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ABSTRACT

Division of Labor and Marital Quality in Russia

Carol S. Kim

School of Family Life

Master of Science

This study examined whether investigation of the linkages between division of labor and marital quality would produce the same results in Russia that have been found in the U.S. Russian couples \( n = 172 \) participated in the study by answering three packets of questionnaires. The Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale was used to measure each partner’s rating of their levels of satisfaction with their marital relationship and their spouse. The results from the structural equation models indicated that the more the wives perceived themselves doing more and expressed dissatisfaction of their spouse’s contribution to child care tasks and apartment maintenance, the lower were their levels of marital satisfaction. Also, the more the wives perceived themselves doing more and expressed dissatisfaction with their spouse’s contribution to household chores and apartment maintenance, the lower were their husband’s levels of marital satisfaction. Overall, the wives’ perception of division of labor, instead of the husbands’, strongly effects marital satisfaction. These findings paralleled the U.S. results of division of labor and marital quality. Clinical implications and directions for future research are discussed.

Keywords: division of labor, Russia, marital satisfaction, marital quality, cross-cultural studies
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my supportive family and friends who have helped me through this program. Thank you mom and dad for the sacrifices you made to come here to America to make sure that all of us would have endless opportunities to have a better life. Seeing wonderful examples of how you two powered through the struggles of living the immigrant life has instilled in me the concept of determination. It is the best gift you two could have ever given me. My sister Susan and brother-in-law William, thank you so much for your kindness and generosity, it has helped me more than you will ever know. My sister Grace, thank you for being such a great listener. My sister Megan, talking and being around you inspires me to want to be a better person, thank you. To the special person in my life, Derrick, you have been such an inspiration to me throughout my journey in this program through your examples. You have been so supportive. Thank you so much for believing in me, and always pushing and reminding me to strive for excellence. It means the world to me. To my cohort, I love you and thank you for the support and kindness you have offered me. It was pleasure being part of this experience with you.

I would also like to thank my chair, Mark Butler, for being so flexible with me in terms of my educational needs in this program. Thank you for caring and supporting my goals. You have been a wonderful mentor, teacher, and a chair. To David Nelson, Rick Miller, and Lexie Pfeifer, thank you so much for your contributions. All you have made this thesis possible.

Finally, I would like to thank my Heavenly Father for giving me the skills and the talents that I possess. Thank you so much for giving me the strength to get through this program. I feel tremendously blessed.
Table of Contents

Introduction ........................................................................................................................................... 1

Review of the Literature ......................................................................................................................... 3
  Division of Labor and Marital Quality in the United States ................................................................. 3
  Cross-cultural Theories ......................................................................................................................... 6
  Division of Labor and Marital Quality in Other Countries ................................................................. 8
  Russia ................................................................................................................................................... 9
  History of Gender and Marriage in Russia ........................................................................................... 11
  Division of Labor and Marital Quality in Russia .................................................................................. 13

Summary .............................................................................................................................................. 18
  Research Question ............................................................................................................................... 18

Methodology .......................................................................................................................................... 19
  Participants .......................................................................................................................................... 19
  Procedure ........................................................................................................................................... 20
  Instruments .......................................................................................................................................... 20

Analyses ............................................................................................................................................... 21

Results ................................................................................................................................................. 22

Discussion ............................................................................................................................................ 27

References ............................................................................................................................................ 33
Introduction

In the U.S., studies have shown that the division of labor between husband and wife, specifically in housework, is strongly correlated with marital quality, and that marital quality is an important indicator of long-term marital success, contentment, and strength of attachment bond (Perry-Jenkins, 1990; Suitor, 1991; Voyandoff & Donnelly, 1999; Wilkie, Ferree, & Ratcliff, 1998). Research shows that women do the majority of housework (Vannoy & Cubbins, 2004; Bunk, Kluwer, Schuurman, & Siero, 2000), but when labor is equally shared or at least perceived to be fair, there is a significant positive correlation with marital satisfaction (Voyandoff & Donnelly, 1999; Claffey & Mickelson, 2009). Research also shows that the division of labor seems to have a more profound effect on the marital satisfaction of wives than of husbands. Significantly, wives’ marital satisfaction scores are a much stronger predictor of marital longevity or, alternatively, demise through divorce than are husbands’ scores (Blaire, 1993). Additionally, studies of division of labor in the U.S. show that there are many factors that determine how labor is divided, including how individuals were raised in their own families of origin.

Research on the topic of division of labor has only been conducted in a few places elsewhere, like China, Vietnam, and parts of Europe (Pimental, 2006; Teerawichitchainan, Knodel, Loi, & Huy, 2010; Hank, 2007; Popova, 2002). Only a few of these studies have investigated the connection between division of labor and marital quality in a cultural context. As one of the largest countries in the world, with a population of 142 million people, Russia provides a diverse setting in which to study the relationship between division of labor and marital quality.
Looking further, the social, political, and economic history of Russia reflects earlier conditions in the U.S. in terms of gendered division of labor. For example, during times of war for U.S. and Russian citizens, women were encouraged to enter the work force while the men were serving in their respective militaries. Nonetheless, after the war, women were encouraged to resume their traditional domestic roles and leave the work force behind (Vannoy & Cubbins, 2004).

Alternatively, it is important to consider social and structural discrepancies that exist in Russia in comparison to the U.S. These very discrepancies could give us important information on the dynamics of how division of labor and marital quality may affect each other in cultural context. Specifically, the impact that Russia’s unique cultural milieu may have on division of labor and marital quality could produce results differing from those anywhere else in the world. To highlight, one may wonder how Russia’s long-standing history of alcoholism among men, or the unstable economy, could possibly intensify already significant stratification of gender roles.

In summary, specific research on division of labor in the home and marital quality in Russia could produce results either discrepant or concordant with U.S. findings. In this study, the point of focus will be data obtained from both Russian partners in couple relationships. This data reports their perspectives on daily household chores in terms of what chores each partner desires the other to do, who contributes to household chores, and how they rate their levels of marital satisfaction. Through this multicultural lens, we will be able to add to previous studies done in the U.S. with a cultural emphasis.
Review of the Literature

Division of Labor and Marital Quality in the United States

Marital quality provides an important metric or gauge of a couple’s chances of long-term marital success, contentment, and strength of the attachment bond. One of the factors in determining levels of marital quality is how household chores are divided amongst spouses (Perry-Jenkins, 1990; Suitor, 1991; Voyandoff & Donnelly, 1999; Wilkie, Ferree, & Ratcliff, 1998). For centuries, society accepted traditional gender views and roles, with husbands being the primary income earners while wives primarily took on the role of child rearing and management of the home (Vannoy & Cubbins, 2004; Bunk, Kluwer, Schuurman, & Siero, 2000). Societal norms have changed in the past few decades with regard to women, though, as they have campaigned politically, culturally, and legally for equal rights. Women entered and remain in the workforce in much larger numbers, traditional views of gender roles have been challenged, and more egalitarian views concerning division of labor in the home have begun to replace traditional gender stratification (Bartley, Blanton, & Gilliard, 2005). Sociological data have documented this transition, tracking a decline of women’s contributions in the home (Coltrane, 2000). This decline may be due to the fact that most women are working outside of the home, which decreases their hours spent doing household chores. Despite the decline in women’s activity in the home, men’s contributions have risen by only a small rate, suggesting to many the persistence of gender-stratified views in our society (Coltrane, 2000; Frisco & Williams, 2003). However, in another study based on time-diary data, it was found that husbands from 1965 to 2000 have consistently worked more hours in paid employment than their working wives (Bianchi, Robinson, & Milkie, 2006). It is also important to mention that when unpaid and paid work is combined, the total number of hours of work by both husband and wife are
approximately equal. This may offer one of the many explanations as to why husbands’ contribution in the home has not been as significant and has not increased substantially.

Clearly, the idea of fairness seems to be a driving force behind some transitions in the roles taken by husbands and wives in the home. Equity theory states that individuals are most content when they perceive that their partners are doing the same amount of work as they themselves are. Feeling either deprived or advantaged in the relationship with regards to the amount of contributed work is predicted to produce relationship dissatisfaction (Buunk & Mutsaers, 1999). A number of studies indicate perceived equity in home labors does indeed have a strong association with marital quality (Buunk & Mutsaers, 1999; Frisco & Williams, 2003; Perry-Jenkins, 1990; Wilkie, Ferree, & Ratcliff, 1998; Voyandoff & Donnelly, 1999).

To have a deeper understanding of this division of labor and how the concept of equity theory plays into levels of marital satisfaction, it is necessary to examine what division of labor entails. According to several national surveys, the five archetypal time-consuming household chores consist of (a) meal preparation or cooking, (b) housecleaning, (c) shopping for groceries and household goods, (d) washing dishes or cleaning up after meals, and (e) laundering, which consists of washing, ironing, and mending clothes. These types of chores cannot be postponed and are continuous. They are often referred to as “mundane,” “repetitive,” and “boring” (Coltrane, 2000). Based on these responses, the prevalent assumption is that neither men nor women particularly enjoy household chores (Coltrane, 2000). Consequently, we may predict that perceived equitable distribution of household chores would be related to reports of marital quality. This model is consistent with Suitor’s (1991) findings that division of labor carries more weight in determining marital quality than other variables like education, age, and wife’s employment status.
Interestingly, though, it has been found that equal hours spent on household chores do not alone produce higher levels of marital satisfaction (Benin & Agostinelli, 1988; Wilkes, Ferree, & Ratcliff, 1998). Referring back to equity theory, the partner’s perception of what is fair seems to be the primary contributing factor. Benin and Agostinelli (1988) found that wives’ satisfaction level is grounded in the perceived equitability of the division of labor and whether or not husbands contribute by taking part in women’s traditional chores. In other words, it’s not equal hours but equal burden and onerousness of their respective chores that are predictive of wives’ marital satisfaction scores, which are predictive of the durability of the marriage relationship. Apart from findings relating to wives, Benin and Agostinelli also found that husbands desire equality in the home, but do not desire to spend many hours on family work. Again, these findings reveal that the relation between division of labor and marital quality is a complex one. Perception, as research and theory suggest, plays a significant role.

To further illustrate the significance of perception, a study conducted by Wilkes, Ferree, and Ratcliff (1998) discusses several discrete conditions that contribute to the perception of inequality. As an example, a comparison was made between the hours both partners reported doing housework and the estimation/perception of the hours their spouses spent on doing housework. Where the husband’s estimation of the number of hours his wife spent doing housework was higher than her own self-report, the wife felt that her husband was recognizing her contribution in the home. When wives feel better understood by their husbands, it in turn predicts increased levels of marital satisfaction (Wilkes, Ferree, & Ratcliff, 1998). Another example of how perceptions of equality versus inequality were conceptualized and measured was by asking both partners to rate both how fair they thought their contribution was in the home, and their sense of the fairness of the expectations their spouses had for them. Findings indicated that
both partners’ gender expectations of themselves and of their partners influenced the results. In this and other ways, the manner in which a perception of equality or inequality in division of household labor is formed is found to be quite complex.

Other studies have focused attention on the role gender ideals play in determining perceptions of the division of labor. The gender ideals of each partner determine whether they bring egalitarian or traditional attitudes and expectations to their family life. Lye and Biblarz (1993) found that when men hold less traditional views in comparison to their wives, there are fewer disagreements. On the other hand, when wives hold less traditional views compared to their husbands, disagreements increase. These findings make sense in that stereotypic traditional views uphold gender stratified and inequitable division of household labor, while less traditional views support a more equitable division of household labor—irrespective of contributions outside the home. Thus, when husbands hold less traditional views compared to their wives, they are likely to participate in household labor to a degree that exceeds their wives’ expectations and is highly satisfactory to their wives, while the converse is true in the opposite circumstance where wives, but not husbands, are the ones holding less traditional views. Disagreements result from husbands who hold more traditional views failing to meet the level of expectation of their more non-traditional wives.

**Cross-cultural Theories**

These findings on division of labor and its effects on marital quality, based on U.S. samples, beg the question of whether they are universal or if cultural differences will produce unique relations between division of labor and marital quality. These are the primary concerns that are naturally associated with cross-cultural research. Specifically, cross-cultural research deals with the “emic versus etic” distinction (Hart, Nelson, Robinson, Olsen, & McNeilly-
Choque, 1998; Berry, 1989). The “emic” approach would study, define, and describe behaviors within the culture. Taking this perspective, the assumption is made that cultural values have an influence over family processes and relations among family variables will be distinct from one culture to the next. An emic perspective suggests that family processes need to be studied and interpreted within each respective culture. The “etic” approach, on the other hand, makes the assumption that behaviors and relationships are similar across cultures. Comparisons of behaviors found in one culture to another are made using similar assumptions and measures. An etic perspective assumes that patterns of family interaction will be similar across cultures, regardless of cultural differences (Bean, Barber, & Crane, 2006; Lamborn & Felbab, 2003).

Based on Russian and Western psychological literature, it appears that both cultural settings have similarities that seem to recommend an etic approach. Consider for example, in studies of marriage and its effects on children’s aggression, the comparison of findings from Russia and Western nations. In both places conflict in marriage was highly correlated with aggression among boys but not among girls. Thus, it appeared that the relation between conflict in marriage and children’s behavior was the same in both countries, despite the different cultural settings (Hart et al., 1998).

However, studies on division of labor find variance in the results depending on the country and culture being studied, which suggests the relevance of an “emic” perspective. For example, researcher Laura Sanchez (1993) found that religion influences how household chores may be divided. In particular, Sudanese couples had the lowest percentage of husbands helping wives with the housework, due to their Islamic codes. This Islamic code appears to reinforce the stratification of gender roles. Thus, there is evidence of a need to identify cultural variables that might be influential in our study.
Division of Labor and Marital Quality in Other Countries

Results of studies completed in several countries regarding marital quality and division of labor have mostly been consistent with findings in the U.S. Nonetheless, cultural nuances are also evident in these same studies.

To illustrate, in China, historically it has been culturally acceptable for Chinese wives to perform a majority of the household chores, but this mindset has recently been dissolving. Currently, Chinese wives perform 50-60% of household chores. This is in contrast to Western couples, where wives are performing 70-80% of household chores (Xu, 1998). Researcher Xu suggests that government has emboldened the egalitarian ideology that emanated from Communist rule back in 1949, and this may be the rationale for the trend towards equal division of labor among Chinese couples (1998). The establishment of a more egalitarian ideology shifted couples’ dynamics in terms of the division of household labor. A 2006 study conducted by Pimentel further documented and described this shift. Pimental found that if wives with egalitarian ideals contributed more to completion of household chores than their husbands, the levels of marital closeness decreased and in turn there were higher levels of disharmony. This dynamic relation between shifting cultural conditions and its impact on division of labor and marital quality is consistent with some U.S. findings previously reviewed. In both countries, culture can play a critical role in defining the relation between division of labor and marital quality.

In another study, these relations were investigated in Japanese society, where the predominant cultural expectations are for women to do the bulk of the household chores. Men fulfill the provider role, and cultural expectations for their participation in household chores are not strong. In consequence of this strong gender complementarity in cultural beliefs and
expectations, actual division of household chores was not a significant predictor of marital satisfaction in Japan. Rather, couples mutually accepted traditional views on division of labor. However, any discrepancy between the actual and desired division of labor, (even if agreeably inequitable), was still an important factor determining marital satisfaction for wives. Where wives felt imposed upon by family-related tasks, it lessened their satisfaction with their husbands and affected marital quality (Sakata & Koshi, 1992).

Findings in Japan thus demonstrate different outcomes in terms of the division of labor that is considered equitable, while the significant impact of culture in determining expectations and molding perceptions of equitable versus inequitable division of labor is the same as in the U.S. and China. This suggests support for both “etic” and “emic” approaches to cross-cultural literature. It is essential to consider linkages between culture and significant marital variables, as well as to understand the reality of stable patterns of relations across cultures.

**Russia**

In light of the unique impact of culture upon the complex relations between division of household labor and marital outcomes, it is important to conduct cross-cultural studies. We cannot always generalize findings from one country and culture to another. There are few countries where cross-cultural research focused on division of labor (Pimental, 2006; Teerawichitchainan, Knodel, Loi, & Huy, 2010; Hank, 2007; Popova, 2002), and the need for cross-cultural research in Russia is evident because of the lack of currently available information.

Russia is one of the largest countries in the world, with a population of 142 million people. Given seismic political, economic, and social changes over the last several decades, and given Russia’s cultural and ideological heterogeneity, it is impossible to predict marital and family dynamics and relations on the basis of cultural conjecture alone. Russia is an ideal next
point of focus for cross-cultural research, including research on division of household labor and marital quality.

As previously noted, it seems as though Russia historically has been culturally anchored to traditional values and gender stratification similar to what has historically been found in the U.S. and China. However, the history of communism—for both China and Russia—seems to have promoted shifts in gender roles and gender expectations. Nonetheless, little information is available about Russian marriages, but with what information is available, it is assumed that conflict over gender role issues and equality could parallel conflicts in the U.S. in the same way China parallels the U.S. Nevertheless, despite these possible similarities, it is important to remember cultural, political, and economic influences that could lead to very different division of labor conditions and attendant relations to marital quality. For example, one report shows that the proportion of egalitarian marriages in Russia decreased from 46% in 1989 to 37% in 1995 (Vannoy & Cubbins, 2001). Perhaps, the discrepancies between the numbers may be due to mothers choosing to forego paid employment and stay at home, given the opportunity to do so. However, without cross-cultural research, we simply do not know how these changes may have affected the dynamics of marriages and families, or what other additional factors may be at play. Other contributing factors might include Russia’s long-standing history of male alcoholism and economic problems. These could reinforce and intensify traditional gender roles and decrease egalitarian ideals; altogether, the conflagration of changes in Russia dictates the necessity of direct investigation of marriage and family dynamics there. Researching marriages and families in Russia can greatly contribute to the growing body of cross-cultural studies and provide new ideas for future research.
History of Gender and Marriage in Russia

To understand the influence of culture upon gender roles, how these together tie into the propagation of traditional versus egalitarian views, and understanding the history of a society can be helpful. Gender can be and generally is highly salient in structuring and organizing how a husband and a wife run their home and how labor is divided. Culture, in turn, profoundly defines the meaning and implications of gender in society, marriage, and family.

Women in Russia were first granted civil rights by the Zemsky reform of 1864 and then in October 17, 1905 by the Manifesto. After the October Revolution of 1917, decrees were issued on marriage, divorce, and employment for both men and women. Later, in 1918, the first Soviet constitution ostensibly granted women equal rights in economic, cultural, social, and political settings. Work was seen as an economic duty to both men and women (Ashwin & Lytkina, 2004). During this specific time period, when the former USSR was a leading political entity, women’s employment was at its peak compared to the rest of the world (Boss & Gurko, 1994). Despite women being granted equal rights in the formal legal sense, it did not necessarily change how they were actually treated either in society or the home. It has been reported that women, for example, still received lower pay than men. This lag between imposed socio-political dogma and actual practice seems to be the same globally; studies have shown that gender discrimination seems to be prevalent and recurrringly evident in terms of downward pressures on women’s pay in relation to men’s pay (Papova, 2002; Olson & Matskovsky, 1994). However, there are other factors that need to be considered when discussing the contributions of these gender stratifications.

When Russia lost about 20 million men during World War II, widows had no choice but to become heads of their households, which greatly changed the family structure and the roles of
women and men. For a time, the number of employed women increased significantly as they filled the positions previously occupied by the men who had died in World War II (Boss & Gurko, 1994). This period of cultural necessity lessened men’s authority in their families as women became more economically and parentally prominent (Boss & Gurko, 1994).

Other socio-historic factors following World War II seemed to affect men in terms of having less authority. Very few men had a chance to gain positive, self-affirming employment that would provide support to their traditional gender beliefs of men being the breadwinners. Lack of opportunity to fulfill their traditional roles led to feelings of guilt (Boss & Gurko, 1994). Passivity seems to have become men’s coping mechanism as they dealt with the enervating social bureaucracy of communist society. Sometimes, the attitude of “passivity” introduced ambiguity concerning the roles husband and wives should take on in the home. It is theorized that this accounts for perceived cautiousness and lack of self-confidence in Russian men. Economic strangulation, social isolation, and distancing and disengagement from family life altogether undermined men’s access to generative activity and self-fulfillment either within the home or outside the home. For many, alcohol abuse became their maladaptive resort (Boss & Gurko, 1994), which may be a reinforcing factor to women’s primary authority in the home. Alcohol abuse seems to be a growing problem in Russia especially among men, and one may wonder how this could intensity the already significant stratification of gender roles.

At the turn of the twenty-first century, Russia went through a difficult transition when it adapted to the political, economic, and social challenges that followed the collapse of the USSR. During this time, Russians experienced poverty, economic hardships, and social challenges, and these profoundly affected gender roles. In the late 1980’s, it was apparent that Soviet-era communism would not endure. Mikhail Gorbachev, a Soviet official, initiated a reform known as
“perestroika,” which meant restructuring. Perestroika was focused on creating democracy so that the communist party no longer maintained control. Soon after, in August of 1991, the Soviet Union collapsed. After the collapse, Boris Yeltsin led the country through more hardships during which Russian society, culture, and the future felt uncertain, unstable, and untenable in the modern world. The Yeltsin era could be described as mired in corruption and troubled by unexpected economic challenges, which precipitated political upheaval (Nelson, Hart, Keister, & Piassetskaia, 2009). During these troubling times, men increased their alcohol consumption, began dying at earlier ages, and committed suicide in greater numbers (Ashwin & Lytkina, 2004).

In summary, still today, Russian women’s and men’s culturally defined role is very complicated, heterogeneous, and unresolved (Boss & Gurko, 1994). The, whiplash, back-and-forth shifts of gender roles and gender expectations in Russian society in consequence of seismic shifts in Russian political, economic, and social demographic conditions evoked a perplexing conundrum among Russian men and women, which profoundly affected marriage and family life. Taking this understanding of recent Russian history, we are prepared to investigate and interpret division of household labor in Russia and its effects on marital quality, and we can better comprehend the potential validity of both emic and etic approaches and dimensions.

Division of Labor and Marital Quality in Russia

In conceptualizing and theorizing about the relation between division of household labor and marital quality in Russia, it is imperative to recognize which components mentioned above may weigh heavier in determining marital satisfaction among Russian couples. In one study, researchers examined 233 young couples’ relationships in Moscow. The study focused on the relationship between reports of overall marital satisfaction and satisfaction with particular
aspects of their lives. For husbands, the major factors that increased marital satisfaction were (1) their wives’ attitude toward them, (2) their sex life, (3) their satisfaction with their jobs, (4) how they spent their free time, (5) their wives’ friends and acquaintances, and (6) the way decisions were made in the family. For women, the major factors were (1) their husbands’ attitude towards them, (2) their sex life, (3) assistance that their husbands’ parents provided with child care, (4) how husbands spent their free time, (5) housing conditions of the family, and (6) satisfaction with distribution of household roles (Boss & Gurko, 1994). Observing the women’s expectations, six out of the six related to family life. For men, three out of six related to family life. For men as compared to women, there appears to be a lack of emphasis on their home life.

One of the conflicting issues for Russian women is their desire to focus on their family life, while simultaneously needing to be employed; and most often, full-time employment is necessary, as previously mentioned (Boss & Gurko, 1994). Economic problems make it difficult for men to support their family on only one income, so women work out of necessity. This leaves women feeling overworked, with little time to care for their children or to pursue their own interests. Adding to women’s burden is the cultural expectation for women to be responsible for the household. Thus, division of household labor is a culturally influenced dynamic for women in Russian society that cuts against the grain of economic realities! Women are expected to be employed and also to manage their home largely on their own at the same time (Ashwin & Lytkina, 2004).

The urbanization of Russia and the socialization of men to solely contribute to “masculine” chores in the home is also a factor contributing to women feeling overworked (Boss & Gurko, 1994). Men believe there is little they are required to contribute in the home since “masculine” tasks are fewer in number than they were in an agrarian, pre-urban society. Most
urban families in Russia are living in apartments, and maintenance is centrally controlled. If there are repairs or remodeling that needs to be completed in the home, little information and tools are available for men to contribute. This is a contributing factor to men’s lack of involvement in the home. Thus, with rigid stratification of gender roles, men’s perceived opportunity or expectation for participation in household chores is negligible. If women did not face the economic necessity of employment, their perception of burden associated with household chores might be diminished. If infrastructural conditions were different, men might have an increased perception of opportunities to contribute to household chores in stereotypic masculine ways. But neither of these is the case.

Another conflicting issue that men might feel concerning contributing in the home comes from an observed study (Ashwin & Lytkina, 2004). Women knowingly or unknowingly discourage men from participating with household chores perceived to be “feminine.” Culturally, there is a strong connection between being domestic and feminine; and when women have the experience of seeing men working in their domestic sphere, it results in tension and stress when they see it as a threat to their femininity (Ashwin & Lytkina, 2004). Also, men who attempt to contribute to household chores are placed in a double bind. It brings a sense that they are being “unmanned” if they feel their efforts are being undermined or are unappreciated by their wives. The sense of feeling “unmanned” intensifies if the husband is out of work or is otherwise not able to fully provide for his family.

However, despite social and economic constraints, studies have shown that 33% of Moscow residents reported that both spouses still manage to equally participate in household chores (Olson & Matskovsky, 1994). Yet these egalitarian practices are more prevalent among younger than older couples (Boss & Gurko, 1994).
With the cultural upheavals and overall uncertainty concerning the current state of gender roles and gender expectations in Russia, we cannot be certain about division of labor in the home and its subsequent effects on marital quality without direct investigation. Yet very few investigations of the division of labor in Russia and its effects on marital quality have been conducted. Cubbins and Vannoy (2004) conducted one of these few studies. Instead of stressing marital quality, Cubbins and Vannoy, however, made marital conflict their focal point. With a sample size of 599 couples, the variables considered were spouses’ economic resources, gender beliefs, time constraints as perceived by wives, and husbands’ views of marital contention. The study intended to measure directly and indirectly how both spouses perceived division of household labor and its relation to marital quality.

The results of the study indicate that wives expect their own household responsibilities to decrease as their work hours outside the home increase. As we have previously seen, wives’ perception of fair treatment is an important determining factor in their evaluation of their marital quality. Consistent with findings regarding women in the U.S., there was for women in Russia as well a strong correlation between division of household labor and marital quality.

Wives’ experience of time constraints and inequitable division of household labor also predicted wives’ reports of the level of marital conflict (Cubbins & Vannoy, 2004). Findings showed that wives tended to be sensitive to how much they versus their husbands contribute to household work. Specifically, wives were dissatisfied when their husbands put in fewer hours of paid work than the average for men yet did not contribute more to household labor. Conversely, when husbands put in more hours than average into paid work, no effect on wives’ report of marital conflict was observed. When wives perceive themselves as fulfilling more of the
household responsibilities, it directly affects their perceptions of the level of conflict and leads to increased thoughts of divorce.

Gender role stratification may only increase the inequitable distribution of household labor. Interestingly enough, it seems that when nontraditional women marry traditional men, they expect men to contribute less to household chores because of the traditional belief the men hold. This in turn, creates lower levels of contention. In turn, if a nontraditional woman were to marry a man who is also nontraditional, there will be an increase in conflict due to wives raising their level of expectations. These wives expect their husbands to be more willing to help around the home since they do not hold the rigid traditional beliefs that household chores are specifically the domain for women (Cubbins & Vannoy, 2004).

Having children was also shown to decrease marital satisfaction which could also be related to increases in the overall amount of household labor to be performed (Cubbins & Vannoy, 2004).

The results for men were complementary to the findings for wives with a few exceptions (Cubbins & Vannoy, 2004). Husbands with more nontraditional ideals reported contributing more to household chores. When they perceived their wives were contributing more, their levels of reported marital satisfaction decreased. The decrease may be a direct result of the wife’s dissatisfaction with the unequal division of labor. Since struggles appear to arise between husbands and wives when division of household labor is perceived to be inequitable, it makes sense that husbands would report better marital quality when they carry more of the burden and their wives are less perturbed. But, in fact, husbands who generally reported themselves as doing less household labor also reported themselves as happier.
No other research has been conducted specifically on the division of labor and marital quality in Russia. Findings from the research that has been conducted frequently, but not always, coincides with findings from studies in the U.S. Additional research is needed to build on the foundation that Cubbins and Vannoy (2004) have established. Their study focused on the correlation between division of household labor and contention; the current study focuses on division of labor and global marital quality.

Summary

Research Question

The purpose of the current study is to examine the relationship among Russian couples between their perceptions of the division of household labor and their marital quality, using a sample obtained from Voronezh, Russia. This research builds upon the study done by Cubbins and Vannoy (2004), by adding a discrepancy measure signifying the difference between how each spouse perceives the division of labor and how each would like it to be. The idea of using a discrepancy measure comes from Suitor’s (1991) research. This method of using a discrepancy calculation as a metric for estimating perceived satisfaction with division of labor may provide a more straightforward and intuitive calculation and metric than what is obtained by using a separate marital satisfaction rating scale.

This study also adds the unique variables of childcare-related tasks. Studies done in the U.S. have shown that when husbands help with childcare-related tasks, there is an increase in marital satisfaction and a decrease of psychological distress for wives. However, no known research in Russia has focused on husband’s help with childcare-related tasks as an extension of division of labor and its correlation to marital quality.
This study adopts an “etic” approach when comparing division of household labor and marital quality. The etic approach assumes that the dynamics of couples are the same across cultures, and cultural influences are not as influential as the generalized rules of couple dynamics and interaction are. An etic approach also assumes that Western measures of marital satisfaction are appropriate for Russian couples. Employing an etic approach, we assume that, similar to findings in other countries, Russian couples will have a decrease in marital quality when there is unequal division of labor.

**Methodology**

Data collection took place in Voronezh, Russia, a city with a population of about one million approximately 250 miles south from Moscow. Voronezh is relatively isolated due to its southern location, and it is detached from the political activities in Moscow and far from the Western cultural influences found in St. Petersburg and elsewhere. The population of Voronezh consists almost entirely of ethnic Russians.

**Participants**

Participants were 207 parents of preschool-age children from 15 classrooms and 3 nursery schools who agreed to participate in this study (207 mothers and 167 fathers). The difference in the numbers of fathers and mothers was due to there being 32 single-parent families and 8 fathers who declined to participate. For the purpose of this study, the single-parent families were excluded, yielding a final participant sample of 172 couples. School administrators assisted in arranging group meetings with parents to explain the procedures of this study and to answer any questions parents may have. Confidentiality was assured and parents were given the option to terminate participation at anytime. Wives averaged 14 years and 11 months of education (SD
= 2.34), and husbands averaged 14 years and 6 months (SD = 2.42). Among participants, 69% had one child, 30% had two children, and 1% had more than two.

Procedure

**Measurement issues.** It is necessary to discuss the methodological issues that are inherent with cross-cultural research. The emic versus etic perspectives need to be taken into consideration. To not take on the assumptions of the “etic” ideals, it is important to consider using instruments that are similarly understood by individuals in both settings. A primary way to ensure this is by means of forward- and back-translating questionnaires to obtain translation conformity (Hart, Nelson, Robinson, Olsen, & McNeilly-Choque, 1998; Berry, 1989).

Three packets of questionnaires were given to the parents and they took 30-45 minutes to complete each questionnaire.

**Instruments**

**Division of labor.** A series of eleven questions regarding household division of labor assessed each partner’s perception of who performed more of the specific tasks in the home. Out of the eleven questions, two were about automobile maintenance, and these will not be included in this study for the reason that many people did not own cars in Russia at this time. Five questions are about childcare tasks, two questions are about apartment maintenance, and the last two are about household tasks. Within the childcare tasks domain, two questions focused on who did more when it came to things such as feeding and changing diapers, two inquired about who they thought took on the disciplinarian role, and lastly one inquired about who managed their children’s health care. With the first four childcare questions, the phrase “When both husband and wife are home,” prefaced each assessment of who generally performed more of what task. This approach is also applicable to the household task section, which used examples such as
laundry, preparing meals, and vacuuming as household tasks. Lastly, for the apartment maintenance tasks domain, two questions were about home repairs. On the questionnaire, both partners were asked to rate who they thought performed the task and what their desire of distribution of the task would be. A scale ranging from one through five was given as options. Number one indicated that the husband did “much more” than their wife, and number five indicated that the wife did “much more” than their husbands. Number three showed that the task was “shared equally.”

**Marital Satisfaction.** The Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale was used to measure each partner’s ratings of levels of satisfaction with their relationship and their spouse. A Likert-type scale was used ranging from one through five (not very satisfied to very satisfied) (Schumm, et al., 1986). The reliability of this scale was excellent (Chronbach’s alpha = .96). Schumm found criterion-related validity for the scale which insinuates that the distressed and non-distressed wives could be discriminated (Schumm, 1985). Other tests have been conducted to test the scale’s reliability, and these procured a test-retest correlation of $r = .71$ which parallels the validity of items from the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Mitchell, Newell, & Schumm, 1983; Grover, Paff-Bergen, Russell, & Schumm, 1984).

**Analyses**

When examining the variables of childcare, household chores, disciplining, and apartment repairs, it is important to know who contributes more. The control variables in this data will be wife and husband’s education, wife and husband’s age, and the hours wife and husband work per week. Dyadic analysis will compare the effect of partners’ present contribution to division of labor and their partner’s marital satisfaction and vice-versa. In order to assess whether model fit is sufficient, the general fit, the incremental fit indices, and the root
mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) are preferred when it comes to SEM (Hoyle & Panter, 1995). Model fit is considered good when TLI > .95, CFI > .95, and the RMSEA < .05.

**Results**

*Confirmatory Factor Analysis of Current Household Division of Labor*

For the first part of our analysis, a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA, using the AMOS statistical program) was used to assess the measurement fit of the division of household labor constructs from the Russian data. These data reflected the current division of household labor, with higher scores showing wives to be more responsible for the particular household task. Dissatisfaction scores, which are described below, are not a part of this first analysis. Preliminary data analysis, including exploratory factor analysis, suggested that Russian husbands and wives did not view aspects of current household division of labor in the same way. In particular, the exploratory factor analysis showed that a four-factor model of the current household division of labor might be possible. The question regarding children’s health care was excluded from further analysis as it did not load with the two child-related factors which emerged. In the subsequent CFA model, the four categories (household chores, apartment maintenance, child care, and child discipline) were confirmed. In the first estimation of the CFA, two negative but non-significant error variances were encountered. These two errors were allowed to be correlated (no other correlated errors were introduced), and the model was re-estimated. The factor loadings and the goodness of fit indices obtained in this measurement model showed good fit ($X^2 = 93.02$, $df = 75$, $TLI = .97$, $CFI = .99$, $RMSEA = .04$). These four constructs of current household division of labor will be analyzed in the first path-analytic multiple regression described below.

In the next step of the analysis, difference scores between current household division of labor and desired division of labor were needed in order to compute dissatisfaction scores that
would be used to predict marital satisfaction in the second path-analytic model. The current division of labor scores were subtracted from desired division of labor scores. With this original set up, the wives’ negative scores represented husbands not doing enough (dissatisfaction), and the husbands’ positive scores represented their perception that their wives were not doing enough (dissatisfaction). In order to simplify this data for interpretation, wives’ scores were recoded to be consistent with husbands’ scores (with positive scores representing dissatisfaction for both spouses). Furthermore, scores less than zero were recoded to be zero, so that zero represented more or less satisfaction with current circumstances and scores above zero reflected relative degrees of dissatisfaction with the current arrangement of household labor. We did this as we were only interested in variability in dissatisfaction with household labor scores (reflecting spousal shortcomings, which should be most predictive of marital dissatisfaction).

Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations Tables

Table 2 displays the means and standard deviations, as well as the intercorrelations, among the current household division of labor and marital satisfaction variables. Selected control variables are also included. At the bivariate level, there were several significant relationships found. For wives, when they felt that they contributed more to household chores ($r = -.15, p < .05$), apartment maintenance ($r = -.20, p < .05$), and child care tasks ($r = -.24, p < .01$), their levels of marital satisfaction decreased. Wives’ feelings of dissatisfaction with division of labor in regard to household chores ($r = -.23, p < .01$) and apartment maintenance ($r = -.24, p < .01$) were also negatively predictive of their husbands’ levels of marital satisfaction.

Table 3 displays the means and standard deviations, as well as the intercorrelations, among the dissatisfaction with household division of labor and marital satisfaction variables. Selected control variables are also included. At the bivariate level, there were consistent
correlations between the wives’ and husbands’ levels of marital satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the current division of labor. More specifically, for wives, as their dissatisfaction with their spouse’s contribution to household chores \((r = -0.23, p < .01)\), apartment maintenance \((r = -0.35, p < .01)\), and child care \((r = -0.32, p < .001)\) increased, their marital satisfaction decreased. For husbands, their levels of marital satisfaction were affected by their dissatisfaction with their spouse’s contribution to apartment maintenance \((r = -0.22, p < .01)\) and child care \((r = -0.17, p < .05)\). In addition, wives’ dissatisfaction with husbands’ contributions to household chores \((r = -0.20, p < .05)\) and apartment maintenance \((r = -0.30, p < .001)\) also negatively predicted the marital satisfaction of husbands.

We also elected to conduct paired-sample \(t\)-tests in order to compare the mean of wives’ and husbands’ marital satisfaction as well as the categories of the division of labor between them. In regard to marital satisfaction, results showed that husbands \((M = 4.01, SD = .90)\) reported significantly higher marital satisfaction than their wives \((M = 3.69, SD = 1.07)\). In regard to perceptions of the current division of labor subscales, wives and husbands did not differ in their evaluations of the current division of labor for apartment maintenance \((M = 2.10, SD = 1.02\) and \(M = 2.19, SD = 1.11\) for husbands and wives, respectively) and childcare \((M = 4.28, SD = .74\) and \(M = 4.34, SD = .74\) for husbands and wives, respectively). These means generally reflect agreement that husbands do a little more than wives in regard to apartment maintenance and wives are more involved in childcare tasks. Significant differences emerged for the remaining current division of labor subscales. First, in regard to household chores \((t(152) = 3.05, p < .01)\), mean comparisons showed that husbands and wives generally agreed that wives do more than husbands in this regard, but wives perceived the discrepancy to be greater \((M = 4.37, SD = .80\) and \(M = 4.54, SD = .63\) for husbands and wives, respectively). Second, in regard to
child discipline ($t(148) = 2.80, p < .01$) husbands and wives generally perceived equality in this domain yet wives still felt that they were a bit more involved in child discipline ($M = 3.11, SD = 1.09$ and $M = 3.31, SD = .90$ for husbands and wives, respectively).

Another series of paired-sample $t$-tests was conducted in order to test whether differences existed in husbands’ and wives’ dissatisfaction with the division of labor. All of these findings emerged significant. First, in regard to dissatisfaction with household chore arrangements ($t(151) = 16.79, p < .001$), mean comparisons showed that husbands experienced little dissatisfaction ($M = .09, SD = .33$) whereas wives experienced a significant degree of dissatisfaction ($M = 1.21, SD = .80$). Second, regarding apartment maintenance ($t(138) = 3.61, p < .001$), wives also felt greater dissatisfaction than husbands ($M = .22, SD = .50$ & $M = .51, SD = .86$ for husbands and wives, respectively). The same pattern held for child discipline ($t(113) = 2.02, p < .05$) with wives ($M = .52, SD = .73$) reporting greater dissatisfaction than husbands ($M = .32, SD = .57$). Finally, in regard to childcare ($t(150) = 15.52, p < .001$), mean comparisons showed that husbands generally experienced little dissatisfaction ($M = .07, SD = .26$) whereas wives experienced a significant degree of dissatisfaction ($M = 1.10, SD = .79$). Accordingly, results showed that wives always perceived a greater disconnect, relative to husbands, between desired and current arrangements for division of labor, and these differences were particularly strong for household chores and childcare.

**Multivariate Multiple Regression Path Analyses**

Two multivariate multiple regressions were performed in SEM using the Analysis of Moments Structure (AMOS) software (Arbuckle & Wothke, 1999). The first model used current perceptions of household division of labor to predict marital satisfaction, and the second model focused on dissatisfaction with household division of labor to predict marital satisfaction. In
order to account for missing data, the regressions used full information, maximum likelihood estimation. Also, in order to simplify the graphical representation of the results, correlations between the exogenous variables and the correlated disturbances are not shown in the Figures. The correlation between the disturbances for the marital conflict endogenous variables was equivalent to .56.

Figure 1 represents husband and wife perceptions of the current division of household labor and connections with concurrent levels of marital satisfaction. Control variables are also allowed to predict marital satisfaction within each spouse (e.g., wives’ age predicting wives’ marital satisfaction). The model fit the data well, with a chi-square of 7.51 (df = 6, p = .28) and CFI of 1.00, TLI of .95, and RMSEA of .04. The overall variance in marital satisfaction explained by the predictors in the model for both wives and husbands was significant ($R^2 = .14$ for wives, and $R^2 = .13$ for husbands.

A number of significant or marginally significant findings are notable in the first model. First, when wives perceived themselves doing more of childcare tasks ($\beta = -19$, $p < .10$), they tended to experience lower levels of marital satisfaction. Also, when wives perceived themselves doing more household chores ($\beta = -.18$, $p < .10$) and apartment maintenance ($\beta = -.20$, $p < .05$), their husbands reported lower levels of marital satisfaction. In regard to husband perceptions, the more husbands perceived their wives contributing more to child discipline ($\beta = -22$, $p < .05$), the greater the tendency for wives to experience lower levels of marital satisfaction. An additional finding also emerged in which husband perceptions of their wives doing more in household chores ($\beta = .22$, $p < .05$) were related to higher levels of marital satisfaction for wives. These variables were essentially uncorrelated at the zero-order level. Accordingly, this particular finding appeared to be evidence of a suppressor effect.
Figure 2 presents the results of the multivariate model in which scores of dissatisfaction with household division of labor is associated with marital satisfaction. The model fit summary reported a chi-square of 6.61 ($df = 6, p = .36$), with a CFI of 1.00, TLI of .97, and RMSEA of .02, all suggesting good model fit. The overall variance in marital satisfaction explained by the predictors in the model for both wives and husbands was significant ($R^2 = .20$ for both wives and husbands).

A number of significant or marginally significant findings are notable in this second model. Generally speaking, the greater the discrepancy between what each spouse thinks their partner should be doing versus how it is now, the more dissatisfied they are with their marriage. In particular, the greater the wife’s dissatisfaction with division of labor in regard to apartment maintenance ($\beta = -.22, p < .01$) and child care ($\beta = -.20, p < .05$), the lower the wife’s marital satisfaction tend to be. Wives’ dissatisfaction with division of labor in regard to household tasks ($\beta = -.17, p < .05$) and apartment maintenance ($\beta = -.23, p < .01$) also predicted decreased marital satisfaction scores for husbands as well. Lastly, the greater the husband’s dissatisfaction with his spouse’s contribution to apartment maintenance ($\beta = -.18, p < .05$) and childcare ($\beta = -.15, p < .10$), the lower the husband’s level of marital satisfaction tends to be.

**Discussion**

The purpose of this study was to assess associations between division of household labor, and dissatisfaction with such, and marital satisfaction in Russian couples. The original hypothesis of this study ascribed to the “etic” ideal that the findings in Russia would be similar to what has been obtained in prior studies in the U.S. More specifically, unequal division of labor between spouses was expected to relate to decreased levels of marital satisfaction. In past research, the wife’s level of marital satisfaction is particularly associated with how satisfied both
partners are with the division of labor in the home (Suitor, 1991; Voyandoff & Donnelly, 1999; Wilkie, Ferree & Ratcliff, 1998; Pimentel, 2000). Findings at both the bivariate and univariate levels for Russian couples were consistent with this hypothesis, whether the focus was current state of division of labor or the levels of dissatisfaction with current arrangements.

In this study, findings suggested that when wives perceived that they contributed more than their husbands to childcare tasks, they experienced lower levels of marital satisfaction. Wives also experienced dissatisfaction with their husband’s contribution. In order to lower the dissatisfaction levels, husbands, in the wives’ perspective, need to contribute more in terms of childcare and apartment maintenance. Equity theory seems to play a definite part in the results (Buunk & Mustaers, 1999).

A series of studies in the U.S. support that there is strong correlation between division of labor and marital quality (Buunk & Mutsaers, 1999; Frisco & Williams, 2003; Perry-Jenkins, 1990; Wilkie, Ferree, & Ratcliff, 1998; Voyandoff & Donnelly, 1999). Generally, household chores cannot be delayed and are ongoing. Household chores are often referred to as “mundane,” “repetitive,” and “boring.” One can make the assumption that both husband and wife do not enjoy doing household chores (Coltrane, 2000). This offers the explanation of wives feeling dissatisfied when they feel their contribution is greater than their spouses.

It was interesting to see that when wives experienced dissatisfaction with the contribution of their spouses and saw themselves contributing more to household chores and apartment maintenance than their husbands, the husbands experienced lower levels of marital satisfaction. This could be due to their wives being unhappy about the arrangement in the home, which could in turn negatively impact interaction in the couple relationship, which may then produce the husbands’ dissatisfaction with the marriage. Blair (1993) found that wives’ perception of
unfairness in a marriage has a stronger impact than husbands’ reports of unfairness. The reason is that the wives are more likely to express their distress over issues of equality in the home than their husbands, whereas their husbands are more likely to avoid any type of conflict that may promote stress. This leaves the wife unable to resolve the disagreement, and over time this will accumulate greater feelings of dissatisfaction in the wife.

With wives having the stronger influence over how satisfied a couple’s marriage is, it is a wonder how husbands seem to fail in contributing more in household related tasks. Some researchers suggest that wives might have the tendency to consciously or unconsciously discourage men from participating in the domestic sphere. This belief or behavior limits husbands from gaining opportunities to learn and grow through taking care of the home and their children (Ashwin, 2004; Allen & Hawkins, 1999; Fagan & Barnett, 2003). This dynamic is referred to as maternal gatekeeping. Maternal gatekeeping could be a phenomena that helps explain why husbands fail to make a more significant contribution in the home. There are several reasons why maternal gatekeeping may exist. To name two, first, for gender related reasons, wives may feel guilty or hesitant about relinquishing household responsibilities to their husbands since wives feel that it should be their job. Second, wives may act as managers overseeing how their husbands have accomplished their tasks. Wives may be critical and not trust their husbands to do the job in the way they would like it to be done. A critical stance could discourage husbands from trying to be actively involved. Through a qualitative study, researcher Ashwin (2004) found that the same problems exists in Russia as well. It seems as though women in Russia still desire assistance in the home, but a confusing message is sent when wives discourage their husbands from attempting to take initiative to help around the home.
In our last findings, it was interesting to see that husbands’ dissatisfaction with their wives’ contribution to apartment maintenance led to husbands feeling lower levels of marital satisfaction. A study conducted in the U.S. may help explain this finding. Kamo (2000) found that in terms of division of labor, husbands tend to overestimate their own contribution in the home while their wives do not, as measured by inter-spouse response discrepancies. There seem to be four possible sources of misperceptions that may contribute to the overestimation, such as: social desirability, resentment in doing household work, insufficient knowledge of the spouses’ contributions, and efficiency in performing household tasks (Kamo, 2000). This may be the explanation as to why Russian husbands are not satisfied with the contribution of their spouses.

Another explanation may be linked to the history of Russia regarding gender roles. It was interesting to see in Figure 2 that the husbands were not satisfied with their spouse’s contribution even though the wives reported that they are contributing more. Traditionally, when looking at the different categories within division of labor, apartment maintenance is viewed as a masculine job (Boss & Gurko, 1994). Trying to maintain traditional gender roles in Russia has been difficult and confusing due to couples’ economic situation, which compels both spouses into the work force (Boss & Gurko, 1994). Husbands who have participated in this study may be confused about the roles they should take on relative to division of labor in the home, since traditionally wives should be homemakers and husbands should be breadwinners. Their dissatisfaction may be originating from the confusion of gender roles since they are not able to maintain the traditional home environment. Maybe the assumption is made that their wives should be contributing more to apartment maintenance.

We may also speculate how alcoholism may play into the interesting results of this study. It is said that the parent who consumes more alcohol tends to take on the authoritarian role
(Nelson, Hart, Keister, & Piassetskaia, 2009). In past research, studies have shown that the men were more likely to be alcoholics (Boss & Gurko, 1994). Given that men were more likely to resort to alcohol, women took over most tasks in the home. However, it is uncertain whether wives take over most of the household tasks because they feel their husbands are incapable of making a contribution, or if it is because the husbands have taken on the authoritarian role and have higher expectations of their wives.

Overall, perceptions of and striving for equity may be the driving force behind the transitions of the roles taken between husbands and wives in the home. The results here exemplify that generally the couples in this study do not feel that things are fair, with the sentiment or perception being strongest among wives. Turning to equity theory, we predict that individuals are most satisfied when they perceive that their partners are doing the same amount of work as they themselves are. Feeling deprived or feeling advantaged in the relationship with regards to the amount of work one perceives himself or herself contributing will create feelings of less satisfaction between themselves and their partner (Buunk & Mutsaers, 1999). We believe that the unfairness the couples in this study report feeling accounts for their decreased levels of marital satisfaction.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

One of the more significant limitations in this current study was the fact that only two questions were used to account for each category of division of labor—leading to lower reliability.

Additionally, the current study was unable to examine the significant impact of husbands’ alcoholism among Russian couples. Since it is a big part of the Russian lifestyle, it would be
interesting to know how alcohol ties into division of labor and how that in turn affects levels of marital satisfaction and marital quality.

**Clinical Implications**

Overall, the findings of this study support an “etic” approach and viewpoint in that regardless of the cultural variables that may exist in a different county, findings were still largely consistent with findings from studies conducted in the U.S. on division of labor. Most of the findings suggest that the wives’ perception of division of labor has more of an impact on levels of marital satisfaction than do husbands’ perceptions.

There was, however, one finding that was not congruent with research conducted in the U.S. Namely, the greater the dissatisfaction husbands felt about their wives’ contribution to apartment maintenance, the lower were the levels of marital satisfaction husbands reported. This finding could be tied to maternal gatekeeping, or it could be a reflection of the instability of the social, economic, and political aspects of Russia and its impact on gender roles and expectations. This may also provide some insight into how some Russian families may be unstable because of confusion surrounding the roles husbands and wives are to take or not take. Taking equity theory into account, it seems as though couples have different perceptions of what is fair. Because of these differing perceptions, lower levels of marital satisfaction are being produced.
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Appendix

Table 1. Standardized Factor Loadings of Division of Labor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs and Representative Items</th>
<th>H Loading</th>
<th>W Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household Chores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally, who does more of the regular inside household tasks, such as laundry, preparing meals, cleaning etc...?</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When both husband and wife are home, who generally does more of the regular inside household tasks, such as laundry, preparing meals, vacuuming, etc...?</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment Upkeep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally, who does more of the apartment maintenance?</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When both husband and wife are home, who generally does more of the apartment maintenance?</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally, who punishes the children when they misbehave?</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When both husband and wife are home, who generally handles punishing children when they misbehave?</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally, who does more of the child-care tasks, such as feeding, changing diapers, reading to the children, etc...?</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When both husband and wife are home, who generally does more of the child-care tasks, such as feeding, changing diapers, reading to the children, etc...?</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2 Descriptive Statistics and Correlations of the Current Division of Labor and Marital Satisfaction Scales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SD</strong></td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Wife's Marital Satisfaction</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Husband's Marital Satisfaction</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Wife Household Chore Satisfaction</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>.53***</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Wife Apartment Upkeep Satisfaction</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Wife Child Discipline Satisfaction</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.64***</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Wife Child Care Satisfaction</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Husband Household Chore Satisfaction</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Husband Apartment Upkeep Satisfaction</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Husband Child Discipline Satisfaction</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Husband Child Care Satisfaction</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation is significant when *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001

### Table 3 Descriptive Statistics and Correlations of the Dissatisfaction with Division of Labor and Marital Satisfaction Scales.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Wife’s Marital Satisfaction</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.32***</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Husband’s Marital Satisfaction</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>-.30***</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Wife Household Chore Satisfaction</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Wife Apartment Upkeep Satisfaction</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Wife Child Discipline Satisfaction</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Wife Child Care Satisfaction</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Husband Household Chore Satisfaction</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Husband Apartment Upkeep Satisfaction</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Husband Child Discipline Satisfaction</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Husband Child Care Satisfaction</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation is significant when *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001
Figure 1. SEM multiple regression: The Current Division of Labor and Marital Satisfaction Scales
Figure 2. SEM multiple regression: The Dissatisfaction with Division of Labor and Marital Satisfaction Scales.