

THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF HEGEMONIC MASCULINITY

Sarah Small, Colorado State University

sarah.small@colostate.edu

MOTIVATION

- Observing economic phenomena that could be attributed to defense of masculinity
- Examples:
 - “Male backlash” theory in studies of IPV (Caridad Bueno & Henderson, 2017; Bhattacharya, 2015; Finnoff, 2012; Atkinson, Greenstein, & Lang, 2005)
 - Bertrand, Kamenica, and Pan (2015): 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
 - Men who do “women’s work” in the labor market spend more time on male-typed housework (Schneider, 2012)

MOTIVATION

- Masculine identities are deeply embedded in notions of income and work
- 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.”
- I consider how the macro cultural dynamics of hegemonic masculinity influence microeconomic negotiations within households of various race and class groups

WHAT IS MASCULINITY?

- Masculinity means different things to different people (based on class, race, geography, etc.) during different time periods
- Notions of masculinity are relational
 - ‘Not feminine’ (Cohen, 2010)
 - Positioning White men in the middle ground (Reeser, 2011)
- 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, pg 832).”
 - Only a small minority of men might enact it (in contradiction to Himmelweit, 2003).

WHAT MAKES HEGEMONIC MASCULINITY HEGEMONIC?

- “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.” (Kimmel, 2006)
- There is generally a “singular form of masculinity that stand atop a gender hierarchy” (Garlick, 2017)
- Often works in ways which oppress men outside of the hegemonic groups
 - Examples:
 - notions of manhood and race in the United States
 - notions of manhood and class in the United States

HEGEMONIC MASCULINITY & RACE IN THE US

- 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 be taken “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)

HEGEMONIC MASCULINITY & CLASS IN THE US

- Morgan (2005) writes that upper- and middle-income men aim to make their service-sector work seem masculine
 - Present lower class men as sheep
 - “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.
- Men in ‘unskilled work’ responded by prescribing physical strength to their masculine identities if they were to be excluded from notions of technical mastery (Maynard, 1986).
- Used to oppress men outside the hegemonic group

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

- My broad research questions:
 - How does hegemonic masculinity influence the behavior of men inside and outside the hegemonic group?
- Empirically, (and in a U.S. context) I ask:
 - What are the behaviors that upper-class White men set as masculine social norms for which 'all men must contend'?
 - Which groups of men adopt similar behaviors? Who reinforces behaviors associated with hegemonic masculinity and who works against them?

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

- One way of empirically examining these questions:
- Do the behaviors described in Bertrand, Kamenica & Pan (2015) exist in upper-income groups as opposed to lower income groups, and in Black masculinities as opposed to White?
- 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.

DATA

- Like Bertrand, Kamenica, and Pan (2015), I use Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID) data
- From 1986-2017, inclusive.
- Restrict sample to:
 - aged 18 and older,
 - opposite-sex couples who are either married or 'permanently cohabitating'
 - those who have reported the number of housework hours done per week by both the man and woman partners.

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

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
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
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

MODEL

- Similar to Bertrand, Kamenica and Pan (2015), I estimate a linear probability model with couple and year fixed effects:

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

- *Housework Gap* = Woman's housework hours - Man's housework hours
- Vector $\mathbf{I}_{i,t-1}$: the log of each partner's labor income, the log of the household's total income (including non-labor income)
- Vector $\mathbf{X}_{i,t}$: age of both partners, ages squared, number of children under 18 in the household, age of the youngest child in the household

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

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

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

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

RESULTS & INTERPRETATION

- Upper- and middle-income White men may have a stronger aversion to the situation in which a woman out-earns her male partner relative to lower-income White 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.
- These preliminary results should be interpreted cautiously, as there are some overlapping confidence intervals among these groups

DISCUSSION

- Middle-income White men and lower-income Black men emulate the masculinity norms set by upper-income White men?
- Upper- and middle-income Black men may be opposing these norms
 - 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 White men, who 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

FUTURE WORK

- More empirical work studying responses other 'threats' to masculinity is necessary in order to understand whether these trends generally hold.
- This paper leans heavily on Bertrand, Kamenica, and Pan's (2015) assertion that performing or not performing housework is a way to compensate for deviating from the social norm that men should earn more than women
- I could consider:
 - how occupational segregation impacts notions of 'manhood' and thus performances of housework (similar to Schneider, 2012),
 - the impact of unemployment or public assistance as 'threats' to masculinity
- Or rates of intimate partner violence (Atkinson, Greenstein, & Lang, 2005), are impacted by women out-earning their partners