27.3	22.7	2.9	82.0	10.7
50% female	29.6	25.9	2.1	87.3	6.8	26.8	22.4	2.6	82.7	9.8
75% female	30.5	26.8	2.0	88.0	6.3	26.3	22.2	2.3	83.4	8.9
100% female	31.3	27.8	1.9	88.7	5.8	25.8	21.9	2.1	84.1	8.0
	Models using linear proportion occupation female and its second-order (squared) term									
	Partnered women					Single women				
Proportion of occupation female	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
0% female	30.4	26.0	2.8	85.1	8.6	29.8	25.0	3.2	82.7	10.9
25% female	29.3	25.4	2.3	86.4	7.4	27.7	23.1	2.9	82.3	10.6
50% female	29.2	25.6	2.0	87.4	6.6	26.4	22.0	2.6	82.5	10.0
75% female	30.1	26.5	2.0	88.1	6.2	26.0	21.9	2.3	83.2	9.0
100% female	32.0	28.3	2.1	88.4	6.1	26.4	22.6	2.1	84.5	7.7
Sample size[2]	*2,561*			*2,561*		*1,265*			*1,263*	

Table A12. Predicted values from linear regression models predicting women's housework. American Time Use Survey, 2003-2012.[1]

	Models using dummy variables (equivalent to Table 3A in the main document)									
	Partnered women					Single women				
Proportion of occupation female	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
0-25% female	20.7	17.2	2.4	83.7	9.7	17.0	13.5	2.0	79.0	12.4
26-50% female	20.0	16.7	1.9	83.4	9.0	15.9	13.0	1.6	81.4	10.6
51-75% female	18.9	16.0	1.8	84.2	8.7	15.5	12.7	1.6	81.4	10.8
76-100% female	20.6	17.4	2.0	85.1	8.4	16.6	13.8	1.6	82.2	9.8
	Models using linear proportion occupation female									
	Partnered women					Single women				
Proportion of occupation female	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
0% female	19.0	15.9	1.8	83.0	9.3	15.8	12.8	1.8	80.3	11.7
25% female	19.3	16.2	1.9	83.5	9.1	15.9	13.0	1.7	80.8	11.3
50% female	19.7	16.6	1.9	84.0	8.9	16.0	13.2	1.7	81.3	10.8
75% female	20.1	16.9	2.0	84.6	8.6	16.1	13.4	1.6	81.8	10.3
100% female	20.4	17.2	2.0	85.1	8.4	16.2	13.6	1.5	82.2	9.8
	Models using linear proportion occupation female and its second-order (squared) term									
	Partnered women					Single women				
Proportion of occupation female	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male	Total hours	Female tasks	Male tasks	% total female	% total male
0% female	22.4	18.4	2.5	82.7	10.0	18.5	14.7	2.3	78.5	12.8
25% female	20.2	16.8	2.1	83.4	9.3	16.4	13.3	1.8	80.4	11.5
50% female	19.2	16.3	1.9	84.0	8.8	15.5	12.8	1.6	81.6	10.6
75% female	19.6	16.6	1.9	84.6	8.6	15.8	13.1	1.5	82.0	10.2
100% female	21.3	17.8	2.1	85.1	8.6	17.3	14.3	1.8	81.6	10.2
Sample size[2]	*21,106*			*19,923*		*18,065*			*16,536*	