**Supplemental Materials**

**Dads Doing Diapers: Individual and Relational Outcomes Associated with the Division of Childcare across the Transition to Parenthood**

**by J. Fillo et al., 2014, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology***

**http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0038572**

**Supplementary Results & Information**

**SPSS Syntax for Growth-Curve Modeling and Lagged Modeling**

We used SPSS 19 to estimate our multilevel models. The data were structured in a person-period format such that there was a case for each study wave for each couple member (10 total cases per couple). In the syntax below, required SPSS syntax is presented in upper case and variables are presented in lower case. The growth curve syntax used to evaluate Hypothesis 1 is presented first, and the residual change syntax used to evaluate Hypothesis 1 is presented second. Several books and book chapters are available with more detailed information regarding these analytic approaches (e.g., Kashy & Donnellan, 2008, 2012; Kenny, Kashy, & Cook, 2006).

MIXED childcare\_self\_efficacy WITH gender time doc woman man

/FIXED gender time doc

gender\*time gender\*doc time\*doc

gender\*time\*doc

/PRINT = SOLUTION TESTCOV COVB

/RANDOM = woman man woman\*time man\*time | SUBJECT(id) COVTYPE(UN)

/REPEATED = gender | SUBJECT (id\*phase) COVTYPE(CSH).

The MIXED line specifies the use of the MIXED procedure and includes all variables included in the model, which are as follows: *childcare\_self\_efficacy* is the outcome variable of interest (i.e., childcare self-efficacy), *gender* is an effect-coded variable (1 = male, -1 = female) used to distinguish the dyad members, *time* is the number of months since the child’s birth, and *doc* is an individual’s relative contributions to childcare (which varies at each time point). This line also contains two dummy variables, *woman* (coded 1 for women and 0 form men) and *man* (coded 1 for men and 0 for women). The FIXED line specifies terms included as fixed effects in the model. For Hypothesis 1, this includes, *gender*, *time*, *doc* (contributions to childcare), and all possible interaction terms. The last two lines model the interdependence that exists between dyad members. The RANDOM line specifies that the intercepts (*woman* and *man* variables) and slopes (*woman\*time* and *man\*time*) are modeled as random effects. The variable *id* specifies the dyad unit. The REPEATED line specifies that couple members’ data (distinguished by the *gender* variable) at the same time point are treated as repeated measurements, and indicates the inclusion of the correlation between the spouses’ time-specific residuals.

The model structure for the residual change analyses are nearly identical to the growth curve analyses, with the exception of the addition of the value of the outcome variable at the prior wave (*i - 1; prior\_wave\_cse).* This variable contains a missing value for all participants at the first wave (i.e., 6 weeks pre-birth).

MIXED childcare\_self\_efficacy WITH gender time doc prior\_wave\_cse woman man

/FIXED gender time doc prior\_wave\_cse

gender\*time gender\*doc time\*doc

gender\*time\*doc

/PRINT = SOLUTION TESTCOV COVB

/RANDOM = woman man woman\*time man\*time | SUBJECT(id) COVTYPE(UN)

/REPEATED = gender | SUBJECT (id\*phase) COVTYPE(CSH).

**Attachment Anxiety Results**

Though we did not hypothesize effects for anxious attachment, we conducted exploratory analyses that tested both attachment dimensions simultaneously. Specifically, for the four models that included attachment avoidance, we ran exploratory analyses that included attachment anxiety and interactions with anxiety, parallel to the terms involving avoidance (see anxiety-related correlations in Table S1). By including avoidance and anxiety in the same model, we could test: (a) whether anxiety predicted our outcomes, and (b) whether avoidance effects remained significant when controlling for anxiety. The findings are discussed below, with hypotheses numbered according to the results reported in the main manuscript. Because the avoidance effects are discussed in the main manuscript, this supplement focuses on any new findings that emerged with the addition of the anxiety terms.

**Work-family conflict (Hypothesis 2).** In this model, we predicted perceptions of work-family conflict using gender, time, childcare contributions, and both attachment dimensions, resulting in two possible four-way interactions. As in the main paper, there were significant main effects for gender, childcare contributions, and avoidance (see Table S3).

For attachment anxiety, there was also a significant two-way interaction between time and anxiety. However, these effects were qualified by a four-way interaction between gender, time, childcare contributions, and anxiety (see Figure S1). For less anxious individuals who reported relatively low childcare contributions, work-family conflict was moderate and did not significantly change across the transition for men (*b* = 0.011, *t*(232) = 1.70, *p* = .09) or for women (*b* = -0.042, t(428) = 1.74, *p* = .08). When less anxious individuals reported relatively high contributions to childcare, work-family conflict was lower across the transition for both men (*b* = -0.019, *t*(350) = 1.13, *p* = .26) and women (*b* = 0.011, *t*(241) = 1.24, *p* = .22). For highly anxious individuals who report relatively low contributions to childcare, women reported increases in work-family conflict over time (*b* = 0.037, *t*(309) = 2.04, *p* = .04), while men reported moderate and stable levels of conflict (*b* = 0.015, *t*(283) = 1.64, *p* = .10). In contrast, when highly anxious individuals reported relatively high childcare contributions, women reported low and stable levels of work-family conflict (*b* = -0.003, *t*(220) = 0.40, *p* = .69), while men reported increases in conflict across the transition (*b* = 0.037, *t*(548) = 1.74, *p* = .08). Thus, it appears that more anxious women experience work-family conflict when they contribute less to childcare, while more anxious men experience work-family conflict when they contribute more to childcare.

**Relationship Satisfaction (Hypothesis 3).** In this model, we predicted relationship satisfaction using gender, time, childcare contributions, and both attachment dimensions, resulting in two possible four-way interactions. As in the main paper, there were main effects for time, avoidance, and childcare contributions (see Table S2). There were also two 2-way interactions involving avoidance: one with gender, and another with time. In addition, there was a three-way interaction between gender, time, and avoidance. However, these effects were qualified by a four-way interaction between gender, time, childcare contributions, and avoidance, as reported in the main manuscript.

For attachment anxiety, there was a three-way interaction between time, childcare contributions, and attachment anxiety (see Figure S2). For less anxious individuals, satisfaction remained high across the transition when they reported relatively low childcare contributions (*b* = -0.019, *t*(657) = 0.50, *p* = .62), but it declined when they reported relatively high contributions (*b* = -0.092, *t*(1015) = 2.38, *p* = .02). For more anxious individuals, satisfaction was high at birth, but declined steeply across the transition when they reported relatively low contributions to childcare, *b* = -0.133, *t*(872) = 3.91, *p* < .001. When they reported relatively high contributions, highly anxious individuals were less satisfied at birth, but remained stable across the transition, *b* = -0.042, *t*(853) = 0.92, *p* = .35.

**Conclusion.** All previously reported effects remained significant once anxiety and associated interaction terms were included in these models. These findings, therefore, reinforce our initial hypotheses.
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Table S1

*Correlations between Attachment Anxiety and Variables at Time 1*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Men | Women |
| 1. Attachment anxiety |  (.24\*\*\*) |  |
| 2. Childcare contributions  | .01 | .07 |
| 3. Attachment avoidance | .26\*\*\* | .18\* |
| 4. Work-family conflict | .25\*\*\* | .15\* |
| 5. Childcare self-efficacy | .08 | .10 |
| 6. Relationship satisfaction | -.07 | -.28\*\*\* |

*Note.* Extending Table 2, the value in parentheses represents the correlation between husbands’

and wives’ attachment anxiety. *\* p* < .05. \*\*\* *p* < .001.

Table S2

*Work-Family Conflict and Relationship Satisfaction as a Function of Childcare Contributions, Moderated by Attachment Avoidance or Anxiety*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Outcome variable |
|  | Work-family conflict | Relationship satisfaction |
| Fixed effects | *b* | *t* | *b* | *t* |
| Intercept | 3.163 | 37.40\*\*\* | 42.869 | 125.90\*\*\* |
| Gender | 0.192 | 2.29\* | -0.423 | 1.83† |
| Time | 0.006 | 1.09 | -0.072 | 3.02\*\* |
| Avoidance | 0.158 | 1.97\* | 1.170 | 4.29\*\*\* |
| Anxiety | 0.058 | 0.81 | 0.047 | 0.20 |
| DOC  | -0.120 | 3.01\*\* | -0.251 | 1.99\* |
| Gender  Time | 0.005 | 0.98 | -0.020 | 1.25 |
| Gender  Avoidance | 0.122 | 1.52 | -0.790 | 3.05\*\* |
| Gender  Anxiety | 0.106 | 1.49 | 0.235 | 1.01 |
| Gender  DOC | 0.039 | 0.98 | 0.053 | 0.39 |
| Time  Avoidance | -0.003 | 0.53 | -0.077 | 3.88\*\*\* |
| Time  Anxiety | 0.015 | 3.00\*\* | -0.015 | 0.88 |
| Time  DOC | 0.0003 | 0.12 | 0.002 | 0.25 |
| Avoidance  DOC | 0.010 | 0.23 | -0.224 | 1.61 |
| Anxiety  DOC | 0.063 | 1.77† | -0.045 | 0.38 |
| Gender  Time Avoidance | -0.006 | 1.06 | -0.040 | 2.07\* |
| Gender  Time Anxiety | -0.001 | 0.11 | 0.016 | 0.95 |
| Gender  Time  DOC | -0.001 | 0.46 | -0.00009 | 0.01 |
| Gender  DOC  Avoidance | 0.026 | 0.62 | 0.079 | 0.55 |
| Gender  DOC  Anxiety | -0.069 | 1.93† | 0.067 | 0.56 |
| Time  DOC  Avoidance | -0.002 | 0.74 | -0.005 | 0.51 |
| Time  DOC  Anxiety | -0.002 | 0.95 | 0.019 | 2.27\* |
| Gender  Time DOC  Avoidance | -0.002 | 0.60 | -0.029 | 3.01\*\* |
| Gender  Time DOC  Anxiety | 0.008 | 3.35\*\*\* | -0.004 | 0.41 |

*Note.* DOC = contributions to the division of childcare. For gender, 1 = men, -1 = women.

† *p* < .10. \* *p* < .05. \*\* *p* < .01. \*\*\* *p* < .001.



*Figure S1.* Linear changes in work-family conflict over time as a function of contributions to childcare (DOC), moderated by gender and attachment anxiety.

*Figure S2.* Linear changes in relationship satisfaction as a function of contributions to childcare (DOC), moderated by attachment anxiety.