

Does the domestic division of labour vary between married and cohabiting couples and is this reflected in their gender ideologies?

Jenny Elizabeth Brickdale

Master's by research

University of York

Sociology

December 2015

## **Abstract**

This research investigated the division of labour and the gender ideologies held by seven married couples and nine cohabiting couples in northern England in the summer of 2014. The research used three data collection methods of questionnaires, time use diaries and interviews. The results from these methods were triangulated and analysed. The results showed that egalitarian gender ideologies were held by most of the participants, with the exception of some of the married women, and that they generally believed in the equal division of labour. However, the equal division of labour was not implemented in the couples researched. Men generally worked longer hours in paid employment than the women. The women generally did more housework and childcare than the men. Married women overall did more housework than the cohabiting women. Mothers with young children did more childcare than other mothers and also in comparison to their partners. Housework tasks had a gender divide (women did indoor tasks and men did outdoor tasks) but this was not as noticeable in the division of childcare tasks. Men and women generally enjoyed doing childcare tasks. Men and women also gained pleasure from their employment and they had all worked in the public sphere. This research has contributed a number of findings to sociological knowledge. The first was that it directly compared the gender ideologies of married and cohabiting couples. The second was the division of tasks in the home was divided quite equally between the genders, particularly in childcare tasks. Thirdly, this research showed that women still generally have a greater domestic burden than their male partners. Finally, it also provided data that indicated that some women enjoyed having the greater share of domestic work and so indicated that high female engagement in the home may not be the result of gender subjugation.

## **List of Contents**

Page 2 – Abstract

Page 3 – List of contents

Page 5 – List of tables

Page 6 - Acknowledgements

Page 7 - Declaration

Page 8 – Chapter One: Statement of the Problem

Page 12 – Chapter Two: Literature Review

- Pg 13 – Patterns in the domestic division of labour
- Pg 15 – Research in to the domestic division of labour in married and cohabiting couples
- Pg 17 – Potential reasons for the gendered division of labour
- Pg 19 – Gender ideologies
- Pg 20 – Why this research was new and necessary
- Pg 21 – Explanatory factors
- Pg 23 – Opinions about the division of labour
- Pg 24 – Conclusion
- Pg 25 – definitions to be used in this research

Page 26 – Chapter Three: Methodology

- Pg 26 – Sample type
- Pg 27 – Data collection methods
- Pg 28 – Time use diaries
- Pg 29 – Questionnaires
- Pg 31 – Interviews
- Pg 32 – Reliability and validity
- Pg 33 – Research ethics
- Pg 34 – Data analysis
- Pg 35 – Pilot study

Page 37 – Chapter Four: Analysis of the Results

- Pg 38 – Section One: Paid work
- Pg 38 – Overall patterns in paid work
- Pg 39 – Gender ideologies and paid work
- Pg 43 –Section two: Housework

- Pg 43 – Overall patterns of housework
- Pg 44 – Explanations of housework hours
- Pg 46 – Attitudes towards the division of labour
- Pg 47 – Housework and gender roles
- Pg 48 – Gendered divisions of labour
- Pg 50 – Section Three: Childcare
- Pg 51 – Overall patterns in childcare
- Pg 51 – Attitudes to childcare
- Pg 52 – Gender ideologies and childcare
- Pg 55 – Conclusion

Page 57 – Chapter Five: Discussion of the findings

- Pg 57 – Role of gender
- Pg 58 – Relationship Type
- Pg 59 – Age and primary socialisation
- Pg 60 – Educational level and employment type
- Pg 60 – Individual choice
- Pg 61 – Age of children
- Pg 62 – Limitations of research
- Pg 63 – Limitations of questionnaires
- Pg 63 – Limitations of time use diaries
- Pg 64 – Limitations of interviews

Page 64 – Chapter Six: Conclusion

- Pg 67 -Possibilities for future research

Page 69 - Appendix One: Table of participants

Page 71 - Appendix Two: Table of articles in the literature review

Page 73 - Appendix Three: Questionnaire

Page 83 - Appendix Four: Time use diary

Page 93 - Appendix Five: Interview topic areas

Page 99 – Appendix Six: Tables outlining quantitative data about participants' undertaking of housework

Page 102 - Appendix Seven: Tables outlining the quantitative data collected from participants about childcare

Page 104 - Appendix Eight: the characteristics of the sample

### **List of Tables**

- Pg 37 – Table 4.1 – average number of hours on housework, childcare and paid work in one week (time use diaries)
- Pg 99 – Table 4.2 – housework tasks completed by the participants according to questionnaire data
- Pg 100 – Table 4.3 – number of participants who completed these housework tasks in a week (time use diaries)
- Pg 101 – Table 4.4. – average number of times participants undertook tasks within a week (time use diaries)
- Pg 102 – Table 4.5 – number of participants who reported completing childcare tasks in a week (time use diaries)
- Pg 103 – Table 4.6 – average number of times participants conducted each task within a week (time use diaries)
- Pg 104 – Table 4.A – the sample and its key characteristics
- Pg 105 – Table 4.B – comparison of the married and cohabiting couples

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to thank everyone who participated in this research for their time and honesty. I literally could not have done this research without you! Your information has helped me to see Sociology and social research in a completely new way and analysing and writing about it has definitely made me a better teacher. Your generosity has helped me to add to sociological knowledge in this research area and has improved my ability to understand the world around me.

I would also like to thank my supervisor Professor Ellen Annandale. I must have really tried your patience as it took me such a long time to re-adjust to academic work after being out of education for so long! I have never known anyone to be so thorough in their analysis of my work and to have such high standards set for me to meet; your professionalism has definitely made me a better student and has also made me realise how tough academic research really is. I have so much respect for how hard you work and how dedicated you are to the students you are supporting. I have learned so much from you which I now use in my own teaching at college and which has enabled me to support my EPQ and High Achievers students in a better way. I think I will hold off on doing the PhD for a few years though to recover from doing this MA!

Finally, I would like to dedicate this Masters to my 'army of little boys': Robbie, Taylor, Maxx, Jacob, Alfie, Harry, Bradley and Hunter. I hope you shall all grow up to be egalitarian in both thought and deed in your relationships and that you are always respectful and considerate to the people you love. I grow more proud of you all every day.

### **Declaration**

I declare that all of the work within this Masters is my own original work and that I have not plagiarised any part of it.

All literature used within this Masters has been referenced and accredited. A full list of the literature I have used can be found in the bibliography.

The work in this thesis is my own and has not been submitted for examination at this or any other institution for another award.

## **Chapter One: Statement of the Problem**

### **“Does the domestic division of labour vary between married and cohabiting couples and is this reflected in their gender ideologies?”**

The division of labour is seen by feminists such as Oakley, as an indication of the extent of gender equality within the UK and of the strength of patriarchy in UK society (Oakley, 1974). So if women in contemporary society are still doing the majority of housework and childcare, and men are still the main breadwinners, then can equality have been achieved? If there is still a gendered division of labour within UK homes, then are men and women dissatisfied or content with this? Does people's belief in gender equality always lead to an equal gendered division of labour, or is there a difference between having a belief in equality and then the implementation of domestic gender roles? These core issues about the division of labour within relationships, people's contentedness with their domestic roles, the gender ideologies that people hold about the division of labour, will be explored in this research.

Since the 1980s, terms such as the New Man have come into popular usage (Castella, 2014). This refers to men who are active in the home; assisting their female partners with housework and looking after their children. We are shown examples in the media of men who are more pro-active in childcare and housework, such as the 2010s media personality David Beckham, but to what extent are these high-profile men representative of what is going on in mainstream UK society? Do the majority of British men really feel that they should do more in the private sphere and do they see it as desirable to help women with their traditional domestic burden? Now there is a high level of engagement of women from all social classes in paid work (ONS, 2013) is the expectation still that they must do the majority of the domestic labour in their homes?

UK social institutions such as the media and schools are now pro-actively promoting the notion of gender equality. Recent education policies that promote this include the initiative to get more girls into STEM subjects via the government's WISE campaign (WISE Campaign, 2016). In the media, men are often cast into roles that show them caring for children and doing housework chores, such as in the Calgon advertisements where a man cleans the dishwasher. There have been legal changes made which could enable egalitarian role-sharing in people's homes. For example, since the UK Shared Parental Leave Act (2015), mothers and fathers can legally divide-up parental leave according to their own personal preferences instead of the previous situation where the mother had a long maternity leave and the father was only allowed three weeks'



paternity leave (gov.uk, 2016). As the 2012 British Social Attitudes Survey (BSAS) (Scott and Clery, 2013) showed, the mainstream gender ideology in UK society was that men should share housework and childcare with their partners. We are taught via many agencies of secondary socialisation that the traditional gender ideologies and roles are unacceptable. (It must be noted this does not cover all agencies of secondary socialisation; there are many conservative agencies who still promote the traditional division of labour e.g. Orthodox Jews.) However, does this overall change in UK ideology about gender equality in the home actually translate to a change in people's personal gender ideologies and their practices within their homes?

No project on gender divisions within the home in the UK could be complete without reference to Oakley's book *Housewife* (1974); her findings are a useful comparative resource to see how far gender divisions have changed since the 1970s. As Oakley noted, little research had been done on women and their domestic work up to the 1960s; sociology had been dominated by looking at men, and women were ignored (Oakley, 1974). When Oakley was conducting her research, family diversity was limited and cohabitation was uncommon; marriage was the dominant relationship type and nuclear families the most common family type (ONS, 2014). In the 1960s, just before Oakley's research began, less than 1% of under-50s cohabited (Ward, 2011). Consequently, her research was conducted on wives aged 20-30 who had children and her results reflected what the division of labour within married couples was like (Oakley, 1974). As noted, Oakley discovered in her research that married couples had a strict division of labour with traditional conjugal roles because marriage was a traditional institution with specific norms and values (Oakley, 1974).

This research aims to discover whether today's married couples have the same gendered roles in the home as Oakley found and whether they believe in the gendered division of tasks to the extent that they did in the 1970s. In 2011, one in six people under-50 cohabited (ONS, 2011) so what will be interesting to know is whether the cohabiting couples in this research feel these same social expectations and therefore enact the gendered division of labour or whether they are more egalitarian in their attitude and roles in the home. Do the social expectations of marriage make married couples more gender divided in the home? As cohabitation is a non-traditional relationship type then it is important for feminists to see if this new family type has gender stereotypes attached to it or not and also to what extent housework, childcare and paid work are shared between men and women in this relationship type depending on the strength of the gender ideologies they hold.

There has been recent but limited research looking at the division of labour within married and cohabiting couples in the UK since the 1970s, such as Dominguez-Folgueras (2012) and Davis (2007), which showed that heterosexual cohabiting couples were likely to divide up housework and childcare more equally and that both partners were likely to be engaged in paid work. However, women still engaged in the majority of domestic labour, tasks were divided up by gender, and women were more likely to work part time and take time off after children had been born (Delaunay, 2006). Married couples were more traditional in their approach with more sex typing of domestic chores, women doing more housework and childcare, and men were more likely to work (Baxter, 2005). The similarities and differences of the gender ideologies held by cohabiting couples and married couples are rarely investigated by sociologists in the UK; hence they will be studied in this research.

As noted, there has been little research done on the differing gender ideologies held by married and cohabiting couples. There have been questions asked in large-scale quantitative surveys, such as the British Social Attitudes Survey (Scott and Clery, 2013), that have asked people what they think about gender divisions within the home. However, these surveys made no differentiation between whether respondents are married or cohabiting; and so no difference in ideology was noted between them. This research will be innovative as it will be looking at the ideologies of cohabiting and married couples and comparing them.

The most recent research on gender divisions in the home and gender ideologies was conducted for the 2012 British Social Attitudes Survey (Scott and Clery, 2013). The BSAS found that in 2012 only 13% of respondents believed in the traditional division of labour in the home; a decline from 48% in 1989 (Scott and Clery, 2013). It found that 33% believed that women should stay at home if children were under four compared to 64% in 1989 (Scott and Clery, 2013). The BSAS found that women self-reported doing thirteen hours of housework a week and twenty-three hours of family member care, compared to men self-reporting doing eight hours of housework and ten hours of family member care (Scott and Clery, 2013). The report also found that:

“the nuclear family norm of a married heterosexual couple bringing up their children, with a traditional division of labour, is increasingly under challenge. There has been a rise in women's participation in the labour market... the tendency is for both partners to work. However, women, especially those with young children...do the bulk of unpaid care” (Scott and Clery, 2013, pg116).

These trends will be looked at in this this research as will whether there are differences in the married and cohabiting couples.

The BSAS report concluded that most people believed in gender equality and are intellectually opposed to the traditional division of labour (Scott and Clery, 2013). It will be interesting to note if this is found for the participants in this study and whether it is affected by relationship type. Younger generations opposed the notion of segregated conjugal roles and they accepted that women go to work and earn money (Scott and Clery, 2013). This research needs to take into consideration that there may be other factors like generation or religion that may be associated with people's gender ideologies and their divisions of labour. Finally, the BSAS found that little had actually changed within the home since 1989, despite the changes in attitudes towards gender; men did little unpaid domestic labour in comparison to women, women did more housework and childcare, and paid work was more equal between men and women (Scott and Clery, 2013).

In theoretical works about gender divisions in the home, feminist sociologists discussed the impact of gender divisions on women. Greer (2006) said that women have little time for leisure activities and that they are constantly exhausted from working in the home. Faludi in '*Backlash*' (1992) noted the damage done to married housewives by their role. They were likely to suffer from a plethora of illnesses, both physical and mental (Faludi, 1992). We will see if this is borne out in this research; are married women unhappy with patriarchy in the home and do cohabiting women feel the same way?

Giddens (1993) in *The Transformation of Intimacy* wrote that today's relationships in the UK and USA have more equal roles as people now have pure relationships. Pure relationships are where people have chosen to be with each other because of mutual attraction and respect but they have the opportunity to separate if one or both partners is unfulfilled (Giddens, 1993). Giddens believed that pure relationships will lead to less dominance by one partner so therefore roles will be more equal (Giddens, 1993). Relationships today now have institutional reflexivity, where people decide what roles they want according to their individual beliefs, so people are not shoehorned into pre-defined traditional roles that are gender-based; instead they can pick the role they actually want to have (Giddens, 1993). It may be expected that cohabiting couples are more likely to have these pure relationships because of their non-traditional relationship type and thus they may be more likely to share the division of labour in the home and believe in equality. This will be investigated in this research alongside seeing if the married couples also show signs of having pure relationships.

Beck and Beck-Gernsheim in *The Normal Chaos of Love* (1995) argued that people in the UK and USA have choice about what they do in their relationships and the roles they can adopt. There is now individualization within society where people can make their own decisions about their lives and they are less constricted by social norms compared to the 1970s and before (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim, 1995). Today, relationships are more fluid; the solid roles of male breadwinner and female housewife have vanished in many couples, especially younger couples (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim, 1995). Will the individualization of roles be found in this research?

This statement of the problem will be ended with a quote from Scott and Clery (2013, pg134) –

“The British public perceives a mismatch between depictions of gender-neutral adult-worker families and the practical realities of the gender division of paid and unpaid labour, especially when children are young. Is the gender revolution stalled? Or are we seeing a 'structural lag' – whereby men and societal institutions have to catch up with the realities of changing families and women's new roles?”

These are the areas that will be investigated but they will be framed in the context of married versus cohabiting couples. Are cohabiting couples more likely to divide housework and childcare up equally and are married couples more likely to divide-up by gender? Is this the result of their gender ideologies?

## Chapter Two: Literature Review

Appendix Two outlines the literature discussed in this review. The literature was drawn from a variety of sources including YorSearch, York University library, my own books and from Google Scholar. The online search terms I used to find some of this literature included "division of labour in married and cohabiting couples" and "gender ideologies within married and cohabiting couples". I read this literature between October 2013 and May 2016.

There is an extensive body of social science literature on the division of labour within households; especially from the 1970s onwards. This body of work explores the roles in the home and amount of housework, childcare and paid work undertaken by men and women as well as explanations for why these roles are so gender divided. To a lesser degree, this body of work gives some insight into the gender ideologies that couples have and the connection between these ideologies and the resulting division of labour in the home. The context for my interest in this area of research is that I am an A-level sociology lecturer and we teach about the division of labour within the home.

### *Patterns in the domestic division of labour*

Kan's (2008) research, which investigated the USA, UK and other industrialised countries, showed that housework in the early 2000s remained a female occupation despite more women going into paid work; even when women worked full time they still did the bulk of the housework. Men in the early 2000s may have done slightly more housework than in previous decades, such as the 1970s, but women still did the most housework (Kan, 2008). Women's housework hours decreased in the early 2000s from the 1970s but their hours of paid labour have increased since the 1970s and so women's total work time has increased over the years (Kan, 2008). This indicates that the division of labour is still unequal and that women appear to have more overall labour to do on a daily basis than men.

Bianchi (2011) writes that families have dual earner couples because the family's finances need both the man's and woman's contributions to make them economically viable and so this has meant that for parents their second shift of caregiving must be attached to their first shift of paid work. The UK female employment rate has risen which may have increased their overall burden of work; in mid-2013 around 67% of women aged 16 to 64 were in work which was an increase from 53% in 1971 (ONS, 25/9/13). Women are usually the family's unpaid caregiver and are highly affected by their integration into the labour market as there is a tension between the time needed for paid

work and for caregiving (Bianchi, 2011). In the UK in 1996 67% of married or cohabiting mothers with dependent children were in work but by 2013 this had increased to 72% (ONS, 25/9/13).

Bianchi (2011) found that more US mothers did paid work outside the home since the 1960s but they did less housework in the home in comparison to that period. This is supported by Bianchi and Milkie (2010) who found that during 2000-2010, the amount of time men and women spent on paid and unpaid work was becoming more similar and that in areas such as cleaning and childcare men were becoming increasingly involved. However, both studies found the amount of time women spent doing childcare in the late 2000s was around the same amount or higher compared to women in the 1960s when most mothers did not do paid work (Bianchi, 2011, Bianchi and Milkie, 2010).

Assave et al (2014) also found that more women now do paid work but that the bulk of housework is still done by them and there is still a strong gender division between the tasks done by men and women in the home. Occasional tasks, such as small repairs, are completed by men whereas routine tasks, such as cleaning, are done by women (Assave et al, 2014). Women do spend less time cooking in comparison to the 1960s but this is due to technological advances and not to do with men doing these tasks instead (Assave et al, 2014). Fathers have increased the amount of time they spend on childcare over thirty years and these childcare hours are added on to long hours of paid work (Bianchi, 2011).

A UK OnePoll survey for Molly Maid, a UK cleaning company, in 2014 found that "the gender gap is closing more than ever when it comes to helping out around the house, with women spending on average 8.14 hours a week on cleaning tasks alone, and men 7.21 hours a week" (Molly Maid, 2014). Despite men increasing their amount of housework and childcare, it is noticeable from all the research in this review that men appeared to do less than women do in the home on a regular basis; a OnePoll survey found that on average, women spend 28% more time on housework and 31% more time on childcare than their partners (Molly Maid, 2014)

Fathers and mothers spend more time than previous generations caring for their children and this increase has been greater for fathers than for mothers which has meant that there has been a reduction in the gender gap in how childcare is done (JRF, 1997). Bianchi (2011) found in the US mothers' longer working hours were associated with increased father involvement in children's lives. This may indicate that men will engage with domestic tasks if their partner does more paid work which in turn may indicate a re-balancing of the relationship to support the woman's increased burden. If a couple had

children this also increased the amount of housework men did in Shelton and John's (1993) research.

Women's working hours can be connected with their status as a mother; some women do leave the workplace when they have children. In 2013, the UK employment rate for women levelled off during their early-30s, coinciding with the average age for a woman to have her first child (ONS, 2013). Bianchi (2011) found that the majority of married women aged 25-54 with pre-school children did not work full time all year round and other mothers' employment hours remained responsive to the age of their children. Bianchi and Milkie (2010) also found that mothers would curtail their employment if the pressures of work and childcare became overwhelming but fathers would not.

Despite parents being heavily involved with their children, respondents in the 1997 National Study of the Changing Workforce in the USA still believed they did not spend enough time with them (Bianchi, 2011). In this study, mothers who worked felt they missed out on their children more than non-working women and fathers felt that they had too little time with their children because they worked long hours (Bianchi, 2011). This is backed up by Bianchi and Milkie (2010) who found that many parents did not have positive wellbeing because they did not spend enough time with their children. I wish to see if my participants also see caring for their children as more, or equally, important as their paid work.

#### *Research on the division of labour in married and cohabiting couples*

Dominguez-Folgueras (2012) looked at the division of labour of married and cohabiting couples in France, Germany, UK, Italy and Spain and compared them to see if it was different between these two relationship types. She only focused on household tasks and not childcare. She focused on the two different household tasks available: daily tasks, such as cleaning the house, which are routine and occasional tasks, which are more flexible and easy to postpone, such as shopping. Thompson and Walker (1989) in Dominguez-Folgueras (2012) defined routine tasks (e.g. washing up) as 'female' and occasional tasks (e.g. putting the bins out) as 'male'.

Dominguez-Folgueras (2012) analysed data from the Multinational Time Use Survey conducted in 2010 and she argued that the data showed that cohabiting couples spent less time than married couples doing housework; with cohabiting women doing an hour less a day than married women. It also showed that cohabiting men spent more time doing the routine 'female' tasks than married men and that cohabiting women spent less time than married women doing all types of tasks (Dominguez-Folgueras, 2012). The

distribution of tasks between both members of the couple were much fairer in cohabiting couples than in married couples but women still did 70% of all housework on average (Dominguez-Folgueras, 2012). The distribution seemed to follow the male/ female typology where women did more cleaning and cooking and men did more occasional tasks but cohabitation was associated with women doing more occasional tasks and men doing more routine tasks (Dominguez-Folgueras, 2012).

Dominguez-Folgueras (2012) found that cohabiting couples had a more egalitarian division of labour as cohabiting women did less housework than married women. However, this egalitarianism was not due to men doing significantly more housework but because women were doing less. Dominguez-Folgueras's (2012) data also noted a particular trend for UK couples as it showed that in the UK there was not a significant difference in the amount and time spent on housework between married and cohabiting women.

Davis (2007) used data from twenty-eight countries, including the UK, and looked at the hours spent on housework, childcare and paid work in relation to whether the couple were married or cohabiting. In every nation, women did more housework than men regardless of relationship type. However, cohabiting men did more housework than married men in all nations which indicated that relationship type may have an effect on men's labour-load. Men with egalitarian beliefs did more housework and women with egalitarian beliefs did less housework which suggests that gender ideologies may have an impact on the division of labour. Davis (2007) found in countries with high levels of cohabitation there were more equal divisions of labour in homes but it was unknown whether the relationship type has created the equality in the division of labour. Egalitarian ideologies were more likely to produce egalitarian divisions of labour in cohabiting couples than married couples (Davis, 2007) but again it is unknown if the ideology has created the division of labour or vice versa.

Baxter et al (2010) analysed three waves of data (2001, 2002, and 2003) from the Household, Income and Labour Dynamics Survey in Australia. Their findings showed that women did more housework than men in all relationship types and that when people entered a relationship; it was men who gained the advantage over women in terms of the division of housework (Baxter et al, 2010). Gender divisions in housework began even before a relationship was formed and women did more housework when they lived with their parents, which indicated that parental behaviour may have led to the unequal division of labour in later relationships (Baxter et al, 2010).



### *Potential reasons for the gendered division of labour*

In a landmark argument, during the period in which research on the domestic division of labour was first developing, Oakley (1974) noted that the domestic division of labour by gender is a social construction of UK society; it is not a natural worldwide phenomenon. She discussed how societies such as the Congolese Mbuti pygmies did not have the female expressive role and the male instrumental role; instead couples did most jobs together and women were not kept in the private sphere. She also noted how parenting was shared jointly by the genders (Oakley, 1974).

Oakley (1974) outlined a key point that in the UK "the status of housework is interwoven specifically with the status of married women" (pg5). The tradition of married couples is that the man goes into the public sphere and the women stays oppressed in the private sphere (Oakley, 1974). This oppression is because women's domestic labour is unpaid and unrelenting and it is a characteristically female activity which women have to do simply on the grounds of their gender. Women do not choose to do this labour; it is forced upon them by a patriarchal society. Marriage is a social institution which socially constructs the gendered division of labour (Oakley, 1974); the roles that result from this are non-negotiable and free will has no place in this division.

Marriage creates a stage for the construction of gender ideologies and housework is associated with women's feminine identity and being a breadwinner is seen to be part of a man's gender identity (Kan, 2008). Kan (2008) writes that housework may be the scene for the symbolic enactment of gender identities when gender stereotypes are violated elsewhere e.g. both husband and wife working full time. Hence, Kan (2008) is indicating that equality in the public sphere, men and women both working, ironically then leads to an unequal division of labour in the private sphere so that married couples feel they are 'playing out' the 'correct' gender roles of the married couple in at least one aspect of their lives.

This notion of domestic labour being part of the creation of dominant and submissive roles in the home was also highlighted by Shelton and John (1993) who looked at empirical data from the 1987 National Survey of Families and Households which researched 9643 households. Shelton and John (1993) explained that the specific roles of husband and wife were highly gendered and thus they may affect the paid work and housework roles performed by both spouses which were marriage-specific. The notion of the husband as the breadwinner and the wife as the homemaker may be applicable only to married couples because this relationship type institutionalised them (Shelton and John 1993).

This idea of gender roles and their associated connotations was further developed by Shelton and John (1993) who discussed the impact of sex role attitudes on the division of labour within relationships. Cohabiting men and women may have more liberal and non-traditional beliefs about sex roles than married couples, which potentially could lead to an equal division of labour (Shelton and John, 1993). However, marriage led to spouses holding more traditional sex-role attitudes which then created traditional divisions of labour in the home; their attitudes were noticeably more traditional than cohabiting couples' (Shelton and John, 1993).

Assave et al (2015) wrote that in more egalitarian countries (in comparison to the UK) such as the Nordic countries, there has been a move towards gender egalitarianism both in the private and public spheres. Other countries, such as the UK, seem to have become more egalitarian in the public sphere, such as more women working, but not so much in the family sphere; this is known as the stalled gender revolution (Assave, 2015). As Assave et al (2015) relate, gender ideology may well be gender specific; men and women may differ in their gender ideologies and even if societal institutions have evolved to gender equality, there may still be a gender ideology/gender equality mismatch in the family sphere which persists via norm transmission. Women are more likely to accept socially defined gender-divided roles (Assave et al, 2015) and this is a gendered issue I wish to investigate. Couples may also differ in the gender ideologies they hold compared to the gender division of tasks that they actually implement (Assave et al, 2015). I will see if this occurs and, if it does, consider whether it could be due to time-constraints, household responsibilities, obligations to work and the wider kin network.

The institutionalisation principle for the gendered division of labour explains that marriage is a centuries-old institution with a clearly defined structure and strict ideas governing the behaviour of spouses (Baxter, 2005). The production of gender is important for married couples and therefore, the division of labour is more segregated and favourable to men in marriage. Cohabitation is an incomplete institution with a lack of rules to govern partners' behaviour and so people negotiate the roles they want and thus if the partners have more egalitarian beliefs then they can have a fairer division of labour. However, cohabiting couples could choose to have an unequal division of labour and thus inequality may not be the result of oppression but the result of a rational decision between equal partners to create the 'best fit' for their relationship.

This point is backed up by Delauney (2010) who showed how research has found that western society has gone from having asymmetrical gender patterns to more egalitarian couple relationships today where roles are based less upon gender and more upon

democracy. Men and women want fulfilment from both their paid work and their domestic work; therefore, they do not want to spend all their free time doing housework (Delaunay, 2010). However, despite women entering the labour force, the gendered division of labour within the domestic sphere had been maintained and women still do the majority of housework and childcare (Delaunay, 2010) but this could be due to democratic-choices in relationships.

Delaunay (2010) also showed how the birth of a first child led to a stronger gender divide in the division of labour between couples. Men immersed themselves in fatherhood and traded housework for care of their child. This phenomenon was explained by Delaunay (2010) via the concept of the 'we-family' in which stronger gender identities emerged. Portuguese women took long periods of maternity leave and so removed themselves from the workforce as they believe that their caregiving role should be dominant whilst men became hyper-masculine and wanted to be an adequate breadwinner (Delaunay, 2010).

Oakley (1974) assumed that women will always feel oppressed when conjugal roles are uneven. However, some women may have relished the expressive role and may have actively chosen to have it. This notion is addressed within Delaunay's (2010) data as she found that at special occasions such as Christmas, women reclaimed the traditional gender roles. Delaunay believes this was due to female generational maintenance at these times of tradition and women were positive about reclaiming their expressive role.

### *Gender ideologies*

In Assave et al (2015), they referenced Kroska's (2007) definition of gender ideology as the "attitudes regarding the appropriate roles, rights and responsibilities of women and men in society" (pg836). As they noted, Kroska (2007) proposed that these gender ideologies can range from traditional gender ideologies, where women do nurturing activities and men do breadwinning activities, to more equal ideologies based on egalitarian roles (Assave et al, 2015). Assave et al (2015) noted that the vast majority of studies they used (from 1992-2000) supported the idea that gender ideology to some extent affects the actual division of labour. They argued that gender ideologies are formed by the cultural and institutional influences around them (Assave et al, 2015).

Yule (1997) outlined two types of ideologies; patriarchal and familial. She defined ideology overall as a system of beliefs which are promoted by specific groups at certain periods of time and which are present in political and social policy decisions (Yule, 1997). Patriarchal ideologies are sets of ideas which normalise culturally constructed gender

roles and attitudes and familial ideologies see the nuclear family with the heterosexual couple and their children complete with a traditional division of labour as normal (Yule, 1997). She also noted that individuals can interchange the ideologies they hold according to context and situation; in some instances, people can hold an egalitarian ideology about one issue but then swap to a patriarchal ideology for another issue (Yule, 1997). This could be applied to people's relationships and divisions of labour.

Carlson and Lynch (2013) defined gender ideology as being "one's belief regarding men's and women's appropriate family roles" (pg1) and that ideology has a reciprocal relationship with people's behaviours. Gender ideology is believed to be one of the key reasons for the division of housework in marriage and the gender ideology hypothesis suggests that gender socialisation in early childhood is the main reason governing men's and women's later participation in housework (Carlson and Lynch, 2013). It is men's gender ideologies that have more impact on the division of labour in comparison to women's and the more egalitarian the male's gender ideology, the less housework women do and the more men do (Carlson and Lynch, 2013). Carlson and Lynch's (2013) research supported Yule's (1997) argument that gender ideologies can be fluid and can be shaped by many social and personal factors such as earnings and parenthood. People may also change their gender ideology based on self-interest explanations, such as if a wife works a lot the husband will do more housework to maintain a clean home (Carlson and Lynch, 2013).

#### *Why this research was new and necessary*

The body of research on the division of labour in cohabiting couples needed to be further developed for several reasons. Family diversity has rapidly transformed British society with the number of opposite sex cohabiting couple families increasing significantly, from 1.5 million in 1996 to 2.9 million in 2012, and the number of dependent children living in these cohabiting couple families doubling from 0.9 million to 1.8 million in the same period (ONS, 2012). Contemporary research needs to be conducted to see if these recently formed cohabiting couples have traditional divisions of labour too. Marriage rates have been rapidly declining since the early 70s, from 404,734 in 1971 to 232,443 in 2009 (ONS, 2014). As cohabitation rates have increased rapidly as marriage rates have declined, it is imperative to see if there are differentiations in the gender roles in these relationship types. There is a lack of UK literature that compares the division of labour between married and cohabiting couples. Thus my research will show, on a small-scale, a snapshot of gender roles in these relationships in contemporary British society. There is also a lack of literature connecting gender ideology to the different divisions of

labour within these two types of couples; especially in the UK and conducted in recent years.

Some research stated that men have more control over the division of labour in their relationships than their female partners and thus inequality may be the result of unilateral male decisions rather than an equal decision about what the roles should be. Cunningham (2005) stated that there should be future research on why married couples have segregated conjugal roles and why women appear to have little influence on this division of labour. This research will address this as married couples will be asked why they have segregated conjugal roles (if this is the case) and who determines the allocation of tasks within the home.

Delaunay (2010) argued that there needs to be more small-scale research conducted about why there is a difference in the division of labour between cohabiting and married couples and more qualitative data produced about this. My research is small-scale and it will include open-ended questions which will produce qualitative data. It will allow the participants' words to build the data as their responses will form the overall findings and conclusion.

Davis (2007) suggested a research area that I am going to investigate. The possible flexible nature of the division of labour within cohabiting couples may be to do with the structure of their relationship, i.e. that cohabitation inherently leads to the more equal division of labour because of the flexibility of the relationship type. Alternately, Davis (2007) noted that it may also be due to the partner selection within cohabiting couples that they have more equal divisions of labour. It may be that people who cohabit choose partners who have more egalitarian values. This uncertainty around the reasons for the more equal division of labour within cohabiting couples underpins many of the questions asked about gender ideologies and the division of labour in this research.

### *Explanatory Factors*

Assave et al (2014) looked at four reasons for differing divisions of labour in couples. The first is the relative resources approach which is where the person who earns the least does the most housework so as to even out the imbalance within the relationship. It explains that financial power leads to power within the household in terms of deciding to opt out of domestic chores and thus forcing the other partner to do them. This is a gender-neutral theory but given that there is a gender pay gap which impacts negatively on women in the UK then it could have a gender dimension when applied to UK couples. Statistics from 2015 showed that for all part-time and full-time workers aged eighteen-upwards, men were paid more on average than women and more women were working

in part-time jobs that tend to be lower paid. (Equal Pay Portal, 2016) The second is the time availability perspective which is where the person who does the least hours in paid work does the housework because they are perceived as having more free time in which to do so (Assave et al, 2014). Again, this could have a gender-dimension when applied to the UK because more women than men work part-time and so would be more likely to have to do the housework. In 2013 42% of women worked part-time whereas 12% of men worked part-time (ONS, 2013)

Assave et al's (2014) third reason is the gender-neutral economic dependency model where the person who contributes proportionally less to the household income does more housework so they balance out the inequality in their incomes. Again, this could be made gender-specific in the UK because of the gender pay gap and many women working in lower paid occupations such as cleaning compared to men who proportionally work more in higher-earning professions (ONS, 2013). The fourth is the gender ideology perspective which is where the beliefs in gender roles influence the housework sharing in a couple; this could be egalitarian or gender-divided (Assave et al, 2014). The former may lead to a more equal division of labour and the latter a more traditional division of labour.

The arguments outlined above by Assave et al are reiterated by other theorists. Becker (1991) in Kan (2008) said that how much a person participated in the labour market determined how much housework they did and this was assumed to be the result of rational cooperation between the partners to do with the allocation of time between domestic work and paid work. Economic resources were the main factor in determining a person's bargaining position in the family; the more resources a person had, the stronger their bargaining power (Kan, 2008). This approach assumed that neither the husband or wife wanted to do the housework and so the person with the least resources would end up doing the most housework; however, the more the gap between a husband's and wife's resources narrowed, the more they shared the housework (Kan, 2008).

Women who earned more or who were younger did less housework than other women but household income and age had no effect on men's housework hours (Kan, 2008). This is backed up by Shelton and John (1993) who found that younger women spent less time on housework compared to older women. This may be due to differing generational attitudes to sex roles. This point about age is one I shall be exploring in my research. The number of dependent children affected both men's and women's household hours but women's more than men's (Kan, 2008) and a finding replicated in Shelton and John's (1993) research. Gender-role attitudes affected the amount of housework done by men

and women; women with traditional gender attitudes did more housework than other women and men with traditional attitudes did less housework (Kan, 2008).

Delaunay (2010) noted that the education levels of the partners can be associated with differing contributions to household labour as the more educated a person is, the less likely they were to do a lot of domestic labour. This may be because they could afford to employ domestic helpers or it may be because they believed in egalitarian values as the result of a higher education. Shelton and John (1993) also found that the more educated a woman is and the more educated her spouse is, the less housework the woman performed, but there was no correlation between education levels and a man's domestic labour share.

Delaunay (2010) explained that temporal diversity may also affect the domestic division of labour. If one partner does very long shifts, then they may not be available to do housework and childcare so their partner does more of it. In this research it will be key to note how long people work on a regular basis and how this impacts upon their contribution to the home and/or childcare. It will be crucial to see how the person's partner feels about them working long shifts and thus how it impacts upon the couple's division of labour.

Sociologists also need to take into account people's ability to do domestic tasks. People may be disabled or unwell so they cannot do certain tasks in the home. The data collection methods used in this study will allow people to state if they do less in the home for these reasons. If one partner has an illness, then some household tasks are not possible so they are added to the other partner's division of labour.

People's personal preferences on what tasks they want to do must be taken into account. It may be that some participants want to do more than their partner as they believe that they are better at it or they enjoy doing it. This is connected to Beck's (1993) idea of negotiated relationships and choice. I must look at participants' micro perspectives on their arrangements and not impose any macro explanations that are not applicable to them.

#### *Opinions about the division of labour*

One of the areas I shall investigate in my research is whether people are happy with their division of labour and if they see it as fair. Baxter et al (2012) conducted research in this area and found little evidence from the four waves (1996-2006) of the Australian National Longitudinal Study that the transition from a cohabiting relationship to marriage

or the birth of a child changed perceptions of fairness about the division of labour (Baxter et al, 2012). They said that it was not the relationship type or the presence of children that influenced whether people saw their division of labour as fair but a plethora of other reasons. Both men and women perceived fairness in housework to vary directly with the respondent's housework hours and inversely with their partner's housework hours (Baxter et al, 2012). Women's attitude changes were not to do with their perceptions of fairness but with men's; as men became more egalitarian, then women viewed their share of the housework as more fair, and vice versa (Baxter et al, 2012). Again this raises the point that men seem to have a lot of power and control over the division of labour. In their study, couples where both the men and women worked longer hours than average, had been in a relationship for more than three years, had a higher share of other tasks or whose partners did less than average housework hours, were more likely to perceive their share of housework as unfair (Baxter et al, 2012). In Baxter et al's (2012) research, men with egalitarian gender attitudes were less likely to perceive their share of the household as unfair. This may be due to their belief that both men and women should engage in domestic tasks as they both shared responsibility for their home. Women who did more outdoor tasks saw their share of housework as unfair and both men and women who did more housework hours saw their share of housework as unfair (Baxter et al, 2012). This notion of indoor and outdoor tasks is of note, as they do have gender connotations, so I shall see if this is evident in my work. Equality, as defined as 50/50 split between men and women of tasks and time, does not appear to be the main basis of perceptions of fairness so people may have unequal divisions of labour but are still happy with their relationship (Baxter et al, 2012).

### *Conclusion*

There has been a growing body of data collected about the difference between the division of labour between married and cohabiting couples; however, there is not a great amount that is specifically UK based and so this research will help contribute to this. The linking of couples' division of labour to their gender ideologies is rarely done which makes this research pertinent. Finally, the data produced will be both qualitative and quantitative in form and so this is different to other studies which have mainly have produced quantitative data.



### *Definitions to be used in this research*

After evaluating the previous research about the division of labour and gender ideologies, I have constructed my definitions of these terms which will form the basis of this research. The division of labour will be defined as how “the woman and man in the relationship divide up their time for paid work, housework tasks (both internal and external tasks for the home) and labour for the family, and childcare tasks. It also encompasses the division of tasks within the home in terms of housework tasks and childcare tasks undertaken on a regular basis”. Gender ideologies will be defined as “the beliefs held by participants about the socially expected and morally correct roles of the man and woman within the home and public sphere and about how much paid work, housework and childcare they should engage in. These ideologies can be based upon gender division or upon egalitarianism; although some people may hold both of these ideologies but alternate between them depending on context and situation.”

### **Chapter 3: Methodology**

In this chapter the following areas are discussed: sample type, data collection methods, time use diaries, questionnaires, interviews, validity and reliability, research ethics, data analysis and the pilot study.

#### *Sample type*

I used an opportunity sampling method to get a quota sample of cohabiting and married couples. I aimed to get ten married and ten cohabiting couples to research as this was a manageable amount for me to research given work-constraints and also because it is a large enough number for some generalisation to the wider population to be made.

Participants were selected by myself asking people with whom I was acquainted if they wished to participate in my research. These included family members, colleagues at the college I work at and friends. Some people, who had initially expressed an interest in doing the research, later said they did not want to do the research because they or their partner saw it as too intrusive or they did not have the time. In the end, nine cohabiting couples and seven married couples agreed to take part totalling thirty-two participants overall. As Brewis (2014) noted, using acquaintances means that the sample is convenient to create, rapport and empathy already exists between researcher and participants, and it was easy to find people who met the requirements to participate in the study.

The sample for this research was reasonably diverse in terms of age, education, profession and life stage. Most people were educated to at least college level; however, the sample did not include people with no educational qualifications so the results cannot be reasonably generalised to them. Only half of the participants had university and graduate professional qualifications so it is not an exclusively professional sample and the results have the potential to be generalised to people with varying levels of educational qualifications. There were many ages represented in this research range from people in their early 20s to those in their early 60s. This reflects people with different life stages who may have different norms and values.

There were some limitations to this sample which will mean that it may be difficult to generalise the results to other social groups that are not represented in the sample. It is a fairly mono-racial sample with only two participants coming from a 'non-white' background This would make it challenging to apply these results to other racial or

cultural groups. Everyone researched had lived in the north of England for a substantial number of years so this could make it difficult to generalise the results to people who live in other locations. Also, having only thirty-two participants means that the research could be criticised for its limited range of respondents. Therefore, the sample's characteristics may be different to the population overall and having so few participants means that I cannot say with confidence that the findings can be applied to all married and cohabiting couples.

Another sampling issue was that the married couples were generally older (in their 40s and 50s) than the cohabiting couples (in their 20s and 30s). Older people will have been socialised in decades such as the 1950s-1970s when traditional gender roles were largely dominant and nuclear families were the dominant family type (ONS, 2014). Therefore, they may still hold traditional beliefs about gender roles, and the division of labour which may then impact upon their ideologies and the gender-division of tasks in the home. Thus, it may not be their marital status that leads them to hold more traditional gender beliefs but instead their generation.

#### *Data Collection Methods*

This study used questionnaires with both closed and open questions (Appendix Three), time-use diaries (Appendix Four) and semi-structured interviews (Appendix Five). The questionnaires had a range of questions about how much housework, childcare and paid work people did, what tasks they did, and how they felt about the division of labour within their relationships. The time-use diaries asked people to write down over the course of one week all the activities they undertook and for what period of time they did them for. Finally, the interviews were conducted on three couples and enabled me to get some more detail about their divisions of labour and gender ideologies.

There were issues with the open questions in the questionnaires being answered. Some participants gave in-depth explanations which enabled detail to be gained about their domestic situations. However, seven participants wrote little and so their explanation of their home life was limited. This imbalance in the answers given meant that it was possible to explore some couples in-depth and others only to a certain extent.

All three types of data collection (time-use diaries, questionnaires and interviews) were compared and the contributions given in one form of data were compared to their contributions in forms of data. This enabled a clearer picture of the people's workload in the home and at work to be gained along with descriptions of their gender ideologies.

Methodological triangulation was essential in this work because it helped increase the validity of the research and also showed the difference between what the participants thought they did on a daily basis, as shown in questionnaires, and what the reality was, as assessed via time-use diaries (Denscombe, 1998).

Quantitative data had to be obtained because numerical data was needed to see if there were different patterns in the amount of hours that men and women did in terms of housework, childcare and paid work. These patterns would then be related to the open questions and the interviews to see why they occurred (Denscombe, 1998). Some of the closed questions focused on gender ideologies and attitudes towards the traditional division of labour and the open questions allowed the participants to explain these previous answers and to confirm that they have not just chosen an answer at random i.e. this enabled methodological triangulation (Denscombe, 1998).

The time use diaries and the closed questions on the questionnaires produced quantitative data and this data was gained for the following reasons. Existing research showed a link between people's beliefs and their contribution to the domestic division of labour; their internal beliefs can affect their external actions (Cunningham, 2005). People have accurate perceptions of the world around them so they can provide valid measurements that can be used to describe their social world (Landeros, 2009). For example, they can assess how long they spend doing a certain task and when they did their domestic labour.

Using quantitative methodology is useful in the confirmatory stages of the research cycle (Moser and Kalton, 1971). It may enable the researcher to see differences between married and cohabiting couples' divisions of labour in terms of what jobs they do and how much time they spend on them. This could then lead to the creation of explanations for any differences that occur within this sample.

#### *Time use diaries*

Self-completion diaries can provide a helpful alternative to interviews or questionnaires in order to gain data about events that people may have forgotten (Corti, 1993). In this study, the participants were asked to write down what time they did a specific task and how long they spent on it (see Appendix Five). The diaries were also used before the interviews because the statistics that were gained from them were then discussed in the interview (Corti, 1993). For example, I analysed the couples' hours spent doing domestic

and paid labour from their diaries and then in the interviews I asked them why they did this amount of time and how they felt about it.

An open-format diary was used where the respondents could write down what they did in the allocated week in their own words. They were free to write down their activities in whatever format they wished, however, instructions were given as to how to complete the entries and an example was given for use as a template (see Appendix Four).

Corti (1993) provided some useful guidelines on how to use time use diaries effectively in research:

1. An A4 booklet is the best size
2. The cover page should have a clear set of instructions on it and a reminder about the importance of recording events immediately
3. A model example should be on a page
4. Each page should show a clear time period e.g. 24 hours

Corti (1993) also indicated that the time-period the diary represents must be long enough to capture normal behaviour over a specific time-period and so the participants were asked to complete their diaries for a week.

These diaries enabled me to gain a good idea of how participants used their time in terms of childcare, housework and paid work. The diaries showed what tasks they undertook, what times they did them and how long they spent on them. They were intended to reveal the gender differences in how men and women use their time and then these data were used to compare the gender differences between the married and cohabiting couples as well as between men and women in each group.

To help the participants fill in their time-use diaries a check-list was provided on the front page (see Appendix Five). This included how much they should write, what they should include and my contact details in case of any problems.

### *Questionnaires*

Using self-completed questionnaires meant that they were cost-effective and some participants felt that they did not take long to complete. However, other participants complained that they were long and repetitive. This meant that they did not fill in some of the last questions or they wrote limited answers which reduced the amount of data gained and limited the validity of the analysis.

The use of questionnaires in this research followed the example of their use in *'Poverty in the United Kingdom'* by Townsend (1979). He indicated that there are issues with questionnaires that need to be dealt with before the research begins. Townsend pointed out that researchers must not impose their own beliefs on to their own work and they must remain objective (Townsend, 1979). Therefore, no value judgements about conjugal roles were used in the data collection and questions were neutral in tone. He also stressed the importance of operationalization (Townsend, 1979); people needed to understand the concepts that are being used in the materials.

After the participants filled in their time-use diaries, they were given the questionnaire a week later. This period of time was left between using the two data collection methods because they were less likely to remember what they had put in their time-use diaries and so the data in their questionnaires could not be cross-referenced by participants to the diaries which could affect validity. The questionnaires included both open and closed questions (see Appendix Three). This allowed the collection of both quantitative and qualitative data about the division of labour and gender ideology.

The closed questions were about gender ideology and the roles of men and women in the household. They were influenced by numerous surveys such as the 2012 British Social Attitudes Survey, which had a section on gender roles (Scott and Clery, 2013). In the closed questions in this research, the participants were asked to circle a number from 1-10 in terms of their level of agreement with the statements given (1 meaning 'do not agree' and 10 meaning 'strongly agree'). Alternately, they were asked to circle 'yes' or 'no' in some questions. The closed questions influenced the open questions in the second half of the questionnaire (see Appendix Three) because the open questions allowed the participants to explain the answers they had selected in the closed questions. For example, there was a closed question that they answered about whether they enjoyed doing housework, and then later on there was an open question asking them about the same area so they could explain their answer.

The second half of the questionnaire contained open questions in which people were able to express their opinions about gender ideologies and their division of labour. Again, the open questions were influenced by the British Social Attitudes Survey where BSAS researchers asked a small number of open questions to get some explanations for the patterns they were seeing in the data produced from the closed questions (Scott and Clery, 2013). Influenced by these BSAS open questions, this research included open

questions to gain further detail and to enable methodological triangulation (Denscombe, 1998).

The main issue with these questionnaires is that the participants will have individually interpreted them according to, for example, their level of education or level of sociological knowledge as some of them were sociology teachers. However, all the questions were easy to read and clear in their meaning due to the operationalisation of the concepts that was undertaken (Moser and Kalton, 1971). I used simple language such as "enjoyable", "breadwinner" and "household appliances" in the questions; these are words in common usage in the UK. The phrases housework, paid work and childcare were used in the surveys as participants in the pilot study felt that they were self-explanatory and that all participants would understand what was included in these phrases. Complex sociological terminology was not used in the participants' materials because some people may not have understood what was meant by it.

### *Interviews*

The starting point for this research was Oakley's (1974) research on housework conducted in the early 1970s, and it was inspired by her methodology. Her use of informal conversations in which she asked women about motherhood was seminal in its influence upon how researchers should communicate with participants about personal issues (Oakley, 1974). She spent around nine hours with each woman and treated each interview like a conversation and she found that this meant that women opened up; thus increasing the validity of their responses (Oakley, 1974). This influenced my interviews of respondents because it enabled a good rapport and more detail to emerge.

I interviewed six participants (one married couple and two cohabiting couples) after their results from their diaries and questionnaires were analysed. The interviews lasted a couple of hours and the answers were audio-recorded. Only three couples were interviewed because they were geographically close to me at the time I wanted to do the interviews. Also, they were representative of the sample; the cohabiting couples were younger, had children and had a range of educational qualifications whereas the married couple were older, university educated and their children had left home.

The reason for conducting interviews was because they enabled further questioning of people about their diary and questionnaire results so allowed data triangulation. By asking people about what they have previously said or about themes identified from

their results, enabled the identification of whether they had previously given answers they thought were socially desirable.

Semi-structured interviews were used. Certain questions were pre-devised for each individual before the interview which enabled personalised discussion (Jones, 1993). The interviews were more like a conversation than a formal interview. This is because often interviews are an unusual situation so they needed to be made to feel as natural as possible (Moser and Kalton, 1973). Participants were interviewed at their homes, individually and in couples, which made them feel comfortable.

This research was inspired by '*Wigan Pier: Revisited*' (Campbell, 1984) in which women were allowed to explain their housework and childcare responsibilities at their own pace and in their own words. This book highlighted the importance of people, especially women who are oppressed by a patriarchal society, being enabled to put their individual mark onto sociological research (Campbell, 1984).

#### *Reliability and validity*

A key part of doing sociological research is that it should allow the possibility of being peer reviewed so therefore it should be replicable. Positivist researchers believe in a scientific approach to methodology; that there should be the possibility of it being checked by others to ascertain the internal validity of the methods used but also to assess the external validity of the data produced (Jones, 1993). This led to my use of standardised diaries and questionnaires.

This research was reasonably high in reliability; the questionnaires and time use diaries could be easily replicated. Standardised questions that could be replicated by other researchers were used and the time-use diaries were blank for participants to fill in. However, the interviews lacked reliability. They were personalised for each of the participants and thus impossible to replicate. However, all the questions used were written down so other researchers can see what was asked and could use them for similar participants to the ones in this research.

The interviews were high in validity due to their semi-structured nature. They allowed people to explain their answers and guide the questioning to areas they believed were important to the topic (Moser and Kalton, 1971). The questionnaires were valid. The open questions allowed people to explain their answers to the closed questions and they allowed elaboration (Moser and Kalton, 1971). They created qualitative data which gave



insight into the reasons for their division of labour and the connection of this to their gender ideologies.

However, there are two validity issues with the questionnaires. Firstly, people may not have interpreted questions in the way the researcher meant them to or they may have rushed their answers (Moser and Kalton, 1971). Secondly, the closed questions had pre-coded answers which means that categories were imposed on to the participants that they are forced to choose from (Denscombe, 1998). These pre-coded answers may have not represented what they thought.

The overall validity of this research might have been affected by the topic being researched. People may have been influenced by social desirability when completing the research. They may have been embarrassed or ashamed that they do too much or little within their home and so tried to hide this (Denscombe, 1998). They may have felt pressure to adhere to social norms about egalitarian domestic roles if aware of them.

The results of the time use diaries may have lacked validity. This could have been due to people's busy lives e.g. some of them said they filled in the diaries at the end of the day after the activities had been completed and so may have accidentally omitted activities. They may also have put activities in to the wrong time areas or they may not have remembered how long they did them for.

### *Research Ethics*

The research proposal for this dissertation was submitted to the University of York Ethics Committee and consent was obtained.

Informed Consent forms were signed by all participants consenting to all the different data collection methods they used (see Appendices Three, Four, Five). They completed these forms because the participants needed to understand what they were doing at every stage of their research. It also gave them the chance to withdraw from the research.

Participants' identities were kept confidential as they were all saved on a memory stick that was kept at my home with locked file content. This was in-line with the university's Data Protection Policy. Anonymity was also protected as participants are referred to in this research by initials that cannot identify them. They are named after their relationship type (C means cohabiting, M means married), their gender (F means female

and M means male) and their couple number in my research (1 means the first couple I analysed in each relationship set). For example, CF1 is the cohabiting female in the first cohabiting relationship that I analysed. This meant that they will avoid scrutiny from others if they have what is perceived as a socially abnormal gender ideology e.g. they believe that women should not work.

The topic investigated is not an overly sensitive one and so there are few issues connected to protection from harm. Therefore, participants were unlikely to be harmed via their engagement. However, there was the slight possibility that they have an unequal division of labour because of emotional, physical or economic abuse. I was aware of these issues and if they had become relevant then I would have reported my concerns to the university.

### *Data analysis*

Data was triangulated both during and at the end of the research: the results of the time use diaries were compared with the questionnaire results and the interview findings. This checked the validity of the responses given overall (Denscombe, 1998). If there were anomalies between what people have written in their open questions compared to their time use diaries, for instance, then this data was revisited.

All analysis of the questionnaire data was undertaken by myself counting the responses for the closed questions and then placing the responses into tables and then charts were created from this data. Tables and charts were also generated for the data of the different types of couples to see the patterns for the married couples and secondly for the cohabiting couples.

The time use diaries were quantified via the following analytic techniques. First of all, how many hours (to the nearest half-hour) each participant did per week in terms of housework tasks, childcare tasks, and paid work, were calculated. Next, how many of each specific type of task (e.g. washing up) they did per week was calculated. A person's data was then compared with their partner's so if there were any differences in their division of labour then these could be identified.

The open questions from the questionnaires were read through and I created a pen portrait for each of the participants via their answers to these questions so that their reasoning behind their current division of labour, their opinion on this, and if they feel it should change, was outlined and the detail noted down (see Appendix One). These

enabled connections to be made between their gender ideologies and their division of labour. Excerpts of these pen portraits were then used in the analysis of results to show any similarities or differences between married or cohabiting couples in terms of their division of labour and gender ideologies.

I transcribed the interviews myself and wrote down the data found from them. The interviews had the same analysis applied to them as the open questions from the questionnaire, where the person's key ideas and statements were picked out from their data, and then compared to what they had noted for their answers in the questionnaires and their data from their time-use diaries (Denscombe, 1998). The interview data helped to build up the person's pen portrait and provided more evidence for their division of labour and gender ideology.

### *Pilot Study*

The importance of doing a pilot study was explained by Hundley and Van Teijlingen (2002). Areas that my pilot study had to focus on included the wording of the questionnaire and the order of the questions as well as the range of answers on multiple-choice questions (Hundley and Van Teijlingen, 2002). Pilot studies can also help see other problems such as poor recording of data by participants, remind us of ethical issues such as giving out consent letters and ensuring data is kept confidential (Moser and Kalton, 1971). Specific actions need to be taken if you are producing qualitative data as researchers need to read or listen through the first couple of interviews so that you can see where they are doing well or badly (Hundley and Van Teijlingen, 2002). Such concerns informed my own research.

The pilot study was conducted with two couples in May 2014; one married and one cohabiting couple. Only two couples were used because they were the couples that I had easy access to and they had enough time available for me to practice my interview technique upon them. They completed the time-use diaries and the questionnaires and were then informally interviewed to explore their experience of completing these data collection methods and to see if they had any suggestions on how to improve them. They then took part in an informal interview, both separately and together as a couple, to assess the topic areas and question formats.

The following suggestions were made by the participants regarding the time use diaries. All queried what they should be including in the diary and they also questioned how much detail they should go into the time slots. They all asked when they should be

completing the diaries; as they went along or at the end of the day? Since all of these issues were covered in the diaries' instructions, this was evidence that the participants had not read them carefully.

To overcome this, participants in the main study were asked to read through the time use diary instructions with the researcher before they started them. They were also shown the time-use diaries and what they needed to include within them. They were advised that they should just write as much as they could in the slots. This would mean that they were not being selective with their information, which could impact on validity.

The questionnaire was easier for the participants to complete and they felt more confident with this. The participants noted that they had no issues understanding the language used. In terms of practicality, there was enough space for them to write their answers in and the text was large enough to read.

There were two areas of criticism. The first related to the meaning of the 1-10 agreement scale used in the closed ended questions. Therefore, the questionnaires were improved so that the guidance about what the numbers represented was repeated throughout the questionnaires in bold text. The second issue was how much detail they should write in response to the open questions. They were concerned that they may not write enough. Therefore, in the main study, they would be verbally told that they should write as much as they wanted to write and this was also written down in the instructions.

In the interviews, I had an advantage in knowing all of their participants which made the situation more relaxing due to having a relationship of trust with them. Therefore, there was a rapport and I could elicit detail from the participants. However, this is an artificial situation that is abnormal for acquaintances to be in and so this artificiality had to be overcome (Brewis, 2014). This was achieved by chatting to them at the start of the interviews about other topics so they were put at ease. Also, they were reminded that all data would be held in a secure location, that it was confidential and that in the research they would be identified by non-identifying initials.

## Chapter Four: Analysis of the Results

The research data will be analysed in three sections according to the three main aspects of the domestic division of labour: paid work, housework and childcare.

In this chapter the participants will be referred to through initials. CF means cohabiting female, CM means cohabiting male, MF means married female and MM means married man. They are individualised via their couple reference number e.g. CF1 means cohabiting female from the first cohabiting couple analysed in my data process.

*Table 4.1: The average number of hours spent on housework, childcare and paid work within a week - time use diaries*

	Paid work	Housework	Childcare (4 married couples and 4 cohabiting couples)	Overall average hours spent on housework and paid work	Overall average hours spent on housework, paid work and childcare (only for couples with children)
Married women (7)	37.5	26.0	28.0	63.5	91.5
Married men (7)	48.0	13.5	25.0	61.5	86.5
<b>Difference between hours completed</b>	Married men do 10.5 hours more paid work on average.	Married women do 12.5 hours more housework on average.	Married women do 3 hours more childcare on average.	Married women do 2 hours more labour a week on average.	Married women do 5 hours more labour a week on average.
Cohabiting women (9)	37.0	17.0	40.5	54.0	94.5
Cohabiting men (9)	50.0	9.5	26.0	59.5	85.5
<b>Difference between hours completed</b>	Cohabiting men do 13 hours more paid work on average.	Cohabiting women do 7.5 hours more housework on average.	Cohabiting women do 14.5 hours more childcare on average.	Cohabiting men do 5.5. hours more labour a week on average.	Cohabiting women do 9 hours more labour a week on average.

## **Section One: Paid work**

### *Overall patterns in paid work*

Table 4.1 shows that the traditional clear division of paid work, where the woman stays at home and the man goes out to work to provide for the family, was not found in this sample. However, importantly, it does show that men did work longer hours, on average, in comparison to their female partners.

Six of the seven married women went out to work during the week researched (the other woman is retired). In three of the married couples, the woman spent more hours at work than her husband did during this week. Of the other six married couples, employed women all worked at least twenty hours in this week and most of them worked between 25-45 hours. This shows that the traditional gendered division of labour in these married couples did not exist because none of these women stayed in their homes devoting themselves exclusively to housework and/or childcare.

The married men's time use diaries clearly showed their engagement with paid work. With the exception of the retired man, all the men worked for at least 40 hours in the week with most doing between 40-60 hours in this week. However, some of the married men and women worked very similar hours to each other. Of particular note are the average hours worked by both married men and women during the week analysed. On average, the married men worked for 48 hours and married women worked for 37.5 hours, on average, in this week.

In the cohabiting couples, all the men and women went out to work. The time-use diaries showed that the cohabiting women did a similar amount of hours of paid work as the married women on average. The data showed that the majority of cohabiting men worked more hours than the cohabiting women. On average, the cohabiting men worked more hours than all the other subgroups researched. The gender gap in hours worked was replicated in both the married and cohabiting couples; it is men who spent more hours in paid work than women and this is a crucial finding in this research. Seven of the nine cohabiting men worked longer hours than their female partners and four of the seven married men worked longer hours than their wives.

Appendix A shows how well-educated or skilled most of the married and cohabiting women were. Those who were not university educated had professional qualifications.

No-one did a routine manual job; they all were employed, or had been employed, in jobs that required academic or professional qualifications.

Work was a major part of the participants' identity as it consumed much of their time and so it was important to explore how they felt about it. Participants were asked if they enjoyed going to work. Amongst both the married and the cohabiting couples, the vast majority of both the men and women agreed that they enjoyed work. This is highly significant as it is the only question on which virtually all participants agreed. This may be because most of the participants have 'good jobs' which involve some level of skill and most were paid above the national average wage of £27200 (ONS, 2014) so were likely to enjoy a good standard of living.

#### *Gender ideology and paid work*

The cohabiting couples showed considerable egalitarianism when asked about whether the traditional division of labour of men working and women staying at home should remain. Over 90% of the cohabiting women strongly disagreed with this statement which shows their rejection of the traditional model of a relationship. Over 80% of the cohabiting men strongly disagreed with it too. This is one possible explanation for why all the cohabiting women went out to work because both they and their partners believed it was acceptable to do so. This disagreement against the traditional division of labour by cohabiting couples was not reflected by the married couples. The majority of the married women agreed that men should work and women should stay at home. Given that they are so involved time-wise in paid work in their daily lives, this may reflect some discomfort with their 'dual burden'. It could indicate that they engage in paid work due to financial constraints on the couple. However, more married men disagreed with this statement or were neutral about it. This may be because their wives had all worked and so the men had already consented to a non-traditional division of labour.

Cohabiting couples showed strong gender equality about whether a mother should stay at home if her child is under the age of four. They were asked this to see if they believed that women should be a paid worker or a stay at home mother whilst their children were very young. Over 80% of the cohabiting women strongly disagreed that women should stay at home when their children are under the age of four; this could show a rejection of the traditional mothering role. It possibly also showed the importance of a career and women's access to childcare. The majority of cohabiting men also strongly disagreed

with this statement which seemed to suggest they supported their female partners going to work, no matter the age of their child.

The married couples were more traditional in comparison to the cohabiting couples in their beliefs about women and the care of children under the age of five. A small majority of married men agreed that women should stay at home when their children were very young, but their support for this was quite weak; this could indicate that they would like to see this happen but may not occur in practice. They might prefer their wives to stay at home but they may accept the financial reasons for women to go out to work. The married women's responses were much more dispersed; the same number of women agreed with the statement as disagreed with it. It was the older married women (those aged 40+) who thought that women with young children should stay at home with them and the younger married women (aged 20-40) who disagreed with this view. This could indicate that the traditional gender attitudes of the past could still influence the older women.

Participants were asked about whether they felt that men were better breadwinners than women. Statistically, in the UK today, more men work full time and are more likely to have well-paid, professional or managerial jobs in comparison to women (ONS, 2014). As noted earlier, this is not the case with the majority of the couples researched in this study as many of the women earned significantly more than the UK's £27200 average (ONS, 2014).

The cohabiting women, despite in the closed questions being pro-women working, did not all maintain these beliefs in their qualitative answers. When asked if men were better breadwinners, many agreed that men were and they gave traditional reasons for why this was the case. CF1 agreed saying "they are driven...are expected to be ambitious and breadwinners". A second (CF2) believed that men are naturally better at earning money as "men are better at focusing on one thing and can put their home out of their mind". These views may reflect the women's primary socialisation in which their parents may have had more traditional viewpoints about the division of labour. The only woman who referred to a quantifiable social reason for why men are better breadwinners stated that (CF3) "yes because women are lower earners and women working would leave the family on the breadline". This is based on economic fact; men do earn more than women on average (ONS, 2014). There were two cohabiting women who alternately thought the breadwinner should be the person most capable of gaining the better wage: (CF9) "different jobs in different sectors lead to different pay so it should be based on that".



It was the cohabiting men who held the most gender-neutral ideologies. This did not vary by age, profession, education, or qualifications. 80% of the cohabiting men rejected the statement that men are better breadwinners than women. The explanations given were connected to individualism and real life experience. One man wrote, it (CM9) "depends on the individual and their career path" and another (CM7) that "some jobs e.g. doctors earn a lot regardless of being male or female". They believed that women do have some success in certain professions and that it is more about the job held than gender in terms of what affects wage-earning power. 20% of cohabiting men only agreed that men are better breadwinners because of (CM1) "the effect of maternity leave on career progression" and (CM6) "statistically men are better paid". These are all external gendered barriers to women's career progression that are not the men's internal gender beliefs.

Married women were not as likely as the cohabiting women to believe that men are better breadwinners; this showed a stronger belief in the traditional division of labour in the previous quantitative questions. Moreover, some disagreed with the breadwinner statement on the grounds of equality: (MF7) "women can be if they are given the opportunity to be so" and (MF2) "everyone is equal". This showed that they believed that it is not always necessary for the man to be the main earner. The older married women did believe that men make better breadwinners but on the grounds of men's higher earning abilities as (MF6) "they are paid more" and (MF4) "men earn more". This shows a pragmatism that many women may have to deal with the glass ceiling in the workplace so men find it easier to earn more.

Interestingly though, when asked later on in the questionnaire if women would be a better breadwinner than men, the vast majority of married women were in disagreement; in stark contrast to the married men's responses. This indicated that the married women may hold more stereotypical views of women's role than their husbands do. One wife commented (MF4) "no as women feel they need to do it all and after a while they suffer due to stress". This indicated that the idea of women 'having it all' cannot be achieved. This is reiterated in another woman's comment: (MF2) "there's no limit on ability but women have more constraints on them" which indicates that women cannot just focus on a career if they have to do housework and childcare. Another woman seemed almost outraged at the notion of a female breadwinner (MF1) "No. Shouldn't be either or... I don't divide equally in my house for pride's sake". This participant had a highly gender divided division of labour and her husband had traditionalist views. Two married women noted the gender pay gap: (MF7) "they are paid

less", and (MF5) "lack of earning potential" so they saw women as being unable to provide for her family.

A large majority of the married men disagreed that men make better breadwinners compared to women; this again shows their difference to the married women's beliefs. They commented on equality and that, for example, (MM3) "anyone can have a good career". This may show a belief in meritocracy in the workplace and beyond. Two men also mentioned workplace barriers preventing women being as high a wage earner as men such as (MM2) "sexism in the workplace means they [men] get a better deal" and (MM5) "this is socially still the case". No man, married or cohabiting, said that women should not be engaged in paid employment.

The beliefs held by different couples about the gendered division of paid work within couples were explored in greater detail in the interviews. Three couples were interviewed; two were younger cohabiting couples with children, and the other was a married older couple whose children had left home.

The first cohabiting couple (CM7 and CF7) were adamant that the person who goes to work should be the person with the ability to earn the most money. The man noted an example of a friend of his who had retired from the army to be a stay at home dad as his wife was a highly paid consultant on over £80000 a year. They both said social stereotypes were irrelevant and the decision had to be made based upon what was best for the family in terms of financial earnings. It was interesting to note that this couple did not mention the idea that both members of the couple could work and alternative arrangements could be made for childcare and housework.

The woman stayed at home when their baby was born because the man got three weeks' paternity leave but then had to return to work. He could not get flexible working hours. The woman had been in flexible work before the birth so it was easiest for her to stay at home. It also meant that she was free to do the school runs for the older boys. This arrangement removed childcare costs and ensured they were not dependent on others for childcare. However, the woman did say that once she had stopped breastfeeding she would be returning to work because family members could then look after the baby.

The second cohabiting couple (CM5 and CF5) had always earned similar amounts of money to each other until the woman went back into further education. She was now financially dependent on her partner. The couple both believed that hard work equals success and they saw no gender limits on this other than motherhood. Both commented

that having children was always going to adversely affect a woman in the short term after giving birth as it reduced her earning abilities and her working hours. They said that this was because it was women who were given so much maternity leave and the father only got three weeks' paternity leave. Therefore, it made financial sense for the man to work and earn more during this period than the woman. They said this was just something women had to accept because babies had to take priority over work and they believed it was best if the woman stayed at home to look after the child. The man expressed his desire that he could have stayed at home to look after his boys.

The couple were in the position that once the woman graduated as a midwife she would immediately start earning more than the man. The man was happy with this; he believed that being an educated professional would be a good as it would bring in more money. He believed that women should be as educated and well-paid as men.

The married couple (MF4 and MM4) demonstrated more traditional viewpoints; these reflected the views of many of the married couples in this study. Both believed that both men and women should have equal opportunities to work, but with exceptions. Both believed that when a woman has had a child she should be a 'stay-at-home mum' for as long as possible. This married woman had stayed off work for eight years after having her children. She believed that it was best for the children to have their mother with them full time as she could look after them properly. The man agreed that women should be able to do any jobs they want to and commented that he had encouraged his daughter and his wife to pursue their careers. He said he had worked for good female bosses and bad male managers so gender is not a reason for competence or otherwise. It is all about individual capabilities and intelligence.

### ***Section two: housework***

Two main aspects of housework were investigated: how much housework and the types of housework participants did.

#### *Overall patterns of housework*

As seen in Table 4.1, the time-use diaries revealed that, with the exception of only one couple, all the cohabiting couples had an unequal division of housework in which the women did more housework than their partners. The same pattern was seen in all of the married couples. What was especially noticeable in some of the married couples was the large amount of additional hours some of the women spent on housework compared to

their husbands; in one case it was thirty hours more. Crucially, it does not appear that relationship type had much of an association with the number of hours that different genders spend on housework; gender has the most association.

Cohabiting women did fewer hours of housework than married women did but they still did more housework compared to their male partners. Marriage appeared to mean that women do more housework; however, this could be due to the married women being older than the cohabiting women in the sample and so they may do more housework due to previous socialisation into a traditional female role.

Married men did more housework than cohabiting men. This difference, as shown in the time use diaries, contradicted previous literature about married men doing less housework than cohabiting men such as Davis (2002). However, there was a slightly more equal gender division of housework between the cohabiting couples than there is amongst the married couples. Cohabiting men did more of the feminine tasks such as making meals than the married men did. However, married men were also pro-active in stereotypically feminine tasks such as washing up.

It must be noted that there was no difference in the number of household appliances owned by the married and cohabiting couples. Thus, any differentiation of the hours of housework undertaken is unlikely to be explained by a lack of technology. In Delaunay's (2010) research it had been found that women's domestic division of labour has been reduced by them employing a paid cleaner. None of the cohabiting couples had a cleaner but two of the married couples did so this cannot be a factor for the differences in housework undertaken by the couples.

#### *Explanations for housework hours*

Participants were asked to explain why they did their share of the housework. Their responses revealed why most of the women do more housework than the men. The cohabiting women explained that they did the majority share due to being 'house-proud'; they described it as a conscious choice: (CF1) "I am a perfectionist", (CF2) "I would be embarrassed if people came round and it was messy" and (CF6) "get more stressed if the house is untidy". They saw housework as a job they want to do to a high standard and they chose to do the amount they did.

Some of the married women explained that they do the larger amount of housework because it is essential to maintain a basic standard of living: (MM1) "would live in a dirty

house if I didn't", (MF2) "to have things to eat", and (MF6) "keep the house clean". This indicated that they felt they have an obligation to do the housework or else the home would not function. This seemed to contradict the more positive explanations given by the cohabiting women. Other married women feel a need to do the housework to suit their own standards: (MF5) "tidy house makes me happy" and (MF7) "I hate clutter". These are more self-motivated reasons which reflect what the cohabiting women said.

Some of the cohabiting men explained their lack of engagement in housework in terms of the lack of time they have available to do this work in: men commented that (CM2) "time available", (CM4) "I work away" and (CM5) "work stress" stops them engaging in housework. Paid work is then used to negate housework duties. This can be backed up by the fact that the cohabiting men did spend more hours on average doing paid work compared to their female partners and they are not perhaps unjustified in saying this. Other men, who did the most housework in this group, also discussed the notion of being house-proud for their reason for housework engagement: (CM1) "I am house proud and I want to maintain the property", (CM8) "you can't leave stuff to build up" and (CM9) "Don't want the house to be dirty". These men were the ones who also did more of the stereotypically female tasks in the home as well. They may be evidence of the 'New Man'.

Although married men did more housework than the cohabiting men on average, they were either pragmatic or unenthusiastic about it; none commented positively on their engagement in this area. Some married men did their level of work for the home to run smoothly: (MM4) "needs to be done" and (MM7) "we agreed I do more outside". It appeared that these men feel obligated to do their share which may reflect an egalitarian attitude. Other husbands, just like some of the cohabiting men, did little housework and accounted for this according to the amount of paid work that they did: (MM1) "I work full time" and (MM2) "shortage of time". They prioritised their job over their home but this could be due to the fact that they did work a considerable number of hours more than their wives. This notion of men doing more paid work than women but women doing more housework and childcare than men is a critical finding in this research; participants' overall hours of doing all types of labour combined are generally equal and so there may be a 'trade-off' in types of labour and tasks done.

The cohabiting women explained why they had an inequality of housework hours' division in their homes. Some used the same reasoning as their partners; the man works for more hours so they do less housework: (CF2) "he does two jobs and shifts", (CF3) "he works very long hours" and (CF5) "he works full time and pays the bills". This is

despite the fact that most women were also breadwinners with careers and two of the women actually worked longer hours than their male partners. However, a reason may be that many of these women were school-teachers so they had lots of holidays throughout the year, whereas their partners did not; this may have made them feel that they worked less than the men overall so they should do more housework. The cohabiting women who were not teachers had all taken maternity leave or had worked part time in the past. This may have made them feel that their male partners had always worked constantly in paid work so should do less housework.

Two of the cohabiting women explained their partners' lack of housework engagement due to a (CF6) "lack of awareness of what needs doing and laziness as he knows I will do it" and (CF2) "he doesn't realise it needs doing as I don't allocate it to him". This may indicate that in these relationships women 'manage' the housework schedules. This view of men being clueless about housework was also repeated by some of the married women too. Cohabiting men seem to perceive that their partners do housework because they have chosen to do so. Reasons given by these men for why their partners do more work include: (CM1) "she likes to live in a clean and tidy home" and (CM3) "greater amount of pride". This indicates that women may choose their greater involvement in housework; a critical point.

Married women also justified their husbands' lesser engagement in housework because they believed that their husbands worked longer hours than they did. Many mentioned that their husbands worked full time and so this meant they had less time to do housework. This appeared to be a 'trade off' in both types of relationships; men will work longer hours so women do more housework to balance this out. Married men said that their wives did a specific amount of housework because they felt they are better at it or they felt they needed to do it. Comments by the husbands included: (MM4) "they are more attuned to what needs doing" and (MM5) "she is less tolerant to mess".

#### *Attitudes towards the division of housework*

Cohabiting women were generally in agreement that their partners did enough in the home; even though in the time use diaries week the cohabiting men did the least housework out of the subgroups. The women felt that the housework was evenly distributed: (CF1) "we do the jobs we like and will do others if asked to do so", (CF2) "it's all relative. He does more manual work and DIY" and (CF9) "we do equal amounts". When they felt that their partner did less than they did they explained that this was

because their partner worked more but made up for it when they were not at work. This points to a feeling of equality.

Cohabiting men were also largely happy with their partner doing enough in their home: (CM3) "she does what is required and expected of a lady in the home", (CM4) "they're responsible for it" and (CM6) "she does all the tasks I don't enjoy". Overall, cohabiting men generally had no criticism of their partners' contributions of labour within the home and this contentedness could be because, on average, cohabiting couples did less housework than married couples in the week researched.

Married women were also generally happy with how much housework their husbands did in the home which may indicate that these women do not feel oppressed by how much household labour they themselves do. They commented on why they were happy with doing the majority share of housework: (MF5) "he does his fair share", (MF3) "he does all the outside and heavier jobs and I do all the indoor jobs" and (MF7) "he does the garden, dogs and bins and I am happy not to be responsible for those parts". The gendered division of tasks was seen as positive and it may be connected with their acceptance that their husbands did less housework because the men did the tasks that the wives did not want to do. All the married men appeared happy with how much their wives did in the home. This may show the satisfaction that men enjoy from having the traditional roles enacted within their homes.

### *Housework and gender roles*

Cohabiting couples were divided about whether women are better at housework than men. A small majority of the women showed strong agreement with this traditional statement. A minority strongly disagreed; these are women who gave consistently anti-traditional views in the majority of their answers. The men had widely dispersed views on this: the same amount agreed with the statement as disagreed with it. This shows that gender neutrality in housework may not be fully engrained in people's minds; no matter their relationship status.

The married couples showed far more traditional views in their response to this question about whether women are better at housework than men. The vast majority of married women agreed that women are better at housework than men; this could be their justification for why they do more housework than their husbands. The vast majority of married men also agreed with this question. This may show that the institution of marriage institutionalised the notion of traditional roles.

Half of the cohabiting women agreed that they had an equal division of labour in their home and nothing needed changing. The other half wanted some changes made to their division of labour such as: (CF1) "I could do more cooking and he could do more cleaning", (CF2) "we set specific jobs and split the remainder" and (CF6) "he needs to choose to do it instead of endless rows". This showed some resentment about men not doing their fair share in the domestic sphere.

Most of the cohabiting men also felt there could be a more equal division of labour but it would have to be them, and not their female partners, who needed to change to make it more equal. They suggested the following: (CM2) "if I get sent a schedule then I can do more" and (CM8) "have a rota". However, by creating the rotas the women would be increasing their household labour by having to do extra administration for the man! The rest of the men were happy with their domestic situation.

Nearly all of the married women were happy with the division of labour in their home. They felt positive about it: (MF3) "no it's equal and it works", (MF7) "he does enough and has more responsibility for outdoor tasks". Nearly all the married men were happy with the division of labour in the home too: (MM2) "we adapt around work and kids' schedules" and (MM5) "we are fair". This showed that their unequal division of housework is acceptable to them; even if some of the women have expressed dissatisfaction at how much they do previously in the data.

#### *Gendered division of housework*

There was also a gendered division of housework tasks in the couples researched (see tables 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4 in Appendix Six).

The cohabiting couples' questionnaire data showed more equality in the tasks being shared in the home compared to the married couples' data. Indoor tasks, generally stereotyped as female, such as washing up, were done almost equally by men and women. It was only mopping and ironing that was done more by women. Some outdoor tasks, generally stereotyped as male, were also conducted equally by men and women. These included tasks such as sorting out pets. However, men were predominantly more likely to do DIY and gardening; only a minority of women did these. In tables 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4 in Appendix Six, it was only DIY which was male dominated and communication with relatives, mopping and dusting that were undertaken by women-only.



The married couples' questionnaire data showed some equality but not to the extent of the cohabiting couples. There were more noticeable gendered divisions of labour. Some indoor tasks that men and women generally did equally included washing up, dealing with finances and washing clothes. However, there were some indoor tasks that were gendered. Mopping, dusting and ironing were done predominantly by women. Outdoor tasks, stereotyped as male, were highly gender divided. Washing the car, putting the bins out and DIY were predominantly male activities and gardening was twice as likely to be done by men. In the time use diaries tables (4.2, 4.3 and 4.4 in Appendix Six), these gender divisions were also more pronounced than in the cohabiting couples' data. Married men were more likely to put the bins out, vacuum and do DIY whereas women were more likely to do washing of clothes, communication with family, sorting out finances, dealing with pets and ironing. This indicated the indoor/outdoor tasks divide which the married couples commented on their relationship having.

The interviews provided further detail as to why women do more housework than their male partners and the gendered division of housework tasks.

The first cohabiting couple (CM7 and CF7) explained that that they disliked housework and saw it as a chore. The woman commented that it was never-ending and exhausting. This woman did the most housework because she was the one who stayed at home as the man worked full time. He said he could not do a lot of housework as he was away too much and would rather do childcare than housework. The woman said she did the essential housework tasks regularly such as making meals or washing clothes.

In the second cohabiting couple (CF5 and CM5) the woman explained that she believed that women are better at housework and men have a tendency to be lazy. She showed some resentment towards her partner as she said that he did not do enough around the home. She talked about housework being endless and time consuming. She said she would prefer to do it as she would "do it right and he wouldn't" so she accepted her housework burden as being partially due to her high domestic standards. The man said he did some housework and he talked about re-doing the fence in the gardens. He was engaged in stereotypical male tasks that involved heavy labour and spent a lot of time doing them.

The married couple (MF4 and MM4) explained that the man did little housework in comparison to the woman but this is the way it has always been; even when they had cohabited before marriage. This was justified by the couple because he has always worked more hours than the woman. Even though the man only works a few more hours

than the woman; she did the majority of the tasks in the home and spent more time doing them. The wife also said that her husband was not very good at doing tasks and he would forget to do them so she would do them. The husband said he felt shame at how much more housework his wife did but that she did it better than him. He said that he could never work out what to do so he waited for his wife to tell him. The woman showed happiness at him doing the outdoor tasks as she did not feel she had the strength for them.

### ***Section three: childcare***

#### *Overall patterns in childcare*

The time use diaries' data, summarised in tables 4.5 and 4.6 in Appendix Seven, show that both men and women were highly engaged in childcare. All the fathers, both married and cohabiting, did at least twenty-hours of childcare in the week with the exception of one man who worked away. Married couples did a fairly even amount of childcare between them whereas cohabiting couples had a large difference in the amount of childcare performed. This may be because the cohabiting couples' children were younger on average and the cohabiting mothers were more likely to work fewer hours in order to do childcare.

Men's engagement with their children had not created a fully equal division of childcare within their relationships. In the cohabiting couples with children, in three couples the mother did more childcare than the father; one woman did twelve more hours, another did eight hours more, and another did forty-nine hours more. However, there was one cohabiting couple in which the man did eleven hours more childcare than the woman.

A similar picture was found in the married couples with children (including those with adult children who lived away from home, whose data is not included in tables five and six in Appendix Seven). In five of the couples, the woman did more childcare than the man with one woman doing fourteen hours more, another doing five hours, another with one hour more, another doing fourteen hours more, and a final woman doing eight hours more than her husband. Another couple did equal amounts of childcare and in another couple the man did more childcare than the woman by fourteen hours. The main pattern for married and cohabiting couples was that women are more likely to do more childcare than men during their average week. Again, it is not relationship type that seemed to impact upon the division of childcare but the gender of people and this is a crucial finding.

### *Childcare task division by gender*

Tables 4.5 and 4.6 in Appendix Seven also show a gendered division of the types of childcare tasks, according to the questionnaires. In the cohabiting couples, some childcare tasks were equally done by men and women such as washing children. However, it was women who were more likely to undertake activities such as washing their clothes. Questionnaire findings were also backed up by the data in the time use diaries. Cohabiting women were more likely to undertake activities like feeding children and sorting out their clothes. Cohabiting men were not more likely than women to do any childcare tasks. Tasks that were divided relatively equally included playing with them and dressing them. Men were engaged but this data shows women still had the majority of the burden.

In the married couples, childcare was also more gender-divided. The questionnaire data showed that women were engaged in all the childcare related tasks. Men were less likely to be involved in everyday childcare tasks although they were engaged in playing with their children. This seemed to indicate that married men were more involved with the 'fun' aspects of childcare. In the time use diaries, this was not as evident. All married women did many more tasks in the week researched than men such as sorting out children's clothes. Married men were more active in children's hobbies only. Married couples were quite equally engaged in some childcare tasks in this week including feeding children.

### *Attitudes towards childcare*

In previous literature such as Delaunay (2006), men were seen to be more involved in childcare than fathers in previous generations. It has already been seen via the time-use diaries that men do involve themselves with some aspects of their children's lives. In the questionnaire, participants were asked if they felt they did too much childcare every week. All of the cohabiting women disagreed with this statement with 50% strongly disagreeing. 75% of the men also disagreed with 50% strongly disagreeing. Only 25% remained neutral. This may show that the cohabiting participants felt that childcare is not a burden upon them.

The married couples were divided in terms of if they felt they did too much childcare. 40% of women and 60% of men strongly disagreed that they did too much childcare, 25% of both genders mildly disagreed they did too much childcare, and 40% of women

and 20% of men agreed they did too much childcare. This showed that overall both genders were happy with their childcare allocation but women were more likely to show some unhappiness. This contrasted with the unanimous happiness displayed by the cohabiting couples about their childcare hours.

Childcare seemed to be a more positive aspect of the participants' domestic labour which appeared to be shared more equally than housework. In the cohabiting couples, 75% of both men and women strongly agreed their partner did enough childcare and the remaining 25% were neutral on the matter. This may show happiness with their partners' engagement with children. This role appeared to be based on the sharing of childcare tasks. In the married couples, all the men were in agreement or neutral about their partners doing enough childcare. The overwhelming majority of the women were in agreement that their husbands did enough childcare as well. This shows that both cohabiting and married couples expressed satisfaction with the division of childcare within the home.

All the cohabiting men strongly agreed that they enjoyed looking after their own children; this could be the influence of the 'New Man' stereotype. 75% of the cohabiting women also strongly agreed that they enjoyed doing childcare with 25% remaining neutral. The married couples showed less enjoyment with the childcare they do. 80% of the married men said they enjoyed doing the childcare but these were less strong agreements compared to the strong agreement shown by the cohabiting men. The married women also showed lower levels of agreement about enjoying childcare, especially in comparison to the cohabiting women.

Interestingly, more of the cohabiting couples with children got help with childcare from their families compared to the married couples. This could be because their children are younger and so the children cannot go to school. This could be part of why the cohabiting couples feel more positive towards childcare as they have some of the burden lifted from them by their families. Married couples may feel more pressure with childcare because they have to deal with it all without alleviation of the pressure by others.

### *Gender ideology and childcare*

The majority of the cohabiting women agreed with the statement that women are better at childcare than men and the rest were neutral about this; this is unexpected as it was predicted that they would have been in disagreement due to ideals about equality. It may show that some cohabiting women still held the traditional belief that women are

better at child-rearing. Cohabiting men were divided on this question. 50% disagreed that women were better; these were men showed high levels of equality in their answers on other questions. Less than 40% agreed with the statement which showed just how unusual the women's responses were. The married couples showed a more traditional approach to this question. The vast majority of men agreed with this statement which may show a consistent belief in the traditional female role as the mother. The women were divided down the middle; the same amount of women agreed with the statement as disagreed with it. This again showed how the married women were divided into those who were older and more traditional and those who were more modernistic and younger.

The majority of the cohabiting men strongly agreed that childcare should be divided equally; as expected as they were 'hands-on' fathers who got involved in childcare. Most of the cohabiting women also agreed with this statement but they were not as strong in their belief in it as the cohabiting men. This is interesting as it could show that traditional views of the mother still persisted within women's ideologies regardless of relationship type.

The married men again showed their belief in equality and revealed why they did, on average, as much childcare in one week as their wives. Around 90% showed very strong agreement with this statement that men should be engaged with childcare. This was in line with contemporary thinking about men feeling obligated to do childcare for their children's benefit (Scott and Clery, 2013). In the married women, around 30% showed slight agreement with the statement, 30% were neutral and 30% were in slight disagreement. This may show that some may not have wished to have childcare removed from them as it gave them satisfaction.

Cohabiting women largely disagreed than women make better stay at home parents as they said it was more to do with the individual. They were adamant that it should be the more suitable parent that stayed at home with children: (CF1) "depends on who's more suitable", (CF2) "both can be a good influence" and (CF9) "depends on individual skills". This may show that some cohabiting women do have a liberal attitude towards gender roles. However, there was a significant older minority who wrote that they felt women do make better stay at home parents than men; these were also the women who had agreed that women are better at childcare than men. These women talked about more stereotypical notions of women such as (CF3) "they are better all-rounders and are more patient and nurturing", (CF6) "women are better multi-taskers" and (CF1) "it's the traditional role and women are taught to do it".

Cohabiting men were overwhelming in their opinion that women do not make better stay at home parents than men which was consistent with their egalitarian gender ideology throughout. The reasons they gave included: (CM6) "sex doesn't matter", (CM7) "when the child is older then everyone can deal with its needs" and (CM9) "It's all down to different personality traits". However, as with the cohabiting women, there were some dissenters who went against this opinion. Their belief that women do make better stay at home parents were based on traditional reasons: (CM8) "women have a stronger bond with the child" and (CM3) "that's what my parents did".

Married women were supportive of the statement that women make better stay at home parents; in contrast to most of the cohabiting women's opposition. Reasons they gained for their support for this statement include: (MF5) "more patient", (MF2) "they can multi-task", and (MF7) "kids still have a stronger bond with mums due to breast feeding, maternity leave and maternal instincts". The notion of women as the compassionate parent appeared to resonate. The married men were split over this statement; half showed support for it and half opposition. This contrasted with the cohabiting men's opposition to the statement and revealed a gap in their gender ideologies. There were no clear divides in the support for or against this statement; it was not a matter of older men versus younger men. The married men who believed that women should be stay at home parents did so because they believe women are innately better parents: (MM4) "men are worse at dealing with emotions", (MM7) "due to women's maternal instinct" and (MM6) "they are more natural". Those men that disagreed with the statement gave similar reasons to the cohabiters who also opposed the statement. This indicated that there may be social factors that led to the holding of these equality ideals due to the universality of them across all social factors.

The interviews explained why men are more involved with childcare but why women do more of it.

The first cohabiting couple (CM7 and CF7) had three sons; one under one, a fourteen-year-old and a seven-year-old. The arrival of the new baby had been a big change in the home. The baby was dependent as he was breast feeding so this meant that the mother did feeds during the day and night so she was exhausted. She commented that as children got older, childcare got easier as they could do more things for themselves. The father did tasks such as changing nappies. He was restricted in how much childcare he could do due to work. On weekends he spent time with the older boys and took them out to sporting events. This enabled the mother to have more time without them so she could rest. He spent time playing with the baby as did the mother.

The second cohabiting couple (CF5 and CM5) explained that the man was engaged in childcare. He said he had been involved in the hands-on aspects of childcare such as washing them. However, his main roles were to play with them and encourage them in their hobbies. The woman said she dealt more with the practical sides of childcare as “he plays with them all the time”. She said the main jobs she did on a daily basis were washing, feeding and taking them to childcare. This compares with the more fun tasks that the man did; although both are necessary for the children to grow up to be well-rounded. They shared the discipline of the children with the mother being the first person to tell them off and the father was then used as the final warning.

The married couple (MM4 and MF4) had grown-up children who had left home so they reflected on their past childrearing experience. The couple divided childcare up in a very traditional manner. Both believed that the model in which the man goes to work and the mother stays at home with the children was the best. They explained that this was because men earned more so they could support their family effectively and the family would have a better standard of living. Also, they believed that women are innately more caring and better at dealing with emotions.

### *Conclusion*

The integrated data from the three research methods showed the overall patterns:

1. Men and women were highly engaged with paid work.
2. Men tended to work longer hours than women in paid work.
3. Cohabiting men had the most egalitarian attitudes towards the division of labour. Married women had the most traditional attitudes; their husbands tended to be more modern in their attitudes.
4. Cohabiting and married women did more housework on average than their male partners.
5. Married women did more housework on average than cohabiting women.
6. Married men did more housework on average than cohabiting men.
7. Women gained greater pleasure from doing housework than men. However, married women were less happy with their housework share than cohabiting women.
8. Cohabiting couples, on average, did less housework than married couples.
9. There was a gender divide in housework tasks in both relationship types with men doing more outdoor and physical tasks and women doing more indoor and repetitive tasks. However, cohabiting couples had less of a gender divide than married couples in their tasks.

10. Men were engaged in childcare and usually spent more time on this in comparison to their engagement with housework.
11. Married and cohabiting men spent similar amounts of time doing childcare.
12. Cohabiting women spent more time than married women doing childcare but this is often because their children were younger.



## Chapter Five: Discussion of the Findings

Firstly, the overall findings will be re-explained before they are interpreted:

- All the men and women, with the exception of the retired couple, worked. Most of the cohabiting men worked longer hours than the cohabiting women. It was more divided within the married couples as some wives worked longer hours than their husbands but other husbands worked longer hours than their wives.
- Housework was still traditionally divided by most of the couples with the woman doing more hours than the men. Most married women did more hours of housework than cohabiting women. Married men did more housework than cohabiting men. There was also a gender division in the tasks being completed with most of the women doing indoor tasks and men doing more outdoor tasks.
- Childcare was more equally divided within all the couples but women generally did more hours of childcare than men. There was not much difference in the hours done by married men and cohabiting men in childcare but cohabiting women did more hours of childcare than married women; possibly because they had younger children. It was also found that there was a gendered division of childcare tasks across all the couples where men did the 'fun' tasks and women did the maintenance tasks such as washing them.

### *The role of gender*

A major finding of this research was that to be male or female in a relationship, whether that is marriage or cohabitation, meant that you are far more likely to do certain roles. Women were more likely to do more housework and childcare and men were more likely to do more paid work, regardless of their relationship type. As Scott and Clery (2013) noted earlier, the division of labour is unequal in all relationships and egalitarianism has not led to an equal sharing of all the roles between partners, and this has also been found in this research too.

Gender is a key factor in deciding what people do in relationships for many reasons. People may replicate what they saw their same-sex parent do during childhood and so these gender divisions are the result of generational transmission. They may have also been socialised by their parents into the roles they then adapt as adults; for instance, the men may have been taught how to do DIY by their fathers.

Wider society also still promotes gender-specific roles in the home (Allen and Webster, 2001). Television advertising is awash with gendered roles; women are used to advertise

babies' nappies and kitchen utensils; men are used to advertise cars, and gardening tools (Emons and Wester, 2010). In public areas, many women's bathrooms are the only place to change a baby's nappy.

Within schools there is a clear gender division within subjects according to the expressive and instrumental roles. Girls are far more likely to study subjects such as Psychology and English which link into the expressive role (Institute of Physics, 2013). Boys are much more likely to study subjects such as Physics and Maths which link into the instrumental role (Institute of Physics, 2013). Once people reach adulthood they often enter jobs which reflect the gendered roles they are more likely to have in the home. Women are more likely to enter professions such as nursing whereas men are more likely to become electricians (ONS, 2013). Thus people's professions could then impact upon the roles they hold in the home.

### *Relationship type*

Marriage is an ancient institution which has specific gender stereotypes attached to it. Therefore, it may be that the people who choose to be married may be more traditional in their ideologies as they want to be part of something that is traditional. They may adopt the traditional division of labour attached to this institution once married to show society that they are married persons and behave accordingly. This was shown in Kan's (2008) research in which he argued that married people will 'play out' traditional roles in their homes because these are the traditional roles attached to this relationship type. Shelton and John (1993) also argued that the different gender roles were institutionalised via marriage and so people followed the expressive and instrumental role when married.

In this research, a major finding was that the married men did less housework and childcare than their wives which fits the stereotype of traditional married couples. The wives, despite being engaged in paid work, were still primarily responsible for the home and children. As Davis (2002) noted, married couples are gender-divided in terms of the division of labour and this may be due to marriage conferring upon them these roles. This could be backed up by how traditionally-minded many of the married women were as many showed strong beliefs in the expressive and instrumental roles. These women appeared not to believe that equality was achievable nor desirable. Scott and Clery's (2013) data showed that married couples had less equal gender ideologies and my data also showed more traditional beliefs were connected with married couples, in particular the wives. This was a major contribution of this research to sociological knowledge.

The gendered division of housework and childcare tasks found within the married couples could also be explained by the institution of marriage. The expressive role is strongly associated with marriage in which the mother does the housework and childcare as is the instrumental role of the man working in the public sphere (Oakley, 1974). Baxter (2005) also agreed with marriage institutionalising these traditional gender roles and this is why marriages lead to a clear gender division of tasks and time.

Cohabitation can be seen as a new relationship type which is different to the institution of marriage. It was described by Beck and Beck-Gernsheim (1995) as enabling a negotiated relationship in which the traditional roles have been disposed of and people can create their own identities. Cohabitation may allow people to be more egalitarian as they do not need to follow the strict gender roles attached to marriage. This was found in this research to some extent as the cohabiting men were engaged in housework and childcare and all the cohabiting participants worked. However, their egalitarian gender attitudes did not manifest themselves into an equal division of labour as cohabiting women still did more housework and childcare on average and the men worked for longer hours on average as well. This is a significant finding in this work.

#### *Age and primary socialisation*

It is noticeable that one of the major divisions between the married and cohabiting participants is their ages. Overall, most of the married couples are older (in their 40s and 50s) whereas most of the cohabiting participants are younger (in their 20s and 30s). Delaunay (2010) also found that the older the couple, the more traditional their gendered division of labour and this finding was also replicated in this research, which is crucial to note.

The older participants may have been socialised into more traditional relationship roles because of the decades in which they were reared. In the 1960s and 1970s the expressive and instrumental roles were still dominant (Gershuny and Robinson, 1988). These participants may have also seen their married parents follow these traditional roles and so they may accept these roles as normal. Therefore, their primary socialisation may have led them to enter into the institution that had always been promoted to them and enact the roles they had seen. Thus they may be more likely to follow the traditional division of labour in the home because this is what was perceived as normal.

The cohabiting couples were younger and so they went through primary socialisation in more recent decades in which marriage was not as promoted as it previously had been. They were brought up in a society in which Christian values about marriage have reduced in relevance and where family diversity is now the norm (Bruce, 2001). They will have also seen women going out to work and this may be a norm to them too. The society that the younger participants were socialised into may not be as gender divided in the way that it was for the older participants. This recent socialisation of the cohabiting participants may be the reason why they all worked. It may also explain why the cohabiting men made the effort to do more housework and to take on some of the traditionally female tasks. Cohabiting women may do less housework than the married women because they were socialised into doing less.

#### *Education level and employment type*

All the participants had jobs which required either specific skills or levels of education. Many of them earned well above the national average pay. Most of the participants were educated in the post-compulsory sector as well. This could be one of the reasons that all the men and women in this study have all worked. Most have gone through the education system and moved on to post-compulsory study so they were career-minded. Therefore, this could be seen as more important to them rather than conforming to social stereotypes about what men and women should do in relationships.

One of the major contributions of this research is the findings about the men's more egalitarian gender ideologies than the women's. The men were all educated with good jobs and this may explain the gender ideologies that they held. The cohabiting men's egalitarian beliefs were consistent all the way through and they appeared to believe that men and women are equal. The married men also consistently repeated their belief that individualism is far more a determinant of what a person is like than gender. They may believe this because of their levels of education. It could be that the more educated men are, then the more they can see the logic behind the notion of equality, and so they can see that women are as capable as men. Also, men will have seen women being successful so may see them as their intellectual equals.

#### *Individual choice*

Sociologists such as Beck and Beck-Gernsheim (1995) and Giddens (1993) believe that we now live in a post-modern world in which everyone has individual choice and flexible

identities. People are no longer as constrained by the structures of society and traditional ideologies about roles and relationships. People are now more self-determining.

One of the major findings of this research was that many people described their choice in their roles in their homes. This was shown via many of the participants' answers as to why they did their amount of childcare, housework and paid work and provided some evidence for Beck and Beck-Gernsheim's (1995) notion of negotiated relationships. Some participants explained that they chose to do the amount that they did, which included some of women who did high levels of housework and childcare and did highly gendered tasks too. They explained that they enjoyed doing this work and/or they wanted to nurture their children; they had negotiated with their partner to do these roles in exchange for his income.

This makes us re-evaluate how we see women in the home and is a significant contribution to sociological knowledge. It is often assumed that any woman who does a lot of housework and childcare is subjugated (Oakley, 1974), (Faludi, 1992). A micro perspective must be taken to understand the way that women work in their own homes as one woman may love her role as a full time housewife and mother and she has chosen to leave the workforce to do this.

However, a note of caution must be taken with the concept of individual choice. Faludi (1992) would argue that women have false consciousness due to the dominant patriarchal ideology. Women are exposed to the expressive role being the best roles for women via the agencies of socialisation around them (Abrams, 1990). In a patriarchal society, women do not have free thought and thus when women believe that they are making an autonomous decision, such as 'choosing' to stay at home, they are instead opting to perform actions which will ultimately benefit men (Faludi, 1992). This could explain why cohabitation makes only a bit of difference to the number of hours that women spend working in the home.

### *Age of children*

One of the major findings was that the women in this research who had the youngest children did the most childcare; this backed up the findings from Delaunay (2010) whose research also found that the birth of a child led to the formulation of a more traditional division of labour. My research found this was because of practical reasons such as women having to breastfeed them and for legal reasons such as the discrepancy between maternity and paternity leave. The mothers in my research were either on

maternity leave or had worked part time so they had far more time than the fathers to look after their children. The children could not go to school due to their age and so they were dependent upon their mothers for care. This meant that these women, who were not in full time employment, had to look after their offspring.

Another novel contribution from this research is that it is important to note that the age of children did not affect the amount of childcare that men did. Due to men in 2014 legally being entitled to take three weeks' paid paternity leave, they were not going to be the primary caregiver of very young children unless they did not work or worked from home. This backed up Davis' (2002) research that found that traditional social policy makes people's division of labour more traditional.

### *Limitations of the research*

Firstly, the sample size is small. Researching sixteen couples means that it is difficult to generalise these results to the wider population. However, this study had a grounded approach; it aimed to build up a large amount of qualitative and quantitative data on the couples studied so that their divisions of labour were discussed in-depth and their ideologies well-explained. Therefore, the small sample was justified on these methodological grounds.

Secondly, the couples do not fully represent all the different groups within UK society today. All the couples lived in the north of England, there were no couples over the age of 65, most were 'white' British, most were atheist or Christian, and most had high levels of education. Key personal features, that may affect the division of labour and gender ideologies held, were not represented within these couples such as different religions and older people.

The final limitation of the sample is that they are all acquaintances of myself. This could have created issues with the validity of the data as the participants may have felt that because they knew me then they could not fully open up about their private lives because they would have felt embarrassed. The social desirability effect may have emerged as the participants may not have wanted to appear discriminatory in their domestic practices. Therefore, they may have lied about gender equality or they may have manipulated evidence in their time use diaries about what they actually did in the home.

However, this does appear not to have been the case and the participants do seem to have been largely honest about their division of labour and their ideologies. Their honesty can be seen through their answers in which they make points or circle answers which could be seen as socially unacceptable by others or where they look unequal in their relationships. Many of them wrote about personal beliefs about what they did in the home and sometimes these beliefs and activities did not conform to society's beliefs about how people should behave in their relationships. This may mean that participants prioritised the accuracy of results above conforming to current social beliefs.

Brewis (2014) also used a convenience sample of her friends in her research and found some similar issues. She described how she had to ensure that she only used the data from the research and did not use any other conversations she had had with her participants from any other times (Brewis, 2014). I found that challenging too as I had to ensure that I did not use data that I had not collected during this research. Brewis (2014) also raised the issue of her work 'freeze-framing' her participants and only showing a small part of their lives. I found this too because I have seen my participants' relationships change since my research was conducted but I am unable to discuss these changes as they have happened post-research.

#### *Limitations of the questionnaires*

Firstly, some participants did complain that they felt the last four questions in Part B were repetitive (Appendix Three). These questions were the ones about ideologies. A small minority of participants wrote an answer for one question and then just wrote 'as above' for the next question. However, many participants made the effort to answer all the questions and provided different answers for the different questions.

Secondly, some participants left some questions blank or they wrote short answers. This could have been due to them lacking time or not understanding the questions. This does undermine the amount of knowledge that could be gained. Not having the detail from some participants about their relationships does mean that not all participants' data is as helpful as others and so the knowledge about specific couples is more limited. This does limit the validity of some responses.

#### *Limitations of the time use diaries*

The first limitation is that there are variations in the amount of detail that participants have included in their time use diaries. Most followed the instructions carefully and wrote

a comprehensive guide to their week. However, a small minority, mainly men, did not include many details in these diaries and so it made it difficult to see what activities they did during the week. This meant that the researcher could not compare these participants easily to others who had provided more detailed responses.

The second issue was that some participants filled in the diaries retrospectively. They could have forgotten activities that they had done when they completed their diaries and so this could undermine the validity of the results. However, given that people have busy lives, this was to be expected. Most participants were detailed in their diaries and they also spoke to me to confirm details about what they had done. I sat down with most of the participants when they handed their diaries in and checked it with them. This meant that further details could be added which were missed off.

Finally, it was difficult to work out precisely how long participants had actually spent on each activity from their diaries. They all tended to write down what they done during each hour but they did not write down precisely how long they spent on each specific activity. Therefore, when counting up how long participants spent on specific activities, it was too vague. Therefore, the statistics about how long participants spent on specific activities, as taken from their diaries, cannot be seen as precise and need to be seen as a general guide to what they did.

#### *Limitations of the interviews*

The interviews were only conducted on three couples and so they may not have been fully representative of the views of all the other participants. This research did have the aim of acquiring a lot of qualitative data but I was unable to do so because of time constraints. By conducting more interviews this qualitative data could have been created.



## Chapter Six: Conclusion

The research has shown many interesting patterns in terms of the housework, paid work and childcare performed by men and women in cohabiting and married relationships. This research gives a contemporary contribution to sociological knowledge of this topic area in that it is clear that relationship type has some impact upon the division of labour within couples but this is secondary in importance in comparison to the impact of gender. In terms of paid work, the gender divide was the same in both married and cohabiting couples; men did more paid work than women on an average week in both types of relationships. In terms of housework both gender and relationship type were equally as important in their impact; both married and cohabiting men did less housework than their female partners overall but married women did more housework than cohabiting women on average. Finally, childcare was again affected by gender and relationship type; women did more childcare than men on average but cohabiting women did more childcare than married women.

Cohabiting couples were more egalitarian overall in their attitudes than married couples but married men were more egalitarian than their wives in their gender attitudes. Married women were traditional in their beliefs about the gender division within the home and their roles as wives and mothers; a significant finding in this research. Married couples followed the more traditional division of labour in their homes when it came to paid work, housework and childcare but wives did work and husbands were involved in housework and childcare. Cohabiting couples in this research are not as equal as previous literature indicated they would have been (Dominguez-Folgueras 2012, Davis 2007) which is a critical finding. Cohabiting men did more paid work than their female partners, they did less housework than their partners, and they did less childcare as well; the same patterns as the married men. There was some gender differentiation in the tasks performed within the home; men were more likely to do outdoor tasks such as DIY, women were more likely to do tasks related to schools and education if they had children, women were more likely to cook more meals on an average week. However, this gender differentiation was slightly more pronounced in the married couples than in the cohabiting couples; married men were less likely to do stereotypically female tasks in the home and for their children in comparison to cohabiting men. These findings again tie in with previous literature such as Sullivan (2000).

These differences in the division of labour between married and cohabiting couples were also pronounced in the gender ideologies they hold. Married couples held more traditional ideologies about the roles of men and women; with married women being the

most traditional. Married men were more egalitarian in their ideologies than married women; however, not as much as cohabiting couples. Cohabiting couples firmly believed in equality in the home and the workplace. They were consistent in their beliefs that men and women should divide up the labour in their homes as equally as possible. This is one key explanation of the findings found about the division of labour in relationships.

However, it was repeatedly noted by many of the participants, married and cohabiting, that equality in the home is difficult to achieve in a world which is still gender-divided. They believed in gender equality but it was difficult to enact in a world in which women were discriminated against. Many noted about women having less career progression due to earning less than men, the length of maternity leave in comparison to paternity leave, and the higher career progression opportunities for men. The couples may have believed that they should be egalitarian but if they had children this became almost impossible to enact because of social structures. This is another key explanation of the findings found about the tasks performed by couples in their relationships.

However, caution must be taken with these overall results. It cannot be proven whether it is the relationship type that creates these differences in the division of labour and the gender attitudes held by the couples, or whether the participants held these attitudes and behaved in this manner before they entered their relationship type. Cohabiting couples may cohabit because they believe in equality and oppose the gender stereotyping in marriage. Therefore, their egalitarianism may not a result of their relationship type but is instead a long term view held by themselves. In comparison, married couples may have always held traditional ideologies, hence why they opted for the traditional relationship of marriage. This was also highlighted by Carlson and Lynch (2013).

In wider terms, this study showed that most participants held fairly egalitarian ideologies, particularly men of all relationship types, which is an addition to sociological knowledge about men's gender beliefs today. Belief in equality seemed to be quite universal for both men and women and previous sexism about women, especially mothers, working appears to have reduced. Men of both relationship types appeared to have no objection about being in a dual earner relationship. Men also believed in being more active in the home and being engaged with childcare; their ideologies included a belief in a more equal division of labour. Women believed in equality and both genders working. However, cohabiting women believed more in the equal division of labour than married women. Married women retained a belief in the traditional division of labour and their ideologies were more gendered. Therefore, in terms of wider society, it could be

extrapolated to say that gender ideologies are more egalitarian than in the 1970s when Oakley was writing and that a belief in equality in the home is now held by many women and men. However, this belief was not universally held by all participants and so this may be a key reason for the inequality within all the relationships studied.

Scott and Clery (2013) found that people believed in equalitarian gender ideologies but found them difficult to implement due to the practical realities of everyday-life and this research agreed with this finding. Participants did believe that men and women should be engaged with paid work, housework and childcare but that this did not happen because of wider social structures. At the time of research in 2014, men only got three weeks' paternity leave compared to a year for women and this restricted men from looking after their own children. Also, the gender pay gap was still large and so for the family's financial security it made more sense for the man to work full time rather than the woman. It will take a lot of legislative changes to create equality in the home.

#### *Possibilities for future research*

The first would be that the study could be conducted on more couples; it could easily be done on a wider-scale because the questionnaires and diaries are self-completing and so could be sent via post, email or social media to participants and later, couples picked at random to be interviewed.

The second possibility for further research would be that a more diverse sample could be used. This sample has been quite homogenous and so it does have issues with how representative it is. Therefore, in the future, it could be deliberately engineered that a wider range of participants are used, for example, more religious groups and older people.

Another possibility is that this research could be done online. Most people today have internet access so people could do the questionnaires and diaries online and then email them back to the researcher. The time use diaries could even be provided to participants in the form of a phone-app. This app could ensure participants update their activities as they go along and could provide participants with reminders to do their diaries. The data from the app could then be sent directly to the researcher.

In the future, there could be other questions added to the questionnaire to gain more insight into people's gender ideologies and possible influences on their divisions of labour. These questions could include asking participants to describe the divisions of

labour they witnessed in their family home during childhood, to explain what their perfect division of labour would be in their relationship, and asking them to describe what they think a normal division of labour is within couples in the UK.

Finally, there would be more open-ended questions in future research so that the participants would be able to explain their gender beliefs, domestic arrangements and opinions on their divisions of labour in more detail. This would enable more qualitative data to be produced from participants about what their relationships are like and the beliefs they hold. This would enhance the grounded data gained by this research.

## Appendix One: Table of the Participants

Participant	Code name	Age	Works?	Earns?	Children	How many and ages?	Education	Job	Married for how long? (years)	Lived together for how long? (years)
Married 1 female	MF1	39	Part time	10k-19k	Yes	2: 3 and 11	5 GCSEs A*-C	Admin	15	18
Married 1 male	MM1	42	Full time	30k-39k	Yes	2: 3 and 11	Less than 5 GCSEs	Manager	15	18
Married 2 female	MF2	44	Full time	30k-39k	Yes	3: 10, 10 and 8	Master's degree	Education	17	17
Married 2 male	MM2	45	Full time	40k-49k	Yes	3: 10, 10, 8	Bachelor's degree	Business	17	17
Married 3 female	MF3	48	Full time	30k-39k	Yes	2: 22 and 20	PGCE	Teacher	27	27
Married 3 male	MM3	48	Full time	40k-49k	Yes	2: 22 and 20	Masters	Head of Department	27	27
Married 4 female	MF4	60	Part time	20k-29k	Yes	2: 28 and 25	Postgrad certificate	Case worker	28	29
Married 4 male	MM4	57	Full time	30k-39k	Yes	2: 28 and 25	Master's	Teacher	28	29
Married 5 female	MF5	44	Full time	30k-39k	Yes	1: 13	Bachelor's degree	Teacher	16	22
Married 5 male	MM5	44	Full time	30k-39k	Yes	1: 13	Masters	Lecturer	16	22
Married 6 female	MF6	53	Retired - does voluntary work	Less than 9999	No		RSA typing qualification	Retired	26	26
Married 6 male	MM6	50	Retired	Less than 9999	No		A-levels	Retired	26	26
Married 7 female	MF7	28	Full time	20k-29k	Yes	1: 3 months	A-levels	General manager	2 months	2.5
Married 7 male	MM7	24	Full time	20k-29k	Yes	1: 3 months	NVQ	Meter fitter	2 months	2.
Cohabiting 1 female	CF1	33	Full time	20k-29k	No		PGCE and HND	Psychology teacher		1
Cohabiting 1 male	CM1	35	Full time	20k-29k	No		5 GCSEs A*-C	Retail manager		1
Cohabiting 2 female	CF2	31	Full time	30k-39k	No		PGCE	Teacher		7
Cohabiting 2 male	CM2	34	Full time	30k-39k	No		NVQ	Police officer		7
Cohabiting 3 female	CF3	27	Full time	20k-29k	No		Bachelor's degree	Campaigns manager		3.5

Cohabiting 3 male	CM3	33	Full time	20k-29k	No		Bachelor's degree	Field campaigner		3.5
Cohabiting 4 female	CF4	27	Part time	Less than 9999	Yes	1: 3	NVQ	Child care		4
Cohabiting 4 male	CM4	26	Full time	40k-49k	Yes	1: 3	Apprenticeship	Construction		4
Cohabiting 5 female	CF5	27	Part time placement	Less than 9999	Yes	2: 2 and 4	Access to HE qualification	Doing midwifery degree		7
Cohabiting 5 male	CM5	30	Full time	20k-29k	Yes	2 - 2 and 4	NVQ	Sales co-ordinator		7
Cohabiting 6 female	CF6	42	Full time	30k-39k	Yes	2: 3 and 6	PGCE	Teacher		19
Cohabiting 6 male	CM6	43	Full time	20k-29k	Yes	3: 26, 6 and 3	Diploma in Social Work	Support Worker		19
Cohabiting 7 female	CF7	37	Part time	Less than 9999	Yes	3: 15, 9 and 8 months	Less than 5 GCSEs A*-C	Own business		2.5
Cohabiting 7 male	CM7	27	Full time	30k-39k	Yes	3: 15, 9 and 8 months	Less than 5 GCSEs A*-C	Sergeant in army		2.5
Cohabiting 8 female	CF8	28	Full time	20k-29k	No		PGCE	Teacher		1
Cohabiting 8 male	CM8	30	Full time	20k-29k	No		A-levels	ICT technician		1
Cohabiting 9 female	CF9	28	Full time	20k-29k	No		NVQ	PA		2
Cohabiting 9 male	CM9	30	Full time	20k-29k	No		Bachelor's degree	Sales		2

## Appendix Two: Table of Articles from the Literature Review

	<b>"Is cohabitation more egalitarian?"</b>	<b>British Social Attitudes Survey</b>	<b>"To marry or not to marry?"</b>	<b>"Gender in cohabitation and marriage"</b>	<b>"Gender differentiation and new trends"</b>	<b>"Effects of union type on division of labour"</b>	<b>"Is it time for dads to 'man down'?"</b>
Name of author	Dominquez-Folgueras	Office of National Statistics	Baxter	Cunningham	Delaunay	Davis	Netmums
Data produced or used by the study (quantitative or qualitative)	Quantitative	Quantitative	Quantitative	Quantitative	Quantitative and qualitative	Quantitative	Quantitative
Research methods used	Meta-analysis of surveys	Survey	Survey	Self-report studies and phone interviews	Semi-structured interviews, observations and documents	Multilevel modelling and gender ideology measures	Questionnaire
Size of sample	Large	Large	Large	Large	Small = 31 couples	Large	Large – 1075 participants
Country the research was conducted in	France, Germany, UK, Italy and Spain	UK	Australia	America	Portugal	28 countries including the UK	UK
Overview of results gained	Women who cohabit do less housework than married. There is less gender division of household tasks in cohabiting couples.	Gender ideology is more equal in cohabiting couples than married one. Division of labour is unequal in all relationships.	Cohabiting couples have less gendered division of housework than married. Cohabiting women do less housework than married women.	In cohabiting couples, if they have equal gender ideologies then there's less gender division of housework. In married couples women have less power so do more housework.	Women do less housework overall as they get outside help in. Men do less housework than women in all relationships and women always do more. Birth of children make gendered division of labour.	Women do more housework than men. Cohabiting couples are more equal than married couples e.g. men do more housework.	Men prioritise being a dad above their breadwinner role. The role of fathers has changed in last generation. Half of women want their partners to do more housework and half of men think they should do more housework.
Did they find that marriage	Cohabitation	N/A	Cohabitation	Cohabitation	No difference between married and	Cohabiting	N/A

or cohabitation was more egalitarian?					cohabiting couples.		
Conclusion of the study	Cohabitation is more egalitarian and marriage sustains traditional division of labour.	There's no new man. The gender division of labour remains and gendered division of tasks remains.	There are big differences in the division of housework, childcare and paid work between married and cohabiting couples. Married couples are less equal than cohabiting.	Gender ideology affects the division of labour, especially for married couples.	Age affects the division of labour more than marital status.	Countries that have more egalitarian social policy have more egalitarian divisions of labour between couples. Cohabitation is more equal than marriage for the division of labour.	Men are being more actively involved in childcare and they are prioritising it above their traditional instrumental role. Many couples still have an unequal division of housework.
What areas did they look at?	Housework	Housework and care roles	Housework and childcare	Housework	Link between people's gender ideologies and its impact on the division of labour.	Work and housework	Housework and childcare.
What sources did they use in their work?	Multinational Time Use Survey	Social Attitudes Survey	Australian National Survey	Intergenerational Panel Study of Parents and Children	Primary research by author	Primary research	Netmums survey
Year(s) research conducted	2010	2012	1996-7	1980s and 1990s	2006-7	2002	2015



## Appendix Three: The Questionnaire

### Questionnaire

#### Instructions:

- There are a number of questions I would like you to answer over the next few pages. This questionnaire should take you no more than an hour at the very most.
- There are two different types of questions on this questionnaire. The first section includes questions that only need you to circle a pre-prepared answer. The second section includes questions that need you to write out an answer in your own words.
- If you don't understand any of the questions then please email me to ask me for some guidance. Don't just randomly guess please!
- You don't need to do all the questions at once. Do them when you have time in manageable chunks.
- These questions are about a number of different areas. These include housework, childcare, paid work and your beliefs about roles in the home.
- I will collect them from you at our pre-arranged time – see top of the paper.
- These questionnaires are anonymous and will be kept confidential. The only people that will see them are myself and my supervisor, the Head of Sociology at York University. You will not be referred to by your name in my research – you will be called participant (X).
- Before you fill in your answers to the questions you will need to complete some questions about you again please.
- If you have any questions about any of this then please email me on **[jeb562@york.ac.uk](mailto:jeb562@york.ac.uk)** and I will get back to you asap.

Thank you

**Please fill in the following details about yourself:**

**Your age:**

**The city you live in:**

**Do you (please circle all that apply):**

- 1) work full time (over 25 hours a week)
- 2) work part time (under 25 hours a week)
- 3) not work (unemployed)
- 4) in full time education
- 5) in part time education
- 6) do voluntary work for more than eight hours a week
- 7) are a full time parent
- 8) do a work placement for more than eight hours a week

**Your gender/ sex (please circle the one that applies):**

Male

Female

Prefer not to say

**Your individual income bracket from any source of income e.g. work, student loan, benefits (please circle the one that applies) – not you and your partner combined:**

- 1) up to £9999
- 2) between £10000 and £19999
- 3) between £20000 and £29999
- 4) between £30000 and £39999
- 5) between £40000 and £49999
- 6) above £50000

**Do you have children (own, adopted, step)?**

Yes No

**If yes then how many do you have?**

**If yes then what are their ages?**

**If you have children, then how many live at home (for more than 4 days of the week)?**

**How many are under five that live at home (for more than 4 days of the week)?**

**What is your current level of education? (circle the one that applies)**

- 1) No GCSEs
- 2) less than 5 GCSEs at A\*-C
- 3) five or more GCSEs at A\*-C
- 4) A-levels or level three Btec
- 5) Apprenticeship
- 6) NVQ
- 7) Bachelors degree (your undergraduate degree)
- 8) Masters degree
- 9) PhD
- 10) Other type of qualification **Please state type of qualification:**

**What is your area of employment? Please give a description of what you do at work.**

**Are you married?**

**If yes, then how long have you been married?**

**If yes, then did you live together before you were married?**

**For all couples, how long have you lived in the same home as your partner?**

All these answers are totally confidential and will not be discussed with anyone except my Masters supervisor, the Head of Sociology at York University, who will also keep it completely confidential.
---

## **Section A Questions**

If you don't have children, then ignore the childcare questions!

**1. How much housework (not childcare) do you estimate that you do every week? (circle the one that applies)**

Under 5 hours

5 to 10 hours

11 to 15 hours

16 to 20 hours

21 to 25 hours

More than 25 hours

**2. How much childcare do you estimate that you do every week? (circle the one that applies)**

Under 5 hours

6 to 10 hours

11 to 15 hours

16 to 20 hours

21 to 25 hours

More than 25 hours

**The following questions will now ask you to circle an answer on the scale from 1-10.**

**1 means you disagree completely with the statement and 10 means you completely agree with the statement.**

**3. Do you feel that you do too much housework every week?**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**4. Do you feel that you do too much childcare every week?**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**5. Do you think that your partner does enough housework?**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**6. Do you think your partner does enough childcare?**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**7. Would you like your partner to do more housework?**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**8. Would you like your partner to do more childcare?**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**9. Do you enjoy doing housework?**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**10. Do you enjoy doing childcare?**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**11. Do you have a cleaner who comes in once a month or more?**

Yes No

**11a. Does a member of your family help you with housework once a month or more?** Yes No

**11b. Does a member of your family help you with childcare once a month or more?** Yes No

**12. Please circle the following household appliances that you have in your home:**

Microwave Hoover Dishwasher Washing machine Tumble dryer

Oven Iron

**The following questions will now ask you to circle an answer on the scale from 1-10.**

**1 means you disagree completely with the statement and 10 means you completely agree with the statement.**

**13. Do you find housework stressful?**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**14. Do you find childcare stressful?**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**15. Do you enjoy going to work/ education/ voluntary work?**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**16. Do you think you do more housework than your parent(s) did?**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**17. Do you think that you do more childcare than your parent(s) did?**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**18. Do you wish you could spend more time with your children?**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**19. Do you think that women are better at childcare than men?**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**20. Do you think that men earn more money than women?**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**21. Do you think that women are better at housework than men?**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**22. Do you think that a mother should stay at home if her child is under the age of four?**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**23. Do you think that the best family relationship is for men to go to work and women stay at home?**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**24. Do you think that housework should be divided equally between men and women?**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**25. Do you think that childcare should be divided equally between men and women?**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**26. Do you think it is good if a mother with children under the age of 16 works full time?**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**27. Are children more likely to have a poor relationship with their mother if their mother works full time?**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**28. Is it better if a mother with children under the age of five to stay at home with them?**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**29. Please can you circle the tasks you do regularly every week below:**

Putting the bins out

Cooking the tea

Washing the children  
Cleaning the car  
Doing the washing up  
Giving the children medication/ healthcare  
Washing clothes  
Doing the ironing  
Hoovering  
Looking after pets  
Food shopping  
Dusting  
Mopping the floors  
Doing homework with children  
Sorting out children's school clothes  
Sorting out finances and banking  
Taking children out  
Playing with children  
Communicating with relatives  
Doing DIY  
Organising holidays and trips away  
Gardening

## **Section B questions**

Answer these questions in your own words. You can write as much or as little as you like. Don't worry about grammar or spelling!

If you don't have children, then ignore the childcare questions!

**How you feel about the amount of housework that you do?**

**Why do you do the amount of housework that you do?**

**Do you enjoy doing housework?**

**How could housework be made more enjoyable?**

**How do you think the amount of housework you currently do could be reduced in the future?**

**What parts of childcare do you enjoy?**



**What parts of childcare do you enjoy less?**

**How could childcare be made easier in your home?**

**Why does your partner do the amount of housework that they do?**

**Do you think that your partner does enough in your home? Please explain your answer.**

**Do you think that there could be a more equal division of housework and childcare in your home? How could this be achieved do you think?**

**Do you think that women make better stay at home parents than men? Please explain your answer.**

**Do you think that men make better stay at home parents than women? Please explain your answer.**

**Do you think that men make better breadwinners than women? Please explain your answer.**

**Do you think that women make better breadwinners than men? Please explain your answer.**

## **Appendix Four: Time Use Diary**

### **Time Use Diary**

#### How to use this time use diary

This is a diary you are going to fill in for a week. The first thing you need to do is fill in your details on the next page. The next thing you need to do is complete this diary every day – instructions on what to do are below.

**It is really important that you fill this diary in accurately and regularly for my research. Don't lie and try and complete it on time.**

#### How your data will be used

You will remain anonymous – I won't ask for your name and so it won't be used in my research. You will be referred to as participant (X).

I will be making statistics and charts from your results. I will also refer to your answers in my work. I will not be making any value judgements about you.

#### What to do with this time use diary

- There is a chart for each day of the week. It is divided up into hours.
- You need to write in each hour of the day what you were doing in that time. You can write down one or more activities in each hour. If possible, please could you write down how long you were doing each task for.
- You can write down any activities you were doing at that time. If you were at work then you can simply write down "at work".
- During the hours you are at home please write down the specific activities you were doing at that time. Examples of things you can write down include: watching TV, playing with the kids, cooking, taking out the bins, cleaning, washing the car, doing DIY. But you can write down anything you do, even if it's not on that list of examples.
- I will take this time use diary off you at the pre-arranged time – written by hand at the top of the page.

If you need help with filling this time use diary in then please email me on [jeb562@york.ac.uk](mailto:jeb562@york.ac.uk) and I will get back to you about it.

**Please fill in the following details about yourself:**

a) Your age:

b) The city you live in:

c) Do you (please circle all that apply):

1) work full time 2) work part time (under 25 hours) 3) not work (unemployed) 4) in full time education 5) in part time education 6) do voluntary work for more than eight hours a week 7) are a full time parent 8) do a work placement for more than eight hours a week

d) Your gender/ sex:

e) Your individual income bracket from any source of income e.g. work, student loan, benefits (please circle the one that applies) – **not you and your partner combined:**

1) under £10000 2) between £10000 and £20000 3) between £20000 and £30000 4) between £30000 and £40000 5) between £40000 and £50000 6) above £50000

f) Do you have children (own, adopted, step)? If yes then how many? What are their ages?

g) If you have children, then how many live at home (for more than 4 days of the week)?

How many are under five that live at home (for more than 4 days of the week)?

h) What is your current level of education? (circle the one that applies)

1) No GCSEs 2) less than 5 GCSEs at A\*-C 3) five or more GCSEs at A\*-C 4) A-levels or level three Btec 5) Apprenticeship 6) NVQ 7) Bachelors degree (your undergraduate degree) 8) Masters degree 9) PhD

I) What is your job title?

J) Are you married? If so, then how long have you been married? Did you live together before you were married?

K) How long have you lived in the same home as your partner?

**All these answers are totally confidential and will not be discussed with anyone except my Masters supervisor, the Head of Sociology at York University, who will also keep it completely confidential.**

This is an example of a completed time use diary below.

Hours	
6-7am	Set table for breakfast. Put washing on. Put dishwasher on.
7-8am	Get kids up and dressed and fed. Get partner up and give them breakfast. Make school packed lunches.
8-9am	Get kids to school. Go to work.
9-10am	Work
10-11am	Work
11-12pm	Work
12-1pm	Work

1-2pm	Work
2-3pm	Work
3-4pm	Pick kids up from school. Give them food when home. Tidy house. Clean bathroom and bedroom. Put washing out.
4-5pm	Start cooking tea. Do some ironing.
5-6pm	Serve tea. Clear table. Put dishwasher on.
6-7pm	Help kids with homework. Chat to kids about their day.
7-8pm	Watch TV.
8-9pm	Get kids ready for bed – bath and sort clothes out for tomorrow. Check school bags. Chat to them before sleep.
9-10pm	More ironing and clean lounge and kitchen.
10-11pm	TV and get ready for bed.
11pm-5am	Sleep

Hours	
6-7am	
7-8am	
8-9am	
9-10am	
10-11am	
11-12pm	
12-1pm	
1-2pm	
2-3pm	
3-4pm	
4-5pm	

5-6pm	
6-7pm	
7-8pm	
8-9pm	
9-10pm	
10-11pm	
11pm-5am	

Hours	
6-7am	
7-8am	
8-9am	
9-10am	



10-11am	
11-12pm	
12-1pm	
1-2pm	
2-3pm	
3-4pm	
4-5pm	
5-6pm	
6-7pm	
7-8pm	
8-9pm	
9-10pm	

10-11pm	
11pm-5am	

Hours	
6-7am	
7-8am	
8-9am	
9-10am	
10-11am	
11-12pm	
12-1pm	
1-2pm	
2-3pm	
3-4pm	

4-5pm	
5-6pm	
6-7pm	
7-8pm	
8-9pm	
9-10pm	
10-11pm	
11pm-5am	

Hours	
6-7am	
7-8am	
8-9am	

9-10am	
10-11am	
11-12pm	
12-1pm	
1-2pm	
2-3pm	
3-4pm	
4-5pm	
5-6pm	
6-7pm	
7-8pm	
8-9pm	

9-10pm	
10-11pm	
11pm-5am	

Hours	
6-7am	
7-8am	
8-9am	
9-10am	
10-11am	
11-12pm	
12-1pm	
1-2pm	
2-3pm	
3-4pm	

4-5pm	
5-6pm	
6-7pm	
7-8pm	
8-9pm	
9-10pm	
10-11pm	
11pm-5am	

Hours	
6-7am	
7-8am	
8-9am	

9-10am	
10-11am	
11-12pm	
12-1pm	
1-2pm	
2-3pm	
3-4pm	
4-5pm	
5-6pm	
6-7pm	
7-8pm	
8-9pm	

9-10pm	
10-11pm	
11pm-5am	

Hours	
6-7am	
7-8am	
8-9am	
9-10am	
10-11am	
11-12pm	
12-1pm	
1-2pm	
2-3pm	



3-4pm	
4-5pm	
5-6pm	
6-7pm	
7-8pm	
8-9pm	
9-10pm	
10-11pm	
11pm-5am	

## **Appendix Five: Interview Topic Areas**

### **Interview Topic Areas**

I will be doing a semi-structured interview with my participants. I therefore have no pre-set questions that I wish to ask as such; just areas that I want to cover. I will be treating each participant as an individual and so I will put these areas into conversations that are suitable and appropriate for each individual participant.

The areas I want to cover in each interview are:

- How much housework and childcare do they do?
- How do they feel about doing housework and childcare?
- Why do they do the amount of housework and childcare that they do?
- Do they have help with doing housework and childcare? Paid or otherwise?
- Gender division of household tasks
- How could they improve the housework/ childcare situation in their home?
- Why is their division of labour not equal? (if this is the case)
- Men and women's roles – what should they be?
- Do they believe in feminism and gender equality?
- Women and men and parenting; who should do what?
- What do they see as the perfect situation in their home for housework, childcare and paid work?

At the start of each interview I must remind them about confidentiality, anonymity and how their data will be used. I will be taping the interviews so I must inform them of this and get their consent for the interview to take place. I will also explain roughly what the interview will be about, how it will work and what they are expected to do.

**Appendix Six: Tables outlining quantitative data about participants' undertaking of housework**

*Table 4.2: the housework tasks completed by participants according to the questionnaire data*

	Wash Car	Put out bins	Wash up	Wash Clothes	Vacuum cleaning	Mop	Talking with family	Make meals	Dust	Sort out finances	Look after pets	Food shop	DIY	Iron clothes
Married women (7)	2	5	9	9	9	5	7	7	6	5	5	5	1	1
Married men (7)	2	7	8	8	7	1	6	7	3	6	3	6	4	4
Cohabiting women (9)	0	3	4	7	5	4	7	6	4	6	4	6	2	4
Cohabiting men (9)	2	6	5	5	4	2	5	4	2	3	5	3	6	2

*Table 4.3: the number of participants who completed these housework tasks in a week (time use diaries)*

	Wash the car	Put out bins	Wash up	Wash clothes	Vacuum cleaning	Mop	Talk with family	Make meals	Dust	Sort out finance	Look after pets	Food shop	DIY	Iron Clothes
Married women (7)	1	2	7	6	2	1	2	7	1	3	6	4	0	3
Married men (7)	1	5	6	3	4	0	0	6	2	0	2	4	3	0
Cohabiting women (9)	1	1	5	5	4	1	1	9	1	1	3	3	0	1
Cohabiting men (9)	1	2	5	5	4	0	0	8	0	1	3	3	3	1

*Table 4.4: the average number of times participants undertook tasks within a week (time use diaries)*

	Was h car	Put out bins	Was h up	Wash clothe s	Vacuu m Cleanin g	Mop	Talkin g with family	Make meal s	Dust	Sortin g out financ e	Look after pets	Food Shop	DIY	Ironin g clothe s
Married wome n (7)	1	2.5	5	4	2	3	2.5	14	1	1	5	3.5	0	2
Married men (7)	1	1.6	4	4	1	0	0	6	2	0	1	1	1	0
Cohab iting wome n (9)	1	3	6	5	1	1	2	9	2	1	5	1	0	1
Cohab iting men (9)	1	1.5	4	3	1.5	0	0	4.5	0	1	5.5	4.5	2.5	3

**Appendix Seven: Tables outlining the quantitative data collected from participants about childcare**

*Table 4.5: The number of participants who reported completing childcare tasks in a week (time use diaries)*

	Feeding children	Assisting with children's hobbies	Playing with children	Waking children up	Dressing children	School activities with children	Putting children to bed	Washing children
Married women (4)	3	2	4	2	2	3	3	3
Married men (4)	3	3	4	1	0	2	2	1
Cohabiting women (4)	4	4	4	2	3	3	4	4
Cohabiting men (4)	2	3	4	1	2	1	3	2

*Table 4.6: Average number of times participants conducted each task within a week (time use diaries)*

	Feeding children (only)	Helping with children's hobbies	Playing with children	Waking children up	Dressing children	School activities with children	Putting children to bed	Washing children	Reading with children
Married women (4)	5	1	2	3	2	4	5.5	3	2
Married men (4)	2	6	3	3	0	1.5	3.5	3	0

Cohabiting women (4)	14	1.5	6	5	6	3	6	6	1.5
Cohabiting men (4)	4.5	2	4	2	3	2	3	1.5	1

## Appendix Eight: the characteristics of the sample

*Table 4.A: The sample and its key characteristics*

	Number	Percentage
<b>Couples status</b>		
Married	7	44
Cohabiting	9	56
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	16	50
Female	16	50
<b>Employment status</b>		
Part time	5	16
Full time	25	78
Retired/voluntary work	2	6
<b>Age group</b>		
20-25	1	3
26-30	11	34
31-35	5	16
36-40	2	6
41-45	7	22
46-50	3	9
51-55	1	3
56-60	2	6
<b>Children</b>		
Yes	20	63
No	12	37
<b>Education</b>		
Less than five GCSEs	3	9
Five GCSEs	2	6
A-levels	3	9



Professional qualification	1	3
Bachelor's degree	5	16
PGCE	5	16
Masters	4	13
NVQ	5	16
Apprenticeship	1	3
Access to HE	1	3
Postgraduate qualification	2	6

*Table 4.B: Comparison of married and cohabiting couples*

		Married (n, %)	Cohabiting (n, %)
Children	Yes	6 (86)	4 (56)
	No	1 (14)	5 (44)
Overall earnings			
	-£10000	0	0
	£10000-20000	1 (14)	0
	£21000-£29000	0	0
	£30000-£39000	0	1 (11)
	£40000-£49000	0	1 (11)
	£50000-£59000	2 (28)	5 (56)
	£60000-£69000	1 (14)	1 (11)
	£70000-£79000	3 (43)	1 (11)
	£80000-£89000	2 (28)	0
Highest qualification in the couple			
	Less than 5 GCSEs	0	0
	5 GCSEs	1 (14)	0
	A-levels	2 (28)	0

	Professional qualification	0	1 (11)
	Bachelor's degree	0	2 (22)
	PGCE	0	3 (33)
	Masters	4 (57)	0
	Postgraduate qualification	0	1 (11)
	NVQ	0	1 (11)
	Access to HE	0	1 (11)
Average age of the couple			
	20-25	0	0
	26-30	1 (14)	5 (56)
	31-35	0	2 (22)
	36-40	0	1 (11)
	41-45	3 (43)	1 (11)
	46-50	1 (14)	0
	51-55	1 (14)	0
	56-60	1 (14)	0

## Bibliography

Abrams K (1990), Ideology and women's choices, *Georgia Law Review* 24(4), 761-802.

Allen S and Webster P S (2001), When wives get sick: gender role attitudes, marital happiness, and husbands' contribution to household labor, *Gender and Society*, 15 (6):898-916.

Assave A, Fuochi G, Mencarini L (2014), Desperate housework: relative resources, time availability, economic dependency, and gender ideology across Europe, *Journal of Family Issues*, 35 (8):1000-1022.

Assave A, Fuochi G, Mencarini L, Mendola D (2015), What is your couple type? Gender ideology, housework-sharing, and babies, *Demographic Research*, 32:835-858.

Baxter, J (2005), To marry or not to marry: marital status and the household division of labour, *Journal of Family Issues*, 26 (3):300-321.

Baxter J, Haynes M, Hewitt B (2010), Pathways into marriage: cohabitation and the division of labour, *Journal of Family Issues*, 31 (11):1507-1529.

Baxter J, Haynes M, Western M, and Hewitt (2012), Gender, justice and domestic work: life course transitions and perceptions of fairness, *Longitudinal and Life Course Studies*, 4 (1):78-85.

Beck U and Beck-Gernsheim E (1995), *Normal Chaos of Love*, Cambridge:-Polity.

Bianchi S M (2011), Family change and time allocation in American families, *Annals of The American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 638 (1):21-44.

Bianchi S M and Milkie M A (2010), Work and family research in the first decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72 (June):705-725.

Brewis J (2014), The ethics of researching friends: on convenience sampling in qualitative management and organization studies, *British Journal of Management*, 25(4) 849-862.

Bruce S (2001), Christianity in Britain, RIP, *Sociology of Religion*, 62 (2) 191-203.

Burghes L, Clarke L and Cronin N (2013) *Fathers and Fatherhood in Britain*, <https://www.jrf.org.uk/report/fathers-and-fatherhood-britain>, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, accessed 27/4/16.

Campbell B (1984) *Wigan Pier: Revisited*, London:-Virago.

Cardinal G and Hayward J (2004), *Epistemology: the theory of knowledge*, London:-Hodder Murray.

Carlson D and Lynch J (2013), Housework: cause and consequence of gender ideology?, *Social Science Research Journal*, 42 (6):1505-1518.

Castella T (30/1/14), *Whatever happened to the term New Man?*, BBC Magazine, [www.bbc.co.uk/news/magazine-25943326](http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/magazine-25943326), accessed 3/12/14.

Corti L (1993), *Using Diaries in Social Science Research*, Social Research Update, Issue 2, Department of Sociology, University of Surrey.

Cunningham M (2005), Gender in cohabitation and marriage: the influence of gender ideology on housework allocation over the life course, *Journal of Family Issues*, 26 (8):1037-1062.

Davis S (2007), Effects of union type on the division of household labour: do cohabiting men really perform more housework?, *Journal of Family Issues*, 28 (9):1246-1272.

Delaunay C (2010), Gender differentiation and new trends concerning the division of household labour within couples: the case of emergency physicians, *Journal of Comparative Research in Anthropology and Sociology*, 1 (1):33-56.

Denscombe M (1998), *The Good Research Guide for Small-Scale Social Research Projects*, Buckingham:-Open University Press

Dey I (1993), *Qualitative Data Analysis*, London:-Routledge.

Dominguez-Folgueras M (2012), Is cohabitation more egalitarian? The division of household labour in five European countries, *Journal of Family Affairs*, 34 (12):1623-1646.

Emons P, Wester F and Scheepers P (2010), He works outside the home; she drinks coffee and does the dishes, gender roles in fiction programs on Dutch television, *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 54(1):40-53.

Equal Pay Portal (updated 1/5/2016), *Statistics*,  
<http://www.equalpayportal.co.uk/statistics/>, accessed 12/5/16.

Faludi S (1992), *Backlash*, New York:-Knopf Doubleday.

Giddens A (1993), *The Transformation of Intimacy*, Cambridge:-Polity.

Greer G (2006), Why women don't relax, *The Guardian*,  
<http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2006/may/04/gender.consumerandethicalliving>, accessed 13/6/16.

Gershuny J and Robinson J P (1988) Historical changes in the household division of labor, *Demography*, 25 (4):537-552.

Gov.uk (6/4/2016), *Shared Parental Leave and Pay: Employer Guide*,  
[www.gov.uk/shared-parental-leave-and-pay-employer-guide/overview](http://www.gov.uk/shared-parental-leave-and-pay-employer-guide/overview), accessed 1/5/16.

Hundley V and Van Teijlingen E (2002), The Role of Pilot Studies in Midwifery Research, *Midwives Magazine*, 5 (11):372-374.

Institute of Physics (2013), *Closing Doors Exploring Gender and Subject Choices in Schools*, London, [http://www.iop.org/publications/iop/2013/file\\_62083.pdf](http://www.iop.org/publications/iop/2013/file_62083.pdf), accessed 2/6/16.

Institute of Public and International Affairs (2009), *What is Interpretive Research?*, University of Utah, [www.ipia.utah.edu/imps/html/research.html](http://www.ipia.utah.edu/imps/html/research.html), accessed 4/6/16.

Jones P (1993), *Studying Society Sociological Theories and Research Practices*, London:-CollinsEducational

Kan M Y (2008), Does gender trump money? Housework hours of husbands and wives in Britain, *Work Employment and Society*, 22 (1):45-66.

Landeros O E, Salazar G, Bertha C, Cruz Quevedo E (2009), Influence of positivism on nursing research and practice, *Index de Enfermería [Index Enferm]* (digital edition) 2009; 18(4). Accessed via [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/262556847\\_La\\_influencia\\_del\\_positivismo\\_en\\_la\\_investigacion\\_y\\_practica\\_de\\_enfermeria](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/262556847_La_influencia_del_positivismo_en_la_investigacion_y_practica_de_enfermeria) on 15/6/16.

Morning Star (5/8/2014), *The Changing Role of the Housewife*, <http://morningstaronline.co.uk/a-af88-The-changing-role-of-the-housewife#.V2biqPkrLIU>, accessed 10/12/15.

Molly Maid (2014), *Survey Shows Brits Spend 10 Years of Their Life Doing Household Chores*, <http://www.mollymaid.co.uk/news/survey-shows-brits-spend-10-years-of-their-life-doing-household-chores/>, accessed 21/3/16.

Moser and Kalton (1971), *Survey Methods in Social Investigation*, London:-Heinemann Educational Books

Netmums (2015), *Is it time for dads to 'man down'?*, [www.netmums.com/activities/summer/father-s-day/is-is-time-for-dads-to-man-down](http://www.netmums.com/activities/summer/father-s-day/is-is-time-for-dads-to-man-down), accessed 21/3/16.

Oakley A (1974), *Housewife*, London:-Penguin Books.

Office for National Statistics (7/3/2013), *Chapter 3 – Households, families and people (General Lifestyle Survey Overview – a report on the 2011 General Lifestyle Survey)*,

[http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20160105160709/http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171776\\_328352.pdf](http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20160105160709/http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171776_328352.pdf), accessed 17/5/16.

Office for National Statistics (2012), *Statistical Bulletin Families and Households – 2012*,

<http://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/families/bulletins/familiesandhouseholds/2012-11-01>, accessed 17/5/16.

Office for National Statistics, *Marriage, Cohabitation and Civil Partnerships*,

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/marriagecohabitationandcivilpartnerships>, accessed 17/5/16.

Office for National Statistics (25/9/2013), *Women in the Labour Market – 2013*,

<http://www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peopleinwork/employmentandemployeetypes/articles/womeninthelabourmarket/2013-09-25>, accessed 17/5/16.

Office for National Statistics (2014), *Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings: 2014 Provisional Results*,

[www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/ashe/annual-survey-of-hours-and-earnings/2014-provisional-results/stb-ashe-statistical-bulletin-2014.html#tab-Key-points](http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/ashe/annual-survey-of-hours-and-earnings/2014-provisional-results/stb-ashe-statistical-bulletin-2014.html#tab-Key-points), accessed 17/5/16.

Office for National Statistics (11/6/2014), *Numbers of Marriages, Marriage Rates and Periods of Occurrence*,

<http://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/marriagecohabitationandcivilpartnerships/datasets/numberofmarriagesmarriage-ratesandperiodofoccurrence>, accessed 17/5/16.

Rowlands B (2005), Grounded in practice: using interpretative research to build theory, *The Electronic Journal of Business Research Methodology*, 3 (1):81-92.

Scott J and Clery E (2013), Gender roles an incomplete revolution?, pp.115-138 in Park A, Bryson C, Clery E, Curtice J and Phillips M (eds.) (2013), *British Social Attitudes: the 30th Report*, London:- NatCen Social Research.

Shelton B A and John D (1993), Does marital status make a difference? Housework among married and cohabiting men and women, *Journal of Family Issues*, 14 (3):401-420.

South J S and Spitze G (1994), Housework in marital and nonmarital households, *American Sociological Review*, 59 (3):327-347.

Sullivan O (2000), The division of domestic labour: twenty years of change?, *Sociology*, 34 (3):437-456.

Telegraph Man (15/6/15), Being the Breadwinner is now the 8<sup>th</sup> Most Important Job for Dads, *The Telegraph*, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/men/relationships/fatherhood/11674703/Being-the-breadwinner-is-now-the-eighth-most-important-job-for-dads.html>, accessed 8/8/15.

Townsend P, (1979) *Poverty in the United Kingdom*, London:- Penguin Books.

Ward V (29/11/2011) One in Six Cohabiting as Marriage Rates Decline, *Daily Telegraph*, [www.telegraph.co.uk/women/sex/divorce/8924245/One-in-six-cohabiting-as-marriage-rate-declines.html](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/women/sex/divorce/8924245/One-in-six-cohabiting-as-marriage-rate-declines.html), accessed 2/11/14.

West C and Fenstermaker S (1993), Power, inequality and the accomplishment of gender: an ethnomethodological view, pp.151-174 in Paula England (ed.), *Theory on Gender/Feminism on Theory*, New York:-Aldine.

WISE Campaign (2016), <https://www.wisecampaign.org.uk/>, accessed 10/5/15.

Yule, J (1997), Engendered ideologies and leisure policy in the UK. Part one: gender ideologies, *Leisure Studies*, 16 (2):61-84.



