

Men, Work and Gender

CHRISTINA LEE
University of Newcastle

R. GLYNN OWENS
University of Auckland

Contemporary analyses of work and unemployment need to place psychological findings in the context of society, culture, and gender in understanding the meanings of paid and unpaid work for men and for women. The Australian Psychological Society discussion paper (in this issue) takes a comprehensive view of the literature and places it in the contemporary Australian social context, but fails to consider the extent to which socially constructed gender roles affect individuals' relationships with work. This paper complements the discussion paper by examining men's relationships with work and unemployment from a gendered perspective. Given the centrality of paid work to men's sense of self, there is surprisingly little psychological research on the extent to which patterns of paid and unpaid work, and discrepancies between desired and actual patterns of employment, interact with gender roles and expectations to affect men's physical and emotional wellbeing. This is particularly a concern, given structural changes in patterns of employment. Increasingly, men need to juggle the traditional view that a real man provides financially for his family with contemporary definitions of masculinity that emphasise egalitarianism and flexibility, in the context of rapid changes to work and family structures. The challenge for men is to find new ways of defining themselves and their sense of self-worth, other than exclusively through paid work.

The discussion paper on the psychology of work and unemployment in Australia (Winefield et al., 2002, in this issue) makes a useful contribution to discussions about the role of work, both paid and unpaid, in Australia today. The paper makes a valuable addition to the literature by placing the psychological evidence in its social and cultural context, and in considering the working lives of women and the interactions between paid and unpaid labour.

An issue of growing importance, and one which has been relatively neglected in this otherwise extremely thorough review, is that of the particular issues that arise for men as a result of the gendered meanings associated with paid work. As the authors have pointed out, structural changes in employment patterns mean that men can no longer expect a lifetime of full-time employment that financially supports a wife and children. However, gendered assumptions about masculinity have failed to keep pace with these changes. We have argued elsewhere (Lee & Owens, in press) that an increasing mismatch between hegemonic models of masculinity on the one hand, and social reality on the other, has negative impacts on men's physical and emotional wellbeing. This paper complements

the work of Winefield et al. (2002) by considering evidence for this point of view within the area of work and unemployment.

Men, Gender, and Employment

It is a natural consequence of capitalist ideology that a man will be defined by what he does — his value as an economic commodity — rather than who he is. A central tenet of hegemonic masculinity is the assumption that a "real" man will have a full-time, permanent job — probably involving making something — that financially supports his family (Price, Friedland, & Vinokur, 1998). He will see his career as the most important aspect of his life, and will always be prepared to sacrifice family activities for work and for career advancement. As Coltrane (1989) expressed it, the "essential nature of men is taken to be that of provider" (p. 488). Men who are unemployed or underemployed, who live in role-reversed or in same-sex relationships, or who otherwise do not conform to the stereotype of the man providing for wife and children, are stigmatised (e.g., Grbich, 1992). Irrespective of the desirability or otherwise of such attitudes, the practical reality is that, for many men, these objectives will be unattainable, and the discrepancy between goals and reality will produce substantial distress.

Feminists have argued that capitalism, and the dominant cultural discourses of patriarchal societies, position men and women as essentially different, and that social institutions — including law, government, employment, and childcare systems — militate against women's freedom to make optimal life choices (Riger, 1992). These arguments can be extended to the position of men: many will, either through choice or necessity, be unable to participate in the benefits of patriarchy and thus become stigmatised. The few who do conform to social expectations are also unable to make genuinely unconstrained choices about their lives.

Paid Work

There is no psychological literature that parallels the well-articulated theories and extensive research on multiple roles in women's lives (e.g., Baruch & Barnett, 1986; Repetti, Matthews, & Waldron, 1989). Research on the physical and emotional effects of paid work among women has focused on the difficulties faced by women who combine paid work, domestic labour, care of children, and caregiving for frail or elderly family members (e.g., Doress-Worters, 1994; Lundberg, 1996), but the extent to which men's social roles might support or conflict with each other has generally been ignored. In fact, researchers seem to accept uncritically the

notion that men have only one role that matters — that of paid worker — and that any other roles are essentially optional and secondary. Yet rises in unemployment, under-employment, and job insecurity (Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), 1995) render this problematic. Men must also cope with the inherent conflicts between a traditionally patriarchal society and the increased value placed on feminist and egalitarian worldviews, and men who subscribe to such values experience guilt or conflict over continuing social inequity in both paid and unpaid work. Similar problems may result from men's preferences for and experiences of childcare and unpaid domestic labour in the context of their working lives.

There is ample evidence that the "traditional" division of labour benefits men economically (Apter, 1993). Employed men are paid more than employed women, both in absolute terms and on an hour-by-hour basis, and are more likely to be in jobs that provide paid overtime, training opportunities, commissions, and other economic incentives (ABS, 1995). Men are more likely than women to attain senior status and prestige (e.g., Cameron, Redman, Burrow, & Young, 1995) and more likely to follow unbroken and successful career trajectories (e.g., Leonard, 1996).

This inequity is largely maintained by the socially constructed necessity for women to leave the workforce in order to care for children. Girls are more successful than boys at school (Social Trends, 1995) and are more likely to complete undergraduate degrees (ABS, 1995). But by the age of 30, men and women's career paths have clearly diverged, with men moving into higher status positions and women tending to move down or out of the paid labour force (Rindfuss, Cooksey, & Sutterlin, 1999).

There is of course nothing inevitable about these gender-based life trajectories; they are a consequence of employment systems and government policies that make it exceptionally difficult for both partners to maintain their employment patterns when they become parents. Then, gender-based expectations and economic conditions mean that couples generally decide that the man will continue employment once he becomes a father. In fact, new fathers usually work longer paid hours (Bittman & Lovejoy, 1993).

It is certainly the case that the majority of men do have full-time paid employment. Australian census data indicate that 90% of married men with children participate in the paid workforce (ABS, 1995), while the figure for married women with children under 15 is 40%, and 80% for women without children. However, while men are still more likely than women to have full-time permanent work, a significant proportion do not. The Australia Bureau of Statistics (1995) found that 7% of all employed men worked part-time and 16% were in casual jobs. While this is significantly lower than the figures of 39% and 31% respectively for women, it still represents a substantial proportion of employed men.

The conflict between social expectations and the reality of personal and family lives leads to stress and to stress-related illness (e.g., Kahne, 1991; Lundberg, 1996). Men who do not conform to the stereotype are stigmatised and often find it difficult to avoid internalising a perception of low self-esteem (e.g., Smith, 1998; Willott & Griffin, 1997); while it is well acknowledged that the job market has contracted, there still seems to be a widespread assumption that men without full-time permanent employment are somehow responsible for their circumstances. Pritchard (1992) showed that suicide rates among young men in Europe during the 1970s and 1980s were statistically associated with unemployment rates, and suggested that systemic unemployment appeared to have a differentially powerful effect on suicide among men of working age.

Social and government rhetoric still proclaims that a "real" man will somehow go out and find a job whatever the circumstances, shifting the blame for unemployment to the individual, rather than exploring strategies for restructuring the workforce in acknowledgment of global changes in economic systems. In Australia, for example, a recent survey showed that the total amount of unpaid overtime worked by employees out of fear of job loss would, if converted into paid jobs, more than compensate for the total level of unemployment (Hamilton & Denniss, 2000). Modern labour relations policies that reduce employment security combine with social expectations to produce a system in which full-time, permanent paid jobs are increasingly scarce and increasingly demanding.

The few studies that have acknowledged the unreality of traditional male stereotypes (e.g., Duxbury & Higgins, 1994; Milkie & Peltola, 1999) found that men do indeed experience role conflicts between paid work and domestic responsibilities, particularly if they are fathers. Generally, the level of conflict is lower than that experienced by women and tends to arise at a higher level of responsibility and commitment in the paid job (e.g., Greenglass, Pantony, & Burke, 1988). Extent of job control and decision latitude ameliorates role conflicts among both men and women (e.g., Piechowski, 1992; Rosenfield, 1989). For the minority of men who attain senior career positions with a high level of self-determination, the ability to reconcile such conflicts may be easier, but the majority of men will never reach senior positions or have discretion over their employment conditions.

The research suggests that men do indeed find it difficult to deal with a life in which their reason for existence is not full-time work outside the home, and this problem is compounded by findings that the women from whom they might expect social support also seem to internalise these stereotypes, and that their negative reactions serve to exacerbate men's distress (Davis, 1993; Dixon, 1998).

Dixon (1998), for example, in a study of the effects of systemic unemployment among African Americans, found that women, whether employed or unemployed themselves, expressed an expectation that a "real man" would have a paid job, and tended to regard their unemployed husbands and friends as lazy, rather than as victims of the economic environment. Dixon also found that men found it more difficult than women to cope with the same levels of unemployment and financial uncertainty, at least in part because men seem to internalise an assumption that there is a necessary relationship between masculinity and paid employment. As in other research, the men experienced a sense of loss of identity without a paid job, while the women identified themselves in terms of their relationships with family members and were better able to find a sense of identity other than in paid work.

Lobo and Watkins (1995) examined unemployment among middle-aged and older Australian men, and found that even when wives were supportive, unemployed husbands generally found the role change hard to accept, especially if their wives had paid work. Women had also frequently internalised expectations about male- and female-appropriate work, many actively resisting their husbands' attempts to alter longstanding gender-based divisions of domestic labour by taking on "women's work" within the home, and reporting a sense of resentment that their husbands were no longer living up to what they regarded as "their side of the bargain". The longer the period of unemployment the more wives became critical, children became embarrassed, and men's sense of self-blame increased and family relationships deteriorated.

The negative effects of men's unemployment on their emotional health and on their intimate relationships appear to be mediated both by men's gender-based expectations for themselves, and by women's gender-based expectations for the men in their lives. This suggests a need for a radical realignment of the expectations of both men and women. The acceptance at an individual level of a wider range of options in men's relationships with the paid workforce, and at a structural level of more flexibility and variation in work practices, could have a significant impact on men's emotional health and on the quality of their intimate relationships.

Domestic Labour

The assumption that unpaid domestic labour is naturally women's work and that it is inferior to men's work is clearly not beneficial to women, who take on a higher burden of unpaid domestic work regardless of their paid employment status (Baxter & Bittman, 1995). But it should not be assumed that cultural practices that are harmful to women are necessarily beneficial to all, or indeed any, men. The nineteenth-century concept of "separate spheres", that men are naturally and essentially fit for public life and paid employment while women are equally naturally designed for the private world of home and family (Cott, 1977), continues to restrict the choices of both men and women. In a society in which men cannot necessarily expect to find or maintain paid employment, and in which wives' and mothers' incomes are needed to provide adequate living standards in many families, these patriarchal assumptions about paid and unpaid labour conflict with economic and social reality.

The psychological literature tends to be predicated on the assumption that women will necessarily take on paid work in addition to full responsibility for care of children and management of a home (Apter, 1993). There is no parallel body of work that examines men's health and its relationship with their unpaid work commitments. Role conflicts are seen as a "women's problem", and the social and cultural arrangements that support their asymmetry along gender lines are rendered invisible.

Perhaps the most well-established research finding on gender and labour is that unpaid domestic labour is predominantly a female activity. When people move into domestic relationships, men's domestic labour tends to decrease while women's increases (Bittman & Lovejoy, 1993; Gupta, 1999), a finding replicated internationally (Baxter, 1997) and across social classes (Wright, Shire, Hwang, Dolan, & Baxter 1992). This is despite major differences between countries at the public policy level, for example in conditions for parental leave. A comparison of data from Indonesia, the Philippines, Taiwan, South Korea, and the US (Sanchez, 1993), surprisingly, also found few differences in the distribution of domestic labour. Material conditions, national development, and public policy appear to have a limited impact on inequity at the level of domestic labour (Baxter, 1997; Sanchez, 1993).

Despite egalitarian attitudes to domestic labour among most working couples (Bittman & Lovejoy, 1993), both the magnitude and the specifics of actual workload are strongly affected by social expectations about gender-appropriate responsibilities (Greenglass, 1991; Perry-Jenkins, 1993), and studies (e.g. Bittman, 1992; Blair & Lichter, 1991; Social Trends, 1995; South & Spitze, 1994) are consistent in showing that women carry out more unpaid domestic labour than men. Even when wives spend more hours in paid work than their husbands, they still do far more unpaid domestic work than men (Ishii-Kuntz & Coltrane, 1992).

Consistent with men's self-image as financial provider is a view that other forms of support are not part of their role as husband and father (Perry-Jenkins & Crouter, 1990). Women, by contrast, are socialised to view caring for others and maintaining a household as at least as valuable as is providing financially (Perry-Jenkins, 1993). Women tend to see domestic labour as their responsibility, while men are more likely to see their contributions to domestic labour as "helping out" (Gunter & Gunter, 1990).

There is ample evidence from several countries that perceived equity in division of domestic labour is an important predictor of relationship satisfaction, and both men and women seem to regard domestic labour as primarily women's responsibility (e.g., Wilkie, Ferree, & Ratcliff, 1998).

As for paid labour, the majority of gender-based research on unpaid domestic labour focuses on women and their perspectives; men's attitudes and the extent to which they perceive inequities have not received the same attention. Women are, in general, more contented with inequitable division of labour than might be expected.

Kroska (1997) has argued that widespread satisfaction with apparent inequities in domestic labour needs to be understood in the context of "doing gender". Members of a relationship prefer to contribute to that relationship in ways that reflect their personal and gender identity. Men will often find it easier to leave the majority of domestic work to be done by their partner, perhaps justifying this by invocation of cultural stereotypes of men's domestic incapacity or women's higher standards of domestic hygiene, than to find ways of making a greater contribution to their households (Bittman, 1992).

Gender-based inequities in workloads are often explained solely by individual attitudes and choices. Research such as that of Grbich (1992, 1995) with role-reversed households demonstrates that it is possible for individual couples to come to their own idiosyncratic arrangements for the allocation of household labour. However, structural aspects of society and of paid work put constraints on the organisation of most individuals' time. In Britain, for example, 62% of couples said that housework should be divided equally, but only 27% actually achieved this (Social Trends, 1995). Thus, it can be argued that efforts to deal with the problem of women's workloads will be unsuccessful if they focus only on individual men and women, and assume that their choices about time use and the division of labour are always made freely and on an individual basis.

The equation of domestic labour with femininity is culturally reinforced at many levels. Grbich (1992) found that Australian men who took on the primary caregiver role experienced strong negative reactions from their peers, who conveyed a sense that the role was simply not appropriate and that, by transgressing an important social precept, these men were "letting their mates down". This gender-role stereotyping is apparent from an early age: even children are allocated household tasks along gender lines, and, at all ages, girls have more household tasks than boys (Blair, 1992; Mauldin & Meeks, 1990). Analyses of media images of families and households, and particularly advertisements for household products, childcare products, and food and cooking products, have demonstrated an equation of domestic labour with femininity in both Western and Asian cultures (Coltrane & Allan, 1994); Furnham, Mak, & Tanidjojo, 2000). If men are ever portrayed engaging in domestic labour, they are generally doing it badly, with a bad grace, or at the very least with an elegant sense of irony. Men who are competent in household management or childcare are overwhelmingly portrayed as outside the

mainstream, and not to be taken seriously as models of "appropriate" masculine behaviour.

Domestic labour is an area in which traditional and contemporary concepts of masculinity conflict. The socialisation processes that discourage men from developing skills or interest in domestic labour are contradicted by the value which is placed on a nonsexist and egalitarian approach to relationships, leaving men (and women) in the uncomfortable situation in which they must negotiate individual household arrangements, but in which the conflicting nature of cultural prescriptions means that any choice will be in some sense wrong. Research (e.g., Bittman & Lovejoy, 1993) shows that many couples deal with this ambiguity by maintaining unequal work practices despite a verbal commitment to equity. While a small number of couples do appear able to divide housework and childcare equitably (Risman & Johnson-Sumerford, 1998), this is by no means easy, and a much larger number of couples live with less equity than they claim they would prefer (e.g., Voydanoff & Donnelly, 1999). It is of limited value to attribute this to individual men's intransigence or women's gullibility, and it is more useful to consider this as a creative strategy by which couples deal with the conflicting demands placed on them by cultural expectations.

Men, Women, Work, and Relationships

Evidence (e.g., Bird, 1999) that inequities in household labour go some way to explaining higher levels of depression among women suggests that men might benefit in a more equitable system if their partners were happier. Such a position would be opposed by any zero-sum model of human happiness, suggesting that benefits that accrue to women from equitable family circumstances must be at the expense of men. At first glance, the research might appear to support such a zero-sum model. For example, Rosenfield (1992) found that women's paid employment had a negative effect on their husbands' mental health, and that this effect was correlated with the extent that it reduced income disparity and increased the men's unpaid domestic workloads — two factors that contribute positively to women's mental health. Data from the 1970s and 1980s in the US and Canada (Burr, McCall, & Powell-Griner, 1997; Krull & Trovato, 1994) have even suggested that changes from traditional gender-based work patterns and increased participation of mothers in the paid workforce may have been positively related to male suicide, although more recent evidence (e.g., Burr et al., 1997) shows that this effect has disappeared, suggesting that it may have been the process of change that was disturbing for men, rather than women's paid work per se.

It has also been argued that increases in wives' incomes may increase marital discord by shifting the power balance within relationships. However, Rodgers (1999) has demonstrated that any association is more likely to be the reverse, an effect of marital discord on women's employment patterns. Women in unsatisfactory relationships are more likely to seek paid work, either in search of personal satisfaction or out of a concern to maintain a level of independence and choice for their future lives.

It is not necessary, therefore, to take this as evidence for the view that men must suffer if women are to receive fair treatment. Rather, it may be more useful to interpret these findings as arising from the fact that employment continues to be structured on the assumption that a worker will have an unpaid domestic assistant, so that men whose female partners are in paid work find it difficult to manage their time. Such an interpretation leads logically to the view that

changes in employment structures might be beneficial to the health and wellbeing of both men and women.

Psychological research has generally failed to explore the cultural basis of these data, and continues to be based on outdated and increasingly untenable social assumptions. For example, Olds, Schwartz, Eisen, and Betcher (1993), in a paper that purported to examine the effects of part-time employment and shared childcare on parents' wellbeing, in fact studied couples in which the woman worked part-time and the man full-time. The implicit assumption is that men do not work part-time. This example is typical of a large body of literature that fails to examine the assumptions we make, both about the work involvement of men and women, and about the structure of work environments.

Childcare

Some researchers separate childcare from other unpaid domestic labour in analysing the relative contributions of men and women. People generally find childcare more enjoyable than housework, and fathers who do contribute to household labour are more likely to involve themselves with childcare than with other tasks (e.g., Deutsch, Lussier, & Servis, 1993). Two Australian studies (Baxter & Bittman, 1995; Baxter, Gibson, & Lynch-Blosse, 1991) have shown that, despite this preference, men still spent significantly less time than women in childcare, with average weekly involvement being between 13 and 18 hours for mothers and between 3 and 8 hours for fathers. Australian men in role-reversed households (Grbich, 1995) reported that they enjoyed childcare but disliked housework, seeing the latter as boring, repetitive, and unfulfilling. While women in these households did very little housework, averaging little more than men in traditional households, they were still most likely to take on the cleaning of floors, bathrooms, and toilets.

The assumption that men are fundamentally less able than women to look after children (e.g., Hojat, 1990) can be traced to essentialist views about the nature of men and of women and the widely believed myth of the "mothering instinct". There is, however, no evidence that men are unable to provide adequate childcare. Feminist writers (e.g., Wearing, 1984) have pointed out that the assumption that only women can care for children has the effect of restricting women's economic and social power. Simultaneously, it denies the validity of men's interest in their own children and excludes men from emotional closeness and caring activities within their families (Carrigan, Connell, & Lee, 1985), and in a time when men may be less able to construct identities through paid work, it reduces their capacity to construct a positive identity through fatherhood.

There is evidence that men's active involvement in family life tends to lead to better relationships with their partners and children (e.g., Bailey, 1994; Hawkins, Christiansen, Sargent, & Hill, 1993), and in particular to better emotional outcomes for their sons (Brody, 1999). However, even fathers with a strong personal commitment to parenting seem to become involved only when their partners' employment schedules require it. Both broader social structures and individual gender socialisation make an equitable approach to parenting and to household labour extremely difficult to put into practice (Smith, 1998). As a result, many parents, both fathers and mothers, internalise traditional notions about fatherhood and motherhood, endorsing the view that women should play the major parenting roles and that men should provide supervised assistance when asked (Dempsey, 2000).

The psychological literature perpetuates the assumption that childcare is self-evidently women's work. For example, a survey of infant care in dual-earner couples examined the circumstances under which mothers would engage in "substituting fathers for paid child-care providers" (Glass, 1998, p. 821), the wording suggesting a worldview that categorises the notion of fathers caring for their own children as deviant, as less appropriate than paying to have them cared for by a stranger, and as therefore in need of investigation.

In some families where childcare is shared by both parents, the parents carry out psychological work in order to maintain the man's sense of himself as the breadwinner. Deutsch and Saxon (1998) conducted in-depth interviews with US working-class couples who worked alternate shifts and shared the care of their children. These couples managed to maintain traditional gender beliefs, despite living an egalitarian lifestyle, by maintaining the perception that the father was the breadwinner and the one with the "real" job; the mother was still the central caregiver, and worked only because of financial pressures, which were frequently viewed as temporary. In this way, these couples actively constructed a view of their family life that conflicted with their material circumstances but not with traditional, essentialist concepts of appropriate male and female behaviour.

This example demonstrates the strength of cultural stereotypes, the psychological discomfort involved in challenging them at an individual level, and the lengths to which people will go to reduce this discomfort. It also provides an interesting contrast with the evidence presented earlier (e.g., Bittman & Lovejoy, 1993), describing couples who maintain a verbal commitment to egalitarian household management while dividing actual household labour inequitably. Both these arrangements can be seen as strategies for reconciling inconsistent cultural prescriptions on men and women, to be simultaneously traditional and egalitarian.

Non-traditional Household Structures

The small amount of psychological research that has focused on the health outcomes associated with paid and unpaid work for men generally assumes that all men are heterosexual and live in partnerships with women. The strategies that gay men, and men living in other non-traditional circumstances, use to negotiate paid and unpaid labour would provide information on alternative social and personal arrangements. Men who do not live in traditional nuclear families are forced to make active decisions about many aspects of their lives, including the allocation of unpaid domestic labour.

The experiences of these men are of interest in their own right, but may also provide models of more egalitarian relationship structures for other men. There is, however, very little research that surveys same-sex households without problematising them; an exception is the work of Kurdek (1993), who found that members of same-sex households had more equitable division of labour than did heterosexual couples. While such research is of value in that it legitimises non-traditional household structures, there is a need for work that explores the conflicts and compromises made by men who live in non-traditional household relationships in the negotiation of responsibility for domestic labour.

It is estimated that 2% of US households are completely role-reversed, with a woman in full-time paid work and a man taking care of unpaid domestic work (US Bureau

of the Census, 1993). Smith (1998), in a qualitative study of 11 Australian fathers in role-reversed relationships, found that the men found their role difficult, both to define and to carry out. The men lacked confidence in their ability to carry out domestic tasks, particularly childcare, and appeared to believe that being male made them necessarily less capable parents than the "other mothers". They described difficulties in establishing the legitimacy of their role; for example, mothers at creche assumed that fathers were temporarily in charge while the "real" carer was otherwise engaged. Their daily lives were also made more difficult by material and structural manifestations of the gender order, such as the positioning of baby change rooms in women's toilets and the provision of social events for parents that explicitly excluded fathers (ladies' tennis, mothers' groups). Some men reported that simply being a man alone with a baby was enough to elicit concerned reactions from strangers.

These men used a number of strategies to cope with their lifestyle, which had usually arisen unintentionally because they had been unable to find paid work. They felt that the situation had pushed them to re-evaluate previously accepted notions of masculinity, specifically, to reject traditional views of essential differences between the sexes, and were generally positive about undergoing what they saw as a significant developmental process, but still reported an overall sense of isolation, difficulty, and role illegitimacy. In the light of such observations, it is unsurprising that few men adopt such a lifestyle as a matter of choice.

Similarly, the work of Grbich (1992), also with role-reversed parents in Australia, indicated that fathers had to deal with strong negative reactions from their social group, and a sense that the role of primary caregiver was not an appropriate one for men. These men reported that, over time, their own attitudes and behaviours and those of their wives shifted towards a more egalitarian view of roles and responsibilities, and again they generally described these changes in positive terms (Grbich, 1995).

Conclusion

Men are socialised to see paid work as of central importance in their lives, in their definitions of themselves, and in their sense of self-worth. Given the centrality of employment in men's sense of self, there is surprisingly little psychological research on the extent to which patterns of paid and unpaid work, and discrepancies between desired and actual patterns of employment, interact with gender roles and expectations to affect men's physical and emotional health. This is particularly a concern given structural changes in patterns of employment. Increasingly, men need to juggle the traditional view that a real man provides financially for his family with contemporary definitions of masculinity that emphasise egalitarianism and flexibility, in the context of rapid changes to work and family structures. The challenge for men is to find new ways of defining themselves and their sense of self-worth other than exclusively through paid work. The challenge for society is to recognise the unreality of masculine stereotypes and to move towards a recognition of men as individuals with an identity and existence beyond that indicated by their paid employment. The concepts discussed in this paper complement the perspective presented by Winefield et al. (2002).

References

- Apter, T. (1993). *Professional progress: Why women still don't have wives*. Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan.

- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (1995). *Australian women's yearbook 1995*. Canberra: Author.
- Bailey, W.T. (1994). A longitudinal study of fathers' involvement with young children: Infancy to age 5 years. *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 155*, 331-339.
- Baruch, G.K., & Barnett, R. (1986). Role quality, multiple role involvement, and psychological well-being in midlife women. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 578-585.
- Baxter, J. (1997). Gender equality and participation in housework: A cross-national perspective. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 28*, 220-247.
- Baxter, J., & Bittman, M. (1995). Measuring time spent on housework: A comparison of two approaches. *Australian Journal of Social Research, 1*, 21-46.
- Baxter, J., Gibson, D., & Lynch-Blosse, M. (1991). *Doubletake: The links between paid and unpaid work*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Bird, C.E. (1999). Gender, household labor, and psychological distress: The impact of the amount and division of housework. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 40*, 32-45.
- Bittman, M. (1992). *Juggling time: How Australian families use their time*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Bittman, M., & Lovejoy, F. (1993). Domestic power: Negotiating an unequal division of labour within a framework of equality. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology, 29*, 302-321.
- Blair, S.L. (1992). The sex-typing of children's household labor: Parental influence on daughters' and sons' housework. *Youth and Society, 24*, 178-203.
- Blair, S.L., & Lichter, D.T. (1991). Measuring the division of household labor: Gender segregation of housework among American couples. *Journal of Family Issues, 12*, 91-113.
- Brody, L.R. (1999). *Gender, emotion, and the family*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Burr, J.A., McCall, P.L., & Powell-Griner, E. (1997). Female labor force participation and suicide. *Social Science and Medicine, 44*, 1847-1859.
- Cameron, R., Redman, S., Burrow, S., & Young, B. (1995). Comparison of career patterns of male and female graduates of one Australian medical school. *Teaching and Learning in Medicine, 7*, 218-224.
- Carrigan, T., Connell, R., & Lee, J. (1985). Toward a new sociology of masculinity. *Theory and Society, 14*, 551-604.
- Coltrane, S. (1989). Household labour and the routine production of gender. *Social Problems, 36*, 473-490.
- Coltrane, S., & Allan, K. (1994). "New" fathers and old stereotypes: Representations of masculinity in 1980s television advertising. *Masculinities, 2*, 43-66.
- Cott, N. (1977). *The bonds of womanhood: Women's sphere in New England, 1780-1835*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Davis, D.L. (1993). When men become "women": Gender antagonism and the changing sexual geography of work in Newfoundland. *Sex Roles, 29*, 457-475.
- Dempsey, K.C. (2000). Men's share of child care: A rural and urban comparison. *Journal of Family Studies, 6*, 245-266.
- Deutsch, F.M., Lussier, J.B., & Servis, L.J. (1993). Husbands at home: Predictors of paternal participation in childcare and housework. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65*, 1154-1166.
- Deutsch, F.M., & Saxon, S.E. (1998). Traditional ideologies, nontraditional lives. *Sex Roles, 38*, 331-362.
- Dixon, P. (1998). Employment factors in conflict in African American heterosexual relationships: Some perceptions of women. *Journal of Black Studies, 28*, 491-505.
- Doress-Worters, P.B. (1994). Adding elder care to women's multiple roles: A critical review of the caregiver stress and multiple roles literatures. *Sex Roles, 31*, 597-616.
- Duxbury, L., & Higgins, C. (1994). Interference between work and family: A status report on dual-career and dual-earner mothers and fathers. *Employee Assistance Quarterly, 9*, 55-80.
- Furnham, A., Mak, T., & Tanidjojo, L. (2000). An Asian perspective on the portrayal of men and women in television advertisements: Studies from Hong Kong and Indonesian television. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 30*, 2341-2364.
- Glass, J. (1998). Gender liberation, economic squeeze, or fear of strangers: Why fathers provide infant care in dual-earner families. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 60*, 821-834.
- Grbich, C.F. (1992). Societal response to familial role change in Australia: Marginalisation or social change? *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 23*, 79-94.
- Grbich, C.F. (1995). Male primary caregivers and domestic labour: Involvement or avoidance? *Journal of Family Studies, 1*, 114-129.
- Greenglass, E.R. (1991). Burnout and gender: Theoretical and organizational implications. *Canadian Psychology, 32*, 562-574.
- Greenglass, E.R., Pantony, K.L., & Burke, R.J. (1988). A gender-role perspective on role conflict, work stress and social support. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 3*, 317-328.
- Gunter, N.C., & Gunter, B.G. (1990). Domestic division of labor among working couples: Does androgyny make a difference? *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 14*, 355-370.
- Gupta, S. (1999). The effects of transitions in marital status on men's performance of housework. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 61*, 700-711.
- Hamilton, C., & Denniss, R. (2000). *Tracking well-being in Australia: The Genuine Progress Indicator 2000*. Canberra, Australia: Australia Institute.
- Hawkins, A.J., Christiansen, S.L., Sargent, K.P., & Hill, E.J. (1993). Rethinking fathers' involvement in child care: A developmental perspective. *Journal of Family Issue, 14*, 531-549.
- Hojat, M. (1990). Can affectional ties be purchased? *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 5*, 493-502.
- Ishii-Kuntz, M., & Coltrane, S. (1992). Predicting the sharing of household labor: Are parenting and housework distinct? *Sociological Perspectives, 35*, 629-647.
- Kahne, H. (1991). Economic perspectives on work and family issues. In M.T. Notman & C.C. Nadelson (Eds.), *Women and men: New perspectives on gender differences* (pp. 9-22). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press.
- Kroska, A. (1997). The division of labor in the home: A review and conceptualization. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 60*, 304-322.
- Krull, C., & Trovato, F. (1994). The quiet revolution and the sex differential in Quebec's suicide rates: 1931-1986. *Social Forces, 72*, 1121-1147.
- Kurdek, L.A. (1993). The allocation of household labor in gay, lesbian, and heterosexual married couples. *Journal of Social Issues, 49*, 127-139.
- Lee, C., & Owens, R.G. (in press). *The psychology of men's health*. London: Open University Press.
- Leonard, R.J. (1996). Complementary activities and multiplex relationships in the life-courses of educated women. *Journal of Family Studies, 2*, 3-14.
- Lobo, F., & Watkins, G. (1995). Late career unemployment in the 1990s: Its impact on the family. *Journal of Family Studies, 1*, 103-111.
- Lundberg, U. (1996). Influence of paid and unpaid work on psychophysiological stress responses of men and women. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 1*, 117-130.
- Mauldin, T., & Meeks, C.B. (1990). Sex differences in children's time use. *Sex Roles, 22*, 537-554.

- Milkie, M.A., & Peltola, P. (1999). Playing all the roles: Gender and the work-family balancing act. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61, 476-490.
- Olds, J., Schwartz, R.S., Eisen, S.V., & Betcher, R.W. (1993). Part-time employment and marital well-being: A hypothesis and pilot study. *Family Therapy*, 20, 1-16.
- Perry-Jenkins, M. (1993). Family roles and responsibilities: What has changed and what has remained the same? In J. Frankel (Ed.), *The employed mother and the family context* (pp. 245-259). New York: Springer.
- Perry-Jenkins, M., & Crouter, A.C. (1990). Men's provider-role attitudes: Implications for household work and marital satisfaction. *Journal of Family Issues*, 11, 136-156.
- Piechowski, L.D. (1992). Mental health and women's multiple roles. *Families in Society*, 73, 131-139.
- Price, R.H., Friedland, D.S., & Vinokur, A.D. (1998). Job loss: Hard times and eroded identity. In J.H. Harvey, (Ed.), *Perspectives on loss: A sourcebook* (pp. 303-316). Philadelphia, PA: Brunner/Mazel.
- Pritchard, C. (1992). Is there a link between suicide in young men and unemployment? A comparison of the UK with other European Community countries. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 160, 750-756.
- Repetti, R.L., Matthews, K.A., & Waldron, I. (1989). Employment and women's health. *American Psychologist*, 44, 1394-1401.
- Riger, S.C. (1992). Epistemological debates, feminist voices: Science, social values and the study of women. *American Psychologist*, 47, 730-740.
- Rindfuss, R.R., Cooksey, E.C., & Sutterlin, R.L. (1999). Young adult occupational achievement: Early expectations versus behavioral reality. *Work and Occupations*, 26, 220-263.
- Risman, B.J., & Johnson-Sumerford, D. (1998). Doing it fairly: A study of postgender marriages. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 60, 23-40.
- Rodgers, S.J. (1999). Wives' income and marital quality: Are there reciprocal effects? *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61, 123-132.
- Rosenfield, S. (1989). The effects of women's employment: Personal control and sex differences in mental health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 30, 77-91.
- Rosenfield, S. (1992). The costs of sharing: Wives' employment and husbands' mental health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 33, 213-225.
- Sanchez, L. (1993). Women's power and the gendered division of domestic labor in the Third World. *Gender and Society*, 63, 434-459.
- Smith, C.D. (1998). "Men don't do this sort of thing": A case study of the social isolation of househusbands. *Men and Masculinities*, 1, 138-172.
- Social Trends. (1995). *Social trends on CD-ROM - Version 1.0*. London: Central Statistical Office of the UK.
- South, S.J., & Spitze, G. (1994). Housework in marital and nonmarital households. *American Sociological Review*, 59, 327-347.
- Thompson, L. (1991). Family work: Women's sense of fairness. *Journal of Family Issues*, 12, 181-196.
- US Bureau of the Census. (1993). Primary child care arrangements used by employed mothers for children under 5 years 1977 to 1991. *Current Population Reports* (Series P-23, No. 610). Washington: US Government Printing Office.
- Voydanoff, P., & Donnelly, B.W. (1999). The intersection of time in activities and perceived unfairness in relation in psychological distress and marital quality. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61, 739-751.
- Wearing, B. (1984). *The ideology of motherhood*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Wilkie, J.R., Ferree, M.M., & Ratcliff, K.S. (1998). Gender and fairness: Marital satisfaction in two-earner couples. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 60, 577-594.
- Willott, S., & Griffin, C. (1997). "Wham bam, am I a man?": Unemployed men talk about masculinities. *Feminism and Psychology*, 7, 107-128.
- Winefield, A.H., Montgomery, B., Gault, U., Muller, J., O'Gorman, J., Reser, J., & Roland, D. (2002). The psychology of work and unemployment in Australia today: An Australian Psychological Society Discussion Paper. *Australian Psychologist*, 37, 1-9.
- Wright, E.O., Shire, K., Hwang, S., Dolan, M., & Baxter, J. (1992). The non-effects of class on the gender division of labor in the home: A comparative study of Sweden and the United States. *Gender and Society*, 62, 252-282.