

The Emergence of Women as Main Earners in Europe

Agnese Vitali

University of Southampton, UK

Daria Mendola

University of Palermo, Italy

Paper prepared for the European Population Conference 2014

Preliminary draft, please do not cite or quote

Abstract

This paper conducts a cross-sectional empirical research aimed at documenting the emergence of a new family model characterized by women who earn the largest share of the household income. We show that in Europe, couples with women as the main earner have started to represent a non-negligible share of the population. We provide a descriptive analysis of the social-demographic characteristics of couples in which women are the main earner in comparison to couples in which men are the main earner and equal-earner couples. We undertake a comparative approach using micro-level surveys for 21 European countries from the European Social Survey.

Keywords

European Social Survey, Family Change, Female Breadwinners, Gender Roles.

Introduction

For long, men have received a better education than women and used to be the sole or main person responsible for raising the income necessary to sustain the household. In Western societies, the predominant family model was characterized by a specialization of gender roles with men working and women staying at home. Many societal aspects were implicitly built on the notion that the male-breadwinner model (Becker 1981) was at place, and welfare systems were structured around the gendered division of work and care tasks (Crompton 1999; Lewis 2001). The male-breadwinner model has been challenged as women entered higher education and employment, and started to earn income and hence became economically independent from their partners, giving rise to more egalitarian societies (Esping-Andersen 2009). In addition, individuals' ideational and value change have led to a decline in the centrality of the family and new family forms have emerged, such as lone motherhood and non-marital cohabitation, further eroding the normative role of men as main breadwinner (Van de Kaa 1987; Lewis 2001). Over time, dual-earner families have become widespread (Blossfeld et al. 2001; Oppenheimer 1994).

Today, in a growing number of married couples in the US, wives are more likely to have achieved higher education than their husbands (Schwartz and Mare, 2005) and represent the sole or main household income provider (Wang et al. 2013). Studies found that women earn more than their partners in one in four couples in the US (Wang et al. 2013), and one in five in Australia (Drago et al. 2005). The share of couples where the woman is the sole earner, which includes the stay-at-home fathers and can be referred to as "female breadwinner" couples, is also on the rise. Hence, couples in which women contribute the largest share of the household income now represent a non-negligible share of the population. Because of its novel distribution of economic power within the partners, this new model profoundly transforms the traditional organization of the family. Research on women who out-earn their partners is rare given the recent nature of the phenomenon, and it is limited to the US and Australia. To the best of our knowledge, there is only one study for Europe, i.e. Bloemen et al. (2013) for France. Further, most existing studies were conducted on data collected two decades ago or more (Atkinson et al. 1984; Brennan et al. 2001; Rogers et al. 2001; Winkler et al. 2005), and hence disregard the social change concerning women and their role observed during the most recent decades.

This paper aims at filling a gap in the literature by investigating the emergence of women who out-earn their partners in Europe, using up-to-date micro data from the European Social Survey, describing families in the 2000s. We aim at identifying the socio-demographic characteristics of men and women in couples where women are the main earner in comparison to couples where men are the main earner and equal-earner couples, and to investigate whether women in the three family categories differ in terms of psychological wellbeing, time spent on housework-related activities, and gender-egalitarian attitudes.

With its relevant internal differences in welfare regimes, cultural traits and demographic outcomes, Europe is a laboratory for studying cross-country heterogeneity. Public policies regarding the family and employment, in European countries, have responded to the societal change very differently (Lewis 2001). Many governments have promoted family-friendly policies such as availability of kindergarten, part-time work, and parental leave to ease the combination of work and family-related tasks targeted to the dual-earner family. But not all institutions supported women's empowerment and provided adequate policies to these new types of families. In contrast to gender-egalitarian societies, that facilitate outsourcing of family activities such as childcare and care for the elderly (Esping-Andersen et al. 2012), in settings characterized by low gender equality in the private sphere (McDonald 2013), such as countries in the South of Europe, all the burden of domestic tasks and care giving is still mainly associated with women. In this paper we are able to compare women as

main earners across Southern Europe, Central and Eastern Europe, Liberal, Continental and Scandinavian countries, and juxtapose the results to those found by previous research in the US.

In addition, our data allows comparing two points in time covering the period before and after the 2008 economic crisis. This means that we are able to investigate if the relevance of the economic role for women within the family has become more widespread during the economic crisis as unemployment rates were raising, in particular for men (Cho et al. 2012).

Background

In all industrialized countries today, women are more and more represented in the labour market. As of 2012, employment rate for women of working age in the European Union was equal to 58.5%, against 69.6% for men, indicating that, though men are still more likely to be employed than women, the gender gap in the labour market has reduced considerably over time (Source: Labour Force Survey, Eurostat). Studies show that the gender gap in earnings persists in that men are more likely to earn higher incomes than women, regardless of the level of education achieved (OECD 2013; Vincent-Lancrin 2008), but it is nonetheless shrinking. Particularly interesting is the increasing number of women in the educational system. In 2005 there were 1.3 female graduates for each male graduate (Vincent-Lancrin 2008) on average across OECD countries. The most recent data for 2011 show that the proportion of students who entered tertiary education and graduated with at least a first degree was 10% higher for women (71.9%) than it was for men (61.8%) (OECD 2013).

This trend observed at the macro level is also visible at the individual level, when looking at the composition of couples in terms of their educational background. In 2000, wives were more likely to have achieved higher education than their husbands in the US (Schwartz and Mare, 2005). In spite of the prediction formulated by the Beckerian model of the family (Becker, 1981) that women's increased economic autonomy would have led to a decrease in women's desirability of marrying and staying married, high-educated working women are more likely to marry with respect to lower-educated women (Oppenheimer, 1997; Goldstein and Kenney, 2001). Hence, women's high educational attainment, work and earnings act postponing but not foregoing marriage (Oppenheimer, 1994).

Scholars in different fields have investigated the causes and consequences of the social change brought about by the increased economic power of women. The sociological literature has studied women's empowerment and gender roles (Crompton 1999; Esping-Andersen 2012; Mencarini et al. 2012; Oppenheimer 1994). Family demographers have investigated the interrelations between the social and the demographic change, with particular attentions to low fertility (Balbo et al. 2013; Kohler et al. 2002). Economists have studied the role of family-friendly policies and institutions (Adsera 2004; Del Boca 2002), and psychologists the psychological implications brought about by the increased economic power of women (Coughlin et al. 2012; Meisenbach 2010).

However, the causes and consequences brought about by the emergence of women as main earners have been so far rarely investigated and definitely not in a comparative framework. The psychological literature has devoted attention to this new reality investigating, via qualitative studies, the psychological consequences for men (Coughlin et al. 2012), and gendered identities of women (Meisenbach 2010). Results have shown that the psychological consequences for men are mediated by their gender ideology in that men who have a conservative masculine ideology tend to suffer from depression symptoms and have a generally low wellbeing when they are out-earned by their partner, while no significant effects were found for men with gender-equal attitudes (Coughlin and Wade 2012). Higher-earning women's wellbeing is instead less frequently investigated (Meisenbach 2010).

The few empirical studies based on representative survey data acknowledging the rise of women as primary earners have mainly looked at the consequences for marital quality and risk of divorce (Brennan et al. 2001; Rogers et al. 2001). Female breadwinners were found to be more exposed to the risk of spousal violence (Macmillan et al. 1999; Atkinson et al. 2005). Masculine ideology has been shown to be a mediating factor for both relationship quality (Coughlin et al. 2012) and risk of violence against women (Atkinson et al. 2005). Existing literature on division of household tasks among cohabitators suggests that women who out-earn their partners do more housework, because doing housework for high-earning women is a way to do gender deviance neutralization (Lui 2013; Schneider 2011).

Research on Europe is lacking on this topic, while it could be informative to compare different institutional and cultural settings which might buffer the above-mentioned effect (Esping-Andersen 2009).

Data and Methods

The empirical approach in this paper will be based on descriptive analyses using the European Social Survey (ESS, <http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/>), a repeated cross-sectional survey providing information different European countries. The ESS is a biennial social survey aimed at measuring values and behaviours of Europeans and at understanding how and why such patterns change over time. We focus on 21 countries and two time periods, 2004 and 2010. The ESS proves to be useful since two of its rounds contain rotating modules devoted to the study of family, work and wellbeing plus self-reported socio-demographic information on partners. Particularly relevant for this project is a survey question which allows identifying the household breadwinner on the basis of the most common definition, i.e. the person who earns the majority of their household income. The question reads as follows: “Around how large a proportion of the household income do you provide yourself?” and possible answers are in a scale from 1 “None” to 7 “All”. Using this question in combination with the living arrangements of the respondent, it is possible to identify the couple of married or cohabiting partners where the woman is the sole or the primary earner (including, but not restricted to female-breadwinner families), where the man is the sole or the primary earner (including, but not restricted to male-breadwinner families), and where the man and the woman provide about the same share of the total household income (equal-earner families). Warren (2007) offers a review of sociological studies on breadwinning where the breadwinner is most often identified as the main financial provider (i.e. the person who earn the majority of household income), and sometimes as the main labour market participant in terms of levels of participation in paid work and hours committed to the labour force. In the final version of the paper we will consider alternative definitions of a female-breadwinner model, such as that of families where the woman is more educated, or has a more stable or more prestigious job than her partner, and test the robustness of the different definitions (Haug 1973).

Furthermore, the ESS includes a battery of questions on values and attitudes which allows investigating whether women and men in the three family classifications differ in terms of attitudes towards gender equality and work-family balance.

During the post-2008 recession, many countries in Europe have witnessed declining real earnings and increased unemployment rates (Aassve et al. 2013) in particular for men because men are mainly employed in the economic sectors most hardly hit by the crisis (Cho et al. 2012). This implied that many households in Europe have recently become dependent upon women’s labour income. Hence, one might argue that breadwinner women started to emerge in Europe only recently and temporarily. Comparing figures obtained with ESS rotating modules from 2004 and 2010, we are

able to assess if the emergence of breadwinner women was linked to the recession or it was detectable already in 2004, i.e. well before the recession had begun.

We perform ordinal logistic regressions to identify the main determinants behind each of the three family models (the man as main earner, equal-earner, and the woman as main earner). We consider the dependent variable to be ordered with respect to the increasing economic role/power of women within the family, as the economic role of women is low in families where the man is the main earner, intermediate in egalitarian families, and high in families where the woman is the main earner. We consider, as covariates, individual socio-demographic characteristics such as age, educational attainment, employment status and occupation of the woman, household-specific characteristics such as the household income, the number of children living in the household, whether there is a child below age 3, and whether the partners are in a marital or a non-marital union. Finally, we consider the partner's employment status and the difference between men's and women's socio-demographic characteristics. We consider whether the woman is younger (reference category), older or of the same age as her partner, whether she is less (ref.), more or equally educated, and whether she has a lower (ref.), higher or equally prestigious occupation.

In order to ease the presentation of results, we group countries on the basis of their welfare regimes (Esping-Andersen 1990; Ferrera 1996) into Liberal countries (Great Britain and Ireland), Scandinavian countries (Norway, Sweden, Finland and Denmark), Southern European countries (Spain, Portugal and Greece), Continental Europe (Germany, Belgium, Switzerland, France and Netherlands), and Central and Eastern Europe (Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Slovenia, Slovakia, Ukraine, and Poland). The final sample is constituted of about 21,000 women aged between 20 and 65, who are currently co-residing with a male spouse or partner. We use population and design weights.

Preliminary Results

Table 1 shows the percentage of respondents classified as belonging to families with the man as main earner, the equal-earners, and the woman as main earner. ESS data allow comparing the distribution into the three family models in two different points, 2004 and 2010, i.e. before and after the 2008 economic crisis. In 2010 the majority of couples in Europe are such that men earn more than their partners (62%), suggesting that the traditional family model with a gendered division of roles still characterizes the majority of families in Europe. About one fourth of the couples (22%) are such that both partners earn about half of the total household income, and as many as 15% are couples where women out-earn their partners. The latter category shows important heterogeneity across Europe, though in all countries it is at least equal to 10%. In Slovenia and Denmark 22% of the couples are such that women are the main earner in 2010, followed by Great Britain (19%), some of the countries in Central and Eastern Europe (19% in Poland, 18% in Estonia, and 16% in Hungary) and in the other Scandinavian countries (16%). Women as main earner are less widespread in Ukraine, Czech Republic and countries in Continental and Southern Europe.

Between 2004 and 2010, the proportion of equal-earner couples increased (+11% in France, +4% in Spain, Sweden and Slovakia, +3% in Belgium, Greece, Ireland, and Switzerland) and so did the proportion of couples with women as main earner (+9% in Greece, +5% in Poland and the Netherlands, +4% in Great Britain, +3% in Norway, Denmark and Spain). We know that during the crisis and the recession that followed, unemployment rates increased particularly for men (Cho et al. 2012).

Table 1: Percentage of respondents in men as main earner, equal-earner, and women as main earner models, 2004 and 2010 and percentage change

	2004			2010			% Change 2004-2010		
	Men as main earner	Equal Earner	Women as main earner	Men as main earner	Equal Earner	Women as main earner	Men as main earner	Equal earner	Women as main earner
Continental Europe:	67.5	19.1	13.4	63.3	22.1	14.6	-4.2	3.0	1.2
Switzerland	72.5	15.9	11.7	67.9	18.4	13.7	-4.6	2.5	2.1
Netherlands	76.7	13.5	9.9	72.6	12.7	14.7	-4.1	-0.7	4.9
Germany	69.8	17.9	12.3	69.0	16.6	14.4	-0.8	-1.2	2.0
France	60.0	22.6	17.5	51.2	33.7	15.1	-8.7	11.1	-2.3
Belgium	58.6	25.6	15.8	55.7	28.9	15.3	-2.9	3.3	-0.4
Liberal Countries:	71.2	15.9	12.9	66.6	17.5	15.9	-4.6	1.6	3.0
Great Britain	69.2	16.2	14.5	64.4	17.0	18.6	-4.8	0.7	4.1
Ireland	73.2	15.5	11.3	68.8	17.9	13.3	-4.4	2.5	1.9
Southern Europe:	68.3	21.0	10.7	62.7	22.9	14.5	-5.6	1.9	3.7
Portugal	59.5	26.2	14.3	62.0	24.4	13.6	2.5	-1.8	-0.7
Spain	68.9	20.6	10.6	61.6	24.8	13.6	-7.3	4.3	3.0
Greece	76.5	16.2	7.4	64.5	19.4	16.2	-12.0	3.2	8.8
Scandinavian Count.:	53.3	31.4	15.3	51.2	31.1	17.7	-2.1	-0.3	2.4
Sweden	52.6	32.6	14.8	47.1	36.4	16.4	-5.5	3.8	1.6
Norway	56.4	30.7	12.9	52.6	31.2	16.2	-3.8	0.5	3.4
Finland	55.4	29.7	14.9	55.4	28.0	16.6	0.0	-1.6	1.6
Denmark	48.8	32.5	18.7	49.8	28.6	21.6	0.9	-3.9	3.0
Centr. and East. Eu:	57.8	24.7	17.6	59.7	24.2	16.1	1.9	-0.5	-1.4
Czech Republic	65.1	20.6	14.3	69.0	18.0	12.9	3.9	-2.6	-1.4
Slovakia	58.0	22.7	19.3	60.0	26.4	13.7	2.0	3.6	-5.6
Ukraine	65.1	22.2	12.7	66.1	21.9	12.0	1.0	-0.3	-0.7
Hungary	56.8	22.7	20.6	59.7	24.4	15.9	3.0	1.7	-4.7
Poland	62.3	23.6	14.1	62.4	18.9	18.7	0.1	-4.7	4.6
Estonia	58.7	23.1	18.2	60.0	22.1	17.9	1.3	-1.0	-0.3
Slovenia	38.6	37.8	23.6	40.5	37.6	21.9	1.9	-0.2	-1.7
Total	65.6	20.7	13.8	62.4	24.7	15.3	-3.2	64.0	1.5
N	7,070	2,232	1,483	6,360	2,277	1,558			

This means that worsened economic circumstances pushed women who were out of the labour force into the labour market, or increased the importance of working women's economic contribution in the sustainment of their households. Greece, the European country most affected by the recession, passed from holding the lowest proportion of main-earner women in 2004 (7%), to surpass the European average and reach 16% in 2010. We cannot however find a common pattern across the 21 countries analysed. For example, between 2004 and 2010, the proportion of male-breadwinner families increased substantially in Czech Republic (+8%), Portugal (7%) and Slovakia (4%), while in some countries we observe a small variation between the two points in time.

Tables 2 to 6 show preliminary results from generalized ordered logistic models estimated for each country separately. Results are reported by grouping welfare regimes together. As expected, we find heterogeneity across countries.

Her age shows a negative association with the likelihood of being an equal earner or a main earner in the Netherlands, Portugal, and Slovakia (and, at 10% level, also in Belgium, Slovenia, and Poland). This means that younger women are more likely to contribute an equal or the largest share of their household income, with respect to older women in a selection of Continental and Central and Eastern European countries, while no significant association is found for countries in the remaining welfare regimes. Her educational attainment results to be statistically significant only in three Continental countries (Belgium, Switzerland, and France). Her occupation is positively associated with her contribution to the household income. Women in intermediate, and in particular in professional/managerial occupations are more likely to be equal earner, and more likely to be main earners in all Scandinavian and Liberal countries. A positive association is also found for most Conservative countries, and, with a marginal significance, in most Central and Eastern European countries. In Southern Europe, we find a marginally significant association in Portugal, no association in Spain, and we find that women in professional/managerial occupations are more likely to be equal earner while no association is found for what concerns main earners in Greece.

The presence of children in the household, and the presence of at least a child aged less than 3 years old are, as expected, negatively associated with the economic role of women within the family. In other words, women with (young) children are more likely to contribute a lower share of household income than their partners'. This result holds in particular for Southern European countries and for two Continental countries, namely France and Germany, and, with a lower significance, for the Netherlands, Ireland, Slovenia, Denmark and Finland. Cohabiting women are more likely to contribute a large share of the household income with respect to married women in two Continental countries, namely Switzerland and Germany. A positive association is also found in Ireland, Norway and two countries in Eastern Europe, namely Poland and Hungary, but in this case it is only significant at the 10%. Possibly, women who are not married to their cohabiting partner are more likely to be economically independent from their partner, and hence more likely to provide an equal share of the household income. But it might also be that couples who are in a non-marital cohabitation are more modern and hence are more prone to accept that women earn the largest share of the household income. In Norway, Finland, Portugal, Slovenia and Slovakia (and Switzerland at the 1% level of significance), as household income increases, women are more likely to earn less than their partners. This result might seem counterintuitive especially in the case of equal earner couples, where both partners are contributing to the household income, given that dual-earner couples earn more than couples with a sole-earner, *ceteris paribus*. One interpretation for this result is that women in families with a relatively high household income tend to be out of the labour force, or to contribute only a little share of the total household income. This seems to indicate that in these five countries, women are

more likely to contribute household income when they are constrained to do so by the low total household income.

Women who attained the same level of education of their partners' have a higher economic role within the family with respect to women who attained a lower level of education. The association becomes stronger when women attained a higher level of education than their partners'. Similarly, women who are employed in equally or higher prestigious occupations than their partners' are more likely to contribute a larger share of household income. This holds in particular in Scandinavian and Liberal countries, Poland, and, at the 10% significance level, in most of Continental countries (Belgium, Germany, and the Netherlands). In France and Greece, women with an equally prestigious occupation than their partners' are more likely to be equal earner, and in Czech republic, women with a more prestigious occupation than their partners' are more likely to be equal earner, while no association is found for being main earner. The economic power of women within the family is not associated with women's higher educational attainment nor with more prestigious occupation with respect to their partners' in Southern Europe, probably indicating that labour markets in these regions might limit the economic empowerment of women due to the existence of gender pay gaps.

The employment status for men can be used to understand if women who contribute a largest share of the household income do so because of economic constraints arising when the man is unemployed, inactive or disabled. In this respect, Greece is certainly a country where the economic role of women within the family is linked to worsened economic circumstances. In fact, Greek women are more likely to be equal or primary earners when their partner is not working. Interestingly, Greece is the only country for which equal and primary earners among women have significantly increased in 2010 as opposed to 2004, as a consequence of the harsh economic recession. An association between economic power of women and men's unemployment/inactivity is also found in France, Denmark, Norway, Liberal and Southern European countries. In a limited number of countries (France, Ireland, Portugal, and Slovakia) we find a puzzling result: in those couples where women are employed are men are not, women are more likely to contribute a lower share of household income. This result is probably due to the way we have constructed this variable, which includes man who are inactive, unemployed, doing housework, as well as disabled and retired. The latter two categories are indeed recipient of money in the form of benefits/pensions, which contribute to the household income. In the final version of the paper we will distinguish between these different categories.

In the final version of the paper we will provide a detailed descriptive analysis of the values and attitudes of women and men in the three family models. In particular, we will include country-specific descriptive analyses aimed at investigating whether women and men in man as main earner, equal earner and women as main earner families differ in terms of happiness, psychological wellbeing (i.e. life-satisfaction, feeling of loneliness), time spent on housework-related activities, and gender-egalitarian attitudes.

Conclusion and Discussion

The key contribution of this paper is to provide the first comprehensive study on the emergence of women as main earners and female-breadwinner families in Europe. This paper represents an initial step in a broader program of research that will examine the causes and consequences of the increased economic power of women within the couple.

In the final version of the paper we will include a discussion of the results presented in the paper and we will mention future directions for research on this topic.

Table 2: Estimated coefficients from generalized ordered logistic regression, Continental Countries

	Belgium		Switzerland		France		Germany		Netherlands	
	2,3 vs. 1	3 vs 2,1	2,3 vs. 1	3 vs 2,1	2,3 vs. 1	3 vs 2,1	2,3 vs. 1	3 vs 2,1	2,3 vs. 1	3 vs 2,1
Age: 20-34 (Ref.)										
Age: 35-44	-0.645 *	0.379	0.167	0.167	0.238	0.238	0.285	0.285	-0.659 *	-0.66 *
Age: 45-54	-0.726 *	0.249	-0.4	-0.4	-0.356	-0.356	0.137	0.137	-0.942 **	-0.11
Age: 55-64	-1.04 *	-1.04 *	-0.165	-0.165	-0.625	-0.625	-0.059	0.856	-1.121 **	0.088
Low Education (Ref.)										
Medium education	-0.675 *	-0.675 *	-0.836 *	-1.79 ***	-0.253	-0.253	0.194	0.194	0.126	0.126
High education	-0.856 *	-0.856 *	-0.595	-0.595	-1.082 *	-1.082 *	0.577	0.577	0.193	0.193
Routine/Manual Occupation (Ref.)										
Intermediate Occupation	0.322	0.322	0.116	0.116	0.972 ***	0.972 ***	0.545 *	0.545 *	0.645 *	0.645 *
Professional/Managerial Occupation	0.801 **	0.801 **	0.56	0.56	1.178 ***	1.178 ***	0.618	0.618	1.135 **	1.135 **
Wave 2005	-0.046	-0.046	0.009	0.009	0.391	-0.423	-0.132	-0.132	0.026	0.026
N. Children	-0.141	-0.141	-0.221	-0.221	-0.526 ***	-0.229	-0.443 ***	-0.174	-0.297 *	-0.11
Child aged less than 3 years old	-0.149	-0.149	-0.554	-0.554	0.186	0.186	-0.165	-0.165	-0.662	-0.66
Cohabiting vs. Married	0.157	0.157	1.082 ***	1.082 ***	0.222	0.222	0.965 ***	0.965 ***	0.331	0.331
Household income	0.083	0.083	-0.129 *	-0.129 *	-0.075	0.12	-0.052	-0.052	0.055	0.055
Equal age	0.115	0.115	0.486	1.327 **	-0.067	-0.067	0.103	0.103	0.056	0.056
Woman older	0.274	0.274	0.134	0.134	0.104	0.104	-0.144	-0.144	0.361	0.361
Equal education	0.514	0.514	1.025 **	0.31	0.546	0.546	0.381	0.381	0.897 *	0.897 *
Woman more educated	1.418 ***	1.418 ***	1.561 ***	0.552	1.524 ***	1.524 ***	0.59	0.59	1.478 ***	1.478 ***
Equally prestigious occupations	0.516 *	0.516 *	0.409	0.409	0.726 **	0.076	0.442	0.442	0.123	0.123
Woman in more prestigious occupation	0.084	0.084	-0.107	-0.107	0.254	0.254	0.575 *	0.575 *	0.602 *	0.602 *
Woman Inactive/Unemployed/Other, Partner Employed (Ref.)										
Both Employed	1.31 ***	0.455	1.667 ***	1.667 ***	1.466 ***	0.602	1.691 ***	1.691 ***	1.173 ***	0.051
Woman Employed, Partner Inactive/Unemployed/Other	0.32	0.32	1.539	1.539	15.156 ***	-13.48 ***	-0.095	-0.095	0.667	0.667
Both Inactive/Unemployed/Other	0.072	0.072	-0.673	-0.673	-15.359 ***	14.009 ***	0.113	0.113	-0.44	-0.44
<i>N</i>	556		590		574		843		685	

p-value: *** <0.01; ** <0.05; * <0.1. “2,3 vs. 1”: Egalitarian and Female Breadwinner vs Male Breadwinner; “3 vs. 2,1”: Female Breadwinner vs. Egalitarian and Male Breadwinner.

Table 3: Estimated coefficients from generalized ordered logistic regression, Liberal Countries

	Ireland		GB	
	2,3 vs. 1	3 vs 2,1	2,3 vs. 1	3 vs 2,1
Age: 20-34 (Ref.)				
Age: 35-44	-0.219	-0.219	-0.37	-0.37
Age: 45-54	-0.299	-0.299	-0.32	-0.32
Age: 55-64				
Low Education (Ref.)	-0.369	-0.369	-0.745	-0.745
Medium education	0.096	0.096	0.115	0.115
High education				
Routine/Manual Occupation (Ref.)	0.08	0.08	0.515	0.515
Intermediate Occupation	-0.25	-0.25	0.731 *	0.731 *
Professional/Managerial Occupation	0.409	0.999 **	1.466 ***	1.466 ***
Wave 2005	0.373	0.373	-0.078	-0.078
N. Children	-0.181	-0.181	-0.225	-0.225
Child aged less than 3 years old	-0.017	-1.145 *	0.37	0.37
Cohabiting vs. Married	0.913 *	-1.023	0.326	0.326
Household income	0.017	0.017	-0.116	-0.116
Equal age	-0.3	-0.3	-0.68 *	-0.68 *
Woman older	-0.262	0.575	0.011	0.011
Equal education	0.554	0.554	0.404	0.404
Woman more educated	1.119 **	1.119 **	0.57	0.57
Equally prestigious occupations	0.666	-0.709	0.516	0.516
Woman in more prestigious occupation	0.843 **	0.843 **	0.535 *	0.535 *
Woman Inactive/Unemployed/Other, Partner Employed (Ref.)				
Both Employed	2.379 ***	2.379 ***	2.957 ***	2.957 ***
Woman Employed, Partner Inactive/Unemployed/Other	11.562 ***	-27.91 ***	2.475 **	13.217 ***
Both Inactive/Unemployed/Other	-12.071 ***	26.506 ***	1.752 *	-11.94 ***
N	639		583	

p-value: *** <0.01; ** <0.05; * <0.1. “2,3 vs. 1”: Egalitarian and Female Breadwinner vs Male Breadwinner; “3 vs. 2,1”: Female Breadwinner vs. Egalitarian and Male Breadwinner.

Table 4: Estimated coefficients from generalized ordered logistic regression, Southern European Countries

	Portugal				Spain				Greece			
	2,3 vs. 1		3 vs 2,1		2,3 vs. 1		3 vs 2,1		2,3 vs. 1		3 vs 2,1	
Age: 20-34 (Ref.)												
Age: 35-44	-0.574		-0.574		0.11		0.11		-0.326		-0.326	
Age: 45-54	-0.227		1.157		-0.035		0.771		-0.43		-0.43	
Age: 55-64	-0.879		-30.21	***	0.379		0.379		0.219		0.219	
Low Education (Ref.)												
Medium education	1.034		-0.681		0.341		0.341		0.171		0.171	
High education	1.866		-1.52		0.1		0.1		-0.02		-0.02	
Routine/Manual Occupation (Ref.)												
Intermediate Occupation	0.565		0.565		0.563		0.563		0.74	*	-0.907	
Professional/Managerial Occupation	1.58	*	1.58	*	0.651		0.651		1.285	**	-0.205	
Wave 2005	0		0		0.345		0.345		0.912	***	0.912	***
N. Children	0.293		0.293		-0.301	*	-0.301	*	-0.216		-0.216	
Child aged less than 3 years old	-1.287	*	-1.287	*	0.671		0.671		-0.006		-2.114	**
Cohabiting vs. Married	1.108		1.108		0.328		0.328		-0.615		-0.615	
Household income	-0.319	**	-0.319	**	-0.037		-0.037		-0.033		-0.033	
Equal age	-1.097		1.379		0.111		1.043	*	-0.548		1.126	
Woman older	0.645		0.645		-0.235		-0.235		-0.808		0.743	
Equal education	-0.302		-0.302		0.531		0.531		-0.121		-0.121	
Woman more educated	0.271		0.271		0.72		0.72		0.251		0.251	
Equally prestigious occupations	0.665		0.665		0.631		-0.42		0.722	*	-1.581	*
Woman in more prestigious occupation	0.349		0.349		0.178		0.178		0.121		0.121	
Woman Inactive/Unemployed/Other, Partner Employed (Ref.)												
Both Employed	2.678	***	2.678	***	3.334	***	1.555	*	2.973	***	0.562	
Woman Employed, Partner Inactive/Unemployed/Other	15.643	***	-16.86	***	-1.662		18.614	***	2.804	**	2.804	**
Both Inactive/Unemployed/Other	0.555		18.709	***	1.036		-30.92	***	-16.939	***	17.921	***
N	215				409				482			

p-value: *** <0.01; ** <0.05; * <0.1. “2,3 vs. 1”: Egalitarian and Female Breadwinner vs Male Breadwinner; “3 vs. 2,1”: Female Breadwinner vs. Egalitarian and Male Breadwinner.

Table 5: Estimated coefficients from generalized ordered logistic regression, Scandinavian Countries

	Denmark		Sweden		Norway		Finland	
	2,3 vs. 1	3 vs 2,1	2,3 vs. 1	3 vs 2,1	2,3 vs. 1	3 vs 2,1	2,3 vs. 1	3 vs 2,1
Age: 20-34 (Ref.)								
Age: 35-44	0.302	0.302	-0.346	-0.346	-0.084	-0.084	0.191	0.191
Age: 45-54	0.224	0.224	-0.268	-0.268	0.552	0.552	-0.107	-0.107
Age: 55-64	0.199	0.199	-0.236	-0.236	0.283	0.283	-0.302	-0.302
Low Education (Ref.)								
Medium education	-0.058	-0.058	-0.155	-0.765 *	-0.364	-0.364	-0.302	-0.302
High education	0.006	0.006	-0.044	-0.044	-0.404	-0.404	-0.11	-0.11
Routine/Manual Occupation (Ref.)								
Intermediate Occupation	0.437	0.437	0.156	0.156	0.484 *	0.484 *	-0.134	-0.134
Professional/Managerial Occupation	0.875 **	0.875 **	0.74 **	0.74 **	0.562 *	0.562 *	1.172 ***	1.172 ***
Wave 2005	-0.168	-0.168	-0.041	-0.041	-0.325	-0.325	-0.35	-0.35
N. Children	-0.245 *	0.062	0.085	0.085	0.052	0.052	-0.202 *	-0.202 *
Child aged less than 3 years old	0.013	0.013	-0.616	-0.616	0.302	0.302	-0.587	-0.587
Cohabiting vs. Married	0.28	0.28	0.046	0.046	0.454 *	0.454 *	0.424	0.424
Household income	-0.054	-0.054	-0.087	-0.087	-0.164 ***	-0.164 ***	-0.22 ***	-0.22 ***
Equal age	0.312	0.312	0.274	0.274	-0.135	-0.135	-0.201	-0.201
Woman older	0.059	0.059	0.296	0.296	-0.005	-0.005	-0.043	-0.043
Equal education	0.369	0.369	0.157	0.157	0.764 **	0.764 **	0.204	0.204
Woman more educated	0.609	1.306 **	0.3	0.3	1.239 ***	1.239 ***	0.57	0.57
Equally prestigious occupations	0.817 **	0.817 **	0.258	0.258	0.843 ***	0.843 ***	0.319	0.319
Woman in more prestigious occupation	1.239 ***	1.239 ***	0.344	0.344	0.753 ***	0.753 ***	0.663 **	0.663 **
Woman Inactive/Unemployed/Other, Partner Employed (Ref.)								
Both Employed	1.355 ***	1.355 ***	1.06 ***	1.06 ***	1.385 ***	0.574	2.25 ***	1.261 **
Woman Employed, Partner Inactive/Unemployed/Other	1.45	3.332 ***	-0.068	0.983	1.582 **	1.582 **	0.174	0.174
Both Inactive/Unemployed/Other	-1.135	-3.154 ***	0.321	0.321	-1.24 *	-1.24 *	0.567	0.567
<i>N</i>	560		671		676		660	

p-value: *** <0.01; ** <0.05; * <0.1. “2,3 vs. 1”: Egalitarian and Female Breadwinner vs Male Breadwinner; “3 vs. 2,1”: Female Breadwinner vs. Egalitarian and Male Breadwinner.

Table 6: Estimated coefficients from generalized ordered logistic regression, Central and Eastern European Countries

	Slovenia		Slovakia		CZ		Poland		Hungary	
	2,3 vs. 1	3 vs 2,1	2,3 vs. 1	3 vs 2,1	2,3 vs. 1	3 vs 2,1	2,3 vs. 1	3 vs 2,1	2,3 vs. 1	3 vs 2,1
Age: 20-34 (Ref.)										
Age: 35-44	0.58	0.58	0.786	0.786	-0.472	0.267	0.762 *	0.762 *	0.133	0.133
Age: 45-54	0.118	1.126 *	-0.047	1.514 *	-0.368	-0.368	0.828 *	0.828 *	0.256	0.256
Age: 55-64	0.127	0.127	0.266	-12.5 ***	-0.178	-0.178	1.111 *	1.111 *	0.296	0.296
Low Education (Ref.)										
Medium education	-0.134	-0.134	-1.161 *	0.369	-0.207	-0.207	-0.148	-0.148	0.123	-0.92
High education	-0.189	-0.189	-1.202	-1.202	0.096	0.096	0.295	0.295	0.145	-0.61
Routine/Manual Occupation (Ref.)										
Intermediate Occupation	0.649 *	0.649 *	1.133 ***	1.133 ***	0.061	0.061	0.305	0.305	0.604	0.604
Professional/Managerial Occupation	1.205 *	1.205 *	0.897	0.897	0.78 *	0.78 *	0.429	0.429	0.915 *	0.915 *
Wave 2005	0.164	0.164	1.079 *	-2.769	-0.157	-0.157	-0.664 *	-0.664 *	-0.247	-0.25
N. Children	-0.352 *	0.319	-0.183	-0.183	-0.221	-0.221	-0.189	-0.189	-0.097	-0.1
Child aged less than 3 years old	-0.252	-0.252	0.446	0.446	0.511	0.511	-0.107	-0.107	-0.78	-0.78
Cohabiting vs. Married	-0.199	-0.199	1.108	1.108	-0.038	-0.038	1.222 *	1.222 *	0.715 *	0.715 *
Household income	-0.281 ***	-0.281 ***	-0.26 **	0.432	0.025	0.025	-0.062	-0.062	-0.084	-0.08
Equal age	-0.588	-0.588	0.191	0.191	0.096	0.096	-0.237	-0.237	-0.534	0.658
Woman older	0.386	0.386	-0.244	1.287 *	0.331	0.331	0.023	0.023	0.571 *	0.571 *
Equal education	0.461	0.461	1.419 **	1.419 **	0.131	1.057	-0.196	0.494	0.658	0.658
Woman more educated	1.324 **	1.324 **	1.956 *	1.956 *	0.185	0.185	-0.001	-0.001	1.396 **	1.396 **
Equally prestigious occupations	0.643	0.643	0.235	0.235	0.46	0.46	0.978 **	0.978 **	0.27	0.27
Woman in more prestigious occupation	0.759 *	0.759 *	-0.176	-0.176	2.221 ***	0.803	1.004 **	1.004 **	0.083	0.083
Woman Inactive/Unemployed/Other, Partner Employed (Ref.)										
Both Employed	2.077 ***	0.429	1.736 ***	-0.217	0.059	0.059	2.705 ***	1.326 **	0.647 *	-0.35
Woman Employed, Partner Inactive/Unemployed/Other	0.395	0.395	0.549	-15.29 ***	0.624	0.624	-0.426	-0.426	0.761 *	0.761 *
Both Inactive/Unemployed/Other	-0.185	-0.185	0.144	17.041 ***	0.163	0.163	0.315	0.315	0.331	0.331
N	331		390		575		495		531	

p-value: *** <0.01; ** <0.05; * <0.1. “2,3 vs. 1”: Egalitarian and Female Breadwinner vs Male Breadwinner; “3 vs. 2,1”: Female Breadwinner vs. Egalitarian and Male Breadwinner.

References

- Aassve, A., Cottini, E. and Vitali, A. (forthcoming 2013). Youth Vulnerability in Europe during the Economic Crisis. *Demographic Research – Descriptive Findings*.
- Adsera, A. (2004). Changing fertility rates in developed countries. The impact of labor market institutions. *Journal of Population Economics*, 17: 17–43.
- Atkinson, M.P., and Boles, J. (1984). WASP (wives as senior partners). *Journal of Marriage and the Family*: 861–870.
- Atkinson, M.P., Greenstein, T.N. and Lang, M.M. (2005). For women, breadwinning can be dangerous: Gendered resource theory and wife abuse. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67(5): 1137–1148.
- Balbo, N., Billari, F. C., and Mills, M. (2013). Fertility in advanced societies: A review of research. *European Journal of Population*, 29(1): 1–38.
- Becker G.S. (1981). *A Treatise on the Family*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Blossfeld, H.P. and Drobnic, S. (Eds.). (2001). *Careers of Couples in Contemporary Society: From Male Breadwinner to Dual-Breadwinner Families*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bloemen, H.G., and Stancanelli, E.G. (forthcoming). Toyboys or supergirls? An analysis of partners' employment outcomes when she outearns him. *Review of Economics of the Household*, 1–30.
- Brennan, R.T., Barnett, R.C. and Gareis, K.C. (2001). When she earns more than he does: a longitudinal study of dual earner couples. *Journal of marriage and family*, 63(1): 168–182.
- Cho, Y. and Newhouse, D. (2012). How Did the Great Recession Affect Different Types of Workers? Evidence from 17 Middle Income Countries. *World Development*, 41: 31–50.
- Coughlin, P. and Wade, J.C. (2012). Masculinity ideology, income disparity, and romantic relationship quality among men with higher earning female partners. *Sex roles*, 67(5-6): 311–322.
- Crompton, R. (Ed.). (1999). *Restructuring gender relations and employment: the decline of the male breadwinner*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Drago, R., Black, D. and Wooden, M. (2005). Female breadwinner families. Their existence, persistence and sources. *Journal of Sociology*, 41(4): 343–362.
- Esping-Andersen, G., and Billari, F.C. (2012). Re-theorizing Family Demographics. Paper presented at European Population Conference, Stockholm.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (2009). *The Incomplete Revolution: Adapting to Women's New Roles*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Goldstein, J.R., and Kenney, C.T. (2001). Marriage delayed or marriage forgone? New cohort forecasts of first marriage for US women. *American Sociological Review*, 66(4): 506–519.
- Haug, M. R. (1973). Social class measurement and women's occupational roles. *Social Forces*, 52(1): 86–98.
- Kohler, H.P., Billari, F.C., and Ortega, J.A. (2002). The emergence of lowest-low fertility in Europe during the 1990s. *Population and development review*, 28(4): 641–680.
- Lewis, J. (2001). The decline of the male breadwinner model: implications for work and care. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 8(2): 152–169.

- Lui, L. (2013). *Re-negotiating Gender: Household Division of Labor when She Earns More Than He Does*. Springer.
- Macmillan, R. and Gartner, R. (1999). When she brings home the bacon: Labor-force participation and the risk of spousal violence against women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61(4): 947–958.
- McDonald, P. (2000). Gender equity, social institutions and the future of fertility. *Journal of Population Research*, 17: 1–16.
- McDonald, P. (2013). Societal foundations for explaining fertility: Gender equity. *Demographic Research*, 28(34): 981–994.
- Meisenbach, R.J. (2010). The female breadwinner: Phenomenological experience and gendered identity in work/family spaces. *Sex roles*, 62(1-2): 2–19.
- Oppenheimer, V.K. (1994). Women's rising employment and the future of the family in industrial societies. *Population and Development Review*, 293–342.
- Oppenheimer, V.K. (1997). Women's employment and the gain to marriage: The specialization and trading model. *Annual review of sociology*, 431–453.
- Qian, Z. and Preston, S.H. (1993). Changes in American Marriage, 1972 to 1987: Availability and Forces of Attraction by Age and Education. *American Sociological Review* 58(4): 482–495.
- Rogers, S.J. and DeBoer, D.D. (2001). Changes in Wives' Income: Effects on Marital Happiness, Psychological Well-Being, and the Risk of Divorce. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63(2): 458–472.
- Schneider, D. (2011). Market earnings and household work: New tests of gender performance theory. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 73(4): 845–860.
- Schwartz, C.R. and Mare, R.D. (2005). Trends in educational assortative marriage from 1940 to 2003. *Demography*, 42(4), 621–646.
- Surkyn, J. and Lesthaeghe, R. (2004). Value Orientations and the Second Demographic Transition (SDT) in Northern, Western and Southern Europe: An update. *Demographic Research* 3(3) <http://demographic-research.org/>.
- Van de Kaa, D.J. (1987). Europe's second demographic transition. *Population bulletin*, 42(1), 1–57.
- Vincent-Lancrin, S. (2008). The reversal of gender inequalities in higher education: An on-going trend. *Higher Education to 2030*, 265–298.
- Vitali, A., Aassve, A. and Lappegård, T. (2013a). Diffusion of Childbearing in Cohabitation (Submitted). Paper presented at the 2013 Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America, New Orleans.
- Wang, W., Parker, K. and Taylor, P. (2013). Breadwinner Moms. *Pew Research Center*: 1–28.
- Warren, T. (2007). Conceptualizing breadwinning work. *Work, Employment & Society*, 21(2), 317–336.
- Winkler, A. E., McBride, T. D., and Andrews, C. (2005). Wives who outearn their husbands: A transitory or persistent phenomenon for couples? *Demography*, 42(3): 523–535.