(Re)Producing Gender: Does What Parents Say and Do Matter?*

Vanessa R. Wight

Department of Sociology

University of Maryland

*This paper is incomplete. Please do not cite without author's permission.

"Are parents perpetuating the chore wars?" asked a recent headline in the *Wall Street Journal* (Shellenbarger, 2006). Reporting on the results from a nationwide study documenting differences between girls and boys in the types of chores performed and the likelihood of being compensated for their work, Shellenbarger speculates that the way parents divvy up housework to children may perpetuate a longstanding family battle over the unequal distribution of housework for generations to come. Her question is provocative and the underlying social process for which it argues, i.e., parents transmit gendered behavior to children, fits observed patterns of housework specialization among adult women and men today (Bianchi, Milkie, Sayer, & Robinson, 2000; Bianchi & Raley, 2005; Sayer, 2005; Sayer, Cohen, & Casper, 2004).

Most of the literature addressing the persistence of housework specialization argues that specialization remains because it is either an efficient way to maximize household production and utility (Becker, 1991) or it reflects power differentials within the family (Blood & Wolfe, 1960). Therefore, as long as we find inequities in the labor market, we will find evidence of them in the home. However, women have made considerable gains in the labor market (Toossi, 2002)—gains that portend a shift toward greater gender egalitarianism. Thus, we might expect the unequal distribution of unpaid work within families to shift as well. There is evidence of a leveling between women and men in the types and amount of housework performed. However, despite this trend, the housework contributions of men have slowed in recent years, even amidst women's increasing presence in the labor market (Bianchi, Robinson, & Milkie, 2006).

Why might this be the case? One answer may be that housework tasks and specialization are tacit expressions of gender—gender is in our everyday practices and social interaction (West & Zimmerman, 1987). Thus, the way we negotiate housework fulfills our assumptions about the "appropriate" roles for women and men. In short, we "do gender" (West & Zimmerman, 1987).

This argument suggests that gender is more than just a static designation that helps us identify and distinguish women from men. Rather, gender is a socially-constructed process and is defined by the act of doing—it is part of our everyday practices (such as housework behavior). But this view of gender also implies that by "doing gender" differently, women and men can redefine their roles (and subsequent distribution of work) within the home and the labor market. As Lorber and Farrell (1991) note, because we "do gender" to maintain our membership within our respective social status (i.e., because we are active participants in creating and expressing our gender), "the seeds of change are ever present" (p. 9). Thus, questions of whether parents teach and transmit gender through their modeling of gender-stereotypical housework or expressed gender-role attitudes becomes an important site of analysis, but one that has received relatively little attention.

Why do we care whether parents perpetuate gendered-behavior? Family arrangements where women continue to shoulder a majority of the unpaid labor arguably retards overall progress toward gender equality, and puts women at a competitive disadvantage to men in the labor market. As Joan Williams (2000) argues, anyone who spends a significant amount of time in unpaid family care cannot simultaneously perform as an "ideal" worker, such as working full time and overtime without interruptions. In short, the labor market rewards individuals who can operate in the marketplace as unencumbered laborers (Crittenden, 2001; Waldfogel, 1998) and gender specialization within the home largely impedes women's ability to exercise such unfettered ties to the labor market. Although childcare, more than housework, impedes women's ability to perform as this "ideal worker," housework specialization within the home nonetheless reinforces a traditional model of family roles that places women at a competitive disadvantage to men in the labor market. Therefore, in order to understand why the progress toward gender equality has fallen short of reaching actual equality, it is imperative to ask ourselves why, in spite of women's widespread gains in the labor market, changes within the home have come more slowly?

If we think, as Shellenbarger (2006) suggests, that gender specialization in the home is slow to change because parents continue to model gender stereotypical behavior and/or espouse gender stereotypical attitudes, and children learn this behavior through observation, then the parental transmission of gender norms and behavior become an important locus of study—especially if the goal is social change toward less gender differentiated behavior in the home and market place. Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to assess the intergenerational transmission of gender from parents to children. This research is important because it adds to our understanding of how gendered behavior is learned and maintained within society. With this knowledge, we can begin to understand how to dismantle what largely remains a system of unequal relations between women and men.

In order to assess the transmission of gender, this paper will describe the relationship between sources of parental influence such as parents' housework behavior, gender-role attitudes, and mother's employment status, and children's gendered behavior and attitudes as adults. However, much of the research on the basic formation of orientations toward gender has argued against socialization, positing that these models are static, inflexible to life course changes, and are problematic at times of wide-scale social change when beliefs and orientations may diverge from one generation to the next. Thus, the literature in this area has generally focused on one of three competing explanations: 1) parents socialize children into gendered roles; 2) parents transmit access to social, cultural, and economic resources, which account for children's gendered outcomes; or 3) children's own adult circumstances, such as marital or parental status, explain their adult gendered behavior and attitudes. Therefore, using the National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH), this paper will expand what we know about the acquisition of gender by assessing the relative importance of each of these mechanisms with a particular focus on whether what parents say and do does affect children's own gendered behavior and attitudes, all things equal. In short, this paper

takes a first step in sorting out whether the gender climate in which children are raised is an important source of influence associated with how children eventually regard the roles of women and men and negotiate housework as adults.

Historically, longitudinal data on parents' and children's subsequent behavior in adulthood, which is necessary for such an examination, has been limited. However, recent release of the NSFH-3, the third wave of panel data measuring multiple aspects of American family life, provides detailed data on the housework behavior of parents (both main respondents and spouses or partners), and the housework behavior of the parents' children who aged into early adulthood by the third wave of data collection. These data also provide measures of parents' gender-role attitudes across children's lives and the attitudes of children in adulthood. In addition, the data include other factors of parental influence such as measures of maternal employment, as well as detailed indicators of parents social status and children's own adult contemporaneous characteristics, which are generally heralded as the main factors responsible for gendered housework behavior and gender ideology. Therefore we are now equipped to examine in somewhat greater detail the extent to which the family is the proving ground for early ideas about gender. How parents teach and transmit ideas about gender to children, such as modeling gender-role behavior and attitudes are important to understanding how gender dichotomies remain and unequal relations between women and men endure.

Only a few studies have linked parental housework and/or attitudes to children's later adult housework behavior. Two of these studies found evidence that parents are important agents in the development of children's gendered behavior and attitudes. For example, evidence from qualitative interviews indicated that children generally divide the work in their own family in the same way as their parents (Thrall, 1978). In a recent attempt to more rigorously test Thrall's (1978) finding, Cunningham (2001b), using a locally drawn Detroit-area sample of white mothers and children,

found that the division of housework among parents was significantly associated with a son's relative contribution to female-typed housework in adulthood. Parental housework behavior, however, was not significantly associated with a daughter's housework in adulthood. Furthermore, in a related study, Cunningham (2001a) found that more gender egalitarian attitudes and division of housework among mothers were associated with more gender egalitarian attitudes and notions of the ideal division of housework among both adult daughters and sons.

In short, these findings suggest that parental behaviors and attitudes early in the life course have a long-term effect on children's allocation of household labor later in adulthood. Thrall's (1978) results, which were based on a single open-ended retrospective question asked 30 years later, make the reliability of these results questionable. Cunningham's work, on the other hand, which is based on a locally drawn Detroit-area sample of white mothers and children, provides some of the best research to date on whether parental behavior has a lasting effect on children's later adult outcomes. However, none of these studies on the transmission of housework behavior and gender-role attitudes from parents to children has been based on a nationally representative sample of parents and children that includes reports of both spouses on a wide range of housework tasks. These studies have also paid less attention to the relative contribution of other competing mechanisms in explaining this process.

The central question addressed in this paper is do gender egalitarian parents produce gender egalitarian children or, conversely, do parents who maintain more rigid gender roles produce children with similar notions of gender? Specifically, I ask:

1) To what extent does parental socialization in the form of parents' housework behavior and gender-role attitudes explain children's adult housework behavior and attitudes?

2) To what extend what extend does a parent's social status, such as their income, education, religion, ethnic and racial background, and geographic location explain children's adult gendered behavior and attitudes?
3) To what extent do a child's own adult contemporaneous circumstances, such as their educational attainment, marital status, parental status, etc. explain their gendered behavior and attitudes?
4) Is there a direct relationship between parents' gendered behavior and attitudes and children's adult gendered behavior and attitudes, all things equal?

The National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH) is well suited for examining these questions. With the recent release of its third wave, researchers now have the capability to assess the relationship between childhood experiences captured in parental interviews at Wave 1 (1987–1988) when focal children were age 5–18 and Wave 2 (1992–1994) when children were age 10–23, and adult housework and attitudinal outcomes of focal children at Wave 3 (2001–2003) when children were age 18–34 (see Table 1.1).

[Table 1.1 about here]

These data allow the first longitudinal assessment, using nationally representative data, on how parents' time doing housework and exposure to parents with specific gender-role attitudes is related to gender norms and behavior in adulthood. For example, the first wave of data in the NSFH asks main respondents and spouses or partners to estimate the number of hours per week that they, their spouses, and other household member under age 19 spend on nine household tasks (preparing meals, washing dishes, cleaning house, outdoor tasks, shopping, washing/ironing, paying bills, auto maintenance, driving). The third wave of data (collected approximately 15 years later) follows both the main respondents, their partners, and their focal children who are now adults and asks the same questions on time spent in nine household tasks. Furthermore, these data provide a series of

comparable measures across all three waves of data that allow one to measure parents' gender attitudes and the gender attitudes of the adult focal children. Thus, these data provide researchers with detailed measures of the "gender regime" under which children were raised from multiple time points and, for the focal children, from multiple stages in the life course—childhood and adulthood. In short, while the causal relationship between parents' behavior and children's adult behavior, even with panel data, is difficult to establish, these are the best data with which to describe and begin to sort out questions of parental influence and the determinants of children's gendered behavior as adults. In sum, they are the best data we have to address Shellenbarger's (2006) original question: Are parents perpetuating the longstanding battle over the unequal distribution of unpaid labor in the household?

Examining the mechanisms by which parental housework behavior and attitudes are associated with adult children's outcomes is important for a number of reasons. First, understanding the contribution that parents gendered norms and behavior have on children's subsequent behavior in adulthood is important to understanding how gender egalitarianism is produced (or not produced) in the home—a topic on which we have limited knowledge because the data requirements are substantial (i.e., longitudinal data on two generations).

Second, understanding how gendered behavior and attitudes are learned and adopted in children's early home environment has wider implications for gender inequality later in life. Gender inequality in the home negatively affects women's labor force outcomes such as their labor force participation, opportunities, and earnings (Blau, 1998; Budig & England, 2001; Waldfogel, 1998). Furthermore, the persistence of gender specialization, where women assume a disproportionate share of the housework and caregiving can be a risky endeavor today given high rates of marital dissolution (Bianchi, Subaiya, & Kahn, 1999).

Finally, research suggests that time spent doing housework affects well-being. Housework is depressing (Glass & Fujimoto, 1994)! An unequal distribution of housework and a lack of sharing in the drudgery on the part of a husband increases levels of depression among wives (Ross, Mirowsky, & Huber, 1983).

As dual earning continues to increase in prevalence and become the common earning arrangement among couples, both women and men will face challenges to balancing work and family. Women, in particular, will continue to face a comparative disadvantage in the labor market if they manage the majority of unpaid family work by cutting back their paid work. Thus, it is important to know how gender-role attitudes and the gendered division of housework, a symbolic enactment of gender roles, are produced and transmitted in adults' early home environment and whether it affects children's gendered outcomes in adulthood. With this knowledge we are better equipped to understand the reproduction of gendered norms and behavior across families and implement solutions that move us toward more egalitarian roles for women and men.

Data and Methods

This section will provide a more concise description of the data, analytical sample, measures, and analysis plan.

Preliminary Results

Preliminary results suggest that factors from all three mechanisms are significantly associated with children's adult gendered behavior and attitudes. Yet, even when important indicators of parents status and children's own contemporaneous circumstances are taken into consideration, there still appears to be a direct and enduring association between parent's gendered behavior and attitudes and children's adult gendered behavior and attitudes. Tables 2–6 show descriptive statistics on a

sample of 1,844 adult focal children at the third wave of the NSFH. Tables 7–10 show preliminary results from OLS regression predicting adult daughters' and sons' gender ideology and housework time (respectively) given key indicators of parental socialization, social status, and children's adult characteristics.

Although not yet shown, this paper will also examine the relative importance of the three competing mechanisms on a restricted sample of focal children who were raised by two parents and who are themselves living in a partnership. I propose to analyze this subgroup because both the mother and father were present when the adult focal children were young. This allows me to assess whether these children observed parents negotiating housework in line with traditional gender roles more finely than the analysis above, which includes single mothers. In addition, given that within this sample adult focal children have a partner of the opposite sex with which they can negotiate the terms of housework according to how view the roles of women and men, they are in the best position to demonstrate (or not) gender stereotypical behavior. Thus, these focal children are the most refined sample from which to assess the role of parents' gendered behavior in predicting the gendered behavior of their adult children.

References

Becker, G. (1991). *Treatise on the Family*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bianchi, S. M., Milkie, M. A., Sayer, L. C., & Robinson, J. P. (2000). Is Anyone Doing the Housework? Trends in the Gender Division of Household Labor. *Social Forces, 79*(1), 191-228.

Bianchi, S. M., & Raley, S. B. (2005). Time Allocation in Families. In S. M. Bianchi, L. M. Casper & R. B. King (Eds.), *Work, Family, Health, and Well-Being* (pp. 21-42). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bianchi, S. M., Robinson, J. P., & Milkie, M. A. (2006). *Changing Rhythms of American Family Life*. New York: Russell Sage.

Bianchi, S. M., Subaiya, L., & Kahn, J. R. (1999). The Gender Gap in the Economic Well-Being of Nonresident Fathers and Custodial Mothers. *Demography, 36*(2), 195-203.

Blau, F. D. (1998). Trends in the Well-Being of American Women, 1970-1995. *Journal of Economic Literature, 36*(1), 112-165.

Blood, R. O., & Wolfe, D. W. (1960). *Husbands and Wives: The Dynamics of Married Living*. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.

Budig, M. J., & England, P. (2001). The Wage Penalty for Motherhood. *American Sociological Review, 66*, 204-225.

Crittenden, A. (2001). *The price of motherhood: Why the most important job in the world is still the least valued*. New York: Owl Books.

Cunningham, M. (2001a). The Influence of Parental Attitudes and Behaviors on Children's Attitudes toward Gender and Household Labor in Early Adulthood. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 63*, 111-122.

Cunningham, M. (2001b). Parental Influences on the Gendered Division of Housework. *American Sociological Review, 66*(2), 184-203.

Glass, J., & Fujimoto, T. (1994). Housework, paid work, and depression among husbands and wives. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 35*(2), 179-191.

Lorber, J., & Farrell, S. A. (Eds.). (1991). *The Social Construction of Gender*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Ross, C. E., Mirowsky, J., & Huber, J. (1983). Dividing work, sharing work, and in-between: Marriage patterns and depression. *American Sociological Review, 47*, 198-211.

Sayer, L. 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.

Sayer, L. C., Cohen, P. N., & Casper, L. M. (2004). *Women, Men, and Work*. Washington, DC: Population Reference Bureau.

Shellenbarger, S. (2006). Boys Mow Lawns, Girls Do Dishes: Are Parents Perpetuating the Chore Wars? *The Wall Street Journal,* p. D1.

Thrall, C. A. (1978). Who Does What: Role Stereotypy, Children's Work, and Continuity between Generations in the Household Division of Labor. *Human Relations, 31*(3), 249-265.

Toossi, M. (2002). A century of change: The U.S. labor force, 1950-2000. *Monthly Labor Review, May 2002*, 15-28.

Waldfogel, J. (1998). Understanding the "family gap" in pay for women with children. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives, 12*(1), 137.

West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing Gender. *Gender & Society, 1*(2), 125-151.

Williams, J. (2000). *Unbending Gender: Why Family and Work Conflict and What To Do About It*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Table 1.1. Age of Focal Children in NSFH by Year of Data Collection

Age of Children at NSFH-1 1987-1988	Age of Children at NSFH-2 1992-1994	Age of Children at NSFH-3 2001-2003
5–12	10–17	18–25
13–18	18–23	26–31

Table 2. Average Gender-Role Attitudes of Adult Focal Children at Wave 3*

	Adult Daughters	Adult Sons
Much better if man earns living; woman stays home	3.79	3.46
Preschool children suffer when mother is employed	3.42	3.15
If both spouses work they should share housework equally**	3.91	3.70
Overall gender ideology score	11.12	10.31
Total (N)	(1,002)	(842)

*Based on a five-point scale where 1 equals "strongly agree" and 5 equals "strongly disagree."

**This question was reverse-coded so that a higher score indicates a more gender-egalitarian attitude.

Table 3. Focal Children's Average Hours per Week in Housework Tasks and Percentage of Total Housework Spent on Female-Typed Tasks (Wave 3)

	Adult Daughters	Adult Sons
Total (N)	(1,002)	(842)
Focal Children's Housework at Wave 3		
Prepare meals	5.59	3.37
Wash dishes	4.67	2.79
Clean house	6.12	3.27
Outdoor chores	1.25	3.68
Shop for groceries	2.51	1.60
Clothes care (wash, iron, mend)	3.98	2.05
Pay bills	1.74	1.61
Maintain automobiles	0.40	1.80
Driving	1.96	1.21
Total housework time (hours per week)	28.22	21.36
% of housework time on female-typed tasks	82.12	65.13

Table 4. Measures of Mothers' Gender Ideology and Weekly Housework Hours (Wave 1)

	Adult Daughters	Adult Sons
Total (N)	(1,002)	(842)
Mother's Gender Ideology at Wave 1		
Much better if man earns living; woman stays home	2.69	2.84
Preschool children suffer when mother is employed	2.89	2.85
If both spouses work they should share housework equally	4.04	4.08
Overall average gender ideology score	9.62	9.77
Mother's Housework at Wave 1		
Prepare meals	10.12	10.10
Wash dishes	5.51	6.46
Clean house	8.49	8.50
Outdoor chores	1.83	2.12
Shop for groceries	3.41	3.07
Clothes care (wash, iron, mend)	5.03	4.61
Pay bills	2.10	1.79
Maintain automobiles	0.41	0.26
Driving	3.30	2.66
Total housework time (hours per week)	40.19	39.56
% of housework time on female-typed tasks	78.06	79.55
Maternal Employment at Wave 1		
% employed	64.79	64.35

Table 5. Means and Percentage Distributions on Mothers' Wave 1 Characteristics

	Adult Daughters	Adult Sons
Total (N)	(1,002)	(842)
Mean age	36.89	36.61
White, non-Hispanic	0.60	0.62
Black, non-Hispanic	0.15	0.11
Other	0.25	0.28
College degree or more	0.16	0.21
Married/cohabiting	0.74	0.80
Catholic	0.33	0.28
Protestant (fundamentalist)	0.31	0.29
Protestant (nonfundamentalist)	0.23	0.28
Other	0.03	0.06
No religious affiliation	0.09	0.10
Northeast	0.16	0.16
North central	0.25	0.30
South	0.37	0.31
West	0.22	0.23
Living in an urban area	0.74	0.74

Table 6. Means and Percentage Distribution of Focal Children's Adult Characteristics

	Adult Daughters	Adult Sons
Total (N)	(1,002)	(842)
Age 18 to 24	0.40	0.44
Age 25 and older	0.60	0.56
Married	0.40	0.27
Cohabiting	0.16	0.13
Single	0.45	0.60
Children under age 19 present	0.47	0.26
Children under age 5 present	0.35	0.19
College degree or more	0.23	0.18
Employed[c]	0.75	0.82
Hours worked	27.65	35.28
Raised with Two Adults (151 missing)		

Table 7. OLS Regression of Daughters' Adult Gender Ideology at Wave 3 on Sources of Parental Influence, Social Status Variables, and Focal Children's Adult Characteristics

	Adult Daughters													
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6		Model 7	
	Beta	(SE)	Beta	(SE)	Beta	(SE)	Beta	(SE)	Beta	(SE)	Beta	(SE)	Beta	(SE)
Intercept	9.30 ***		11.38 ***		10.78 ***		9.52 ***		12.76 ***		11.44 ***		10.56 ***	
Adjusted R-squared	0.04		0.01		0.01		0.05		0.03		0.07		0.13	
Sample size (N)														
Sources of Parental Influence														
Mother's gender ideology	0.19 ***						0.16 ***						0.14 ***	
Mother's total housework			-0.01 ***				-0.01 **						0.00 *	
Mother emlpoyed					0.52 ***		0.34 *						0.47 **	
Mothers' Social Status														
Mothers' age									-0.02 *				0.00	
Black, non-Hispanic									0.96 ***				0.74 ***	
Other race/ethnicity									0.08				0.43 *	
College degree or more									0.49 *				-0.09	
Married/cohabiting									-0.05				0.08	
Catholic									-0.41				-0.31	
Protestant (fundamentalist)									-1.08 ***				-1.00 ***	
Protestant (nonfundamentalist)									-0.41				-0.48 #	
Other									-0.83 #				-0.91 *	
North central									-0.19				-0.25	
South									-0.31				-0.15	
West									-0.58 *				-0.38 #	
Living in an urban area									-0.14				-0.17	
Children's Adult Characteristics														
Age 25 and older											-0.44 **		-0.40 *	
Married											-0.58 **		-0.61 ***	
Cohabiting											-0.26		-0.31	
Children under age 19 present											0.17		0.08	
Children under age 5 present											-0.20		-0.11	
College degree or more											0.78 ***		0.71 ***	
Employed											0.43		0.39	
Hours worked											0.00		0.00	
Total housework time											-0.01 **		-0.01 *	

# p <.1 *p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

Omitted categories are adult focal children whose mothers are white, have no religioius affiliation, live in northeast, and who themselves are aged 18-24 and single.

Table 8. OLS Regression of Son's Adult Gender Ideology at Wave 3 on Sources of Parental Influence, Social Status Variables, and Focal Children's Adult Characteristics

	Adult Sons													
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6		Model 7	
	Beta	(SE)	Beta	(SE)	Beta	(SE)	Beta	(SE)	Beta	(SE)	Beta	(SE)	Beta	(SE)
Intercept	8.37 ***		10.36 ***		10.00 ***		8.35 ***		10.88 ***		10.61 ***		8.94 ***	
Adjusted R-squared	0.04		0.00		0.01		0.04		0.01		0.03		0.07	
Sample size (N)														
Sources of Parental Influence														
Mother's gender ideology	0.20 ***						0.18 ***						0.18 ***	
Mother's total housework			0.00				0.00						0.00	
Mother emlpoyed					0.48 **		0.21						0.32 #	
Mothers' Social Status														
Mothers' age									-0.01				0.00	
Black, non-Hispanic									0.481 #				0.33	
Other race/ethnicity									-0.79 ***				-0.59 **	
College degree or more									0.33 #				-0.01	
Married/cohabiting									-0.10				-0.02	
Catholic									0.09				-0.16	
Protestant (fundamentalist)									-0.26				-0.41	
Protestant (nonfundamentalist)									0.14				-0.12	
Other									-0.28				-0.52	
North central									-0.49 *				-0.52 *	
South									-0.38				-0.32	
West									-0.32				-0.28	
Living in an urban area									0.30 #				0.26	
Children's Adult Characteristics														
Age 25 and older											0.14		0.17	
Married											-0.77 ***		-0.91 ***	
Cohabiting											-0.26		-0.38	
Children under age 19 present											-0.04		0.15	
Children under age 5 present											-0.27		-0.35	
College degree or more											0.55 ***		0.40 #	
Employed											-0.24		-0.39	
Hours worked											0.00		0.01	
Total housework time											0.00		0.00	

# p <.1 *p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

Omitted categories are adult focal children whose mothers are white, have no religioius affiliation, live in northeast, and who themselves are aged 18-24 and single.

Table 9. OLS Regression of Daughters' Adult Housework Time at Wave 3 on Sources of Parental Influence, Social Status Variables, and Focal Children's Adult Characteristics

	Adult Daughters													
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6		Model 7	
	Beta	(SE)	Beta	(SE)	Beta	(SE)	Beta	(SE)	Beta	(SE)	Beta	(SE)	Beta	(SE)
Intercept	34.84 ***		25.55 ***		29.03 ***		31.24 ***		15.02 **		34.19 ***		27.92 ***	
Adjusted R-squared	0.00		0.01		0.00		0.01		0.03		0.21		0.22	
Sample size (N)	(1102)		(1002)		(1002)		(1002)		(1002)		(1102)		(1102)	
Sources of Parental Influence														
Mother's gender ideology	-0.69 *						-0.54 #						0.07	
Mother's total housework			0.07 ***				0.06 **						0.06 ***	
Mother emlpoyed					-1.25		-0.53						-0.16	
Mothers' Social Status														
Mothers' age									0.29 **				0.04	
Black, non-Hispanic									-0.30				2.54	
Other race/ethnicity									3.25				1.41	
College degree or more									-6.91 ***				-0.78	
Married/cohabiting									-1.21				-1.46	
Catholic									1.90				-1.69	
Protestant (fundamentalist)									2.67				-0.26	
Protestant (nonfundamentalist)									-1.12				-2.90	
Other									1.53				2.48	
North central									2.96				3.49 #	
South									6.60 **				5.45 **	
West									3.90 #				0.76	
Living in an urban area									-1.28				-1.25	
Children's Adult Characteristics														
Age 25 and older											3.92 *		3.51 *	
Married											2.42		3.26 #	
Cohabiting											2.07		2.47	
Children under age 19 present											11.66 ***		11.79 ***	
Children under age 5 present											4.04 #		3.79 #	
College degree or more											-6.21 ***		-5.65 **	
Employed											-4.96 #		-4.83 #	
Hours worked											-0.03		-0.06	
Gender ideology score											-0.93 **		-0.72 *	

# p <.1 *p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

Omitted categories are adult focal children whose mothers are white, have no religioius affiliation, live in northeast, and who themselves are aged 18-24 and single.

Table10. OLS Regression of Son's Adult Housework Time at Wave 3 on Sources of Parental Influence, Social Status Variables, and Focal Children's Adult Characteristics

	Adult Sons													
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6		Model 7	
	Beta	(SE)	Beta	(SE)	Beta	(SE)	Beta	(SE)	Beta	(SE)	Beta	(SE)	Beta	(SE)
Intercept	26.34 ***		19.46 ***		20.49 ***		23.83 ***		-3.37 ***		19.32 ***		-4.92	
Adjusted R-squared	0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.07		0.03		0.08	
Sample size (N)	(842)		(842)		(842)		(842)		(842)		(842)		(842)	
Sources of Parental Influence														
Mother's gender ideology	-0.51						-0.64 #						-0.03	
Mother's total housework			0.05 #				0.05 #						0.06 *	
Mother emlpoyed					1.36		2.77						2.97 #	
Mothers' Social Status														
Mothers' age									0.53 ***				0.51 ***	
Black, non-Hispanic									10.02 ***				10.52 ***	
Other race/ethnicity									6.40 ***				5.99 **	
College degree or more									-6.45 **				-4.66 *	
Married/cohabiting									-1.79				-1.24	
Catholic									10.12 ***				8.18 **	
Protestant (fundamentalist)									1.78				-0.60	
Protestant (nonfundamentalist)									0.27				-0.83	
Other									4.76				3.65	
North central									3.77				3.56	
South									9.70 ***				9.40 ***	
West									3.22				3.14	
Living in an urban area									-0.64				0.15	
Children's Adult Characteristics														
Age 25 and older											5.18 **		1.58	
Married											-3.35		-2.00	
Cohabiting											-1.85		-1.85	
Children under age 19 present											3.95		3.23	
Children under age 5 present											-2.57		-1.64	
College degree or more											-7.48 ***		-6.14 **	
Employed											-1.81		-3.95	
Hours worked											0.14 #		0.12 #	
Gender ideology score											-0.21		-0.19	

# p <.1 *p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

Omitted categories are adult focal children whose mothers are white, have no religioius affiliation, live in northeast, and who themselves are aged 18-24 and single.