

4-2018

Wives' Perceptions of Husbands' Housework and Parenting Contributions

Reilly Kate Kincaid

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/uhp_theses



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

eCommons Citation

Kincaid, Reilly Kate, "Wives' Perceptions of Husbands' Housework and Parenting Contributions" (2018). *Honors Theses*. 164.
https://ecommons.udayton.edu/uhp_theses/164

This Honors Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the University Honors Program at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu, mschlangen1@udayton.edu.

Wives' Perceptions of Husbands' Housework and Parenting Contributions



Honors Thesis

Reilly Kate Kincaid

Department: Psychology

Advisor: Catherine Lutz Zois, Ph.D.

April 2018

Wives' Perceptions of Husbands' Housework and Parenting Contributions

Honors Thesis

Reilly Kate Kincaid

Department: Psychology

Advisor: Catherine Lutz Zois, Ph.D.

April 2018

Abstract

Although husbands today may contribute more home and family labor than in previous decades, the type of contributions they make tend to be those of a “helpmate,” leaving the responsibility for organizing and managing housework and childcare to their wives. Gordon and Whelan-Berry (2005) found that husbands generally spent more time “doing” rather than “managing” in the household. The present study sought to examine working wives’ perceptions of how much their husbands “do” and/or “manage” in terms of housework and childcare. Results provide quantitative support for the high incidence of high-doing but low-managing husbands and shed light on the different implications that husbands’ various contributions have for wives’ marital and life satisfaction. Husbands’ “doing” behavior emerges above their “managing” behavior in terms of its importance in predicting wives’ satisfaction, suggesting that the “helpmate husband” arrangement is not only tolerated, but perhaps even preferred among some women.

Acknowledgements

I am tremendously grateful to my thesis mentor and role model, Dr. Zois, for the endless guidance, patience, kindness, and expertise she provided at every stage in the process. Dr. Zois made the completion of this project not only possible, but also genuinely enjoyable and exciting. I am also very grateful to my mom, dad, and college roommate, Jenna, for enduring me at my worst and loving me regardless. I have been very blessed.



Table of Contents

Abstract	Title Page
Acknowledgements	Title Page
Introduction	1
Method	9
Results	16
Discussion	20
References	30
Tables	37
Appendices	
A. Demographics Questionnaire	42
B. Housework and Childcare Instrument	45
C. Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS)	50
D. Relationship Rating Form (RRF)	51
E. Participant Recruitment Email	53

Wives' Perceptions of Husbands' Housework and Parenting Contributions

While women have achieved promising gains in many areas of public life, the politics of private life may be more resistant to reform. Even as women's collective participation in the public sector increases, the expectations and norms around spousal distributions of housework and childcare are slower to change (Thébaud, 2010). This inequality may have implications for subjective contentment of working wives and mothers (Glass & Fujimoto, 1994; Lennon & Rosenfield, 1994, Piña & Bengson, 1993).

There is much variability between husbands in both the *amounts* as well as the *types* of housework and childcare that they undertake (Lachance-Grzela & Bouchard, 2010; Mannino & Deutsch, 2007). This study sought to clarify wives' general perceptions of the type and magnitude of husbands' contributions to housework and parenting, and identify connections between wives' perception of husbands' contributions and their levels of marital and life satisfaction.

Trends in Employment, Housework, and Childcare in Heterosexual Marriages

Although gendered divisions of responsibility for housework and childcare in heterosexual families continue to change as more mothers work outside the home, an unequal distribution of labor still appears to prevail (Baxter, Hewitt, & Haynes, 2008; Bianchi, Milkie, Sayer, & Robinson, 2000; Coltrane, 2000; Davis, Greenstein, & Marks, 2007; Thébaud, 2010). Husbands' increased participation in housework and parenting appears to be slow to follow wives' increased participation in the paid workforce, with some studies suggesting that women still contribute about twice as much time to housework as men do (Baxter et al. 2008; Bianchi et al. 2000; Coltrane, 2000; Davis et al. 2007) and mothers still spend about twice as much time with their children as fathers do

(Parker & Wang, p. 6, 2013). However, in comparison to the average time that fathers spent doing housework in 1965, fathers today have more than doubled their contributions, from an average of four hours per week to 10, while over the same period of time, mothers' time spent doing housework has decreased from an average of 32 hours per week to 18 (Parker & Wang, p. 6, 2013). Although statistics such as these suggest some degree of gender convergence in the way dual-income couples divide their time between paid and unpaid work, this apparent redistribution of labor should not be immediately interpreted as a trend toward true equality (Lincoln, 2008). Historically traceable differences continue to linger in the type of unpaid household work that husbands and wives generally undertake (Lachance-Grzela & Bouchard, 2010; Mannino & Deutsch, 2007; Lincoln, 2008; Thébaud, 2010).

Paid and Unpaid Work

Prior to the Industrial Revolution and the rise of capitalism, families labored for their own survival. They cooked their own food, made their own tools, and sewed their own clothes; husband and wife were economically *interdependent* partners (Freedman, 2007; Johnson, 2014). When industrialization and capitalism introduced and expanded the wage labor market, men were removed from the sphere of family work and put into a new sphere where monetary value was assigned to their labor (Freedman, 2007). This transition redefined “work” into how it is commonly understood today: labor that is traded for pay. This new definition renders invisible much of the unpaid domestic work that has become primarily women's responsibility since this transition (Freedman, 2007; Johnson, 2014). However, research has found that unpaid housework—specifically, the housework that does not allow much flexibility in when it can be completed, such as

preparing meals or doing laundry—is as necessary and economically important as paid work in maintaining society (Coltrane, 2000).

Because family and household labor is not acknowledged as real work (Thébaud, 2010), the role of managing such labor may also be belittled and constructed differently from the management roles that exist in the male-dominated capitalist marketplace (Mederer, 1993, p. 143). Managing, in any sense, usually entails more responsibility relative to the work being managed (Gordon & Whelan-Berry, 2005; Mederer, 1993). Similarly to most management positions in the paid workforce, the responsibility of managing housework may be associated with greater emotional burden and psychological distress (Gordon & Whelan-Berry, 2005; Mederer, 1993). However, unlike the paid workforce, where some combination of authority, prestige, or monetary reward is usually attached to management positions to compensate for the added responsibility and burden (Mirowsky & Ross, 2005; Schieman & Reid, 2009), these external rewards do not transfer into the realm of home and family (Mederer, 1993, p. 143). Although some family managers may individually value their role for other reasons (Allen & Hawkins, 1999; Gaunt, 2005), responsibility without recognition creates a breeding ground for inequality (Mederer, 1993, p. 143). Thus, in order to study current distributions of family labor and be able to propose relevant steps toward more egalitarian marriages, a distinction must be made between the management and carrying-out of housework and parenting.

Doing and Managing

Using a qualitative method, Gordon and Whelan-Berry (2005) identified a distinction between two types of housework participation: “doing” and “managing.” They

described *doing* as “carrying out, performing, or implementing of a sequence of household activities” and *managing* as the “planning, coordinating, and initiating of all household and family-related activities” (p. 912). While these two dimensions are not exclusionary—the person who shoulders the bulk of the household managing can function as the primary “doer” of housework as well—the activities associated with doing are often performed in response to some initiative or delegation from the person who typically manages or coordinates the completion of housework (p. 912).

Based on the varying levels of doing and managing that wives reported their husbands as engaging in, Gordon and Whelan-Berry (2005) identified four types of husbands. *Uninvolved* husbands were described by their wives as managing no or low levels of housework and carrying out no or low levels of housework; in other words, they performed “low on managing and [low on] doing” (p. 914). *Helpmate* husbands were low on managing but high on doing, typically carrying out the household tasks their wives’ asked of them but not holding the responsibility for organizing family schedules or maintaining the order of the house (p. 914). *Egalitarian* husbands were high in managing and high in doing, involved at proportions relatively equal to those of their wives (p. 916). *Coordinator* husbands were high in managing but low in doing, performing roles analogous to those of the wives who had helpmate husbands (p. 916). The majority of the husbands in this study fell into the helpmate category (50%), followed by egalitarian (28%), followed by uninvolved (14%), followed by coordinator (8%) (Gordon & Whelan-Berry, 2005).

The gendering and separation of the workplace and home help to explain the results of Gordon and Whelan-Berry’s (2005) study. Men continue to be advantaged in

the attainment of authority positions in most paid workplaces (McDonald, Lin, & Ao, 2009; Budig, 2002), perhaps due in part to the interaction of patriarchal ideology and capitalist culture, accelerated most notably by the Industrial Revolution. The unpaid, non-work space of home and family continue to be coded as the woman's realm and women are more commonly faced with the 'natural' responsibility of managing this type of work (Thébaud, 2010). A number of studies have found that married women are expected to manage home and family (Lachance-Grzela & Bouchard, 2010; Mannino & Deutsch, 2007, Thébaud, 2010; Mederer, 1993). Both genders continue to be overrepresented in formal and informal management roles of their culturally respective spheres. Men's overrepresentation in public management positions is evidenced by their dominance in authority positions of S&P 500 companies, making up approximately 94% of CEOs, 90% of top earners, 80% of board seats, and 75% of executive managers (Catalyst, 2017). Meanwhile, their underrepresentation in home management is evidenced by the trend of 'helpmate' husbands captured by Gordon and Whelan-Berry (2005) as well as by the widely unaddressed assumption implied by the label of the helpmate category itself: husbands who do housework are *helping* their wives with their work and fathers who parent are *helping* mothers with their work. This subtle yet pervasive expectation conveyed in the language of both scholarly literature as well as colloquial conversation may be problematic as it has the potential to obscure male responsibility.

Household Labor Distributions and Wives' Satisfaction

The potential connection between low-managing husbands and dissatisfied wives' is suggested by the research on perceived fairness and emotional outcomes for spouses. A study by Mederer (1994) revealed that fairness is judged not only by hours spent in

parenting and housework, but also by the *type* of parenting and housework undertaken. Mederer (1994) found that *managing* housework was perceived as an unfair burden by women. Mederer also found that women were less likely to argue over unfair distributions of managing than “task accomplishment” (what is described generally in the current study as “doing”), which may suggest that women in 1994 assumed their lot of household managing to be less negotiable or that the quality of managing might have been compromised if shared more equally with their husbands.

Some studies indicate that when the distribution of housework appears fairer, wives are less likely to display symptoms of depression, yet when the distribution is perceived to be less fair, symptoms of depression are higher in wives (Glass & Fujimoto, 1994; Lennon & Rosenfield, 1994, Piña & Bengson, 1993). Piña and Bengson (1993) found that satisfaction with husbands’ help was positively related to wives’ experiences of positive marital interaction, closeness, and affirmation, and negatively related to wives’ thoughts of divorce. Piña and Bengson also found that satisfaction with husbands’ help was positively related to wives’ positive affect and negatively related to wives’ negative affect. Increased time spent in housework is associated with increased depression for both spouses (Glass & Fujimoto, 1994); thus, if some of the time involved in managing housework is shifted to husbands to create a more egalitarian distribution, wives’ emotional outcomes may be expected to improve.

Moreover, while no research to our knowledge has examined whether inequities in levels of managing household and parental responsibilities is associated with lower levels of marital and life satisfaction even in the face of equality in total number of hours worked by men and women in the home, there are some theoretical reasons why this may

be the case. A study by Dempsey (2000) revealed that working wives prefer for their husbands to share *ongoing* responsibility for housework and childcare, rather than only contributing “help” when needed. Wives’ attempts to obtain long-term household equity in comparison to help with isolated tasks may be less successful (Dempsey, 2000; Mannino & Deutsch, 2007). According to Schieman and Reid (2009), those who occupy (general) managing roles often confront “resistance, non-compliance, and unsatisfactory performance (Hodson, 2001; Ross & Reskin, 1992); moreover, they are usually in charge of managing it (Friedman, Tidd, Currall, & Tsai, 2000)” (p. 1618). These characteristics of (general) managerial roles may produce interpersonal conflict and stress (Schieman & Reid, 2009), subsequently decreasing wives’ satisfaction. Moreover, several studies have indicated that among working women, those who hold managerial jobs report more symptoms of depression and negative health (Walters et al., 1996; Hartley, Popay, & Plewis, 1992; Gjerdingen, McGovern, Bekker, Lundberg, & Willemssen, 2001). Additionally, the wife managing the household, and thus, often telling her husband what needs to be done (Finkel & Safir, 2016), may create a dynamic whereby the wife perceives that she is inhabiting the mother role with her husband. This perception may, in turn, have a negative effect on her marital satisfaction (Finkel & Safir, 2016).

The Current Study

There exist gaps in the literature in regards to the correlations between wives’ increased participation in the workforce and the level/type of housework and parenting that husbands engage in, as well as the potential influence that these distributions of labor may have on the marriage and life satisfaction of the spouses themselves. The results of the Gordon and Whelan-Berry study suggest that sexual politics continue to permeate

divisions of labor in the home, even as heterosexual spouses' hours in paid and unpaid work converge. Thus, research that examines spouses' hours but does not distinguish between the *type* of paid and unpaid work that occupies these hours is limited in regards to what it can reveal about gender equality or lack thereof. It is also unlikely then, that adequate solutions for addressing inequality within marriages will emerge from research that does not distinguish between the dimensions of doing and managing the work of home and family.

This study sought to address these gaps in the literature by attempting to quantitatively replicate the Gordon and Whelan-Berry (2005) findings and expand them to husbands' participation in childcare-related work. This study examined wives' expectations going into starting a family, their perceptions of the amount and type of parenting and housework that their husbands contribute (distinguishing between "doing" and "managing"), and the implications for their marital and life satisfaction, posed by a potential recognition of dissonance between expectations and perceptions of husbands' contributions, as well as by the types and levels of the contributions themselves.

Hypotheses

It was predicted that wives would report their husbands as more likely to participate in doing housework and childcare than in managing or organizing these types of household work (H1). It was also predicted that labor distributions participants witnessed growing up will be positively correlated with their expectations of labor distributions going into starting their own family (H2). It was also predicted that discrepancies between expected division of household labor and current perceived division of labor will be negatively correlated with marital and life satisfaction (H3).

While there was no formal hypothesis related to the following, an important research question that this study sought to explore was whether certain combinations of interactions between the two dimensions (doing and managing) are more or less predictive of wives' marital and life satisfaction than others. Based on the literature review, the combination of low-doing, low-managing ("uninvolved") husbands would presumably be more likely to predict lower satisfaction for their wives, while high-doing, high-managing ("egalitarian") husbands would presumably be more likely to predict higher satisfaction for wives. Prior to conducting this study, however, it was unclear what the consequences might be in terms of marital and life satisfaction for wives with high-doing, low-managing ("helpmate") husbands or low-doing, high-managing ("coordinator") husbands, although the latter was expected to be a less common division of labor among dual-income marriages.

Method

Participants

The research sample was limited to female faculty and staff at the University of Dayton, who were in dual-income heterosexual marriages and had children. Participants were recruited via email, and participation was strictly voluntary. Of the original 125 survey respondents, fifteen were excluded because a substantial amount of data was missing from their responses. One additional respondent was excluded because she did not meet eligibility criteria, as her responses indicated she did not have any children. Of the 109 participants included in analyses, ages fell between 26—30 years (1.8%), 31—35 years (12.8%), 36—40 years (22.9%), 41—45 years (17.4%), 46—50 years (17.4%), 51—55 years (12.8%), 56—60 years (11.0%), 61—65 years (2.8%), and over 65 years

(.9%). Regarding race, 91.7% of participants identified as non-Hispanic white, 2.8% as black or African American, 2.8% as Hispanic/Latina or Asian/Asian American, and 2.8% chose not to answer. Length of current marriage ranged from one to 43 years with a mean of 16.35 years ($SD = 10.24$). The number of children raised/being raised by participants was most commonly two (42.2%), followed by one (23.9%), three (19.3%), four (11.0%), or more than four (3.7%), and ages of participants' youngest child ranged from 2 weeks to 35 years old ($M = 10.41$ years, $SD = 8.16$). Additional background information relating to level of education attained, employment situation, husbands' employment situation, labor distributions modeled during participants' upbringing, and participants' expectations for labor distributions going into starting a family can be found in Table 1.

Measures

Demographics. The online survey began with a section that contained questions relating to participant demographics. Variables assessed included age, race/ethnic group, years of school attended, employment situation (full-time or part-time), husband's employment situation (full-time, part-time, out of work but looking, or out of work and not looking), years married to current spouse, number of children, ages of children, and the employment situation of the participant's mother as she witnessed it growing up (full-time, part-time, or no work outside the home). The demographics form also included four questions about the division of housework and parenting labor that participants witnessed growing up and their expectations around division of housework and parenting labor going into starting a family. The demographics form can be found in Appendix A.

Housework and childcare. The instrument for assessing spouses' contributions in the doing and managing of housework and childcare was developed by the researchers,

as no formal measures for assessing such contributions could be found in the existing scholarship. The housework items included in the instrument are based on the “low-schedule-control” tasks identified by Barnett and Shen (1997). These tasks (such as planning and preparing meals or doing laundry) allow for less flexibility in terms of when they can get done, as opposed to “high-schedule-control” tasks (such as taking out garbage or looking after the car) that allow for a higher degree of flexibility in the timing.

Because no studies distinguishing “low-schedule-control” from “high-schedule-control” parenting appeared to exist in the published literature on this topic, an informal, no-risk, pilot study of five working moms was conducted in order to develop questions that most accurately address parenting work that mothers consider to be “routine.” This was done in an effort to yield higher content validity (asking enough questions to, as adequately and fairly as possible, sample the broad range of routine parenting responsibilities). The full measure, therefore, consisted of four subscales, containing items that assessed wives’ perceptions of how often their husbands carry out parenting activities, organize/manage parenting activities, carry out housework, and organize/manage housework. Participants scored their husbands’ participation in the type of parenting or housework activity described by indicating a number from a five-point Likert scale that ranged from 1 (never) to 5 (always).

The parenting measure consisted of four items designed to assess ‘doing’ behavior and four items designed to assess ‘managing’ behavior. An example item from the doing-parenting subscale is “How often does your husband CARRY OUT the physical or health care of your child/children? (*ex: doing or supervising hygiene or grooming tasks for child/children such as bathing, dressing, brushing teeth, brushing*

hair, washing face; doing or supervising the taking of vitamins or medications).” An example item from the managing-parenting subscale is “How often does your husband ORGANIZE OR MANAGE matters related to the physical or health-related needs of your child/children? (*ex: scheduling haircuts; scheduling doctor/dentist/therapist appointments; researching health concerns related to child/children).*”

The housework measure consisted of six items designed to assess ‘doing’ behavior and four items designed to assess ‘managing’ behavior. An example from item from the doing-housework subscale is “How often does your husband CARRY OUT preparing meals? (*ex: cooking; setting table).*” An example item from the managing-housework subscale is “How often does your husband ORGANIZE OR MANAGE the preparing of meals? (*ex: compiling the grocery list; planning meals/looking for recipes; working to accommodate picky eaters, dietary needs and restrictions, or allergies).*”

After conducting reliability analyses for all subscales to compute item-total correlations, three items were dropped from the housework and childcare instrument because they substantively lowered Cronbach’s alpha coefficients. After dropping items that asked participants about pet care and the organizing of disciplinary guidelines (such as grounding children for poor behavior), Cronbach’s alphas for the Doing Childcare, Managing Childcare, Doing Housework, and Managing Housework subscales were .82, .82, .73, and .68, respectively. Cronbach’s alphas for the Doing, Managing, Housework, and Childcare scales were .83, .80, .87, and .85, respectively. The housework and childcare instrument can be found in Appendix B.

Life satisfaction.

Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS; Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985).

The SWLS was designed to measure general cognitive judgments of how satisfied one is with his or her life. It does not measure positive or negative affect. The measure consists of five items, and participants indicate how much they generally agree or disagree with each item by selecting a number from a seven-point Likert scale that ranges from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). An example item is “In most ways my life is close to my ideal.” All items are positively-keyed.

The SWLS has been established as a valid and reliable measure (Pavot & Diener, 1993; Blais, Vallerand, Pelletier, & Brière, 1989). According to Pavot and Diener (1993), internal consistencies, tested by several different researchers over a period of seven years, averaged .86 and the test-retest reliabilities, tested by several researchers over a period of seven years, with temporal intervals ranging from two weeks to four years, averaged .70. The SWLS is moderately correlated with other constructs of well-being and life satisfaction, with correlation coefficients ranging from .28 to .82, demonstrating adequate convergent validity (Pavot & Diener, 1993). Evidence for validity of the SWLS is also supported by research indicating that the groups that obtain the lowest scores on the measure are those that would be expected to experience lower life satisfaction, such as “psychiatric patients, prisoners, students in poor and turbulent countries, and abused women” (Pavot & Diener, 1993, p. 167). Blais et al. (1989) found the SWLS to be negatively correlated with the Beck Depression Inventory, thus demonstrating good discriminant validity. In the current study, Cronbach’s alpha for the SWLS was .90. The SWLS can be found in Appendix C.

Marriage satisfaction.

Relationship Rating Form (RRF; Davis & Todd, 1982). The RRF was designed

to assess seven global characteristics and 20 more specific facets of friendships and romantic relationships. Most, but not all, of the facets map onto the global characteristics. This study utilized only three of the subscales: Success (which we considered to be most representative of the Global Satisfaction scale), Conflict (which we considered to be most representative of the Conflict/Ambivalence scale), and Commitment (which we considered pertinent to a general assessment of marriage satisfaction, although it does not map onto a global scale). In determining which subscales to include, we were highly selective, attempting to include only items that would be most relevant to highlighting potential patterns between marriage satisfaction and distributions of household labor. The RRF can be administered using either a seven- or nine-point Likert scale response format, with both options reportedly yielding approximately the same results. The present study used the seven-point format in order to maintain consistency with the SWLS and maximize simplicity.

The RRF has been established as a valid and reliable measure (Davis, 1996). Internal consistencies were tested twice, and averaged .85, .73, and .89, for the “success,” “conflict,” and “commitment” subscales, respectively, and the test-retest reliabilities were .66, .64, and .81, for the “success,” “conflict,” and “commitment” subscales, respectively (Davis, 1996). Additionally, Davis (1966) found that the RRF’s global scales were “predictive of longitudinal satisfaction and relationship stability” (p. 3). For the current study, alpha coefficients for the “success,” “conflict,” and “commitment” subscales were .95, .70, and .95, respectively. The questions borrowed from the RRF can be found in Appendix D.

Procedure

All procedures involved in the current study were approved by the Psychology Department's Research Review and Ethics Committee (RREC), a subcommittee of the University of Dayton's Institutional Review Board (IRB). A recruitment email was sent to female faculty and staff in order to request participation in the current study. The link to the survey was included in this email. This email can be found in the Appendix E. SurveyMonkey, an online survey software, was used as the format for collecting data. Completion of the survey was not linked to IP addresses, in order to protect participants' identifying information. Five-dollar Amazon gift cards were used as an incentive for participants to complete the study. However, the gift card was not withheld if any participant wished to end the study prematurely.

Upon following the link in the email, participants were directed to the informed consent. This page informed them of potential risks and benefits, as well as their rights as participants. Upon consenting to participation, they began the questionnaires. The order of the questionnaires was as follows: demographics, housework and childcare instrument (with childcare-related questions preceding housework-related questions, and 'doing' questions preceding 'managing' questions within each subscale), Satisfaction With Life Scale, Relationship Rating Form. Completion of the questionnaires was followed by a final page that contained debriefing information for participants to read, as well as a link to a separate form. This form asked only for their email addresses in order to distribute gift cards, and the responses from this form were downloaded as a file separate from the survey answers in order to ensure confidentiality. Participants had the option to be taken to the debriefing page at any time throughout the study, so that payment and debriefing information were not withheld if they chose to terminate participation early.

Results

Preliminary Analyses

All descriptive statistics for continuous variables can be found in Table 2.

Bivariate correlations were calculated in order to identify possible confounds between the continuous background characteristics (i.e., age of youngest child and number of years married) and the criterion variables (i.e., life satisfaction, marital commitment, marital success, and marital conflict). Results indicated that there were no statistically significant associations between youngest child's age or years married and the four indices of satisfaction. Therefore, youngest child's age and years married were not statistically controlled for in main analyses.

For the categorical background variables (i.e., age group, race, education level, employment status, husbands' employment status, number of kids, presence of multiple births, labor distributions modeled during upbringing, and labor distributions expected at the start of family formation), potential confounds were investigated by conducting a series of between-subjects one-way ANOVAs or independent samples t-tests with the background characteristic as the grouping variable and either life satisfaction or type of marriage satisfaction (i.e., conflict, commit, or success) as the outcome variable. No statistically significant group differences were found. Therefore, age group, race, education level, employment status, husbands' employment status, number of kids, presence of multiple births, labor distributions modeled during upbringing, and labor distributions expected at the start of family formation were not statistically controlled for in main analyses.

Primary Analyses

Hypothesis 1. The hypothesis that wives would report their husbands as more likely to participate in doing housework and childcare than in managing or organizing these types of work was tested using a paired samples t-test. Only the ‘doing’ items that paralleled with comparable ‘managing’ items were included in this analysis. The results of the t-test showed a significant difference in husbands’ scores on doing ($M = 9.72$, $SD = 2.33$) and managing ($M = 6.91$, $SD = 2.56$) for parenting; $t(106) = 13.93$, $p < .001$. Wives reported their husbands as more likely to participate in doing childcare than in managing it. There was also a significant difference in husbands’ scores on doing ($M = 9.44$, $SD = 2.43$) and managing ($M = 8.39$, $SD = 2.71$) for housework; $t(107) = 6.967$, $p < .001$. Husbands were reported as more likely to participate in doing housework than in managing it. Thus, Hypothesis 1 was supported.

A one-sample t-test was used to test a related research question: Is there a difference *between housework and parenting* in the amounts of doing and managing husbands undertake? Prior to conducting the t-test, two difference scores were created, one for the difference in doing housework versus childcare and another for the difference in managing housework versus childcare. The abbreviated ‘doing’ scales previously mentioned were used when creating the difference score in order to compare variables that encompassed equal numbers of items. Interestingly, whereas there was not a significant difference between the amounts of parenting versus housework husbands *do*, there was a significant difference between the amounts of parenting ($M = 6.9$, $SD = 2.56$) versus housework ($M = 8.4$, $SD = 2.7$) husbands *manage* ($M = -1.53$, $SD = 2.66$); $t(106) = 5.94$, $p < .001$. Although husbands are less likely to ‘manage’ than to ‘do,’ they are even less likely to manage the labor related to parenting and childcare.

Hypothesis 2. The hypothesis that the division of labor witnessed during participants' upbringing would be positively correlated with their expectations of labor distributions prior to starting their own families was tested using simple bivariate correlations. No significant correlations were found between the housework or childcare distributions of participants' parents and the housework or childcare distributions participants expected in their own marriages. Thus, the second hypothesis was not supported by the results. However, a significant positive correlation was found between the distributions of housework responsibility and the distributions of childcare responsibility that participants witnessed during their upbringing, $r = .59, p < .01$. A significant positive correlation was also found between the distributions of housework responsibility and the distributions of childcare responsibility that participants expected going into starting their families, $r = .49, p < .01$.

Hypothesis 3. The hypothesis that discrepancies between expected labor distributions and current perceptions of labor distributions would be negatively correlated with life and marital satisfaction was tested using simple bivariate correlations. Two separate standardized residual variables were created, one for doing housework and one for doing childcare, in order to measure discrepancies between expectations of husband's contributions and current perceptions of husbands' actual contributions. No significant correlations were found between these residual variables and the criterion variables. Therefore, these results do not offer evidence that discrepancies between expected labor distributions and perceptions of actual distributions are significantly associated with lower satisfaction in life and marriage. These correlations can be found in Table 3.

Research Questions. Prior to looking at the interactions between doing and managing in the housework and parenting dimensions as they relate to life and marriage, the simple relationships between doing housework, managing housework, doing childcare, managing childcare, life satisfaction, marital commitment, marital success, and marital conflict were examined. These correlations can be found in Table 4.

To examine the research question regarding whether certain combinations of interactions between the two dimensions (doing and managing) would be more or less predictive of wives' marriage and life satisfaction than others, linear regression was used. The continuous predictor variables (i.e., doing childcare, managing childcare, doing housework, and managing housework) were mean-centered prior to creating interaction items in order to reduce the chances of problems with multicollinearity (Cohen, Cohen, Aiken, & West, 2003). Two separate Doing x Managing interaction variables were then created, one for housework and one for childcare. Life satisfaction, marital commitment, marital success, and marital conflict were separately regressed on the doing, managing, and Doing x Managing variables for both dimensions (housework and childcare). Doing housework showed a significant main effect for life satisfaction, marital commitment, and marital success, but not marital conflict. Managing housework did not significantly predict any of the criterion variables. Moreover, contrary to expectations, the housework Doing x Managing interaction was not significant for any of the criterion variables. A similar pattern emerged with regards to childcare. Doing childcare showed a significant main effect for marital commitment, marital success, and marital conflict, but not life satisfaction. Managing childcare did not significantly predict any of the criterion variables. Contrary to expectations, the childcare Doing x Managing interaction was not

significant for any of the criterion variables. These results are summarized in Tables 5-12.

Discussion

The purposes of this study were to quantitatively replicate Gordon and Whelan-Berry's (2005) findings, examine whether the 'helpmate husband' trend extends beyond housework into distributions of parenting labor as well, and explore the implications that husbands' various contributions have for wives' marital and life satisfaction. Using a confidential online survey method, female faculty and staff at a mid-sized university in the Midwest answered questions assessing their expectations prior to starting a family, their perceptions of the amount and type of parenting and housework that their husbands contribute (distinguishing between "doing" and "managing"), and their current marital and life satisfaction. This study supports Gordon and Whelan-Berry's findings that husbands are more likely to contribute to home and family labor by doing tasks as opposed to managing them. Results extend previous research by indicating that this doing-managing difference may be more pronounced in the realm of parenting, where husbands appear even less likely to manage tasks. Wives' expectations of their husbands were not significantly correlated with the labor divisions modeled by their parents. Furthermore, discrepancies between expected labor distributions and perceptions of actual distributions did not show significant negative correlations with wives' satisfaction. Doing housework significantly predicted life satisfaction, marital commitment, and marital success, but not marital conflict. However, neither managing nor Doing x Managing interactions predicted wives' satisfaction. The remainder of this paper will discuss in greater detail these results and implications as they relate to specific

hypotheses and will conclude by addressing limitations and future directions.

Hypothesis 1: Amount of Doing versus Managing Husbands Contribute

The results of this study suggest significant differences in the amounts of doing and managing that husbands take responsibility for within both housework and parenting. These findings are consistent with researchers' expectations that significant discrepancies would emerge from wives' reports of their husbands' behavior in these two dimensions. These findings are also comparable to the results of Gordon and Whelan-Berry's (2005) study wherein qualitative differences in doing and managing behavior were drawn out from interviews with wives. Although our study examined husbands' behavior along *dimensions* of doing and managing, rather than categorizing husbands based on either a high or low level of the two types of contribution, the discrepancies reported in husbands' doing and managing suggest that if husbands were to be assessed in terms of Gordon and Whelan-Berry's four categories (i.e., 'uninvolved,' 'helpmate,' 'egalitarian,' or 'coordinator'), the majority of participants' husbands would be considered "helpmates," or low-managers but high-doers. This high incidence of "helpmate" behavior appears to exist not only in distributions of housework, but also in distributions of childcare in dual-income families. These results are also consistent with past studies suggesting married women are expected to manage home and family labor (Lachance-Grzela & Bouchard, 2010; Mannino & Deutsch, 2007, Thébaud, 2010; Mederer, 1993). These findings provide support for the contention of doing and managing as distinct dimensions, and indicate that responsibility for managing and organizing household and family needs has not redistributed even as the hours that women dedicate to paid work approach those of men's and the carrying-out of home/family tasks may become increasingly shared

territory.

This study also extends past research by examining differences *between housework and parenting* in the amounts of doing and managing husbands undertake. Results indicate that when it comes to managing, but not doing, the type of work makes a difference. Husbands are not likely to take responsibility for managing, but they are even less likely to undertake the managing of parenting compared to housework. This result is consistent with past findings that husbands spend fewer hours in childcare activities than in housework and that this gap is persistent across time (Bianchi, 2011). The results of this study provide more detailed insight into the type of contributions that are likely, or unlikely, to occupy these hours. Our finding that husbands are least likely to contribute through childcare-managing raises questions as to why this is the case. Managing is proposed to carry a greater emotional burden than doing (Gordon & Whelan-Berry, 2005). Further, although both parenting and housework are vital to family well-being, parenting labor entails more emotional vulnerability because of its relational/nurturing aspect. Thus, it follows that of the four types of contributions examined, childcare-managing may be the most emotionally burdensome. Role identification helps to explain why working fathers may intentionally or unintentionally avoid this emotional vulnerability (Jansz, 2000). Men may be less comfortable contributing in ways that entail nurturing and emotional vulnerability because they conflict with a masculine identity (Eisler & Skidmore, 1987; Jakupcak, 2003; Oransky & Marecek, 2009; Jansz, 2000). Thus, childcare-managing may produce greater gender-role stress. Further, past research on identity theory has found that working fathers who consider the ‘parent’ role most central to their sense of self are not necessarily any more involved than fathers who

consider the ‘worker’ role most central, but fathers who consider the ‘nurturer’ role highly central are significantly more involved and take greater responsibility for childcare (Rane & McBride, 2000). Thus, the degree to which fathers internalize gender roles and nurturer roles may help account for their low childcare-managing.

Hypothesis 2: Correlations Between Parents’ Labor Distribution and Labor Distribution Expected of Own Marriage

Researchers’ predictions that the division of labor witnessed during participants’ upbringing would be positively correlated with their expectations of labor distributions prior to starting their own families was not supported by the results of this study. While research on family socialization regarding housework task allocation is mixed (Koopman-Boyden & Abbott, 1985), this result is not consistent with past research findings that parental distributions of paid and unpaid work positively influence sons’ and daughters’ later performance in housework (Cunningham, 2000). How closely the needs of the family a woman was raised in match the needs of the family she raises may help explain whether or not she is influenced by her parents’ labor distribution. For example, if a woman was raised in a lower socioeconomic status family of seven, yet by the time she is starting her own family she is upper-middle class and planning to have no more than two children, the labor distribution she witnessed growing up may be less relevant in informing her expectations of her husband. The results of this study may also be explained by past research that has challenged the family of origin as the primary socializing force in predicting housework expectations (Koopman-Boyden & Abbott, 1985). Koopman-Boyden and Abbott (1985) found that parental housework distributions did not predict housework participation for men, and although parental housework

distributions were a strong predictor for women, they predicted wives' housework divisions in the opposite direction. Perceptions of parents' marriage quality may also affect the direction of and degree to which parents' housework distributions influence women's expectations and allocation of housework in their own marriages. For example, if she perceived a high degree of tension between her parents, this may lead her to develop a vision for her own marital distribution of labor that diverges greatly from her parents.' Thus, the roles of socioeconomic status transitions, family size trends, and parents' relationship quality should be explored to further understand the circumstances under which labor distributions modeled and labor distributions expected correlate.

Hypothesis 3: Expectations-Reality Discrepancies and Implications for Satisfaction

Contrary to predictions, incongruencies between expectations and current perceptions of labor distributions were not related to wives' marital or life satisfaction. Under the assumption that insufficient husband contributions (i.e., discrepancies between expectations and reality) would be perceived as unfair and unsatisfactory by most wives, these results are not consistent with past research on the correlation between wives' approval of husbands' help and wives' positive affect (Piña & Bengson, 1993). However, this assumption may be faulty. Women often perceive distributions in which they shoulder disproportionate amounts of housework as adequately fair and just (Benin & Agnostinelli, 1988; Lennon & Rosenfield, 1994). Thus, although our results suggest that wives are happier when husbands are 'doing' more, wives may also justify some dissonance between expectations and reality in ways that allow them to perceive fairness and preserve satisfaction.

Research Question: Drawbacks to Having a Helpmate Husband

Researchers' predictions that low rates of both doing and managing would predict lower marital and life satisfaction for wives were only partially supported. Of the Doing, Managing, and Doing x Managing variables examined, only Doing was significantly related to wives' satisfaction. In other words, having a husband who carries out tasks *and* manages household work may be no more satisfying than a husband who *only* carries out tasks. Further, having a husband who manages a high amount but carries out very few tasks may be just as unsatisfying as a husband who is largely uninvolved in household work. Therefore, having a "helpmate" husband rather than a more egalitarian marriage in which spouses share managing responsibility appears to bring about positive, rather than negative consequences for working mothers' satisfaction. While a clear-cut gendered division between paid work and housework trends toward extinction, the "helpmate husband" may provide an opportunity for dual-income spouses who endorse traditional gender ideology to reconcile with their egalitarian economic arrangement by neutralizing gender role deviance in the home (Greenstein, 2000). Compared to task completion, the *managing* of family life is more central to the feminine gender role (Mederer, 1993). According to Mederer (1993), "employed women can push for help with tasks and retain their gender identity by accepting without conflict the responsibility for household management. [Men] can retain their gender identity by not being in charge of the household, regardless of how many tasks they do" (p. 143). This explanation is supported by past findings that as husbands' economic dependence on wives increases, their participation in housework decreases, presumably as a way to preserve masculine gender normalcy (Brines, 1994, as cited by Bianchi et al., 2000; Greenstein, 2000; Bittman, England, Sayer, Folbre, & Matheson, 2003). Length of marriage may also affect attitudes

around gender roles (Katz-Wise, Priess, & Hyde, 2010). Parents' attitudes about gender roles may grow increasingly traditional with time (Katz-Wise, Priess, & Hyde, 2010), which may influence how wives react to husbands' unconventional contributions, such as managing. This attitudinal shift could explain why husbands' managing behavior was not significantly related to wives' satisfaction, given that the mean marriage length within the sample was 16.35 years. While egalitarian distributions may be the favorite of wives who possess strong feminist attitudes, other women may be ambivalent about their husbands' role in managing, and others may even view men's increased authority in parenting and housework as encroaching on their domain of power (Polatnick, 1984; Allen & Hawkins, 1999; Gaunt, 2008). When seeking to understand why men don't manage more, the power associated with the household domain may be just as important as the gender role attached to it (Allen & Hawkins, 1999; Gaunt, 2008). Given that men are more likely to be in management and authority positions in wage labor (Catalyst, 2017), women's generally lower authority in the paid workforce (relative to men's) may encourage them to protect or value more greatly the relatively higher authority they have in the home. Some studies have suggested that wives may engage in "maternal gatekeeping" to exercise control over husbands' roles in childcare (Allen & Hawkins, 1999; Gaunt, 2008). Although the responsibilities of household managing are not rewarded with monetary compensation, women may value this authority role for other reasons (Allen & Hawkins, 1999; Gaunt, 2005).

The results suggest that although husbands' managing may not be a significant predictor of wives' satisfaction with life and marriage, husbands' doing is important to women. Wives' who perceived higher rates of housework-doing and childcare-doing

from their husbands reported higher marital commitment and marital success. However, differences emerged in each dimension's relationship to marital conflict and life satisfaction. In marriages where husbands carry out higher amounts of parenting labor, wives reported lower marital conflict; however, carrying out *housework* was not related to reports of marital conflict. Given that women are socialized to be more conflict-avoidant (Hochschild, 1989), and mothers in particular may use a more communal/relational (rather than individual) process for deciding, wives may be more likely to engage in conflict over something they see as having direct implications for the well-being of their children. Research has found that women would prefer to undertake disproportionate amounts of housework than push their husbands to take on more (Berheide, 1984; Hochschild, 1989). Past studies have also found that caring for family members is an outcome of household/family labor that women report valuing highly (Mederer, 1993; Thompson, 1991). Thus, if women are generally more selective in "picking their battles," childcare may emerge above housework as a battle they choose to pick with their husbands. Whereas housework may be less tied to conflict, whether as a source of it or a way to minimize it, childcare may have higher stakes for marital conflict, serving as more likely fuel for conflict when husbands do not participate and a more potent peace-keeper when husbands ramp up their childcare-doing.

This should not be taken to mean that wives do not care about housework, however. Although doing housework wasn't related to marital conflict, it was significantly associated with wives' life satisfaction. Wives' whose husbands were doing more housework are generally happier with their lives.

Limitations and Future Directions

The implications of the current study's findings are constrained by several limitations regarding study design and the variables examined. The current sample consisted of female faculty and staff at a mid-sized university in the Midwest; thus, the pool from which participants were drawn had a much higher level of education than what would be expected of a more representative sample. Within the research sample, the most common education level attained was five or more years of post-graduate education ($n = 47$). Additionally, 91.7% of participants were non-Hispanic white. Thus, future research should seek to replicate this study using a more demographically diverse sample.

Further research is needed to assess to what degree the “helpmate husband” arrangement emerges from individual choice, lack thereof, or other factors unrelated to personal preference such as work schedules. Future studies should also incorporate questions related to gender ideology in order to assess if and how women's beliefs about gender might influence their expectations of labor distributions, their perceptions of their husbands' actual contributions, and the relationship between expectations-reality dissonance and their satisfaction. Additionally, the cross-sectional design of the current study limits the explanations that can be proposed for the patterns identified. The use of cross-lagged longitudinal designs should be considered in future research on household labor distributions in order to build a stronger case for how husbands' contributions affect wives' satisfaction over time.

Conclusions

This study advances research on gender and family psychology by providing support for the “helpmate husband” trend using a dimensional rather than categorical approach, and emphasizing the importance of husbands' “doing” patterns to the marital

and life satisfaction of wives. The specific ties between husbands' childcare participation and marital conflict minimization as well as housework participation and wives' life satisfaction enable a more detailed understanding of women's psychology within the context of heterosexual marriage and dual-income parenting, offering direct implications for improving marital and family well-being. Further, our findings add support to the contention that doing and managing are distinct dimensions, suggesting that differences linger in the *type* of household work that husbands and wives undertake even as the hours they spend in paid and unpaid domains may trend toward convergence. Greater attention to these critical differences between doing and managing in the household can advance knowledge of marital psychology, enable questions regarding the role of individual choice and behavior, and ultimately, suggest tools for deconstructing integral elements of gender inequality as a system.

References

- Allen, S. M., & Hawkins, A. J. (1999). Maternal gatekeeping: Mothers' beliefs and behaviors that inhibit greater father involvement in family work. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 199-212. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/353894>
- Barnett, R. C., & Shen, Y. C. (1997). Gender, high-and low-schedule-control housework tasks, and psychological distress A study of dual-earner couples. *Journal of Family Issues*, 18, 403-428. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/019251397018004003>
- Baxter, J., Hewitt, B., & Haynes, M. (2008). Life course transitions and housework: Marriage, parenthood, and time on housework. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 70, 259-272. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2008.00479.x>
- Benin, M. H., & Agostinelli, J. (1988). Husbands' and wives' satisfaction with the division of labor. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 349-361. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/352002>
- Berheide, C. W. (1984). Women's work in the home: Seems like old times. *Marriage & Family Review*, 7, 37-55. doi: https://doi.org/10.1300/J002v07n03_04
- Bianchi, S. M. (2011). Family change and time allocation in American families. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 638, 21-44. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716211413731>
- Bianchi, S. M., Milkie, M. A., Sayer, L. C., & Robinson, J. P. (2000). Is anyone doing the housework? Trends in the gender division of household labor. *Social Forces*, 79, 191-228. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/79.1.191>
- Bittman, M., England, P., Sayer, L., Folbre, N., & Matheson, G. (2003). When does

gender trump money? Bargaining and time in household work. *American Journal of Sociology*, 109, 186-214. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1086/378341>

Blais, M. R., Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., & Brière, N. M. (1989). L'échelle de satisfaction de vie: Validation canadienne-française du "Satisfaction with Life Scale" [French Canadian Validation of the Satisfaction with Life Scale].

Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 21, 210. doi:

<https://doi.org/10.1037/h0079854>

Budig, M. J. (2002). Male advantage and the gender composition of jobs: Who rides the glass escalator?. *Social Problems*, 49, 258-277. doi:

<https://doi.org/10.1525/sp.2002.49.2.258>

Catalyst (2017). Pyramid: Women in S&P 500 companies. Catalyst.

Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). Applied multiple correlation/regression analysis for the behavioral sciences. UK: Taylor & Francis.

Coltrane, S. (2000). Research on household labor: Modeling and measuring the social embeddedness of routine family work. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 62, 1208-1233. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.01208.x>

Cunningham, M. (2001). Parental influences on the gendered division of housework.

American Sociological Review, 184-203. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/2657414>

Davis, K.E. (1996). The relationship rating form (RRF): A measure of the characteristics of romantic relationships and friendships [Instrument Summary]. Columbia, SC.

Davis, S. N., Greenstein, T. N., & Gerteisen Marks, J. P. (2007). Effects of union type on division of household labor: Do cohabiting men really perform more

housework?. *Journal of Family Issues*, 28, 1246-1272. doi:

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X07300968>

Dempsey, K. C. (2000). Men and women's power relationships and the persisting inequitable division of housework. *Journal of Family Studies*, 6, 7-24. doi:

<https://doi.org/10.5172/jfs.6.1.7>

Diener, E. D., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49, 71-75. doi:

https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4901_13

Eisler, R. M., & Skidmore, J. R. (1987). Masculine gender role stress: Scale development and component factors in the appraisal of stressful situations. *Behavior Modification*, 11, 123-136. doi:

<https://doi.org/10.1177/01454455870112001>

Finkel, N., & Safir, M. P. (2016). Gender differences in personal and interpersonal emotional outcomes from family work. *Asian Journal of Women's Studies*, 22, 249-268. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/12259276.2016.1202028>

Freedman, E. (2007). No turning back: The history of feminism and the future of women. Ballantine Books.

Friedman, R. A., Tidd, S. T., Currall, S. C., & Tsai, J. C. (2000). What goes around comes around: The impact of personal conflict style on work conflict and stress. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 11, 32-55. doi:

<https://doi.org/10.1108/eb022834>

Gaunt, R. (2005). The role of value priorities in paternal and maternal involvement in

child care. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67, 643-655. doi:

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2005.00159.x>

Gaunt, R. (2008). Maternal gatekeeping: Antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Family Issues*, 29, 373-395. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X07307851>

Gjerdingen, D., McGovern, P., Bekker, M., Lundberg, U., & Willemsen, T. (2001).

Women's work roles and their impact on health, well-being, and career:

comparisons between the United States, Sweden, and The Netherlands. *Women &*

Health, 31, 1-20. doi: https://doi.org/10.1300/J013v31n04_01

Glass, J., & Fujimoto, T. (1994). Housework, paid work, and depression among husbands and wives. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 35, 179-191. doi:

<https://doi.org/10.2307/2137364>

Gordon, J. R., & Whalen-Berry, K. S. (2005). Contributions to family and household activities by the husbands of midlife professional women. *Journal of Family*

Issues, 26, 899-923. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X04273590>

Greenstein, T. N. (2000). Economic dependence, gender, and the division of labor in the home: A replication and extension. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 62, 322-

335. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.00322.x>

Hartley, M., Popay, J., & Plewis, I. (1992). Domestic conditions, paid employment and

women's experience of ill-health. *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 14, 313-343. doi:

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9566.1992.tb00126.x>

Hochschild, A. (1989). *The second shift: Working parents and the revolution at home.*

New York: Viking.

- Hodson, R. (2001). *Dignity at work*. Cambridge University Press. doi:
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511499333>
- Katz-Wise, S. L., Priess, H. A., & Hyde, J. S. (2010). Gender-Role Attitudes and Behavior Across the Transition to Parenthood. *Developmental Psychology, 46*, 18-28. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017820>
- Koopman-Boyden, P. G., & Abbott, M. (1985). Expectations for Household Task Allocation and Actual Task Allocation: A New Zealand Study. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 47*, 211. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/352084>
- Jakupcak, M. (2003). Masculine gender role stress and men's fear of emotions as predictors of self-reported aggression and violence. *Violence and Victims, 18*, 533. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1891/vivi.2003.18.5.533>
- Jansz, J. (2000). Masculine identity and restrictive emotionality. *Gender and Emotion: Social Psychological Perspectives, 166-186*. doi:
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511628191.009>
- Johnson, A. G. (2005). *The gender knot: Unraveling our patriarchal legacy*. Temple University Press.
- Lachance-Grzela, M., & Bouchard, G. (2010). Why do women do the lion's share of housework? A decade of research. *Sex Roles, 63*, 767-780. doi:
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-010-9797-z>
- Lennon, M. C., & Rosenfield, S. (1994). Relative fairness and the division of housework: The importance of options. *American Journal of Sociology, 100*, 506-531. doi:
<https://doi.org/10.1086/230545>

- Lincoln, A. E. (2008). Gender, productivity, and the marital wage premium. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 70, 806-814. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2008.00523.x>
- Mannino, C. A., & Deutsch, F. M. (2007). Changing the division of household labor: A negotiated process between partners. *Sex Roles*, 56(5-6), 309-324. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-006-9181-1>
- McDonald, S., Lin, N., & Ao, D. (2009). Networks of opportunity: Gender, race, and job leads. *Social Problems*, 56, 385-402. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1525/sp.2009.56.3.385>
- Mederer, H. J. (1993). Division of labor in two-earner homes: Task accomplishment versus household management as critical variables in perceptions about family work. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 55. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/352964>
- Mirowsky, J., & Ross, C. E. (2005). Education, cumulative advantage, and health. *Ageing International*, 30, 27-62. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02681006>
- Oransky, M., & Marecek, J. (2009). "I'm not going to be a girl" masculinity and emotions in boys' friendships and peer groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 24, 218-241. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558408329951>
- Parker, K., & Wang, W. (2013). Modern Parenthood: Roles of Moms and Dads Converge as They Balance Work and Family. Pew Research Center.
- Pavot, W., & Diener, E. (1993). Review of the satisfaction with life scale. *Psychological Assessment*, 5, 164. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.5.2.164>

- Piña, D. L., & Bengtson, V. L. (1993). The division of household labor and wives' happiness: Ideology, employment, and perceptions of support. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 901-912.
- Polatnick, R. M. (1984). Why men don't rear children: a power analysis. *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, 18, 45-86.
- Rane, T. R., & McBride, B. A. (2000). Identity theory as a guide to understanding fathers' involvement with their children. *Journal of Family Issues*, 21, 347-366.
doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/019251300021003004>
- Ross, C. E., & Reskin, B. F. (1992). Education, control at work, and job satisfaction. *Social Science Research*, 21, 134-148. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0049-089X\(92\)90012-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0049-089X(92)90012-6)
- Schieman, S., & Reid, S. (2009). Job authority and health: Unraveling the competing suppression and explanatory influences. *Social Science & Medicine*, 69, 1616-1624. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2009.08.038>
- Tang, C. (2011). Routine housework and tripartite marital commitment. *Personal Relationships*, 19, 483-503. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.2011.01374.x>
- Thébaud, S. (2010). Masculinity, bargaining, and breadwinning: Understanding men's housework in the cultural context of paid work. *Gender & Society*, 24, 330-354.
doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243210369105>
- Thompson, L. (1991). Family work: Women's sense of fairness. *Journal of Family Issues*, 12, 181-196. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/019251391012002003>

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics for Categorical Background Variables (N = 109)

Variables	<i>n</i>	%
Years of School Attended		
Less than 4 years of college	10	9.1
4 or 5 years of college	13	11.9
1 or 2 years of post-grad	24	22.1
3 or 4 years of post grad	15	13.8
5+ years of post grad	47	43.1
Employment Situation		
Full-time	100	91.7
Part-time	8	7.3
Husband's Employment Situation		
Full-time	96	88.1
Part-time	7	6.4
Out of work but looking for work	1	.9
Out of work and not looking for work	5	4.6
Employment Modeled By Mother During Participant's Upbringing		
Full-time	48	44.0
Part-time	30	27.5
No work outside the home	30	27.5
Housework Distribution Modeled During Participant's Upbringing		
Only Dad	0	0
Mostly Dad	0	0
Shared Equally	8	7.3
Mostly Mom	59	54.1
Only Mom	39	35.8
Childcare Distribution Modeled During Participant's Upbringing		
Only Dad	0	0
Mostly Dad	1	.9
Shared Equally	11	10.1
Mostly Mom	57	52.3
Only Mom	37	33.9
Housework Distribution Expected By Participant		
Only Husband	0	0
Mostly Husband	1	.9
Shared Equally	70	64.2
Mostly Participant	35	32.1
Only Participant	1	.9

Childcare Distribution Expected By Participant		
Only Husband	0	0
Mostly Husband	1	.9
Shared Equally	64	58.7
Mostly Participant	44	40.4
Only Participant	0	0

Note. Employment situation (N=108), Employment Situation Modeled By Mother During Participant's Upbringing (N=108), Housework Distribution Modeled During Participant's Upbringing (N= 106), Childcare Distribution Modeled During Participant's Upbringing (N=106), and Housework Distribution Expected By Participant At Start of Family Formation (N=107), sum to less than 100% (i.e., < 109) because some participants chose not to respond.

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics for Continuous Study Variables (N = 109)

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Min-Max	α
Doing	28.56	5.88	12-38	.84
Doing Childcare	12.90	3.09	4-20	.82
Doing Housework	15.68	3.62	6-22	.73
Managing	15.26	4.59	6-25	.80
Managing Childcare	6.91	2.56	3-12	.82
Managing Housework	8.39	2.72	3-13	.68
Life Satisfaction (SWLS)	27.60	5.64	11-35	.90
Marital Commitment (RRF)	24.34	4.70	4-28	.95
Marital Success (RRF)	16.40	3.91	4-21	.95
Marital Conflict (RRF)	6.99	2.33	3-16	.70

Note. SWLS = Satisfaction With Life Scale; RRF = Relationship Rating Form

Table 3
Intercorrelations Between Expectations-Reality Discrepancies (ERD) and Satisfaction with Life and Marriage

	Hswk ERD	Chcare ERD	Life	Marriage		
				Commit	Success	Conflict
Hswk ERD	—					
Chcare ERD	.38**	—				
Life	-.05	.07	—			
Marriage						
Commit	-.04	-.01	.68**	—		
Success	.03	.08	.73**	.91**	—	
Conflict	-.09	-.13	-.49**	-.67**	-.71**	—

Note: Hswk = Housework, Chcare = Childcare, ERD = Expectations-Reality Discrepancies, Life = Life Satisfaction, Commit = Commitment. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 4
Intercorrelations Between Continuous Study Variables

	Childcare		Housework		Life	Marriage		
	Do	Mng	Do	Mng		Commit	Success	Conflict
Childcare								
Do	—							
Mng	.65**	—						
Housework								
Do	.54**	.39**	—					
Mng	.63**	.48**	.83**	—				
Life	.32**	.25*	.34**	.22*	—			
Marriage								
Commit	.33**	.12	.33**	.20*	.68**	—		
Success	.33**	.15	.34**	.25**	.73**	.91**	—	
Conflict	-.30**	-.21*	-.18	-.17	-.49**	-.67**	-.71**	—

Note. Do = Doing, Mng = Managing, Life = Life Satisfaction, Commit = Commitment. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 5

Regression Analyses Predicting Life Satisfaction from Doing and Managing Housework

Variable	<i>B</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Doing Housework	0.79	.51	2.97	.004
Managing Housework	-0.44	-.22	-1.30	.198
Doing x Managing	-0.03	-.05	-0.55	.582

Note. $R^2 = .136$. $p < .005$.

Table 6

Regression Analyses Predicting Marital Commitment from Doing and Managing Housework

Variable	<i>B</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Doing Housework	0.70	.54	3.13	.002
Managing Housework	-0.41	-.24	-1.42	.160
Doing x Managing	0.02	.04	0.42	.678

Note. $R^2 = .124$. $p < .005$.

Table 7

Regression Analyses Predicting Marital Success from Doing and Managing Housework

Variable	<i>B</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Doing Housework	0.51	.48	2.80	.006
Managing Housework	-0.19	-.13	-0.80	.424
Doing x Managing	0.03	.07	0.68	.501

Note. $R^2 = .127$. $p < .005$.

Table 8

Regression Analyses Predicting Marital Conflict from Doing and Managing Housework

Variable	<i>B</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Doing Housework	-0.11	-.17	-0.94	.352
Managing Housework	-0.04	-.05	-0.29	.776
Doing x Managing	-0.02	-.08	-0.79	.433

Note. $R^2 = .040$. $p > .05$.

Table 9

Regression Analyses Predicting Life Satisfaction from Doing and Managing Childcare

Variable	<i>B</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Doing Childcare	0.48	.26	1.88	.063
Managing Childcare	0.17	.08	0.60	.548
Doing x Managing	-0.02	-.02	-0.23	.821

Note. $R^2 = .105$. $p < .01$.

Table 10
*Regression Analyses Predicting Marital Commitment from Doing and Managing
 Childcare*

Variable	<i>B</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Doing Childcare	0.65	.43	3.11	.002
Managing Childcare	-0.29	-.16	-1.23	.220
Doing x Managing	0.00	.00	-0.01	.990

Note. $R^2 = .120$. $p < .005$.

Table 11
Regression Analyses Predicting Marital Success from Doing and Managing Childcare

Variable	<i>B</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Doing Childcare	0.55	.44	3.18	.002
Managing Childcare	-0.20	-.13	-1.02	.312
Doing x Managing	0.03	.06	0.57	.569

Note. $R^2 = .118$. $p < .01$.

Table 12
Regression Analyses Predicting Marital Conflict from Doing and Managing Childcare

Variable	<i>B</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Doing Childcare	-0.22	-.29	-2.10	.038
Managing Childcare	-0.02	-.02	-0.13	.895
Doing x Managing	-0.00	-.01	-0.12	.904

Note. $R^2 = .090$. $p < .05$.

Appendix A

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Please take a few moments to answer the questions on this page.

1. What is your age?
 - a. Under 25
 - b. 26-30
 - c. 31-35
 - d. 36-40
 - e. 41-45
 - f. 46-50
 - g. 51-55
 - h. 56-60
 - i. 61-65
 - j. Over 65

2. What is your race or ethnic group?
 - a. American Indian or Alaskan Native
 - b. Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
 - c. Asian or Asian American
 - d. Black or African American
 - e. Hispanic or Latina
 - f. Non-Hispanic White
 - g. Other

If other, please list _____

- h. Prefer not to answer

3. How many years of school did you attend? (Circle highest level completed)

Middle School	High School	Vocational School
6 7 8	9 10 11 12 GED	1 2 3
College	Postgraduate Years	

1 2 3 4 5

1 2 3 4 5+

4. Which of the following best fits your current employment situation?
- a. Full-time
 - b. Part-time
5. Which of the following best fits your husband's current employment situation?
(select only one)
- a. Full-time
 - b. Part-time
 - c. Out of work but looking for work
 - d. Out of work and not looking for work
6. How many years have you been married to your current spouse?
- _____
7. How many children do you have?
- a. One
 - b. Two
 - c. Three
 - d. Four
 - e. More than four
8. What are the ages of your children?
- _____
9. Did your mom work outside the home when you were growing up?
- a. Full-time
 - b. Part-time
 - c. No work outside the home

Read carefully: For the following questions, circle the number corresponding to the answer that fits best. For numbers **10** and **11**, the terms “mom” and “dad” are used to describe whoever lived in the home and served as mother and father figures. If one of these parental figures was not present, skip these items.

10. Between your mom and your dad, who was expected to take responsibility for routine housework in your family growing up? (ex: doing dishes, doing laundry, preparing food, cleaning)

1.....2.....3.....4.....5
 Only Dad Mostly Dad Shared Equally Mostly Mom Only Mom

11. Between your mom and your dad, who was expected to take responsibility for routine childcare in your family growing up? (ex: dressing kids, packing lunches, helping with homework, preparing kids for bed, driving to activities)

1.....2.....3.....4.....5
 Only Dad Mostly Dad Shared Equally Mostly Mom Only Mom

12. Between you and your husband, who did you EXPECT was going to take responsibility for routine housework, going into starting a family?

1.....2.....3.....4.....5
 Only Him Mostly Him Shared Equally Mostly Me Only Me

13. Between you and your husband, who did you EXPECT was going to take responsibility for routine childcare, going into starting a family?

1.....2.....3.....4.....5
 Only Him Mostly Him Shared Equally Mostly Me Only Me

Appendix B

HOUSEWORK AND CHILDCARE INSTRUMENT

Read carefully: For the following items, circle the number corresponding to the answer that best describes your current husband's level of involvement in the activities described.

If a question asks about a type of work not typically done by you OR your husband, (for example, if it is typically done by your child/children or an outside service provider such as a cleaning service,) or if a question asks about tasks that are less or not routinely needed in your home for any reason, (for example, if the question asks about pet care and you do not have any pets) skip the question.

CARRYING OUT PARENTAL ACTIVITIES

1. How often does your husband CARRY OUT the **physical or health-related care** of your child/children?

(ex: doing or supervising hygiene or grooming tasks for child/children such as bathing, dressing, brushing teeth, brushing hair, washing face; doing or supervising the taking of vitamins or medications)

1.....2.....3.....4.....5
Never Infrequently Sometimes Frequently Always

2. How often does your husband CARRY OUT the **educational care** of your child/children?

(ex: helping with, checking, supervising, or encouraging homework, reading, studying, or completion of college applications)

1.....2.....3.....4.....5
Never Infrequently Sometimes Frequently Always

3. How often does your husband CARRY OUT the **nutritional care** of your child/children?

(ex: feeding child/children directly; encouraging appropriate eating habits or meal choices; packing lunches; preparing or serving snacks)

1.....2.....3.....4.....5
Never Infrequently Sometimes Frequently Always

4. How often does your husband CARRY OUT the **social or extracurricular care** of your child/children?

(ex: supervising play-dates; driving child/children to friends' houses, sports, or activities; supervising or encouraging the practice of an instrument, sport, or other activity; chaperoning; attending a child's game, event, or performance)

1.....2.....3.....4.....5
 Never Infrequently Sometimes Frequently Always

ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT OF PARENTAL ACTIVITIES

5. How often does your husband ORGANIZE OR MANAGE matters related to the **physical or health-related needs** of your child/children?

(ex: scheduling haircuts; scheduling doctor/dentist/therapist appointments; researching health concerns related to child/children)

1.....2.....3.....4.....5
 Never Infrequently Sometimes Frequently Always

6. How often does your husband ORGANIZE OR MANAGE matters related to the **educational needs** of your child/children?

(ex: filling out paperwork or permission slips for school; finding tutors and setting up tutoring sessions; setting up parent-teacher conferences; researching colleges or scheduling visits)

1.....2.....3.....4.....5
 Never Infrequently Sometimes Frequently Always

7. How often does your husband ORGANIZE OR MANAGE matters related to the **social or extracurricular needs** of your child/children?

(ex: RSVP-ing to birthday parties; buying birthday presents for child/children to bring to parties; communicating with other parents to set up play-dates or to ensure parental supervision of "hangouts" or parties; researching affordable/available activity programs in the area; filling out enrollment papers; communicating with coaches/leaders, setting up carpools)

1.....2.....3.....4.....5
 Never Infrequently Sometimes Frequently Always

8. How often does your husband ORGANIZE OR MANAGE matters related to the **disciplinary or moral development needs** of your child/children?
(*ex: enforcing timeouts or groundings; setting curfews; communicating family rules or values to child/children*)

1.....2.....3.....4.....5
Never Infrequently Sometimes Frequently Always

CARRYING OUT HOUSEWORK

1. How often does your husband CARRY OUT **preparing meals**?
(*ex: cooking; setting table*)

1.....2.....3.....4.....5
Never Infrequently Sometimes Frequently Always

2. How often does your husband CARRY OUT **cleaning up after meals**?
(*ex: clearing table, loading/unloading dishwasher; hand-washing/drying cooking utensils; wiping off surfaces*)

1.....2.....3.....4.....5
Never Infrequently Sometimes Frequently Always

3. How often does your husband CARRY OUT **house cleaning or house tidying**?
(*ex: mopping, sweeping, vacuuming, or dusting; making beds, de-cluttering, putting away miscellaneous items, or "straightening up"*)

1.....2.....3.....4.....5
Never Infrequently Sometimes Frequently Always

4. How often does your husband CARRY OUT **laundry-related tasks**?
(*ex: doing laundry; bringing clothes to/from drycleaners; ironing; folding; putting clothes away*)

1.....2.....3.....4.....5
Never Infrequently Sometimes Frequently Always

5. How often does your husband CARRY OUT **pet-care-related tasks**?
(*ex: walking; feeding; administering medications; cleaning cage or litter box; letting pet in or out of house*)

1.....2.....3.....4.....5
 Never Infrequently Sometimes Frequently Always

6. How often does your husband **CARRY OUT shopping** for household goods?
(ex: shopping for groceries, pet supplies, family member clothing, or other miscellaneous needs)

1.....2.....3.....4.....5
 Never Infrequently Sometimes Frequently Always

ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT OF HOUSEWORK

7. How often does your husband **ORGANIZE OR MANAGE the preparing of meals?**
(ex: compiling the grocery list; planning meals/looking for recipes; working to accommodate picky eaters, dietary needs and restrictions, or allergies)

1.....2.....3.....4.....5
 Never Infrequently Sometimes Frequently Always

8. How often does your husband **ORGANIZE OR MANAGE the cleaning up after meals?**
(ex: assessing what needs to get done; delegating responsibility; ensuring completion of tasks in a timely manner)

1.....2.....3.....4.....5
 Never Infrequently Sometimes Frequently Always

9. How often does your husband **ORGANIZE OR MANAGE house cleaning or house tidying?**
(ex: monitoring what cleaning tasks need to get done; delegating responsibility for tasks; deciding where personal articles/items go or finding storage spaces for things; asking/reminding family members to pick up after themselves)

1.....2.....3.....4.....5
 Never Infrequently Sometimes Frequently Always

10. How often does your husband ORGANIZE OR MANAGE **pet-care-related tasks**?

(ex: monitoring pet(s) needs (walking, feeding, cleaning cage or litter box, etc.); delegating responsibility; ensuring completion of tasks in timely manner; monitoring whether pet is inside or outside; shopping for pet food/supplies)

1.....**2**.....**3**.....**4**.....**5**
Never Infrequently Sometimes Frequently Always

Appendix C

Satisfaction With Life Scale

Read carefully: Below are five statements that you may agree or disagree with. Using the 7-point scale below, indicate your level of agreement with each item.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly	Disagree	Slightly	Neither	Slightly	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree	Agree Nor	Agree		Agree
			Disagree			

1. In most ways my life is close to my ideal.

1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7

2. The conditions of my life are excellent.

1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7

3. I am satisfied with my life.

1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7

4. So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.

1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7

5. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.

1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7

Appendix D

(Partial) Relationship Rating Form

Read Carefully: Below are ten questions asking about your relationship with your husband. Using the 7-point scale below, indicate how you generally feel about your husband.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not At All	Very Little	Some- what	A Fair Amount	Very Much	Strongly or Almost Always	Completely or Extremely

1. Are you happy in your relationship with this person?

1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7

2. Do you fight and argue with this person?

1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7

3. Are you committed to staying in your relationship?

1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7

4. Has your relationship with this person satisfied your needs?

1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7

5. Does this person treat you in unfair ways?

1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7

6. Does this person measure up to your ideals for a life partner?

1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7

7. Has your relationship with this person been a success?

1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7

8. Is there tension in your relationship with this person?

1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7

9. How likely is it that your relationship will be permanent?

1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7

10. How committed is your partner to this relationship?

1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7

Appendix E

Hello,

If you are NOT a female staff or faculty member in a heterosexual dual-income marriage raising at least one son or daughter, please disregard this email.

My name is Reilly Kincaid and I am studying psychology here at UD. For my honors thesis, I am examining wives' perceptions of their husbands' contributions to parenting and housework, using an online questionnaire.

The questionnaire will take approximately **10 minutes** to complete. You will be asked a variety of questions regarding your husband's contributions to housework and parenting, as well as your satisfaction with your marriage and life in general. You will also be asked about your parents' division of household labor and your expectations around division of household labor going into starting a family.

Although participation is completely voluntary, participants who complete the questionnaire will receive a \$5.00 Amazon gift card.

If you are able to participate, please click the link below and you will be taken to the study's informed consent page. Please read the informed consent carefully as it describes additional information regarding the study's description, risks, and confidentiality.

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/WivesSurvey>

If you have any questions at any time—please contact me at kincaidr1@udayton.edu or my thesis advisor, Dr. Zois, at czois1@udayton.edu.

Thank you so much for your time!

Reilly Kincaid