GENDER BORDER CROSSING AND THE HOUSEHOLD DIVISION OF LABOR AND CHILDCARE

_____

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Sociology

Sam Houston State University

_____

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

_____

by

Ken Arsenault

May, 2018

GENDER BORDER CROSSING AND THE HOUSEHOLD DIVISION OF LABOR AND CHILDCARE

by

Ken Arsenault

_____

APPROVED:

J. Bart Stykes, PhD
Thesis Chair

Jason Konefal, PhD
Thesis Co-Chair

Emily Cabaniss, PhD
Committee Member

Abbey Zink, PhD
Dean, College of Humanities and Social Sciences

ABSTRACT

Arsenault, Ken, *Gender border crossing and the household division of labor and childcare.* Master of Arts (Sociology), May, 2018, Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas

The division of household labor is unequally distributed against women. Men employed less than their female partner have more opportunity to equalize this division. The theoretical perspective of gender borders is used to explain how partners navigate this division of labor and how men border cross into the gender territory associated with women. Data from the 2016 American Time Use Survey are used to locate border crossings of partnered fathers with co-resident children. Inline with exchange-related models, findings indicate that men increase both their frequency of border crossing and their time in women's territory as the employment status of their partner increases and then exceeds their own. Yet during the nighttime men's border crossings decrease as women's employment status reaches parity, with stay-at-home fathers crossing proportionately less in the nighttime than fathers in all other earner categories. The methodological benefits of using time as a model variate are discussed as are the implications of this research for gender equality within the household.

KEY WORDS: Division of household labor, Gender, Border crossing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

Table **Page**

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Gender is a social construction and is something we "do" (West and Zimmerman 1987), and "undo" (Deutsch 2007). These social constructions come with a set of expectations. For instance, women as mothers are expected to be nurturers, and men as fathers are expected to be providers (Townsend 2002). Gender roles are also situated in places, such that gender "performances" (West and Zimmerman 1987) are situational. Within the home women are expected to perform the housework, while they care for household children at the same time. In this way, the household is a social boundary that has an "objectified form[s] of social differences manifested in unequal access to and unequal distribution of resources (material and nonmaterial) and social opportunities" (Lamont and Molnar 2002:168). When men cross this social boundary—when they clean the house or watch the children—they are crossing the border into women's territory (Doucet 2006).

Couples deviating from traditional gender norms provide a unique lens to revisit the gendered division of household labor. Research indicates that men who are economically dependent on their wives do less housework the more they depend on their wives (Brines 1993, 1994; Bittman et al. 2003). Other research suggests that some fathers (particularly stay-at-home fathers) may not feel judged by the cleanliness of their house (Doucet 2006:184), so may not feel social pressure to perform housework. Herein lies the guiding question for this study: How does the employment status of a father—in relation to his partner—influence his border crossings within the household?

Two competing theories attempt to explain this division of household labor (see Lachance-Grzela and Bouchard 2010 for a thorough review). The first theory

uses economic language, stressing relations of bargaining, dependency, or "human capital" (see Dalmia and Scilian 2008). The other theory states that gender is an influential—if not determinate—factor in deciding who does what work (see Brines 1993 most notably). In contrast to economic theory, under this gendered model even when men are unemployed and their partner is employed full time, the men will perform less housework to align with their gendered expectations. Despite the progress that has been made towards reducing gendered behavior in the household or reducing gender inequality, women continue to perform the lion's share of housework and childcare (Lachance-Grzela and Bouchard 2010).

Prior studies have not adequately addressed the relationship between the division of household labor and gender borders. Unlike previous research which relied on measuring the division of household labor in aggregate, this study uses time as a model variate to analyze gendered activities throughout the day, which enables the identification of gender border crossings. Through analyses of fathers' border crossings and their earner statuses, this study finds that—consistent with economic theory—men border cross more and spend more time in women's territory in proportion to the earnings of their partner. Yet, when analyses focus on the distribution of border crossings *throughout* the day, gendered behavior is apparent. By demonstrating that time must be considered when analyzing gendered activities, this study contributes to existing research on the division of household labor, and further emphasizes men's apparent wealth of leisure time within the home when compared to their partners.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Social Construction of Gender

Gender is a social construction that we "do" by creating differences that "are not natural, essential, or biological" (West and Zimmerman 1987:137). West and Zimmerman (1987) argue that so long as "society is partitioned by 'essential' differences between women and men and placement in a sex category is both relevant and enforced, doing gender is unavoidable" (p. 137). According to West and Zimmerman (1987) it is the doing of gender that "furnishes the interactional scaffolding of social structure, along with a built-in mechanism of social control" (p. 147). Risman (1998) extends this thinking and contends that the notion of gender as purposeful masks the realities of gender stratification (p. 23). For Risman, it is not just our interactions with others that influences how we do gender; rather, gender stratification at the macro-level influences our gendered behavior, which, in turn, influences what behavior is acceptable and not acceptable. The roles of "mother" and "father," for instance, come with specifically gendered expectations, with mothers expected to be nurturing and fathers expected to be providers (Townsend 2002). Additionally, these expectations are influenced by the interaction between parents (Doucet 2006), which, again, influences parents' gendered behavior. For these reasons, studying the behavior of coupled parents should provide a unique vantage point on gender compared to studying the behavior of childless couples.

Just as gender is a social construct, so too is the gendered division of household labor; even more, the home is a primary location where gender is "performed" (West and Zimmerman 1987), and is a place that gender is produced (Berk 1985). Aside from biological imperatives such as childbirth and breastfeeding,

gender roles are partitioned such that women are responsible for childcare, and that women are held accountable by society and their male partners for their gendered expectations (Risman 1998). Assigning work in this gendered manner reinforces masculine hegemony (Coltrane 1996:27), and pressures men to *not* take care of household responsibilities (Bittman et al. 2003:191). Coltrane asserts that the "idealized notion of separate spheres for mothers and fathers shapes what it means to be a man or a women in our society" (1996:25). Men that care for children may experience "role conflict" (West and Zimmerman 1987:140) because they are breaking from their gender-normative behavior. Through cultural definitions, men's role is employment outside the home and a specialization in providing (Townsend 2002). Men that are found to be "undoing gender" (Deutsch 2007)—or doing gender "inappropriately"—are held accountable for their failure to enact their prescribed gender role. In households where fathers spend more time than their partner on childcare, Doucet (2016) argues that these households "provide important lessons on shifting gender relations and the possibilities and difficulties of achieving gender equality in paid and unpaid work" (p. 6).

Border Crossing and Borderwork

Thorne (1993) and Doucet (2006) use the concept "borderwork" to explain how men and women maintain gender borders. Thorne (1993) studied the gendered behavior of elementary school boys and girls, and found that if a boy was seen playing with girls he would be called a "sissy." In this way, the border differentiating boys and girls is maintained by using borderwork to shun someone that crosses the gender border. Furthermore, boys and girls will often self-regulate their behavior to ensure they are enacting the appropriate gendered behavior (West and Zimmerman 1987).

Thorne (1993) and Doucet (2006) use the term "border crossing" to describe what occurs when a person performs the activities ascribed to the opposite gender. This language suggests that the borders between genders have spatial characteristics. For example, Thorne's (1993) research demonstrated that young children relegate certain areas of the classroom and schoolyard to girls, and other areas to boys, with boys typically allotted more space. However, viewing border crossings as situated in spaces only partially captures the way gender relations operate. Thorne found that some boys would do activities typically associated with girls, such as playing jump rope while singing rhymes. Similarly, Thorne observed some girls punch boys. In the case of schoolyard children, boys that *both* entered the girl's area *and* played the girl's games were theorized to be border crossing. In these cases, the border crossings of the children centered on gendered *activities,* rather than places.

Doucet (2006) extends Thorne's (1993) concepts of border crossing and borderwork to the relationship between stay-at-home fathers and their female partners. The men in Doucet's study tend to take the position that "they can never be mothers, or replace the mothering done by women" (2006:123), despite the fact that they were performing many childcare tasks typically assigned to women. Doucet explains that some fathers rely on mothers to define fatherhood for them, and *at the same time* fathers look at how mothers mother and then adapt their identities as fathers based on this mothering. Put another way: fathers can rely on their partner to define the gendered expectations of fatherhood while still shaping their gendered behavior as a father. In this interactional way (West and Zimmerman 1987; Chesley 2011), both fathers and mothers do borderwork to shape a father's identity as a father.

The concepts borderwork and border crossing provide a useful approach to viewing the way gender boundaries are maintained and traversed, and is the

theoretical basis underpinning this current study. West and Zimmerman (1987) suggest that an "understanding of how gender is produced in social situations will afford clarification of the interactional scaffolding of social structure and the social control processes that sustain it" (p. 147). When men perform housework they are doing gender in non-traditional ways; in effect, they are "undoing" their gender (Deutsch 2007). Stay-at-home fathers go further in their undoing of gender in that they are either assigned or take on by choice many household tasks associated with women. The raises a central question that this study attempts to answer: How does a father's employment status influences his household border crossings?

Theoretical Explanations for the Division of Labor

Housework is work done in and around the house without pay, and includes such activities as shopping for household supplies and providing childcare (Bittman et al. 2003:187). Domestic duties have been stratified as women's work (Risman 1998), with women completing more housework and spending more time in childcare than their husbands (Bianchi et al. 2006). The division of household labor is gendered with household gender inequality "crystallized" (Grusky, and Weisshaar 2014) across most household domains. Using a socialist-feminist theoretical perspective, Calasanti and Bailey (1991) state that the household division of labor is "rooted in the historical transformations of capitalism and patriarchy which set the context of people's private and public lives and ideologically define 'women's place' at home" (p. 39).

There are several sociological models that explain how partners divide household labor, and they generally fall into two categories: economic or quasi-economic models, which will be discussed first, and models that consider the

influence of gender, to be discussed afterward[1]. Human capital theory states that couples divide household labor based on who is best at what job, including paid employment. Under this theory if partner A makes more money than partner B, it would be more beneficial for the household if partner B spends more time on tasks within the household (see Dalmia and Sicilian 2008). Unlike human capital theory where individuals consider what is best for overall household utility, under the bargaining model, individuals consider what is best for themselves when making decisions about the household division of labor (see Lachance-Grzela and Bouchard 2010). Under this theory, if partner A makes more money than partner B, partner A can use their earnings to "opt out" of household tasks. Partner B is less (economically) fortunate, so has less, or limited, bargaining power. The last theory that is encompassed by the economic umbrella is the economic dependency model. Here the primary earner is *entitled* to the household labor supply of their economic dependents. In cases where household members are less dependent on the primary earner (such as if they are also employed), there is less constraint from earning asymmetry, providing leverage to perform less housework (see Lachance-Grzela and Bouchard 2010). Although women are traditionally more likely to be economic dependents, it is important to note that—like all economic models—gender is not a determining factor in regards to the household division of labor. More to the point, in cases where a woman is the primary (or sole) earner, economic models adequately explain the division of household labor between the woman and her male partner.

Although the economic models are inherently gender-neutral, when testing the economic dependency model empirically against the behavior of men and women, Brines (1993) indicates that gender itself is the primary driver of the division of

1. When describing these models, both Brines (1993, 1994) and Bittman and colleagues (2003) alternate between the terms "model" and "theory." In addition, Brines (1994) notes that there is "substantial conceptual overlap" (p. 653) among these models.

household labor. She finds that the time primary earner wives spend on housework increases the more they support their husbands. The same is not true when husbands are primary earners. Brines suggests that this behavior by wives is an attempt to balance gender deviance—what Bittman and colleagues call "gender deviance neutralization" (2003:193). Viewing this division of labor as if it were a bargaining arrangement, Bittman and colleagues find that primary earner women can use their earnings to bargain out of housework. However, they are not able to use this bargaining power to increase the housework of their partner (2003:204). Brines concludes that the "'doing' or 'not doing' of household tasks serves as the vehicle for displaying gender accountability" (1993:335).

Yet, the situation between women who work and men who do not is a bit more complicated. Bittman and colleagues (2003) update the research of Brines with more recent data, and compare the results across the United States and Australia. They find that, like Brines (1994), there is a curvilinear relationship between a husband's hours of housework and his share of the household couple's income. Bittman and colleagues note, however, that the curvilinearity is caused by a small portion (2-3%) of men in their sample: men that earn nothing. More recent research using the American Time Use Survey (ATUS) dataset finds evidence of this neutralization effect when women out-earn their male partners *and* when a woman's absolute earnings are taken into account (Schneider 2011); that is, it appears women may exhibit gender deviance neutralization via housework regardless of whether their male partner earns something or nothing. It is clear from these studies that there is a linkage that must be disentangled between a father's hours of employment and his household division of labor.

Although the traditional work week is 40 hours long, as of 2018 the average weekly hours of employees across all industries is around 34 hours (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2018). However, when paid employment is combined with unpaid labor, such as household tasks and child care, the actual amount of work done in a week is far greater. In her seminal work, *The Second Shift*, Hochschild (1989) found that women work an extra month a year doing work in and around the house. At the same time, from 1965 and 2003, research finds that married employed fathers have increased their amount of unpaid work nearly six hours (Hook 2006). In fact, studies have found that when combining time spent in paid and unpaid work, a married mother and father spend the same amount of time working (Bianchi et al. 2006; Bredtmann 2014). Other research shows that women who do *not* work have shorter work weeks than the father of their children (Bianchi et al. 2012:59). Although there had been a rise in the amount of housework by fathers in the past few decades, most recently there has been a decrease in this amount as fathers increase their time in child care (Bianchi et al. 2012:58). Despite some increases in household labor by men, women continue to spend more time doing housework and child care, and have less leisure time than their spouses (Bianchi et al. 2006).

Unlike child care, housework can go awhile undone. Dishes and laundry can wait and these tasks can be fit around busy schedules (Bianchi et al. 2012:60). Miller and Sassler find that in households of unmarried cohabiting couples with male primary earners, the men often leave household chores to their female partners because they feel such chores are "women's work" (2010:687). Furthermore, some men had little expectations how these same chores would get done (2010:688), suggesting that they simply expected their female partners would do most of the work. Some women in the Miller and Sassler study supported this gendered division of

household labor, especially those that were not providing equal financial support. For these women, they viewed their excessive (and unequal) distribution of household labor as compensation for the financial support by their male partner (2010:689), which aligns with exchange-related—and gender neutral—theories of the household division of labor (e.g. Bittman et al. 2003). When the situation was reversed and the woman was the primary earner, the men in the Miller and Sassler study did *not* increase their household labor (2010:689), suggesting that some men adhere to gendered norms of household labor regardless of the financial support of each partner—which is more aligned with the assertion of Brines (1993, 1994) that gender is the determining factor for the division of household labor. In all, Miller and Sassler highlight that even when there is no marital contract, cohabiting couples do *not* challenge the traditional male breadwinner/female housekeeper dichotomy (2010:696). This suggests that research on the division of household labor does not necessarily need to include a partner's relationship status in analyses.

Child Care

Historically in the United States, women were not always solely responsible for childcare responsibilities: Nineteenth century fathers were expected to be the family patriarch and moral teachers (Coltrane 1996). Even more, the idea that parents should be solely responsible for their own children is a modern concept that was born out of the creation of the nuclear family and the increased individualism of the early twentieth century (Coontz 1992). According to Cootnz (1992), the idea of the male "breadwinner" stems from the shift away from household life that occurred with the industrial revolution, with the responsibility of household work becoming the primary responsibility of women alone (Coltrane 1996). However, over time, the changing national and global economic landscape has led to a rise in dual-earner households.

Although society continues to assign women the primary caregiver role, there has been a rise in stay-at-home fathers in the past couple decades (Livingston 2014).

There are many associated tasks or activities associated with child care, and the division of labor is unequal across these domains. For example, research indicates that the ratio of a father's time to a mother's time is most equal in recreational care of children, compared to other areas such as physical care (Raley et al. 2012). Whereas a father may spend more time in personal care than in recreational activities with his infant child, as the child grows older this trend may reverse. Furthermore, the amount of time a father spends on one domain may vary depending on the gender of the child (Dyer, Day & Harper 2013:851). An additional factor that may influence a father's involvement is whether he is their biological or social (step) father (Berger et al. 2008). Implicit in this is that these fathers are *not* the primary caregivers of their children; rather, the time in child care that these fathers spend may be a matter of choice. In contrast, fathers that are the primary caregiver for their children may not be afforded the choice on how and when they spend time with their children. It may be necessary for fathers with limited outside employment to undo gender in more situations and instances than other fathers.

Employment with Children

Research indicates that the time parents spend working has a very significant effect on parental time (Rapoport and Le Bourdais 2008:928). For instance, fathers spend more time taking care of children in solo when their wife is employed (Raley et al. 2012:1439). The shift mothers work also influences fathers' domestic responsibility—women that work opposite shifts than their husbands require that their husbands increase their share of childcare (Webber and Williams 2008). The ratio of a mother's earnings to her partner's also influences the amount of time she spends with

her children. For example, mothers spend less time caring for children in solo—and less time with their children overall—the more they earn relative to their husband (Raley et al. 2012:1439). Through her earning potential a mother "may negotiate greater involvement from fathers as their earnings rise relative to those of their husbands" (Raley et al. 2012:1449). Despite this evidence that supports economic theories of the division of household labor, other studies indicate that childcare remains gendered as women's work, either inline with the idea of gender deviance neutralization (Bittman et al. 2003), or through the notion that mothers are primarily responsible for child rearing (Hays 1998). As Ishii-Kuntz and Coltrane emphasize: "[T]heories that stress the importance of a wife's resources and bargaining position may be more applicable to divisions of routine housework than to divisions of child care" (1992:641-642). These findings combined suggest that research on the household division of labor should treat housework and childcare separately, regardless of whether they occur within the same physical location.

Daily vs. Granular Household Division of Labor

The time a family "withdraws" for a specific task comes from the balance in their weekly time allowance—what some refer to as the "family time economy" (Maher, Lindsay, and Franzway 2008). The family time economy is shaped by a host of factors, including "policy settings, gendered labor market opportunities, gendered ideologies of care, childcare structures and the public/social discourse around such policies" (Maher, Lindsay, and Franzway 2008:553). Regardless of how much time is actually spent on household labor, there can be disagreement between the partners. For instance, Miller and Sassler conducted a series of qualitative interviews on unmarried cohabiting couples, and found that partners did not always agree on the amount of time each partner spent on household chores (2010:684). Additionally,

Miller and Sassler found that men tended to over report their levels of housework, while their female partners under report these same levels (2010:685). Unlike studies that rely on estimates, studies that rely on time use diaries limit the amount of activity time an individual can report to the 24 hours of the day, thereby providing a more accurate account of daily activities that is unaffected by under or overestimation.

Despite the fact that time use diaries record activities that occur in the household throughout the day, analyses have primarily focused on measuring activities as an aggregate over the day (e.g. Bittman et al. 2003; Bianchi et al. 2006; Hook and Chalasani 2008; Schneider 2011; Raley et al. 2012; Miller and Bowd 2014). In their analysis of time use of mothers, Connelly and Kimmel (2009) do analyze a mother's time use over the day; however, they limit this analysis to only time spent on childcare. Kimbrough (2015) uses time use data throughout the day in his analysis; however, his research focused on time spent traveling and not on activities within the home. Rapoport and La Bourdais (2008) perform analyses on time use data throughout the day *and* focus on work schedules and parental time—both of which are elements influencing the daily division of household labor; unfortunately, though, Rapoport and La Bourdais only use detailed time use data to ascertain the work "shifts" of the parents. Research by Latshaw and Hale (2016) is exceptional in that it uses detailed time use data to measure the gendered division of labor. The guiding question in that research, though, asks what stay at home fathers do with their time when their partner returns home. Latshaw and Hale withstanding, although time use diaries like the ATUS offer activity data in detail and in summary, the detailed data generally remain an untapped resource to understand time spent on activities throughout the day. Studying how family members use their daily time may lead to a

greater understanding of how gender influences the family time economy, and the family as a whole.

CHAPTER III

CURRENT STUDY

Existing studies on the gendered division of household labor have provided valuable theoretical frameworks (e.g., Brines 1993, 1994; Bittman et al. 2003), established contemporary baselines for comparing the division of labor based on employment status (e.g., Bianchi et al. 2006, 2012; Chesley 2011), and explained how this employment status influences parents' division of childcare responsibilities (e.g., Raley et al. 2012). Yet, these studies have not sufficiently addressed the relationship between gender *borders* and the household division of labor. Unlike gender border work, which is an ongoing process, gender border *crossing* is an occurrence—it is something that occurs at a specific time. Previous studies have relied on measuring the gendered division of labor as an average over the week (Brines 1993, 1994; Bianchi et al. 2006, 2012; Bianchi, Milkie, Sayer, and Robinson 2000; Bittman et al. 2003), or averages over the day (Sayer and Fine 2011; Wight, Bianchi, and Hunt 2012). Given that border crossings are time-specific, this methodology is inadequate for capturing border crossings. Previous studies have also either used data that rely on self-reports of time spent on housework (e.g., Brines 1993, 1994), or did not tap into valuable detailed activity data offered by time use surveys such as the ATUS (e.g., Bitmman et al. 2003). This is a problematic because this activity data provides specifics on daily household activity, especially the start and stop time of activities—data essential to identifying gender border crossings. An additional problem with previous studies is that viewing the division of household labor over the week may mask the daily division of labor. For instance, in an average week a father may spend less time than his female partner on childcare, yet he may spend more time on childcare during certain periods of the day. This study addresses these methodological

shortcomings by using data from the ATUS to better understand the specifics of gender border crossing, particularly crossings that are situated within the household—an area that is overwhelming gendered as women's territory. Using a descriptive analytic strategy, this study will first identify household gender border crossings, and then will identify characteristics of these border crossings, such as their prevalence, timing, and frequency. Lastly, the relationship between a father's hours of employment and his border crossings will also be explored.

This research centers on the operationalization of border crossing as a man's transition into tasks normally ascribed to women, and considers two aspects of these crossings: both the frequency of their occurrence and the total time spent in women's gender territory. Three questions guide this research. The first is: "When do men border cross?" Previous research indicates that the burden of evening childcare falls to women, such that it remains predominately women's work and that fathers are afforded more sleep than mothers. Daytime is operationalized as the time between the average sunrise and sunset (6AM-6PM). Accordingly, I hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 1: Fathers border cross more during the daytime hours.

Second, I ask "What household activities are most associated with men's border crossings?" Work cited indicates that men have increased the amount of time they spend on childcare. For this reason, I hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 2: Fathers border cross more with childcare than with other household tasks.

Finally, I ask "What is the association between a father's employment status and his frequency of border crossing?" Taking a gender neutral approach, we might expect the less a father works outside the home, the more opportunity he should have to spend on household tasks. I therefore hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 3a: Fathers who work less than their partners border cross more than other fathers.

Alternatively, gender deviance neutralization theory and prior studies indicate that there may be a curvilinear relationship between the hours a man works and the amount of housework he performs, such that as his hours of employment approach zero as the time he spends on housework decreases. For this reason I propose the competing hypothesis:

Hypothesis 3b: Fathers who work less than their partners border cross less than or equal to other fathers.

Data

This study relies on the ATUS—a federally-administered survey administered since 2003 that provides activity data on the daily life of a nationally representative sample of Americans. Households in the ATUS sample are randomly selected from a subset of households that participated in the Current Population Survey (CPS), with one household member 15 years or older being selected for the ATUS interview. The ATUS sample is a stratified three stage sample of the CPS, with oversampling of Hispanic and black populations, as well as an oversampling of households with children. Approximately 26,000 households are sampled annually, with samples evenly distributed across months and evenly distributed across the weekday and weekend (with 50% of the sample reporting on weekdays and 50% on weekends). Excluded from the ATUS sample are active military personnel, as well as those that are institutionalized (e.g., those that are in prison or a nursing home) like the vast majority of household-based surveys. The survey is administered in English or Spanish, and participants are interviewed using computer-assisted telephone interviewing. The respondents are asked to recall the events of the previous day,

beginning at 4AM and extending up to 4AM on the current day, and are asked whom they spent their time with, and where they spend their time.

This study uses the latest 2016 ATUS data, which had a response rate of 46.8%. The time diary approach characteristic of the ATUS has a greater respondent burden than many surveys, particularly because respondents have already completed the CPS and may therefore experience "survey fatigue" (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2017:13). In spite of a relatively low response rate[2], these data are considered a reliable source of information and have already made substantial contributions to research on work and family and the household division of labor (e.g., Connelly and Kimmel 2010; Rapoport and La Bourdais 2008; Schneider 2011).

2. There is no clear consensus as to what constitutes an "acceptable" response rate, though some suggest that 70% is frequently considered acceptable for telephone interviews (Singleton and Straights 2004:257).

CHAPTER IV

METHODS

All analyses and data manipulation of the ATUS data files were conducted using IBM SPSS version 21 statistical software. Prior to discussing the specifics of how variables are constructed, a more general discussion underlying the strategy to code household labor is warranted. Household labor tasks are divided into two dichotomous categories based on "traditional" gendered lines informed by the above literature review. In terms of activities within the household and related to childcare, "Men's work" consists of: repairs of any type (both on the inside and outside of the home); car maintenance; yard work; recreational care of children[3]. "Women's work" consists of activities that are not designated as "men's work" just mentioned, and includes all other work under the heading of "Household Activities." In addition, because childcare responsibilities are overwhelmingly relegated to women, most activities in the category of "Caring for & Helping Household Members" were assigned to the "Women's work" category.[4] All other activities are considered leisure (e.g., sleeping, eating, watching television), or occur outside the home, and are categorized here as "other work." It is important to note that although these "other" activities are performed by both women and men, the decision to code using this scheme was to ensure that, for example, a transition from watching television to

3. Although prior studies indicate men spend more time in recreational care of children than other areas of childcare, that in itself does not indicate that recreational care is "Men's work."

4. The ATUS coding lexicon codes activities in three tiers. Major (first tier) categories include broad activities such as "Telephone Calls", "Personal Care", and "Consumer Purchases" (first tier codes 16, 01, and 07, respectively). Second-tier categories are more specific and include items such as "Housework" and "Activities Related to Household Children's Health" (first and second tier combined codes of 0201 and 0303, respectively). Third-tier categories narrow the scope to specific activities. For this paper, the primary focus will be on activities in the first-tier categories of "Household Activities" and "Caring for & Helping Household Members." Given the scope of this paper, all second and third-tier categories under the first-tier category "Household Activities" will be included in analyses. Beneath the first-tier category "Caring For & Helping Household Members" is a second-tier category indicating that a respondent is caring for household adults, such as when a respondent is providing nursing services for an elderly relative; however, based on the background of this paper, only second and third-tier categories under "Caring For & Helping Household Members" that relate to childcare will be included in analyses.

watching children was captured as a border crossing. Because this study is concerned only with men's border crossings into women's territory (via women's work), "other work" and "men's work" are grouped into the same category.

Sample

There are 10,493 respondents in the 2016 ATUS dataset, and the sample in this study was first limited to men having a coresident partner. The ATUS includes a variable that measures the presence of *any* household children less than 18 years old, and another that measures the presence of a respondent's *own* household children. Of men with a coresident partner, 1,411 men reported that there were children less than 18 years old in their household, yet 1,322 men reported the presence of their *own* household children. Because the ATUS questionnaire asked the relationship status for all household members, it was possible that some of these households contain children less than 18 years of age who are *not* a respondent's own children, such as if the child was the respondent's grandchild or nephew. Although it may be possible that the respondent did provide childcare to these children, because of the framing of the background section of this study, only respondent's living with a child of their own were included in analyses. Of note, it was not possible to calculate earner status (an independent variable—see below) for 9% of the men in the initial sample because they had missing information on either their employment status or the status of their partners. Given that earner status was a focal variable in this study, the decision was made to further reduce the sample to men that reported the necessary information to measure earner status; therefore, the final sample for all analyses was 1,202 men with 23,482 total activities.

Dependent Variables

Border crossing. The operationalization of border crossing required a two-step process. First, the ATUS data files were merged, with the resultant data including roster data (for respondent's sex), respondent data (for labor force status), and activity data (for daily/hourly activities). A new categorical variable was then created by dividing activities into two gendered categories, where activities align along traditional gender territory (as mentioned above and informed by the literature review): women's work is coded 0, and all other work is coded as 1.

Although border crossings are bidirectional, this study is only focused on men's border crossings into women's territory. Accordingly, the border crossing variable was calculated as 1 when a respondent begins an activity classified as "women's work," and calculated 0 in all other cases (e.g., when no border crossing occurred). For instance, if a male respondent only performed activities in his own gender territory (e.g., only did "Men's work"), then no border crossings occurred, and the variable remained 0 throughout the respondent's day.

Time in territory. Time in territory is cumulative throughout a respondent's day (e.g., across activities) and measures a respondent's total time in women's gender territory. As an example of this variable, if a respondent never had a border crossing, then his time in territory would be zero minutes. Had the respondent border crossed twice, for instance, then his time in territory would be the sum of the length of each occurrence of "women's work." For each activity, existing ATUS variables were used to measure the total time of an activity, noting that these variables took into account (and adjusted for) the possibility that a respondent's last activity of the day went past the end of the survey day at 4AM. The SPSS LAG procedure was used to accumulate time across activities.

Independent Variables

Earner status. The ATUS provides data on total hours worked per week at the respondent's primary job (and other jobs combined) and the total hours worked per week for the respondent's partner. In addition, the ATUS measured whether respondents and their partners worked part or full time.[5] Earner status was derived from the ATUS variables indicating part or full time status of the respondent and their partner, and was coded into four mutually exclusive groups: the egalitarian earner (where both partners are either unemployed, part time, or full time); the stay-at-home father[6] (where the partner works more than the respondent and the respondent works part time or is unemployed); the traditional earner (where the respondent works full time and the partner is unemployed); the full time earner with part time partner. Egalitarian earners were the most common earner type within the sample (46%), so were treated as the reference group in multivariate analyses.

Age of child. The ATUS measures age in years for all household members (including the respondent). A new variable was constructed and measured at the ordinal level using age ranges similar to those used by Raley and colleagues (2012:1435): 0-2 years old (infant/toddler); 3-5 years old (preschool-age); six and older (school age or older). Given that the youngest household child should require the most care giving, and that including all children makes interpretation of results overly complex, only the youngest household child was included in analyses. Age of child was treated as a categorical variable as there are likely significant differences in childcare requirements based on age.

---

5. Exploratory analyses sought to determine if the ratio of a respondent's hours worked to the hours their partner worked was a better measure of earner status instead of using part or full time status indicators; however, many respondents (n=409) left blank the number of hours their partner worked, reducing the sample size from 1,202 to 782.

6. Doucet (2016) cautions against viewing fathers dichotomously as either working or not working, and found that many fathers that embraced the stay-at-home father label were indeed employed part time (2006).

Family complexity. The CPS measures the relationship of household children in reference to mothers and fathers. It was possible, then, to see if the resident children of a father are biological, step, or adopted, noting that some men may have resident biological and step children. Using the SPSS compute function, a new variable was created, such that 0 indicated a child is biological to both resident partners, and 1 indicated that the respondent and/or their partner is not the child's biological parent (i.e., the child has a complex family arrangement). As mentioned above regarding age of child, only the family complexity of the youngest child was included in analyses.[7] In cases where there was missing data regarding family complexity it was assumed for all analyses that the youngest child was biological to both resident parents (i.e., had a simple family arrangement). With the majority of fathers (95.6%) having youngest children with simple arrangements, it serves as the reference category in multivariate analyses.

Time of day. The ATUS denotes the start time of activities as seconds since midnight, and this serves to measure the time of day of an activity. This variable was coded into 6 hour blocks for descriptive analyses: 12AM-5:59AM, 6AM-11:59AM, 12PM-5:59PM, 6PM-11:59PM. The ATUS records time in the 24 hour format, which eliminated the need to convert from the 12 hour format.

Sociodemographic Variables

Race/ethnicity. Race and ethnicity of respondents was coded into 5 mutually exclusive and exhaustive categories: white (reference), black, Hispanic, Asian, and "other" racial/ethnicity classifications.[8] White respondents were the majority (70.1%) in the sample, so were treated as the reference group in multivariate analyses.

---

7. It was not possible to calculate family complexity for 19% of the children of the respondents due to nonresponse to questions regarding the relationship status of some children.
8. The decision to code race and ethnicity this way was due to their being a very limited of respondents (less than 30) in all other racial/ethnicity categories combined.

Education. Educational attainment is provided by the CPS portion of the ATUS and was recoded into four mutually exclusive and exhaustive categories to indicate the highest education level obtain by the respondent: no degree, high school diploma (or GED), some college experience (including associate's degree), and bachelor's degree or higher. 50% of men in the sample hold at least a bachelor's degree, so served as the reference group in multivariate analyses.

Age. Age of respondent was treated as an interval level variable for multivariate analyses, and was grouped into 10 year blocks for descriptive analyses: 20-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, and 60 or over.

Analytical Strategy

After describing the sociodemographic characteristics of the sample using weighted percentages according to the US population as of 2016, analyses were conducted in two phases. The first consisted of descriptive analyses that detailed the characteristics surrounding gender border crossings, such as the time of the day of the crossings and the activities most associated with border crossings into women's gender territory. The second phase of analyses consisted of measuring the influence of the independent variables upon the dependent variable. Multiple linear regression was used to predict a respondent's time in the opposite gender territory as well as their frequency of border crossing into this opposite territory.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS

Table 1 provides the sociodemographic characteristics of respondents in the sample. As indicated by the table, the majority of men in the sample are white (64%), well educated (41.4%), and older (the average age of men in the sample is about 41 years old). The majority of men have older children (school age or older; 51%), and in most households, the youngest child is the child of both household partners (i.e., has simple family complexity; 96%).

Fathers with a traditional earner arrangement as well as stay-at-home fathers are the least educated among the earner categories, having the highest percentage of fathers that have either no degree or only a high school diploma (or GED). This contrasts with egalitarian earners, and fathers that work full time and have a part time partner where the majority of both earner categories have at least some college. Traditional earners and stay-at-home fathers are again similar in that they both have the youngest children among men in the sample. The majority of egalitarian earners and fathers that work full time with part time working partners have children at least school aged (55% and 56%, respectively). A majority (56%) of Hispanic fathers are traditional earners, whereas the majority of fathers of all other race/ethnic category are egalitarian earners. Limited variation exists between earner types when it comes to the age of the fathers: Stay-at-home fathers are the youngest group, averaging 38 years old; respondents that work full time and have a part time working partner are the oldest earner type, averaging 42 years old.

Table 2 displays the time of day of border crossings into women's territory across all respondents. Within the sample of 1,202 men, just under 3,000 border crossings into women's territory occurred. The majority of border crossings occur

during the daytime, and the same is true regardless of the earner category of the respondent, which is consistent with hypotheses. Interestingly, there is a clear trend when considering all nighttime crossings or all daytime crossings: At night, there are less border crossings for stay-at-home fathers than for those with a traditional earner arrangement. Indeed, the relationship is direct: As earner status approaches equality and then begins to favor women, border crossing frequency decreases. This occurs regardless if it's the evening (6PM-11:59PM) or the early morning (12AM-5:59AM). Even during the morning time (6AM-11:59AM), stay-at-home fathers had a lower percentage of border crossings than traditional earners, with the other categories of fathers falling somewhere in between. During the afternoon time, however, this trend completely reverses and as earner status reaches an arrangement that favors women's employment, the percentage of border crossings increases.

Based on Table 3, there are three activities most associated with men in the sample border crossing into women's gender territory: physical care for household children (24% of crossings), food and drink preparation (22% of crossings), and pickup up or dropping off household children (10% of crossings)[9]. Supplementary analyses sought to determine the frequency of these activities based on earner status and noted little to no variation in activity prevalence. Of activities listed in Table 3 (which only includes activity counts greater than or equal to 30), only eight out of seventeen (47%) activities, or 1,334 out of 2,986 of activities (about 45%) are associated with childcare. Yet, given that most frequent activity is related to childcare,

9. Other less frequent border crossing activities (n<30) were: storing household items, including food presentation; heating and cooling; interior maintenance, repair, and decoration (not elsewhere classified; NEC); exterior cleaning; ponds, pools, and hot tubs; walking/exercising/playing with animals; (household) financial management; (management of) household and personal mail and messages (except e-mail); (management of) home security; household management (NEC); arts and crafts with household children; organization and planning for household children; walking for/with household children; picking up/dropping off household children; caring for and helping household children (NEC); providing medical care to household children.

there is support for the hypothesis that fathers border cross more into childcare than other activities.

Table 4 breaks down the average border crossing frequency across all men in the sample, and by the various earner types defined in these analyses; in addition, this table notes the statistical significance of border crossing frequency between earner statuses. Significant differences in average border crossing frequency exist between the earner categories, with a noteworthy trend: As the respondent's partners increase their hours of employment, the fathers increase their border crossing frequency. In addition, stay-at-home fathers have the highest average border crossing frequency among the earner categories, which combined, is consistent with gender-neutral theories of the division of household labor, and supports the hypothesis that fathers that work less than their partners border cross more than other fathers.

Other patterns in average border crossing frequency emerge, though tests of significance were not performed among subsamples of the main sample. Both black and Hispanic fathers follow the overall trend in that their border crossing frequency increases as women's employment status increases, with the trend continuing as the women are employed more than their partners (i.e., the respondent is a stay-at-home father). Asian fathers also follow this trend, though there are no Asian fathers that are stay-at-home fathers. White fathers do not clearly follow this trend because white egalitarian fathers border cross less than white fathers that work full time and a have a part time working partner. With the exception of fathers 60 or over (where n=24), men 30-39 have a higher border crossing frequency than fathers of any other age, regardless of earner type. In terms of educational attainment, for most earner categories there is a direct relationship: as educational attainment increases, so does border crossing frequency. The one exception to this pattern is that stay-at-home

fathers with some college have a higher border crossing frequency than those with a bachelor's degree or higher. For all earner categories except stay-at-home fathers, border crossing frequency decreases as the age of the youngest child increases. Stay-at-home fathers actually border cross more when they have the oldest children than if they had the youngest children.

Significant variation in the average *time* spent in women's territory also exists based on the sociodemographic characteristics of this sample of fathers. Similar to Table 4, Table 5 indicates that there is significant variation in time in women's territory based on earner category. This is not entirely unexpected, however, because (1) both time in territory and border crossing frequency are derived from the base border crossing variable, and, as a result (2) time in territory and border crossing frequency are highly correlated with each other ($r=.622$, $p<0.001$). Once again (as was the case in Table 4), as woman's earner status approaches parity—and continues on to favor their employment over their partner's—fathers' time in territory increases. Indeed, stay-at-home fathers have nearly double the time in territory of traditional earners (161 minutes compared to 83 minutes, respectively).

In terms of sociodemographics, the patterns are not as evident as they were with Table 4. Also note that, like Table 4, significance tests for subsamples of the main sample were not conducted. Among the race/ethnic categories, it is noteworthy that black fathers have substantially less time in territory than their non-black counterparts, regardless of earner category. Black fathers with a traditional earner arrangement, for instance, generally have half the time in territory of non-black fathers. The exception here is that black stay-at-home fathers have more than double the time in territory than their non-black counterparts. In this way black fathers are on both extremes of time in territory based on earner status. Age of a respondent's

youngest child follows the overall trend in that as partners' earner status approaches equality and then favors women's employment, time in territory increases. Yet, within the individual earner categories, there is no clear pattern of time in territory. In terms of educational attainment, regardless of earner category, fathers with no degree have less time in territory than those with bachelor's degree. It's also noteworthy that fathers with only a high school diploma (or GED) and a traditional earner arrangement have less than half the time in territory of other fathers, regardless of educational attainment or earner category.

Table 6 presents the results of linear regression analysis predicting a respondent's frequency of daily border crossings. Significant differences emerge with regards to race/ethnicity, education, earner status, and the age of respondent's youngest child. The bivariate model indicates that there are significant differences in the frequency of border crossing frequency for Hispanic men, who report less border crossings than their white counterparts; yet, when other characteristics are added into a full model, this significance is lost

According to Table 6, education is positively associated with the frequency of border crossing, as fathers with a bachelor's degree cross the border more frequently than their less-educated counterparts. Moreover, these differences become more substantial when covariates are included in the model. Consistent with a gender-neutral hypothesis, stay-at-home fathers border cross more frequently than their egalitarian counterparts whereas traditional fathers cross less often. Once, again, these linkages become more—rather than less pronounced—once sociodemographic controls are introduced. Lastly, as expected, border crossing was more common among men with younger children. Once again, the coefficient sizes and level of significance increased once additional characteristics were included in the model.

Neither father's age nor family complexity was associated with border crossing frequency. Overall, the model is a good fit ($F=7.202$, $p<0.001$), and explains 7.8% of the variation in border crossing frequency. These findings combined provide some support for the hypothesis that fathers that work less than their partners border cross more than other fathers, and—at the same time—does not support the competing gender deviance neutralization hypothesis.

Consideration of the zero-order and full models demonstrates there is strong evidence of suppression effects. A forward stepwise regression analysis (not shown) was conducted, and when only traditional earner status is used as a predictor, 2.2% of the variance in border crossing frequency is explained. Yet, when educational attainment is added as a predictor in this model, 5.8% of the variance is explained, with each educational category having a greater partial correlation than that of their simple correlations with border crossing frequency. Also, when adding stay-at-home father status as a predictor, the predictive power of the model increases to 6.6%. Note that the earner status of full time respondent and part time working partner is excluded from this stepwise model. Recall from Table 1 that both traditional earners and stay-at-home fathers are the least educated fathers among the earner statuses. Respondents that work full time and have a part time working partner, as well as fathers with an egalitarian arrangement are very well educated, with the majority of each status having at least some college. When controlling for earner status, the relationship between border crossing frequency and educational attainment becomes "unsuppressed" (Thompson and Levine 1997), revealing that as educational attainment increases, so too does border crossing frequency.

Linear regression was used to predict respondent's time in women's territory, shown in Table 7. The zero-order model shows that there are significant differences in

average time in women's territory for both black and Hispanic men, with both groups spending slightly less time in territory than their white counterparts. Once covariates are included in a full model, significant differences emerge between the time black men spend in women's territory remain compared to white men, yet the differences for Hispanic men are no longer significant. Black men spend on average nearly 40 minutes less time in women's territory than white men. The bivariate model indicates that there are significant differences in time in territory for the least educated respondents, with those with no degree and those with a high school diploma (or GED) spending on average about 30 fewer minutes in women's territory than their more-educated counterparts. When sociodemographic controls are added in a full model, these significant differences remain, yet the difference between men with no degree and those with at least a bachelor's degree is only marginally significant. In both the zero order and full model there are significant difference in time in territory between fathers with infants or toddlers compared to those with children at least school aged, with having the youngest children being associated with nearly 30 minutes more time in women's territory compared to those with the oldest children.

The full model shows that compared to egalitarian earners there are significant differences in time in women's territory for each earner category. The full model also shows that fathers who work more than their partner spend less time in women's territory compared to egalitarian fathers, and fathers that work less than their partners (e.g., stay-at-home fathers) spend over 50 minutes *more* time in women's territory than egalitarian earner fathers. In all, the model is significant ($F=98.273$, $p<0.001$) in explaining 5.2% of the variation in time in territory.

Like the previous analysis on border crossing frequency, similar forward stepwise analysis was conducted for time in women's territory (results not shown) to

aid in the interpretation of suppression effects. When controlling only for a traditional earner status, only 1.4% of the variance of respondents' time in territory is explained, yet when adding the additional controls of having only a high school diploma (or GED) and having the youngest child, the model's explanatory power doubles. Now, 3% of the variance in time in women's territory is explained, and partial correlations between traditional earner status and time in territory now exceed the simple bivariate correlation. Controlling for black race, no degree, and stay-at-home status further increases this stepwise model's explanatory power to 4.3%. Recall from Table 5 that fathers with a traditional arrangement who had only a high school degree (or GED) spent the least amount of time in women's territory of all the earner status/educational attainment combinations (with the limited exception of five [n=5] fathers that work full time, had no degree, and had a part time working partner, who spent about 3 minutes in women's territory). Once again, the addition of educational attainment in the model has revealed the otherwise suppressed relationship between earner status and time in women's gender territory: as educational attainment increases, men spend more time in women's territory.

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION

This study examines the relationship between a father's earner status in relation to his partner and how this influences his transition into territory normally relegated to women. By using detailed time use diary data, this study provides an innovative methodological approach to understanding what factors are associated with men's border crossings into women's territory. By studying the impact of a couple's earner arrangement on a father's time in women's territory, this study provides unique insights into gender inequality in the household, and makes recommendations to mitigate the inequality.

I find that as a couple's earner status reached parity (i.e., egalitarian earner status), men increased their frequency of crossing into women's gender territory. Similarly, as a partner's earner relationship reaches equality and then begins to favor women's employment (e.g., stay-at-home fathers), men spent more time in women's territory. This is consistent with prior studies on father involvement that show that the likelihood of a father having daily involvement with his children increases as the hours his partner works increases (Yoshida 2012). It also is consistent with relative resources theory, which suggests that men can bargain out of housework the more they work compared to their partners. Furthermore, stay-at-home fathers had both the most time in women's territory and more border crossings than their egalitarian counterparts, in conflict with gender deviance neutralization theory (Brines 1993, 1994; Bittman et al. 2003) which suggests that men's housework time should decrease as their hours of work decrease. This is a promising finding for gender equality in the household because it indicates that men are traversing the gendered boundary in proportion to need. However, given that the focus of this study was only on measuring

men's border crossings into women's territory, women's housework time was not considered. Regardless of how often a man crosses, his division of household labor could be quite imbalanced, with his partner still performing most of the work. The major methodological innovation for this study was to include time as a variable in the measurement of the household division of labor. This allowed a more comprehensive and granular analysis of the division of labor otherwise not provide by other studies. In addition, the inclusion of time as a model variate was central to the operationalization of a man's *time* in women's territory, and, was central to capturing an individual border crossing instance.

Focusing on men's use of time in the household enables a more nuanced examination of the relationship between earner category and border crossings. Analyses indicate that there was an imbalance in the time of day of border crossings: The majority of crossings occurred in the daytime, regardless of the earner category. In itself this does not suggest gendered behavior because the majority of sleep occurs at night, which is true for both genders. Yet, recall that the most frequent border crossing activity was physical care for children. Infants and very young children may not sleep the entire night, requiring at least one parent to wake up to provide childcare. Indeed, my results indicate that having younger children was associated with both an increase in border crossing frequency and increased time in women's territory compared to having older children. Earlier research indicated the opposite—that fathers who had *older* children spent significantly more time performing childcare than fathers who had younger children, perhaps because the childcare was easier (Ishii-Kuntz and Coltrane 1992:642). Existing research suggests that when married partners have children a division of labor develops because individuals "make investments in specific human capital" via task specialization (Dalmia and Scilian

2008:458). Under this theory, stay-at-home fathers should have more border crossings than other fathers at *all* times of the day because they have specialized in housework and childcare, whereas their partners have specialized in paid employment. However, the findings of my study are partially inconsistent with human capital theory. Instead, during the nighttime hours the proportion of respondent's border crossings *decreased* as women's employment status increased, so much so that stay-at-home fathers had a lower proportion of border crosses in the nighttime than all other fathers. This suggests that either these men are performing gender deviance neutralization, or that nighttime childcare continues to be women's work. Existing research supports the latter suggestion. For instance, Burgard (2011) indicates that women are more likely to report interruptions to their sleep because of gendered expectations for childcare responsibilities. This loss of sleep occurred regardless of whether the women were employed full time and their spouse was the primary caregiver. This also fits with the notion that even when women work full time they must be fully involved with their children via "intensive mothering" (Hays 1998). Qualitative interviews by Maume and colleagues indicate that most fathers they interviewed "took for granted" that the mothers would be the ones who lost sleep as a result of childcare responsibilities (2010:759). The mere presence of the mother in the house may enable men to get more sleep by evading some domains of childcare responsibility (Maume et al. 2010:762), which allows men more leisure time than women (Hochschild 1989; Latshaw and Hale 2016). Because sleep has an important role in health and wellbeing (Burgard 2011), the gender gap in sleep has a negative impact not only on gender inequality, but on the health and wellbeing of women.

Burgard concedes that her research cannot determine whether the gendered behavior in nighttime childcare is the result of choice or constraint (2011:1208). For

instance, as an alternative to gendered behavior, Burgard suggests that a child's preference for a mother over the father may be a factor determining who wakes up to care for the child (2011:1208). When considering daytime alone, the results of my study are generally consistent with human capital theory: stay-at-home fathers border crossed more than other fathers. Methodologically this highlights the benefit of studying the division of household labor throughout the day. Had the division of labor been studied as daily or weekly averages—like most studies—then the unequal distribution of border crossings throughout the day would have gone unnoticed. Regardless of whether men are spending limited time providing childcare at night, overall the most frequent activity associated with border crossing into women's territory was childcare-related. Young children require constant care giving, and when seeking employment parents of young children must either find an alternative caregiver, or adjust their employment accordingly. Most often it is women that reduce their employment in response to caregiving needs (Bianchi et al. 2012:60). In this way gendered caregiving not only negatively influences the division of household labor, it also negatively impacts gender equality in the labor market (Bianchi et al. 2012:60). The fact that the fathers in this study are border crossing into childcare often is, therefore, promising for gender equality both inside and outside the home. Instead of being the primary "breadwinner" (Coontz 1992), or the sole provider (Townsend 2002), it appears men are embracing the notion of being actively involved with their children, a suggestion others have made as well (Chesley 2011). Yet, the fact that these men are infrequently border crossing into *other* household activities is problematic. Generally speaking, childcare responsibilities cannot be avoided or put off until a later time. It is possible, then, that these fathers were unwilling to perform

childcare but had no choice. The fact that these other household tasks could be put off until later can explain their relatively low frequency of occurrence.

It is surprising that one of the top non-childcare related border crossing activities is food and drink preparation. Gendered stereotypes speak of men coming home from a "hard day's work" expecting a hot plate of food. Starting with this latest 2016 ATUS, the coding lexicon for activities removed examples of activities that fell within the tier categories. For instance, in the 2015 coding lexicon under "food and drink preparation" there are examples of "cooking dinner" and "making coffee/tea." It is quite possible, then, that the male respondents in this study are simply making themselves a cup of coffee, rather than cooking themselves a meal—a task gendered as "women's work." Yet, perhaps these men are responding to a more modern notion of masculinity—a masculinity exhibited by male professional chefs on television (see Nolen 2015 for a review of this literature). Furthermore, if these men are cooking for themselves, they may be embracing a masculine identity that values self-sufficiency. Some research indicates that men may treat the kitchen as a creative outlet (DeVault 1991), rather than being a place of work to avoid. Perhaps this accounts for why over 20% of border crosses are related to this activity—the kitchen may be one area that is less gendered than expected.

Differences in the composition of earner type emphasize that, though related, border crossing frequency and time in women's territory measure different aspects of gendered behavior. Recall that when controlling for other factors, such as age or race/ethnicity, a full model indicated that men in each educational attainment category had a lower border crossing frequency than men with at least a bachelor's degree. The same was not completely true for educational attainment and time in women's territory, however. When a full model was considered, only men with a high school

diploma (or GED) spent significantly more time in women's territory than those with a bachelor's degree. Other compositional differences confirm a disconnect between increases and border crossing frequency and increases in time in women's territory. For example, in this study black men are unique in that they are the only race/ethnic group that had significantly less time in territory than white fathers when control for other factors, yet they did not have significantly less border crossings. This emphasizes that although a man can frequently cross into the opposite gender territory, the total time he spends in that territory may still be quite low. For example, although men frequently border crossed to provide care for children, they may have actually spent limited time doing so. This emphasizes that frequently caring for children is distinct from caring for them for extended periods, and highlights an additional methodological innovation of this study: had time *not* been a consideration regarding the division of labor (as is the case in most studies), then this disjunction between border crossing frequency and time in territory would have gone unnoticed. In terms of mitigating gender inequality in the household, rather than having men increase the *number* of times they perform "women's work," what is more beneficial is that they spend more *time* performing "women's work." Additionally, a necessary requirement for realizing gender equality within the home is to narrow the gendered leisure gap. Having men spend more time in the opposite gender territory may be sufficient to realize this goal. In all, the findings that a man's level of education is positively associated with increased housework (Bianchi et al. 2000) or childcare (Bianchi et al. 2006; Yoshida 2012) is consistent with prior studies. This implies that measures to reduce gender inequality in the household division of labor should include educational opportunities for men.

Despite the substantive and methodological contributions of this study, it did have some limitations. The sample of men in the stay-at-home earner category was very low (n=31); though technically sufficient enough to satisfy the requirement of the central limit theorem. Future research on this topic may want to pool ATUS years to increase the number of stay-at-home respondents. Men in this sample are overwhelmingly white and well educated. Although the ATUS data is weighted based on the proportion of each race/ethnic group, the percentage of black respondents in the sample was low. Black men are more likely to be nonresident fathers (Stykes 2012), and because this sample was limited to men with their own corresident children, this likely explains their low turnout in the sample. Because increases in educational attainment are associated with more liberal gender ideologies (Bolzendahl and Myers 2004), it is likely that a less educated sample would have both few border crosses and less time in women's territory. Aside from being white and educated and having the inherent privilege associated with those characteristics, respondents were also privileged in another way: Three out of four earner categories could afford to have one partner not working full time, with the exception being egalitarian earners. Some research on stay-at-home fathers, for instance, shows that they have higher than average household income (Fischer and Anderson 2012). This higher income may allow them the opportunity to limit their employment. Still, it is possible that some couples limited their employment to provide childcare, and therefore weren't necessarily privileged. Other couples may have had one or more partners unemployed for other reasons (e.g., layoffs, disability). Future research will want to include in analyses the reason respondents had limited employment, of which the ATUS readily supplies answers.

It is clear that performing childcare is a major border crossing activity for men, yet it is not possible to determine whether the partner of respondents were home. Given that childcare remains a gendered activity, it was assumed that respondents were performing childcare because there was no one else available to fill the role. Existing research shows that childless couples spend more time simultaneously working outside the home than couples with children (van Klaveren, van den Brink, and van Praag 2011). Future research will want to include as a covariate with earner status the time respondents start their work day, particularly for the large portion of men in this sample that were egalitarian earners—although these men border crossed more than both traditional earners and earners that work full time and had a part time working partner, the amount these egalitarian earners actually border crossed may have been suppressed by not including in the model when they start their work day.

Table 1. Weighted Sample Sociodemographic Characteristics, Totals and by Earner Type.

	Total (n=1,202)		Traditional (n=409)		Respondent full time, partner part time (n=209)		Egalitarian (n=553)		Stay-at-home father (n=31)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Race/Ethnicity										
Asian	83	6.3	32	6.2	8	4.3	43	7.5	0	0.0
black	60	7.3	17	6.7	9	8.1	31	7.2	3	11.1
Hispanic	190	20.8	106	33.8	24	12.2	53	12.4	7	29.4
other	26	1.8	9	1.9	6	1.9	11	1.8	0	0.0
white	843	63.9	245	51.4	162	73.5	415	71.2	21	59.5
Age (years)										
20-29	84	9.0	47	13.7	7	2.8	28	6.4	2	21.3
30-39	465	37.8	165	37.7	72	35.5	214	38.1	14	45.4
40-49	469	38.0	138	33.1	95	44.6	225	40.9	11	21.6
50-59	160	13.6	50	14.2	31	15.1	75	12.7	4	11.7
60 and over	24	1.7	9	1.3	4	2.1	11	1.9	0	0.0
Educational Attainment										
no degree	84	9.9	56	18.0	5	5.3	20	4.8	3	11.9
high school diploma (or GED)	219	25.9	77	26.4	33	19.2	102	27.1	7	37.2
some college	295	22.8	92	19.7	50	22.5	144	25.4	9	21.9
bachelor's degree or higher	604	41.4	184	35.9	121	53.0	287	42.7	12	29.0
Age of Youngest Child										
infant/toddler	363	30.1	146	34.3	55	27.2	155	27.1	7	36.6
preschool age	234	18.7	92	21.0	38	18.1	96	16.7	8	24.5
school age or older	605	51.2	171	44.7	116	54.6	302	56.2	16	38.9
Family Complexity of Youngest Child										
simple	1,149	95.9	392	96.6	202	97.1	525	94.9	30	96.8
complex	53	4.1	17	3.4	7	2.9	28	5.1	1	3.2

Table 2. Time of Day of Border Cross into Women's Territory across All Respondents and by Earner Type (in 6 Hour Increments).

		Total		Traditional		Respondent full time, partner part time		Egalitarian		Stay-at-home father	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Nighttime											
	6PM-11:59PM	1,021	34.2	305	36.4	193	35.3	491	33.0	32	27.8
	12AM-5:59AM	150	5.0	46	5.5	25	4.6	75	5.0	4	3.5
	Total	1,171	39.2	351	41.9	218	39.9	566	38.0	36	31.3
Daytime											
	6AM-11:59AM	938	31.4	272	32.5	166	30.3	468	31.5	32	27.8
	12PM-5:59PM	877	29.4	214	25.6	163	29.8	453	30.5	47	40.9
	Total	1,815	60.8	486	58.1	329	60.1	921	62.0	79	68.7
Daily Total		2,986		837		547		1,487		115	

Table 3. Activities of all Respondents that Led to Border Cross into Women's Territory (n=2,986)*.

Activity	n	%
Physical care for household children	717	24.0
Food and drink preparation	659	22.1
Pickup up/dropping off household children	307	10.3
Household & personal organization and planning	205	6.9
Kitchen and food clean-up	167	5.6
Interior cleaning	144	4.8
Care for animals and pets (not veterinary care)	102	3.4
Laundry	81	2.7
Looking after household children (as primary activity)	71	2.4
Homework (helping household children with)	66	2.2
Walking/exercising/playing with animals	55	1.8
Talking with/listening to household children	52	1.7
Attending household children's events	44	1.5
Reading to/with household children	40	1.3
Waiting for/with household children	37	1.2
Storing interior household items, including food	35	1.2
(Management of) household & personal e-mail and messages	35	1.2
Total	2,817	94.3

* Only activities where n>=30 shown

Table 4. Average Border Crossing Frequency (into Women's Gender Territory) of Respondent by Sociodemographic Characteristics, Totals and by Earner Type

	Total (n=1,202)		Traditional (n=409)		Respondent Full Time, Partner Part Time (n=209)		Egalitarian (n=553)		Stay-at-home Father (n=31)	
	μ	SD	μ	SD	μ	SD	μ	SD	μ	SD
Overall	2.48	2.12	2.05[bcd]	1.98	2.62[ce]	2.20	2.69[df]	2.13	3.7[bef]	2.30
Race/Ethnicity										
Asian	2.41	2.10	1.69	1.51	2.00[a]	2.27	3.02	2.28	-	-
black	2.32	1.98	1.06[a]	1.09	1.67[a]	2.24	2.81	1.66	6.33[a]	1.15
Hispanic	1.91	2.04	1.50	1.67	1.96[a]	2.46	2.51	2.22	3.29[a]	2.87
Other	2.54[a]	1.92	1.33[a]	1.00	4.17[a]	2.56	2.64[a]	1.50	-	-
white	2.63	2.14	2.42	2.14	2.74	2.11	2.67	2.15	3.48[a]	2.04
Age (years)										
20-29	1.90	1.81	1.55	1.79	1.57[a]	1.72	2.46[a]	1.75	2.00[a]	2.83
30-39	2.67	2.11	2.28	1.96	2.74	2.22	2.85	2.13	4.21[a]	2.08
40-49	2.46	2.15	2.08	1.97	2.53	2.16	2.65	2.22	2.91[a]	2.51
50-59	2.30	2.20	1.70	2.19	2.68	2.37	2.40	2.03	5.00[a]	1.63
60 or over	2.71[a]	2.01	1.78[a]	1.86	4.00[a]	2.00	3.00[a]	1.95	-	-
Educational Attainment										
no degree	1.39	1.59	1.32	1.49	0.40[a]	0.55	1.10[a]	1.29	1.33[a]	2.31
high school diploma (or GED)	2.00	1.69	1.65	1.56	2.09	1.61	1.65	1.40	3.29[a]	1.50
some college	2.39	2.18	2.16	2.02	2.14	2.01	1.81	1.50	5.00[a]	2.65
bachelor's degree or higher	2.86	2.21	2.38	2.16	3.05	2.33	2.11	1.63	3.58[a]	2.02
Age of Youngest Child										
infant/toddler	2.69	2.16	2.09	1.98	2.87	2.46	3.15	2.09	3.43[a]	2.37
preschool age	2.54	2.09	2.24	1.97	2.34	1.62	2.80	2.35	3.88[a]	1.46
school age or older	2.34	2.10	1.91	1.98	2.59	2.23	2.42	2.04	3.75[a]	2.70
Family Complexity of Youngest Child										
simple	2.50	2.13	2.08	1.97	2.60	2.20	2.71	2.14	3.77	2.31
complex	2.09	2.06	1.29[a]	1.99	3.14[a]	2.04	2.32[a]	2.04	2.00[a]	-

a. cell count < 30; b. Difference between traditional and stay-at-home father significant at $p<0.05$; c. Difference between traditional and full time respondent with part time partner significant at $p<0.05$; d. Difference between traditional and egalitarian significant at $p<0.05$; e. Difference between full time respondent with part time partner and stay-at-home father significant at $p<0.05$; f. Difference between egalitarian and stay-at-home father significant at $p<0.05$

Table 5. Average Time (in minutes) in Women's Territory of Respondent by Sociodemographic Characteristics, Totals and by Earner Type.

	Total (n=1,202)		Traditional (n=409)		Respondent Full Time, Partner Part Time (n=209)		Egalitarian (n=553)		Stay-at-home Father (n=31)	
	μ	SD	μ	SD	μ	SD	μ	SD	μ	SD
Overall	102.25	113.99	83.43[bc]	106.48	98.95[d]	101.46	114.13[be]	120.10	160.87[cde]	134.65
Race/Ethnicity										
Asian	106.02	92.87	82.88	90.45	88.88[a]	100.93	126.44	90.62	-	-
black	73.00	75.72	34.65[a]	73.04	37.56[a]	64.12	88.87	56.59	332.67[a]	40.92
Hispanic	85.06	122.96	76.24	121.73	69.63	87.57	100.08	128.87	158.00[a]	181.93
Other	131.85[a]	128.40	44.67[a]	52.50	227.50[a]	137.94	151.00[a]	129.49	-	-
white	106.92	115.02	91.42	103.90	102.44	99.97	115.56	124.69	151.57[a]	127.41
Age (years)										
20-29	90.73	116.70	88.02	130.28	58.14[a]	102.54	98.61[a]	89.87	158.00[a]	223.45
30-39	106.98	113.02	88.09	107.55	109.63	114.52	116.30	113.56	173.50[a]	127.50
40-49	101.52	111.97	87.62	102.33	87.83	85.47	113.79	123.30	143.09[a]	156.15
50-59	93.73	118.73	57.58	96.68	111.19	113.59	106.69	131.64	167.00[a]	104.81
60 or over	122.17[a]	131.22	53.33[a]	66.52	147.50[a]	96.05	169.27[a]	162.27	-	-
Educational Attainment										
no degree	76.94	128.39	82.48	142.16	3.40[a]	6.54	84.80[a]	105.58	43.67[a]	75.63
high school diploma (or GED)	79.24	97.53	31.04	23.99	85.06	83.22	83.79	103.32	185.71[a]	146.87
some college	102.63	131.09	70.96	94.91	74.86	92.50	124.19	150.77	235.78[a]	160.36
bachelor's degree or higher	113.93	106.65	99.33	106.09	116.64	107.29	121.92	107.06	119.50[a]	85.70
Age of Youngest Child										
infant/toddler	115.48	124.65	94.32	117.98	106.73	113.54	136.92	131.47	150.71[a]	128.27
preschool age	94.25	95.74	76.88	91.08	86.32	80.10	106.63	98.46	183.13[a]	127.78
school age or older	97.41	113.29	77.66	103.64	99.41	102.08	104.83	119.06	154.19[a]	147.31
Family Complexity of Youngest Child										
simple	103.19	114.83	85.13	107.39	97.07	101.15	115.62	121.28	162.73	136.55
complex	81.98	92.45	44.24a	74.79	153.14[a]	102.81	86.29[a]	92.46	105.00[a]	-

a. cell count < 30; b. Difference between traditional and egalitarian significant at $p<0.05$; c. Difference between traditional and stay-at-home father significant at $p<0.05$; d. Difference between full time respondent with part time partner and stay-at-home father significant at $p<0.05$; e. Difference between egalitarian and stay-at-home father significant at $p<0.05$

Table 6. OLS Regression Model Predicting Border Crossing Frequency into Women's Territory across All Respondents (n=1,202).

	Zero Order	Full Model (OLS Coefficients)
Intercept		2.383 ***
Race/Ethnicity		
(white)		
black	-0.018	-0.389
Hispanic	-0.118 ***	-0.16
Asian	-0.01	-0.301
other	0.004	0.074
Age (in years)	0.004	0.012
Educational Attainment		
no degree	-0.141 ***	-1.235 ***
high school diploma (or GED)	-0.107 ***	-0.805 ***
some college	-0.026	-0.465 **
(bachelor's degree or higher)		
Earner Status of Respondent and Partner		
traditional	-0.148 ***	-0.554 ***
full time, part time partner	0.029	-0.141
(egalitarian)		
stay-at-home father	0.094 **	1.158 **
Age of Youngest Child		
infant/toddler	0.063 *	0.534 **
preschool-age	0.014	0.325 †
(school age or older)		
Family Complexity of Youngest Child		
(simple)		
complex	-0.05	-0.279
F Statistic		7.202 ***
R^2		0.078

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

Table 7. OLS Regression Model Predicting Average Time (in minutes) in Women's Territory across All Respondents (n=1,202).

	Zero Order	Full Model (OLS Coefficients)
Intercept		89.301 ***
Race/Ethnicity		
(white)		
black	-0.059 *	-39.332 **
Hispanic	-0.065 *	-3.76
Asian	0.009	-4.736
other	0.039	31.527
Age (in years)	0.003	0.708
Educational Attainment		
no degree	-0.061 *	-28.321 †
high school diploma (or GED)	-0.095 **	-32.686 ***
some college	0.002	-10.65
(bachelor's degree or higher)		
Earner Status of Respondent and Partner		
traditional	-0.119 ***	-29.582 ***
full time, part time partner	-0.013	-17.961 *
(egalitarian)		
stay-at-home father	0.084 **	53.59 *
Age of Youngest Child		
infant/toddler	0.076 **	27.823 **
preschool-age	-0.035	4.275
(school age or older)		
Family Complexity of Youngest Child		
(simple)		
complex	0.038	-16.659
F Statistic		98.273 ***
R^2		0.052

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

REFERENCES

Berger, Lawrence M., Marcia J. Carlson, Sharon H. Bzostek, and Cynthia Osborne. 2008. "Parenting Practices of Resident Fathers: The Role of Martial and Biological Ties." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 70:625-639.

Berk, Sarah F. 1985. *The Gender Factory: The Apportionment of Work in American Households.* New York, NY: Plenum Press.

Bianchi, Suzanne M., Melissa A. Milkie, Liana C. Sayer, and John P. Robinson. 2000. "Is Anyone Doing the Housework? Trends in the Gender Division of Household Labor." *Social Forces* 79(1):191-228.

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

Bianchi, Suzanne M., Liana C. Sayer, Melissa A. Milkie, and John P. Robinson. 2012. "Housework: Who Did, Does or Will Do It, and How Much Does it Matter?" *Social Forces* 91(1):55-63.

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

Bredtmann, Julia. 2014. "The Intra-household Division of Labor: An Empirical Analysis of Spousal Influences on Individual Time Allocation." *LABOUR: Review of Labour Economics and Industrial Relations* 28(1):1-39.

Brines, Julie. 1993. "The Exchange Value of Housework." *Rationality and Society* 5(3):302-340.

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

Bolzendahl, Catherine I., and Daniel J. Myers. 2004. "Feminist Attitudes and Support for Gender Equality: Opinion Change in Women and Men, 1974-1998." *Social Forces* 83(2):759-790.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2017. *American Time Use Survey User's Guide: Understanding ATUS 2003 to 2016.* Retrieved August 22, 2017 (https://www.bls.gov/tus/atususersguide.pdf).

Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2018. "Table B-2. Average weekly hours and overtime of all employees on private nonfarm payrolls by industry sector, seasonally adjusted." Retrieved February 20, 2018 (https://www.bls.gov/news.release/empsit.t18.htm)

Burgard, Sarah A. 2011. "The Needs of Others: Gender and Sleep Interruptions for Caregivers." *Social Forces* 89(4):1189-1215.

Calasanti, Toni M., and Carol A. Bailey. 1991. "Gender Inequality and the Division of Household Labor in the United States and Sweden: A Socialist-Feminist Approach." *Social Problems* 38(1):34-53.

Chesley, Noelle. 2011. "Stay-at-home Fathers and Breadwinning Mothers: Gender, Couple Dynamics, and Social Change." *Gender and Society* 25(5):642-664.

Coltrane, Scott. 1996. *Family Man: Fatherhood, Housework, and Gender Equity.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Connelly, Rachel, and Jean Kimmel. 2009. "Spousal Economic Factors in ATUS Parent's Time Choices." *Social Indicators Research* 93(1):147-152.

Connelly, Rachel, and Jean Kimmel. 2010. *The Time Use of Mothers in the United States at the Beginning of the 21st Century.* Kalamazoo, MI: Upjohn Institute.

Coontz, Stephanie. 1992. *The Way We Never Were: American Families and the Nostalgia Trap.* New York, NY: BasicBooks.

Dalmia, Sonia, and Paul Sicilian. 2008. “Kids Cause Specialization: Evidence for Becker’s Household Division of Labor Hypothesis.” *International Advances in Economic Research* 14:448-459.

Deutsch, Francine M. 2007. “Undoing Gender” *Gender Society* 21(1):106-126.

Devault, Marjorie L. *Feeding the Family: The Social Organization of Caring as Gendered Work.* Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Doucet, Andrea. 2006. *Do Men Mother? Fathering, Care, and Domestic Responsibility.* Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Doucet, Andrea. 2016. “Is the Stay-at-Home Dad (SAHD) a Feminist Concept? A Genealogical, Relational, and Feminist Critique.” *Sex Roles* 75:4-14.

Dyer, Justin W., Randal D. Day, James M. Harper. 2013. “Wrestling Proteus: Assessing the Varying Nature of Father Involvement Across Contexts.” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 75:837- 857.

Fischer, Jessica, and Veanne N. Anderson. 2012. “Gender Role Attitudes and Characteristics of Stay-at-Home Employed Fathers.” *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 13(1):16-31.

Grusky, David B., and Katherine R. Weisshaar. 2014. “The Questions We Ask About Inequality.” Pp. 1-16 in *Social Stratification: Class, Race, and Gender in Sociological Perspective*, edited by David B. Grusky and Katherine R. Weisshaar. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Hays, Sharon. 1998. *The Cultural Contradictions of Motherhood.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Hochschild, Arlie Russell. 1989. *The Second Shift.* New York, NY: Avon Books.

Hook, Jennifer L. 2006. “Care in Context: Men’s Unpaid Work in 20 Countries, 1965-2003.” *American Sociological Review* 71(4):639-660.

Hook, Jennifer L., and Satvika Chalasani. 2008. "Gendered Expectations? Reconsidering Single Fathers' Child-Care Time." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 70(4):978-990.

Ishii-Kuntz, Masako, and Scott Coltrane. 1992. "Predicting the Sharing of Household Labor: Are Parenting and Housework Distinct?" *Sociological Perspectives* 35(4):629-647.

Kimbrough, Gray. 2015. "Measuring Community in the American Time Use Survey: Department of Economics Working Paper Series." University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Lachance-Grzela, Mylene, and Genevieve Bouchard. 2010. "Why Do Women Do the Lion's Share of Housework? A Decade of Research." *Sex Roles* 63:767-780.

Lamb, Michael E., and Catherine Tamis-LeMonda. 2004. "The Role of the Father: An Introduction." Pp. 1-31 in *The Role of the Father in Child Development,* edited by M. R. Lamb. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Lamont Michele, and Virag Molnar. 2002. "The Study of Boundaries in the Social Sciences." *Annual Review of Sociology* 28:167-195.

Latshaw, Beth A., and Stephanie I. Hale. 2016. "'The Domestic Handoff': Stay-at-home Fathers' Time-use in Female Breadwinner families." *Journal of Family Studies* 22(2):97-120.

Livingston, Beth. 2014. *Growing Number of Dads Home with the Kids.* Washington, DC: Pew Research Center. Retrieved March, 19 2017 (http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2014/06/05/growing-number-of-dads-home-with-the-kids/).

Maher, Jane Maree, Jo Lindsay, and Suzanne Franzway. 2008. “Time, Caring Labour and Social Policy: Understanding the Family Time Economy in Contemporary Families.” *Work, Employment, and Society* 22(3):547-558.

Miller, Pavla, and Justin Bowd. 2014. “Family Time Economies and Democratic Division of Work.” *Journal of Family Studies* 20(2):128-147.

Miller, Amanda, and Sharon Sassler. 2010. “Stability and Change in the Division of Labor Among Cohabiting Couples.” *Sociological Forum* 25(4):677-702.

Nolen, Jason Andrew. 2015. "’They Will Worship You and Call You the Man’ Constructions of Masculinity in Men's Cookbooks.” *Conference Papers: American Sociological Association* 1-33.

Raley, Sara, Suzanne M. Bianchi, and Wendy Wang. 2012. “When do Fathers Care? Mother’s Economic Contribution and Fathers’ Involvement in Child Care.” *American Journal of Sociology* 117(5):1422-1459.

Rapoport, Benoit, and Celine Le Bourdais. 2008. “Parental Time and Working Schedules.” *Journal of Population Economics.* 21(4): 903-932.

Risman, Barbara J. 1998. *Gender Vertigo: American Families in Transition.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Sayer, Liana C., and Leigh Fine. 2011. “Racial-Ethnic Differences in U.S. Married Women’s and Men’s Housework.” *Social Indicators Research* 101:259:265.

Schneider, Daniel. 2011. “Market Earnings and Household Work: New Tests of Gender Performance Theory.” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 73:845-860.

Singleton, Royce A., and Bruce C. Straits. 2005. *Approaches to Social Research: Fourth Edition*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Stykes, Bart. 2012. “Who are Nonresident Fathers? Demographic Characteristics of Nonresident Fathers (FP-12-08).” National Center for Family & Marriage Research. Retrieved March, 7, 2018 (https://www.bgsu.edu/content/dam/BGSU/college-of-arts-and-sciences/NCFMR/documents/FP/FP-12-08.pdf)

Thompson, Franklin T., and Daniel U. Levine. 1997. “Examples of easily explainable suppressor variables in multiple regression research.” *Multiple Linear Regression Viewpoints* 24:11-13.

Thorne, Barrie. 1993. *Gender Play: Girls and Boys in School.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Townsend, Nicholas W. 2002. *The Package Deal: Marriage, Work, and Fatherhood in Men’s Lives.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

van Klaveren, Chris, Henriette Maasen van den Brink, and Bernard van Praag. 2011. “Intra Household Work Timing: The Effect on Joint Activities and the Demand for Child Care.” *European Sociological Review* 29(1):1-18.

Webber, Gretchen, and Christine Williams. 2008. “Part-Time Work and the Gender Division of Labor.” *Qualitative Sociology* 31:15-36.

West, Candace, and Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. “Doing Gender.” *Gender and Society* 1(2):125-151.

Wight, Vanessa R., Suzanne M. Bianchi, and Bijou R. Hunt. 2012. “Explaining Racial/Ethnic Variation in Partnered Women’s and Men’s Housework: Does One Size Fit All?” *Journal of Family Issues* 34(3): 394-427.

Yoshida, Akiko. 2012. “Dads Who Do Diapers: Factors Affecting Care of Young Children by Fathers.” *Journal of Family Issues* 33(4):451-477.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Ken Arsenault

Education

MA 2018 (pending); Sociology, Sam Houston State University, TX.

Thesis: "Gender Border Crossing and the Household Division of Labor and Childcare."

BA 2014 (*sum cum laude*); Sociology, Bridgewater State University, MA.

Honors Thesis: "Civil Unrest and Collective Violence in France: A Historical Comparative Analysis."

Research Interests

- Family
- Gender
- Globalization

Manuscripts in Peer Review Process

Arsenault, Ken, Bart J. Stykes. "Moving Past Dichotomies of Fathering Roles: A New Approach." Revise and resubmit at the *Journal of Family and Marriage.*

Conference Presentations

2018 "Gender Border Crossing and the Household Division of Labor and Childcare." Paper presentation at the annual Eastern Sociological Society meeting, Baltimore, MD.

2017 "Moving Past Dichotomies of Fathering Roles: A New Approach." Paper presented in collaboration with J. Bart Stykes. at the annual Population Association of America meeting, Chicago, IL.

2017 “The Crystallization of Inequality in the Household Division of Labor.” Roundtable presentation at the annual Eastern Sociological Society meeting, Philadelphia, PA.

2015 “Impacts of Migration and Unemployment Rates on National Identity Formation.” Paper presented at the annual Eastern Sociological Society meeting, New York, NY.

2013 “Rentier Capitalism in the Gulf Corporation Council and Its Impact on Democracy.” Paper presented at the annual Massachusetts Statewide Undergraduate Research Conference, Amherst, MA.

University Service

2016 Research Assistant to Professor J. Bart Stykes.

Civil Service

2003-2008 United States Air Force; honorably discharged.

Professional Affiliations

American Sociological Society

Eastern Sociological Society