THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHREYER HONORS COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

MALE PARTICIPATION IN THE HOUSEHOLD LABOR FORCE AFTER
UNEMPLOYMENT: JOB LOSS, CHORES, AND CHANGING MASCULINITY

VERONICA CAROLINE JOYCE
SPRING 2018

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements
for baccalaureate degrees
in Sociology and Spanish
with honors in Sociology

Reviewed and approved* by the following:

Sarah Damaske
Associate Professor of Labor & Employment Relations,
Sociology, and Women's Studies
Thesis Supervisor

Stacy Silver
Associate Professor of Sociology and
Human Development and Family Studies
Honors Adviser

*Signatures are on file in the Schreyer Honors College

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this investigation is to understand the ways in which the division of household labor may change after men lose their jobs. To understand the ways in which men of different classes do and undo gender through household labor I analyzed transcriptions of 100 interviews with men and women in Pennsylvania, from the Inequality, Gender, and Unemployment study. I looked at the ways in which the division of household labor can be connected to men's gender ideologies and whether or not their expressed ideology matched the actual division of labor. The modal category for men was reporting that they "helped" with certain chores or that they were the sole doer of a single chore. In contrast, the modal category for women who had lost jobs was reporting that they do most of the chores. I additionally found evidence that men redefine masculinity to include housework and are proud of what they take on even if it does not match the gender ideology which they expressed. Finally, the overall participation of men in household labor is lower than what would be expected based on their answers to "who should be most responsible for household labor?" Although the majority of men reported that men and women should be ideally equally responsible for paid labor and household work, in actuality, men reported doing far less than half of the household labor.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Chapter 1

Introduction

During the Great Recession of 2007, many households underwent changes due to job loss. Disproportionately, men lost their jobs and their family's lives were disrupted. When people lost their jobs, it was often for prolonged periods; the modal category for time spent out of work was upwards of 29 weeks (Mattingly & Smith 2010). This upheaval led to adjustments within households, sometimes changing which partner was responsible for being the breadwinner (Mattingly & Smith 2010; Davis, Jacobsen, & Anderson 2012). In the past, the role of breadwinning has been assigned to men and has become an integral part of masculinity in general (Gerson 1993). While there has been a trend of women entering the workforce since the 1970s, men are still expected to be the main financial providers for their families (Townsend 2002). Yet the trend towards egalitarianism in the paid labor sector has led to less emphasis on the sole provider role for men. There has been a complementary emphasis on men taking on a more active role as fathers within their households (Zuo & Tang 2000). The Ad Council is a nonprofit focused on social issue advertisement. They released a campaign of 'Fatherhood Involvement' ads that emphasized men taking time to be with their children (Ad Council). These ads are a part of the National Responsible Fatherhood Clearinghouse of the Department of Health and Human Services. It received funding in 2005 signifying a government interest in 'responsible fatherhood' for the first time (National Responsible Fatherhood Clearinghouse). This was part of a movement towards blurring the once strict boundaries between genders.

While the campaigns are not perfect – they often show fatherhood as being a moment of joy with a child rather than facing the responsibilities and hardships that come with fatherhood – they do show a public interest in having men become involved fathers (Ad Council; National Responsible Fatherhood Clearinghouse). Through time, the idea of what it means to be a good father has changed. It has recently settled into an expectation of caring and nurturing while being involved in the household (Lamb 2008). Since industrialization, men's and women's roles within a household have been separated into provider and carer – prior to this period, there was little labor to be done outside of the households and so most tasks were shared (Lamb 2008). The definition of fatherhood has evolved since this time to become less strict in terms of the necessity of breadwinning and to involve childcare (Lamb 2008). During the "heyday of the stay-at-home mother", there was not expectation of men to engage in household labor or childcare (Bianchi, Robinson, & Milke 2006, pg. 1). However, since this time both men and women have increased their participation in childcare with women spending less time one household labor and both parents including children in their daily lives more. Despite a societal perception that men do not participate in household labor, women are able to participate less because men participate more (Bianchi et al. 2006). Overall, this suggests a movement towards society redefining masculinity to include more household labor.

Given that the traditional role of a father has changed from being solely a provider to also include being a nurturer (Lamb 2008; Bianchi et al. 2006), how might changing employment opportunities further shape men's relationship to work done in the home? Men are expected to be the breadwinners (Mattingly & Smith 2010). When this role is taken away, how do men redefine themselves or take on new roles? The purpose of this research is to understand the ways in which men do or undo gender in their roles after facing unemployment. Gender can be 'done' through

performing tasks within the guidelines of one's gender identity. There are expectations of how a person will act and fit in to our society as a whole based on their gender. Acting upon those expectations is doing gender (West & Zimmerman 1987; Deutsch 2007). People do gender based on how they believe they will be judged by the rest of society (Deutsch 2007). Undoing gender is acting in ways that "reduce gender difference[s]" (Deutsch 2007 pg. 122). With men potentially taking on more traditionally feminine tasks after job loss and leaving the role of "breadwinner" to the women in their relationships, it is important to know whether these new roles are being taken on, and if they are taken on, whether they are adopted willingly or reluctantly (Chesley 2011; Bianchi et al. 2006). The work inside the home still needs to be done even as women are taking on the work outside of the home (Barnes 2016). These questions may be particularly relevant in working class households, because they cannot afford to hire help, so either men will need to take on those tasks or the women will have to do both the paid and unpaid work.

With this newer, more egalitarian workforce emerging, it follows that households should be seeing a similar trend in the sharing of work in the home. As women are spending more time at work, they are spending less time at home, leaving room for men to take on traditionally female household labor tasks (Zuo & Tang 2000; Bianchi et al. 2006). However, that does not seem to be the case just yet. Traditionally, working class women have been in the workforce out of the financial necessity when their male partner's wages do not cover the costs or when they are without a male partner (Barnes 2016). With women taking on more traditionally masculine roles such as significantly providing income for the family, the traditionally feminine tasks should, logically, be split equally between the partners. However, as women are taking on these roles in increasing amounts, men tend to remain reluctant to take on traditionally feminine tasks. Though they are taking on more work than they have in the past, it is still not near the amount of

work which women are currently taking on in the home (Demantas & Myers 2015; Greenstein 1996b).

So what happens when the male breadwinner loses his job and the sole provider of income becomes the woman? Who does the dishes? In the past, when women were less able to work outside of the home, they took care of the household work while the men participated in the paid labor force. Now that women are established in the paid labor force, how are the men contributing to household labor? After the recession, many men lost their jobs and had to tackle new norms within their households (Davis, Jacobsen, & Anderson 2012). It is important to know how the loss of this traditionally masculine role affects a man's view of himself and the work that he does and whether or not he is willing to take on a traditionally feminine role. If he views his new work as being a women's job, it can have negative effects on the work being done and the amount of work which women then have to take on in addition to paid labor (Carlson 2015). In a world that is still divided by gender, the minority group's work continues to be viewed as less useful and valued (Risman 2004). In our society, women and their work inside the home are still not viewed as being equal to men so taking on traditionally female tasks is seen as taking on less useful work (Risman 2004). If the men are doing gender in the traditional sense it would mean that they do not willingly take on these female tasks and do not see household labor as something they should be taking on. On the other hand, they have the opportunity to undo gender in this situation by taking on their new role willingly and redefining their masculinity through it (Chesley 2011).

I will be exploring the ways in which men change their household labor participation after facing unemployment. Using data from 100 interviews, I will be interpreting the ways in which men view household labor as well as traditionally assigned gender roles. When men lose

their jobs, do they participate more in household labor? At what rates do they take on 'female' labor verses 'male' labor? Is class a significant factor in their participation? I will also be comparing their expressed gender ideologies to the actual division of household and paid labor within their partnerships. Do men's gender ideologies match up with their household structures? With an ongoing trend towards egalitarianism in the paid labor sector, we could hope to see a breaking down of gendered divisions in all facets of life. Undoing gender in the home would mean a more egalitarian view of what was once considered women's work and not valued by society.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

DOING GENDER

In today's society, the spectrum of what it means to identify as a particular gender is changing and expanding (Schilt &Westbrook 2009; Kitzinger 2005). , there persist the two most widely accepted genders: male and female. With these two genders, there are attached many expectations and stereotypes that are deeply embedded in our society's views of who should be doing what at home and at work. We are taught these expectations and stereotypes through our interactions with other people as we grow up and enter into society (Schilt &Westbrook 2009; Risman 2004; Cameron & Kulick 2003).

In 1987, Candace West and Don H. Zimmerman introduced the theory of 'doing gender.' This theory revolves around the idea that gender is not fixed or biological. Gender is something that can change over time and is subject to societal pressures and norms (West & Zimmerman 1987). This theory follows the idea that as people go through their daily lives, they perform their gender through their tasks. Many daily tasks have been assigned to one of the two predominant genders, e.g. the task of caring for children is often understood to be primarily mothers' work, while earning money is primarily father's jobs (Folbre 2001). They can even be thought to be a necessary part of a person's ability to identify as a particular gender. Men and women may

accept this division of tasks as being a part of their lives even when, empirically, the division of the tasks is unequal (Hochschild 1989).

Culturally, social norms hold that men and women are expected to do their assigned tasks and if they do not, they are not fulfilling their societal role. Even when men and women do not abide by these social rules, they do recognize that these norms are widely held and may unconsciously make decisions with these norms in mind (Correll 2004). They may not be viewed as a 'real' woman if they do desire neither to clean the house nor have children and men may not be 'real' men if they are unable to fulfill the role of providing for their family (West & Zimmerman 1987). These gender roles, set by society are able to change as a person gets older as well as change through time as society changes (West & Zimmerman 1987). As women have taken on more paid labor, the definition of women's work is expanding to include paid labor along with household labor and care work (Damaske 2011). But the boundaries of masculinity appear to be expanding more slowly (Townsend 2002).

Along with this idea that gender is done, is the idea that gender itself is a social construct. "[G]ender is an institutionalized system of social practices for constituting people as two significantly different categories, men and women, and organizing social relations of inequality on the basis of that difference" (Ridgeway & Correll 2004). Society chooses how it believes men and women are meant to behave but these ideals are not concrete. The requirements of men and women differ across space and time. However, the consequences of these socially constructed ideals are real. If a person's actions fall outside of the gendered norms of society, it can lead to negative consequences for that person. When so many people share similar ideas, those who do not fit into those molds will not be as accepted into that society (Ridgeway & Correll 2004). From an early age, males and females begin to take different paths towards their futures. Widely

held assumptions about men and women's different abilities to complete certain tasks influence people of all ages and produce men and women who follow paths shaped by these cultural schemas. Men are believed to be "more competent" than women when it comes to most work tasks and women are believed to be better at care work (Correll 2004, pg 513). These assumptions lead to different roles in the paid labor force and in the household labor force and a dichotomy between the tasks assigned to each gender (Correll 2004).

In addition to the gendered division of tasks – and perhaps the reason that tasks have been assigned as such – the United States has other strong, deeply held beliefs about gender. Some of these beliefs are as follows. Women are caring but less able-bodied than men. They are also less able to focus on intellectual tasks due to the composition of their hormones and their predisposition to be preoccupied by care work rather than anything else (Correll 2004). It is believed that women are simply better at household tasks than are men; the same is thought about care work (Folbre 2001). It is also thought that men are in charge of the important things in our society, which must be done so that it can run smoothly and prosper (Ridgeway & Correll 2004; Correll 2004). The division of society into two distinct genders allows for a system of inequality to fall into place between the two. There cannot be inequality between two groups if there are not two distinct groups (Risman 2004; Cameron and Kulick 2003). The division of labor is tied to this distinction so that women are assigned the less desirable tasks and men are considered worthier of the more desirable tasks. This creates a world in which you must fit into a category and must complete your assigned tasks (Risman 2004). Gender is more than the identity of an individual; it is an institution within society that dictates the actions and reactions of the individuals living within it. If there are different paths and expectations set out for men and women, men are unlikely to be looking to take the path assigned to women and vice versa

(Risman 2004). It is widely believed that there is too little emphasis being placed on leadership for girls or on feelings for boys (Pew Research Center 2017). Children are being raised in a way that does not emphasize crossing gendered barriers to try out or internalize behaviors and characteristics typical of the other gender. Men feel more negatively about boys participating in feminine activities than girls participating in masculine activities. Overall, they have stronger negative feelings on this subject than do women (Pew Research Center 2017). These expectations have led to gender going beyond the individual person to affect both the public and private spheres (Hochschild 1989). Gender is done through all parts of society (West & Zimmerman 1987).

UNDOING GENDER

Beyond the idea that gender is done, is the idea that gender can also be undone. Doing gender involves maintaining gender categories and reshaping old ideas of what it means to be one gender or the other. Undoing gender means breaking down the barriers between the genders and blurring the lines between what it means to be male or female (Risman 2009). The gendered division of household labor can be undone by men taking on more household work (rather than women taking on less because in that case, the work would just not get done, the men have to then take it on). People's ability and willingness to do or undo gender has a lot to do with what the people around them are doing (Deutsch 2007). As a society changes and moves from one era to the next, so do gender expectations (Ridgeway & Correll 2004). In this way, gender could become undone through time. Currently, there is a trend toward egalitarianism in contrast with the traditional ideal, which has been a part of our society for many years (Gerson 2010; Zuo &

Tang 2000). As family structures are changing, women are redefining what it means to be women. They are expanding their influence on society and taking on tasks which had previously been assigned to men. In this way women are not only expanding what being a woman means but they are also blurring the lines between being a man and being a woman (Folbre 2001; Gerson 2010; Ridgeway & Correll 2004). Overall, undoing gender can bring about greater equality between men and women (Ridgeway & Correll 2004). It is not a guarantee as women are able to undo gender without undoing male privilege but it has the potential to even out the playing field (Risman 2009).

"When we rebel we can, sometimes change the institutions" which are built on the doing of gender (Risman 2004, pg 34). The old system which assumed women to be "naturally" less cable of working has been challenged and, in some ways, broken down. There still remain gendered differences in the paid labor force but they are neither as strict nor as commonplace as they once were. Paid labor is no longer a gendered activity as a whole but is still more desirable from a societal standpoint (Risman 2004). Being seen as a masculine male carries more prestige than being seen as a feminine woman. This points to the idea that in general, feminine characteristics are not desirable in society. There is less motivation for men to be taking on these roles due to this lower level of importance to society. Women are significantly more likely than men to identify as being sensitive or nurturing (traditionally female traits) but similarly likely than men to identify as being assertive or intelligent (traditionally male traits). This evidence supports the notion that men are less likely to be taking on (proudly) traditionally feminine traits while women are likely to take on traditionally masculine traits (Pew Research Center 2017). Masculine gender expectations can be undone through taking on these traditionally feminine traits and giving them more prestige within society. Women and men face many pressures when

it comes to performing gender in their households. As women break the boundaries of traditional femininity, redefining 'female' with these new trends continues to establish a distinction between men and women. The concept of undoing gender goes beyond those boundaries to establish more similarities between men and women. A 'postgender society' would be one where tasks and characteristics are not assigned to or expected of a person based on their biological sex/appearance (Risman 2009).

DIVISION OF HOUSEHOLD LABOR

Men and women perform their gender in many ways. One important way is through their daily lives at work and at home. In today's society a man's role is defined by his being a provider for the family and a woman's role is defined by being the caretaker of the family (Folbre 2001). Now that more women are entering the workforce, more men are taking on some of the household work (Doucet 2015). However, even though this shift is occurring, women still tend to do more of the unpaid labor even when they are contributing much or all of the paid labor (Legerski & Cornwall 2010). When men take on more unpaid labor, it can be in a different way than how women take it on. They tend to do "manly" chores around the house rather than taking on all of the housework equally (Hochschild & Machung 2012). As Latshaw (2015) found, even when men are stay-at-home fathers, they tend towards the more masculine chores. She found that SAHF tend not to take on chores such as laundry, cleaning, or household maintenance in very serious amounts. Latshaw found that even when the women are the only ones participating in paid labor, women were still largely responsible for the chores in the home that the men do not want to take on (Latshaw 2015).

Some of these differences in the work done in the home can be explained by the beliefs which men and women hold about household labor. Men may believe that the women in their lives are just better at the household work (Latshaw 2015). They think themselves unable to meet the standards which their wives have set for chores like laundry or cleaning (Doucet 2015; Latshaw 2015).. Women tend also to say that they have their own methods and that if it's not perfect, they will redo it themselves anyway (Doucet 2015; Latshaw 2015). More of the differences could be explained by the idea that work is so closely tied to masculinity that it is hard for men to lose that part of themselves when confronting unemployment. If they choose to, they can undo gender by reshaping their masculinity through a new lens: unpaid labor (Chesley 2011; Carlson 2015).

Taking on more unpaid labor means more than just cutting the lawn or starting a project in the garage, it means taking on tasks that are traditionally assigned to women (Hochschild & Machung 2012). I am looking at the assigned meanings of certain tasks: which parts of household labor are masculine and which are feminine and how are they being redefined? Doing housework is more than just chores, in the United States it is seen as women's work and breadwinning as men's but chores like household repairs and outside work are typically assigned to men (Demantas & Myers 2015). "Cooking, shopping, and laundry in addition to … shopping for children's clothes, remembering birthdays, caring for house plants, and taking family photos" (Hochschild & Machung 2012, p. 147) along with cleaning and daily maintenance of the household are generally considered "female" tasks even in egalitarian households. The "male" tasks include repairs, bills, and cars. Even as couples make an effort to do similar amounts of work within the home, there is inequality evident in the categories into which the tasks fall (Hochschild & Machung 2012). Men and women may perform their genders through their roles

but what happens when those roles are taken away or changed? When men lose their jobs and have to face household work rather than breadwinning labor, their sense of self may be at stake. Society places pressure on men to be the breadwinner and if they can no longer achieve this goal, they have to either reevaluate their roles or be stuck somewhere they do not fit. In this way, when men are confronted with household work after unemployment they can either take it on and make it their own, take on a small amount but refuse to accept that they should be in this role, or they can refuse to take on work at all (Myers & Demantas 2016).

GENDER IDEOLOGIES

Gender ideologies play a large role in the division of household labor. The belief that women belong in the home and men at work leads to households in which the labor is divided by gender (West & Zimmerman 1987). The traditional way of doing gender refers to the separated public and private spheres. Men work in the public sphere while women work in the private sphere. Espousing a traditional gender ideology refers to someone who believes that men and women have and should have separate roles in society (Davis & Greenstein 2009; Gerson 2010). A traditional household is made up of a male breadwinner and a female homemaker (Davis & Greenstein 2009; West & Zimmerman 1987). A neotraditional ideology is one where the belief is still held that women are responsible for household labor but they may also participate in paid labor (Gallagher & Smith 1999). A neotradtional household is one where the man is the breadwinner and the woman may participate in paid labor as long as the unpaid labor is taken care of (Gallagher & Smith 1999). Holding an egalitarian gender ideology refers to believing that men and women are equally responsible for both paid and unpaid labor. These ideals hold that

the total sum of paid and unpaid labor in the household should be divided between the two

partners in a household (Davis & Greenstein 2009; Hochschild 1989). Nontraditional gender

ideologies dictate that the man wants to stay home. Nontraditional households have stay-at-home

father (Kramer, Kelly, & McCulloch 2015). These gender ideologies do not always match the

actual division of labor within a home. Someone can espouse an egalitarian gender ideology but

in their homes, the woman may be responsible for all of the household labor in addition to both

partners having full time jobs (Hochschild 1989).

Ideologies can be developed and change over time (Vespa 2009). When households are

first formed, ideologies and household expectations may not be articulated leading to the person

with more perceived power leading the household under their ideologies. Men generally have

more power in their households and their lack of participation in household labor leaves much of

it to be done by the women who are less able to exert their power (Miller & Carlson 2016;

Moore 2008). Because of this, women have a harder time dividing the household labor in ways

in which they see as being fair. Men overall tend to be more satisfied with the division of

household labor than women are (Minnotte, Minnotte, & Pedersen 2013; Miller & Carlson

2016). With women entering a more egalitarian workforce than ever, egalitarian ideals about the

household and family structure have been pushing their way through years of traditional values.

These newer values are not always present or acted upon which may lead to dual-earner

households with a neotraditional setup (Gerson 2010; Miller & Carlson 2016). Previous studies

by Lamb have shown that fathers in dual-earner households are no more likely to contribute to

childcare than men in traditional households. Though men's participation in child rearing has

increased in the past few decades, it is still less than half of what women are doing (Lamb 2008).

Other factors such as children, employment, age, and the ideologies of the women can have an influence on the ideologies of the men in a household. Children can make couples less egalitarian (Vespa 2009). Fatherhood can sometimes push men to feel that they need to be working more hours. This pressure, coupled with maternity leave and a lack of paternity leave means that women are home with the children while men are at work (Glauber & Gozjolko 2011). Being a breadwinner is still a role assigned to men that leaves housework to be the work of the non-breadwinner which is still usually the woman in the household. "Gender flexible" families do not view the men as being unmanly if they are unemployed or do not have the breadwinner status. These families play out their egalitarian ideals and the men tend to take on more housework (Myers & Demantas 2016). Men who face unemployment have the opportunity to make their households more egalitarian as they are no longer in the position of being financially powerful and may need to redefine their masculinity (Minnotte, Minnotte, & Pedersen 2013).

SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND HOUSEHOLD LABOR

There is considerable debate over whether working class men statuses are more or less egalitarian than their middle/upper class counterparts. Working-class men may desire more egalitarian divisions of household labor but middle-class men are more likely to live in more egalitarian households. In these households, women may have more power to promote their egalitarian ideals and see them played out through the division of unpaid labor (Miller & Carlson 2015). However, they may also be more willing to stay at home after job loss and allow their wives to provide for the family while they take on the unpaid labor (Chesley 2011). According to

a study done by Miller and Carlson in 2016 comparing the desired and achieved divisions of household labor between middle and working-class cohabitating couples, working class men may tend to do less of the unpaid labor in the home than their spouses. In around two thirds of the working-class households which they surveyed women did the majority of the household labor. In the middle-class households, it was reported that women did the majority of the work about half the time. Working-class women were less able to promote their egalitarian ideals in their homes and therefore were less likely to meet their egalitarian expectations when it came to household labor (Miller & Carlson 2016). Working class families are less likely to be married. Married people have less egalitarian ideals than unmarried people. Overall, men have less egalitarian views than do women (Vespa 2009). While one might expect that higher levels of income due to dual-earnership may lead to a more egalitarian household, this has not been found to be the case (Lamb 2008). Working class men may feel more threatened by the employment of their significant others as their income alone would not be enough to support their family and their role of breadwinner becomes more precarious. Working class men are less likely to enjoy their jobs but stay in them in order to provide for their families and maintain their masculinity (Zuo & Tang 2000).

However, there is conflicting evidence that indicates that middle and upper-class men are less egalitarian than working class men. Men of higher classes may put on more of a show for the public eye rather than actually acting in the role of being a father. This involves showing up to events to be supportive but taking on little care work or household labor once in their own homes. They rely on their wives to do the work at home while they focus on breadwinning (Shows & Gerstel 2009). Working class men are more likely to report that they do all or most of the work than are men of higher classes (Miller & Carlson 2016). These men also tend to be

fathers both in public and in private. They may espouse more egalitarian views and therefore take on more of the household and care work than men of higher classes (Shows & Gerstel 2009). Despite contradictory findings, there is consensus that men of neither class category take on more labor than their wives or prove to act fully on egalitarian ideologies (Miller & Carlson 2016). Due, again to the lack of consensus on this factor, I included socioeconomic status as a variable in my research. All of the participants were of middle or working classes so comparing their answers should paint a picture of the division of household labor which is prevalent in if indeed there is a trend.

Based on this prior research, I will be trying to understand they doing and undoing of gender through household labor after unemployment of men. I will be trying to understand how race and SES play into the formation of gender ideologies and how those ideologies shape the structure of a household. I will also be looking at the ways in which men view the household work and if it becomes a part of their new definition of masculinity after job loss.

EXPRESSED VERSUS ACTED IDEOLOGIES

When it comes to studying human subjects, there may be cause to look into the ways that people's answers are contradictory. When interviewing participants, they may experience pressures from social desirability and give answers that they believe to be correct rather than giving their whole story. This means that there could be a disparity between what people are saying and what they are acting out in their lives (Scott and Lyman 1968). People may "develop strategies to protect themselves" when answering questions with social implications (Damaske 2011). The perception that one may receive judgment for their responses leads to a dichotomy

between what people say and what they do. Giving an explanation for a situation is a way that people cover up these differences (Scott and Lyman 1968; Damaske 2011).

With women entering the workforce, there is a trend towards espousing egalitarian ideologies. When these egalitarian ideals don't seem like they will play out as planned, women and men both have "fallback" plans (Gerson 2010). These fallbacks include autonomy for women and a traditional/neotraditional household for men. This means that though men may say that they want to share in household labor equally, they will often fall into less egalitarian household setups. Younger generations are showing a stronger focus on balancing their lives between family and work rather than being work-centric as past generations have been (Gerson 2010). However, these fallback plans give evidence to the idea that while women are moving into the realm of traditionally masculine tasks, men are not moving into the traditionally female one. By falling back on traditional household structures, men are not participating in household labor as much as they had anticipated or even desired (Gerson 2010).

EXPECTATIONS

Based on prior research, I expect to find that working class men of will maintain a less traditional perspective of household work. In homes with lower incomes where money is more of an issue, I expect to see that men and women both feel pressure to retain employment more so than in households where income is more stable. This may mean that the division of labor in the household will be more egalitarian and less traditional because they are accustomed to dual-earner household structures rather than a breadwinner and stay-at-home-parent structure. It may be more likely that both partners engage in both the paid and unpaid labor for the household due

to this (Barnes 2016). It is possible that the men's perspectives of the work which they do take on will be less negative and therefore they will be undoing gender more than men in higher income households (Myers & Demantas 2016). I also expect that men with more traditional gender ideologies will less likely to give up their roles and stick more closely to doing gender in the traditional sense. Men may not actively think that they need to be the breadwinner and their wives should be doing the housework but when those ideas are challenged, I expect to see that these men view taking on housework in a negative light (Minnotte, Minnotte, & Pedersen 2013). I expect that men's expressed gender ideologies will not match the actual division of household labor after job loss. Men who express egalitarian ideas and desires should be taking on the majority of household labor after unemployment but I do not expect this to be the case (Damaske 2011). If men are taking on more household labor after unemployment, they could be taking major strides to undo gender in the home and unassign tasks to specific genders.

Chapter 3

Data and Methods

SAMPLE

The data for this project came from The Pennsylvania Gender and Unemployment qualitative data set where the sample included 104 men and women from 5 counties in Pennsylvania between 2013 and 2015. The first 20 participants were found via snowball sampling. The second group of 84 participants was recruited from unemployment centers in the area. In total, 53 men and 51 women participated in the interviews, although 4 are excluded from the final analyses due to age, so the total sample size is 100. 89 participants identified as white, 7 as black, 3 as latinx, and 1 as Asian. 44 participants belonged to the middle class and 56 to the working class. Their ages range between 27 and 51 with a median age of 40 years old. They had all recently lost a full-time job and been out of work between 2 and 40 weeks. 63 were married; 17 were cohabiting; 20 were single. 75 participants had children under the age of 18 in their households and 84 had children under the age of 23 living with them (Damaske 2016).

METHOD

The data I analyzed was gathered from 100 in-depth interviews for the PA Gender and Unemployment Study. Each interview took around 2 to 3 hours with a set of questions to guide the conversation. The interview method was chosen in order to help build and develop theory rather than prove or support hypotheses. Interviews give people the ability to express their own

views on a given subject in their own words. This allows for a deeper understanding of how the

participants view their situation and what they would like other people to know about their

situation as well (Luker 2010). In this case, they are able to express their optimism or pessimism

about their job loss, future prospects, and how their pasts have affected both. Getting in depth

interviews from so many participants allows us to see trends in the views and perspectives on the

situation. Interviewing people who are similar to each other and from similar areas helps us to

gain an understanding of how people like them or from those areas may be internalizing the same

experiences and what factors contribute to those shared experiences.

      The interviews used concrete questions as well as open-ended and guided questions

which allowed for a flow of conversation and the ability to breach different topics. The questions

focused on 11 topic sections: basic demographics and household makeup, family of origin

history, education history and aspirations, work history, unemployment and job loss experience,

current work (if applicable), past and current relationships, childbearing, division of household

labor, hopes for now and the future, and opinion questions. Each participant was asked about a

series of household chores and childcare tasks and who performed each on in their households.

Other questions delved into the participants' childhood household structure as well as their

current household structure. The overall goal of the interview process was to understand the

changes which a person experiences when they lose their job. The interviews were recorded, then

transcribed word for word and coded using the qualitative interview software, Atlas.ti. For a

complete list of the questions I analyzed for this study, refer to Appendix B.

      Household structure: Each participant was asked about the composition of their

household. This included how many people lived there and the ages and employment statuses of

each person in the household. Participants were asked to define the relationship they had with

each person as well. I used these questions to understand who was in the household to be taking on the unpaid labor.

Family and household history. To understand how each participant came to be who they are today, they were asked about their family and household history. This included childhood household composition, financial status, and sources of family income. They were also asked about the educational achievements and work history for both their father (figure)s and mother (figure)s. This section allowed me to understand their families growing up and what they saw to be normal when it came to household structures. I coded this into gender ideology influence to see how their current household structures may have been influenced by past experiences.

Aspirations. Participants were asked about past and current relationships to understand how their family setup came to be and expectations they held about having children. Following this, they were asked about the division of childcare in their home as well as the division of household chores between spouses/partners and their overall satisfaction with said division. From there, they were asked to share their thoughts about how an ideal family is structured and if their families and lives were what they or their parents had hoped for them. They were also asked to describe their ideal employment situation. Then they were asked about their ideologies involving the setup of the home such as: who should be providing and who should be staying home and whether things are better now than they were for men and women in the past. I used these questions to assess their expressed gender ideologies as well as their achieved household division of labor.

ANALYSIS

Each interview was recorded and subsequently transcribed into the Atlas.ti system. From there, Professor Damaske, a team of her graduate students, and myself coded each variable and sections were coded into code families. Many families matched up with the questions asked. All codes were organized into a master excel document. Through iterative coding, more categories were added as patterns developed to questions which were not explicitly asked. The process of reading and re-reading the interviews helped us find patterns and trends between the people interviewed. In this way, we are able to see the connections between the interviewees and experiences in unemployment in Pennsylvania. Using this type of qualitative coding is better for our research because it allows for understanding of the meanings of what the interviewees are saying. Rather than just asking people who they think should be more responsible for paid or unpaid labor, we were able to see the actual division of labor in their households and how they felt about it. Interviews allow also for the interviewee to tell their full story. Using in-person interviews establishes trust and comfort level between the researcher and the participant. This means that the answers and stories being told are more likely to be genuine and candid. When conversation leads to a topic, it is more likely that someone will be able to think of a truthful and full answer rather than when they are given a set of questions to answer (Luker 2010).

Using an iterative analysis in the interviews allowed for a better understanding of how people's experiences are similar or different. Each interview was conducted using the same set of open ended questions which ensured that all questions would be answered but also allowed for individual freedoms in answering questions and interesting conversation to flow. This method helped us to look at the relationships and correlation between unemployment and the division of household labor.

Chapter 4

Results

Descriptively, the sample was mainly comprised of married white, middle and working

class adults between the ages of 25-54 with children in the household. Four of the respondents

have been eliminated from the study due to age related differences. For the purpose of this paper,

I focused on the answers that the men gave to the questions about family structure and division

of household labor.

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics

	Male	**Female**	**Total**
Gender	51	49	100
Race			
White	47	42	89
Black	*4*	3	7
Latinx	0	3	3
Asian	0	1	1
SES			
Middle Class	26	18	44
Working Class	25	31	56
Marriage Status			
Cohabiting	7	10	17
Married	34	29	63
Non-Residential Partner	1	4	5
Single	9	6	15
Total	**51**	**49**	**100**

Source: Damaske 2015

For the purposes of this project, gender ideologies and achieved divisions of household

labor have been separated into four categories: egalitarian, neotraditional, nontraditional, and

traditional (for discussions of prior uses of these categories see Hochschild 2015; Gerson 1993;

Damaske et al. 2016). Men with egalitarian ideologies are those who believe that both paid labor

and household labor can and should be shared equally between partners (men and women are

both responsible). Those with neotraditional ideologies believe women should be responsible for

household labor but that women can participate in paid labor. Men with traditional ideologies

believe women should be in the home and men should be the breadwinners. Nontraditional

ideologies mean the men believe that men should be staying home while women take on the paid

labor. In contrast to the ideologies, which capture the men's stated beliefs about what an ideal

division of labor would be (see Gerson 2010 for a discussion of the importance of gender ideals),

the household codes captured what the men reported as the actual division of labor in the

household Egalitarian households are those in which men reported sharing in most or all of the

chores with their partners. Neotraditional households refers to those men who believe that paid

labor can be shared between men and women but that household labor is the responsibility of the

woman and her paid labor comes second to that or is simply supplementary to their own income.

Traditional households refer to a household with a male breadwinner and a female homemaker.

Nontraditional household refers to a household with a female breadwinner and a male

homemaker. We should expect to see that men with more egalitarian ideologies have households

that are more egalitarian and take on a greater share of household labor. We can expect men of

either class to be more or less egalitarian based on conflicting prior research. We should also

expect to see that men take on male chores in greater numbers than they do female chores.

CHORES

Refer to Table 2 to see the stratification of participation by each chore. The chores that

were classified as female chores had much lower participation rates than those categorized as

male chores. This shows that gender was still strongly being done after unemployment. Many of

the female chores were reported as being shared equally in their households but the chores which were traditionally assigned to men were mostly done solely by the male participants. Although the modal category for men's gender ideologies was egalitarian, these ideas did not translate into their households. In an egalitarian household, we would expect the labor to be divided somewhat equally between the two partners. This may mean splitting all chores evenly; this may mean dividing tasks such that one person always cooks and the other always cleans-up, etc. This may also extend to how time was balanced between work inside and outside the home. If one person work outside the home more, they may reduce their household labor and vice versa, if they are working less, they can participate more. When men who espouse egalitarian ideologies lost their jobs, therefore, we would expect to see them increasing their share of the household labor, as they are no longer participating in paid labor for their household. We would also expect to see higher rates of participation in household labor in general due to the number of men who reported egalitarian ideologies. In such a circumstance, the unpaid labor would be split equally before the job loss and after their job loss, their household labor would further increase.

There was a clear divide between the chores in which men were more willing to participate and those in which they were less willing to participate. Table 2 shows the responses men gave when asked who was most responsible for a certain chore in their household. These interviews were done after they experienced job loss so the data accounts for any increases in household labor that the men reported.

Table 2 Reported Doers of Chores

Chore	Self		Spouse		Equal	
	Middle Class	Working Class	*Middle Class*	Working Class	*Middle Class*	Working Class
Female Type	**34**	**26**	**33**	**37**	**46**	**48**
Groceries	6	4	7	8	7	7
Laundry	5	6	10	6	4	7
Cooking	8	5	6	6	6	8
Meal Cleanup	9	5	2	7	9	7
Cleaning	3	5	4	6	12	8
Childcare	3	1	4	4	8	11
Male Type	**45**	**32**	**5**	**7**	**14**	**19**
Bills	11	7	3	6	5	6
Repairs	18	13	0	0	1	3
Outside	14	10	0	1	2	1
Play	2	2	2	0	6	9
Middle Class N = 26			**Working Class N=25**			

Source: Damaske 2015

Household labor like cleaning and childcare seems to be becoming less gendered according to this data. Many men reported sharing the cleaning and childcare load, even though they were typically assigned to women in the past. In comparing the overall number of times men reported the doer of these chores, a pattern becomes evident. Middle class men took on more of the work themselves than did working class men. The modal category for female type chores was 'equal.' The most striking differences in who was the most responsible for a type of labor was in the male type chores. Few men reported sharing this work with their spouses and even fewer reported their spouses to be the sole doers of these chores.

In middle class households, cleaning was reported as 'shared' more than any other household task. In working class households, childcare was reported as being shared equally the most. This could show that men are taking on a more egalitarian role with childcare after job loss as 7 middle class and 10 working class men reported taking on more childcare after their job losses. They were still not the sole caretakers but there seemed to be a good deal of equal sharing

of childcare in households where men lose their jobs. When trying to understand these numbers

it is important to consider the ways in which men talked about the division of chores within their

households.

Men reported different motivations for taking on more labor after their job losses.

Nathan, a middle class man, felt suddenly able to give his home his full attention and do

things he had always been wanting to do. His example shows how household labor

gender roles can be undone after a man loses his job.

> "So it's fantastic because I get the time to do it instead of wasting time on weekends
> doing it. Like you don't need to detail it, just clean it and move on. Now I can have it
> spick and span to my liking with no outside influence. So it has been beneficial for me as
> well because I like doing this stuff." *Nathan, Middle Class, Egalitarian Gender Ideology,
> Egalitarian Household*

Nathan described being able to do more household labor as something he enjoyed and took pride

in. He liked being able to do it his way and knowing that it was perfect. Before his job loss, he

was not able to do as much household labor and felt that certain chores were being under-done. It

is important to note that this new responsibility was taken on willingly and happily. This points

to undoing of gender as cleaning is traditionally considered a female task. Men may not be able

to do as much household labor as they believe they should be doing if their job takes up too

much of their time.

When it comes to overall feelings about the division of labor, Harold admitted that his

wife still did more of it but that he was satisfied. This supports research that has found even

when women are breadwinning, they still do a greater share of the unpaid labor in their homes

(Legerski & Cornwall 2010; Doucet 2015). He felt satisfied with the division while

acknowledging that it was not necessarily a fair division and he was getting the good side of the

deal. He knew that his significant other did more of the household labor but he had no plans or

desire to take on more. This was consistent with his neotraditional ideology.

> "Oh, yeah, I think if anything she's getting the short end of the stick, I'm probably getting off easy. No, definitely satisfied." *Harold, Middle Class, Neotraditional Gender Ideology, Traditional Household*

For Gerald, however, taking on more work during his unemployment was common sense.

He saw that he was home more often and there was more that he could do in that realm than he

had done previously. He recognized that he had not been participating in much of the unpaid

labor before his job loss and felt that it was only fair to take on more of it afterwards. Despite his

increased efforts, it was clear that his wife still did not view his increased participation as being

as involved as she believed it could be. Harold, then, provides an example of gender being

somewhat undone in a household after unemployment.

> "… [Meal cleanup is] kind-of whoever cooks, the other cleans. That's kind-of the way it's been but since I'm home during the day, a lot of days I do more of that kind of stuff. I can say that I probably didn't do my fair share before so the fact that I'm doing most of it now is probably not a bad thing.
> I do more housecleaning now than I have in the past, I would say. She would say it's still not enough. I would say that has increased on my end since losing my job" *Gerald, Middle Class, Egalitarian Gender Ideology, Neotraditional Household*

When it comes to laundry and household repairs, the data shows there was a divide in

who was responsible for what in the households. Gender was being done through this division of

chores at the same time that it was being undone through childcare responsibilities and food.

Both genders in this study reported that men do the majority of male type household labor. There

seemed to be very little sharing happening in this area as well as very little willingness to make it

shared. Men did not express a desire for women to take on more of this labor although there were

some times where men reported that women 'help out' with their chores.

> "I do majority of the repairs around the house but she definitely helps out, like we painted the hallway - that kind of stuff." *Troy, Working Class, Traditional Gender Ideology, Neotraditional Household*

Troy shows that there is sometimes room for women to help with traditionally masculine chores but that he was primarily responsible. As a working class male with a traditional gender ideology, it is not surprising to see the chores in his household maintained their gendered division. He reported, overall, the division of labor had not changed much after his job loss and his wife was still primarily responsible for the female type chores.

Some of the disparities between gender ideologies and the actual divisions of labor could be accounted for by women being the gatekeepers of household labor.

> "She won't let me do the laundry, she doesn't trust me. I've asked so many times, I'm like I'll do it, I don't mind doing the laundry, she just doesn't trust me. Folding it she doesn't trust." *Harold, Middle Class, Neotraditional Gender Ideology, Traditional Household*

> "I'm not allowed to grocery shop because she's very particular about how she grocery shops and how that fits into her life." *Dean, Middle Class, Gender Ideology not indicated, Household Type not indicated*

Rather than expressing an aversion to doing laundry or grocery shopping, Harold and Dean reported that their wives were the sole doers of a chore whether they wanted it to be that way or not. Though Harold expressed mostly neotraditional ideals when it came to who should be most responsible for different types of labor, within his own life, he believed his wife was stopping him from increasing his participation in household labor.

This provides support for the idea that there are certain chores which men and women see themselves as being better at accomplishing (Ridgeway & Correll 2004; Latshaw 2015). Harold tried to take on tasks but was not allowed to by his wife. He also expressed the idea that when there was a strongly gendered task such as household repairs, the person of the other gender was just 'helping out' with doing that task. In this way, his household was doing gender through

chores because the person to whom the task was assigned believed it to be their task and responsibility.

CHANGES AFTER JOBLOSS

When men lose their job, they have more free time and there is the possibility that they could take on more household labor than they had been doing previously. Men generally do less housework than women so when they lose their jobs and their partners are still working or they are just spending more time in their homes if they are not married, they may have the ability to take on more work. Some may even redefine their roles as the man of the house through this new labor (Greenstein 1996b). Men who expressed egalitarian expectations for who should be the most responsible for household labor versus paid labor could be expected to show signs of taking on more labor after job loss.

As can be seen from this sample, many men took on more unpaid labor when they left the workforce. Overall, 23 out of 51 (45%) men reported that they took on more household work after job loss. None indicated that their participation in household labor had decreased in this situation and 18% said that it had all stayed the same while the remaining 37% did not indicate whether or not they had taken on more labor. This information was found through asking men whether the division of household labor had changed after they lost their jobs.

Table 3 Changes in Household Labor after Unemployment

Change after Unemployment	More Egalitarian	No Change
Middle Class	**12**	**5**
Working Class	**11**	**4**
Household Labor	**19**	**9**
Middle Class	11	5
Working Class	8	4
Childcare	**17**	**8**
Middle Class	7	4
Working Class	10	4
Egalitarian	**12**	**3**
Middle Class	7	2
Working Class	5	1
Neotraditional	**4**	**3**
Middle Class	1	1
Working Class	3	2
Nontraditional	**2**	**1**
Middle Class	1	1
Working Class	1	0
Traditional	**5**	**3**
Middle Class	3	2
Working Class	2	1
Total	**23**	**9**

Source: Damaske 2015

I found that middle class men were more likely to espouse egalitarian gender ideologies and to act them out. They were also more likely to take on labor after unemployment. When the labor was split into 'Household Labor' and 'Childcare' the numbers did change between class. Middle class men were more likely to take on additional housework than they were to take on additional responsibility for childcare. Working class men, however, were more likely to take on additional childcare than housework. While the numbers are not drastically different but they do signify that class may have an impact on the division of household labor after unemployment. Overall, working class men reported more egalitarian shares of childcare between themselves

and their spouses than middle class men did. However, they reported being the primary caregiver less often than middle class men did.

> "Yeah. I mean, just the - I'll do more dishes and laundry and cleaning than I did before just because I'm there but … it's not drastic but I definitely picked up a little bit more of that." *Derek, Middle Class, Egalitarian Gender Ideology, Egalitarian Household*

Men who expressed egalitarian gender ideologies were more likely to take on household labor after unemployment. Neotraditional, nontraditional, and traditional men were similarly likely to each other to take on household labor. For men, the modal category for answers to "who is most responsible for [a female type chore]" was "she does."

Although many men took on more household labor after unemployment, many of the households still did not have an egalitarian division of household labor. This suggests that there were even fewer instances of an equal split of unpaid labor before the job loss. Some men stuck to their ways by only participating in the chores that they viewed as masculine. Many though, expressed a desire to make things more equal in their homes because it had not been so previously. Still, many reported that their wives did certain chores while they did others. They also acknowledged that the division was not necessarily fair for their female partners. This shows that they were not assigning all household labor to women and believe that there should be at least some sharing.

GENDER IDEOLOGIES

While men who espoused egalitarian ideals were more likely to achieve egalitarian divisions of labor in their households, there were still many of them who lived in neotraditional or traditional households. Although men who expressed egalitarian ideologies responded that

paid labor, household labor, and childcare should be shared equally between men and women, many of them did not take on enough household labor or childcare responsibilities in their partnerships to achieve egalitarian households.

Middle class men were more likely to express egalitarian ideologies and to achieve those types of households. Many men's ideologies matched the actual divisions of their household labor. However, there were instances within the middle class men who espoused egalitarian ideals achieving traditional households and men who espoused traditional ideologies achieving egalitarian households. It is of note that most of the men who reported a desire to stay home and take care of their children/households did not achieve that type of division of labor.

Table 4 Achieved Division of Household Labor by Expressed Gender Ideology

	Egalitarian	**Neotraditional**	**Nontraditional**	**Traditional**	**Total**
Egalitarian	11	4	0	2	**17**
Neotraditional	1	4	0	3	**8**
Nontraditional	0	1	1	1	**3**
Traditional	2	3	0	7	**12**
Middle Class	**9**	**4**	**1**	**7**	**21**
Egalitarian	7	1	0	2	10
Neotraditional	0	1	0	1	2
Nontraditional	0	1	1	0	2
Traditional	2	1	0	4	7
Working Class	**5**	**8**	**0**	**6**	**19**
Egalitarian	4	3	0	0	7
Neotraditional	1	3	0	2	6
Nontraditional	0	0	0	1	1
Traditional	0	2	0	3	5
Total (51)	**14**	**12**	**1**	**13**	**40**

Source: Damaske 2015

Even after taking on more labor after unemployment, the majority of men did not share equally in the roles traditionally assigned to women. The fallback plans from Gerson (2010) could come into play here in that when men cannot achieve their desired gender ideologies within their homes, they fall back into more traditional roles. Though 17 men reported a desire to

share household labor equally, only 11 accomplished this in their homes. The other 6 men lived

in either traditional or neotradiaitonal households where their spouses took on the household

labor. When it comes to balancing paid and unpaid labor, they may have prioritized paid labor

and therefore were not participating in unpaid labor as much as they had anticipated. This could

also be explained by the differences in what people say versus what they act out (Damaske

2011).

> "If money's not an [issue], I would be 100 percent family and zero percent work.
> Well, that's not true 'cause I do, I do have that in me - I want to help, you know,
> like I said, so maybe like 10 or 20 percent work. We'll say 80/20. Eighty for
> family time and just enjoying the people around me and twenty percent in doing
> something fulfilling like training people, helping with weight loss goals." *Darren,*
> *Middle Class, Egalitarian Gender Ideology, Egalitarian Household*

Darren expressed an egalitarian gender ideology leaning almost to a nontraditional

ideology. He still felt the desire and necessity to participate in paid labor but his focus was to

take care of his family. He took on more unpaid labor after losing his job, which is in line with

his ideology and contributed to his achievement of an egalitarian division of household labor.

Yet he did not exactly follow through on what he said about his household, as he did not take on

the majority of the labor even though he expressed a desire to do so.

Some men expressed egalitarian ideologies when asked who should be the most

responsible for paid or unpaid labor but when it comes to their household, they had different

expectations. Carl showed how his ideology was shaped by his spouse and childrearing. Carl

previously had no plans of putting in work with the kids. His ideology had been shaped by his

childhood family structure but was changed when he married a woman with children. Carl

seemed to have fallen in with the structure set by his wife who had been a single mother for

years before they married. He let her take the lead and tell him what to do as far as children and

housework was concerned. This goes against the idea that women have a harder time asserting

their ideologies in their homes but the stepfamily setup complicates the situation slightly

(Minnotte, Minnotte, & Pedersen 2013; Miller & Carlson 2016; Greenstein 1996b). It does lend

support to the idea though that a biological parent may have more power in a household than the

step-parent (Moore 2008).

> "Honestly, before I got married and I had no family, I had this misconception
> about it. I always thought that, and this going to sound sexist so please don't take
> it that way, I always thought the wife took care of the immediate needs of the
> kids, 'cause that's the way I was raised. But now, I'm learning it takes both of you
> fulltime 100 percent, and everything that I thought I knew is ignorance." *Carl,
> Middle Class, Egalitarian Gender Ideology, Traditional Household*

Carl is an example of a man who's expressed gender ideology does not match the division

of labor within his household. He espoused egalitarian ideals, saying that men and

women are equally responsible for paid labor, household labor, and childcare. However,

when it came to the actual division of labor within his home, his wife took on the

majority of the work even though she was the sole provider of income at the time of the

interview.

For the purposes of this investigation, chores were categorized into female type

and male type chores. I chose to evaluate the number of times men reported that they

were the sole doer of a chore to understand how much household labor was being done

by men after job loss when they have the time to be doing all of it.

In order to understand the percentage of the type of household labor which was being

done solely by the men after unemployment, I combined all of the instances of participation in

each category and averaged them out. For example, to find out the percentage of female type

household labor being done by egalitarian, middle class men, I added all of the possible 'self'

selections from groceries, cooking, meal cleanup, laundry, and cleaning. The total from that was

13 instances of 'self' participation. I took those 13 instances and divided them by the 11 men in

the middle class egalitarian category and then divided it again by the 5 chores being reported on.

This number gives me the average percentage of the female type chores being done solely by

men in this study. In other words, within this study there were 51 instances in which men could

have reported being the sole doer of each chore. In total, there were 255 instances in which the

men could have reported 'self' for female type household labor. They reported 'self' 60 times in

this category, which gives us an overall percentage of the female type household labor of 23%.

See Table 6 in appendix.

Table 5 Men Reporting "Self" for Participation in Household Labor by Gen ID

	"Female" HH Labor	"Male" HH Labor	Childcare
MC (26)	**23%**	**55%**	**10%**
Egalitarian (11)	24%	70%	5%
Neotraditional (2)	10%	50%	0%
Nontraditional (2)	30%	100%	25%
Traditional (9)	32%	41%	16%
WC (25)	**19%**	**40%**	**4%**
Egalitarian (9)	33%	37%	16%
Neotraditional (6)	7%	33%	0%
Nontraditional (2)	20%	16%	0%
Traditional (7)	23%	62%	0%
Total (51)	**23%**	**47%**	**8%**

Source: Damaske 2015

We can also see differences in the amount of household labor that is gender typed being

done between classes. Surprisingly, within the middle-class men, those with traditional gender

ideologies reported being the sole doer of female type household labor the most at 36% of the

total amount of times they could have reported doing so. They were followed by nontraditional

(30%), then egalitarian (24%), then neotraditional men (10%) in the middle class. Middle class

men seem to be most likely to espouse egalitarian ideologies but less likely to be the sole doer of

a female chore after job loss. Instead, they took on male type household labor by themselves in

greater amounts (55%) than working class men did. Traditional men in the middle class reported

doing the least amount (40%) of the male labor on their own while egalitarian men reported a

high number of 70% but not as high as the nontraditional men who did 100% of the male chores as the sole doer within the middle class.

In working class households, egalitarian men were the most likely to take on female type household labor (33%) as the sole doers as well as the only ones to participate in childcare as the sole care giver (16%). Traditional working class men took on 23% of the household labor as sole doers followed by nontraditional (20%), and neotraditional (7%). They were the primary doers of male type household labor more than female type labor, albeit less often than middle class men (40% compared to 55%). This suggests that there was more sharing happening in this chore type for working class men as very few reported their spouses to be the primary doers of these chores. The nontraditional men in the working class took on the least amount male type chores by themselves (16%) as compared to traditional men who took on the most (62%).

Overall, middle class men had higher rates of participation in all forms of household labor as compared to working class men. This is consistent with prior research that asserts that middle class men will have more egalitarian households than working class men (Miller & Carlson 2016). It is interesting to note again, that men who said they would rather be stay-at-home fathers were not more likely than men with other gender ideologies to be the sole doers of chores after unemployment. Men with egalitarian gender ideologies were no more likely than traditional men to be the sole doers either. This is consistent with the research that found that men in dual-earner households are no more likely to participate in household labor than are those in traditional households. This suggests that household labor is not becoming ungendered.

For both classes, there was very little childcare being done solely by the fathers – 10% was being done by the middle class men and 4% was being done by the working class men. (Not all of the men in this study had children but that has been accounted for in my data by not

including those without children in the childcare column). This does not mean that they are not

participating as they could be sharing equally in the childcare but when the women in this study

lost their jobs, they were the primary caregivers for their children at least 25% of the time. I

included primary caregiving and playing for this category refer to the table in Appendix A to see

women's data in this area.

Chapter 5

Conclusion

Through this study, I wanted to know if there were connections between the division of household labor and male unemployment. Additionally, I investigated whether there was a connection between class or gender ideology and the division of household labor after men lose their jobs. Men have the ability to do or undo gender in their home through their participation in unpaid labor. Unemployment may prove to be a disruptive event that could change the ways men and women do gender (Damaske in progress). Because women are already expected to do the household work, it is harder for them to do or undo gender without their husband's increased participation. If women simply do less household labor without their husbands picking it up, the tasks just won't get done (Legerski & Cornwall 1987; Moore 2008; Miller & Carlson 2016).

This study makes several valuable contributions to the existing literature. In terms of whether the division of household labor changes after men's unemployment, I found that most men do take on more unpaid labor. Yet, I find that they are not undoing gender through this additional labor. Most of their increased tasks were in "male" tasks. They tended to still be the dominant doer of masculine tasks while they either shared or left the work to their female partners when it comes to the more feminine tasks.

Men continued to perform their masculinity through opting into or out of certain chores. Some men did attempt to redefine their masculinity by taking on more work and supporting their wives. They even tried to take on more work than their partners were prepared for them to do such as Harold and his wife in the task of laundry. Harold demonstrated undoing gender through

trying to do the laundry, a task strongly assigned to women according to my data. Some men took on work that they acknowledged to be women's work or just something that they never saw themselves doing as a part of their lives. Some of them did change as they saw that the division was unfair and that that was not right for their wives.

The biggest differences evident between classes came from the reports of 'self' as the main doer of a chore. Overall, middle class men participated in around 5% more household labor as the sole doers of female type chores than working class men and 15% more of the male type chores. Within the classes, an interesting difference emerged. Middle class men with egalitarian gender ideologies were less likely than those with traditional gender ideologies to report being the sole doers of female type labor after unemployment. Working class men's participation matched their expressed gender ideologies more as the egalitarian men participated more than the traditional men did.

Laundry was shown to be more gendered in middle class households than in working class households as more middle class men reported that their wives were in charge of the laundry. Cleaning was the most shared chore in middle class households while childcare was the most shared in working class households. The numbers and behaviors between classes weren't drastic, however, my research points to middle class men being more likely to espouse egalitarian ideologies as well as to achieve egalitarian divisions of household labor that egalitarian middle class men do not to take on tasks as the sole doers.

There was some undoing of gender being done by men who took on more household labor after unemployment. Men did not always consider the work they were taking on to be women's work but to be a part of who they were and what they should be doing. This shows that today there may be slightly less stigmatization for men to take on traditionally female tasks.

Even the possibility of men over-reporting the amount of work they did indicates that they were not ashamed to be doing these tasks and conversely, think they were doing something good by doing so.

In sum, this study supports the idea that gender can be done or undone through household tasks. There were certain tasks that men and women assign to themselves and each other. This assignment may be undone on an individual level by the person of the opposite gender taking on a gendered task. When men lose their jobs, they lose part of society's definition of masculinity with it. They then have the choice to either change what it means to be a man or to not. Taking on household labor is one way to redefine masculinity. There is not sufficient evidence towards differences between men of different SES. There is some evidence to show that views of household labor are changing and that women may be able to expect fairer divisions of labor as time progresses. There are changes being made in how men view unpaid labor and what it means to be a man.

Appendix A

Tables

Table 6 Women Reporting "Self" for Participation in Household Labor by Gen ID

	"Female" HH Labor	"Male" HH Labor	Childcare
MC (18)	58%	24%	25%
Egalitarian (11)	43%	18%	14%
Neotraditional (4)	85%	50%	50%
Traditional (3)	73%	11%	33%
WC (31)	75%	20%	35%
Egalitarian (9)	64%	19%	22%
Neotraditional (13)	82%	25%	46%
Traditional (6)	70%	22%	50%
Total (51)	**64%**	**22%**	**32%**

Source: Damaske 2015

Appendix B

Interview Questions

Gender, Inequality, and Unemployment:Men and Women's Differing Social and Economic Costs
Interview Questions
ENUMERATION
You are (partnered/married), is that right?
Now, I'd like to get an idea about who else lives in your household.
Who are the other adults who live with you?
Now how about the children?
Is there anyone else who usually lives here?
FAMILY AND HOUSEHOLD HISTORY
To start, I'd like to ask you some questions about your family and about the kinds of arrangements you lived in when you were growing up. First, I'd like to get a picture of who you lived with during your childhood.
Could you tell me who you lived with while you were growing up? (IF NECESSARY: Did you live with both biological parents throughout your childhood or did you live with other people at least some of the time? Siblings?)
In general, how would you describe your family's financial situation during that time? (If necessary: Was there more than enough money for the needs of the household, just enough money, or not enough money?)
What were the sources of family income in your household during that time?
MOTHER, STEPMOTHER, AND/OR SURROGATE MOTHER
Now I'd like to ask you some questions about your (biological) mother (and your stepmother or any mother figures you had growing up)
When you were growing up, would you say your mother worked for pay all of the time, most of the time, some of the time, a little of the time or not at all?
What was the main job(s) your mother held while you were growing up? Did your mother's work situation change while you were growing up? Did she ever lose a job?
If did not work: What did your mother do instead of working?
Did anyone in your family go to work (or try to go to work) to make up for your job loss?
Did anyone increase their work hours to make up finances?
If yes, what happened?
How did you feel about this?
How did they feel about this?
Do you think your job loss affected your relationship with your spouse? If yes, how so?
If partnered/married: Now, in some households, it is common for spouses/partners to pool their money together. But in others, spouses/partners each have their own pot of money. How would you characterize your household? Since you lost your job, have you found that you needed to ask for money to use?

PAST AND CURRENT RELATIONSHIPS

You are (partnered/married), is that right?

Have you ever been married or in a long-term partnership before your current relationship? If yes, can you tell me a little bit about that relationship and what happened and how it ended?

How long have you known your partner?

When did this relationship start?

How long have you been together?

How would you describe your relationship?

What are your future plans?

Is partner employed? If yes, what do s/he do?

How do s/he feel about job?

How do you feel about his/her work (or staying at home)?

What is the race of your partner? And the ethnicity?

CHILDBEARING DECISIONS

Now, along these same lines, I'd like to ask you some questions about children.

When you were growing up, did you have any expectations or hopes about having children? (If necessary, probe: what were they?)

Did you have any thoughts about how you would like to combine having children with working outside the home?

DIVISION OF LABOR IN THE HOUSEHOLD

Tell respondent: I'm going to read you a list of chores, you tell me who is primarily responsible for them.

How are chores divided in the house for each of the following tasks:

Grocery shopping

Cooking

Meal-clean-up

Laundry

House cleaning

Bills

Repairs

Other chores (specify)?

When it comes to child care, who is regularly responsible for the following: Looking after the kids

Bathing the kids

Feeding the kids

Playing with the kids

Disciplining the kids

Doctor visits

School visits

Other (please specify)

Did these arrangements change after your job loss? What changed? If not, why do you think nothing changed?

How much leisure time would you say you have each week?

How much leisure time would you say your partner has each week?

Do you think there is a difference? Why?

How satisfied are you with these arrangements?

THEN, NOW AND THE FUTURE

Now, I've just got some general questions for you about your past, present and future.

If you could have things just the way you wanted, what would be your ideal balance between family, work and the rest of your life?

What do you think the chances are that you will achieve this balance?

In thinking about the future, what do you think your life will be like five or ten years from now?

When you compare your life to that of your parents', do you think you are better off, worse off or relatively the same?

(If isn't clear from above answer) Do you think you are financially similar to your parents or financially different?

Do you think that you have different goals for your life than your parents had for theirs? Please specify?

Do you think you have different goals for your children than your parents had for you? Please describe.

OPINION

In your opinion, what is an ideal job?

Probe: Why? How does this job compare to yours?

What do you think about changes in American families such as more working mothers?

Do you think someone should be most responsible for providing the family income?

If yes, who and why?

If no, why not?

Do you think someone should be the most responsible for taking care of the children?

If yes, who and why?

If no, why not?

Do you think someone should be the most responsible for doing the housework?

If yes, who and why?

If no, why not?

In your opinion, is there anything the government can do to make life easier for families?

Do you think women have it better or worse today than in the past? (Why?)

Do you think men have it better or worse today than in the past? (Why?)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ad Council: About Us. Retrieved March 28, 2018, from https://www.adcouncil.org/About-Us

Ad Council: Fatherhood Involvement. Retrieved March 28, 2018, from https://www.adcouncil.org/About-Us

Barnes, R. (2016). Chapter 2. Raising the Race. Rutgers University Press: New Jersey.

Bianchi, S. M., Robinson, J. P., & Milke, M. A. (2006). *The changing rhythms of American family life*. Russell Sage Foundation.

Cameron, D., & Kulick, D. (2003). Introduction: Language and desire in theory and practice.

Carlson, J. (2015) Mourning Mayberry Guns, Masculinity, and Socioeconomic Decline. Gender & Society 29.3: 386-409.

Chesley, N. (2011). Stay-at-home fathers and breadwinning mothers: Gender, couple dynamics, and social change. Gender & Society, 25, 642-664

Correll, S. J. (2004). Constraints into Preferences: Gender, Status, and Emerging Career Aspirations. *American Sociological Review*, 1 Feb. 2004, Volume: 69, issue: 1, page(s): 93-113

Damaske, S. (2011). *For the Family? How Class and Gender Shape Women's Work.* New York: Oxford UP,. Print.

Davis, S. N., & Greenstein, T. N. (2009). Gender ideology: Components, predictors, and consequences. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *35*, 87-105.

Davis, S. N., Jacobsen, S. K., & Anderson J. (2012). "From the great recession to greater gender equality? Family mobility and the intersection of race, class, and gender." Marriage & Family Review 48.7: 601-620.

Demantas, I. and Myers, K. (2015), "Step Up and Be a Man in a Different Manner": Unemployed Men Reframing Masculinity. The Sociological Quarterly, 56: 640–664.

Deutsch, F. M. (2007). Undoing gender". Gender and Society, 21(1), 106-127.

Doucet, A. (2015). Parental responsibilities: Dilemmas of measurement and gender equality. Journal of marriage and family, 77(1), 224-242

Folbre, N. (2001). *The invisible heart: Economics and family values*. New York: New Press.

Gallagher, S. K., & Smith, C. (1999). Symbolic traditionalism and pragmatic egalitarianism: Contemporary evangelicals, families, and gender. *Gender & Society*, *13*(2), 211-233.

Gerson, K. (2010) *The Unfinished Revolution: Coming of Age in a New Era of Gender, Work, and Family*. New York: Oxford UP,. Print.

Gerson, K. (1993). *No man's land: Men's changing commitments to family and work*. New York, NY: BasicBooks.

Glauber, R., & Gozjolko, K. L. (2011). Do traditional fathers always work more? Gender ideology, race, and parenthood. Journal of marriage and family, 73(5), 1133-1148.

Greenstein, T.N. (1996a). Husbands' participation in domestic labor: Interactive effects of wives' and husbands' gender ideologies. Journal of Marriage and the Family 58:585-95

Greenstein, T. N. (1996b). Gender ideology and perceptions of the fairness of the division of household labor: Effects on marital quality. Social Forces, 74(3), 1029-1042

Hochschild, A. (1989). with Machung, A.(1989). *The second shift: Working parents and the revolution at home.*.

Hochschild, A. R., & Machung, A. (2012). *The second shift: Working families and the revolution at home*. New York, N.Y: Penguin Books.

Hochschild, A. R. (2015). The managed heart. In *Working In America* (pp. 47-54). Routledge.

Kitzinger, C. (2005). Heteronormativity in action: Reproducing the heterosexual nuclear family in after-hours medical calls. *Social problems*, *52*(4), 477-498.

Kramer, K. Z., Kelly, E. L., & McCulloch, J. B. (2015). Stay-at-home fathers: Definition and characteristics based on 34 years of CPS data. *Journal of Family Issues*, *36*(12), 1651-1673.

Lamb, M. E. (2000). The history of research on father involvement: An overview. *Marriage & Family Review*, *29*(2-3), 23-42.

Latshaw, B. A. (2015). From mopping to mowing: Masculinity and housework in stay-at-home father households. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, *23*(3), 252-270.

Legerski, E. M., & Cornwall, M. (2010). Working-class job loss, gender, and the negotiation of household labor. *Gender & Society*, *24*(4), 447-474.

Luker, K. (2010). *Salsa dancing into the social sciences: Research in an age of info-glut* (First Harvard University Press pbk. ed.). London;Cambridge, Mass;: Harvard University Press

Mattingly, M. J., & Smith, K. E. (2010). Changes in wives' employment when husbands stop working: A recession-prosperity comparison. Family Relations, 59(4), 343-357.

Miller, A. J., & Carlson, D. L. (2016). Great Expectations? Working-and Middle-Class Cohabitors' Expected and Actual Divisions of Housework. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *78*(2), 346-363.

Minnotte, K. L., Minnotte, M. C. and Pedersen, D. E. (2013), Marital Satisfaction among Dual-Earner Couples: Gender Ideologies and Family-to-Work Conflict. Family Relations, 62: 686–698.

Moore, M. R. (2008). Gendered power relations among women: A study of household decision making in Black, lesbian stepfamilies. *American Sociological Review*, *73*(2), 335-356.

Myers, K., & Demantas, I. (2016). Breadwinning and bread-losing: Exploring opportunities to rework manhood. *Sociology Compass*, *10*(12), 1119-1130..

National Responsible Fatherhood Clearinghouse. (n.d.). Retrieved March 28, 2018, from https://www.fatherhood.gov/

Pew Research Center, (2017), "On Gender Differences, No Consensus on Nature vs. Nurture"

Ridgeway, C. L., & Correll, S. J. (2004). Unpacking the gender system a theoretical perspective on gender beliefs and social relations. *Gender & society*, *18*(4), 510-531.

Risman, B. J. (2004). "Gender as a Social Structure: Theory Wrestling with Activism." *Gender and Society Vol. 18, No. 4 Pp. 429-450*

Risman, B. J. (2009). from doing to undoing: Gender as we know it. Gender and Society, 23(1), 81-84.

Schilt, K., & Westbrook, L. (2009). Doing Gender, Doing Heteronormativity: "Gender Normals," Transgender People, and the Social Maintenance of Heterosexuality. *Gender & Society*, *23*(4), 440-464.

Scott, M. B., & Lyman, S. M. (1968). accounts. *American Sociological Review, 33*(1), 46-62.

Shows, C., & Gerstel, N. (2009). Fathering, Class, and Gender A Comparison of Physicians and Emergency Medical Technicians. *Gender & Society*, *23*(2), 161-187

Townsend, N. W. (2002). The Package Deal: Marriage. *Work and Fatherhood in Men's Lives*.

Vespa, J. (2009). Gender ideology construction: A life course and intersectional approach. Gender & Society, 23(3), 363-387.

West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (2009). Accounting for Doing Gender. *Gender and Society, 23*(1), 112-122.

Zuo, J., & Tang, S. (2000). Breadwinner status and gender ideologies of men and women regarding family roles. *Sociological perspectives*, *43*(1), 29-43.

ACADEMIC VITA

EDUCATION	**Paterno Fellows Program**
	Schreyer Honors College
	College of the Liberal Arts, Penn State University, University Park, PA May 2018
	B.A. Sociology; B.A. Spanish
	Minors: Labor and Employment Relations; Sustainability Leadership

WORK EXPERIENCE	**Summer Intern**
	Foundation for Individual Rights in Education **June 2017 – August 2017**
	• Collaborated on projects revolving around free speech and student rights
	• Organized and ran a student summer conference
	• Participated in group debates and seminars
	Eco-Reps Student Program Coordinator
	Penn State Housing **May 2017 – Present**
	• Promote and teach sustainability in the residence halls
	• Lead 60 Eco-Reps through weekly meetings and peer education
	• Implement sustainable changes in Housing, Resident Life, and Dining
	Undergraduate Research Assistant
	Department of Labor and Employment Relations **September 2016 – Present**
	• Conduct research alongside Dr. Sarah Damaske of Labor and Employment Relations for the PA Gender and Unemployment Study
	• Report and research on the effects of unemployment of the male breadwinner on the gendered division of household labor
	• Received grant funding for research

SKILLS	Spanish Language	Microsoft Office	Google Suite	SPSS IBM

LEADERSHIP	Penn State Eco-Reps,	**2014 – Present**
	• *Eco-Rep* – Promote sustainability through peer education	2014 – 2015
	• *Mentor* – Lead small group of new Eco-Reps	2015 – 2016
	• *Area Coordinator* – Oversee Eco-Rep Program, East Halls	2016 – 2017
	• *Student Program Coordinator* – Oversee all programing	2017-Present
	Student Conduct Advisors,	**2014 – Present**
	• *Advisor* – Protect students' right to due process	2014 – Present
	• *Director* – Oversee advisors and program	2015 – Present
	Relay for Life	**2016 & 2017**
	• *Team Captain* – Raised over $1,800 each year	

HONORS/ PROGRAMS	FIRE Student Defender Conference, New Orleans, Louisiana	**Dec 2-4, 2016**
	FIRE West Coast Conference, UCLA	**Apr 28-30 2017**
	Ronda Study Abroad Program, Penn State University	**Summer 2016**
	Philadelphia Urban Seminar, Penn State University	**Summer 201**