

Schober, Pia S.

Article — Published Version

Gender Equality and Outsourcing of Domestic Work, Childbearing, and Relationship Stability Among British Couples

Journal of Family Issues

Provided in Cooperation with:

German Institute for Economic Research (DIW Berlin)

Suggested Citation: Schober, Pia S. (2013) : Gender Equality and Outsourcing of Domestic Work, Childbearing, and Relationship Stability Among British Couples, Journal of Family Issues, ISSN 1552-5481, Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, CA, Vol. 34, Iss. 1, pp. 25-52, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X11433691> , <http://jfi.sagepub.com/content/34/1/25.abstract>

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/146093>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

Gender Equality and Outsourcing of Domestic Work, Childbearing, and Relationship Stability Among British Couples

Journal of Family Issues

34(1) 25–52

© The Author(s) 2013

Reprints and permission:

sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

DOI: 10.1177/0192513X11433691

<http://jfi.sagepub.com>



Pia S. Schober¹

Abstract

This study investigates whether gender inequality in the division of housework and child care may be an obstacle to childbearing and relationship stability among different groups of British couples. Furthermore, it explores whether outsourcing of domestic labor ameliorates any negative effects of domestic work inequality. The empirical investigation uses event-history analysis based on 14 waves (1992-2005) of the British Household Panel Study. The author finds that the association between domestic work arrangements and family outcomes vary by the presence of children, women's employment, and gender role attitudes. Gender inequality in domestic work reduces relationship stability among egalitarian childless women and among all mothers. For first and second births as outcomes, the association is weaker and depends on the level of inequality and women's employment status, respectively. Domestic outsourcing is not significant for these family outcomes with the exception of formal child care, which is positively associated with the risk of a second birth.

¹University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

Corresponding Author:

Pia S. Schober, Department of Sociology, University of Cambridge, Free School Lane, Cambridge, UK CB2 3RQ

Email: pss36@cam.ac.uk

Keywords

child care, childbearing, fathering, fertility, housework, life course, relationship breakdown

Introduction

Employed women who are also responsible for most of the domestic work can respond to their dual burden in a number of ways. Gershuny, Bittman, and Brice (2005) have argued that they can (a) tolerate it, (b) leave the labor market, (c) renegotiate the domestic division of labor, or (d) leave their husbands. In addition, two other responses come to mind. Women may try to (e) outsource domestic work, either to other family members or by paying someone to do it. In addition, since most women's domestic work burden increases significantly with each child they have (Sanchez & Thomson, 1997; Schober, 2011), they may (f) reduce the number of children they have. Women may also choose a combination of various options simultaneously or vary them over the course of their relationships and/or employment careers.

In light of the U.K. context of high family instability and significant differences in fertility between women with low and high education, this study will examine whether an unequal division of domestic labor is associated with a lower probability of having children or with a greater separation risk for couples. We will also explore whether paid or unpaid help with housework or child care may be acceptable substitutes for the domestic work contributions of husbands to increase childbearing or relationship stability. The empirical investigation uses event-history analysis based on 14 waves (1992-2005) of the British Household Panel Study. The results show significant variations in the association of men's domestic contributions with childbearing or relationship stability, whereas domestic outsourcing seems to be largely insignificant for these family outcomes.

The following section discusses how this study extends the literature on this topic. The third section describes the theoretical framework and the hypotheses for the empirical analysis. Details on the measures in the British Household Panel Study and methods used for the empirical analysis are given in the fourth and fifth sections. The sixth section presents the results. This is followed by a more detailed interpretation and conclusions in the light of previous research.

Literature Review and Contribution to Existing Research

Existing evidence on fertility trends reports significant associations with changing gender relations, in particular, women's employment and issues of combining employment with family work. In the late 1990s, the discussion around the very low fertility levels in Continental Europe centered on increasing female labor market participation and the lack of sufficient institutional support for mothers who want to combine employment and child care as possible explanations (e.g., Brewster & Rindfuss, 2000; McDonald, 1997). Some scholars have since brought considerations of men's domestic work back into the picture (Bernhardt & Goldscheider, 2008; Cooke, 2004, 2008; Olah, 2003; Torr & Short, 2004). They find that men's contributions to either housework or child care are positively associated with the probability of a second birth among couples in Germany, Italy, Hungary, and Sweden (Cooke, 2004, 2008; Olah, 2003). There is no evidence of such an effect in Spain (Cooke, 2008). In the United States, Torr and Short (2004) find a curvilinear effect with very traditional couples and those with a relatively equal division of housework being more likely to have a second child than the middle group. In Sweden, consistency between the division of domestic labor and couples' gender role attitudes, in a traditional or egalitarian way, predict a higher likelihood of a second birth compared with couples where practice does not match their ideals (Bernhardt & Goldscheider, 2008).

With the exception of Cooke (2008), these previous studies, however, have not considered whether help with unpaid work from other people than the male partner may also affect fertility outcomes. This analysis will extend the literature by including measures of outsourcing of housework and child care. So far, there is also no evidence specifically for the United Kingdom, which has had higher fertility rates than the low fertility countries in Continental Europe but lower female labor market participation rates than Sweden or the United States. Fertility levels have generally not been considered alarmingly low. However, higher rates of childlessness and the lower completed family size of women with high levels of education or those in managerial occupations (Ekert-Jaffé, Joshi, Lynch, Mougin, & Rendall, 2002; Rendall, Ekert-Jaffé, Joshi, Lynch, & Mougin, 2009; Rendall & Smallwood, 2003; Sigle-Rushton, 2008) raise some questions regarding the extent to which this is voluntary or the result of difficulties in combining employment and child care. This research contributes to the question whether

variations in childbearing behavior may be due to women's responsibilities for domestic work that conflict with their paid work commitments or their egalitarian attitudes.

Various American studies provide evidence of a significant negative association between women's housework and perceived relationship quality, especially when mediating factors such as women's employment or gender role attitudes are taken into account (e.g., Frisco & Williams, 2003; Wilkie, Ferree, & Ratcliff, 1998). A more egalitarian division of child care is positively associated with relationship satisfaction and stability of couples in the Netherlands (Kalmijn, 1999) but not significant in Germany (Cooke, 2004). Instead, Cooke (2004) finds a positive association between husbands' relative housework contributions and divorce among childless couples in Germany. Since she cannot account for differences in women's gender role attitudes, this result, however, may well be due to unobserved factors, such as traditional family values, which increase both women's housework time and their propensity to stay in a relationship (Haynes, Baxter, Hewitt, & Western, 2009). Results among couples with young children are generally quite mixed (Belsky, Lang, & Huston, 1986; MacDermid, Huston, & McHale, 1990; Ruble, Fleming, Hackel, & Stangor, 1988). These contradictory results suggest that the effect of gender inequality in domestic work on relationship stability may depend on the life course stage, in particular, the presence and ages of children, and other mediating factors such as women's labor market participation and gender role attitudes.

Britain has had one of the highest divorce rates in Europe over the past decades. Although family background and socioeconomic disadvantages have been found to be strong predictors of dissolution risk (Pryor & Trinder, 2004), changes in gender roles have received less attention in British divorce studies. The two existing studies provide mixed evidence. Chan and Halpin (2002) find no significant association of couples' division of housework with couples' divorce risk. However, they only look at the risk of dissolution among first marriages and do not consider what difference the presence of children and the division of child care may make. Sigle-Rushton (2010) finds a lower risk of relationship breakdown among couples where men contribute to child care. As cohabitation is increasingly practiced and seen as a substitute for marriage even among British couples with children and given the still higher rates of breakdown of cohabitations (Steele, Kallis, Goldstein, & Joshi, 2005), it seems crucial to include cohabiting unions. Furthermore, we will investigate the importance of housework and child care division as well as domestic outsourcing separately for childless couples and those with dependent children. So far, there is also a lack of evidence of whether outsourcing

of domestic work may also reduce the pressure on the relationship. As a relatively liberal welfare state with considerable wage differences between women with high and low education and no particular incentives to promote men's involvement in domestic labor, the United Kingdom provides a context in which outsourcing may be crucial in relieving couples' and, in particular, women's workload.

Reviewing the Theoretical and Empirical Evidence

Economists and sociologists have long concentrated on the consequences of the expansion of female employment on childbearing or divorce risk. Neoclassical economic models (Becker, 1991) predict that a specialized division of labor will increase childbearing by lowering women's opportunity costs in the form of forgone earnings. They also predict a lower risk of divorce, since the gains from staying in a relationship are larger when one partner specializes in domestic work than in a more symmetrically structured division of labor. For relationship instability, sociologists have proposed two counter arguments. Oppenheimer (1997) has argued that women's employment nowadays is attractive as a family strategy to reduce risks of unemployment and financial pressures, thereby lowering the risk of relationship dissolution. Theoretically, more symmetrical roles have also been suggested to provide more shared experience and empathy among partners (Scanzoni, 1978; Simpson & England, 1981) and more democratic relationships (Giddens, 1992).

The British evidence on childbearing is largely in line with the economic argument. Women with higher levels of education, which are also typically associated with higher wages and better career opportunities, have a lower probability of having a first child and a lower completed family size (Ekert-Jaffé et al., 2002; Kneale & Joshi, 2008; Rendall & Smallwood, 2003). The empirical evidence on relationship stability is more mixed. While Chan and Halpin (2002) find a significant positive association between women's relative earnings or hours in employment and divorce risk in the United Kingdom, some U.S. results suggest employed women have more stable marriages (Schoen, Rogers, & Amato, 2006). In general, many studies find the effect of women's employment or earnings on relationship stability to depend on other factors such as their partners' income (Kalmijn, Loeve, & Manting, 2007; Ono, 1998; Rogers, 2004) or women's gender role attitudes (Kalmijn, Graaf, & Poortman, 2004; Sayer & Bianchi, 2000). Therefore, a growing body of research has argued that the relationship between women's domestic work

and childbearing or relationship quality will depend on their expectations (Bernhardt & Goldscheider, 2008; Deutsch, 1985; Pina & Bengtson, 1993; Walster, Walster, & Berheide, 1978; Wilkie et al., 1998). These expectations will be shaped by the amount of time women spend on paid work as well as by the combination of paid and unpaid work that is consonant with their gender role identities or attitudes.

We assume that men's contributions to housework and child care will matter for childbearing decisions and relationship stability mainly when women participate in the labor market. These couples are also more likely to need help with housework or child care from someone outside the household. During labor market interruptions, when the male partner is the sole breadwinner, women are more likely to accept the full responsibility for the domestic sphere. The combination of paid work with housework and child care responsibilities is likely to increase the workload and frustration for women, especially when they have children. To reduce this, greater domestic contributions from their partners or external help with household labor may become a precondition to childbearing decisions. We would also expect more equally shared domestic work or external domestic help to reduce conflict between partners and promote relationship quality. Unfortunately, the available data do not allow us to investigate different underlying processes of the associations between domestic work arrangements and these family outcomes, for instance, by distinguishing feelings of unfairness from overload.

Cooke (2008) finds that live-in relatives or servants and the use of formal child care increase the probability of a second birth among dual-earner couples in Italy. However, given the lack of other research, it is unclear whether paid or unpaid help from outside the household will have a stronger effect. Unpaid help may be perceived as a larger contribution by relieving the household of additional costs. However, since this is usually done by relatives, in particular grandmothers, other sources of conflict in these family relationships may partly offset the financial advantage.

Theoretical approaches focusing on identity and gender (Stets & Burke, 2000; West & Zimmerman, 1987) suggest that men's and women's identities regarding their roles as male/female partner in a relationship and as mothers or fathers constitute the evaluation standards for their division of labor. Discrepancies between these standards and the actual division of child care and housework are expected to result in increased levels of stress, frustration, or anxiety. Postponed childbearing and dissolution of the relationship are two strategies to reduce this. We therefore assume that women's share of domestic work is more negatively associated with the likelihood of a first or second birth or the risk of separation for women with egalitarian identities compared

with those with more traditional division of labor standards. Although measures of identities would be ideal for this study, questions about attitudes unfortunately provide the only available large-scale evidence on differences in the values people attach to different combinations of employment and family care.

The association between domestic work arrangements and childbearing or partnership stability is also expected to vary by life course stage, in particular by the presence of dependent children in the household. In line with previous empirical results from other countries (Bernhardt & Goldscheider, 2008; Henz, 2008), we expect gender inequality in the division of domestic work and outsourcing to have a weaker effect on couples' decisions to have a first child than for the second one. The amount of housework is usually still limited before parenthood and therefore women may still feel able to cope with doing most of it and may not fully anticipate the increase in domestic work which the arrival of the first child entails.

In contrast, given that the presence of children still has a stabilizing effect on partnerships in the United Kingdom (Steele et al., 2005), dissatisfaction with the division of housework is less likely to lead to separation among parent couples than it is among childless couples, where partners are not bound together by responsibilities for a common child. The division of child care, however, is expected to have a strong effect on relationship stability, since it results not only from partners' (dis)satisfaction with the division of labor. If the mother and the father share the responsibility for child care and both spend significant amounts of time with the child, this may strengthen relationship stability due to the bonds established between both parents and the child (England & Kilbourne, 1990). Unfortunately, the available child care measure does not allow testing different hypotheses regarding child care effects of time alone with the child or more shared family time and empathy with the partner.

The analysis will explore separately the associations between domestic work arrangements and decisions to have children or end a relationship. Even though childbearing and relationship decisions are often interdependent processes (see, e.g., Steele et al., 2005) and we assume that the gender division of domestic work and the extent of domestic help will have an impact on both, they are rarely seen as alternatives by actors at one point in time. The nature of their interdependence and the effects of domestic work inequality and outsourcing may vary between outcomes and may differ by life course stage and mediating factors. As we are particularly interested in exploring these variations, we test the hypotheses separately for childbearing and relationship dissolution and for childless couples and parents, respectively.

Hypothesis 1: Gender inequality in the domestic work division is negatively associated with couples' likelihood of having a first or second child for women who also do paid work or who hold relatively egalitarian attitudes.

Hypothesis 2: Paid or unpaid help with housework or child care are positively associated with couples' probability of having a first or second child when women participate in the labor market.

Hypothesis 3: The gender division of domestic work and outsourcing are more strongly associated with the decision to have a second child than for the first child.

Hypothesis 4: Gender inequality in the domestic work division is positively associated with the risk of family breakdown for women who work in the labor market or who hold relatively egalitarian attitudes.

Hypothesis 5: Paid or unpaid help with housework or child care is negatively associated with the risk of relationship dissolution for women in paid work.

Hypothesis 6: The gender division of housework and outsourcing are more strongly associated with the risk of relationship breakdown among childless couples than among couples with dependent children.

Socioeconomic and Demographic Influences on Childbearing and Separation Risk

Neoclassical economic models and several empirical studies suggest a negative effect of women's earnings or education on childbearing (Rendall & Smallwood, 2003). Results for relationship stability are mixed. Some studies find a larger risk of relationship breakdown among women with higher education (Chan & Halpin, 2002), whereas others suggest that the association between couples' educational level and divorce has become negative in recent years (Harkonen & Dronkers, 2006). By reducing financial worries, couples' higher income seems to have a compensating positive effect on childbearing and relationship stability (Ekert-Jaffé et al., 2002; Kreyenfeld, 2002). The empirical analysis therefore controls for both partners' educational levels and couples' total earnings to reduce the risk that the division of domestic work and family outcomes are jointly determined by couples' socioeconomic characteristics.

Married couples are more likely to have children and less likely to separate than those in cohabiting unions (e.g., Berrington & Diamond, 1999; Steele et al., 2005). Previous studies also suggest that expectations toward the gender division of labor might be more egalitarian in cohabiting unions than

in marriages (Cunningham, 2005; Cunningham, Beutel, Barber, & Thornton, 2005; Kalmijn et al., 2007). However, Haynes et al. (2009) found no differences by marital status in the association between domestic work and relationship breakdown. We would also assume this difference to be captured in part by women's gender role attitudes and employment status as mediating factors. However, we conduct some additional examinations whether the associations of the division of domestic work and outsourcing vary by marital status.

Evidence from other countries suggests that the probability of having a second child is greater if the woman already has a child with a previous partner (e.g., Henz & Thomson, 2005). For relationship stability, theoretical work on women's perceptions of fairness proposed the importance of women's sense of feeling appreciated and understood by their partners (Major, 1987; Thompson, 1991). This may be captured by the similarity in partners' gender role identities (Sanchez, Manning, & Smock, 1998). A greater separation risk has been found for couples where women are substantially more educated or older or earn more than their partners (e.g., Kalmijn et al., 2007; Steele, Sigle-Rushton, & Kravdal, 2009). A greater risk to dissolve has also been found for couples where one partner has previously been married and experienced a separation or divorce (Steele et al., 2009).

Data and Methods of Analysis

This study uses 12 waves of the British Household Panel Study (BHPS) from 1992 to 2005. The BHPS is based on probability sample of households from Great Britain in the year 1991. All members of the household are interviewed annually, and new partners of sample members or additional household members are added to the sample. In addition to relationship and fertility histories, the BHPS has asked questions on housework since 1992, one question about the division of child care responsibility since 1994 and includes biannually repeated questions on attitudes about gender.

We apply event-history analysis to model whether couples who have their first or second child or experience relationship breakdown between 1992 and 2005 differ from those who do not in their division of housework and child care and extent of domestic help they have had in the previous year. We model separately couples' childbearing and relationship dissolution for childless couples and couples with children, respectively. This facilitates testing whether the associations with couples' domestic work arrangements differ in terms of mediating factors and depending on the stage of the life course stage, which is the main aim of this study. Allowing for differences in the starting

samples in the analysis of childbearing and relationship stability also increases the otherwise relatively small number of separation events. Second births are analyzed separately from the transition to parenthood to allow including couples whose first birth took place before they joined the panel. Excluding them would result in less than half the sample size and greater risk of selection bias by focusing on couples who continuously respond to the panel. By modeling the transitions separately, however, our comparison of effects between groups can only be exploratory and we cannot account for unobserved factors which may be correlated with the time people spend on domestic work and their family transitions.

To restrict the sample to the usual childbearing age and avoid a heavy influence of teenagers having children, which is likely to be linked to a different set of social factors, that is, socioeconomic circumstances and contraception use, we confine the sample for the childbearing analysis to include only married or cohabiting couples where the female partner is between 20 and 40 years. For the analysis of separation risk, we include all women aged between 20 and 55 years, who live in cohabiting unions, since we want to focus on women who may also participate in the labor market. The sample of parents includes only couples where the youngest child is aged 12 years or younger and lives in the same household, as information on child care is only available for these families.

The dependent variables are represented by a dichotomous measure that indicates whether or not the couple had a first/second birth or separated at each year following the couples' wave of entry, respectively. In the event of death of one partner, the couple is coded as censored. Ideally, one would want to follow all couples from the start of the relationship and the time of the first birth, that is, the onset of risk of separation or a first or second birth, respectively. However, for many couples the start of the relationship or the first birth occur either before the initial wave of the BHPS in 1991 or before 1992 and 1994, when the BHPS asked the questions on housework and child care divisions for the first time. Consequently, the onset of risk is set to the year couples enter into the panel or to 1992 for childless couples and to 1994 for couples with one or more children who entered earlier. For first births and separations, the duration of the relationship is controlled for. The age of the first child or the youngest child is included in the estimation of second births and parents' separation risk, respectively. The samples of parent couples include couples where the mother had a child in a previous relationship to avoid selection bias by focusing only on two-parent families with biological children. The year when couples are first observed varies in this

unbalanced panel, as original sample members may find new partners after entering the panel.

Event-history analysis of yearly fertility and relationship data are used, since the central explanatory variables to this study—the division of housework and child care—can only be observed once a year. As the duration dependency of the baseline hazard for each subgroup is unknown and not the focus of this article, we use a Cox proportional hazard model adjusting for tied survival data by the Breslow method. The proportional hazard assumption is tested for each model. Robust standard errors are calculated to account for the serial dependency of several observations of the same couple over time.

To reduce endogeneity issues, we use first order lags of all explanatory and control variables, that is, they are measured at time $t - 1$ for childbearing or separation outcomes at time t . To reduce the risk of adaptations in anticipation of parenthood, lags of $t - 2$ are used for couples whose interview took place 9 months or less before a birth event. All measures are time-varying except for information about previous relationships. Although lagged explanatory variables allow us to examine the temporal order of events, there remains the possibility of reverse causation, for example, poor relationship quality may reduce men's housework contribution or couples may adapt their division of labor or gender role attitudes already while planning a pregnancy.

Since a balanced sample would reduce the sample sizes to very small event numbers, this analysis is based on an unbalanced panel of the original BHPS starting sample and respondents who joined their households over the observation period. As longitudinal weights to adjust for attrition and nonresponse are not available for an unbalanced panel, we conducted separate analyses of predictors of nonresponse. These show that 15% of childless couples leave the panel before the end of the survey and before having a child or separating, whereas the attrition rate is with approximately 8% smaller among parent couples. This is in line with previous BHPS attrition studies (Uhrig, 2008). Significant predictors of nonresponse among childless couples are being unmarried and younger ages for women and men. Among couples with children, younger couples, those with older children, and those living in Scotland are most likely to leave the panel. Nonresponse is also more frequent during more recent years of the survey. On the whole, we therefore find only a few significant differences between stayers and leavers of the BHPS sample. We control for all these demographic, regional, and time predictors in each model.

Between 1992 and 2005, 1,519 childless couples are observed for more than 1 year. Six-hundred and seven of these become parents between 1992

and 2005. However, only 1,030 (68%) childless couples have no item nonresponse in any of the independent variables. Between 1994 and 2005, we observe 1,517 parent couples with one child, for whom the age of the child can be calculated. Of these, 637 couples have a second child during the observation period. Forty-four percent of the couples with one child have nonresponse in some of the items needed for the analysis, leaving 847 couples with no missing data. In the analysis of separation risk, we observe 3,167 childless couples and 2,553 couples with at least one child aged 13 years and younger. Of these, 127 (8%) and 344 couples (13.5%) separate or divorce during the observation period, respectively.

Overall, the percentage of observations lost due to item nonresponse is larger than the effects of wave nonresponse or attrition. Since item nonresponse may not be completely random, we test for potential bias by imputing some of the missing values through chained equations. This approach is appropriate especially when missingness depends on measurable characteristics. In practice, this is difficult to establish, but we find that having a disability or being in poor physical health is positively correlated with item nonresponse. Even if there are other unobserved predictors, simulation studies have suggested that multiple imputation still is a suitable strategy (Schafer, 1997). The imputed models are based on five imputed data sets. We impute all the variables except the nonnormally distributed continuous variables of women's hours of paid work and their relative housework time, which may cause problems with this imputation approach. After imputation the final sample for the analysis of first and second births includes 1,205 childless couples and 1,130 couples with one child. The final samples for the analysis of relationship stability include 2,777 childless couples and 2,304 couples with children aged up to 12 years. The statistical results after imputing the missing items are presented, since they either do not vary or are only slightly less significant than those before.

Measuring the Explanatory Variables

The division of housework within couples is operationalized as the percentage of time women spend on housework relative to the total weekly housework time of both partners. Since gender inequality may be perceived as more unfair at higher levels, we also test for a curvilinear relationship between women's housework share and childbearing and relationship outcomes. Women's housework share is significantly higher among parent couples 70% than among childless couples where women spend just over 60% of housework time (see Tables 1 and 2). For child care, we only differentiate between the cases when "the mother is mainly responsible for

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for the Analysis of First and Second Births

At First Year Observed in the Sample	Partnered Childless Women Aged 20-45 Years		Partnered Women Aged 20-45 Years With One Child	
	Mean/Percentage	Standard Deviation	Mean/Percentage	Standard Deviation
Woman's share of weekly housework time	62.64	20.60	72.50	21.14
Help with housework	4.38		2.64	
Woman main child care responsibility			69.96	
Man shares child care responsibility			32.50	
Informal day care			31.34	
Formal day care			21.75	
Only parental child care			46.92	
Woman's gender role attitude factor	3.48	0.60	3.32	0.68
Woman's paid work hours	34.95	14.63	21.96	18.18
Man's paid work hours	37.10	19.74	36.90	21.29
Couple's gross monthly earnings (GBP)	2013.36	1100.30	1630.37	1173.08
Woman high education	24.09		12.24	
Woman medium education	47.00		39.18	
Woman low education	28.90		48.59	
Man high education	24.47		13.58	
Man medium education	44.13		46.57	
Man low education	31.40		39.85	
Woman's age	28.05	5.70	30.89	6.73
Man's age	30.81	7.34	33.26	7.71
Married	32.54		53.56	
Relationship duration	2.85	3.38	5.39	5.67
Age of first child in months			64.63	66.74
Scotland	17.67		22.18	
Wales	9.36		15.86	
England	72.97		61.96	
Number of couples	1,205		1,130	1,205
Number of couple years	3,960		3,458	3,960

Source: Author calculations based on BHPS 1992-2005.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for the Analysis of Relationship Breakdown

At First Year Observed in the Sample	Partnered Childless Women Aged 20-55 Years		Couples With Children <13 Years	
	Mean/Percentage	Standard Deviation	Mean/Percentage	Standard Deviation
Woman's housework share	63.10	21.14	76.70	19.69
Help with housework	4.29		2.13	
Mother main child care responsibility			71.08	
Father shares child care			28.92	
Formal child care			11.85	
Informal child care			24.24	
Only parental care—omitted			63.91	
Woman's gender role attitude factor	3.44	0.59	3.18	0.65
Woman's paid work hours	33.68	16.08	16.66	17.06
Man's paid work hours	35.37	21.03	36.74	22.24
Couple's gross monthly earnings (GBP)	1950.05	1241.53	1497.70	1232.33
Woman earns less than 40% of household income	39.69		77.03	
Woman earns between 40% and 60%	43.10		13.71	
Woman earns more than 60%	17.21		9.25	
Both partners high education	12.96		4.18	
Both partners medium education	20.58		13.67	
Man more educated than woman	21.54		27.63	
Woman more educated than man	25.41		14.75	
Both partners low education	17.02		35.99	
Difference in gender role attitudes (woman – man)	0.16	0.69	0.08	0.68
Woman's age	31.13	9.57	33.50	7.08
Age difference (woman – man)	-2.85	6.15	-2.43	4.79
Married	37.36		74.79	
Either partner previously divorced	12.52		18.03	
Relationship duration	3.29	5.88	8.74	6.73
Age of youngest child in years			4.06	3.82
Number of children			1.68	1.02
Scotland	20.16		21.37	
Wales	11.82		19.82	
England	68.03		58.81	
Number of couples	2,777		2,304	
Number of couple years	13,309		12,681	

Source: Author calculations based on BHPS 1992-2005.

looking after the child(ren)” or when “the father shares or takes more responsibility for child care,” since the 2% of couples stating that the father is more responsible are too small to form a separate category.

Outsourcing of housework is captured by a dummy variable whether someone other than the man or the woman mostly does one of four tasks: cleaning, cooking, laundry, or grocery shopping. Less than 5% of all families regularly outsource some of their housework. For outsourcing of child care, we differentiate between the use of (a) informal child care arrangements provided by relatives, neighbors, or friends; (b) formal child care in the form of nannies, nurseries, childminders, or after-school clubs; and (c) all other arrangements where either the father or the mother is taking care of the children. These other arrangements include when mothers do not work for pay or work only from home or during school hours. Parental care is by far the most frequent care arrangement, followed by informal care. Only about 10% of children attend formal daycare institutions.

We control for women’s usual weekly paid work hours and examine interactions between domestic labor and women’s employment status. Women who were on maternity leave in the previous year are recorded as not in paid work. Gender role attitudes are measured based on the strength of respondents’ (dis)agreement with six statements: (a) “A preschool child is likely to suffer if his or her mother works,” (b) “All in all, family life suffers when the woman has a full time job,” (c) “A woman and her family would all be happier if she goes out to work,” (d) “Both the husband and wife should contribute to the household income,” (e) “Having a fulltime job is the best way for a woman to be an independent person,” (f) “A husband’s job is to earn money; a wife’s job is to look after the home and family.” Based on these questions, we calculate two common underlying attitude factors for women and men, respectively. Cronbach’s alpha of about .8 for both composite indices provide strong evidence that these six questions represent a common underlying factor. The factors are rescaled to the original Likert scale of values between 1 and 5, with larger values representing more egalitarian attitudes. To include interactions between women’s child care responsibility and their relatively egalitarian or very traditional attitudes about gender, we create dummy variables for women in the top and bottom quartiles of the attitude distribution, respectively.

For women and men, we differentiate between three levels of educational attainment: “GCSE or less,” “A-levels or similar qualification,” or “university degree.” Since a higher dissolution risk has been found among couples where women are more educated than their partners, while the risk is likely to be lower among couples where both partners have high educational attainment, we construct dummy variables representing whether both couples have the same level of low, medium, or high education or whether the woman or

the man is more educated for the separation risk analysis. In the analysis of partnership stability, we also include women's contribution to the household income measured as their gross monthly earnings relative to the sum of both partners' earnings. To allow for nonlinear specifications, we distinguish between women who earn less than 40%, between 40% and 60%, and above 60% of household income. We interact women's relative earnings with marital status to allow for a different effect in marital and cohabiting unions. To control for couples' financial situations, we include fathers' work hours and the log of couples' gross monthly earnings adjusted for inflation using the retail price index with 1992 as the base year.

Demographic controls include partners' ages, the length of couples' relationships, and marital status. For parent couples, the youngest child's age is controlled for. We also account for the survey year to reduce the risk of spurious association due to trends over time in the dependent and independent variables. For the analysis of separation risk, we include additional controls such as the difference between women's and men's gender role attitudes, whether one partner has previously been married, and had experienced a separation or divorce. We also tested variables for whether one of the partners had children during previous relationships, whether they had a premarital birth, and the mother's age at first birth, but they were not significant and are therefore not included in the final models.

Results

Modeling Strategy

This section presents the statistical results of the event-history analysis of couples' likelihood to (a) have a first child, (b) have a second child, (c) separate while childless, and (d) separate while the youngest child is 12 years or younger. For each part of the analysis, we adopt the following modeling strategy. Based on a model including just controls, the first modeling step adds measures of couples' division and outsourcing of housework and for parent couples also child care. In a second step, we tested for a curvilinear effect of the division of housework. In a third step, we include interactions between the division of domestic work and women's gender role attitudes. Fourth, we test an interaction with mothers' employment status by restricting the sample to mothers in paid work because this facilitates comparing the results to previous studies. Finally, we rerun these models for subsamples for married and cohabiting couples, respectively, to examine whether the effects of housework and child care arrangements vary by marital status. In the following tables, only the first model plus any other significant modeling steps are shown for each part of the analysis.

Findings for First Births

As shown in Model 1 in Table 3, neither women's housework share nor having housework help is significantly associated with the likelihood of having a first child. Women's longer paid work hours, however, significantly reduce their probability of becoming mothers. When a squared term of women's housework share is added in Model 2, the main effect and the square term are significant at the 10% level. This suggests that the effect seems to be curvilinear, and the turning point is calculated at 63% of the total housework time. This means that a higher housework share for women is positively associated with their likelihood of a first birth until they do about 63%. Above that, a higher housework share has a decreasing marginal effect on the probability of motherhood. For instance, for women with a housework share of 83% (the sample mean plus one standard deviation), the probability of having a first child is 7% lower than for women with an average housework share of 63%. Interactions between women's housework share and their attitudes about gender or their employment status were not found significant (not shown). Hypothesis 1 is rejected except for very high levels of housework inequality. Even at above-average levels of housework inequality, women's larger housework share is overall still positively associated with the risk of parenthood, even if at a decreasing rate.

Having help with housework is not significant, and this is the same if we restrict the sample to (self)employed women (model not shown). Hypothesis 2 regarding the positive effect of outsourcing of housework therefore has to be rejected. Other covariates such as low levels of education for women, being married, and shorter relationship durations show the expected positive association with the probability of a first birth. Additional tests show no significant differences between subsamples of married and cohabiting couples (not shown).

Findings for Second Births

Model 3 shows that women's larger shares of housework or child care responsibility are not significantly correlated with the likelihood of a second birth. Interactions between couples' division of housework or child care and women's gender role attitudes, however, do not reach significance (model not shown). Instead, it seems mothers' employment is more important for their expectations regarding the division of unpaid work. When we restrict the sample to mothers in paid work in Model 4, women's housework share becomes marginally significant at the 10% level. The combination of inequality in housework and paid work therefore may reduce the likelihood

Table 3. Cox Proportional Hazard Models of the Risk of First and Second Births

	First Births				Second Births			
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4 ^a	
	B	RSE	B	RSE	B	RSE	B	RSE
Help with housework	-0.282	0.226	-0.219	0.229	0.117	0.191	0.116	0.219
Formal child care					0.298	0.146*	0.359	0.181*
Informal child care					0.111	0.132	0.195	0.163
Only parental care—omitted								
Woman's housework share	-0.0001	0.002	0.022	0.013 [†]	-0.002	0.002	-0.005	0.003 [†]
Woman's housework share squared			-0.0002	0.0001 [†]				
Mother main child care responsibility					-0.055	0.108	0.020	0.123
Father shares child care—omitted								
Woman's gender role attitudes	-0.108	0.082	-0.119	0.085	-0.186	0.074*	-0.185	0.090*
Woman's paid work hours	-0.006	0.004 [†]	-0.008	0.004*	-0.018	0.004***	-0.016	0.005***
Number of couples		1,205		1,205		1,130		933
Number of couple years		3,960		3,960		3,458		2,647
Number of births		492		492		535		350
Wald χ^2 ^b		170.14***		171.16***		124.14***		125.25***
Imputation cycles		5		5		5		5

Note: All models are based on the BHPS 1992-2005 and include controls for men's paid work hours, couples' monthly gross income, educational levels of both partners, age and age squared of men and women, marital status, relationship duration, survey year, and dummy variables for Scotland and Wales. Models 3 and 4 also include the first child's age in months and its square. Missing items are imputed using chained equations.

a. Model 4 is based on a sample of mothers in paid work.

b. Model fit statistics are based on models before imputation.

[†] $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

of a second birth. Women with a housework share of 94% (mean plus one standard deviation) are 10% less likely to have a second child than women who do 73% of the housework (sample mean). Although this provides some support for Hypothesis 1, which assumed that the association between domestic work inequality and second birth probability may depend on women's employment, the result should be treated with caution given the marginal significance. Furthermore, Hypothesis 1 has to be rejected for the division of child care and for gender role attitudes as mediating factor.

In Model 3, parents who use formal child care are 34% ($e^{0.298} - 1$) more likely to have a second child than those where the mother is not working or where the father looks after the child while the mother works. As we would expect, this is stronger among working mothers (43%) in Model 4. However, this only partly confirms Hypothesis 2 regarding a positive effect of outsourcing, since surprisingly there is no significant difference between outsourcing to relatives or friends and parental care arrangements and no significant association is found for help with housework.

Hypothesis 3 assumed that gender inequality in domestic work and lack of external help would have a stronger negative effect on couples' probability of having a second than a first child. There is some support for this, since for the some childless women a larger housework share even increases the probability of a first birth and outsourcing is not significant. However, the association of domestic work inequality and second births is also only marginally significant and there is no consistent positive effect of outsourcing on second births. Of the other covariates, mothers with high levels of education are more likely to have a second child quickly than those with low education, probably representing a catch-up effect also found in other studies. The age of the first child and its square, parents' ages, and marital status also show significant relationships with the second birth risk. Housework and child care variables show the same patterns among married and cohabiting couples, but are less significant than in the total sample.

Findings for Childless Partnership Breakdown

Model 5 in Table 4 presents the results for the likelihood of dissolution among childless couples. Without interactions neither women's housework share nor having help with housework is significantly associated with separation risk. Model 6 adds an interaction between women's housework share and their attitudes about gender and we see that the main effect for housework and the interaction term is significant. In line with Hypothesis 4, a larger housework share therefore seems to increase the risk of partnership

Table 4. Cox Proportional Hazard Models of the Risk of Partnership Breakdown

	Childless Couples				Couples with Children Aged Under 13 Years			
	Model 5		Model 6		Model 7		Model 8 ^a	
	B	RSE	B	RSE	B	RSE	B	RSE
Help with housework	0.345	0.264	0.334	0.266	0.116	0.308	0.087	0.380
Formal child care					-0.039	0.220	0.054	0.263
Informal child care					0.231	0.169	0.403	0.202 [†]
Only parental care—omitted								
Woman's housework share	-0.004	0.004	-0.047	0.022*	-0.002	0.003	-0.004	0.004
Woman's housework share × gender role attitudes			0.012	0.006*				
Mother main child care responsibility					0.397	0.169*	0.654	0.222**
Father shares child care—omitted								
Woman's gender role attitudes	0.263	0.187	-0.578	0.451	0.256	0.129*	0.259	0.173
Woman's paid work hours	-0.002	0.007	-0.002	0.007	-0.006	0.005	0.0004	0.007
Number of couples	2,777		2,777		2,304		1,812	
Number of couple years	13,309		13,309		12,681		8,557	
Number of separations	192		192		288		173	
Wald χ^2 ^b	139.8***		137.13***		105.36***		63.98***	
Imputations cycles	5		5		5		5	

Note: All models are based on the BHPS 1992-2005 and include controls for men's paid work hours, couples' monthly gross income, interactions between women's relative earnings and marital status, interactions between both partners' educational levels, women's age, differences in age and gender role attitudes between partners, relationship duration, whether one partner experienced previous marital breakdown, the survey year, and dummy variables for Scotland and Wales. Models 7 and 8 also include the number of children in the household and the youngest child's age. "x" symbolizes an interaction. Missing items are imputed using chained equations.

a. Model 8 is based on a sample of mothers in paid work.

b. Model fit statistics are based on models before imputation.

[†] $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

breakdown for egalitarian childless women. An increase by one standard deviation in women's housework share (from the mean of 63% to 84%) would result in a 21% rise in separation risk for women with average gender role egalitarianism. Additional explorations of interactions with women's

employment status revealed no significant results (not shown). Hypothesis 5 regarding a positive effect of having help with housework on partnership stability is rejected for childless couples.

In line with previous studies, couples with two highly educated partners show a lower separation risk, whereas those with different education levels seem to be more likely to separate than homogenous medium educated couples. Relatively equal earnings stabilize childless cohabiting relationships, whereas relationships of married couples appear to be most stable when women earn less than 40% of the household income. Younger and unmarried couples and those with a previous marital breakdown of either partner also face a greater likelihood of union dissolution. The associations for the gender division of housework and outsourcing do not differ by marital status (models not shown).

Findings for Parental Partnership Breakdown

Model 7 gives the results for separation risk among parents with children aged 12 years or less. In line with Hypothesis 4, mothers' main child care responsibility is positively associated with the risk of relationship breakdown compared with couples where partners are equally responsible for child care, increasing the separation risk by 46%. Women's housework share, however, is not significant. Mothers' egalitarian attitudes about gender increase the risk of separation, but interactions with inequality in the division of housework or child care did not prove significant (models not shown). Model 8 restricts the sample to working mothers to investigate whether the effect of housework and child care inequality and outsourcing is stronger among them. Indeed, the division of child care increases in significance, suggesting a 92% lower separation risk for couples where both parents are jointly responsible for looking after the children. However, mothers' housework share is still not significantly associated with relationship stability. Hypothesis 4 is therefore rejected for the division of housework but not for child care among couples with dependent children. In contrast to Hypothesis 5, there is no sign of help with housework or child care strengthening relationship stability.

Hypothesis 6 assumed that housework inequality and lack of help would have a stronger negative effect on the likelihood to separate of childless couples than among parents who are bound together by the common responsibility for children. This was confirmed for the division of housework but has to be rejected for outsourcing. Similar to childless couples, younger and

unmarried women and couples where either partner previously experienced marital breakdown are more likely to separate. In addition, the number of children and the age of the youngest child increase the risk of breakdown. The association of domestic work arrangements and relationship stability does not differ significantly between subsamples of married and cohabiting parent couples (models not shown).

Discussion

This research finds significant associations between the division of domestic work and couples' childbearing decisions and partnership stability; the relationship, however, differs by the presence of children, women's employment status, and attitudes about gender. The division of housework is marginally significant in predicting couples' childbearing even after women's employment and socioeconomic factors are controlled for. A division of housework where the male partner does a larger or equal amount of housework seems to lower the likelihood of a first birth compared with couples with moderate levels of inequality. This is in line with findings for Germany (Henz, 2008), where a more traditional division of housework is positively associated with couples' probability of becoming parents. However, when women's housework share exceeds the average of 63%, the association reverses and greater inequality is negatively related to couples' likelihood of becoming parents.

The finding that more equal sharing of domestic work is positively associated with the probability of a second birth among working mothers matches results for other countries (Cooke, 2004, 2008; Olah, 2003; Torr & Short, 2004). In contrast with Torr and Short's U.S. study (2004), even if we replicate their cut-off points, we do not find the same curvilinear effect with the most traditional group also having a second child more quickly. This may suggest that there is less variation in how much working mothers expect their partners to help around the house in Britain compared with the United States. Cooke (2004) finds a stronger effect for child care than for housework among German couples. One explanation for the lack of significance in the United Kingdom may be that the binary variable of child care responsibility in the BHPS does not capture enough of the variation in couples' child care division. Whereas Bernhardt and Goldscheider (2008) find that inconsistency between gender role attitudes and domestic work practice reduces the likelihood of a second birth in Sweden, this is not the case in Britain. We tested whether one reason for the difference may be that they use interactions with preparental attitudes. We replicated this for a subsample of BHPS couples, which we can observe before having their first child, but the results were not

significant. A more likely reason therefore may be that social norms about gender are more egalitarian in Sweden (Wall, 2007), which makes women's attitudes socially more acceptable to use as a criterion for childbearing decisions.

As for relationship stability among childless couples, we find support for the argument that inconsistency between women's egalitarian attitudes and a traditional division of housework is associated with a heightened risk of partnership breakdown. Among parents of preschool and school-aged children, however, we find mothers' employment to represent a more important criterion for their own and their partners' child care contributions. The findings of shared child care improving relationship stability have also been found in a Dutch study and a British study (Kalmijn, 1999; Sigle-Rushton, 2010). Although the lack of association between the housework division and separation risk contradicts the significant relationships found by previous U.S. studies focusing on marital dissatisfaction (Belsky et al., 1986; Helms-Erikson, 2001; Pina & Bengtson, 1993; Wilkie et al., 1998), it may be that dissatisfied couples are still more reluctant to take the step toward separation or divorce when they have dependent children than without children or with grown up children. Overall, these results suggest that gender inequality in the division of housework and child care is significantly associated with the risk of partnership dissolution. This contrasts with the insignificant results in Chan and Halpin's (2002) study of divorce among British couples. The variation can probably be explained by the different samples used in our study, which investigates the associations separately for childless women and mothers and includes cohabiting as well as married couples.

Outsourcing of housework generally does not seem to be a suitable substitute for men's contributions to facilitate childbearing or relationship stability. Only the use of formal child care is positively associated with couples' likelihood to have a second child. This is in line with results found for second birth decisions in Italy (Cooke, 2008). Although the presence of another member in the household also seems to increase second births in Italy, we do not find a significant effect for informal help in the United Kingdom. Possibly, parents may feel that grandmothers who take care of the first child may not be able or willing to provide significant help with child care for a second child. The positive effect of formal child care use could also represent a positive effect (or the attempt to catch-up) of some women with greater ability or willingness to purchase formal child care, which is very expensive in the United Kingdom compared with other countries.

Overall, the findings suggest women's expectations of their own and their partners' domestic work contributions vary between family outcomes and

life course stage. We also find different mediating factors to be important for childless couples and parents. Future research should continue to look into differences by life course stage, ideally including more detailed measures of the child care division in couples, perceptions of fairness, partnership quality, and bonds between parents and children to shed more light on the positive association between fathers' child care involvement and relationship stability. A larger sample size would enable a more detailed examination of differences between marriages, cohabitations preceding marriages, and long-term cohabiting unions. The robustness of the findings should also be tested further by modeling the division of domestic work simultaneously with childbearing and separation events to account for additional unobserved factors. In a few years, the new British Understanding Society panel survey should make many of these research extensions possible.

Acknowledgments

The author wishes to thank Wendy Sigle-Rushton, Jane Lewis, Jacqueline Scott, and four anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments on previous versions of this article.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: This research was supported by funding from the UK Economic and Social Research Council (grant number PTA-026-27-2081).

References

- Becker, G. S. (1991). *A treatise on the family* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Belsky, J., Lang, M., & Huston, T. L. (1986). Sex typing and division of labor as determinants of marital change across the transition to parenthood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 517-522.
- Bernhardt, E., & Goldscheider, F. (2008). *Domestic gender equality and childbearing: First and second births in Sweden*. Paper presented at the European Population Conference, Barcelona, Spain.
- Berrington, A., & Diamond, I. (1999). Marital dissolution among the 1958 British Birth cohort: The role of cohabitation. *Population Studies*, 53, 19-38.

- Brewster, K. L., & Rindfuss, R. R. (2000). Fertility and women's employment in industrialized nations. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, 271-296.
- Chan, T. W., & Halpin, B. (2002). Union dissolution in the United Kingdom. *International Journal of Sociology*, 32(4), 76-93.
- Cooke, L. P. (2004). The gendered division of labor and family outcomes in Germany. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 66, 1246-1259.
- Cooke, L. P. (2008). Gender equity and fertility in Italy and Spain. *Journal of Social Policy*, 38(1), 123-140.
- Cunningham, M. (2005). Gender in cohabitation and marriage—The influence of gender ideology on housework allocation over the life course. *Journal of Family Issues*, 26, 1037-1061.
- Cunningham, M., Beutel, A. M., Barber, J. S., & Thornton, A. (2005). Reciprocal relationships between attitudes about gender and social contexts during young adulthood. *Social Science Research*, 34, 862-892.
- Deutsch, M. (1985). *Distributive justice*. New Haven, CT: Yale University.
- Ekert-Jaffé, O., Joshi, H., Lynch, K., Mougin, R., & Rendall, M. (2002). Fertility, timing of births and socio-economic status in France and Britain: Social policies and occupational polarization. *Population*, 57, 475-508.
- England, P., & Kilbourne, S. B. (1990). Markets, marriage and other mates: The problem of power. In R. F. A. S. Robertson (Ed.), *Beyond the marketplace* (pp. 163-188). New York, NY: De Gruyter.
- Frisco, M. L., & Williams, K. (2003). Perceived housework equity, marital happiness and divorce in dual-earner households. *Journal of Family Issues*, 24, 52-73.
- Gershuny, J., Bittman, M., & Brice, J. (2005). Exit, voice, and suffering: Do couples adapt to changing employment patterns? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67, 656-665.
- Giddens, A. (1992). *The transformation of intimacy: Sexuality, love and eroticism in modern societies*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.
- Harkonen, J., & Dronkers, J. (2006). Stability and change in the educational gradient of divorce. A comparison of seventeen countries. *European Sociological Review*, 22, 501-517.
- Haynes, M., Baxter, J., Hewitt, B., & Western, M. (2009). *Lifecourse pathways and housework time: Australia and the United Kingdom*. Paper presented at the BHPS Conference 2009, Colchester, England.
- Helms-Erikson, H. (2001). Marital quality ten years after the transition to parenthood: Implications of the timing of parenthood and the division of housework. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63, 1099-1110.
- Henz, U. (2008). Gender roles and values of children: Childless couples in East and West Germany. *Demographic Research*, 19, 1451-1500.

- Henz, U., & Thomson, E. (2005). Union stability and stepfamily fertility in Austria, Finland, France & West Germany. *European Journal of Population*, 21(1), 3-29.
- Kalmijn, M. (1999). Father involvement in childrearing and the perceived stability of marriage. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61, 409-421.
- Kalmijn, M., Graaf, P. M., & Poortman, A.-R. (2004). Interactions between cultural and economic determinants of divorce in the Netherlands. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66, 75-89.
- Kalmijn, M., Loeve, A., & Manting, D. (2007). Income dynamics in couples and the dissolution of marriage and cohabitation. *Demography*, 44, 159-179.
- Kneale, D., & Joshi, H. (2008). Postponement and childlessness: Evidence from two British cohorts. *Demographic Research*, 19, 1935-1968.
- Kreyenfeld, M. (2002). Time-squeeze, partner effect or self-selection? An investigation into the positive effect of women's education on second birth risks in West Germany. *Demographic Research*, 7(2), 15-48.
- MacDermid, S. M., Huston, T. L., & McHale, S. M. (1990). Changes in marriage associated with the transition to parenthood: Individual differences as a function of sex-role attitudes and changes in the division of household labor. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 52, 475-486.
- Major, B. (1987). Gender, justice and the psychology of entitlement. In P. Shaver & C. Hendrick (Eds.), *Sex and gender* (pp. 124-148). Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.
- McDonald, P. (1997). *Gender equity, social institutions and the future of fertility* (Working Papers in Demography, No. 69). Canberra, Australia: Research School of Social Sciences.
- Olah, L. S. (2003). Gendering fertility: Second births in Sweden and Hungary. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 22, 171-200.
- Ono, H. (1998). Husbands' and wives' resources and marital dissolution. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 60, 674-689.
- Oppenheimer, V. K. (1997). Women's employment and the gain to marriage: The specialization and trading model. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 23, 431-453.
- Pina, D. L., & Bengtson, V. L. (1993). The division of household labor and wives' happiness: Ideology, employment, and perception of support. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 55, 901-912.
- Pryor, J., & Trinder, L. (2004). Children, families, and divorce. In J. Scott, J. Treas, & M. Richards (Eds.), *The Blackwell companion to the sociology of families* (pp. 322-339). Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Rendall, M. S., Ekert-Jaffé, O., Joshi, H., Lynch, K., & Mougin, R. (2009). Universal versus economically polarized change in age at first birth: A French-British comparison. *Population and Development Review*, 35, 89-115.

- Rendall, M. S., & Smallwood, S. (2003). Higher qualifications, first-birth timing, and further childbearing in England and Wales. *Population Trends*, 111, 18-26.
- Rogers, S. J. (2004). Dollars, dependency, and divorce: Four perspectives on the role of wives' income. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66, 59-74.
- Ruble, D. N., Fleming, A. S., Hackel, L. S., & Stangor, C. (1988). Changes in the marital relationship during the transition to first time motherhood: Effects of violated expectations concerning division of household labor. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55, 78-87.
- Sanchez, L., Manning, W. D., & Smock, P. J. (1998). Sex-specialized or collaborative mate selection? Union transitions among cohabitators. *Social Science Research*, 27, 280-304.
- Sanchez, L., & Thomson, E. (1997). Becoming mothers and fathers: Parenthood, gender, and the division of labor. *Gender & Society*, 11, 747-772.
- Sayer, L. C., & Bianchi, S. M. (2000). Women's economic independence and the probability of divorce: A review and reexamination. *Journal of Family Issues*, 21, 906-943.
- Scanzoni, J. (1978). *Sex roles, women's work and marital conflict: A study of family change*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Schafer, J. L. (1997). *Analysis of incomplete multivariate data*. London, England: Chapman & Hall.
- Schober, P. S. (2011). The parenthood effect on gender inequality: Explaining the change in paid and domestic work when British couples become parents. *European Sociological Review*. Published online May, 2011.
- Schoen, R., Rogers, S. J., & Amato, P. R. (2006). Wives' employment and spouses' marital happiness. Assessing the direction of influence using longitudinal couple data. *Journal of Family Issues*, 27, 506-528.
- Sigle-Rushton, W. (2008). England and Wales: Stable fertility and pronounced social status differences. *Demographic Research*, 19, 455-502.
- Sigle-Rushton, W. (2010). Men's unpaid work and divorce: reassessing specialization and trade in British families. *Feminist Economics*, 16(2), 1-26.
- Simpson, I. H., & England, P. (1981). Conjugal work roles and marital solidarity. In J. Aldous (Ed.), *Two paychecks: Life in dual-earner families* (pp. 147-172). Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE.
- Steele, F., Kallis, C., Goldstein, H., & Joshi, H. (2005). The relationship between childbearing and transitions from marriage and cohabitation in Britain. *Demography*, 42, 647-673.
- Steele, F., Sigle-Rushton, W., & Kravdal, O. (2009). Consequences of family disruption on children's educational outcomes in Norway. *Demography*, 46, 553-574.
- Stets, J. E., & Burke, P. J. (2000). Identity theory and social identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 63, 224-237.

- Thompson, L. (1991). Women's sense of fairness. *Journal of Family Issues*, 12, 181-196.
- Torr, B. M., & Short, S. E. (2004). Second births and the second shift: A research note on gender equity and fertility. *Population and Development Review*, 30, 109-130.
- Uhrig, N. (2008). *The nature and causes of attrition in the British Household Panel Survey* (ISER Working Paper, No. 2008-05). Essex, England: Institute for Social & Economic Research, University of Essex.
- Wall, K. (2007). Main patterns in attitudes to the articulation between work and family life: A cross-national analysis. In R. Crompton, S. Lewis, & C. Lyonette (Eds.), *Women, men, work and family in Europe* (pp. 86-115). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Walster, E., Walster, G. W., & Berheide, E. (1978). *Equity: Theory and research* (Vol. 3). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & Society*, 1, 125-151.
- Wilkie, J. R., Ferree, M. M., & Ratcliff, K. S. (1998). Gender and fairness: Marital satisfaction in two-earner couples. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 60, 577-594.