

The Political Economy of Hegemonic Masculinity: Class, Race, and Work

Sarah F. Small, Colorado State University

sarah.small@colostate.edu

I. Introduction

Very few economists have directly considered the importance of masculinity in tying together many of these works. The opportunity to do so is ripe as several important connections exist. For instance, several economists have written on the “male backlash” theory in studies of intimate partner violence (Caridad Bueno & Henderson, 2017; Bhattacharya, 2015; Finnoff, 2012; Atkinson, Greenstein, & Lang, 2005). The male backlash theory postulates that when women begin to out-earn or otherwise out-perform their male partners, those male partners often respond with violence to reassert their dominant status in the home. In these scenarios, one could postulate that men are responding to threats to their masculine identity through violence. Other studies on intrahousehold dynamics have found that there is a general aversion to the situation in which a wife out-earns her husband, as illustrated in marriage markets, divorce and marital happiness, and allocations of housework (Bertand, Kamenica, & Pan, 2015). Again, in this case we see men’s role as breadwinner being threatened, which impacts their self-identity. Others have similarly found that men who do “women’s work” in the labor market spend more time on male-typed housework relative to men in gender-balanced occupations (Schneider, 2012). In this study, the importance of performing manhood becomes even more clear. Based on this literature, it seems that the role of gender identity, namely masculinity, is often influenced by dynamics involving work and income. Each seems to highlight the importance of working in ‘manly’ activities or breadwinning as pivotal in men’s self-image, and then in turn, in their behavior and work allocation in the home.

Studies focusing on relationships outside the home follow similar trends. Perhaps most famously, Akerlof and Kranton (2000) use their model to demonstrate how a man responds to a threat to his masculine identity upon the inclusion of a woman in his workplace domain. This model only assumes a man will feel threatened by the inclusion of women in his workplace, but many studies have backed this assumption. For instance, McLaughlin, Uggen, and Blackstone (2012) find women supervisors are more likely to experience sexual harassment and theorize that men see sexual harassment as an equalizer against women in power. Even men in women-dominated occupations often overcompensate for some kind of loss in masculine identity they incur by working in such fields. Cross and Baglihole (2002) and Simpson (2004) use in-depth interviews to document the experiences of men in women-dominated occupations. They find that men often distance themselves from women colleagues or from the feminine aspects of their jobs: librarians who are men called themselves ‘information scientists,’ men working as flight attendants emphasized safety over service.

Considering these studies on the whole, it starts to become clear that masculine identities are deeply embedded in notions of work and that many of the previously listed economic phenomena might be attributed to men’s efforts to preserve masculinity. As Folbre (1994) writes, “Bargaining takes place on the cultural as well as on the micro economic level...macro economic or macro cultural dynamics complicate microeconomic negotiations.” This paper considers how the macro cultural dynamics of hegemonic masculinity influence microeconomic negotiations within households. I expand on the macro cultural dynamics of masculinity by providing a brief overview of how it has been economically and historically constructed in the United States. I specifically consider how White masculinities were formed differently than and influenced

notions of Black masculinities, and how upper-class masculinities were formed differently than and influenced notions of working-class masculinities.

After examining this historical evolution, I examine whether the behaviors and tensions described in Bertrand, Kamenica & Pan (2015) exist or play out differently upper-income groups as opposed to lower income groups, and in Black masculinities as opposed to White. Specifically, I consider their finding that within a given couple, when the wife earns more than the husband, the gap in time spent on housework is higher relative to couples in which the wife makes the same or less than their husband. I reexamine this finding in light of different classed and racialized dynamics of hegemonic masculinity. Preliminary results indicate that upper-income White men might have a stronger aversion to the situation in which a woman out-earns her male partner relative to lower-income White men and upper- and middle-income Black men. Lower-income Black men also seem to have a relatively strong aversion to the situation in which a woman out-earns her male partner, especially when compared to middle- and upper-income couples with Black men. This paper's contribution is to establish that men of different race and class groups are differently impacted by hegemonic masculinity, and thus respond differently to economic 'threats' to their masculinity.

In future work, I hope to examine other economic 'threats' to masculinity along similar class and race dimensions, a question to which I return in the final section of this paper. Overall, this is an effort to understand how hegemonic masculinity operates along class and race dimensions, especially in response to shifting notions of work and income within families.

II. What is Hegemonic Masculinity?

Masculinity, in many ways, is a difficult concept to define: it means different things to different people based on class, race, geography, etc. Some scholars describe it relationally: masculinity as behavior that is simply "not feminine" (Cohen, 2010). This definition, of course, requires an understanding of what is feminine. In a similar vein, Schneider (2012) and others (Simister, 2013; Sullivan, 2011; Bittman, et al., 2003) use the notion of 'gender deviance neutralization' to refer to the phenomenon that when men and women diverge from normative expectations about gender in one realm, they seek to compensate for that deviance in other spheres of action. Many argue that performing housework affirms women's identity as feminine and avoiding housework affirms men's identity as masculine (Bittman, et al., 2003; Gupta & Ash, 2008; Sevilla-Sanz, et al., 2010; Thébaud, 2010; Greenstein, 2000). Thus, when a woman out-earns her male partner, he seeks to neutralize this gender deviance by reducing his contributions to housework. It is worth noting that Bertrand, Kamenica, and Pan (2015) also find that when women out-earn their male partners, women also increase their level of housework as their male partners decrease their contributions to housework.

I argue that this type of gendered behavior has much more to do with wider notions of patriarchy, power, and privilege. Housework is indeed laborious work: prescribing gendered notions of who ought to do it is a reflection of power and patriarchy. Insisting that it is work for women and not for men places additional burdens on women that men get to avoid. Additionally, a man withdrawing from housework just as his female partner begins to earn more than him is an attempt to regain dominance in the home. While she may out-earn him, he responds by ensuring

he still does relatively less housework, and that she must still do work to serve him. Furthermore, when women take on additional housework in the case where she out-earns her male partner, this may be an example by which women's behavior responds to patriarchy and hegemonic masculinity just as men's does. While gender deviance neutralization is a useful concept in understanding the gendered aspects of housework and relative income, it does not address the power dynamics at the core of the problem. For this reason, I instead use the notion of 'hegemonic masculinity' as introduced by Raewyn Connell as "the configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees, or is taken to guarantee, the dominant position of men and the subordination of women" (Connell, 2005: 77). Stated another way, hegemonic masculinity is "the currently most honored way of being a man.... It requires all other men to position themselves in relation to it, and it ideologically legitimates the global subordination of women to men" (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005: 832). The specific behaviors associated with hegemonic masculinity change over time and across cultures, making Connell's definition fitting for nearly any patriarchal society.

III. Historical & Economic Construction of Hegemonic Masculinity in the U.S.

Some scholars associate specific behaviors with masculinity. For instance, David Cohen (2010) has identified three central characteristics to contemporary U.S. masculinity: heterosexual, not feminine, and physically aggressive (Cohen, 2010: 525). While this conceptualization is certainly useful in many contexts, it is worth considering how U.S. notions of manhood have changed throughout history, often in response to changes in the macroeconomy, and how notions of manhood look different for different groups of men. Putting masculinity in a historical context reminds us that it is socially constructed: it is constantly changing and is neither static nor timeless. In this section of the paper, I sketch a brief history of American masculinities as they have been shaped by institutional and economic changes, with specific attention to how White masculinities and upper-class masculinities have evolved in the context of hegemonic masculinity.

Perhaps contrary to our more recent understandings of masculine identity, historically, masculine behaviors did not necessarily involve distance from work in the home or from women. In the preindustrial economy, women and men were often in the same world of daily experience: they both worked primarily in the home sphere (Laslett and Brenner 1989). White men often managed household labor and educated children. They were the patriarchal authority in their homes, responsible for educating their families according to religious doctrine. Their productivity took place in the home, giving them the ability to be in charge of their own destiny and their family's destiny. However, in the early nineteenth century, manhood was "no longer fixed in land or small-scale property ownership or dutiful service (Kimmel, 2006, pg 17)." White men were no longer the managers of household labor but instead were responsible for providing an income on which their families survived (Laslett & Brenner, 1989). Some argue that the development of industrial capitalism took working-class White men's abilities to coordinate their own productive labor, and in turn their own destinies. Samuel Eliot in 1871 wrote that "to put a man upon wages is to put him in the position of a dependent" and "the less of a man he becomes" (cited in Rodgers, 1974, p. 33). This forced them to turn to other, more harmful ways

to express masculinity. Working-class White men were no longer seen as moral beacons, responsible for their children's religious and emotional upbringing, but were seen as aggressive, sexual, and competitive (Laslett & Brenner, 1989). In this era, White masculinities were defined by success in the market, individual achievement, mobility, and wealth.

As working-class White men were thrust into the wage-earning workforce during this period, they became more aware of other men and of the importance of work in their masculine status. "The workplace was a man's world... If manhood could be proved, it had to be proved in the eyes of other men (Kimmel, 2006, pg 19)." White masculinity was no longer measured by one's success within his family but was now dependent on his success in the workforce and the public sphere. Kimmel explains that this was why many White men were opposed to women entering the labor force: "it was as if workplace manhood could only be retained if the workplace only had men in it (2006, pg 23)." In this sense, an effort to maintain higher wages of White men in the industrial workforce via exclusion of other laborers became intertwined with notions of gender relations. Maynard (1989) argues that men workers mixed their evolving class consciousness with a strong sense of their gender identity because "as industrial capitalism unfolded in this period it not only altered class relations, but also shifted gender relations precipitating a crisis in masculinity." As women moved into industry, they no longer depended on men as a link to the public sphere, which further threatened men's dominance, both in the workplace and in the home (Hacker, 1957;). In order to maintain their dominance in the workplace and the home, men worked to exclude women from many occupations (for a comprehensive history of this, see Cockburn, 1991).

Efforts to exclude women from certain workplaces were also met by efforts to exclude Black men. The privileges conferred by race were (and often continue to be) used to make up for alienating and exploitative class relationships. (Roediger, 1999). Whiteness served as a secondary wage for white workers who were resisting the view of wage labor as a form of wage slavery. "Slaves were seen as dependent, helpless men, incapable of defending their women and children, and therefore less than manly" (Hoch, 2004). For working class White men, already feeling their identities threatened by wage work, turned to racism, antifeminism, and nativism: excluding the 'other' would help White men to preserve their gender identity, especially in regard to work (Kimmel 2006, pg 62). For example, in the early 1900s, lynching of Black men became widespread. White workers feared the influx of low paid Black workers into the labor force and lynched them as a way to reduce competition or terrorize others to stay out. Alleging sex crimes (especially against White women) legitimated the practice (Davis, 1983). This is a particularly poignant example about White men's constructions of 'hyper-masculine' narratives about Black men, which I discuss in the subsequent section.

As White women began to enter the paid labor force in the 20th century, and specifically began working on occupations previously designated for men, White men again shifted their notions of masculine behavior and roles of manhood. In practice, the male-breadwinner model began to decline, but among some groups of men, the ideology of the male-breadwinner model continued to persist. In the late 20th century, notions of 'the family wage' for men became less important and issues to relating "to working conditions, hours of work, parental leave, and so on came more and more to the fore," which Morgan (2005) argues made men feel as though work was less masculine.

Ultimately, given this brief history White men's changing notions of masculinity in the U.S., one can begin to see the importance of shifting macroeconomic contexts in notions of manhood. Additionally, one begins to see that masculinity, as it is associated with upper- and middle-class White men in the U.S., often has to do with power. Often most clearly, this means power over women, but it may also mean power over Black men or power over working-class men. This is why Raewyn Connell's definition of hegemonic masculinity is more relevant and accurate than other conceptions of masculine identity which ignore power relations.

IV. What Makes Hegemonic Masculinity Hegemonic?

Turning back to Connell's definition, not only is hegemonic masculinity about perpetuating patriarchy, but it is, relatedly, about ensuring men outside of the hegemonic group, in some way, conform to notions of masculinity prescribed by the hegemonic group.

Connell writes that hegemonic masculinity "requires all other men to position themselves in relation to it. (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005, pg 832)" In line with Connell's conceptualization, Kimmel (2006, pg 4) writes that "all American men must contend with a singular vision of masculinity, a particular definition that is held up as the model against which we measure ourselves." This is where the concept of *hegemonic* masculinity becomes especially important. By defining masculinity in this way, it becomes clear that the concept is rooted in notions of power and social relations. Connell & Messerschmidt acknowledge that notions of masculinity differ locally, regionally, and globally, but that there is generally a "singular form of masculinity that stand atop a gender hierarchy" (Garlick, 2017, pp. 35) In her work, Connell is clear in her claim that only a small minority of relatively powerful men need to enact hegemonic masculinity in order for it to steer the behavior of other groups of men. Notably, this is somewhat in contradiction to Himmelweit's (2003) macro-model of norms, in which the strength of the norm relies on the proportion of the population conforming to it.

One clear expression of the hegemonic groups' efforts to prescribe specific notions of manhood on other, oppressed groups is when one considers masculinity and race in the United States. Reeser (2011) writes extensively on this topic. For example, he explains that White men often spread narratives about Asian men as effeminate, or Black men as hyper virile, which places White masculinity as the perfect expression of manhood. These narratives should not be taken as two separate constructs, but "as part of a larger system of race-gender codings, the white man is privileged as the man in the middle: neither too masculine nor too unmasculine...Ending up in the middle is a way for white masculinity to be accorded the privileges of the happy medium and to keep those privileges away from the men coded otherwise." (Reeser, 2011, pp. 150) In this sense, hegemonic masculinity works to subordinate both women and 'non-hegemonically masculine' men. In explaining the subjection of Black men, Reeser writes the following on the narratives of Black masculinity:

The image of the man in gender overdrive might be a way to suggest that he is out of control. The African American man is so gendered or so sexualized, or so the racist logic goes, that he is unable to control himself since he wants to have sex, to break into houses, or to rape women. The man of excess, then, can be just as subject to the rule of

hegemonic masculinity as the effeminate man, and consequently, the construct of non-excessive or moderate applies to the white man or to another racialized group seen as ideal by contrast. ...This kind of thinking about excess can be a way to code a group as lacking and thus not fully legitimate in terms of masculinity. The white man may be disturbed or anxious by the black man's virility or by a perception of gender similarity with himself, and respond to this anxiety by coding his racial other as lacking in some way (without intelligence, culture, self-control, financial success, etc.). In this sense, and excess of masculinity can be transformed into a lack. (Reeser, 2011, pp. 149)

When a powerful group in society codes Black men as 'excessive' and 'out of control', this provides justifications for heavy surveillance, incarceration, and other punishments of Black men, even when Black men enact gender norms in similar ways to White men. Scholars have found that in educational, labor market, and criminal justice settings, "black men pay a disproportionate price for enacting masculinity norms in comparison to white males" with similar incomes (Royster, 2007). Additionally, placing White (in this case, the hegemonic) masculinity in the middle group serves to maintain the dominance of the hegemonic group, both by heavy surveillance and punishment of black man, and by coding them as lacking intelligence, culture, or self-control.

Similar dynamics exist when one considers the role of class and hegemonic masculinity in forming working-class conceptualizations of manhood. Morgan (2005) also discusses the shift of more and more men into service work in the late 20th century. He writes that upper- and middle-income working men aimed make this work seem masculine and to separate themselves from work done by the masses. Because of this, working-class men "were presented as sheep who were easily led by politically motivated leaders or group pressure. Management, on the other hand, was presented as dealing with some of the key issues in the national economy" (pp. 170). In response, working class men constructed their masculinity as collective, physical, and oppositional: similar in many ways to the White colonists in America opposing British aristocracy. Additionally, designations of 'skilled' and 'unskilled' work were changing, largely driven by the capitalist class and an economic shift to service sector work. Men in the 'unskilled' category responded by prescribing physical strength to their masculine identities if they were to be excluded from notions of technical mastery (Maynard, 1986). On the other hand, middle and upper-class men working in services associated their masculinity with individuality, rationality, and intelligence. Again, efforts put forth by the hegemonic group to redefine masculine work or behavior places them in the optimal position: upper- and middle-income men seen as rational leaders and individuals rather than brutish sheep. In this way, the hegemonic group is again considered to have the perfect 'amount' of manhood relative to the oppressed working class.

V. Empirical Research Questions

Given this background, my research question is largely about how hegemonic masculinity influences the behavior of men inside and outside the hegemonic group. How does the notion of 'all men must contend' in Connell's definition of hegemonic masculinity play out? In a U.S. context, I ask who is the dominant group maintaining hegemonic masculinity and what are their masculine behaviors. What are the masculine behaviors that upper class White men set

as standards for masculinity in which ‘all men must contend’? I also ask how other groups of men adopt or do not adopt similar behaviors. Who reinforces behaviors associated with hegemonic masculinity and who works against them?

Carrigan, Connell, and Lee (1985) and Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) have discussed the possibility that there are hegemonic masculinities, plural: a hierarchy of sorts, subject to local, national and global dynamics, and to class and race dynamics. In other words, there are certainly overlapping modes of oppression which suggests that men in different class and race groups would behave differently when contending with hegemonic masculinity, as presented by upper-income White men, or by others with power relative to those within their own class and race groups.

I examine whether the behaviors and tensions described in Bertrand, Kamenica & Pan (2015) exist or play out differently upper-income groups as opposed to lower income groups, and in Black masculinities as opposed to White. Specifically, I consider their finding that within a given couple, when the wife earns more than the husband, the gap in time spent on housework is higher (driven both by men doing less housework and by women doing more housework) relative to couples in which the wife makes the same or less than their husband. I reexamine this finding in light of different classed and racialized dynamics of hegemonic masculinity. These results are preliminary. As I continue with this paper, I hope to consider how some of the other economic phenomena associated with hegemonic masculinity play out for different race and class groups. I discuss this future research in the final section of this paper.

VI. Data

Like Bertrand, Kamenica, and Pan (2015), I use Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID) data. The main disadvantage of the PSID is its question about housework is rather vague: “About how much time do you spend on housework in an average week—I mean time spent cooking, cleaning, and other work around the house?” However, the main advantage is that both the household head and the spouse/partner answer the question, which allows us to directly measure the gender gap in home production within a household. The panel nature of the data also allows examination of how changes in relative income affect this gap

In this early version of the paper, I make use of PSID data from 1986-2017, inclusive. I restrict my sample to those who are aged 18 and older, and to opposite-sex couples who are either married or ‘permanently cohabitating’. My data is also restricted to those who have reported the number of housework hours done per week by both the man and woman partners. Like Bertrand, Kamenica, and Pan (2015), I make use of this data to understand the relationship between gaps in housework hours and relative income (where the gap in housework is calculated by subtracting the number of housework hours done by the male partner from the number of housework hours done by the female partner). In order to do this, I make use of the PSID data on total labor income (which includes regular pay, overtime pay, tips, and bonuses) as well as hourly wage rates earnings data. Using this information, I construct binary variables to indicate whether the woman outearns her partner or not. In my model (described in the subsequent section), I also make use of data on labor hours per week, age, and education for both partners, as well as the number of children under 18 in the family unit, the age of the youngest child, the total

income of the family unit (including non-labor income), and whether or not the partners are married or permanently cohabitating. The descriptive statistics for these measures are listed below in Table 1. In Table 2, I list the same data but it is disaggregated by the race of the male partner: if the man in the couple is White or Black. The female partner may be of any race. However, it is worth noting that among couples with Black men, 93% of the female partners are Black and among couples with White men, 97% of the female partners are White. In Table 3, I also list some summary statistics for the upper, middle, and lower income terciles. Income terciles are calculated simply by sorting the available population into thirds for each year. In the future, I intend to test different measures of class, including by occupation, asset ownership, etc.

VII. Model

Similar to Bertrand, Kamenica and Pan (2015), I estimate a linear probability model with couple and year fixed effects regressing the housework gap in year t on whether the wife earned more than the husband in year $t - 1$. My baseline specification is as follows:

$$HouseworkGap_{i,t} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 WomanEarnsMore_{i,t-1} + \beta_2 \mathbf{I}_{i,t-1} + \beta_3 \mathbf{X}_{i,t} + \lambda_i + \alpha_t + \epsilon_{i,t}$$

The dependent variable, the housework gap, is calculated as the woman's housework in time t minus the man's housework in time t . The independent variable of interest, $WomanEarnsMore_{i,t-1}$, is a binary variable equal to 1 if the woman earned more than her male partner in time $t-1$, and equal to 0 if not. As indicated in the results tables below, I have used two different measures of earning when constructing this variable. In some regressions, I use a measure which indicates whether or not the woman has a higher hourly wage rate than her male partner. In others, I use a measure which indicates whether or not the woman had a higher total annual labor income than her male partner. In my baseline regression, I also include various measures of income, represented by vector $\mathbf{I}_{i,t-1}$. These include the log of each partner's labor income, the log of each partner's labor income squared, the log of the household's total income (including non-labor income), all in year $t-1$. Vector $\mathbf{X}_{i,t}$ represents couple-specific controls, including the age of both partners, ages squared, as well as the number of children under 18 in the household and the age of the youngest child in the household. The terms λ_i and α_t represent couple and year fixed effects respectively.

In additional regressions, I add controls for each individual's labor hours per week, level of education, a binary indicator variable for whether the woman is not working, and a binary indicator variable for whether the man is not working. These additions to the baseline model are noted in the subsequent tables.

After estimating this model for the entire population, and getting coefficient estimates similar to that of Bertrand, Kamenica, and Pan (2015), I then estimate separate models for couples with a White man and for couples with a Black man. These results, using relative wage rates and relative total labor incomes, respectively, as the dependent variables, are listed in Table 4 and Table 5. I then estimate separate models for those in the lowest income group, the middle income group, and the highest income group. These results are listed in Tables 6 and 7. Finally, I estimate separate models for couples with Black men in the lowest, middle and highest income

groups. The results are reported in Tables 8 and 9. I do the same income-tercile breakdown for couples with White men, with the results reported in Tables 10 and 11.

This separate models approach allows for an investigation of how the mix of causal factors change across different intersections of race and class, and also facilitates a direct comparison of the model's overall explanatory power across these intersections (Sprague, 2016; Scott & Siltanen, 2017). Another strategy might be to incorporate interaction terms. While I intend to estimate a model using interaction terms as a robustness check in the future, it is somewhat useful to not have a reference group which is implicitly often defined as normal. Estimating separate models also allows us to better account for race- and class-based heterogeneity.

VIII. Results & Interpretation

Referring to Table 4 and Table 5, one can see that when considering the total population, it would appear when a woman earns more than her male partner in period $t-1$, the gap in housework increases by a substantial amount: over one hour for models comparing the couples' wage rates, and more than half an hour for some models using the couples' total labor income. In Table 4, when hourly wage rates are compared, it seems that the increase in the housework gap when a female partner out earns her male partner is larger in couples with a White man than in couples with a Black man. However, when total labor incomes are compared in Table 5, this statement no longer holds: none of the coefficients for women having higher labor incomes in $t-1$ are statistically significant for couples with White men. Additionally, for the model considering couples with Black men, it seems that some of the coefficients' magnitudes are much higher than the statistically insignificant coefficients in the model considering couples with White men. This difference in the models may have to do with a difference what the measures capture. The total labor income measure includes tips, overtime, and bonuses, while the hourly wage rate measure does not. In the context of hours spent on housework, it may also make more sense for the hourly wage rate measure to be more sensitive, in that it represents the opportunity cost of one hour's worth of housework. The total income measure may also be picking up some information on hours spent in paid labor. For this reason, I add controls for labor hours in all models, as indicated at the bottom of each results table.

Next, in Table 6 and Table 7 the results for the models separated by income tercile are presented. In Table 6, the independent variable of interest is whether or not the woman has a higher hourly wage rate than the man. Using this measure, it appears that for the lowest income tercile, there is a relatively smaller or statistically insignificant relationship between the woman out-earning the man and the increase in the gap in housework. The increase in the housework gap when a female partner out earns her male partner is largest in middle-income and upper-income couples. Similar results hold in Table 7, where the independent variable of interest measures whether or not the woman's total labor income is higher than her male partner's.

Table 8 and Table 9 indicate the results for couples with Black men for all three income terciles. Tables 10 and 11 report the results for couples with White men for all three income terciles. In the case of couples with Black men, it seems that lower-income couples see a bigger increase in the housework gap when the woman out-earns the man relative to middle- and upper-

income couples. Using the wage-rate measure as the dependent variable, as reported in Table 10, it seems that the opposite trend occurs in couples with a White man. In this case, upper- and middle-income couples with White men experience large and statistically significant increases in the housework gap, but lower-income couples with White men see no statistically significant effects. When using the total labor income measure as the independent variable of interest, as reported in Table 11, there are no statistically significant results for any income tercile with White men in the partnership.

Overall, based on the results presented in Table 8 and Table 10, it seems that upper- and middle-income White men might have a stronger aversion to the situation in which a woman out-earns her male partner relative to lower-income White men and upper- and middle-income Black men. Lower-income Black men in this model also seem to have a relatively strong aversion to the situation in which a woman out-earns her male partner, especially when compared to middle- and upper-income couples with Black men (as indicated in the results presented in Table 8 and Table 9). However, these preliminary results should be interpreted cautiously, as there are some overlapping confidence intervals among these groups, and the results are somewhat sensitive to which type of income measure is used.

What do these results mean in light of research done on hegemonic masculinity? Recall that the broader research questions are as follows: What are the masculine behaviors that upper class White men set as standards for masculinity in which ‘all men must contend’? Who reinforces behaviors associated with hegemonic masculinity and who works against them?

Given the previous discussion about the dynamics of hegemonic masculinity, it seems that middle-income White men and lower-income Black men contend with the masculinity norms set by upper-income White men by conforming to and simulating them in some way. Upper- and middle-income Black men may be opposing these norms as a way to retaliate against notions of White manhood or to establish their own notions of Black manhood. More specifically, this may be an example of Black men combatting the White narratives of Black ‘man in overdrive’, as Reeser (2011) puts it. Lower-income Black men, oppressed by both racism and class dynamics, may be emulating behaviors found in the hegemonic group as a way of reasserting manhood and dominance. Lower-income White men, who may be oppressed by class dynamics, but still receive the ‘wages of Whiteness’ may be attempting to position themselves in the middle ground, as Reeser (2011) argues, relative to Black men in their same income group. However, more empirical work studying responses to other ‘threats’ to masculinity is necessary in order to understand whether these trends generally hold.

IX. Conclusions & Future Work

Ultimately, this analysis only offers a peek into the dynamics of hegemonic masculinity. In order to get a more robust understanding of how various groups of men contend with prescriptions of masculinity passed down by hegemonic groups in society, one must consider other expressions of manhood and how different groups respond to ‘threats’ to masculinity. I intend to do this in future work. For instance, I will consider other dynamics which might influence relative housework: I could consider how occupational segregation impacts notions of ‘manhood’ and thus performances of housework (similar to Schneider, 2012), or perhaps the

impact of unemployment or public assistance as ‘threats’ to masculinity. In these analyses, similar to the one I have taken on here, I will break down analyses based on race and class groups. I will also consider other dependent variables in my models aside from housework. For instance, Syrda (2019) finds that men have increasing levels of stress when their wives begin to out-earn them. Does this vary by race and class groups? One might also consider a class and race analysis of how marriage and divorce rates (Bertrand, Kamenica, and Pan, 2015) or rates of intimate partner violence (Atkinson, Greenstein, & Lang, 2005), are impacted by women out-earning their partners. I hope to examine several of these phenomena in the future so as to offer a more robust understanding of how the macro-norms associated with hegemonic masculinity influence different groups of men and their behavior within homes.

To my knowledge, this work is the first of its kind to consider hegemonic masculinity in conjunction with the intrahousehold economic phenomena studied in this paper, and those listed in the previous paragraph. Merging these insights, and conducting an empirical analysis focused on race and class dynamics, is helpful in understanding notions of power and oppression that are present in behaviors previously attributed to ‘gender deviance neutralization.’ Analyses such as these are important if we are interested in a nuanced understanding of gender dynamics within homes: hegemonic masculinity may be harmful for women, but also for men in the non-hegemonic group. Beginning to understand the nuance and power relations associated with the behavior of men is helpful in improving the economic and social situation of women and subordinated men.

TABLE 1: Summary Statistics for All Couples: PSID 1986-2017

	N	mean	S.D
Woman Housework in t	99,429	21.65	15.31
Man Housework in t	99,429	7.81	9.31
Housework gap in t	99,429	13.84	16.68
Woman total labor income	97,537	15069.64	21494.51
Man total labor income	97,537	34856.31	66317.02
Woman hourly wage	91,070	9.54	15.38
Man hourly wage	85,987	16.42	23.69
Woman work hours per week	99,118	19.57	20.49
Man work hours per week	99,013	31.49	23.08
Total income	97,537	63981.26	84281.89
Woman earns more income	97,537	0.198	0.398
Woman earns more hourly wages	85,713	0.247	0.431
Only woman working	98,733	0.054	0.225
Only man working	98,733	0.214	0.410
Woman's age	99,429	42.59	13.55
Man's age	99,429	45.25	14.09
Married	99,429	0.775	0.418
Number of children	99,429	1.27	1.31
Age of youngest child	60,698	6.99	5.07

TABLE 2: Summary Statistics for White and Black Couples: PSID 1986-2017

Couple:	w/ White man			w/ Black man		
	N	mean	S.D	N	mean	S.D.
Woman Housework in t	71,841	22.00	15.02	21,113	19.54	15.19
Man Housework in t	71,841	7.79	8.88	21,113	7.60	9.99
Housework gap in t	71,841	14.21	16.36	21,113	11.94	16.57
Woman total labor income	70,560	15296.41	22676.03	21,078	14721.69	17402.95
Man total labor income	70,560	38605.28	76017.94	21,078	23752.67	22323.39
Woman hourly wage	65,838	9.82	16.63	19,829	8.74	10.71
Man hourly wage	62,172	17.93	25.99	18,940	11.74	12.63
Woman work hours per week	71,659	19.37	20.38	21,009	21.04	20.74
Man work hours per week	71,638	32.38	23.06	20,954	28.85	22.77
Total income	70,560	69798.55	94628.94	21,078	46564.82	35943.95
Woman earns more income	70,560	0.183	0.387	21,078	0.251	0.433
Woman earns more hourly wages	61,973	0.229	0.420	18,890	0.309	0.462
Only woman working	71,470	0.047	0.211	20,863	0.078	0.267
Only man working	71,470	0.216	0.411	20,863	0.194	0.395
Woman's age	71,841	43.20	13.86	21,113	40.96	12.42
Man's age	71,841	45.75	14.33	21,113	43.97	13.22
Married	71,841	0.773	0.419	21,113	0.761	0.427
Number of children	71,841	1.18	1.25	21,113	1.52	1.42
Age of youngest child	41,629	7.20	5.12	14,568	6.62	4.92

TABLE 3: Summary Statistics by Income Tercile: PSID 1986-2017

	N	mean	S.D
Lower Income			
Woman Housework in t	32,312	24.3	17.19
Man Housework in t	32,312	8.07	11.09
Housework gap in t	32,312	16.25	16.68
Woman work hours per week	32,198	12.90	18.88
Man work hours per week	32,132	23.90	23.75
Woman earns more income	32,312	0.211	0.408
Woman earns more hourly wages	28,173	0.241	0.428
Only woman working	32,031	0.086	0.280
Only man working	32,031	0.271	0.444
Woman's age	32,312	43.24	16.61
Man's age	32,312	46.22	17.28
Married	32,312	0.776	0.416
Number of children	32,312	1.32	1.42
Age of youngest child	19,175	5.92	4.78
Middle Income			
Woman Housework in t	32,581	21.22	14.60
Man Housework in t	32,581	7.76	8.77
Housework gap in t	32,581	13.46	15.69
Woman work hours per week	34,481	21.50	20.23
Man work hours per week	32,461	33.35	21.81
Woman earns more income	32,581	0.203	0.402
Woman earns more hourly wages	28,783	0.256	0.437
Only woman working	32,370	0.459	0.209
Only man working	32,370	0.203	0.402
Woman's age	32,581	40.94	12.63
Man's age	32,581	43.46	13.09
Married	32,581	0.769	0.421
Number of children	32,581	1.33	1.29
Age of youngest child	20,961	6.91	5.01
Upper Income			
Woman Housework in t	32,644	19.10	13.11
Man Housework in t	32,644	7.499	7.63
Housework gap in t	32,644	11.60	14.09
Woman work hours per week	32,567	24.37	20.58
Man work hours per week	32,567	37.11	21.71
Woman earns more income	32,644	0.181	0.385
Woman earns more hourly wages	28,757	0.244	0.430
Only woman working	32,496	0.028	0.165
Only man working	32,496	0.164	0.370
Woman's age	32,644	43.55	10.56
Man's age	32,644	46.00	10.94
Married	32,644	0.766	0.423
Number of children	32,644	1.163	1.210
Age of youngest child	19,301	8.18	5.16

TABLE 4: Relative hourly wage rates and housework gap by couples with Black and White men^a

Dependent variable: housework gap	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Total population				
Woman has higher wage rate in $t - 1$	1.736***	1.010***	1.558***	1.230***
	[0.191]	[0.192]	[0.228]	[0.231]
Obs.	37,297	37,093	22,204	22,204
R-squared	0.128	0.151	0.141	0.151
Couples w/Black man				
Woman has higher wage rate in $t - 1$	1.386***	0.779**	1.115**	0.793**
	[0.368]	[0.369]	[0.434]	[0.441]
Obs.	9,176	9,077	5,353	5,353
R-squared	0.070	0.085	0.072	0.081
Couples w/White man				
Woman has higher wage rate in $t - 1$	1.734***	0.926***	1.672***	1.302***
	[0.231]	[0.230]	[0.278]	[0.280]
Obs.	25,970	25,880	15,481	15,481
R-squared	0.143	0.169	0.157	0.167
Additional controls:				
Labor hours	no	yes	no	yes
Education	no	no	yes	yes
Whether man/woman not working	no	no	yes	yes

^aData from the PSID 1986-2017. The dependent variable (housework gap) is calculated by subtracting the number of hours the man spends on housework in time t from the number of hours the woman spends on housework in time t . Income related controls include the log of each partner's labor income, the log of each partner's labor income squared, the log of the household's total income (including non-labor income), all in year $t-1$. Other controls include couple and year fixed effects, age of both partners, ages squared, as well as the number of children under 18 in the household and the age of the youngest child in the household. Standard errors are in brackets. ***significant at 1%, **at 5%, *at 10%.

TABLE 5: Relative labor income and housework gap by couples with Black and White men^a

Dependent variable: housework gap	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Total population				
Woman has higher labor income in $t - 1$	0.381	0.226	0.714***	0.657***
	[0.237]	[0.235]	[0.274]	[0.274]
Obs.	41,798	41,555	26,379	26,379
R-squared	0.123	0.150	0.137	0.150
Couples w/Black man				
Woman has higher labor income in $t - 1$	0.271	0.218	1.750***	1.717***
	[0.445]	[0.444]	[0.527]	[0.526]
Obs.	10,172	10,059	6,274	6,274
R-squared	0.066	0.082	0.069	0.078
Couples w/White man				
Woman has higher labor income in $t - 1$	0.201	0.016	0.168	0.148
	[0.219]	[0.287]	[0.330]	[0.329]
Obs.	29,017	28,910	18,382	18,382
R-squared	0.140	0.168	0.155	0.168
Additional controls:				
Labor hours	no	yes	no	yes
Education	no	no	yes	yes
Whether man/woman not working	no	no	yes	yes

^aData from the PSID 1986-2017. The dependent variable (housework gap) is calculated by subtracting the number of hours the man spends on housework in time t from the number of hours the woman spends on housework in time t . Income related controls include the log of each partner's labor income, the log of each partner's labor income squared, the log of the household's total income (including non-labor income), all in year $t-1$. Other controls include couple and year fixed effects, age of both partners, ages squared, as well as the number of children under 18 in the household and the age of the youngest child in the household. Standard errors are in brackets. ***significant at 1%, **at 5%, *at 10%.

TABLE 6: Relative hourly wage rates and housework gap by income tercile^a

Dependent variable: housework gap	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Lower income group				
Woman has higher wage rate in $t - 1$	0.915*	0.343	0.733	0.396
	[0.512]	[0.510]	[0.689]	[0.696]
Obs.	8,854	8,784	4,885	4,885
R-squared	0.085	0.103	0.110	0.118
Middle income group				
Woman has higher wage rate in $t - 1$	1.671***	0.837**	1.542***	1.151***
	[0.332]	[0.331]	[0.396]	[0.401]
Obs.	14,437	14,356	8,704	8,704
R-squared	0.120	0.146	0.129	0.136
Upper income group				
Woman has higher wage rate in $t - 1$	2.013***	1.364***	1.259***	1.003***
	[0.287]	[0.289]	[0.335]	[0.340]
Obs.	14,006	13,953	8,615	8,615
R-squared	0.149	0.177	0.169	0.182
Additional controls:				
Labor hours	no	yes	no	yes
Education	no	no	yes	yes
Whether man/woman not working	no	no	yes	yes

^aData from the PSID 1986-2017. The dependent variable (housework gap) is calculated by subtracting the number of hours the man spends on housework in time t from the number of hours the woman spends on housework in time t . Income related controls include the log of each partner's labor income, the log of each partner's labor income squared, the log of the household's total income (including non-labor income), all in year $t-1$. Other controls include couple and year fixed effects, age of both partners, ages squared, as well as the number of children under 18 in the household and the age of the youngest child in the household. Information in income terciles by year is presented in Appendix A. Standard errors are in brackets. ***significant at 1%, **at 5%, *at 10%.

TABLE 7: Relative labor income and housework gap by income tercile ^a

Dependent variable: housework gap	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Lower income group				
Woman has higher labor income in $t - 1$	0.078	-0.142	0.405	0.404
	[0.676]	[0.670]	[0.875]	[0.873]
Obs.	9,863	9,784	5,817	5,817
R-squared	0.083	0.103	0.105	0.112
Middle income group				
Woman has higher labor income in $t - 1$	0.484	0.355	1.046**	1.010**
	[0.426]	[0.421]	[0.499]	[0.497]
Obs.	16,214	16,114	10,341	10,341
R-squared	0.119	0.149	0.128	0.140
Upper income group				
Woman has higher labor income in $t - 1$	0.738**	0.657*	0.900**	0.883**
	[0.356]	[0.353]	[0.398]	[0.398]
Obs.	15,721	15,657	10,221	10,221
R-squared	0.140	0.173	0.155	0.172
Additional controls:				
Labor hours	no	yes	no	yes
Education	no	no	yes	yes
Whether man/woman not working	no	no	yes	yes

^aData from the PSID 1986-2017. The dependent variable (housework gap) is calculated by subtracting the number of hours the man spends on housework in time t from the number of hours the woman spends on housework in time t . Income related controls include the log of each partner's labor income, the log of each partner's labor income squared, the log of the household's total income (including non-labor income), all in year $t-1$. Other controls include couple and year fixed effects, age of both partners, ages squared, as well as the number of children under 18 in the household and the age of the youngest child in the household. Information in income terciles by year is presented in Appendix A. Standard errors are in brackets. ***significant at 1%, **at 5%, *at 10%.

TABLE 8: Relative wage rates & housework gap by income tercile (for couples with Black men) ^a

Dependent variable: housework gap	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Lower income group				
Woman has higher wage rate in $t - 1$	1.880**	1.700**	1.002	0.841
	[0.846]	[0.851]	[1.060]	[1.085]
Obs.	2,787	2,750	1,468	1,468
R-squared	0.074	0.085	0.044	0.047
Middle income group				
Woman has higher wage rate in $t - 1$	0.600	-0.295	0.698	0.594
	[0.611]	[0.611]	[0.672]	[0.683]
Obs.	3,804	3,760	2,337	2,337
R-squared	0.062	0.079	0.045	0.049
Upper income group				
Woman has higher wage rate in $t - 1$	0.624	0.112	-0.146	-0.466
	[0.608]	[0.618]	[0.780]	[0.791]
Obs.	2,585	2,567	1,548	1,548
R-squared	0.033	0.050	0.014	0.023
Additional controls:				
Labor hours	no	yes	no	yes
Education	no	no	yes	yes
Whether man/woman not working	no	no	yes	yes

^aData from the PSID 1986-2017. The dependent variable (housework gap) is calculated by subtracting the number of hours the man spends on housework in time t from the number of hours the woman spends on housework in time t . Income related controls include the log of each partner's labor income, the log of each partner's labor income squared, the log of the household's total income (including non-labor income), all in year $t-1$. Other controls include couple and year fixed effects, age of both partners, ages squared, as well as the number of children under 18 in the household and the age of the youngest child in the household. Information in income terciles by year is presented in Appendix A. Standard errors are in brackets. ***significant at 1%, **at 5%, *at 10%.

TABLE 9: Relative labor income & housework gap by income tercile (for couples w/ Black men)^a

Dependent variable: housework gap	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Lower income group				
Woman has higher labor income in $t - 1$	0.391	0.191	2.918**	2.716**
	[1.120]	[1.125]	[1.382]	[1.381]
Obs.	3,037	2,997	1,698	1,698
R-squared	0.064	0.081	0.039	0.044
Middle income group				
Woman has higher labor income in $t - 1$	0.951	1.133	1.927**	1.994**
	[0.760]	[0.755]	[0.877]	[0.877]
Obs.	4,260	4,209	2,755	2,755
R-squared	0.119	0.149	0.058	0.063
Upper income group				
Woman has higher labor income in $t - 1$	0.514	0.521	1.675*	1.742*
	[0.731]	[0.724]	[0.891]	[0.890]
Obs.	2,875	2,853	1,821	1,821
R-squared	0.033	0.052	0.020	0.029
Additional controls:				
Labor hours	no	yes	no	yes
Education	no	no	yes	yes
Whether man/woman not working	no	no	yes	yes

^aData from the PSID 1986-2017. The dependent variable (housework gap) is calculated by subtracting the number of hours the man spends on housework in time t from the number of hours the woman spends on housework in time t . Income related controls include the log of each partner's labor income, the log of each partner's labor income squared, the log of the household's total income (including non-labor income), all in year $t-1$. Other controls include couple and year fixed effects, age of both partners, ages squared, as well as the number of children under 18 in the household and the age of the youngest child in the household. Information in income terciles by year is presented in Appendix A. Standard errors are in brackets. ***significant at 1%, **at 5%, *at 10%.

TABLE 10: Relative wage rates & housework gap by income tercile (for couples with White men)^a

Dependent variable: housework gap	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Lower income group				
Woman has higher wage rate in $t - 1$	0.665	-0.261	0.716	0.390
	[0.699]	[0.691]	[0.976]	[0.980]
Obs.	5,183	5,156	2,864	2,864
R-squared	0.089	0.112	0.091	0.098
Middle income group				
Woman has higher wage rate in $t - 1$	1.806***	0.957**	1.893***	1.346***
	[0.406]	[0.404]	[0.505]	[0.510]
Obs.	9,858	9,828	5,871	5,871
R-squared	0.098	0.134	0.162	0.141
Upper income group				
Woman has higher wage rate in $t - 1$	2.164***	1.510***	1.452***	1.229***
	[0.333]	[0.334]	[0.381]	[0.385]
Obs.	10,929	10,896	6,746	6,746
R-squared	0.166	0.198	0.183	0.195
Additional controls:				
Labor hours	no	yes	no	yes
Education	no	no	yes	yes
Whether man/woman not working	no	no	yes	yes

^aData from the PSID 1986-2017. The dependent variable (housework gap) is calculated by subtracting the number of hours the man spends on housework in time t from the number of hours the woman spends on housework in time t . Income related controls include the log of each partner's labor income, the log of each partner's labor income squared, the log of the household's total income (including non-labor income), all in year $t-1$. Other controls include couple and year fixed effects, age of both partners, ages squared, as well as the number of children under 18 in the household and the age of the youngest child in the household. Information in income terciles by year is presented in Appendix A. Standard errors are in brackets. ***significant at 1%, **at 5%, *at 10%.

TABLE 11: Relative labor income & housework gap by income tercile (for couples w/ White men)^a

Dependent variable: housework gap	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Lower income group				
Woman has higher labor income in $t - 1$	-0.298	-0.453	-1.191	-1.065
	[0.924]	[0.908]	[1.226]	[1.220]
Obs.	3,037	2,997	1,698	1,698
R-squared	0.064	0.081	0.039	0.044
Middle income group				
Woman has higher labor income in $t - 1$	-0.0646	-0.255	0.250	0.254
	[0.538]	[0.528]	[0.634]	[0.629]
Obs.	11,033	10,993	6,979	6,979
R-squared	0.131	0.165	0.140	0.155
Upper income group				
Woman has higher labor income in $t - 1$	0.529	0.475	0.454	0.448
	[0.420]	[0.416]	[0.453]	[0.448]
Obs.	12,264	12,227	8,022	8,022
R-squared	0.156	0.194	0.165	0.183
Additional controls:				
Labor hours	no	yes	no	yes
Education	no	no	yes	yes
Whether man/woman not working	no	no	yes	yes

^aData from the PSID 1986-2017. The dependent variable (housework gap) is calculated by subtracting the number of hours the man spends on housework in time t from the number of hours the woman spends on housework in time t . Income related controls include the log of each partner's labor income, the log of each partner's labor income squared, the log of the household's total income (including non-labor income), all in year $t-1$. Other controls include couple and year fixed effects, age of both partners, ages squared, as well as the number of children under 18 in the household and the age of the youngest child in the household. Information in income terciles by year is presented in Appendix A. Standard errors are in brackets. ***significant at 1%, **at 5%, *at 10%.

Works Cited

- Akerlof, G. A., & Kranton, R. E. (2000). Economics and identity. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 115(3), 715-753.
- Atkinson, M. P., Greenstein, T. N., & 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.
- Bertrand, M., Kamenica, E., & Pan, J. (2015). Gender identity and relative income within households. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 130(2), 571-614.
- Bhattacharya, H. (2015). Spousal violence and Women's employment in India. *Feminist Economics*, 21(2), 30-52
- Bittman, M., England, P., Sayer, L., Folbre, N., & Matheson, G. (2003). When does gender trump money? Bargaining and time in household work. *American Journal of sociology*, 109(1), 186-214
- Caridad Bueno, C., & Henderson, E. A. (2017). Bargaining or backlash? Evidence on intimate partner violence from the Dominican Republic. *Feminist Economics*, 23(4), 90-116.
- Carrigan, T., Connell, B., & Lee, J. (1985). Toward a new sociology of masculinity. *Theory and society*, 14(5), 551-604.
- Cockburn, C. (1991) *In the Way of Women: Men's Resistance to Sex Equality in Organisations*, London: Macmillan.
- Cohen, David S. "Keeping Men Men and Women Down: Sex Segregation, Anti-Essentialism, and Masculinity." *Harv. JL & Gender* 33 (2010): 509.
- Connell, R.W. (1983). Men's Bodies. *Which Way is Up? Essays on Sex, Class, and Culture*, 17-32.
- Connell, R. W. (1993). The big picture: Masculinities in recent world history. *Theory and society*, 22(5), 597-623.
- Connell, R. W. (2005). *Masculinities*. University of California Press.
- Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender & society*, 19(6), 829-859.
- Cross, S., & Bagilhole, B. (2002). Girls' jobs for the boys? Men, masculinity and non-traditional occupations. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 9(2), 204-226.

- Davis, Angela Y. (1983) Chapter 11: Rape, Racism and the Myth of the Black Rapist, *Women, Race & Class*. Vintage Books, a division of Random House. New York.
- Folbre, N. (1994). *Who pays for the kids?: gender and the structures of constraint*. Routledge.
- Finnoff, K. (2012). Intimate partner violence, female employment, and male backlash in Rwanda. *The economics of peace and security journal*, 7(2).
- Garlick, S. (2017). *The nature of masculinity: Critical theory, new materialisms, and technologies of embodiment*. UBC Press.
- Greenstein, T. N. (2000). Economic dependence, gender, and the division of labor in the home: A replication and extension. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 62(2), 322-335.
- Gupta, S., & Ash, M. (2008). Whose money, whose time? A nonparametric approach to modeling time spent on housework in the United States. *Feminist Economics*, 14(1), 93-120.
- Hacker, H. M. (1957). The new burdens of masculinity. *Marriage and family living*, 19(3), 227-233.
- Harvey, K. (2005). The history of masculinity, circa 1650–1800. *Journal of British Studies*, 44(2), 296-311.
- Himmelweit, S. (2003). Chapter 16: An evolutionary approach to feminist economics in *Toward a Feminist Philosophy of Economics*. Editors: Barker, D., & Kuiper, E. Routledge.
- Hoch, P. (2004). White hero black beast: Racism, sexism and the mask of masculinity. *Feminism and masculinities*, 93-107.
- Kimmel, M. (2006). *Manhood in America*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Laslett, B., & Brenner, J. (1989). Gender and social reproduction: Historical perspectives. *Annual review of sociology*, 15(1), 381-404.
- Maynard, S. (1989). Rough work and rugged men: The social construction of masculinity in working-class history. *Labour/Le Travail*, 159-169.
- McLaughlin, H., Uggen, C., & Blackstone, A. (2012). Sexual harassment, workplace authority, and the paradox of power. *American sociological review*, 77(4), 625-647.
- Morgan, D. (2005). Class and masculinity. *Handbook of studies on men and masculinities*, 165-177.
- Reeser, T. W. (2011). *Masculinities in theory: An introduction*. John Wiley & Sons.

- Rodgers, D. T. (2014). *The work ethic in industrial America 1850-1920*. University of Chicago Press.
- Roediger, D. R. (1999). *The wages of whiteness: Race and the making of the American working class*. Verso.
- Royster, D. A. (2007). What happens to potential discouraged? Masculinity norms and the contrasting institutional and labor market experiences of less affluent black and white men. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 609(1), 153-180.
- Schneider, D. (2012). Gender deviance and household work: The role of occupation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 117(4), 1029-1072.
- Scott, N. A., & Siltanen, J. (2017). Intersectionality and quantitative methods: Assessing regression from a feminist perspective. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 20(4), 373-385.
- Sevilla-Sanz, A., Gimenez-Nadal, J. I., & Fernández, C. (2010). Gender roles and the division of unpaid work in Spanish households. *Feminist Economics*, 16(4), 137-184.
- Simister, J. (2013). Is Men's Share of Housework Reduced by 'Gender Deviance Neutralization'? Evidence From Seven Countries. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 44(3), 311-325.
- Simpson, R. (2004). Masculinity at work: The experiences of men in female dominated occupations. *Work, employment and society*, 18(2), 349-368.
- Sprague, J. (2016). *Feminist methodologies for critical researchers: Bridging differences*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Sullivan, O. (2011). An end to gender display through the performance of housework? A review and reassessment of the quantitative literature using insights from the qualitative literature. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 3(1), 1-13.
- Syrda, J. (2019). Spousal Relative Income and Male Psychological Distress. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 0146167219883611.
- Thébaud, S. (2010). Masculinity, bargaining, and breadwinning: Understanding men's housework in the cultural context of paid work. *Gender & society*, 24(3), 330-354.