

Factors Associated with Couples' Relative Earning Patterns in 2016

Vanessa Wanner Lang
Bowling Green State University

ABSTRACT

Dual-earning couples are currently the norm in the United States. However, such couples are far from a homogeneous group in terms of the relative income contribution of each partner. To what extent the share of couples where women earn equally to or earn more than their male partners has increased is an important question, which surprisingly little research has investigated, an important oversight given changing union patterns and demographic shifts in the U.S over the past few decades. The goal of this paper is to examine the 2017 Current Population Survey (CPS) to provide a contemporary portrait of couples' relative earning patterns and factors associated with such patterns. Preliminary findings show small but real shifts in the earning patterns of couples. This research will provide a more nuanced understanding of gender equality in the United States.

INTRODUCTION

One of the dramatic changes for U.S. couples in the past several decades has been the decline in male sole-earning partnerships and the increase in dual-earner partnerships (Casper & Bianchi, 2002). According to U.S. Census estimates, the proportion of father sole-earner married couples declined from 70% in 1960 to 31% in 2012 and the proportion of dual-earner married couples increased from 25 % to 60 % during that same period (Pew Research Center, 2015). Starting in the 1980s, dual-earner partnerships have become the norm in the United States (Bond, Thompson, Galinsky, & Prottas 2003; King, Karuntos, Casper, Moen, Davis, Berkman, Kossek, 2012). The reasons for such changes may include several economic and social changes such as the decline in manufacturing jobs in the United States, which has left many men unemployed or underemployed (Albanesi & Aysegul, 2018), the increase in women's education relative to that of men (Buchmann & Diprete, 2006; Gerson, 2010), the increased acceptance and participation of working mothers (Cotter, Hermsen, & Vanneman, 2011) which is associated with women's (both wives' and mothers') attachment to the labor force (Goldin, 2006), and shifts in values toward preferences for egalitarian marriage and partnerships (Bianchi, 2013, 2014; Nock, 2001). These trends for women's employment combined with the decline in men's economic opportunities has in part led to a decline in the traditional bread-winner homemaker model of marriage to the new modal earning pattern of dual-earning unions.

Dual-earner couples do not always mean that partners contribute to their household income equally. In 1970, nearly 90% of were in fact "traditional" where the husbands earned more than the wives (31%) or were sole providers (56%) (Raley et al, 2006). To what extent the share of couples where women earn equally to or earn more than their male partners has increased is an important question, which surprisingly little research has investigated. Using data

from the Current Population Survey (CPS), Raley, Mattingly, and Bianchi (2006) assessed change from 1970 to 2001 in the prevalence of married couples where (a) the wife earned all or the majority of household income (income hypergamy); (b) the husband earned all or the majority of household income (income hypogamy); and (c) the wife's and husband's income contributions are relatively equal (income homogamy). The authors found an increase in dual-earning marriages with equal providers or women as primary or sole providers, and a decline in men as sole providers. Women's advancement in education and husbands being employed less than 35 hours per week were strongly associated with these changes. However, as of 2001, the majority (64%) of all couples had earning arrangements where husbands were either the sole (25%) or majority (39%) provider. In short, although equal providing increased, wives continued to be the secondary provider in the majority of U.S. couples.

Since then, there has been limited research examining earning patterns within couples and what factors are related to such patterns. Yet, there have been a few notable demographic trends in the past fifteen years that make a follow-up examination warranted. First, according to monthly 1994-2017 CPS data, in 2015, Millennials—i.e., those who were born in 1980 or later—became the majority population employed in the labor force (Fry, 2018). As a generation Millennials are delaying marriage (Anderson & Payne, 2016), tend to hold more egalitarian views on traditional gender roles (Donnelly, Twenge, Clark, Shaikh, Beiler-May & Carter, 2016), and have higher levels of advanced degrees than previous generations. The growth of Millennials in the labor force may have increased the prevalence of couples with equal providers (income homogamy).

Second, cohabitation has continued to be a modal path to marriage (Kennedy & Bumpass, 2008; Manning, 2013). It has become a common living arrangement across the life

course (Manning & Stykes, 2015). Due to data limitations, Raley et al. (2006) focused on married couples only. Prior research has shown that cohabiting couples differ from married couples in many aspects of their lives including lower levels of education (Kennedy & Bumpass, 2008), more egalitarian attitudes (Kaufman 2000; Thornton, Axinn, and Xie, 2008) and more egalitarian time allocation in market and nonmarket work (Bianchi, Lesnard, Nazio, & Raley, 2014). Thus, omitting cohabiting couples might have led to underestimates of equal provider couples and women main provider couples.

Third, according U.S. Census Bureau population estimates, the racial/ethnic make-up of the U.S. population has become more diverse with increases in Hispanic and Asian immigration (Krogstad, 2017). Raley et al. (2006) focused only on white-black differences, I will use a more inclusive approach and assess both Hispanic and Asian differences in couple earning patterns. Studies have found that the nature of marriage and romantic partnerships differs between Hispanics or Asians and non-Hispanic whites (Oropesa, 1996; Manning, 2001; Brown, Van Hook, & Glick, 2008). In view of the growing share of these race-ethnic groups, omitting these groups from the analysis might over- or underestimate overall earning patterns within couples in the United States.

In this chapter, using data from the 2017 March Supplement of the CPS, I seek to assess the distribution of three types of earning patterns within couples—(a) male partner earning the majority of household income, (b) equal providers, and (c) female partner earning the majority of household income—and what factors are associated with these types, focusing on age, relationship status (marriage vs. cohabitation), and race/ethnicity in addition to other key sociodemographic characteristics that Raley et al (2006) examined, including presence of children, women's education, couple's relative age and education, and couple's hours of paid

work.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Perspectives

Two perspectives have dominated the explanations for relative earning patterns within couples. First, the *human capital perspective* (Becker, 1985) argues that individuals with greater human capital (e.g., education) experience higher returns from time allocation to paid work in terms of earnings and career advancement. This perspective predicts that factors such as relative education between partners shape couples' relative earning patterns. Specifically, partners with higher levels of education relative to their partner, or those who work more than their partners will earn more than their partners regardless of gender.

Second, the gender perspective argues that gender has pervasive effects on social life (West & Zimmerman, 1987; Williams, 2001). Despite the increases in women's education and occupational aspiration, there still exists a "traditional" idea that emphasizes housework as women's work and that mothers are better than fathers in raising children (Wall, 2001). Compared to their male counterparts, women continued to devote more time to family and household responsibilities (Bianchi, 2011), even among highly-educated women with professional jobs who have high potential earning power (Cha, 2010). Breadwinning continues to be expected for men to be "marriageable" (Oppenheimer, Kalmijn, & Lim, 1997) or a "good" father (O'Brien & Shemilt, 2003; Sullivan, 2004). In general, women are more likely to make adjustments to their careers relative to their male counterparts (Cha, 2010; Shafer, 2011) and thus earn less than their male partners with the same—or even a lower—level of education. According to the gender perspective, egalitarian attitudes toward gender may at both the individual and societal level influence couples' relative earning patterns.

These two perspectives help predict what factors are related to earning patterns within couples. In the present analysis, I focus on demographic characteristics, such as age, couple union type, race/ethnicity, education, and presence of children, and differences within couples especially age gap and education gap in part because the CPS does not provide attitudinal information. Below I discuss how each factor is related to earning patterns within couples.

Factors Associated with Couple Earning Patterns

Education

As the human capital perspective posits (Becker, 1985), I expect women's higher levels of education to be related to couple earning types. Specifically, women's higher levels of education (absolute as well as relative to their male partner) will be positively associated with both equal earning (income homogamy) and women earning the majority of household income (income hypergamy). In recent decades, there has been a rise in assortative mating by education among couples in the United States (Schwartz and Mare, 2005), where men and women partner based on similarities in education. In addition, as women have been outpacing men with higher rates of college completion (Buchmann & Diprete, 2006; Schwartz & Han, 2014), increasingly women are marrying men with less education relative to themselves (Schwartz & Gonalons-Pons, 2016). These various trends warrant a follow-up study of Raley and colleagues (2006) to reexamine the association between women's education and couple earning patterns and to see whether the share of couples where women earn more than their male partner increased.

Number and Age of Children

For women, childrearing is one of the major determinants of reducing time allocation in paid work, which tends to result in a reduction of earnings (Casper & Bianchi, 2002; Raley et al., 2006). The same is not true for men. Mothers with younger children are less likely to be in the

labor force than mothers with older children (The U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2017a). In 2016, the labor force participation rate of mothers with children under 6 years was lower (64.7%) compared to the rate of those whose youngest child was 6-17 years old (75%). In 2016, 95.6 percent of employed fathers worked full time, compared to 76.3 percent of employed mothers. In addition, among employed mothers, those with young children were less likely to work full time than those with older children. In contrast, employed fathers were equally likely to work full time, regardless of the age of their children. Women with two or three children are more likely than their counterparts with only one child to be out of labor force longer (Budig & England, 2001) and experience higher a “motherhood wage penalty” (Budig & Hodges, 2010). Given these findings, I hypothesize that the number of children or having children under age 6 will be negatively associated with women earning all or the majority of household income relative to their male partner.

Couple Union Type—Cohabitation and Marriage

Starting in the 1990s and extending into the present, the growth in cohabitation constitutes one of the major changes in American family life (Kennedy & Bumpass, 2008; Casper & Cohen, 2000; Manning, 2013; Smock, Manning, & Porter, 2005). However, little is known about the relative income contribution of men and women in cohabiting unions. Understanding cohabitating couple earning patterns is important because of the growing numbers of young adults experiencing this living arrangement (Manning & Stykes, 2015). Prior research has found that compared to married couples, cohabiting couples appear to be more egalitarian in terms of more equally dividing housework (Davis & Greenstein, 2007; Eggebeen, 2005; South and Spitze, 1994; Surkyn and Lesthaeghe, 2004) and less likely to hold traditional attitudes toward gender (Clarkberg, Stolzenberg, & Waite, 1995). In addition, compared to married

women, cohabiting women are more likely to have higher levels of education than do their male counterparts (Casper & Bianchi, 2000).

In view of these characteristics of cohabiting unions compared with those of marriage, I hypothesize that compared with marital unions, cohabiting unions will have a stronger positive association with income homogamy and income hypergamy (women earn more).

Age

Past research suggests that income homogamy and income hypergamy (women earn more) may be increasing among younger individuals, particularly Millennials. One reason is the shrinking gender gap in job opportunities for this age group compared to older age groups. Millennials have faced an insecure and changing job market. According to a recent 2017 Pew Report using 2016 CPS data, Millennial young men, aged 25-34, have experienced declines in their incomes. Specifically, only 25% young men (aged 25-34) in 1975, had median incomes less than \$30,000 per year. That number has increased to 41% as of 2016 (The U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2017b). In contrast, young women, aged 25-34, have experienced considerable gains in income since 1975. For example, young women have experienced a growth rate of nearly 23% in median income (\$23,000 in 1975, \$29,000 in 2016) (The U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2017b). Although women continue to earn less than men on average, the increases in their earnings and education relative to men have been substantial.

Another reason is attitudinal. Millennials have more egalitarian views on women's roles in the spheres of work and family compared with Baby Boomers (Clarkberg et al., 1995; Donnelly, Twenge, Clark, Shaikh, Beiler-May & Carter, 2016; South and Spitze, 1994). As a generation, they are delaying marriage. In 2014, the median age of first marriage was 27 for women and 29 for men (Anderson & Payne, 2016). Compared with older generations, they have

more favorable views on cohabitation (Eickmeyer, 2015; Stykes, 2015) and are cohabitating at higher rates. In addition, Millennials are less religious (David, 2016), and have more positive views on average toward mothers of young children working outside the home relative to older generations (Donnelly et al., 2016).

As a result of these characteristics, I hypothesize that compared with older age groups (i.e., 35-44 years and 45-54 years), younger individuals, those aged 25-34, will have a stronger positive association with equal earning and women earning the majority of household income.

Race/Ethnicity

As of 2016, U.S. Census Bureau population estimates illustrate that Hispanics accounted for just over half of the total U.S. population growth (Krogstad, 2016) and made up 17% of the labor market in 2015, which is higher than Black (12%) or Asian (6%) population. When taking into consideration the changing race-ethnic demographics of the labor force, a closer examination of couples' relative earning patterns is warranted.

Hispanic Americans. Although Hispanic Americans involve a wide range of different groups, because of the large volume of recent immigrants from Mexico, the patterns of Hispanic American families tend to reflect those of Mexican immigrant families (Flores, 2017). Due to their lower levels of education relative to other race-ethnic groups, Hispanic labor market participation is concentrated in the service and the manual labor industries (Laudale & Oropesa, 2007). The declines in manual labor (e.g., construction), manufacturing jobs, and other lower-wage sectors since the early 2000s in the United States have disproportionately affected Hispanic men relative to men in other racial groups (Jacobson & Mather, 2010). Thus, from the human capital perspective, I hypothesize that compared to non-Hispanic white couples, Hispanic couples will have a stronger positive association with couple hypergamy (women earn more).

The gender perspective, however, predicts a different pattern and suggests a competing hypothesis. Research has shown that gender-specific scripts are traditionally part of Hispanic culture and manifest into family life. These include *marianismo*, which refers to mother's self-sacrifice for her children and submissive, modest, religious, and humble characteristics (Le Vine, Sunderland Correa, & Tapia Uribe, 1986; Nader, 1986) and *machismo*, which emphasizes men being the head of the household and using strength and power to care for his family (Forst & Lehman, 1997; Ruiz, 2005). Both of the gender-specific scripts encourage women and men to divide paid and unpaid work along the traditional gender lines. Thus, according to the gender perspective, I hypothesize that compared with non-Hispanic white couples, Hispanic couples will have a stronger positive association with men earning the majority of household income (income hypogamy).

African Americans. As in the case of Hispanic men discussed above, African American men have experienced greater labor market instability and unemployment in the recent decades (Holzer, 2009). Thus, differences between African American men and women in labor market opportunities and employment may contribute to a larger proportion of African American women out earning their male partner. In addition, compared with other racial groups, African American women have a longer history of working in paid employment (Lindsey, 2015). Because of this, the economic provider role for African American wives and mothers has been, and continues to be, central to the role of wife and mother. Past research is inconsistent as to whether African Americans have more egalitarian gender attitudes compared with Whites. Some research has suggested that compared to middle and working-class white married couples, African American married couples are more likely to be egalitarian (Harris & Firestone, 1998; Landry, 2000). Compared to White husbands, African American husbands are more likely to

take responsibility for child rearing and household labor when their wives are employed (Hofferth, 2003). In addition, Ciabattari (2001) found that compared with White men, African American men held less traditional attitudes toward employed mothers. Together, I hypothesize that compared with non-Hispanic white couples, African American couples will have a stronger positive association with income homogamy and income hypergamy (women earn more).

Asian Americans. In 2015, Asians had the largest percentage of those with a college degree or more (61%) compared to non-Hispanic whites (39%), Blacks (28%) and Hispanics (19%) (The U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2015). From the human capital perspective, women earning equally or more than their partners is more common among more highly educated populations (The U.S. Census of the Bureau, 2016; Raley et al., 2006). Based on this past finding, I hypothesize that compared with non-Hispanic whites, Asians will have a higher proportion of equal earning couples and income hypergamy (women earning more). However, similar to Hispanic families, whose gender ideology is more traditional, Asian American families tend to subscribe to a more collectivist view on family, where personal needs are seen as secondary to those of the family (Lindsey, 2016; Ino & Glick, 2002). In addition, gender roles within the family tend to value women being subordinate to men (Hall, 2009; Park, Vo, & Tsong, 2009). As a result of their more traditional views of gender, I hypothesize that compared with non-Hispanic white couples, Asian couples will have a stronger positive association with hypogamy (men earning more relative to their female partners).

CURRENT STUDY

The first goal of this paper is to describe the distribution of different-sex couples by earning patterns in 2016. Following Raley et al. (2006), I will take the following two steps. First, I will look at all couples where at least one partner was employed and had earnings to examine

three couple earning types, including (a) male-sole earner, (b) dual-earner, and (c) female-sole earner couples. Then, I will focus on the dual-earner couples and examine the following three types of couple earning patterns: (a) the female partner contributes more than 60% of the family income (income hypergamy), (b) the female and male partners contribute about equally (income homogamy), and (c) the male partner contributes more than 60% of family income (income hypogamy).

The second goal is to assess how various demographic factors, such as age, couple union type (married vs. cohabiting), race/ethnicity, women's education, and gaps between partners, such as relative education and relative age, are associated with the above couple earning types (a) for all couples where at least one partner works; and (b) among dual-earner couples only. Because employment status—full-time, year-round vs. reduced hours or weeks—is closely related to annual earnings, I will control the analyses for male and female partners' extent of employment.

METHODS

Data

I use data from the 2017 March Supplement to the Current Population Survey (CPS), which includes the Annual Social and Economic Supplement (ASEC), which captures labor market characteristics, including annual earnings for each partner, for the preceding year, 2016. The CPS is a nationally representative sample survey and encompasses data on both married and cohabiting couples' demographic and employment characteristics. Data were downloaded from Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS). The original sample of the 2017 CPS is $n = 313,179$. I select partnered individuals in different-sex households (married or cohabiting) ($n = 139,034$). I then restrict my sample to respondents and partners aged 25-54 in order to reflect an

age range where most individuals have finished school and are not yet retired ($n = 74,108$). Further I exclude those where both respondent and partners were unemployed in the previous year ($n = 1,752$) and not in universe (NIU) ($n = 1,378$), and when both the respondent and the partner reported zero earned income from the previous year ($n = 1,330$). Finally, respondents and partners were excluded when they were NIU on pre-tax wage and salary income from previous year ($n = 27,444$). With these restrictions, the final sample size is $N = 42,204$. Sample weights, including the person weight and the family weight, were used in accordance with CPS March supplement guidelines. Besides the total analytical sample, I created the dual-earner sample, for which I will restrict the total analytical sample to couples where both the female and male partners were employed in the previous year ($n = 28,624$).

Measures

Dependent variable

Couple Earning Types. I use couples' income and employment to determine the five couple earning groups: (a) *woman sole provider*—female partner reports positive income and employment and male partner is not employed (7.61%), (b) *man sole provider*—male partner provides positive income and employment and female partner is not employed (24.48%) — (c) *woman provides majority* where female partner provide 60% or more in dual-earner households (10.25%). (d) *man provides majority* in dual-earner households where male partners provide 60% or more (31.68%); and (e) *equal providers*— dual income couples where women contribute at least 40% but less than 60% (25.99%) (Nock, 2001). To calculate the three relative earning types (woman provides majority, man provides majority, equal providers among the dual-earning couples, I will divide respondents' annual earnings by the sum of the respondents' annual earnings and partners' annual earnings (Kenney, 2006). Couples where both partners are

providing income are measured as those where both partners report positive income and both partners report positive employment. For both *man sole provider* couples and *woman sole provider* couples, if the partner reports positive income but negative employment, they are coded as nonproviders. In doing this, I account for individuals whose income is from unearned sources (e.g., investments, inheritance).

Independent variables

Women's Education is coded as a series of five mutually exclusive dummy variables: less than high school education (7.19%); high school education (reference category) (20.99%); some college (14.15%); Associates (12.02%); Bachelors (28.33%); and postgraduate degree (17.32%).

Couples' Relative Education is coded into three mutually exclusive dummy variables: equal education (reference category) (85.95%); woman is more highly educated (9.27%); and man is more highly educated (4.78%). *Children*. I create two variables to account for children in the household. First, I create four dummy variables indicating the *number of children* under the age 18, including *no children* (reference category) (25.83%); *one child* (23.64%); *two children* (32.31%), and *three or more children* (19.22%). Second, I create a dichotomous indicator for *presence of preschooler*, because women are more likely to make adjustments to their market work when children are young relative to their male partners. Couples with at least 1 child aged 0-5 are coded as 1 (26.64%) and no presence of children aged 0-5 are coded as 0 (73.36%).

Couple Union Type was coded as a mutually exclusive dichotomous variable indicating: different-sex married unions, coded as 0 (88.74%), and different sex cohabiting unions coded as 1 (13.39%). *Age* is coded according into three groups: 25-34 years (reference category) (29.62%), 35-44 years (37.44%) and 45-54 years (32.59%). *Couple's relative age* is a dichotomous variable where the male partner was greater than 5 years older than female partner

in both married about cohabiting unions, given that younger women who are partnered with older men have less time to accumulate human capital (i.e., income and work experience). I code the case as 1 when the male partner is greater than 5 years older (13.39%), and as 0 when the male partner is less than 5 years older (86.61%). *Race/Ethnicity* is coded as series of five mutually exclusive dummy variables: are non-Hispanic white (reference category) (58.81%); both partners are Hispanic (14.63%); both partners both partners are Black (6.65%); both partners are Asian (6.74%); and other race couples (13.17%), which included interracial couples and those identifying as “other” race.

Control variables

Annual paid work hours. I measure *annual paid work hours* for both male and female partners. Based on the Bureau of Labor Statistics definition of employment status, *full-time* employment is calculated as working 35 or more hours per week time times 50 weeks per year, and *less than full-time* is calculated as working between 1-34 hours per week times 50 weeks per year. Two dichotomous variables are created indicating: *female less than full-time* (coded 0) (64.54%) and *male less than full time* (coded 1) (35.46%).

PRELIMINARY RESULTS

First, as shown in Table 1, I took the all couple sample (n=42,204) and described the distribution of the five types of couples (woman sole provider, man sole provider, and the three groups of dual providers) across all the covariates.

These preliminary descriptive findings show small but real shifts in the earning patterns of couples since 2001 that Raley and colleagues (2006) examined. As of 2016, among all couple earnings types, approximately 8% of women were sole providers, compared to around 5% in 2001. The percent of couples where women provided the majority increased from around 7% in

2001 to approximately 10% in 2016. The largest shift occurred for men providing the majority, where around 32% of men were main providers in 2016 compared to approximately 40% in 2001. These patterns illustrate a continued departure away from the traditional breadwinner-homemaker model of partnership.

— Table 1 —

NEXT STEPS AND DISCUSSION

In the final version of this paper I will use multinomial logistic regression models to examine how demographic factors are associated with the likelihood that a couple is dual-earning vs. sole providing (man or woman) (proposed analysis plan in Table 2). In the first two models dual providers (the modal category) will be the reference, in the third model man sole provider is the reference compared to woman sole provider. Third, I will restrict the analysis to dual-earner couples ($n = 28,624$) and use multinomial logistic regression models in order to assess how the various demographic factors are associated with the three dual-earner couple types (i.e., equal providers, man provides the majority of family income, woman partner provides the majority of family income). In the first two models, man provides the majority (modal category) will be the reference and in the third model, equal providers will be the reference category (proposed analysis plan in Table 3).

To what extent the shares of couples where women earn equally relative to their partners or couples where women are main contributors of household income have increased are important indicators for evaluating gender equality among U.S. couples. Prior research found that as of 2001 (Raley et al., 2006), men were main contributors in more than half (55%) of dual-earner couples; and that women's human capital and the presence and the age of children are key determinants of couple earning types. Despite several notable recent demographic shifts in the

U.S. population in the past fifteen years (i.e., changes in union formation and Hispanic and Asian immigration), limited research has examined how demographic factors are associated with relative earning types, which this paper aims to do. Overall, the findings from this paper will provide a more nuanced understanding of gender equality in the United States.

REFERENCES

- Albanesi, S., & Şahin, A. (2018). The gender unemployment gap. *Review of Economic Dynamics*, 30, 47-67.
- Anderson, L., & Payne, K.K. (2016). Median Age at First Marriage, 2014. (FP-16-07). Resource document. National Center for Family and Marriage Research.
<https://www.bgsu.edu/ncfmr/resources/data/family-profiles/anderson-payne-median-agefirst-marriage-fp-16-07.html>
- Becker, G. S. (1985). Human capital, effort, and the sexual division of labor. *Journal of labor economics*, 3(1, Part 2), S33-S58.
- Bianchi, S. M. (2011). Family change and time allocation in American families. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 638(1), 21-44.
- Bianchi, S. M. (2013). The More They Change, the More They Stay the Same? Understanding Family Change in the Twenty-First Century. 42(3), 324-331.
- Bianchi, S. M. (2014). A demographic perspective on family change. *Journal of family theory & review*, 6(1), 35-44.
- Bianchi, S., Lesnard, L., Nazio, T., & Raley, S. (2014). Gender and time allocation of cohabiting and married women and men in France, Italy, and the United States. *Demographic research*, 31, 183.

- Buchmann, C., & DiPrete, T. A. (2006). The growing female advantage in college completion: The role of family background and academic achievement. *American sociological review, 71*(4), 515-541.
- Budig, M. J., & England, P. (2001). The wage penalty for motherhood. *American sociological review, 204-225*.
- Budig, M. J., & Hodges, M. J. (2010). Differences in disadvantage: Variation in the motherhood penalty across white women's earnings distribution. *American Sociological Review, 75*(5), 705-728.
- Bond, J. T., Thompson, C., Galinsky, E., & Prottas, D. (2003). The 2002 national study of the changing workforce. *New York: Families and Work Institute*.
- Brown, S. L., Van Hook, J., & Glick, J. E. (2008). Generational differences in cohabitation and marriage in the US. *Population Research and Policy Review, 27*(5), 531-550.
- Casper, L.M. and S.M. Bianchi. (2002). *Continuity and Change in the American Family*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Casper, L. M., & Cohen, P. N. (2000). How does POSSLQ measure up? Historical estimates of cohabitation. *Demography, 37*(2), 237-245.
- Cha, Y. (2010). Reinforcing separate spheres: The effect of spousal overwork on men's and women's employment in dual-earner households. *American Sociological Review, 75*(2), 303-329.
- Clarkberg, M., Stolzenberg, R. M., & Waite, L. J. (1995). Attitudes, values, and entrance into cohabitational versus marital unions. *Social forces, 74*(2), 609-632.
- Cotter, D., Hermsen, J. M., & Vanneman, R. (2011). The end of the gender revolution? Gender role attitudes from 1977 to 2008. *American Journal of Sociology, 117*(1), 259-89.

- David, M. (2016). Why Millennials are less religious than older Americans. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center. Assessed on May 11th, 2018. <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/01/08/qa-why-millennials-are-less-religious-than-older-americans/>
- Davis, S. N., Greenstein, T. N., & Gerteisen Marks, J. P. (2007). Effects of union type on division of household labor: Do cohabiting men really perform more housework?. *Journal of Family Issues*, 28(9), 1246-1272.
- Donnelly, K., Twenge, J. M., Clark, M. A., Shaikh, S. K., Beiler-May, A., & Carter, N. T. (2016). Attitudes toward women's work and family roles in the United States, 1976–2013. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 40(1), 41-54.
- Eggebeen, D. J. (2005). Cohabitation and exchanges of support. *Social forces*, 83(3), 1097-1110.
- Eickmeyer, K. J. (2015). Generation X and Millennials: Attitudes Toward Marriage & Divorce. *NCFMR Family Profile FP-15–12, National Center for Family & Marriage Research, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH.*
- Flores, A. (2017). How the U.S. Hispanic Population is Changing. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center Social and Demographic Trends project. Assessed on May 18th, 2018. <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/09/18/how-the-u-s-hispanic-population-is-changing/>
- Fry, R. (2018) Millennials surpass Gen Xers as the largest generation in the U.S. labor force. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center Social and Demographic Trends project. Assessed on May 18th, 2018. <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2015/05/11/millennials-surpass-gen-xers-as-the-largest-generation-in-u-s-labor-force/>
- Forst, J. K., & Lehman, W. E. (1997). Ethnic differences in the workplace environment by

- employees in two municipal workforces. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 19(1), 84-96.
- Gerson, K. (2010). *The unfinished revolution: How a new generation is reshaping family, work, and gender in America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Goldin, C. (2006). *The quiet revolution that transformed women's employment, education, and family* (No. w11953). National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Hall, C. C. I. (2009). Asian American women: The nail that sticks out is hammered down. In N. Tewari & A. N. Alvarez (Eds.), *Asian American psychology: Current perspectives* (pp. 193-209). New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Harris, R. J., & Firestone, J. M. (1998). Changes in predictors of gender role ideologies among women: A multivariate analysis. *Sex Roles*, 38(3), 239-252.
- Holzer, H. J. (2009). The labor market and young black men: Updating Moynihan's perspective. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 621(1), 47-69.
- Ino, S. M., & Glickens, M. D. (2002). Understanding and treating the ethnically Asian client: A collectivist approach. *Journal of health & social policy*, 14(4), 37-48.
- Jacobsen, L. A., & Mather, M. (2010). *US economic and social trends since 2000*. Population Reference Bureau.
- Krogstad, J. M. (2016). Key facts about how the U.S. Hispanic population is changing. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center Social and Demographic Trends project. Assessed on November 15th, 2017. <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/09/08/key-facts-about-how-the-u-s-hispanic-population-is-changing/>

- Krogstad, J. M., (2017). U.S. Hispanic growth has leveled off. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center Social and Demographic Trends project. Assessed on November 15th, 2017.
<http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/08/03/u-s-hispanic-population-growth-has-leveled-off/>
- Kaufman, G. (2000). Do gender role attitudes matter? Family formation and dissolution among traditional and egalitarian men and women. *Journal of Family Issues*, 21(1), 128-144.
- Kennedy, S., & Bumpass, L. (2008). Cohabitation and children's living arrangements: New estimates from the United States. *Demographic research*, 19, 1663.
- King, R. B., Karuntos, G., Casper, L. M., Moen, P., Davis, K. D., Berkman, L., Kossek, E. E. (2012). Work-family balance issues and work-leave policies. In R. J. Gatchel & I. Z. Schultz (Eds.), *Handbook of occupational health and wellness* (pp. 323–339). New York, NY: Springer.
- Landry, B. (2002). *Black working wives: Pioneers of the American family revolution*. Univ of California Press.
- Landale, N. S., & Oropesa, R. S. (2007). Hispanic families: Stability and change. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.*, 33, 381-405.
- Le Vine S. E. Sunderland Correa C., & Tapia Uribe F. M. (1986). Marital morality of Mexican women: An urban study. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 42, 183–202.
- Lindsey, L. L. (2015). *Gender roles: A sociological perspective*. Routledge.
- Manning, W. D. (2013). Trends in cohabitation: Twenty years of change, 1987–2008 (Family Profile-13-12). *Bowling Green: National Center for Family & Marriage Research*.

- Manning, W. D., & Stykes, B. (2015). Twenty-five years of change in cohabitation in the US, 1987-2013. *Family Profiles Series FP-15-01, National Center for Family and Marriage Research, Bowling Green State University.*
- Manning, W. D. (2001). Childbearing in cohabiting unions: Racial and ethnic differences. *Family Planning Perspectives, 217-223.*
- Nader L. (1986). Subordination of women in comparative perspective. *Urban Anthropology, 15, 377-397.*
- Nock, S. L. (2001). The marriages of equally dependent spouses. *Journal of Family Issues, 22(6), 755-775.*
- O'Brien, M., & Shemilt, I. (2003). *Working fathers: Earning and caring.* Manchester: Equal Opportunities Commission.
- Oppenheimer, V. K., Kalmijn, M., & Lim, N. (1997). Men's career development and marriage timing during a period of rising inequality. *Demography, 34(3), 311-330.*
- Oropesa, R. S. (1996). Normative beliefs about marriage and cohabitation: A comparison of non-Latino Whites, Mexican Americans, and Puerto Ricans. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 49-62.*
- Park, Y. S., Vo, L. P., & Tsong, Y. (2009). Family affection as a protective factor against the negative effects of perceived Asian values gap on the parent-child relationship for Asian American male and female college students. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 15(1), 18.*
- Pew Research Center. (2015). The American family today. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center Social and Demographic Trends project. Assessed on May 18th, 2018.
<http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2015/12/17/1-the-american-family-today/>

- Raley, S. B., Mattingly, M. J., & Bianchi, S. M. (2006). How Dual Are Dual-Income Couples? Documenting Change From 1970 to 2001. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68(1), 11-28.
- Ruiz, E. (2005). Hispanic culture and relational cultural theory. *Journal of Creativity in Mental Health*, 1(1), 33-55.
- Sarah Flood, Miriam King, Renae Rodgers, Steven Ruggles, and J. Robert Warren. *Integrated Public Use Microdata Series, Current Population Survey: Version 6.0* [dataset]. Minneapolis, MN: IPUMS, 2018.
- Schwartz, C. R., & Han, H. (2014). The reversal of the gender gap in education and trends in marital dissolution. *American Sociological Review*, 79(4), 605-629.
- Schwartz, C. R., & Mare, R. D. (2005). Trends in educational assortative marriage from 1940 to 2003. *Demography*, 42(4), 621-646.
- Schwartz, C. R., & Gonalons-Pons, P. (2016). Trends in relative earnings and marital dissolution: Are wives who outearn their husbands still more likely to divorce?. *RSF*.
- South, S. J., & Spitze, G. (1994). Housework in marital and nonmarital households. *American Sociological Review*, 327-347.
- Stykes, B. (2015). Generation X and Millennials: Attitudes About Having & Raising Children in Cohabiting Unions (FP-15-13). National Center for Family & Marriage Research.
- Surkyn, J., & Lesthaeghe, R. (2004). Value orientations and the second demographic transition (SDT) in Northern, Western and Southern Europe: An update. *Demographic research*, 3, 45-86.
- Sullivan, O. (2004). Changing gender practices within the household: A theoretical perspective. *Gender & Society*, 18(2), 207-222.

Smock, P. J., Manning, W. D., & Porter, M. (2005). "Everything's there except money": How money shapes decisions to marry among cohabitators. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67(3), 680-696.

The U.S. Bureau of the Census, (2015). Educational attainment in the United States: 2015. Assessed on November 15th, 2017.

<https://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/publications/2016/demo/p20-578.pdf>

The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, (2016). Unemployment rates and earnings by educational attainment, 2017. Assessed on November 15th, 2017

https://www.bls.gov/emp/ep_chart_001.htm

The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, (2017a). Employment characteristics of families 2017.

Assessed on November 15th, 2017. <https://www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/famee.pdf>

The U.S. Bureau of the Census, (2017b). The changing economics and demographics of young adulthood:1975-2016. Assessed on November 15th, 2017.

<https://www.census.gov/library/publications/2017/demo/p20-579.html>

Thornton, A., Axinn, W. G., & Xie, Y. (2008). *Marriage and cohabitation*. University of Chicago Press.

Wall, G. (2001). Moral constructions of motherhood in breastfeeding discourse. *Gender & Society*, 15(4), 592-610.

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

Williams, J.C., (2001). *Unbending gender: Why family and work conflict and what to do about it*. Oxford University Press.

Table 1. March Supplement CPS 2017: The Percent Distribution of Couple Earning Types by Demographic and Economic Factors (N = 42,204), weighted, In Universe

	Full Sample	Woman sole provider (n = 3,116)	Man sole provider (n 10,464)	Dual-Earners (n = 28,624)		
				Woman provides majority (n = 4,170)	Equal providers (n = 10,742)	Man provides majority (n =13,712)
<i>Couple Earning Types</i>						
Woman sole provider	7.61%	---	---	---	---	---
Man sole provider	24.48%	---	---	---	---	---
Dual-earner, woman provides majority	10.25%	---	---	---	---	---
Dual-earner, man provides majority	31.68%	---	---	---	---	---
Dual-earner, equal providers	25.99%	---	---	---	---	---
<i>Women's Education</i>						
Less than HS	7.19%	8.21%	14.41%	2.19%	4.01%	5.59%
High School (ref.)	20.99%	24.14%	25.89%	12.89%	17.56%	21.89%
Some college	14.15%	14.66%	14.93%	11.49%	12.80%	15.38%
Associates	12.02%	13.51%	10.25%	11.43%	11.20%	13.89%
College degree	28.33%	23.90%	23.77%	33.87%	31.72%	28.35%
MA/Professional/Doctorate	17.32%	15.58%	10.75%	28.13%	22.70%	14.89%
<i>Relative Education</i>						
Equal education (ref.)	85.95%	81.12%	83.64%	82.88%	87.36%	88.74%
Woman more educated	9.27%	14.92%	7.74%	16.09%	10.39%	5.97%
Man more educated	4.78%	3.95%	8.61%	1.03%	2.25%	5.29%
<i>Number of Children</i>						
None (ref.)	25.83%	27.72%	16.49%	34.36%	32.72%	24.17%
One	23.64%	25.10%	21.29%	24.48%	24.28%	24.3%
Two	31.31%	30.28%	33.34%	27.68%	29.78%	32.43%
Three or more	19.22%	16.90%	28.88%	13.48%	13.22%	19.1%
<i>Presence of Preschool Children</i>						
One or more	26.64%	20.98%	35.98%	22.29%	23.48%	24.78%
None (ref.)	73.36%	79.02%	64.02%	77.71%	76.52%	75.22%
<i>Couple Union Type</i>						
Married (ref.)	88.74%	87.80%	91.57%	83.98%	87.16%	89.6%
Cohabiting	11.26%	12.20%	8.43%	16.02%	12.84%	10.4%
<i>Age</i>						
25-34 years (ref.)	29.62%	21.26%	29.27%	31.23%	33.56%	28.03%
35-44 years	37.79%	38.06%	39.39%	36.03%	37.68%	37.15%
45-54 years	32.59%	40.17%	31.34%	32.74%	28.77%	34.82%
<i>Couple Relative Age</i>						
Men < 5 years	86.61%	85.47%	85.32%	88.56%	87.48%	86.54%
Men > 5 years (ref.)	13.39%	14.53%	14.68%	11.44%	12.52%	13.46%
<i>Race-ethnicity</i>						
Both non-Hispanic white (ref.)	58.81%	56.91%	51.36%	60.78%	59.67%	63.67%
Both Hispanic white	14.63%	12.48%	23.39%	9.01%	11.66%	12.63%
Both Black	6.65%	9.29%	4.57%	9.40%	8.25%	5.42%
Both Asian	6.74%	6.17%	9.25%	4.62%	6.41%	5.88%
Other/Interracial	13.17%	15.15%	11.43%	16.18%	14.01%	12.39%
<i>Paid work hours</i>						
Men < full-time	35.46%	35.37%	11.02%	54.33%	46.24%	32.39%
Women < full-time	64.54%	64.73%	88.98%	45.64%	53.76%	67.61%

Table 2: Multinomial Logistic Regression Models Contrasting that a Couple is Dual-earner or Sole Provider (N=42,023)

	Dual Providers vs. Woman sole providers	Dual providers vs. Man sole providers	Man sole providers vs. Women sole providers
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
<i>Women's Education</i> (ref. High school)			
Less than HS			
Some college			
College degree			
Postgraduate degree			
<i>Relative Education</i> (ref. equal education)			
Woman more educated			
Man more educated			
<i>Number of Children</i> (ref. none)			
One			
Two			
Three or more			
<i>Presence of Preschool Children</i> (ref. none)			
One or more			
<i>Couple Union Type</i> (ref. Married)			
Cohabiting			
<i>Age cohorts</i> (ref. 25-34 years)			
35-44 years			
45-54 years			
<i>Couple Relative Age</i> (ref. Men > 5 years)			
Men < 5 years			
<i>Race-ethnicity</i> (ref. Both non-Hispanic white)			
Both Hispanic			
Both Black			
Both Asian			
Other			
<i>Paid work hours</i> (ref. Men < full-time)			
Women < full-time			

Table 2-3: Multinomial Logistic Regression Models Contrasting the Three Dual-Earning Couple Types (n=28,624)

	Man provides majority vs. Equal Providers	Man provides majority vs. Woman provides majority	Equal Providers vs. Woman provides majority
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
<i>Women's Education</i> (ref. High School)			
Less than HS			
Some college			
College degree			
Postgraduate degree			
<i>Relative Education</i> (ref. equal education)			
Woman more educated			
Man more educated			
<i>Number of Children</i> (ref. none)			
One			
Two			
Three or more			
<i>Presence of Preschool Children</i> (ref. none)			
One or more			
<i>Couple Union Type</i> (ref. Married)			
Cohabiting			
<i>Age</i> (ref. 25-34 years)			
35-44 years			
45-54 years			
<i>Couple Relative Age</i> (ref. Men > 5 years)			
Men < 5 years			
<i>Race-ethnicity</i> (ref. Both non-Hispanic white)			
Both Hispanic			
Both Black			
Both Asian			
Other			
<i>Paid work hours</i> (ref. Men < full-time)			
Women < full-time			