

**GENDER EQUALITY PERCEPTIONS, DIVISION OF HOUSEHOLD WORK, AND
PARTNERSHIP BREAKUP IN SWEDEN IN EARLY 21ST CENTURY**

Livia Sz. Oláh
Department of Sociology,
Stockholm University, Sweden
Phone: +46(8)- 16 28 76; e-mail: livia.olah@sociology.su.se

and

Michael Gähler
Swedish Institute for Social Research,
Stockholm University, Sweden
Phone: +46(8)- 16 25 41; e-mail: michael.gahler@sofi.su.se

Abstract

With the increase in female employment and the decrease in gender labour specialization there has also been a marked change in men's and women's gender role attitudes. An increasing share of both genders has come to prefer gender egalitarianism. Here we study the impact of gender equality perceptions, i.e. the interplay between gender role attitudes and behaviour in terms of sharing unpaid work with one's partner, on union stability. We focus on Sweden, a country with long experience of the dual-earner model and policies supporting female labour-force participation while also promoting men's active engagement in family tasks. We expect egalitarian men to have the lowest risk of union break-up along with non-egalitarian women, while egalitarian women may be the most likely to experience partnership dissolution, together with non-egalitarian men. For the empirical analyses we use data from the Swedish Young Adult Panel Study (YAPS) conducted in 1999, 2003 and 2009. Logistic regression is the tool of analysis at this exploratory stage. Our preliminary findings suggest that both women and men who hold gender egalitarian views but experience a traditional division of work in their partnership are substantially more likely to divorce / separate than those with egalitarian views who also share housework equally. Men with traditional views and traditional division of housework in their relationship face a high risk of partnership break-up as well.

Next, we will estimate discrete-time hazard models also taking into account the length of the partnership at the time when the division of housework is measured. We also plan to analyze parents separately, taking into account their division of childcare work.

WORK –IN-PROGRESS; PLEASE, DO NOT QUOTE

INTRODUCTION

The era of the Second Demographic Transition in the developed world has been characterized by the deferment of marriage and declining marriage rates, increasing prevalence of less committed relationships, especially cohabitations, postponement of parenthood and low fertility rates, and high and/or increasing rates of partnership dissolution, even among families with children. Moreover, the supremacy of the male breadwinner-female homemaker model has been successfully challenged by the dual-earner family model. These changes, especially women's increasing economic independence, have had important implications on gender relations both on the societal level and in the family. The traditional gender division of labor characterizes a rapidly diminishing proportion of couple relationships, as both women and men engage in paid work throughout the life course and share the responsibilities for housework and childcare to varying extent. The extension of the female gender role to include gainful employment is socially accepted, even for mothers with young children, nearly everywhere in the industrialized world, but men's engagement in domestic tasks is still considered more or less controversial (i.e. not fully compatible with the male gender role), depending on the gender system in a country. With the increase in female employment and the decrease in gender labor division there has also been a marked change in men's and women's gender role attitudes. An increasing share of both genders has come to prefer gender egalitarianism, irrespective of how it is operationalized.

In this paper we set out to explore how, and if, these demographic, economic, and social changes, each with substantial impact on people's lives, are related to each other. More specifically, we raise the question whether the gender division of labor in couples and individual gender role attitudes have implications for union stability, i.e. the risk for divorce and separation.

In Sweden, union stability has decreased substantially during the last decades. Not only have formal divorce rates increased (Statistics Sweden 2010) but, in addition, non-marital unions have become increasingly widespread (Kiernan 1996; cf. Kiernan 2003) and these unions are even more fragile than formal marriages, also when children are involved (Statistics Sweden 2007a). Increasing divorce and separation rates are by no means only a Swedish, or Scandinavian, phenomenon, rather this pattern is close to universal (Goode 1993; Lyngstad & Jalovaara 2010). Scholars have claimed a number of potential forces driving this development, among them *legal changes*, e.g. changes in law that have simplified divorce, *social changes*, e.g. changing attitudes towards divorce and decreased social stigma following divorce, *secularization*, as religion has weakened its influence over individuals' family decisions, and even the *increased length of life*, as longer (healthier) lives increases the potential for partner change. The relative importance of these possible forces is disputed. Most scholars seem to agree, however, that a main factor behind the dramatic growth in post-war divorce rates is the increase in *female employment*. It has been argued that economic independence diminishes the incentive for women to enter a conjugal union and it increases the possibility to leave an unsatisfying relationship. Such a view has been most clearly expressed in studies of new home economics which claim that work specialization between spouses, i.e. the traditional male good-provider model with female main responsibility for household tasks and child care, maximizes both spouses' gain from marriage and minimizes the risk for divorce, whereas dual-earner families run an increased risk for divorce as interdependency of spouses decreases (Becker 1991). This reasoning has been challenged, however, by others who argue that wives' employment and income reduces the economic risk of the family and should, therefore, "be viewed as a highly adaptive family strategy rather than as a threat to the family as a social institution (Oppenheimer 1994, p. 321).

It is still an unresolved question whether a traditional or egalitarian gender division of paid and unpaid work induces union stability. One dimension that has often been neglected in this field of research, however, is how spouses *perceive* the work division and to what extent attitudes and behaviour are consistent with each other. An unequal division may only decrease relationship quality, and increase divorce risks, if spouses have a preference for a non-traditional, more egalitarian, division of work, whereas an equal division may actually be a problem for spouses who have preferences for a more traditional gender-role division. Thus, we argue that it is important to assess how gender role attitudes and actual division of paid and unpaid labor between spouses interact in shaping union (in)stability.

Here we benefit from using a longitudinal data-set comprising information not only on actual gender division of labor but also on attitudes towards gender-related issues, measured well before any divorce or separation takes place. By combining data on behavior and attitudes from this quite unique, three-wave data-set, we are able to examine the impact of consistency and inconsistency regarding these dimensions on the risk for union dissolution. We focus on Sweden, a country with long experience of the dual-earner model and policies supporting individuals' labor force participation independently of their sex, and active efforts to increase men's engagement in family life (Oláh and Bernhardt 2008).

THE INTERSECTION OF GENDER DIVISION OF LABOR, GENDER ROLE ATTITUDES, AND UNION STABILITY

Although the development has stalled during later years (Cotter, Hermsen & Vanneman 2011), there have been large changes in people's attitudes regarding gender roles during the last decades. Increasing shares of women and men approve of female employment and fewer nowadays agree that men and women are designated for different work tasks and should divide paid and unpaid work between them, i.e. gender work specialization (Thornton &

Young-DeMarco 2001; also see Svallfors 2006 for a comparative study including Sweden and the U.S.). This change in gender role attitudes has been accompanied (the causal order is difficult to disentangle) by a declining actual gender division of labor. As indicated by time use studies, men's and women's paid and unpaid work time is converging, although not equalized, as men do less paid and more unpaid work than previously, while women do less unpaid and more paid work (Bygren, Gähler & Neramo 2004; Sayer 2005). However, American women have increased their involvement in earning activities by far greater extent than they decreased their unpaid work time. Women having a second shift diminished their leisure time, both compared to women in the 1950s and 1960s, and compared to their male contemporaries, since American men have increased their unpaid work time only slightly, while decreasing time in paid work (Gershuny 2000). In Sweden, gender differences are less pronounced. Swedish men have not changed their work hours whereas Swedish women have balanced their changes in time for paid and unpaid work. Thus, there is only a small gender gap in leisure time (Bygren et al. 2004). Still, although men's and women's gender role attitudes do not indicate any preference for gender work specialization, and although differences have become less pronounced over time, a gendered division of paid and unpaid work (particularly the latter) persists. This imbalance between attitudes and action has implications for the satisfaction with sharing of family responsibilities, as well as for relationship quality (Stevens, Kiger & Riley 2001; Voydanoff & Donnelly 1999), which in turn are likely to affect the stability of partnerships, possibly being mediated by gender-role attitudes (Rogers & Amato 2000; Shelton & John 1996).

Increasing female labor force participation has long been regarded as one of the main forces driving rising divorce rates (Cherlin 1981). The logic behind this was seen in that spouses gain most from marriage when they specialize, i.e. one spouse focuses on market work and breadwinning whereas the other takes main responsibility for domestic chores and

child care (Becker 1991). This interdependency between spouses, it is argued, strengthens marital stability and minimizes the risk for divorce. With women's increasing economic independence, however, the gain from marriage diminishes and the loss is reduced in case of divorce. Critics point out, however, that women's earnings contribute to household resources and reduce the economic risk the family may face. Thus, female employment should increase marital utility for both spouses (Oppenheimer 1994). Empirical evidence is mixed. Whereas some studies show that female employment, work hours, and relative income are positively associated with the risk for divorce (Kalmijn, Loeve & Manting 2007; Poortman 2005), others show no or a positive effect of women's employment and income on union stability (see Lyngstad & Jalovaara 2010 for a review). The complexity of the issue is further underscored by the finding that the association between gender division of work and the risk for divorce varies with policy context. In Germany, characterized by policy reinforcing gender specialization, male breadwinner families are the least likely to divorce and the divorce risk rises with increasing domestic work efforts by the husband. In the U.S., with its liberal policy being "silent on the private sphere", wives being out of labor force increases the risk for divorce whereas husband's increasing domestic contributions decrease the risk for divorce (Cooke 2006).

Gender role attitudes are also associated with spouses' perceptions of their marriages and divorce risks (Kaufman 2000; Thompson 1991). Above all, women with gender egalitarian attitudes have come to view their marriages and relationships more critically. Longitudinal studies show that wives who adopt less traditional gender role attitudes more often perceive their marriages as less rewarding. They report less marital happiness and interaction, more disagreement and problems, and a higher proneness for divorce than wives with stable, and more traditional, gender role attitudes. For men, however, the opposite pattern is found. Husbands who adopt less traditional gender role attitudes report higher marital quality than

husbands reporting no change in gender role attitudes. Whereas women adopting less traditional gender role attitudes may perceive that they are exploited in their marriages, and face resistance and conflict if they press for change, men adopting less traditional gender role attitudes may receive appreciation from their wives (Amato & Booth 1995). This pattern is confirmed for actual divorce risks. Women expressing gender egalitarian views are more likely to divorce/separate than women with more traditional orientation on gender labour specialization whereas egalitarian oriented men are less likely to divorce than traditionally oriented men. Kaufman (2000) speculates that men with gender equal views are likely to be more family oriented than men with traditional gender role attitudes as they focus more on home and family tasks and take more responsibility for their children. Greater family involvement implies that family issues matter more for these men. Hence gender egalitarian men have more to lose from family disruption and should be less likely to divorce/separate than men with traditional gender role attitudes. Moreover, men holding gender egalitarian attitudes may be more highly valued as partners as they are likely to take domestic responsibilities. These arguments are supported by findings for Sweden on parents displaying significantly lower risk of family dissolution if the father took parental leave with the first child compared to couples where the father did not engage in active parenting (Oláh 2001; see also Goldscheider et al. 2010 for further examples).

The studies referred so far focus *either* on the gender division of work *or* gender role attitudes and how they are associated with marital quality and divorce. Thus, it is not clear how these dimensions relate to each other, i.e. whether a given workload affects union stability differently for women and men with egalitarian and traditional gender ideologies. Studies integrating measures on paid and unpaid work, and how the division between them is perceived, are rare. One exception, however, is a study by Voydanoff and Donnelly (1999). They find that mother's and father's who perceive the division of paid and unpaid work as

unfair to self express lower levels of marital quality, i.e. less marital happiness and more marital disagreements. Paid work hours per se are not associated with marital quality. Household chores hours, however, are associated with marital disagreement for men and marital happiness for women. When perceived unfairness is controlled for, however, the latter association ceases.

In this paper we aim at studying the effect of consistency regarding gender role attitudes and gender division of labor on the risk for divorce and separation. We hypothesize that divorce risks are relatively low for women and men whose gender ideology is in accordance with how workload, paid and unpaid work, is divided between them and their spouse/partner. If there is inconsistency between gender role attitudes and the gender division of labor, we expect divorce risks to be higher in general whereas consistency should generally increase union stability. Furthermore, however, we expect the magnitude of these associations to vary by gender. We expect *consistent egalitarian* women, i.e. women holding egalitarian gender role attitudes living in a union with relatively egalitarian gender division of work, to exhibit relatively lower risks of partnership break-up than corresponding men. The argument is that women preferring egalitarian unions are less likely to find a new (male) partner holding egalitarian gender role attitudes. For the same reason we expect to find relatively lower dissolution risks among *consistent traditional* men compared to corresponding women. Inconsistency between attitudes and actual behaviour is likely to increase the risk of divorce/separation in general. However, we are inclined to believe that this is less the case for women with traditional attitudes in egalitarian unions and for men with egalitarian attitudes in traditional unions as they gain from the division of labor by doing a smaller share of household chores than they are prepared to do according to their gender role attitudes. These hypotheses are graphically summarized in Figure 1.

THE SWEDISH CONTEXT

In Sweden female labor force participation is high. The combination of paid work and family responsibilities has been facilitated by a number of policy measures, most importantly the parental leave program and public childcare provision. An important aspect of the Swedish policy context is a continuous emphasis on gender equality both in the public sphere and in family life, since the late 1960s. Individual taxation (since 1971), no-fault divorce and the abolition of spousal alimony (since 1974) provided incentives for women's labor-force participation, independently of marital and/or parental status. The parental-leave program (introduced in 1974 and extended several times, most recently in 2002) as well as public childcare provision have facilitated reconciliation of work and family responsibilities for both women and men since the mid-/late 1970s. Also, men's family role has been actively promoted by policy efforts (the parental leave program, in which fathers and mothers have been eligible for leave on equal conditions, since 1974; the introduction in 1980 of the 10 daddy days at the birth of a child which can be used in parallel with the mother using parental leave; reserving one month of the parental leave for fathers in 1995; extending the total amount of parental leave with one additional month reserved for the father in 2002, i.e. two of the total of 13 months with income-related parental benefit are now reserved for fathers; the introduction in 1983 of parents' continued joint custody for children, as a rule in case of separation/divorce, which has been further strengthened in 1998). Thus, egalitarian gender roles of women and men seem to have long-term societal support in Sweden, which is likely to affect gender-role attitudes and probably even behaviour to some extent. In fact, egalitarian gender role attitudes are relatively widespread in Sweden (Svallfors 2006) and Swedish women have a higher labor market participation rate (Jaumotte 2003), are less economically dependent on their husbands (Evertsson and Neramo 2004; Sørensen 1994), and do a smaller

share of household work (Fuwa and Cohen 2007) than women in most other countries. Hence, the Swedish context is ideal for studying the impact of gender equality perceptions on the stability of partnerships (for all, and specifically for parents).

DATA AND METHODS

In this paper, we analyze data extracted from the three waves of the Swedish Young Adult Panel Study (YAPS) designed by professor Eva Bernhardt and conducted in 1999, 2003 and 2009. YAPS is a mail questionnaire survey with the Survey Unit of Statistics Sweden in charge of all field work. It provides data on men and women born in Sweden in 1968, 1972, 1976 and 1980, including a small sample of young women and men (347 respondents) with at least one parent born in either Poland or Turkey. The study is augmented with register data on vital events, currently up to the end of 2009. YAPS has been designed to enable studies, like ours, of the complex relationship between attitudes, behaviour and demographic behavior. It provides information on plans, expectations and attitudes regarding family and working life, including gender-role orientation, histories of childbearing and partnerships, as well as information about current situation and background characteristics.

Our working sample includes women and men living in a co-residential partnership at the 2003 wave of the survey for whom we have information in the 2009 wave. Information on attitudes are extracted from the 1999 wave in one form of the gender equality perception variable, but from the 2003 wave for two other forms (the one with the same structure as that based on the attitudes in 1999, replaced with the same information from 2003 is not displayed in the paper given very similar results), and for all three forms we have information on behaviours from the 2003 wave. The sample includes 1482 persons, i.e. 874 women and 608 men (around 67% of them were living in a cohabiting relationship and 33% in marriage). At a later stage we will also analyze parents; for them our working sample includes 781

individuals (488 women and 293 men). The event of interest is partnership dissolution in the period between wave 2 and 3 (i.e. 2003- 2009). 16% experienced union disruption in the overall sample, and about 12% of the parents (the latter analyses are not presented in this version of the paper). In our exploratory analysis, logistic regression is the tool of analysis. At a later stage we will use discrete time hazards models.

Our main explanatory variables are *gender equality perceptions* (based on information of gender-role attitude measured by the ideal division of earning and caring responsibilities between parents with pre-school aged children at the 1999 wave, and on the actual share of housework in the relationship at the 2003 wave; we also created this variable using all information from the 2003 wave [not displayed in the paper], and in another form based on private-sphere gender attitudes¹ in 2003 combined with the share of housework; in the analysis of parents only this variable also includes information on sharing childcare tasks) and *union type*. Our control variables are the followings: respondent's sex, cohort (age), ethnic background (also that of the couple), childhood family background, whether children in the household, educational attainment (also that of the couple), employment status (also that of the couple), religiosity (also that of the couple).

RESULTS

Descriptive statistics for variables in the analyses are presented in Table 1. A few reflections could be made: As could be expected, female respondents were less likely than male

¹ This is based on respondents answer on two statements, these are: "Household work is the woman's main task" and "Breadwinning is the man's main task". Respondents who strongly disagreed with both of these statements were categorized as 'egalitarian', otherwise as 'non-egalitarian' Combined with the division of housework in the relationship, we have created 4 categories. See Table 1.

respondents to be full-time employed in 2003 whereas female respondents are more likely to have a post-secondary education. Moreover, male and female respondents differ somewhat in their gender-role attitudes and how they perceive the gender division of household labor. Women hold egalitarian attitudes to a higher extent than men do and they perceive the division of domestic tasks in their unions as being slightly more traditional than men do. This is indicated by women more often placing themselves as “ambivalent egalitarian”, irrespective of attitude measure. Regarding other variables, gender differences, as expected, are non-substantial.

In Table 2, results from binary logit regressions on divorce/separation risk (during the period 2003-2009) by consistency/ambivalence of attitudes on the ideal division of work in families with pre-school aged children (in 1999) and the division of household work (in 2003) is displayed for all and for women and men separately. The results for all, i.e. both genders, suggest that consistently egalitarian unions are more stable than all other union types. In other words, respondents holding gender egalitarian attitudes in unions where spouses/partners divide household tasks equally between them, are the least likely to divorce or separate. Unions with all other combinations of gender-role attitudes and division of domestic tasks exhibit higher risks for divorce/separation, although we find significantly higher dissolution risk only for ambivalent egalitarian partnerships. Thus, respondents with a preference for gender equality, living in a union where domestic tasks are traditionally divided between the male and the female partners, exhibit an excessive risk for divorce/separation.

Regarding the other variables in the model, we find results in the expected direction for union type in 2003, family type in childhood and the presence of children in the household in 2003. Marriages are much less likely to end in divorce than cohabitations to end in separation and respondents who experienced the break-up of parents during childhood are much more likely to experience family dissolution themselves, i.e. there seems to be an intergenerational

transmission of divorce/separation. Having a child in the household diminishes disruption risks quite substantially. Moreover, the youngest respondents, 29 years old in 2009, exhibit a higher risk for divorce/separation than older respondents. This is not likely to reflect a cohort effect but rather the “trial-period” of living together which is common for young Swedes. Other conditions controlled for in the model do not seem to be associated with the risk for partnership dissolution, at least not to any significant extent.

These patterns partly seem to differ between men and women. In the last two columns in Table 2 we present the corresponding model for the two genders separately. Results show that having a post-secondary education increases the divorce/separation risk for men but not for women, interestingly. Moreover, there is a clear interaction between gender and economic activity in 2003. Full-time employed women are more likely to divorce/separate than women with part-time work and women outside the labor market. For men the pattern is reversed. We next turn our attention to the gender-role attitudes measured in 1999 and the gender division of domestic work in 2003 variable. Here we contrast those who prefer fathers to take main responsibility for breadwinning and mothers to take main responsibility for child care with those who prefer equal sharing of earning and caring responsibilities, and combine this attitude with information on the division of housework in the respondent’s relationship. The pattern that emerges for this variable is close to what could be expected, given our theoretical discussion. Women holding egalitarian gender-role attitudes, living in a relationship characterized by a traditional division of household work (ambivalent egalitarian), exhibit the highest risk for divorce/separation (significant at the 10% level) whereas women in consistently egalitarian unions are clearly less likely to dissolve their partnership. For men, the pattern is not as intuitive. The quite high risk for divorce/separation in the “ambivalent egalitarian” category is not surprising but we would have expected the risk for dissolution to be higher in the “ambivalent traditional” category. It must be remembered, that most

partnership break-ups are initiated by women and that the high risk for divorce/separation in the “ambivalent egalitarian” category may be caused by the female part not being as content with how domestic tasks are divided as the male part.

We have also tested the impact of an alternative measure of attitudes (Table 3). Here we focus on breadwinning/homemaker attitudes in general and whether it is consistent with the division of housework in the relationship, both these aspects measured in 2003. Results from this analysis are quite similar to those presented above, but we find significantly higher disruption risk in addition to “ambivalent egalitarian” unions also in “consistent traditional” relationships, for the overall sample and for men. This indicates that the association between gender-role attitudes and gender division of work, on the one hand, and the risk of partnership break-up, on the other, is quite robust to type of measure of gender-role attitudes.

As couple homogeneity of different aspects is often seen as important for partnership stability, we have also run models including variables based on information for the couple whenever available (in 2003) instead of the respondent only. Unfortunately, there were no questions asked about the partner’s childhood family type, thus we are confined to use information regarding the respondent only for that aspect. We see in Tables 4 & 5 that couples where both partners’ parents are of Swedish or Scandinavian origin have lower disruption risk both for the overall sample and for the male sample, than other couples. Also, if at least one person in a couple has a post-secondary education, the risk of dissolution is lower than otherwise, and significantly so for the total sample and for the female sample. If both work full-time, the risk of break-up is about half than otherwise in the male sample, but this aspect seem to matter little in the overall and the female samples. Interestingly, both partners being very religious does not influence partnership stability significantly. As for the consistency of attitudes on the ideal division of work in families with pre-school aged children (1999) and the division of housework (2003), we find significantly higher dissolution risk in the

ambivalent egalitarian category for the total sample and for men, compared to the consistent egalitarian category. The pattern is similar but non-significant for the female sample. Addressing the consistency of breadwinning/homemaker attitudes in general (2003) and the gender division of housework, Table 5 also shows significantly higher break-up risk for the ambivalent egalitarian category for the total sample, and for men with traditional views who follow a traditional division of housework in their partnerships. Hence, these findings support the ones found in the models based on individual-level information only, that is having egalitarian views but following a traditional home division of work is accompanied with high risk of partnership break-up, and that men with traditional views sharing housework in a traditional way with their partners also are significantly more likely to experience the dissolution of the relationship than are those with egalitarian views sharing household task more equally.

CONCLUDING DISCUSSION (TO BE WRITTEN) – SEE FIGURE 2

REFERENCES

- Becker, G. S. 1991. *A Treatise on the Family*. Enlarged edition. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bygren, Magnus, Michael Gähler and Magnus Nermo. 2004. "Familj och arbete – vardagsliv i förändring." Pp. 11-55. *Familj och arbete – vardagsliv i förändring*. Magnus Bygren, Michael Gähler and Magnus Nermo, editors. SNS Förlag.
- Cherlin, A. 1981. *Marriage, divorce, remarriage*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Cooke, L. P. 2006. "'Doing' Gender in Context: Household Bargaining and Risk of Divorce in Germany and the United States." *American Journal of Sociology*, 112 (2): 442-472.
- Cotter, D., Hermsen, J. M. and Vanneman, R. 2011. "The End of the Gender Revolution? Gender Role Attitudes from 1977 to 2008." *American Journal of Sociology*, 117 (1): 259-289.
- Evertsson, Marie and Magnus Nermo. 2004. "Dependence within Families and the Household Division of Labor – Comparing Sweden and the United States." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 66(5):1272-86.
- Fuwa, Makiko and Philip N. Cohen. 2007. "Housework and Social Policy." *Social Science Research* 36(2):512-30.
- Gershuny, J. (2000): *Changing Times: Work and Leisure in Postindustrial Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goldscheider, Frances; Oláh, Livia Sz. and Allan Puur (2010): "Reconciling studies of men's gender attitudes and fertility: Response to Westoff and Higgins." *Demographic Research*, Vol. 22, article 8, pp. 189-198.
- Goode, W. J. (1993): *World Changes in Divorce Patterns*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Jaumotte, Florence 2003. "Female Labour Force Participation: Past Trends and Main Determinants in OECD Countries." *OECD Economics Department Working Paper No. 376*. Paris.
- Kalmijn, M., Loeve, A. and D. Manting. 2007. "Income Dynamics in Couples and the Dissolution of Marriage and Cohabitation." *Demography*, 44 (1): 159-179.
- Kaufman, Gayle (2000): "Do gender role attitudes matter? Family formation and dissolution Among traditional and egalitarian men and women." *Journal of Family Issues*, 21: 128-144.
- Kiernan, K. E. (1996). Partnership Behaviour in Europe: Recent Trends and Issues. In D. A. Coleman (ed.), *Europe's Population in the 1990s* (pp. 62–91). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kiernan, K. (2003). Cohabitation and Divorce across Nations and Generations. *CASEpaper 65*. Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion. London: London School of Economics.
- Lyngstad, T. H. and M. Jalovaara. 2010. "A review of the antecedents of union dissolution." *Demographic Research*, 23 (Article 10): 257-292.

- Oláh, Livia (2001): Gender and family stability: Dissolution of the first parental union in Sweden and Hungary." *Demographic Research*, 2001, Vol. 4, article 2, pp. 27-96.
- Oláh, Livia Sz. and Eva M. Bernhardt (2008): "Sweden: Combining childbearing and gender equality." *Demographic Research, Special Collection 7: Childbearing Trends and Policies in Europe*, edited by Tomas Frejka et al., Vol. 19, article 28, pp. 1105-1144. <http://www.demographic-research.org/>
- Oppenheimer, V. K. (1994). "Women's rising employment and the future of the family in industrial societies." *Population and Development Review*, 20, 293-342.
- Poortman, A-R. 2005: "Women's Work and Divorce: A Matter of Anticipation? A Research Note." *European Sociological Review*, 21 (3): 301-309.
- Rogers, Stacy J. and Paul R. Amato (2000): "Have changes in gender relations affected marital quality?" *Social Forces*, 79 (2): 731-753.
- Sayer, Liana C. (2005): "Gender, time and inequality: Trends in women's and men's paid work, unpaid work and free time." *Social Forces*, 84 (1): 285-303.
- Shelton, Beth Anne and Daphne John (1996): "The division of household labor." *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 22, pp. 299-322.
- Sørensen, Annemette. 1994. "Women's Economic Risk and the Economic Position of Single Mothers." *European Sociological Review* 10(2):173-88.
- Statistics Sweden (2007a): *Children and their Families 2006*. Statistics Sweden.
- Statistics Sweden (2007b): *Description of the Population in Sweden 2006*. Statistics Sweden.
- Statistics Sweden (2010): *Statistical Yearbook of Sweden 2010*. Statistics Sweden.
- Stevens, Daphne; Kiger, Gary and Pamela J. Riley (2001): "Working hard and hardly working: Domestic labor and marital satisfaction among dual-earner couples." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63 (2): 514-526.
- Svallfors, Stefan. (2006). *The Moral Economy of Class – Class and Attitudes in Comparative Perspective*. Stanford University Press.
- Thompson, Linda (1991). "Family work: Women's sense of fairness" *Journal of Family Issues*, 12 (2): 181-196.
- Thornton, A., & Young-de Marco, L. (2001). Four Decades of Trends in Attitudes toward Family Issues in the United States: The 1960s through the 1990s. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63, 1009-1037.
- Voydanoff, Patricia and Brenda W. Donnelly (1999): "The intersection of time in activities and perceived unfairness in relations to psychological distress and marital quality." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61 (3): 739-751.

TABLES

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for variables in the analyses.

	All (n)	Percent	Women (n)	Percent	Men (n)	Percent
Gender						
Man	608	41.0				
Woman	874	59.0				
Cohort (age in 2009)						
1968 (41)	400	27.0	214	24.5	186	30.6
1972 (37)	462	31.2	282	32.3	180	29.6
1976 (33)	405	27.3	245	28.0	160	26.3
1980 (29)	215	14.5	133	15.2	82	13.5
Ethnic background						
Two Swedish-born parents	1,318	88.9	774	88.6	544	89.5
Polish-born parent	109	7.4	68	7.8	41	6.7
Turkish-born parent	55	3.7	32	3.7	23	3.8
Family type in childhood						
Other	1,189	80.2	696	79.6	493	81.1
Parents divorced	293	19.8	178	20.4	115	18.9
Education						
Other	1,098	74.1	626	71.6	472	77.6
Post-secondary	384	25.9	248	28.4	136	22.4
Religiosity						
Very religious	82	5.5	55	6.3	27	4.4
Other	1,400	94.5	819	93.7	581	95.6
Economic activity in 2003						
Full-time work	812	54.8	341	39.0	471	77.5
Part-time work	159	10.7	140	16.0	19	3.1
Other	511	34.5	393	45.0	118	19.4
Union type in 2003						
Cohabitation	992	66.9	575	65.8	417	68.6
Marriage	490	33.1	299	34.2	191	31.4
Consistency of attitudes (1999) on ideal division of work in families with pre-school aged children & the division of housework (2003)						
Consistent egalitarian (egalitarian/egalitarian)	629	42.4	375	42.9	254	41.8
Consistent traditional (traditional/traditional)	240	16.2	141	16.1	99	16.3
Ambivalent egalitarian (egalitarian/traditional)	412	27.8	266	30.4	146	24.0
Ambivalent traditional (traditional/egalitarian)	201	13.6	92	10.5	109	17.9
Consistency of breadwinning/homemaker attitudes (2003) & the division of housework (2003)						
Consistent egalitarian (egalitarian/egalitarian)	577	38.9	354	40.5	223	36.7
Consistent traditional (traditional/traditional)	297	20.0	151	17.3	146	24.0
Ambivalent egalitarian (egalitarian/traditional)	355	24.0	256	29.3	99	16.3
Ambivalent traditional (traditional/egalitarian)	253	17.1	113	12.9	140	23.0

Child in the household in 2003						
Other	701	47.3	386	44.2	315	51.8
Child in the household	781	52.7	488	55.8	293	48.2
Ethnic background (couple)						
Both with Swedish-/ Nordic-born parents	1204	81.2	708	81.0	496	81.6
Other	278	18.8	166	19.0	112	18.4
Education (couple)						
Other	936	63.2	563	64.4	373	61.3
At least one post-secondary	546	36.8	311	35.6	235	38.7
Religiosity (couple)						
Both very religious	54	3.7	36	4.1	18	3.0
Other	1428	96.3	838	95.9	590	97.0
Economic activity in 2003 (couple)						
Other	1036	69.9	614	70.2	422	69.4
Both in full-time work	446	30.1	260	29.8	186	30.6
Divorce/separation experience						
Yes	239	16.1	139	15.9	100	16.4
No	1,243	83.9	735	84.1	508	83.6
Total	1,482	100.0	874	100.0	608	100.0

Table 2. Consistency/ambivalence of attitudes (1999) on the ideal division of work in families with pre-school aged children, and division of household work (2003) and the risk for partnership break-up (2003-2009). Binary Logistic Regression (Odds Ratios).

	<i>All</i>	<i>Women</i>	<i>Men</i>
Consistency of attitudes (1999) on ideal division of work in families with pre-school aged children & the division of housework (2003)			
Consistent egalitarian (egalitarian/egalitarian)	1	1	1
Consistent traditional (traditional/traditional)	1.40	1.33	1.67
Ambivalent egalitarian (egalitarian/traditional)	1.79***	1.53†	2.66***
Ambivalent traditional (traditional/egalitarian)	1.29	1.32	1.26
Gender			
Male	1	–	–
Female	1.00	–	–
Cohort (age in 2009)			
1968 (41)	1	1	1
1972 (37)	0.78	1.06	0.49*
1976 (33)	0.80	1.10	0.52†
1980 (29)	1.56†	1.58	1.47
Ethnic background			
Two Swedish-born parents	1	1	1
Polish-born parent	1.21	0.84	1.91
Turkish-born parent	1.55	1.49	1.41
Family type in childhood			
Other	1	1	1
Parents divorced	1.56**	1.62*	1.49
Education			
Other	1	1	1
Post-secondary	1.01	0.70	1.61†
Religiosity			
Very religious	1	1	1
Other	1.13	1.05	1.08
Economic activity in 2003			
Full-time work	1	1	1
Part-time work	0.83	0.58†	1.92
Other	1.01	0.73	1.73*
Union type in 2003			
Cohabitation	1	1	1
Marriage	0.55***	0.69	0.35***
Child in the household in 2003			
Other	1	1	1
Child in the household	0.61**	0.63†	0.73
<i>Pseudo R²</i>	<i>0.05</i>	<i>0.05</i>	<i>0.10</i>
<i>N</i>	<i>1,482</i>	<i>874</i>	<i>608</i>

*** $p \leq 0.001$, ** $p \leq 0.01$, * $p \leq 0.05$, † $p \leq 0.10$

Table 3. Consistency/ambivalence regarding breadwinning/homemaker attitudes (2003) and gender division of household work (2003) and the risk for partnership break-up (2003-2009). Binary Logistic Regression (Odds Ratios).

	<i>All</i>	<i>Women</i>	<i>Men</i>
Consistency of breadwinning/homemaker attitudes (2003) & the division of housework (2003)			
Consistent egalitarian (egalitarian/egalitarian)	1	1	1
Consistent traditional (traditional/traditional)	1.71**	1.23	2.90***
Ambivalent egalitarian (egalitarian/traditional)	1.72***	1.56†	2.36**
Ambivalent traditional (traditional/egalitarian)	1.35	1.17	1.66
Gender			
Male	1	–	–
Female	1.01	–	–
Cohort (age in 2009)			
1968 (41)	1	1	1
1972 (37)	0.78	1.07	0.50*
1976 (33)	0.81	1.13	0.53†
1980 (29)	1.50	1.56	1.38
Ethnic background			
Two Swedish-born parents	1	1	1
Polish-born parent	1.20	0.85	1.94
Turkish-born parent	1.45	1.44	1.22
Family type in childhood			
Other	1	1	1
Parents divorced	1.57**	1.61*	1.50
Education			
Other	1	1	1
Post-secondary	1.03	0.68	1.73†
Religiosity			
Very religious	1	1	1
Other	1.17	1.04	1.20
Economic activity in 2003			
Full-time work	1	1	1
Part-time work	0.83	0.58†	2.03
Other	1.01	0.73	1.73*
Union type in 2003			
Cohabitation	1	1	1
Marriage	0.54***	0.69	0.35***
Child in the household in 2003			
Other	1	1	1
Child in the household	0.60**	0.64†	0.68
<i>Pseudo R²</i>	<i>0.05</i>	<i>0.05</i>	<i>0.10</i>
<i>N</i>	<i>1,482</i>	<i>874</i>	<i>608</i>

*** $P \leq 0.001$, ** $P \leq 0.01$, * $P \leq 0.05$, † $P \leq 0.10$

FIGURES

Figure 1. Model for consistency/ambivalence regarding gender role attitudes, gender division of work and risk for partnership break-up, by gender.

	Gender role attitudes			
Gender division of work	<i>Women</i>		<i>Men</i>	
	Egalitarian	Traditional	Egalitarian	Traditional
Traditional	+	(-)	(+)	-
Egalitarian	-	(+)	(-)	+

Figure 2. Findings - consistency/ambivalence regarding gender role attitudes, gender division of work and risk for partnership break-up, by gender (based on Table 3)

	Gender role attitudes			
Gender division of work	<i>Women</i>		<i>Men</i>	
	Egalitarian	Traditional	Egalitarian	Traditional
Traditional	+	(+)	+	+
Egalitarian	(-)	(+)	(-)	(+)

Table 4. Consistency/ambivalence of attitudes (1999) on the ideal division of work in families with pre-school aged children, and division of household work (2003) and the risk for partnership break-up (2003-2009), taking into account couple homogeneity. Binary Logistic Regression (Odds Ratios).

	<i>All</i>	<i>Women</i>	<i>Men</i>
Consistency of attitudes (1999) on ideal division of work in families with pre-school child & the division of housework (2003)			
Consistent egalitarian (egalitarian/egalitarian)	1	1	1
Consistent traditional (traditional/traditional)	1.16	1.21	1.14
Ambivalent egalitarian (egalitarian/traditional)	1.51*	1.34	1.96*
Ambivalent traditional (traditional/egalitarian)	1.21	1.28	1.20
Gender			
Male	1	–	–
Female	0.99	–	–
Cohort (age in 2009)			
1968 (41)	1	1	1
1972 (37)	0.72	1.02	0.43*
1976 (33)	0.76	1.04	0.51†
1980 (29)	1.29	1.45	1.09
Ethnic background (couple)			
Both with Swedish-/ Nordic-born parents	1	1	1
Other	1.72***	1.31	2.46***
Family type in childhood			
Other	1	1	1
Parents divorced	1.48*	1.54*	1.35
Education (couple)			
Other	1	1	1
At least one post-secondary	0.69*	0.62*	0.79
Religiosity (couple)			
Both very religious	1	1	1
Other	1.04	1.17	0.74
Economic activity in 2003 (couple)			
Other	1	1	1
Both Full-time work	0.81	1.06	0.53*
Union type in 2003			
Cohabitation	1	1	1
Marriage	0.56***	0.70	0.36***
Child in the household in 2003			
Other	1	1	1
Child in the household	0.58***	0.57*	0.61†
<i>Pseudo R²</i>	0.06	0.05	0.12
<i>N</i>	1,482	874	608

*** $p \leq 0.001$, ** $p \leq 0.01$, * $p \leq 0.05$, † $p \leq 0.10$

Table 5. Consistency/ambivalence regarding breadwinning/homemaker attitudes (2003) and gender division of household work (2003) and the risk for partnership break-up (2003-2009), taking into account couple homogeneity. Binary Logistic Regression (Odds Ratios).

	<i>All</i>	<i>Women</i>	<i>Men</i>
Consistency of breadwinning/homemaker attitudes (2003) & the division of housework (2003)			
Consistent egalitarian (egalitarian/egalitarian)	1	1	1
Consistent traditional (traditional/traditional)	1.41	1.09	2.01*
Ambivalent egalitarian (egalitarian/traditional)	1.47*	1.40	1.75
Ambivalent traditional (traditional/egalitarian)	1.30	1.17	1.61
Gender			
Male	1	–	–
Female	1.00	–	–
Cohort (age in 2009)			
1968 (41)	1	1	1
1972 (37)	0.72	1.03	0.42*
1976 (33)	0.76	1.07	0.49*
1980 (29)	1.24	1.43	0.99
Ethnic background (couple)			
Both with Swedish-/ Nordic born parents	1	1	1
Other	1.70***	1.31	2.44***
Family type in childhood			
Other	1	1	1
Parents divorced	1.49*	1.54*	1.37
Education (couple)			
Other	1	1	1
At least one post-secondary	0.69*	0.61*	0.82
Religiosity (couple)			
Both very religious	1	1	1
Other	1.12	1.15	0.83
Economic activity in 2003			
Other	1	1	1
Both Full-time work	0.80	1.06	0.51*
Union type in 2003			
Cohabitation	1	1	1
Marriage	0.55***	0.70	0.35***
Child in the household in 2003			
Other	1	1	1
Child in the household	0.57***	0.59*	0.57†
<i>Pseudo R</i> ²	0.06	0.05	0.12
<i>N</i>	1,482	874	608

*** $p \leq 0.001$, ** $p \leq 0.01$, * $p \leq 0.05$, † $p \leq 0.10$