

Racial and Ethnic Homogamy and Gendered Time on Core Housework

Catherine Bolzendahl*
Department of Sociology
University of California, Irvine

Zoya Gubernskaya
Department of Sociology
State University of New York, Albany

ABSTRACT

Gendered patterns in time spent on housework differ among racial/ethnic groups, but it is not clear whether racial/ethnic partner homogamy contributes to these differences. The increasing number of interracial marriages may work to undermine patterns of marital homogamy, and suggest a new mechanism explaining gendered division of housework. To evaluate this, we pool 10 years of data from the American Time Use Survey and examine how time spent on housework varies by gender and racial/ethnic homogamy. Our findings show that those in interracial partnerships are more gender egalitarian as women in such unions spend less time on housework and men spend more. Homogamy effects are strongest among Hispanic and Asian respondents. Descriptive patterns based on partner's race/ethnicity are explored, and implications for marital deinstitutionalization and theories of racial/ethnic differences in housework mechanism are discussed.

Key Words: Race, Ethnicity, Housework, ATUS, Gender, Homogamy, Interracial Marriage

*Prof. Catherine Bolzendahl; Department of Sociology; University of California, Irvine; 3151 Social Science Plaza; Irvine, CA 92697; cbolzend@uci.edu

Interracial marriages are a growing proportion of partnerships (Fu and Heaton 2008), a process driven partly by immigration and increased ethnoracial diversity in the U.S. and partly by changing attitudes (Lee and Bean 2010, Powell et al. 2010). Racial and ethnic homogamy has worked to preserve divisions between racial and ethnic groups. Traditions, languages, religion, foods, clothing, and mannerisms are reproduced as couples marry within their racial or ethnic group. Positive social outcomes of this process include group solidarity, strong social identities, network ties that provide access to human capital, and the maintenance of rich sources of cultural capital. However, race/ethnicity is also strongly tied to socio-economic inequalities, thus racially homogamous marriages also contribute to the maintenance of racial stratification in the poorest and richest groups of Americans. Cultural capital might also be cultural “baggage,” where individuals find it difficult to shake potentially repressive, obligatory, or coercive aspects of their racial/ethnic group culture. Interracial marriage thus may provide an opportunity to revise cultural marriage narratives. In particular, it is possible that interracial marriage may allow partners to redefine their household roles, by moving into a relationship that does not (necessarily) come with shared cultural expectations about men’s and women’s gender and household roles, thus reflecting general trends in the deinstitutionalization of marriage (Cherlin 2004).

Along these lines, previous research has found that the patterns in and determinants of gendered time spent on housework vary across racial/ethnic groups (Wight et al. 2012, Sayer and Fine 2011, e.g., Pinto and Coltrane 2009), and these differences are not fully explained by the differences in socio-economic and demographic characteristics. Studying how those in interracial relationships accept or reject traditional marital roles and family behaviors may help us better understand mechanisms behind gender differences. Previous research has focused primarily on

economic (e.g., resources/power) and cultural mechanisms (e.g., gender ideology) as determining gendered disparities in housework, but the effect of interracial marriages may operate independently of these. This suggests an additional mechanism for equality in housework time, which may reflect changing partner negotiations regarding resources, culture, and the meaning of marriage. To evaluate this possibility, we ask, how does time spent on housework vary by racial/ethnic homogamy across racial/ethnic groups, and among men and women?

We address this question by using data from the 2003-2012 American Time Use Survey (ATUS) to look at the performance of core, female-typed, housework among Non-Hispanic white, Hispanic, black, and Asian Americans with racially/ethnically homogamous or interracial/interethnic partners (hereafter: racial homogamy and interracial partnership). Below we review previous research on gender and racial/ethnic differences in housework time, patterns of racial homogamy in the U.S., and relevant implications from research on marital homogamy for our study.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A solid body of research suggests that the performance of household labor differs among racial and ethnic groups (Pinto and Coltrane 2009, Sayer and Fine 2011, Wight et al. 2012, Lachance-Grzela and Bouchard 2010). Over the years, there has been some variation in findings regarding these differences, largely because studies vary in their measures of race/ethnicity, housework, and whether models control for confounding variables. In general, intersectional approaches have taught us the need to consider race and gender simultaneously (Browne and Misra 2003, McCall 2005), suggesting the importance of examining housework by both gender and racial/ethnic identification (Choo and Ferree 2010, John and Shelton 1997).

Below we review the main findings for racial/ethnic differences in gendered household labor time, moving onto theorizing the role of racial homogamy for gender gaps in household labor time. Throughout, we use the term homogamy, rather than endogamy, to indicate the continuing importance of status as it overlaps with race and given that most of our models below control for a wide variety of status inequalities.

The Gendered Racial/Ethnic Performance of Household Labor

Most research has focused on racial/ethnic differences among women and among men. Among women, recent findings based on ATUS data indicate that Hispanic women do more core (female-type) housework than any other group, followed by Asian and white women, with black women spending least time on these chores (Sayer and Fine 2011, Wight et al. 2012). White women have been found to spend more time on occasional (male-type) housework than women of all other races/ethnicities (Sayer and Fine 2011, Wight et al. 2012). Related research often echoes these findings (Orbuch and Eyster 1997, Silver and Goldscheider 1994), but not always (Shelton and John 1993, John and Shelton 1997, Gupta 2007). Among men, raw numbers suggest Hispanic men spend somewhat less time on core chores than white or black men (Wight et al. 2012), but in full models this difference disappears (Sayer and Fine 2011, Pinto and Coltrane 2009), casting doubt on prior findings that black men spend more time on core housework chores than their white male counterparts (Shelton and John 1993, John and Shelton 1997, Artis and Pavalko 2003).

Together, these findings confirm the importance of race and ethnicity for differentially shaping the socially constructed gender roles that play out within families, demonstrating the variability of both gender and race. Yet, a focus on racial/ethnic differences within gender alone also obscures the importance of the gender differences within racial groups. Women in all

racial/ethnic groups spend significantly more time on core housework than men, which is why the literature often refers to it as “female-typed” (Lachance-Grzela and Bouchard 2010). A more equitable division of labor is thus achieved both by women spending less time on this work, and/or men spending more time on this work. Over time, previous research finds that the division of household labor has become more equitable, mainly because of women’s reduced hours and only partially because of men’s increased hours (Bianchi et al. 2000, Hook 2006). Nevertheless a gender gap remains and some findings indicate that the size of this gap may vary by group, which has important implications for racial homogamy and housework. Unfortunately very little work explicitly tests the gender gap by race/ethnicity in full models, but gender ratios from raw ATUS data indicate that the gender gap in female-type chores is the smallest among blacks, followed by whites, Asian, and is largest among Hispanics (Sayer and Fine 2011, Wight et al. 2012), and these findings are supported by some prior related research (Golding 1990, Pinto and Coltrane 2009). With regard to occasional chores, basic ratios show that the gender gap is again largest among Hispanics, followed by blacks and whites, and Asians, who have the most egalitarian gender ratios for occasional chores (Wight et al. 2012, Sayer and Fine 2011).

Racial Homogamy and Household Labor

Clearly, race and ethnicity matter for time spent on household labor. Despite increasing research, findings of racial/ethnic differences in housework time cannot be explained away by a host of socio-economic and demographic controls. Instead, researchers argue that the influence is based in the social construction of race and ethnicity, so that being identified as black, Asian or Hispanic comes with a package of internal and external stereotypes, cultural symbols, and social experiences (Reskin 2012, Brubaker 2009). Racial and ethnic identity may therefore influence not only opportunities and behaviors, but values and beliefs about family relationships,

household organization, and patterns of the division of housework across groups (Pinto and Coltrane 2009, Segura 1992, Mirandé 1997, Collins 1990, McLoyd et al. 2000, Wight et al. 2012). In part, research has responded by expanding measures of family, employment, education, earnings, and time to more accurately capture non-white respondents' experiences (Wight et al. 2012, Pinto and Coltrane 2009). Especially with regard to Hispanic findings, recent research argues for better cultural measures, such as maternal gatekeeping and an emphasis on familialism or communitarianism (Pinto and Coltrane 2009, Coltrane et al. 2004, Agius Vallejo and Lee 2009, Zinn 1979, Segura 1992). The latter point suggests that movements away from racial homogamy may matter unevenly across racial and ethnic groups.

Racial Homogamy Hypotheses

Most Americans are in racially homogamous marriages, but interracial marriage is increasing over time such that small percentages lead to large numbers on the population level and raising questions about the cultural and economic implications of these interracial partnerships (Fu and Heaton 2008, Kalmijn 1998, Qian and Lichter 2011). Those in interracial partnerships may have a more equitable division of labor because the partnership complements their own non-traditional orientation and/or offers an opportunity to renegotiate gendered cultural expectations for time spent on housework. For example, a relevant related body of research on same-sex couples shows they have more egalitarian than heterosexual couples in divisions of household labor (Solomon et al. 2005, Kurdek 1993, Patterson 2000). Same-sex couples cannot rely on traditional household gender roles and may also wish to actively eschew traditionally heteronormative household management styles. Thus, in racially homogamous relationships partners may consciously or unconsciously fulfill gendered familial roles that lead to differential gender gaps in household time across racial groups. Interracial partnerships may

help to breakdown these shared cultural assumptions and thus offer a unique opportunity to test the hypothesis that those interracial partnerships will have smaller gender gaps in time spent on core household chores (H1). This hypothesis assumes interracial marriage will consistently be linked to less time spent by women and more time spent by men on housework.

However, it may be that racial homogamy has uneven effects by race/ethnicity. This is partly because patterns of interracial marriage vary by gender and across racial/ethnic groups(Qian and Lichter 2011, Fu and Heaton 2008), but also given research showing that gender gaps in housework vary between racial/ethnic groups. In particular, previous findings suggest Hispanic and Asian Americans have less equitable divisions of labor than whites, but blacks are more equitable. For these reasons, we examine the hypothesis that gender equality in housework time may be greater for some interracial partnerships (i.e., Hispanic and Asian respondents) than others (i.e., whites and blacks) (H2). A corollary of this hypothesis is a question of whether women and men in interracial marriages adjust their housework hours depending on the cultural stereotypes associated with their partner's race/ethnicity. While data are not sufficient to test this question rigorously, we explore this possibility in our analysis.

Finally, all research finds that women spend far more time on core chores than men, and women's time on housework varies more than men's, thus if interracial partnerships reduce gender gaps in time spent on housework, we expect this will be due mainly to women in interracial partnerships adjusting their housework hours, rather than men (H3). However, as suggested in H2, we must examine whether this effect varies by the respondent's race/ethnicity.

METHOD

Data and Analytic Technique

Our study uses the American Time Use Study (ATUS) dataset, from 2003 to 2012, which contains respondent-reported time diary data. The sample is drawn from the non-institutionalized population age 15 years and older and is conducted annually by the Census Bureau following their final interview for the Current Population Survey (CPS). (Abraham et al. 2008). A phone interview follows an initial mail notification of the survey and its content. Respondents report on their diary days, which run from 4 a.m. on the designated day to 3:59 a.m. the following day. Pooling the annual ATUS interviews produces a sample of 136,960 respondents. Response rates average 56% (Krantz-Kent 2013). All data are weighted as recommended by ATUS, including a person weight, and a control for whether the diary day is a weekend and holiday day (U.S. Census Bureau 2014). We dropped respondents younger than 18 years or older than 64 years, those not married or partnered, and those whose racial/ethnic identity is not white, Hispanic, black, or Asian. Those of other or mixed race identity (N=1,135) were not large enough subsamples for meaningful analysis. Six respondents missing data on spouse's education were dropped, missing values for family income and weekly earnings were imputed from means based on gender, race, education, age, nativity, employment status, and home ownership. Models run with imputed values and missing dropped listwise produced similar results. The final analytic sample is 61,823 respondents. Samples by gender and race are listed in Table 1. All models below are OLS regressions, run in STATA v. 13 and include a control for survey year.

Measures

Household labor. The dependent variable is a measure of time spent on core household labor. Core chores are routine and, on average, women spent significantly more time doing them than men, thus they are also referred to as female-type chores (Lachance-Grzela and Bouchard 2010, Schneider 2012, South and Spitze 1994). Core chores include cooking, cleaning, doing

dishes, and laundry. Average time spent on these chores, by gender and race/ethnicity is listed in Table 1. Time reports were divided by 60 to convert minutes to hours in the results. We also tested a measure of occasional, male-type chores such as lawn/yard care, interior and exterior maintenance, and vehicle repairs. Differences by racial/ethnic homogamy and gender were not found in any models, thus we do not include them below (results available upon request).

Race/Ethnicity and Homogamy. Respondents self-identified with a racial group and as Hispanic or non-Hispanic. These values were recoded to produce four groups: non-Hispanic whites, blacks, and Asians, and Hispanics. The Hispanic category includes a mixture of national backgrounds; 63% are Mexican and 18% are Central-South American, with the remainder including Puerto Ricans, Cubans, and “others.” Among Hispanics 95% identify racially as white. The respondent’s partner’s race and ethnicity is coded similarly, though partners with other or mixed races are included. A measure of racial/ethnic partner homogamy is then created to equal 1 when partners are the same race/ethnicity, and 0 in all other cases. Note that we do not have data for partner’s housework time, and any reference to gender gaps does not refer to intra-household housework time, but to average differences between women and men in housework time in a particular analytic grouping.

Controls. Previous literature has identified a number of important determinants of time spent on household labor, especially women’s time on core chores. To consider the importance of time availability, we control for respondent and partner’s employment status, and the number of children and of other adults in the household. We control for relative resources with measures of age, respondent and partner’s education, and (logged) family income. An alternative measure of (logged) weekly earnings produced similar results. We control for whether the partners are married or cohabiting, for home ownership, region of the country, and whether the respondent

was born in the U.S. More detailed measures of time since immigration and parental nativity were tested, but were not preferred over the more parsimonious nativity measure.

TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

As expected, data in Table 1 indicates that for all groups, women's spend more time on housework than men. The size of the gender gap however, varies substantially across groups by race/ethnicity and partner homogamy. The gender gap is largest among Hispanics in homogamous relationships and it is smallest among blacks in interracial relationships. Among whites, men in interracial relationships do significantly more housework than those in homogamous relationships, though substantively it is only about five additional minutes. white women's work time does not differ by relationship type and the gender gap does not significantly vary by homogamy, suggesting that whites' time on housework, on average, varies little by interracial marriage. Among Hispanics the pattern is stronger, Hispanic women do less work and Hispanic men do more work when they are in interracial relationships, in comparison to their counterparts partnered with other Hispanics. The gender gap is significantly and substantially smaller among Hispanics in interracial couples. Differences by interracial partnership are never significant among blacks, and are marginally significant among Asians. Asian women in interracial relationships do nearly 30 fewer minutes of housework than Asian women in homogamous relationships, but Asian men's work does not differ and the overall gender gap is marginally significantly lower among interracial respondents. Descriptively, these results suggest initial support for H1 that time spent does vary by racial homogamy, and H2, that the role of homogamy varies by racial/ethnic group.

Despite combining ten years of data, the number of respondents interracially partnered is low, especially among black women and Asian men. The mean differences we see are suggestive, but do not account for a variety of racial/ethnic differences in socio-demographic and economic characteristics, making it difficult to confirm the independent effect of racial/ethnic intermarriage/partnership. Turning to regression models is thus an important further step, but given the small sample sizes for black and Asians in interracial partnerships, we emphasize that such results should be considered with caution and must be confirmed with broader and larger samples.

Multivariate Results

To further test differences according to gender, race/ethnicity, and racial/ethnic marital homogamy, we present results from linear multivariate models in Tables 2 and 3. All models control for year, weekend or holiday diary day, and include ATUS-supplied weights. Models 2-8 control for age, educational level, marriage, U.S. native born, employment status (full or part time, not in labor force), home ownership, region, family income, number of children, number of other adults in household, and spouse's employment status and level of education. In Table 2, after establishing basic racial/ethnic differences in a base model (M1) and a model with all controls (M2), we move onto consider housework differences by gender and homogamy (M3) and race and homogamy (M4).

TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

Women always spend significantly more time on housework than men; more than an hour per diary day. Without controls (M1), we find that Hispanic and Asian respondents spend more time than whites on housework, however once we control for a number of factors found to influence housework time (M2), we find that Hispanics spend about nine more minutes than

whites on housework, while black spend about nine minutes less. Asians do not differ significantly from whites, but Hispanics spend more time, and blacks spend less time than Asians. On average, respondents in racially homogamous partnerships do not spend more time on housework than those in interracial relationships. The effect of racial homogamy, however, differs by gender and by racial/ethnic identity. Women in racially homogamous relationships spend significantly more time on housework than women in interracial partnerships (M3), while men in homogamous relationships spend less time on housework than men in interracial partnerships. This supports H1, and suggests those in interracial partnerships have smaller gender gaps in housework time. The non-effect of homogamy in M2 was due to countervailing effects by gender, wherein homogamy increases women's time and decreases men's time. There is also support for H3 showing that the interracial marriage effect operates more strongly through women's reduced time on housework relative to women in racially homogamous partnerships, given that the size of the effect of homogamy is nearly double for women ($\beta=.27$) as compared to men ($\beta=-.10$). Differences in patterns by race/ethnicity in M3 suggest that the effects of homogamy vary by the respondent's racial/ethnic group, which we further test in M4. Among Hispanics and among Asians, on average, those in homogamous relationships spend more time on housework than whites in homogamous relationships. Homogamous blacks do not differ significantly from homogamous white. Thus, the size of the effect of interracial marriage may vary by racial/ethnic group (H2b), but is difficult to fully capture since M4 does not allow gender to vary.

TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

Thus, to consider gender and race/ethnicity simultaneously, we next look at the effects of racial homogamy by gender among each racial/ethnic group (M5-8) in Table 3. Among whites

(M5), homogamy affects men's time on household labor more than women's, and men in homogamous relationships spend about six fewer minutes on housework than men in interracial partnerships. White women's time on household labor does not vary significantly when they are in homogamous or interracial marriages. Hispanic women's and men's time is affected most strongly, and women in relationships with Hispanic men spend nearly an hour more a day on housework than Hispanic women in interracial partnerships, while Hispanic men in homogamous relationships spend about 24 fewer minutes a day on housework than those in interracial partnerships (M6). Black men's and women's time on housework does not vary significantly by racial homogamy (M7). Homogamy does not affect Asian men's housework time, but Asian women in homogamous relationships spend, on average, nearly 25 more minutes a day on housework than those in non-homogamous relationships (M8). Overall, racial homogamy effects differ by gender and race/ethnicity, supporting H2, but not fully supporting H3.

Finally, we offer some exploratory analysis of mean differences in time spent on housework by interracial marriage. Due to small sample sizes the regressions in Tables 2 and 3 did not disaggregate by type of interracial marriage. However, based on the overall results for racial homogamy, we explore mean patterns in Table 4 for all groups with more than 100 observations. We conducted two-sample mean t-tests to compare hours between those in racially homogamous relationships to those in various interracial relationships. In every case but one, mean differences suggest those in interracial marriages have descriptively smaller gender gaps in time on housework, consistent with the findings in M3 (Table 2) and suggesting support for H1. One exception is white women partnered with Hispanic men. These women spend more time on housework than their peers married to white men. However, some interesting patterns occur across racial/ethnic partnerships suggesting support for H2, where differences by homogamy are

stronger for some racial/ethnic groups than for others. Specifically, white women partnered with black men spend less time on housework than white women with white partners. Both Hispanic and Asian women with white partners spend significantly less time, on average, on housework than their peers in racially homogamous relationships. Most of the differences are found among women, supporting H3, but one difference emerges among men. Specifically, white men with Asian partners spend significantly more time on housework, on average, than white men in homogamous relationships. While far from definitive, these findings nevertheless echo many of the key findings from the tables above, suggesting the more basic measure of racial homogamy captured meaningful differences, regardless of type of interracial partnership.

TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

DISCUSSION

Time spent on core housework varies based on whether respondents are in racially and ethnically homogamous relationships. We find robust support for H1 that gender gaps vary by racial homogamy, and among those in interracial partnerships we see that women spend less time on housework and men spend more. Women spend more time on these chores regardless of race/ethnicity and partner homogamy, but gender and racial gaps in housework differ among those in homogamous and interracial relationships. Nevertheless, when breaking down our approach by race/ethnicity we also see strong support for H2. Although racial homogamy produced similar overall patterns, suggesting a blanket effect, regression results showed that significant differences were more likely to be concentrated among some racial and ethnic groups than others. Homogamy has the strongest effect on Hispanic respondents, such that Hispanic men partnered with non-Hispanic women spend significantly more time on housework, and Hispanic women partnered with non-Hispanic men spend significantly less time. Among women,

Hispanic women partnered with non-Hispanic men do not differ from white women in time spent on housework. Differences among whites and blacks were scant, and overall these groups are not strongly influenced by racial homogamy. Asian women are more strongly affected by homogamy and spend more time on housework when partnered with Asian men than when in interracial relationships. In general, the effects are concentrated among women, and in women's time relative to men's, supporting H3.

It is important to note that all of the differences we found took into account a wide variety of socio-demographic and economic characteristics that may be conflated with race and ethnicity and housework time. The ATUS lacks attitudinal controls, so we could not examine the extent to which these differences are due to gender and familial ideologies, however, it seems likely that the racial/ethnic differences we found reflect, at least to some degree, different values regarding gender, housework, and family roles. In general, those open to heterogamous partnerships may be less traditional in their outlook with regard to gender and household roles. Entering a relationship with a partner from another racial/ethnic background may lead to a re-negotiation of time and expectations when cultural gender models cannot be easily imported into the new household and taken-for-granted expectations regarding cooking and cleaning are confronted and exposed.

Fully explaining why interracial marriage matters more for some racial groups more than others with regard to housework is beyond the scope of this paper, however, we can point toward some directions for future research. First, the largest effects were concentrated among the two racial groups often argued as having the most traditional divisions of labor – Hispanics and Asians. While current research on household labor in Hispanic families rejects simplifying concepts such as machismo or marianismo (exaggerated masculinity or femininity) as

explanations, it has called attention to other cultural practices that increase women's housework time, such as maternal gatekeeping and an emphasis on familialism (Pinto and Coltrane 2009, Coltrane et al. 2004), where household labor may be shaped by ideals about family commitment, obligation and cohesion. A strong sense of mutual responsibility toward family is a key strategy for facilitating immigrant and working class social mobility, and research documents the importance Mexican origin Americans place on "giving back" to their kin and larger ethnic community (Agius Vallejo and Lee 2009; Zinn 1979). This sense of responsibility may increase housework for Mexican women as they in particular may do so through cooking or caring for kin and community (Segura 1992). Hispanic men and women who marry outside of their ethnicity may be less integrated into cultural communities where these gendered norms hold, or may be actively rejecting such roles. We found in our exploratory analysis in Table 4 that Hispanic women partnered to white men spend significantly less time on housework, but white women with Hispanic men spend slightly more time on housework, for example. Similar arguments might be made for immigrant Asian communities. We saw in Table 4 that Asian women also spend significantly less time on housework when partnered with white men, and white men spend more time when partnered with Asian women, contrary to some racialized gender stereotypes regarding this interracial partnership (Pyke and Johnson 2003, Sue et al. 2009). Research on Asian communities argues that there is a greater emphasis than among whites on filial piety and obligation, putting others' needs above your own, and placing a greater emphasis on women's family roles (Xu and Lai 2002, Staples and Mirandé 1980, Kamo 2000), though research on Asian American families remains quite limited (Fang et al. 2008). Historically, the deinstitutionalization of marriage has increased the emphasis on marriage as a choice and a means of personal development (Cherlin 2004). Hispanics and Asians in homogamous marriages

may be more strongly bound by older institutional notions of marriage, a set of norms that those in interracial marriages may reject or be excluded from adopting, leading to more differentiation between homogamous and interracial couples in gendered housework patterns.

In general further understanding these differences requires more nuanced studies that take into account differences within races/ethnicities (e.g., distinguishing among Hispanic and Asian sub-groups), larger sample sizes, and surveys or studies that can incorporate various attitudes, motivations, and experiences to better account for how and why interracial relationships produce more egalitarian divisions of labor.

WORK CITED

- Agius Vallejo, J. & Lee, J. (2009). Brown Picket Fences. *Ethnicities*, **9**, 5-31.
- Artis, J. E. & Pavalko, E. K. (2003). Explaining the Decline in Women's Household Labor: Individual Change and Cohort Differences. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, **65**, 746-761.
- Bianchi, S. M., Milke, M. A., Sayer, L. C. & Robinson, J. P. (2000). Is Anyone Doing the Housework? Trends in the Gender Division of Household Labor. *Social Forces*, **79**, 191-228.
- Browne, I. & Misra, J. (2003). The Intersection of Gender and Race in the Labor Market. *Annual Review of Sociology*, **29**, 487-513.
- Brubaker, R. (2009). Ethnicity, Race, and Nationalism. *Annual Review of Sociology*, **35**, 21-42.
- Cherlin, A. J. (2004). The Deinstitutionalization of American Marriage. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, **66**, 848-861.
- Choo, H. Y. & Ferree, M. M. (2010). Practicing Intersectionality in Sociological Research: A Critical Analysis of Inclusions, Interactions, and Institutions in the Study of Inequalities. *Sociological Theory*, **28**, 129-149.
- Collins, P. H. (1990). *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*, London: HarperCollins.
- Coltrane, S., Parke, R. D. & Adams, M. (2004). Complexity of Father Involvement in Low-Income Mexican American Families*. *Family Relations*, **53**, 179-189.
- Fang, S.-R. S., McDowell, T., Goldfarb, K. P., MacDonald, A., Perumbilly, S. & Gonzalez-Kruger, G. E. (2008). Viewing the Asian American Experience Through a Culturally Centered Research Lens: Do Scholarship in Family Science and Related Disciplines Fall Short? *Marriage & Family Review*, **44**, 33-51.
- Fu, X. & Heaton, T. B. (2008). Racial and Educational Homogamy: 1980 to 2000. *Sociological Perspectives*, **51**, 735-758.
- Golding, J. M. (1990). Division of Household Labor, Strain, and Depressive Symptoms among Mexican Americans and Non-Hispanic Whites. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, **14**, 103-117.
- Gupta, S. (2007). Autonomy, Dependence, or Display? The Relationship Between Married Women's Earnings and Housework. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, **69**, 399-417.
- Hook, J. L. (2006). Care in Context: Men's Unpaid Work in 20 Countries, 1965-1998. *American Sociological Review*, **71**, 639-660.
- John, D. & Shelton, B. (1997). The Production of Gender among Black and White Women and Men: The Case of Household Labor. *Sex Roles*, **36**, 171-193.
- Kalmijn, M. (1998). Intermarriage and Homogamy: Causes, Patterns, Trends. *Annual Review of Sociology*, **24**, 395-421.
- Kamo, Y. (2000). Racial and Ethnic Differences in Extended Family Households. *Sociological Perspectives*, **43**, 211-229.
- Krantz-Kent, R. (2013) Efforts to understand and improve response to the American Time Use Survey. *59th ISI World Statistics Congress*. Hong Kong.
- Kurdek, L. A. (1993). The Allocation of Household Labor in Gay, Lesbian, and Heterosexual Married Couples. *Journal of Social Issues*, **49**, 127-139.

- Lachance-Grzela, M. & Bouchard, G. (2010). Why Do Women Do the Lion's Share of Housework? A Decade of Research. *Sex Roles*, **63**, 767-780.
- Lee, J. & Bean, F. (2010). *The Diversity Paradox: Immigration and the Color Line in Twenty-First Century America*, New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- McCall, L. (2005). The Complexity of Intersectionality. *Signs*, **30**, 1771-1800.
- McLoyd, V. C., Cauce, A. M., Takeuchi, D. & Leon, W. (2000). Marital Processes and Parental Socialization in Families of Color: A Decade Review of Research. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, **62**, 1070-1093.
- Mirandé, A. (1997). *Hombres y Machos: Masculinity and Latino Culture*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Orbuch, T. L. & Eyster, S. L. (1997). Division of Household Labor among Black Couples and White Couples. *Social Forces*, **76**, 301-332.
- Patterson, C. J. (2000). Family Relationships of Lesbians and Gay Men. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, **62**, 1052-1069.
- Pinto, K. & Coltrane, S. (2009). Division of Labor in Mexican Origin and Anglo Families: Structure and Culture. *Sex Roles*, **60**, 482-495.
- Powell, B., Bolzendahl, C., Geist, C. & Steelman, L. (2010). *Counted Out: Same-Sex Relations and Americans' Definitions of Family*, New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Pyke, K. D. & Johnson, D. L. (2003). Asian American Women And Racialized Femininities. *Gender & Society*, **17**, 33-53.
- Qian, Z. & Lichter, D. T. (2011). Changing Patterns of Interracial Marriage in a Multiracial Society. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, **73**, 1065-1084.
- Reskin, B. (2012). The Race Discrimination System. *Annual Review of Sociology*, **38**, null.
- Sayer, L. & Fine, L. (2011). Racial-Ethnic Differences in U.S. Married Women's and Men's Housework. *Social Indicators Research*, **101**, 259-265.
- Segura, D. A. (1992). Chicanas in White-Collar Jobs: "You Have to Prove Yourself More". *Sociological Perspectives*, **35**, 163-182.
- Shelton, B. A. & John, D. (1993) Ethnicity, Race, and Difference: A Comparison of White, Black and Hispanic Men's Household Labor Time. In J. C. Hood (Ed.), *Men, Work, and Family*. (pp. 131-150), Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Silver, H. & Goldscheider, F. (1994). Flexible Work and Housework: Work and Family Constraints on Women's Domestic Labor. *Social Forces*, **72**, 1103-1119.
- Solomon, S. E., Rothblum, E. D. & Balsam, K. F. (2005). Money, Housework, Sex, and Conflict: Same-Sex Couples in Civil Unions, Those Not in Civil Unions, and Heterosexual Married Siblings. *Sex Roles*, **52**, 561-575.
- Staples, R. & Mirandé, A. (1980). Racial and Cultural Variations among American Families: A Decennial Review of the Literature on Minority Families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, **42**, 887-903.
- Sue, D. W., Bucceri, J., Lin, A. I., Nadal, K. L. & Torino, G. C. (2009). Racial microaggressions and the Asian American experience. *Asian American Journal of Psychology*, **S**, 88-101.
- U.S. Census Bureau (2014) American Time Use Survey User's Guide: Understanding ATUS 2003 to 2013. Bureau of Labor Statistics.
- Wight, V. R., Bianchi, S. M. & Hunt, B. R. (2012). Explaining Racial/Ethnic Variation in Partnered Women's and Men's Housework: Does One Size Fit All? *Journal of Family Issues*, **34**, 394-427.

- Xu, X. & Lai, S.-C. (2002). Resources, Gender Ideologies, and Marital Power: The Case of Taiwan. *Journal of Family Issues*, **23**, 209-245.
- Zinn, M. B. (1979). Chicano Family Research: Conceptual Distortions and Alternative Directions. *Journal of Ethnic Studies*, **7**, 59-71.

Table 1. Means (standard deviations) for time spend on household labor

	<u>white</u>		<u>Hispanic</u>			<u>black</u>		<u>Asian</u>		
	Homog.	Non-Homog.	Homog.	Non-Homog.		Homog.	Non-Homog.	Homog.	Non-Homog.	
Women	1.99 (2.01)	1.93 (1.99)	2.94 (2.45)	2.05 (2.07)	*	1.72 (2.02)	1.65 (1.86)	2.53 (2.00)	2.04 (2.11)	*
N	23,441	1,419	3,803	807		2,175	124	1,033	390	
Men	.64 (1.16)	.73 (1.24)	.58 (1.21)	.69 (1.33)	*	.62 (1.28)	.70 (1.33)	.66 (1.17)	.63 (1.14)	
N	20,336	1,183	3,194	698		1,794	322	921	183	
Gender gap (women/men)	3.01	2.64	5.07	3.15	*	2.77	2.36	3.83	3.24	+

Notes: Significant mean differences between homogamously and non-homogamously partnered respondents are indicated by + $p < .10$; * $p < .05$; two-tailed tests. Results include no controls or weights.

Table 2. Unstandardized OLS Regression coefficients (standard errors) of number of hours spent on core housework on gender and racial/ethnic homogamy (N=61,823)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	<i>Base</i>	<i>Full Model</i>	<i>Gender Interaction</i>	<i>Race/Ethnicity Interaction</i>
<i>Gender</i>				
Female	1.43*** (.02)	1.20*** (.02)	.96*** (.05)	1.20*** (.02)
<i>Race/Ethnicity (ref: white)</i>				
Hispanic	.49*** (.03)	.15*** (.03)	.15*** (.03)	-.02 (.06)
black	-.05 (.03)	-.16*** (.03)	-.17*** (.03)	-.03 (.08)
Asian	.21*** (.04)	.05 (.05)	.06 (.05)	-.17 (.10)
<i>Race/Ethnic Homogamy</i>				
Homogamous	— —	.03 (.03)	-.10** (.03)	-.04 (.04)
<i>Homogamy Interaction Effects</i>				
*Female	— —	— —	.27*** (.06)	— —
*Hispanic	— —	— —	— —	.21** (.07)
*black	— —	— —	— —	-.15 (.09)
*Asian	— —	— —	— —	.28** (.11)
Constant	.93 (5.53)	3.14 (5.29)	3.25 (5.29)	3.94 (5.29)
R-squared	.172	.233	.234	.234

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$, two-tailed tests; standard errors in parentheses

Notes: All models control for year, weekend or holiday diary day, and include ATUS-supplied weights. Models 2-4 control for age, education, marriage, foreign born, employment, home ownership, region, family income, children, other adults, spouse's employment and education.

Table 3. Unstandardized OLS Regression coefficients (standard errors) of number of hours spent on core housework on gender, racial/ethnic group membership, homogamy, and their interactions

	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	<i>Racial/Ethnic Group</i>			
	<i>white</i>	<i>Hispanic</i>	<i>black</i>	<i>Asian</i>
<i>Gender</i>				
Female	.99*** (.07)	.98*** (.11)	.78*** (.20)	.99*** (.16)
<i>Racial/Ethnic Homogamy</i>				
Homogamous	-.11** (.04)	-.40*** (.07)	-.16 (.09)	-.03 (.11)
<i>Homogamy Interaction Effects</i>				
*Female	.12 (.07)	.99*** (.11)	.27 (.20)	.42* (.18)
Constant	5.59 (5.91)	-6.53 (15.97)	22.80 (18.99)	-7.38 (25.11)
N	46,379	8,502	4,415	2,527
R-squared	.204	.361	.158	.308

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$, two-tailed tests; standard errors in parentheses

Notes: All models control for year, weekend or holiday diary day, and include ATUS-supplied weights. Models 5-10 control for age, education, marriage, foreign born, employment, home ownership, region, family income, children, other adults, spouse's employment and education.

Table 4. Means and standard deviations of time spent on housework by racial/ethnic intermarriage among women and among men

		Spouse/Partner's Race/Ethnicity			
		white	Hispanic	black	Asian
<u>Women</u>					
white		1.99 (2.01)	2.05 (2.11)	1.63 (1.76)*	1.90 (1.76)
	<i>N</i>	23,441	761	242	119
Hispanic		2.08 (2.09)*	2.94 (2.45)	— ^a	—
	<i>N</i>	708	3,803	—	—
black		—	—	1.72 (2.02)	—
	<i>N</i>	—	—	2,175	—
Asian		2.03 (2.12)*	—	—	2.53 (2.00)
	<i>N</i>	291	—	—	1,033
<u>Men</u>					
white		.64 (1.16)	.71 (1.17)	—	.85 (1.48)*
	<i>N</i>	20,336	595	—	242
Hispanic		.66 (1.13)	.58 (1.21)	—	—
	<i>N</i>	630	3,194	—	—
black		.66 (1.12)	—	.62 (1.28)	—
	<i>N</i>	208	—	1,794	—
Asian		.72 (1.28)	—	—	.66 (1.13)
	<i>N</i>	111	—	—	921

* $p < .05$ t-test comparison with homogamous mean, e.g., white women partnered with black men spend less time on average on housework than white women partnered with white men

^a Means are not reported when sub-sample observations totaled less than 100