Division of Labor Among Gay Fathers: Associations with Parent, Couple, and Child Adjustment

Samantha L. Tornello

Holbrook, NY

B.A., Stony Brook University, The State University of New York, 2003

M.A., Adelphi University, 2005

M.A., University of Virginia, 2010

A Dissertation presented to the Graduate Faculty of the University of Virginia in Candidacy for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Psychology

University of Virginia

May, 2014, Ph.D.

Abstract

In the family, division of labor (i.e., how a couple designates who will perform specific tasks in their household), is an important part of the co-parenting relationship. Along with the allocation of household tasks and childcare, the degree to which a couple agrees on how to divide these tasks has been associated with an array of factors relating to individual, family, and child adjustment. The present study is designed to examine the division of household and childcare labor among gay fathers and to explore the associations of their divisions of labor with aspects of the family system. The sample consisted of 335 self-described gay fathers who took part in an internet-based study. All of the participants identified themselves as gay fathers who currently had male partners and at least one child under 18 years of age residing in their home. The study had three main aims: first, the study replicated and extended past findings by examining the current and ideal division of labor among gay couples of different types. Second, the study tested three theories of division of labor to gain a greater understanding of the factors that play a role in how labor is divided in these families. Lastly, the study evaluated associations between discrepancies among current and ideal divisions of labor, on the one hand, and parent well-being, couple functioning, and child adjustment, on the other. In all, gay fathers reported having and desiring an egalitarian division of labor, this pattern remained relatively stable over time, and results supported the time-availability theory along with some aspects of life course theory were supported. Lastly, discrepancies between actual and ideal division of labor were associated with parental well-being and couple functioning but not children's adjustment. These results contribute to greater understanding of the role that division of labor plays in parent, couple, and child adjustment among gay father families.

Table of Contents

Dedication and Acknowledgements

I want to first thank all of the fathers who participated in the Gay/Bisexual Father Study. This study was the pipe dream of a first-year graduate student, but it became a reality in unbelievable proportions. These fathers volunteered their time, shared their invaluable personal experiences, and their families' stories. Thank you; without you, this dissertation wouldn't exist.

I want to next thank my mentor Dr. Charlotte Patterson. Thank you for your patience. Thank you for the many discussions leading up to this project and the countless revisions of all manuscripts, including this dissertation. Thank you for your professional, emotional, and personal support throughout the years. Your wisdom and advice has and will continue to guide my career. Next, I would like to thank Dr. Robert Emery. Bob, I can't thank you enough for letting me join your lab and allowing me to bring same-sex topics into every discussion of family, marriage, and children. Thank you for your irreplaceable guidance in all aspects of my career and life, along with your steadfast faith in my ideas and passions. Thank you to my two additional dissertation committee members, Dr. Dick Reppucci and Dr. Allison Pugh, for their helpful suggestions and feedback throughout the dissertation process.

Thank you to all of the members of the Patterson and Emery Labs. Your feedback, discussion, and friendship helped me get through. A special thanks to some of my closest psychology friends, B Blanchfield, Rachel Riskind, Kathleen Schmidt, Cristina Reitz-Krueger, & Rachel Farr, for their many conversations, words of encouragement, and tears. Without all of you, I would have never survived. Thank you for being my friends! In addition, thank you to all of the graduate students and faculty of the UVA psychology department. The support personally and professionally has been priceless.

I want to specifically thank some of the undergraduate research assistants, Wilson, Sarah, Allie, Jessica, Dominique, & Anna. I also want to thank all of the research assistants who have worked with me throughout my graduate school career. All took part of some aspect of the Gay/Bisexual Father Study, whether through recruitment, maintaining contact with participants, or brainstorming ideas. Thank you for your thoughts, creativity, and laughter!

Thank you to my family and friends in New York. Thank you to my Mom and Walter for their support in my academic endeavors. A special thank you to my sister, Lizz, who has always stayed by my side and will always be my best friend. Thank you to all of my extended family and friends who are family, for all of the support for me and my dreams.

Last but not least, my family. First, thank you to my furry family (Fire, Ice, Diesel, Eeyore, Mr. Powers, Little Man, Dude, & IBS). They are always filled with unconditional love in my best and worst moments. You have all brought me great joy and entertainment throughout the years. A very special thank-you to my wife, Jennifer, who was reluctant to move to Virginia but has loved every minute of it. We have created such a wonderful and loving home and family here. They will always remember us with our millions of news interviews, newspaper articles, and rallies! We will always remember this time with the help of thousands of pictures. We will miss our many hikes through the beautiful mountains and the simple family walks through our neighborhood to the downtown mall. You have listened to enough presentations, summaries of research, and graduate school meltdowns to last a lifetime but you deserve the most credit for helping me getting through. The last thank you goes to our son, Sebastian. Sebastian, you were literally a part of me through this dissertation process and the dream of you kept me writing. You are our heart, our soul, and our miracle. Always remember:

dream bigger than you can ever imagine!

Chapter 1: Introduction

Gay parenthood is not a new phenomenon, but the experiences of gay fathers have been under-studied relative to those of other parents. It has been estimated that 37% of LGBT identified adults have had at least one child (Gates, 2013) and one in six gay men have fathered or adopted a child (Gates, Badgett, Macomber, & Chambers, 2007). In the United States today, nearly 3 million LGBT identified people have a child and about 6 million children and adults have an LGBT parent (Gates, 2013). Information on the numbers of other types of gay father families, such as families created through surrogacy or co-parenting arrangements are difficult to estimate and thus are largely unknown.

For many gay men, disclosing one's sexual orientation may once have been synonymous with never becoming a parent (Berkowitz & Marsiglio, 2007; Mallon, 2004; Murphy, 2013; Savage, 1999). For some younger men, this may be changing. In nationally representative samples, approximately half of the gay male participants have expressed a desire to become parents (Gates, et al., 2007; Riskind and Patterson, 2010). Although there are many families headed by gay fathers in the United States today, little is known about these families.

Gay Men Becoming Fathers

Pathways to parenthood and experiences of becoming parents are extremely varied among gay men (Goldberg, 2012; Golombok & Tasker, 2010; Patterson & Tornello, 2011; Tornello & Patterson, in press). The increased availability of reproductive technology has opened the door to parenthood for many gay men. Some are becoming parents through surrogacy or as donors for lesbian couples (e.g., Berkowitz, 2013; Dempsey, 2012; Golombok & Tasker, 2010). It has been suggested that there has been a generational shift in the pathways to parenthood for gay men in some English-speaking countries (Patterson & Tornello, 2011), especially in the

United States (Tornello & Patterson, in press). Many younger gay men are becoming parents through adoption or surrogacy while most gay fathers over the age of 50 became parents in the context of previous heterosexual relationships (Patterson & Tornello, 2011; Tornello & Patterson, in press). These differences in pathways to parenthood can result in dissimilar experiences for the fathers. For example, men who marry women, have children in the context of that marriage, and later divorce have different experiences than men who became parents through adoption and surrogacy in the context of an already established gay identity (Tornello & Patterson, in press). In what follows, I review research that has examined experiences of gay father families (for more extensive reviews, see Goldberg, 2013; Golombok & Tasker, 2010; Patterson, 2004; Tasker, 2005).

Divorced gay father families. As previously stated, many gay men have become fathers in the context of heterosexual marriages (Tornello & Patterson, in press). Many of these men did not identify as gay before they were married, although the majority seem to have suspected that they were gay and/or had experienced same-sex attraction (Bozett, 1982; Wyers, 1987). In addition, many of these men cite social pressure, desire for family acceptance, and the hope of becoming fathers as reasons for entering into heterosexual marriages (Pearcey, 2005; Ross, 1971; Saghir & Robins, 1973). Most of these marriages seem to have ended in divorce, after men acknowledged gay identities.

Research examining the experiences of divorced gay fathers as parents has often compared their experiences to those of their heterosexual peers. Bigner and Jacobsen (1989a) found that gay and heterosexual fathers cited many similar reasons for becoming parents. However, this research identified two important differences. Gay fathers were more likely to describe their reasons for wanting to have children in the context of social norms, such as seeing

parenthood as part of their "adult role." On the other hand, heterosexual fathers were more likely to cite traditional reasons, such as carrying on the family name or having someone to take care of them in old age. Bigner and Jacobsen (1989b) compared the parenting styles of heterosexual fathers and gay fathers. They found that these groups did not differ in amount of interaction and intimacy with their children, but gay fathers tended to be more strict and were more responsive to their children's needs. In a study that compared gay and bisexual fathers who were single to those who had a cohabiting partner, men who had a cohabiting partner reported that they were better able to handle parenting difficulties (Barrett & Tasker, 2011). In addition to the work exploring gay fathers' experiences, research that examines the adjustment of their children is also beginning to emerge.

Much of the research examining children of divorced gay fathers has focused on the children's sexual orientation. Studies that explore the sexual orientation of adult children of divorced gay fathers have found that the great majority of children identify as heterosexual (Bailey, Bobrow, Wolfe, & Mikach, 1995; Bozett, 1987; Miller, 1979; Turner, Scadden, & Harris, 1990). Turner, Scadden, and Harris (1990) found that all of the children of gay fathers in their sample were heterosexual. Similarly, Bailey and colleagues (1995) found that over 90% of the sons of gay fathers who took part in their study were heterosexual. More recent research has begun to explore the experiences of men in planned gay father families, paying particular attention to family functioning and child adjustment.

Planned gay father families. Gay men who became fathers in the context of their gay identity - whether through adoption, foster care, surrogacy or co-parenting arrangements - are considered to have formed planned families headed by gay fathers. I will briefly review some of

the literature examining couple dynamics and child adjustment among planned gay father families.

Research in this area has mainly focused on adoptive gay father families and to a much lesser extent, co-parenting and surrogacy families (Goldberg, 2013). In a study comparing lesbian, gay, and heterosexual adoptive parents of young children, Farr, Forsell, and Patterson (2010) found that all three types of couples reported being together for a long period of time, and being relatively satisfied with their relationships. Using the same sample, Farr and colleagues (2009) found that neither parenting styles nor parenting stress were related to parental sexual orientation. Similarly, Erich, Leung, and Kindle (2005) compared family functioning of lesbian, gay, and heterosexual parents who had elementary school aged children and found no differences in functioning across family types.

Less is known about the experiences of gay men who elect to become parents via surrogacy. To date, only one published study has examined the transition to parenthood for gay father families who used surrogacy arrangements. Bergman and colleagues (2010) interviewed 40 gay father couples regarding their experiences of becoming parents, couple dynamics, and the impact of parenthood on each individual parent. Most of the men surveyed reported experiencing changes similar those reported by heterosexual parents. Changes such as sleeping less, working fewer hours, and spending less time with friends were reported by many gay fathers. Regarding the impact of parenthood on the couple, gay fathers (like heterosexual parents) reported a decrease in intimacy and time alone with their partners, although the men stated they were nevertheless highly satisfied with their relationships. Gay men reported that their relationships with families of origin, especially with parents, had improved since they become parents. Lastly,

the gay fathers reported that they had experienced increases in self-esteem since becoming fathers.

Bos (2010) compared two types of families with elementary-aged children: planned gay father families and families with heterosexual fathers. In this study, the gay fathers had children in the context of a co-parenting agreement with a lesbian couple. Researchers compared the father-child relationship, parental stress, and the children's well-being and found no global differences between the two groups. They did, however, find that gay fathers felt less competent than heterosexual fathers in their fathering roles. Fathers who experienced greater fear of their family being rejected by others reported greater stress related to their role as a parent, were more concerned about their child rearing practices, and described their children as having greater conduct problems (Bos, 2010). Research examining adjustment of children being reared by gay fathers has found no differences in the development of these children as compared to those reared by heterosexual parents (Erich, Leung, & Kindle, 2005; Farr, Forsell, & Patterson, 2009). We are beginning to gain insight into how gay father families function, but little information is available about factors that play a role in the co-parent relationship. One aspect of the co-parenting relationship is division of labor.

Division of Labor

Division of labor, or how a couple designates who will perform various tasks in the household, is an important aspect of the co-parenting relationship. The division of labor within heterosexual couples and families has been studied in great depth (reviewed in Coltrane, 2000; Lachance-Grzela & Bouchard, 2010) but the division of labor within gay father families has not received as much research (e.g., Farr & Patterson, 2013; Goldberg, Smith, & Perry-Jenkins, 2012; Johnson & O'Connor, 2002; McPherson, 1993). Part of co-parenting involves the

designation of which member of the couple will complete specific tasks. Problems stemming from an unsatisfactory division of labor not only have a negative impact on the functioning of the couple, but also on each parent individually, on their children, and on the family system in its entirety (reviewed in Coltrane, 2000; Lachance-Grzela & Bouchard, 2010).

Much of the research on the division of labor in same-sex parent families has focused on lesbian mothers. A few studies have recently begun to examine the experiences of gay fathers. The majority of research in this area has found that, on average, heterosexual couples report more specialized patterns of dividing labor than do lesbian and gay couples, who report that they divide labor in a more egalitarian or less specialized way (e.g. Cowan & Cowan, 1992; Farr & Patterson, 2013; Goldberg et al., 2012; Gotta et al., 2011; Johnson & O'Connor, 2002; McPherson, 1993; Patterson, 1995; Patterson, Sutfin, & Fulcher, 2004; Solomon, Rothblum, & Balsam, 2005). There are clear differences in the ways different types of couples divide labor, but much less is known about why these differences exist and if these patterns change over time.

In addition to how couples divide unpaid labor, this study will explore if division of household and childcare labor patterns among gay fathers change over time. Only one study has directly examined division of labor over time among same-sex couples. Goldberg and Perry-Jenkins (2007) found no significant change in household division of labor across the transition to parenthood among lesbian mothers. I hypothesize that these gay fathers will report dividing their unpaid household and childcare labor in a relatively egalitarian manner, that they will prefer this pattern, and, in the absence of major life events, that the division of labor patterns will remain stable over time. I present below an overview of theories in this area of research, and comment on empirical work relevant to them.

Theories of Division of Labor

Many theories exist to explain why couples designate certain individuals to perform specific childcare and household tasks (e.g., Coltrane, 2000; Lachance-Grzela & Bouchard, 2010). I will present three theories that are prominent in research on the division of labor of heterosexual, lesbian, and gay couples.

Relative resource theory. Relative resource theory bases the division of labor in a household on resources within the couple (Blood & Wolfe, 1960). According to relative resource theory, assignment of childcare and household tasks in the family is dependent on each partner's resources. The individual in the couple with fewer resources (e.g., lower individual income, lower level of education, or lower occupational prestige) should do more of the childcare and unpaid household labor. Much of the research on division of labor in heterosexual couples has been consistent with this theory (e.g., Cunningham, 2007; Pinto & Coltrane, 2009; Mannino & Deutsch, 2007).

Income is associated with the division of childcare and household labor among heterosexual couples. Specifically, the member of the couple who earns the higher percentage of household income tends to perform less unpaid labor than the lower-earning person (e.g., Cunningham, 2007; Pinto & Coltrane, 2009; Mannino & Deutsch, 2007), although this finding has not occurred in every study (Davis & Greenstein, 2004). Mannino and Deutsch (2007) examined the association between wives' income and their participation in unpaid labor. They found that for the women in the study, a higher contribution to the total household income was linked with less involvement in household labor. In a longitudinal 31 year study, Cunningham (2007) found that women's income had the strongest association with changes in the division of labor over time. Income seems to be associated with the amount of labor each member

completes, but some researchers have found that there is a curvilinear relationship between income and household labor, especially for women in heterosexual couples. Specifically, as women's income increases, they perform less household labor. However, when they provide half or more of the household income, the unpaid labor decrease does not seem to be proportional to their increase in individual income (Bittman, England, Sayer, Folbre, & Matheson, 2003). Although much of the research in this area has reported associations between income and unpaid labor, some studies have found greater support for the role of educational attainment (Davis & Greenstein, 2004) or a combination of both level of education and household income (Ishii-Kuntz & Coltrane, 1992b).

Level of education has been found to be associated with division of labor among heterosexual couples, although the results have not always been consistent (e.g., Blair & Licher, 1992; Davis & Greenstein, 2004; Kamo & Cohen, 1998; Pinto & Coltrane, 2009). In a study that compared the division of labor in 13 different countries, researchers found husbands were more likely to participate equally in the household labor when the wives' education level was equal to or greater than their husbands', even when controlling for household income (Davis & Greenstein, 2004). Some research has found that specific groups of highly educated men do more (Kamo & Cohen, 1998), and others have found that highly educated men do less (Blair & Licher, 1992). One study found that if women had a higher level of education, along with contributing a higher percentage of the household income, the couple tended to share household labor more evenly (Ishii-Kuntz & Coltrane, 1992b). On the other hand, some studies have found that education level had marginal or no effects on the division of labor (Kamo & Cohen, 1998; Pinto & Coltrane, 2009). Pinto & Coltrane (2009) found marginal effects of education on women's household labor contribution, but no effect of education on men's housework. Household income

was a significant predictor for men's participation in household labor: the greater the household income, the fewer hours that men participated in household labor and the smaller the proportion of household labor they completed. The exact role of education and division of labor is not entirely clear, but both seem to play a role in the division of labor patterns of heterosexual couples.

While there seems to be some support for the relative resource theory for heterosexual couples, there is limited evidence for this perspective with gay and lesbian couples (e.g., Carrington, 1999; Chan, Brooks, Raboy, & Patterson, 1998; Goldberg et al., 2012; Kurdek, 1993; Patterson, Sutfin, & Fulcher, 2004; Sutphin, 2010). Kurdek (1993) found that for heterosexual couples - but not for lesbian or gay couples - lower income seemed to be tied to greater participation in household labor for both men and women. Although not statistically supported, Blumstein & Schwartz (1983) reported that, even with large discrepancies in income among lesbian couples, these couples still divided unpaid labor in an egalitarian manner. In a recent study, Sutphin (2010) examined the association between income and the division of individual household tasks among same-sex couples. She found that income was moderately associated with meal preparation and paying bills such that the partner with higher income reported greater responsibility for financial decisions in the household. It is important to note that these both were trending significant ($p < .10$), with no task being significantly associated with income at the $p < .05$ level. This was the first study to examine individual tasks rather than an average household score. The results of this study show a slight trend towards income playing a role in the division of labor in same-sex couples (Sutphin, 2010). Goldberg and colleagues (2012) explored the division of labor among heterosexual, lesbian, and gay adoptive parents. They found that income was not a predictor of childcare division of labor and masculine

household labor tasks (e.g., Taking out the trash or maintain the car) but it was a predictor of feminine household division of labor tasks (e.g., doing the dishes or cleaning the house). On the other hand, Patterson and colleagues (2004) explored the association between division of labor and income discrepancy between partners among heterosexual and lesbian couples. They found that income was not associated with division of labor for either heterosexual or lesbian couples (Patterson et al., 2004).

Very little research has examined associations between level of education and division of labor among lesbian and gay couples. In one study comparing heterosexual and lesbian couples, Chan and colleagues (1998) found that heterosexual couples in which the husbands had higher levels of education shared childcare labor more equally, but this was not the case among lesbian couples, who shared evenly regardless of educational attainment. Goldberg and colleagues (2012) also found that education was not associated with the division of household or childcare among a sample of heterosexual, lesbian, and gay adoptive parents. Sutphin (2010) discussed but did not directly test the idea that educational attainment may not be associated with division of labor among same-sex couples. She hypothesized that this lack of association was due to a relatively equal educational levels among members of same-sex couples compared to heterosexual couples.

In summary, the relative resources theory seems to be more successful in describing division of labor among heterosexual than lesbian or gay couples. It has been hypothesized that relative resource variables have a greater impact on the division of labor among heterosexual couples than among lesbian couples due to the existence of more similarities in these variables between members of lesbian couples and the lack of traditional gender roles (Patterson, et al., 2004; Sutphin, 2010). For heterosexual individuals, there is a traditional expectation for women

to complete more of the unpaid labor and for men to bear greater responsibility for paid labor. These expectations can, in turn, create a discrepancy between individual income and level of education within the couple. Given the findings of previous research, relative resource factors such as income and education are not expected to be significant predictors of division of labor among gay fathers.

Time-constraint theory. According to time-constraint theory, time spent in paid employment outside the home creates a greater demand on the other partner and in turn greater participation by that partner in household- related tasks (e.g., Artis & Pavalko, 2003; Coverman, 1985). This trend has been found in both heterosexual parent families and gay and lesbian parent families, but results have not always been consistent.

For both heterosexual men and women, being employed is associated with decreased participation in unpaid labor (Bianchi, Milkie, Sayer, & Robinson, 2000). Research has found an association between the number of hours that a heterosexual woman works in paid employment outside the home and the amount of unpaid labor she completes in the home. The more a woman works outside the home, the less likely she is to perform large amounts of unpaid labor (e.g., Mannino & Deuthsch, 2007; Pinto & Coltrane, 2009) and the more likely her male partner is to participate in household labor (e.g., Cunningham, 2007; Ishii-Kuntz & Contrane, 1992b; Kroska, 2004). In support of time-constraint theory, Cunningham (2007) found that it was not just the fact that the women were employed that affected the amount of unpaid labor completed; it was the actual numbers of hours in paid labor that were most important.

Interestingly, when heterosexual men work more hours outside the home, women perform significantly more household labor, yet the reverse is not necessarily true. This phenomenon has been described as women's 'second shift' (Hochschild, 1989). The 'second

shift' is the idea that even when women increase their work in paid employment, while the men stay the same, women still complete a much higher proportion of the unpaid labor (Artis & Pavalko, 2003; Bartley, Blanton, & Gilliard, 2005; Hochschild, 1989; Neal, Chapman, Ingersoll-Dayton & Emien, 1993). Lincoln (2008) found that even when members of a heterosexual couple were both working equal hours in paid employment, men spent about 16 hours fewer per week in household labor compared to their female partners. It is becoming more common to see both men and women working an equal number of hours in paid employment, but clearly a gap in unpaid work still exists.

Research on division of labor among lesbian and gay couples has had mixed results regarding the applicability of time- constraint theory on the division of unpaid labor for these couples (e.g., Carrington, 1999; Chan, et al., 1998; Goldberg, 2012; Goldberg & Perry-Jenkins, 2007; Kurdek, 1993; Patterson, 1995; Patterson, et al., 2004). When comparing heterosexual, lesbian, and gay couples without children, Kurdek (1993) found that employment was related to the amount of participation in household labor for heterosexual couples but not for lesbian and gay couples. Chan and colleagues (1998) examined the division of labor and hours of paid employment among lesbian mothers and heterosexual parents, all of whom had become parents though donor insemination. They found that on average, non-biological lesbian mothers and heterosexual fathers worked similar hours in paid employment. Even with these similarities in paid work, the lesbian mothers shared childcare labor more equally compared to the heterosexual parents. Patterson and colleagues (2004) examined the best predictors of division of labor by comparing heterosexual parents and lesbian mothers. They found that the amount of time that the father spent in paid employment was the best predictor of the heterosexual couples' division of childcare labor. However, this was not related to division of labor among lesbian couples. In a

study that examined the experiences of gay fathers, Goldberg (2012) found that many of the men described wanting to split childcare as evenly as possible. In families in which one man spent more time than the other in paid employment, however, specialized divisions of unpaid household labor were common. Overall, research in this area has found that lesbian couples participate more equally than heterosexual couples in paid and unpaid work (Fulcher, Sutfin, & Patterson, 2008; Patterson, et al., 2004).

Taken together, these studies illustrate that there are differences between same-sex and heterosexual couples regarding the degree to which each member of the couple participates in paid employment. The number of actual hours worked in paid employment is clearly related to the amount of an individual's participation in unpaid labor, which often varies across family types. For gay fathers, it is expected that the difference in the number of hours each member of the couple spends in paid employment will be associated with their childcare and household division of labor.

Life course theory. Life course theory is based in part on the idea that experiences at one point during the life course can have an impact on development during later periods. Life course theory frequently examines associations among variables such as age, family structure, living arrangements, and life transitions, in the context of cultural and historical contexts (Elder, 1998). Research has evaluated the association between these variables and the division of labor in both heterosexual and gay and lesbian families.

Some research has examined the associations between relationship status and division of labor and has found that heterosexual married couples have a more traditional, specialized division of labor compared to cohabiting, unmarried heterosexual couples (South & Spritze, 1994; Stafford, Bechman, & Dibona, 1977). Specifically, Davis and colleagues (2007) found that

cohabiting men performed more of the household work than married men and that cohabiting women did less of the household work than married women. In addition, men who were divorced or widowed did significantly more household work compared to their cohabiting and married counterparts (South & Spritze, 1994). Although entering into marriage seems to be related to an intensification of the traditional division of labor in heterosexual families, the duration of the relationship itself- regardless of relationship status - has been found to be related to greater specialization (Miller & Sassler, 2010).

Miller and Sassler (2010) examined the experiences of 30 cohabiting heterosexual couples and found that although some cohabiters expressed a desire for an egalitarian relationship, many of the couples became more traditional in their approach to the relationship over time. Similarly, Pittman and Blanchard (1996) studied the association between division of labor and age at time of marriage and found that men who got married later in life contributed more to the household labor. For heterosexual couples, relationship status, in particular being married and the timing of marriage related to one's age, is clearly related to the division of labor. But are these results similar for lesbian and gay couples?

There is little research on the association between the relationship status of lesbian and gay couples and the couples' division of labor. Since the legal recognition of lesbian and gay relationships is relatively new and still does not exist in many states in the U.S., this variable has not been examined in great depth. In a study comparing the division of labor among lesbian and gay couples who had legally-recognized civil unions, those who did not, and their heterosexual married siblings, researchers found that there were no differences in the division of childcare or household labor between the lesbian and gay couples, regardless of legal recognition (Solomon, et al., 2005). In their book, McWhirter and Matteson (1984) proposed but did not empirically

evaluate the idea that the longer heterosexual couples are together, the more specialized their division of labor becomes. In a review of the literature on the division of labor among lesbian and gay couples, Kurdek (2005) also proposed that the longer the couples are together, the greater their specialization of unpaid labor. More research is needed to understand the role of these factors in the lives of lesbian and gay couples.

Very limited research has focused on the role of family structure on division of labor patterns. Ishii-Kuntz and Coltrane (1992a) compared first-married couples with biological children, remarried couples with only stepchildren, remarried couples with biological children and stepchildren, and remarried couples with stepchildren. Husbands in the remarried group were found to contribute significantly more to household labor than husbands in all other family types. This finding was particularly true for fathers in the remarried biological child group (Ishii-Kuntz & Coltrane, 1992a). In contrast, Demo and Acock (1993) compared the divisions of labor reported by a nationally representative sample of heterosexual women who were married for the first time, divorced, remarried (stepfamilies), or never married. They found that regardless of family type, the women reported completing two to three times more household labor than their male partners.

Research on the division of labor among lesbian and gay parents has typically examined primary-parented families rather than step-parent families. In a qualitative study of black lesbian stepfamilies, however, researchers found that biological mothers were responsible for substantially more childcare and household labor than step-mothers (Moore, 2008). In addition, in a study on the experiences of gay stepfamilies, Crosbie-Burnett and Helmbrecht (1993) found that for all family members, family happiness was associated with the degree to which the step-parent felt included in family life, and with the quality of the step-parents' relationship. Most of

the research in this area has been descriptive in nature, has been based on relatively small samples, and has not compared gay-fathered primary parent couples to step-parent families. More research is needed to understand the role that family structure plays in the division of childcare and household labor in these families.

In sum, understanding associations among marital status, length of relationship, family structure, and division of labor are the first steps towards understanding how they all influence family lives. Not much research has explored associations between division of labor and legal recognition of relationships among same-sex couples (Solomon, et al., 2005), but I hypothesize that having a legally-recognized relationship would not be associated with gay fathers' division of childcare and household labor. I do, however, expect that length of relationship will be related to the division of unpaid labor. Specifically, those who have been in their romantic relationships for a longer period of time will have more specialized divisions of both childcare and household labor. Lastly, I hypothesize that there will be differences in division of labor regarding the primary parenting families in comparison to step-parent families, such that primary parenting families will report more egalitarian division of labor.

Division of Labor and Individual, Couple, and Child Functioning

Issues arising from concerns about unpaid household and childcare labor have been found to be related to an array of issues for couples. Unfair divisions of labor are also seen as having a negative impact on parents, on children, and on the family system (reviewed in Coltrane, 2000; Lachance-Grzela & Bouchard, 2010). Much of the research in this area has focused on heterosexual couples, with only a limited amount of research examining the experiences of same-sex couples. I will review three major areas in which discrepancies in division of labor have had a negative impact on the family system: individual well-being, functioning of the couple, and

child adjustment (e.g., Chan, et al., 1998; Coltrane, 2000; Frisco & Williams, 2003; Goldberg & Perry-Jenkins, 2004; McBride & Rane, 1998; Patterson, 1995; Sutphin, 2010).

Division of labor and individual well-being. Multiple studies have found that participating in more unpaid labor or having an unequal division of labor among partners is associated with less positive individual well-being, often among both partners (e.g., Biehle & Mickelson, 2012; Bird, 1999; Coltrane, 2000; Glass & Fujimoto, 1994; Goldberg & Perry-Jenkins, 2004; Golding, 1990; Krause & Markides, 1985; Kurdek, 1993). Some researchers have suggested that the actual labor is related to household strain (Golding, 1990) or varies according to each individual's gender role ideology (Pina & Bengtson, 1993). Much of the current research has been conducted with heterosexual couples, and only a limited number of studies have examined experiences of lesbian and gay couples (Goldberg & Smith, 2008; Kurdek, 1993).

When an individual experiences a gap between actual and ideal aspects of paid and unpaid labor, they may experience a diminished sense of well-being (Goode, 1960). Glass and Fujimoto (1994) studied the association between equity in paid and unpaid labor in a large sample of heterosexual couples, and the prevalence of depressive symptoms among them. They found that perceived inequity in unpaid labor was associated with depressive symptoms among the heterosexual women surveyed. On the other hand, greater perceived inequality in paid labor was associated with greater depressive symptoms among heterosexual men. Perceived inequity therefore seems to be associated with well-being among both heterosexual men and women.

Researchers in this area have begun to explore the role of individual ideology and couple structure on the association between division of labor and individual well-being. One study found that heterosexual wives who believed that the division of labor should be egalitarian in nature experienced greater unhappiness than did wives who held more traditional views (Pina &

Bengtson, 1993). Goldberg and Perry-Jenkins (2004) examined the extent to which division of childcare and household labor could predict levels of well-being for working-class heterosexual women. They found that when husbands performed fewer tasks related to childcare than mothers expected, mothers experienced greater distress. If women held more traditional role expectations of their husbands, and if their husbands engaged in more childcare than their wives expected, the women also experienced distress. Thus, violation of the women's expectations of their partner's role, not the actual division of labor per se, was associated with increased distress among the women. Similarly, Biehle and Mickelson (2012) found that when mothers who reported unmet expectations regarding father's role in childcare, these mothers reported greater depressive symptoms. Therefore, it was not the actual division of labor that was associated with well-being of each parent but instead the partner's failure to meet role expectations. In a study of parents of adolescents, perceived unfairness mediated associations between the amount of time mothers spent in unpaid labor and their levels of distress. These associations were even stronger when the women held less traditional gender ideological beliefs (Voydanoff & Donnelly, 1999). Thus, much of the research in this area has shown that expectations of division of labor play a role in individual well-being among heterosexual couples.

To date, only two studies have examined association between division of labor and well-being among lesbian and gay individuals. In a study comparing the experiences of childless lesbian, gay, and heterosexual couples, Kurdek (1993) explored the association between household labor and psychological functioning. For heterosexual women, engaging in more household labor was related to more psychological symptoms; for lesbian women, on the other hand, it was related to fewer psychological symptoms. No associations between psychological symptoms and division of unpaid labor were found among the gay men. In a study of 34 lesbian

mothers conducted by Goldberg and Smith (2008), perceived unfairness regarding household labor, but not childcare, was found to be associated with well-being.

Overall, research on lesbian, gay, heterosexual couples has shown that participating in more unpaid labor, or specifically perceiving inequalities in division of this labor, was associated with decreased feelings of individual well-being (e.g., Biehle & Mickelson, 2012; Bird, 1999; Coltrane, 2000; Glass & Fujimoto, 1994; Goldberg & Perry-Jenkins, 2004; Golding, 1990; Krause & Markides, 1985; Kurdek, 1993). Thus, in the current study, I expect that greater discrepancies in both childcare and household division of labor will be associated with decreased well-being among gay fathers. In the next section, I will discuss the literature that explores the association between the division of labor among the couple and the couples' relationship functioning.

Division of labor and couple functioning. Research has repeatedly reported associations between greater satisfaction with the division of labor and more positive couple relationships for both heterosexual (e.g., Blair, 1998; Coltrane, 2000; Cowan & Cowan, 1992; Frisco & Williams, 2003; Grote & Clark, 2001; McBride & Rane, 1998; Voydanoff & Donnelly, 1999) and same-sex couples (e.g., Chan, et al., 1998; Downer & Mendez, 2005; McBride & Rane, 1998; Sutphin, 2010). In this section, I will review the research on relationship satisfaction, parenting alliances, and division of labor among different types of couples.

Some studies have found that perceived unfairness in unpaid household labor is associated with lower levels of marital happiness among wives, but less so among husbands (Blair, 1998; Ward, 1993). Voydanoff and Donnelly (1999) examined experiences of perceived unfairness of both childcare and household division of labor among heterosexual parents of adolescents. They found that wives' perceived inequity was associated with decreased marital

happiness among wives but greater marital happiness among husbands. In contrast, if husbands perceived greater inequity in paid labor, they reported less marital happiness. Similarly, researchers examined the experiences of dual-earning married heterosexual couples (Frisco & Williams, 2003) and heterosexual couples over the transition to parenthood (Biehle & Mickelson, 2012) and found that for both heterosexual women and heterosexual men, the perception of inequity in unpaid labor was associated with lower marital satisfaction. In addition, researchers found that wives who felt they were performing more of the unpaid labor than their partners reported higher rates of separation and divorce (Frisco & Williams, 2003).

In a longitudinal study, Grote and Clark (2001) followed married couples through the transition to parenthood to investigate the association between perceived unfairness and marital distress over time. Data were collected at three points in time: before the birth of the first child, when the child was six months of age, and when the child was one year of age. Cross-sectional analyses at the second point, when the child was six months of age and the third point, when the child was one year of age, replicated the finding that dissatisfaction with the division of unpaid labor was associated with couple relationship problems. Related to this, Suitor (1991) also found that satisfaction with the division of labor was a better predictor of marital quality than age, level of education, or the number of hours women worked in paid employment. Thus, division of labor, in particular levels of satisfaction with the allocation of tasks, has been found to be associated with relationship functioning among heterosexual couples.

Parenting alliance, or how parents work together in their roles as parents, is an important aspect of the parental relationship that should be differentiated from relationship satisfaction (Abidin, 1995). Some research has found that the parenting alliance is related to involvement in childrearing, specifically among fathers (Downer & Mendez, 2005; McBride & Rane, 1998). In a

study of heterosexual parents, McBride and Rane (1998) found that there was a significant association between father's involvement and both mother's and father's parenting alliance scores. Similarly, researchers who were examining father involvement found the same results: greater father involvement in childcare activities was related to a stronger alliance between the parents (Downer & Mendez, 2005).

There is much less research regarding the association between division of labor and relationship satisfaction with lesbian and gay couples, but the few existing studies have reported findings that are quite similar to those with heterosexual couples. Chan and colleagues (1998) examined the association between satisfaction with division of labor and relationship satisfaction among lesbian mothers of young children. They found that non-biological lesbian mothers who reported greater satisfaction with division of labor reported greater relationship adjustment. Sutphin (2010) reported that same-sex couples who were more satisfied with their division of labor experienced higher relationship satisfaction overall. To date, there have been no studies examining the associations of division of labor and parenting alliance among same-sex couples.

For heterosexual, lesbian, and gay couples, dissatisfaction with the current division of labor seems to be linked to dissatisfaction with the romantic relationship (e.g., Chan, et al., 1998; Coltrane, 2000; Frisco & Williams, 2003; Grote & Clark, 2001; Sutphin, 2010). In addition, a small amount of research suggests that a stronger alliance between parents is associated with greater involvement in childcare, particularly for heterosexual fathers. Specifically, researchers have found an association between increased involvement of fathers in childcare and stronger alliances between heterosexual parents (Downer & Mendez, 2005; McBride & Rane, 1998) but this has been untested among same-sex parents. I hypothesize that for gay fathers, uneven

divisions of labor will be associated with lower levels of relationship functioning and with less effective parental alliances.

Division of labor and child adjustment. Research examining the association between division of labor and child adjustment is extremely limited. There have been only two research studies to date that examine these associations (Chan, et al., 1998; Patterson, 1995).

To evaluate associations between division of labor and levels of child adjustment, Patterson (1995) measured satisfaction with childcare and household division of labor among 26 lesbian mothers, each of whom had at least one child. Overall, lesbian couples who reported dividing childcare labor in a more egalitarian manner had children with more positive behavioral adjustment. Similarly, Chan and colleagues (1998) conducted a study that included both lesbian and heterosexual families; all had become parents through donor insemination. They found that for lesbian couples, if the non-biological mother engaged in more childcare tasks, the biological mother reported less child externalizing behaviors. This pattern did not emerge for heterosexual parents.

It is important to explore not only the actual division of labor, but the couples' satisfaction with it. Chan and colleagues (1998) found that for both lesbian parent and heterosexual parent families, greater satisfaction with the current division of household labor was associated with fewer child behavior problems. For lesbian couples, greater satisfaction with division of household labor was related to both mothers' report of fewer externalizing problems in their children. For heterosexual couples, fathers' lower satisfaction with household tasks and greater satisfaction in household decision-making was associated with mothers' report of fewer externalizing behaviors in their children. In addition, Chan and colleagues (1998) found that satisfaction with division of labor by itself was not directly related to child adjustment but that

satisfaction with the division of labor mediated the association between relationship satisfaction and division of labor. In families with better functioning parental relationships, children manifested fewer behavioral problems.

Research in this area has been sparse but promising. Prior research has found an association between more egalitarian division of labor and child adjustment (Chan, et al., 1998; Patterson, 1995). Chan and colleagues (1998) also reported that relationship functioning mediated the association between satisfaction with division of labor and child adjustment outcomes. For the current study, I hypothesize that division of labor alone will not predict child adjustment, but that parent's feelings about division of labor will be associated with child adjustment.

Present Study

The purpose of this study is to gain an understanding of the division of childcare and household labor among gay fathers and to explore associations of this division of labor with other family processes and outcomes. The study has three major aims. First, I will replicate and extend past findings by examining the current actual and ideal division of labor among gay parenting couples. Second, I will examine the division of labor in terms of three major theories - relative resource theory, time constraint theory, and life course theory - to understand which characteristics or variables are associated with division of childcare and household labor among gay fathers. Third, I will evaluate the implications of discrepancies among the actual and ideal division of labor on the one hand, and parental well-being and functioning and child adjustment on the other.

To achieve the first aim, I will evaluate two hypotheses. I hypothesize that gay fathers will both report an egalitarian division of childcare and household labor and that they will also

desire that pattern. Based on prior research, the majority of lesbian and gay couples seek an equitable division of labor both in theory and in practice (e.g., Bennett, 2003; Chan, et al., 1998; Dunne, 2000; Kurdek, 1993). Second, in the absence of major life events, the division of labor among fathers in this study should remain stable over time (Goldberg & Perry-Jenkins, 2007).

To achieve the second main aim, I will test three different theories of division of labor. First, I will test the relative resource theory. I hypothesize that income and level of educational attainment will not be significant predictors of childcare and household division of labor for these fathers. Much of the research has supported income and level of education as predictors of division of labor patterns among heterosexual but not same-sex couples (Chan, et al., 1998; Kurdek, 1993; Patterson, Sutfin, & Fulcher, 2004). Household labor is not expected to be allocated on the basis of relative resources among gay couples.

Second, I will test the time availability hypothesis. I hypothesize that for gay fathers, the number of hours spent in paid employment will be a significant predictor of childcare and household division of labor. Prior research has found that on average, lesbian couples participate relatively equally in paid employment as compared to heterosexual couples, and that hours in employment are associated with division of unpaid labor (Fulcher, Sutfin, & Patterson, 2008; Patterson, Sutfin, & Fulcher, 2004). Thus, time availability is expected to show an association with division of labor among gay fathers.

Lastly, I will test different dimensions of the life course theory. Since legal recognition of gay and lesbian relationships is relatively new, this variable has not been examined in great detail. Consistent with earlier findings, however, I hypothesize that the couples' relationship status, for instance having a legally recognized relationship, will not be associated with the division of childcare and of household labor. Next, length of relationship has been discussed as a

factor that is associated with division of labor. The research on same-sex couples has hypothesized that the longer a couple is together, the more specialized their division of childcare and household labor becomes (Kurdek, 2005; McWhirter & Matteson, 1984). Following these leads, I hypothesize that the length of the couples' relationship will be related to the current division of unpaid labor. Specifically, men who have been in their current relationship for a longer period of time will have a more specialized division of both childcare and household labor than men who have been in relationships for shorter durations. Lastly, very little research has focused on the role of variations in the family structure, such as remarriage and stepfamilies, in families headed by same-sex couples. I hypothesize that there will be differences in division of labor among the primary-parenting couple families and step-parent families. Specifically, the biological father will be more likely than the step-fathers in a step-family to perform a greater share of the childcare for his biological children.

For the third aim, I will evaluate the associations between feelings about division of childcare and household labor and parental well-being, couple functioning, and child adjustment. Multiple studies have found that participating in more unpaid labor or an unequal division of labor is associated with lower levels of individual well-being among lesbian, gay, and heterosexual couples (e.g., Bird, 1999; Coltrane, 2000; Glass & Fujimoto, 1994; Goldberg & Perry-Jenkins, 2004; Kurdek, 1993). I hypothesize that greater discrepancies between actual and ideal childcare and household division of labor will predict more depressive symptoms and lower life satisfaction among gay fathers in the current study.

Next, I will examine the association between division of childcare and household labor and relationship functioning, specifically relationship quality and parental alliance. Research has found an association between greater satisfaction with the division of labor arrangements and

more positive relationships among lesbian, gay, and heterosexual couples (e.g., Chan, et al., 1998; Coltrane, 2000; Frisco & Williams, 2003; Grote & Clark, 2001; Sutphin, 2010). For same-sex couples (Chan, et al., 1998; Sutphin, 2010), it has been found that the more satisfied the individual is with the division of labor, the greater the relationship satisfaction overall. Some research has found that the parenting alliance is related to involvement in childrearing for heterosexual fathers (Downer & Mendez, 2005; McBride & Rane, 1998), but no research to date has examined parenting alliances among same-sex parents. I hypothesize that for gay fathers, discrepancies between actual and ideal division of labor will be associated with impaired relationship functioning and diminished parenting alliance.

Lastly, previous research has found an association between a more egalitarian division of unpaid labor and child adjustment in families headed by lesbian but not heterosexual parents (Chan, et al., 1998; Patterson, 1995). Further, Chan and colleagues (1998) found that relationship functioning mediated the association between satisfaction with the division of labor and child adjustment outcomes. I hypothesize that division of labor alone will not predict child adjustment but that discrepancies between actual and ideal division of labor will be associated with child adjustment.

In conclusion, the goal of this dissertation is to gain a greater understanding of the division of childcare and household labor among gay fathers. Specifically, I hope to gain greater insight into the associations between division of unpaid labor and individual wellbeing, couple functioning, and child adjustment among families headed by gay fathers.

Chapter 2: Method

Participants

The sample consisted of 335 self-described gay fathers recruited from across the United States and drawn from a larger study of gay/bisexual fathers (Tornello & Patterson, in press; Patterson & Tornello, 2011). To be eligible to participate in this study, a man had to identify himself as a gay father, had to report a male partner residing in the same household half or more of the time, and had to report having a child 18 years of age or younger residing in the household.

To construct the subsample of interest from the overall group of 877 respondents (Tornello & Patterson, in press), participants were dropped from the sample based on the following exclusion criteria: (1) If the participant had children over the age of 18 (n = 350); (2) If none of the children resided in the same household with the father (n = 90); (3) If the participant was currently single (n = 85); (4) If the participant did not live in the same household as a partner at least half of the time (n = 9); and (5) If the participant did not report information regarding the division of labor at both time points (n = 8). The final sample consisted of 335 gay fathers.

Demographic information about the participants is shown on Table 1. Participants' ages ranged from 25 to 63 years of age (M = 42.54, SD = 6.33), and their partners' ages ranged from 22 to 67 years of age (M = 42.73, SD = 7.30). The participants reported that they and their partners were, on average, highly educated, earned above-average incomes, and worked full-time. Most participants (84.8%) and their partners (81.5%) had received a Bachelor's degree or higher. The majority of participants reported that they and their partners were White/Caucasian, 89.6% and 83.0% respectively, with a minority identifying as Latino, African American/Black, Asian, Biracial/multiracial or some other ethnicity/race. About one-third of the men identified as

Protestant (32.5%) or reported no religious affiliation (28.7%), and the others described their religious affiliations as being Catholic (11.3%), Jewish (10.4%), or something else (17.1%). Participants reported residing in 39 different states and the District of Columbia. Less than one-third of respondents reported that they resided in any one region of the country: 31.8% from the West, 30.0% were from the Northeast, 25.5% from the South, and 12.7% from the Midwest.

Gay fathers reported that their families were created through an array of different methods. The most common pathway described was adoption (67.8%) followed by the use of surrogacy (15.2%), having children in the context of a former heterosexual relationship (13.4%), or co-parenting or donor arrangements (3.6%). Participants reported approximately two children per family (M = 1.62, SD = .72), with a sample total of 573 children. Children's ages were reported as ranging from newborn to 18 years with the average child's age being about 7 years (SD = 5.02). These children were more likely to be male (70.7%) than female. The children were racially diverse with half identifying as White/Caucasian (50.4%) and a minority as Biracial/Multiracial (21.5%), Latino(a) (12.8%), Black/African American (8.1%), Asian (5.4%) or some other race/ethnicity (1.8%).

Procedure

Participants were recruited through advertisements for a "Gay/Bisexual Dads Study" which were sent in emails, published in newsletters, and placed on websites of relevant gay/bisexual family friendly organizations. The ads described the study and its eligibility criteria, and gave the researcher's email address. To express interest in participation, prospective participants were asked to contact the researcher via email.

After a prospective participant expressed interest in the study, a researcher contacted him to describe the study and review the eligibility criteria. If the man was eligible and willing to

participate, the researcher provided a link and password that allowed the participant to access the online survey. Each link included a code that identified an individual participant and also members of couples. If the participant did not respond within one month of the initial contact, follow-up emails were sent to encourage participation.

When a participant visited the study's website, he was asked to read a consent form that described the study and to affirm his agreement to the conditions described before taking the survey. Participation was completely voluntary, and no financial incentives were offered. On average, the survey took about 30 minutes to complete. At the end of the survey, participants were asked if they would like to participate in any follow-up studies. If the participant indicated that he would like to be contacted in the future, contact information was obtained. After completing the survey, participants were directed to a debriefing page that provided information about how to contact the researcher and how to access gay-friendly resources. Wave One of data collection occurred between January 2009 and August 2009.

Approximately one year (M = 382.61 days, SD = 82.88) after initial survey completion, an email was sent to the fathers who had noted their contact information during the first phase of data collection, asking if they would be interested in participating in a follow-up study. The email described the goals of the follow-up study and provided a link with a password to access the survey. Each link included the personalized participant code that identified an individual participant and also members of couples from the prior data collection. The follow-up survey was completed by about half (52.5%) of the participants from the original sample.

When a participant visited the study's website, he was asked to read a consent form and agree with its conditions before taking the survey. Participation was completely voluntary, and no financial incentives were offered. The survey took about 30-45 minutes to complete. After

completing the survey, participants were once again shown a debriefing page that provided information about how to contact the researcher and how to access gay-friendly resources. Wave Two took place from April 2010 to October 2010. Both phases of data collection were approved by the University of Virginia Institutional Review Board for the Social and Behavioral Sciences.

Materials

Demographic information. At Wave One, participants were asked to provide demographic information, including age, gender, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, zip code, religious affiliation, relationship status, length of current relationship, education, employment, and income (see Table 1). If a participant described himself as currently in a relationship, he was also asked to answer demographic questions about his partner. In addition, participants were asked to provide demographic information for their child or children, including age, gender, and race/ethnicity.

Pathway to parenthood. At Wave One, participants were asked a series of questions about how their child or children joined their family. Participants and/or their partner were asked if they were biologically related to the child, if the child was adopted, or if the child had come to the family from the foster care system. The participant was asked to clarify whether the child joined the family in the context of the current relationship, a former heterosexual relationship, a former gay relationship, when the participant had been a single father, or in some other context. Participants were also asked about the legal status of their relationships and the legal status of their partners' relationships with the child or children. Based on responses to questions about family formation, participants were directed to a second set of questions relevant to their particular family type. If none of the options applied, participants were prompted to describe their particular situation in their own words.

Division of labor. *Who Does What?* is a self-report survey, designed to assess the couple's actual and ideal division of labor (Cowan & Cowan, 1990). This instrument was used during both Wave One and Wave Two and consists of three scales, two of which - childcare (e.g., feeding the child) and household (e.g., cleaning the house) – were used for this study. Each item was scored on a scale of 1 to 9, in which 1 = *I do it all* to 9 = *partner does it all*, with 5 = *we both do this equally*. Participants rated their current experience (referred to as *actual*) and how they would like it to be (referred to as *ideal*). Every participant completed the same household task scale (13 items). There were six different childcare scales in which the number of items varied widely based on the age of the child (using a range of 12 to 20 items) (Cowan & Cowan, 1990).

Six different scores were calculated, with three scores regarding childcare and three regarding household tasks. First, a total score reflecting the current division of labor was calculated by taking the average of the *actual* responses on each subscale. Second, a total score reflecting the participant's *ideal* division of labor was calculated by taking the average of the ideal responses on each subscale. A total score closer to 5 indicated a greater *desire* for egalitarian division of labor. Third, to gain an understanding of the amount of discrepancy between the couple's actual and ideal division of labor, a discrepancy score was calculated by taking the absolute difference between the actual and ideal scores and averaging those scores. A total discrepancy score closer to zero indicated less discrepancy or greater satisfaction with the current division of labor.

Depressive symptoms. The *Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale* (CES-D Scale) is a 20 item self-report survey designed to measure current depression symptomology (Radloff, 1977). This scale was used only at Wave Two. Participants were instructed to answer

the items while thinking about the past week. Items were scored on a four-point Likert scale in which 0 = *Rarely or none of the time (less than 1 day),* 1 = *Some or a little of the time (1- 2 days),* 2 = *Occasionally or a moderate amount of time (3-4 days),* and 3 = *Most or all of the time (5-7 days).* Sample items included, "I was bothered by things that usually don't bother me," and "I had trouble keeping my mind on what I was doing." A total CES-D score was calculated by summing scores for all 20 items. Scores ranged from 0 to 60, with higher scores indicating greater depressive symptoms, and scores above 16 indicating probable depression (Radloff, 1977). Cronbach's alpha for the total CES-D Scale was .91.

Satisfaction with life. The *Satisfaction with Life Scale* (SWLS) is a 5 item self-report scale designed to give a global impression of a person's overall satisfaction with his or her life (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985). This scale was used only at Wave Two. Items were scored on a seven- point Likert scale which ranged from 1 = *Strongly disagree* to 7 = *Strongly agree.* Sample items included, "In most ways, my life is close to ideal," and "So far I have gotten the important things I want in life." A total score was calculated by adding the scores for all five items. Scores ranged from 5 to 35, with higher scores indicating greater life satisfaction. Scores from 30 to 35 = *Highly satisfied*, 26- 29 = *Satisfied,* 21- 25 = *Slightly satisfied*, 20 = *Neutral*, 15- 19 = *Slightly dissatisfied,* 10 – 14 = *Dissatisfied*, 5- 9 = *Extremely dissatisfied*. Cronbach's alpha for the total SWLS was .80.

Relationship adjustment. The *Dyadic Adjustment Scale* (DAS) is a 32-item self-report survey used to measure multiple dimensions of the quality of relationships (Spanier, 1976). This scale was used only at Wave One. Items have varied Likert scales; for example, some were scored on a 0 to 5 scale in which 0 = *never* to 5 = *more often* or 5 = *always agree* to 0 = *always disagree*. Items included, for example, "How much do you and your partner agree regarding

aims, goals, and things believed important?" and "How often do you and your partner quarrel?" The total DAS score was calculated by summing scores on all 32 items. Total dyadic adjustment scores can range from 0 to 151, with higher numbers representing better relationship functioning. Spanier (1976) found that the average score for married couples in enduring relationships was 114.8 ± 17.8. Those in relationships that eventually dissolved had lower scores (average = 70.7 ± 23.8). The DAS had good reliability, $\alpha = .88$, for this sample.

Parenting alliance. The *Parenting Alliance Inventory* (PAI) is a 20 item self-report scale designed to measure the quality of the working parental relationship between co-parents (Abidin & Brunner, 1995). This scale was used only at Wave Two. Items were scored on a five-point Likert scale which ranged from 1 = *Strongly disagree* to 5 = *Strongly agree.* Items included, "My child's other parent and I are a good team" and "My child's other parent tells me I am a good parent." A total score was calculated by summing scores on all 20 items. Scores ranged from 20 to 100, with higher scores indicating a stronger alliance between the parents. Abidin and Brunner (1995) found that the average score for married couples in enduring relationships was 84.0 ± 13.1, with scores for those in relationships that eventually dissolved averaging 52.4 ± 16.4. Cronbach's alpha for the total PAI was .95.

Child adjustment. The problem behavior scale of the Social Skills Rating System (SSRS) was used to measure total behavioral problems in children (Gresham & Elliott, 1990). This scale was used only at Wave Two. Each item had a three-point Likert scale, ranging from 0 to 2 with 0 = *never*, 1= sometimes, and 2 = *very often.* There were three different age-based scales: preschool (3 years of age through kindergarten), elementary (kindergarten through grade 6), and secondary (grades 7 through 12). Items included statements such as "gets angry easily" and "appears lonely." Raw scores were calculated by summing all items of the age appropriate

scale. These scores were then converted to standardized scores based on age and gender (see Gresham & Elliott, 1990). Standardized scores ranged from 85 to 145 (M = 100, SD = 15), with higher scores indicating more behavioral problems. Cronbach's alpha for the SSRS scales ranged from .74 to .89.

Statistical Power

Power analyses were conducted to determine the level of power for each proposed analysis. Power analyses were conducted using G-Power version 3.1 (Erdfelder, Faul, & Buchner, 1996). Alpha levels for all analyses were set at .05. The number of participants varied as a function of when the measure was collected (Wave One, n = 335; Wave Two, n = 176), so power analyses are based on both samples by reporting a range.

For bivariate correlations, power could reach 1.00 for large, 1.00 to .99 for medium, and .96 to .76 for small effects. For paired t-tests, power could reach 1.00 for large, 1.00 to .99 for medium, and .97 to .84 for small effects. For independent t-test, power could reach 1.00 to .99 for large, .99to .95 for medium, and .57 to .37 for small effects.

For a simple regression with one predictor, power could reach 1.00 for large, .99 for medium, and .73 to .46 for small effects. For multiple regressions with two predictors, power could reach 1.00 for large, 1.00 to .99 for medium, and .63 to .37 for small effects. For multiple regressions with six predictors, power could reach 1.00 to .99 for large, 1.00 to .97 for medium, and .39 to .20 for small effects. For multiple regressions with eleven predictors, power could reach 1.00 to .99 for large, 1.00 to .95 for medium, and .37 to .17 for small effects.

Overall, not all analyses will have sufficient power to detect small effects (e.g., d = .20, f^2 = .02) but all will have adequate power to detect medium effects (e.g., d = .50, f^2 = .15), and all will have excellent power to detect large effects (e.g., d = .70, f^2 = .35).

Chapter 3: Results

The results will be presented under three major headings. First, I will examine the patterns and changes over time of childcare and household division of labor among gay fathers. Second, I will test major theories associated with division of labor patterns among couples. Lastly, I will explore the associations between discrepancies in the division of labor, on the one hand, and parent well-being, couple functioning, and child adjustment, on the other.

Division of Labor Description and Change

The first aim of this study was to examine the patterns and changes over time of household and childcare division of labor among gay fathers. Gay fathers reported currently having a relatively equal division of household labor, *M* = 5.29, *SD* = 0.74, and childcare labor, *M* = 5.42, *SD* = 1.02 at Wave 1 and a relatively equal division of household labor, *M* = 5.32, *SD* = .84, and childcare labor, *M* = 5.37, *SD* = 1.16 at Wave 2. In addition, in both waves, gay fathers reported wanting a relatively equal division of household labor, *M* = 4.96, *SD* = .61 (Wave 1), *M* = 4.96, SD = 0.62 (Wave 2) and childcare labor, *M* = 5.15, SD = 0.68 (Wave 1), *M* = 5.37, *SD* = 1.16 (Wave 2; see Table 2). Overall, gay fathers reported dividing their labor in a relatively equal fashion and they also reported that they preferred it this way.

The total discrepancy scores (a score closer to zero indicated less discrepancy between actual and ideal division of labor) for household labor at Wave 1, *M* = 0.77, *SD* = 0.65, and Wave 2, *M* = 0.87, *SD* = 0.68, were close to zero, on average. Similarly, total discrepancy scores for childcare labor were also close to zero at Wave 1, *M* = 0.63, *SD* = 0.56, and Wave 2, *M* = 0.66, *SD* = 0.66. In sum, gay fathers reported that they want to - and actually do - divide their household and childcare labor in an equal fashion. They similarly report few discrepancies in actual and expected division of labor (see Table 2).

Lastly, I conducted a series of paired t-tests to assess whether there was a significant change in division of labor patterns over time (see Table 3). There was no change in actual household division of labor from Wave 1, M = 5.29, SD = .76, to Wave 2, M = 5.32, SD = .85, t (148) = -.66, p = .51. In addition, there was no change in actual childcare division of labor from Wave 1, M = 5.34, SD = 1.02, to Wave 2, M = 5.35, SD = .1.16, t (143) = -.14, p = .89. There was no change in ideal household division of labor from Wave 1, M = 5.01, SD = .58, to Wave 2, M = 4.95, SD = .62, t (144) = 1.56, p = .12. Similarly, there was no change in ideal childcare division of labor from Wave 1, M = 5.13, SD = .67, to Wave 2, M = 5.04, SD = .82, t (140) = 1.69, p = .09. These fathers reported no change in actual or ideal household labor and childcare labor across the two data collections. In contrast, there was a significant increase in the difference between actual and ideal household labor from Wave 1, M = .73, SD = .59, to Wave 2, M = .87, SD = .68, t (144) = -3.14, p = .002. There was, however, no change in the difference between actual and ideal childcare labor from Wave 1, M = .58, SD = .53, to Wave 2, M = .67, SD = .67, t (140) = -1.53, p = .13. Overall, the division of labor remains relatively stable over time except that the difference between actual and ideal division of household labor increased slightly over time.

Theories of Actual Division of Labor

The second aim of this study was to explore the applicability of three theories of division of labor patterns among gay fathers. For each theory, the associations between theoretical variables and actual division of labor were examined. In addition, these theories were examined to explore which variables were the best predictors of division of labor patterns among gay fathers.

To assess the relative resource theory, Pearson correlations were used to evaluate the associations between actual division of labor and income and level of education at Wave 1 (see Table 10). Neither education, r = -.06, p = .32, nor income, r = -.04, p = .50, was associated with household division of labor among gay fathers. Also, neither education, r = -.05, p = .37, nor income, r = -.08, p = .18, were associated with childcare division of labor among gay fathers. Next, I conducted two simultaneous regressions, one predicting household division of labor and one childcare division of labor. Each model included income and level of education as predictors. As expected, neither household division of labor, $F_{2, 318}$ = 1.18, p = .31, nor childcare division of labor, $F_{2, 311}$ = 1.23, p = .30, was predicted by the relative resource theory (income and education; see Table 4).

To test the time availability theory, Pearson correlations were used to evaluate the association between actual division of labor patterns and hours worked in paid employment at Wave 1 (see Table 10). The number of hours in paid employment was associated with childcare division of labor, r = -.29, p < .001, but not household division of labor, r = -.08, p = .14. The more hours the father worked in paid employment, the less childcare, but not household, labor he reported completing. Next, I conducted two simultaneous regressions with only hours worked in paid employment as a predictor of either household division of labor or childcare division of labor. Using this simultaneous regression model, hours worked in paid employment was not a significant predictor of household, $F_{1,330}$ = 2.23, p = .14; R^2 = .00, but was a significant predictor of childcare labor, $F_{1.323}$ = 28.53, p < .001; R^2 = .08. The number of hours the father worked in paid employment accounted for 8% of the variance in childcare labor (see Table 5). In all, the greater number of hours the fathers worked in paid employment the less amount of childcare, but not household labor he performed.

To investigate the life course theory, the associations between length of relationship, relationship legal status, and family composition and actual division of labor patterns were examined. Using Pearson correlations, an association was found between the length of the fathers' current relationship and their division of childcare, r = -.13, p = .02, but not household labor, r = -.05, p = .38 (see Table 10). Next, I conducted two simultaneous regressions, one model predicting household division of labor and one childcare division of labor using only length of relationship as the predictor. Using this regression model, the length of relationship was not a significant predictor of actual household division of labor, $F_{1,330}$ = .79, p = .38; R^2 = .00, but was a predictor of actual childcare division of labor, $F_{1.323}$ = 5.79, p = .02; R^2 = .02. The longer the couple reported being in a relationship, the more egalitarian the division of childcare labor the fathers reported. It should, however, be noted that not much of the variance was accounted for by these analyses. Length of romantic relationship was not a significant predictor for household division of labor (see Table 6).

Second, the association between the legal status of the fathers' current relationship and how the men divided their unpaid labor was tested. There was an association between the legal status of the fathers' current relationship and childcare labor, r = -.11, p = .04, but not with the division of household labor, r = -.02, p = .74, (see Table 10). Next, using independent-tests, I compared the division of household and childcare labor between the gay fathers who were in a legally recognized relationship and those who were a committed relationship without legal recognition (see Table 7). Fathers in a legally recognized relationship reported participating in relatively similar amounts of household labor, M = 5.27, SD = .75, and wanting to divide their household labor in this fashion, M = 4.96, SD = .63, compared to the fathers who were not in a legally relationship, M = 5.30, SD = .74, M = 4.96, SD = .60, respectively. There were no

significant differences across legal status of the actual division of household labor, t (331) = -.34, p = .74, and ideal division of household labor, t (323) = -.05, p = .96. In contrast, fathers in a legally recognized relationship reported a more egalitarian division of actual childcare labor, M = 5.29, SD = 1.04, and ideal childcare labor, M = 5.05, SD = .63, compared to those who were not in a legally recognized relationship, M = 5.52, SD = 1.01, M = 5.24, SD = .71, respectively. There was a significant different across legal status for actual childcare labor, t (324) = -2.05, p = .04, and ideal childcare labor, t (315) = -2.51, p = .01.

To understand this finding further next I examined the association between legal relationship status and family type to ensure that this finding is representative of all gay father regardless of family type. Removing the men who had children in the context of a former heterosexual relationship, the association between division of childcare labor and relationship legal status disappears. Men who had children in the context of their current same-sex relationship reported an egalitarian division of actual childcare labor, M = 5.31, SD =1.03, and ideal childcare labor, M = 5.06, SD = .62, compared to those who were not in a legally recognized relationship, M = 5.32, SD = .90, M = 5.09, SD = .54, respectively. Men who had children in the context of a former heterosexual relationship and were in a legally recognized relationship reported a more egalitarian division of actual childcare labor, M = 4.95, SD =1.30, and ideal childcare labor, M = 4.68, SD = .79, compared to those who were not in a legally recognized relationship, M = 6.23, SD = 1.03, M = 5.76, SD = .95, respectively. There was a significant difference across legal status for actual childcare labor, t (45) = -2.76, p = .008, and ideal childcare labor, t (45) = -2.62, p = .01. It is important to note that the group of men who had children in the context of a former heterosexual relationship and were in a legally recognized relationship was a very small group (n = 6). In all, childcare but not household division of labor

differed based on the fathers' legal relationship recognition among fathers who had children in the context of a former heterosexual relationship. Specifically, these fathers in a legally recognized relationship reported being more egalitarian in their actual and ideal division of childcare labor.

Third, the role of family structure was examined by comparing the division of labor among the fathers who had their children in the context of a former heterosexual relationship (step-parented families) and those who had children through other methods (primary-parent families; see Table 8). There was a significant association between family structure and division of childcare labor, $r = .26$, $p < .001$, but not household labor, $r = .11$, $p = .05$ (see Table 10). Using independent t-tests, I explored the means of reported actual and ideal division of household and childcare division of labor by family type (step-parented families vs. primary-parent families). First, I explored household division of labor. Biological fathers who were in step-families reported completing a similar amount household labor $M = 5.43$, $SD = .81$, compared to the fathers not in step-families, $M = 5.26$, $SD = .73$. In addition, the biological fathers in step-families reported wanting to divide their household labor, $M = 5.13$, $SD = .59$, compared to the fathers who were not in step-families, $M = 4.95$, $SD = .61$. In all, Gay fathers in step-families reported a similar actual division of household labor, $t\ (331) = 1.49$, $p = .14$, and ideal division of household labor, $t\ (323) = 1.90$, $p = .06$. Next, I explored childcare division of labor. Biological fathers in step-families reported doing a significantly greater amount of the actual childcare labor, $M = 6.04$, $SD = 1.16$, and wanting to divide their childcare labor in this way, $M = 5.75$, $SD = .90$, compared to their peers from primary-parented families, $M = 5.31$, $SD = .97$, $M = 5.07$, $SD = .58$, respectively. Fathers in step-families reported significantly greater

specialization in childcare division of labor, t (324) = 4.63, $p < .001$, and they also described themselves as desiring such specialization, t (55.54) = 4.96, $p < .001$.

Lastly, variables from all three theories were added to a simultaneous multiple regression to explore which variables were the best predictors of household and childcare division of labor among gay fathers. This regression included relative resource theory variables (income and education), the time availability theory variable (hours worked per week in paid employment), and the life course theory variables (length of relationship, legal recognition of relationship, and family structure (step-family or planned gay fathered families). Using a simultaneous multiple regression model, no variables were significant predictors of household division of labor, $F_{6,312} = 1.33$, $p = .25$; $R^2 = .01$. For division of childcare labor, hours worked in paid employment and family type were significant predictors of the actual division of childcare labor, $F_{6,305} = 10.55$, $p < .001$; $R^2 = .16$. In sum, fathers who work fewer hours in paid employment reported performing more of the childcare labor in their homes. In addition, biological fathers in step-families reported that they had more responsibility for childcare labor (see Table 9).

Division of Labor and Individual, Couple, and Child Functioning

For the third aim of this study, associations between differences in actual and ideal division of household labor and childcare labor and parent well-being, couple functioning, and child adjustment were explored. First, correlational analyses were conducted to examine the associations between division of labor and the individual, couple and child outcome variables. Next, a series of hierarchical multiple regressions were conducted to predict individual functioning, couple functioning, and child adjustment. For each regression, the first step included demographic variables (father's age, total number of children, and age of eldest child), the second step included variables that were theoretically relevant to the division of labor (income,

education, hours worked per week in paid employment, length of relationship, legal recognition of relationship, and family structure), the third step included the actual division of labor score (household or childcare), and the last step included the division of labor discrepancy score (household or childcare). Two separate models were constructed for each outcome, one with household labor and one with childcare labor in the third and fourth step.

Parental well-being was explored by examining two dimensions: depressive symptoms and satisfaction with life. First, there was a significant association between the father's reported depressive symptomology and dissatisfaction with on household division of labor, $r = .33$, $p < .001$, and dissatisfaction with childcare division of labor, $r = .22$, $p = .005$. Fathers who reported greater dissatisfaction with division of household and childcare labor were more likely to report depressive symptoms. In addition, there was a significant association between the father's reported satisfaction with life and the household actual-ideal difference, $r = -.32$, $p < .001$, and childcare actual-ideal difference, $r = -.25$, $p = 001$. Fathers who reported greater discrepancies between their actual and ideal divisions of household and childcare labor reported experiencing less satisfaction with life (see Table 10).

Next, models were constructed to explore if the difference between actual and ideal division of household labor was predictive of gay fathers' reported depressive symptoms. Age, the total number of children, and child age were entered in the first step. Results showed that there were no significant predictors of depressive symptomology, $F_{3,131} = .42$, $p = .74$, $R^2 = .00$. For the second step, the variables theoretically predictive of division of labor were added to the model. In this step, age and length of current relationship were all statistically significant predictors of amount of depressive symptoms, although the model was not significant, $F_{9,125} = 1.55$, $p = .14$, $R^2 = .04$. In the third step, the actual household division of labor was added to the

model. Similarly, age and length of current relationship were all statistically significant predictors of amount of depressive symptoms, although the model was not significant, $F_{10,124}$ = 1.53, p = .14, R^2 = .04. In the last step, the household actual-ideal difference score was added to the model. In the final model, household actual-ideal difference was the only significant predictor of depressive symptomology, $F_{11,123}$ = 3.12, p = .001, R^2 = .15. This variable accounted for 15% of the variance in depressive symptoms (see Table 11). In sum, fathers who reported greater discrepancies between their actual and ideal division of household labor reported experiencing greater depressive symptomology.

Next, the same model was explored with childcare labor as the dependent variable. First, age, total number of children, and child age were entered in the first step. Results showed that none of the variables were significant predictors of depressive symptomology, $F_{3,130}$ = .14, p = .94, R^2 = .00. For the second step, the variables theoretically predictive of division of labor were added to the model. In this step, no variables were significant predictors of depressive symptoms, $F_{9,124}$ = 1.03, p = .42, R^2 = .00. In the third step, actual childcare division of labor was added to the model. In this step, age, length of current relationship, and actual childcare labor were statistically significant predictors of depressive symptoms, although the model was not significant, $F_{10,123}$ = 1.50, p = .19, R^2 = .04. In the last step, the childcare actual-ideal difference score was added to the model. In the final model, age and childcare actual-ideal difference were significant predictors of depressive symptomology, $F_{11,122}$ = 2.32, p = .02, R^2 = .10. These two variables accounted for 10% of the variance in depressive symptoms (see Table 12). In sum, older fathers who reported greater discrepancies between their actual and ideal division of childcare labor reported experiencing greater depressive symptomology.

Next, models were constructed to explore if the difference between actual and ideal division of household labor was predictive of gay fathers' reported satisfaction with life. To begin, age, total number of children, and child age were entered in the first step. Results showed that age of eldest child and number of children were significant predictors of life satisfaction among gay fathers, $F_{3,134} = 3.92$, $p = .01$, $R^2 = .06$. For the second step, the variables that were theoretically predictive of the division of labor were added to the model. Age of eldest child was a statistically significant predictor of the fathers' reported life satisfaction, $F_{9,128} = 2.19$, $p = .027$, $R^2 = .07$. In the third step, actual household division of labor was added to the model. In this step, actual household labor alone was a significant predictor of life satisfaction, $F_{10,127} = 2.47$, $p = .01$, $R^2 = .10$. In the last step, the household actual-ideal difference score was added to the model. In the final model, the household actual-ideal difference was the only significant predictor of the gay fathers' reported satisfaction with life, $F_{11,126} = 3.78$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .18$. Discrepancies in household actual-ideal division of labor accounted for 18% of the variance in reported satisfaction with life (see Table 11). In sum, fathers who reported fewer discrepancies between their actual and ideal division of household labor reported greater satisfaction with life.

Next, the same model was explored with childcare labor. First, age, total number of children, and child age were entered in the first step. Results showed that age of the eldest child was a significant predictor of reported satisfaction with life, $F_{3,132} = 3.83$, $p = .01$, $R^2 = .06$. For the second step, the variables that were theoretically predictive of division of labor were added to the model. Again, age of eldest child was a significant predictor of reported satisfaction with life, $F_{9,126} = 2.12$, $p = .03$, $R^2 = .07$. In the third step, actual childcare division of labor was added to the model. In this step, age of the eldest child and actual childcare labor were statistically significant predictors of satisfaction with life, $F_{10,125} = 3.42$, $p = .001$, $R^2 = .15$. In the last step,

the childcare actual-ideal difference score was added to the model. In the final model, only childcare actual-ideal difference was a significant predictor of satisfaction with life, $F_{11,124}$ = 4.58, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .23$. Discrepancies in childcare actual-ideal division of labor accounted for 23% of the variance in the fathers' reported satisfaction with life (see Table 12). In sum, fathers who reported fewer discrepancies between their actual and ideal division of childcare labor reported being more satisfied with life.

Next, I explored associations between different aspects of couple functioning and division of labor among these gay fathers. Couple functioning was explored by examining two dimensions: parenting alliance and relationship quality. First, there was a significant association between the fathers' reported parenting alliance and household actual-ideal difference, $r = -.38$, $p < .001$, and childcare actual-ideal difference, $r = -.32$, $p < .001$. Fathers who reported fewer discrepancies between their actual and ideal division of household labor and childcare labor reported experiencing a greater sense of alliance with their partner. In addition, there was a significant association between the father's reported relationship quality and household actual-ideal difference, $r = -.26$, $p < .001$, and childcare actual-ideal difference, $r = -.22$, $p < .001$. Fathers who reported fewer discrepancies between their actual and ideal division of household labor and childcare labor reported being more satisfied with their relationships (see Table 10).

Models were constructed to determine whether the difference between actual and ideal divisions of household labor were predictive of the alliance between the parents reported by the gay fathers. First, age, total number of children, and child age were entered in the first step. Results showed that number of children and age of eldest child were significant predictors of relationship quality, $F_{3,133} = 6.24$, $p = .001$, $R^2 = .10$. For the second step, the variables theoretically predictive of division of labor were added to the model. In this model, number of

children and age of eldest child were still statistically significant predictors of the quality of the alliance between the parents, $F_{9,127} = 3.10$, $p = .002$, $R^2 = .12$. In the third step, actual household division of labor was added to the model. In this step, only age of eldest child was a statistically significant predictor of parenting alliance, $F_{10,126} = 3.18$, $p = .001$, $R^2 = .14$. In the last step, the household actual-ideal difference score was added to the model. In the final model, age of eldest child and household actual-ideal difference were significant predictors of the gay fathers' reported parenting alliance, $F_{11,125} = 4.57$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .22$. These two variables accounted for 22% of the variance in the fathers' reported alliance with their partners (see Table 13). In sum, fathers who reported fewer discrepancies between their actual and ideal division of household and had younger children reported a stronger sense of parenting alliance.

Next, the same model was explored with childcare labor. First, age, total number of children, and child age were entered in the first step. Results showed that age of eldest child was a significant predictor of parenting alliance, $F_{3,130} = 5.74$, $p = .001$, $R^2 = .10$. For the second step, the variables theoretically predictive of division of labor were added to the model. Again, age of eldest child was a significant predictor of reported alliance between the parents, $F_{9,124} = 2.89$, $p = .004$, $R^2 = .11$. In the third step, actual childcare division of labor was added to the model. Similarly, age of eldest child, hours worked in paid employment, and actual childcare labor were significant predictors of reported parenting alliance, $F_{10,123} = 5.24$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .24$. In the last step, the childcare actual-ideal difference score was added to the model. In the final model, age of eldest child, actual childcare labor, and childcare actual-ideal difference were significant predictors of reported relationship quality, $F_{11,122} = 7.30$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .34$. These three variables accounted for 34% of the variance in reported relationship quality (see Table 12). In sum, fathers who reported fewer discrepancies between their actual and ideal division of childcare, had

younger children, and were performing less actual childcare labor reported greater alliance between the parents.

Next, models were constructed to determine whether the difference between actual and ideal divisions of household labor were predictive of the relationship quality reported by the gay fathers. First, age, total number of children, and child age were entered in the first step. Results showed that no variables were significant predictors of relationship quality, $F_{3,267} = .24$, $p = .87$, $R^2 = .00$. For the second step, the variables theoretically predictive of division of labor were added to the model. In this model, age, education, length of current relationship, and relationship legal status were statistically significant predictors of the quality of the parents' relationship, $F_{9,261} = 2.51$, $p = .009$, $R^2 = .05$. In the third step, actual household division of labor was added to the model. In this step, age, education, length of current relationship, relationship legal status, and actual household division of labor were statistically significant predictors of relationship quality, $F_{10,260} = 2.73$, $p = .003$, $R^2 = .06$. In the last step, the household actual-ideal difference score was added to the model. In the final model, age, education, length of current relationship, and household actual-ideal difference were significant predictors of the gay fathers' reported relationship quality, $F_{11,259} = 4.52$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .13$. These four variables accounted for 14% of the variance in the fathers' reported quality of the relationship with the partner (see Table 13). In sum, fathers who reported fewer discrepancies between their actual and ideal division of household, were older, had newer relationships, and were less educated reported experiencing greater relationship quality.

Next, the same model was explored with childcare labor. First, age, total number of children, and child age were entered in the first step. Results showed that no variables were significant predictors of relationship quality, $F_{3,264} = .26$, $p = .86$, $R^2 = .00$. For the second step,

the variables theoretically predictive of division of labor were added to the model. In this step, age, education, length of relationship, and relationship legal status were significant predictors of reported relationship quality, $F_{9,258} = 2.54$, $p = .008$, $R^2 = .05$. In the third step, actual childcare division of labor was added to the model. Similarly, age, education, length of relationship, and relationship legal status were significant predictors of reported relationship quality, $F_{10,257} = 2.56$, $p = .006$, $R^2 = .06$. In the last step, the childcare actual-ideal difference score was added to the model. In the final model, age, education, length of current relationship, and childcare actual-ideal difference were significant predictors of reported relationship quality, $F_{11,256} = 3.50$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .10$. These four variables accounted for 10% of the variance in reported relationship quality (see Table 12). In sum, fathers who reported fewer discrepancies between their actual and ideal division of childcare labor, were older, had newer relationships, and were less educated, reported experiencing greater relationship quality.

Last, I explored the relationship between division of labor and the fathers reports of children's behavior using the problem behavior scale of the Social Skills Rating System (SSRS). There was a significant association between the children's reported behavior and household actual-ideal difference, $r = .19$, $p = .02$, but there was no association with childcare actual-ideal difference, $r = .13$, $p = .11$. Fathers who reported greater discrepancies between their actual and ideal division of household labor, but not childcare labor, reported more frequent behavioral problems with their children (see Table 10).

Next, models were constructed to explore if the difference between actual and ideal division of household labor was predictive of child behavioral problems reported by gay fathers. First, age, total number of children, and child age were entered in the first step. Results showed that none of these variables were significant predictors of children's behavior, $F_{3,132} = 1.01$, $p =$

.39, R^2 = .00. For the second step, the variables theoretically predictive of division of labor were added to the model. Again, no variables were significant predictors of behavior, $F_{9,126}$ = .85, p = .57, R^2 = .00. In the third step, actual household division of labor was added to the model. Again, no variables were significant predictors of child behavior, $F_{10,125}$ = .86, p = .57, R^2 = .00. In the last step, the household actual-ideal difference score was added to the model. In the final model, no variables were significant predictors of behavior, $F_{11,124}$ = .94, p = .51, R^2 = .00 (see Table 15). In sum, discrepancies between the actual and ideal division of household labor were not predictive of children's behavior problems.

Next, the same model was explored with childcare labor. First, age, total number of children, and child age were entered in the first step. Results showed that no variables were significant predictors of children's behavior, $F_{3,132}$ = .74, p = .53, R^2 = .00. For the second step, the variables theoretically predictive of division of labor were added to the model. Again, results showed that no variables were significant predictors of child behavior, $F_{9,126}$ = .73, p = .68, R^2 = .00. In the third step, actual childcare division of labor was added to the model. Similarly, results showed that no variables were significant predictors of behavioral issues, $F_{10,125}$ = .69, p = .73, R^2 = .00. In the last step, the childcare actual-ideal difference score was added to the model. In the final model, no variables were significant predictors of children's behavior, $F_{11,124}$ = .74, p = .70, R^2 = .00. (see Table 16). In sum, discrepancies between their actual and ideal division of childcare labor were not predictive of behavior problems in children.

To summarize, gay fathers reported dividing their household and childcare labor in a generally egalitarian manner, and this division remained relatively stable over time. The findings were consistent with time-constraint theory and with some aspects of life course theory, but not with relative resource theory. Lastly, greater differences between actual and ideal division of

household and childcare labor were associated with more negative individual well-being and with more negative couple functioning but not with children's behavior.

Chapter 4: Discussion

Many gay men have become fathers (Gates et al., 2007; Gates, 2013), and many more have the desire to do so in the future (Riskind & Patterson, 2010). The majority of research on family and co-parenting dynamics has, however, focused on heterosexual parents. Division of labor, or how a couple works out who will perform different household and childcare tasks, is an important aspect to understand when exploring the family system. This study is the first to explore how a diverse group of gay fathers divides labor involved in household upkeep and childcare, factors associated with how this labor is divided, and associations of division of labor with individual, couple, and child functioning.

The first aim of the study was to replicate and extend past findings regarding division of labor patterns among gay fathers. Second, three theories of division of labor were examined to understand the factors associated with how household and childcare labor is divided among gay fathers. Lastly, associations between discrepancies between current and ideal division of labor, on the one hand, and parent well-being, couple functioning, and child adjustment, on the other, were explored.

Division of Labor Patterns

Prior research has consistently found that compared to heterosexual couples, lesbian and gay couples report that, on average, they divide their unpaid labor in a relatively egalitarian manner (e.g. Cowan & Cowan, 1992; Farr & Patterson, 2013; Goldberg et al., 2012; Gotta et al., 2011; Johnson & O'Connor, 2002; Patterson, Sutfin, & Fulcher, 2004). The gay fathers in this study also, on average, reported dividing their household and childcare labor in an egalitarian manner and preferring to divide their labor in this way. This replicates prior research on lesbian mothers and gay fathers (e.g., Farr & Patterson, 2013; Goldberg et al., 2012; Johnson &

O'Connor, 2002; Patterson, Sutfin, & Fulcher, 2004). In addition, the discrepancy between how they did divide labor and how they would ideally want to divide labor was relatively small. As with prior research, the gay fathers reported that they divided their unpaid labor in an egalitarian fashion and that they preferred to do it this way.

There are no prior research findings about how division of household and childcare labor patterns among gay fathers may change over short periods of time. Only one study has examined household division of labor over the transition to parenthood among lesbian mothers and it found no change over time (Goldberg & Perry-Jenkins, 2007). For gay fathers in this study, the division of household and childcare labor did not change significantly over a one year period. The one exception to this finding was a slight increase in the discrepancy between actual and ideal divisions of household labor over the one year time period. It is important to note that this difference was minor (M = .73 compared to M = .87) and was still close to zero, indicating a relatively small difference between actual and ideal division of labor. This slight increase could be due to the attrition of participants from Wave 1 to Wave 2. Approximately 52.5% of participants who participated in Wave 1 continued to participate in Wave 2. It is important to note that these analyses only included those who participated in both Waves. Overall, the division of labor patterns among gay fathers remained relatively stable over time.

Theories of Division of Labor

The second aim of the study was to explore three major theories about division of labor patterns among couples: the relative resource theory, the time-constraint theory, and the life course theory (e.g., Coltrane, 2000; Lachance-Grzela & Bouchard, 2010). These theories have previously been tested among heterosexual couples, with much less exploration among same-sex

couples. This study explored these three major theories as applied to the division of labor among gay fathers.

Relative resource theory states that the division of household and childcare labor within a couple is based on the resources of each partner (Blood & Wolfe, 1960). Specifically, among heterosexual couples, the individual - traditionally the male - with the greater income and educational attainment is less likely to participate in the household and childcare division of labor (e.g., Cunningham, 2007; Pinto & Coltrane, 2009; Mannino & Deutsch, 2007). For the gay fathers in this study, results showed that providing more of the household income or having greater educational attainment was not associated with the amount of household and childcare labor that men performed. These results are consistent with the limited research on relative resource theory as it relates to division of labor among lesbian and gay couples (e.g., Chan, Brooks, Raboy, & Patterson, 1998; Kurdek, 1993; Patterson, Sutfin, & Fulcher, 2004; Sutphin, 2010). In a direct comparison of childless heterosexual, lesbian, and gay couples, Kurdek (1993) found that income was related to the amount of unpaid labor participation among heterosexual but not among lesbian or gay male couples. No previous research has examined the association between division of labor and educational attainment among gay fathers. Chan and colleagues (1998) found that lesbian couples - but not heterosexual couples - divided their unpaid labor relatively equally regardless of educational attainment. Some have hypothesized that lack of support for relative resource theory among same-sex couples could be due to smaller gaps in individual income, educational attainment, and gender roles between members of same-sex couples (Patterson, et al., 2004; Sutphin, 2010). Among gay fathers in the current sample, the majority of participants (84.7%) and their partners (76.4%) had received a Bachelor’s Degree or higher and there was no significant difference within couples between participant and partner

individual income. In sum, consistent with findings from earlier research, gay fathers' income and educational attainment were not associated with their division of labor.

In contrast to relative resource theory, time-constraint theory did predict childcare but not household division of labor patterns among these gay fathers. Time-constraint theory is based on the idea that the individual in the couple who works fewer hours in paid employment outside the home will perform more of the unpaid labor in the home (e.g., Artis & Pavalko, 2003; Coverman, 1985). Research investigating this theory has had mixed results for both heterosexual and same-sex couples (e.g., Chan, et al., 1998; Goldberg & Perry-Jenkins, 2007; Kurdek, 1993).

For heterosexual couples, employment has been found to be associated with the amount of unpaid labor performed in the home (Bianchi, Milkie, Sayer, & Robinson, 2000). Specifically, the more hours that heterosexual women work outside the home, the less unpaid labor they report performing at home (e.g., Mannino & Deuthsch, 2007; Pinto & Coltrane, 2009). Even when hours in paid employment outside the home were exactly the same for men and women in heterosexual couples, women still perform more household and childcare labor (e.g., Bartley et al., 2005; Hochschild, 1989; Lincoln, 2008; Neal et al., 1993).

Research findings supporting time-constraint theory among same-sex couples have been less consistent (e.g., Chan, et al., 1998; Goldberg, 2012; Goldberg & Perry-Jenkins, 2007; Kurdek, 1993; Patterson, 1995). Some research comparing heterosexual and same-sex couples has found that for heterosexual couples (but not same-sex couples), hours worked in paid employment was associated with division of unpaid labor (Chan, et al., 1998; Goldberg & Perry-Jenkins, 2007; Kurdek, 1993). In interviews with gay fathers, Goldberg (2012) found that they wanted to divide their unpaid labor in a fairly egalitarian manner but due to one partner's paid employment, they fell back on specialization. Time-constraint theory was supported in the

current sample in that gay fathers who were working more outside the home did not perform as much childcare as their partners.

The last theory examined was life course theory. Life course theory suggests that experiences across the life course can have differential impacts on the individual at different points (Elder, 1998). The life experiences that were examined among gay fathers in this study were the couple's legal relationship recognition, length of romantic relationship, and the presence or absence of a step-parent. I will review the findings of this study as they relate to the literature in this area for each life course dimension examined.

There is little research examining division of labor patterns of same-sex couples as a function of the length of their romantic relationship. Research on heterosexual couples has found that the longer a couple has been together, the greater the specialization of their division of labor (Miller & Sassler, 2010). Although, Kurdek (2005) proposed that this same pattern might exist for same-sex couples, this notion has never been empirically tested among same-sex couples. In the present study, men who were in relationships longer reported less specialization in their childcare labor. The same was not, however, true for household labor. This study did not examine the couple's division of labor over the life of their relationship but collected data at two time points that were one year apart. It would be helpful to examine the division of labor of couples employ at the beginning of their relationship and trace possible change over longer periods of time.

Very little research has examined the association between legal relationship recognition of same-sex couple relationships and their division of labor (Solomon et al., 2005). Among heterosexual couples, marriage has been associated with more traditional division of labor patterns (e.g., Davis et al., 2007; South & Spritze, 1994; Stafford, Bechman, & Dibona, 1977).

For the gay fathers in this study there was no difference in household division of labor patterns based on marital status. However, there was a significant difference in childcare division of labor. In contrast to the research on married heterosexual couples, married same-sex couples reported being more egalitarian than unmarried couples in their childcare division of labor. However, this finding disappeared after data from men who had children within the context of a former heterosexual relationship were removed. For these men, being in a step-family with a legally recognized relationship was associated with having a more egalitarian division of childcare labor. Although it should be noted that the sample of men in step-families with a legally recognized relationship was extremely small (n = 6). This topic is ripe for future research.

Only one study to date has examined the association between division of labor and legal recognition of relationships (Solomon et al., 2005). Solomon and colleagues (2005) found differences in household division of labor among heterosexual married compared to unmarried couples, but not among the same-sex couples in vs. not in legally recognized civil unions. These results should be interpreted with caution since same-sex couples who can marry legally in the U.S. are a select group. These couples must be living in the few states that granted legal recognition at the time of data collection and would have entered into a union that is recognized at the state – but not the federal - level. Even with these selection issues, gay fathers who were in legally recognized relationships divided their childcare labor in a more egalitarian fashion, which is in direct contrast to results for heterosexual married couples. Further research should be done to examine this provocative finding.

Lastly I compared division of labor patterns among men who had children in the context of a prior heterosexual relationship and were subsequently in a same-sex relationship. These were de facto step-family situations. Gay fathers in same-sex de facto step-families reported

being less egalitarian in their childcare but not household tasks compared to fathers who had children in the context of a same-sex relationship. A limited amount of research has examined step-families and division of labor, but from this limited work it seems clear that family structure is important among both heterosexual (Demo & Acock, 1993; Ishii-Kuntz & Coltrane, 1992a) and same-sex couples (Crosbie-Burnett & Helmbrecht, 1993; Moore, 2008). Ishii-Kuntz and Coltrane (1992a) found that heterosexual fathers who had biological children and later remarried participated in more of the household labor. In a qualitative study of black lesbian de facto step-families, Moore (2008) found that biological mothers reported preforming more of the household and childcare tasks than did step-mothers. As with other families, the gay male step-parents in the current study reported performing less childcare but reported a more egalitarian pattern for household labor.

Overall, the results did not support relative resource theory (e.g., Chan et al., 1998; Kurdek, 1993; Patterson et al., 2004) but were consistent with time-constraint theory (e.g., Goldberg, 2012; Patterson, 1995) and also some aspects of life course theory (e.g., Moore, 2008; Solomon et al., 2005). None of the theories were successful in predicting household division of labor. Although biological fathers in step-family situations tended to perform more household labor, the overall model was not significant. In contrast, for childcare labor, both the number of hours worked in paid employment and the family type were significant predictors of division of labor. As with previous research, working less time outside the home (e.g., Goldberg, 2012; Patterson, 1995) and being the biological father in a step-family (Moore, 2008) were predictive of doing more of the unpaid labor involved in childcare. From a theoretical perspective, time-constraint theory and life course theory both helped to explain how unpaid childcare labor is divided in families headed by gay fathers, but neither was entirely successful.

Division of Labor and Individual, Couple, and Child Functioning

The third aim of the study was to explore the degree to which discrepancies among the current and ideal division of household and childcare labor were associated with parental well-being, couple functioning, and children's adjustment. Prior research has found an association between division of childcare and household labor inequalities and negative individual well-being, poor relationship functioning, and children's problematic behavior (reviewed in Coltrane, 2000; Lachance-Grzela & Bouchard, 2010). This study replicated and extended many of these findings.

Research has found an association between unequal division of labor and negative individual well-being within heterosexual couples (e.g., Biehle & Mickelson, 2012; Coltrane, 2000; Goldberg & Perry-Jenkins, 2004). There have been mixed results in a small number of studies exploring unequal division of labor and well-being among same-sex couples (e.g., Goldberg & Smith, 2008; Kurdek, 1993). Kurdek (1993) explored the association between division of labor and psychological well-being among heterosexual, lesbian, and gay male couples. He found that for heterosexual women, performing a larger share of the household labor was associated with more psychological symptoms, but for lesbian women it was associated with fewer psychological symptoms. In addition, Kurdek (1993) found no association between well-being and the division of labor among gay men. Similarly, Goldberg and Smith (2008) found that perceived unfairness surrounding household - but not childcare - labor was associated with a diminished sense of well-being among lesbian couples. In this study I explored two dimensions of well-being: fathers' reports of depressive symptoms and the level of satisfaction with life. In general, greater perceived inequality in how the fathers divided their household and childcare labor was associated with the fathers' overall decreased sense of well-being.

For gay fathers in this study, those who reported greater inequality in both household and childcare division of labor reported greater depressive symptoms. There could be a number of reasons for why these results differ from those of prior research. First, some studies (e.g., Kurdek, 1993) examined household division of labor among childless couples. Having children increases the amount of both household and childcare tasks that need to be performed; therefore the experiences of childless couples could be different from those of couples with children. Goldberg and Smith (2008) explored perceived inequalities of the division of labor over the transition to parenthood. They found that household inequalities, but not childcare inequalities, before the birth of a child were associated with greater anxiety after the birth of the child. The differences in findings across these studies might have been due to differences among outcomes (i.e., anxiety vs. depressive symptoms). For example, anxiety is defined as excessive worry or fear, while depression is defined as having less interest than usual in aspects of the individual's life along with experiencing a depressed mood (American Psychiatric Association, 2000). In addition, Goldberg and Smith (2008) only explored the experiences of lesbian mothers, not gay fathers, which could possibly account for differences in findings. Future research examining separate dimensions of well-being as related to perceived inequalities in division of labor would be beneficial.

The second dimension of individual well-being that was explored was the fathers' overall satisfaction with life. This dimension of well-being is very different from psychological symptoms of depression or anxiety. This measure allows for an overall description of the fathers' levels of satisfaction with their current life situation without exploring their psychological functioning per se. Kurdek (1993) measured psychological symptoms, specifically depressive symptoms and overall psychological distress, while Goldberg and Smith (2008) measured

anxiety. Neither explored the participants' overall satisfaction with life. Individuals can be psychologically stressed but not necessarily dissatisfied with life. The examination of the participant's overall satisfaction with life thus adds a dimension of experience that has not been explored among same-sex couples.

For these gay fathers, perceived inequality in both household and childcare labor were associated with their reported satisfaction with life. Fathers who reported experiencing inequalities between their actual and ideal division of their household and childcare labor reported less satisfaction with life overall. Again, Kurdek (1993) explored the actual division of household labor among childless couples, not perceived inequalities, and did not explore childcare labor specifically. Goldberg and Smith (2008) did explore perceived inequality and reported similar findings. They found that inequalities in household but not childcare labor were associated with lower levels of anxiety. The differences in the results of this study compared to those of prior research are probably due to slight differences in outcomes measured, population examined, and type of division of labor examined. In all, regardless of slight differences in methodology, the overall findings are similar. Greater discrepancies between actual and ideal division of household and childcare labor were associated with lower overall wellbeing among gay fathers in this study.

Next, I explored associations between division of labor and couple functioning. Prior research has found that greater satisfaction in division of labor is associated with more favorable couple functioning among heterosexual couples (e.g., Blair, 1998; Coltrane, 2000; Frisco & Williams, 2003; Grote & Clark, 2001) and same-sex couples (e.g., Chan, et al., 1998; Downer & Mendez, 2005; McBride & Rane, 1998; Sutphin, 2010). Among heterosexual couples, dissatisfaction with division of unpaid labor has been found to be related to lower marital quality

(e.g., Biehle & Mickelson, 2012; Grote and Clark, 2001; Suitor, 1991), higher rates of separation and divorce (Frisco and Williams, 2003), and poor parenting alliance (e.g., Downer & Mendez, 2005; McBride and Rane, 1998). In this study, I explored two dimensions of couple functioning: report of relationship adjustment and parenting alliance. As hypothesized, greater perceived inequality in fathers' division of household and childcare labor was associated with poorer relationship functioning.

The first dimension of relationship functioning explored was the fathers' reported overall relationship quality. Much of the research in this area has focused on heterosexual couples (e.g., Coltrane, 2000) with much less attention paid to same-sex couples (e.g., Chan et al., 1998; Sutphin, 2010). Overall, the findings have been very consistent. Couples with greater perceived inequality in division of labor have reported lower relationship quality (e.g., Chan et al., 1998; Coltrane, 2000; Sutphin, 2010). Chan and colleagues (1998) found that, among lesbian couples, those who were more satisfied with division of labor also reported greater relationship adjustment. Sutphin (2010) found similar results among both male and female same-sex couples. These results are not surprising. Couples who believe that the division of household and childcare labor is fair and equal are more likely to feel better about the quality of their couple relationship.

There were additional variables which were important predictors of relationship adjustment: romantic relationship length and legal recognition of romantic relationship. Fathers who had been in their romantic relationship for a shorter period of time and those who had a legally recognized relationship reported experiencing more positive relationship adjustment. Consistent with these findings, prior research has found a decline in relationship quality over time among heterosexual and same-sex couples (e.g., Kurdek, 2005). Second, for these gay

fathers, having a legally recognized relationship was associated with greater relationship adjustment. Directionality of this association is difficult to determine. Is it that those who experience an enhanced sense of relationship adjustment are more likely to legalize their relationship, or is it that legal recognition helps solidify the relationship by giving the couple legal protections, which in turn improves relationship adjustment? Or both? Further exploration into the associations among these variables is needed.

The second dimension of relationship functioning examined here was parenting alliance. Parenting alliance is often described as how the parents work as a team in their parental roles. Some scholars have urged researchers to differentiate between relationship satisfaction or quality and the parenting alliance (Abidin, 1995). Very little research has explored the association between parenting alliance and inequalities in division of labor among heterosexual couples (e.g., Downer & Mendez, 2005; McBride and Rane, 1998) and no studies to date have explored this association among same-sex couples.

For the fathers in this study, smaller discrepancies between actual and ideal division of both household and childcare labor were associated with a greater sense of alliance between members of the couple. Parenting alliance is an aspect of the couple's relationship functioning which is directly connected to their parenting and children's functioning. Specifically, parenting alliance is described as how parents work together in their parenting role in order to meet the needs of their children. In this study, couples who perceived greater inequality in their division of unpaid labor experienced a weaker alliance. Although this finding held for both household and childcare, discrepancies in childcare division of labor accounted for a greater amount of the variance when compared to discrepancies in household unpaid labor. In addition, fathers who performed more childcare labor reported stronger alliance with their partners. These findings

replicate the limited amount of research on heterosexual parents which has found that parental involvement, particularly fathers' involvement in childcare activities, is associated with a stronger alliance between the parents. Future research should explore how the alliance between the parents and division of labor interact with additional aspects of the parental relationship.

In addition to the findings regarding inequalities in the division of labor, other factors such as age of children were associated with the fathers' parenting alliance. Having younger children was associated with a stronger alliance between the parents. This is an interesting result that has not been explored in great detail in the literature. It is not clear why this finding emerged. Are parents are more likely to disagree on parenting techniques with teenagers compared to infants? Again, this is an interesting finding which requires further exploration.

Lastly, I explored the association between children's adjustment and discrepancies between actual and ideal division of labor. For the gay fathers in the present study, the actual division of household and childcare labor was not associated with measures of children's adjustment. Contrary to the hypothesis of this study but consistent with results of prior research, discrepancies between actual and ideal household and childcare division of labor did not predict children's adjustment. It could be that division of labor is not directly related to children's adjustment but that variables associated with division of labor, such as individual well-being or levels of couple functioning, matter more. In addition, it could be that other aspects of childhood growth, such as social development, but not behavioral adjustment, were associated with division of labor. In sum, discrepancies in household and childcare division of labor were not directly associated with the children's behavioral outcomes.

Contributions and Implications

This study provides valuable information about the division of labor and co-parenting dynamics of gay father families. Many gay men are currently fathers, and many more want to become parents in the future (Gates, et al., 2007; Gates, 2013; Riskind and Patterson, 2010). Research on the experiences of gay fathers is limited, and this study is the first to explore the relevance of different theories to division of labor among gay father families. Evaluating how these variables relate to a family's allocation of unpaid labor is an important aspect of understanding how gay father families work. This empirical information about factors that are associated with how gay fathers structure their families helps to deepen our understanding of these families. These results can also inform social and political debates regarding sexual orientation, gender roles, and fatherhood.

In addition, this study has provided information about family and co-parenting dynamics, along with child adjustment in families headed by gay fathers. The results of this study add to the growing body of knowledge about family and couple dynamics among families headed by gay fathers. This study explored how division of childcare and household labor relates to multiple levels of functioning within these families. To date, this is the first study to explore gay fathers' well-being, couple functioning, and child adjustment as they relate to the division of household and childcare unpaid labor. Similar to findings with heterosexual couples, disagreement regarding how unpaid labor is divided is associated with less overall well-being and the poorer relationship functioning. Specifically, inequalities in division of labor among gay fathers were associated with their reports of greater depressive symptoms and less satisfaction with their life overall. Gay fathers who reported greater disparities between actual and ideal division of labor also reported poorer relationship quality and lower parenting alliances. This knowledge will be

helpful for providers, such as healthcare providers, social workers, counselors, and therapists to acknowledge when working with these families.

Limitations, Strengths, and Future Research

Some limitations of the current study should be acknowledged. First, this study used self-report survey methodology to collect information. Carrington (1999) has argued that survey measures may not be the most accurate way to measure division of labor among couples. He has suggested that couples would show less egalitarian division of labor if they were being observed directly rather than asked to tell about division of labor. Some researchers have, however, found that couples' self-reports of their division of labor are similar to observed behavior (Farr & Patterson, 2013). Future research in this area would benefit from employing both qualitative and quantitative methodologies along with both self-report and observational measures.

A second limitation was that data were collected from only one of the fathers in each couple. Therefore, only the experiences of the partners surveyed are reported here, and their experiences may not reflect with equal accuracy the experiences of both members of the couple. While most of the research on division of labor has found moderate agreement between members of a couple (e.g., Farr & Patterson, 2013; Patterson et al., 2004) it would be best to collect data from multiple respondents in the family. In addition, for some variables, such as children's adjustment, it would be beneficial to have a third party such as a teacher from whom information could be gathered. Future research should utilize multiple respondents for each family.

The generalizability of findings from this sample to all gay fathers or same-sex parents must also be considered with caution. These gay fathers responded to advertisements sent in emails, published in newsletters, and placed on websites of gay/bisexual family-friendly organizations. This sample would thus not include those who had limited access to the internet or

those who did not have the time to participate in a 30-40 minute survey. In addition, this study included only respondents who identified as gay, not bisexual. Only the respondent was asked about this personal sexual orientation. The sexual orientation of the non-participating partner was unknown. Future research should use varying recruitment techniques and strive to obtain a more diverse sample of gay fathers.

This study also had a number of strengths. First, this study added knowledge to the limited amount of information on gay fathers and their families. The majority of research on families, parents, and children focuses on heterosexual parents. Of the research that does exist on same-sex parenting, the majority focuses on lesbian mothers. This study added to knowledge about gay fathers. In addition, this was one of the largest studies to date exploring the division of labor and family functioning of families headed by male same-sex parents. The larger sample size allowed for the use of more statistical controls in the models, and this enhanced understanding of the results.

A second strength is the diversity of the sample. The use of internet data collection allowed for recruitment of participants from across the United States. In addition, these fathers differed from one another across many demographic variables. Participants ranged in age from 25 to 64 years, which allowed for variation in experiences of parenthood. The men created their families in many different ways, from having children in the context of a former heterosexual relationship to having children in the context of a same-sex relationship through surrogacy or adoption. The children ranged in age from newborns to 18 years of age and were racially diverse. This variation across the sample allowed for important variables to be controlled and provided a more complete picture of the experience of gay fathers and their families.

This study also collected multiple measures of related constructs. Both household and childcare division of labor were examined separately to preserve any differences between the two types of labor. This study also examined different dimensions of parental well-being and couple functioning. In addition, the longitudinal design of this research allows for reliability estimates of some of the measures used in this study. Thus, the study added to knowledge about gay fathers in all of these areas.

In addition to the suggestions for future research already mentioned, there are some additional directions which should be considered. Research should examine these families over longer periods of time in a longitudinal study. The division of labor over time and its associations with the experiences of gay fathers and their children should be studied. For example, research has yet to examine how division of labor may be associated with different aspects of childhood development over time. Does having same-sex parents who divide their unpaid labor in a more egalitarian fashion have a long term impact on children's development? Do changing developmental needs of children affect division of labor patterns in the family? If so, how do these changes affect the dynamics of the couple and family system? Longitudinal studies of gay fathers and their family would be valuable.

Conclusion

This study is the first to explore the division of household and childcare labor patterns among gay fathers along with associations among division of labor and individual, couple, and child outcomes. In all, gay fathers reported having and desiring an egalitarian division of unpaid labor. They also reported that this pattern was stable over one year's time. There was no support for relative resource theory, but the results were consistent with the time-availability theory along with some aspects of the life course theory. Discrepancies among the actual and ideal

division of household and childcare labor were significantly associated with fathers' individual well-being and couples' relationship functioning, but were not associated with children's adjustment. In all, division of labor among gay fathers is an important aspect of the daily lives of gay father families, and results of the current study deepened our understanding of it.

References

Abidin, R. R. (1995). *Parenting Stress Index* (3rd ed.). Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Abidin, R. R., & Brunner, J. F. (1995). Development of a Parenting Alliance Inventory. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 24*, 31-40. doi: 10.1207/s15374424jccp2401_4

American Psychiatric Association. (2000). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (4th ed., text rev.).* Washington, DC: Author.

Artis, J. E., & Pavalko, E. K. (2003). Explaining the decline in women`s household labor: Individual change and cohort differences. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 65,* 746-761. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2003.00746.x

Bailey, J. M., Bobrow, D., Wolfe, M., & Mikach, S. (1995). Sexual orientation of adult sons of gay fathers. *Developmental Psychology, 31,* 124-129. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.31.1.124

Barnett, R. C., & Baruch, G. K. (1987). Determinants of fathers` participation in family work. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 49*, 29-40.

Bartley, S. J., Blanton, P. W., & Gilliard, J. L. (2005). Husbands and wives in dual-earner marriages: Decision-making, gender role attitudes, division of household labor, and equity. *Marriage and Family Review, 37*, 69-94. doi: 10.1300/J002v37n04_05

Barrett, H., & Tasker, F. (2001). Growing up with a gay parent: Views of 101 gay fathers on their sons' and daughters' experiences. *Educational and Child Psychology, 18,* 62-77.

Bergman, K., Rubio, R. J., Green, R. J., & Padron, E. (2010). Gay men who become fathers via surrogacy: The transition to parenthood. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies, 6,* 111-141. doi: 10.1080/15504281003704942

Berkowitz, D., (2013). Gay men and surrogacy. In Goldberg, A. E., & Allen, K. R. (Eds.), *LGBT-parent families* (71-85). New York: Springer.

Berkowitz, D., & Marsiglio, W. (2007). Gay men: Negotiating procreative, father, and family identities. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 69,* 366-381. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2007.00371.x

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: 10.1093/sf/79.1.191

Biehle, S. N. & Mickelson, K. D. (2012). First-time parents' expectations about the division of childcare and play. *Journal of Family Psychology, 26,* 36-45. doi: 10.1037/a0026608

Bigner, J., & Jacobsen, R. B. (1989a). The value of children for gay versus nongay fathers. *Journal of Homosexuality, 18,* 163-172. doi: 10.1300/J082v18n01_08

Bigner, J., & Jacobsen, R. B. (1989b). Parenting behaviors of homosexual and heterosexual fathers. *Journal of Homosexuality, 18,* 173-186. doi: 10.1300/J082v18n01_09

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: 10.1086/378341

Bird, C. E. (1999). Gender, household labor, and psychological distress: The impact of the amount and division of housework. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 40,* 32-45.

Blair, S. L. & Lichter, D. T. (1992). Wives' perception of the fairness of the division of labor: The intersection of housework and ideology. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 54,* 570-581.

Blair, S. L. (1998). Work roles, domestic roles, and marital quality: Perceptions of fairness among dual-earner couples. *Social Justice Research, 11,* 313-335. doi: 10.1023/A:1023290917535

Blood, R. O., & Wolfe, D. M. (1960). *Husbands & wives: The dynamic of married living.* New York: Free Press.

Blumstein, P., & Schwartz, P. (1983). *American couples: Money, work, sex.* New York: Morrow.

Bos, H. H. M. W. (2010). Planned gay father families in kinship arrangements. *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Family Therapy, 31,* 356-371. doi: 10.1375/anft.31.4.356

Bozett, F. W. (1987). Children of gay fathers. In Bozell F. W. (ed.) *Gay and Lesbian Parents.* New York, NY: Praeger, 39-57.

Carrington, C. (1999). *No place like home: Relationships and family life among lesbians and gay men.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Chan, R. W., Brooks, R. C., Raboy, B., & Patterson, C. J. (1998). Division of labor lesbian and heterosexual parents: Associations with children`s adjustment. *Journal of Family Psychology, 12,* 402-419.

Claffey, S. T., & Mickelson, K. D. (2009). Division of household labor and distress: The role of perceived fairness for employed mothers. *Sex Roles*, 60, 819-831. Doi: 10.1007/s11199-008-9578-0

Coltrane, S. (1990). Birth timing and the division of labor in dual-earner families: Exploratory findings and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Family Issues, 11,*157-181. doi: 10.1177/019251390011002003

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: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.01208.x

Coverman, S. (1985). Explaining husbands` participation in domestic labor. *The Sociological Quarterly, 26,* 81-97. doi: 10.1111/j.1533-8525.1985.tb00217.x

Cowan, C. P., & Cowan, P. A. (1992). *When partners become parents: The big life change for couples.* New York: Basic Books**.**

Crosbie-Burnett, M. & Halmbrecht, L. (1993). A descriptive empirical study of gay male stepfamilies. *Family Relations, 42, 256-262.*

Cunningham, M. (2007). Influences of women`s employment on the gendered division of household labor over the life course: Evidence from a 31-year panel study. *Journal of Family Issues, 28,* 422-444. doi: 10.1177/0192513X06295198

Davis, S.N., & Greenstein, T.N. (2004). Cross-national variation in the division of household labor. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 66,* 1260-1271. doi: 10.1111/j.0022-2445.2004.00091.x

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: 10.1177/0192513X07300968

Demo, D. H., & Acock, A. C. (1993). Family diversity and the division of domestic labor: How much have things really changed? *Family Relations, 42,* 323-331.

Dempsey, D. (2012). More like a donor or more like a father? Gay men's concepts of relatedness to children. *Sexualities, 15,* 156-174. doi: 10.1177/1363460711433735

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: 10.1207/s15327752jpa4901_13

Downer, J. & Mendez, J.L. (2005). African American father involvement and preschool children's school readiness. *Early Education and Development, 16,* 317-339. doi:

10.1207/s15566935eed1603_2

Elder, G. H. (1998). The life course as developmental theory. *Child Development, 69,* 1- 12. doi: 10.2307/1132065

Erdfelder, E., Faul, F., & Buchner, A. (1996). GPOWER: A general power analysis program. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers, 28,* 1-11. doi: 10.3758/BF03203630

Erich, S., Leung, P., & Kindle, P. (2005). A comparative analysis of adoptive family functioning with gay, lesbian, and heterosexual parents and their children. *Journal of GLBT Families Studies, 1,* 43-60. doi: 10.1300/J461v01n04_03

Erickson, R. J. (2005). Why emotion work matters: Sex, gender, and the division of household labor. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 67,* 337-351. doi: 10.1111/j.0022-2445.2005.00120.x

Farr, R. H., Forssell, S. L., & Patterson, C. J. (2009). Parenting and child development in adoptive families: Does parental sexual orientation matter? *Applied Developmental Science, 14,* 164-178. doi: 10.1080/10888691.2010.500958

Farr, R. H., Forssell, S. L., & Patterson, C. J. (2010). Gay, lesbian, and heterosexual adoptive parents: Couple and relationship issues. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies, 6,* 199-213. doi: 10.1080/15504281003705436

Farr, R. H., & Patterson, C. J. (2013). Coparenting among lesbian, gay, and heterosexual couples: Associations with adopted children's outcomes. *Child Development, 84,* 1226-1240. doi: 10.1111/cdev.12046

Frisco, M.L., & Williams, K. (2003). Perceived housework equity, marital happiness, and divorce in dual-earner households. *Journal of family issues, 24*, 51-73. doi: 10.1177/0192513X02238520

Fulcher, M., Sutfin, E. L., & Patterson, C. J. (2008). Individual differences in gender development: Associations with parental sexual orientation, attitudes, and division of labor. *Sex Roles, 58,* 330-341. doi: 10.1007/s11199-007-9348-4

Fuwa, M. (2004). Macro-level gender inequality and the division of household labor in 22 countries. *American Sociological Review, 69,* 751-767. doi: 10.1177/000312240406900601

Fuwa, M., & Cohen, P.N. (2007). Housework and social policy. *Social Science Research, 36,* 512-530. doi: 10.1016/j.ssresearch.2006.04.005

Gates, G. J. (2013). *LGBT Parenting in the United States.* The Williams Institute, UCLA School of Law, UC Los Angeles.

Gates, G. J., Badgett, M. V. L., Macomber, J. E., & Chambers, K. (2007). *Adoption and foster care by gay and lesbian parents in the United States.* The Williams Institute, UCLA School of Law, UC Los Angeles.

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

Goldberg, A. E. (2012). *Gay men becoming dads.* New York: New York University Press.

Goldberg, A. E., & Allen, K. R. (Eds.). (2013). *LGBT-parent families.* New York: Springer.

Goldberg, A. E., & Perry-Jenkins, M. (2004). Division of labor and working-class women's well-being across the transition to parenthood. *Journal of Family Psychology, 18,* 225-236. doi: 10.1037/0893-3200.18.1.225

Goldberg, A. E., & Perry-Jenkins, M. (2007). The division of labor and perceptions of parental roles: Lesbian couples across the transition to parenthood. *Journal of social and personal relationships, 24,* 297-318. doi: 10.1177/0265407507075415

Goldberg, A. E., & Smith, J. Z. (2008). The social context of lesbian mothers' anxiety during early parenthood. *Parenting: Science and Practice, 8,* 213-239. doi: 10.1080/15295190802204801

Goldberg, A. E., Smith, J. Z., & Perry-Jenkins, M. (2012). The division of labor in lesbian, gay, and heterosexual new adoptive parents. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 74,* 812-828. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2012.00992.x

Golding, J. M. (1990). Division of household labor, strain, and depressive symptoms among Mexican Americans and Non-Hispanic Whites. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 14,* 103-117. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.1990.tb00007.x

Golombok, S., & Tasker, F. (2010). Gay fathers. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (5th ed.). New York: John Wiley.

Goode, W. J. (1960). The theory of role strain. *American Sociological Review, 25,* 483-496.

Gotta, G., Green, R. J., Rothblum, E., Solomon, S., Balsam, K., & Schwartz, P. (2011). Heterosexual, lesbian, and gay male relationships: A comparison of couples in 1975 and 2000. *Family Process, 50,* 353-376. doi: 10.1111/j.1545-5300.2011.01365.x

Greenstein, T.N. (2009). National context, family satisfaction, and fairness in the division of household labor. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 71,* 1039-1051. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2009.00651.x

Gresham, F. M., & Elliott, S. N. (1990). *Social Skills Rating System Manual.* American Guidance Service, Inc.

Grote, N.K., & Clark, M.S. (2001). Perceiving unfairness in the family: Cause or consequence of marital distress? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80,* 281-293. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.80.2.281

Hochschild, A. (1989). *The Second Shift.* New York, NY: Viking Penguin, Inc.

Ishii-Kuntz, M. & Coltrane, S. (1992a). Remarriage, stepparenting, and household labor. *Journal of Family Issues, 13,* 215-233. doi: 10.1177/019251392013002006

Ishii-Kuntz, M., & Coltrane, S. (1992b). Predicting the sharing of household labor: Are parenting and housework distinct? *Sociological Perspectives, 35,* 629-647. doi: 10.2307/1389302

Johnson, S. M., & O'Connor, E. (2002). *The gay baby boom: the psychology of gay parenthood.* New York, NY: New York University Press.

Kamo, Y., & Cohen, E. (1998). Division of household work between partners: A comparison of black and white couples. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies,* 131-145.

Knudsen, K., & Waerness, K. (2008). National context and spouses` housework in 34 countries. *European Sociological Review, 24,* 97-113. doi: 10.1093/esr/jcm037

Krause, N., & Markides, K. S. (1985). Employment and psychological well-being in Mexican American women, *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 26,* 15-26.

Kroska, A. (2004). Divisions of domestic work: Revising and expanding the theoretical explanations. *Journal of Family Issues, 25,* 900-932. doi: 10.1177/0192513X04267149

Kurdek, L. A. (1993). The allocation of household labor in gay, lesbian, and heterosexual married couples. *Journal of Social Issues, 49,* 127-139.

Kurdek, L. A. (2005). What do we know about gay and lesbian couples? *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 14,* 251-254. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.1993.tb01172.x

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: 10.1007/s11199-010-9797-z

Lincoln, A. E. (2008). Gender, productivity, and the marital wage premium. *Journal of marriage and family, 70,* 806-814. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2008.00523.x

Mallon, G. P. (2004). *Gay men choosing parenthood.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Mannino, C.A., & Deutsch, F.M. (2007). Changing the division of household labor: A negotiated process between partners. *Sex Roles, 56,* 309-324. doi: 10.1007/s11199-006-9181-1

McBride, B. A. & Rane, T. R. (1998). Parenting alliance as a predictor of father involvement: An exploratory study. *Family Relations, 47,* 229-236.

McPherson, D. (1993). Gay parenting couples: Parenting arrangements, arrangement satisfaction, and relationship satisfaction (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9333588)

McWhirter, D. P., & Matteson, A. M. (1984). *The male couple: How relationships develop.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Miller, B. (1979). Gay fathers and their children. *Family Coordinator, 28,* 544-565.

Miller, A., & Sassler, S. (2010). Stability and change in the division of labor among cohabiting couples. *Sociological Forum, 25,* 677-702. doi: 10.1111/j.1573-7861.2010.01207.x

Moore, M. R. (2008). Gendered power relations among women: A study of household decision making in Black, lesbian stepfamilies. *American Sociological Review, 4,* 335-356. doi: 10.1177/000312240807300208

Murphy, D. A. (2013). The desire for parenthood: Gay men choosing to become parents through surrogacy. *Journal of Family Issues, 34,* 1104-1124. doi: 10.1177/0192513X13484272

Neal, M. B., Chapman, N. J., Ingersoll-Dayton, B., & Emlen A. C. (1993). *Balancing Work and Caregiving for Children, Adults, and Elders.* Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publishing.

Patterson, C. J. (1995). Families on the lesbian baby boom: Parents` division of labor and children`s adjustment. *Developmental Psychology, 31*, 115-123.

Patterson, C. J. (2004). Family relationships of lesbian and gay men. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 62,* 1052-1069. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.01052.x

Patterson, C.J., Sutfin, E.L., Fulcher, M. (2004). Division of labor among lesbian and heterosexual parenting couples: Correlates of specialized versus shared patterns. *Journal of Adult Development, 2*, 179-189. doi: 10.1023/B:JADE.0000035626.90331.47

Patterson, C. J. & Tornello, S. L. (2011). Gay fathers' pathways to parenthood: International perspectives. *Zeitschrift für Familienforschung (Journal of Family Research), 7,* 103-116.

Peplau, L. A., Veniegas, R. C., & Campbell, S. M. (1996). Gay and lesbian relationships. In R. C. Savin-Williams & K. M. Cohen (Eds.), *The lives of lesbians, gays, and bisexuals: Children to adults* (pp. 250-273). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace.

Pina, D. L., & Bengtson, V. L. (1993). The division of household labor and wives's happiness: Ideology, employment, and perceptions of support. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 55,* 901-912.

Pinto, K.M., & Coltrane, S. (2009). Divisions of labor in Mexican origin and Anglo families: Structure and culture. *Sex Roles, 60,* 482-495. doi: 10.1007/s11199-008-9549-5

Pittman, J.F., & Blanchard, D. (1996). The effects of work history and timing of marriage on the division of household labor: A life-course perspective. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 58*, 78-90.

Radloff, L. S. (1977). The CES-D scale. *Applied Psychological Measurement, 1,* 385-401. doi: 10.1177/014662167700100306

Riskind, R. G., & Patterson, C. J. (2010). Parenting intentions and desires among childless lesbian, gay, and heterosexual individuals. *Journal of Family Psychology, 24,* 78-81. doi: 10.1037/a0017941

Rogers, S. J., & Amato, P. R. (2000). Have changes in gender relations affected marital quality? *Social Forces, 79,* 731-753. doi: 10.1093/sf/79.2.731

Savage, D. (1999). *The kid: (What happened when my boyfriend and I decided to get pregnant): An adoption story.* New York: Dutton.

Solomon, S. E., Rothblum, E. D., & Balsam, K. F. (2005). Money, housework, sex, and conflict: Same-sex couples in civil unions, those not in civil unions, and heterosexual married siblings. *Sex Roles, 52,* 561-575. doi: 10.1007/s11199-005-3725-7

South, S. J., & Spitze, G. (1994). Housework in marital and nonmarital households. *American Sociological Review, 59,* 327-347.

Spanier, G. B. (1976). Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyad. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 38, 15-28.

Stafford, R., Backman, E., & Dibona, P. (1977). The division of labor among cohabiting and married couples. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 39,* 43-57.

Sullivan, M. (1996). Rozzie and Harriet? Gender and family patterns of lesbian coparents. *Gender and Society, 10,* 747-767. doi: 10.1177/089124396010006005

Suitor, J. J. (1991). Marital quality and satisfaction with the division of labor across the family life cycle. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 53,* 221-230.

Sutphin, S. T. (2010). Social exchange theory and the division of household labor in same-sex couples. *Marriage and Family Review, 46,* 191-206. doi: 10.1080/01494929.2010.490102

Tornello, S. L. & Patterson, C. J. (in press). Age, life pathways, and experiences of gay fathers: Life course perspective. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies.*

Turner, P. H., Scadden, L., & Harris, M. B. (1990). Parenting in gay and lesbian families. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Psychotherapy, 1,* 55-66. doi: 10.1300/J236v01n03_04

Voydanoff, P., & Donnelly, B. W. (1999). The intersection of time in activities and perceived unfairness in relation to psychological distress and marital quality. *Journal of Marriage*

and Family, 61, 739-751.

Ward, R. A. (1993). Marital happiness and household equity in later life. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 55*, 427-438.

Table 1:

Demographic Information of Gay Fathers, Their Partners, and Eldest Child

	Participant	Partner	Child 1
Variable	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*
Age	42.54 (6.33)	42.73 (7.30)	7.11 (5.02)
Household Income (K)	212 (435)	---	---
Hours worked (wk)	38.23 (15.21)	38.12 (15.57)	---
Length of Relationship	12.02 (7.00)	---	---
Total Number of Children	1.62 (.72)	---	---
Race (%)			
White/Caucasian	89.6	83.0	50.4
Black/African American	.9	3.9	8.1
Latino	4.5	6.3	12.8
Biracial/Multiracial	2.1	2.1	21.5
Asian	2.1	3.0	5.4
Other	.9	1.8	1.8
Education (%)			
High school/GED	.6	.3	---
Some college	14.7	18.2	---
Bachelor's degree	32.5	37.0	---
Graduate degree	53.3	44.5	---
Religion (%)			
Catholic	11.3	12.6	---

Protestant	32.5	31.4	---
Jewish	10.4	7.8	---
Other affiliation	17.1	16.5	---
No religious affiliation	28.7	31.7	---

Note. Standard deviations are given in parentheses

Table 2.

Division of Labor Among Gay Fathers Whole Sample: Wave 1 and Wave 2

	Time	
	Wave 1	Wave 2
	n = 333	*n* = 151
Measure	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*
Household division of labor now [a]	5.29 (.74)	5.32 (.84)
Household division of labor want [a]	4.96 (.61)	4.96 (.62)
Childcare division of labor now [a]	5.42 (1.02)	5.37 (1.16)
Childcare division of labor want [a]	5.15 (.68)	5.05 (.82)
Household actual-ideal difference [b]	.77 (.65)	.87 (.68)
Childcare actual-ideal difference [b]	.63 (.56)	.66 (.66)

Note: [a] 1 = *I do it all* to 9 = *partner does it all.* [b] higher values indicate greater discrepancy between actual and ideal division of labor.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

Table 3.

Changes in Division of Labor Among Gay Fathers from Wave 1 and Wave 2

	Time		
	Wave 1	Wave 2	
	n = 149	*n* = 149	
Measure	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*	*t* (df)
Household division of labor now [a]	5.29 (.76)	5.32 (.85)	*n. s.*
Household division of labor want [a]	5.01 (.58)	4.95 (.62)	*n. s.*
Childcare division of labor now [a]	5.34 (1.02)	5.35 (1.16)	*n. s.*
Childcare division of labor want [a]	5.13 (.67)	5.04 (.82)	*n. s.*
Household actual-ideal difference [b]	.73 (.59)	.87 (.68)	-3.14 (144)**
Childcare actual-ideal difference [b]	.58 (.53)	.67 (.67)	*n. s.*

Note: [a]1 = *I do it all* to 9 = *partner does it all.* [b] higher values indicate greater discrepancy between actual and ideal division of labor.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

Table 4.

Predicting Household and Childcare Division of Labor Using the Relative Resource Theory

	Division of household labor [a]			Division of childcare labor [a]		
Variable	*B*	*SE B*	*β*	*B*	*SE B*	*β*
Income	.00	.00	-.04	.00	.00	-.07
Education	-.03	.03	-.08	-.03	.04	-.05
R^2		.00			.00	
F (df)		1.18 (2, 318)			1.23 (2, 311)	

Note: [a]1 = *I do it all* to 9 = *partner does it all.*

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Table 5.

Predicting Household and Childcare Division of Labor Using the Time Constraint Theory

	Division of household labor [a]			Division of childcare labor [a]		
Variable	*B*	*SE B*	*β*	*B*	*SE B*	*β*
Hours worked in paid employment	.00	.00	-.08	-.02	.00	-.29***
R^2		.00			.08	
F (df)		2.23 (1, 330)			28.53 (1, 323)***	

Note: [a]1 = *I do it all* to 9 = *partner does it all.*

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Table 6.

Predicting Household and Childcare Division of Labor by Length of Romantic Relationship

	Division of household labor [a]			Division of childcare labor [a]		
Variable	*B*	*SE B*	*β*	*B*	*SE B*	*β*
Length of current relationship	-.01	.01	-.05	-.02	.01	-.13*
R^2		.00			.02	
F (df)		0.79 (1, 330)			5.79 (1, 323)*	

Note: [a]1 = *I do it all* to 9 = *partner does it all.*

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Table 7.

Comparison of Division of Labor Among Gay Fathers in a Legally vs. Not Legally Recognized Relationship

	Relationship legally recognized *n* = 147	Relationship not legally recognized *n* = 186	
Measure	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*	*t* (df)
Division of household labor now [a]	5.27 (.75)	5.30 (.74)	*n. s.*
Division of household labor want [a]	4.96 (.63)	4.96 (.60)	*n. s.*
Division of childcare labor now [a]	5.29 (1.04)	5.52 (1.01)	-2.05 (324)*
Division of childcare labor want [a]	5.05 (.63)	5.24 (.71)	-2.51 (315)**

Note: [a]1 = *I do it all* to 9 = *partner does it all.*

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

Table 8.

Comparison of Division of Labor Among Gay Fathers Comparing Step-parent family and Primary-parent family

	Primary-parent family *n* = 285	Step-parent family *n* = 48	
Measure	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*	*t* (df)
Division of household labor now	5.26 (.73)	5.43 (.81)	*n. s.*
Division of household labor want	4.95 (.61)	5.13 (.59)	*n. s.*
Division of childcare labor now	5.31 (.97)	6.04 (1.16)	4.63 (324)***
Division of childcare labor want	5.07 (.58)	5.75 (.90)	4.96 (51.54)***

Note: [a]1 = *I do it all* to 9 = *partner does it all.*

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

Table 9.

Hierarchical Multiple Regression of Theoretical Variables Predicting Actual Household and Childcare Division of Labor

	Household division of labor [a]			Childcare division of labor [b]		
Variable	*B*	*SE B*	*β*	*B*	*SE B*	*β*
Income	.00	.00	-.02	.00	.00	-.03
Education	-.02	.03	-.04	.04	.03	.06
Hours worked in paid employment	.00	.00	-.08	-.02	.00	-.33***
Length of current relationship	.00	.01	-.01	-.01	.01	-.08
Relationship legally recognized [c]	.01	.09	.01	-.15	.11	-.07
Family type [d]	.24	.14	.11	.75	.18	.25***
R^2	.01			.16		
F (df)	1.33 (6, 312)			10.55 (6, 305)***		

Note: [ab] 1 = *I do it all* to 9 = *partner does it all.* [c] 0 = *Relationship not legally recognized,* 1 = *Relationship legally recognized.* [d] 0 = *Primary-parent families,* 1 = *Step-parent families.*

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Table 10.

Correlations Among Demographic, Measures, and Division of Labor

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1. Actual division of household labor [a]	1		.															
2. Actual division of childcare labor [a]	.34***	1		.	.	.												
3. Household actual-ideal difference [b]	.25***	.17**	1	.														
4. Childcare actual-	.13*	.38****	.54****	1														
5. Age	.06	.00	-.06	-.03	1													
6. Total children	.05	.06	-.08	.04	.05	1												
7. Eldest child's age	.12*	.16**	-.06	.08	.27***	.35***	1											
8. Income	-.04	-.08	-.08	-.08	.21***	.02	-.04	1										
9. Education	-.06	-.05	.04	-.04	.17**	-.01	-.08	.00	1									
10. Hours worked in paid employment	-.08	-.29***	.00	.01	-.04	.01	.07	.06	.13*	1								
11. Length of relationship	-.05	-.13*	.02	.02	.55***	.04	.13*	.07	.15**	-.13*	1							
12. Legal status of relationship [c]	-.02	-.11*	-.09	.00	.14*	-.08	-.07	-.02	.02	-.09	.19**	1						
13. Family type [d]	.11	.26***	-.01	.03	-.20***	.20***	.45***	-.08	-.21***	.08	-.39***	-.27***	1					

14. Satisfaction with Life [e]	-.01	-.17*	-.32***	-.25**	-.15	.12	-.12	.04	.03	-.01	-.15*	.08	-.03	1				
15. Depression symptoms [f]	.01	.06	.33***	.22**	-.07	-.08	.00	-.05	-.05	-.14	.11	-.03	-.03	-.51***	1			
16. Parenting Alliance [g]	-.06	-.29***	-.38***	-.32***	-.09	.09	-.33***	-.01	-.12	-.10	.00	.09	-.25**	.54***	-.26***	1		
17. Relationship Functioning [h]	-.09	-.08	-.26***	-.22***	.00	.02	-.05	-.01	-.14*	-.54	-.12*	.04	.06	.27***	-.33***	.39***	1	
18. Child Behavior [i]	.06	-.12	.19*	.13	-.03	.08	.07	-.04	.14	.04	.04	.01	.06	-.08	.16	-.16	-.14	1

Note: [a] 1 = *I do it all* to 9 = *partner does it all.* [b] higher values indicate greater discrepancy between actual and ideal division of labor. [c] 0 = *Relationship not legally recognized,* 1 = *Relationship legally recognized.* [d] 0 = *Primary-parent families,* 1 = *Step-parent families.* [e] higher values indicate higher satisfaction with life. [f] higher values indicate greater depressive symptoms. [g] higher values indicate greater alliance between the parents. [h] higher values indicate greater relationship quality. [i] higher values indicate greater child behavior problems.

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Table 11.

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Including Household Division of Labor Predicting Depression Symptomology and Satisfaction with Life (Wave 2)

	Depression Symptomology [a]			Satisfaction with life [b]		
Variable	*B*	*SE B*	*β*	*B*	*SE B*	*β*
Step 1						
Age	-.12	.12	-.10	-.10	.08	-.11
Total number of children	-.40	1.15	-.03	1.53	.73	.18*
Child age	.03	.17	.02	-.26	.11	-.22*
R^2		-.01			.06	
ΔR^2		.00			.00	
F (df)		.42 (3, 131)			3.92 (3, 134)*	
Step 2						
Age	-.35	.15	-.28*	-.02	.10	-.02
Total number of children	-.34	1.15	-.03	1.25	.75	.15
Child age	.14	.19	.08	-.28	.13	-.24*
Hours worked in paid employment	-.09	.05	-.17	-.01	.03	-.03
Income	.00	.00	.01	.00	.00	.07
Education	-.14	.44	-.03	.20	.30	.06
Length of current relationship	.27	.13	.23*	-.15	.09	-.19
Relationship legally recognized [c]	-1.13	1.50	-.07	1.46	1.02	.13
Family type [d]	-3.22	2.85	-.12	1.77	1.93	.10
R^2		.04			.07	
ΔR^2		.05			.01	
F (df)		1.55 (9, 125)			2.19 (9, 128)*	
Step 3						
Age	-.36	.15	-.29*	-.01	.10	-.01
Total number of children	-.26	1.15	-.02	1.13	.75	.14
Child age	.12	.19	.07	-.25	.13	-.21
Hours worked in paid employment	-.09	.05	-.17	-.01	.03	-.03
Income	.00	.00	.01	.00	.00	.07

Education	-.16	.44	-.03	.23	.29	.07
Length of current relationship	.27	.13	.23*	-.15	.09	-.19
Relationship legally recognized [c]	-1.07	1.50	-.07	1.38	1.01	.12
Family type [d]	-3.42	2.85	-.13	1.94	1.91	.11
Actual household labor [e]	.94	.82	.10	-1.14	.54	-.18*
R^2		.04			.10	
ΔR^2		.00			.03	
F (df)		1.53 (10, 124)			2.47 (10, 127)*	
Step 4						
Age	-.28	.14	-.22	-.06	.09	-.07
Total number of children	.89	1.12	.07	.40	.73	.05
Child age	.04	.18	.02	-.21	.12	-.17
Hours worked in paid employment	-.07	.05	-.14	-.02	.03	-.05
Income	.00	.00	.03	.00	.00	.06
Education	-.30	.41	-.06	.32	.28	.10
Length of current relationship	.18	.12	.16	-.10	.08	-.12
Relationship legally recognized [c]	-1.11	1.41	-.07	1.42	.96	.12
Family type [d]	-3.41	2.69	-.13	2.04	1.82	.11
Actual household labor [e]	-.52	.85	-.05	-.32	.56	-.05
Household labor actual-ideal difference [f]	4.61	1.12	.38***	-2.83	.75	-.34***
R^2		.15			.18	
ΔR^2		.11			.08	
F (df)		3.12 (11, 123)**			3.78 (11, 126)***	

Note: [a] higher values indicate greater depressive symptoms. [b] higher values indicate higher satisfaction with life. [c] 0 = *Relationship not legally recognized,* 1 = *Relationship legally recognized.* [d] 0 = *Primary-parent families,* 1 = *Step-parent families.* [e] 1 = *I do it all* to 9 = *partner does it all.* [f] higher values indicate greater discrepancy between actual and ideal division of labor.
*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Table 12.

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Including Childcare Division of Labor Predicting Depression Symptomology and Satisfaction with Life (Wave 2)

	Depression Symptomology [a]			Satisfaction with life [b]		
Variable	*B*	*SE B*	*β*	*B*	*SE B*	*β*
Step 1						
Age	-.07	.11	-.06	-.13	.07	-.15
Total number of children	-.14	1.08	-.01	1.37	.73	.16
Child age	.04	.15	.03	-.24	.11	-.20*
R^2		-.02			.06	
ΔR^2		.00			.00	
F (df)		.14 (3, 130)			3.83 (3, 132)*	
Step 2						
Age	-.27	.14	-.23	-.07	.10	-.08
Total number of children	-.02	1.10	.00	1.06	.75	.13
Child age	.13	.17	.08	-.24	.12	-.21*
Hours worked in paid employment	-.06	.05	-.11	-.02	.03	-.05
Income	.00	.00	-.01	.00	.00	.09
Education	-.03	.42	-.01	.18	.30	.05
Length of current relationship [c]	.24	.12	.22	-.13	.09	-.16
Relationship legally recognized [d]	-1.21	1.45	-.08	1.66	1.02	.15
Family type [e]	-3.02	2.73	-.12	1.57	1.92	.09
R^2		.00			.07	
ΔR^2		.02			.01	
F (df)		1.03 (9, 124)			2.12 (9, 126)*	
Step 3						
Age	-.33	.14	-.28*	.00	.10	.00
Total number of children	.05	1.08	.00	1.08	.71	.13
Child age	.15	.17	.10	-.28	.12	-.23*
Hours worked in paid employment	-.03	.05	-.05	-.05	.03	-.14
Income	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.07

Education	-.04	.41	-.01	.19	.28	.06
Length of current relationship	.26	.12	.24*	-.15	.08	-.19
Relationship legally recognized [c]	-.73	1.44	-.05	1.16	.99	.10
Family type [d]	-3.61	2.70	-.15	2.20	1.84	.12
Actual childcare labor [e]	1.40	.60	.21*	-1.49	.41	-.31***
R^2		.04			.15	
ΔR^2		.04			.08	
F (df)		1.50 (10, 123)			3.42 (10, 125)**	
Step 4						
Age	-.29	.14	-.24*	-.04	.09	-.05
Total number of children	.78	1.07	.07	.43	.71	.05
Child age	.06	.17	.04	-.20	.11	-.17
Hours worked in paid employment	-.06	.05	-.13	-.02	.03	-.06
Income	.00	.00	.03	.00	.00	.04
Education	-.04	.40	-.01	-.01	.22	.00
Length of current relationship	.17	.12	.16	-.09	.08	-.11
Relationship legally recognized [c]	-.42	1.39	-.03	.90	.94	.08
Family type [d]	-2.55	2.63	-.10	1.38	1.78	.08
Actual childcare labor [e]	.22	.70	.03	-.59	.46	-.12
Actual-ideal difference childcare labor [f]	3.76	1.22	.33**	-2.95	.82	-.35***
R^2		.10			.23	
ΔR^2		.06			.08	
F (df)		2.32 (11, 122)*			4.58 (11, 124)***	

Note: [a] higher values indicate greater depressive symptoms. [b] higher values indicate higher satisfaction with life. [c] 0 = *Relationship not legally recognized,* 1 = *Relationship legally recognized.* [d] 0 = *Primary-parent families,* 1 = *Step-parent families.* [e] 1 = *I do it all* to 9 = *partner does it all.* [f] higher values indicate greater discrepancy between actual and ideal division of labor.
*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Table 13.

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Including Household Division of Labor onto Parenting Alliance (Wave 2) and Relationship Functioning (Wave 1)

	Parenting alliance [a]			Relationship functioning [b]		
Variable	*B*	*SE B*	*β*	*B*	*SE*	*β*
Step 1						
Age	.00	.14	.00	.04	.15	.02
Total number of children	2.99	1.40	.18*	.67	1.37	.03
Child age	-.85	.21	-.37***	-.17	.21	-.06
R^2		.10			-.01	
ΔR^2		.00			.00	
F (df)		6.24 (3, 133)**			.24 (3, 267)	
Step 2						
Age	.01	.19	.01	.47	.19	.19*
Total number of children	3.01	1.44	.19*	.59	1.35	.03
Child age	-.76	.24	-.33**	-.35	.23	-.12
Hours worked in paid employment	-.07	.06	-.11	-.01	.06	-.01
Income	.00	.00	-.01	.00	.00	-.04
Education	-1.09	.56	-.16	-1.27	.59	-.14*
Length of current relationship	-.06	.17	-.04	-.43	.17	-.19*
Relationship legally recognized [c]	1.35	1.94	.06	4.42	1.99	.14*
Family type [d]	-3.16	3.70	-.09	5.13	3.54	.11
R^2		.12			.05	
ΔR^2		.02			.06	
F (df)		3.10 (9, 127)**			2.51 (9, 261)**	
Step 3						
Age	.02	.19	.01	.47	.19	.19*
Total number of children	2.80	1.43	.17	.63	1.34	.03
Child age	-.71	.24	-.30**	-.31	.23	-.10
Hours worked in paid employment	-.08	.06	-.11	-.03	.06	-.03
Income	.00	.00	-.02	.00	.00	-.05

Education	-1.04	.56	-.16	-1.25	.59	-.13*
Length of current relationship	-.05	.16	-.03	-.44	.17	-.20*
Relationship legally recognized [c]	1.2	1.93	.05	4.06	1.98	.13*
Family type [d]	-2.82	3.67	-.08	4.98	3.52	.11
Actual household labor [e]	-1.92	1.04	-.15	-2.67	1.28	-.13*
R^2		.14			.06	
ΔR^2		.02			.01	
F (df)		3.18 (10, 126)**			2.73 (10, 260)**	
Step 4						
Age	-.12	.18	-.07	.37	.18	.15*
Total number of children	1.22	1.42	.08	.40	1.29	.02
Child age	-.63	.23	-.27**	-.38	.22	-.12
Hours worked in paid employment	-.09	.06	-.13	-.02	.06	-.02
Income	.00	.00	-.03	.00	.00	-.06
Education	-.84	.53	-.13	-1.17	.57	-.13*
Length of current relationship	.10	.16	.06	-.34	.17	-.15*
Relationship legally recognized [c]	1.17	1.83	.05	3.33	1.92	.11
Family type [d]	-2.28	3.48	-.06	4.58	3.39	.10
Actual household labor [e]	-.34	1.07	-.03	-1.18	1.28	-.06
Actual-ideal difference household labor [f]	-5.75	1.49	-.34***	-6.61	1.46	-.27***
R^2		.22			.13	
ΔR^2		.08			.07	
F (df)		4.57 (11, 125)***			4.52 (11, 259)***	

Note: [a] higher values indicate greater alliance between the parents. [b] higher values indicate greater relationship quality. [c] 0 = *Relationship not legally recognized*, 1 = *Relationship legally recognized.* [d] 0 = *Primary-parent families*, 1 = *Step-parent families.* [e] 1 = *I do it all* to 9 = *partner does it all.* [f] higher values indicate greater discrepancy between actual and ideal division of labor.
*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Table 14.

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Including Childcare Division of Labor onto Parenting Alliance (Wave 2) and Relationship Functioning (Wave 1)

	Parenting alliance [a]			Relationship functioning [b]		
Variable	*B*	*SE B*	*β*	*B*	*SE B*	*β*
Step 1						
Age	.01	.14	.01	.05	.16	.02
Total number of children	2.76	1.41	.17	.62	1.38	.03
Child age	-.84	.21	-.36***	-.18	.21	-.06
R^2		.10			-.01	
ΔR^2		.00			.00	
F (df)		5.74 (3, 130)**			.26 (3, 264)	
Step 2						
Age	.04	.19	.02	.47	.19	.19**
Total number of children	2.82	1.45	.18	.51	1.36	.02
Child age	-.73	.24	-.32**	-.37	.23	-.12
Hours worked in paid employment	-.08	.06	-.11	-.01	.06	-.01
Income	.00	.00	-.02	.00	.00	-.04
Education	-1.05	.57	-.16	-1.28	.60	-.14*
Length of current relationship	-.11	.17	-.07	-.43	.17	-.20*
Relationship legally recognized [c]	.97	1.96	.04	4.38	2.01	.14*
Family type [d]	-3.84	3.71	-.11	5.42	3.61	.12
R^2		.11			.05	
ΔR^2		.01			.06	
F (df)		2.89 (9, 124)**			2.54 (9, 258)**	
Step 3						
Age	.10	.18	.06	.49	.19	.20*
Total number of children	2.33	1.34	.14	.52	1.35	.03
Child age	-.67	.23	-.29**	-.34	.23	-.11
Hours worked in paid employment	-.17	.06	-.24**	-.05	.07	-.05
Income	.00	.00	-.03	.00	.00	-.05

Education	-.91	.53	-.14	-1.21	.60	-.13*
Length of current relationship	-.15	.16	-.10	-.47	.18	-.21**
Relationship legally recognized [c]	-.07	1.82	.00	4.05	2.02	.13*
Family type [d]	-2.91	3.44	-.08	6.07	3.62	.13
Actual childcare labor [e]	-3.98	.85	-.38***	-1.59	.99	-.11
R^2		.24			.06	
ΔR^2		.13			.01	
F (df)		5.24 (10, 123)***			2.56 (10, 257)**	
Step 4						
Age	.02	.17	.01	.39	.19	.16*
Total number of children	.94	1.29	.06	.64	1.32	.03
Child age	-.54	.21	-.23*	-.28	.23	-.09
Hours worked in paid employment	-.10	.06	-.15	-.01	.07	-.01
Income	.00	.00	-.07	.00	.00	-.06
Education	-.92	.49	-.14	-1.38	.59	-.15*
Length of current relationship	.02	.15	.01	-.38	.17	-.17*
Relationship legally recognized [c]	-.73	1.70	-.03	3.67	1.98	.12
Family type [d]	-4.43	3.22	-.13	3.81	3.61	.08
Actual childcare labor [e]	-1.89	.92	-.18*	-.06	1.07	.00
Actual-ideal difference childcare labor [f]	-6.63	1.49	-.40***	-6.41	1.86	-.23**
R^2		.34			.09	
ΔR^2		.10			.03	
F (df)		7.30 (11, 122)***			3.50 (11, 256)***	

Note: [a] higher values indicate greater alliance between the parents. [b] higher values indicate greater relationship quality. [c] 0 = *Relationship not legally recognized*, 1 = *Relationship legally recognized.* [d] 0 = *Primary-parent families*, 1 = *Step-parent families.* [e] 1 = *I do it all* to 9 = *partner does it all.* [f] higher values indicate greater discrepancy between actual and ideal division of labor.
*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Table 15.

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Including Household Division of Labor onto Child Behavior (Wave 2)

	Child Behavior [a]		
Variable	*B*	*SE B*	*β*
Step 1			
Age	-.15	.15	-.09
Total number of children	.58	1.47	.04
Child age	.30	.22	.13
R^2		.00	
ΔR^2		.00	
F (df)		1.01 (3, 132)	
Step 2			
Age	-.28	.20	-.17
Total number of children	.37	1.52	.02
Child age	.29	.26	.13
Hours worked in paid employment	.02	.07	.03
Income	.00	.00	-.01
Education	.99	.60	.15
Length of current relationship	.19	.17	.12
Relationship legally recognized [b]	-.38	2.05	-.02
Family type [c]	1.58	3.89	.05
R^2		-.01	
ΔR^2		.01	
F (df)		.85 (9, 126)	
Step 3			
Age	-.28	.20	-.17
Total number of children	.25	1.53	.02
Child age	.32	.26	.14
Hours worked in paid employment	.02	.07	.03
Income	.00	.00	-.01
Education	1.01	.60	.15
Length of current relationship	.19	.17	.13
Relationship legally recognized [b]	-.45	2.05	-.02
Family type [c]	1.74	3.90	.05
Actual household labor [d]	-1.09	1.11	-.09
R^2		-.01	
ΔR^2		.00	
F (df)		.86 (10, 125)	
Step 4			
Age	-.25	.20	-.15
Total number of children	.77	1.58	.05
Child age	.29	.26	.13

Hours worked in paid employment	.02	.07	.03
Income	.00	.00	.00
Education	.94	.60	.14
Length of current relationship	.16	.17	.10
Relationship legally recognized [b]	-.46	2.05	-.02
Family type [c]	1.67	3.89	.05
Actual household labor [d]	-1.71	1.21	-.14
Actual-ideal difference household labor [e]	2.08	1.62	.13
R^2		-.01	
ΔR^2		.00	
F (df)		.94 (11, 124)	

Note: [a] higher values indicate greater child behavior problems. [b] 0 = *Relationship not legally recognized*, 1 = *Relationship legally recognized.* [c] 0 = *Primary-parent families*, 1 = *Step-parent families.* [d] 1 = *I do it all* to 9 = *partner does it all.* [e] higher values indicate greater discrepancy between actual and ideal division of labor.

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Table 16.

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Including Childcare Division of Labor onto Child Behavior (Wave 2)

	Child Behavior [a]		
Variable	*B*	*SE B*	*β*
Step 1			
Age	-.12	.15	-.07
Total number of children	.84	1.47	.05
Child age	.23	.21	.10
R^2		-.01	
ΔR^2		.00	
F (df)		.75 (3, 132)	
Step 2			
Age	-.21	.20	-.13
Total number of children	.71	1.52	.04
Child age	.18	.25	.08
Hours worked in paid employment	.02	.07	.03
Income	.00	.00	-.02
Education	.91	.60	.14
Length of current relationship	.18	.18	.12
Relationship legally recognized [b]	-.73	2.07	-.03
Family type [c]	2.31	3.90	.07
R^2		-.02	
ΔR^2		.01	
F (df)		.73 (9, 126)	
Step 3			
Age	-.24	.20	-.14
Total number of children	.70	1.52	.04
Child age	.19	.25	.08
Hours worked in paid employment	.03	.07	.05
Income	.00	.00	-.02
Education	.91	.60	.14
Length of current relationship	.19	.18	.13
Relationship legally recognized [b]	-.55	2.10	-.03
Family type [c]	2.08	3.92	.06
Actual childcare labor [d]	.54	.87	.06
R^2		-.02	
ΔR^2		.00	
F (df)		.69 (10, 125)	
Step 4			
Age	-.21	.21	-.13
Total number of children	1.15	1.57	.07
Child age	.14	.25	.06
Hours worked in paid employment	.01	.07	.02

Income	.00	.00	.00
Education	.91	.60	.14
Length of current relationship	.15	.18	.10
Relationship legally recognized [b]	-.37	2.10	-.02
Family type [c]	2.65	3.95	.08
Actual childcare labor [d]	-.08	1.03	-.01
Actual-ideal difference childcare labor [e]	2.04	1.83	.12
R^2		-.02	
ΔR^2		.00	
F (df)		.74 (11, 124)	

Note: [a] higher values indicate greater child behavior problems. [b] 0 = *Relationship not legally recognized*, 1 = *Relationship legally recognized.* [c] 0 = *Primary-parent families*, 1 = *Step-parent families.* [d] 1 = *I do it all* to 9 = *partner does it all.* [e] higher values indicate greater discrepancy between actual and ideal division of labor.
*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Appendix A: Who Does What Household Tasks

WHO DOES WHAT?

Please show how you and your partner divide the family tasks listed here. Using numbers on the scale below, show **HOW IT IS NOW** on the left side and **HOW I WOULD LIKE IT TO BE** on the right.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

He/She does it all — we both do this about equally — **I** do it all

HOW IT IS NOW		**HOW I WOULD LIKE IT TO BE**
	A. Planning and preparing meals	
	B. Cleaning up after meals	
	C. Repairs around the home	
	D. House cleaning	
	E. Taking out the garbage	
	F. Buying groceries, household needs	
	G. Paying bills	
	H. Laundry: washing, folding, ironing	
	I. Writing letters/making calls to family, friends	
	J. Looking after the car	
	K. Providing income for our family	
	L. Caring for plants, garden, yard	
	M. Working outside family	

Appendix B: Who Does What Childcare Tasks (54 months to 95 months)

WHO DOES WHAT?

On this page we ask you about 3 aspects of caring **for your first child**. Use the numbers on the 1-9 scale to show **HOW IT IS NOW** on the left and **HOW I'D LIKE IT TO BE** on the right.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

He/She does it all — we both do this about equally — **I** do it all

HOW IT IS NOW (1 to 9)		**HOW I'D LIKE IT** (1 to 9)
	A1. Reading to our child	
	B. Preparing meals for our child	
	C. Dressing our child	
	D. Cleaning or bathing our child	
	E. Deciding whether/how to respond to child's crying	
	F. Getting up at night with our child	
	G. Taking our child out: drives, parks, walks, visits, Playgrounds	
	H. Choosing toys for our child	
	I. Playing with our child	
	J. Doing our child's laundry	
	K. Arranging for babysitters or childcare	
	L. Dealing with the doctor regarding our child's health	
	M1. Getting our child to and from school	
	N. Tending to our child in public: restaurants, visiting, shopping, playgrounds	
	O. Setting limits for our child	
	P. Disciplining our child	
	Q. Teaching our child	
	R. Picking up after our child	
	S. Arranging our child's visits, play with friends	
	T. Helping when our child has a problem with playmates/siblings	