Gender divisions of domestic work: housework shares when adult children live with Mom and Dad

Paper presented at Population Association of America Annual Meeting
April 30 – May 2, 2015, San Diego

Lyn Craig* and Abigail Powell
lcraig@unsw.edu.au
University of New South Wales, Australia

ABSTRACT

We use data from the most recent Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) Time Use Survey to investigate shares of domestic work along two dimensions; routine and non-routine activities, a and housework done for the whole household versus housework done for oneself only. We argue that the latter is an underutilised marker of responsibility for household management and serving others. Exploiting data from matched household members, we examine relative shares of fathers and mothers, and also of co-resident young people aged 15-34 (416 households), to investigate whether parental gender patterns are echoed in the younger generation. Mothers do the lions' share of routine housework and housework for others; parents are relatively equal in the shares of non-routine housework and housework done for themselves only. Parents' employment configuration predicts adjustments in their relative shares. Young women do a higher share of routine activities and housework for the household than young men, and co-resident children over 25 years old do more housework for themselves than those who are younger. The higher shares of these young people appear to displace fathers' housework shares, but not mothers', suggesting their contribution does not ameliorate gender divisions of labor between parents.

INTRODUCTION

Gender differences in the division of domestic labor are well-established (Bianchi, Robinson and Milkie 2006; Sayer 2005). Although on average men's housework has gone up over time, it has done so only slightly, and women continue to perform the lion's share (Bianchi and Milkie 2010; Cooke and Baxter 2010). The persistent discrepancy has implications for gender equity in the paid workforce as well as in the home (Bergmann 2005; Gornick and Meyers 2003; Lachance-Grzela and Bouchard 2010). It has been attributed to three main theoretical explanations: marital bargaining on the basis of relative resources, limited male time availability, and conforming to traditional gender ideology and roles (Bittman et al. 2003; Brines 1994; Coltrane 2000; Greenstein 2000). A body of scholarship has established that relative resources and time availability can explain some variation in the division of labor, but that gender swamps all other explicators (Bianchi and Milkie 2010; England 2011a; Hook 2010; Lachance-Grzela and Bouchard 2010). The household division of labor is one of the "most obdurate features of our current gender system" (Ridgeway and Correll 2004: 512).

Some seeking to understand how this obduracy is facilitated look to the 'doing gender' approach which argues that gender is constructed, recreated and reinforced through everyday interaction (West and Zimmerman 1987; West and Zimmerman 2009). The approach de-emphasised socialisation and biological essentialism by conceptualizing gender as an accomplishment rather than a fixed attribute (Connell 2009; Jurik and Siemsen 2009; Risman 2009). Importantly, if gender is constructed, then it can be deconstructed (Deutsch 2007; Sullivan 2004). However, while individual agency is important, gender remains an aspect of social structure that is not only created by individual behaviour but also constrains it (Giddens 1984; Ridgeway and Correll 2004; Risman 2009). How men and women 'do' or 'undo' gender is underpinned by the accountability they feel for behaving in ways consistent with prevailing cultural beliefs about masculinity and femininity and social ideas of sex category

membership (Connell 2009; Ridgeway and Correll 2004; West and Zimmerman 2009). Socialisation still has relevance, as these ideas can become "internalized into preferences or taken-for granted assumptions about courses of action" (England 2011b: 117).

Internalized traditional preferences may be exemplified by (some) women's reluctance to give up domestic control, or 'maternal gatekeeping' (Allen and Hawkins 1999; Gaunt 2008). On balance, however, ideals of masculinity seem more resistant to change than ideals of femininity (Bianchi and Milkie 2010). This is perhaps because in most respects men stand to lose while women stand to gain (Connell 2006). Thus reasons that male domestic behaviour has changed little, despite the substantial changes in gender attitudes that have accompanied women's mass entry into the paid labor force, include male resistance to losing power in the household (Connell 2009). Men may be more likely to get their own way domestically, with their relatively privileged social position increasing their chances of having their preferences, rather than those of women, prevail (Chafetz 2004). Some research suggests they may resist doing housework especially when their performance as an economic provider is compromised (Baxter and Hewitt 2013; Bittman et al. 2003; Halleröd 2005).

A component of gendered housework patterns is that men exercise more choice than women over which tasks to perform and when to perform them (McMahon 1999). Research has shown task specialisation by gender, with regular 'routine' housework encompassing cooking, grocery shopping, cleaning and laundry, typically the province of women, while more time-flexible, sporadic tasks such as outdoor work and maintenance are more likely to be done by men (Baxter 2002; Bianchi and Milkie 2010; Hook 2010). The routine, regular tasks are regarded as most onerous and time-constraining (Dempsey 2001; McMahon 1999; Sullivan 1997). Although men's participation in some routine housework, notably cooking, has risen in recent years, task separation persists (Craig, Powell and Brown 2014; Sayer 2005). Furthermore, women are typically assigned the role of domestic manager, with overall responsibility for the running of the household. In most families, mothers are

where ‘the buck stops’ domestically. They are usually more responsible for planning and organization, maintaining harmony, managing relationships, and performing the emotion work necessary to family life (Coltrane 2000; Mattingly and Sayer 2006; Strazdins and Broom 2004).

Among other things, this suggests that much of women’s housework is likely to be performed as a service to others, for the benefit of the whole household, while more of men’s housework is likely to be done for themselves only and involve little service to others or planning on their behalf. This is an important distinction. Many women describe taking responsibility for planning and organization as the most onerous aspect of domestic labor (Coltrane 2000; Deutsch 2000). It is much easier to ‘help out’, and do tasks only when and if requested (Sullivan 1997). We argue it is similarly easier to look after oneself only, rather than to think about and meet others’ needs. Of course, men doing housework for themselves may relieve their wives of having to do some chores for them. Nonetheless it is unlikely to ameliorate women’s subjective experience of lacking domestic support. This widely felt lack translates to a social phenomenon that has been described as ‘the wife drought’ (Crabb 2015). The ‘reversed-role family’ has been long-heralded (Russell 1987), but it still the case that most partnered men are net recipients of domestic servicing, while partnered women rarely are (Crabb 2015; Fineman 2004; Folbre 2001). The implication is that few women enjoy the luxury of delegating much responsibility for domestic organization and service to others in their family. Previous research analysing housework has not directly investigated markers of differential responsibility for others. We remedy this gap, exploiting the detail of our data source to differentiate not only between routine and non-routine tasks as is standard in the literature, but also between housework performed for the household, or for oneself only.

We also advance the literature by offering a more inclusive picture of contributors to total household work than prior research. Although scholars increasingly argue that work-family issues should be approached from a household, rather than an individual, perspective (Bianchi and Milkie 2010;

Cooke and Baxter 2010), "most studies of 'household' divisions are actually reporting 'conjugal' distribution of labor, since they discuss only the adult partners' participation" (Punch 2001: 803). Yet research conceptualising the domestic workload as the combined inputs of couples overlooks that many people live in larger family units. Some research looks at how the transition to parenthood impacts gender divisions between parents (Craig and Bittman 2008; Craig and Mullan 2010; Dribe and Stanfors 2009), but very little examines how parental shares relate to the presence of older children, taking those older children's inputs into account. This is notwithstanding that in many countries a sizable minority of households consist of young people co-resident with their parents. In the US, for example, the proportion stood at 31 % in 2011 (US Census Bureau 2001, 2011); in Australia, the proportion is 29%. This paper uses time-diary data from matched family members to examine the gender and generational division of domestic labor in households in which children aged 15 and over live together with their parents, distinguishing between routine and non-routine tasks, and between housework done for oneself or for others.

We are primarily interested not in the absolute amount of housework family members perform, but at how these aspects of housework are shared in relative terms. Relative shares are a more direct indicator of in/equity in the division of labor than the amount of time devoted to housework, because they show the extent to which one family member is replacing the other's housework time (Craig and Mullan 2011). Yet the bulk of housework research looks at factors associated with differences in absolute time inputs, and draws inferences about gender shares on the basis of time spent by unrelated men and women (Bianchi and Milkie 2010; Lachance-Grzela and Bouchard 2010). More factors have been found to predict variation in women's, than in men's, housework time. Factors negatively associated with women's housework time include higher education, employment and higher earnings (Gupta and Ash 2008; Kan 2008; Presser 1994). Factors positively associated with women's housework time include men's higher earnings, nonstandard work schedules and longer working hours, non-English speaking background, and having young children (Craig and Bittman

2008; Sayer 2005). Conversely, studies have found men's housework time to be positively associated with higher education, and in some instances, with women's working hours (Baxter, Hewitt and Western 2005; Deding and Lausten 2006). However, a change in absolute amount of housework does not necessarily make the gender division more equal. Here we investigate which aspects of parental time availability and relative resources have associations with *shares* of housework. We expect they will be relevant, but will explain only part of parental gender gaps.

We also expect some characteristics of co-resident young people to be related to housework shares. The first of these is gender. We do not expect young women living in the family home to be held, or to hold themselves, to account for household work to the same extent as mothers. However, the family home is a primary site where gendered behaviour is produced and internalised (Berk 1985; Bianchi and Milkie 2010) and research among children and teenagers shows that gendered housework patterns are evident from a young age (Coltrane 2007a; Dodson and Dickert 2004; Salman Rizavi and Sofer 2010). Differences between girls' and boys' domestic contribution are thought to be engendered by parents modelling gender-stereotyped behaviour, and/or children gaining sex-stereotyped skills by more often spending time and taking part in joint activities with same-sex than opposite-sex parents (Cunningham 2001; Evertsson 2006; McHale, Crouter and Tucker 2003; Wight et al. 2009). This underpins shared expectations of gendered behaviour (De Ruijter, Treas and Cohen 2005), with patterns passed from parents to children (Evertsson 2006; McHale, Crouter and Tucker 2003). Thus we expect young women to not only do a greater share of domestic labor than young men, but also to do a greater share of the routine housework and housework for others rather than oneself only.

The second is young people's age. The presence of young children in a household creates a demand for parental housework time, which lessens as they grow (Craig and Bittman 2008; Ironmonger 2004). When children are young and learning life skills they are likely to do little housework,

especially independently (Bonke 2010; Miller 2005). Both children and teenagers have objectively low domestic time inputs (Hilbrecht, Zuzanek and Mannell 2008; Wight et al. 2009), but those over the age of 20 do slightly more (Craig, Powell and Brown 2014). What is unknown is whether higher absolute time inputs of older young people mean that they replace any of their parents' housework time. The social categories of 'parent' and 'child' may carry expectation about domestic roles analogously to the categories 'man' and woman', such that young adults and their parents adhere to normative patterns whereby net domestic services flow downwards from the older to the younger generation. If so, the higher absolute time inputs of those over 20 years may arise because they are doing more for themselves only rather than others in the household. In this case, we could expect that, compared to teenagers, older young people perform a greater share of the housework done for oneself, but not for the whole household.

A further consideration is that even if some young people do take on a greater share of the overall domestic burden, including for others, this may not relate to fathers and mothers' housework shares in the same way. It is not quite clear what to expect in this regard. On the one hand, since women typically do more domestic work than men, more domestic work by older young people or by young women could be associated with lower shares for mothers. It could alter the interaction between spouses and facilitate some 'undoing' of gendered housework patterns. On the other hand, as discussed above, men's housework is more contingent than women's. Therefore it may be that fathers, but not mothers', shares are negatively associated with young people's domestic work. Generational and gender patterns may be intertwined, such that the expectation that men will benefit from net domestic services from women encompasses daughters as well as wives.

Research focus

This paper uses time-diary data from matched family members to examine routine and non-routine housework, and also housework done for oneself or others. We advance research on gender divisions

of labor significantly in three ways. First, for whom housework is done is an underutilised marker of responsibility for household management and service. Second, we focus not on amount of time spent, but on how housework is actually shared between household members. Relative shares indicate the extent to which one family member replaces another's housework time, along each dimension of housework (Craig and Mullan 2011). Third we investigate not only gender shares between couples, but also whether and how mothers and fathers' shares relate to those of the co-resident young people. The vast majority of previous investigation into unpaid work concentrates on couples (Punch 2001), and relies on either time diary records of individual unrelated men and women (see for example Hook 2006; Sayer, Bianchi and Robinson 2004) or upon one partner's estimation, which may be subject to reporting bias (see for example Fuwa 2004; Geist 2005). Our analyses improve on these approaches as they are based on independent records of the actual time allocation of men, women and young people in the same household, from which we derive their relative shares.

DATA AND METHOD

We analyse data from the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) 2006 Time Use Survey (TUS), a nationally representative sample of Australian households. All individuals aged 15 years and over in sampled households are required to provide time use information. Respondents record their primary activity, any simultaneous (secondary) activity, where they are, who they are with and (significantly for this study) who they do the activity for, to a detail level of five minute intervals, over two consecutive diary days.

We select households in which two heterosexual parents co-reside with young people aged 15-34, and at least one household member has reported doing domestic labor on the diary day. Because we are interested in gender shares, single parent households are excluded, as are households with three generations or more than one family unit. This means young adults with their own children are excluded. Some households include children under 15 - these are younger siblings of young adults

living with parents. However, we are unable to examine the domestic contribution of children under 15 since they are not required to complete the time use survey. We arranged the data such that both partners and co-resident young peoples' information was combined as one household record for each diary day. Our final sample is 416 households (813 diary days), comprised of 832 parents and 591 15-34 years olds. Information about the sample is detailed in Table 1.

[Table 1]

Dependent variables

Our interest is in *domestic work* (ABS 2006 TUS codes 400-499) which includes *food preparation* (e.g. cooking, clean-up, setting the table); *laundry and cleaning* (e.g. washing, ironing, sorting clothes, wet and dry housework); *outdoor work* (e.g. gardening, animal care, cleaning grounds, pool care); *household maintenance* (e.g. home improvements, making furniture and furnishings, car care); *household management* (e.g. paperwork, bills and budgeting, recycling and disposing of rubbish) and *communication and travel* associated with domestic work and *purchasing consumer goods* (ABS 2006 TUS code 611 purchasing groceries, food etc.).

Our focus is not the amount of time respondents spend in these activities, but rather how the total household work is divided between household members in relative terms. Thus our dependent variables are *shares* of household work. To calculate shares we first computed total minutes per day spent in domestic work by mothers, fathers and co-resident young people combined. The sum of all respondents' contribution makes up total household domestic work; the total combined time they spend on domestic work as a main activity. Second we disaggregated total domestic work along two dimensions:

1. Activity type:

   a. *Routine tasks*: the sum of *food preparation*, *laundry and cleaning* and *grocery shopping*, and
   b. *Non-routine tasks*: the sum of *outdoor work, household maintenance,* and *household management.*

2. For whom the activity is done:
   a. exclusively *for oneself*
   b. *for the household*, including activities done for both others in the household and oneself. (For example, if a person has cooked dinner for the whole family, including themselves, this has been coded as done for the household.)

To calculate relative shares we divided each of these measures by mothers, fathers and young peoples' combined total domestic work, creating two sets of six ratio measures that sum to one. Together the first six measures show the ratio (proportion) of a household's total routine domestic work to a household's total non-routine domestic work, as well as mothers, fathers and young peoples' shares of routine and non-routine domestic work relative to each other. Together the second six measures show the ratio (proportion) of a household's domestic work performed for others to a household's domestic work performed for oneself, as well as mothers', fathers' and young peoples' shares relative to each other. Table 2 shows means for each set of ratio measures for all households that reported performing any domestic work on the diary day, and the mean minutes per day spent in each aspect of domestic work by mothers, fathers and young people.

[Table 2]

Analysis plan

We estimate a series of OLS regression models to examine how routine and non-routine housework, and housework performed for oneself or for others, is shared within households. For modelling proportions (ratios), the Fractional Logit (FL) model is a potential strategy (Buis 2006; Papke and

Wooldridge 1996). However, OLS yields substantively similar results and is preferred because the results are easier to interpret (Craig and Mullan 2011). As a preliminary step we directly tested gender gaps by running models on pooled observations of mothers and fathers and young people. These are not shown, but we report results where relevant in the text, and full tables are available upon request. In main analyses we estimate models for mothers, fathers and young people separately.

We enter variables capturing parental characteristics that the literature suggests would be related to the way they share domestic labor between themselves. Parents' *employment configuration* is captured in dummy variables (dual full-time earner (omitted)/father full-time, mother part-time/male breadwinner (father full-time, mother not employed)/father not full-time). We note that in our sample the proportion of fathers who are not employed full-time is over 20% (see Table 1), probably because many are retired or semi-retired, as is to be expected in households with adult children. (In an early specification we controlled for parents being over retirement age, but dropped it as no significant associations were found.) The employment configuration variables simultaneously capture both spouses' time availability and tap an indirect indicator of their relative contribution to household income. With the possible exception of 'father not full time', they also give an indirect indicator of parents' gender ideology. Male breadwinner (MBW) households are viewed as most traditional, and dual full-time earner (DFT) households most progressive (Hook 2010). We recognize that these variables do not isolate independent effects of time availability, relative resources and gender ideology, since they are not mutually exclusive (Coltrane 2007b; England 2011a; Hook 2006; Lachance-Grzela and Bouchard 2010).

Another potential influence on couples' shares of housework is *education.* Qualifications enhance earning capacity and thus strengthen personal resources, so may improve relative bargaining power (Brines 1994; England and Srivastavab 2013). However, education is also an important marker of class, and couples are likely to have similar levels of education, so there may be no relative

advantage to each partner. Also, higher education is associated with more employment for women, and progressive gender attitudes, and is therefore also a partial indicator of gender ideology (Baxter and Hewitt 2013). We capture both joint couple and individual education levels by entering dummy variables for different parental combinations of educational status: neither parent has a college degree (yes=0) both parents have a college degree (yes=1) only father has a college degree (yes=1) only mother has a college degree (yes=1).

We control for household characteristics that previous research has found to be related to housework and/or to the presence of young adults in the family home. We enter the *gender* of the oldest young person in the household (male omitted, female=1) because gender is central to the performance of housework (Sayer 2005), and young men are more likely than young women to be co-resident with parents (Mahaffy 2004; Mitchell 2004). We enter *age of the young person* (15-19 (omitted) /20-24/25-34). A data limitation is that we only have time use information from children above the age of 15. However, the domestic time of teenagers is similar to that of younger children (Hilbrecht, Zuzanek and Mannell 2008; Miller 2005), and young people aged 15-19 years are a reasonable base category against which to examine the contribution of more adult young people. Most teenagers are still studying and not domestically self-sufficient, and previous research shows that, compared to them, older young adults do more housework (Craig, Powell and Brown 2014). Here we examine whether this higher amount constitutes a higher share of the household total, whether it encompasses both routine and non-routine activities, and whether it is for themselves only or also for others in the household.

We include a measure of the socio-economic status (SES) of the area in which households are situated (lowest 60%(omitted)/highest 40%), because class is associated with domestic work (Baxter 2002) and children's co-residence at older ages (Mahaffy 2004). We prefer this measure to household income, because the latter has substantial missing values for young people, and because

older parents may be retired or semi-retired and thus have low current income that does not reflect their accumulated wealth. We enter whether the household is from a *non-English speaking background* (yes/no (omitted)) because these households have been found to have more traditional patterns of household time allocation (Craig, Powell and Brown 2014).We control the *number of co-resident young people*, because more of them are likely to perform more housework in total, but perhaps to do proportionately less each. We enter a dummy variable indicating *whether there are children under 15 in the household* (no omitted) as they are likely to create more housework and be associated with more traditional gender divisions of labor between parents (Dribe and Stanfors 2009). Due to the sample restrictions described above, these will be siblings, not off-spring, of the young people.

Finally, we control for *absolute total hours households spent in housework*. Outcome variables are thus net of time differences in overall amount of housework. This means the influence of differing standards or demand relating to factors such as size of dwelling are to some extent controlled, and we can focus on relative shares and housework composition. In an early specification we controlled for domestic outsourcing, but found no significant associations so excluded it from the final models. We also tested interactions between young people's age and gender, to see if there was an extra effect of being/having an older daughter, but the interaction terms did not add significant explanatory force.

As stated we estimate models for mothers, fathers and young people separately. Importantly, because our ratio measures are mutually exclusive, we are able to simultaneously analyze the impacts of the independent variables on multiple household members' shares of household work. Results can be interpreted by reading coefficients and models together as well as separately. In each set of models the constant row sums to one (100 percent of total household work), and an increase in coefficients in one model implies decreases in others in the same row. This means that in addition to showing associations between the independent and dependent variables in each model, our analyses can show

whether household adjustments in shares of housework result from fathers doing relatively more/less, mothers doing relatively more/less, young people doing relatively more/less or from the actions of some or all parties. We can also see if reduced shares of, for example, housework done for others by a household member is transferred to their own share of housework for themselves, rather than to another household member.

The reference group across the main models is a mother/father/young person in a household in which both parents work full-time, neither have a tertiary degree, the household contains one young person, who is male, aged 15-19, with no sibling under 15 years, is in the lowest 60% of SES and is English speaking. Analyses accounted for clustering of persons within households, were weighted to ensure an equal distribution of days of the week and were executed using the survey command (STATA version 11.2).

RESULTS

Table 3 shows OLS results for the proportion of routine and non-routine domestic labor performed by mothers, fathers and young people, respectively. Table 4 shows OLS results for the proportion of domestic labor performed 'for household' and 'for oneself' by mothers, fathers and young people, respectively. In each table, intercepts for mothers, fathers and young people sum across, adding up to 100 per cent of household domestic labor performed by all parties. We thus have an overview of households' total domestic work composition by routine vs non-routine activity (Table 3) and by for whom the housework was done (Table 4). We also have each person's proportional contribution to the household total that is comprised of each dimension of domestic labor. Recall that this means that each coefficient can not only be interpreted in relation to the intercept in each model, but also that coefficients across models can be read together, because an increase in one implies a decrease in others. Our innovative approach allows us to identify which share adjustments are made by whom.

[Table 3]

[Table 4]

Reading across intercepts in the top row of Table 3 shows that, in reference category households, 59% of total household domestic labor was routine activities performed by mothers, 18% was routine activities performed by fathers and 6% was routine activities performed by young people. This means that 83% of the total domestic work in these households was comprised of routine domestic labor activities, with mothers contributing nearly three times as much of this type of housework as fathers, and nine times as much as young people. Seventeen per cent of these households' total domestic labor was comprised of non-routine activities, constituted by mothers and fathers each performing 8%, and young people 1%, of the household total domestic work.

Reading across intercepts in the top row of Table 4 shows that in reference category households, of the total domestic labor performed by all parties, 49% was performed for the household by mothers, 13% was performed for the household by fathers, and 2% was performed for the household by young people. This indicates that 64% of total housework was done for the household, rather than for oneself only. Mothers were estimated to contribute over three times as much of the housework done for the household as did fathers, and 25 times as much as young people. Mothers, fathers and young people in the reference category were estimated to perform 18%, 14% and 5% respectively of total household work as housework that was done for oneself only. So 37% of the total domestic labor these households performed was done for oneself only, rather than for the whole household. On this measure, there was only a four percentage point difference between men and women (which the preliminary pooled models showed was not statistically significant), and parents averaged three to four times as much of this type of housework as young people.

These results illustrate gender and generational inequity in total housework shares. Combining both forms of housework together, reference-category mothers, fathers and young people are estimated to do 67%, 27% and 7% of the total respectively. As expected, our analyses showed that share

differences were widest in routine housework; that is, in tasks that are more laborious and must be done regularly (Sullivan 1997), and in housework done for the household, rather than oneself only.

We found parental employment configuration was relevant to how housework was shared between mothers and fathers. Compared to DFT households, in households in which the father worked full-time and the mother part-time (FTPT), men were estimated to do four percentage points less of the routine housework. There were positive coefficients for part-time working mothers' routine and non-routine housework, although, probably because the share displacement was spread across both activity types, they did not reach statistical significance. In MBW households, women were estimated to do 11 percentage points more of the routine housework than their counterparts in dual earner households. This higher share was matched by a lower share of routine (six percentage points) and non-routine (five percentage points) domestic work by fathers. There were no share adjustments by young people. We also found evidence that fathers who did not work full-time (i.e. were employed part-time or were out of the workforce) took on a greater share of non-routine housework (six points more). There were also indications that in these households fathers did a higher share and mothers a lower share of the routine housework (five percentage points more and six percentage points less, respectively), although this was only marginally statistically significant.

With regard to housework done for the household rather than oneself, results again suggest parents in MBW households traded off shares with each other (mothers were estimated to do 10 percentage points more than in dual full-time earner households, and fathers 11 percentage points less). Fathers not employed full-time (FNFT) were estimated to do a larger share of the housework done for oneself (eight percentage points). In this case, we observed negative coefficients for both mothers and young people's share of the housework done for the household (seven and two percentage points, respectively). This implies that non-fulltime working fathers' higher share of housework for themselves replaces the relative share of both mothers and young people's housework for others,

although we caution that significance was only at the 10 percent level. Parental education was not associated with significant share adjustments on either housework dimension.

Young women were estimated to do a greater share of the routine housework than young men (three percentage points more). This brought their estimated routine housework contribution to 9% of the household total domestic work. Contrary to the possibility this would be associated with mothers doing a smaller share of the routine housework, it was *fathers'* share which showed a decrease in association with young person's gender. Fathers were estimated to do four percentage points less of the household routine care if the oldest young person in the household was a daughter rather than a son. This reduced their estimated share to 14% of the household total. We found no significant associations with young persons' gender for shares of non-routine housework. No associations with young people's gender were found for mothers' shares of routine or non-routine housework.

Similarly, young women were estimated to do a higher proportion of the household total work performed for the household (three percentage points more) than young men. There was no gender difference predicted for young people's housework for oneself only. No associations with young people's gender were found for mothers' shares of housework for themselves or for others in the household. Fathers' shares of housework for the household and for themselves were both negatively associated with young people's gender. Although again conventional significance levels were not reached, the results tentatively imply that fathers' share of housework is lower when the young adult is female rather than male, but mothers share does not depend on the gender of the young adult.

There were significant associations between young people being aged 25 or over and their shares of routine housework and household work done for oneself only (six and five percentage points, respectively, higher than for teenagers). In these households fathers were estimated to do four percentage points less of the household routine work, and five percentage points less of the total household labor done for the household. On neither dimension were there corresponding associations

for mothers, again suggesting that fathers' the relative contribution is more amenable to variation in connection with young peoples' share than is mothers'.

A higher number of young people in the household predicted they would in combination do slightly higher shares of the housework (two percentage points higher for the household, five percentage points higher for oneself, and - on the activity dimension - five percentage points more of the routine housework). Fathers were estimated to do three percentage points less non-routine housework, and housework for themselves, per each additional young person. Mothers' share of the routine housework, housework for self or others did not vary with the number of co-resident young people, but their share of non-routine household work was estimated to be two percentage points lower per additional young person. Having children under 15 years old was associated with both fathers and mothers being estimated to do four percentage points less of the household work for themselves only, and with mothers being estimated to do three percentage points more of the non-routine housework. Being non-English-speaking was associated with mothers doing nine percentage points more of the routine housework. Socio-economic status had no significant associations with shares of domestic work on any measure.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

We used time-diary data from matched household members to investigate the gendered nature of shares of domestic work along two dimensions: routine vs non-routine household tasks, and domestic work done for the household versus domestic work done for oneself only. The latter distinction offers a window into an aspect of domestic responsibility that many women find particularly onerous: managing, planning for and servicing others (Coltrane 2000; Deutsch 2000; Sullivan 1997), but which has been underutilised in prior studies. The main purpose was to examine gender shares of these measures and identify factors associated with more equal distribution. We also offered a new inclusive picture of contributors to total household work, by looking at households in which young

people aged 15-34 are co-resident with their parents. This improved on studies of 'household' divisions that discuss only adult partners' participation (Punch 2001: 803). Our approach yielded a description of divisions of labor in a little-studied family form. It allowed us to identify factors associated with change in relative shares between mothers, fathers and young people, and to identify whose shares were traded off against each other.

Most obviously, and confirming a very large body of prior research, was that mothers' overall share of domestic labor far outweighed that of other household members. Mothers contributed the bulk of the routine housework and the household labor that was done for the household. Parents' employment configuration was relevant to how housework was shared between mothers and fathers, as expected. Our measures showed that this was particularly so for routine housework and housework performed on behalf of others. Parents were estimated to have significantly more unequal shares on these measures in MBW than in DFT households, consistent with arguments they are more traditional (Hook 2010). Fathers not employed full-time were estimated to do a larger share of the household work, but interestingly it was for themselves, rather than for others. This implies that even if they have more time available for housework, men will not necessarily take over any relative responsibility for planning and service to others. Parental education was not associated with share adjustments on any measure. This implies that the progressive gender attitudes thought to underlie the higher absolute time inputs of men educated to degree-level (Baxter and Hewitt 2013; England and Srivastavab 2013) do not extend to taking on a higher relative share of the household total.

Thus our results support arguments that relative resources and time availability at best very partially account for gender divisions of labor (Baxter 2002; Bianchi and Milkie 2010; England 2011a; Lachance-Grzela and Bouchard 2010). The results also starkly highlighted that parents remain the primary providers of household labor beyond their children's teenage years. Young people's share of the total domestic work in co-resident households was very low. On the 'for whom' dimension,

young people had slightly higher estimates for housework for oneself than housework done for the household. This implies that they relieve parents of some relative responsibility but more by looking after themselves than others.

Certain characteristics of young people, notably gender and age, were associated with slight share adjustments between them and fathers. Specifically, fathers' share of housework was lower when the oldest young adult was female rather than male, or aged over 25 rather than teenaged. Mothers' shares did not depend on the gender or age of the young adult. The results suggest that young people taking on higher shares of housework displaces fathers, but not mothers, housework shares. A possible implication is that fathers gain relatively more than mothers from third parties contributing to the domestic load. This is consistent with the interpretation that because men's housework is more contingent than women's (Bianchi et al. 2000; Connell 2006; McMahon 1999), their shares are most amenable to reduction. The results align with recent research into domestic outsourcing, which has found paid household help has no effect on either genders' housework time (Sullivan and Gershuny 2013), or that it reduces men's time as much or more than women's, with no net effect on intra-household gender shares of housework (Craig and Baxter 2014).

Men may take opportunities to transfer domestic labor to a third party more readily than women because performing it is consistent with feminine gender norms, but inconsistent with male gender norms. Relatively unvarying women's shares could be evidence of maternal gatekeeping (Allen and Hawkins 1999; Gaunt 2008). Parents may be reluctant to alter their shares of domestic responsibility because they feel accountable for behaving consistently with prevalent cultural beliefs about gender roles (Berk 1985; Brines 1994; Greenstein 2000; Ridgeway and Correll 2004; West and Zimmerman 2009), because of preferences internalized over time, or due to taken-for-granted assumptions about the way to behave (England 2010; England 2011b). As suggested earlier, taken-for-granted assumptions about housework are likely to be relevant to the social categories 'parent' and 'child',

such that domestic services flow strongly down the generations. It may be particularly difficult for mothers, who are predominantly the primary carers, to adjust from doing everything for children to expecting them to take over some net responsibility for domestic tasks (Kloep and Hendry 2010). Similarly it may be difficult to increase adult children's contribution to the household chores, if this has not been the norm when they were younger.

In any event, our results suggest that any disruption to downward service flows is minimal, and that to the limited degree it is present, it mostly involves fathers, but not mothers, doing a smaller share. This again suggests gender conformity rather than resistance and in this case that *men* are actively 'doing', rather than 'undoing', gender (Deutsch 2007). The results could reflect male gender display (Baxter and Hewitt 2013; Bittman et al. 2003; Halleröd 2005). Alternatively, it may result from differential domestic power (Connell 2009; McMahon 1999). The simplest explanation for the share adjustments being between young people and fathers may be that fathers divest themselves of housework shares because they can (Chafetz 2004). It is worth noting that the displacement of fathers' shares of domestic work by co-resident young adults is of routine housework and housework that serves others, which as we have shown are dimensions of domestic labor most typically done by women. Conversely, the higher shares of young women were in routine housework and housework done for the household, suggesting that gender patterns in looking after others are (weakly) echoed in the younger generation. It should not be overlooked that young people are also agentic actors, who participate in how gender is constructed, recreated and reinforced through everyday interaction, forming part of the social structure constraining parental gender divisions, offering opportunities to undo or to perpetuate established patterns (Connell 2009; Ridgeway and Correll 2004; West and Zimmerman 2009). Overall, the results suggest that the contributions of female and older co-resident young people exacerbate rather than ameliorate parental gender divisions of labor.

This study is subject to a number of limitations. The data are cross-sectional, which limited study of young people's maturation. To disentangle age and cohort effects would ideally require time use panel data, but unfortunately none are available. More broadly, our analyses identify correlations only, not causal effects. A further limitation is that selection effects may affect our findings. Young people who live at home are arguably more dependent on their parents than those who have left the family, either financially or emotionally, and as such may be less able or less inclined to take on domestic responsibility (Mahaffy 2004). Households in which young adults co-reside with parents may be more conservative (Mitchell 2006). We are also limited by the fact that we cannot include the household labor of children aged under 15. However, their contribution is likely even less than that of teenagers, who are the base comparison here. Furthermore, our data cannot distinguish between adult children that have never left the family home and those that have left and returned. The latter are thought to be increasing in number in both the USA and Australia (de Vaus 2004; Mitchell 2004), and we may expect them to be more independent, depending on the reasons for their return. Should the data become available, future research using fixed effects modelling with longitudinal data could better account for potential selection effects and unobserved heterogeneity. Since domestic labor patterns differ cross nationally due to varying workplace structures, social policies and cultural norms (Fuwa 2004; Geist 2005; Gornick and Meyers 2003; Hook 2010), future research could also examine whether these findings pertain in other countries.

REFERENCES

Allen, Sarah M. , and Alan J. Hawkins. 1999. "Maternal Gatekeeping: Mothers' Beliefs and Behaviors That Inhibit Greater Father Involvement in Family Work." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 61(1):199-212

Baxter, Janeen. 2002. "Patterns of Change and Stability in the Gender Division of Household Labour in Australia, 1996-1997." *Journal of Sociology* 38(4):399-424.

Baxter, Janeen, and Belinda Hewitt. 2013. "Negotiating Domestic Labor: Women's Earnings and Housework Time in Australia." *Feminist Economics* 19(1):29-53.

Baxter, Janeen, Belinda Hewitt, and Mark Western. 2005. "Post-familial Families and the Domestic Division of Labour." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 36(4):583-600.

Bergmann, Barbara. 2005. *The Economic Emergence of Women Second Edition*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Berk, S.F. 1985. *The Gender Factory: the apportionment of work in American households*. New York: Plenum.

Bianchi, Suzanne, and Melissa Milkie. 2010. "Work and Family Research in the First Decade of the 21st Century." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 72(3):705-25.

Bianchi, Suzanne, Melissa Milkie, Liana Sayer, and John Robinson. 2000. "Is anyone doing the housework? Trends in the gender division of household labor." *Social Forces* 79(1):191-228.

Bianchi, Suzanne, John Robinson, and Melissa Milkie. 2006. *Changing Rhythms of American Family Life*. New York: Russell Sage.

Bittman, Michael, Paula England, Liana 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.

Bonke, Jens. 2010. "Children's housework - Are girls more active than boys?" *electronic International Journal of Time Use Research* 7(1):1-16.

Brines, Julie. 1994. "Economic Dependency, Gender and the Division of Labour at Home." *American Journal of Sociology* 100(3):652-88.

Buis, Martin. 2006. "Proportions as dependent variable." in *12th UK Stata Users Group Meeting*. London.

Chafetz, Janet. 2004. "Bridging feminist theory and research methodology." *Journal of Family Issues* 25:963-77.

Coltrane, S. 2007a. "Fatherhood, gender and work-family policies." in *Real Utopias*, edited by E.O. Wright. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin.

Coltrane, Scott. 2000. "Research on Household Labor: Modeling and Measuring the Social Embeddedness of Routine Family Work." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 62(4):1208-33.

—. 2007b. "Fatherhood, Gender and Work-Family Policies." in *Real Utopias*, edited by Erik Olin Wright. The Havens Center, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Connell, Raewyn. 2006. *Masculinities: Knowledge, power, and social change*. Oxford, UK: Polity.

Connell, Raewyn 2009. "Accountable Conduct: "Doing Gender" in Transsexual and Political Retrospect." *Gender & Society* 23(1):104-11.

Cooke, Lynn Prince, and Janeen Baxter. 2010. "'Families' in International Context: Comparing Institutional Effects across Western Societies." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 72:516-36.

Crabb, Annabel. 2015. *The Wife Drought*. Sydney: Random House.

Craig, Lyn, and Janeen Baxter. 2014. "Domestic outsourcing, housework shares and subjective time pressure: gender differences in the correlates of hiring help." *Social Indicators Research*.

Craig, Lyn, and Michael Bittman. 2008. "The Effect of Children on Adults' Time-Use: An analysis of the incremental time costs of children in Australia." *Feminist Economics* 14(2):57-85.

Craig, Lyn, and Killian Mullan. 2010. "Parenthood, gender and work-family time in USA, Australia, Italy, France and Denmark " *Journal of Marriage and Family* 72(5):1344-61.

—. 2011. "How Mothers and Fathers Share Childcare: A cross-national time-diary comparison." *American Sociological Review* 76(6):834-61.

Craig, Lyn, Abigail Powell, and Judith Brown. 2014. " Co-resident parents and young people aged 15-34: who does what housework?" *Social Indicators Research*.

Cunningham, Mick. 2001. "Parental influences on the gendered division of housework " *American Sociological Review* 66(2):184-203

De Ruijter, E., J.K. Treas, and P.N. Cohen. 2005. "Outsourcing the gender Factory: Living arrangements and service expenditures on female and male tasks." *Social Forces* 84(1):305-22.

de Vaus, David. 2004. "Diversity and change in Australian families: Statistical profiles." Melbourne: Australian Institute of Family Studies.

Deding, Mette, and Mette Lausten. 2006. "Choosing between his time and her time: Paid and unpaid work of Danish couples." *electronic International Journal of Time Use Research (eIJTUR)* 3(1):28-48.

Dempsey, Ken. 2001. "Women's and men's consciousness of shortcomings in marital relations, and of the need for change." *Family Matters* 58(Autumn):58-63.

Deutsch, Francine. 2000. *Halving it All: How Equally Shared Parenting Works*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

—. 2007. "Undoing Gender." *Gender & Society* 21(1):106-27.

Dodson, L., and J. Dickert. 2004. "Girls' Family Labor in Low-Income Households: A Decade of Qualitative Research." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 66(2):318-32.

Dribe, Martin, and Maria Stanfors. 2009. "Does Parenthood Strengthen a Traditional Household Division of Labor? Evidence From Sweden." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 71(1):33 - 45.

England, Paula. 2010. "The Gender Revolution: Uneven and Stalled " *Gender & Society* 24(2):149-66.

—. 2011a. "Missing the Big Picture and Making Much Ado About Almost Nothing: Recent Scholarship on Gender and Household Work." *Journal of Family Theory & Review* 3(1):23-26

—. 2011b. "Reassessing the Uneven Gender Revolution and its Slowdown." *Gender & Society* 25(1):113-23.

England, Paula, and Anjula Srivastavab. 2013. "Educational differences in U.S. parents' time spent in child care: the role of culture and cross-spouse influence." *Social Science Research*.

Evertsson, Marie. 2006. "The reproduction of gender: housework and attitudes towards gender equality in the home among Swedish boys and girls." *The British Journal of Sociology* 57(3):415-36.

Fineman, Martha. 2004. *The Autonomy Myth: A Theory of. Dependency*. New York: The New Press.

Folbre, Nancy. 2001. *The Invisible Heart: economics and family values*. New York: The New Press.

Fuwa, Makiko. 2004. "Macro-level Gender Inequality and the Division of Household Labor in 22 Countries." *American Sociological Review* 69(6):751-67.

Gaunt, Ruth. 2008. "Maternal Gatekeeping Antecedents and Consequences." *Journal of Family Issues* 29(3):373-95.

Geist, Claudia. 2005. "The Welfare State and the Home: Regime Differences in the Domestic Division of Labour." *European Sociological Review* 21(1):23-41.

Giddens, Anthony 1984. *The Constitution of Society. Outline of the Theory of Structuration.* Cambridge: Polity

Gornick, Janet, and Marcia Meyers. 2003. *Families that Work: Policies for Reconciling Parenthood and Employment*. New York: Russell Sage.

Greenstein, Theodore. 2000. "Economic Dependence, Gender and the Division of Labour in the Home." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 62(2):322-35.

Gupta, Sanjiv, and Michael Ash. 2008. "Whose Money, Whose Time? A Non-paramentric Approach to Modelling Time Spent on Housework in the United States." *Feminist Economics* 14(1):93-120.

Halleröd, Bjorn. 2005. "Sharing of housework and money among Swedish couples: Do they behave rationally?" *European Sociological Review* 21:273-88.

Hilbrecht, Margot, Juri Zuzanek, and RC Mannell. 2008. "Time Use, Time Pressure and Gendered Behavior in Early and Late Adolescence." *Sex Roles* 58:342-57.

Hook, Jennifer. 2006. "Care in context: Men's unpaid work in 20 countries, 1965-2003." *American Sociological Review* 71(4):639-60.

—. 2010. "Gender Inequality in the Welfare State: Sex Segregation in Housework, 1965-2003." *American Journal of Sociology* 115(5):1480-523.

Ironmonger, Duncan. 2004. "Bringing up Betty and Bobby: The Macro Time Dimensions of Investment in the Care and Nurture of Children." in *Family Time: The Social Organisation of Care*, edited by Nancy Folbre and Michael Bittman. London: Routledge.

Jurik, Nancy, and Cynthia Siemsen. 2009. "“Doing Gender” as Canon or Agenda: A Symposium on West and Zimmerman." *Gender & Society* 23(1):72-75.

Kan, Man Yee 2008. "Measuring Housework Participation: The Gap between “Stylised” Questionnaire Estimates and Diary-based Estimates." *Social Indicators Research* 86(3):381-400.

Kloep, M., and L.B. Hendry. 2010. "Letting go or holding on? Parents' perceptions of their relationships with their children during emerging adulthood." *British Journal of Developmental Psychology* 28(4):817-34.

Lachance-Grzela, M., and G. Bouchard. 2010. "Why do women do the lion's share of housework? A decade of research." *Sex Roles* 63:767-80.

Mahaffy, Kimberly A. 2004. "Gender, Race, Class, and the Transition to Adulthood: A Critical Review of the Literature " *Sociological Studies of Children and Youth* 9:15-47.

Mattingly, Marybeth, and Liana Sayer. 2006. "Under pressure: Gender differences in the relationship between free time and feeling rushed." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 68(1):205-21.

McHale, Susan, Ann Crouter, and Corinna Tucker. 2003. "Family Context and Gender Role Socialization in Middle Childhood: Comparing Girls to Boys and Sisters to Brothers." *Child Development* 70(4):990-1004.

McMahon, Anthony. 1999. *Taking Care of Men: Sexual Politics in the Public Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Miller, Pavla. 2005. "Useful and Priceless Children in Contemporary Welfare States." *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender State and Society* 12(1):3-41.

Mitchell, Barbara. 2004. "Home, But Not Alone: Socio-Cultural and Economic Aspects of Canadian Young Adults Sharing Parental Households." *Atlantis* 28(2):115-25.

—. 2006. "The Boomerang Age from Childhood to Adulthood: Emergent Trends and Issues for Aging Families." *Canadian Studies in Population* 33(2):155-78.

Papke, Leslie , and Jeffrey Wooldridge. 1996. "Econometric Methods for Fractional Response Variables With an Application to 401(K) Plan Participation Rates." *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 11:619-32.

Presser, Harriet. 1994. "Employment Schedules Among Dual-Earner Spouses and the Division of Labour by Gender." *American Sociological Review* 59:348-69.

Punch, Samantha 2001. "Household Division of Labour: Generation, Gender, Age, Birth Order and Sibling Composition." *Work, Employment & Society* 15(4):803-23.

Ridgeway, Cecilia, and Shelley Correll. 2004. "Unpacking the gender system: A Theoretical Perspective on Gender Beliefs and Social Relations." *Gender & Society* 18(4):510-31.

Risman, Barbara. 2009. "From doing to undoing: Gender as we know it." *Gender & Society* 23(1):81-84.

Russell, Graeme. 1987. "Problems in role-reversed families." Pp. 161-79 in *Reassessing fatherhood: New observations on fathers and the modern family*, edited by Charlie Lewis and Margaret O'Brien. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Salman Rizavi, S., and C. Sofer. 2010. "The third partner in the household: an analysis of children's household work." in *27th Journées de Microéconomie*. University of Angers, France.

Sayer, Liana. 2005. "Gender, Time and Inequality: Trends in Women's and Men's Paid Work, Unpaid Work and Free Time." *Social Forces* 84(1):285-303.

Sayer, Liana, Suzanne Bianchi, and John Robinson. 2004. "Are Parents Investing Less in Children? Trends in Mothers' and Fathers' time with Children." *American Journal of Sociology* 110(1):1-43.

Strazdins, Lyndall, and Dorothy Broom. 2004. "Acts of Love (and Work) Gender Imbalance in Emotional Work and Women's Psychological Distress." *Journal of Family Issues* 25:356-78.

Sullivan, Oriel. 1997. "Time Waits For No (Wo)Man: An Investigation Of The Gendered Experience Of Domestic Time." *Sociology* 31(2):221-39.

—. 2004. "Changing gender practices within the household: A theoretical perspective." *Gender & Society* 18(207-22).

Sullivan, Oriel, and Jonathan Gershuny. 2013. "Domestic outsourcing and multitasking: How much do they really contribute?" *Social Science Research* 42(5):1311-24.

West, Candace, and Don Zimmerman. 1987. "Doing Gender." *Gender and Society* 1(2):125-51.

—. 2009. "Accounting for Doing Gender." *Gender & Society* 23(1):112-22.

Wight, Vanessa, Joseph Price, Suzanne Bianchi, and Bijou Hunt. 2009. "The time use of teenagers " *Social Science Research* 38(4):792-809.

Table 1: Household characteristics

Parents' employment status	Dual full-time earners (DFT)	32.5
	Full-time employed father, part-time employed mother (FTPT)	33.3
	Male breadwinner: full-time father, mother not employed (MBW)	12.9
	Other households – father not employed full-time (FNFT)	21.3
Parents' educational level	Neither has degree	63.7
	Both have degree	12.5
	Only father has degree	12.1
	Only mother has degree	11.7
Oldest young person's		%
Age	15-19	52.3
	20-24	30.1
	25-34	17.6
Gender	Male	56.3
	Female	43.7
No. of young people 15-34	1	66.4
	2	28.7
	3+	4.9
Child(ren) under 15 in household	No	69.5
	Yes	30.5
Language spoken at home	English	87.7
	NESB	12.3
Socio-economic Indices For Area (SEIFA)	Lowest 60%	53.2
	Highest 40%	46.7

Table 2: Average (mean) shares and amount spent on household labor by household member and type of domestic work

Household labor...	...which is routine			...which is non-routine			
	Mothers	Fathers	Young people	Mothers	Fathers	Young people	Total
Share	0.51	0.15	0.11	0.09	0.11	0.03	1.00
Amount (mins a day)	184	49	37	35	54	14	374
Household labor...	…performed for the household			…performed for oneself			
Share	0.44	0.16	0.05	0.16	0.10	0.09	1.00

Amount (mins a day)	161	63	20	58	40	32	374

Table 3: Estimates of mothers', fathers' and young people's shares of total household routine and non-routine domestic work

		Routine domestic work			Non-routine domestic work		
		Mothers	Fathers	Young people	Mothers	Fathers	Young people
Intercept (note: row sums to 1)		0.59***	0.18***	0.06*	0.08***	0.08*	0.01
Parents' employment status	Dual full-time earner						
	Full-time male, part-time female	0.02	-0.04*	-0.01	0.02	0.00	0.00
	Male breadwinner	0.11**	-0.06**	-0.01	0.03	-0.05**	-0.02^{X}
	Father not full-time	-0.06	0.05 ^{X}	-0.03	-0.01	0.06**	-0.01
Parents' education	Neither has tertiary degree						
	Both have tertiary degree	-0.05^{X}	0.03	0.02	0.02	-0.01	-0.01
	Only father has tertiary degree	-0.03	-0.01	0.03	-0.01	0.03	-0.01
	Only mother has tertiary degree	-0.03	0.05^{X}	-0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00
Young person is female		-0.01	-0.04**	0.03**	0.01	0.00	0.00
Young person is aged	15-19						
	20-24	-0.04	-0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.00
	25-34	0.03	-0.04**	0.06**	-0.01	-0.02	0.00
No of young people 15-34 in household		0.00	-0.01	0.05***	-0.02**	-0.03**	0.02^{X}
Child(ren) aged 0-14 in household		0.02	0.01	0.00	-0.03**	-0.01	0.00
Non-English-speaking household		0.09**	-0.04^{X}	-0.01	-0.01	-0.02	-0.01
Socio-Economic	Lowest 60%						
Status (SES)	Highest 40%	-0.01	0.02	0.00	0.00	-0.00	-0.01
Total domestic work		-0.00***	-0.00**	-0.00***	0.00**	0.00***	0.00*
R squared		0.09	0.10	0.08	0.06	0.15	0.02

$p<0.10^{X}$,* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Table 4: Estimates of mothers', fathers' and young people's shares of domestic work by 'for whom' activity is done

		For household			For self only		
		Mothers	Fathers	Young people	Mothers	Fathers	Young people
Intercept (note: row sums to 1)		0.49***	0.13**	0.02	0.18***	0.14***	0.05^{X}
Parents' employment status	Dual full-time						
	Full-time male, part-time female	0.01	-0.03	0.00	0.03	-0.01	-0.00
	Male breadwinner	0.10**	-0.11***	-0.01	0.05^{X}	0.00	-0.02
	Father not full-time	-0.07^{X}	0.03	-0.02^{X}	0.01	0.08**	-0.02
Parents' education	Neither has tertiary degree						
	Both have tertiary degree	-0.04	0.03	-0.01	0.00	-0.01	0.02
	Only father has tertiary degree	-0.03	-0.01	0.02	-0.01	0.03	0.00
	Only mother has tertiary degree	-0.03	0.04	-0.01	-0.01	0.01	-0.01
Young person is female		0.01	-0.02	0.03**	0.00	-0.02^{X}	0.01
Young person is aged	15-19						
	20-24	-0.04	0.01	0.00	0.01	-0.01	0.01
	25-34	0.01	-0.05**	0.02	0.00	-0.02	0.05**
No of young people 15-34 in household		-0.01	-0.01	0.02**	-0.01	-0.03**	0.05***
Child(ren) aged 0-14 in household		0.04	0.04^{X}	0.00	-0.04*	-0.04**	0.00
Non-English-speaking household		0.05	-0.03	0.00	0.04	-0.02	-0.03^{X}
Socio-Economic Status (SES)	Lowest 60%						
	Highest 40%	-0.02	0.02	-0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00
Total domestic work		-0.00	0.00**	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.00**
R squared		0.05	0.10	0.04	0.02	0.09	0.07

$p<0.10^{X}$,* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001