Household Work and Marital Quality in Same-Sex and Different-Sex Marriages

Asya Saydam

Department of Sociology, Population Research Center, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX

Description of Topic and Theoretical Focus

The unequal division of household labor has long been a persistent issue within households, with women overwhelmingly shouldering the bulk of domestic responsibilities (Bianchi & Milkie, 2010; Sayer, 2016). This unequal distribution is not merely an abstract concern; it has tangible consequences for marriages, often leading to conflict, dissatisfaction, and even dissolution (Adelson, Nelson, and Hafiz 2021; Cubbins and Vannoy 2004; Klumb, Hoppmann, and Staats 2006; Ruppanner, Brandén, and Turunen 2018).

Prior research has highlighted gender differences largely among different-sex couples, suggesting that women do most share of the housework despite the convergence of men's and women's unpaid labor time (Bianchi et al. 2012; Bianchi and Milkie 2010). Despite the egalitarian uptick in relationships in different-sex couples, day to day unequal distribution of housework outcomes can result in shifts of narratives, described as a "de-gendering" process (Daminger 2020). On the other hand, few studies suggested that same-sex couples share housework more equally (Hofmarcher and Plug 2022; Reczek 2020) and even when they don't, the egalitarian framework they take upon is different from different sex couples (Goldberg 2023). However, there remains a lack of research for same-sex couples, and how different types of housework operate differently from different sex couples.

Household tasks are not monolithic and require different levels and intensity of labor. Research have shown that women generally tend to be responsible for routine indoor tasks like cooking, laundry, and cleaning, that cannot be delayed in day to day life, while men contribute less on these more care intense work and focus on non-routine, sporadic activities such as outdoor work and maintenance (Craig and Powell 2018). Cognitive or mental work is defined in various ways but generally covers thinking, planning, organizing, and overall management of the household. While it has received the least attention, its gendered pattern and impact on women's well-being have been pointed at for different-sex couples in various research (Reich-Stiebert, Froehlich, and Voltmer 2023). On the other hand, some research has explored labor allocation in same-sex couples (Bauer 2016), however the focus has primarily been on lesbian couples with children, leaving a gap in our understanding of housework dynamics play out in gay male couples (Brewster 2017; Goldberg and Perry-Jenkins 2007). This gap in literature raises questions about whether traditional gendered notions of housework apply differently in same-sex relationships overall, potentially offering opportunities to redefine and reconceptualize these norms (Goldberg 2013). This study addresses this gap by examining gender differences in the division of household labor across different types of couples, including same-sex and different-sex couples utilizing couple level data from a mid-life study. Thus, my first set of research questions are*: How division of housework vary for men and women in same-sex and different-sex marriages? How does housework as routine, non-routine and cognitive tasks vary by gender and gender composition of the dyad?*

The following hypotheses are drawn from the literature to address these research questions:

H1: There are differences among men and women of how routine, non-routine and cognitive tasks are shared:
H1a: There are significant differences in routine housework by gender, respondents reporting higher level of dependence on their partner, when their partner is women.
Hb: There are significant differences in non-routine housework by gender, respondents reporting higher level of dependence on their partner, when their partner is women.
H1c: There are significant differences in cognitive tasks by gender in different and same-sex couples, partners sharing cognitive work more equally than partners in different-sex couples.

Unequal distribution of housework has been associated with reduced marital satisfaction and increased stress, particularly for women performing cognitive labor (Dean, Churchill, and Ruppanner 2022; Haupt and Gelbgiser 2023; Petts and Carlson 2023). It can also lead to heightened conflict, as one partner, typically women, takes on a disproportionate share of chores, causing resentment and frustration (Perry-Jenkins and Gerstel 2020). However, women and men in different-sex relationships might also be more "gender conforming" (Pollitt, Robinson, and Umberson 2018) than individuals in same-sex couples, resulting in differences not translating into similar dissatisfaction and conflict. Similarly, women and men in same-sex relationships might also be operating (and aware of) outside the traditional gendered patterns, still resulting in differences among housework not translating into similar dissatisfaction and conflict. Therefore, my second set of research question are: *How are differences in division of housework as routine, non-routine and cognitive tasks between spouses is associated with marital quality? Do these associations vary by actor gender, partner gender, and dyad gender?*

The following hypotheses are drawn from the literature to address these research questions:

Hypothesis 2a: In different-sex couples, women who have a partner dependent on them for routine tasks might report lower marital quality compared to their same-sex counterparts, who are also the more dependent party.

Hypothesis 2b: Within different-sex couples, men who have a partner dependent on them for non-routine tasks might report higher marital quality compared to their same-sex counterparts. This might stem from conformity to gender roles for men, and the satisfaction derived from fulfilling these roles, differing from men in same-sex relationships.

Hypothesis 2c: Regarding cognitive tasks, women in different sex relationships might report lower marital quality compared to their same-sex counterparts, reflecting potential disparities in marital satisfaction based on gender within different and same-sex relationships.

Following others, I use gender-as-relational approach (Springer, Hankivsky, and Bates 2012; Thomeer, Umberson, and Reczek 2020) that is grounded in a theoretical framework that views gender as a dynamic, institutionalized process shaping power dynamics among individuals of different genders (Ferree 2010). This research explores how the interplay between the division of housework tasks and marital quality may differ for men and women in same- and different-sex marriages, taking into account the ongoing negotiation of gender within relationships (Umberson, Thomeer, and Lodge 2015).

Data and Methods

Data. The current study utilizes the first wave of longitudinal dyadic data from the Health and Relationships Project (HARP) in the US, focusing on marital dynamics and well-being among mid-life (aged 35-65) same-sex and different-sex couples (Umberson 2019). All respondents in the dataset were legally married between 2004 and 2012 and self-identified as either a man or a woman. Data collection for the first wave occurred in 2015, resulting in a final sample of 838 individuals within 419 couples. Demographic characteristics of the final sample are presented in Table 1.

Measures.
Household work (IV). To assess the division of housework, I considered three distinct types of tasks: routine, non-routine tasks, and cognitive tasks. Routine tasks encompassed general housework and laundry, and meal preparation. Non-routine tasks encompassed home maintenance and minor repairs. Finally cognitive tasks included keeping up with checking and savings accounts and paying bills, making major financial and legal decisions. I used an indicator of division of housework where both actor (the respondent) and partner (the respondent's spouse) are asked, "How much do you depend on your spouse

to handle or help with?". This question was accompanied by five response categories ranging from 1 (not at all) to 4 (a lot). For routine tasks, I summed the two items related to general housework and meal preparation to create an overall routine task variable, where higher values indicate higher dependence (α = .60; range 2-8). In other words, I used the self-report of dependence as an indicator of doing *less* on that particular task compared to their partner. To continue, for non-routine tasks, I used one item, home maintenance and minor repairs (range 1-4). For cognitive tasks I summed the other two items related to financial responsibilities, and legal decisions to create an overall cognitive task variable, with higher values indicating higher dependence (α = .60; range 2-8). In order to compare various housework tasks effectively, I adjusted the scales to accommodate different range by using the "POMS" (proportion of maximum scaling) method. Unlike traditional standardization or *ipsatization* techniques, this method preserves information about the actual differences between data points (Little 2013; Moeller 2015). The process involves setting the scale from 0 to the highest value and then dividing each score by that maximum value. This converts each scale to a range between 0 and 1.

Marital Quality (DV). I construct marital quality adopting from on the Couples Satisfaction Index (Funk and Rogge 2007). Respondents were asked to rate the degree of happiness of their relationship and responses range from extremely unhappy (1) to perfect (7). Respondents were also asked to indicate how true the following statement is for their relationship with their spouses: "I have a warm and comfortable relationship with my spouses" Response options vary from 1 (not at all true) to 6 (completely true). Two other questions were also used in the measure of marital quality: "How rewarding is your relationship with your spouse?", and "In general, how satisfied are you with your relationship?". Responses to the 4 questions were summed (α = .92; range, 4-25).

Control variables include respondents' age (in years), education (0 = some years of college or less; 1 = college degree or higher), race (0 = White; 1 = Non-White), work status (0 = Not working; 1 = Working) , child in household (0 = No; 1 = Yes), years lived together (in years), and household income. Household income ranged from 1 (no household income) to 7 ($150,000 or more), and I recoded it as binary (0 = $0-$99,999; 1 = $100,000 and more).

Approach:
First, I examine how patterns of self-reported household task dependence vary for men and women in same and different-sex marriages using mixed-effects multilevel modeling to examine the associations of household work by types of tasks across same- and different sex married couples. Second, to look at the relationship between marital quality and division of household tasks and test for hypothesis 2a, 2b, and 2c, I use analysis of variance (ANOVA) with Bonferroni correction. This approach allows to see if reported marital quality by each partner aligns with the gendered notions of the relevant housework.

Lastly, I use mixed-effects multilevel modeling and Actor-Partner Interdependence Model (APIM) (West, Popp, and Kenny 2008) to examine the associations between household work and marital quality across same- and different sex married couples. I employ the factorial method by adding actor gender, partner gender, and the interaction between actor gender and partner gender. The factorial approach enables us to utilize regression estimates in order to predict scores for four distinct groups men married to men (MM), men married to women (MW), women married to men (WM), and women married to women (WW). All models were estimated using STATA 17.0. 1 individual was missing on one home maintenance and minor repairs, among housework items. 9 individuals were missing on marital quality items, relationship happiness (7) and rewarding relationship (2). I imputed these missing 10 observations with the mean score they attain from other items in the relevant scales. Results do not change if I use listwise deletion and have 409 couples, 818 individuals.

Preliminary Results

Descriptive Results
Table 1 provides a summary of the demographic characteristics of the sample. The average age of respondents in our sample was 48 years, and the couples had been together for an average of 15 years. The sample was highly educated (%80 reported having a college degree and more) and predominantly non-Hispanic White, with 86.36% identifying as such. Over 80% of respondents were employed full- or part-time. While more than 71% of different-sex couples reported living with children, only 12% of men married to men and 39% of women married to women reported having children in the household. Household income varied across the different types of couples, with approximately 43% of different-sex couples reporting an income above $100,000, while nearly 81% of men married to men and 67% of women married to women reported having an income above this threshold.

To explore the significant differences across the four groups, I performed post hoc pairwise comparisons following analysis of variance (ANOVA) with Bonferroni correction. The results show that the women in different-sex marriages reported significantly lower marital quality (M=19.30) than men in different sex (M=19.67) and women in same sex marriages (M=20.68). Men in different sex relationships (M=0.70) and women in same sex relationships (M=0.64) reported higher dependence on routine household tasks to their partners compared to men in same-sex (M=0.62) and women in different sex marriages (M=0.54). For non-routine tasks, men in different sex relationships (M=0.26) reported lower dependence on their partners compared to women in different (M=0.77) and same sex relationships (M=0.56). For cognitive tasks, men in different sex couples (M=0.67) and women in same-sex couples (M=0.66) reported significantly higher dependence their partners than women in different sex relationships (M=0.56).

Household tasks in same- and different-sex marriages
I began by exploring the first hypothesis, how dependence on routine, non-routine and cognitive household tasks varied across gendered relational context by performing a regression analysis separately for each type of task on actor gender, partner gender, and dyad gender (Table 2).

Starting **with routine tasks**, which include general housework and laundry, and meal preparation, the significant respondent gender and partner gender coefficients in Model 1 of Panel A indicate that regardless of partner gender, women report lower levels of dependence on routine tasks to their partner, than men ($b = -0.07$, $p < 0.001$) and respondents report higher dependence on routine tasks to their partner when married to a women ($b = 0.09$, $p < 0.001$). Model 2 considered the gender composition of the couple, introducing interaction terms for actor gender and partner gender. Results (Panel A, Model 2) indicate that while actor gender and partner gender mattered, gender composition of the couple remain insignificant in determining the dependence on partner across couple types for routine tasks. In these models, I also find that, having a college degree compared to no college degree ($b = 0.06$, $p < 0.05$) and working compared to not working ($b = 0.10$, $p < 0.001$) are positively associated with higher levels of dependence to partner on routine tasks. This finding aligns with past research, that housework doesn't happen in a vacuum, and relative resources (in this case college degree, one of the pathways of working outside home) shape how one partner is dependent on the other for housework. We also found that in Model 2, having a child in the household as opposed to not having one is marginally and positively correlated with higher levels of dependence on their partner ($b = 0.04$, $p < 0.10$).

In contrast, for **non-routine tasks** (Panel B, Model 1) which include home maintenance and minor repairs, women respondents reported significantly higher levels of dependence on their partners compared to men ($b = 0.27$; $p < .001$). However, respondents report lower levels of dependence on non-routine tasks to their partner when married to a woman ($b = -0.25$; $p < .001$). The nonsignificant interaction term in Model 2 of Panel B implies that the significant coefficients for respondent and partner gender in Model 1 are independent of each other, indicating that being married to a same-sex partner doesn't correlate with increased (or decreased) reliance on non-routine tasks. Different from routine tasks, in these models, I

find that, only working compared to not working ($b = 0.08$, $p < 0.05$) is positively associated with higher levels of dependence on partner with non-routine tasks.

Shifting our focus to **cognitive tasks** involving the management of checking and savings accounts, bill payments, as well as crucial financial and legal decision-making, the outcomes are somewhat different from routine and non-routine tasks. The significant partner gender coefficient in Model 1 of Panel C indicate that respondents report higher dependence on cognitive tasks to their partner when they are married to a woman ($b = 0.08$, $p < 0.001$). However, women don't report significant levels of dependence on their partners with cognitive tasks. In Model 2, when gender composition of the couple is accounted for, the significant coefficient for partner gender becomes null. I also found that, having a college degree compared to no college degree ($b = -0.05$, $p < 0.10$) is negatively associated with higher levels of dependence to partner on cognitive tasks.

Household tasks and marital quality
Descriptive findings
I explored the relationship between household tasks and marital quality, first descriptively using post hoc pairwise comparison analysis of variance (ANOVA) with Bonferroni correction. Table 3 summarizes the hypotheses and findings.

Recall that, the first argument of the second hypotheses is that, for routine tasks, women in different sex couples whose partner is dependent on them, might report *lower* marital quality compared to their same-sex counterparts who also report lower dependence on their partners. Based on the findings in Table 2, we know that women report lower dependence on their partners for routine tasks, which implies that they report doing more on routine work within their households. Since doing unequal (more) work is associated with lower marital quality, we would expect that women who report lower level of dependence to their partner (who do more) will report lower marital quality. Does this vary by couple type? To analyze this, I looked at the subgroup of women who reported lower dependence on their partners, regardless of partner gender. The findings suggest that women in different sex relationships (M=19.55) report significantly lower levels of martial quality compared to women in same-sex relationships (M=20.66). This finding implies that, women, who generally report doing more routine work than their partners, report lower marital quality when they are in a different-sex relationship, confirming previous research and hypothesis 2a.

The second part of the second hypothesis examines differences related to non-routine tasks. As indicated by the findings in Table 2, women respondents displayed a notably higher level of reliance on their partners compared to men, suggesting that men in different-sex relationships engage more in non-routine tasks than their counterparts in same-sex relationships. In contrast to women, it's expected that men might adhere to conventional masculinity ideals, where the performance of traditional male roles could potentially enhance marital quality for men in different-sex relationships compared to those in same-sex relationships.

To investigate this further, I analyzed the subgroup of men who reported lower dependence on their partners, regardless of their partner's gender. The results suggest that there is no significant difference between men in different-sex and same-sex relationships. This finding holds particular significance, especially when juxtaposed with the findings related to routine tasks. Unlike routine tasks, which involve daily care and may consequently impact daily stress leading to potential marital outcomes, non-routine tasks may not significantly influence such marital outcomes due to their less frequent and less demanding nature, a gendered nuance between household task types.

Exploring the differences in cognitive tasks constitutes the third part of the second hypothesis. Analysis of Table 2 reveals that respondents exhibit greater dependence on their partners for cognitive tasks when

married to women, highlighting that women tend to undertake more cognitive labor, aligning with prior research. Notably, within same-sex marriages, this unequal distribution of cognitive work might diverge from traditional gender notions and does not translate into lower marital quality. To substantiate this, I focused on the subgroup comprising men and women married to women, and who reported higher reliance on their partners for cognitive tasks. The results indicate that women in same-sex relationships report higher marital quality compared to women in different-sex relationships.

Multilevel modeling findings.
Finally, I examine whether division of housework tasks (respondent's dependence on their partner) predicts respondents reported marital quality for men and women in same-sex and different-sex relationships (Table 3). For routine tasks (Panel A, Model 1), there is a significant positive association between the level of dependence on one's partner and marital quality ($b = 0.96$; $p < .01$). In other words, individuals who rely more on their partners for routine household tasks tend to report higher levels of marital quality which aligns with previous findings. Importantly, this positive correlation remains consistent in models 2 and 3, where interaction by couple type (Model 2) and actor gender and dependence level (Model 3) are added to the model, respectively. However, the results become null when the interaction of partner gender and respondent dependence level, as well as the three-way interaction of actor gender, partner gender and respondent level of dependence are added to models in Model 4 and 5. Overall, individuals who depend more on their partners for routine tasks, in other words, individuals that do *less* than their partners report higher marital quality. However, this association does not significantly differ across gender or couple type.

Shifting our focus to non-routine tasks (Panel B), we do not observe any significant association between respondents' level of dependence on their partners with non-routine tasks to their marital quality, and no difference across gender or couple type. Only exception is, in Model 1 and 3, there is a positive relationship between partner gender (women) and marital quality (respectively Model 1 - $b = 0.50$; $p < .10$, Model 3 - $b = 0.50$; $p < .10$).

Lastly, for cognitive tasks, we see a similar outcome with routine tasks, that there is a significant positive association between the level of dependence on one's spouse for cognitive tasks and marital quality (respectively Model 1 - $b = 0.77$; $p < .01$, Model 2 - $b = 0.76$; $p < .01$, Model 4 - $b = 1.16$; $p < .01$, Model 5 – $b = 1.19$; $p < .05$.). Importantly, in line with the descriptive results, in Model 4 where partner gender and respondent dependence level are interacted, partner gender (women) is associated with higher marital quality. In Model 5, where actor gender, partner gender and their interactions with actor level of dependence are added into the model, partner gender and respondent level of dependence is negatively associated with marital quality (Model 4 - $b = -2.04$; $p < .05$), implying that for couples where respondent reports higher level of dependence on their partner for cognitive tasks, women respondent and marital quality are negatively associated.

Conclusion
Preliminary findings offer some evidence of persisting gendered dynamics in the division of household tasks within both same-sex and different-sex couples. These dynamics manifest differently for routine, non-routine and cognitive tasks, with men often reporting greater dependence on routine and cognitive tasks and women reporting higher dependence on non-routine tasks. Women in same-sex marriages compared to women in different-sex relationships, as well as men in different-sex relationships compared to men in same-sex relationships, reported higher dependence on their partners for routine household tasks. Furthermore, for non-routine tasks, men in different-sex relationships reported lower dependence on their partners compared to women in different-sex and same-sex relationships. Women in same-sex marriages also reported higher dependence on non-routine tasks compared to women in different-sex marriages. For cognitive tasks, it was observed that respondents reported higher reliance on their partner's involvement with cognitive tasks when married to a woman, though women themselves did not exhibit

significant dependence on their partners for these tasks. However, this significance diminished when considering the gender composition of the couple.

Considering marital processes, while routine tasks, that require frequent and daily care, higher dependence on one partner appears to be negatively associated with marital quality for the less dependent partner. For, non-routine tasks, which are less frequent and less time sensitive, dependence is not associated with marital quality. For cognitive tasks, that are less physical but weigh heavily on financial management and decision-making, findings are twofold. In different sex and same-sex marriages, respondents tend to report higher dependence on their partners for cognitive tasks if they are married to a woman, potentially suggesting a heavier cognitive workload for women, aligning with prior research. However, in same-sex marriages, the unequal distribution of cognitive tasks might not adhere to traditional gender norms, resulting in higher marital quality for women in such relationships compared to those in different-sex marriages.

The study of household work often overlooks the nuances of different types of work, particularly in relation to same-sex couples. These preliminary findings highlight the importance of considering gendered dynamics within households, even within same-sex couples, where we might anticipate more equal divisions of labor. This research can contribute to a more nuanced understanding of the interplay between gender, household labor, and marital processes.

Subsequent analysis
Future analysis will consider the differences by the joint effect of routine, non-routine, and cognitive tasks, as well as explore whether other marital dynamics, like marital conflict and individual level outcomes like stress are correlated with differences by the household tasks for men and women in same-sex and different-sex marriages.

References
Adelson, Megan J., Jackie A. Nelson, and Mariam Hafiz. 2021. "Longitudinal Associations Between Household Labor Division Inequity and Conflict Among Newlywed Couples." *Journal of Family Issues* 42(12):2861–80. doi: 10.1177/0192513X21993185.

Bauer, Gerrit. 2016. "Gender Roles, Comparative Advantages and the Life Course: The Division of Domestic Labor in Same-Sex and Different-Sex Couples." *European Journal of Population* 32(1):99–128. doi: 10.1007/s10680-015-9363-z.

Bianchi, Suzanne M., and Melissa A. Milkie. 2010. "Work and Family Research in the First Decade of the 21st Century." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 72(3):705–25. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00726.x.

Bianchi, Suzanne M., Liana C. Sayer, Melissa A. Milkie, and John P. Robinson. 2012. "Housework: Who Did, Does or Will Do It, and How Much Does It Matter?" *Social Forces; a Scientific Medium of Social Study and Interpretation* 91(1):55–63. doi: 10.1093/sf/sos120.

Brewster, Melanie E. 2017. "Lesbian Women and Household Labor Division: A Systematic Review of Scholarly Research from 2000 to 2015." *Journal of Lesbian Studies* 21(1):47–69. doi: 10.1080/10894160.2016.1142350.

Craig, Lyn, and Abigail Powell. 2018. "Shares of Housework Between Mothers, Fathers and Young People: Routine and Non-Routine Housework, Doing Housework for Oneself and Others." *Social Indicators Research* 136(1):269–81. doi: 10.1007/s11205-016-1539-3.

Cubbins, Lisa A., and Dana Vannoy. 2004. "Division of Household Labor as a Source of Contention for Married and Cohabiting Couples in Metropolitan Moscow." *Journal of Family Issues* 25(2):182–215. doi: 10.1177/0192513X03256499.

Daminger, Allison. 2020. "De-Gendered Processes, Gendered Outcomes: How Egalitarian Couples Make Sense of Non-Egalitarian Household Practices." *American Sociological Review* 85(5):806–29. doi: 10.1177/0003122420950208.

Dean, Liz, Brendan Churchill, and Leah Ruppanner. 2022. "The Mental Load: Building a Deeper Theoretical Understanding of How Cognitive and Emotional Labor Overload Women and Mothers." *Community, Work & Family* 25(1):13–29. doi: 10.1080/13668803.2021.2002813.

Ferree, Myra Marx. 2010. "Filling the Glass: Gender Perspectives on Families." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 72(3):420–39.

Funk, Janette L., and Ronald D. Rogge. 2007. "Testing the Ruler with Item Response Theory: Increasing Precision of Measurement for Relationship Satisfaction with the Couples Satisfaction Index." *Journal of Family Psychology* 21(4):572–83. doi: 10.1037/0893-3200.21.4.572.

Goldberg, Abbie E. 2013. "'Doing' and 'Undoing' Gender: The Meaning and Division of Housework in Same-Sex Couples." *Journal of Family Theory & Review* 5(2):85–104. doi: 10.1111/jftr.12009.

Goldberg, Abbie E. 2023. "From Safety in Silence to Speaking up for LGBTQ+ Families: A Reflection on the Personal, Professional, and Political through a Feminist Lens." *Journal of Family Theory & Review* 15(2). doi: 10.1111/jftr.12500.

Goldberg, Abbie E., and Maureen Perry-Jenkins. 2007. "The Division of Labor and Perceptions of Parental Roles: Lesbian Couples across the Transition to Parenthood." *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 24(2):297–318. doi: 10.1177/0265407507075415.

Haupt, Andreas, and Dafna Gelbgiser. 2023. "The Gendered Division of Cognitive Household Labor, Mental Load, and Family–Work Conflict in European Countries." *European Societies* 0(0):1–27. doi: 10.1080/14616696.2023.2271963.

Hofmarcher, Thomas, and Erik Plug. 2022. "Specialization in Same-Sex and Different-Sex Couples." *Labour Economics* 77:101995. doi: 10.1016/j.labeco.2021.101995.

Klumb, Petra, Christiane Hoppmann, and Melanie Staats. 2006. "Division of Labor in German Dual-Earner Families: Testing Equity Theoretical Hypotheses." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 68(4):870–82. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00301.x.

Little, Todd D. 2013. *Longitudinal Structural Equation Modeling*. New York: Guilford Press.

Moeller, Julia. 2015. "A Word on Standardization in Longitudinal Studies: Don't." *Frontiers in Psychology* 6:1389. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01389.

Perry-Jenkins, Maureen, and Naomi Gerstel. 2020. "Work and Family in the Second Decade of the 21st Century." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 82(1):420–53. doi: 10.1111/jomf.12636.

Petts, Richard J., and Daniel L. Carlson. 2023. "Managing a Household during a Pandemic: Cognitive Labor and Parents' Psychological Well-Being." *Society and Mental Health* 21568693231169521. doi: 10.1177/21568693231169521.

Pollitt, Amanda M., Brandon A. Robinson, and Debra Umberson. 2018. "Gender Conformity, Perceptions of Shared Power, and Marital Quality in Same- and Different-Sex Marriages." *Gender & Society* 32(1):109–31. doi: 10.1177/0891243217742110.

Reczek, Corinne. 2020. "Sexual- and Gender-Minority Families: A 2010 to 2020 Decade in Review." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 82(1):300–325. doi: 10.1111/jomf.12607.

Reich-Stiebert, Natalia, Laura Froehlich, and Jan-Bennet Voltmer. 2023. "Gendered Mental Labor: A Systematic Literature Review on the Cognitive Dimension of Unpaid Work Within the Household and Childcare." *Sex Roles* 88(11–12):475–94. doi: 10.1007/s11199-023-01362-0.

Ruppanner, Leah, Maria Brandén, and Jani Turunen. 2018. "Does Unequal Housework Lead to Divorce? Evidence from Sweden." *Sociology* 52(1):75–94. doi: 10.1177/0038038516674664.

Springer, Kristen W., Olena Hankivsky, and Lisa M. Bates. 2012. "Gender and Health: Relational, Intersectional, and Biosocial Approaches." *Social Science & Medicine (1982)* 74(11):1661–66. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2012.03.001.

Thomeer, Mieke Beth, Debra Umberson, and Corinne Reczek. 2020. "The Gender-as-Relational Approach for Theorizing About Romantic Relationships of Sexual and Gender Minority Mid- to Later-Life Adults." *Journal of Family Theory & Review* 12(2):220–37. doi: 10.1111/jftr.12368.

Umberson, Debra. 2019. "Health and Relationships Project, United States, 2014-2015: Version 2."

Umberson, Debra, Mieke Beth Thomeer, and Amy C. Lodge. 2015. "Intimacy and Emotion Work in Lesbian, Gay, and Heterosexual Relationships." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 77(2):542–56. doi: 10.1111/jomf.12178.

West, Tessa V., Danielle Popp, and David A. Kenny. 2008. "A Guide for the Estimation of Gender and Sexual Orientation Effects in Dyadic Data: An Actor-Partner Interdependence Model Approach." *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin* 34(3):321–36. doi: 10.1177/0146167207311199.

Table 1. Descriptive Data for Sample by Gender Composition of the Couple (n=838 individuals, 419 couples)

	Total		Men with Men		Men with Women		Women with Men		Women with Women	
	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)
Marital quality (4-25)	20.35	(3.86)	20.7[c]	(3.36)	19.67	(4.04)	19.30[a, d]	(5.33)	20.68[c]	(3.51)
Household work										
Household tasks: Routine (0-1)	0.63	(0.27)	0.62[b]	(0.26)	0.70[a, c]	(0.27)	0.54[d]	(0.29)	0.64[c]	(0.26)
Household tasks: Non-routine (0-1)	0.54	(0.38)	0.54[b, c]	(0.29)	0.26[a, c, d]	(0.29)	0.77[a, b, d]	(0.31)	0.56[b, c]	(0.38)
Household tasks: Cognitive (0-1)	0.63	(0.31)	0.61	(0.33)	0.67[c]	(0.32)	0.56[b, d]	(0.33)	0.66[c]	(0.29)
Demographic characteristics										
Age (35-65)	48.60	(8.38)	49.91[b, c]	(8.26)	46.92[a, d]	(8.21)	45.42[a, d]	(7.74)	49.41[b, c]	(8.39)
Race (% white)	86.40		86.69		83.06		81.45		89.18	
Education (% College degree +)	80.19		81.05[b]		68.55[a, d]		74.19[d]		85.96[b, d]	
Work status (% working)	81.15		84.27		78.23		76.61		81.58	
Relationship duration (3.5-45)	15.36	(8.22)	16.36[g]	(7.82)	16.43[g]	(8.76)	16.43[g]	(8.76)	13.88[e, f]	(7.89)
Children in household (% yes)	40.81		12.10[f, g]		71.77[e, g]		71.77[e, g]		39.18[e, f]	
Household income (% $100,000 and more)	64.20		81.45[f, g]		42.74[e, g]		42.74[e, g]		67.25[e, f]	
N	836		248		124		124		342	

Note: S.D. = Standardized Deviation. Ranges of continuous variables are in parentheses. Significant differences from post-hoc pairwise comparison following analysis of variance (ANOVA) with Bonferroni correction are reported (p < .05).
a Significantly different from men with men.
b Significantly different from men with women.
c Significantly different from women with men.
d Significantly different from women with women.
e Significantly different from male same-sex couples.
f Significantly different from different-sex couples.

Table 2. Estimates from Multilevel Regression Models Predicting Housework Dependence on Household Tasks by Gender and Couple Type (n=838 individuals, 419 couples)

| Variables | Panel A: Routine Tasks | | | | Panel B: Non-Routine Tasks | | | | Panel C: Cognitive Tasks | | | |
| | Model 1 | | Model 2 | | Model 1 | | Model 2 | | Model 1 | | Model 2 | |
	B	(SE)	B	(SE)	B	(SE)	B	(SE)	B	(SE)	B	(SE)
Respondent woman (ref: man)	-0.07***	(0.02)	-0.10**	(0.03)	0.27***	(0.03)	0.23***	(0.04)	-0.03	(0.02)	-0.05	(0.04)
Partner woman (ref: man)	0.09***	(0.02)	0.07*	(0.03)	-0.25***	(0.03)	-0.29***	(0.04)	0.08***	(0.02)	0.05	(0.04)
Respondent woman x Partner woman			0.05	(0.05)			0.07	(0.06)			0.05	(0.06)
Covariates												
Age (years)	0.00	(0.00)	0.00	(0.00)	0.00	(0.00)	0.00	(0.00)	0.00	(0.00)	0.00	(0.00)
College degree (ref. some college or less)	0.06*	(0.02)	0.06*	(0.02)	0.03	(0.03)	0.03	(0.03)	-0.05+	(0.03)	-0.05+	(0.03)
Currently working (1 = yes)	0.10***	(0.02)	0.10***	(0.02)	0.08*	(0.03)	0.08*	(0.03)	0.00	(0.03)	0.00	(0.03)
Race (ref. non-Hispanic white)	-0.02	(0.03)	-0.02	(0.03)	-0.06	(0.04)	-0.06	(0.04)	-0.04	(0.03)	-0.04	(0.03)
Relationship duration (years)	0.00	(0.00)	0.00	(0.00)	0.00	(0.00)	0.00	(0.00)	0.00	(0.00)	0.00	(0.00)
Children in household (1 = yes)	0.03	(0.02)	0.04+	(0.02)	0.02	(0.03)	0.03	(0.03)	0.01	(0.02)	0.02	(0.03)
Household income	-0.01	(0.01)	-0.01	(0.01)	0.00	(0.01)	0.00	(0.01)	0.01	(0.01)	0.01	(0.01)
Constant	0.49***	(0.08)	0.51***	(0.08)	0.33**	(0.11)	0.36**	(0.11)	0.60***	(0.09)	0.62***	(0.10)

***$p < .001$, **$p < .01$, *$p < .05$. + $p < .10$.

Table 3. Descriptive Findings for Household Work and Marital Quality for Sub Samples by Gender Composition of the Couple

Comparison task	Hypothesis 3a Routine			Hypothesis 3b Non-Routine			Hypothesis 3c Cognitive Tasks		
Comparison groups	WW & WM			MM & MW			WW & MW		
	M	(SD)	N	M	(SD)	N	M	(SD)	N
Respondent reported dependence (0-1)	0.40	(0.21)	217	0.19	(0.22)	194	0.90	(0.14)	224
Partner reported dependence (0-1)	0.87	(0.15)	217	0.89	(0.18)	194	0.40	(0.22)	224
Marital quality reported by R in same-sex couples	20.66[c]	(3.46)	148	20.38	(3.99)	104	20.90[b]	(3.31)	156
Marital quality reported by R in different-sex couples	19.55[d]	(4.48)	69	19.76	(3.66)	90	19.50[d]	(4.37)	68

Note: S.D. = Standardized Deviation. Ranges of continuous variables are in parentheses. Significant differences from post-hoc pairwise comparison following analysis of variance (ANOVA) with Bonferroni correction are reported ($p < .05$).

a Significantly different from men with men;
b Significantly different from men with women;
c Significantly different from women with men;
d Significantly different from women with women;

Table 4. Estimates from Multilevel Regression Models Testing Housework Dependence on Marital Quality (n=838 individuals, 419 couples)

Variable	Model 1 B	(SE)	Model 2 B	(SE)	Model 3 B	(SE)	Model 4 B	(SE)	Model 5 B	(SE)
Panel A: Routine Tasks										
Respondent dependence level (0-1)	0.96**	(0.35)	0.96**	(0.35)	1.10*	(0.56)	0.75	(0.55)	0.70	(0.68)
Respondent woman	0.11	(0.25)	-0.23	(0.53)	0.26	(0.54)	0.11	(0.25)	-0.12	(0.85)
Partner women	0.31	(0.26)	-0.02	(0.53)	0.31	(0.26)	0.08	(0.53)	-1.05	(0.99)
Respondent woman x Partner woman			0.61	(0.85)					1.44	(1.26)
Respondent woman x Respondent dependence					-0.24	(0.75)			-0.22	(1.18)
Partner woman x Respondent dependence level							0.37	(0.75)	1.50	(1.25)
Respondent woman x Partner woman x Respondent dependence level									-1.13	(1.46)
Constant	19.21**	(1.10)	19.36**	(1.11)	19.14***	(1.12)	19.32**	(1.12)	19.52***	(1.15)
Panel B: Non - Routine Tasks										
Respondent dependence level (0-1)	0.38	(0.26)	0.38	(0.26)	0.48	(0.40)	0.51	(0.40)	0.28	(0.45)
Respondent woman	-0.06	(0.26)	-0.41	(0.54)	0.02	(0.37)	-0.06	(0.26)	-1.27	(0.89)
Partner women	0.50+	(0.26)	0.15	(0.54)	0.50+	(0.26)	0.62	(0.40)	-0.05	(0.63)
Respondent woman x Partner woman			0.63	(0.85)					1.78	(1.14)
Respondent woman x Respondent dependence					-0.16	(0.53)			1.14	(0.98)
Partner woman x Respondent dependence level							-0.22	(0.53)	0.65	(1.03)
Respondent woman x Partner woman x Respondent dependence level									-1.96	(1.31)
Constant	19.52**	(1.09)	19.67**	(1.11)	19.49***	(1.10)	19.47**	(1.10)	19.75***	(1.12)
Panel C: Cognitive Tasks										
Respondent dependence level (0-1)	0.77**	(0.29)	0.76**	(0.29)	0.68	(0.45)	1.16**	(0.44)	1.19*	(0.52)
Respondent woman	0.05	(0.25)	-0.27	(0.53)	-0.05	(0.47)	0.06	(0.25)	-0.42	(0.80)
Partner women	0.34	(0.26)	0.02	(0.53)	0.34	(0.26)	0.81+	(0.47)	1.33	(0.85)
Respondent woman x Partner woman			0.60	(0.85)					-0.33	(1.16)
Respondent woman x Respondent dependence					0.16	(0.63)			0.26	(1.01)
Partner woman x Respondent dependence level							-0.76	(0.63)	-2.04*	(1.03)
Respondent woman x Partner woman x Respondent dependence level									1.35	(1.26)
Constant	19.12**	(1.10)	19.27**	(1.12)	19.18***	(1.13)	18.85**	(1.13)	18.93***	(1.16)

Note: Controls are age, education, race, work status, relationship duration, children in household and household income (omitted from table).
+p <.10, *p <.05, **p <.01, ***p <.001.