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Abstract

Many studies attempt to explain the gender division of labor in the household by using different samples or in different contexts. And the results show support for all possible explanatory perspectives: Relative resources, time availability, gender equality attitudes, and patriarchy. This study intends to study this question from a comparative approach. Even though previous explanations receive different support in various studies, we do not have evidence as to which perspective provide better explanatory power across societies. This paper uses a pooled data set prepared by International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) in 2002. The data set contains both country-level and individual-level information. In general the results of doing binomial logistic analyses support three major perspectives. Better relative resources (wife’s education, family income), liberal GRA, and time availability (husbands working part time or with no work or wives working full time) have positive effects on reducing women’s household duties in laundry, caring, shopping, and preparing meals. However the explanatory power is low in all equations too. The findings also indicate that income may change the pattern of gendered division of labor at the individual level. But wealthy countries do not necessarily become more egalitarian in sharing housework between men and women than in less wealthy ones.
Research Orientation and Literature

Share of housework between husbands and wives remains an issue worthy of intellectual interests not simply because of the gender gap per se. That women taking the major share of housework persists even when many women are doing full-time jobs. Family responsibilities remain a serious burden for wives or mothers regardless of their formal employment status but have limited impacts on married men's employment stability. According to some cross-national studies (Sanchez 1993; Baxter 1997), the discrepancy of the share of household duties between husbands and wives can be frequently observed in many countries. The situation occurs in both western industrial countries and so-called third world countries/areas. For instance, only 30% of American husbands reported doing household work, which is similar to the performance by Javanese men (a region of Indonesia) (Sanchez 1993: 442-443). Time spent in the housework also differs between men and women. Even though working women reduced the hours spent doing the housework in 2000 according to the official survey, it is still one hour more than men did in Taiwan (Lee and Chang 2005). A survey in Germany also shows that wives with full-time jobs spend about double of the time on caring for babies than their husbands (Beck-Gernsheim 2002: 67).

Many studies attempt to explain the gender division of labor in the household by using different samples or in different contexts. And the results generally show the support for various theoretical perspectives: Relative resources, time availability, and gender equality attitudes (Coltrane 2000). According to these findings, higher income or better education has positive impacts on achieving equality of division of labor between gender; having a full-time job decreasing wives’ time spent on family duties; and liberal gender role attitudes (GRA) increasing men's share of family work.

Based on previous findings, this study intends to improve our understanding of this issue by adopting a comparative approach. One of the advantages of doing a cross-national study is to allow for proving the external validity of different explanatory perspectives. As different individual factors receive support in various studies, we do not have evidence as to which perspective has stronger explanatory power across societies than others. And, in addition to this heuristic reason, seeking out a more generalized theoretical perspective helps to determine if the gendered division of labor can be changed through the empowerment at individual level or needs major changes of institutional arrangements, such as cultural or social dimensions.
As GRA have generally becoming more liberal in most parts of the world, its impact on getting men to do more housework is not always positive. Previous research shows inconsistent findings if men with more egalitarian attitude would participate more in the housework (Shelton and John 1996). A comparative study shall be able to help confirming the association between subjective values and daily practices and identify which countries demonstrate to be more conservative in this regard than others.

Furthermore, using cross-national data set allows a researcher to consider the impacts on the sharing behavior to vary with national characteristics. For instance, western industrialized countries are viewed as being more liberal in GRA and have more resources to advocate equality policies and measures than many other countries. Thus controlling for individual differences in GRA, it is expected that aggregate indicators also have impacts on the division of domestic labor by gender.

Gendered division of household labor is a familiar subject for many researchers in family sociology (Coltrane 2000; Shelton and John 1996). Studies focusing on the data of respective countries demonstrate variations of gendered division of labor in different household duties and thus support different perspectives. Probably mainly because of data limitations, few studies have been devoted to investigate cross-national differences regarding this issue. Sanchez (1993) and Baxter (1997) are few exceptions. Using survey data from five western industrialized countries, Baxter (1997) finds little variation in the share of household work by men and women in Australia, Canada, Norway, Sweden, and the United States. However, she finds that wives and husbands having paid jobs, both with liberal gender attitudes, or wives having substantial contribution to the family income increases husbands’ share of the housework. Baxter thus concludes that to change the gendered pattern of division of labor at home we have to empower women with more resources to get employed in the formal labor markets. While Sanchez (1993) does find the share of household work by husbands to vary among six countries or areas (Java, Sudanese Indonesia, the Philippines, Taiwan, South Korea, and the United States), there are no any determinants to have consistent effects among the six countries in her research.¹

Although revealing some interesting findings, these two studies contain only a few countries or areas in the analysis. Also, in Sanchez (1993), the analytical model

¹ Taiwan appears to have the largest sample size (985 cases) in all these six groups in Sanchez’s work (1993). It is more than double the size of the second-largest group, Java or Sudanese Indonesia (478 cases).
does not include the indicators for GRA and neither study considers urban-rural differences. Using the previous two comparative studies as a starting point, this paper intends to push the current research a little bit forward by using a data set containing more country samples in the analysis.

As being discussed earlier, one of the major attempts of the paper is to test the predictability of several main theoretical perspectives to the gendered division of household labor across countries, mainly time availability, relative resources, and general role attitudes (Coltrane 2000; Shelton and John 1996). The paper predicts a positive causal relationship between egalitarian attitudes and equal division of labor at home as a review article suggests (Shelton and John 1996: 306). And, in general, doing full time, paid work would be less likely to participate in the housework, which is true for both men and women. However, as Chapman (2004: 106-107) argues, men do not necessarily work more in the household chores when they spend more time at home. As a result of gender display at home, some men particularly wish to remain their masculine status when they suffer in the work achievement.

Previous studies use relative income and educational achievement to represent the concept of relative sources of women. Thus, women making more money or completing higher education would do less homework. These results do not get full support from empirical studies. For instance, according to Bittman et al. (2003), men tend to do even less housework when they are not the breadwinner in the family in Australia, but they do take more duties in the case of United States. And as Shelton and John’s review (1996: 305), education is tied with egalitarian attitudes toward gender role. Thus, education does not necessarily represent resources to exempt from doing more or less work at home after controlling for GRA.

However, to take the advantage of having a cross-national sample, the author also incorporates country-level factors into the analysis. While people in advanced industrial countries enjoy relatively higher living standards, their governments also invest more in educational expansions. The social development under these contexts would help to advocate egalitarian attitudes. As a result of these developments, it is expected that gender attitudes, in general, tend to be more liberal in these countries.

However, individual factors or better resources in the societies as a whole may not explain the persistence of unequal contribution of domestic labor. The author of this paper intends to also bring in the concept of patriarchy to interpret the findings of persistent gendered pattern. As they find that men do less household work, especially
female-typed work, regardless of marital status, South and Spitze (1994) interpret the results as showing a politics of doing gender at home, even before men getting married. It is an indirect way of showing the existence of patriarchy that improvement of individual factors or social and economic developments may still not change the gendered pattern of labor division at home.

Data Sources and Methods

This study uses the data set of 2002 Family and Changing Gender Roles (III) prepared by ISSP (International Social Survey Programme). Research teams from 40 countries participate in the ISSP for this particular survey by using identical questions concerning GRA, gendered division of labor at home, and personal and background variables (Appendix 1). According to the discussion above, educational achievements and urbanization appear to be important predictors of both GRA and gendered division of household labor. However, there are ten countries without the information of respondents’ education. Also, the survey does not contain the data of urban or rural differences for Germany (both former East and West regions), Poland, and Israel. These countries/areas are deleted from the analysis. The multivariate analysis thus examines the data of 26 countries. Fortunately these countries cover various regions with different levels of cultural, economic, religious, and political developments, and they cover all continents or major regions of the world, except Africa.

Dependent variables

Since the author does not have the knowledge as to which specific task would be more representative of international similarities or differences in gendered division of labor, the dependent variables include various kinds of household chores based on the ISSP survey: Doing the laundry, making small repairs, looking after sick family members, shopping for groceries, doing the household cleaning, and preparing the meals. The measure of each of these chores is the extent of responsibility shared by wife, husband or other people, or equally shared. Because of the fewer number of cases in the categories of equal share and doing by others, this paper transforms this question into a dummy variable and uses the category of mainly doing by women (or by spouses if reported by male respondents) as the study group and combines other categories into the reference group.

The author explains briefly why using an indicator of task segregation is better than using hours spent in various household chores for this paper. Measuring the share

---

2 The website for getting relevant information: http://www.gesis.org/ZA/.
of responsibility by different family actors is better than using the time spent in each
task by men or women as the latter may not effectively reflect the stereotype of
division of labor by gender in the households. In addition, the number of hours spent
may also contain some unmeasured factors, including the possibilities of being willing
to spend more time in one household chore or even inefficiencies by the performers
self (Goldscheider and Waite 1991: 37).

**Independent variables**

Based on previous research, the paper tests the explanations of gendered division
domestic labor at the household level based on three main perspectives: GRA, relative resources, and time availability. For GRA, all respondents were asked to
answer six questions representing attitudes toward gender role.\(^3\) Based on the results
of factor analysis (not shown in the paper), the first three indicators consistently load
into one factor regardless of the factor methods used. Another two indicators have
unstable loadings with any single factor and one indicator does not fit into any factors
regardless of the methods used. Thus, the paper adds the scores of first three measures
of GRA (see footnote 2) as one indicator in the multivariate analysis.

Education is the measure representing relevant resources by individual family
members and work status measures time availability. It is expected that respondents
doing part-time work, being unemployed or not in the labor force would devote more
time to household work than the self-employed or those working on the full-time
schedule. For female respondents, working in full-time paid jobs may also represent
the extent of relative economic independence. Gender, age, family income, and region
are used as controlling variables in the analysis.

Family income represents the resources of the household to be used to alleviate
the burden of both wife and husband. Thus, higher income should be expected to
particularly decrease the possibility of women performing traditional female
household works. In the ISSP survey, the unit of monthly income is coded by using of
the value of currencies for respective countries. The paper standardizes the value by
dividing individual income by the mean income for each country or area to create a
measurement of relative income. The analytical models then use the relative income
in the analysis.

\(^3\) The six questions indicating gender role attitudes include: 1) A working mother can establish just as
warm and secure a relationship with her children as a mother who does not work; 2) A pre-school child
is likely to suffer if his or her mother works; 3) All in all, family life suffers when the woman has a
full-time job; 4) A job is all right, but what most women really want is a home and children; 5) Being a
housewife is just as fulfilling as working for pay; and 6) Having a job is the best way for a woman to
be an independent person.
For the country-level variables, the paper uses two measures developed by United Nations to represent the degree of general economic and social development and the achievements of advocating gender equality across countries. The two measures are Human Development Index (HDI) and Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM). HDI is a composite of variables including life expectancy, literacy of adults, registration rate of students in high school, lower level education, and per capita income (UNDP 2002). GEM is also a composite of incorporating variables of the percentage of women in the higher economic and political positions and the ratio of income between men and women. Taiwan is not a member of UN and is not included in the Report. However, using the identical equations the statistical department of Taiwan government is able to calculate both measures and publish them in a research book (DGBAS 2003).

Findings

Descriptive statistics

Table 1 shows descriptive statistics of variables used in the analysis. There are four different answers for each item of household work. Among the six items of household work listed in Table 1, doing the laundry and household cleaning, and preparing the meals appear to be mainly women’s responsibilities. The load of looking after sick families and shopping for groceries are equally shared in the family. The only household work being divided between men and women is making small repairs. In sum, no household work listed here is mainly responsible by men only, but half of the six household duties are clearly taken by women.

As to GRA, the results show that about two thirds of respondents agree or strongly agree that working mothers can establish good relationship with children just as non-working mothers (the first item on the list, #1), and the statement that: “Having a job is the best way for a woman to be an independent person (#6).” The attitudes are more heterogeneous for each of the other four indicators. About 49.7% of the respondents agree or strongly agree that pre-school children or family life would suffer if the mother has a full-time job (#2). However, there is also a high percentage of respondents (35.8%) disagree or strongly disagree with this statement. The similar split pattern appears in the remaining three items. In general, most people seem to tie child or family welfare with women and to blame working for pay as a cause of the
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4 For all the values in Table 1, the author calculates the country averages first and then takes the grand mean or percentage from the country-level averages.
possible suffering.

ISSP survey creates three categories for the measurement of education level of respondents: Lowest formal qualification or below (equivalent to primary school level or below), above the lowest level (equivalent to the level of junior high school), and higher secondary completed or above (equivalent to senior high school completed or above). According to the results shown in Table 1, on average over half of the respondents from the surveyed countries have at least completed high school education or received advanced degree.

The work status of respondents is used to measure the time availability of respondents participating in the household work. Close to 48.2% of respondents have full-time jobs during the survey period and about 12.1% work as part-time workers. Still, about 39.7% of respondents possess contingent work or without paid jobs (for example, housewives).

As this study aims to examine cross-national differences of division of household labor, the paper provides more detailed descriptions of the sample used in the analysis. Figure 1 shows the distribution of different patterns of household task share across 26 countries. The ranking of these countries is based on the percentages of equal share. Specifically, among all six items of housework, taking care of sick families and shopping for groceries are more likely to be shared by the couple than other items. In contrast, doing the laundry and making small repairs are the least likely to be equally shared in the family. Overall, women are the main taker of all the housework; when men do participate in doing the housework, they share with their wives together. Interestingly, in many countries women are also responsible for doing small repairs, the traditionally male-type housework.

As to differences among countries, by checking the top five countries in the percentage of equal share, Figure 1 shows that domestic work in the Scandinavia countries, particularly Finland, Sweden, and Norway, is more likely equally shared by the families than in many other countries in the sample. Families in the United States also share most of the housework as these northern countries. One of the former socialist countries in the survey, Slovenia, also ranks among the top five in some items. The only two countries from Asia appearing among the top five are the Philippines (doing the laundry) and Taiwan (taking care the sick families).

Some countries consistently appear at the bottom end of the spectrum judging by
the percentage of equal share, particularly Cyprus, Brazil, and Japan. However, the low percentage of equal share does not necessarily mean that men do not do any housework. In Brazil and Cyprus, while many women have to take the major burden of some items of housework (such as looking after sick families, shopping for groceries, and preparing meals), in other items men take most of the responsibilities, including doing the laundry and the household cleaning. Except Japan, in which women are the major taker of all housework, including repairing around the house.

Another country worthy of more discussion is Netherlands. Even though Western European countries tend to be more liberal in gender equality attitudes than many other countries, Netherlands seems to stand as an exception. It is the country which clearly maintains the pattern of gendered division of labor of household duties among all 26 countries in the sample. In Netherlands, women are the major taker of all housework except repairing, which is almost absolutely all men's work. The survey data also show that respondents in Netherlands are much less open in GRA than most other countries in the sample. And, among Dutch female respondents only 8.2% of them have full-time jobs (the far lowest in the sample) and 44.4% work part time (the highest in the sample)\(^5\). This may partly explain why the country maintains a gender-typed division of domestic labor.

**Multivariate analysis**

To examine the factors determining the different patterns of division of labor in the household, the paper differentiates the respondents or households into two categories according to their answers: Usually or always done by women, and by other means.\(^6\) The omitted group is the latter category. The analysis focuses only married and living together couples only. I also conduct the analyses for women and men samples separately. The main purpose is to identify the different impacts of individual features between husbands and wives. For instance, previous findings show that women with more education tend to do less housework, while more highly educated men tend to take more household duties (Coltrane 2000: 1221). This paper will assess the effects of education by gender.

Table 2 lists the results of doing binomial logistic analysis for the six items of
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\(^5\) Because of space limitations, these data are not shown in the paper.

\(^6\) The author tried to use the original four categories (by women, by men, equal share, and by others) as well as three categories (delete the category of by others). However, since there are too few cases in the categories of ‘equal share’ and ‘by others’ in some countries, these countries are dropped from the analysis. As I am mainly concerned with the prevalence of gendered division of household labor across countries, the explanations of why women do most of the housework is the attention of the paper. Thus, in order to keep more countries in the analysis, the paper uses the dichotomous category.
The author finds that, among individual factors, GRA, education, age, and work status have consistent, significant effects in most housework items, for both female as well as male samples. Take cleaning as an example, in the household with the wife or husband having liberal gender attitudes, both at least completing senior high school education, younger, and husband working part time or with no work, or wife doing full-time job, this duty is less likely to be mainly done by wife. The same interpretation may apply to doing the laundry, taking care sick families, shopping for groceries, and preparing meals. However, the results also show that, while the repair work is more likely to be done by men, women would more likely take over the work if they have full-time jobs. It seems that in the households with women doing full-time work they are less likely to abide by the traditional gendered division of labor at home.

As to the impact of household characteristics, residing in the urban areas helps to alleviate the burden of doing all items of housework for women, except the repair work. The household income level does not have significant impacts on explaining why women do most of shopping for groceries and cleaning, but is significant factors for other items of housework. In sum, higher family income or residing in the cities tend to reduce the likelihood that women become the major taker of household duties.

Even though it is not the original purpose to check the consistency of answers by men and women, the author does find the factors operate in the expected directions and with the same level of strength for both male and female samples in most housework items. It may be an indication of the stability of the results of the analysis.

As to the two country-level factors, the author expects both of them to have negative effects on women taking the major burden in the equations. According to Table 2, higher GEM reduces the likelihood for women to do all six items of the housework.7 Thus as expected, higher achievements in gender equality advocacy indeed have positive effects on changing the traditional gender-typed division of labor at home. However, HDI turns out to have positive effects. Since HDI has a high correlation with GEM (.83), it is natural to think the results might be contaminated by the high possibility of collinearity. To test if it is a true case, the author tries another measure in the equation. The percentage of women in the parliament is another indicator of gender equality and has a moderate relationship with HDI (.430). After substituting GEM by that measure in the equation HDI still have positive effects as when using GEM in the equation. The author suspects that the results may actually
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7 France, Bulgaria, and Brazil do not have GEM values.
suggest that husbands do not necessarily help more around the household in rich countries. The following is a simple exercise to try to verify this suggestion.

I conduct another analysis by including all individual and households variables as used in Table 2 and also adding country dummies into the equation. The results are shown in Appendix 2. Among all the six items of work, individual and household features can relatively explain best the variations of doing the laundry, household cleaning, and preparing meals. After adding country dummies into the analysis, the explanatory power of the binomial logistic models increased in all six items, particularly in the models of doing the laundry and small repairs at home and for male samples.

The results in Appendix 2 reveal consistent findings for some countries. After controlling for employment status, educational achievements, and gender equality attitudes, in comparison to Australia, Japanese women are the main taker of family work, even including repair work around the house. Not only do they perform women-type duties, they do all duties at home, regardless of their job conditions or educational levels. On the contrary, women from the Nordic countries including Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and Finland, and the United States tend to have less loading in household work. Former socialist countries, such as Hungary, Czech, Slovenia, Bulgaria, and Slovak seem not to be particularly prominent in achieving gender equality in the household work sharing, particularly in meal preparations. Women in countries with a large of population believing in Catholics, such as Spain, France, Brazil, and Mexico are less likely responsible for some of the housework than the Protestants-dominant Australia. Religion seems not to be an important factor to explain country differences in this example. And among Asian countries, Taiwan and the Philippines apparently do better than Japan as women in those two countries are less likely to take the main responsibilities of caring for sick families, cleaning households, or go shopping for daily necessities.

Discussions

In general the results support the three major perspectives. Better relative resources (wife’s education, family income), liberal GRA, and time availability (husbands working part time or with no work or wives working full time) have
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As to the education measure in the ISSP data set, the number of observations for the second category---complete at least lowest education---is zero in the survey results of Japan, Finland, and Netherlands. However, the results of dropping the three countries from the analysis do not change much from those of analyzing all 26 countries.
positive effects on reducing women’s household duties in laundry, caring, shopping, and preparing meals. However, after controlling these variables, the extent of variances explained by the model remains low judging by the value of pseudo R square and log likelihood. The author tends to agree with what Berk (1985) and South and Spitze (1994) suggests that gender politics in the household, and institutional and cultural forces all contribute to the persist existence of gendered division of labor in contemporary societies.

While the results confirm some findings of previous studies, the paper produces different findings too. As in Baxter (1997), this paper finds that GRA and age to have significant effects across countries. However, education level has significant effects in all items of housework in the current paper. As this paper, Sanchez (1993) includes income levels, age and age-square, and education in the analytical models but does not find any variables to have consistent effects in all the six countries. However, the author needs to emphasize that, since the measure of dependent variable is whether women do most of the housework or not, the results represent what determine women doing less work rather than determine an egalitarian operation of division of labor by gender at home. Nevertheless our indicator should still be a valid measure of task segregation by gender in the household.

Even though individual and household factors seem to have relatively universal effects in explaining why some women take more household duties than others, these factors explain a small proportion of those differences. Income may change the pattern of gendered division of labor at the individual level. But wealthy countries do not necessarily become more egalitarian than poor countries. Japan and Netherlands are above all the interesting cases for future studies.
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Table 1
Descriptive Statistics for the ISSP 2002 Module *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names of Variables</th>
<th>Division of Household Work</th>
<th>Gender Role Attitudes</th>
<th>Relative Resources</th>
<th>Time Availability</th>
<th>Controlling Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usually or always done by woman</td>
<td>Equally shared</td>
<td>Usually or always done by man</td>
<td>Done by others</td>
<td>Agree or strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Doing the laundry</td>
<td>50.21</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>36.56</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>65.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Making small repairs around the house</td>
<td>41.79</td>
<td>12.64</td>
<td>40.47</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>49.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Looking after sick family members</td>
<td>35.56</td>
<td>41.73</td>
<td>20.95</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>47.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Doing the household cleaning</td>
<td>42.55</td>
<td>23.51</td>
<td>29.04</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>49.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Preparing the meal</td>
<td>45.62</td>
<td>18.89</td>
<td>32.91</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>63.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Numeric values are average based on country percentage, except for “age” which is a continuous variable and is based on country average. There are 23 countries in valid cases.
Table 2
Binomial Logistic Analyses Results of Gendered Division of Household Labor

(Dependent variable: Usually or always done by women=1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Laundry</th>
<th>Repair</th>
<th>Care</th>
<th>Shopping</th>
<th>Cleaning</th>
<th>Meal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRA</strong></td>
<td>-0.170</td>
<td>-0.180</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>-0.200</td>
<td>-0.210</td>
<td>-0.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>-0.087</td>
<td>-0.097</td>
<td>-0.107</td>
<td>-0.117</td>
<td>-0.127</td>
<td>-0.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age²</strong></td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>-0.069</td>
<td>-0.074</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>-0.094</td>
<td>-0.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.410</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td>0.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No work</td>
<td>0.759</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>0.779</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td>0.799</td>
<td>0.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City</strong></td>
<td>-0.416</td>
<td>-0.426</td>
<td>-0.436</td>
<td>-0.446</td>
<td>-0.456</td>
<td>-0.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender Empowerment Measure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Development Index</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constant</strong></td>
<td>-2.90</td>
<td>-4.65</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>-3.00</td>
<td>-3.27</td>
<td>-3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pseudo-R² (%)</strong></td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(without country level measures)</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pseudo-R² (%)</strong></td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(with country level measures)</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P<.1; ** P<.05; *** P<.01
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Women’s Share of Household Duties across Countries

a. Doing the Laundry

b. Making Small Repairs around the House

c. Looking after Sick Family Members

Country

Equally shared  Usually done by woman  Usually or always done by man  Done by others
Figure 1  (Continued)

d. Shopping for Groceries

![Graph showing percentage of people engaged in shopping for groceries by country.]
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e. Doing the Household Cleaning
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Country

f. Preparing the Meal

![Graph showing percentage of people engaged in meal preparation by country.]

Country
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# Appendix 1

## Distribution of Countries or Areas across Various Regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North-East Asia</th>
<th>Other parts of Asia</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Northern Europe</th>
<th>Western Europe</th>
<th>Eastern Europe</th>
<th>Southern Europe</th>
<th>North America</th>
<th>South and Central America</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japan (1,132)</td>
<td>The Philippines (1,200)</td>
<td>Australia (1,352)</td>
<td>Denmark (1,379)</td>
<td>Great Britain (1,960)</td>
<td>Bulgaria (1,003)</td>
<td>Cyprus (1,004)</td>
<td>United States (1,171)</td>
<td>Brazil (2,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan (1,983)</td>
<td>New Zealand (1,025)</td>
<td>Finland (1,353)</td>
<td>Flanders (Belgium; 1,360)</td>
<td>Czech Republic (1,289)</td>
<td>Spain (2,471)</td>
<td>Chile (1,505)</td>
<td>Mexico (1,495)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norway (1,475)</td>
<td>Norway (1,475)</td>
<td>France (1,903)</td>
<td>Hungary (1,023)</td>
<td>Slovak Republic (1,133)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sweden (1,080)</td>
<td>Sweden (1,080)</td>
<td>Ireland (1,240)</td>
<td>Slovenia (1,093)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Netherlands (1,249)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Switzerland (1,008)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The number in the parenthesis represents the number of valid cases among completed survey results.
2. These countries do not have data for urban-rural differences.
3. These countries do not have data for spouses’ education.
## Appendix 2

### Binomial Logistic Analyses Results of Gendered Division of Household Labor: A Cross-National Comparison

(dependent variable: Usually or always done by women=1; country reference: Australia)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Laundry</th>
<th>Repair</th>
<th>Care</th>
<th>Shopping</th>
<th>Cleaning</th>
<th>Meal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan (39)</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico (38)</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland (37)</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil (35)</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium (34)</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland (33)</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium (34)</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil (35)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland (37)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico (38)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan (39)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Log-Likelihood N**: 3,173.9

**Pseudo-R² (%)** (without country differences): 4.13

**Pseudo-R² (%)** (with country differences): 7.21

---

* P<.1; ** P<.05; *** P<.01