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A Review of Academic Literature on Men’s Health and Men’s Sheds

Men experience more incidence of morbidity and live fewer years than women (Mahalik et al., 2007; White and Holmes, 2006; Fletcher, 1992).

Suggested contributions to this include biological, psychological and sociological factors including: that ‘masculinity’ could be a determinant of health; that men are unwilling to burden health services; there is a lack of appropriate men-friendly health service provision (Connell, 1995; Evans et al., 2011; Gough and Conner, 2006; Marmot et al., 2010).

This provides a rationale for reviewing Men’s Sheds: community organisations that provide space for men, often providing the opportunity to engage in activities (Golding et al., 2007; Wilson and Cordier, 2013; Ormsby et al., 2010; Cordier and Wilson, 2014).

Across the world there are over 1,000 Men’s Sheds with more than 100,000 members. The majority of these are in Australia (Cavanagh et al., 2014; Wilson and Cordier, 2013).

In terms of pragmatic contributions that influence the health of men, the literature points to a set of foundations in support of the concept of community based organisations where men can enhance their social and community networks. In these community organisations men can trade masculine credits (de Visser and Smith, 2006, 2007) to address health and wellbeing issues, at no risk to their masculine capital (Bourdieu, 1986).

A review of the Men’s Sheds literature suggests that Men’s Sheds are a supportive:–

Physical environment, offering…

A defined place for men

• A place where it is considered socially acceptable for men to be in the company of other men (Ballinger et al., 2009).

Utilitarian activities or a primary health and wellbeing focus

• The data referred to two distinct types of Men’s Sheds: those with utilitarian activities and those with a primary health and wellbeing focus (Cordier and Wilson, 2014).

A place acceptable for men

• It was evident that the attending men felt both comfortable and safe in the environments (Wilson and Cordier, 2013). Men are often limited in options for support (Markham and White, 2016).

Social environment, offering…

Supporting positive relationships

• Physical attributes appear to support men: engaging with the social environment; reducing social isolation; finding positive social relationships with other men (Misan and Sergeant, 2008).

Engaging qualities

• The equipment that the Men’s Sheds had to offer was the initial engager, but it was the social elements of the environment that retained participant engagement (Wilson and Cordier, 2013).

Facilitation

• Men’s Sheds facilitate “health by stealth”, particularly true of Sheds with a utilitarian focus, fostering conversations during activities (Wilson and Cordier, 2013:459).

Determinants of Health

Constitutional factors are challenging (at best) to change.

Individual lifestyle factors can, at times, be influenced. However, there is a propensity to ‘victim blame’ individuals and the nuances of behaviour change are not widely understood (Green et al., 2015).
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