Measures

Angela Jauregui, Lauren Meyer, & Syrine Matoussi

Smith College

Author Note

Measures

Participants:

The current study includes 182 couples where 172 are heterosexual couples, 7 are same-sex female and 3 are same-sex male. The majority of the sample were married (91.8%) and 8.2% were not married but in a committed relationship. Overall, the sample was split evenly between genders, with women making up 51% and men making up 49% of it. The majority of the sample was white (74%), 10% identified as Asian or Asian American, 6.6% as Black or African American, and 5.8% as Latinx or Hispanic. The majority of the individuals reported working from home (61.5%) and 20% were working in person(the rest were either missing value or other). The average age for parents was 45.8(middle-age) with SD=8.35. Their average annual income was 76,618 and the variance in incom is significant with a SD=105,704. Finally, the reported number of children was 1.34 but the variance was big across the couples with an SD= 2.17.

In our analysis we discarded participants who did not answer most of the questions or missed questions that are crucial to our analysis. Specifically for our first reasearch question we decided not to include the 7 same-sex female couples since we were mostly focsused on the connection between childcare tasks and relationship quality for men. Overall there are 172 different-gender couples and 10 same-sex couples. The majority of the couples were same race (322), and 42 were mixed-race.

```
##       Rho
## 0.7070156
```

Measures:

Relationship Satisfaction. Relationship satisfaction was measured using 25 items from Braiker and Kelly's Relationship Questionnaire [@-BraikerH]. Because we were

evaluating relationship satisfaction levels of fathers, we omitted the Participants answered questions pertaining to their feelings about their partners and the quality of their relationship. Items included, "how much do you feel you 'give' to the relationship?" and "how attached do you feel to your partner?" Response options used a 9-part Likert scale ranging from 1=not at all to 9=very much. The mean for all 25 items was calculated for the outcome. Alpha was .9.

Distribution of Childcare Tasks. Distribution of childcare chores was both a predictor and an outcome variable. For two weeks, participants kept daily diaries in which they recorded if they had spent any time on 16 childcare chores including "helped children with distance learning activities today" and "playing with your child today." Participants responded by selecting "yes" or "no" for each daily activity. A total of tasks completed was summed for each participant and a percentage of tasks was calculated for each dyad.

Self-Objectification and Partner-Objectifcation. Self- and partner-objectification were both measured using 10 of the 12 items from Noll and Fredrickson's Self-Objectification Questionnaire [@-NollS]. Five of the items pertain to attraction (weight, sex appeal, physical attractiveness, firm/sculpted muscles, and measurements) and five to competency (physical coordination, health, strength, energy level, and physical fitness level). Items included body characteristics. "Coloring" and "coordination" were the two items omitted. For self-objectification, participants ranked how they assigned each characteristic to their own physical self-concept and for partner-objectification they ranked how much they valued each characteristic in their partner. Ranking was done in ascending order from 1 (most) to 10 (least). Scores were found by summing the ranks for attraction and competency items separately. Scores range from -25 to 25, with higher scores representing a higher level of objectification.

Gatekeeping. To measure gatekeeping in childcare tasks, eight items pertaining to childcare were used from the Orientation Toward Domestic Labor Questionnaire

(**AllenS?**). Participants answered to what extent they agreed or disagreed with statements regarding their partner. Items were modified to be gender neutral and included "I like to be in charge when it comes to caring for our child" and "My partner doesn't really know how to do a lot of childcare tasks, so it's just easier if I do them." Response options used a 5-part Likert scale ranging from 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree. Outcome was calculated using the mean for all eight rows. Alpha was .86.

Table 1:

Measures	mean	SD
annual_income($)	76,618.80	105,704.12
age	45.80	8.35
number_of_children	1.34	2.17
gatekeeping	3.00	0.92
relationship_satisfaction	6.47	1.31

Data analysis

We used R [Version 4.0.4; R Core Team (2021)] and the R-packages *dplyr* [Version 1.0.5; Wickham, François, Henry, and Müller (2021)], *ggformula* [Version 0.10.1; Kaplan and Pruim (2021)], *ggplot2* [Version 3.3.3; Wickham (2016)], *ggridges* [Version 0.5.3; Wilke (2021)], *ggstance* [Version 0.3.5; Henry, Wickham, and Chang (2020)], *kableExtra* [Version 1.3.4; Zhu (2021)], *lattice* [Version 0.20.41; Sarkar (2008)], *lubridate* [Version 1.7.10; Grolemund and Wickham (2011)], *Matrix* [Version 1.3.2; Bates and Maechler (2021)], *mosaic* [Version 1.8.3; Pruim, Kaplan, and Horton (2017); Pruim, Kaplan, and Horton (2021)], *mosaicData* [Version 0.20.2; Pruim, Kaplan, and Horton (2021)], *nlme* [Version 3.1.152; Pinheiro, Bates, DebRoy, Sarkar, and R Core Team (2021)], *papaja* [Version 0.1.0.9997; Aust and Barth (2020)], *psysds364data* [Version 0.0.0.9000; Garcia (2021)], *tidyr*

[Version 1.1.3; Wickham (2021)], and *tinylabels* [Version 0.2.0; Barth (2021)] for all our analyses.

Results

Discussion

References

Aust, F., & Barth, M. (2020). *papaja: Prepare reproducible APA journal articles with R Markdown.* Retrieved from https://github.com/crsh/papaja

Barth, M. (2021). *tinylabels: Lightweight variable labels.* Retrieved from https://github.com/mariusbarth/tinylabels

Bates, D., & Maechler, M. (2021). *Matrix: Sparse and dense matrix classes and methods.* Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=Matrix

Garcia, R. (2021). *psysds364data: What the package does (one line, title case).*

Grolemund, G., & Wickham, H. (2011). Dates and times made easy with lubridate. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *40*(3), 1–25. Retrieved from https://www.jstatsoft.org/v40/i03/

Henry, L., Wickham, H., & Chang, W. (2020). *Ggstance: Horizontal 'ggplot2' components.* Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ggstance

Kaplan, D., & Pruim, R. (2021). *Ggformula: Formula interface to the grammar of graphics.* Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ggformula

Pinheiro, J., Bates, D., DebRoy, S., Sarkar, D., & R Core Team. (2021). *nlme: Linear and nonlinear mixed effects models.* Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=nlme

Pruim, R., Kaplan, D., & Horton, N. (2021). *mosaicData: Project MOSAIC data sets.* Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=mosaicData

Pruim, R., Kaplan, D. T., & Horton, N. J. (2017). The mosaic package: Helping students to 'think with data' using r. *The R Journal*, *9*(1), 77–102. Retrieved from https://journal.r-project.org/archive/2017/RJ-2017-024/index.html

R Core Team. (2021). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing.* Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Retrieved from

https://www.R-project.org/

Sarkar, D. (2008). *Lattice: Multivariate data visualization with r.* New York: Springer. Retrieved from http://lmdvr.r-forge.r-project.org

Wickham, H. (2016). *ggplot2: Elegant graphics for data analysis.* Springer-Verlag New York. Retrieved from https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org

Wickham, H. (2021). *Tidyr: Tidy messy data.* Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tidyr

Wickham, H., François, R., Henry, L., & Müller, K. (2021). *Dplyr: A grammar of data manipulation.* Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=dplyr

Wilke, C. O. (2021). *Ggridges: Ridgeline plots in 'ggplot2'.* Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ggridges

Zhu, H. (2021). *kableExtra: Construct complex table with 'kable' and pipe syntax.* Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=kableExtra

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics

Measures	mean	SD
annual_income($)	76,618.80	105,704.12
age	45.80	8.35
number_of_children	1.34	2.17
gatekeeping	3.00	0.92
relationship_satisfaction	6.47	1.31