



GENDER EQUALITY AND GENDER DIFFERENCES IN HOUSEHOLD WORK AND PARENTING

ANDREA DOUCET

Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, University of Cambridge, Free School Lane, Cambridge CB2 3RQ, UK

Synopsis — Drawing on qualitative research with 23 British dual earner couples, this article explores theoretical issues of gender differences and gender equality as they relate specifically to an understanding and analysis of women and men's contributions to household work and parenting. It is argued that the relationship between women's greater contribution to household work and their relative inequality to men in employment and public life — what Dinnerstein (1978) referred to as the relationship between "the rocking of the cradle and the ruling of the world" — remains the chief focus of research and analysis in the subject area of gender divisions of household labour. While recognizing the importance of such a focus, both for feminist research as well as for women outside of academia, I draw attention to one of the costs of such a focus, which has been an inadequate recognition of the various configurations that gender differences may take within household life. In particular, the article argues that there are several critical insights from ongoing feminist debates on gender equality and gender difference which could be usefully incorporated into the methodological and theoretical literature on gender divisions of household labour so as to enrich our understanding and analysis of persistent gender differences in household life and labour.

The past two decades have produced an astonishing number of multidisciplinary studies on the topic of gender and household labour¹ wherein the central query has been whether or not women's increased participation in the labour market, and to a lesser extent male unemployment, has brought about a renegotiation of gender roles and responsibilities within the household. A review of the literature on this subject across a number of countries reveals that no matter what technique is used to measure the household division of labour, the household's work still belongs largely to women.² In coming to such conclusions on the "astounding stability" (Berk, 1985) in gendered household work and responsibilities, the authors who investigate these issues then devise categories to describe the views and practices

of households. Most studies have some typology of categories along the lines of "traditional," "transitional," "egalitarian" (Hochschild, 1989), or "traditional," "traditional-rigid," "traditional-flexible," and "renegotiated" (Morris, 1985). Other authors deduce whether or not there is "nearly equal sharing" or "actual equal sharing" between women and men in relation to family work (Brannen & Moss, 1991, p. 180). Within such typologies, an "egalitarian" household is one where the man and the woman within it do "share(d) housework equally" (Hochschild, 1989)³ or "whose contributions are roughly equal to one another" (Brannen & Moss, 1991), whether measured by minutes and hours, tasks, or overall responsibility. Thus, the overall consensus by researchers is that there are few egalitarian households and that gender equality in household work has not yet been achieved.

All of the authors investigating gender equality in household life have, in various ways, made valuable and important contributions in helping to advance and further our understanding of how and why the slow pace of change in men's contributions to household

The author is very grateful to Rosalind Edwards, Jane Ribbens, Bob Blackburn, Carol Gilligan, Natasha Mauthner, Jane Ireland, and the members of the Women's Workshop on Qualitative Family/Household Research for comments on earlier versions of this article as well as for their support and encouragement.

life have not kept up with the rapid pace of women's increasing labour market participation. While it would seem that the well documented "astounding stability" of gendered household labour cannot be contested, I would argue, nevertheless, that what is required is a more sophisticated definition and a deeper analysis of gender equality and gender differences within the domestic domain. In particular, it is striking that this subject area has not kept pace with important theoretical developments occurring outside of the subject area. For example, there has been a failure to integrate some of the excellent theoretical work by feminist authors on gender equality and gender difference (Bacchi, 1990; Bock & James, 1992; Braidotti, 1991; Komter, 1991; Meehan & Sevenhuijsen, 1991; Meijer, 1991; Phillips, 1991; Rhode, 1989, 1990; Scott, 1988).

Drawing on my research with 23 White British dual earner couples⁴ who are attempting to share in the work and responsibility for housework and childcare (Doucet, 1995), this article argues that it is difficult to speak about gender equality within household life as measured by the time spent, number of household tasks done, or taking the responsibility for household work. Whereas equality in employment is more easily measured and tested against factors such as pay, promotions, and the relative status of women and men, the issue of equality within the home is not so straightforward. Does equality mean women and men perform all household tasks, and/or do they spend an equal amount of time performing such tasks? Does it mean doing everything even if that means that the women learn how to do plumbing and electrical chores for the first time whereas their male partner has been doing such tasks since he was a boy? Does it mean that men have to call up the baby-sitter as many times as the women do and go to the toddler groups or play group sessions where he might be the only man in the room? Do women and men have to share everything from the first day of their first child's life or, alternatively, may they have periods where one parent does more than the other? Moreover, what is the fit between researchers "objective" measures of equality and more subjective criteria as determined by the couples being studied as to what is "fair" within their own household division of labour? (Doucet, in press).

In order to deal with such questions, this article argues that this important body of litera-

ture on gender divisions of household labour appears to have been relatively unaffected by wider debates which have been reshaping feminist perspectives on gender equality and gender difference. The first section of the article is a brief overview of the vast body of feminist theoretical literature on gender equality and gender difference. The second section examines how issues of gender equality and difference have been handled within the theoretical and empirical literature on gender and household life. Finally, drawing on several critical insights from feminist debates on gender equality and gender difference, as well as my own empirical research, I suggest ways that theoretical and empirical literature on gender and household labour might be strengthened.

GENDER EQUALITY AND GENDER DIFFERENCE

Broadly speaking, and at the risk of greatly simplifying feminist theory and politics, it is possible to discern two distinct, yet related, concepts in the history of feminist thought. These concepts, around which an intense debate has been centred, particularly during the 1980s, are "gender equality" and "gender difference." Although the terms lend themselves to definitional differences depending upon the academic discipline as well as between countries, it is nevertheless possible to speak about them in general terms.⁵ I briefly consider the basic tenets of these two strands of feminist thought — gender equality and gender difference — and then go on to discuss in greater detail a third strand which attempts to synthesize, as well as go beyond, the first two strands.

Gender equality and equal rights feminism

The first strand or tradition falls under many different labels, including "equal rights feminism" (Braidotti, 1991), "equal treatment" (Bacchi, 1990), "those who anticipate a genuinely gender-free theory" (Phillips, 1991), and the "equality category" (Scott, 1988). The basic principle to be emphasised here is that this wide and diverse strand of feminist theory and politics tends to minimise, or deny, gender difference because it considers these differences to be obstacles to socioeconomic equality. Thus, gender differences ought to be an irrelevant consideration in the schools, employment, the courts,

and legislation (Scott, 1988). In particular, there is a strong emphasis on facilitating women's participation in paid work on an equal footing with men and sometimes, though not always, a concurrent devaluing of women's traditional care-giving and home-making roles. Feminists who strive for equality with men claim that women are as capable as men are in competing for equal access to a wide range of social, economic, and intellectual opportunities.

Gender difference

A second strand discerned in historical and contemporary feminism takes its shape in many guises including what authors reviewing this body of work have titled: "ethical feminism" (Braidotti, 1991), "the difference category" (Scott, 1988), "special treatment theorists" (Bacchi, 1991), "those for whom sexual difference is a necessary and substantial divide" (Phillips, 1991), "relational feminism" (Rhode, 1989), "radical feminism," and "cultural feminism." Most difference-oriented writers celebrate activities and work traditionally associated with women as well as challenge the value accorded to them by society. Women's differences from men are highlighted in many areas, including: women's care-taking roles (O'Donnell, 1985), their different conception of power (Hartsock, 1983), their predominantly different concepts of self, relationships, and morality (Gilligan, 1982), their experiences in "maternal thinking" (Ruddick, 1989), and their countervailing ethic based upon nurturing and cooperation (Rich, 1976).

In contrast to equal rights feminism, feminists who acknowledge or celebrate women's specificity, autonomy, or difference argue for a feminist practice in which women are not defined in terms of "male defined values which pretend to universal validity" (Bock & James, 1992, p. 4). While there are many differences between feminists in this group in terms of goals and strategies,⁶ as well as distinct layers of the arguments depending upon the country⁷ and academic disciplines in which difference is conceptualized, the important point to be highlighted for the purposes of this particular discussion is that there is a recognition of the need to acknowledge the existence of gender differences in many areas of social life.

Moving beyond equality and difference

In recent years, many writers have made the point that difference and equality are not antithetical categories. Indeed, as Irene Costera Meijer points out, they are certainly not opposites since, for example, the opposite of equality is inequality rather than difference. It is not a simple either/or; they complement and presuppose each other:

The equality sought by the "equal-rights tradition" can only be achieved if the feminine (difference) is valued more highly. The "difference tradition" considers otherness a desirable position because it is critical of cultural structures. Yet this other human being will only be able to use her influence to its fullest capacity when she is taken equally seriously. Difference and equality appear to presuppose each other. (Meijer, 1991, p. 33)

There is, thus, an increasing consensus among many authors that in certain theoretical and historical contexts, the concepts of gender equality and gender difference are highly interdependent "so that any adequate analysis must take account of the complex interplay between them" (Bock & James, 1992, p. 10; see also Bock, 1992; Offen, 1992). Many writers from a wide range of academic disciplines have highlighted several important points which help us to move beyond the equality and difference dilemma (Bacchi, 1990, 1991; Bock & James, 1992; Meehan & Sevenhuijsen, 1991; Phillips, 1991; Rhode, 1989, 1990; Scott, 1988). Three points are worth mentioning here.

Recognizing differences among women and among men. Partly in response to the gender difference strand and partly in response to feminist theories intersecting with postmodern theories, there is now a greater recognition of "the multiple play of differences" (Scott, 1990, p. 174) among women's and among men's experiences across culture, class, race, and ethnicity as well as in relation to differing historical, social, and economic forces. As underlined by Deborah Rhode: "Gender is part of what constructs and constrains human identity, but it is only a part" (Rhode, 1989, p. 311).

Not difference, but disadvantage. A second point in moving beyond the equality-difference

dilemma is also posited by Deborah Rhode, who maintains that rather than simply focusing on "difference per se," it is more useful to consider "the disadvantages that follow from it." (Rhode, 1990, p. 204; also Rhode, 1989). Put another way, she argues: "The difference dilemma cannot be resolved; it can only be recast. The critical issue should not be difference, but the *difference difference makes*" (Rhode, 1989, p. 313; my emphasis; see also Rhode, 1992). In a similar vein, Jane Flax maintains that what feminists should seek to end is "not gender, not differences, and certainly not the feminine," but rather "domination" (Flax, 1992, p. 194).

Challenging the "general working and living conditions of women and men" (Bacchi, 1991, p. 83). Although the equal rights tradition has been important as a theoretical tool and a political strategy for women's struggles to gain equal entry into and access to the rewards of the public world of work and politics, it, nevertheless, has its limitations as well. Many authors concur with Elizabeth Meehan and Selma Sevenhuijsen when they argue that "the employment of equality as a concept and as a goal supposes a standard or a norm which, in practice, tends to be defined as what is characteristic of the most powerful groups in society" (Meehan & Sevenhuijsen, 1991;⁴ see also Rhode, 1989, 1990; Young, 1990).

Thus, these same authors argue for fundamental changes in employment and social welfare structures. As underlined by Carol Lee Bacchi, the fundamental issue at stake is the fact that "government and employers refuse to accept social responsibility for basic human needs such as child bearing and child nurture" (Bacchi, 1990, pp. 83–84). In a similar vein, Deborah Rhode argues for the creation of a "society truly committed to caretaking values" which would be achieved not only through fundamental changes in employment structures and welfare policies, but also through a recognition that the important questions at stake are "not only of *gender equality* but also of *cultural priorities*" (Rhode, 1990, pp. 210–211; my emphasis).

ISSUES OF GENDER EQUALITY AND GENDER DIFFERENCES IN LITERATURE ON GENDER AND HOUSEHOLD LABOUR

Let us consider for a moment how the issues of gender equality and gender differences have

been woven through the literature of gender divisions of household labour. All of the authors in this subject area speak about gender equality and seem to set, at least implicitly, that this is the goal to strive toward. As for how equality is defined, there is a more than subtle suggestion that what constitutes equality in household life is that which will encourage gender equality outside household life. In other words, the informing framework of much of the literature on gender divisions of household labour is that of an "equality" or "equal rights" framework. I would argue that equality within the household is viewed in terms of a "male model" of minimal participation in housework and childcare and in relation to a "male model" of full time continuous employment. High work orientation is valued (Brannen & Moss, 1987, 1991). Full-time childcare is implicitly or explicitly considered as optimal (Backett, 1982; Brannen & Moss, 1991) while also recognizing that there is a problem in that this domain of childcare remains subject to gender and class inequalities as well (Brannen & Moss, 1991; Graham, 1991; Hochschild, 1989; Rothman, 1989). Women who may choose to opt out of a career structure because they cannot cope with the demands of child rearing and a "male work norm" (Sassoon, 1987) are seen to suffer from "ideologies of motherhood" or the "ideological salience of giving time to children (Brannen & Moss, 1991, p. 111). While explicitly questioning the "traditional masculine model of employment" (Brannen & Moss, 1991, p. 259), this model still exists as an implicit model for the measure of women's success.

With regard to the issue of gender differences, there seems to be a unanimous consensus, albeit a silent one, on the problematic nature of such differences. Gender differences in household life are seen as disadvantages because they further inhibit gender equality outside the home.

It is, of course, understandable why gender equality is given attention at the expense of a greater detail to gender differences. The weighting of the balance of household labour on the side of women has been very costly to many women. Many studies have pointed out how women's employment may suffer as it is mainly women who have had to make adjustments in their schedules in order to balance both paid and domestic work (Berk, 1985; Brannen & Moss, 1991; Crouter, 1984; Evetts, 1988; Hochschild, 1989). Several studies have also pointed out that in dual earner households,

it is the women who experience fatigue, anxiety, illness, role-strain, conflict, and guilt in their decision to return to work and in their daily lives as parents and workers (Brannen & Moss, 1991; Crouter, 1984; Hochschild, 1989). As described so well by Julia Brannen and Peter Moss, the fact that women continue to do most of the household work often leads to "the potentially serious long-term consequences of subsequently leaving employment or leaving their full time job for another part-time one" wherein they often find themselves in a situation of "occupational downgrading, with loss of earnings, pensions and other benefits." They also mention how "these actions affect future career prospects, pensions and long term household income," and they can also leave "women (and their children) economically vulnerable to the future loss of their partner's financial support because of marital breakdown or for some other long-term reason" (Brannen & Moss, 1991, p. 253).

In a similar vein, authors who argue for "co-parenting" (Ehrensaft, 1987) or for men and women to "mother" (Ruddick, 1989) or "co-mother" (Kimball, 1988) constantly cite the work of Nancy Chodorow (1978) and Dorothy Dinnerstein (1978) in that these two authors have stressed that gender differentiation and sex oppression will exist as long as women continue to dominate parenting. Both their theories, especially Chodorow's, were quickly incorporated into feminist theorizing in this area, at least partly because they seemed to offer a "concrete and workable strategy for transforming gender relations" (Young, 1984, p. 142); just "add men and stir" to infant care and parenting, and male domination of women would disappear since the "whole edifice erected in the base of exclusive female parenting would topple" (Young, 1984, p. 142). Thus, within the subject area of gender and household labour, the relationship between "the rocking of the cradle and the ruling of the world" (Dinnerstein, 1978) was and remains the chief focus of research in this area.

While I would concur that such a focus has had enormous value for feminist research as well as for women outside of academia, the cost of this focus has, in my view, been an insufficient attention to the scope and range of gender differences within, and in relation to, household life. The overwhelming concentration on equality has resulted in an inadequate recognition of

the various configurations that gender equality and gender differences may take both within and outside of household life. If we go back to the theoretical points made above in the section of this article entitled "moving beyond difference and equality," there are several critical insights which could be usefully incorporated into the methodological and theoretical tenets of the sociological literature on gender divisions of household labour. I address three points in the following discussion.

Recognizing differences among women and among men

Most studies on this subject of gender and household labour have concentrated on couples who are professional, middle class, dual-career, and heterosexual couples.⁸ Recently, there has been increasing recognition accorded to distinguishing characteristics of mothering and fathering such as the age of mothers (Berryman, 1991; Phoenix, 1991; Phoenix et al., 1991) and the age of fathers (Bronstein & Cowan, 1988). However, there has been less attention given to distinctions among parents in accordance with the ages and stages of child rearing. If the distinction is made at all between households with or without children, there is often no recognition made of the various stages and changing needs and demands of children as they grow up, or of the fact the childcare tasks differ greatly depending upon the numbers and ages of children (e.g., Bird, Bird, & Schruggs, 1984; Morris, 1985; Pahl, 1984).

In addition, there is little emphasis on how women and men experience their changing status as mothers and fathers in relation to a wide range of indeterminate, constantly shifting factors which correspond to the ages and numbers of children as well as to the inconstant (variable) needs and personality of each particular child. Indeed, much of the literature on how women and men divide the work of parenting is focused on the infant stage or the early parenting years (e.g., Backett, 1982; Brannen & Moss, 1991). This underplays the rich variety of roles which can be played out between gendered parents and gendered children: mother-daughter, mother-son, father-daughter, and father-son relationships which change as the child moves through his/her "social ages" (Ribbens, 1990). Is it possible that, for some women and men, motherhood and fatherhood

may be distinct activities and identities at certain times in the cycle of parenting as well as in the cycle of a particular child's life?

Finally, while there is greater recognition of individuals' intersecting identities of class, race, sexuality, and so on, studies of men and women's household and work lives are constructed with little attention given to how the identities of particular persons actually intersect, in practice, with identifying features such as race, class, and sexuality. I would concur with the point that "gender identity cannot be adequately understood or even perceived except as a component of complex interrelationships with other systems of identification or hierarchy" (Alcoff & Potter, 1993, p. 3). I would also add, however, that these "systems of identification or hierarchy" are still seen too rigidly as race, class, sexuality, culture, and age, whereas all of these categories are not determinate in themselves but rather are made concrete, experienced, and perceived in a multitude of different ways.

Not difference, but disadvantage

The second point discussed above in "moving beyond difference and equality" is rarely considered in sociological literature on the gendered division of household labour; this is the point about the difference difference makes and whether gender differences translate into disadvantages. What difference does it make, for example, if women make the dinner and men change the oil in the car? What difference does it make if a woman spends 10 minutes a day changing nappies and a man only 3 minutes? This may seem like a minor point, but the fact is that sociological analysis in this area rarely considers such distinctions. While it is true, as Arlie Hochschild correctly points out "dinner needs to be prepared every evening around six o'clock, whereas the car oil needs to be changed every six months, any day around that time, any time that day" (Hochschild, 1989, p. 8), this distinction between routine and non-routine work varies tremendously between households according to such factors as income level, social class, and locality. In my own research, carried out in south-east England, many young couples had just bought homes which required a tremendous amount of repair, much of which fell to men because of their greater experience and acquired expertise in

this area. One of my couples complained that they both felt burdened, she by the "basics" (routine work) and he by the "specials" (the ongoing repair and maintenance to the house). Moreover, the fact that these distinctions between routine and nonroutine work are considered largely irrelevant is further evidenced by the fact that many studies in this area only look at daily routine housework and childcare related activities (e.g., Backett, 1982; Brannen & Moss, 1991).

As mentioned earlier in this section, there may be disadvantages for many women who opt for part-time work in that they are losing out on long-term earnings and better career prospects (Joshi, 1987). While the differences within household life have been held accountable for a wide range of impressively documented differences in the socioeconomic positions of women and men outside of household life, there is, however, little attention paid to the daily, weekly, monthly, and yearly layers of difference which may move and change as children grow older and as women's and men's experiences as mothers and fathers alter in relation to a wide range of indeterminate, constantly changing factors.⁹ These factors include, among others: expanding or narrowing opportunities at work (promotion, demotion, or redundancy); perceptions of their particular child or children's needs as related to the age of the child(ren), the personality and disposition of each child, availability and suitability of local childcare, and the birth of another child; a change in the child(ren)'s childcare arrangements (the loss of a childminder or nanny); a child's transition into nursery or school; and personal incidents such as illness or the death of a significant loved one. In the main, gender differences are viewed as problematic within sociological literature on gender and household labour. While some of these differences may be disadvantages, some are simply differences which are neither deficiencies nor disadvantages. In addition, there is little distinction between household leisure and work so that there is a tendency to view all activities — both work and play — which occur in the home as part of the "second shift" (Hochschild, 1989).

My empirical research uncovered several differences, some gendered and some not, which are not necessarily experienced as disadvantages. In particular, it became clear that not all household tasks are "chores" and thus are

not necessarily seen as part of the "second shift." The most obvious examples are child-care related activities which may be experienced much more as pleasures rather than as work (Boulton, 1983; Oakley, 1974). Yet, even on other routine household tasks, I was surprised at the range of differing attitudes about them expressed by women and men in my study. For example, Nick's hobby is "ironing and listening to rock music," whereas Mark tells me, quite seriously, that he does "love cleaning the toilet." Monica, who works long days, says: "I love hanging out the laundry. But I'm not usually here to do it. So when I get the chance I do it." Overall, there is a wide spectrum of feelings about housework as well represented by the divergent views from two women in my study, Marie and Charlotte. Marie reflects on employment and housework and says:

It's a pay off isn't it. You end up working and earning so that you can afford to cut the corners to carry on working. You end up working and earning to be able to buy convenience foods so you can do other things. Okay, I mean, I still wouldn't want to clean the house. It's a priority list, isn't it? You end up — well what would go first if I had less money? I think having a cleaner. It would take a long time before we'd stop having a cleaner. Because I don't want to work less hours to clean the house.

In contrast to Marie, Charlotte offers her views on the issue:

But I actually quite enjoy housework, I mean, I find it quite therapeutic after work. There's nothing like going and cleaning your bathroom after you've been talking about the latest proposal for the government on education. I quite enjoy a lot of domestic things.

Challenging the "general working and living conditions of women and men" (Bacchi, 1991, p. 83). The third point above about the need to challenge "the general working and living conditions of women and men" is now well integrated into this subject area (Brannen & Moss, 1991; Hewitt, 1993; Lewis, Izraeli, & Hootsmans, 1992). Many authors recognize

the need to rethink the place of paid work in the lives of men and women and the balance which must be struck between home and work so that men, women, and children may reap the benefits. Greater consideration is now given to the question of whether or not continuous full-time employment with career advancement as first priority is to be the norm for men and women for "48 hours for 48 weeks of 48 years"? (Coote, Harman, & Hewitt, 1990, p. 49). Or, alternatively, is work to be restructured so that employment careers can be successfully pursued following different pathways which diverge from the "traditional masculine model of employment" (Brannen & Moss, 1991, p. 259).

At another level, however, it could well be argued that much of this literature on gender divisions of household labour exhibits the more deeply rooted theoretical and methodological flaw of applying concepts, categories, and meanings derived from more "masculine" or "public life" settings and applying them to private settings such as that of household life (Edwards & Ribbens, 1991). For example, concepts such as "strategies" used to describe how men and women balance household and employment life (Brannen & Moss, 1991; Hochschild, 1989; Pahl, 1984) and time budget studies (Berk, 1985; Gershuny et al., 1986) have recently been criticised for the ways in which they do not capture the complexities, intimacies, and rhythms of household life (Davies, 1989; Edwards & Ribbens, 1991).

There are basically two outcomes which emerge from the continuing predominance of concepts and categories from "public life" settings and on-going efforts to apply such concepts to domestic life. First, there is a tendency to devalue work which occurs in the home. Second, there is still insufficient attention paid to research respondents' own perspectives and views on these issues (Doucet, in press). I address each of these points in some detail.

From what perspective? One result of the predominance of concepts and categories from "public life" settings is the continuing devaluation of what goes on inside the home. In this sense, this subject area of gender and household labour is still informed by Ann Oakley's findings made two decades ago that housework is overwhelmingly isolating, monotonous, and

oppressive (Oakley, 1974). Even more critical, however, is the devaluation of "caring work," particularly childcare so that when parents are caught in the tension between work and home, between their own needs and those of the children, these tensions are seen as having one easy solution: resolution on the side of employment and on the side of needs which are expressed outside of the home rather than fulfilled within it. Thus, "care" and "caring" work are firmly caught in an irresolvable tension between women's needs and their children's perceived needs; this is a tension which pervades the literature on women's caring work within the home. As stated by Janet Finch and Dulcie Groves over 10 years ago in their frequently cited book on elder care, there remains "a *tension* between women's economic *independence* (actual, potential, or desired) and their traditional role as front-line unpaid carers" (Finch & Groves, 1983, p. 2; my emphasis).¹⁰

This tension between work and home is often treated in a particular manner within this subject area of gender divisions of household labour. On the one hand, there is quite a strong consensus that what is desirable for improving the home — work balance for women and men is something resembling the Swedish model of favourable employment and state policies for increased maternity leave, paternity leave, universal childcare, and flexible working conditions (Melhuish & Moss, 1991). On the other hand, there is a recognition within the literature of "the down side of difference" (Rhode, 1990, p. 6) which details the pitfalls of part-time work which continues to trap women into low paid jobs leaving them little opportunity for occupational mobility and making them particularly vulnerable in cases of divorce. One side of the tension receives the greater attention within the subject area of gender and household labour. This is the latter, the "down side of difference." Thus, when women within research studies state a preference for part-time work or where women successfully negotiate favourable part-time working conditions, there is little recognition that this might possibly be something positive.

For example, Julia Brannen and Peter Moss (1991) discuss how many women in their sample of 243 mothers expressed an anxiety about the "lack of maternal care" in their children's daily lives, and the authors refer to this as "the ideological salience of giving time to children"

(Brannen & Moss, 1991, pp. 110–111). In attempting to illustrate how this ideology works, Brannen and Moss give us the words of a full time teacher who is the mother of a 3 year old:

I was wanting to change his childminder anyway (They now have a second child and the childminder was unable to have both children) . . . For various reasons actually . . . Basically (the childminder's family) are a completely different social class from us. It began to be important to me, just that he was in a more similar kind of house . . . He was beginning to watch TV an awful lot . . . Things were cropping up like racist comments . . . and the husband thought school was a total waste of time . . . And the language he was beginning to pick up! (Brannen & Moss, 1991, p. 110)

Rather than highlight this woman's expression of concern over the fact that her 3 year old is "beginning to watch TV an awful lot," is learning "that school was a total waste of time," and is hearing "racist comments" combined with fact that there is now another sibling in the childminder's house, the authors' discussion surrounding this story focuses almost exclusively on the ideological dimension of this woman's dilemma and how she, other women, and indeed their children are influenced by "the dominant construction of full-time motherhood" (Brannen & Moss, 1991, p. 111). While Brannen and Moss's analysis aptly combines material and ideological factors as explanatory variables for women's greater commitment to and responsibility for household life, there is, in my view, an unsettling sense in which they seem to belittle or dismiss these women's feelings of confusion, tension, and ambivalence about "a lack of maternal care" as they leave their young children with other carers.

Thus, one of the main weaknesses with the subject area of gender divisions of household labour is the valuing of equality, as measured by women's participation in the labour market, at the expense of a more careful appreciation of the stresses and strains of caring for young children and the differences within households over time, differences between partners, as well, and differences between households depending upon factors such as income, social

class, social networks, and numbers and ages of children. In particular, caring work which has historically been a domain symbolizing entrenched gender differences has often been devalued, underplayed, or ignored altogether. Recent research from Duncombe and Marsden has rightly pointed to "the relative invisibility of emotional housework" in this subject area as well as the "degrading of emotion work" (Duncombe & Marsden, 1993, p. 21). While other authors join Jean Duncombe and Dennis Marsden's laudable efforts in also pointing out the importance of including emotion, love, intimacy, and emotion work (in both home life and employment) as important topics for academic discussion (Hochschild, 1983; Giddens, 1992; Jackson, 1989; James, 1989), there is nevertheless still a tendency to view emotion work with partners and emotion work with children in the same category, whereas I would argue that it is important to distinguish between the two (Johnson, 1988). Lumping all "emotion work" or caring work into the realm of the "domestic domain" (James, 1989) detracts from the particularity of the parent-child relation and also limits the perspectives of the "cared for" (Barry, 1993), which, in the case of children, is a tremendously multivaried category of dependents between the ages of 0 and 18.

From whose perspective? Whereas most authors in this subject area have concentrated on pointing to the problems in women's and men's employment lives, it is equally imperative to consider how we interpret and understand women's and men's domestic lives. Attempting to address domestic lives "in their own terms" (Edwards, 1990, p. 479) entails an attention to the ways in which household lives are described and lived out. Drawing on my own research, I have found it difficult, if not impossible, to classify couples in terms normally used by authors in this area; such classifications include "traditional," "transitional," "egalitarian" (Hochschild, 1989) or "traditional," "traditional-rigid," "traditional-flexible," and "renegotiated" (Morris, 1985). I would argue that it is extremely difficult to actually define or describe an "egalitarian" couple (Hochschild, 1989) or an "actually equal sharing" (Brannen & Moss, 1991, p. 180) between women and men in relation to family work. Indeed, one of the main findings of my research is that most of the couples in this study demonstrate considerable confusion and

ambivalence over the issue of gender equality and even more so over gender differences, both in terms of just what they are and where such differences should be permitted to prevail. Just as there are varied meanings attached to household work tasks, there are diverse definitions about what it means to "share" the household work or to be an "egalitarian" couple. Although all couples in my study identify themselves "as attempting to share the work and responsibility for housework and childcare," each couple's story represents a wide range of distinct patterns of sharing related to differing ideas on both the meaning and appropriate structure for sharing the household work. In order to illustrate this point, two distinctly different examples are worth mentioning here.

The first example comes from a couple who are Elizabeth, a solicitor, and Saxon, a publisher, both in their mid-50s. They are both well aware of the role played by their respective gendered upbringing and socialisation. Thus, they are comfortable with doing different things in the household as long as there is an overall sense of sharing. They each feel that their household division of labour reflects their unique likes, dislikes, and relative competence in certain tasks. He tends to do most of the household DIY and she does most of the "kin work" (Di Leonardo, 1987), including remembering birthdays, buying birthday and Christmas presents, and organizing family gatherings. In their words:

Elizabeth: And, it *doesn't matter*, so we just let it fall as it happens. You know, if I'd felt very strongly about that, I would have pushed. If you'd felt about that very strongly you would have pushed.

Saxon: Yes that's right, you're quite right. Those are your strengths and these are my strengths and we tend to do those things and they do happen to fall into relatively conventional role models as well.

Whereas it is true that Elizabeth and Saxon are, in his words, "relatively conventional" in some aspects of their household division of labour, they also have a very "unconventional" history as regards the sharing of the household work. During their 21 years of marriage, they have both taken turns at doing flexi-time and

part-time work, and they each took time off from work to be at home, both full-time and part-time, with the children. Thus, it would be difficult to classify this household as either "traditional" or "egalitarian" given that it is actually both of these.

A second example which illustrates diversity in the meaning and structure of sharing the household work is that of Marie, a tax consultant, and Jake, an engineer. They both feel that to "share" the household work is to have both of them able to do everything. He makes curtains and bakes bread, she wires socket outlets and does plumbing work. With very few exceptions, every task can be done by either one of them. Even with regards to heavy DIY work, she insists on doing it, even if it means going a bit slower. In Marie's words:

I mean, his father's nearly sixty and he was wheeling these barrow loads of stone that I couldn't have lifted off the ground. And that's when you start to sort of realize that you *can* but it takes longer. I don't mind taking longer. I'll just do smaller barrow loads.

Nevertheless, whereas Marie and Jake have a very "egalitarian" division of labour within the household, their individual interviews with me reveal more conventional gender differences between them in terms of, for example, their commitment to paid employment, how the children had affected their work, and their social networks. Thus, although Marie and Jake are, in their household routine, very different from Elizabeth and Saxon, they also exhibit traits of both an egalitarian household with some traditional gender differences existing around the edges. Both of these couples call into question the simplicity of categories traditionally used to define and describe women's and men's household lives and labour.

In sum, then, there is a critical link between what might be termed "insider perspectives" (Bell & Ribbens, 1994) and the point made here about the need to challenge "the general living and working conditions of women and men" (Bacchi, 1991, p. 83). While arguments for the reorganization of paid work do seem to me to go some way toward recognizing and valuing the importance of activities more traditionally associated with women and the domestic sphere and, thus, gender differences, this

does not necessarily extend far enough to effectively represent domestically based experiences, activities, and perspectives.

CONCLUSIONS

Drawing from recent feminist literature which emphasises the need to "move beyond equality and difference," there are several ways in which research on gender and household labour might benefit from insights gleaned from such theoretical work. First, it is important to consider women's and men's varied and constantly changing experiences of parenthood and how the identities and activities associated with parenting actually intersect with other identities and how these alter in relation to the uneven effects of one's personal biography. In attempting to understand these differences and how they operate, it is imperative to begin with an attempt to listen to and understand women and men's lives, as far as is possible, "in their own terms" and to facilitate the greater inclusion of the what Bell and Ribbens recently term "insider perspectives" which value women and men's "own understanding of their own lives" (Bell & Ribbens, 1994). This is, thus, "a plea for sociological analysis which, when it looks at women's and men's lives in the household works outwards from the domestic instead of from the public inwards" (Edwards & Ribbens, 1991, p. 487).

Second, it remains difficult, if not impossible, to speak about equality within household life as measured by women's and men's participation in, time spent doing, or taking the responsibility for a broad range of household tasks. Gender differences in household labour and life existed for all couples in my research study. The scope and range of gender differences took on various configurations, but they nevertheless existed within all households, even those whom other authors might describe as fully "egalitarian." Thus, it would be more worthwhile to speak about gender differences and the disadvantages which follow from such differences (Rhode, 1989, 1990) rather than arguing for equality between women and men within household life. Moreover, it would be fruitful to explore questions which pay heed to the interplay between gender differences and gender equality both within and outside of household life. Can gender differences exist side by side with gender equality? Which dif-

ferences lead to disadvantages? How do differences within the household relate to inequality outside the household?

Finally, there is a crucial need to attempt to understand the processes of why and how women and men take responsibility for their children's lives, the diverse kinds of responsibility for the practical and emotional dimensions of household life, and how these responsibilities change between women and men as well as between the various ages and stages of child rearing. Laura Balbo's (1987) excellent work on women's caring and servicing work has not, in my view, been duplicated in research on households with children. Balbo, in using the metaphor of patchwork quilts, suggests "that if we study concrete descriptive evidence of how people live and their everyday coping strategies, we arrive at a more complete picture with a different message" (in Sassoon, 1987, p. 24; my emphasis). This "different message" might be the need to rethink not only who-does-what within households but also how we define, interpret, and understand various types of caring work within households with children.

ENDNOTES

1. Since the 1970s, academic studies of gender divisions of labour within the household have collected basically three major types of data: (1) time-budgets (Gershuny et al., 1986; Meissner, Humphreys, Meis, & Scheu, 1975); (2) qualitative or quantitative data on the distribution of household tasks (Jowell, Witherspoon, & Brook, 1988; Pahl, 1984); and (3) data which also includes the issue of responsibility for these same household tasks (Brannen & Moss, 1991; Hochschild, 1989; Morris, 1985). Some research has collected data on both time and tasks (Berk, 1985) or all three types of data: time, tasks, and responsibility (Brannen & Moss, 1991; Morris, 1985).
2. Studies of time use demonstrate that compared with their male partners, employed women spend up to twice as many hours per week on housework and childcare (Berardo, Shehan, & Leslie, 1987; Berk, 1985; Pleck, 1985). Data collected on survey items on gender and the distribution of household tasks suggest more promising results; women's employment does lead to men's greater involvement in household tasks (Barnett & Baruch, 1987; Brannen & Moss, 1991; Pahl, 1984; Ross, 1987). However, men tend to be more involved in the more pleasurable, leisurely childcare tasks such as outings to the park or the movies rather than the more routine daily household tasks (Barnett & Baruch, 1987; Hochschild, 1989; Wheelock, 1990). Finally, a multitude of studies have confirmed that women retain responsibility for household matters. They are the managers, planners, organisers, and supervisors of housework and childcare-related activities in the home (Barnett & Baruch, 1987; Brannen & Moss, 1991;

- Haas, 1981; Hochschild, 1989; Jowell, Witherspoon, & Brook, 1988; Moen, 1989; Morris, 1990).
3. In addition to sharing housework equally, Hochschild writes that the "pure egalitarian, as the type emerges here wants to identify with the same spheres her husband does, and to have an equal amount of power in the marriage" (Hochschild, 1989, p. 15).
 4. Of the 23 couples (66 individuals) that I interviewed, 65 persons were White, 2 were of Asian origin (from India), and 1 was Spanish.
 5. Whereas some authors emphasise how feminist debates around equality and difference centre around the end goal of feminist struggles (Phillips, 1991), others have pointed out that the two conceptions of gender equality and gender difference reflect a debate over strategy rather than any disagreement about feminism's ultimate goal since in either conception, "the goal of feminism is for women to be in some way the same as men, whether this sameness be interpreted as identical treatment or as access to the same opportunities" (Jagger, 1990; p. 250).
 6. For example, "Some advocates of sexual difference favour the ideal of a dual world containing both masculine and feminine values and institutions. Others reject the view that the expression of female difference either would or should result in a cultural or political dualism of this sort" (Bock & James, 1992; p. 4).
 7. For example, there is a distinct concept of sexual difference developed in Italian feminist thought (Bock & James, 1992; Bono & Kemp, 1991; Cavarero, 1993; Kemp & Bono, 1993). Due to its particular historical, cultural, and institutional background, Italian feminists maintain their distinctiveness from British and American feminist thought and "insist more vehemently than other strands of feminist thought on the view that all traditional discourses about women, most particularly those which hold out a promise of equality, contain a male bias. Nor does it regard it as sufficient to uncover the bias in dominant ideals of equality and then put the problem aside" (Bock & James, 1992; p. 6).
 8. There has, however, been an increasing body of research on working class households (Ferre, 1987; Morris, 1985) various ethnic groups (McAdoo, 1988; Mirande, 1988); the work-home balance for single parents (Graham, 1987); nonheterosexual couples (Bozett, 1985, 1988; Shulenburg, 1985); as well as the contributions of older children in the household to household labour (Goodnow, 1989; Morrow, 1992; Solbert, 1988).
 9. Moreover, it is worth mentioning that there is scant attention paid to the possible disadvantages incurred by men as a result of gender differences both within and outside the home; for example, the constant responsibility of being the household breadwinner, less flexibility of lifestyle and labour force participation, low social resources such as limited social networks in old age.
 10. Another excellent example of such an effort is Finch and Mason's recent work which attempts to describe the nature of "kin responsibilities" (Finch & Mason, 1993).

REFERENCES

- Alcoff, Linda, & Potter, Elizabeth. (1993). Introduction: When feminisms intersect epistemology. In Linda Alcoff & Elizabeth Potter (Eds.), *Feminist epistemologies* (pp. 1-14). London and New York: Routledge.

- Bacchi, Carol Lee. (1990). *Same difference: Feminism and sexual difference*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Bacchi, Carol Lee. (1991). Pregnancy, the law and the meaning of equality. In Elizabeth Meehan & Selma Sevenhuijsen (Eds.), *Equality, politics and gender* (pp. 71–87). London: Sage.
- Backett, Kathryn. (1982). *Mothers and fathers: A study of the development and negotiation of parental behaviour*. London and Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Balbo, Laura. (1987). Crazy quilts: Rethinking the welfare state debate from a woman's point of view. In Anne Showstack Sassoon (Ed.), *Women and the State* (pp. 45–71). London: Unwin Hyman.
- Barnett, Rosalind C., & Baruch, Grace K. (1987). Determinants of father's participation in family work. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 49, 29–40.
- Barnett, Rosalind C., & Baruch, Grace K. (1988). Correlates of father's participation in family work. In P. Bronstein & P. C. Cowen (Eds.), *Fatherhood today: Men's changing role in the family* (pp. 66–78). New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Barry, Jackie. (1993). *Contexts of care*. Paper presented to the Women's Workshop on Qualitative Family/Household Research.
- Bell, Linda, & Ribbens, Jane. (1994). Isolated housewives and complex maternal worlds — the significance of social contacts between women with young children in industrial societies. *Sociological Review*, 42, 227–262.
- Berardo, Donna H., Shehan, Constance, & Leslie, Gerald R. (1987). A residue of tradition: Jobs, careers and spouses' time in housework. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 49, 381–390.
- Berk, Sarah F. (1985). *The gender factory: The apportionment of work in American households*. New York: Plenum.
- Berryman, Julia. (1991). Perspectives on later motherhood. In Ann Phoenix, Anne Woollett, & Eva Lloyd (Eds.), *Motherhood: Meanings, practices and ideologies*. London: Sage.
- Bird, Gloria W., Bird, Gerald A., & Scruggs, Marguerite (1984). Determinants of family task sharing: A study of husbands and wives. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 46, May, 345–382.
- Bock, Gisela. (1992). Equality and difference in nationalist socialist racism. In Gisela Bock & Susan James (Eds.), *Beyond equality and difference: Citizenship, feminist politics and female subjectivity* (pp. 89–109). London and New York: Routledge.
- Bock, Gisela, & James, Susan (Eds.). (1992). *Beyond equality and difference: Citizenship, feminist politics and female subjectivity*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bono, Paola, & Kemp, Sandra (Eds.). (1991). *Italian feminist thought: A reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Boulton, Mary Georgina. (1983). *On being a mother*. London: Tavistock.
- Bozett, Frederick W. (1985). *Gay men as fathers*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Bozett, Frederick W. (1988). Gay fatherhood. In Phyllis Bronstein & Carolyn P. Cowan (Eds.), *Fatherhood today: Men's changing role in the family* (pp. 214–235). New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Braidotti, Rosi. (1991). Introduction: Dutch treats and other strangers — reading Dutch feminism. In Joke J. Hermesen & Alkeline van Lenning (Eds.; translated by Anne Lavelle), *Sharing the difference: Feminist debates in Holland* (pp. 1–16). London and New York: Routledge.
- Brannen, Julia, & Moss, Peter. (1987). Fathers and employment. In Charles Lewis & Margaret O'Brien (Eds.), *Reassessing fatherhood* (pp. 36–53). London: Sage.
- Brannen, Julia, & Moss, Peter. (1991). *Managing mothers: Dual earner households after maternity leave*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Bronstein, Phyllis & Cowan, Carolyn P. (Eds.). (1988). *Fatherhood today: Men's changing role in the family*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Cavarero, Adriana. (1993). Towards a theory of sexual differences. In Sandra Kemp & Paola Bono (Eds.), *The lonely mirror: Italian perspectives in feminist theory* (pp. 189–221). London and New York: Routledge.
- Chodorow, Nancy. (1978). *The reproduction of mothering*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Coote Anne, Harman, Harriet, & Hewitt, Patricia. (1990). *The family way: A new approach to policy-making* (Social Policy Paper No. 1). London: Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR).
- Crouter, Ann (1984). Spill-over from family to work: The neglected side of the work-family interface. *Human Relations*, 37, 425–442.
- Davies, Karin. (1989). *Women and time: Weaving the strands of everyday life*. Sweden: University of Lund.
- Di Leonardo, M. (1987). The female world of cards and holidays: Women, families, and the world of kinship. *Signs*, 12(3), 440–453.
- Dinnerstein, Dorothy. (1978). *The rocking of the cradle, and the ruling of the world*. London: Souvenir Press.
- Doucet, Andrea. (1995). *Gender differences, gender equality and care: Towards understanding gendered labour in British dual earner households*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, University of Cambridge.
- Doucet, Andrea. (in press). Encouraging voices: Towards more creative methods for collecting data on gender and household labour. In Lydia Morris & Stina Lyons (Eds.), *Gender relations in public and private: Changing research perspectives*. London: Macmillan.
- Duncombe, Jean, & Marsden, Dennis. (1993). Love and intimacy: The gender division of emotion and 'emotion work'. *Sociology*, 27(2), 221–241.
- Edwards, Rosalind. (1990). Connecting method and epistemology: A white woman interviewing black women. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 13, 477–490.
- Edwards, Rosalind, & Ribbens, Jane. (1991). Meanderings around 'strategy': A research note on strategic discourse in the lives of women. *Sociology*, 25, 477–489.
- Ehrensaft, Diane. (1987). *Parenting together: Men and women sharing the care of their children*. London: Collier Macmillan Publishers.
- Evetts, Julia (1988). Managing childcare and work responsibilities: The strategies of married women: Primary and infant teachers. *The Sociological Review*, 36(3), 503–531.
- Ferree, Myra Mart (1987). Family and job for working-class women: Gender and class systems seen from below. In Naomi Gestel & Harriet E. Gross (Eds.), *Families and work*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Finch, Janet, & Groves, Dulcie. (1983). *A labour of love: Women, work and caring*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Finch, Janet, & Mason, Jennifer. (1993). *Negotiating family responsibilities*. London: Routledge.

- Flax, Jane. (1992). Beyond equality: Gender, justice and difference. In Gisela Bock & Susan James (Eds.), *Beyond equality and difference: Citizenship, feminist politics and female subjectivity* (pp. 193–210). London and New York: Routledge.
- Gershuny, J. I., Miles, I., Jones, S., Mullins, C., Thomas, G., & Wyatt, S. M. E. (1986). Preliminary analysis of the 1983/4 ESRC Time-Budget Data. *Quarterly Journal of Social Affairs*, 2, 13–39.
- Giddens, Anthony. (1992). *The transformation of intimacy: Love, sexuality eroticism in modern societies*. Oxford: Polity.
- Gilligan, Carol. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Goodnow, Jacqueline (1989). Work in households: An overview and three studies. In D. Ironmonger (Ed.), *Households work*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.
- Graham, Hilary. (1983). Caring: A labour of love. In Janet Finch & Dulcie Groves (Eds.), *A labour of love: Women, work and caring*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Graham, Hilary. (1987). Being poor: Perceptions and coping strategies of lone mothers. In Julia Brannen & Gail Wilson (Eds.), *Give and take in families: Studies in resource distribution*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Graham, Hilary. (1991). The concept of caring in feminist research: The case of domestic service. *Sociology*, 25, 61–78.
- Haas, Linda. (1981). Domestic role sharing in Sweden. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 43, 957–967.
- Hartsock, Nancy C. M. (1983). *Money, sex, and power: Toward a feminist historical materialism*. New York: Longman.
- Hewitt, Patricia. (1993). *About time: The revolution in work and family life*. London: IPPR/Rivers Oram Press.
- Hochschild, Arlie R. (1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling*. London: University of California Press.
- Hochschild, Arlie R. (1989). *The second shift*. New York: Avon Books.
- Jackson, Stevi. (1989). Even sociologist fall in love: An exploration in the sociology of emotion. *Sociology*, 27(2), 201–220.
- Jaggar, Alison M. (1990). Sexual difference and sexual equality. In Deborah L. Rhode (Ed.), *Theoretical perspectives on sexual difference*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- James, Nicky. (1989). Emotional labour: Skill and work in the social regulation of feelings. *Sociological Review*, 37, 15–42.
- Johnson, Miriam, M. (1988). *Strong mothers, weak wives: The search for gender inequality*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Joshi, Heather. (1987). The cost of caring. In Caroline Glendinning & Jane Millar (Eds.), *Women and poverty in Britain*. London: Wheatsheaf Books.
- Jowell, Roger, Witherspoon, Sue, & Brook, Lindsay (Eds.). (1988). *British social attitudes: The fifth report*. Hants: Gower Publishing Company Ltd.
- Kemp, Sandra, & Bono, Paola (Eds.). (1993). *The lonely mirror: Italian perspectives on feminist theory*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Kimball, G. (1988). *50/50 parenting: Sharing family rewards and responsibilities*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Komter, Aafke. (1991) The construction of dilemmas in feminism. In Joke J. Hermesen & Alkeline van Lenning (Eds.; translated by Anne Lavelle), *Sharing the difference: Feminist debates in Holland* (pp. 46–61). London and New York: Routledge.
- Lewis, Suzan, Izraeli, Dafna N., & Hootsmans, Helen. (1992). *Dual-earner families: International perspectives*. London: Sage.
- McAdoo, J. L. (1988). Changing perspectives on the role of the black father. In Phyllis Bronstein & Carolyn P. Cowan (Eds.), *Fatherhood today: Men's changing role in the family* (pp. 79–92). New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Meehan, Elizabeth, & Sevenhuijsen, Selma. (Eds.). (1991). *Equality, politics and gender*. London: Sage.
- Meijer, Irene C. (1991). Which difference makes the difference? On the conceptualization of sexual difference. In Joke J. Hermesen & Alkeline van Lenning (Eds.; translated by Anne Lavelle), *Sharing the difference: Feminist debates in Holland* (pp. 32–45). London and New York: Routledge.
- Meissner, M., Humphreys, S. M., Meis, M., & Scheu, W. J. (1975). No exit For wives: Sexual division of labour and the cumulation of household demands. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 12(4), 424–439.
- Melhuish, Edward, & Moss, Peter. (Eds.). (1991). *Day care for young children: International perspectives*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Mirande, A. (1988). Chicano fathers: Traditional perceptions and current realities. In Phyllis Bronstein & Carolyn P. Cowan (Eds.), *Fatherhood today: Men's changing role in the family* (pp. 93–106). New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Moen, Phyllis. (1989). *Working parents: Transformation in gender roles and public policies in Sweden*. London: Adamantine Press.
- Morris, Lydia. (1985). Renegotiation of the domestic division of labour. In Bryan Roberts et al. (Eds.), *New approaches to economic life* (pp. 400–416). Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Morris, Lydia. (1990). *The workings of the household*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Morrow, Virginia. (1992). *Family values: Accounting for children's contribution to the domestic economy* (Working Paper No. 10. Working paper series). Cambridge: Sociological Research Group, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, University of Cambridge.
- O'Donnell, Lydia. (1985). *The unheralded majority: Contemporary women as mothers*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Oakley, Ann. (1974). *Housewife*. London: Allen Lane.
- Offen, Karen. (1992). Defining feminism: A comparative historical approach. In Gisela Bock & Susan James (Eds.), *Beyond equality and difference: Citizenship, feminist politics and female subjectivity*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Pahl, Ray E. (1984). *Divisions of labour*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Pleck, Joseph H. (1985). *Working wives, working husbands*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Phillips, Ann. (1991). *Engendering democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Phoenix, Ann (1991). *Young mothers?* Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Phoenix, Ann, Woollett Anne, & Lloyd, Eva. (Eds.). (1991). *Motherhood: Meanings, practices and ideologies*. London: Sage.

- Rhode, Deborah L. (1989). *Justice and gender: Sex discrimination and the law*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Rhode, Deborah L. (Ed.). (1990). *Theoretical perspectives on sexual difference*. London: Yale University Press.
- Rhode, Deborah L. (1992). The politics of paradigms: Gender difference and gender disadvantage. In Gisela Bock & Susan James (Eds.), *Beyond equality and difference: Citizenship, feminist politics and female subjectivity*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Ribbens, Jane. (1990). *Accounting for our children: Differing perspectives on 'family life' in middle income households*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. London: CNAA/South Bank Polytechnic.
- Rich, Adrian. (1976). *Of woman born*. New York: W.W. Norton Co. Inc.
- Ross, Catherine E. (1987). The division of labour at home. *Social Forces*, 65, 816–833.
- Rothman, Barbara Katz (1989). Women as fathers: Motherhood and child care under a modified patriarchy. *Gender and Society*, 3(1), 89–104.
- Ruddick, Sara. (1989). *Maternal thinking: Towards a politics of peace*. New York: Ballantine.
- Sassoon, Anne Showstack. (1987). Introduction: The personal and the intellectual, fragments and order, international trends and national specificities. In Anne Showstack Sassoon (Ed.), *Women and the state* (pp. 13–42). London: Unwin Hyman.
- Scott, Joan W. (1988). *Gender and the politics of history*. New York: Colombia University Press.
- Scott, Joan W. (1990). Deconstructing equality-versus-difference: Or, the uses of poststructuralist theory for feminism. In Marianne Hirsch & Evelyn Fox Keller (Eds.), *Conflicts in feminism* (pp. 134–148). New York and London: Routledge.
- Shulenburg, J. (1985). *Gay parenting*. New York: Doubleday.
- Solberg, Ann. (1988, July). *The everyday life of Norwegian children*. Paper presented to the Third International Workshop: The Ethnography of Childhood, Cambridge.
- Wheelock, Jane. (1990). *Husbands at home: The domestic economy in a postindustrial society*. London: Routledge.
- Young, Iris Marion. (1984). Is male gender identity the cause of male domination? In Joyce Trebilcock (Ed.), *Mothering: Essays in feminist theory* (pp. 129–146). Totowa, NJ: Roman and Allanheld.
- Young, Iris Marion. (1990). *Throwing like a girl and other essays in feminist philosophy and theory*. Bloomington and Indiana: Indiana University Press.